THE

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLĀM
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

P. 13, Bibliography art. Ecua, l. 3, read: "ii. i. p. 58" for "ii. 58"; ibid., l. 4, read: "Nahr Sis (I. Shōb = Guadajoe)" for "a Nahr Šūs"; ibid., l. 6, add: Dā'irat al-Ma‘ārif, iii. 679 sqq. (Oshūna [Lisbon] I. Oshūna = Osuna).

P. 30a, Bibliography of the art. Eritrea, add: Quirino Maio, La Colonia Eritrea, Torino 1891; Nicoletti Altimari, Da Asis a Casalà, Rome 1893; Anonymus, Tre Anni in Eritrea, Milano 1901; Penne, Per l'Italia africana, Rome 1906.


P. 102a, l. 28, add: Cf. Evaristo Carusi, Sui Rapporti fra Diritto romano e Diritto musulmano (Estratto degli Atti della Società italiana per il Progresso delle Scienze, Siena 1913, viii., Riunioni), Rome 1913.

P. 104a, l. 42, read: "three" instead of "two"; l. 43, add: the edition of the Risāla forming the introduction of the Kitāb al-‘Umm, ed. Bālābāl 1312.


P. 191a, l. 1, read: "reliable" instead of "reliable".

P. 192b, l. 31, l. 7 a. f., read: "known" instead of "know".


P. 211a, l. 11 a. f., read: "fol. 153v" instead of "fol. 135v".

P. 211b, l. 20, read: "1553" instead of "1559"; l. 21, read: "1736" instead of "1876"; ult., read: "792" instead of "733".


P. 258a, Art. Ḥandūs, l. 7, read: "Ḥandūsīya" instead of "Ḥandūsīya"; l. 21, read: "Berbères" instead of "Bérères".

P. 366b, l. 15, 25, 28, 30, 36, read: "Musailima" instead of "Musailama"; l. 23, 35, read: "al-Radjudjāl b. Unfuwa" instead of "Radjudjāl b. Unfuwa".
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

P. 262b, l. 20, read: "Note 1" instead of "Note 19".
P. 265a, l. 8, read: "kəʾimmakām" instead of "kəʾimmakām"; l. 33 a. f., read: "Makrami" instead of "Maqrami".
P. 266a, Art. ʿHĀBE, Bibliography, add: Schwarzlose, Die Waffen der alten Araber, see Index.
P. 267a, l. 18, read: "Barghāl" instead of "Barghāl".
P. 269a, l. 5, read: "125", "1" instead of "125", "9".
P. 270a, l. 4, read: "dʾAlcandetē" instead of "dʾAlcandetē".
P. 281b, Bibliography, l. 14, read: "dʾAlcandetē" instead of "dʾAlcandetē"; add: Berbrugger, Les épisodes militaires de la grande Kabylie, Alger 1897, p. 79 sqq.
P. 282b, l. 17, add: Vaudal, Le pacha Bonneval, Paris 1885, p. 52—60.
P. 286b, l. 19, read: "MANT" instead of "AL-MANĀF".
P. 288b, l. 29, read: "Tabarca" instead of "Tabacco".
P. 290a, l. 15 a. f., add: (cf. R. Basset, Notes sur les Mille et une Nuits, iii., Rev. des Traditions populaires, 1897, p. 146—152).
P. 290b, l. 7, add: The romance was published in Tatar Kazan 1867; l. 15, add: Three chapters of a Malay adaptation of this romance have been edited (without mention of MSS.) and translated by P. P. Roorda van Eysinga (Tjurīṭaśa dari pada ṣevang bhrīnam Hatim Tayi in Uitrekeels uit Maleische Geschiedenis, p. 261 sqq., appendix to his Maleisch en Nederduitsch Woordenboek, Batavia 1824—1825; Dutch transl., in De Oosterling, 1835, i. 352 sqq.; cf. also J. J. de Hollander, Handeling bij de boevingen der Maleishe taal en letterkunde, Breda 1893, 6th ed., p. 68—116). A MS. of the Malay version is found in Paris (A. Cabaton, Catal. somm. des MSS., indio-polynésiens, p. 227, No. 61, ii.); l. 28, add: cf. also R. Basset, Bibliogr. des auteurs arabes, extr. des Annales universit. de l’Algérie, sept.—déc., 1913, p. 2.
P. 295b, l. 5—6, read: "Muṣṭalāh" instead of "Mūṣṭalāh".
P. 299a, Art. ḤEKŠ, l. 6—7, read: "Muṣallā" instead of "Maṣallā".
P. 299b, l. 6, read: "Kādjar" instead of "Kādjar".
P. 307a, l. 17 a. f., add: G. Marçais, Les Arabes en Barbery, Constantine 1913, 1st partie, Ch. i.
P. 313a, l. 7 a. f., add: Garcin de Tassy, Hist. de la littér. hindoue et hindoustanî, Paris 1807, vol. i., Introd.
P. 314a, l. 16—17, read: "Mohan Lal" instead of "Mohanhal".
P. 320a, l. 15, add: see also Max von Berchem, Voyage en Syrie, Cairo 1915, p. 335 sqq.
P. 320b, l. 6 and 27, read: "Wellsted" instead of "Wellsted"; ult., read: "Ortokuśi" instead of "Urukūsūl".
P. 396b, l. 39, add: Besides the works quoted in the article: Bargès, Complément de l’histoire des Beni Zeiyān, Paris 1887, p. 205—217.
P. 397a, l. 21, add: R. Basset, Notice sommaire des mss. orientaux de deux bibliothèques de Lisseboune, Lissabon 1894, p. 4—6.
P. 400a, l. 3, add: cf. also Dozy, Recerches, i. 21—40.
P. 411a, l. 9, add: cf. J. Tkač, Čiër den araban, Kommentar des Averroes zur Poetik des Aristoteles, in Wiener Studien, xxiv. 70 sqq.
P. 414b, l. 25 a. f., add: R. Basset, Mélanges africains et orientaux, Paris 1915, Ch. vii.
P. 417b, l. 24, read: “xvii.” instead of “xviii.”.
P. 424a, l. 29, add: On Ibn al-Ṭīṭākā, cf. also the observation by Mirzā Muḥammad Kazwīnī in the Persian introduction to his edition of Djuwaini’s Tarīkh-i Djaḥān-gūstā, i. (G. M., xvi.), 34 sq. (see also Kit. Umḍat al-Ṭālib fī Anṣāb Aḥ Āḥ Ṭālib, Bombay 1318, p. 159 sq.). According to the same author, ibid., p. 14, the proper title of the Kitāb al-Fakhrī is Munyat al-Fadlā fī Tawārīkh al-Khulafa’ of which the history of the “Abbāsids by Hindūshāh b. Saḥīr, entitled: Kitāb Tadjāriḥ al-Salaf, is an enlarged Persian translation. The Bibl. Nat. of Paris possesses a defective manuscript of the latter work (N°. 373 in Blochet, Catal. des Ms. persans, i. 251), but several copies exist in ʻEṭerān.

P. 426a, l. 10, read: “Asafū” instead of “Asafīr”.
P. 447a, l. 18 a. f., read: “Abū l-Nāṣir” instead of “Abū Nahṣim”.
P. 491b, l. 10 a. f., read: “al-Ālamgirīya” instead of “al-Ālamgīrī”.
P. 560b, l. 30 a. f.: The equation is to be read as follows:

$$2.97 \times 6 + 2 \times \frac{2.07}{6} = 18.81 = 4.72 \times 4 = 18.81$$

P. 563a, l. 18 a. f., read: “iṭṭāḥad” instead of “iṭṭāḥad”.
P. 566b, l. 8 a. f., read: “329 sq.” instead of “322”.
P. 590b, l. 24 a. f., read: “ma’mūr” instead of “ma’mūr”.
P. 592a, l. 17, add: Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Le pélerinage à la Mekke, Paris 1923.
P. 594b, l. 24 a. f., add: E. Chantre, Recherches anthropologiques au Caucase, Lyon 1885—1887.
P. 601a, l. 5, read: “lamghār” instead of “amrur”.
P. 613b, l. 8 a. f., read: “162 sq.” instead of “1623”.
P. 617b, l. 29 a. f., read: “des” instead of “der”; l. 2 a. f., read: “süülichen” instead of “süüliche”.
P. 618a, l. 20 a. f., read: “Drewnestei” instead of “Drewnestei”; l. 9 a. f., read: “Winogradow, Föderisius” instead of “Minogradow, Föderisius”.
P. 796b, Art. KAMI, l. 18, read: “vowel” instead of “consonant”.
P. 730b, Art. ʻARA DENIZ, l. 26 sq., read: “ed. Société géographique de Paris, 1839, mare Ponti quod vulgariter Marc Majus appellant”.
P. 787b, l. 27 ab infra, read: “mafʻūlan” instead of “mafʻūltun”.
P. 884b, l. 21—22, read: “In November 1922 Turkey abolished the Sultanate and on October 30, 1923, declared itself a Republic”.
P. 885b, fin., add: Orientale Moderno, Rome 1922 sq.
P. 1059b, l. 18, read: “Köprüşu”, instead of “Köprüşuya”.
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EBU, the Ottoman-Turkish pronunciation of Abū [q. v., i. 734 et seq.]

ÉCija, the capital of a district in the eastern province of Seville in Spain with 25,000 inhabitants, is picturesquely situated on the left bank of the lower course of the Genil, which is navigable below it, in a torrid valley, — whence it is called el Sairen de España "the bakehouse of Spain"; its streets are narrow and its church towers (formerly minarets) covered with azulejos. It is the ancient Iberian Astigi of which the Arabs made Isti'ja, Esti'ja (rarely Esti'ja in this period) whence is derived the Spanish Écija (st > c, z, as in Basile, Basta, Baza; Caesaraugusta, Sáragosa, Zaragoza; Mustá'rab, Mozárab etc., cf. Grüber, Grandes de los Romanos y Filipíneos, i. p. 520). After the battle of Laguna de la Janda in 711, the Roman Colonia Julia Augusta Firma, one of the four conventus juridici of the Provincia Baetica and the Gothic see of Astigi was forced to conditional surrender by Tāriq after a siege of a month; in the history of the Arab period it played an important part, particularly as the northwestern stronghold of the renegade 'Omar Ibn Ibaṣīn [q. v. and the article IBAZISTO, i. 736]; in his long rebellion, till the town was taken in 891 by Emir 'Abd Allāh of Córdoba [cf. the article CARNOTA, i. 829]. It had always a large Mozárab community, was taken in 1242 by Ferrándiz of Castile, and reoccupied with Christians in 1262 by Alfonso X the Wise after the expulsion of the Moors. In 1402 it was made a city (ciudad) by Henry III and throughout the history of the kingdom of Granada it plays an important part as one of the frontier fortresses of Castile as it did at a later period again in the war of the Spanish Succession and the Peninsular War.

Bibliography: Yakût, Mā'djam, i. 168; Dimishkî (ed. Mehran), p. 35, 232 et seq.; Ibn Duckmāk, Kitāb al-Intiṣār, v. 29; Ibn al-Dīfān, al-Talḥa; al-Samawi, p. 191; Makrīzī, Khiṣāf, i. 237; d'Anville, Mémoires sur l'Égypte ancienne et moderne, p. 209; Quatremère, Mémoires, i. 44; All Bābā Mubārak; al-Khiṣāf al-Qadīd, viii. 44 et seq.; Amelineau, Géographie de l'Égypte; Boinet Bey, Dictionnaire géographique de l'Égypte; Maspero, Egyptische Kunstgeschichte (German edition of Steinor); Baedeker, Ägypten I, p. 330. (E. Graef.)

EDIRNE (Gr. Εδερνοντικός, Engl. Adrianople, Fr. Andrinople, in Idrisi, transl. Jaubert, ii. 383) was taken from the Byzantines in 763 = 1362 with the surrounding country by the Ottomans under Murād I. The Turkish sources give 761, 762 and 763 A.H. as the date of its capture and the statements of western writers on the point are equally divergent and indefinite; Jirecek in his Geschichte der Bulgaren, p. 328, decided on 1363 but Murād I's letter on his victory of the beginning of Dhu l-Ka'da 763 = end of August 1362 in Feridūn, Mumshiyāti Sulṭānīf, i. 91 et seq., suggests 763 = 1362 as the date; cf. v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Ott. Reiches, i. 163 et seq.; Zinkeisen, i. 218—221; Gibbon (ed. Bury), vii. 31.

The city picturesquely situated on an elevation at the confluence of the Maritsa, Arda and Tandja in the centre of a fertile depression, had been strongly fortified against Bulgar invasion in the later years of the Byzantine Empire; Murād I made it the European residence (mādīm) of the
Sultans — 768 A. H. is the year given. During the wars of succession between the sons of Bâyazid I, Mr. Suleimân Çelebi and, after his death, Mûsa Çelebi continued to use it as such. Even after the conquest of Constantinople (1453) it continued to be the second residence while Brusa fell completely into the background. The Sultans stayed there regularly for longer or shorter periods with the whole court and government, notably before the campaigns against Austria and the Poland but also for the sake of the hunting there. From Ahmed I’s reign (beginning of the xvith century) Adrianople became the favourite residence of the Sultans: Mehmed IV (1648—1687) spent the greater part of his reign in Adrianople; in Mustafa II’s reign (1695—1703) the Sultan’s lengthened stay in Adrianople led to a revolt of the Janissaries and to his deposition. Henceforth Adrianople was only visited occasionally by the Sultans and in the course of the xvith century it was gradually abandoned as a royal residence. During the Russo-Turkish wars of the xith century, Adrianople was twice occupied by the Russians, in 1829 from the 20th August—20th November and in 1878 from the 20th January to the end of March. The government of Adrianople was in earlier times (till 1826) in the hands of the Bostândjibashi [q. v., i. 766]. Justice was administered by a Mulla Kâdi of high rank. After the administrative reforms Adrianople became the capital of the vilayet of the same name and in 1911 the head-quarters of the Fourth army corps (kol onu), On the 25th March 1913 the town was captured by the Bulgarians after a siege of five months.

Adrianople was for long of great importance under Turkish rule not only as a royal residence and military centre but also as a commercial town; in the xith century the original Greek population was joined by numerous Jewish emigrants from Spain, Armenians, Ruggans and other foreigners who carried on trade with the west.

The city grew considerably; the old Byzantine fortified town (the so-called warach) remained to the Greeks, Armenians, Jews and Franks while the Turks settled outside the walls. In 1850 there were over 30,000 hearths, i.e. about 150,000 inhabitants; with the retirement of the Sultans from Adrianople began the gradual decline of the city; about the time of the Russo-Turkish war of 1828—1829 the population was estimated at 80,000—90,000 of whom 50% were Turks, 33% Greeks and Bulgars, and the remaining Jews, Armenians and Franks. The number has since risen to somewhat over 100,000.

From the time of the sons of Bâyazid to the reign of Murâd IV (the middle of the xiiith century) and for a brief period again under Mustafa II (1675—1703), Adrianople was one of the mints of the Ottoman Empire.

The splendid monuments of architecture in the city date from its period of greatest prosperity in the xith and xiiith centuries. Of Byzantine buildings there have survived the ruins of a church called Aya Sofâa. The ancient quadrangular fortress had four huge round towers at the corners and twelve square towers in each wall. Nine gates are mentioned, viz.: Kul Kupası, Top K., Kafes (Kafestî) K., also called Mihal K., Köcedilir or Kazandjilir K., Oğrâin (Eger) K., Manis K., Taşk K., Indilir or Stamûli K., Orta K. (according to Enis al-Mustâmirîn; cf. Niebuhr, Reisen, i. 164). The number of gates and their names in Enïylla, iii. 428 and v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Osman. R., vi. 700 differ from these. The Porte Triomphale illustrated in Sayger-Desarnod is probably identical with the German K. in Djewri, p. 6 et seq.

The New Imperial Palace on an island formed by the Tundja was built by Mehemmed II in 1452 and Selim I (1512—1520); later Sultans added individual kiosks and other buildings. By the beginning of the xiiith century it had begun to fall into decay; in 1829 the peace with Russia was signed there; on the 17th January 1858 the Turkish troops retreating before the Russians blew up the main buildings. The outlook tower dating from the xiiith century still remains. We infer from the accounts of European travellers of the xiiith and beginning of the xiiith centuries, that the Serai was similarly planned to the Old Serai of Topkapı in Constantinople, cf. the last account in v. Molte, Briefe aus der Türkei, 6 th ed., p. 150. According to Ewliya the New Serai occupied the hunting-ground of the Greek emperors: as a matter of fact the site does seem identical with the "meadows of Commen" on the Tundja where in 1337 the wedding of the Bulgar Crown-Prince Michael to a Byzantine princess was celebrated (Kantakuzen, Hist., i. 508). — The Old Serai lay near the Selimye on the "planetree square" (Kazâk Meidâni) and is said to have been built by Murâd I in 757 A. H. (according to others in 820 A. H. by Mehemmed I); it was afterwards — according to Ewliya in the reign of Suleimân I — adopted as barracks for the 'Ademogloah, like similar buildings elsewhere (the Galata Serai, the Serai in Brusa, etc.) and is known to have been used as such to the end of the xiiith century.

The Mosques. The old buildings were apparently left to the Christians at the conquest with the exception of the Çelebi Djami, which is considered the oldest mosque; another mosque, the Kilitse Djami, situated like the preceding within the walls, with a central octagonal fountain, was turned into a mosque by Mehemmed II. Gülşah in 1578 counted 15 Greek churches.

The oldest mosque is that of Bâyazid Yildırım also called Kupeli Djami, near the Mihal bridge on the Maritta; 792 is given by Hadidji Khalifa, Ta'kvim, as the date of its erection while the author of the Enîs al-Mustâmirîn gives 802 A. H.; Ewîliya says it was completed by Mehemmed Çelebi.

The second oldest mosque is the "Old Djami" (Ensi Djami, formerly also called Ulû Djami), begun by Mr. Suleiman Çelebi, continued by his brother Mustafa and completed by Mehemmed I, though some authorities say it was only finished by Murâd II; it was burned down on the 14th Redžeb 1159 (30th July 1746) and restored the following year.

Murâd II built three mosques, the largest of which was the Üc Sherfeli, so called from the three balconies on two of its four minarets; it took ten years (841—851 A. H.) to build (Enîs al-Mustâmirîn). The same Sultan built the Dâr al-Hâdith Djami in 838 A. H., in the forecourt of which is the mausoleum of the two princes Hasan and Orkhan, sons of Murâd II, and a year later (839) the Murâdije, originally a Mewlewî monastery.

From this earlier period the following mosques also date:

1. Eṣba (Ar’isha) Kadin Djami, on the
road to Stambul, built in 825 by ʿAlī ʿl-Sūltān, daughter of Mehmed II. 2. Kōdji Elyās at the gate Kafeskapou, dating from 825 H.; 3. the mosque of Mihālheg on the Tundja, hospital and poor-kitchen, dating from 825 H.; 4. the Beilerbei Djamī, dating from 832 H., as well as the mosque of Sarūjian Pasha, which is well-known because the head of the Grand Vizier Kārā Mustafā who was executed after the unsuccessful siege of Vienna in 1683, is buried there.

In the reign of Mehmed II there were built: the Selim Čeľebi Djamī (in 867, or 873 A.H.), the Sultan Djamī, founded by Sitti Sultan, wife of the Sultan, in 877 H., the mosque at the Zāwūj of Sādiķedec (882 A.H.), and the mosque of Djezeri Čāсим Pasha (883 H.). Bāyāzid I built the mosque, which bears his name, on the bank of the Tundja during the years 889—893 (1484—1488); it was particularly celebrated for its splendid philanthropic endowments (medrese, hospital and asylum, poor-kitchen) and is therefore sometime also called Yeni ʿImāret Djamī. His Vizier Sulejmān Pasha founded another mosque near the “New Bridge”. In the reign of Selim I, Lari Čeľebi built a mosque in 920 ʿA.H.; Sulejmān I built the mosque attached to the Zāwūj of Şūdja and the Taşālīk Djamī, the latter being one of the famous Sinān’s works.

The most celebrated building in Adrianople, the Sultan Bayazid mosque was built for Selim II in 976—982 (1568—1574) by the architect Sinān, who describes it as his greatest masterpiece by which he surpassed even Aya Sofya. Situated on the highest part of the town with a large cupola and four slender pillared minarets each with 3 balconies and as many staircases, and a spacious forecourt, and splendidly equipped in the interior, it became the court-mosque of the city. In Adrianople Sinān also built the mosque of ʿAbbās Čeľebi Sultan at the New Bridge and the mosque of Dostārdar Muṭṣafū Pasha.

40 large and small mosques are all mentioned besides others in the former foci, schools of Tradition (Dār-AL-ḤADITH), Dervish monasteries and Zāwūjays. The Selimye is further said to have had a library containing 5000 volumes.

The bezestans (warehouses), čarghi (bazaars) and khāns (fondachi) of this city are equally celebrated. The “Old bezestan”, a wakf of the Dār al-Ḥadith Djamī was built by Murād I, Sultan Mehmed I. These are surpassed by ʿAli Pasha’s Bazaar (967 = 1559—1560) built by Sinān for Semit ʿAlī Pasha, and the Shoemakers’ Bazaar (Kawawāj Carşāsi, also called ʿUsn Carşāsi), built by Murād III as a wakf of the Selimye mosque. Among the 18 larger khāns may be mentioned: the Khan Rustem Pasha, built by Sinān, that of Mustafā Pasha (Ibi Kapan) and the largest of all, the Khan ʿAlīhe Kādīn, near the mosque of the same name, built in 1018 (1609—1610) by Ekmekjīzdeh Ahmed Pasha. The Serais of the Viziers and Pashas (detailed in Ewlyi, i. 458 et seq.) were also very numerous; they were, like the Imperial Palace, left to fall to pieces after Adrianople lost its importance as the second royal residence.

The stone bridges over the Marita and Tundja, which in part date from the Byzantine period, deserve special mention. The following are given:

1. the bridge at the Serrādji-khāne, built in 855 (A.H.) by Shihāb al-Din Pasha, collapsed at the beginning of the xviiith century and was rebuilt; 2. The bridge of Bāyāzid II over the Tundja, with 6 arches; 3. the bridge near the mosque of Bāyāzid I, dating from the Byzantine period and repaired by Sulejmān I in 951 A.H.; 4. a bridge of the year 1010 A.H. at the tomb of the saint Feserāḥ; 5. the Mihāl bridge, of the Byzantine period, repaired in 823 by Mehmed I and in 1059 A.H. by Kemān舒š Muṣṭafā Pasha; 6. The New Bridge of Ekmekjīzdeh Ahmed Pasha of the year 1027 A.H.

The aqueducts were built by Sulejmān I and restored in the beginning of the xviiith century (v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Osm. Reiches, vii. 66).


(E. H. MORDTMANN.)

EDINBE, the Turkish pronunciation of the Arabic Adjinābī, “stranger” [q. v., i. 141].

EDREMD, the capital of a Kāzā of the Sandjak of Karasi in the Vilāyet of Brusa, with a population of Turks and Greeks (c. 8000 souls in all of whom 2000 are Greeks, in 1883 houses), is situated 5-6 miles inland from the port of Ağıvai in the uppermost corner of the Gulf of Edremid. The ruins of the ancient Adramyttion (Ἀδραμύττιτος, Ἀδραμύττιος in the Byzantine authors, آدرمحمد in Idrisi) are at Karataş on the sea near the Skala of Kemew-Edremid. Adriamytion was destroyed by the Turcoman Tūṣ-Zānī who had established himself in Smyrna since 1090, and after it had been rebuilt the town again suffered at the hands of another Turk Monolykos in 1115 (Alexias, ii. 224, 245, ed. Reifferscheid). To defend it against such attacks Manuel I fortified the town (about 1160; Niketas, p. 159). Earlier in the xivth century Edremid fell into the hands of the Karasioglu of Bergama, after the Genoese
of Phocaea had undertaken the defence of the town against the Turks (Pachymeres, ii. 557 et seq.). When Sulṭān Orkhan disposed the Karasoghiļ about 1345, Edremid passed with the other lands of this dynasty under Ottoman rule. In 1403 Timūrlank’s troops on their return march from Brusa to Magnesia made a raid on Adramyttion, Assos and Pergamum from Balikcısı (Ducas, p. 72, compared with Sheref al-Din). It is not known when the town was transferred from the sea-coast to the interior.

**EDRIS.** [See IDRIS.]

EFENDI, an Ottoman-Turkish word borrowed from the Byzantine Greek Ἑφέντης (Du Cange), derived from the ancient Greek ἀφέντής "sir, master", a legal term (used by Phrynicias, Polybius and even Euripides with this meaning). This name is given to men who have had a liberal education; ordinary people and subordinate officers are called Ada (Aa by elision of the velar) they receive the title Efendi when they have completed their literary education. Efendim (abbreviated familiarly and jokingly to Efem), "Sir", "madam". The Khādi of Constantinople is also called İstanbul Efendisi. The Raqqa Efendis (for Raqqa al-Kuttab = "chief of the scribes") was before the reforms the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The Sulṭān also holds but not exclusively the title Efendimiz = "our Lord"; the Arabs of Egypt apply the analoguous expression Efendi-nā to the Khedive. This term is purely Turkish and has penetrated everywhere that Greek influence has made itself felt.

**Bibliography:** J. Psichari, Efendi, in the *Milanges Hvacet*, p. 387—427; A. de Biberstein Kazimiri, Dictionnaire Arabe-Français, i. 41; Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire Turc-Français, i. 42-43. ([CL. HuRT.)

**EGERDİR,** the capital in a Ḍağı of the Sandjak of Hamidabad in the Wilāyet of Kōniya, situated on a tongue of land at the south end of the lake of Egerdir, with a few thousand inhabitants, all Muhammadans; on the adjacent island of Nisi (Νησί), Turkish Nisin, Nis adasi with a monastery live about 1000 Turkish-speaking Greeks. The town presumably fell into the hands of the Seljukis at the same time as the district of Isparta, which Kilidjian Arslan III conquered (600-601 A.H.) (see Houtsma, Reveil, etc., iii. 62); its citadel which now is destroyed is said to have been built by Kaikusbâd I. After the break-up of the Seljuk empire, Egerdir became the capital of the Turkoman Hamidoglu, one of the first rulers of this dynasty, Felek al-Din (beginning of the xivth century) gave it the name Felekbir, or Felekabad (Abu ʿl-Fidā, Geography, transl. by Reinhard, ii. 2, 134). In 783 or 784 A.H. the last Hamidoglu sold his kingdom to Murad I and Egerdir thus passed under Ottoman rule. Timūrlank conquered the town and the fortified island of Nisadasi on the 17th Shaʿbān 805 = 11th March 1403, (Saʿd al-Din, according to Sheref al-Din on the 17th Red hej) on his march through Anatolia and gave them to the Karanmoglu whom he restored; the latter had to return them to the Ottomans in 1425 with the district of Hamideli. The town has no less than 30 large and 18 small mosques and also a small library with 218 manuscripts; the name was originally pronounced Egridir (İbn Baṭṭa, ii. 267; İbn Farraj Allāh in Ṣayt. et Extr., xii. 360, 384).

**Bibliography:** Saʿd al-Din, i. 211 et seq.; Ḥādji Khalifa, Dīhmānummā, p. 630; Sarre, Reise in Kleinasië, p. 142 et seq.; cf. the article Hamidoglu. ([J. H. MORDTMANN.]

EGIN, the capital of a Ḍağı containing about 60,000 people in the Sandjak of Kharpūt in the Wilâyet of Maṇṣūrat al-ʿAzīz, occupies a picturesque site about 3000 feet above sea-level in a wooded hollow, where the river widens, on the right bank of the Kara Șu or western Eu phrates, N. E. of "Arab-kir surrounded by a crescent of hills 1500 feet high, down whose sides fall numerous streams. The town is believed to have been founded in the xiith century by Armenians from Waspurakān (see St. Martin, *Mémoire sur l'Arménie*, i. 189). So recent a writer as Von Molckte still describes it as a stronghold of the Armenians, who leave it in their youth for Constantinople and return with the wealth they have amassed. More recently the population estimated by Cui net at 19,000, by Yörke at 20,000, is composed one half of Armenians the other of Turks. In 1895-1896 there were massacres of Armenians in the town.

**Bibliography:** Ḥādji Khalifa, Dīhmānummā (Constantinople 1145), p. 624; Ritter, Erdkunde, x. 790—792; H. von Molcke, Briefe über Zustände .... in der Türkei, p. 378 et seq.; V. W. Yörke in the Geogr. Journ., viii. (1896, ii.), p. 333 et seq. ([R. HARTMANN.]

EGRI, German Erleau, archbishopric and the political centre of the Hevesian comitate in Hungary, was in Turkish hands from 1576 to 1687. It is particularly celebrated for its heroic and successful defence under Stephen Dobó from the 9th Sept. to the 18th Oct. 1552 against overwhelming forces under the Vicari Ahmed (Von Hammer, Gesch. d. Osman. Reiches, iii. 307; Jorga, Gesch. d. Osman. Reiches, iii. 243). It was not till 1596 that the Turks, in the reign of Mehmed III, succeeded in taking it (v. Hammer, op. cit. iv. 262 et seq.; Jorga, op. cit. iii. 321 et seq.). In 1687 the town surrendered to General Caraffa on the death of the commander of its garrison, ʿOlmān Rustem Agha (v. Hammer, op. cit., vi. 507; Jorga, op. cit., iv. 229).

**EGRI-DAGH.** [See ARARAT i. 420,2.]

**EGYPT.**

The name Egypt — the etymology is more correctly preserved in the German form Ägypten — is derived from the Greek Ἑὔγειρος of which only the abbreviation Kīlī survives into the Muhammadan period as the name of the inhabitants of the country. The land itself is known by the old Semitic name the Arabic form of which is Masr; from this the colloquial language has made Masr. The Muslim conquest began at the end of the year 18 = 639. From that year to the present day Egypt has been one of the centres of the political, cultural and religious development of Islam. Nowhere else has Islam come into such active contact with modern Europe as in the land of the Nile. It is a very difficult task to give a survey of the multifarious aspects of Egyptian life in the purely Muslim period but with this modern development it becomes well nigh impossible. If in
spite of this an attempt is here made to give a comprehensive survey, it is only possible by making an essential distinction between medieval and modern Egypt. The modern period in Egypt begins with the French expedition of 1798 and with Muhammad 'Ali. There are many connecting links between this old and the new period but it is nevertheless an entirely new Egypt with entirely new aspects which must be treated in quite a different fashion in such an article as this, that arises in the nineteenth century. The invasion of the Nile valley by European civilisation has been for the latter of immensely greater moment than even the rise of Hellenism was. An entirely new period begins with the Khehives in contrast to which perhaps the whole history of Egypt and certainly the Muslim period forms a distinct unity. The subject has been divided with reference to this distinction. Here we shall only discuss mediaeval Muhammadan Egypt (659—1798) and refer the reader to the article MISNEIVES for Egypt under European influence.

1. The Historical Development.

As all the dynasties and important men are dealt with in separate articles, the object of this article is only to give a general survey and detail the historical aspects and events which cannot or ought not to be given in the separate articles.

Survey of

A. II. the rulers of Egypt. A. D.

18—21 Conquest by 'Amr b. al-'As. 639—641

21—38 Governors for the Orthodox Caliphs. 641—658

38—132 Governors for the Umayyads. 658—750

132—254 Governors for the 'Abbasids. 750—868

254—292 Dynasty of the Tūlūnids. 868—905

292—323 Governors for the 'Abbasids. 905—935

323—358 Ikshīdīd dynasty. 935—969

358—567 Fāṭimid Caliphs. 969—1171

567—648 Ayyūbid dynasty. 1171—1250

648—792 Bahri Mamluks. 1250—1390

792—923 Burdi Mamluks. 1390—1517

923—1212 Ottoman Pashas and Mamluks. 1517—1798

1212 Napoleon's Expedition. Beginning of the modern period. 1798

The great conquests in Syria and the 'Irāq displaced the capital Medina to the outskirts of the new empire. Byzantine Egypt constantly threatened the young empire and even Medina itself lay perilously near the Byzantine naval harbour of Klysma (Khism, Suez). Egypt with its rich corn-supplies might have appeared a much more desirable acquisition to the central government than the more distant Syria or 'Irāq, at least a regular traffic in corn to the Ḥiḍāj began immediately after the conquest. It is most improbable therefore that there is any historical foundation for the Arab story that Egypt was conquered against the wish of the Caliph. By the year 18 (639) the raiding policy of the early years of the conquest had already been abandoned for one of permanent occupation. The state of affairs in Egypt at that time invited the Arab conquest. The ten years of Persian rule had been followed by a strong Byzantine reaction after the victories of Heraclius. The latter hoped by his Īṣṇunās to terminate the endless strife between Monophysites and Dyophysites and at the same time give the restituted empire an united church. But it was too late, the Monophysite Egyptians, who apparently never grasped the Monotheletic proposals for compromise, believed that the hated creed of Chaldon was to be forced upon them. As at the same time the financial claims of the empire on Egypt were very great and the administration of church and finance were in the same hands, it may be imagined that the attachment of the Egyptians to Byzantium was not over great. In 631 the emperor Heraclius had sent Cyrus, previously Bishop of Phasis in the Caucasus, to Alexandria as Patriarch and at the same time head of the civil administration. For ten years this man sought by every means in his power to persuade the Coptic church to adopt the Īṣṇunās and at the same time to increase the revenues of the treasury. The portrait of Cyrus is painted blacker and blacker by later Coptic tradition; for not only did he indirectly pave the way for the Arabs but he was the governor of Egypt who concluded the most important treaties with the Arabs. It is from Cyrus that the essential features of the half-legendary character of the Muḥāwīs [q. v.] of Arab tradition are derived. The conqueror of Egypt was 'Amr b. al-'As [q. v., p. 334 et seq.]. He had already distinguished himself in Syria and now appeared unexpectedly in December 18 (639) on the eastern frontier of Egypt from which the troops had been withdrawn and about a month later (Muḥarram 19 = January 640) captured Pelusium with only 3000—4000 men. 'Amr could not risk a decisive battle till he had been reinforced by about 5000 men under the leadership of Zubair, the celebrated companion of the Prophet. With these he defeated the Byzantines under the Augustalis Theodoros in the battle of Helipollis (Radjab 19 = July 640), which was immediately followed up by the occupation of one of the chief harbours of Babylonia [q. v., i.e. that of the town held out for some time longer. Cyrus who was within its walls entered into negotiations with 'Amr in spite of considerable opposition in his own camp and then left Egypt to have the treaty proposed with 'Amr ratified by the Emperor. Heraclius was exceedingly enraged, Cyrus was accused of treason and banished; soon afterwards Heraclius died (23rd Sāfār 20 = 11th February 641). As his death seemed to destroy all hope of relief, the citadel of Babylon capitulated on the 21st Rabi'il II = 9th April 641. The eastern Delta and, as Babylon was the key to the upper Nile valley, Upper Egypt also thus fell into 'Amr's hands. He now crossed the Nile and following its western arm, slowly advanced on Alexandria via Nikiu, the see of a bishop, which surrendered on the 26th DjiOTTOM 1 = 13th May. Here he met with a vigorous resistance and, although able to occupy the surrounding country temporarily, saw for the time being no hope of actually capturing the strongly fortified seaport. We are not very well informed as to the gradual expansion of his power in the rest of Egypt. Meanwhile affairs had taken a sudden turn in Constantinopole. Cyrus was sent back to Egypt to get the most favourable terms.
possible from 'Amr. Cyrus returned to Alexandria on the 2nd Shawwal 20 (14th Sept. 641). His further course of action is not quite clear. In contrast to his previous attitude he now assiduously courted the support of the Copts and it is not improbable that he wanted to establish an Egyptian primacy under Arab suzerainty. In autumn he concluded, unknown to the Alexandrians, the final treaty of surrender with 'Amr by which the city was to be vacated by the Greeks by the 16th Shawwal 21 (15th Sept. 642). On payment of a certain tribute the inhabitants were guaranteed liberty of life and property as well as the free exercise of their religion. At first they were very indignant at this treaty but ultimately bowed to necessity. The Greeks abandoned the city and it was surrendered to the Arabs at the expiry of the appointed period. Cyrus died before the surrender took place. To protect his rear, 'Amr undertook an expedition in the following winter (22 = 642-643) against the neighbouring Pentapolis (Barqa) and thus concluded the conquest of the land. It was not Alexandria but Fustat, the city which had grown up around the camp before Babylon, that were ceded as the capital of the country [see the article Cairo, i. p. 816 et seq.]. Once again the Byzantines were stirred to activity. In 25-26 (645) a Byzantine fleet under Manuel suddenly appeared in the roadsteads of Alexandria and the city rose in rebellion and welcomed the Byzantines. At this time 'Amr was no longer at the head of affairs in Egypt but he had to be summoned there, as his successor was not able to cope with this unexpected development. His military genius once more triumphed; in a short time he drove the Byzantines out of the country and conquered Alexandria for a second and last time - on this occasion by force of arms - in 25 (646).

The last step in the conquest was to render secure the southern frontier. Egypt has on the whole natural boundaries, the sea in the north, the Libyan desert in the east and the Arabian desert and the Red sea in the west. It was only the southern frontier that was undefined. It was defined by an expedition under 'Abdallâh b. Sa'd who had replaced 'Amr as governor for a time before the second occupation of Alexandria and filled the post a second time till shortly before the murder of 'Othmân. In 31 = 651-652 he advanced against the Christian kingdom of Nubia, south of Assuan, reached Dongola (Dunkula in al-Kindi, ed. Guest, p. 12 and 13) and in Ramâdan of the same year concluded a treaty with the ruler of the Nubians which has been preserved (Kurâ [3], i. 200, 12 et seq.; cf. Zeitschr. für Assyriol. u. Asyr. XXII. 141 et seq.). By its terms an official exchange of commodities with Nubia was instituted. This agreement was called bâṣ [3], v. 3, i. 608 et seq. which - it may be added here - is probably derived from the Latin pactum. Down to the Mamlûk period Philae (Filiâk) formed the southern boundary of Egypt. The most northerly point in the Nubian kingdom was called al-Knâr.

When in the reign of the Caliph 'Othmân quarrles everywhere broke out between the Fiscus and the Arab troops, 'Abdallâh b. Sa'd had to leave Egypt and it was from Egypt that the assassins of 'Othmân went to Medina (35 = 656). Egypt was next under 'Ali's rule till it was taken from him by 'Amr b. al-Askâ, the Anti-caliph Mu'âwiyâ's general (38 = 658). Henceforth it remained in the possession of the Umayyads except for the brief period of the nominal suzerainty of the Anti-caliph 'Abdallâh b. al-Zubâr, who held Egypt from 64-65 (683-684). Of the governors of this period 'Abd al-'Arîz b. Merwân [q. v., i. 36], the brother of the Caliphs 'Abd al-Malîk, was of special importance for the country; he ruled the land practically independently from his headquarters in Hâlwa. It was he who gave the administration the character it long maintained. The later governors of this period are of more importance for economic than purely political history. When the dynasty was overthrown, Egypt was the last refuge of the unhappy Merwân II, who met his end here. This event made such an impression on the Coptic Christians that it has found a place in the Coptic Apocalypse of Daniel where Merwân appears as the seventeenth king with the number 666 (M+e+s-e+e+s+a+s=y = 666). Severus of Ashmûnain gives a very remarkable account at great length of his end from the mouth of an alleged eyewitness which presents a marked contrast to the brief statements in the Muhammadan chronicles (ed. Evetts, p. 119 et seq.; ed. Seyholf, 173 et seq.; Hamalberg text of Severus, ed. Seyholf, p. 165 et seq.). The Muhammadan chroniclers speak of "Turks" and in the Apocalypse of Daniel the conqueror of Merwân is Plutourgos. It is important to note these Christian echoes of the tragedy because the passing of the Caliphate from the Umayyads to the Abbasids seems from the Muhammadan historians to have made no particular impression on the Egyptians. From the point of view of economic history also this transition was of importance.

Under the 'Abbasids the country was ruled by governors, who till the year 242 = 856 were usually Arabs. In this year the last Arab governor left the country which was henceforth to be governed by Turks only till Ahmad b. 'Uthîm founded the first Turkish dynasty. Ma'âmûn was the only Caliph to visit the Nile valley and even the feudal vassals appointed by Ma'âmûn and his successors between the Caliph and the governors rarely visited Egypt. The most important historical movement which, though in the main completed in the pre-'Uthîmîd period, went on down to the Mamlûk period, was the spread of Arab culture and the Muslim religion in Egypt. These were not identical developments; for the Egyptians who remained Christians soon began to adopt the language of the ruling classes also and by the fourth or fifth century we find that the Coptic ecclesiastic has to write Arabic if he wishes to be understood. Arab culture was spread by various causes. The town-dwelling Arabs, who were concentrated in the capital Fustat, the Arabs who held the higher offices in the Coptic speaking provinces contributed very little to the propagation of Arab influence in the provinces. The introduction of the Arabic language in the government offices said to have taken place in 87 (705-706) - in reality both Greek and Arabic were used down to the beginning of the second century - did not affect 1% of the population. The chief factor in the spread of Arab, culture which gave it so much greater effect than the preceding Hellenism, was the gradual settlement of the country districts by Arab nomads. Unlike the Greeks who were town-dwellers and built up civic communities of great importance in the history of civilisation the Arabs had not from
the first been dwellers in cities. The men of Mecca and Medina like the Arabs of Syria of course quickly adapted themselves to the environment of a large city, but they required pastures to be maintained for them, they wanted their rabh (cow-lodges), and out of such a country life permanent settlements frequently grew up in the provinces. The numerous Bedouin tribes on the other hand who came to Egypt in the train of the picked troops of the regular army or were deliberately transported thither as in the case of the Kais in 107 = 725 or lastly gradually migrated casually and without any settled plan led a very nomadic life. These tribes and clans gradually advanced southwards on the borders of the cultivated country on both sides of the Nile valley. Their cattle-rearing was of benefit to the agriculturist population who supplied them with corn. Their relations however were frequently less peaceful particularly as the turbulence of the Bedouins added to the extortions of the treasury became a continual source of affliction to the Copts. Sections or even whole tribes gradually succumbed to the advantages of a settled life and thus a strong vein of Arab blood was constantly being added to the Coptic people of the Nile valley. This process of assimilation is still going on and the government of the Khedives has done much to make these always unruly Bedouins of the frontiers adopt a settled life. From the authorities, rare for the early period but copious later (cf. El-Mansur, Abhandlung über die Inuigen ein bewundernswerte Stämme, ed. Wustenfeld) it would appear that quite a considerable migration took place which even sent offshoots as far as the Sādān. How far direct immigration of tribes and individuals (traders) across the Red Sea into Upper Egypt also played a part has not yet been investigated, but Strabo's description of Coptos in Upper Egypt as a half Arab town is suggestive. The traffic on ancient trade-routes was certainly doubled after Arabia and Egypt had become parts of one and the same empire. These wandering Arabs were of course never great carriers of civilization but the ancient civilization of the Nile valley assimilated by the Arabism of the language remained. The mixing process must have been greater than the anthropological and moral similarity of religion which was so frequent in the age of the Pharaohs would lead one to suppose. The power of assimilation possessed by the climate of the Nile valley which has been observed in animals, must certainly have done its work, but without a great deal of mixing it is inexplicable that the Coptic peasant in the country with his essentially conservative nature should have adopted another language. Not only did the Arabs become naturalised but the Copts must have been arabised to a greater extent.

By side with this adoption of Arab culture, the spread of Islam usually went hand in hand but the latter also followed other laws. In religion the Arabs brought the Copts freedom from the Byzantine yoke but the latter were not the less hostilely disposed to Islam. At the time of the conquest there were two ecclesiastical communities opposed to one another, the Jacobites i.e. the Coptic church and the Malkeites i.e. the orthodox Byzantine church represented by Cyprus. As was their custom the Arabs supported the heterodox movement, and the Jacobites attained unrestricted power, they annexed quite a number of Malkeite churches and monasteries and took advantage of their good relations with the Arab rulers to win as many Malkeites as possible over to their side. For example they succeeded in getting a double poll-tax levied on Malkeites which caused many to become Jacobites. This method was afterwards used by Islam against Christians of both sects. As the Arabs were at first hailed by the Copts as their deliverers from the Byzantine yoke, it naturally followed that even in the early years after the conquest numerous conversions to Islam took place, but on the whole active proselytising was hardly noticeable in the early decades after the conquest. The Arab government even regularly appointed a patriarch and 'Abd al-Aziz and others allowed the building of new Christian churches which was quite contrary to the later practice and the Shari'a. We get the impression from Christian Arabic sources of the time that the Arabs were only concerned about the money they extracted from the Christians but there were of course at the same time occasional attacks on their religion also; thus, for example, al-ṣūdāyah, the son of 'Abd al-Aziz forced the Christians to take part in the yāzīd. The Arab government also found itself forced on economic grounds to take steps against the monastic system which deprived the land of the best of its youthful vigour and it was natural that the Christians had to pay a very considerable tribute, which ceased when they adopted Islam. When only of official recognition the Christians were sometimes badly treated by the Muhammedan populace. All these reasons explain the rather rapid progress of Islam in Egypt and make it seem remarkable that as late as the eighth century there should have been popular risings on account of the number of Christian officials in the Diwan (Maqrizi, Khitaṣ, ii, 512 et seq.). This war on Christian officials lasts throughout the whole history of Egypt. At the end of the first century A.H. we still find Christians in the highest offices in the civil administration. 'Omar II's attempt to replace the Christian officials also by Muslims ('Der Islam, ii, 154) was predestined to failure. In the course of centuries Christians were gradually replaced by Muslims throughout the public offices but the mechanism of administration was so complicated that its management remained for centuries a privilege of the Christian Copts. As late as the Fātimid period we still find Christians and Jews, who at most only formally professed Islam, even in the office of wazir. That the diwan at this time were full of Christian officials is clear from al-Sairafi's polemic in his account of the Diwan al-Inṣād (Qann Diwan al-Kudūs, ii, 94 et seq.). The similar state of affairs in the Manuel period had already been discussed. In all cases one can see that the government for the time being protected Christians—probably for fiscal reasons—but it had occasionally to make concessions to the fanaticism of the mob. Individual rulers also as, for example, the Fātimid al-Hākim had sometimes the same views as the mob. We can thus observe that in course of time the demands of the Shari'a gradually won greater influence in everyday life, for example the prescription of a distinctive dress for Christians and Jews, the interdiction of riding on horseback, of building new churches etc., but even in times of great excitement these orders were only put into execution for a brief period; for otherwise popular anger against their neglect would not have con-
stantly broken out again. Mašrīzī who deals with these matters in several passages of his Kitāb al-makarim tawwurūr marks two important dates in the progress of Islam in Egypt. The first of these is the period following the great Coptic rising in the reign of Ma’āmun. The gradually increasing pressure of taxation had goaded the Copts to several risings, which were ruthlessly put down by Ma’āmun and his generals (see Becker, Beiträge zur Geschichte Ägyptens, p. 129 et seq.). From that time on the Copts began to adopt Islam and the Arabs gained power in the country districts. At a much later period, 1587, the Copts causing a crisis not only in the capital but throughout the country in the reign of Nāṣir b. Ḳalādīn in 720 et seq. Churches were destroyed, Christians tortured and in one of the smaller towns such as Kyūbul 450 Christians became converts to Islam in one day (Wusentfeld, Marzil’s Geschichte der Köpten, p. 81); this place may be taken as typical of the rest of the country. The last resistance of the Christians seems thereby to have been broken and the advance of Islam reached the stage at which it is now. It is in Old Cairo and certain districts of Upper Egypt that Coptic communities of any size have survived. According to a calculation, in Becker’s Beiträge, p. 113, based on the yield of the diyaq, the proportion of Muslims seems by Saladin’s time to correspond to what it is to day. But this is probably not correct; for the average assessment of diyaq is now known from papryi recently discovered to be much lower than the amount there taken on the authority of the Sharī’a so that the number of Christians in Saladin’s reign is to be placed at a much higher figure. It is not till the later Mamluk period that we can say that the process of conversion to Islam is concluded although it had made great progress as early as the beginning of the Tulunid period.

The history of Muhammadan Egypt as an independent state begins with the Tulunids [rev.]. Their accession had been preceded by a period of decline in the economic prosperity of the land as its resources had been recklessly exhausted by the government (cf. Beiträge, p. 136 et seq.). The governors or the often independent finance-administrators were simply tax-farmers. The revenues of the country went partly to Baghdad and partly into the pockets of successive governors without the country itself benefitting in the slightest thereafter. The state of affairs was changed on the foundation of an independent dynasty. The money now remained in the country. When independent of the central government, Ahmad b. Tulun [rev.] no longer made a point of plundering the country but rather tried to make it yield a permanent revenue and increase the glory of his dynasty. From being a dependency Egypt developed into the centre of a great empire, the government improved, and general prosperity increased as at all times when the country has had a strong government. For the first time for centuries Syria was again ruled from Egypt and the whole history of antiquity as of the later Muhammadan period shows that the destinies of these two countries are closely bound up. In this direction lies the natural expansion of an independent Egyptian kingdom. In one point, however, the Tulunids showed themselves true patricians. While the contemporary Persian dynasties were creating a national civilization, the Tulunids were content to be imitators. Just as at one period the German rulers had each to have their little Versailles, the capital of Egypt was modelled on Samarra and Bagdad. This fact has been much exaggerated and Fustat-Cairo denied any genuine development in art or culture (E. Richmond, The Significance of Cairo, Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 1915, p. 23 et seq.). What is undoubtedly true in this, is that a new period in the history of Egypt begins with the Tulunids and that Egypt did not escape the general development of Muslim civilization.

In tracing the history of Egyptian civilization we may divide it into four very distinct periods, the Arabic, the Arabo-Persian, the Perso-Turkish and the pure Turkish, throughout which it must never be forgotten that the backbone of the populace was Arabised Copts. The pre-Tulunid period may be described as the Arabic. The Arabo-Persian period covers the rule of the Tulunids, Íkhshidids and Fāṭimidids. The influence of Persian culture becomes gradually more and more marked. In spite of their Shi’ite creed the Fāṭimidids make no break in the development of culture. A new stage only begins at the end of the Fāṭimid period with Saladin and the Ayyubids. They brought the spirit and culture of the great Saljuq empire to Africa also. In art and industry, in political and intellectual life, indeed even in calligraphy the dawn of a new era may be observed which we shall discuss in detail below. This second Perso-Turkish period covers the whole Mamluk period as the Mamluks regarded themselves in everything as the successors of the Ayyubids, whose political ambitions and even the titles of their court officials they inherited and maintained. The fourth and last period is that of the Ottoman rule in which Egypt is a Turkish province. The successors of the Mamluks created nothing of value to civilization.

From the point of view of political history we get quite another picture. The epochs 18–254 = 639–868 and 923–1212 = 1517–1798 serve as prelude and epilogue to the great period of Egyptian independence. The latter falls into three periods of which the Fāṭimid is the middle one. The pre-Fāṭimid period is characterised by the struggle of the Turkish governors for independence from the central government of the Caliphate. The independence of the Tulunids became possible by the great slave rising after the suppression of which the brief glory of the dynasty was soon at an end. Íkhshid and his successors had to deal with less resistance, the Íkhshidid kingdom being a parallel to the Ḥamdānid and Buḍyid kingdoms, political entities which only became possible on the dissolution of the ʿAbbāsid empire. This is the period of the struggle for the right to exercise suzerainty over the Caliph. The two Egyptian dynasties only lasted into the fourth century A.H. They had neither a national nor a religious footing in the country. They were based on the ability of their founders whose kingdom was held together for some time longer after their death by the community of interest of those who had assisted them. They are ideal examples of the wonderful chances in a soldier’s career in those days, their rulers were promoted generals and yet something different from the Praetorian rulers of the Mamluk period. The idea of rightful
succession had not yet been quite obscured by license and opportunism. Beside the soldiers we have a further important factor in the financier. A phenomenon like the Mādārī’sūn family, whose members without the slightest military power at times unofficially ruled Egypt purely by their economic superiority, is a characteristic of the period. The bureaucracy and the tax-farmer, those inheritances from the ancient world, had not yet lost their power before the all-destroying militarism of the Mamlūk period. The pre-Fāṭimid period differs markedly from the post-Fāṭimid in its internal structure as well as in its political attitude although the two have many features in common.

The character of the Fāṭimid period itself is quite different. For the first time Egypt had a dynasty full of vitality founded on a religious basis. Egypt itself was, however, not ʿAtlīte and the easy manner, in which Salādīn restored orthodoxy, shows that the creed which had been forced upon the country had only been formally adopted. But the prestige of religion was of inestimable value for the preservation of the dynasty and controlling the ambition of the generals which could only find an outlet by becoming at most mayors of the palace. Muʿizz had not come, like the ʿUlānīd and Ikhshīd, as the representative and envoy of a legitimate ruler to the country but as the autocratic ruler of a powerful kingdom for whom the way had been prepared by his generals. The first Egyptian Fāṭimid thus had not to gain his position gradually by force of arms but came with all the prestige of a ruler of North Africa and surrounded by the halo of religion and the regal splendour of an ʿImām and Caliph. The Fāṭimid kingdom was organised on the model of the ʿAbbāṣīd or rather after still older Persian prototypes. They had nothing to learn when they arrived in Egypt but understood perfectly how to reconcile the ancient administrative system of the country with their assumptions of hierarchy. Not only were they themselves in part excellent rulers but they took care to surround themselves with statesmen of great ability. Their authority offered an almost insurmountable barrier to the encroachments of all the pretenders of the ʿAbbāṣīds naturally overtook them also and the Mamlûk system arose out of their troops, but it was only through Salādīn and his successors, more particularly through the military heirs and the abolition of the bureaucracy intermediary between the rulers and the people that the Mamlûks became an all-supreme power and a scourge to the citizens.

The contemporary political problems of the Fāṭimid period also were quite different from those of the preceding epoch. It is true that there again was a struggle for Syria — even in the reign of the conqueror of Egypt — it was no longer however a war against a powerful Caliphate but against the Bāyḍīs and Salādījīs. Between the latter and the Fāṭimid kingdom lay a number of small, independent kingdoms some of which sided with the East and some with the West. It was a war between ʿAbbāṣīds and Fāṭimids for mention in the khwāṭba. It was an insignificant episode from the point of view of the history of the world but to the Fāṭimids it was the fulfillment of their highest ambition when the khwāṭba was pronounced for them and their “holy fathers” for a brief period (449-450 = 1058) even in Baghdad, the capital of the ʿAbbāṣīd, by the ephemeral usurper Baṣṣārī. At its zenith the Fāṭimid empire was the only great Muhammadan power in the eastern Mediterranean. Here we have the historical antagonism of two great powers, — which extended as far as Sicily and South Italy — namely that of Byzantium and Egypt. They created the pre-eminence of Egypt, which was still further increased by Salādīn and survived into the Mamlūk period. This golden period in Egypt’s history lasted from al-Muʿizz to al-Muṣṭaṣir and has been described for us in glowing colours by the Persian Nāṣīr-i Khusrāw, shortly before its economic and political collapse in the reign of the last named Caliph. No other land in Islam could then compare with Egypt. It was only under the great Salādījī Sultān the ʿIrāq regained its premier position. Syria was lost to the Fāṭimids before the Salādījī invasion. Had it still been held by Egypt, Syria might have been able to make a powerful defence against the invasions which were shortly to break in upon it, but an enfeebled Egypt and the small Aṭībīe states could not do this successfully.

Fāṭimid power began to decline rapidly everywhere after the famine and rebellions in the reign of al-Muṣṭaṣir. Badr al-Dīnānī [q. v., i. p. 560] and his son al-Afījī [q. v., i. p. 146] could only temporarily check its decline. The praetorian government ruined the country; another factor was the invasion of the Crusaders and Amaulīch stood at the gates of Cairo when the star of the Fāṭimids was about to set. This period of retrogression takes us to the third period of Egypt’s prosperity under the Ayyūbīds [q. v., i. p. 252 et seq.] and the Mamlūks [q. v.].

Salādīn restored the glory of Egypt anew. The features of the new epoch outlined above are only the expression of a new period in the political history. The well-nigh inexhaustible natural wealth of Egypt enabled every new ruler to devote himself to foreign politics on a large scale, if only he knew how to bring order into domestic affairs. The tasks, which wrecked the declining power of the Fāṭimids, the suppression of rebellions at home and the repulse of the Crusaders, were successfully accomplished by the Ayyūbīds and their successors. The struggle between East and West now centres round Egypt and the name Damietta [q. v., i. p. 920 et seq.] recalls many important events in the history of the later Crusaders. Relying for support on the religious reaction of the Salādījī period, the Ayyūbīds were the true Shāhīds, who recognised the purpose of their dynasty in war against the enemies of Islam. They reunited Syria to Egypt and held it for a long period. But this glorious dynasty unfortunately lacked any cohesion among the members of the family; split up into numerous lines, the main object of the dynasty seemed to be exterminate itself in internecine warfare. Whoever held Egypt had the advantage, as it was the centre of the kingdom. Salādīn, al-ʿĀdīl and al-Kāmīl were essentially Egyptian rulers. The power of the Ayyūbīds lay in the Ghuzz [q. v.]; here lay the possibility of an ethnic basis for the dynasty but it was destroyed by the rivalries of the individual lines. Unity no longer lay in the ruling family but in the ethnic relationship of the troops of the kingdom consisting almost entirely of slaves (Mamlūks). While those who fought under the Ayyūbī flag were not all Turks but included Slavs and Greeks, the Turkish element consider-
ably predominated. As they were constantly at war with one another, the various members of the dynasty became more and more dependent on the good will of their generals and ultimately became mere playthings in the hands of ambitious commanders. It thus created no great stir when in the end the rulers, whose power had now become purely nominal, disappeared from the scene and those who had for long had the real control of the government now openly assumed responsibility for their actions.

The idea of a dynasty slowly disappeared. Although associations with the Ayyūbids remained throughout the whole political system and although Kalā'un, among the Bāḥri Mamluks, was able to found a kind of dynasty, with the Circassian Mamluks the government was a military oligarchy not only in principle, but in practice. The development of the military siefs gave an entirely military character to the government. It was a feudal state, based not on the possession of land but on rent, relying for its defence not on free-born yeomen with a permanent interest in the soil, but on purchased slaves who were often warded off set free. The Mamluk aristocracy was a kind of stratum above the Egyptian people proper, which was at times plundered in the most shameless fashion. Constantly quarrelling with one another, ruling the country as they pleased, ethnically a body of foreigners, numerically in no proportion to the native Egyptians, their survival for several centuries, particularly their energetic bearing, and their great architectural activity, which required enormous financial resources, appears at first sight a puzzle. It should never be forgotten that it was the Mamluks, who under Baibars formed the barrier which checked the advancing tide of Mongol invasion. The battle of Ain Djalut was no chance success, for Kalā'un and other Sulṭāns again and again repulsed the Mongols (Ilkānids). This is the great debt that the world owes to these slave Sulṭāns, for they saved Egypt from the fate of Irāq and it is due to them that the Nile valley has had a continuity of development in culture and political institutions unlike any other Muslim country. Beside this great feat the final expulsion of the Crusaders seems an insignificant and easy success. The subjection of Nubia also was of less importance for the history of Egypt than for that of the Sudān. On all sides the same great power of expansion can be traced. The Egyptian government stood at the centre of international interest as a powerful organism. Its relations with the Golden Horde arose out of their common opposition to the Ilkānids, but Byzantium and other European kingdoms also sought the friendship of the powerful Mamluk Sulṭāns. During the same period one splendid building arose after another in Cairo in spite of the fact that the constant wars were consuming immense treasure. The old buildings which at the present day still give Cairo its characteristic appearance are almost all Mamluk. Whence came the power and the money to do all this in a state with such a precarious constitution? It was probably in the first place the unusual ability of a series of great rulers like Baibars, Kalā'un, Nāṣir, Bārkūs, Qait-Bey, that brought the land this prosperity. In a state organised like that of the Mamluks where every one carried a marshall's baton in his knapsack, it was only men of unusual ability that came to the top; there was a kind of survival of the fittest in the system. In spite of their fondness for quarrelling with one another at home, they developed a strong esprit-de-corps in face of danger from abroad. The Mamluks, moreover, were mainly Turks or Circassians, that is to say, unusually powerful members of naturally warlike peoples, selected for the slave life. The rivalry among the individual generals further provided an excellent military training. It was a clever move of Baibars to offer a home in Cairo to the Ḍāhidā, driven out of Bagdad by the Mongols. The claims of the Mamluk Sulṭāns to the throne which were by no means sound, were raised above all suspicion by this step. This clever coup raised their prestige in a way which can hardly be understood at the present day. The great Mamluks by no means lacked the qualities of rulers. From time to time something was done to improve the state of the country, canals were made, or reforms undertaken. The Arab Bedouin element had become very strong in the country alongside of the Fellahin and energetic steps had to be taken against it from time to time so that agriculture was not generally suffered. The splendid culture of this period could not possibly have been maintained out of the income from the land alone, although the rural population was very heavily burdened. The great source of the governments revenue was the Indian trade which passed through Egypt as will be discussed below. When it ceased, the dominion of the Mamluks came to an end. When the Portuguese obtained a footing in the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea and diverted trade with India round the Cape, a blow was struck at the very heart of Egypt's prosperity. Fortune had willed that in the same decades the might of the Ottomans began to threaten the Nile valley like some inexorable fate. Egypt thus became a Turkish province and its golden age was over. The whole eastern Mediterranean began to sink into the background by the transfer of the world's trade to different routes and the discovery of America. The focus of civilization had shifted. The period 1517—1798 is for Egypt one of stagnation; the great events in the world's history had their scene elsewhere.

Selim I entered Cairo on the last day of Rajab 1 of the year 923 (22nd April 1517). The last Mamluk ruler Tunān Bey had previously been hanged at the Bāb Zuwaila. Selim and his successor Sulaimān organised the constitution of the country with great caution. The holder of the new Paşālīk was not to become too powerful nor was the Mamluk constitution of the military upper stratum to be completely suppressed. The Paşā and six bodies of senators, under Beys, with two Divān or supreme councils were to hold the balance. The Mamluk system thus found new scope for its energies. For about a century the Paşās had some real authority and initiative but after a few unfortunate experiences the Porto began to change its representatives every two years whereby making it impossible for them to have any permanent influence. An endless series of Paşās files before our eyes, whose authority gradually becomes weaker before the power of the Beys; mutiny, deposition or assassination became daily events and ultimately the Porto was forced to send only Paşās, who were acceptable to the Mamluks and who soon sunk to be mere figureheads. The Şaraf al-Balad, the governor of the
city, became the most important figure and next to him the second great official was the Amr al-Hadidh. The prosperity of Egypt continued steadily to decline. But the yearly tribute, which at first had yielded 600,000 piastres, also began to decrease until it finally ceased altogether. The history of these times has been little investigated as the monotonous sameness of a provincial history with its chronicle of petty quarrels between Beys and Pashas is hardly an inviting task. The best account is still that of Marcel in the great work produced by the French expedition. Egyptian troops occasionally took part in the Persian, Syrian and Arab wars of Turkey but the fact that these wars have no importance for the history of Egypt best shows how the times had changed. We find accounts of epidemics and bad harvests, each of which was worse than they had ever been before, appearing in the annals with equal monotony from time to time. Once again, for the last time, we have a movement of some importance emerging from the general turmoil. This was Ali Bey’s [q.v., i. p. 293 et seq.] rising during the Russo-Turkish war in 1182 (1768). Syria once more became a dependency of Egypt and only an evil fate prevented a development of affairs under ‘Ali Bey such as Egypt later experienced under Muhammad ‘Ali. But ‘Ali Bey, as early as 1087 (1773), succumbed to the treachery of a faithless friend. The Porte tried to quell the disorder that arose by sending an army under the Kapitán Pasha Hassan in 1200 (1786) — it was its first energetic interference in the affairs of Egypt since the conquest — but the attempt failed; the ring leaders retired to Upper Egypt and complications with Russia made strenuous action impossible. The ring leaders were soon afterwards able to return to Cairo. These were Ibrahim Bey and Murad Bey who now filled the position of Shaikh al-Balad one after the other. Their common interest in exploiting the population had led these two rivals to throw in their lot with one another. They were the opponents of Napoleon. The Mamluk system had destroyed itself. When Egypt yielded to Turkey the great part it had played in history and when the fertilising stream of international trade ceased to flow, the Mamluk system inevitably collapsed, bringing with it the ruin of Egypt.

To this brief sketch of the history of Muhammadan Egypt before the intervention of European influence we might add that the Muslim historians are acquainted with a pre-Muhammadan history of Egypt in which legend and history are hopelessly intermixed. Egypt had from the beginning had a peculiar interest for the Muslim because it is several times mentioned in the Korân. The celebrated Miyram al-Kibtiya, one of the wives of the Prophet, also belonged to Egypt. Jesus’ stay in Egypt was well known to Muslim Tradition and even the ancient Hadîth has a chapter on the Fadîq Al-Mir which are very much expanded in the Egyptian historians. Their histories did not stop there but give the whole system of pre-Muslim dynasties in which Coptic traditions and Gnostic speculation are mixed in an extraordinary fashion. (Mu’arrzî, Khiitîf, i. 134 et seq.; Kâshkhânî, transl. by Wüstefeld, p. 117 et seq.; and the same scholar's article Die älteste ägyptische Geschichte nach den Zauberk- und Wunderzählungen der Araber in Orient und Occident, i. (1862), p. 326 et seq.). Blochet has recently made the first attempt to investigate more closely the constituent elements of these cycles of legends (Civ. degli Studi Orientali, li. (1909), p. 717 et seq.; iii. (1910), p. 177 et seq.; iv. (1911), p. 47 et seq. and p. 267 et seq.). All accounts of cities and monuments are full of such tales whose existence only can be mentioned here.

2. Constitution and Government.

a. Political Divisions.

In the Arabic geographers and historians we find the administrative unit in the older period the kūrā, a district taking its name from its principal town, and in the post-Fâtîmid period the province (‘amal or more usually plural ‘amāl). In the modern period the ‘amāl have been given the name musârima. The comparison in Milne, A History of Egypt under Roman Rule, p. 216 makes it appear that the most important administrative districts of a higher and lower class have remained unaltered from Roman times to Muhammad ‘Ali, but closer investigation shows that the similarities between ancient and modern times are quite accidental. The political configuration of the country has undergone considerable alterations in the course of centuries. The ancient division into nomes was followed in the Roman period by that into pagi and pagarchies, which in their turn under the Byzantines became entirely remodelled in a more complicated fashion with the increasing influence of the great landlords. The best account of the conditions in this period is to be found in Mathias Gelzer, Studien zur byzantinischen Verwaltung Ägyptens (Leipziger Hist. Abhandlungen, xiii.). Islam developed the Byzantine system as it found it. The first accurate information is given by the Aphroditos papyri of the end of the first (beginning of the eighth) century. They yield the following picture. Egypt was at this time a province of the Caliph’s empire governed by a sūbîn wasl = amîr. Upper and Lower Egypt were separate administrative divisions but not, as might perhaps be expected, so that all subdivisions fell into one or other of these two. The heads of kūrās, which appear as real administrative units and corresponded to the Byzantine pagarchies, were all directly under the governor general. The ancient nomes was now purely a geographical term. The villages (ṣârja) into which the kūrās were divided, were ruled by ṣârîn and ṣârs, Capt. Lashe, Arab. Musulîn, pl. Musulûn (for further details and bibliography see Der Islam, ii. 361 et seq.) who were under the government of the kūrâ. We have no detailed account of the further development of this system and the few notices that exist have not yet been systematically studied. The division into kūrās remained the basis of the administrative system down to the Fâtîmid period. We do however find larger areas containing a number of kūrâs referred to under a single name, such as Asfâl al-‘Arâf, Lower Egypt, which is sometimes also called al-Rīf, Asfâl al-‘Arâf was divided into ḫâlîn al-‘Rīf (the land between the two Nile arms) and al-‘Isâf al-‘Ishârî, the fertile Delta land west of the Rosetta arm and al-‘Isâf al-‘Ishârî, the east of the Damietta arm. Upper Egypt, al-Ṣâ’d, was divided into thether and Farther. But all these names are those of geographical rather than political divisions; and their denotation varied. The kūrâs themselves were by no means inextensible in their boundaries. They were sometimes broken
up or combined with others. Their identification has further been rendered much more difficult especially in the Delta by the considerable shifting that has taken place in the course of the Nile. Valuable preliminary work in this direction has been done by A. R. Guest, The Delta in the Middle Ages in the *Journ. R. As. Soc.*, 1912, p. 941 et seq. The number of kāras is variously given and certainly varied from time to time. According to Maqrizi (*Khitaṣ*, i. 73, 72) there were 25—59 in Lower Egypt, 31—37 according to Guest’s investigations. The figures for Upper Egypt vary between 28 and 30. Lists are given in Maqrizi, i. 72 et seq.; ed. Wiet, i. 306 et seq.; Bibl. Geogr. Arab., v. 73; vi. 81; vii. 331; Ibn Duḫmāk, iv. 128; v. 42; Kalkašandi, transl. Wustenfeld, p. 92 et seq.; Yāṣūt, iv. 549. To these must be added the so-called kāras of the *Ībīla* on the Red Sea and the Sinai peninsula (Kalkašandi, i. c., 100 et seq.). The oases [see Bahrīye, i. p. 587 et seq., Dakhila, i. p. 599 et seq., and Kharga] and Barṣā had a separate government. In Maqrizi, whose authority is acknowledged, the number of kāras in each kāra is given. According to a statement of the year 345 (956) the number of kāras in the whole of Egypt was 2395 of which 1439 were in Lower and 956 in Upper Egypt (*Khitaṣ*, i. 73, 58; Ibn Duḫmāk, v. 43). There were said to have still been over 10,000 flourishing kāras a century after the Arab conquest but this statement seems to be an exaggeration (Maqrizi, ed. Wiet, i. 312). The number is said to have afterwards diminished rapidly.

It is obviously in the steady decline of Egypt’s prosperity that we find the reason for the gradual alteration in the political division of the country. The administrative units were gradually increased in size because the decline in revenues and the decrease in population led to the combination of districts each of which in a period of more intensive cultivation required separate arrangements for its administration. At the end of the Fāṭimid period the old kāras were replaced by *dīmāl*. As Musabbīḥ still knew the old arrangement and we possess a list of the new *dīmāl* of the end of the reign of Mustaṣṣir (Abū Sallīḥ, ed. Evetts, fol. 72, 89), the new arrangement probably dates from Badr al-Dāmālī, the reorganiser of the Fāṭimid kingdom at its collapse. It is improbable that there was any thorough reorganisation of the political divisions of the country at one time, but after the catastrophe under Mustaṣṣir the great setback the land had received made its effects apparent with startling suddenness in the administrative practice of the country also. The *dīmāl*, which is occasionally used as a synonym of kāra, was not a wider denomination than the kāra but its equivalent. In place of the 50—70 kāras we suddenly find 26 *dīmāl* into which Egypt was divided. (*Khitaṣ*, i. 72, 26 et seq.). Ten of these were in Upper and sixteen in Lower Egypt. But the process did not then come to an end, the land continued to decline and the administrative units increased in extent but decreased in number. The celebrated cadastral survey of Muḥammad b. Kallūm, the so-called Rūk Nāṣirī of 715 = 1315 mentions only 15 provinces, 9 of which were in Upper Egypt (*Khitaṣ*, i. 74; ed. Wiet, i. 312), and when Egypt’s prosperity was at its lowest ebb under the Ottomans, the number had sunk as low as 12 (v. Hammer, *Geschichte des Osman. Reiches*, ii. 653) or 14 (de Sacy, *Institut royal de France*, i. 91), at the time of the French expedition there were 16 including Danietta and Rosetta. The variation in the number of provinces is not of course always directly connected with the prosperity of the country; for in Lower Egypt we find partitions or combinations made quite arbitrarily—for example Ibn Dūḵmāk counts 8 divisions there and Ibn Dīḏa as many as 12, or 13 with Dīḏa which he counts in Upper Egypt, although he is writing after the composition of the Rūk Nāṣirī, but the main reason for the replacement of the numerous kāras by a few provinces was undoubtedly the economic decline and desolation of the country. A parallel is offered by the history of the political administration of Egypt in the sixteenth century. Writing in the 60’s Alfred von Kremer (*Ägypten*, ii. 8) mentions the combination of several provinces called Madīliyas since the beginning of the Kāfiya period, into one “from motives of economy”. It is only in quite recent times that these provinces have come to mean more than the ancient kāras; for their subdivisions called *mārakas* correspond to the ancient kāras and the modern *nāḥiyās* are simply the ancient kāras. To make a general survey possible, we have chosen from the numerous lists of provinces, that of the Rūk Nāṣirī, that of the Napoleonic period and that of the present day but it should not be forgotten that in the intervals considerable variations have taken place. The large cities of Alexandria and Cairo and several fortified towns on the frontiers have always occupied a separate position as can only be briefly indicated here. At the present day the following govern-ments (*māhāsi*) still exist: Egypt, Alexandria, Suez Canal and Suez under the Ministry of the Interior and al-Aṣrih i. e. the Sinai Peninsula under the Ministry of War (from the Zīghrāfīyya Mīṣr waal-Sūdān, published by the Egyptian Ministry of Public Instruction, 2nd ed., 112 et seq.). At an earlier period Burullūs, Rosetta, Danietta and the seaports on the Red Sea occupied a similar position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rūk Nāṣirī de l’Égypte</strong></th>
<th><strong>Present day</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>715 = 1315</td>
<td>1212 = 1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Kūṣ</td>
<td>1. Aswān (Nubia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aḥŷmim</td>
<td>2. Girgeh (P.d.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aṣyūṭ</td>
<td>3. Syout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aḫūmnāin</td>
<td>5. Minyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fâyūm</td>
<td>7. Fâyūm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aṭfih</td>
<td>8. Aṭfih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ḍīṣe</td>
<td>9. Gyzeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sârḫiyya</td>
<td>10. Charqyeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ḡarbiyya</td>
<td>12. Damiette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Būḥāira</td>
<td>14. Mānṣūfyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Bahyreh</td>
<td>15. Rosette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The date of 1212 = 1798 for the town of Aswan (Nubia) is attributed to the governorship of Khanqa in 1895 (de Sacy, *Institut royal de France*, i. 91).
Administration and Finance.

A history of Egyptian administration cannot yet be written, but a few indications may stimulate further work on the subject. For no period do we have an absolutely clear picture and the Arab period is particularly obscure. The organisation of finance formed the centre of the whole administration, for punctual and abundant revenue from taxation was the main object for which the country was governed. With the money thus obtained the army and the officials were paid and authority maintained. The financial system was from the very first exceedingly complicated and its administration in detail was only understood by Coptic officials who throughout the centuries of the history of Muslim Egypt were regarded by the fellahin as blood-suckers and by the ruling military classes as swindlers. In addition to this most important class of officials, we find in the period of prosperity under Caliphs and Sultans a whole series of court and high central administrative offices about which we are much better informed than the actual mechanism of the machinery of government.

In the early centuries of Arab rule two political functions were sharply distinguished, the governorship and the treasury. The governor, 'Amir, had control over the military and police only — the latter under a 'Sāhib al-χad'ara — and was appointed 'ulā 'l-qal'ala 'sāli' 'l-ma'āli'a. Alongside of him was the head of the treasury the 'Amil who was appointed 'ulā 'l-kharājd. These two officials had to keep a strict watch on one another. As head of the military and executive the 'Amir was the first, but they were equal in rank and the administration of the treasury even had the greater influence as an anecdoté in al-Kindi, ed. Guest, p. 109 clearly shows. The two offices were only occasionally combined (cf. Gestr. 3. 154). Ibn Ṭūlūn did not become master of the situation until he had obtained control of the taxes also. This division of authority extended throughout the financial system. Under the Arab 'Amil there were, down to the beginning of the 'Abbasid period, two Copt chief secretaries to the treasury, charniwarii, who did not, however, for example, control the divānas of Upper and Lower Egypt respectively but administered both jointly. At the beginning of the 'Abbasid period we still find two officials at the head of the treasury but it seems that they administered the two divisions of the country separately (Severus of Asmīnān, Hamburg text, ed. Seybold, 196, 15; the vulgate text of Severus has a different reading). The receipts for corn delivered to the state granaries also were signed by two officials (Zeitschr. für Assyriol., xx. 104). This system taken over from the Byzantines survived for centuries. Even in the Fātimid period and later we still find in addition to the chief of the treasury or to a Muṣāhir a Nādir, a comptroller, who had to countersign all documents (Ibn Mammāt, p. 7); an example is given in Ḫisāyat, i. 82, 28). In the first century A.H. the old eparchy with its head at Ṭūlūn was still retained and financial purposes below the du'āx were 'gumnīrāt, who remitted payments to Ṭūlūn. Their duties are not quite clear. In particular it is uncertain what relation the du'āx had to the pagarch, 'Sāhib al-Kūra or dinārīs. We find the governor writing to him and demanding the taxes. He had to appear from time to time at the seat of the government to render accounts and had a representative (dābouriūrā) permanently there. The ḥanīf (see above) and the clerks were local officials. The collectors of revenues in kind were called ḥabūl (Papyri Schott-Reinhardt, i. 45); they were chosen by the community. The Aphrodito papyri (Papyri Schott Reinhardt 1; Greek Papyri in the British Museum, Vol. iv.; Zeitscr. für Assyriol., xx. 68; Der Islam, ii. 245) contain information about the taxes at the end of the first century and at the same time of the oldest period also. The government expected two kinds of taxes from the 'Sāhib al-Kūra, the dinārīs and the kīrīmīs. Both were levied on the subdivisions of the kūra by the central authority in accordance with returns prepared and sent in beforehand, and were communicated to them directly in a document (kathārīt), which had, however, to pass through the hands of the 'Sāhib al-Kūra. The dinārīs, i.e. the regular principal taxes were divided into 1) kātūs dinārīs = ḥamā, a tax paid in money only and 2) sinūk dinārīs = darbūt al-ja'fit, a tax paid in kind, wheat or barley. The amount of each tax was fixed by the central authority. The system of taxation was therefore a collective one throughout and it was the business of the local officials to distribute these assessments. The kātūs were provided for out of a) a land-tax (dinārīs γῆς), b) a poll-tax (διανόμη, διάγραφος) c) local rates (ζωλόν). Artisans etc. who did not possess land contributed to the land-tax also. The poll-tax was not at first a general one but it is not yet quite clear on what basis it was levied. Besides these taxes in money there was the embol, which was, however, occasionally paid in money also (ζωλόν = θρασμαν). A portion of it was to be applied to local purposes in the form of provisions (ζωλόν) and the remainder sent to the store-houses in Babylon or Alexandria. The extraordinary taxes were quite as regular as the dinārīs. Materials for shipbuilding, tools, or skilled workmen and sailors and their pay were demanded from the kūra. The kūra had to prepare and provide these and ultimately even to buy them. Substitution by the payment of an equivalent in money was not desired but probably the individual members of the community paid their share in money. All these taxes come under the heading of liturgy. The state of affairs as depicted in the papyri does not agree at all well with the statements of the Arab jurists on dzīya [q. v., i. 1051 et seq.] and kharājd; the points that arise out of this are discussed in these articles. In contrast to the interpretations of the jurists an old historian quoted by Makrīzī Ḫisāyat, i. 77, 5 et seq.; ed. Wiet, i. 323 et seq.) gives an excellent account of the system, which well illustrates the collective character of the taxation and is quite reconcilable with the evidence of the papyri. At a later period Muṣaddasī, (ed. de Goeje, 2nd ed., p. 212, 1) tells us that there really was no proper kharājd in Egypt, but that the soil belonged to the government and the peasant only tilled it; the rent was taken in kind by the officials after the harvest and the remainder was the peasant's share. Although the word kharājd regularly appears in Egyptian documents of the 'Abbasid period with the double meaning of tax in general and land-tax in particular, Muṣaddasī's statements are substantially correct because kharājd and rent were combined in Egypt (Zeitschr. für Assyriol., xxx. 312).
To understand the whole agrarian system of Arab Egypt it must be remembered that at the time when the Arabs assumed authority in Egypt, the government was nowhere directly in touch with the actual tax-payers, the peasants, but owing to the Byzantine system of patroniun a mediatory class of powerful patróni had come into existence guaranteeing the taxes and these were recognised as land-owners. The peasants themselves were bound to the soil and could only change their abode after obtaining permission. Throughout the early period of Islam we find the struggle to keep these colonists (gūlūyā, ʿayyātā) on the land. It is not quite certain how far these great land-owners were replaced by regular officials or if they — this is more probable — remained in existence as private tax-farmers and guarantors till they were gradually replaced by Arabs. In any case the administrative practice of the Fātimid period — and probably we here have the survival of a much older system — recognises three classes of tax-collectors (Ibn Manṣūr, 8, 1): 1. bi-amāna, i. e. people who are absolutely trusted to deliver the taxes without guarantee; 2. bi-baḥūl i. e. those who claim to be able to bring in more than their predecessors and who are pledge to pay the amout yielded by their predecessors as a minimum, i. e. bi-dannām; 3. those who pledge themselves to pay a fixed sum and must make up that amount. The latter class, probably the most common, had its analogue in the public bestowal of estates (kaftāʾ) which were granted to private individuals by public auction (bashāmd) on a certain sum being guaranteed as rent and taxes, which was practically dāmūn or taḵāḥul and technically known as iḥā. These kaftāʾ originally comprised probably only the government estates and the agrei deserti (mawār), but, as far as can be seen, more valuable estates were gradually added to them in the long run. It is still doubtful if the farming out of the kaftāʾ was separated from the administration of other taxes. In any case the difference between an official tax-farmer and a private individual, who under the protection of the state guarantees taxes on the land he rents from the state, was not very great especially as the kaftāʾ included not simply the soil but the men who lived on it also and even whole villages. At a later period all the land became iḥāṣat and iḥāṣa received the meaning of military fief. This process which has already been investigated by Silvestre de Sacy (cf. his still important work Sur la Nature et les Révolutions du Droit de Propricté territoriale en Égypte, Institut Royal de France, i., v., vii.), shows several stages. Under the Abūssids and the dynasties of independent governors the letting of the estates took place annually by a kind of public auction in the Amr and afterwards in the Tulunid Mosque. The allotment was for a period of four years to make up for failure of harvest and other contingencies. This rent was the kharāṣ. Sums expended in improvements, maintenance of canals etc. were allowed to be deducted. The remainder, often very considerable, was the profit of the lessee. What the relations of the latter with the local authorities were is not known. Every 30 years a new survey was made (Khitāf, i. 82). At the beginning of the Fatimid period this system remained unaltered, and any one could still be a candidate, but by the later Fatimid period the military formed the great majority. We read of ḥāṣaʿ al-amāna which yielded good return, and of soldiers’ estates which yielded a poor return (Khitāf, i. 83.). The tenants were called muṣṭafa. The leases were for 30 years. These conditions the existence of which in Egypt can be dated 530 = 1107-1108, can be shown to have existed in Jarak two centuries previously (v. Kremer, Einuahenbudjet des Abbasiden-Kataches, p. 17). In Jarak as in Egypt the persons of influence — and these were in the long run the soldiers — gradually paid less and less in taxes and thus these estates in time became appanages or military fiefs while the tax or rent due on the land came to be looked on as reimbursement. According to Maḥṣūl (Khitāf, i. 95 et seq.) Nizām al-Mulk took the decisive step in this direction (cf. also Bondari, ed. Houtsma, p. 58) and from the year 480 = 1087 on his example was generally followed. He probably only legislated the actual practice. A great period of prosperity is thus said to have been brought to these estates. This may be true for the districts held in fief by the Emirs but for the countless small fiefs this step spelled ruin. For it was not merely a question of a rent which the state had confiscated but the individual villages and districts passed into the possession of the fief-holders who took the place of the treasury in the districts concerned. This practice was probably first brought to Egypt by Saladin or one of his successors. In 515 = 1121 one could still trace a clear distinction between tax-farming and military fief (Khitāf, 83, 16). As the troops did not pay, an immense debt (dawāra) had grown up which was remitted in that year. These very dawāra show it was not yet a question of real military fiefs, which soon afterwards became quite usual. Of course a large share of these estates or their yield still remained at the disposal of the government, for the ruling power for the time could not entirely give up the great rents derived from agriculture. An interesting register of distribution is given in the Khitāf, i. 8 for the Ayūb period after Saladin. From time to time new conditions of allotment arose out of new surveys. Thus we read in the Mamluk period of an arrangement by which 4 twenty-fourths (kīrāf) of the land to be allotted were reserved for the Sultan, 10 for the Emirs and 10 for the soldiers. We are best informed about the so-called Rūh Nāṣīrī, the survey of Muḥammad b. Kalaʾūn of the year 715 = 1315 (Khitāf, i. 87 et seq.). Here the proportion was 10 to the Sultan and 4 to the appanages. The poll-taxes (dawāra) in the country were included for the first time in the ḥāṣa but a in the large sums they were allotted separately. The muṣṭafa became more important and more absolute master of his fief. Ibn Dījān’s book gives a much later system of division from the end of the Mamluk period. In the Ottoman period the melûṣa developed from the muṣṭafa and he then appears as the direct owner, for which see de Sacy, p. 81. The charters granting fiefs were called ṣīḏīl in the early period and in later times mihāl. In Maṣūr’s time all Egypt was divided into the following seven classes of lands (Khitāf, i. 97 et seq.): 1. those which belonged to the privy purse, Diwan al-Khaṣṣ (this diwan replaced the vizierate in the reign of Ibn Kalaʾūn, Kalaṣhānī-Wüstenfeld, p. 157) and appertained to the Diwan Mufrad (instituted by Barūk Ḳibīl, ibid., p. 158); 2. fiefs of the
emirs and soldiers; 3, wafás of the most varied description; 4, fiefs could also be made wafá by the sultan himself, but this was no longer so, (on this point see Der Islam, i. 95 et seq.); 4, Ḍhikār (a particular kind of wafá; to be identified with ḍiyāb); cf. Kalkashandi, Dowd al-Sabīb, 250 sub No. 8; 5, Amūlik, estates purchased from the treasury which had become private property (the rent from them again became a fief; cf. Kalkashandi-Wüstenfeld, 158, iv. where the Arabic text of the manuscript has amūlik for "treasury of the crown-lands"; also cf. Sacy, op. cit., i. 86 et seq.); 6 and 7 desert or unirrigated land. This division survived with many inner changes down to the French period, but it cannot be discussed here in all its details. Those interested may be referred to de Sacy's work already quoted several times and to Lancret, Mémoire sur le système d'imposition territoriale sur l'administration des provinces de l'Égypte dans les dernières années du gouvernement des Mamlouks (Description de l'Égypte, État Moderne, 2nd ed., xi. 461 et seq.); Le Comte Estève, Mémoire sur les finances de l'Égypte depuis sa conquête par le Sultan Sélîm Ier jusqu'à celle du grand chef Bonaparte (ib., xii. 41 et seq.); Tailien, Mémoire sur l'administration de l'Égypte à l'époque de l'arrivée des Français (Mémoires sur l'Égypte, iii. 190).

After this survey of its agrarian policy we will return to the organisation of the state itself. The primitive arrangements of the early centuries continued with the occasional institution of new diwāns through the period of the Tālūnids and Khshshōids also, only with this distinction that in this period the chief authority centred in the person of the ruler himself. It is said of Ibn Tūlūn that he introduced a constitution which was not Arab, that he was the first to have a vizier — in deed but not yet in name —; Ṭahshī, we are told, first introduced the ṭawābit, allowances (Ḳiṭḥāṭ, i. 99, 10); we do not know very much about these institutions however. It is not till the Fātimid period that we have a good account of the constitution. According to Maqrīzī (Ḳiṭḥāṭ, i. 99-101) the natural division of the diwān was into threefold: 1. Kiṭḥāt al-Dīqāqī; 2. Kiṭḥāt al-Kharaṣī and 3. Kiṭḥāt al-Inšā' al-Mulūk. We find this threefold division actually in use under the Fātimid Wizarate. Our knowledge of the Diwān al-Inšā' is particularly accurate; for besides Ḥṣīṭāt, ii. 224 et seq. and Kalkashandi (ed. Wüstenfeld), 188 there is a special work by al-Ṣaʿīrī on the Ḥākin Diwān al-Raṣūl (ed. 'Ali Bahgat, Cairo 1905), an invaluable contemporary document, which was copied by Kalkashandi in his great work L'Art du Style, without its title being given and post-dated. For further information see Becker, Beitwürze, iii. The Diwān al-Dīqāqī was one of the greatest importance even in the pre-Fātimid period. In it the lay the genius of the diwān system at least as far as the Arabs were concerned. The military Diwān was reorganised four times in the early period, but it was not till the rise of the Turkish guards and the Barber and negro troops of the Fātimids that it was placed upon an entirely new basis. Maqrīzī's account of this development (Ḳiṭḥāṭ, i. 94) is most instructive. The troops originally received pay (ṭa'i) and this went on till the system of military fiefs arose; at all periods, however, salaries in cash and ṭeṣā'āt existed side by side in the military Diwān (Kalkashandi-Wüstenfeld, 190 et seq.). Here lay the connection between the military Diwān and the Dawā'ir al-Anwa', or police offices (see Der Islam, i. 95 et seq. op. cit. The revenues of the state are lawful or unlawful with reference to the Shari'a. On the lawful cf. the article Bait al-Māl. The unlawful were mainly the civic mukās i.e. a vast amount of small taxes and all sorts of monopolies. The list of the mukās abolished by Salādīn in Ḥṣīṭāt, i. 104; gives a good idea of their nature in the Fātimid period; it is said that Ibn Tūlūn abolished the mukās (ibid., ii. 257, 33) but even Ibn Kālūn had to abolish most oppressive abuses of this kind (ibid., i. 87, 13). The abolition of the mukās was a favourite move by powerful rulers who wished to be assured of popular favour (Ibn 'Iṣām, i. 99). These taxes were called ḍiyāb in opposition to the kharaṣi; the former were reckoned by the lunar and the latter by the solar year. Ibn Muḍābbir, the greatest antagonist of the Tālūnids is said to have been the first to introduce this kind of tax into Egypt (cf. Beiträge, ii. 144 et seq.). Accounts of the monopolies and other unlawful sources of revenue in the Fātimid period are given in Ḥṣīṭāt, i. 107-111; Ibn Mammāt, 10-26; Kalkashandi-Wüstenfeld, 159-171. The warehouses of (books, weapons, clothes etc.) are also detailed in Ḥṣīṭāt-Wüstenfeld, 175 and Ḥṣīṭāt, i. 408, formed an important part of the Fātimid Dawā'ir al-Anwa'.

But these offices in the Diwāns formed only a part of the hierarchy of officials in the Fātimid period. The latter may be subdivided as follows: 1. Military Officers (Arbāb al-Sayyāf): 1. Officers in the army such as vizier, chamberlain (Ṣāḥīb al-Bāb), field-marshall (ṣīnāqāt) etc. 2. The household with numerous officers in more immediate attendance on the Caliph. B. civil officers (Arbāb al-Allāmā: 1. the ecclesiastical officials (chief kādī, chief dā'i, muḥāsib, the head of Bait al-Māl, al-Nā'ūb, and the Korān-readers; 2. the offices in the Diwāns in the threefold division described above with numerous subdivisions; 3. the provincial; 4. the county officials. All these officials lived in the court. Other classes were outside like the governors. Here we have followed Ḥṣīṭāt-Wüstenfeld, 181 et seq. For other offices in the provinces see Ibn Mammāt, 7 et seq. The Fātimid system of state and court officials developed into the complicated system of the Mamlik period which differed in details. Our sources for the latter are excellent (cf. Ḥṣīṭāt, ii. 204-229 and passim; Kalkashandi, Dowd al-Sabīb, 234—269; transl. Wüstenfeld, 157 et seq. and passim; O'mari's chancery-manual, al-Turīf bi-mlāqāt al-ṣāri'a; Quintrémere, Sultans Mamelouks; Khall al-Zahari, Zuhd al-Raṣīf (ṣīnāqāt) of Ibn Lyās, Badīu ʿl-Kulār; van Berchem, Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum; Blochet, Histoire de l'Égypte de Maqrīzī). It is quite impossible here to give a detailed account of the elaborate organisation of the Mamlik state. We can only mention a few characteristic differences between the Mamlik and the Fātimid systems. Development proceeded along three lines: Persian influence became very strong, the number of offices was considerably increased and they became more and more the prerogatives of the military classes. In place of the Ḍūr or Khasānāt al-Ṣharīb we find the Shārīkhānā, the Khazānāt al-Firāq becomes the Firāqshāhīnā, the Khazānāt al-Surūf the Ḥṣīṭāt-Wüstenfeld, 190 et
through-trade but had a splendid opportunity for realising its own raw produce and the products of its industry. The importance of these geographical factors was much more apparent in the middle ages than at the present day with the levelling influence of intercourse with foreign countries and the progress of invention. In the middle ages the annual rise of the Nile affected the whole life of the country as may be seen from the example quoted in Beitrüge, i. 47 et seq.

The amount of revenue from taxation depended on the Nile and the price of flour and bread varied from day to day according to the level of the river. In Assuan the rise of the Nile is first noticed in the last week of June and in Cairo in the beginning of July. The flood has half reached its height in Cairo about the 15th August and is at its height at the end of September. After fourteen days it begins to fall, has half sunk by the middle of November and reaches its lowest level at the end of May. At the present day the difference between the highest and lowest level is 23 feet in Assuan and in Cairo 16 feet (Baedeker, Egypt, p. XLVI). In the middle ages the level of the Nile was measured by Nilometers (mikyád) in ells ( guar-da) and fingerlengths. The Arabs built Nilometers in Assuan, Dendera, Asuán, Hulwan and lastly the most known one on the island of Rûdân (ib. p. 821). In the early centuries of Islam 16 ells was the height desired while 12 and 18 were the critical points below and above; for it was possible to have too much even of a blessing; in the later middle ages from the ixth = xvth century the level of the land had so risen that 16 ells were no longer sufficient but 17-18 ells were the normal and floods rose occasionally as high as 20 ells (Kalkashandi-Wüstenfeld, 22 et seq.). When it rose the river did not simply overflow its frequently very high banks, but was also led by an extensive system of canals which changed considerably in the course of centuries into the land behind. The canals were closed till the Nile had reached the certain height. The opening of the Kâldjî at Cairo was one of the greatest festivals of the year and was celebrated with old ceremonial and splendour, like all the Nile festivals which were taken over practically unaltered by Islam (ib. 209 et seq.; Ibn Taghribirdî, ii. 480 et seq.; Khîfat, i. 470 et seq.). The greatest and most important of these canals have been described in detail by the writers (Kalk-Wüst., 23 et seq.; Khîfat, i. 70 et seq.). After the fertilising water had spread over the whole land it was allowed to stand on the fields for some time in a system of tanks — to deposit its fertilising elements and then run off again. Seed was then rolled into the still moist earth in the most primitive fashion. The harvest was ripened in a few months and the land lay fallow and dry till the next flood. This utilisation of the flooded land once a year was called the winter crop (al-asfîf al-khāliwâya). Its principal products were wheat, barley broad beans (fa'îl), peas, chick-peas, lentils, flax, clover, onions, garlic, lupines. The winter crop is to be distinguished from the summer crop (ṣaffâya) on land permanently irrigable; the latter’s products were, sugarcane, melons, labia, sesame, cotton, colocasia, auberges, indigo, raddishes, turnips, lettuce, cauliflower (from Khîfat, i. 101 et seq.; Ibn Mannârî, 29 et seq.; cf. also Kalkashandi-Wüstenfeld, 33 et seq.; von Kremer, Agypten, i.
197 et seq.). Vines, date palms and a few other fruit-trees also flourished. In certain places with a plentiful water-supply, such as the Fayyum, rice was also grown. Durra was cultivated in Upper Egypt. On permanently watered land as many as three crops might be obtained in a year by following a certain rotation. The Egyptian agricultural and revenue year was the Coptic solar year. It began with the month Tūt. In Makrūt, Khiṭat, i. 270 et seq. (transl. Casanova, 54 et seq.) and Ibn Mammātī, p. 26 et seq. there is an instructive list shewing what agricultural duties and what taxes etc. fall in each month. For comparison with modern conditions we may here recommend the reader to the Textbook of Egyptian Agriculture, by G. P. Foden and F. Fletcher, 2 vols., Cairo 1908—1910, published by the Ministry of Education. As the land yielded its harvest by the solar year and taxes were paid by the Arab lunar year a whole year had to be dropped after 33 lunar years as 32 solar years corresponded approximately to 33 lunar years. This equation by which no one lost or gained anything as it only existed on paper, was called tāḥṣīl al-sana (Khiṭat, i. 273 et seq.; Casanova, p. 66 et seq.). The quality of the soil and with it its rent and tax-paying capacity varied considerably. While in the modern period a distinction is only made between rāy, the land reached by the flood, and ḍhāriṣ, the land not affected by it (von Kremer, Agypten, i. 179), the middle ages distinguished a whole series of grades of lands, which are detailed by Ibn Mammātī, p. 28 et seq.; Khiṭat, i. 100; ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Waḥīd, p. 115. The unit of agricultural land was the faddān (= acre), which was divided into 400 square kasābas of Ḥākim (Khiṭat, i. 103; 1): 1 square kasaba at the present day = 16 square yards; 1 linear kasaba = 4 yards. The cll, ḍhāra was smaller (at the present day = 2 feet). On the manner of measuring cf. Ibn Mammātī, p. 32 et seq. The most important cubic measure was the ḫirāb, the ancient Artabe = 198 litres of 6 waḥāls (1 waḥāl = 33 litres), but there were Artabes of different sizes. The standard weight was the kīntūr (44.9 kg) of 100 ṛif. One ṛif is therefore a little less than 1 lb. A distinction was made between laṭṭaḥ and ḍharrānī kīntūrs (ʿĀqīt, p. 224).

Egypt is usually regarded as the typical agricultural country but Momsen has pointed out that in ancient Egypt a large section of the population lived by industry. The industries of Egypt were naturally all dependent on agriculture for their raw material, for example the textile industry, the manufacture of oil and ointments, which were also exported. Only a few industries depended on imported raw material such as the unimportant iron manufactures of the seaport of Tinnis and Dīlās in Central Egypt. The silk which was frequently employed in the textile industries was also imported (probably from Syria). The imports of leather were limited to the hides of rare animals as the leather trade of Central Egypt had its materials supplied by the land itself. Weaving was by far the most important industry. It was only carried on on a large scale in the towns which we know to have been centres of the Christian population: Tinnis, Damietta, Bahnas, Ashmūnain, Asyūt and Akhmīm. The Arabs themselves had no manufactures. A distinction may be made between the manufacture of woolen, cotton and linen goods. Lower Egypt was the centre of the linen industry, and to some extent Central Egypt also while the manufacture of wool and cotton seems to have been confined to Central and Upper Egypt. Wool was manufactured into veils, garments and carpets in numerous factories between Bahnas and Akhmīm. Besides the celebrated veils 30 ells long which were sold in pairs, imitations of the red woollen goods of Armenia were manufactured. The wool of goats was used for the manufacture of cameltooth-like stuffs. The woollen goods made in Upper Egypt were exported in large quantities and were famous as far as Persia, Cotton which at the present day is the dominant factor in Egyptian agriculture, was also grown and manufactured in the Arab period and even earlier. Bahnas was the main centre of this industry. In the oases garments were made of the cotton grown there but here the industry was only prosecuted to supply the local demand and nothing seems to have been exported.

By far the most important branch of the Egyptian textile industry was the weaving of linen, the great centre of which lay in the northeast and northwest corners of the Delta, in Damietta and Tinnis in the east and Alexandria in the west. Its products were carried throughout Europe and Asia (Ali bahgīū, Les Manufactures d’Histoire en Egypte au Moyen Age, Institut Égyptien, 6th April 1903). We possess very full details of the looms of the east. Around Damietta and Tinnis there were a number of smaller places in and around the modern Lake Menzaleh each of which produced its local specialties. Common to them all was the manufacture of a fine linen cloth, called sharb of which a single piece cost as much as 100 dinars. In Damietta it was manufactured only in white and in Tinnis only in colours. In addition the manufacture of brocades and silk appliqué work flourished in all these places. Tinnis alone had 5000 looms. The men and not the women wove as was the case even in the time of Herodotos. This industry was therefore not organised in the women’s apartments but in a way peculiar to itself which can be reconstructed by a careful examination of the sources. It has been thought that the whole industry was a monopoly. This is incorrect. We can distinguish clearly between state and private enterprises. To understand the gigantic scale of some of these state factories it must be remembered that the robes produced there were officially given away as presents in large quantities; the whole court received new garments twice a year; besides, in those days robes were bestowed as orders are at the present day, perhaps even often and more indiscriminately. Besides a large wardrobe was a form of investment not to be despised in a period when the hoarding of objects of value was a securer way of saving money than investing capital in industry. Such products of the royal looms as came into the market came from the wardrobes thus formed by disgraced nobles. When the robes were finished in their place of manufacture they were sent to Cairo where those destined for the Caliph were fitted in one of the women’s apartments of the palace, where 30 girls worked under the supervision of a manageress. This is the only trace we find of the Byzantine gynaeceum. The private factories were organised on quite different lines. Outside Damietta on the river bank lay the
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large buildings in the upper stories of which were workrooms which the weavers could hire. It was here that the valuable stuffs were prepared. Unfortunately we do not know who let these rooms, whether it was the state or rich private individuals. All sales were conducted by brokers licensed by the state. There were the regular middle men. But it was probably they also who supplied the workers with material. They kept accurate note that each worker actually used up the material supplied him for the manufacture of a certain garment. What he saved in material was deducted from the price paid him. When the garments had been woven their further treatment was a highly specialised branch of industry. The first man folded them, the second wrapped them up, the third laid them in baskets and boxes and the fourth tied them; each required to be paid and made his sign on the box. They were then loaded on ships and sent away to be sold.

The other industries can only be briefly detailed. Egypt did not have the olive tree; it was only grown here and there as a garden tree. All olive oil had therefore to be imported and a cheap substitute to be found for lamp-oil. The Egyptians prepared the latter even in ancient times by pressing certain seeds which contain oil. The following were cultivated for this purpose: radish, rape, lettuce, sesame, saffron, mustard, flax and hemp. The manufacture of oil probably never exceeded the demands of local requirements. The remains of the crushed seeds were used as cattle food. The only industrial use of oil was in the soap factories which must have been especially numerous in Koptos. Soap was made in various colours and was a popular article of commerce. The manufacture of sugar was a rather more important. Sugar-cane must have been, as at the present day, very often eaten raw but more usually pressed to obtain the sugar which was considered such a delicacy. We have only to read the accounts of various writers of the castles and figures in sugar which were made in thousands and sent by the Caliph to all the officials to understand that this was a most important industry. Sugar was also exported. Although we know nothing of the organisation of these sugar mills, the actual technical processes are well known. In addition to these the most important industries there were smaller ones like the manufacture of papyrus which disappeared with the introduction of paper in the ivth (xth) century. We cannot here go into the great number of smaller industries. The individual trades were under State and organised into guilds.

Great activity in agriculture and industry presupposes the development of trade. We are unfortunately not well informed about the corn trade. Like all trade in the produce of the soil it was under strict state control but it was probably not entirely a state monopoly. The revenues of the state in kind were however again sold by the state; cf. for example the state traffic called bakṣ [r. y., i. 632]. Corn was exported to Arabia and Syria and, according to the former also to the far end of the country. We know almost nothing of private commerce. We only read railway of the prices produced by private speculation, but the state also speculated as it usually had exactly the same interests as the organiser of a private enterprise. Flax played a certain part as an article of commerce next to wheat. The centre of the flax trade lay above the Faiyum in the Nile valley, the Faiyum itself only produced an inferior quality of flax. The corn trade of Upper Egypt had its centre farther south at Manfalūt near Asyūt. Corn, flax and cotton were exported abroad and even to Italy. Foreign trade in general may be divided into three well marked fields: a. trade to Nubia and the Sudan via Assuan and Asyūt; b. the trade through in Indian goods via the harbours of the Red Sea and lastly; c. the Mediterranean trade.

Arab gold and silver coins were current up to the second century and above it the trade was carried on entirely by barter. Nubia chiefly exported slaves, which after the foundation of black regiments (shabīl) by Ibn Ṭūlūn were required in large numbers. There were also considerable expords of gold from the Ṭallūli gold washings. The gold coined at the state mint was obtained chiefly from Takrūr i.e. the Sudan. We do not know how it came to Egypt, possibly via Assuan and Asyūt. Egypt exported to the Sudan in return, corn and textiles and also glass beads, combs and corals (cf. ASUA, i. p. 492-493). In the early centuries of Islam Assam was by far the most important town in Upper Egypt. In the Fāṭimid period Kūf gradually rose to importance and ultimately supplanted it, which was probably due to the prosperity of trade with India (cf. the article AIJHAR, i. 210.). The development of Indian trade was a result of the commercial activity of the Egyptian nobles. In the pre-Fāṭimid period the renting of land and the usurious trade in corn connected with it formed the usual outlet for the investment of private capital. At all periods shops, baths and inns formed a favourite outlet for private enterprise. But under the Ayūbids and Mam букв Indian trade became the favorite form of investment. It lay in the hands of a company who called themselves Karamites and had their headquarters in Kūf and Cairo. The etymology of the word is uncertain. The Karamites had a bank which conducted international business on a large scale. An attempt was made on one occasion under the Mamlük to oust them from their position as intermediaries in the spice (particularly pepper and cinnamon) trade, but it failed. They had at all times to suffer from the encroachments of the state. All goods passing through Egypt were liable to the zakāt, which in Saladin's time was levied at 5-6 places at the rate of 2½% each time. This made a total customs duty of 15% of the value. In the last year of Fāṭimid rule spices to the value of 800,000 dinārs passed through Cairo. This probably did not increase in the later period. As long as Baghhdād flourished, Indian trade went via that city; the Jewish "Raḍāites", who at that time traded between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea did not touch the Nile valley at all. It was only with the decline of Baghdad and especially after its fall that Egypt became the great centre of exchange until this trade lost its importance with the discovery of the sea-route to the East and of America.

We have abundant material for the study of the Mediterranean trade of Egypt in western sources and in the commercial treaties published by Aamar (Diplomia Arab). There are two excellent works covering the whole field: Heyd, Geschichte des Levanthandels und Schaufel, Handelsgeschichte der Romanischen Volker des Mittelmee-
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review in, International Handelskrift in
de Middeloevers (K. Akademie van Wetenschappen,
4th Reeks, Deel ix.). We further propose to give
here a few notes on the tariff policy of Egypt and the
state trade with its monopolies carried on through the
customhouses of which a clear picture is given
by Arabic sources hitherto neglected. It is only
for the Fatimid and post-Fatimid period that we
have fairly detailed information, naturally enough
as intercourse with Europe only began with the
Crusades. Commerce with the Italian cities must
have been more important than the trade with
Byzantium and the west in the pre-Fatimid period.
Customs duties were levied in proportion to the
value of the goods. In the early period the
basis of the tax was one tenth, in Saladin's
time a fifth of the value, but it varied between
10/1% or less and 35/0% or more according to the
nature and place of origin of the goods.
The tenth became the favourite levy; for example Pisa
paid it on wood, iron and pitch i.e. entirely on
articles which Egypt required to import. Precious
metals were for brief periods duty-free but as a
rule the tax on them was 2½—10/0%. The policy of
the Egyptian tariff system was to attract to the
country certain raw products which it could
not do without and were not produced in it.
These were principally wood and iron and all the
articles required for shipbuilding and the munici-
pations of war. Wood, iron and pitch recur contin-
ually in all commercial treaties. The Egyptians did
everything they could to encourage such imports.
In the face of European pressure Egypt
required these articles to maintain its military
efficiency. The Popes of the Crusading period
therefore repeatedly declared these to be con-
traband of war. The re-export of these articles was
also forbidden; for the dogana i.e. the diwaan,
the government customhouses, bought them up at
the current price. We thus find the state acting
not only as an intermediary but as the purchaser
and the process was as follows: when a merchant
imported a number of goods, including wood or
iron, he had first of all to pay the duties on his
whole cargo in wood and iron. If he had still a fair
quantity of the latter left then the government bought
it from him. But he did not receive the whole
price in gold but only a third while he had to
take two thirds in alum. Side by side with the
buying up of all imported wood all forests were
government property, and on them we have full
details (Ali Bahgat, Les Forets en Egypte, Institut
Egyptien 1900, p. 141 et seq.). Wood, iron, pitch,
oakum etc. were state monopolies because they
were not produced in the country and were neces-
sities. To keep the price as low as possible the
government had also a monopoly of such
valuable native products as were much desired
by foreign countries, notably alum, niter and
emeralds, to use them for exchange. Alum was
dug up in the Lybian desert and the oases by
Bedouins and brought to certain harbours on the
Nile notably Kus, Akmim, Assyut and Bahmas.
The government purchased it at these places at
30 dirhems the cwt., or even cheaper. Private
trade was forbidden and strictly punished. The
average amount exported by the state through the
dogana was 5000 cwt.; it sometimes rose to
13,000 cwt. The market price varied from 4—6
dirhams per cwt. Only a small proportion of the
alum remained in the country, the chief purchasers
being the dyers as alum is used for red dye;
but the total disposed of in Cairo was only 80
cwts. The Egyptians had to pay a higher price
than foreigners, viz. 6½—7½ dirhams a cwt.
The nation was obtained in Wadi Natrun, on
the western borders of the Delta. Here the Bedouins
only acted as carriers. The large industry itself
was in the hands of a staff of officials and workmen
appointed by the state. A cwt. cost the state
about 2 dirhems at the mines and was sold in
Cairo and Alexandria for 70 dirhems, which showed
a considerable profit in spite of the high cost of
transport. The latter was not exorbitant as the
Arabs had to carry one third of every consign-
ment free. In the working of the emerald mines
of the Arabian desert the state again appears as a
monopolist. The deposits were in cavities which
were entered with ladders and ropes. While private
enterprise was allowed a free hand in the gold
washing industry of the Bodj country, the state
maintained full control over the emerald mines.
The workers were paid by the government, which
also supplied them with tools. The workers were
only allowed to leave the mines naked so that
they could not conceal any stones. The stones
obtained went to the Sultan's treasury. On the
whole monopolies were a characteristic of the later
period. In the Mamlik period the state claimed
first right to everything. This practice, which was
however known previously, was called farb; i.e.
the state claimed for itself exclusively the part of
middleman. This subject has as yet been but little
investigated. M. Soerberheim's Das Zuckermonopol
unter Sultan Barsch (Zeitschr. für Assyriol., xxvii.
75 et seq.) is an excellent study of one branch of it.
The above material will shortly appear in an
extended form with full references and illustrative
passages in Beiträge, iii. Preliminary articles are
to be found in Klio, iv. 2, p. 1 et seq. and Der
Islam, i. 93 et seq. Ibn al-Hajjaj, Madhhab, iii.
gives an unrivalled account of the details of trade
and industry. With the exception of the works of the
French expedition no preliminary work has been done on the economic conditions of the
Ottoman period.

4. INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITY AND ART.

It is quite impossible to give a full appreciation of the intellectual activities of Egypt in the Muslim
period in the space at our disposal here. We
can only emphasise the fact that in Egypt we
have an unbroken literary development from the
beginnings of Islam to the present day. The bearers
of famous names, who held appointments in mos-
ques and madrasas, libraries and hospitals as well
as in the diwan as innumerable, not to speak of
popular intellectual movements, the popular
romances, and the shadow plays. The architects
and artists to whom the golden age of Egypt
owed its splendid edifices are mostly nameless
and it is as yet hardly possible to comprehend
their influence and inter-connection. Certain it is
that we have here a vast amount of mental energy
to which the whole of mediaeval Egypt owes its
soul. With this wealth of material all that can be
investigated here is what are the essential and
what the special features of the intellectual culture
of Muslim Egypt. Egypt was in the first place
the cradle of important schools of Shī'ī and
Mālikī Law. Secondly Shi'ism as elsewhere here
left its special character on external forms of organisation. In the third place a love for the Nile valley and the splendour of its ancient history had created a historical tradition, which was unequalled by that of any other Muslim country and lastly Egypt was the home of the Oriental populace.

The beginnings of intellectual activity in Egypt are quite obscure. It is clear that the inhabitants of the Nile valley played no part in the decisive controversies of the earliest days of Islam; Egypt was only a province and occupied with other affairs. Maṣṣūzi (Khitat, i. 332) tells us that the various camps followed the teachings of the 'Companions' and Tabbūn among them. Thus the Egyptians attached themselves to 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr, the son of the conqueror, and in the later generation to the Ḥāʾim b. Sa'd. 'Abd Allāh is said to have expounded decisions of the Prophet and eschatology. Now there has actually survived on papyrus a Shī'a of 'Abdallāh b. 'Amr passing under the name of Ibn Lāha', with traditions which deal with the last judgment (Papyri Schott-Reinhold, i. 9). This Ibn Lāha' is one of the best known traditionists of Egypt of the first half of the second century. He and Lāhā are the principal authorities of the period. Al-Allāni, ed. Guest, provides us with an excellent means of studying how the great religious wars of the East, the development of ritual and in the later period of the Ẓāhirī, the traces of an Egyptian practice also. A certain Mawālī, Yazīd b. Abī Ḥanīfah, in the time of 'Omar II, appears to have been the first actual teacher of the Fāṭimids, who discussed ḥarām and ḥalāl. The Mawālī's on the whole played a considerable part in Egypt. The Mālikī madhhab attained importance at a very early period. It is said to have been first introduced by Mawālī 'Abd al-Rahmān (died 163 = 779). The Mālikī ritual reigned supreme till in 195 = 815 al-Shāfī'i came to Egypt and soon attracted a large following. He worked here till his death in 204 = 820 and his tomb is revered as a holy place. The Ḥanafī school was traditionally represented by a Ḥanafī judge sent from Baghdad, but its first representative at once met with a vigorous opposition, led by Lāhā b. Sa'd, because he wished to abolish the akbas (al-Kindi, 371 et seq.; Khitat, ii. 334; cf. also ib. i. 294 et seq.). The Mālikī and Ṣāfī al-Shāfī'i schools thus remained predominant till the coming of the Fāṭimids, who organised everything after the Shī'ite-Isma'ili fashion. It is not generally known that the Shī'ite creed was something new or unheard of in Egypt; in Khitat, ii. 334 et seq. we have not only a history of the beginnings of the Shī'a but a particular account of its development in Egypt. Even before the Fāṭimid period there were sanguinary street-riots and the fanatical orthodox negro militia used to ask the people for their creed: "nān khālık?" Whereupon they had to answer "Mu'āwiya" (ib. 340) — a proceeding which can only be explained by the presence of a strong Shī'ite opposition. The greater part of the population was, nevertheless, always orthodox and therefore felt it deeply when with the Fāṭimid the Shī'a of Isma'ili type was declared the only valid madhhab. The well-known addition was at once made to the qādi'ān, the qādi was pronounced over by the Shī'a, Fāṭima and her children, the kasnāla had to be uttered aloud, certain prescriptions of the farū'īf were altered, the

ru'ya and the tārāwīh abolished in Kāmān, the sale of meliğhīgya, Mu'āwiya's favourite vegetable, forbidden and many other changes made. Under Ḥākim they even went so far as to introduce the public execution of the orthodox Caliphs but popular opinion protested against this and other Shī'a prescriptions also were from time to time replaced by orthodox. During the brief interregnum in 425-426 = 1033-1034, during which the ẓāhirī was read for the Imām Mūtawakkil, there were four Kātim: an Imāmī, an Isma'ili, a Šāfī'i and a Mālikī. The old principal orthodox rituals had thus survived and at once developed considerably when at length Iskandān restored the orthodox creed to the land which so desired it. Even under the Fāṭimids intellectual pursuits flourished. The vizier Ibn Killis gathered jurists and dogmatics, poets and grammarians around him and made great efforts to propagate an Isma'ili Fīkh in Egypt. The Bān 'l-Nū'mān, a celebrated family of ẓāhirīs during the golden age of the Fāṭimids, worked with similar aims. (R. Gottheil in the Journ. Amer. As. Soc., xxvii. 217-296). Endowments began to be set aside for scholars, the Ḍūr al-Ḥikma, the first Muslim university was founded (Khitat, ii. 342, 3), and Korān readers, jurists, grammarians and physicians appointed to it. When it was closed, the Dūr al-Ġudād was opened (ib. i. 445, 2). A staff of 35 lecturers was maintained at the Aṣṣar Mosque (q. v., i. 532 et seq.) (ib. ii. 341, i). The libraries of the Fāṭimid Caliphs (ibid., i. 407 et seq.) testify to their active interest in intellectual pursuits. This activity did not, however, really reach its zenith till the Sādīqī religious reaction entered Egypt with Saladin. It is a peculiar feature of these warlike times that not only the Ayyūbids but also the great Mamlūks, who were all simple soldiers, took the greatest pleasure in and richly endowed intellectual pursuits, more particularly those connected with religion. Madrasas and Khansās sprang up like mushrooms. The material foundations were laid in the fourth century such a that the study of the Fīkh and Šūṣam could flourish. Naturally madrasas were at first built only for the Mālikis and Šāfī'is. But even by this period Abū Ḥanīfah's school had entered Egypt. The number of Ḥanafī madrasas was disproportionately great. This is explained by the fact that Nūr al-Dīn was an enthusiastic Ḥanafī (ib. ii. 343, 39). The appointment of ẓāhirīs for the three principal rituals also dates from this period; Baghār al-Bundūkādi was the first to add the Ḥanbalī as a fourth but this ritual never attained great influence in Egypt (Suyūtī, ed. cit., i. 274). The external arrangements of the madrasas presented features peculiar to Egypt. Each ritual seems to have had its own madrasa; Saladin for example, founded madrasas for the three principal rituals. It soon became common for two rituals to unite in one madrasa and in no particular combination. There were frequently separate chairs for Ḥadīth and Korān reading in addition to the Fīkh. But by 641 = 1243 we also find all 4 madhbabs combined in one madrasa (Khitat, i. 374, 3); in large madrasas medicine was also taught, being the sole secular subject (ib. ii. 380, 3). It appears particularly remarkable to any one acquainted with the later relation of the Fīkh to Šūṣam that, from the viii<sup>th</sup> = xiv<sup>th</sup> century on, a Fīkh and a Šī'a school were frequently conducted...
alongside of one another in the same madrasa and sometimes even the same Şâhî had charge of both (ib. ii. 392, 14; 394, 38; 398, 2; 399, 12). It can readily be understood how after Saladin the teachings of Ash'arî in dogmatics were regarded as indispensable by all these teachers. This showed itself in the rejection of Ibn Taimiyya. With the decline of the madrasas and the mis-management of the late Mamlûk and Ottoman periods the Ash'arî has more and more become the focus of the intellectual life of Egypt.

In spite of the official patronage of the Hanafî school, it was the old established schools of Mâlik and Şâfîî that made the most remarkable development. Even in the early period of Islâm we find among the Şâfîî al-Munzâni and al-Nasâî, one of the six canonical traditionists, who spent a long time in Egypt; of the later period we may mention the Subûkî, Bûlûnî, Zakariyya al-Ansârî, Ibn Hâdîj al-Gisâlânî, Suyûtî down to Shârâbîni and Shâramallânî. The most important of the Şâfîî's, however, were the two great Şâfîî authorities al-Ramîî (Nihâyát) and Ibn Hâdîj al-Hasîlânî (Tâjüf), of whom the first was an Egyptian, while the second at least began his career there. The Fihrist gives quite a long list of names of Egyptian Mâlikî scholars of the early period. It was from Egypt that the whole of North Africa and Spain was won for the Mâlikî school. For the later period special mention should be made of Ibn al-Hâjîjî, the author of the Mustâkhalîf, and later still Lâkâni, Udhûrî, and Zârâî. While all later writers were merely copyists of older authorities it was nevertheless they who kept alive intellectual interests before the coming of European influence. Their activities were chiefly directed to the Fatwâ, through which alone a certain development was possible. Nevertheless, a gradual deadening of the intellectual life was going on always.

No preparatory studies have as yet been made for the history of Sûfism in Egypt; nevertheless it has always played an important part from the time of the Ayâbîds and Mâlikîs to the present day. One of the earliest mystics, Dhu l-Nūn [q. v., i. 965 et seq.] was an Egyptian; Ibn al-Fârîjî, perhaps the greatest Arab mystic poet, belonged to the Nile valley and it was from here also that Bûsîrî's Burda set forth on its triumphant career throughout the whole Muslim world. The Sûfîyya as an organised body is first mentioned in 200 = 815: a brotherhood played a certain part in some political troubles (al-Kindî, ed. Guest, p. 148). The brotherhood system reached its zenith under Sâlîdîn and his successors, to which the long list of Khânkâhs and Zâwiyyas in Ma'ârî's Khatîfî, ii. 414 et seq. bears eloquent testimony. The first Khânkhâh was a Dîr Sâ'dî al-Sâ'nîdî (Khatîfî, ii. 415) which was used for other purposes in the Fâtimid period but made a wâkî by Sâlîdîn (569 = 1173). It was originally destined for Sûfîs from abroad but soon became the centre of Egyptian Sûfism. Its Şâhî bore the title Şâhî al-Shârîyâkîh, which was afterwards given to all heads of Khânkâhs. These Sûfîs in the Ayâbîid period took a prominent part in the public ritual of the chief mosque. The Şâhî appeared after a baldachin and went in ceremonial procession with his adherents on Fridays to the mosque where they read certain lessons before and after the Şâlât al-Djûmû'a. There were Sûfî settlements of this kind not only for men but also for women (Khatîfî, ii. 428, 1), which succeeded divorced women for example and offered them shelter. Only a few of these seem to have been reserved for definite brotherhoods (e. g. ib., ii. 432 ; 435, 109, 95 — for example the Ādâwîya, the order of Şâhî ah had a settlement here — they were usually called after a Şâhî or the founder. The names of orders so well known in Egypt later are entirely lacking in this period; Ma'ârî however (ixth — xvth century) already mentions 11, Fûserî al-Áhmîdîsî al-Rîfîyâ (Khatîfî, ii. 428, 2). The history of the individual şarîs has not yet been written. The development leads in any case to the conclusion that the following were considered the four great Kûtsîs: 'Abd al-Kâdîr al-Gilânî, Aḥmad al-Rîfîî, Aḥmad al-Badawî, the saint of Tânta and Ibrahim al-Dâsîkî. Of these "pole stars" Badawî and Dâsîkî were Egyptians and Rîfîî also is said to have died in Cairo (ib, ii. 428, 27). The communities called after these saints are the Kâdîrîyya, which has no subdivisions in Egypt, the Rîfîyya, which is divided into 3 sections but is overwhelmed by the large Şâhîî (Banîya, Marîkîya, Habîbîya); the Aḥmîdîyya is the most popular order in Egypt, which is divided into 16 subdivisions each with its own Şâhî (furû') of which the Bâbîyya and the Shârânîya are the best known and lastly the Bârâhîmî, the two independent branches of which are called Shâhâwiya and Shârânîba. This scheme which like the next is taken from 'Ali Mubârâk (Khatîfî dîdîdî, iii. 129) is of course not a product of last century but has gradually arisen within the period discussed in this article. Besides these four communities attaching themselves to the four Kûtsîs, the Şâhîs had settled in Egypt at quite an early period and they even had an Egyptian eponym. From the list of Egyptian mystics in Suyûtî, Iwân al-Mu'âjfarîsî (Cairo 1299), i. 292 et seq. It might be assumed that they were predominant in the earlier period. 'Ali Mubârâk, Khatîfî dîdîdîsî, iii. 129, gives 13 furû'. He also mentions the Sa'dîya, the Nakşibânîya, the Khelwattiya with 4 furû' and lastly the Mirghânîya, which was most popular among the Berbers. The latter is a comparatively modern foundation and at the present day all the brotherhoods are under the Şâhîh al-Bakrî, in whose family the blood of the Wâfa'î sharîs and the descendants of Abû Bakr, the Siddîkîs, is mingled. For centuries the Bakris have played a prominent part in the spiritual and more particularly the mystic life of Egypt. The public appearances of the dervishes are now limited to accompanying the Kiswa and the Maḥmîdî and to the feasts of the various Mawâlîs, particularly Mawlî al-Nâbî, which was formerly celebrated with great splendour in the 'Abbâsîya and now in the 'Abbâsîya. It seems as if reforms were to be introduced under the present Bakrî. The most important intellectual contribution made by Egypt is its historical literature. There is no country in the world which through its historical monuments has such a stimulus to the study of history as Egypt. Nevertheless the Muslims never succeeded in getting beyond fables as regards the pre-Mu'âmmadîan history of the country. The fullest survey of this literature (cf. above p. 11—infra) is given by Ibn Wasi' Şâhî. At a very early period, however, an interest in the Muslim period itself arose which followed these lines: political
history, biography of scholars and studies in topography and archaeology, the so-called Khiṣṭāt literature. The same author frequently cultivated all three fields. The origins are very obscure. A. R. Guest has collected all that is to be known about the early history of the historical literature that has survived in the brilliant introduction to his edition of al-Kindī in Ibn ʿAbī al-Ḥakam (died 257 = 871), the oldest author that has survived to us. The later subdivision into the above three branches is not yet found. In al-Kindī (d. 319/931), however, we find them treated in separate sections. In the field of the history of scholarship it was most difficult to preserve local character. Here two interests combined, that of the criticism of tradition and the biographies necessary for it and that of pride in local celebrities, among whom were early reckoned scholars who had made but a temporary sojourn in Egypt. From al-Kindī to Ibn ʿAbī al-Ḥakam, from Ibn Yūnūs to Ṣuṭṭūtī and Makrīzī’s Miṣqāḥa there run unbroken series. Although Egyptian κήδη or Egyptian scholars generally may be discussed, the principle of selection is connected with Egypt. We are likewise only referring here to those who specialise on Egypt among writers of political history; for people like Subkī, for the history of scholars and Naqwī for the historical encyclopaedia belong to another field. What delightful collections of details we owe to the dossiers of Ibn ʿAbī al-Ḥakām for the Tūlūn period, the versatile Ibn Zalīkā, and the diffuse chronicler Musābīḥī for the Fāṭimid period. An appreciation of the whole work of the Fāṭimid historians is given in Bertschke, I. A characteristic distinction from the earlier period, which becomes gradually more marked from the Fāṭimid period on, is the predominance of Ṭabāqātīn who were historians. Musābīḥī grants a wealth of official documents and this becomes the rule with Ibn al-Maʿmūn and ʿAlī Fāḍīl. The very minute descriptions of etiquette at the Fāṭimid court in Ibn Ṭuwair seem to be copied from a book of court ceremonial. Ibn Mammātī gives from personal knowledge rules for the Dīwāns and later al-ʿOmari a chancery-manual, the most perfect work on the latter’s model being Khalīṣhāndī’s. In his Taṣrīḥ al-Faṭḥām al-Nabūlūsī publishes an official memorial and in his Luma’ a thinly veiled petition for reinstatement in office. Finally writers like Ibn Ḥusnīn and Ibn Dīṣān use or reproduce bodily records of official surveys.

Of course concurrently with this we have the discussion of history proper; we need only mention Ibn ʿIyās and the numerous authors in Syria who at that time embraced both Egypt and Syria in their histories of the Empire. There is no Muslim country that can point to so perfect a historical tradition — on its political institutions also — as Egypt.

Lastly the Khiṣṭāt literature is quite unique. In other countries the rudiments of it may, it is true, be found but nowhere has this style of literature attained such a development as in Egypt. Although many of these Khiṣṭāt’s and al-Ḳāḥīt’s was a Pausanias, yet according to Oriental ideas they maintained a high level of accuracy. An unbroken chain runs from the above mentioned fathers of this literature through Ibn Abī ʿl-Baraqat, Dīwānī, Ibn ʿAbī al-Zāhir and Ibn al-Mutawwādī down to Makrīzī’s Khiṣṭāt, an invaluable work in spite of all its faults. It is true that Makrīzī merits relatively little of the credit; for the book is really the work of centuries. If it be taken with the same author’s Miṣqāḥa and the Siwāk, we get a fairly good idea of the pre-Ottoman period’s contribution to the history of Egypt.

Our sketch of the intellectual life of Egypt would be incomplete without a brief reference to the popular literature, whose home was in Egypt or which at least received its final form here. For the tales of the 1001 Nights the reader may be referred to the articles AL-FAʾILA WA-LAILA (v. 254 et seq.). The great romances of Antar, Ṣāḥib Baybars, Saif b. Dūh ʿYazan and the Banū Ḥilâl have been much less studied (Bibliographie in Brockelmann, Gesch. d. Arab. Lit., i. 62; on the significance of the Saif romance, cf. Der Islam, i. 172 et seq.). The character of the eccentric Fāṭimid Ḥakīm early became the subject of a romance (De Sacy, Essai de la Religion des Druses, i.). Of a more burlesque nature is the Egyptian shadow-theatre, on the earliest representative of which, Ibn Dāniyāl, G. Jacob has published numerous studies (Geschichte des Schattentheaters, p. 36 et seq.; extracts from Ibn Dāniyāl’s Fa’il al-ḥājī). Of great importance for the literature of a period depicted in these pieces is G. Jacob’s Ein ägyptischer Jahrmarkts im XIII. Jahrhundert (Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., Sitz. Ber., 1910, v).

However difficult it may be to draw a distinction between what is common to Islam in general and what is peculiar to Egypt in the fields of literature and science, in art it is almost impossible, for the development of art and culture in Egypt is indissolubly connected with that of the whole Eastern Mediterranean and the buildings of Cairo are only too often quoted as examples because they are easy of access and so well preserved owing to favourable historical circumstances. As mentioned above, some critics have gone so far as to deny any Egyptian character to this art of Cairo. Art and science are international possessions in Islam. But in spite of all international influence Egyptian art and architecture retained a certain indigenous character; it is quite as much at home there as the doctrines of a Mālik or a Shāfī. In the beginnings of Islam Coptic architecture enjoyed a great reputation, for in many foreign buildings we find ʿAlī appearing as masters provided by leiturgia (cf. Der Islam, iii. 403). The earliest buildings of Islam in Egypt must therefore have had a Coptic character although even in the oldest mosques the tradition which the Arabs had brought with them decided their general plan and disposition. We know very little about these early centuries. The history of Muslim art in Egypt begins with the Tūlūn Mosque, on the ornamentation and architectural principles of which very lively differences of opinion exist (cf. the articles by Herzfeld and Strzygowski in Der Islam, i.-ii. and ib. ii. 396, with the literature given there; more recently Herzfeld, Erster vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen von Samarrā, Berlin 1912). Are the ornaments, is the principle of pillar and arch construction, is the peculiar form of minaret indigenous or imported from Samarrā? These are the questions the settlement of which must be left to the historians of art. The general character of the Tūlūn culture is in favour of the theory of importation but it is also quite possible that only the external and obvious elements were brought from the east
and then imitated in native architecture and art. We meet with similar questions in the Fatimid period with its new and strange but pleasing art, whose Persian character cannot be denied (pointed arches, innumerable patterns, exuberant Kufic). Here also Herzfeld sees in the ornamentation continuations from the Tulunid period, while S. Flury combats this viewpoint (Die Ornamentik der Huthin- und Aishor Moscheen, 1912). Van Berchem was the first to discuss Fatimid art in the *Journ. As.*, 1891, p. 411 et seq. and Strzygowski has more recently dealt with it in *Myhanna* and *Amida.* The most important architectural monuments are detailed in the article *CAIRO*, i. p. 822 et seq. A new period begins with Saladin. It is in keeping with the reactionary character of his epoch that the art of the period also shows a new spirit, which finds an external expression in the substitution of Naschi as an decorative script in architecture in place of the previous exuberant Kufic. With the new requirements of the period, new kinds of buildings like the madrasa, or the khānkhāna arose, which continue to develop in the course of time the curiosity of building, which existed under the Fatimids, gradually becomes prevalent and assumes more and more markedly eastern forms and we have already seen that the whole Mamluk period was characterised by Persian influence. The use of stalactites as a means of transition from the quadrangular base to the springing of the dome, underwent a constant and richer development. Another borrowing from the East is probably the accentuation of the façade, unknown at an earlier period, which we first find in the Aṣṣar Mosque of the late Fatimid period and attains its artistic zenith in the grandiose gates of the Suliun Hassān-Mosque. For further details cf. the articles *CAIRO*, *ARABESQUE*, *MIRJAM* as well as the literature given there and the following works, Franz Pascha, *Cairo*: Saladin-Migeon, Manuel d'Art Musulman; Stanley Lane-Poole, *The Art of the Saracens in Egypt*; Herz Bey, *Le Musée national de l'Art arabe* (Catalogue); Gayet, *L'Art arabe*: Fouquet, *Contribution à l'Étude de la Céramique orientale* (Institut égyptien, 1900); Artin Jacob, *Contribution à l'Étude du Bleu en Orient*. The really scientific study of Egyptian architecture and decorative art is still in its infancy, it has not yet even been satisfactorily explained what is peculiarly Egyptian in it.

A civilization, which excludes foreign influence, is as a rule the result of the establishment of political boundaries. Egypt as a state has only from time to time been limited to the valley of the Nile. Egypt was at first a province of the Caliphate and then the centre of an empire including Syria and other countries. There are further to be considered the cosmopolitanism of Muslim civilization and the migratory tendency of Muslim sciences, to be brief the picture given above is, at least in the fields of intellectual life and art not exclusively Egyptian but is characteristic of the Muslim civilization of the whole of the Nearer Asia. Egypt, as we have seen, certainly has indigenous characteristics but it owes its intellectual productive power mainly to the continual immigration of powerful intellects, who were attracted by the splendours of Cairo, the city of the Caliphs and Suliuns. Mediaeval Egypt offers a brilliant picture but the Muslim military constitution already contained the seeds of decay. It was an exhausted, impoverished and desolated land that the French expedition found on its arrival. The new Egypt is a work of the Khédives and of Europe. As to how a modern advancing Egypt has been developed from the mediaeval anarchy of the Mamluks, cf. the articles devoted to the Khédives, Muḥammad 'Ali and his successors.

**Bibliography:** The most important works have been given in the text. Cf. also the articles on separate subjects and the compendious descriptive survey of the ground covered here has not yet been written. Our best authorities are S. Lane-Poole, *A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages* and J. Marcel's history in the *Description de l'Égypte*; Else Reitemeyer has written a systematic though not historical *Beschreibung Ägyptens im Mittelalter* (Leipzig 1903).

(C. H. BECKER.)

**EYÜB.** [See *AIVD*, i. 1220 et seq.]

**EKREM-BEY,** Mahmuud, *one of the most important of modern Turkish lyric poets,* wrote ballads and romances after French models and, by introducing these new forms, improved the popular poetical literature. His collections of poems *Nağahne-i Sefa* ("Morning Lays"), *Zorcune* ("Whisperings") and *Cemiyet* ("Youth") enjoy a great popularity. He also wrote several plays; of these the most original is the *Waslat* (1874), the history of a slave who falls in love with the youthful son of the house and is thereupon sold by her mistress. The poet was still alive in 1902.

**Bibliography:** P. Horn, *Geschichte der türkischen Moderne*, p. 37. (CII. HUARD.)

**ELIAS.** [See *ILANS.*]

**ELISA.** [See *ILISA*, i. p. 300.]

**ELIXIR.** Arab. al-khīr, also *kiyar al-falāṣīf,* the secret means by which the alchemists believed base metals could be transmuted into silver and gold; synonymous with "the philosopher's stone". Although it has not yet been found in the older Greek chemical works, it can hardly be doubted that the word is derived from the Greek χίαρον "powder for wounds". It is frequently mentioned in the writings of Dājjār b. Ḥayyān edited by Berthelot. It enters the metals and permeates them like poison in a body; a small quantity will transmute a million times its weight in metal to gold. It can only be kept in vessels of gold, silver or rock-crystal as it attacks glass. According to the definition in the *Mafṣūḥ of al-'Ulmā* the *kiyar* is the drug which transforms molten metal into gold or silver when it is boiled with it. In less credulous circles, however, it was also called maghāhir al-khir, maghāhir ad-dīssim, famous in name but of unknown composition. The word alexir, elixir reached the scholastic philosophers through the chemical works of the Arabs, notably Ibn Sīnā ("Avicenna in *Libro de Aimea*"); among the earliest may be mentioned Roger Bacon (*Opus Minus, Speculum Alchemiae* etc.) and Albertus Magnus in the xiii. century; in the works ascribed to Raymondus Lullius, the properties attributed to it are vastly increased. Even in Roger Bacon and probably in his Arabic sources also we find the elixir also contained a means of prolonging life; for since it can make perfect the luster metals and heals their "diseases", it surely could remove the imperfections of the body, keep it sound and prolong life. Such *elixir* of "life" were prepared for centuries and are still made out of all sorts of ingredients.
**ELUL**, Arabic Ḥilal, the name of the twelfth month in the Syrian Calendar; see TAʿRIKH.

**ELVIRA**, from the Arabic IBIRA (rarely LEIRA and YELIRA; this should be read in Yākūt, i. 348 with Fleischer, v. 40 instead of Ḫilīrā) from old Iberian I(-sector)IIRR (also ELĪRI, ELĪRRI etc. = New Town: ili town berri new (Municipium Florentinum Illeberitanum of the Romans) was in the later period of the Arab conquest and under the Umayyads the province afterwards called Granada, whose Arab capital was at that time Kašṭilīya or Medina Ibīra, only incorrectly called Ḫilīra alone, and lay 1% miles N.W. of Granada, N. of the Genil between the modern Ataraf (Arab. al-Tarf) and Finos Puente at the foot of the southern slopes of the Sierra de Elvira which still bears its name: the name once so celebrated is still preserved in the Pozos de Elvira, the "Well of Elvira" and in Granada in the Puerta and Calle de Elvira in the N.W. like the ancient Castilia in the farm-place caseria, Castilia, Kašṭilīya. — Medina Ibīra was once the rich and flourishing capital of the province of the Arabs from Saragossa; it began to decline steadily in 400 = 1009–1010, when as a result of the great Berber rebellion in Córdoba and the provinces the inhabitants migrated to the adjoining town of Granada so that the town in time fell completely into ruins. Its ruins were still considerable in the xivth century when they were visited by Ibn al-Khaṭīb [q.v.]. The question whether the ancient Iberian and Roman Iliberi(ī) (cf. the first known Spanish Council at Elvira in 304 or 305) and the Gothic see lay on the site of the modern Granada [q.v.] or on the site now occupied by the ruins of the Arab Elvira, is probably to be decided in favour of Granada. The Arabs then, following their usual aversion to the capitals of their predecessors, must have in this case also moved the site of the capital of the province and at first retained the old name for the province only: Kūrat Ilibra with the capital Medina Ilibra = Kašṭilīya.

**Bibliography**: the most important work is, Dozy, Recherches sur l'Histoire et la Littérature de l'Espagne pendant le Moyen-Âge, i. 327–335; "Castilia, Ilibra, Elvira" and p. 335–340 "Iliberi, Grenade" (but on p. 328 Yelbira should be read for Balbira, see above); and the reference to Maqaddasī, p. 236 l. i. should be deleted, as Ταχθία should be read there for Ilibra); Yākūt, i. 348; iv. 97 (Kašṭilīya); iii. 788 (Gharbāna); Marṣūḥ al-Īlīifa, iv. 158; Irḍīsa, p. 175, 203 (Arab.); Kazwīnī, ii. 337; Abu l-Firdās, p. 167; trad., i. 238; Simo-net, Descripción del Reino de Granada (1872); do., Historia de los Moazabes, Indice s. Elvira; Eguilar, Del lugar donde fue Iliberi; do., Origen de las ciudades Garama e Iliberi y de la Alhambría en Homeja a Codera Zaragoza 1904), p. 333–332; Oliver y Hurtado, Iliberi y Granada (Madrid 1870); Gomez-Moreno, De Iliberi a Granada: Boltoī de la Real Academia de la Historia, 46 (1905, 1.), p. 44–61. (After F. Seybold.)

**ELWEND**, Arwand in the Arab authors and graecised as ORONTES by classical writers (Achaemenid inscription, Semiramis legend), still called ERWEND or NARWEND in the district, a lofty granite mountain mass, about 17,560 feet high, a spur of the Zagros system, S.W. of Ha maḏān,
which owes the fertility of its gardens to its wealth in water and snow. The scanty accounts of the Arab geographers are mainly confined to in part fantastic stories of a well on the top of the mountain, which Muslim tradition describes as one of the wells of Paradise no doubt with reference to older religious ideas which clung to the spot, cf. Jackson, Persia Past and Present, p. 146, 170—173.


(R. Hartmann.)

EMİN. [See AMIN, i. 343.]

EMİN PASHA, a distinguished German explorer and coloniser of Africa. Emin whose real name was Eduard Schnitzer was born in Oppeln (Silesia) on the 28th March 1840. From 1858—1864 he studied medicine and science in Breslau, Berlin and Königsberg, taking his Dr. Med. degree in March 1863. In autumn 1864 he went to Antivari which at that time was still a Turkish possession. Here he began to practise medicine privately but in the following summer he was appointed quarantine and medical officer for the district. Schnitzer became a particular favourite of Ismail Pasha, the governor of northern Albania, who resided in Scutari and his wife, a native of Transylvania. After Ismail’s death in 1873 he lived for two years with his widow, whom he left towards the end of 1875 to go to Kharjum. In the middle of April Gordon, then governor of the Equatorial Provinces appointed him government medical officer in Lad. Schnitzer took up his duties here on the 7th May 1876 and adopted the name Emin Efendi, professing to be a Turk educated in Germany. On the 3rd June he was sent as Gordon’s diplomatic agent to king Mtesa of Uganda and in 1877—1878 to Kabila of Unyoro and a second time to Mtesa. At the end of June 1878 Gordon, who had meanwhile become Governor-general of the Süddan, appointed Emin governor of the Equatorial Province on the suggestion of the Russo-German explorer Jungk. Emin, who now received the title Bey, and later Pasha, displayed a wonderful activity in the advancement of civilization in his new office. He controlled the Danakil (a kind of irregular soldier) who were always inclined to raiding, furthered trade, agriculture and civilization in general and extended his territory. When he took over the government, the province showed a deficit of £ 30,000 annually but after a surplus of £ 1200 (cf. G. Schweitzer, Emin Pascha, p. 220 et seq.) which at a later period when Emin was cut off by the Mahdist from Egypt was stored in the form of ivory. When Gordon left the province the number of stations in it was 15; Emin raised it to 50. At the beginning of the Mahdi’s rising (1881-1882) Emin’s territory stretched 400 miles from E. to W. and 300 from N. to S. From the middle of April 1883, Emin in consequence of the Mahdist rising was cut off for years from any connection with the Egyptian government. In the spring of 1884 Kūram Allīh, the leader of the Mahdist army which had conquered the province of Bahr-al-Gezāl, demanded his submission. He refused to surrender and gradually his position became more difficult. He therefore left Lad on the end of April 1884 and transferred his headquarters farther south to Wadelai. On the 2nd January 1886, Junker who had been with Emin since January 1884, set out for the east coast of Africa, which he reached on the 14th December 1886. Another explorer, the Italian Casati remained with Emin from January 1885 till he was relieved. Early in 1887 Lad, where a garrison had up till then been maintained, had to be entirely abandoned. Emin took up his quarters for a brief while in 1886 and for a long period in 1887 at Kibiro, his station on the east shore of the Albert Nyanza. Meanwhile at the instigation of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society a committee of Scottish commercial gentlemen, perhaps attracted also by the possibilities of the country had equipped an expedition to relieve Emin. Stanley was appointed to lead it. He reached Emin (but not the Equatorial Province proper) in the spring of 1888. Stanley’s caravans had suffered so much on the route that its arrival was more of embarrassment than use to Emin; nor was the attitude of Stanley calculated to strengthen Emin’s position. When Emin announced to his officers the orders of the Egyptian government that they should retire with Stanley (to the east shore of the Albert Nyanza) at the same time he informed Emin a prisoner in Dufalé from the middle of August to the middle of November 1888. On the 17th February 1889 Emin, who had resolved to depart, joined Stanley on the western shore of the Albert Nyanza. Their joint expedition reached the coast at Bagamoyo in the beginning of December 1889. Here Emin was received with the greatest honour but owing to an unfortunate accident was confined to bed for three months. On his recovery Emin (at first provisionally) entered the foreign service of the German Empire. On the 26th April he left the east coast with two officers (Stuhlmann and Langhelt). 3 sergeants, 100 soldiers and 592 bearers. His object was to secure for Germany the lands south of the Victoria Nyanza. The most important events of the expedition were the hoisting of the German flag in Tabora and the foundation of the station of Bukoba on the west coast of the Victoria Nyanza. Both these measures were contrary to the will of von Wissmann the governor of German East Africa, but approved by Karl Peters who had been sent by a German committee to relieve Emin but did not meet him till June 1890 in Mpwopwa. Throughout this expedition Emin showed himself a bitter enemy to the Arabs, not only in his letters to Wissmann, but also in the measures he took to suppress the slave-trade. — In the second half of March 1891 vague rumours reached Emin of fighting between the people he had left in the equatorial province and the surrounding negroes. Although forbidden by Wissmann he now crossed the northern boundary of the German protectorate to attract his old officers and soldiers to his side and march with them wherever possible westwards via Mombuuta and occupy the hinterlands of Kamerun. This plan proved quite impracticable. On the 28th September the retreat was begun from Andelabi (on the upper course of the Ituri or Aruwimi). An epidemic of smallpox reduced the expedition to a very sad state. On the 7th December, Emin sent Stuhlmann with the sound men on to Bukoba, while he remained behind with the invalids. In the absence of any
other possible route of retreat he decided to march westwards; he began his journey on the 8th March 1892, first to Ipoto near Kilonga-longa on the Aruwimi. He next went up the Aruwimi, then in a southwesterly direction right across the primate forest with the object of reaching Kibonge, a station on the upper Congo; but 100 miles from his goal, in Kinena, Emin was treacherously murdered on the 23rd October 1892 by command of the prince of Kibonge. The Belgian Captain Dhannis found one half of Emin's last diary on an embankment near Nyangwe, the capital of the land of Manyumena, in February 1893 and the other half after the taking of Kasongo, the capital of the notorious slave-trader Tippu Tipp, on the 22nd April 1893. Kibonge, the instigator of Emin's murder, was court-martialled and shot on the 9th January 1894.

While yet in Turkey Emin had completely adopted the externals at least of a Muslim and Turk and retained this attitude after he had entered the service of Egypt also (G. Schweitzer, Emin Pasha, i. 21). This is the only explanation of the fact that he was so long able to maintain his position in the Equatorial Province. We have already seen that he was not therefore the less an enemy to the slave-traders. Although he tolerated slavery in his own province, it was only because he could do nothing without slave-labour. At a later period, when in German service, he pleaded for a complete separation of the land of the negroes from the Arab territory and for the expulsion of all Arabs without a fixed abode. He thought most highly of Roman Catholic among Christian missionaries (although himself a Protestant!) because they alone laid out pretty stations and made the negroes useful as labourers (Schweitzer, ii. 109). Emin was on the whole rather pessimistic about the possibility of cultivating the negro mind also (Schweitzer, i. 124). As an administrator Emin was a skilful organiser but hardly a conqueror — a man who made the most of his opportunities but took no risks. In science he achieved a reputation more particularly in ornithology and ethnography; he was also a brilliant linguist.

Bibliography: G. Schweitzer, Emin Pasha, his Life and Works, 2 vols., London 1898; P. Reichard, Emin Pasha; V. Hasan, Die Wahrheit über Emin Pasha; G. Casati, Ten Years in Equatoria and the Return with Emin Pasha, (London 1891); F. Stuhlmann, Mit Emin Pasha ins Herz von Afrika; C. Peters, Die deutsche Emin Pasha-Expedition; Emin Pasha, Eine Sammlung von Reisebriefen u. s. w., ed. by G. Schweinfurth and F. Ratzel; Emin Pasha in East Africa (London 1898); H. M. Stanley, In Darkest Africa (London 1890).

A. Schaeck.

EMIR. [See AMIR, i. 330.]

EMIR SUL'TAN, i.e. SHAAMS AL-DIN MEHREMED B. 'ALI AL-HUSAINI AL-BUKHARI, also called Saiyid Mehemmed Bukhari, Saiyid Emir Sulthan, Emir Saiyid ('Aschhpashzadeh, p. 148, Haniwald's chronicle in Leuven, Hist. Mus., p. 541, 543, whence Muzafar in Kananos), the great patron saint of Brusa, born about 770 A.H., migrated to Asia Minor from Bukhara and settled in Brusa where he died of the plague in the 14th year of sanctity in 853 A.H. According to tradition Emir Sulthan was held in high esteem by Bâyazid I. Viderim, whose daughter, Khândi Sulthan, he married; when the Sulthan took the field, he had his sword girded on by him and the saint's admonitions persuaded him to give up the drinking of wine (cf. the anecdote in Ewliya, Travel, etc., ii. 25 = Türkîhê Siieh, ii. 32 et seq.); when Bâyazid wished to slay Timur's envoys, Emir Sultan successfully opposed this breach of international law ('Ălî, Kûnlû, v. 83 et seq). On the capture of Brusa by an advance party of Timur's army in 865 he was taken prisoner and brought to Timur's camp; Timur set him free and wanted him to come with him to Samâland; but Emir Sulthan preferred to return to Brusa (Sa'd al-Dîn, i. 188 et seq.; Shereif al-Dîn, i. v. c. 51). Legend, however, knows nothing of this but says that the saint brought about the withdrawal of Timur's troops from Brusa by a miracle (Sa'd al-Dîn, ii. 427; Ewliya, ii. 48). When Murâd II. succeeded to the throne in 824 A.H., he had his sword girded on by Emir Sulthan and the saint is said to have hastened by his prayers the defeat of the false Muşafî, who challenged Murâd II's claim to the throne ('Ălî, i.e., p. 195 et seq.; Leuven, Hist., i. 495 et seq.). In the following year he took part in the siege of Constantinople with a train of 500 devishes; but the fall of the city propelled him because he did not take place. The Byzantine chronicler Kanaos who was present at the siege gives us a full and vivid description of Miraşîyid the "Patriarch of the Turks" as he calls Emir Sulthan (p. 466 et seq., 477 et seq., ed. Bonn), while the Ottoman historians say not a word about this mishap.

After his death a splendid mausoleum was erected over his grave which became one of the most popular places of pilgrimage of Islam (Tashkopràzade, i. 76, 377; Sa'd al-Dîn, i. 188; Leuven, Hist., i. 571 and 516; v. Hammer, Umbliche, etc., p. 58 et seq.), and legend began to tell of the miracles (Manükê) of the saint.

Bibliography: Tashkoprâzade, i. 76 et seq.; Sa'd al-Dîn, ii. 425—427; 'Ălî, Kûnlû, v. 112; Gûlkâzî Yiğâzî Şirînûn, p. 69—79. (J. H. MOKEDDAN.)

ENIF, i.e. AL-NAS "the nose", is the name of star $\star$ of second to third magnitude in Pegasus, or as it is called by the Arabs the larger Horse. Kazwini and Ulugh Beg call this star Fom al-Farâs (= the horse's mouth), the latter also calls it Diâbî-fa al-Farâs (= the horse's lip). Al-Battani has no special name for it, he calls it "the star which is in its (i.e. the horse's) mouth". The name Enif probably passed from the works of western Arab astronomers into the Latin translations of the middle ages.

Bibliography: al-Battâni, Opus astronomicum (ed. Nallino), ii. 154; iii. 254; al-Kazwîni, Kosmographie (ed. Winkler), i. 25—35; L. Ideler, Untersuchungen über den Ursprung u. die Bedeutung der Sternnamen (Berlin 1809), p. 117. (H. Suter.)

ENNAYER (usually بنير in Arabic texts, Berber lûnîr), the name of the first month of the Julian calendar, among the natives of North Africa who reckon by solar years and have retained the Latin names of the months (cf. Awkâs, i. 521), also the name of the New Year festival celebrated at the beginning of that month by Christians and Muslims in North Africa, for the Muslims there as a rule take part in different Christian feasts, for example, the feast of the summer solstice or the Anûsra feast [see Anûsra,
A portion of the meal prepared the night before the Ennayer festival is kept under a dish.

In some districts it is the custom to strew green twigs on the flat roofs of the houses, on the stables and on the doors of the tents, on the day before Ennayer, so that the new year may be "green", i.e. lucky. In Laghout and Géryville and among many Berber tribes, the ashes are swept from the hearth, new stones placed in it and sometimes a new jemâ is dug in another place in the room; it is further the custom to replace an old article of furniture by a new one and put it in another position.

People in disguise collect offerings, such as the "fig-as" and the mood at Nedroma, the jemâ in Tlemcen and the jemâ keftoun in west Tunisia; a lion keft-adj akhir in western Tunisia, a camel etc., are among the disguises adopted.

The day following, the first of January, is a day of rejoicing: it is then the custom, in the towns of Morocco, to eat the sobâ khâdri (seven vegetables). It is an almost universal custom to kill a fowl; rich people kill a young goat or a sheep; in Kabylie, it is sometimes the occasion of a timgred; in some places sheep's heads are eaten instead of fowls.

The condition in which a man is at the Ennayer festival, decides his condition for the whole year. On this day one ought to be happy, amiable, generous and rich. People meeting wish one another good luck; parents, engaged couples, landlords and tenants, Muslims and Jews exchange presents and show little attentions to one another.

Alsms and presents are given and guests entertained. No borrowed articles are allowed in the house and any that have been lent are asked back so that there may be as much good fortune in the house as possible. The house is not swept throughout the whole length of the festival nor are clothes or linen changed nor the finger-nails trimmed; in Kabylie, however, this is the day chosen for shaving off the first growth of hair on boys.

The country people examine the corn of the ber jikes left over at the meal or the blood of the fowls killed for the feast to find out what sort of weather will prevail during the early months of the year.

Just as used to be the custom in France at Christmas time the Kabils at the Ennayer festival talk to their oxen and goats.

The housewife places a scorpion below the vessel in which the milk is to curdle in order to obtain as much butter as possible. To be able to see clearly they smear the edges of the eye-lids with collyrium.

During the festival all work ceases and no journeys are undertaken; mats, carpets or burnuses in process of manufacture are wound round the beams of the loom or put out of the way during the festival.

Orthodox Muslims naturally try to restrain their co-religionists from the celebration of this festival as much as possible and the teachers in the Koran schools for the same reason do not grant their pupils holidays for Ennayer. Among the Muslim population of the Senegal and Upper Niger, whose conversion to Islam is comparatively recent and who take great pride in their orthodoxy, festivals like the Ennayer and Anzar are unknown.

Bibliography: Doutte, Morrocco (Paris
ENOCH, [See IDRIS.]

ENWERI, AL-HAJJI ṢAÐÛLILAH, Efendi, a native of Trebizond, entered the higher Turkish civil service as Khojdja (superintendent of a diwan) and successively filled the office of Teshrifati (1874-1875), Djebedjer Khâshi (1875-1890), Teshrifati (1890-1891), Buyukt Tekzeredji (1897) and from 1200 to his death with several breaks that of an Anadolu Mülâcâbedjisi. At the end of 1182 he was given the post of Historiographer Royal (Waʃîf Nusret), which he held till the end of 1197 with an interval of 18 months (4th Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1188—1190), during which the post was filled by Behjett and Suleimân Mollâ (cf. Djeddet, ii. 153); in 1202, however, when his successor Wāṣîf Efendi went as ambassador to Spain, he was again given the office of official historian and attached to the army in the field during the war with Austria and Russia, while Edib Efendi remained in the capital in the same capacity (Jaβedet, iii. 426, 438; iv. 2 et seq.), and still held the office after his return to the capital in 1206. He died on the 11th or 13th Rabî' I 1209 (6th or 8th October 1794) when over 60 years of age.

Enwer left a history of the country in 5 parts of which he presented the first three to the sultan in 1194 (Jeddet i. 212); they cover the years 1183—1193, and the following parts cover the period to 1206. The first two volumes of Enwer's chronicle (1183—1188) were recast by Wâṣîf Efendi as the second part of his history (cf. Wâṣîf Târîḫi, i. 315 and ii. 3, ed. Constantinople 1210 A.H.); Isâmîl Kaḥmî (cf. Pertach, Ver. d. Türk. Gesch. zu Berlin, ii. 208) undertook a second recension. Enwer's original work, which is considered rare, is to be found complete in the Imperial Library in Vienna (n. 1117—1119 of Flügel's Catalogue); the Egyptian printed edition of Enwer's chronicle referred to by Reinhard (and following him, Zeuner, no. 940) does not exist.


ENZELI, the harbour of Reşî, the capital of Gilân in Persia. Enzeli lies on a narrow tongue of land, which has been cut by a channel, between the Caspian Sea and a freshwater lake called Murdâb. From Enzeli one goes by boat to Pîrî Bâzur on the south side of the Murdâb, thence by land to Reşî, whence the high road runs via Kazvin to Teherân. In the Russian wars with Persia Enzeli played a considerable part. In 1722 Russian troops landed in Pîrî Bâzur. A Russian demonstration at Enzeli in 1804 failed completely on account of the impossibility of penetrating the hinterland. In spite of its unsheltered roadsides Enzeli is the most important harbour in the Caspian provinces of Persia (1908-1909: 49, 1909-1910: 629 steamships). The town on its own seems to have attained particular importance in the latter half of the sixteenth century. While it had only 300—400 houses in the early decades of last century according to contemporary accounts, the latest English Consular reports estimate its population at 9000.


ERBIL, the ancient Arbelah, celebrated for Alexander's battle there (See Paulus-Wissowa, ii. 407 and vii. 861 et seq.), situated between the two Zab on the road from Mosul to Bagdad at the place where it is joined by two roads from the Iranian highlands (cf. Hüsîng, Der Zagros, p. 38 et seq.), the capital of a Kâdî in the Sandjak of Shahr-i Zîr in the Vilayet of Mosul. In the earlier Arab geographers the town is described as a vasty d of the astân of Hulwân in the Sawâd (Bibl. Geogr. Arab., vi. 6 and 235). Erbil attained its greatest prosperity about 600—1200 as the capital of the Begteqânis [q.v., i. 688 et seq.] and is described as having a high, strong citadel below which lay an extensive town which was the great market for the surrounding country. Yâkût says that in the population of the district Kurds predominated. In the second half of the xiii century under the Mongols, we find Erbil in the possession of Kurd Emîrs of the tribe of Mâzêndjani (Notices et Extraits, xiii. 311 et seq.). Even down to the most recent times the affairs of the town were more often managed by the Kurds of the adjoining mountains than by Turkish officials. Although Erbil was still able to offer considerable resistance to Nâdir Shâh in 1732, it has had no importance of its own for a long time and is now a small country town with 3757 inhabitants (Cuiet).


ERDEL, Hungarian Erdély, the old Turkish name for Transylvania or Siebenbûrgen. After the battle of Mohács (1526) the woïdows of this country became to a certain extent vassals of Turkey until by the Peace of Carlowitz (1699), Siebenbûrgen passed to Austria.

ERLEG, to İqâlî̆sîç Kastër des (Theophanes, i. 482, de Boor; h to İqâlî̆sîç Kastërîsîç of Michael Attaliata, p. 136 (ed. Bonn); İqâlî̆sîç or İuqâlî̆sîç to İqâlî̆sîç in the epic of Digenis Acritas; the Ifârâk of the Arabs (L'îkî Portland, ed. Houtsma, Reccell, etc. iii. 11; iv. 5, 249, 260, Turk.) and occasionally archaized İqâlî̆sîç, İqâlî̆sîç, the Reccel, Erachia of the Crusaders (Tomashchev, Zur histor. Topographie von Kleinasiene, p. 84, 88, 92), Aracel in Bertrandon de la Broquière, p. 104 et seq., ed. Ch. Schefer, was a fortress on the Byzantine frontier on the road from Cilicia to Iconium and was repeatedly taken by the Arabs, notably by Hârân in September 806 (Tabari, iii. 709 et seq. = Theophanes, L.C.), but remained a Byzantine possession till it was taken from them.
by the Seldjûks of Konya. (In 484 = 1091, according to Ewliya, iii. 28.) At a later period it belonged to the kingdom of the Karamanoglu and with the rest of territory passed to the Ottomans in 1466. The population (about 5000) is almost exclusively Muslim; there is a small Armenian community. 50 years ago there were 10 large and 11 small mosques. Among the larger mosques there is one which according to the Lıyıkânınâ was founded by the Karamanoglu İbrahimbeg (according to the Menâsik al-Hāḍîjî by Kîlîçı Arslân); the caravanserai built by the architect Sinân in the sixteenth century for Kustem Pasha is also mentioned. Legend says that the springs at an ancient caravan way produced by the Prophet, on which account the titles of the district were a wâzîf of Medina (Lıyıkânınâ, Ewliya, cf. Sa’d al-Dîn, i. 516). Ereğli was formerly a station on the route followed by pilgrims and since 1908 it has been an important station on the Baghâdî railway from Konya; the town is the capital of a kažî in the sandjak of Konya.


ERİTREA. The population of the Italian colony of Eritrea may be divided into nomadic, semi-nomadic and settled tribes. In certain cases one section of a tribe leads a nomadic life, a second is semi-nomadic and the third settled. According to a tradition generally believed the earliest settlers in Eritrea were eight tribes who came one after the other; but any definite, reliable reference to their origin or order is quite wanting. This tradition certainly shows that the population of Eritrea has always been numerous and undergoing radical transformation, passing from a nomadic to a settled and from a pastoral to an agricultural life. This was the case in times of peace; in time of war, however, the divisions among the people which resulted thereby, lead to confusion which lasted for centuries; now central tribes gradually arose in other sites out of the ruins and step by step became linked up with the more or less permanent settlements.

The present population of Eritrea is for the most part of the Hamitic type, which probably showed pure features, in many parts of the area now forming the Italian colony, in the period of Egyptian civilization, but which suffered many changes for the reasons above mentioned. In any case the traditional number, eight, of the peoples in it has now been raised by its learned men to ten, or fifteen, or even more. At the present day there are very marked differences in language and customs among the inhabitants of Eritrea whether they are descended from a common ancestor or not.

The Abyssinians, who inhabit the plateau and are quite identical with the Tigrinya on the other side of frontier in the Ethiopian kingdom preponderate. The Abyssinians of the colony number not quite 110,000 and show traces of a culture well organised on a patriarchal system. They all, herdsmen as well as agriculturists, form settled communities and live in villages, which usually admit another and are therefore small; this is due to the poverty of the districts inhabited by them. The average number of people in each Abyssinian settlement is about 125. Dâneîelli and Marielli point out that, although small and very small villages predominate, some have quite a considerable population, apart from those whose development is due to the Italian occupation. At the most, however, it is improbable that any one has more than 1000 inhabitants. A similar state of affairs probably exists in the Abyssinian provinces, which border on the colony of Eritrea.

Two other settled agricultural peoples, who live in villages, are the Cunama (somewhat over 13,000) and the Daria (about 7000). Tradition says that these belonged to Hamitic stocks and are among the oldest in the colony. They mix to some extent with the Śūdānese. While the Abyssinians are Christians, the Cunama and Daria are heathen.

The other peoples in Eritrea are of the most part nomadic and pastoral tribes and the majority profess Islam. Among the most noteworthy are the Bani ‘Amer, who have arisen through the fusion and superposition of other peoples; they live by cattle-rearing and alternate their abode between the mountains and the sea. As a rule they speak Beşâyî [cf. the art. BEŞAY] and form a community of about 40,000 souls. Next come the Habab and other allied tribes who live between the Bani ‘Amer and the sea numbering about 24,000 in all; they are wandering herdsmen and speak Tigre; next come the Mensa, the Mârīa or Marea, the Sabderat, the ‘Torhâ, the Emîlîs, the Dâhlâsî, the Engana, etc., all very ancient peoples, originally coming from the highlands of Ethiopia but interspersed with Egyptian and Greek colonists who made their way inland from the sea. The Bilani, in the valley of Cheren, form an interesting section of this group; they are divided into Copts, Roman Catholics, and Muslims and do not lead quite such a nomadic life as the preceding.

The Bet Tukê (4000), the Bëgina (1000) and the Mensa are neighbours of the Bilani. The Asaorta (9000), the Mişîferi (5000) and the Ilês (1500) are nomads who rear cattle and devote some attention to agriculture; they profess Islam.

The inhabitants of the Danakil district belong to the Afar type and number about 13,000 in Italian territory. In all probability they are tribes who are mixed with Greek and Egyptian colonists; the majority are nomads and practically all are Muslims.

The islands are only partially inhabited; their total population is about 2500 of various origins, who live chiefly by fishing and pearl trade. About 10,000 people of Semitic origin live on the coast of Massawa in imposing villages.

According to the census of 1905, the Italian colony of Eritrea has a total population of 274,944, of whom 154,170 are Muslims, 825 Copts, 12,362 pagans and 7255 Roman Catholics and 297 Protestants. These figures do not include the white population or the Danakil groups who live within the boundaries defined in 1908. If these be included, we get a total of 282,000 and not 300,000 or more as has been given in certain unofficial works compiled before the census.

The religions represented in the colony are in the order of importance and number of followers: Islam (in the four sects of the Hanaâfs, Şafi‘îs, Mâlikîs, Ḥanbalîs) Coptic Christianity, Roman Catholic, Evangelical and Greek Christianity, Judaism and Buddhism. Islam is spreading most rapidly and is the most attractive.

The authority of the government is enforced on
the natives by commissioners and residents. For this purpose the colony is divided into five commissions to which the central area belongs and five residencies in the border districts.

As regards the administration of justice the current law of criminal law is that established by royal decree on the 14th May 1908. Until the publication of the code of civil law, any one was considered a subject of the colony, as regards the administration of justice, who not being an Italian or citizen of a recognised foreign state, was born in the colony or belonged to a tribe or race of the colony. Any member of an African or other nation of the Red Sea, who regularly fulfils or has fulfilled his obligations to the authorities, or lastly has lived for two years continuously in the colony, is also considered a subject of the colony. A foreigner who belongs to a people that does not possess a civilisation similar to the European, is regarded in the same light.

Among the natives justice is administered in the first instance by their princes, the assemblies of elders and nobles, the chiefs of provinces and tribes, the Kādis and the commissioners and residents, who in cases of appeal deal with the decisions of the Kādis, heads of provinces, tribes and the princes, with the exception of those that come within the jurisdiction of the courts. The government of the colony is always endeavouring to extend further the authority of the ordinary officials of the colony on the basis of a rational regard for the ethnic and religious distinctions among the various coloured peoples who live in the colony. Italian statutes are applied to the colony with such modifications and alterations as are rendered necessary by the economic conditions, law, everyday life, customs and requirements of the land. Italian law recognises with limitations the most important and fundamental customs of coloured people in the matter of religion also. In the case of the Muslims, as far as is compatible with the spirit of Italian legislation, they approximate to the traditional law as contained in the Koran and expounded by the authorities recognised by each tribe. Italian law is administered in criminal cases and customary law in civil, but particularly in the case of the Muslims and more especially in matrimonial cases, in kor, ḥadāfa and ḫaḍ. The exercise of the Muslim religion is freely allowed.

**Bibliography:** A. Mulazzani, Geografia della Colonia Eritrea (Florence); D. Oddizzi, La Donazione settentrionale (Asmura 1909); G. Iainelli and O. Marinelli, Risultati scientifici di un viaggio nella Colonia Eritrea (1912); A. Baldacci, Le colonie de l'Érythrée (Brussels 1910); G. Iainelli, O. Marinelli and A. Mori, Bibliografia geografica della Colonia Eritrea 1891—1906 (Florence 1907); Ministero degli Affari Esteri: Raccolta di pubblicazioni colonitali italiane (Rome 1911) and Raccolta cartografica (Rome 1911).

**ERIWAN,** Armenian Hrastan, the capital of a gouvernement in Russian Transcaucasia, in 40° 14' N. lat. and 44° 39' E. long. (Greenw.), about 3000 feet above sea-level on the left bank of the Araxes. In the 2nd and 3rd centuries B.C. Araxes with a population of about 1879 3000, according to other authorities 15000, has a history dating back to remote antiquity according to the Armenian sources (see St. Martin, Mémoires sur l'Arménie, I, 116). It is only since the beginning of the Turkish period that the town, written Rewān by the authorities, has obtained any considerable importance in the history of Islam. The tradition given by Ewīyā places the foundation of Erivan as late as the ixth—xith century and that of the citadel about 100 years later under Shāh Ismā'īl. In the reign of Murād III, Erivan which at first belonged to the Şafawids, was won for the Turks by Ferhad Pasha and fortified. Shāh Abbas I regained it in 1604. After a series of battles with varying result it was taken by Murād IV in 1635, but soon afterwards fell again into the hands of the Persians. A brief survey of the history of the town may be gained from the article ARMENIA 141. In 1587 it was taken by the Russian general Paskevitich, who received the title Ermewski in honour of its capture. Since the peace of 1828 Erivan has belonged to Russia. The mosques, celebrated for their faience and other important buildings, date from the viith century.

**Bibliography:** Hādji Khalfa, Djiyān-Nūmā (Constantinople 1145), p. 391; Ewīyā Efendi, Travels (translit. von Hammi), ii. 150 et seq.; Binder, Au Kurdistan, p. 25 et seq.; Müller-Simonis, Die Canara aus Galie persischan, p. 56—65; A. V. Williams Jackson, First visit and Travels in New Yont (New Yont 1819); Sarre, Denkmuls persischer Bankniete, p. 52 et seq. and PL LIII.

(R. HARTMANN)

**ERMEANEK** (Armānāk), the capital of a kād in the sandjak of Iç Ili in the wilāyet of Adana with 6350 inhabitants (Cuijet), built at the junction of the two streams that form the Gök-Şu (CalycaADIUS), is probably the ancient Germanopolis in Isauria (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, vii. 1253). The Oriental writers of the middle ages locate Ermenek two days' journey south of Larena and three miles from the port of 'Ālā'īya A a grotto there with a spring was particularly famous. In the viith—viiith (xiith—xiiith) century Ermenek was one of the principal strongholds and for a time the capital of the Karaman dynasty [v. v.] until it was taken by the Turks in 1472.

**Bibliography:** Notices et Extr., xili. 346 et seq. 373; Hādji Khalfa, Djiyān-Nūmā (Constantinople 1145), p. 611; G. Le Strange, Eastern Caliphate, p. 148; Ritter, Erkundige, xix 307; Cuijet, Turquie d'Asie, ii. 77; Tomaseck in Sitz.-Ber. der Wiener Akad., 1891, viii. p. 60, 59, 105.

(R. HARTMANN)

**ERTOHGRUL,** I. Son of Sulaiman ponds and father of Othmān I., the founder of the dynasty and empire of the Ottomans. According to the oldest tradition, which is preserved in 'Ashikpashazade, he migrated with 400nomadic Turkoman families from Pāsin Owa and Sūrmedi Çuṣūr to Asia Minor where the Sālādi jā 'Alā al-Dīn allotted him the district of Sogd between Karadjihasār and Biledek as winter pastures (kīshla) and the hills of Ermenibili and Domaniç as summer pastures (yalla). Karadjihasār and Biledek still belonged to the Byzantines but they paid tribute to 'Alā al-Dīn; 'Alīshir, the father of German, ruled the adjoining district of Ahūn Ka rbadja. Ertohorog Đức settled in Sogd and was buried there; he never engaged in hunting, maintained his sons, Othmān, Gunduz, and Sarayati (also called Sarubali or Savadj), of whom Othmān succeeded him. According to Neshri (Zeitschr. d. D. Morgenl. Gesell.), xiii. 188—196 Ertogrul im-
migrated in the reign of 'Ala'- al-Din Kaikbād I (616–634 A. H. = 1219–1236 A. D.), repeatedly fought on the latter’s side against the Tatars, conquered Karadjah-Jur and Kutahia and was still alive in ‘Ala’- al-Din Kaikbād II’s reign (end of the seventh century A. H.). The later historians credit him with further conquests (cf. e.g. the chronicles transl. by Leunel, *Hist. Mus.*, p. 97 et seq.; Chalcolokondylès, p. 12 et seq.; Phrantzes, p. 68–77, but they take their statements regarding Θρησκείας, Ἐστιγμών from Turkish sources). Sa’d al-Din (i. 15, cf. p. 65) says that he was slain in 613 A. H. (1215 A. D.) over ninety years of age. Leunel (Anh., p. 3, Hist. iii.) makes him die in 687 A. H. at the age of 93 while Phrantzes gives anno 6773 mundi = 1264–1265 A. D. and his age 77. We may consider the following elements in the traditions to be historical facts viz. that Ertoghrul had settled with his Turkoman clan (hoş) in Söğüt as one of the frontier boys (Üçlü beşleri) of the Saldžük Sulțan’s of Konia, that he took part in the wars of his overlord against the Turks and occasionally availed himself of Byzantine territory on his account.

2. The eldest son of Bayazid I, born 778 A. H. = 1370–1377 (İsmā’īl Bēlīg, Güldeste, p. 40), was appointed governor of the combined district of Sarpol and Kermān by his father (Neshri, Zeitschrif für d. Morgenl. Ges., XV, 335; Leunel, *Hist. Mus.*, p. 317, 336 et seq. cf. 337 et seq., according to Sa’d al-Din, i. 178, of Aqīnlī) and died about 798 A. H. (cf. Leunel. l. c.), certainly before the war with Timurlenk; he was buried in the mosque built by him in Brusa (Sa’d al-Din, i. 125; Güldeste, l. c.). Leunel, op. cit., p. 371, cf. 347, gives a story that he fell in the war against Kādji Burhan al-Din of Siwās. According to Chalcolokondylès, p. 145–147 he was taken prisoner by Timur at the capture of Siwās in 1396 and afterwards put to death. (J. H. MöRITZMANN).

**ERZERUM**, the capital of a wilāyêt in Turkish Armenia, in the plateau about 600 feet above sea-level between the Karā Su or Western Euphrates, the only natural gateway to northern Asia Minor (Siwās) from Russian Transcaucasia (Kars) and Persia (Tabriz), is at the same time connected by a good road with the Black Sea (Trebizond) in the north and Lake Van in the South. Even in ancient times there was an important town, the Teodosiopolis of the Byzantines, (see Chapot, *La Frontière de l’Euphrate*, p. 361) at this point so important strategically and commercially, the capital of the Armenian district of Karin, Karnoi Kafak, which survived in the name given to the town and district by the Arabs, Kālīkālā (on this point cf. Andreas in M. Hartmann, *Boktān*, p. 144 et seq.; Hübsemann in *Indulg. Forsch.*, xvi, 287 et seq. Kālīkālā was taken by Ḥabib b. Maslama in 645–46, according to the Arab historians, but according to Armenian sources not till after 653 (see Ghazarian, *Armenian unter der arab. Herrschaft*, p. 19, 33 et seq., 73). On the wars of the Byzantines and the Arabs with one another and the Armenians, which filled the following centuries, in the course of which Kālīkālā often changed hands, cf. *Armenia* i. 437 et seq. The town has only borne its modern name since the 16th century. In 1049 the Saldžük destroyed the town of Arzan, not far east of Karan, and its population moved to Theodosiopolis — Kālīkālā and gave this town the name of Arzan al-Rūm = “Arzan of the Romans” which became corrupted to Arz al-Rūm and Arj al-Rūm “land of the Romans”. Shortly afterwards, the Saldžük finally destroyed Byzantine rule in Armenia. From 588–627 (1119–1230) Arzan al-Rūm formed an independent Saldžük kingdom (cf. *Tocherianstif*). In 1241 Erzerum was swept by the Mongol invasion. Mustafî (in the first half of the 12th century) speaks of the numerous churches in the town: it must therefore have been for the most part inhabited by Armenians. On the other hand, Ibn Batūtā found Turkoman tribes preponderating and their doings brought about the ruin of the town. The district of Erzerum from this time on was one of the strongholds of the Aḵ-Ḵuyūnīl; after the wars with the Kara-Kuyūnīl that followed Timur’s invasion, Üzun Hasan, the greatest of the Aḵ-Kuyūnīl, built the citadel of Erzerum, but lost it before his death to the Ottoman Mehmed II after the disastrous battle of Terdjān in 878 = 1473. Erzerum then became the centre of one of the most important paşalıks in the Ottoman dominions, an outpost whose possession was often disputed by their Russian rivals, but which was always successfully retained by the Turks. In the Near Eastern history of Turkey it is celebrated for the rebellion of Ābāz Pasha [q.v. i. 6], which was put down in 1627. Since the xviith century the fortress has had to defend, with little success it must be confessed, the Turkish frontier against Russia. After the battle of Dede Boyun (q.v. i. 951 et seq.) in 1878 Erzerum was irretrievably lost, but was only surrendered to the Russians after the truce.

If we may believe the various estimates, the population of Erzerum has considerably declined in the last century. Although the lack of any railway or of a good system of roads militates against the importance of Erzerum, the town, which Cuijet credits with 38,906 inhabitants, is still of importance on strategic grounds as it is a border fortress with modern, if hardly strong enough, and on commercial grounds as the centre of trade for the wilāyêt (annual exports about £100,000 — mainly products of cattle-rearing; imports £400,000 — £450,000) and its hinterland and as a centre for trade with Persia.


**ERZINDJAN**, the capital of a sanjâq, with about 23,000 inhabitants in the wilāyêt of Erzerum, lying in a fertile plain on the north bank of the Karā-Sī between Erzerum and Siwās, is said by the Armenian sources to date back to pre-Christian times. We first obtain definite facts about the town in the Saldžük period (cf. the article MANGUCAK). According to Yākût it was inhabited mainly by Armenians. In 627 (1230) the Khwārizm-Shāh Ḫājāl-al-Din (q.v. i. 1004) was defeated here by the Saldžük ‘Alā al-Din Kār-
ERZİNDJAN — ESAD EFENDI.

Kubah I and the Ayibidas al-Ashraf. Mustafii (Le Strange, op. cit.), says that the walls of Erzinджan were restored by Kaz-Kubah. In 640 (1243) the power of the Gedikhs fell before the Mongols, who entered Asia Minor under Erzerum. In Ibn Battuta's time the majority of the population was Armenian, but he also found a number of Turkish speaking Muslims. The city, which was always a stronghold of the Turkomans, recognised Ottoman suzerainty for a brief period in the reign of Bayazid I. In Timur's time it was in the hands of Karacı Yaruf of the Kara-Kuyunlu, and then passed to Uzun Hasan of the Kız-Kuyunlu. This period, problems of status and authority, and intrigue with Mehmed II's victory over Uzun Hasan at Terven. Under Ottoman rule it has formed a part of the pashalik of Erzerum down to the present day. Though several times destroyed by earthquake (notably in 1784) the town has always been able to recover, thanks to the fertility of the surrounding country. Its chief exports are fruits and vegetables. As a military station it is one of the main defences of the Turkish eastern frontier.


Ewyia Efendi, Tavrčes (transl. von Hammer), ii. 202 et seq.; G. Le Strange, Eastern Caliphate, p. 118; Ritter, Erdkunde, x. 770—774; Cuinet, Turquie d'Asie, i. 211. (R. Hartmann.)

ESAD EFENDI, AJMED, a Turkish official and learned jurist, son of Shaikh i̇l Muhhammed Şâhi̇b, was Kâdî-askar of Anatolia in 1205 (1790—1791), of Rûmilî in 1208 (1793—1794), became Shaikh-i-âlam in 1218 (1803) and held this office for three years and five months. During his tenure of this office he issued a fatoûr, sanctioning the new organisation of the army, known as irâd-i-dieât, proposed by Sultan Selim III. But the revolution of the Janissaries brought about his deposition and it was with difficulty that he escaped with his life in this troubled period. On the accession of Mahmûd II in 1223 = 1808 he again became Shaikh-i-âlam but was again driven out of his office by the revolutionaries three months later. He died in 1230 = 1815.

Bibliography: Sami Beji, Kamis-i-Alem, ii. 993; Şami-Zade, Tarîkh, i. 45. (Cl. Huart.)

ESAD EFENDI, MUHAMMAD, a Turkish official and poet, son of the historian Sa'd al-Din, born in 978 (1570), became Kâdî of Adria in 1304 (1695—1706) and of Rûmilî, made the pilgrimage to Mecca in 1233 (1764) and after his return succeeded his brother Celebi Muhammad Efendi, who had just died, as Shaikh-i-âlam. He filled this high office for seven years under Sulţan Ahmed I, Mustafa I and Othman II; the latter gave him his daughter in marriage. He soon afterwards left office because of the troubles that had broken out, but in 1233 (1625) he was called upon by Murâd IV to resume the post, which he retained till his death in 1234 (1625). His tomb is at Eiyû. He left a Dvin of poems in Arabic, Persian and Turkish.

Bibliography: 'Atî, Dha'il al-Sha'bî, p. 690; Naîmâ, Tarîkh, i. 141, 234, 264. (Cl. Huart.)

ESAD EFENDI, MUHMMAD, a Turkish official and historian, son of Muftı Abû İshâk Isma'il, born in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1096 (Oct. 1685), filled several judicial offices in the lifetime of his father, accompanied the Turkish army to Belgrade in 1152 (1739), became Kâdî-askar of Rûmilî in Muğarram 1157 (20th July 1744) and succeeded Mufti Aş-Mahmûd-Zade in office on the 24th Radjab 1161 (20th July 1748). He was the author of a Lejîfet al-Lâghâ (Arabic-Persian Dictionary, printed in Constantinople 1211 = 1795), a Bahâlî-nâme ("Book of the Nightingale") a Tâkhârî ("collection of biographies") and Arabic and Turkish poems; he also wrote a Tâkhín to four celebrated poems in praise of the Prophet (Purda, Hamzîya, Dîvîsîya and Muṣîrîya) and a metrical translation of Zâmakhsâri's Aṭâ̧ ăal-Dâhâb. He was a good musician and founded several schools and several churches.

After being deprived of his office for no reason on the accusation of 'Abd Allah Pasha, Sulţan Muhammed Tüs grand vizier, in Şaban 1162 (July 1749) he went to Gallipoli and then to İndir-Ko, near Constantinople, where he died on the 10th Shawal 1166 (23th Aug. 1753).

Bibliography: Wâqif, Muhammed-i-Âshîrî, i. 11; J. von Hammer, Hist. de l'empire ottoman, xv. 176, 198, 261; Gesch. d. Osm. Reiches, Index, do., Gesch. der osm. Dichtkunst, iv. 171; Sâmi-Beji, Kamis-i-Alem, ii. 908. (Cl. Huart.)

ESAD EFENDI, SAYYID MUHAMMAD, called Şâhî̇f-Zade (="son of the bookseller") a Turkish official and historian, son of al-Hâджî̇ Ahmed, who was Muḍarrî and at the same time a bookseller and later Kâdî of Jerusalem and Cairo, born in Constantinople near the Ayâ Sofâ on the 18th Rabî I 1204 (6th Dec. 1790), adopted his father's profession and received the position of a judge in Adrianople and Scutari in Albania without actually filling the offices. On the death of Şâhî̇f-Zade in 1241 (1825) he was appointed Historiographer Royal. He held this office for thirteen years, and in addition in 1247 (1831) was appointed editor of an official gazette, the Ta'hârî-i-Waṣâf. In 1250 (1834) he was sent to Persia to congratulate Muhammad Shah, son of Fâṭî 'Alî Shâh, on his accession to the throne. He died in 1263 (1847) while holding the office of President of the Upper Council of Public Instruction.

He composed numerous chronograms (Tâ'rikh) on various events and wrote a brief account of the dissolution of the corps of Janissaries by Sulţan Muhammed II, entitled Us-i Zafir ("foundation of victory") which has been translated into French by Caussen de Pevreval (Paris 1833).

Bibliography: v. Hammer, Gesch. der Osman. Dichtkunst, iv. 403; Sâmi-Beji, Kamis-i-Alem, ii. 909. (Cl. Huart.)
ESKI (Tur. "old"): frequent in place-names like Eski Şehr "Old-town" [q. v.]; Eski Hisar "Old-citadel"; a name borne by the ancient Dakhlya (see Tomasek in Sitz.-Ber. der Wiener Akad., 1881, viii. 6) and Laodicea ad Lycum (see D'Alciz, i. 639) amongst others. Following a very common custom the Turks usually call ancient ruined sites by the name of some adjacent large town with the prefix Eski, e.g. Eski Şam "Old Damascus", Boğá (q. v., i. 795), Eski Masy, the ancient Balad (see Le Strange, Eastern Caliphat, p. 99); on Eski Baghí, see i. 56a and 926b.

ESKISHEHIR, on the Pursak-cai, the capital of the káç of the same name in the sandjak of Kutahía, in the province of Brusa, with about 25,000 inhabitants, chiefly Muslims, is celebrated for its hot springs and the meerschaum pits near it (see Reinhard in Petreanu's Mitteilungen, 1911, ii. 251 et seq.) and has very recently attained considerable importance as a junction on the Constantinople-Koníya and Constantinople-Ankara railways; of the 11 mosques one dates from the Saljuk period, and another was built by Kaum Musa-ja Pasha. Eskişehir is the successor of the Byzantine Dorylaeum (the أء هرة) of the Arabs) while the ancient town of that name was two miles to the north at the modern Şah-Üyük. In the Byzantine period the Emperor's armies assembled in the plain of Dorylaeum before the eastern campaign against the Arabs and Seldjûks (cf. Khandadeh, ed. de Goeje, p. 106). In 59 = 706 al-Abláns b. al-Walid conquered Dorylaeum (Tabari, ii. 119; cf. Theopanes, i. 376, ed. de Boer) and Hasan b. Kâhtaba advanced as far as this town in 162 = 178 (Tabari, iii. 403; Theopanes, i. 452). The Emperor Manuel Komnenos in 1177 again fortified the town which had been destroyed by the Seldjûks and drove out the Yäriks who led a nomadic life in the neighbourhood (Kimnmos, p. 294, 297; Niketas, p. 236 et seq., 246), but by the next year after the unsuccessful war against Khalid Arslân I. he had to agree to destroy the fortifications and a short time afterwards the town was completely occupied by the Seldjûks.

In the xiiith century Ertogrul settled near Eskishehr in the district of Sultan âyûgi (Sultan ânä), Nesht, Zeytchur, d. D. Morgen. Ges., xii. 198) in the apochryphal letter of investiture (menekhr) of 'Âla al-Din b. Farazmân of the beginning of Shawaâl 688 for Othman I. (Feridun, i. 56 of the second edition) the district of Eskishehr is granted to Othman as a sandjak (cf. Leemel, Hist. Mus., p. 125, 126 et seq.); at a later period it was the residence of the Sandjakbeg of İnönü and a station on the pilgrims' route.


ESNE (Egyptian Tase-net, Coptic Snc, Arabic Isna, Greek Latopolis from the fish Latos worshiped there) a town in Upper Egypt, lying on the left bank of the Nile halfway between Luxor and Edfu. It was for a time the capital of

a Mūdiriyé, now Markaz in the Mūdiriyé of Kena, with 19,103 inhabitants, celebrated for the ruins of the temple of the God Chnum, which dates from the Ptolemaic period, in which a number of Roman emperors are depicted in the garb of the Pharaohs. In the Muslim period Esne was a flourishing provincial town. According to Edinwati quoted by Mâkribi the town had 10,000 houses, produced annually 40,000 irshab of dates and 10,000 irshab of small fruits.

Bibliography: Yakut, i. 265 et seq.; Maâkribi, Khita'i, i. 237; Amelineau, Géographie de l'Egypte, 172; A. Binet Rey, Dictionnaire géographique de l'Egypte ( Cairo 1899), p. 153.

The most detailed account and one which takes account of economic conditions also is: 'Alî Mubâraq, Khita'i Djilidé, viii. 59; Baederker, Egypte (H. Ritter).

EUPHRATES. [See AL-FURAT.]

EUTYCHIUS, Patriarch of Alexandria 321-328 (933-939) known in Arabic as Sâd b. al-Dhirik, born at Fustat in 263 (876) was the author of several medical and historical works. The best edition in his Arabic chronicle Nâm al-Dhikwâr, published by Pococke at Oxford in 1658-1659, which was afterwards continued by Yahyâ b. Sa'id al-Ântâki [cf. i. 359]. The fragment of a history of Sicily contained in a famous Cambridge manuscript (cf. Browne, Handlist of Moham. Mus., p. 27, N°. 170) used to be wrongly ascribed to Eutychius [on this point cf. Vasilew, Visantia i Arabi, p. 79 et seq. and the works cited by him]. In the same library at Cambridge (Browne, cited, p. 281, N°. 1317) there is also a theological pamphlet against Eutychius written by Severus b. al-Muqadda.

Bibliography: Ibn Abâ Usâilî (ed. Muller), ii. 86; Leclerc, Hist. de la Medecine Arabe, i. 405; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litteratur, i. 148.

EWLIYA ÇELEBI; or as he repeatedly calls himself, EWLIYA MEHEMMEH B. DERWISH, the "globe-trotter." Siyâh-ı Âlem was born in Constantinople in 1020 (1611-1612) and died soon after 1090 (1679); in the course of forty years he made a series of long journeys within the Turkish empire and took part in the campaigns against Crete, Hungary, Austria etc. under İbrahim and Mehemmed IV and published his observations and experiences in war and peace under the title 'Urdîkhi Siyâh, the 'Traveller's Chronicle' (Vienna Miss., Flügel, N°. 1281; the Stamboul printed edition has Siyâhat-name), an elaborate work in ten parts. For information about himself and his life we are limited to his own statements. According to them his father Derwish Mehemmed âbî (i. 218; iii. 442, 443 of the Stamboul ed., cf. i. 244) had gone with Sultan Suleiman I to Belgrade, Rhodes, Buda, pest, Stuhlweissenburg and Szeged (i. 106, iii. 444); had been present at the siege of Cyprus (iii. 443) and taken part in Mehemmed III's campaign against Eriau (iii. 444); he was also a court-jeweller (Zeh, »dirkî, an-Nâm al-Dhikwâr, or Kuyuwdshîkh) and Vagner served two Sultan from Suleimân I to İbrahim (iii. 442; i. 258); he was died in 1058 A. H. (i. 439), at the age of 117 (iii. 444). His paternal grandfather, Demirîdî Ogâlî Kara Ahmadbeg, Mehemmed II's standard-bearer, had taken part in the capture of Constantinople and attained the age of 147 (iii. 444); his maternalgrandfather, Yawûz
Ozbeg had also been standard-bearer to the conqueror (i. 94); his mother was a sister of Melek Ahmed Pasha, who was Grand Vizier from Sha'bân 1060 to Ramazan 1061 and died in 1073. Ewliya decided to devote himself to scholarship and make a beginning in Ramazan 1045 at Nizâr in Aya Sofia; while here he attracted the attention of Sultan Murad IV, who gave him a post as Muğâbâ in the palace, which he left however two years afterwards as a regular Sipahi (ii. 244–258). Henceforth he gave himself up to his love of travel and we find him on long journeys in the provinces or on campaign, sometimes independently sometimes in the train of some high official, notably his uncle Melek Ahmed Pasha, till he settled down about 1083 (1672-1673). Details are given in the following survey of his travels. Part I contains the description of the capital and its environs which he explored in 1041 and the years following; Part II: Journey to Brusa (Mohtarâm 1050 = April-May 1640). — Excursion to Nikomedia. — Journey to Bitin, Trebizond, Akhîhâz (Djumâa I. 1050=Shabân 1054 = Aug. 1641-Oct. 1644). — Campaign against Crete (1055-1064). — Journey to Eretria, Aïdarbâigân, Georgia etc. (Radjab 1056—end of Dijumâ I. 1058 = Aug. 1646—end of May 1648). Part III: Journey to Damascus, Syria, Palestine, Urmiya, Siwas, Kurdistân, Armenia etc. (Shabân 1058—middle of Radjab 1060 = Sept. 1648—July 1650; in 1059 the author performed the pilgrimage (cf. i. 288) which he describes in a separate part). — Journey to Rumelia (Bulgaria, Dobrudja etc.) 1061-1062 (1651-1652). Part IV: Journey to Van, Tebriz, Bagdad, Bâsm etc. in the years 1065-1066 (1655-1656). Part V: Conclusion of the journey to Van-Yarasa. — Journey to Ossau, campaign against Rakoczy, raid into Russia, 1266-1268 (1656-1658). — Campaign against the rebels in Anatolia; return from Brusa via the Dardanelles to Adrianople, Radjab 1069—beginning of Safar 1070 (March—October 1659). — Mission to the Moldau, in the same year. — Campaign against Transylvania, mission to Bosnia; Campaign against Dalmatia, return to Sofia, from the middle of Shabân 1070-Rabi I. 1071 (April—November 1660). Part VI: Campaign against Transylvania, mission to Albania, return to Constantinople, Dhû l-Ka'da 1071—Radjab 1072 (July 1661—Feb. 1662). — Campaign against Hungary, siege of Udwâr (Tradhuvel), raid made by the author through Austria, Germany and Holland to the North Sea with 40,000 Tatars (14), conquest of Udwâr and other fortresses, return to winter-quarters in Belgrade, Shabân 1073—end of Ramazan 1074 (March 1663—March 1664). Mission to Herzegovina, journey to Ragusa, campaign against Montenegro, Kanâa, Croatia. — The contents of the other parts can only be surmised from the casual statements on p. vi. of the preface to the first volume of the new Stamhö edition; according to these Part VII deals with Austria, the Crimea, the lands of the Carpathians; Part VIII with the Crimea, Crete, Salonika and Thrace, Part IX with the pilgrimage and X with Egypt. In part VII Ewliya presumably describes his journey to Vienna and Central Europe on which he went as for as Dunkirk (cf. Travels, i. 1, 42 et seq.); he probably accompanied Kara Mehmed Pasha, the ambassador of the Porte (in 1075 = end of 1664), and then continued his journey alone from Vienna and after travelling for 3½ years returned to the Crimea, via Sweden, Poland and Russia (i. 300); in 1080 (1669) he accompanied the campaign against Crete and the later one against the Maiotes; part VIII deals with this. Part IX and part X deal specially with his pilgrimage in 1059 and Egypt respectively (cf. i. 288 and 507). The last date that appears in the parts of the Târîh-i Sâlih as yet known is the year 1089 (1678-1679), see i. 301.

Ewliya Çelebi was an imaginative writer with a decided fancy for the marvellous and adventurous; he prefers legend to dry historical facts, delights in exaggeration and does not hesitate at times to draw the long bow. Apart from this, his work is a perfect treasure-house of information on points of social life, folklore and geography, whose value is still further increased by simple and unaffected style in which they are vividly described. He rarely quotes from literary sources although a few are referred to (e.g. the chronicles of Mahly 'l-Din and Muhwî); he himself has been much used by later writers; unfortunately — as e.g. by von Hammer — usually without any attempt at criticism.

Only the first six parts of Ewliya's works have yet been printed, Stamhö 1316—1318; the Manuscript of Ewliya Çelebi (Constantinople 1529 A. 128 = 1843) contain extracts from Part I; v. Hammer translated Parts I—III under the title: Narrative of Travels in Europe, Asia and Africa by Ewliya Efendi (London 1846—1850, Vol. I and II), after giving in the second volume of his Des Osm. Rechts Staatsverfassung etc., p. 455—470 a detailed account of the contents of the first four parts. The only manuscripts of the Târîh-i Sâlih in Europe are in Vienna and in the British Museum.

J. H. Moritzmann.

Ewrenos, the descendants of Ewrenos (أوُرَنُوس), in 'Ashkâpşâhâzâde and Neshri (نَشْرٍ), 'Abârâzâ in Dukas, Bârâzâ in Manuel Palacez, Chron. brev. and Chron. Epigr., Bârâzâ in Chal-kokondyles and Phrantzes, Avranes in Barleuvius) form with the Mihaloghlu, Malkodjoglou and the sons of Türkân the four ancient families of the Ottoman nobility. (Ramberti, Cosi dei Turchi, B. 133 f., ed. 1543; cf. Lencul, Pand., C. 27).

Tradition mentions Ghâzâ Ewrenosbeg among the begs of the Karasîoghlu who on the disposition of this dynasty by Sultan Orkhân in 735 A.H. entered the service of Saleimân Pasha, son of Orkhân. He crossed the Hellispoint with Saleimân Pasha (in 759: or 760) and was installed by Murâd I as 'udîjî (frontier-beg) in the Rumelian territory. In this capacity he conquered Keshan, Ipsala, Gumûldîna (765) Fere (774), Pori, Xântî, Maroanîa (775), Serres (784 or 787), Monastir, Yenidje Wardar and laid the foundations of Ottoman power in western Thrace and Macedonia. After making the pilgrimage he took part in the battle of Kossova (June 1389), conquered Kittros and Wodiena, and repeatedly led Turkish armies against Albania (1398 and beginning of 1396) and the Morea (1391 and 1395). He then fought in the battle of Nikopolis (Sept. 1396) against the Hungarians and accompanied Bayâzid I on his raid into Wallachia. Finally he fought in the battle of Angora in the war against Tiûm. Under Mur Saleimân he took part in the war against the Karamanoglou and besieged the
latter in Aššarai. He afterwards went over to Mūṣṭa Celebi (in 813 a. h.) and finally in 816 a. h. to Meḥmənd I and fought on the latter's side in the battle of Cāmūri. He seems to have died soon afterwards (according to Sījjīl-i ʿOthmānī in 819 or 820 a. h.). If, as the Ottoman historians say, Ewrenos had been a beg under the last Kās-roğān, he must have been over 100 when he died; there is apparently a confusion between two different persons. Even in Murād I's reign Ewrenos was one of the richest vassals, and his estates were so large that tradition relates that he had so much land as a swift steed would carry him round in 24 hours (ʿAlī Kūnch, V, 75; Beaujour, Tablouin Commercio de la Grèce, i. 111 et seq.). He expended a great part of his riches in pious endowments which are still controlled by his descendants and to the present day are free from state inspection by special privilege (Dustur, iv. 400).

On the death of Meḥmənd I in 824 a. h. the sons of Ghazī Ewrenos took the side of the false Muṣṭa, who even had his headquarters for a period in Yenidže before advancing against Murād II, and remained faithful to the pretender after his other followers had forsaken him; they afterwards went over to Murād II. Among them ʿAlībeg and Ḳābībeg were particularly distinguished as brave and skilful generals; they led the Rumelian sipāhs and akhindis (irregulars) in Murād II's campaigns against Albania, the Morea, and notably against Hungary. ʿAlībeg was, according to Ducas, executed by Meḥmənd II on his accession in 1451 A. D. after strangling the Sultan's younger brother by his orders; according to another story (in Beaujour, l. c.) he had run against Murād II in the game of ġirād and the Sultan enraged ordered the aged Ewrenos to put his son to death with his own hands. Of the other sons of Ghazī Ewrenos Baraḵbeg (Bāṣānex, Bāṣānex in Chalkokondyles) and Ahmedbeg are mentioned; the latter took part in the Wallachian campaign of 1462 a. d. and in the siege of Sκόdra in 1478. The two Ewrenosoghlu, ʿĪsā and Suleimān, who fell in battle against the Egyptians in 1488, must have been grandsons of Ewrenos. Henceforth the Ewrenosoghlu begin to lose their important position, although we still find them from time to time acting as provincial governors for the Porte. Nevertheless they remained the most prominent family in the land, chiefly on account of their extensive estates, while the descendants of the other three ancient Ghazī families have retained nothing of the glory of their ancestors except their name.

The celebrated firmān, which Murād I is said to have granted to Ghazī Ewrenos (published by v. Diez, Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien i. 101—132 and in Feridūn's Mīṣḵiātī Ṣalāṭīn, i. 87 et seq. in the second edition) has been doubted as apocryphal by v. Hammer, but is acknowledged by the Porte as genuine. Beaujour (loc. cit.) saw a manuscript history of the Ewrenosoghlu and gave several stories from it. The biographies of Ghazī Ewrenos and his son ʿAlībeg in the collection Meḥlūkhī-i Islāmī (Constantinople, 1501 a. h.) contain valuable material. Von Hammer's account of the Ewrenosoghlu in his Gesch. d. Osm. Reiches, Vol. i. and ii., is only to be used with great caution. (J. H. Mordtmann).

FADAK (Demin. Fudain), a town in Arabia not far from Khaibar [q. v.] and like the latter inhabited by Jews. In the year 626—627 Muhammad sent ʿAlī, afterwards Caliph, against Fadak as he had learned that the latter town was going to support the Jews in Khaibar. When Khaibar was taken in the following year, the Jews of Fadak also submitted and agreed to give up half of their possessions. Muḥaṣṣib al-Maṣʿīdī conducted the negotiations between the Prophet and the people of Fadak and was rewarded by Muhammad for his services. On the death of the Prophet, his daughter Fātimma demanded that Khaibar and Fadak should be given her as her father's inheritance. But Abu Bakr refused to give up these towns and relied here on the words of the Prophet: "No one shall be my heir; what I leave behind me belongs to the poor,"


AL-FADLĪ, MUḤAMMAD B. ʿṢĀFĪ-Ḥ AL-SHĀFĪ, a Cairene Shāikh born at Munayt Fādāl near Samannud in the Delta (Khitāf al-fādāla, in p. 2; xvi. 80; Bāḏjīrī, Ṭabakat al-muṣannaf al-fādāla, p. 9 of ed. of Cairo, 1315) who died in A. H. 1326 (Cat. of Khotiv. Library, ii. p. 39) = A. D. 1821. He appears to be known only as the author of the Kifāyat al-ʿawwām min Ḳifāyat al-ādām, the teacher of the more fertile Bāḏjīrī [q. v.] who added the gloss, written in Arabic, to his master's work. Text and Ḳifāya are now seen to be go together in the Ms. and editions. A translation of the text is given in D. B. Macdonald's Development of Muslim Theology etc., p. 315—351. Bibliography: Brockelmann, ii. p. 489; Ahlwardt's Berlin Cat., iv. p. 459, No. 5148; Ellis, Cat. of Ar. Printed Books in British Mu-
seum, under Muhammad ibn Shahb al-Fadlāl; but the nība according to the Rāmā, idj. is as above. (D. B. Macdonald.)

FADDĀN (A.), an Arabic word derived from the Aramaic (cf. Fränkel, Die Arab. Fremdwörter, p. 129), properly a yoke of oxen for ploughing a piece of ground, an Egyptian measure of area, varying in size with time and place. According to Lane the faddān a few years before his stay in Egypt (1833—1835) measured about 1.1 acres, while during his stay there it was less than an acre. It was divided into 24 ḥirāʾ and contained 333 3/4 σq. kašaba, the kašaba (rood) being first reckoned at 24 and later at 22 ḥirāʾ. In the time of the French expedition there were three different faddān in use: the faddān in use on the banks of the Nile (1,336 arps), that in use away from the Nile (2,375 arps) and the faddān of Damietta (2,012 arps); Upper Egypt (1,670 arps = 5724 sq. metres) and the Copts (5253 sq. metres) had each their own faddān besides. Decourdemanche estimates the ancient faddān of 400 σq. kašaba (the kašaba being reckoned at the length fixed by al-Fāḍil: it was 5.9 rods or 1.8 glasses of Babylonian ells.), at 583.5 square metres and the modern faddān of 333 3/4 σq. kašaba at 4200.83 square metres. In Syria faddān also means a single ox; as a measure of area it is 333 square kašaba.


FAHDĀLAKA (A.) "sum, total" from fahdalika "and this makes", at the end of an addition.

FAIDL. [See FADIL.]

FAĐR (A.) "Daybreak", the title of Sura LXXXIX.

AL-FADĪL b. AL-RABI’, AL-ĀMIN’S visier. A descendant of a Syrian slave manumitted by the Caliph Othmān, al-Fadl proved himself thoroughly Arab in his attitude and constantly championed the Arab spirit in opposition to the numerous Iranian elements in the "Abbāsid empire. His father al-Rabi’ b. Yūnus had played a part in history as visier to the two Caliphs al-Šamār and al-Mahdi. When Ḥarūn on his accession gave the Barmecides preferment, al-Fadl felt himself slighted and became filled with hatred and jealousy of them. On Khaizarān’s death in 173 (789-790) he was appointed visier by Ḥarūn and filled this office till 178 (794-795) when Yahyā b. Khālid al-Barmaki became the real ruler. Al-Fadl then did his best to bring about the fall of the Barmecides and succeeded in once more obtaining the vizierate which he retained under Ḥarūn’s son and successor al-Āmin. Just as his namesake al-Fadl b. Shah ruled al-Āmin’s brother, afterwards Caliph al-Ma’mūn, almost absolutely, al-Fadl exercised an extraordinary influence over al-Āmin. When Ḥarūn died suddenly in Khorāsān in Jhumāḍa II. 193 (March 809), while on a campaign against the rebel Rāfī b. Lāṭif, al-Fadl ordered the whole army destined for Khorāsān back to Baghdad, by command of al-Āmin but in direct violation of the dead Caliph’s last wish, a proceeding which al-Ma’mūn, who was then governor of Khorāsān and at once paid homage to his brother, could not prevent. As al-Fadl feared al-Ma’mūn’s vengeance, if the latter should ever become Caliph, he exerted all his influence to incite al-Āmin against his brother. As early as the year 194 (809-810) at the instigation of al-Fadl and ‘Ali b. Isā, a former governor of Khorāsān, the Caliph had his son Mis‘ūn mentioned in public prayer which was later evidence of his intention to declare him his successor. In consequence al-Ma’mūn broke off all relations with his brother; in Radjab 196 (March—April 812) the latter was taken prisoner and declared deposed, and, although he was soon set free and raised to the throne again, al-Fadl thought it advisable to retire.

In 201 (816-817) he came forth again from retirement. The troops in the capital rose against al-Ma’mūn’s governor, al-Ḥasan b. Sahīl. The commander there, Muhammad b. Abī Khālid, was successful at first; but when he quarrelled with al-Ma’mūn’s other generals, he went over to the rebels himself. Al-Fadl now looked to Muhammad’s side; the latter attacked al-Ḥasan b. Sahīl but was defeated and died of his wounds. Al-Fadl then lived in retirement till his death. On the intercession of Tāhir b. al-Ḥusayn, governor of Khorāsān he was pardoned by al-Ma’mūn. He died in Rabi II. or in Dhu-l-Ka‘da 208 (823-824).


AL-FADIL b. SAHIL, AL-MA’MUN’S visier. Al-Fadl was a native of Persia and did not adopt Islam till 190 (805-806). His family had been strongly recommended to Ḥarūn by the Barmecides and al-Fadl b. Rabi’, their implacable opponent, therefore became a personal enemy of Ibn Sahil. As the former was of Arab origin, the latter was also opposed to him as the representative of the Iranian element, and just as Ibn al-Rabi’ controlled the one brother, al-Āmin, the other, al-Ma’mūn, was simply a tool in the hands of Ibn Sahil. The struggle that arose between the two sons of Ḥarūn was thus also a struggle between their viziers or between Arab and Persian culture. As al-Fadl b. Sahil feared that al-Āmin would on Ḥarūn’s death disregard the arrangements for the succession made by the latter, he persuaded al-Ma’mūn to try to accompany Ḥarūn to Khorāsān in 192 (808). In the following year the Caliph died and when al-Āmin recalled the army sent against Khorāsān and al-Ma’mūn was thinking of hurrying after the troops and reminding them of their duty, Ibn Sahil persuaded him against this. Instead of al-Ma’mūn an envoy was sent to the army; but he could do nothing with them and was received with insults and the army continued its march to Baghdad. In the period following, al-Fadl remained the prince’s faithful friend and adviser and constantly urged him in all things to insist on his own rights against his brother. It was due to the cunning intrigues of Ibn Sahil that al-Ma’mūn allowed himself to be led into trusting the command of the army, which he was sending against al-Ma’mūn in 195 (811) to the incapable ‘Ali b. Isā. ‘Ali was defeated by Tāhir b. al-Ḥusayin; he
himself fell in the battle and his troops were scattered in flight. After this success al-Ma'mūn gave Ibn Sahl the government of the eastern provinces and at the same time gave him the title Dhu 'l-Khāzānatayn (“lord of the two highest offices”) i.e. of vizier and commander in chief. When the aged general Harthama b. A'yan, who had rendered such services to Harūn, was appointed governor of Arabia and Syria, he decided to go to al-Ma'mūn in Merv to give him an account of the condition of various parts of the empire. The Caliph commanded him to go to Damascus; but when Harthama in spite of this appeared in Khorāsān, he was represented by Ibn Sahl as a rebel. The Caliph therefore had him thrown into prison where he was put to death a few days later by Ibn Sahl. Al-Ma'mūn, however, finally found out that the latter did not always do what he told the Caliph and therefore had his former favourite murdered in the bath in Sarks in 202 (818) or 203 (819).


**AL-FAḌL b. YAYHĀ, a Barmakīd, born in Dhu 'l-Hijjah 148 (February 766) governor of Dārjūrān, Tabaristan, al-Raiy etc. 176–180 (792–797) and of Khorāsān 178–179 (794–795–795–796). On the fall of the Barmakids in 187 (806) he was thrown into prison. He died in confinement in al-Raṣṣā in Kamarān 192 or Muḥarrarn 193 (808). For further details see above i. 665a (article Barmakīds).” (K. V. Zettersten.)

**FAḌL ALLĀH, a family of officials in Cairo under the Mamlūks who traced their descent from the Caliph 'Omar I. so that the individual members are also known by the nība al-'Omārī. The founder of the family was Faḍl Allāh Djalāl al-Dīn Abu 'l-Maʿāthir b. 'Izz al-Dīn; one of his sons, Shafar al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahhāb (died 717 = 1317), was private secretary under Kālāwūn, another son, Muḥyī al-Dīn Yaḥyā (died 738 = 1337), was likewise private secretary under al-Nāṣir in Damascus, but moved to Cairo in 733 (1332–1333). The latter had a son, Shihāb al-Dīn Abu 'l-Abbots Aḥmed (born 700 = 1301), who first became kāfī, then secretary of state, but is best known for his literary works. He compiled a comprehensive, encyclopaedic work entitled Mālālik al-Alārī fī Manālik al-Āmār, as well as an official letter-writer al-Taṣf b. 'Abd al-'Adālāt al-Shirīf, which however contains much other valuable material and was printed in Cairo in 1312 (1894–1895). Other works by the same author are detailed by Brockelmann, Gesch. d. Arab. Litt., ii. 141. Shihāb al-Dīn, or as he is usually called, Ibn Faḍl Allāh, died of the plague in Damascus in 748 (1348).

**Bibliography:** in Brockelmann, op. cit., to which may be added that Tischendorf gives extracts from both the above works in his *Revue de Matériaux rel. à l'Histoire de la Horde d'Or*, p. 204–251. Cf. also Makrīzī, Khīṭat, ii. 56 et seq.

**FAḌL ALLĀH, surnamed ḤūḍRĪ, founder of the ḤūḍRĪ sect, born in Astārābād in 740 (1339), was a dervish who shared the religious opinions of the Kārmājīans. He actually seems to have borrowed the system, which develops a whole theology out of the calculation of the numerical value of the Arabic letters, to which he added the four additional letters of the Persian alphabet [cf. ṭarkh, i. 691 et seq.] from the Ismā'īlīs. He was executed in Shirwān in 796 (1393) by Muḥāsān, son of Timūr. One of his pupils, ʿAlī al-Aʿlā, went to Asia Minor, was received into a Bektashī monastery and began to preach Faḍl Allāh's doctrines, which he gave out to be the teaching of Hāджī Ṭekbāš. Faḍl Allāh considered himself an incarnation of the Deity and impressed this belief on his pupils; [on his teaching cf. the article ḤūḍRĪ]. He is the author of Dākhīrāt al-Kabīr, composed half in Persian and half in the dialect of Astārābād, also of a religious poem, which was probably called Iṣkand-īrānā, of another poem called Arūbānāmā “book of the throne” and of a treatise called Ṭabāhāt-īrānā “book of love”.


**FAḌL ALLĀH. [See RAṢḤID AL-DĪN.]

**FAḌLĪ (FADLI, FUTHALI), the dynastic name of a group of tribes in South Arabia. Besides this name we also find Qūṭmān (Qūṭmānī), as the founder of the dynasty, Faḍlī, is said to have been of Turkish origin. They are a branch of the Yāḥī and formerly bore their name also.

The land of the Faḍlī lies between 45° 10' and 46° 30' E. Lat. (Greenw.) and has an breadth of 20–30 miles. It is bounded on the south by the Arabian Sea, in the west by the Lāhējī, in the north by the Yāḥī and in the east by the land of the 'Awdīhī and Dāthīn. In the west there is the large valley of Abyan, with the Wādī Bona (Bana, Benah) and Hasān, both of fair size, which are filled with water during the summer rains. The Dājel Naḥḵāī with the W. Sālā may be mentioned among the hills in the east. The soil is fertile only in the west (district of Abyan); its chief product here is cotton. The east is mainly steppe-country. The capital of the country and residence of the Sulṭān is the town of Sīrīya, five miles from the coast, with about 400 inhabitants, a large mosque and the fortresslike palace of the Sulṭān. The only seaport or commercial town is Shugra (Shuḵra), with about 100 inhabitants and a palace of the Sulṭān, who lives here two months of the year. Jews live here only during the trading season, which lasts only a few months in the year. Among the towns in Abyan we may mention: 'Asālah, with about 500 inhabitants (a fifth of whom are Jews, who have a large synagogue here), one time a flourishing seaport, now here inclined, Māʾr or the W. Hasān with about 300 inhabitants (including many Jews), a large mosque and a hereditary governor of the 'Uṭhmānī dynasty, and Naʿāb with about 300 inhabitants (including many families of Jews) and a hereditary governor, who bears the title "Sulṭān".

The people of the Faḍlī country are Shāfīʿ
and devout Muslims. They strictly observe fasting in Ramadān, the prescribed prayers, the prohibition of wine and other prescriptions of the Korān. The Murākisha and Aḥl ʿEḥa are the most important of the tribes who inhabit the country. They are as a rule free and independent (kalbāʾiṭ). The people of Abyan and the Jews are on the other hand subject to the Sulṭān (raʾiye); he levies taxes on them at will and administers justice. If a raʾiye commits a murder he is stabbed to death with the knives of the Sulṭān’s soldiers at the murdered man’s grave. When a thief is caught, for his first offence he is beaten before the Sulṭān and forced, between the stolen article, on a second offence his hand is cut off; if he commits the offence again he is thrown into the sea in a loaded sack. Religious transgressions such as the breaking of a fast are punished by imprisonment in chains. Adultery is held equal to murder. If a murderer cannot be found, the so-called “test by fire” is tried (ordałów). This is carried out in the presence of the Sulṭān by the “fire-judge” who places a red-hot knife on the tongue of the suspect. The decision then rests with the fire-judge.

The Faḥl at one time belonged to the Yāfi and was under the rule of the Imams of Yemen from whom they separated when they themselves became independent. They later became enemies of the Yāfi and in the fourth decade of last century took from them the fertile district of Abyan. They live at hereditary enmity with the ʿAbādil of Lāḥēj and the ʿAwālikh, to which latter their district of Daṭṭah became tributary. On the other hand they are on friendly terms with the Wāhjdā, Ṣāyid, and ʿAḥjarī. Their relations with England down to 1856 were strained. In this year England made war on them and inflicted a severe defeat on them at ʿAsāla, whereupon they made peace. Since that time they have been on friendly relations with England.

The dynasty of Faḥl is of great physiological interest because of its possession of six fingers. The Sulṭān as well as his nearest relatives have a fingerlike girthy growth beside the little finger of each hand and the little toe of each foot, which is regarded as a sign of extraordinary strength among the Southern Africans as among the Semites generally.


FAĞFUR (avestan bagha-puthra “son of God”) an expression brought to Persia through Fargān (P. Horn, Aṣʿādi’s Lughat-i Furi, p. 56) is the designation of the Emperor of China and the translation of the Chinese tién-tṣu “Son of heaven” (Ibn al-ʿAthir, vii. 221, ult.). The Arabs have preserved the form baghūr, which is more a western form, but fağfur is also found notably in the Arabic inscription in the cemetery at Zaʿīt (Ts’üan-chou), of the year 723 (1323) which has been discussed by M. van Berchem; in Marco Polo (ed. Yule and Cordier, ii. 145) the name is applied to the last Sung Emperor; and as the Mongol Emperors bore the title fağfur (shāhkan) it is probable that the title fağfur refers to Chinese sovereigns of native dynasties before the conquest of the country by foreigners.


FAHIL or FÄHIL, among the Jews Fëhel, called Pella by the Greeks in allusion to the name of the Macedonian town, at the present day the ruins of Faḥl lie on the western slopes of the land east of Jordan. It belonged to the Decapolis and is particularly celebrated because the Christians went thither on leaving Jerusalem before its destruction; it afterwards belonged to Palaestina Secunda and was the see of a bishop. About six months after the battle of Adnādān in Dūn l-ʿQāda of the year 13 (January 635) the Muslims attacked the Byzantines who had assembled in the land east of Jordan, at Faḥl. The Byzantines had broken the dams at Bāṣān and turned the plain into a marsh but the Arabs crossed the Jordan without mishap and put the enemy to flight whereupon the town surrendered. The battle is also called “the Day of the Swamps”.

The geographers mention Faḥl among the towns of the province of Udunum. According to Yaʿkub l the population as usual in this part of the world was half Arab and half Greek.


Fr. Buhl.)

FÄFIL. By this word Muslim scholars in general understand all things which may be taken from the unbelievers “without fighting” and further very often the lands in conquered territories. The name fafīl is explained from the peculiar expression in the Korān, verses 6 and 7. "What God has allowed to return to his apostle (mā ofāʾa lāhu ʿala rasūlīhī). The possessions of the unbelievers which are “returned” to the Muslims form the fafīl.

Verses lix, 6, 8 and 10 of the Korān were revealed, according to Muslim tradition, when Muhammad had resolved not to divide the fields and orchards left by the Banū l-ʿNaḍlr, who had been driven out of the country, as booty of war among those who had taken part in the siege, but to give them to the Muhājiṁrs exclusively. He justified this action by arguing that these were really obtained not by fighting but in a peaceful fashion, by surrender.

After the conquest of Khālar and Fadak also the lands of the Jews there were not wholly divided among the troops as booty but in part placed at the Prophet’s disposal. It was probably on this occasion that Korān lxx. 7 was revealed:
"What God hath granted his apostle as fa'il from the people of the towns, belongs to God — to his apostle, to his family, to the orphan, to the poor, and to the traveller; what the apostle of God gives you, accept, but what be fords you, abstain from!" What could not properly be regarded as booty, was to be managed by the Prophet himself as state property and the proceeds therefrom as the fifth of the Ghanima (q.v.) were to be applied to the general good.

At a later period 'Umar ibn al-Khattab, in accordance with the view of his advisers of the Sufi school, thought that this principle should be applied to the newly conquered territories also. He ordered that only movable property captured should be divided among the Arab conquerors but not the land. The land was to be applied not for the advantage of the generation then living but as fa'il belonging for all time to the whole community for the benefit of all future generations of Muslims also. It was also feared at that time that if the Arabs devoted themselves to agriculture they would become less capable fighters. As a rule therefore, only the native population was assigned the land and the emigration of the Arab army on condition that they were allowed to retain possession of their lands.

In such districts (the so-called Durr al-Sulh q.v. i. 919) the land did not belong to the fa'il.

When in the course of the first century, the people of the conquered lands adopted Islam, they began, in spite of all measures of the Muslim authorities, to avoid the payment of kharāj and only gave the zakāt of the yield of their fields like the Arab Muslims. The land in the conquered provinces thus gradually ceased to be regarded as fa'il.

The views of later Muslim scholars on this point differ; the lands and estates in recently conquered provinces, according to the Ṣūfis, always to be divided among the conquerors as ghanima, according to the Malikis on the other hand, they are to be considered the property of all Muslims, i.e. as fa'il, while the Hanafis would place them at the imām's disposal so that he may administer them either as fa'il for the common good or divide them as ghanima among the troops according to the cause of Islam may be best advanced.

Besides the land, the kharāj, the dijizya and all other tribute to be paid by unbelievers, as for example the duties they have to pay on their goods in order to be allowed to trade in Muslim countries, are included in fa'il. According to Ṣūfī teaching the fifth part of the ghanima; the other four fifths of the fa'il are, according to the same school, to be used for the payment of the regular troops, the maintenance of mosques, roads and bridges and for other objects of general utility to Muslims. On the other hand the other Fāh school hold that the Imām should always apply the fa'il in its entirety for the good of the Muslim community as circumstances require it.

Bibliography: In addition to the chapter on dijizya in the 16th-century works on kharāj by Abū Yūsuf and Yakhūb ibn Abūt; Māwardi, al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyya (ed. M. Enger, Bonn 1853), p. 217 et seq., 237 et seq., 293 et seq.; Dimishki, Rahmat al-Umma fi Debūl thalātī al-A'imma (Dūbā, 1300), p. 151 et seq.; and the literature cited in the Handbuch des islam, Gesetze by the author of this article (Leiden 1910), p. 344 et seq. (Th. W. Juynboll.)

FAIL. (A. properly "agent"), a technical term in Arabic grammar == the subject of the verbal sentence, but only of the active verb (like Zaidun in the sentence jibrilu Zaidun = Zaid came), while that of the passive (like Zaidun in durība Zaidun) is called the fa'il of allāduhu lān yuwāsam fa'ilun, == the "patient" whose agent is not mentioned" (in Sībawaih, Ch. 8 et seq., other expressions are also given).

The fa'il can be a word only, not a sentence (this is given as a teaching of Sībawaih's in al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, i. 289, 12-13). It must follow its fā'il (verb) and is placed by it in the nominative.

In the older grammarians, as, for example, several times in Sībawaih and Kāmil (I. 634, 9) fa'il also means the active participle, which is later called in al-fā'il.

Bibliography: al-Zamakhshari, Mufassal, p. 10 et seq.; Muḥammad al-Aʿzā, Dictionary of Technical Terms (ed. Spranger etc.), ii. 1148 et seq.; Fleischer, Kleinere Schriften, i. 80.

FAILASŪF, philosopher: he who studies falsaṣa [q.v. p. 48 et seq.]; thence frequently used as a epithet for deep thinkers. The Arab philologists know the literal meaning of this word as muḥibb al-ḥikma (lover of wisdom). Al-Kindi [q.v.] was preferably known as the falsāfī al-ʿArab (philosopher of the Arabs), presumably because he was a philosopher of genuine Arab origin in contrast to most Muslim philosophers who belonged to non-Arab nations. (Cf. the correct explanation of this name given to al-Kindi by T. de Boer in the Archiv. für Gesch. der Philos. [1893], xiii. 154, et seq.), al-Dījahīn in quoting a wise saying of "Ali b. Abī Tālib describes him as Failasūf al-ʿArab (in Māwardi, Muntūḥ al-Ḥikam, ms. Landberg, now in the Yale University, fol. 45"; Dījahīn's work from which the quotation is taken is not named). This is quite in keeping with the character which his devotees give "Ali in philosophical (or rather kalām) matters (Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ge., liii. 382). The accuracy of Māwardi's quotation is rendered suspicious because in it Dījahīn speaks of himself as keeper of Harūn al-Rashīd's library.

In modern times the Turks have given the name Falsafī Rūṣūm to the contemporary Stambul scholar Rūṣūm Tewfik who has published a study of the Harūfī Sect (Gīhī Memorial Series, Vol. ix.), on account of his work on philosophical literature. In popular language failasūf is applied in
an uncomplimentary sense to free thinkers or unbelievers. Even the Jewish king Jero boam is called falsifus in this sense (Brevia des Interpolat Actuatorum ult.). An idea of contempt is associated with the forms finals, fulsfas (also falsifum, Syr.), plur. fulsfas, current in the popular language; this is applied to frivolous, imprudent people, good-for-nothings and charlatans (examples in Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Vorgest. Get., xxxviii. 681); Vollers, (ibid. li. 300, 3) gives ful fus. — The verbal form yufsfas (Basis le for geron, ed. Landberg, 38, 3) is also connected with this: he could not wriggle out.

(I. Golzih.)

FAISAL. [See IBN SA'UD.]

AL-FAIYUM. The district of Faiyum is a depression on the eastern borders of the Libyan desert in the form of an irregular triangle with the apex to the south. It measures about 35 miles from N. to S. and about 49 from E. to W. The depression slopes from S. to N. and N. W., at first gradually to the railway line from Abouka to Sanûres (30 feet above sea-level), then very rapidly to the Birket Kârûn (140 feet below sea-level).

This hollow was formed in the Tertiary period through collapses in the earth's crust (as did the Nile valley also). Traces of human activity in the pre-historic period, such as have been found in the diluvial strata of the Nile valley, have not been discovered in the Faiyum, although neolithic flint workings have been unearthed on the northern margin.

In the diluvial period, when the Nile first appeared in its bed, an arm branched off from it in the neighbourhood of Aṣṣūt, the modern Baḥr Yūsuf, which entered the Faiyum basin after a course of 272 miles along the western border of the valley through a breach which it possibly made itself in the edge of the Libyan plateau. In course of time it filled the basin so that a great freshwater lake arose which in the north and West of the Faiyum stretched further than the present cultivated land. Kharaq Amenshamat and his successors of the xixth dynasty, built a dam or sluice at the place where the arm of the Nile entered the Faiyum with a view to stopping further influx of water and gaining arable land. The shallower stretches in the S. and E. were laid bare through the great evaporation and seepage by dykes. A small strip of land which ran out to the middle of this area, with the modern towns of Medine, Ahamayn and Elbghawia formed the "lake-province", tērēh, later phūmē of the ancient Egyptians, whose capital was Shetet, the Crocodilopolis of the Greeks.

The dams and sluices at Illahūn, which in course of time were made more and more efficient, made it possible for the lake (Egypt. Muwaṣṣir, whence the Maus of the Greeks) to be dammed when the Nile was in flood and afterwards run off; the lake thus became of great importance for the irrigation of the Nile valley. There can be no shadow of doubt that the Lake Moiris of the Greeks must have been the lake covering the whole of the Faiyum with the exception of the strip already mentioned. It used to be located in the southern extremity of the district where the village of Shedūm strong walls several miles long are still standing, which can only have been the embankment of an immense reservoir.

When in later centuries the influx of water to the lake began to diminish for unknown reasons and with the increasing dessication its shore retreated farther to the north, it had finally to cease to act as a regulator of the water-supply. When this took place has not yet been ascertained, possibly in the Persian or perhaps not till the beginning of the Ptolemaic period (Flin ders Petrie, Hanura, Bihunu and Aranuo). At this period the dry land had extended as far as the railway line from Abouka to Sanûres. A further contraction in the lake took place in the Greek period under Ptolemy Philadelphus in the middle of the third century B.C. Whether it reached its present dimensions as early as this must be doubted, for in the deepest parts (140 feet below seal level) no traces of buildings of the Greek period are found; Kārûn is at a depth of only 65 feet.

It is not absolutely impossible that the deepest parts at least did not emerge from the water till after the beginning of the Christian era; an investigation of the tombs on the south side of the island in the lake might possibly throw light on this point. It was not till then that the lake assumed the form and dimensions that it has at present, a length of 25 miles with a maximum breadth of about 6 miles and an area of 100 square miles. Its greatest known depth which is in the center is barely 16 feet but there are said to be deeper places in the western part. Its transformation from a freshwater lake to a salt has likewise most probably only taken place in the last period of its formation. In spite of the strong and in recent years increased influx of water no permanent rise in the level may be noticed although there is a slight fluctuation. The great evaporation of the surface on account of its low-lying position is, however, not sufficient to explain the disappearance of such vast quantities of water. It is not improbable the water escapes by one or more subterranean passages, naturally to the N. and not to the S. into the Wādī Kairīyān. The currents which are sometimes apparent in it would be thus explained. Besides, this has been suggested before: Maxey, Ekhun i. 249 suggests that the lake was drained underground to Sīwā (Sanatary). The great wealth in fishes, notably in the two kinds būtūni and lēṣṭēkh with eels and large sheat-fish in smaller numbers, which the lake possessed in ancient times, still remains, although it will soon diminish with the vast amount of fishing in which some hundreds of boats are engaged.

When the channel that fed the Faiyum ceased to act as an aqueduct when Lake Moiris ceased to be a reservoir, it was divided into a number (8) of canals at its end near the capital Crocodilopolis, which spread over the country principally to the N. W., after three had been led off to the N. and two to the S. before it reached the capital. In addition three other canals were led off from the aqueduct immediately after its entrance into the Faiyum, probably even in ancient times, one to the S. to irrigate the basin of Qurak (al-Sultān) and two to the north, that of Sulū (or Salū, written siyū Salū or sayūlā or sulā in Arabic) and that of Baṣḥ (originally perhaps Baṣāḥ); the latter, which is cut through the limestone for a considerable stretch in rising ground underground 100 yards broad and 40 feet deep, shows the scientific skill of the engineers of those days.
The superfluous water not required for irrigation, from these canals flowed into the lake. It was this irrigation of the ancient lake-bed, which of course was not equally productive all over, which gained the Faiyum the prosperity for which it was at all times celebrated, which, combined with the climate, made the district the most valuable province in Egypt.

The waterworks of the Faiyum were at quite an early period ascribed by Muslim tradition, probably under Jewish influence, to the Joseph of the Bible, but only at a later period called after him. When vizier of king Khunf, he caused the channel which brought the water to the Faiyum to be dug; the Faiyum which had previously been called Al-Djaula, was a basin into which were drained the superfluous waters of the Nile from Upper Egypt. Throughout the whole mediaeval period the stream was called Al-Bahr al-munkh (not munkh); it is only in modern times (first in Djabarti?) that the name Bahr Yusuf appears. The sluices of Illahun, which tradition also credits to him, were called Al-Hashur al-Lahluni in the middle ages, and only towards their close do we find the name Al-Hashur Al-Yusufi. Smaller sluices were called Al-Bahr Al-Yusufi, canals Madjiriy Khatimiyah, canals Madjiriy Khatimiyah (Makrizi). It is also dug the canals of Wardan and Gharak and finally, founded the town of Faiyum in which there was a Djami Yusufi in the viith century A. H.

A further personage in the Koran, the fabulously wealthy Karrun (Surah xxviii. 76) was likewise immortalised by tradition in the Faiyum and held to be the builder of the temple in the late Greek town of Dionsias at the western end of the lake. As early as the xiiith century these ruins were called Ksar Karrun and were highly esteemed by treasure-seekers (Kitab Al-Durr al-mahbuz by Ahmed Kamal p. 285—286). The name Karrun was only transferred from them to the lake in recent times, for as late as the end of the middle ages it was still called simply Al-Birka or Al-Birka Al-Ctouna (Makrizi, Khitat, i. 249).

The Faiyum has never played any great roll in the political history of Egypt. The transition from the old Oriental rule, Egyptian or Persian, to the European of the Greeks and Romans brought the land the greatest material and intellectual prosperity that it ever attained in antiquity. The capital of the district had then over 100,000 inhabitants, the modern town has nothing like half that number. In 639 followed the Muslim invasion and a decline set in, which lasted over a thousand years and reached its lowest level under Turkish rule. The causes of this decline are on the whole the same as in other Muslim lands, notably in the very similar country of Babylonia. It is true that the Faiyum was less afflicted by the civil wars that ruined Babylonia, but the religious fanaticism of the new rulers which increased as time went on and the oppression of the Christian populace, of which the papyri give a detailed account for the early centuries and which is testified to by the wholesale destruction of Christian churches and monasteries by the Muhammadan mob for the later period (viiith—xiiith centuries A. H.) — there were still 2 monasteries in the Faiyum in 1210 (Abu Salih, Faiyum, p. 53), and only 13 in 1244 (Othman, Faiyum, p. 22) were always worse in Egypt than in other countries. But particularly it was the incapability of all the Muslim dynasties to manage the internal affairs of the country in an orderly fashion, notably the finance, or where attempts were made in this direction the incapability of maintaining good government for any length of time. Lastly as in Babylonia there was the immigration of Bedouin tribes, a plague which the rulers of Egypt had been striving to ward off for thousands of years, but to which the gates were now opened. The entrance and passage through of Arab, afterwards also of Berber tribes and the fighting with them lasted down to the Fatimid period (Al-Kindi, K. al-Walid see 'I-Kandil, ed. Guest) which favoured the immigration of the Berbers. One Berber tribe, the Lawata, settled in the Faiyum. In the xith—xiiith century its population was predominantly Bedouin; the remnants of the ancient agricultural population had to place themselves under the protection of the immigrants. According to the account of Emir Othman (p. 12—14) these Bedouins belonged to three great tribes:

1. The largest in numbers of genuine Arab descent the "sons of the dog", Banu Kilab, held the largest portion of the land, the north-west and centre to Taizan (also written Taizin, the Greek Teptanus) in the xith century.

2. The Banu 'Edjlan, likewise Arabs, inhabited the eastern part as far as Santres; the modern place-name Hava'ret Edjlan near Illahun shows that they settled there also.

3. The Berber Lawata in the S. E. as far as the province of Bahnas (Makrizi).

These Bedouin tribes in course of time became settled and have amalgamated with the remnants of the ancient population. But to the present day the inhabitants of many villages still call themselves Bedouains although they may have been peasants or fishermen for generations, possibly only to escape military service.

The decline of the Faiyum in the Muslim period may be best illustrated by the rapid diminution in the yield from taxation. It seems that the land was still tolerably prosperous in the 'Umayyad and early 'Abbasid period in spite of the maladministration which began in the second century A. H., although we have no definite figures at our disposal. Our earliest figures date from the ivth century A. H., in the time of Kafir Al-Zaheid (355 Abu Salih, 356 Makrizi, following Ibn Zulik): Ibn Takhirhan who was governor then was still able to raise 620,000 dinars in taxes. Under the Fatimids, however, probably especially in the reign of Al-Mustansir which unfortunately for the country lasted half a century, it must have rapidly declined. At the end of the Fatimid period the revenue had sunk to 145,162 dinars in the year 576 (Abu Salih); for 585 152,703 is given (Makrizi, following Kadi Al-Fadil's K. Mutadiyad-dat Al-Hawadith). Saladin's granting of the villages of the Faiyum in fief to his Turkish and Kurdish officers scarcely contributed to the prosperity of the district. How the administration of the provinces was conducted under him may be judged from the following example: When the Emir Sharim al-Din Khutlaboga was sent as governor to the Faiyum in 577, he could find remaining better to equip the army than to allocate all the harvest of the country. He was then recalled and the Faiyum placed under the Minister of Marine [Diiwan al-Ustuf] (Makrizi, Histoire de l'Egypte
ed. Blochet, p. 142, 144, where Khoutontschu should be read for Khoutontcha. Two years later Saladin granted the Faiyum with Būhi and al-'Ayāt (not 'Anāt : Blochet) to his nephew Taḫī al-Dīn 'Umar Shāhāngāh, who usually resided in Hamā. In the last quarter of this century severe famine raged several times on account of the lowness of the Nile, and in each of these there was great loss of life, one lasted for three years, 596–598. We have a touching lament on the decline of the land in the Tāyiṣābīd period in the book of Emīr 'Othmān, who was appointed governor in 641 A. D. In consequence of the sitting up of the Bahr al-Munḥā water could only flow into the Faiyūm during four months of the year when the Nile was at its height. The smaller canals in the country were also neglected so that parts of it became swamps and infested with miasma. The population was indolent without any intellectual interest; even the upper classes had dubious notions of cleanliness.

At first it was to become much worse. As long as Egypt had rulers, who lived in the country itself, they still took some interest in the maintenance of the irrigation works. Thus we are told of al-Malik al-Nāṣir in 741 that he built a Gīr (dam or sluices). Māqrīzī is able even in his time (beginning of the ixth = xth century) to give a detailed account of the canals and their work in the different months of the agricultural year. Sulṭān Karā Vāl (end of this century) visited the Faiyūm no less than three times and built a mosque in the capital; in his reign the revenues even rose a trifle, to 164,050 dinārs (Ibn Dījān, Taḥfīz, p. 5) but many places had fallen into ruins or become swamps (ibid. p. 150—158). His successor al-Nāṣir Muḥammad in 903 built a mosque (Ibn Iyās, III, 342). Sulṭān Ṭūmān Bāi found time during the few months he reigned to take a personal interest in the restoration of a gīr destroyed by the flood and to complete the work in spite of the great expense (30,000 dinārs) (ibid. iv, 6, 9, 13, 14, 32, 37).

But with the fall of the Mamluks and the transition to Turkish rule the fortunes of the Faiyūm sank to their lowest ebb. As the Ottoman governors were changed on principle almost every year and their powers were very limited, they could do nothing themselves even with the best intentions; their activities were mainly confined to extorting as much as possible out of the more and more impoverished land; as a matter of fact it was no longer “much”. An account of the year 1634 (Mémorial de l’Estat d’Egypte in Recue d’Égypte, ed. Gaillardot Bey, iii, 1896) tells us that the Faiyūm could at that time still yield 200 purses to the Sulṭān and 30 (in all about 12,000 dinārs) to his representatives in Cairo. By the beginning of the xviiith century the whole tribute of Egypt to the Porte had sunk to 1200 purses = about 300,000 dinārs. In September 1806 the town of Faiyūm was occupied and destroyed by the Mamlūk Bey Yāsīn and its inhabitants almost all massacred as they had taken Muḥammad ‘Ali Pasha’s side; the latter was not able to regain the town till July 1810 (Djuḥārī).

The Faiyūm was long in sharing the revival of Egypt’s prosperity in the xith century. It is true that under Muḥammad ‘Ali the Bahr Yūsuf, the life-giving artery of the land, was cleaned out and the ancient sluices of Iltābān pulled down and rebuilt by French engineers. But modern means of transit did not come to open up the land until quite late for it was only in 1874 that the railway reached it. In the same year the area of the province was estimated at 235,908 fedān and the number of inhabitants at 146,588 (Muḥammad Amin Fiktī, Geogr. von Ägypten, 1290 A. H., p. 117). It was only under English rule that a steady revival in prosperity became marked. The irrigation works were first of all put into good order and then good roads and railways were made. To the lines to Abūksra and Sanā’īs already in existence there have been added since 1902 a series of private light railways, which radiate from the capital across the country in all directions. It is only with the introduction of this means of transport that it has been possible to extend the cultivation of cotton, which has brought the land its present great prosperity. The modern province of Faiyūm comprises 642,828 fedān and is the third largest in Upper-Egypt; Miṣr has 463,579 Asyūt 473,864) or roughly 7000 square miles, of which 800 are under cultivation (Bendell, The Topography... of the Faiyum Province, p. 11). In spite of the advance made by agriculture in the last 20 years, however, the area under cultivation is not yet as large as in the Greek and Roman periods. Large stretches of land in the west and notably in the north are still covered with sand but it is only a question of time till they are regained for the plough.

According to the last census (1907), not very reliable it must be confessed, the population was 371,000; the capital had 33,069 inhabitants but has probably 40,000 by now, among them the Greek element is beginning to play an important part. There were 85 towns and large villages and 1031 small villages (kuftār and ‘ezāb).

Very few memorials, and least of all buildings, have survived from the long history of the Faiyūm. The most celebrated work of antiquity, which however lay only on the edge of the district, the Labyrinths, has utterly disappeared. From the ancient Egyptian period there have only survived a small pyramid and the S. E., a round “obelisk” of Badrijī (in the middle ages 45 ft. long, and the pedestals, now also demolished, of the two colossal statues of Amenemhat at Bihaṭm, which were in existence with their inscriptions in the xiiiith century. From the Greek period there have survived the ruins of the towns and temples on the borders of the district, Ka[a]rūn, Dīmē, Ka[s]r-al-Sāgī etc., but nothing in the lowlying parts. Practically nothing has survived from the Arab period. The mosque of Kaṭīr Bāi in Medīn which dates from the end of the middle ages has been absolutely rebuilt in the usual process of conservation. The few churches and monasteries that survive have not yet been investigated; it is hoped that valuable finds, particularly of manuscripts may be found in them; but many have unfortunately been destroyed for ever with the increase in the area under agriculture.

Manuscript records of the past have, however, come to light in much greater quantities with the finds of papyri, which were first made in the winter of 1877-1878 and next from 1884 on in the ruined mounds several miles wide of the ancient capital, and later in other parts of the country. As these cover a period of almost 3000 years
and are written in about ten different alphabets and almost as many languages, they form a handsome compensation to the study of antiquity for the monuments that have disappeared. The Arabic papyri, which have come principally to Vienna but also to Heidelberg and Cairo, are especially valuable because a considerable number of them date from the period of the Arab conquest and these, apart from their historical value, are the oldest documents of the Arabic language and alphabet. It is safe to suppose that these treasures are not yet by any means exhausted and further finds may be expected with certainty.


**FAIZÂBÂD** (FAIZÂBÂD), properly FAÏZÂBAKH, the name of two modern towns in Central Asia; on Faizabad in Bukhâra cf. the article Amu-Darvâa, i. 340, and on Faizabad in Badakhshan see this article i. 552 et seq. (where it is erroneously called Faidhâbâd). Faizabad in Bukhâra, lying in a fertile valley with green pastures throughout the year, is now a town with about 3000 inhabitants. The existence of the tax-collector (amâldâr) of the Beg of Hisâar of Buddhism, Faizabad in Badakhshan lies on the right bank of the Kokôla, which is here crossed by a wooden bridge; the town is a mile or two long and only a quarter of mile broad. Cf. I. Kostenko, Turkestanischen kraj, ii. 149, 204 et seq.; D. Logofet, Bukharskoe khanstvo, i. 186 and 248; J. Minajew, Smiejdenija o strannom po cerekhovam Amu-Darvâr (St. Petersburg 1879), Index. Faizabad is also the name of a village near Bukhâra, at the tomb of Khâdja Bahâr Al-Din Naṣârbând. (W. BARTHOLD)

**FAIZÂBÂD (FYÂZÂBÂD), a town, division and district in Oudh (British India). The town of Faizabad lies on the left bank of the river Gogara near Ayodhya, the ancient capital of Oudh, and with this town has a population of 75,085 of whom 17,674 are Muslims (1901). The town was founded by Saʿādat Khân and first received its name Faizabad in the reign of Šâddar Djang, but the early Nawâbs only rarely resided in the capital; Šuddî al-Dawla, son of Šâddar Djang (1753—1775), was the first to make it his headquarters after his defeat by the English at Buxar in 1764 and erected a number of buildings there. His tomb still stands there as well as the larger and more beautiful one which was his widow Bahâr Begam. The division of Faizabad comprises the districts of Faizabad, Bahraich, Gonda, Sâljâpur Partâbâr, and Bāra Bankî and has an area of 12,113 square miles and a population of 6,855,991 inhabitants of whom 14% are Muhammadan.

**Bibliography:** Imperial Gazetteer XII, 108 et seq.

**AL-FAIZÂBAKH ʿABD ALLAH, a Fatimid Caliph.** Born in 544 (1149), he was the son of the Caliph al-Zâfr and his real name was Abu l-ʿAsim ʿIsâ. After the assassination of his father (23rd Muḥarram 549 = 16th April 1154) he was carried by the vizier ʿAbdâs out on his shoulders and placed on the throne, being then only five years old. The gruesome scenes of those days, particularly the sight of his uncle Yûsuf and Djašîr slain by the orders of ʿAbdâs, are said to have so worked on the mind of the unfortunate boy that he was constantly afflicted with fits till his early death. During the six years of his Caliphate the government was in the hands of Taḥâr b. Razzâq [q. v.]. Within this period fell the death of ʿAbdâs and the execution of his son ʿAsrâf, the actual assassin of al-Zâfr, and the visitation of Damietta, Tinûs, Rosetta and Alexandria by a Sicilian fleet (Diwândât II 550 = August 1155). Al-Faizâ die in the 17th Radjab 555 = 23rd July 1160 at the age of 11½.

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Athîr (ed. Tornberg), xi. 127 et seq., 168; Mašrûf, Khatîf, i. 214, 357; H. 30; Wustenfeld, *Geschichte der Fäti-midenchâfen*, p. 321 et seq. [on a commentary on the Korân, in which he is said to have used no dotted letters. (Badâmûni, Lowe's translation, p. 407). In 1579 he was appointed tutor to Akbar's second son Prince Murâd. In his verses inserted in the Akharrûnâmâ, (Bib. Ind., ed. i. 311), Faïz describes himself as having been tutor to all the three princes. See translation, p. 459. In the same poem he refers to his having become one of Akbar's disciples, that is, a member of the "Divine Faith" body. In 1591 he went as ambassador to the Dakhân, and returned in the following year. He was a kind and charitable man and less set upon self-aggrandizement than a younger brother. He however was also a flatterer, and was accused by the Muhammadans of having seduced Akbar from the true Faith. When Badâmûni was ill and in disgrace, Faïz wrote a very kind letter about him to Akbar. This letter has been preserved by Badâmûni, Bib. Ind. ed., iii. 603, and in the same work will be found a very able, but very cautious criticism of Faïz's character and genius. Badâmûni says, Faïz's technique is admirable, but his poetry wants grit and of his many thousand lines, none is cherished in the memory. This criticism seems correct. His verses are full of conceits and strained expressions, and it is only occasionally, as in his elegy on his friend Faṭḥ Allâh that he shows real feeling. (See Blochmann's translation of the ʿAin-i Akbâr, p. 33, note and p. 490 and 548). According to Badâmûni he composed a palinode in the year before his death in which he uttered praises of Muhammad. In the same poem, l. c. 307, he explains why he changed his pen-name from Faïz to Faïzâ. He died of asthma in Agra on 5th October 1595, (Badâmûni,
Lowe's translation, p. 420). There is a long notice of him in the Darāy-Akbari, (Lahore 1898), p. 359, and another in the Mu'āthhir-iUmarr, ii. 584. He was a voluminous writer and is said to have written 101 books. He formed an extensive library which was taken possession of by Akbar.

**Bibliography:** Faiz's Letters are in MS. in the British Museum: Rieu, Cat. pp. 792 and 984. His version of Bihšarān, Liqāvīt was published at Calcutta in 1828, where also the Sanskrit original was published in 1832. An English translation of the Sanskrit was published at Bombay in 1816 by John Taylor. There is also one by Colebrooke. (One of these translations is quoted by Longfellow in his Kavanaghal). Faiz's best known poem, the Nat Daman, was published at Calcutta in 1831, and there is a later edition by the Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow. For notices of Faiz's poems, see Hammer, Redeihnste, Vienna, 1818; Ouseley, Biograph. Notices; Blochmann, Amin-Akbari; Āga Ahmad, Hoft Asmān (Calcutta 1873, the Markaz Adwar only); Bacle, Or. Dict. and the Catalogues of Rieu and Ethé. (BEVERIDGE).

**FAIZULLAH ENFENDI (AL-SALYD MEHMED),** son of Shaikh Mehemmed, Mufit of Erzerum, came to Constantinople on the completion of his theological studies, where he married a daughter of the celebrated Shaikh al-Islam Wani Enfendi. Introduce by his father-in-law to the court of Sultan Mehemmed IV, he was appointed tutor to Prince Mustafa in 1080 and to Prince Ahmed in 1089 and filed this office till 1097. On the deposition of Mehemmed IV he became Shaikh al-Islam under his successor Suleiman II. On the 13th Rabī' I. 1099 (14th January 1689) but was deposed on the 28th Djiyādā I. (30th April) and banished to Erzerum. When Mustafa II. came to the throne he recalled his former tutor from exile and appointed him Shaikh al-Islam on the 11th Shawwal 1106 (15th May 1695); in this capacity he completely ruled the weak Sultan, and amongst other things saw to it that the offices of Nasib al-Ashraf and the Kāfzāraker of Rumelih and of Anatoliah were given to his sons and further that the eldest of them was designated his successor. He became universally hated for his love of power and as a Kisīd he was driven from Shams al-Din Tahtbour — and finally fell a victim to the rising against the Sultan in 1115 A.H. (1703 A.D.); he was deposed on the 13th Rabī' I. (27th July) and afterwards handed over to the rebels who tortured him for several days before putting him to death (10th Rabī' I. = 23rd Aug.); his corpse was dragged through the streets of Adrianople, where these events took place, and thrown into the Tûdja; a Greek priest was forced to officiate in full canonicals as part of the proceedings.

**Bibliography:** Mustakimzade, Dāhāt al-Meškāb, p. 74 et seq.; Sīdjtīy Qsmāni, vi. 33 et seq.; on the death of Ṭūbāhala-t-Mātraye, Poy, i. 332 et seq.; Kāntemir, p. 736 et seq.; Na'īmā (ed. 1147 II.), ii. at the end; Kāshīd, ii. 19 et seq.; v. Hammer, Gesh. des Osm. Reiches, vii. 89; Chishuli, Travels, p. 69 et seq.

(J. H. MORTDMANN.)

**FAIKH,** the name of a wāldī not far from Mecca, where Husain b. Ali b. al-Hasan with many other 'Alids met their death on the 8th Dhu 'l-Hijja 169 (11th June 756), wherefore the day of Fakkh, like that of Kerbelā was observed by the Shi'is as a day of mourning and it was the custom among them to talk of the martyrs of Fakkh. Husain had homage paid to him a short time before in Medina, collected a few followers and set out for Mecca. In Fakkh he met the 'Abbasīd troops, who scattered his little body of followers and slew him. The place where he and his men fell and were buried, now called al-Shahādā, is regarded as sacred by the people of Mecca, who hold an annual festival there on the 14th Safar. Among those who escaped the massacre was the 'Alid Idrīs b. 'Abd Allāh b. Hasan, who fled to the Maghrīb and became the ancestor of the Idrīsids.

**Bibliography:** Yaḥyā, Muṣjām, iii. 554; Tabari (ed. de Goeje), iii. 552 et seq.; al-Ya'qūbī (ed. Houtsma), ii. 488; Wetzfeld, Chroniken d. Stadts Mecka, iii. 212; Snouck Hurgronje, Mecka, i. 41; ii. 55 et seq.

**FAIKH (A) "glory," a frequent component of titles of honour:** Fakhr al-Dawla "glory of the dynasty," the name of a Buyyid (see below) of the house of Dārāy b. Ṣawm (q.v.); Fakhr al-Din "glory of the faith," a name of al-Rażī (q.v.) and of the Druze chieftain mentioned below; Fakhr al-Mulk "glory of the kingdom," a name of Ibn ʿAlī Ṣamīr (q.v.), of Muhammad b. ʿAlī (q.v.) and of Tūṣūsh viżer (see below p. 45).

**FAIKH AL-DAWLA** Abu l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Rukn al-Dawla, a Buyyid governor. After the death of his father in Muharram 366 (September 976), Fakhr al-Dawla, who was then about 25 years old, received the governorship of Media under the sanctity of his elder brother ʿAḍūd al-Dawla with the exception of Isfahān and all that went with it, which went to a third brother Mu'ayyad al-Dawla. But while the latter was following out terms of his father's will, Fakhr al-Dawla wanted to set himself up as an independent ruler and allowed himself to be tempted by his cousin Bakhtiyar b. Mu'izz to intrigue against ʿAḍūd al-Dawla. Bakhitiyar was slain however and in 369 (979-980) ʿAḍūd al-Dawla sent several bodies of troops against his brother. When they entered Hamadhān, the latter had to take flight and seek help in Dūrjān from his father-in-law ʿAlī b. Waghmur, while the whole of his province fell into the hands of Mu'ayyad al-Dawla. The latter was appointed governor of them and prosecuted the war with great success. In 371 (981-982) he defeated Kābus at Astārarābād, whereupon Kābus and Fakhr al-Dawla fled to Ḥusān al-Dawla, the Sāmūid governor of Khorāsān. An expedition against Dūrjān, undertaken by the Khorāsānians under Ḥusān al-Dawla, Kābus and Fakhr al-Dawla, was unsuccessful. Mu'ayyad al-Dawla was, it is true, surrounded; but when he had fought a way through the enemy, one section of the Khorāsān army, which he had previously won over to his side, took to flight and the allies had to return to Khorāsān without accomplishing their object. On the death of Mu'ayyad al-Dawla in 373 (983-984) Fakhr al-Dawla was recalled from Nīshābūr and remained in possession of the provinces of Media, Tabaristan and Dūrjān till his death. ʿAḍūd al-Dawla had died in 372 (983) and after his death hostilities broke out among his sons. From the war that ensued Bahā al-Dawla b. ʿAḍūd al-Dawla emerged victorious; but when in 379 (989-990) he was recognised as Amīr al-Umār,
his uncle Fakhr al-Dawla attempted to seize the whole of the ʿAlī b. ʿAli, but managed the government business for the latter, notably military affairs. He fought fierce wars with the Banū Sīfa (Saifs), governors of Tripolis; his followers captured Muḥammad Pāsha, then governor of Damascus, but he was soon set free again by Fakhr al-Din as he did not wish to bring about an open breach with the Porte; on the contrary he endeavoured to influence the government in his favour by bribing influential Turks. He did this successfully for a period but finally the eyes of the Turkish authorities were opened and they sent ʿAbd Allāh Cażwini, with numerous troops to Damascus to put an end to the power of Fakhr al-Din. ʿAli met his death shortly after his return to Tripoli and Fakhr al-Din, after some unsuccessful fighting in the neighbourhood of Joppa had to take flight. He went first to Saʿad, thence to Bairit, but he could not remain there owing to the presence of a Turkish fleet. He therefore retired to the mountains, but was captured in Đjezin (Casale di Gezina), and brought to Constantinople in chains. There he died in 1635 by the hand of the executioner. His sons and his brother Ūnūs were taken prisoner and put to death with the exception of a son of Fakhr al-Din and a son of Ūnūs, who escaped by flight. The latter, named Čemem, afterwards became Emir of the Druzes.

When the growing power of the Druze Emir began to arouse the Porte's suspicions, Ahmed Pasha ʿAbdu'llah, governor of Damascus, was ordered to bring him to terms. The latter could do little in these almost inaccessible mountains with their numerous fortresses but when in 1623 (1643) a Turkish fleet appeared on the Syrian coast, Fakhr al-Din escaped to Livorno in a ship and was received by the Grand Duke Cosmo II with great honour. But his hope of soon returning reinforced by Christian troops and putting an end to Turkish rule in Syria was not fulfilled. Not even his claim that the Druzes were descended from a Christian Comte de Dreux and that he himself was a descendant of Godfrey de Bouillon, moved the Christians to a new Crusade. In the meanwhile Fakhr al-Din's son, ʿAli, whom he left as his representative in Syria and the other members of his family had been successfully beseiged, Ahmed Pasha submitted to the Porte and it was not till 1627 (1618), when Ahmed Pasha was recalled from Damascus, that Fakhr al-Din dared return to Syria. But he did not return as Emir, for this rank had passed to ʿAli, as he did not wish to bring about an open breach with the Porte; on the contrary he endeavoured to influence the government in his favour by bribing influential Turks. He did this successfully for a period but finally the eyes of the Turkish authorities were opened and they sent ʿAbd Allāh Cażwini, with numerous troops to Damascus to put an end to the power of Fakhr al-Din. ʿAli met his death shortly after his return to Tripoli and Fakhr al-Din, after some unsuccessful fighting in the neighbourhood of Joppa had to take flight. He went first to Saʿad, thence to Bairit, but he could not remain there owing to the presence of a Turkish fleet. He therefore retired to the mountains, but was captured in Đjezin (Casale di Gezina), and brought to Constantinople in chains. There he died in 1635 by the hand of the executioner. His sons and his brother Ūnūs were taken prisoner and put to death with the exception of a son of Fakhr al-Din and a son of Ūnūs, who escaped by flight. The latter, named Čemem, afterwards became Emir of the Druzes.

When the growing power of the Druze Emir began to arouse the Porte's suspicions, Ahmed Pasha ʿAbdu'llah, governor of Damascus, was ordered to bring him to terms. The latter could do little in these almost inaccessible mountains with their numerous fortresses but when in 1623 (1643) a Turkish fleet appeared on the Syrian coast, Fakhr al-Din escaped to Livorno in a ship and was received by the Grand Duke Cosmo II with great honour. But his hope of soon returning reinforced by Christian troops and putting an end to Turkish rule in Syria was not fulfilled. Not even his claim that the Druzes were descended from a Christian Comte de Dreux and that he himself was a descendant of Godfrey de Bouillon, moved the Christians to a new Crusade. In the meanwhile Fakhr al-Din's son, ʿAli, whom he left as his representative in Syria and the other members of his family had been successfully beseiged, Ahmed Pasha submitted to the Porte and it was not till 1627 (1618), when Ahmed Pasha was recalled from Damascus, that Fakhr al-Din dared return to Syria. But he did not return as Emir, for this rank had passed to ʿAli, but managed the government business for the latter, notably military affairs. He fought fierce wars with the Banū Sīfa (Saifs), governors of Tripolis; his followers captured Muḥammad Pāsha, then governor of Damascus, but he was soon set free again by Fakhr al-Din as he did not wish to bring about an open breach with the Porte; on the contrary he endeavoured to influence the government in his favour by bribing influential Turks. He did this successfully for a period but finally the eyes of the Turkish authorities were opened and they sent ʿAbd Allāh Cażwini, with numerous troops to Damascus to put an end to the power of Fakhr al-Din. ʿAli met his death shortly after his return to Tripoli and Fakhr al-Din, after some unsuccessful fighting in the neighbourhood of Joppa had to take flight. He went first to Saʿad, thence to Bairit, but he could not remain there owing to the presence of a Turkish fleet. He therefore retired to the mountains, but was captured in Đjezin (Casale di Gezina), and brought to Constantinople in chains. There he died in 1635 by the hand of the executioner. His sons and his brother Ūnūs were taken prisoner and put to death with the exception of a son of Fakhr al-Din and a son of Ūnūs, who escaped by flight. The latter, named Čemem, afterwards became Emir of the Druzes.
FAKHĪR, the title of an Arabic historical work, composed by Ibn al-Tūkānī [q. v.].

FAKHĪR, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥasan, a Persian philologist. His great work the 4th part of which was published in 1857 by C. Saloman (Shams li Fakhīrī Ispahanīs lexicon Persicum id est libri Myār ī Gandārīs. quarta quarta pars, editīt C. Saloman, Fasc. prior texta et indicia continens, Casanī 1887) is entitled Myār al-Dīnājālāl, because it was dedicated to the last ruler of the Indu dynasty [q. v.], Dīnāl ī Dinār Abū Isḥāq Muhammad Shah, who ruled in Fars and 'Irāk from 742-754 (1341-1353). According to Saloman he is also the author of a mystical poem Margābī-k ī Kaltūb. Nothing else is known of him.

FAKHĪR a native of Brusa, the most celebrated silhoutte-cutter in Turkey. This art was brought from Persia to Turkey in the xvith century and to the west in the xviiith century, while at first, as in the east, light paper on dark ground was always used. There are specimens of Burse-i Fakhīr's work he cut principally specimens of calligraphy, flowers and gardens in the album prepared for Murād IV, now in the Vienna Hofbibliothek; for Abūmed I he cut out a Gulistān which did not however survive his criticism; Murād IV on the other hand thought very highly of the artist. He died about 1618 and is buried in Constantinople near the Adrianople gate. Cf. Belig, Güldeste (Brusa 1313 H.), p. 332-334; Hābīb, Khāṭf u-Khāfītān (Constantinople 1305), p. 261; J. von Karmase, Zur orientalischen Altertumskunde, iv. p. 46 et seq., in Sitzsber. d. k. k. Akadem. d. Wiss. Wien, Bd. 172; C. Jacob, Die Herkunft der Silhouettekunst aus Persien (Berlin 1913). (G. Jacob.)

FAKHĪ. A fāṣīh is, in the first instance, one who possesses knowledge of or understanding about a thing (syn. ātīm, fāṣīkm). Then as fāṣīh [q. v.] passed from being synonymous with ātīm (as in fāṣīh al-luqā) and became limited to religious knowledge (ātīm al-luqān) then to the religious law al-shāri'a and finally to the derivative details of the last (al-farrā'), so fāṣīh passed from meaning an intelligent, understanding person to meaning a theologian, then a canon lawyer and finally a custos (Litān, vol. xvii. p. 418). The book ascribed to Abū Jannā, al-fāṣīh al-shārī, ("the master of fāṣīh," i.e. "īm al-Kalām") is on the border line of the development, and in it (ed. Allāhābādī, p. 2) fāṣīh is used in a purely general sense. This restriction of meaning was gradually brought about by the employment of the word to translate the (jurī) prudēnse or Roman law (cf. Fīgh and Goldziger in Kultur der Gerichtwirt, i. 3, p. 102). On the distinction between fāṣīh and mudājahid see the latter and Dict. of tech. terms, p. 30 et seq., 198 et seq., 1157. In Egypt the word, in the corrupted form fāṣī, has come to mean a schoolmaster or a professional reciter of the Kurān, just as khatīb in Syria now means a schoolmaster (Lane, Modern Egyptian, chap. ii.).

Bibliography: under Fīgh.

(D. B. Macdonald.)

FAKHĪ. 1. Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad R. Iṣḥāq R. al-Aḥbāb, an Arab historian, wrote at Mecca in 272 = 855 a chronicle of the city, extracts from which are given by Wustenfeld in the second volume of his Chroniken der Stadt Mecca (Leipzig 1859).


(G. Brockelmann.)

FAKHĪR. One who is in need, either physical or spiritual. Thus opposed to ghanī, one who is independent, rich; and commonly contrasted with muṣīmūn, one who is in a miserable state. A beggar is zālīl, an asker. Thus in Kur. xxxvi. 16. "Ye are the needers (jihārū) of Allāh; but Allāh is the Self-sufficient (ghānī)." Fakhr in consequence come to indicate need in relation to Allāh and dependence (tawakkul) of every kind upon Allāh, and is used in Arabic-speaking countries for a mendicant derisive (q. v.; cf. also Goldziger, Vorlesungen, p. 154). The saying ascribed to Muḥammad, "Abā ʿAbbās fakhrī. "Poverty is my pride," the saying ascribed to this. In western languages the term has been extended to cover Indian ascetics and yogis. The coincidence with the English fakir is curious and sometimes misleading. See New English Dictionary and Century Dictionary.

(D. B. Macdonald.)

FAKHĪ, the akhūllus of Muḥammad Khān Bahādur, an Indian scholar who composed an Urdu translation of the Anwār-i Suhail (lith. Lakhnow 1261 = 1845). Cf. the article Khāna wa Dinna. This translation was entitled Anwār-i-Fīlmāt.

Bibliography: Garcin de Tassy, Histoire de la Litt. Hindoue et Hindoust, second ed. i. 443.

FA-L (omen) is not mentioned in the Kurān, perhaps by accident; there the root ʿtār takes its place. Its derivation and original meaning are obscure, as also is its relationship to the root Fāt, e. g. to mufāfīl in Tarafa Muʿallaqa, v. 5 (Litān xiv. p. 51; C. J. Lyall's Ten Poems (Ti-brīl's commentary), p. 31; Seligsohn's Dinārā dar Tarafa (Alam's commentary), p. v.; contrast ʿā lay under FA-L). But in apparently authentic traditions from Muḥammad fa-l and fiyyār both occur, meaning "omen," although somewhat contradictorily. It is plain that Muḥammad believed in omens and was on the watch for them. He drew one from the unsheathing of a sword on an expedition (Aṣ'ārkhī, xiv. 14, 23) and on another occasion avoided a trap by reliance on comfort of omens connected with it (Ibn Hishām, p. 434). But he naturally preferred good omens and advised his followers to pay attention to these only. The word fa-l he retained for such a good omen, and explained it as any good word which one hears accidentally. It should be accepted. But he rejected fiyyār, bird-augury, possibly for heathen associations. Other traditions, however, represent him as bringing fa-l under the genus fiyyār. This was later explained as advice to cultivate always a spirit of hope and confidence in Allāh, which may easily be a true explanation (Kasīlī's akbarkh on ʿāfās of Bukhārī, ed. of 1305, vol vii. p. 396-398). The result is that while bird-augury is formally denied and forbidden, all other ways of seeking and accepting omens are
open to Muslims. Fat, in consequence, has good associational, though it may be used of an evil one, while ḥujjat is always bad (Litw. siv. p. 27 et seq.; Diet. of Arch. Isma'il, p. 907). But modern usage is confused. Thus Marçus (Volhde Feit- schoff, i. p. 432) gives the usage in the Maghrib and Redhouse (Turkish Levant) in Turkish as of a happy pre-age; but Wetsen (Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Oriental. Ges., xxii. 154) of the Syrian Desert, and Spio (Arabic-English Lexicon) of Egypt, as the opposite. Further, fat has developed from meaning an omen which comes of itself unsought, to cover the custom of seeking the omen in various artificial ways. Even the most pious Muslims appear to have abandoned the second meaning, but the custom of consulting the fortune-teller, of taking the Horoscope of the Caliph on the obverse, on the reverse at first the mark of value M, later the cross with steps while Arab legends became more and more common.

The oldest Muhammadan copper coin which is also the oldest dated coin of Islam, is a fals of Damascus with the date Anno xvii (=638), 'Abd al-Malik's mint reforms (completed in 77 = 696) do not seem to have been concerned with the fals but only to have made the use of the Arabic language on the copper coins also compulsory. The fals was not considered by the Arabs as a standard coin but as a tax coin, and its use as a token of sovereignty was a prerogative of the sovereign but was left entirely to the discretion of governors and local authorities. The fals thus varies between great extremes from town to town in weight and value and also in type, and could not therefore like the dinar and dirhem be current throughout the caliphate.

It seems that no legal relationship between silver and copper coins ever existed although there are some grounds for thinking that 48 fulûs were to be current to a legal dirhem; the relationship between the two metals must have been to be re-adjusted from time to time. The Egyptian glass weights for copper coins clearly show that the fals could be any conceivable size; we have glass weights of 1, 2, 3, 4 up to 30 kharruba (kirf) and above, which were used for weighing a certain number of Fulûs.

The fals underwent a peculiar development in Persia; since the beginning of the xth century A.H. the striking of copper coins has been a privilege of the larger towns; these so-called autonomous coins usually have on the obverse a figure (an animal, a plant or an astrological sign), on the reverse the name of the town but not that of the ruler. These civic coins circulated down to quite recent times in Transcaucasia, Persia, Afghânistan, Balûqistan and in the Fândâb. (Cf. R.S. Poole, Catalogue of Coins of the Shahs of Persia in the British Museum, London 1887; W.H. Valentine, Copper coins of Modern Muhammadan States, London 1911.)

Bibliography: S. Lane- Poole, Catalogue of Arabic Glass Weights in the British Museum (London 1891); P. Casanova, Catalogue des Poids de Vin de la Collection Fouquet in Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique au Caire (Paris 1897); Warwick Wroth, Catalogue of Byzantine Coins in the British Museum (London 1908); the Sabatier. Description Générale des Monnaies Byzantines (Paris 1862) and the authors quoted in the article DINAR.

(E. V. Zambrău.)
FALSIFA. Falsafa is the term applied to the Muslim philosophy as developed under Greek influence. In addition to it other tendencies have to be considered, which construct a conception of the universe according to the views on scientific methods prevailing in their time or at least concern themselves with general views of the universe and therefore must be considered as philosophical. This is primarily true of the current of speculative theology. Its aim is to raise to a higher intellectual level the dogmas of Islam (which present a naive puerile view of life), and bring them into agreement with the demands of contemporary knowledge. The latter are naturally broadminded as regards new ideas, i.e. adopt them in a liberal fashion, the former narrow-minded, rejecting them, the orthodox. The former hastily adopt at random and without thorough mental training the new faith, Greek, Persian, Indian and even Christian and Jewish doctrines, so that they frequently throw aside their Islamic premises almost entirely. The so-called Nāsīrī Society c. 845 (Zeitschr. d. D. Morgenl. Ges., ixii., 774 et seq.) constructs for himself a very mixed system which in the main recalls Anaxagoras, Mu'ammar c. 850 (Archiv. f. Systematische Philos., xv. 469 et seq.) follows Indian ideas. Alā al-Hāshimī, died 933 (Zeitschr. d. D. Morgenl. Ges., ixxi., 303 et seq.) develops his theory of modes, possibly likewise after Indian ideas (cf. Vierteljahrschrift für wissenschaftl. Philosoph., xxxvi. 510 et seq.). The Sumānīya (Arch. f. Geschichte d. Philosoph., xxiv. 141 et seq.) spread the knowledge of Indian speculations and of Indian scepticism in Persia. The channel of heterodox doctrines was imperceptibly followed until about 900, when the apostacy of Raywānī (died 915) threw a glaring light on the situation, like a flash of lightning from a cloudless sky. The cry now was: "Back to Orthodoxy!" Ḡuṣn (died 935) dissociated himself from the already more prudent Lūṭbā. He again assumed real qualities in addition to being in God, and further a direct activity and creation by God in regard to what is not God (denial of natural causation as it limits the being of God), even human action (predestination, denial of human freedom). A creature can effect nothing real (occasionalism). This tendency, still too liberal in the eyes of the old orthodox school, became in course of time identified with orthodoxy. It produced Bāyānī (died 1012), Ḡiṣarī (died 1027), Dūrwānī (died 1085) and Ḥāzālī. Later scholars like Ḥāfīz (died 1355), Ḥārūnī etc. considered that they belonged to it. — Baṣra defended the homogeneity of things (Horten, Die Philosophie des Abu Khālid und Die Erweiterttheorie des Abu Khālid in the Archiv f. Geschichte d. Philosoph., xxiv. 453 et seq.), against Baghdad, where Khānī taught the diversity of things, an Indian thesis. The influences of these schools were at work for a considerable time after (Goldziher in Der Islam, iii. 213 et seq; Horten, Die Philosophische Probleme, 1910; do. Die Philosophische Systeme der spekulativen Theologen im Islam, 1912).

To appreciate the importance of Muslim philosophy we must set out from the defects of the Aristotelian system. The Stagirite is unequalled in the precision of his concepts. But he did not succeed in giving a comprehensive view of the whole universe under some monistic concept. The universe is not traced to a single origin. Matter is eternal and opposed to God in a dualistic system. There are attempts at a critical theory of knowledge, which are, however, interpenetrated by strong realistic tendencies and put forward in a lAME fashion. Whence does form come? God is pure intelligence. He has no voluntary activity. He moves the whole universe as an object of love, not as causa efficiens. He further takes no notice of individual things — an unphilosophical deism. It is here that Muslim philosophy begins, following the Neoplatonic model. The great notion of contingency brings into a unity the total of the actual. It is the light that explains the individual problems and allows them to be examined under the widest points of view. In the things of the world being and existence are quite different. The two are not internally and necessarily connected. Existence must thus be imported to things by a self-existent Being and must be permanently maintained in them. The universe is a stream of being which emanates from an inexhaustible source, extends to all that is not God. This idea, which runs through the whole history of Muslim philosophy down to modern times, is again and again formulated anew more clearly and developed. Only one has not understood it: Averroes.

Another aspect of Muslim philosophy is given by the religious beliefs of its representatives. These are stubbornly convinced that Islam is the most perfect revelation of God. The Prophet in supernatural enlightenment and vision perceives divine truths unattainable by the natural intelligence (mysteries) and communicates them to man. The philosopher recognizes a part of these truths with his weak natural intelligence and that is in perfect harmony with the Korānic revelation. Philosophers thus appear as apologists of Islam.

The way for Greek influence within Muslim philosophy was prepared by the translators of the original authorities in question (notably Ḥunayn b. Išāk and his son Isḥāq b. Ḥunayn c. 870—910) and a beginning was made by al-Kindī (died c. 873) and Fārābī (died 950). Both represent an encyclopaedic knowledge but are mainly celebrated as logicians. In Fīrād we already find the main lines on which Avicenna (died 1037) afterwards built up his great system. The fundamental conception which runs through the whole of Muslim philosophy and suggests the reduction of the totality of the actual under one all-embracing idea, the notion of contingency i.e. in all things which are not God, being is substantially distinct from existence (distinctio reals inter essentiam et existentiam; cf. Horten, Königsteine Fārābī, 1906, p. 10 et passim). If they are thus to attain to being they must receive existence, or reality and that too from such an agent as possesses it by reason of his very being (per se et a se). God is thus the self-existent and necessary being, the source of being for the universe, from which the empirical world flows like a stream of being. How important this conception was may be seen from the fact that mystical intuition was developed from it. It conceives the whole reality of the world in pantheistic exaggeration as modifications of the one substantial being, God. (Horten, Mystische Texte aus dem Islam, Bonn 1912, p. 5). The doctrine of the momentariness of accidental being (the accidents lose their existence each moment to receive it at once again from God, the source of being) which originated under Indian influence and dominates the whole of Muslim theology.
and of the "restitutability" or "non-restitutability" (an idea in liberal theology) of beings, is further connected with this. These form the second case of an independent magnitude, which receives existence from the source of the free will in the universe. There runs a law of causation which dominates every thing and has no exceptions; it determines every potency when it becomes an actuality, including the so-called free will of man. Everything is thus necessary, the divine a se, the contingent or created a priori. The human mind develops from a purely material to a habitus primorium principiorum, actually thinking and possessing knowledge (intellectus acquisitus), which receives notions from the per se active mind, which controls the spheres of the moon. In this there is already contained the doctrine of the universe ante rem (in the heavenly world), in re, (in things of sense) and post rem (in our mind) which Avicenna further developed. The human mind attains the level of the prophet's mind, which is attainable by natural faculties, through a special divine inspiration and connection with the higher world of the angels and the book of fate. The prophet's mind perceives mysteries which surpass the intelligence of man and recognises them, being free from error, although he communicates them to men in the Korân in forms intelligible to the senses. The Korân thus contains the highest all-inclusive wisdom in a material form. The domains of the natural are not only distinct in degree but in their essence and accordance to the order of being. Faith and reason are in the most perfect harmony, while fallible human knowledge is subordinate to the divine knowledge contained in the Korân (philosophia est ancilla theologiae). — The Ikhwân al-Safa of Bara (c. 970) form a school of popular philosophy which deviates in many points from these lines in favour of Pythagorean speculations.

After Avicenna had placed the sum total of Greek wisdom at the disposal of the educated Muslim world in a readily intelligible fashion with his own ingenious developments of it, it was possible for it to develop this system in details and to make it as a whole capable of being incorporated into Islam. To understand this further development we must keep in mind the faults of Avicenna's system viz.;

1. There is a lack of clearness in the most essential fundamental idea in it. The contingency of things is conceived as something substantial, distinct from being and existence. Existence is said to advance to being "from outside". But being without existence is not real and thus cannot serve as the bearer or basal principle of a real. These speculations which create clearness here and bridge over the dualism without dropping the idea of contingency are regarded as mere inventions, and according to Avicenna's system are concerned with the very heart of it. (Suhravardi, Shirazi, died 1640).

2. The God of Avicenna works with almost physical necessity and without freedom. The God of the Korân on the other hand creates with unlimited freedom and indeed arbitrarily. A serious collision might thus be expected between the two systems. Averroes also took a serious step backwards. He frequently describes God as possessing free choice but without attaching to him any of the imperfections of human choice. If a philosopher could succeed in defending God's free will in unassailable logic, he would have made an important advance in the philosophic conception of the universe. This task was reserved for al-Ghazâlî and later theologians. 3. The theory that space is free of causation points are not proved. 4. There was a serious gap in the theory of knowledge. He did not succeed in reconciling Aristotelian abstraction with Platonic intuition and emanation. A content, which we have already obtained from the active intellect by the emanation of the form of knowledge, is to be again acquired by abstraction. The middle course, that the abstraction prepared the mind for the reception of the forms, is rather impracticable. There is still another great problem, — how properly to fit together the functions of secondary causes in the all-embracing activity of the primary (God) and so avoid the occasionalism of Ash'ari on the one hand and the excessive independence of the powers of nature in reference to God, i.e. Deism and Naturalism, on the other (as in Avicenna).

The attacks of the opponents of the system in the first place al-Ghazâlî (died 1111) gave the natural stimulus to the further development of the problems still to be settled. — In his youth he had gone through the school of the philosophers and adopted their teachings in the form given by Averroes. Such a view of the universe, however, could only satisfy an intellectualist. But al-Ghazâlî was a voluntarist and sentimentalist. The struggle that was thus arise continued with him himself as rest. It drove him to attack his former friends, the philosophers, and ultimately to seek peace in mysticism. He propounded twenty theses against the philosophers: some seek to prove that the teachings of philosophy are wrong — here we have an attempt at a further development — others to show that the correct teachings belong to the domain of faith, i.e. as mysteries, which cannot penetrate the natural intelligence. The former are mainly concerned with 1. the eternal creatiblity of the world, which is denied. 2. God's knowledge which cannot be called universal, otherwise the knowledge of separate or individual things on God's part cannot be understood. 3. as prime cause as well as the only cause, which is treated as a prime cause operating through necessity — God's free will must be recognised; 4. the resurrection of the body — a purely spiritual recompense in the next world does not satisfy the words in the Korân; 5. the law of causation: this should not be understood as a combination of creative powers and acts, as internally necessary and independent of God. Such a combination cannot be proved to exist on critical investigation. Empiricism points only to the contemporaneity of a series of facts. But no essential dependence of the one on the other can be deduced (cf. Hume). Averroes gives way to al-Ghazâlî in these points. Thus, with the exception of the last, the fourth, with regard to the fourth, goes so far as to teach that it is a very acceptable doctrine that man receives a transfigured body after death.

The Spanish branch of philosophy became especially well known to the Christian philosophers of the middle ages and for this reason is emphasised in European works as being particularly important, although it remained without influence on the development of philosophy within Islam. Ibn Bâdî (died 1138) teaches that the gradual perfection of the human spirit to union with the
divine is the object of philosophy. Ibn Tūsī's (died 1155) "Philosophus autodidactus" became a world-classic. He shows that the knowledge obtained by natural means is in the most perfect harmony with the supernatural revelation of the Koran. This conviction is formulated even more energetically by Averroes (died 1198). He had a critical mind, with an insight for details, and was therefore pre-eminently qualified to be a commentator on Aristotle. He lacked the great gift of speculation and the ability to think constructively bearing all aspects of the question in mind. His cry is "back to Aristotle", a demand as reactionary as if some one were to say at the present day "back to Kant". Averroes himself fortunately did not follow this strictly, although by reason of it he rejects the idea of an absolute contingency of things; he can only imagine a relative one (cf. Hertin, Die Hauptthemen des Averros, p. 67 etc.). In order to fit in with this, he maintains the idea of a creation in the sense that God transfers the world from a pure potentiality, non-being, to existence. This notion of actualisation provides Averroes with a monistic principle of the universe (cf. Hertin, Die Metaphysik des A., preface). In every category of being there exists a per se, which actually possesses the content of that category and can therefore communicate it to all other things, which only possess it potentially and per accidens. God perceives all individual things in himself. He is the totality of things eminientiori modo. Pantheistic ideas are more than once acquiesced in. — The substance of soul is one for all men. Recompense in the next world is not thereby made impossible. It is a spiritual recompense in that substance.

Averroes tried above all to mitigate certain crudities in Avicenna's teaching. 1. In the thesis of the eternity of the world he points out to the theologians that he is at bottom in agreement with them: God created the world out of nothing. He is the all-knowing and all-powerful lord of creation. Whether this creative activity had a beginning in time (theological thesis) or not (philosophical doctrine), is a matter of indifference for the Muslim faith. Besides there was no real time before the world. 2. God does not work with physical necessity nor with man's imperfect kind of freedom, which can also do evil. God can only do what is best (optimism, cf. Leibniz), and this "must" is not an imperfection, for the capability of evil is not a virtue. God's action is above the designation of free or not free. 3. God perceives all individual things as the common teaching of the philosophers shows. Nevertheless His perception cannot be called universal (Avicenna): for the idea of imperfection might be associated with this. His knowledge, which guides all worldly things in union with the divine will in the wisest providence, is raised above the predicates of the universal and particular. 4. The philosophical principle ex uno non fit nisi unum, which makes untenable a direct creation of the plurality of things by God the One (doctrine of creation through the intermediary of the spirits of the spheres) is dropped by Averroes: God directly creates the plurality of things. — The exaggeration of the importance of Averroes, who was called the "most important" philosopher of Islam, and the erroneous opinion that he was an enemy of religion is a fabrication of the European middle ages and is probably based in part at least on errors in translation in the Latin versions of his works and on the circumstance that the other philosophers of Islam were not known. Averroes is of no importance for the further development of philosophic thought in the East.

The fruitful stimulus to speculation given by Ghaḍīlī was eagerly followed up in his period following him. The great stream of philosophic activity begins after Ghaḍīlī and is due to him, as he made philosophy palatable to Islam and the orthodox school of theologians. It was no longer possible for any one to discuss science and even speculative theology, who had not had a thorough education in Greek philosophy. The two great protagonists were Rāzī (died 1209) and Ţūsī (died 1273). The former moves entirely in a world of Greek ideas, which he developed principally in his "mystic investigations" (al-Mukhtār al-Muṣāfaram, ishrāf here means Platonic intuition and thus is a hit at Avicenna) with vigorous attacks on the separate Neoplatonic elements and in the development of the Greek logic, is also developed by him in an elaborate fashion and almost becomes a model. This is particularly apparent in the technical use of objection — he was known as al-Muṣāfārib, the "objec- tors". Ţūsī followed up the questions posed by Rāzī, to which were added those of Ibn Kamānah (died 1277). The struggle centred round the theses (al-ḍarāf) of Avicenna and lasted down to the xivth century; Tustā (c. 1300), Iṣfahānī (died 1348) and Rāzī (Kūth al-Dīn, died 1364) joined in it defending the doctrines of Avicenna and going more deeply into them. Ţūsī victoriously pushed off an important attack by Shahrastānī 1153 ("the slayer of the Greek philosophers", al-Muṣāfarī in his "The slayer of the slayer", Muṣafir al-Muṣafarī).

Under the invigorating influence of such attacks and discussions, philosophy was able to develop to a greater height. Ibn Makkā (Abū 'l-Barakāt, died 1155) wrote his oft-quoted and highly esteemed work "The worthy of consideration" (al-Muṭāfan). Zamakhshāri (died 1143) was at the same time discussing many questions of philosophy with great acuteness. Suhrawardi (died 1191) builds up an entirely new system and forms an independent focus for the development. His development begins where Avicenna had left off at questions of great difficulty. Being cannot advance to existence from outside, but is identical with it. The dualism, which according to Avicenna divides the innermost state of things, is thus overcome. Things are units of reality, in conscious allusion to the ancient Persian doctrine of light: different forms of the light, which emanating from God lose their perfection and approach matter of darkness. Light is identical with spiritual substance. In the theory of knowledge also he does away with the well-known dilemma in Avicenna. Knowledge is, as Plato teaches, a perception, in which the true essences of things which exist for themselves in the heavenly world, illuminate our understanding. He therefore called his philosophy, the philosophy of illumination (cf. Hertin, Die Philosophie der Erscheinung nach Suhrawardi, Halle 1920). The best known of the later philosophers were also inspired by these ideas and wrote commentaries on Suhrawardi's teaching, e.g. Shahrarzā (c. 1250), Shīrāzī (c. 1311), Harawī (Niṣām al-Dīn, c. 1300), Ibn Kamānah (died 1277), Dawānihā (c. 1501) and Shīrāzī (died 1640).
A very important work in philosophy is Ṭūsfī’s (died 1233). "First-fruits of Thoughts" (Akbār al-Afkar), an authority of the first rank in Idī’s circle (died 1355). After Avicenna’s great works on logic men became eager to compress the total of this knowledge in compendiums, not without developing it in various directions. Zarnūjī’s handbook of logic, c. 1203, Khawjīnī’s (died 1248) compendium, Abhārī’s Isagoge (died 1264) — he also compiled an encyclopaedia of philosophy which became celebrated under the title "The Guide to Wisdom" — Kātībī’s logic 1276 (Sahāsīya) — it survived to see over a score of commentaries from the pens of philosophers of the first rank — the "Rising-places of Luminaries", a work by Urnawī (died 1283), Nasafī’s (died 1288) Dialectics and Samarqandī’s (died 1291) authoritative work, which was very frequently commented on, may be mentioned here. The "Leaves" of Samarqandī and "The Philosophy of the Individual" of Kātībī and his commentary on Rāzī, the epitome Sharḥ al-Muḥakākhās exercised a great influence.

Ṭūsfī (died 1273) forms an important centre for further development. In his dogmatic (Tawḍīḥīn), he brought Greek philosophy into the theological speculations of Islam. The fundamental questions of philosophy were lucidly discussed by him. The problem of being and existence was further developed and acutely discussed particularly by his numerous commentators. With Ḥillī (died 1326), Isfahānī (died 1348) we may here give Kūshdī (died 1474) the place of honour; he discussed the most fundamental questions of philosophy in the most thorough fashion and advanced the problems connected with Avicenna’s teachings. It is clear from his exceedingly well developed terminology that the systematic study of philosophy was in a flourishing condition in his time. The scruples once raised by Ghaţāzī against philosophers have for him been long overcome and become negligible. He is particularly attached to Avicenna but quotes also the liberal theologians from ‘Allāf (died 849) to ‘Abd al-Dājbābī (died 1024) and also Khāyāmī (died 1121) ("The Philosophy of Being") Ḥikmat al-Kawn, Suhrwardī, Ldī, etc. He attempts to utilise the most divergent views for his conception of the universe.

Apart from the works of Maḥbūbī (died 1346) and Buḫṣānī (c. 1350) (commentary on Kātībī), those of Idī (died 1355), especially his "Stations" (Manawāṣīf) and his Dialectic form a new and important centre of philosophical discussion. In the former work Idī intended to write a speculative theology and the result was an encyclopaedia of philosophy. So thoroughly had Greek science penetrated the ideas of educated Muslims that they had imperceptibly identified it with theology. We do not mean to say that they approved all the doctrines of Avicenna. It was rather the development after Avicenna’s time that was made most use of, by his teaching was universally defended against his opponents notably by Al-Ghazālī in the background. Idī’s concise and acute formulations stimulated great activity among the commentators — in the same way as Ṭūsfī’s Dogmatic. The problems discussed range from logic to the fundamental questions of metaphysics, touching natural sciences on the way. Dījrādī (died 1413) was the most important at this period. Besides problems of philosophy he discus-

sed the theological questions of the school of ‘Aṣhārī, of which he professed himself a member. Aṣhindī (died 1359) had appeared and vigorously criticised Avicenna’s system in his commentary on Ghazālī’s "The Intentions of the Philosopher", Idī’s circle took up the cudgel on behalf of the old master. We thus find Idī’s commentators thoroughly discussing Taftāzānī’s objections and deriving advantage from them, e.g. Abhārī (Saīd al-Dīn, c. 1300), Fanārī (died 1451), Ṭūsfī (died 1482) and notably the extremely well-read Siyālūkī (died 1659). He is well acquainted with the vast philosophical literature of the Muslims, quotes from hundreds of works, is perfectly at home and gives an independent judgment in all philosophical questions.

Rāzī (Kūtb al-Dīn, died 1364) displayed a great literary activity which considerably advanced the development of philosophy. Although he belonged to none of the above mentioned groups he is quoted by them and regarded as an authority of the first rank. The form which literary activity took was frequently that of commentaries. It must not be inferred from the form of a commentary, which was attached to some standard work, that his thoughts were confined in its scope. Entirely new ideas are frequently developed in these commentaries and acute criticism exercised; this is true for example of Dījrādī’s numerous works, of which the glosses on Ṭūsfī’s Dogmatic at once became a centre of new development. In Logic Taftāzānī’s work "The Elaboration of Logic" built up a great school with which the greatest names in philosophy are associated. We have now come down to the time of Dawwānī, the "glory of the true investigators", (died 1501); he approached this school from the most diverse directions while he wrote commentaries on the original works. His commentary on Suhrwardī’s, "The Temple of Light" is as highly esteemed as the numerous glosses on Ṭūsfī in which he discusses and develops philosophical problems with the greatest acuteness. His peculiar position may be compared with that of his contemporary Caietanus among scholastics. Fārābī, the commentator on Fārābī (cf. Horten, "Das Buch der Ringsteine" Parabis, 1906) was one of his pupils. Ibn Khālīn (died 1406) propounded questions of the theory of knowledge in a critical fashion. Sanātī (died 1486), Shāhānī (died 1565) left their mark particularly in the field of logic, Akhbārī (died 1534) attained fame through his "Stepladder" which had commentaries frequently written down on it to last century.

Shīrāzī (Ṣadr al-Dīn, died 1523) seems to have been an outstanding thinker of this period. He is quoted by later writers as the "great scholar". Ghivaṭ al-Dīn Shīrāzī (died 1542) is also mentioned along with him as an authority; like the preceding he wrote a commentary on Ṭūsfī’s Tashkīrīzāde (died 1554) was a comprehensive writer on philosophical subjects. Shīrāzī (Ṣadr al-Dīn) (died 1643) developed quite a new theory of the universe. Stimulated by Suhrwardī he explained the notion of contingency not as a dualism between being and existence but as a participation in being. Individual things are monistic indivi
dua of being, which develop step by step to more and more perfect beings. His proof of the existence of God is a combination of the proof of contingency with the Platonic from the stages
of perfection (Horton, *Die Gottesbeweise bei Śīrāzī*). Lahādī (c. 1670) likewise is entirely under the influence of Greek thought (cf. Der Islam, ii. 91—131). Harawī (1695), Munāwī (died 1622), Dāstādī (died c. 1659) were also regarded as great teachers. (Husaini) Bihārī, died 1703, composed the *Stepladder of the Sciences*, which was frequently annotated. Fārābī (died 1745) incorporated a vast amount of philosophical knowledge in his terminological dictionary, *Sūtrakālīzāde* (died 1737) was an encyclopaedist.


FANĀ΄ (A'), an important technical term of Sūfism, meaning, "annihilation, dissolution". The Sūfī who attains perfection must be in a kind of state of annihilation.

The authors of treatises on Muslim mysticism have often compared the "annihilation" of Sūfīsm with the Buddhist nirvāṇa; but this comparison is not a particularly fitting one. We now know that the Muslim writers had only a very slight knowledge of Indian philosophy and could not comprehend the notion of nirvāṇa which presumes a fairly intimate acquaintance with that philosophy. Besides, the Buddhist idea of annihilation is independent of the idea of God and includes the idea of the transmigration of souls, to which nirvāṇa, puts an end. To attain this, the desire for existence must be suppressed in the individual; it is only after this desire has been extinguished that one no longer has to return to the cycle of existence. In Muslim mysticism on the other hand there is no question of metempsychosis and the notion of a personal and all-present God is throughout predominant.

The origin of the Muslim conception of fanā΄ has rather to be sought in Christianity from which it seems to be borrowed. This conception simply means the annihilation of the individual human will before the will of God, an idea which forms the centre of all Christian mysticism. The conception thus belongs to the domain of ethics and not in the slightest degree to that of metaphysics like the nirvāṇa of the Hindu.

The oldest systematic exposition of pantheistic Sūfism is the *Kašif al-Maḥdūb* ("Revelation of concealed Matters") gives all the explanation that could be desired of fanā΄.

The virtue of poverty understood in the mystic sense consists in averting the gaze from all created things, and, in complete annihilation, seeing only the All-One, he hastens towards the fullness of eternal life" (p. 20). — Mystic poverty, we are farther told, consists in the annihilation of the human attribute (ṣifāt), which dwells in the ego, so that one is now only rich in God and through God. — "The Sūfī is he that has nothing in his possession nor is himself possessed by anything. This denotes the essence of annihilation (fanā΄)"...

When this feeling has attained its perfection it is called fanā΄-i kadd "absolute annihilation".

The expression fanā΄ is often interchanged with safā ("purity"); this word means that the Sūfī should keep his soul pure from all attachment to any creature. Fanā΄ is further often associated with baṣā ("subsistence"): the man, who has destroyed his own will, henceforth lives in God; the human will is transitory while God's will is eternal.

The author of the *Kašif al-Maḥdūb* expressly states (p. 243) that fanā΄ does not mean loss of essence and destruction of personality as some ignorant Sūfīs think. It is not the essence but the human attributes, which are a danger to the perfection of being, that are destroyed (p. 28). "In India", says the author, "I had a dispute with a man who claimed to be versed in Kūfānī exegesis and theology. When I examined his pretensions, I found that he knew nothing of annihilation..." (p. 243) i.e. he had understood the word fanā΄ in a metaphysical sense.


(B. Carra de Vaux.)

FANAM, a South Indian coin. [See Yule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, p. 348.]

FANAR, the name of the Greek quarter of Stamboul in which the Oecumenian Patriarch took up his residence after the conquest of the town by Meḥmed II. Down to 1587 the patriarchate was in the ancient Byzantine church of the Pamukkarios; when this was transformed into a mosque (Fethiye) in that year, the Patriarch moved his see to the little church of St. George. At quite an early period there settled round the see, in addition to the ecclesiastical and secular officials of the patriarchate, the few old Byzantine families that had remained in Constantinople and other distinguished and prosperous members of the community (the so-called ṣaḥāba) in the Patriarchal school (ō ṣaḥāba fī ṣaḥāba). Conducted by the clergy, which is still flourishing, the ancient classical studies were cultivated and the Fanariots exalted their claim to be in this respect also the noblest of the nation. It was from their circles that the Porte used to choose its Christian officials (Dragomans of the Sublime Porte, and of the Arsenal, Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia, contractors for the supply of furs and meat to the Serai, etc.). The better known families are the Kantakuzen, Skarlasto, Maurogordato, Ghika, Karada, Sanzio, Handjeri, Maurojeni, Ipsilanti, Muruzi, Kalimachi, Mussuro, Aristarchi et al. In the second half of the xviiith century many Fanariots went to Kura-česhme on the Bosporos. Since the beginning of the Greek War of Liberation the old Fanariot families have been gradually disappearing from public life; many of them migrated
to Greece. According to tradition Mehemmed II granted the Fanariots a number of privileges, but the Greek noble families have never enjoyed any special privileges as such.

Bibliography: Cusius, Turcogracia, p. 91; de la Croix, Description de la Nation et de l’Eglise grecque, p. 3 et seq.; Eton, Survey etc., p. 331 et seq.; Dallaway, Constantinople ancien et moderne, p. 98 et seq.; Livre d’or de la Noblese Phanariote en Grèce, en Romaniat, en Russie et en Turquie, par un Phanariote (Athens 1892). (J. H. Mordtmann.)

Fánus (Φάνος), a folding lantern, made of wire rings surrounded by waxed cloth with the upper and lower ends of tin-covered copper. It is carried by night in the hand to light the way for a body of men on the march, a wedding procession or a personage of high rank in the dark streets.

Bibliography: Lane, Modern Egyptians i, 207 (picture on p. 208). (C. H. Hart.)

Fao, a telegraph station and Turkish fortress at the mouth of the Shatt al-‘Arab on the right bank. The place, which is not mentioned by Niebuhr, is the capital of a lähiye which contains about 22 villages with 4000–5000 inhabitants.

Bibliography: Ali countdown,隐瞒Kühlça Leghät, etc., 566; Cuinet, Turquie d’Asie, i. 265 et seq.; v. Oppenheim, Vo Mitaeltzer zum pers. Gerh, ii. 309.

Far. (See Fûru.)

Fârâb, also written Bârâb (e.g. in I斯塔hri, Muñaddas and most Persian authorities) and Fârâb (e.g. in the Hudâd al-‘Alâm, cod. Turmanik, f. 9); the latter seems to be the original pronunciation, a district (in I斯塔hri and Ibn Hâwâl håhiya, in Muñaddas rûstâgh, in Yâqût esvîyâ) in the valley of the Sir-Daryâ, lying on both sides of the main stream, which here receives the waters of the Aris on its right bank. According to Ibn Hâwâl (p. 391) the district measured less than a day’s journey in length and breadth; the soil was in places marshy and contained salt. According to Mas‘ûd (Tanbih, p. 66) a stretch of land more than 50 farsakhs broad was inundated during the Daryâ in Fârâb and adjoining districts annually (in the beginning of January, Kinnin aIhâhâ; as a matter of fact the river at this season is usually covered with ice); at such times intercourse between the villages and farms all of which were on little hills was only possible by boat. The capital (kîsîf) was called Kadar and according to I斯塔hri (p. 346) lay east of the Sir-Daryâ half a farsakh from the river; it is therefore to be located to the west of the ruins of the later Otrar; the distance between the ruins and the river is about 7 miles on the Russian maps and according to the Zafar Namah also Indian edition ii. 668 it was two farsakhs from Otrar to the Sir-Daryâ. On the western bank of the Sir-Daryâ, 2 farsakhs below Kadar, lay Wâshid which Ibn Hâwâl said was the native town of the philosopher Abu ‘Naṣr al-Fârâbî [q. v.]. According to Muñaddas (p. 273) the capital bore the same name as the district; this town of Fârâb is described as a large town with a male population of about 70,000, a Friday-Mosque, a citadel and a market; only a few booths of the latter were within the walls of the town, the majority being in the suburbs (rabâh). Muñaddas says that Wâshid was a small fortified town where a “powerful Emir” lived, with a chief mosque on the market-place, Kadar a recently founded town with an able-bodied population, where Shatt is predominated; it was only after “wars” (probably after the suppression of opposition by the capital) that a minbar was erected. There is probably an error here and Fârâb, which is not mentioned by I斯塔hri and Ibn Hâwâl, is to be regarded as the new and Kadar the old town; the later Otrar also is correctly identified with the town of Fârâb (mentioned by Sam‘ânî also, MS. of the Asiatic Museum, 543, f. 314v) and not with Kadar.

In the historians Fârâb is seldom mentioned, only once in Tabari (ii. 1694 at the foot) for example: in 1217 (739) the ruler of Shâsh (Taşkent) at the command of the governor Naṣr b. Sâyi‘r had to expel Hârîr b. Suraâq who had sought refuge at his court and send him to Fârâb. ‘Alî was apparently only brought to Fârâb for the first time in the Samâdî period, after the subjection of Asbihdî (or Ispîdî) by Nâbî b. Asad in 225 = 839–840 (cf. Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 422; Sam‘ânî in Barthold, Turkestân etc., i. 58 below). Wâshid is again mentioned by Sam‘ânî as a fortress (in Barthold, op. cit., i. 69); ‘Abû Muhammad ‘Abd al-Sâyi‘î b. Muhammad al-Nasîfî said that Sâ’d al-Mülî died there in exile “in the land of the Turks” in Mu‘arrâm 514 = April 1120. For the later history of the district cf. the article OTRAR.

Bibliography: Barthold, Turkestân te ephêbe menologosu nuxhetevi, ii. 177 et seq.; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 842 (ed.). (W. Bartholin)

Al-Fârâbî, Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Tarhân Abu Naṣr, the greatest philosopher of Islam before Avicenna, was born in a Turkish family towards the end of the 9th century A.D. at Washid, a small fortified town in the district of Fârâb (Otrar) in Transoxiana. His father is said to have been a general. He studied in Baghdad under the Christian physician Yoûmann b. Hâlîn and also worked with ‘Abû Bîr Mârkat, a Nestorian Christian, celebrated as a translator of Greek works. He then went to Hâlîb to the court of the Hamânî Sa‘îl al-Dawla, under whose protection he lived the life of a Sufi. He died in 339 (950) at the age of about 80, in Damascus, whether he had accompanied his king on a campaign.

Fârâbî is particularly celebrated as a commentator on Aristotle. His works on this field have won him the name al-mu‘allim al-ghânî, “the second teacher” i.e. successor to the first teacher, Aristotle. He commented on the Categories, Hermetic, the First and Second Analytics, the Sophist, Rhetoric and Poetics i.e. the whole group of treatises which form branches of logic in the widest sense. To this collection of the Organon he prefaced a commentary on the Iliad of Porphry.

He wrote commentaries on the following Greek works on ethics, psychology and science, the Nicomachian Ethics, Alexander of Aphrodisias On the Soul, Aristotle’s Physics, Meteorology and his writings on the Heavens and the Universe and lastly on the Almagest of Ptolemy.

His literary activity was by no means confined to the exposition of Greek texts; on the contrary he wrote a large number of original works. Among the latter are his psychological and metaphysical treatises, on the Intelligence (â‘lî) and the Intelligible, on the Soul (nafs); the Faculties of the
Soul, the One and the Unity, Substance, Time, Empty Space, Space and Measure.

Fāرابī professed the view, which now seems strange and even absurd, but which is explained by the leaning of Oriental philosophers towards syncretism, that ancient philosophy must form a unity, at least that its two great representatives Plato and Aristotle should not contradict one another; their systems ought not to be more than different forms of expressions of one truth. According to this conception the great philosophers of antiquity appear as real prophets and are given the title imām like religious teachers, and their teaching is a kind of revelation which ought not to contain any contradiction or error. Fāрабī wrote several treatises on the basis of this view. The Agreement between Plato and Aristotle, The Intermediary between Aristotle and Galenus (Kitāb al-qāmām baina ra'ayi al-ḥakimain Aṭṭalān al-šāri'a wa Arisṭaṭa), The Intentions of Plato and Aristotle. It should be noted that our philosopher believed in the authenticity of the work entitled Theology of Aristotle (Oṯāḥālīḏīṯ Aḥrīṣṭālīḥ), an apocryphal neo-Platonic treatise based on the Enumades of Plotinus. This error was such as to falsify in a remarkable fashion the idea that was formed of the Peripatetic system.

Dieterici has edited nine small treatises by Fāрабī of which the most celebrated is the epistle entitled The Gems of the Sciences (Risāla fi ṣuqūṭ al-ḥikam); this work, which contains many ideas in a very concise form, passed into use in all the schools of the East; there is a commentary on it by Ismā'īl al-Husaini al-Fāрабī, a writer of the 7th century which has been printed at the al-Amira press (1291 H. H.) and made the subject of a study by M. Horten. Besides this group of treatises, Dieterici has published Fāрабī’s “Model City” (Risāla fi arād al-Madinah al-fāḏila) an important work in 34 chapters in which the Muslim philosopher, inspired by Plato, explains his conception of the organisation of the perfect city. It should be governed by its wise men; its aim should be to imitate here below the perfection of the heavenly city and to prepare its members to obtain felicity in the latter. This theory is of little practical interest, but is of some importance for metaphysics, Fāрабī’s intention like that of the other philosophers of the same school was to embrace the whole cycle of the sciences. He seems to have been quite a good mathematician and a fair physician; he wrote on occult sciences and was also a distinguished musician; it is to his pen that we owe the most important treatise on the theory of Oriental music. He was himself a virtuoso and composer; his talent excited the admiration of Saif al-Dawla and the Mawlawī dervishes still use ancient chants that are attributed to him.

Fāрабī’s system is that of the school of Philosophers in the proper sense of the word (fi-laṣṭif) i.e. Muslim Neo-Platonic philosophy. It is the system which al-Kindī had begun to organise before him and which after him found the most complete expression in the works of Avicenna (q.v. sub Ibn SīnĀ). It is fairly probable that Fāрабī differs from al-Kindī and Avicenna on some points; but it is difficult to define these points as it is better to be reserved, if not sceptical, in interpreting the details of his system. Indeed we do not possess his work in its entirety; we are only acquainted with a small part of it; Fāрабī’s style also is somewhat obscure; several of the treatises that have survived are composed in the form of very brief aphorisms placed one after the other in no sort of order. Lastly it is impossible to be certain that there is no contradiction in a work so vast, in which the influence of Plato, Aristotle or Plotinus alternately predominates. The root idea of the system, which is to make a synthesis on one side of Aristotle and Plato and on the other hand of the syneretic philosophy thus obtained with the religious faith of Islam, cannot but be somewhat contradictory in itself.

T. J. de Boer believes he can see a very marked opposition between Fāрабī and the other members of the school of “Philosophers” notably the celebrated Rāzī (Razes); Fāрабī sometimes polemics against Rāzī who was his contemporary. According to de Boer this opposition consists in that, while Fāрабī’s system is deductive, rational and built up entirely on abstract logic, Rāzī’s philosophy is experimental, inductive and is more especially concerned with the concrete. But I do not think that there are really two systems opposed to one another; they are two sides or two aspects of a more general system: Rāzī, who was a physician and distinguished naturalist, emphasises the concrete aspects of the system while Fāрабī, who had a more inclination for logic, mathematics and mystic speculation, presents the abstract side of it. In Avicenna we find the two aspects reunited. I have pointed to a difference between Fāрабī and Avicenna as regards the position of Mysticism; in Avicenna mysticism appears only at the end of the system to crown his work, as it were; it is quite distinct from the other parts of it and Avicenna treats mysticism — and very artificially — as a chapter in philosophy which he would study in an objective fashion. On the contrary in Fāрабī mysticism penetrates everything; the terms of Sufism are scattered throughout his works and one clearly feels that with him mysticism is not a theory but rather a subjective state. This point of view further contributes to make his system somewhat obscure.

It has been said that Avicenna is clearer, better arranged and more methodical than Fāрабī; Muslim scholasticism has clearly a more finished form in Avicenna. On one important point, the question of the personal immortality of the soul, this difference in lucidity between the two philosophers makes itself felt. The rational soul or reason, illuminated by the world of the mind, the world of ideas, or active intellect, is the real man; it is also what remains of man after death. But does the reason of the individual man lose itself in the active intellect or does it preserve its own consciousness and individuality? Certain passages in Fāрабī are written in such a way as to make it credible that he admits the first view. There is, however, no room for doubt that Fāрабī believed in the personal immortality of the soul; in his treatise on the Model City there is a passage, where he shows the good souls arriving in the celestial city and each of them enjoying a pleasure as great as the number of the souls. Ibn Tufail, who seems to have had no love for Fāрабī, also says that he had doubts on the personal immortality of the soul (see S. Munk, article Fāрабī in the Dictionnaire des Sciences Philosophiques); this charge must refer to passages, the language of which is obscure or which are incomplete.
T. J. de Boer has also pointed out as a difference between Fārābī and the other philosophers of his school that Avicenna does not, like him, derive matter from God. According to this writer, Fārābī conceived matter as having emanated from God by passing through several spiritual intermediaries. I do not think that this statement is quite correct. It is in the treatise on "the principles of beings" of which we possess a Hebrew translation by Moses Ibn Tibbon (אשת תבון), ed. by Weiss, Leipzig 1850-1851) that Fārābī gives the chain of principles in a way which makes it resemble an emanation: the primary intelligence or first cause comes from God; from it come in their order the intelligences of the spheres; the last is the active intelligence; above it are placed the universal soul, then form and lastly matter. Avicenna's metaphysics are really quite comparable to this system.

The matter which is in question here is the substratum of the world which contains its possibility. The world is produced by coming from the primary matter created directly from God. The celestial spheres, animated by their respective souls, are put into motion by the prime mover; the latter is not God himself but rather the primary intelligence which emanates from him.

Fārābī attempts to reconcile Aristotle and Plato on the question of the eternity of the world. In his treatise on the Agreement of the Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, he claims that Aristotle did not believe in an eternal world. The creator made it spring into existence at once without time, the prime mover then put it into motion and from the motion of the spheres the time was produced. In other words time is logically posterior to the actual creation of the world. The school of the philosophers has however admitted the possibility of the infinite series retroacting into the past: according to Avicenna a real infinite series is impossible but an infinite series, the terms of which do not actually exist together, is possible. It may be admitted that the celestial spheres have accomplished an infinite number of revolutions in the past and that time accordingly is eternal. One difficulty against this view arises from the fact that the souls of men who have lived in the past continue to exist in reality as they are immortal; there would thus be an infinite number of souls actually co-existing. In his treatise on the "Model City," Fārābī however speaks of the souls in the other world as if they were finite in number. We cannot really be quite certain that these philosophers do not sometimes contradict one another; they comment with equal confidence on teachers whose doctrines often disagree and there necessarily results a certain amount of hesitation and uncertainty in their systems.

Bibliography: M. Horten, Das Buch der Ringstehne Farabis mit dem Kommentar des Emir Isma'il el-Hossein el-Farani übersetzt und erläutert in Beiträge zur Gesch. der Philosophie des Mittelalters, Vol. v. (Münster 1906); with a bibliography of Fārābī, p. xvii-(xxviii); M. Steinschneider, Al-Farabi des arabischen Philosophen Leben und Schriften in den Mémoires de l'Acad. impériale des Sciences de St. Petersbourg, Vol. xiii. N° 4 (St. Petersburg, 1869); Dieterici, Al-Farabīs Philosophische Abhandlungen (Leiden 1890; Arab. text of nine smaller works);
the town surrendered and was given over to plunder by the soldiers; the citadel, however, only fell after a siege of a month. Timur left Damascus in the spring of 804 = 1402 to make war on the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid. — The remainder of Faradż's reign is occupied with the struggles of the Emirs for influence with the Sultan. The Emirs, who were overthrown in the course of these feuds, were usually imprisoned in Alexandria and executed if they did not succeed in escaping to Syria and collect new followers there. In 808 = 1405 the discontent among the Mamliks reached such a height that Faradż abdicated the throne and went into retirement for a period. The Emirs raised his brother Abd al-Asif to the throne under the name al-Malik al-Manṣūr. A few months later, however, Faradż won back the citadel of Cairo, threw his brother into prison and ascended the throne again. Although his position in Egypt was now secure, he never again exercised authority in Syria for any length of time. Diakam, the governor of Aleppo, proclaimed himself Sultan there under the name al-Malik al-Adil, fortified Aleppo and defended Syria against foreign foes. He went to war with Karâ Velek, the chief of the white Sheep Turkomans, and fell in battle. The most faithful adherent of the Sultan was the above-mentioned Emir Taghrîbî, his bitterest opponent, Shahâr al-Mahmûd [q. v.], who afterwards became Sultan under the name al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad. The war dragged on in Syria with varying success until in 815 A.H. Faradż went there for the seventh time. Against the advice of the dying Emir Taghrîbî, governor of Damascus, he went to meet the foe, regardless of the exhausting condition of his troops. He was defeated and retired to Damascus. As the Emirs there gave him a hostile reception, the Sultan had to submit; he was dethroned, imprisoned and put to death in prison. His lands had been terribly devastated during his reign by Timur's invasions and the constant civil wars, while famine and plague ravaged the country. He constantly required vast sums for his extravagant and luxurious mode of life and these he extorted from his subjects in Cairo.

**Biography:**: Weil, Geschichte der Chafien, v. 72—105 and 108—125; his biography is given in detail in the Mamlûk al-Šâfî, Cairo MS. 1113, Part iii. (M. SOKHN.)

**AL-FARĀFRA (AL-FARĀFIRA)**, an oasis in the Libyan desert, belonging to the Egyptian province of Minaî. It lies between the Wâbîût Bahriye and the Wâbîût Kilîyye [see the article BAHRÎYEH, i. 596 et seq.] and is about 8 days journey by camel from Minaî. Among the earlier Arab geographers the name al-Farâfarö appears, for example in al-Bakr, who mentions its great wealth in date-palms and the numerous villages inhabited by Christian Copts; he also knows of the slum and virirol found there and mentions the hot springs of the oasis. We have no other direct notices of al-Farâfra, probably because it was usually reckoned with Dâkhîle [q. v., i. 899 et seq.] as is clear from Ya'îûbi (p. 332), for example. It was not till Châliaud and Letorcer's journey in 1820 that new light was thrown on the oasis and later by G. Rohîf's expedition in 1873-1874. Farâfra was then only very loosely connected with Egypt; the only bond was the annual tribute of 10,000 piastres. The land was exceedingly fertile and rich in palms, olives, fruits of all kinds, vegetables and cereals; there was also some cotton, but only oil and dates were exported. Nevertheless the inhabitants were in great poverty as they lost the greater portion of their harvests as in ancient times, through the constant raids of the Egyptian and Barât Beduins as well as of the Arabs of the Nile valley. Besides this the finest estates were in the possession of members of the Sanûsiya, who sent the produce to Djarablûs, which was then their headquarters. They had been acquiring a firm footing in the oasis since 1860 and it is to their influence that the great fanaticism of the population is ascribed. The number of inhabitants was still small at that date but it has been continuously increasing since then; Boinet-Bey estimates the population at 542 and the latest figures at 652. The only village is Ksar Farâfra.

**Biography:** Vâşî (ed. de Goeje), p. 332; al-Bakr (transl. de Salm), p. 39; Mârz, Kîåfî, i. p. 234; Alî Bâhâ Mâbarîk, Kîåfî dîjdî, xvii. 30; Rohîf, Dîrî Mûnîîtîn dîl Libîshîn Wûtîs, p. 75 et seq.; Amelin, Geographie de l'Égypte; Boinet-Bey, Dictionnaire géographique de l'Égypte; Baedeker, Egypte. (E. GAEFF.)

**FARAIH, a town of Afghanîstân in the Herât province situated on the bank of the Farâh-rûd river which flows in a south-westerly direction into the Sîsân Hâmûn. Farâh, although decayed, is still a place of some importance, and is the meeting place of several caravan routes and the centre of a fertile district. It was formerly the capital of Drangiana, and was included in the medieavel province of Sidjistan, but is not included in modern Sîsân. It has never quite recovered from its devastation by the Mongols under Chingiz Khân.

The Farâh-rûd is one of the rivers mentioned in the Vendidad (Frâdadha) and is the 0 frûdês of Pliny, and the town is the Prophethias of Alexander's historians and Srao (Prophethias being a Greek rendering of frâdadha or 'progress') also no doubt the Phra of Isidore of Charax. Alexander here detected the plot of Philotas, and from here, Holchich considers, he made his way up the valley of the Farâh-rûd to the Bâmiyân pass. In modern times it has been described by Ferrer and Holdich.

**Biography:** A. Stein in The Academy, May 16th 1885; Holdich, The Gates of India, (London 1910); Ferrer, Caravan Journeys, (London 1857), Ch. 26; Strabo, Book xv. Ch. 2, 8. (M. LONGWORTH DAMES.)

**FARAH, ABU NSA'R MAṢŪD B. AḥB BAKR B. HUSAIN B. DI'AFAR, born at Farâh in Sidjistan, a Persian philologist, who flourished in the beginning of the xiith century A.H. He is the author of a versified Arabic-Persian glossary, called Nîqûṭ al-Shîbîn, which was much used in the east and is found in almost every library in Europe in several copies. Commentaries have frequently been written on this little book. Cf. Cat. Boll. (Pertsch), No. 156, 157 (1); Kien, Cat. Pers. Ms. Brit. Mus., p. 504; Elze, Cat. Oxford, col. 980—983.

He also versified in Arabic in 617 the celebrated compendium of law al-Djûrûs al-Sâghrûn, written by al-Shahîbîn [q. v.]. Cf. Hâdîjî Khâlîfa, ed. Flugel, ii. 559.

**FARÀDÏ** is the name given to the expressly called fixed shares in an estate (1/4, 1/6, 1/6).
2/3, 1/3 and 1/6) in the verses dealing with the law of inheritance in the Korān (iv. 12—15 and 175) which fall to the twelve so-called "people of fixed inheritance" (dawwn 'urfarīd or aḥsāb al-furarīd). As the accurate knowledge of these fixed legacies was the most important part of the law of inheritance, the latter was called 'ilm al-furarīd.

Although the Korān only recognises fixed portions for the daughter, the two parents, the husband and wife, and the brothers and sisters, Muslim scholars have extended the laws applicable to the daughters of a deceased person to the daughters of his son and in the same way those applicable to his parents to the grand-parents; a distinction has further been made in sisters between full and half-sister on the father's side and on the mother's. The total number of these so-called "Korānic" heirs has thus been raised to twelve, viz., in descending order: 1. the daughters of the deceased and those of his sons; 2. in ascending order: father, mother and grandfather on the father's side, grandmother on both sides (and further all other female relatives of the deceased, in ascending line, in so far as they are not related to him through a male relative in ascending line who is not legally qualified to inherit); 3. in the collateral line: the full sister, the half-sister on the father's side and the half-brother and half-sister on the mother's side; 4. widower and widow.

The daughter of the deceased is entitled to half his estate; if there are two or more daughters, they receive together 2/3 of the estate. The son's daughters, full sisters and half-sisters on the father's side are subject to the same rules. (Korān, iv. 12 and 175). Each of the heirs in ascending line may claim 1/6 of the estate; the mother, however, only receives this share if there are children, son's children, or two or more brother's and sisters of the deceased; otherwise she gets 1/3 of the estate (Korān, iv. 15). Each of the half-sisters and half-brothers on the maternal side has also 1/6 of the estate; if two or more inherit together, they receive 1/3 in all (Korān, iv. 15). The widower receives 1/2 of the estate except when a child or son's child inherits with him in which case his share is only 1/6 (Korān, iv. 15). The widow has (Korān, iv. 14) only a claim to half of what a widower would receive in the same circumstances, i.e. 1/4 or 1/8 of the estate, according as she inherits with children (or son's children) or not.

If there are several dawwn 'urfarīd either together or with other relatives of the deceased, they in many cases excluded from their fixed shares. They then according to circumstances either receive nothing at all or the residue of the estate, after the other heirs have received what they are entitled to. The dawwn 'urfarīd can never inherit at the same time. On the diminution of the fixed inheritances in some cases in which several dawwn 'urfarīd inherit at the same time, cf. the article 'AWL. [i. 517b et seq.].

'BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the chapter on inheritance in the collections on Tradition and the Fikh books, the literature quoted is the author of this article's Handbuch des Islamischen Gheber, 3rd. London, 1910), p. 150. E. Sachau in the Zeitschrift der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1894, i. 159—210; L. W. C. van den Berg in the Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlands-Indië, Series 5, viii. 500 et seq.

(T. W. JUYNBOOM.)

FARĀĪDī SECT. This sect was founded in Eastern Bengal about the year 1804 by Haddi Ḥāfiz al-Shārīf Allāh. He was an innkeeper and resided in a village, Bahādūrpur, in the district of Farīdpūr. When eighteen years of age he went on a pilgrimage to Mecca, but instead of returning, as usual, he remained a disciple of al-Shaikh Tahir al-Sulṭān al-Makki, the head of the Ḥāfizī sect there in those days. About 1802, after an absence of twenty years, he came back to India, a skilful disputier, and a good Arabic scholar. On his way home he fell into the hands of Dacoits (handed robbers) who plundered him of everything, including many relics of his residence in Arabia. Finding life insupportable without books or relics, he joined the gang, and shared their many wanderings. The simplicity of his character and the sincerity of his religious convictions struck these wicked men, who ultimately became his most zealous followers. Such is the story told at the present day of the first step taken towards prove-lytism by this remarkable man. For several years Shārīf Allāh quietly promulgated his newly framed doctrines in the villages of his native districts, encountering much opposition and abuse, but attaining a band of devoted adherents, he by degrees acquired the reputation of a holy man.

The chief innovation introduced by him was the non-observance of the Friday prayers and of the two great 'Ids, on the ground that India under British rule was Dar al-farāb [q. v.]. He also ordered that the titles of ustādī (teacher) and bağīrd (pupil), terms which did not imply complete submission, should in future be used in the place of pīr (priest) and muṭābī (disciple), which had for ages been the respective designa-ions of the religious preceptor and his pupil. He further prohibited the usual ceremony of joining hands, which in his eyes only constituted the initiatory at the initiation of a disciple, but required from every one of his would-be disciples tabūq, or repentance for past sins, and a solemn determination to lead a more righ-teous and godly life in future. It is a curious fact that none of these ideas excited much opposition, but on his promulgating a dogma that to allow a mid-wife to cut the navel cord of a new born babe was a deadly sin borrowed from the Hindus, and his insisting that it was the duty of the father to do this, he roused a spirit of opposition which caused many of his adherents to fall away. The zamun-dār (landlords) were alarmed at the spread of the new creed, which bound the Muhammadan peasantry together as one man. Disputes and quarrels soon arose, and Shārīf Allāh was driven away from Navībārī, in the Dāhā district, where he had settled, and was compelled to return to his birthplace. There he resumed his holy office as a minister of the faith, and in a short time en-listed the sympathies and support of a vast major-ity of the uneducated and the most excitable classes of the Muhammadan population. His in-fluence became unbounded, and no one seemed to carry out his orders. He acted with great prudence and discretion, rarely assuming any other character than that of a religious reformer. The movement set on foot by this man attracted little attention during his lifetime, and his name is rarely met with in the annals of those days. On
looking back, however, at his career there is much which amply repays an inquiry. That he came of obscure parentage amid the swamps of Eastern Bengal, and should be the first preacher to denounce the superstitious and corrupt beliefs, which long contact with Hindu polytheism had developed, is remarkable enough; but that the apathetic and careless Bengali peasant should be roused into enthusiasm is still more so. To effect this required a sincere and sympathetic preacher, and no one ever appealed more strongly to the sympathies of a people than Shari'at Allah whose blameless and exemplary life was admired by his countrymen, who venerated him as a father able to advise them in times of adversity, and give consolation in cases of affliction.

He is described as a man of middle height, of fair complexion, and with a long, shapely beard. A very different person was his son, Muhammad Muhsin, better known as Duddhi Miyan, who, though of ordinary abilities, exerted an influence far surpassing that of his father. His name is a household word throughout the districts of Faridpur, Purna, Bakhigunj, Dhang and Nonkhal, and the number of his followers at the present day testifies to the thoroughness of the method with which he and his father fulfilled their mission.

Duddhi Miyan was born in 1819, and, while still young, visited Mecca, where, as he asserted and made his followers believe, visions and revelations of a nature tending to his future greatness, were vouchsafed to him. On his return he devoted himself to the spread of his father’s doctrines, as well as many more which he himself introduced afresh. For instance, he insisted upon his disciples eating the common grasshopper (phanga) which they detested, because the locust (tiddi) was used as food in Arabia, and vigorously contended that there was no greater difference between the two insects than between a goat of their villages and one from the banks of the Lijumna.

The most remarkable advance made during Duddhi Miyan’s lifetime was the organisation of the society. Following the example of the Vaishnavas, he divided Eastern Bengal into circles, and appointed a khilafa, or agent, to each, with power to collect contributions for the furtherance of the objects of the central association. They further kept Duddhi Miyan, usually styled the Pir, or simply Mawlawi, acquainted with everything occurring within their jurisdiction, and whenever a zamindar tried to enforce his legal rights against any one member of the sect, funds were provided to sue him in the court, or, if it could be safely done, men with clubs were sent to plunder his property and to thrust his servants. During his father’s lifetime the sect was never opposed to, nor collided with, the law of the land; but the measures adopted by the son united the zamindars and the indigo planters against him. He tried to make all Muhammadan ryots join his sect on refusal caused them to be beaten, and excommunicated from the society of the faithful, and destroyed their crops. The zamindars once more endeavoured to prevent their tenants from joining, and, it is said, often punished and tortured the disobedient. A mode of torture intensely painful, which left no marks to implicate any one, is said to have been adopted on both sides. The beards of recalcitrant ryots were tied together and red chili powder given as snuff.

Coercion, however, failed, and the landholders did little to check the further spread of a similar disturbance.

It was among the cultivators and village workman that Duddhi Miyan made the largest number of converts. He asserted the equality of mankind, and taught that the welfare of the lowly and poor was as much an object of interest as that of the high and the rich. When a brother fell in distress it must be he taught, the duty of his neighbours to assist him, and nothing, he affirmed, was criminal, or unjustifiable, which might be used as a means to that end. Their enemies, however, alleged, that witnesses were paid for out of the funds of the association.

Duddhi Miyan and the Hadjis, as his followers were originally called, became objects of dread to the Hindu, old Muhammadans, and European landholders. Evidence to convict a prisoner could not be got. It was, however, against the levying of illegal cesses by landlords that Duddhi Miyan made his most determined stand. That a Muhammadan ryot should be obliged to contribute towards the decoration of the image of Durgā, or towards the support of any of the rites of his Hindu landlord, were regarded as intolerable acts of oppression. In this he was certainly right, as the only apology for their continuance was their antiquity, and adaptation to the feelings of the people. But, he advanced a step further when he proclaimed that the earth is God’s, and that no one has a right to occupy it as an inheritance, or levy taxes upon it. The peasantry were, therefore, persuaded to settle on Khāss Mahall lands, managed directly by the Government, and thus escape the payment of any taxes, but that of the land revenue, claimed by the State. His rapid success, however excited the jealousy of the contemporary landlords and many false suits were brought against him. In 1838 he was charged with abetting the plunder of several houses; in 1841 he was committed to the sessions on a charge of murder but was acquitted; in 1844 he was tried for trespass and forming an unlawful assembly; and in 1846 for abduction and plunder. The riot of 1838 assumed at one time a very threatening aspect, and a detachment of Sepoys was sent from Digha to check any disturbance. It was, however, impossible to induce witnesses to give evidence, and on each occasion he was acquitted. At Bahādurpur, where he generally resided, every Muhammadan stranger was fed, while Eastern Bengal was frequented by his spies, and the interests of the whole neighbourhood were in his keeping. He settled disputes, administered summary justice, and punished any Hindu, Muhammadan or Christian who without first referring matters to him dared to bring suits, as for recovery of debt, in the adjoining munsif’s court. Emissaries carried his orders to distant villages, and his letters, signed Ahmad nam na ma’lam, (Ahmad of unknown name) often had the ordinary Hindu superscription to allay suspicion. He taught that there was no sin in persecuting those who refused to embrace his doctrines, or who appealed to Government courts against the orders of the society and its acknowledged leaders. Duddhi Miyan is described as having been a tall handsome man, with a dark flowing beard, and a large turban wound round his head. He died at Bahādurpur 24th September, 1860, and was buried there, but
the Aral Khan river has, within the last few years, washed away every trace of his house and tomb.

Three sons survive, of whom none have as yet exhibited any of the energy, or abilities, of their father and hence the sect is consequently diminishing in number.

The sect of which he was the leader is generally known as the Farānid Sect; and those who profess his doctrines have been enjoined to say the Zuhur (mid-day) Farād (compulsory prayer) on Fridays instead of the usual Djumā or Friday prayer, which is customary with the majority of the Muhammadans.

(A. M. HOAYMET HOSEINI.)

AL-FARAS, the horse, whether stallion (faht) or mare; as a collective al-khal. The horse is considered the most beautiful and nobler creature next to man. The fine proportions of its limbs, the purity of its colour, its swiftness, its obedience to the rider, whether in battle, in pursuit or in flight, its courage and strength, its intelligence and standard of good manners are renowned. A sign of the latter is the fact that a well-bred horse discharges neither urine or excrement while its rider is on its back. It knows its rider so well that no one else is allowed to mount it. It watches beside him when he is asleep, and wakes him with its foot when danger threatens from the enemy or wild beasts. The horses used in the game of polo (dawakān from the Pers. tawgān), watch the ball with the eye and follow it without the rider's needing to guide them. One of the most noteworthy habits of the horse is that it will only drink turbid water; it is afraid of its reflection in clear still water and makes it turbid and frothy with its hoofs.

The following story is told of the creation of the horse: When God wished to create the horse, he said to the south wind: I will make a living being out of thee, collect thyself! He then caused Gabriel to take a handful of wind and from this he created a reddish-brown (kumust) horse. God said to it: I have created thee and made thee for the Arabs and distinguished thee about all other beasts by swiftness for the gaining of food and booty; thou shalt be ridden on the back and may fortune be attached to thy headway. Thereupon he dismissed it and it neighed. Then God said: Blessed be thy neighing; terrify the worshippers of idols, fill their ears and make their feet tremble. He then marked it with spots on the forehead and legs. After the creation of Adam it was led before him and preferred by him to Burūk [q.v., l. 793].

According to another tradition the first to ride a horse was Ismā'il, the son of Abraham. Others again say that the Arab horses are descended from those of Solomon. The latter inherited 1000 horses from David; when they were being led before him, he forgot the afternoon prayer: enraged at this omission he had them all hamstring except a few that he spared because they had not yet been brought before him. When after this people of the tribe of 'Azd came to visit Solomon and asked for a present on taking leave of him, he gave them one of the steeds to which they gave the name sad al-rākīb; from it are descended all the Arab horses.

The wealth of manuscript literature on the horse (cf. e.g. the Catalogues of Berlin and Vienna) has as yet hardly been touched, apart from Perron's work

cited below. Von Hammer-Purgstall gave a preliminary survey of the material in his essay, Das Pferd bei den Arabern [Bibliography, philology: names of horses, references to the Korān, hadiths, proverbs, poems, notably the description of the horse by Khalāf b. Ḥajīyān al-Māzīn]. Masūdī's Muṣāfī al-Dhakab contains a great deal of information about horse-racing and there are many notices in Ibn al-Mundhir [q. v.]. Valuable observations are made by the modern travellers quoted below.

The name al-Faras al-Fārum, the great horse, is given to a constellation Pegasus, Kīfāt al-Faras to the constellation of the foal, al-Faras al-Tā'īm or “complete horse” to a group of stars near Pegasus. "It is not quite clear how the Arab astronomers, who have elsewhere retained the Greek constellations so completely, ... have come to add a third and complete one to the two incomplete horses" (Ideler, Sternnamen, p. 190).


FARĀSĀN (Farāṣān), a group of islands in the S. W. of Cape Lījān, opposite the harbour of Abū 'Arīsh in Tiḥāma. The largest of these islands are Farāṣān Kūbr with the harbour of Khār Farāṣān and Farāṣān Saghir. Mūhrāk and Ṣeydān are other places worthy of mention besides Khār. The inhabitants fish for pearls and catch turtles, which brings them great wealth. Ehrenberg, who discovered the islands, saw many date-groves and fields growing durra and melons, Arab antelopes, numerous gazelles and goats there.

Hamdānī was acquainted with these islands. Their inhabitants, who take their name from the island, are, according to him descended from the great North Arabian tribe of Taghlib [q. v.]. Like the latter they were once Christians and, besides, had many churches on their islands, which had already been destroyed by Hamdānī's time. They carried on a busy trade with the Abyssinians. According to South Arabian genealogists they are Ḥimyarīs.

Al-Farazdák (the "lump of dough": Aghānī, xix. 2), whose real name was Hammām b. Ghiylīb b. Sā'a'a, was one of the three greatest Arab satirists of the Arab period [cf. Dāir and al-Akhṭal]. He belonged to the Tamīmi Mudżāfī b. Dārim. He was probably born about the year 20 (640-641) (cf. Nadār, ed. Bevan, p. xviii.). We know nothing certain about his early life. It may, however, be true that his father sent him to 'Ali after the "Battle of the Camel" (Aghānī, xix. 40, 48), although tradition gives this incident an exaggerated importance in the life of the poet (cf. Nadār, op. cit., in opposition to Hell, Farazdak's Loghadehêc, etc., Munich dissertation, 1900, p. 7 et seq.). There is more foundation for the statement that he (presumably when about 30 years of age) induced the Caliph Mu'āwiya by threatening poems to deliver up the inheritance of Hūtāy, a fellow tribesman of Farazdák, which he had illegally confiscated (Nadār, p. 608, 609, 610, 611; further references are given there notably to Tābarī, ii. 96—108). This incident is said to have provoked the enmity of Ziyād, Mu'āwiya's extremely energetic half-brother, against him. Ziyād was governor in the 'Irāq from 45 to 53 (660-668) and spent six months of each year in Baṣra where Farazdák lived. The latter made himself so unpopular with this firm ruler, that he had to fly from Baṣra about 50 (670). After many adventures he found an asylum with Sa'd b. al-Šāhīd, who had been appointed governor of Medina in 49 (669) (Nadār, p. 63, commentary on verse 46; p. 608 et seq.). He did not stand in such high favour with Sa'd's successor, Marwān b. al-Hakam, who ultimately banished him from the city (Aghānī, xix. 21, 43 et seq.). But Ziyād's death soon allowed him to return to his native city of Baṣra as his son 'Ubaid Allāh was well disposed towards him. It is possible that Ziyād's threats against Farazdák were really not to be taken very seriously (cf. Nadār, p. 611, 617). In any case the poet was in mortal terror. This is clear not only from the numerous laudatory verses on tribes and persons who had supported him in his exile but notably also from his verses of jubilation on the death of the dreaded Ziyād (Nadār, p. 619) and the subsequent lampoons on him.

Farazdák's further life was in part occupied with his feuds with Dāir and al-Akhṭal [q. v.] and by his unfortunate marriage with his cousin al-Nawār, whom he won as his wife by a stratagem but had ultimately to set free again (for details see Hell, op. cit., and Brockelmann, Gesch. d. Arab. Litte., i. 53 et seq.). The exploits of al-Farazdák and Dāir under the Zabūridor governor al-Hārīth b. 'Abd Allāh are narrated in the article Dāirī. The rule of the Omeyyad prince Bishār b. Marwān was favourable to al-Farazdák's activity but fortunately did not last long. He had to keep fairly quiet under the firm rule of al-Hājadīdājī. Driven by necessity, he dedicated himself to and his brother-in-law al-Hakam b. Ayūb (Dīwān, ed. Boucher, No. 91) a number of panegyrics; he even dared to offer consolation to Hājadīdājī when he learned of the death of his brother and his son in one day (Kānit, ed. Wright, l. 291 et seq.). On the death of this powerful governor (in 95 = 714) he composed an official lament (Boucher, No. 225); but in reality he rejoiced at heart and after Sulaimān, Ḥādjīdīdī's enemy, had become Caliph (96 = 715) he was able to give unrestrained expression to his joy.

Even before his acquaintance with al-Hājadīdājī al-Farazdák had begun to irritate another of the great men of the period, Muḥalla b. Abī Šūfrah [q. v.]. He jeered at the latter as an Azīfī and a descendant of fire-worshippers (Boucher, N. 73). Muḥalla b. 'Abd Allāh b. Yazīd had also to put up with all sorts of insults during his first governorship in Khorasan (82—85 = 701—704). But when Yazīd and his brothers escaped from Ḥājadīdājī to prince Sulaimān, he began to moderate his language and after some hesitation went completely over to Yazīd's side when the latter became governor of Khorasan for the second time (end of 97 = 716). This did not, however, prevent him from again lampooning the Muḥallasids after their tragic end and singing the praises of their victors, notably Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik, governor of 'Irāq. Maslama's successor in the 'Irāq, 'Omar b. Ḫubairah imprisoned Farazdák on one occasion (Aghānī, xvii. 141 et seq.; Hell, Farazdák's Loghadehêc, p. 31 et seq.) and was lampooned by him as long as he remained governor. But when 'Omar was relieved of office in favour of 'Khalīd b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kāsī and badly treated, the poet dedicated laudatory verses to him (Aghānī, xix. 17). Al-Farazdák is said to have already been on bad terms with 'Khalīd owing to a previous incident (Aghānī, xix. 60 et seq.) He satirised him as a South Arabian and son of a Christian woman and ridiculed also all his administrative measures. How this affected him has already been told in the article Dāirī.

Al-Farazdák's relations with the 'Umayyads were, as we have seen, not good at first. The first Caliph on whom he wrote panegyrics was 'Abd al-Malik. It was not till Sulaimān's reign (Boucher, N. 21), that he came to court and he seems to have been in particular favour with the latter. He also dedicated laudatory verses to the other Caliphs from 'Abd al-Malik to Yazid II, as far as opportunity arose. This was no longer the case with 'Omar II (for details see Hell, Farazdák's Loghadehêc, p. 29). He hurled most bitter lampoons against Ḥishām b. 'Abd al-Malik, the last Caliph, whom he lived to see, and jeered at him for his avarice and also for his physical infirmities (Boucher, N. 63 and 113; Nadār, p. 984, commentary on verse 20); quite a number of panegyrics on Ḥishām have, however, also survived from al-Farazdák's pen.

Al-Farazdák seems to have died in 114 (732-733) of pleurisy, and was buried in Baṣra in the cemetery of the Tamīm (Aghānī, xix. 44 et seq.; cf. the article Dāirī).

After what has been said above there is little need to add much on the character of Farazdák. His most prominent qualities were unbridled lewdness, cowardice, cruelty and ostentation. The latter seems towards the end of his life to have overcome even his cowardice; cf. his provocative attitude against 'Khalīd b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kāsī (Aghānī, xix. 29 et seq.). Apparently chivalrous actions also such as his intercession on behalf of a widow (Aghānī, xix. 36, 50) or the numerous cases in which he took the blood guilt of a stranger upon himself are really to be explained from his unbounded vanity. His cruelty was proved at the massacre of Greek prisoners.
which Sulaimān once ordered in Medina [cf. Ṣaḥīḥ]. Some of the stories of his cowardice are most scathing (Aḥāni, xix. 25 and particularly 29) as well as those of his lasciviousness. He plays a role in obscene stories in Arab literature similar to that of Abū Nu'wās at a later period. Aḥāni, xix. 35 et seq. is peculiarly characteristic of his lack of scruple in sexual matters. This defect in his character gave his rival Djiar many an opportunity for well-merited scorn (Naḍafī, p. 394 et seq.). In his favour it has been urged that he was all his life a faithful supporter of the house of 'Alī. But he really only showed this on one occasion, with regard to the contested throne of Hishām (for details see Aḥāni, xiv. 78 and Brockelmann, op. cit.). He was usually content with showing his sympathy in a rather non-committal fashion (Aḥāni, xix. 34, 47 et seq.; Ibn Khallikān, iii. 620). Nor must it be forgotten that on other occasions he shows sympathies which seem to be Khāridji (cf. Hell in the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesell., lix. 593), and which certainly can hardly be reconciled with real attachment to the ʿAlīid cause. How deeply he really was still sunk in Bedouin paganism may be seen from the fact that he hurled at Muhallab the reproach that his ancestors had never worshipped Yaghūb and other gods of their ancestors. In pagan fire (Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesell., lix. 600). Similarly he had little hesitation in weaving passages from the Korān into an obscene passage (cf. Boucher, N°, 188, p. 539 = text, p. 180, from below). — The only verses that really came from his heart are those in which he expresses his terror of Ziyād. In Aḥāni, xix. 12 et seq., he gives a touching elegy on the death of one of his sons and afterwards says that the deceased was not worth his ʿAbūyā. That he appropriated verses by other poets (Aḥāni, xix. 22) without hesitation may be excused from the practice of the times. — The Arabs make him die a kind of Antichrist (Aḥāni, xix. 24), although he had fits of piety towards the end of his life and expressed lively fear of the next world in certain verses (Kāmil, p. 70, 61-65).

Although al-Farazdāk particularly cultivated the satire and its opposite the panegyric and begging-poem, other kinds of poem are also found from his pen: Kāmil, p. 208 and Boucher, N°, 119 as well as Hell (Divān), N°, 306 (Tabarī, ii. 103, 11-20) are epic fragments while Boucher, N°. 47 is a song on wine; the verses given in Aḥāni, xix. 9-7 from below are simply obscure without personal reference; his laments have already been mentioned.

Al-Farazdāk was particularly fond of making short poems as these were more effective and more readily preserved (Aḥāni, xix. 35).

We may further add as regards the appreciation of Farazdāk's poems by the Arabs that he was particularly esteemed by the Tamīm, while the Kais preferred Djiar. His opponents do not seem to have ever seriously attempted his life, although they often treated him badly. Philologists in later times esteemed him on account of his immense vocabulary (Aḥāni, xix. 48, 5 from below). A large number of his verses have become proverbial (Aḥāni, xix. 15 et seq.).


FARUD (A.; plur. of fārid) = single, unique, without an equal etc. The word is a technical term in various branches of knowledge.

In theology it designates God as the One, whom there is none like. In the Korān and in the sayings of Muḥammad that have been transmitted in tradition al-fard does not appear as an attribute of God. Al-Azhari on this account disapproves of the application of the word to Allāh. But it is possibly simply a paraphrase of the Korānic (huwa Allāh) ʾāḥad, which has the meaning "unique" in this passage only if at all.

In poetry fard means an isolated verse.

In Tradition fard is synonymous with gharīb musfād. This is the term applied to a tradition, whose chain of transmitters is known only to the second link only by one of the Tabīʿīn (members of the first generation after Muḥammad).

In Arabic grammar fard (with musfād and wāḥid) is a name for singular.

Bibliography: Muḥammad Alī, Dictionary of Technical Terms, ii. 1087, 1107; Lane, s. v.

(A. Schade).

FARD means that which is strictly prescribed and obligatory, the omission of which will be punished while the execution will be rewarded. According to the Ḥanafi school fard means that which is regarded as duty on the basis of cogent arguments; wāḥid (i.e. necessary) on the other hand is that which is considered a duty by the fākhs on grounds of probability only. According to the Shāfīʿīs and other Fikh-schools fard and wāḥid are synonyms. The law distinguishes fard al-ʿānak, to which every one is bound and fard al-kifāya (or: ala l-kifāya), in which it is only demanded that a sufficient number of Muslims should fulfill the religious duties concerned (as, for example, the performance of the common ʿaṭā in the mosque and the waging of the holy war). Cf. also the article Fīrād.


(Th. W. Juvyboll).

FARGHĀNA, Russ. Farganskaya oblast', a territory in Russian Turkestan, in the valley of the Sir-Darya. The name strictly is only that of the valley itself, bounded in the north by the Çotkal range, in the east by the mountains of Farghāna, in the south by the Alai range; in the west the boundary is less sharply defined by the approach of the mountain chains to the river bank, which causes the river to alter its course, which in Farghāna is predominantly southwesterly, first to a western then to a north-
western direction. Between the mountains and the stream there is here, particularly on the south bank, an open space. It is only on this side that the Farghāna valley is connected by a natural road with other lands, and therefore, as Bābur notes, only accessible to hostile attacks all the year round at this point. On the sources of the river and their junction in Farghāna cf. the article SIR-DĀRKĂ. Under Russian rule, the mountain valleys of the north, northeast and south, inhabited almost exclusively by nomads, have been united with the Farghāna valley to form one administrative district, just as in the ivth = xth century when the Arab geographers reckoned the Čotkal valley (Arab. Džudgīhī) as belonging to Farghāna. The administrative district of Farghāna has an area of 40,800 square miles of which only 10,200 belong to the valley proper and of these again only 4000 belong to the land irrigated by the river. In 1897, the population was 1,525,136 (now nearly two million) of whom by far the greater number live on the land irrigated by the river. Unlike all other lands of Russian Central Asia, Farghāna suffers on this account from want of land and over-population; there are only about 1.8 acres of irrigated land to 40 inhabitants and about 10 acres to each landowner.

Our oldest notices of Farghāna are due to the Chinese envoy Čang-k’ien (c. 128 B.C.). In these and the other early Chinese accounts the country is usually called Ta-yiian; the name Farghāna (the oldest Chinese transliteration is P’o-lon’a, later Pa-han-na, P’o-han and Pei-han), only appears in the fifth century A. D. Even the Chinese found an agricultural population here; it numbered only about 60,000 families (about 300,000 people); there were 70 “towns” (apparently villages). The Chinese claim to have brought their iron industry, as well as the art of making articles of gold and silver, to Farghāna; as Hirth suggests, the sēricum ferrum mentioned by Pline was possibly exported from Farghāna. On the other hand the Chinese first became acquainted with the vine and the lucerne (as horse-fodder) in Farghāna. It has been suggested by several Sinologists, including Hirth, that the cultivation of the vine was first introduced into Central Asia by the Greeks and that the Chinese p’u-t’ao is derived from the Greek βυτρός. The name, however, could only have reached China through the intermediary of Persia, which seems out of the question, as no similar Iranian word has yet been shown to exist and besides Strabo (Chap. 73) expressly says that the Greeks had found the vine cultivated everywhere in Central Asia from Hyrcania eastwards. Farghāna was little affected by Graeco-Bactrian culture, which is evident from the fact that the use of coins was still unknown there in the second century B.C.; whether a different state of affairs existed later and whether coins were struck at all in Farghāna in the pre-Muhammadan period as they were in Samaḵand, Bukhārā and Khvāārizm, is not yet definitely known. Central Asia owed to the Graeco-Roman West, apart from the undeniable influence of Greek art, its glass industry which was still fairly important in the early centuries of the Ilīḍrā; the progress of this industry from the west through Iran and Central Asia may also be traced in the language (Greek βύτρας, Pers. bītār and bītār, Chin. pō-lo’i and pō-li’); no mention is made of the development of this industry in Farghāna in the authorities, but its product at least were common in Farghāna also at a later period as the excavations conducted in Akhsikāt in 1885 have shown. Farghāna is not mentioned by the classical geographers; very little of what they tell us about the upper course of the Jaxartes can be reconciled with the later and more accurate accounts of the Arabs; the name Arestis of the people mentioned by Piolemy seems, for example, to correspond to the name of the river and district of Ṣū in Osh (cf. below) (W. Tomasek, Seydiuns, p. 48).

As early as 104 and 103 B.C. the Chinese undertook campaigns against Farghāna, but it is only the history of the centuries immediately preceding Islama that is known with some certainty from Chinese sources. According to the Pei-iščı, the statements in which refer mainly to the viith century A.D., the capital of the country had a circumference of only 4 li (about a mile); the king’s throne was in the shape of a golden ram; his army was several thousands strong. According to the T’ang-shu (which comes down to 754 A. D.) there were 6 large and about 100 small “towns” in the country; the same authority says that the same dynasty had ruled the country without interruption from the third to the viith century A.D. The king of the country was slain between 627 and 649 in a battle with the Turks whereupon a Turkish dynasty seized Farghāna a brother of the late king was only able to hold out in a portion of the country. The town of Kāsān (Chin. K’o-sai) is mentioned as the residence of the Turkish ruler; the native ruler lived in the town of Ḥu-Men(?) When after the collapse of the great Western Turkish empire (658) the country was organised as a Chinese province for a brief period, Kāsān was the capital of the whole country; at a later period the native dynasty seems to have been utterly uprooted by the Turks, for a Turkish ruler (Ahrān Tārkhan) is mentioned in 739 as ruler of all Farghāna. The native dynasty seems to have lost its importance long before this for in 630 Huan-Čang found no single ruler of Farghāna who desired to be fighting with another; the land had been for some decades previously in the condition in which this traveller found it. In the latest Chinese source, the T’ang-shu, Akhsikath (Chin. Si-Kiin) appears as the capital of Farghāna as in Baladur (ed. de Goeje, p. 420); on the other hand the majority of the accounts of the Arab campaigns of siege against Kāsān as the capital (Ya’qūbī, Geogr., p. 294; do., Hist., ii. 478; Ṭabarī, ii. 1257, 11). At the present day the name Kāsān is borne by two towns adjacent to one another, Yukari-Kāsān (Upper Kāsān) with about 4700 inhabitants and Karasu-Kāsān with about 8000; somewhat to the north of Yukari-Kāsān lie the ruins of an old fortress (only about 6’/acres in area) which are called Mugh-Kūrghan (“the fortress of the fire-worshippers”) by the natives (on these ruins cf. A. Briano in the Protes- ti Turk,布鲁河, пход. археологи, iv. 142 et seq.).

The Arabs found practically the same conditions existing in Farghāna as in the other parts of Mā warā ‘al-Nahr. The landowners or knights (dikhān, Arab. plur. dakhā’in) formed the ruling class; the king was no more than the first knight in his country and was called like them dikhān (Ḥudād al-Allām, Cod. Tumanskij, f. 23b); he also bore the Iranian regal title Ḳahkḥid (cf. particularly Ṭabarī, ii. 2142, N. d.).
The rulers of Farghana offered a stubborn resistance to the Arab conquerors; more than a century was to pass between the first campaign under Kutaibah b. Muslim (94 = 712-713) and the final subjugation of the country. In the year 96 = 715 Kutaibah rebelled in Farghana against the Caliph Sulaiman and was slain by his own soldiers; according to Nar-bakhi (ed. Schefer, p. 57) his tomb was in the village of Kakh, according to Djamal al-Kurashi (in Barthold, Turkest an etc., i. 148) in the village of Kultagh (the two names seem to be identical and the difference to be due to corruption in the manuscripts). At the present day the tomb of the "Imam Shaikh Kutaibah" is pointed out in "Shah-Kuduk" (now in the community (violet)) now belonging to the circle of Andijan, and formerly to that of Osh (Protokoli Turk. Kurd. etc., iii, 4); but as far as is known it has never been described or reproduced. According to the opinion of the Arabs this district was "in China" (cf. the verses by the poet Ibn Djumana al-Bahili in Baladachri, p. 204).

Kutaibah had (probably in 94 A.H.) left Islam b. 'Abd Allah al-Balili behind in Farghana (Tabari, ii. 1440, 17): a ravine was called after this "Isam" it lay on the road from Farghana to Khash (Tabari, ii. 1276, 9) or in the modern road (redil) of Isfa (Tabari, ii. 1440, 15). After Kutaibah's death the Arabs seem to have been driven out of Farghana, for the ruler of Farghana was able in 103 = 722 to offer the "ravine of Islam" to immigrants from Sogd (Tabari, ii. 1440); but no mention is made in the historians of the defeat and expulsion of the Arabs. According to a later story (first given by al-Kurashi, in Barthold, Turk estan etc., i. 148) Muhammad b. Djair fell in the head of 2700 "companions and their followers" (yastaba va iiftabin) in battle against the unbelievers at Safid-Bulun or Isfa-Bulun in Farghana (in the neighbourhood of Kasak) under the Caliph Othman; the same story is told with some alterations in a work popular throughout Central Asia, presumably translated from the Arabic into Persian and thence into Turkish (Protokoli Turk. etc., iv. 149 et seq.).

Naas b. Saiyir was the first to be able to send a governor to Farghana again (121 = 739, cf. Tabari, ii. 1694, 9); but on this occasion again Arab rule did not last long. From Yaqubii (ii. 465) it may be assumed that the ruler of Farghana had retired to Khash; but even there he was defeated in the reign of Mansur (136 = 754—775), had to sue for peace and pay a large sum. His envoy was thrown into prison for his firm refusal to adopt Islam and only released in the reign of al-Mahdi (158—169 = 775—785). An army was sent by al-Mahdi against Farghana under Ahmad b. Asad; Kasan is again mentioned in connection with this expedition as the residence of the king, who apparently had won back his country in the interval (Yaquobi, ii. 478). In the time of Harun al-Rashid, during the partitioning of Ghur, b. Asf (175—176 = 792—793), 'Amr b. Djair was ordered to destroy the Djabghu (probably the king of the Turkish Karluk) out of Farghana (Gardaz in Barthold, Turk estan etc., ii. 207). Under al-Ma'mun (198—218 = 813—833) an army had once more to be sent against the rebellious inhabitants of Farghana; at the command of this Caliph the administration of certain parts of Mawar-i-Nahr, including Far- 

ghana, was entrusted by the governor Ghassan b. 'Abbad (203—205 = 819—821) to the Samanid family. The Samanid Nish b. Asad (died 227 = 842) was the last Muslim governor of Farghana (Kasun and Erast) had to be reconquered on account of the apostasy of their inhabitants from Islam (Baladachri, p. 420). When the native dynasty was finally overthrown it is not related. In the reign of Mu'tasim (218—227 = 833—842) there were men from Farghana (Faraghina) in the Caliph's bodyguard (Baladachri, p. 431). In 224 = 838—839 Farghana was visited by a severe earthquake (Gardaz in Barthold, Turk estan etc., i, 3).

The Farghana of the Samanid period is described in great detail by the Arab geographers. The focus of the industrial and commercial life of the country seems at this time to have been transferred to the lands south of the Sir-Darya. The oldest Arab geographers, like Ibn Khurdadbeh (ed. de Goeje, p. 30), make the road from Western Asia to the eastern boundaries of the Caliph's dominions cross the Sir-Darya at khodjan, thence follow the right bank as far as Akhsikath, thence on across the river to Kubah, Osh and Uzgand. On the other hand 'Isbakhi regards the road through the lands lying south of the Sir-Darya as the main road; this led the Kudah (in Bubur, ed. Beveridge, f. 42, Kand-Bada, the modern Kain-i Badaim), Sogh (the modern Sari-Kurgan; Sogh is now the name of a mountain village on the same river but considerably farther south); Rightan (still bears the same name), Zandaramish and Kubah (the modern Kuvaj). There was only a bye-road from Sogh via Khokand (the later capital) to Akhsikath. Akhsikath was still considered the capital (qasaba), Kubah only the second town ('Isbakhi, p. 333); but Muqaddasi (p. 278), says that Kubah is larger and more beautiful than Akhsikath and ought really to be considered the capital. The third town in importance was Osh on the frontier; there was a large ribat (fortified military station) there, into which warriors of the faith poured from all sides (Muqaddasi, loc. cit.); the movements of the Turks were watched from the hill near Osh. Uzgand was about 1/3 smaller than Osh; it is called the "town of the Dihkan Djur-Tegin" (this is the proper reading) by Ibn Khurdadbeh (p. 30) and Kudama (p. 208), so that it was probably the residence of a Turkish prince; Cuir-Tegin is the modern name of a district east of the Yazi pass (Petrovski in Zapiski vost. etd. Arakh. Oghii., vol. 357). The towns of Biskand and Salat were also regarded as "gateways to the Turks" by which one came through the district of Miyân-Rdbah (between the Narin and the Kaha-Darya; the modern Iskak-arasa); the district was called Haft-Dih "seven villages") and had, as Ibn Hawkal (p. 396) says, been taken from the Turks only a short time before; it is apparently the same district as was later called Yitikand (or Litikand) (Tarikh-i Rashidi, transl. E. D. Ross, p. 180).

The land was divided into several districts (kira, pl. kwarar); generally Biskand, Biskand and Salat, Ibn Hawkal (p. 395 et seq.) mentions the following districts, Upper Nasya with Sogh, Khokand and Rightan, Lower Nasya (to the east) with Marghian, Zandaramish and Andukhan (the modern Andijan), Asbara (Isfara) in the plain and in the mountains, Na§kh in the mountains, with the town of Miskan (7 farsakh from Kuba,).
Djiddih (in the valley of Çotçal, with the town of Ardülünkâth and Ürast (near Ösh); several smaller districts are also mentioned. Muqaddasî, who uses the word kūra in another sense and makes the whole of Farghāna one kūra, divides the country into three parts, viz., the land between the Narin and the Kara-Daryâ, the land south of the Sir-Daryâ and the land to the north of the latter river; it is apparent on this that the division of all the towns of Farghāna into Miyânârâdîya, Nasûây (from Nasûy) and Wâghîzya is based, although some towns south of the Sir-Daryâ are erroneously reckoned by Muqaddasî among the Miyânârâdîya (e.g. Zandarûmish) or among the Wâghîzya (e.g. Aşwell and Miskân). Khālitâm (in the Hûdūł al-ʿĀlam, f. 26, Khatlâm, in Muqaddasî, Khâriqlâm) was the chief town in Miyân Rûdīnā, it lay on the Narin (the river itself is called Rûdī Khatlâm in the Hûdūł al-ʿĀlam), and was the birthplace of the Sâmânî Abu l-Ḥasan Naṣr, the eldest son of Aḥmad b. Asad (Iṣṭâkhîrî, p. 334); according to Muqaddasî (p. 272) perhaps the same Aḥmad b. Asad built the town of Naṣr in this district for his son Naṣr. Of the larger towns of the present day only Marghânâ (in Muqaddasî, p. 272) is mentioned as a small town; nothing more than the names of Khâkand and Andukân are given. According to Muqaddasî there were in all 40 places in Farghāna with Friday mosques. As Iṣṭâkhîrî (p. 333) notes the villages in Mâ warâ al-Nahr were nowhere so large as in Farghāna; it sometimes happened that a village stretched for a whole day's journey on account of the number of its inhabitants and the extent of their fields and pastures.

The mountains of Farghāna yielded gold, silver, mercury (according to Muqaddasî, p. 326, no. at Kubâ), petroleum, turquoises (at Khojand, cf. Muhammad Bakrânî in Barthold, Turkestan, i. 81), iron, copper, lead and sal-ammoniac (at Uzgând, cf. iūdâ). Ibn Ḫawkâl (p. 398, 1) mentions tarragon as a special feature of Farghāna, the seed of which was exported to all countries and an article called kîlân or kîlân (cf. Ribl. Geogr. Arâbâ, iv. 344; according to the passage there quoted from Vullers' Lexicon it was a black wood, which was used as a remedy for certain diseases, notably wounds in the intestines). There were deposits of coal at Isfârâ; the price of coal which even in those days was used as fuel, was (Iṣṭâkhîrî, p. 334) 1 dirhem for three assloads (aksi, plus avkâr); as an assload contained at least 60 kg., this was very cheap; at the time of the Russian conquest one pud (16.35 kg.) was being sold at 32 kopecks (about 1½ dirhems) and even today the price of coal is immeasurably higher than in the Sâmânî period. The manufacture of iron, which had been introduced by the Chinese, no longer existed; according to Muqaddasî (p. 325, 12) Turkish slaves, white clothstuffs, curasses and swords, copper and iron were exported from Farghāna and Isfîdîgâb; the last four articles must refer not to Isfîdîgâb but to Farghāna only. Under Sâmânî rule the land developed considerably; according to Ibn Khâriqlâmî (p. 38, 12) the revenue from taxes in Farghāna was only 280,000 dirhems, in Ibn Ḫawkâl's (p. 343, 5) time it had risen to a million. Islam seems by this time to have held undisputed sway; whether there were Christians, Manicheans and fire-worshippers here, as in Sâmânî, at this time is not related. As everywhere in Mâ warâ al-Nahr Ḥanafîs predominated; there were also monasteries (khwârînî) of the Karâmîya (Muqaddasî, p. 313, 12). A few Biblical legends had been located as early as this time in Farghāna; the "tomb of Job" was shown (Muqaddasî, p. 46, 14); this apparently refers to the medicinal spring (about 55 miles east of An-dûjân) still known by the name Ḥâṣrât-Ayîyûb.

No buildings of the Sâmânî period seem to have survived. Nevertheless, Čevelovski however discovered an Arabic inscription of the year 329 = 940-941 at Ösh in 1885 (Ocet Imperatorskoi Arheologicheskoj Kommissii za 1882-1888 god. p. lxiii.).

Like all other parts of Mâ warâ al-Nahr, Farghāna was conquered towards the end of the ivth = xth century by the Turkish Hâk-Khâns or Karâkhanîds. Rulers of this dynasty struck coins in Uzgând (particularly common), Aḥskisâh, Hafîtâdî, Kâsân and Marghânân; the land (Farghāna) is frequently mentioned on the coins in place of the mint-town, as was also the case with the Sâmânî coins. In the historical sources of this period Uzgând is mentioned with particular frequency as the residence of the king of all Mâ warâ al-Nahr (cf. Barthold, Turkistan, ii. 282 et seq.) and later as the residence of a local chief. As the coins show, Farghāna during this period, when it had no king of its own, belonged sometimes to Mâ warâ al-Nahr and sometimes to Kâshghar. In the years 482 = 1089 and 483 = 1090 Sultan Malik-Şâh penetrated to Uzgând. After the battle of 536 = 1141 Farghāna, like the other lands of Mâ warâ al-Nahr, had to submit to the Gûrkhân of the Kara-Khâlitâ; but following their usual custom these conquerors left the earlier dynasty and institutions unchanged. In the second half of the xth = xiiith century Sâmânî seems to have been conquered by a king of Uzgând; coins of Ibrâhîm b. Ḥusain were struck in Uzgând from 560 = 1165 but in Sâmânî only after 574 = 1178-1179. After the death of this ruler his son ʿOthâm ruled in Sâmânî only; Uzgând belonged to another ruler Djalâl al-Dîn Kâdăr-Khân. Soon after 609 = 1212 the southern part of Farghāna was conquered by Muhammad Khaṭîrîmshâh with the other parts of Mâ warâ al-Nahr; the northern part with Kâsân and Aḥskisâh had to be left by the Khaṭîrîmshâh for his rival Kûlîk, king of the Kânîmân. In the Chinese annals Ho-sî-mi-li (probably = İsmâʿîl) is mentioned as the king of Aḥskisâh and Kâsân, who submitted to the Mongols in 1218. During Mongol supremacy Farghāna was one of the possessions of the house of Câghatâtî [p. 1 i. 1 i. 2 t. seq.], but, like many other districts in Mâ warâ al-Nahr, had also a local dynasty which, like its predecessors, had its capital in Uzgând; this town had been granted by the Great Khan Mongke to Arslân-Khân, king of the Kûrâk (Djuwâwînî in Barthold, Turkistan, i. 108). Djalâm al-Kûrašît (ibid., p. 149) mentions İllî-Malik as Wâlî of Farghāna; the tomb of his son Kuṭb al-Dîn Satîmîsh Malik Şâh, who died in 665 = 1266, still stands in Uzgând. In spite of its local dynasty Uzgând was of some importance to the central government under the Kara-Khâlitâ and Mongols; Djuwâwînî says that the treasures (ẓâbânâkâh) of the Gûrkhân were there; according to Wâṣîf (Indian edition, p. 67 at the foot) it was there also that Burâk-Khân [q. v., i. 794 et seq.] ascended the throne and
appropriated the treasures (khasiyān) of Algha and Urgūnā (cf. Caghātāz, i. 812 et seq.).

Several buildings, in addition to a considerable number of tombstones have survived in Uzung from the period viih—viiith = xiiih—xivh centuries; among them is the gateway of a beautiful sepulchral mosque with an inscription where the date of the death of the individual buried there is given as 585 = 1192; beside it there is a second mausoleum and a minaret about 60 feet high; legends only have survived among the present day inhabitants regarding the origin of these tombs; according to some the saint Burāhān al-Dīn Kūlīji was buried here with his steed which is also mentioned by Djamāl al-Kurashī in Barthold, Turkestan, i. 149 others say these are the tombs of "two brothers", the kings Ilīk-i Māḏi and Sāndjār-i Māḏi; in reality the latter’s (died 552 = 1157) tomb is in Merw; "Ilīk-i Māḏi" was Nasr b. ‘Ali (died 403 = 1012-1013) the conqueror of Mā warā al-Nahr who according to the historians was actually buried in Uzung, although his tomb has not survived.

Kūba is not mentioned after the 1vth = xih century; why the prosperity of the town was of such short duration is not known; the story of the “five brothers of Kūba” and their fight with Mūbasīrīn (2v, 193) with which this story is also mentioned by Djamāl al-Kurashī in Barthold, Turkestan, i. 149 et seq.) is legendary. Besides Uzung, Marghānān had attained considerable importance by this time; to Yākūt (iv. 500, from Sam‘ānī) Marghānān is “one of the most famous of cities”; Rīshān, which was of incomparably greater importance in the ivth = xih century, now appears as a mere village in the district of Marghānān (Yākūt, i. 781); the author of the Hidayā, for example, (died 593 = 1197) called himself Margūnimt although he really was born in Rīshān. Towards the end of the viih = xiiih century Farghānā was given a new capital, Andākān founded by Kādżī (7th century), which corresponds to the Andakān of the Arab geographers; the new form appears first in Djamāl al-Kurashī (in Barthold, Turkestan, i. 149 et seq.), although the old is still found in the Zafar-Nāma, (Ind. ed., i. 263 et seq.); in Sultān ‘Omar Shaikh’s Ughur document of the year 873 = 1469 (published by Melloranski in the Zapiski Vost. Otd. Arkh. Ohb., xvi. 101 et seq.) the town is called Andākān.

An Arabic Inscription of the Karakhanid period dated 29th December 1041 in three eras, the Muḥarram, Ṣaḥānīn of Persia and the Greek (Rūm), etc., Syriac-Christian, still exists in the southern part of Farghānā in the ravine of Warak, (south of Isfara) (Protokoli Turk. Kručko Ljub. Arkh., viii. 46 et seq.).

Timūr and the Timūrids had often to fight for the possession of Farghānā with the rulers of the modern Chinese Turkestan; it is evidence of the close connection between Farghānā and Chinese Turkestan that amongst other things in both countries the smallest division for purposes of taxation (which as communities corresponded roughly to the rūṣūk of the older period) was called Armenia (Bakur-Nāma, ed. Beveridge, f. 313), while in the other parts of Mā warā al-Nahr the word Armenia was used in Persia. ‘Omar Shaikh, a descendant of Timūr, ruled Farghānā as an independent kingdom from 873—899 = 1469—1494.

On his successor and the conquest of Farghānā by the Uzbekcs cf. Barber (i. 547 et seq.).

In Bābur’s time there were eight cities in Farghānā (exclusive of Khūdānjān, which Bābur also includes in Farghānā); of these two (Akhsī — the form Akhsī-khāth was only known to Bābur from books — and Khādān) north of the Sir-Daryā and six to the south of it; of the latter he describes Andidjān, Ösh, Marghānān and Isfara; Khōkand is nowhere mentioned by Bābur as a town although Djamāl al-Kurashī (in Barthold, Turkestan, i. 148 et seq.) says that the tomb of a Muslim saint, the Imam ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ali, a brother of the Imam Muhammad Khādār, was there. The name itself is written Khūkand by Bābur (f. 105 and 103v) as the name of a district (qūnān); in the xvih century (e.g. in the Tuhfet al-Khānī of Muhammad Wafā’ī Kāmīnegī, Ms. of the Asiatic Museum c 581, f. 500) the form Khūkan appears and in the older Russian notices Kukan; the form Khōkand, Russian Kokand was only restored in the xixh century through literary tradition. In the capital Andijān the Turki language was already predominant in Bābur’s time; there was no one in the city or in the marketplace who did not understand it; Bābur even says that the dialect of Andijān is identical with the Eastern Turkish spoken by the Bāburīs (f. 105r) and by Mīr ‘Alī Shīr Nawātī. On the other hand “Sartish” was still spoken in Marghānān, i.e., according to the idiom of the time, Persian. Of the products of Farghānā Bābur particularly esteems various kinds of fruits; besides orchards there were flower gardens, which stretched along both sides of the river from Andijān up to Ösh. The Takhir-Sulaimān mountain at Ösh is mentioned by Djamāl al-Kurashī under the name Barakā, by Bābur (f. 26b) as Barakūh; Bābur makes no mention of the localisation here of Solomon’s legends (he only mentions that there were many hidūsh on the advantages of Ösh), but this localisation must have taken place by his time, for Djamāl al-Kurashī says that the tomb of the vizier ‘Asfāh b. Barakhyā (q.v., i. 476v) was not far from the mountain. During the last years of the reign of ‘Omar Shaikh a rock of a red and white colour was discovered on this mountain, from which knife-handles and other articles were made; a tree called Ṛbūlghān (Spirola Cretacea) also grew in the mountains which Bābur (f. 55) thought was found nowhere else (in reality it also grows in South Russia), the wood of which was used for making bird-cages, quivers etc. As to the mines and mining we are only told that turquoise and iron are found in the mountains; no mention is now made of the manufacture of arms in the mines. As a result of the trade-venue of the country “with good government” was sufficient to maintain an army of 3000—4000 men.

Farghānā from the xih = xvih century belonged to the Uzbek kingdom. Andijān is sometimes mentioned as the residence of one of the many minor rulers of the Shaibanid dynasty; in the xvih = xviiih century the land was for the most part in the possession of Khīghiz Sultān. Farghānā “had even been replaced by Andijān” as the name of the country in the Bahr al-Iṣār of Mahmūd b. Wali (Cod. India Office, 575, f. 102v) the following note is made regarding Farghānā, ki aytam bā Andijān mashhūr ast. Towards the end of this century, after the collapse
of the Uzbek kingdom, authority in Farghāna, as in Chinese Turkestan and at a later period in Tashkent, passed to a number of Khojās who lived in Ĉadāk north of the Sir-Dāryā: this place is mentioned as early as the 19th century (Muṣaffādāt, p. 262, where Ĉarāk must be a mistake for Ĉadāk). The power of these Khojās was destroyed by Shāhriyār Bī who succeeded in founding an independent Uzbek kingdom in Farghāna, with Khōjānd as capital: according to Mulla 'Abd al-Muẓaffar Muḥammad (Tārīḵ-i Shāhriyār, ed. Pantusow, p. 21) this took place in 1121 = 1700-710. On this kingdom, which lasted till its overthrow by the Russians in 1876, cf. the article Khojānd. During this period also the name Farghāna seems only to have been known to people with a literary education; ʻAbd al-Karim Būhārī (ed. Scheher, p. 43 et seq.) for example says that the kingdom of Khōjānd in earlier times (dar awāzū) was called "Farghāna". The same historian mentions "Farghāna and Taḵt-i Sulaimān" as the seventh town in the kingdom (after Khōjānd, Tashkent, Khiva, Anārkī, Marghīlan, and Merv) which shows that the name Farghāna was chiefly applied to the town of Osh. Since the establishment of Russian rule a complete transformation in the economic conditions has been effected in Farghāna, particularly through the rapid development of the cultivation of cotton. Previously the land was only exported a very small quantity of raw material after supplying its own wares; since the introduction of American varieties this article has become of importance for the Russian market; about 115 million kg. are annually exported, which supply one third of the amount required by the Russian cotton industry. The cultivation of cotton now brings the country an income of about 40 million roubles; this influx of money was naturally followed by a rise in all prices and a severe economic crisis, which has not been without evil results to the morale of the people; the rising in 1898 was unmistakably influenced by this crisis. The silk-trade is next in importance; it is not mentioned by the geographers of the middle ages and seems only to have developed in Farghāna in the 18th century under the influence of China, as in Samarqand under the influence of Persia. In 1889 about 245,000 kg. of raw silk were exported, valued at 3 million roubles; the amount produced is now about 225,400 kg., but prices have sunk so that this industry now yields only about 2 million roubles. The growth of cereals has declined with the development of cotton so that the country can now only meet its requirements by imports from the district of Samarqand. Little has yet been done to develop other branches of industry or the mines and the deposits of coal. Means of communication are still very unsatisfactory, although since 1899 the country has been traversed by a railway as far as Andiţān; in 1912 a branch line from Khōjānd to Namangān was also opened; there is an almost entire lack of good roads and strong bridges are particularly wanted. The former capital Khōjānd still forms the focus of the industrial and commercial life of the country; it is now a city with about 115,000 inhabitants; Namangān, first mentioned as a village in the 18th century, is now the second town in the country with over 70,000 inhabitants. The town of "New Margelān" now called Skobelew, founded by the Russians, the residence of the military governor, has a population of only 12,000. This relatively thickly populated territory is of less consideration for purposes of colonisation than the other parts of Russian Turkestan; 17 Russian villages of which six are in the Farghāna valley proper, have been founded in Farghāna. Bibliography: Chinese accounts: Jakinf, Sūnán wénzhù yù náoyóu shí tōu wǒu yì fēng pèi zhuì wéi Shǒu fāng jīng (St. Petersburg 1852); Fr. Birth, Zur Kulturgeschichte der Chinesen (Munich 1898); reprint from the Reij enjsche Archief fur de Geschied van de Kriegjaren der Chinese (6th ed. Superiority, 1909); F. Chavannes. Documents sur les Türkmen (Turco-Oriental) Occidens (St. Petersburg 1903), p. 18 et seq.; Houten-Thsang, Mémôres sur les centrales occidentales, traduits par Stan. Julien, 16 et seq.; Arabic accounts: W. Barthold, Turkestan w epockhu mongolsskogo nachala (St. Petersburg 1864), p. 198 et seq.; On the coins of the Karakhanids: A. Markow, Inventarizatsiya i Namangan i nominat Velikogo Imperatorskoj Eritmata (St. Petersburg 1866), p. 198 et seq.; On the ruins of buildings in Uzgend (with illustration) and epitaphs there: Protokol Zaveshanij Turkestanskogo Krucika Ljubitelej arkeologii 16 oktobar 1897 goda. On modern conditions, the publications of the statistical committee of the Farghāna territory, including three volumes of an annual (Pogodnik Ferganskoj oblasti, 1902-1904; in the first volume a very full anonymous article on the silk trade; on the same subject cf. also N. F. Petrovskij, Ocherki drevnosti i dejatelnosti v Sred. V. Evropy (St. Petersburg 1874); Materiali dlia statisticheskogo opisanija Ferganskoi oblasti (5 parts, 1897-1910); Sbornik narodenikh mest Ferganskoi oblasti (Skobelew 1909). A lecture by Prof. A. Wojtkow to the Imperial Russian Geographical Society on the 15th = 28th November and 27th November = 10th December 1912. (W. Barthold.)

Al-FARGHĀNĪ is the astronomer Alfraganus of the middle ages. His full name was Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Kaṭīr al-Farghānī, i.e. born in Farghāna in Tiansooxan but there is no general agreement as to his name. The Phāhrīs has only Muḥammad b. Kaṭīr, Abu ʿl-Faradj only Ahmad b. Kaṭīr, Ibn al-Khīṭī distinguishes two persons, Muḥammad and Ahmad b. Muḥammad, father and son, but it is very probable that all refer to one and the same individual, an astronomer who lived in the reign of the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was said to have been sent to Fāsurāt by the Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭāl
FARIDPURA district of India in eastern Bengal, lying in the delta of the Ganges. Pop. (1911), 2,121,914, of whom 62.9% are Mohammedans. Here was the birthplace of Haji Sha‘ri Atallah, the founder of the reformating sect of Farabiyya [q.v.] or Faraizi and of his son Duda Miya, who caused some trouble to the British Government in the middle of the 19th century. The sect is still numerous in Faridpur. The town (pop. 11,649) takes its name from a saint, Farid Shah, who is buried there.


FARIS, in Arabic, a "large body of men" also a "section of a caravan"; whence in Turkish, since the reforms (Tanzimat), the general of a division in the army and vice-admiral in the fleet. This rank corresponds to that of Istanbullis in the hierarchy of the 'Ulema', Ruth-i ilah (Sinfra evvel) in the civil service and beylerbey or Kamil in the ancient administrative organization; there are also Birindji Farkh (of the first class), whose rank is equal to that of the Bâta (civil). The latter have the right to be called 'Opfet-i (gracious) while the former have to be content with the title 'Se'det-i (fortunate); both titles are followed by the expression 'Hagretleri' which is translated "His Excellency" in the Turkish diplomatic service. (Cl. Huart.)

FARIS AL-SHIDYAK AHMAD B. YUSUF, an Arabic journalist and author, born in Bairut of Maronite parents, was educated at a Maronite school in Cairo and then for some time collaborated with Shihat al-Din on the Egyptian official gazette al-‘Azhari in 1288 = 1871. — Faris is also the name of a recent Persian poet, Mīrīzā Farhang (Abū ‘l-Kāsim) who lived at Shiraz and died about 1892; he was the fourth son of Wīsāl (Mīrāz Kākā) and was 31 years old in 1295 (1878). He was made poet-laureate to Mu‘ayyid al-Dawla ‘Ābānas Mirzâ, governor of Fars.

Bibliography: P. de Lagarde, Persische Studien, p. 37, 45; H. Blochmann, Contributions to Persian Lexicography, p. 65; E. G. Browne, A Year amongst the Persians, p. 119, 267; Kūf Kān, Magama al-Falqāfā, ii. 384. (Cl. Huart.)

FARID AL-DIN, an epithet of Ḍār al-Farid (q.v., i. 513 et seq.) and of Shahar Gandj (q.v.)
Paris where he composed his *Grammaire Française à l'Usage des Arabes de l'Afrique*, de l'Égypte et de la Syrie (Paris 1854) with G. Dugat, and to London. He gave an account of his journey, which suggested to him many critical observations on the Arabs and other peoples, in his Kitâb al-Sâq 'ala 'l-Sâq fîmâ hurâwah 'l-Fâryâq 'an Aqâyam wa Şâhirâh wa 'l-Awâm fî 'l-Čidm al-'lârb wa 'l-'Aqâyam, Paris 1855. His *Practical Arabic Grammar* (2nd ed. by H. G. Williams, London 1866) appeared at the same time. From London he went to Stamboul and there became a convert to Islam.

At the end of July 1860 he founded the Arabic weekly *al-Djâmâ'îb* there, which, subsidised by the Turkish government, took up the cause of Islam but also gave Muslims a knowledge of Europe. At the beginning of the eighties his paper enjoyed the greatest prestige throughout the whole Muslim world, but his son Salih, who undertook the editorship on the death of his father in 1305 = 1884, was unable to maintain the same level. He published selections from this newspaper in seven volumes (Stamboul 1288—1298) entitled *Kanz al-Čiğâb bi Minâshkhat al-Djâmâ'îb*, containing essays on literary subjects, a history of the Franco-Iranian war, poems by and panegyrics on himself and in the last three volumes a history of the Ottoman Empire to 1298. He also found time for serious philological studies. Besides an Arabic primer he published studies in Arabic etymology entitled *Sirr al-Layâil 'ala 'l-Kâbah wa 'l-Abâdîb*, Stamboul 1284; a grammar, *Ghyarat al-Činâb wa Minyât al-Čiğâb n-l-Nâzâwâw wa 'l-Sârîf wa Huûf al-Mâsîn*, Stamboul 1288, 1306; a Pers.-Turk.-Arab. Dictionary, *Kanz al-Lughât*, Bairût 1876 and critical contributions to Arabic lexicography *al-Djâmî* 'ala 'l-Kâmîs, Stamboul 1399.

**Bibliography:** Zieitser, d. Deutsch. Morg., Gen., v. 249 et seq.; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. Arab. Lit., ii. 505; see also l. p. 1063.

(C. Brockelmann.)

**Fâris b. Muḥammad Ḥusam al-Dawla, Abū 'l-Shawk,** as he is usually called, lord of Holwân and other places in the neighbourhood 401—437 (1010—1046). He inherited his power from his father, Abū 'l-Fath Muḥammad b. Ḥanîzâ, who had held sway for about twenty years in Dâşıkâ, Holwân, etc. Abū 'l-Shawk was at war during almost the whole period of his rule with neighbouring rulers and with his own family. His first fight was with al-Maṣāfi al-Hilla, but it ended in peace by a marriage between Dubais son of al-Maṣāfi and a sister (or daughter) of Abū 'l-Shawk. His next quarrel, with Ṭâhir b. Ḥilāl, a descendant of Bâdri b. Ḥasan waḥīd [q.v.] was at first less auspicious, as his brother Su'dî was slain by Ṭâhir and he himself had to take to flight in spite of the help given him by al-Maṣâfi, who was now his ally, but it also ended with a marriage. When peace had actually been concluded, Abū 'l-Shawk killed Ṭâhir to revenge his brother (406 = 1015-1016). In 421 (1030) he regained possession of Dâşıkâ which had been held in the interval by the Ūkâlid Mâlik b. Bâdîn; he won Kamîsîn and Khulandîn in 430 = 1039. In the following year, however, a war broke out between his son Abū 'l-Fath, who governed Dinawar for him, and his brother Muḥalîl, to whom he had ceded Shahzûr. The uncle was victorious and took his nephew prisoner and gave him a sound thrashing. Abū 'l-Shawk felt himself thereby forced to besiege his brother in Shahzûr but did not attain his object because Muḥalîl intited 'Allâ al-Dawla b. Ḥâkîmû (see the article Muḥammad b. Ḥâkîmû; another brother called Sûhûb also seized the opportunity to take the field against Abu 'l-Shawk. Although he succeeded in forcing 'Allâ al-Dawla to retreat, he had to cede Dinawar to him. He did not dispose of his brother so readily; it was only when a much more dangerous enemy, the Sâldjûk İbrâhim Inâl, appeared against him, soon deprived him of a considerable portion of his territory and even plundered and burned the capital Holwân in 437 (1046), that he made peace with his brother, the more readily as his son had in the meanwhile died in prison. But his day was done, for he died a few weeks later. His brother Muḥalîl took possession of Kamîsîn and Dinawar and his son Su'dî, whom the Kurds treacherously left in the lurch, sought and found refuge with İbrâhim Inâl. The conflict with Muḥalîl thereupon broke out again but, although even the measures of the Sâldjûk Togrûlbeg (442 = 1050) brought no lasting peace, the further course of this family feud is not of sufficient historical interest to be detailed here.

**Bibliography:** al-Kázwînî, Kornographie (ed. Wustenfeld), i. 29; I. Ideler, Untersuchungen über die Ursprungs u. die Bedeutung der Sternnamen (Berlin 1809), p. 3 and 12.

(II. Süter.)

**Färkân.** [See Majâfarrân.]

**Fârân.** [See Fârân.]

**Fârmül** a mountainous district in Afghanistan lying to the west of Kâbul, inhabited by a race of Tadjik origin known as Fârmûl. [M. Longworth Dames.]**

**Farrukhābad.** The name of a district and town in the United Provinces of British India. It is one of the districts of the Allahâbâd division and is situated in the Eastern part of the Dôâb between the Ganges and Djamâa between 26° 46' and 27° 43' N. and 78° 8' and 80° 1' E. The area is 1685 sq. m., and the population (in 1901) 925,812. The proportion of Muḥammadans is larger than in most of the neighbouring districts, chiefly owing to the extensive Afghan immigration in the xixth and xvith cent. The principal town is Farrukhâbad which is joined as a municipality with the civil and military station at Fathgâh close by. Pop. 67,338. Another important town is Kanaundj. Pop. 18,552.

There are several ancient sites of importance in the district, the principal of which are Sannika, which is mentioned by the Chinese pilgrim Hiouen Thsang, Cannipla the capital of the kingdom of Panâla, and Kanaundj which plays a great part in early Indian history. It was Harâha Vardhana's capital in the viii cent. A.D., and afterwards the centre of the powerful empire of the Prathirâha Râjdîpûs. It was plundered by Mahâmûd Ghaznâvi, but endured till Muhammad b. Sâm's invasion
in 589 (1193). The conqueror himself struck coins there in the Indian style, and it was afterwards a temporary capital of Muhammad III b. Tughlaq. In the xviii th century a semi-independent state was founded by Muhammad Khan Bangash, a member of the Afghan colony which had settled in the neighbourhood during the reign of Avrangzeb. He founded a new town on the banks of the Ganges which he named Farrukhabad after the Emperor Farrukh-Siyar after the Emperor Farrukh-Siyar in 1126 (1714), and it soon attained great prosperity, and became an Imperial mint. Muhammad Khan died in 1156 (1743) and was succeeded by his son Kaim Khan who was killed in 1161 (1748) in a battle against the Rohillas. A large part of the territories of the Nawabs of Farrukhabad was lost, and the state seemed to have come to an end, the Emperor (Almud Shah) being hostile to the Bangash family. But its fortunes were revived by Almud Khan, a younger brother of Kaim Khan, who defeated the Wazir Safdar Djang and recovered Farrukhabad 1163 (1750). From him the town derived its second name of Almudnagar Farrukhabad, which appears on the coins of 'Alamgir II, Shaik Djabhan III. and Shaik Alim II. the earliest being dated 1170. After many vicissitudes and the temporary loss of his dominions Almud Khan finally succeeded in recovering a great part of them and lived till 1185 (1771); the state however remained subordinate to Oudh. The first British occupation of Farrukhabad took place in 1777 when a body of troops and a Resident were posted there by Warren Hastings, but the Nawabs continued to hold it till 1802 when it was incorporated in the British Dominions, Nusr Djang being then Nawab. In 1804 the Maharattas were defeated close to Farrukhabad in 1804 by Lord Lake. The Nawabs retained their private estates, but the last of them, Tahsul Husain, joined the mutinous Bengal army in 1857 and obtained possession of Farrukhabad which he held till Jan. 1858. He was exiled and went to Mecca in 1859. After the British occupation Farrukhabad, which had been one of the Alm's principal mints, became a mint of the East India Company who continued to issue coins bearing the name of Shaik Alim and the regnal year 45 up to 1835, although Shaik Alim had died in 1221 (1806). These rupees were in Persian and followed Shaik Alim's inscriptions. They were known as the Farrukhabadi Sicca rupee, from the word 'sikka' with which the Persian legend commences.


(M. Longworth Dames.)

FARRUKHÁN Gilân-Shaîb, an Isb pâbeh of Tabristân (709-722) called the Great (huqûq) and the Virtuous (âhu 'l-manâhîb), son of Dâhu, conquered Mazandaran and restored himself to the frontiers of his kingdom. Defeated by a rebel Dailamites he fled to Amul, entrenched himself in Firdâbâd and finally rid himself of the besiegers by causing them to believe that he had enormous supplies of bread. He gave asylum to the Khârijis persecuted by al-Hâjîâb, but afterwards made war on them and executed their chiefs, when 'Usâyâ b. Âli al-Bakrî advanced against him with an army. Yâzîd b. al-Mu'âlib, governor of Khorasan under Sulaymân b. 'Abî al-Malkî (96-99 = 715-717), unsuccessfully attempted to conquer Firdâbâd, found himself lucky to be able to get out of the country on payment of compensation for the devastation he had wrought. Farrukhán died in 722; he was the maternal grandfather of al-Mansûr, son of the Caliph al-Mahdi. His capital was Sîrî, which he had rebuilt and improved; he was succeeded by his son Dâd-hurz-mîr.


(F. Huart.)

FARRUKHÎ, Âbu 'l-İsâ'ân Âli b. Dâhîî, a Pârsiân poet born in Sîstan, a pupil of 'Unûrî. Rashid Wolîî has compared him with the Arabic poet Mutahhâb, on account of the simplicity of his style combined with the originality of his genius. He was the panegyrist of Sulţân Mahâm of Ghazna and of the Emir Âbu'l-Mugâflar Tâhir b. Na'cî Câhînî, governor of Balkh. He wrote a treatise on the art of poetry entitled Târîfân al-Âlîâh. The Divân of his poems enjoyed a certain fame in Transoxiana but he was forgotten in Khorasan. He died in 429 (1038). His Divân was lithographed in Tehran in 1301-1302.

Bibliography: Nîgâni 'Arûstî Samûkandî, Câhîr Meşâla (Gibb Memorial Series, xi.), p. 36 (transl. by Browne, p. 58); Dâwlat-Shaîb, Tâdâkîyat al-Shârârî (ed. Browne), p. 55; Muhammâm 'Awwî, Lâbûb al-Bâhî (ed. Browne), ii. p. 47; Râza-Kullî-Khan, Madjma' al-Fâlîma, i. 439 (with many extracts from the Divân); V. Hamner, Redecke Licht Perseus, p. 47; Schefer, Christomathie persane, ii. 242-252 (Pers. text: with notes); H. Ehl in the Grundr. der Iran. Philol., ii. 224 et seq.

(F. Huart.)

FARRUKHÎSIYÂR, Muhammâm, fourteenth emperor of Dîhil of the house of Timûr, was born in 1686-1687, and was the second son of Muhammad 'Azîm ('Azîm al-Shâ'n), third son of Shaîb Alâm Bahâdûr Shaîb. His early life was spent in Bengal, where his father was governor, but when Djâhândar ascended the throne he was summoned to Dîhil, doubtful in order that he might share the fate of his father and elder brother. He fled from Dhakâ and took refuge in Patna and owing to the general discontent怀被由的 by Djâhândar's misconduct, found little difficulty in persuading the two Saiyid brothers of Bhirha, Husain 'Ali Khan, governor of Bhirâ, and 'Abdallah Khan, governor of Isâbâbâd, to espouse his cause. Having proclaimed Farrukhîsiyâr emperor they marched with him towards Dîhil, defeating Djâhândar at Samûgâr, near Agra. Djâhândar was strangled and his son was blinded, and on Febr. 10, 1713, Farrukhîsiyâr ascended the throne in Dîhil. Quarrels broke out almost at once between the emperor and the two Saiyids. There were faults on both sides. The Saiyids were ambitious grasping, and overhearing, and Farrukhîsiyâr was weak, treacherous, and cowardly, and the history
of his reign is largely a record of his abortive plots against the brothers. In 1719 Hasain 'Ali Khan hastened from the Dakhan, his viceroyalty, to support his brother at court and on March 1 the emperor was dragged from the women's apartments of his palace, where he had taken refuge, and thrown into prison, the Saiyids raising to the throne, under the title of Rafi' al-Darajat, a puppet prince, cousin to Farrukhsiyar who was murdered or committed suicide in prison two months later. His reign is memorable in the annals of British India for the famous farānān, exempting the English Company, on payment of a fixed sum annually, from customs duties throughout the empire. This was obtained by the influence of a Scottish surgeon named Hamilton, who had accompanied a mission to Dilli and earned Farrukhsiyar's gratitude by curing him of an obstinate disease.

Bibliography: Siyar al-Muta'ākhkhūrin. (T. W. Harg.)

FāRUKH [arabicised from the Old Persian Pārshu [Achaemenid inscriptions]], the ancient Persis, the ancestral home of the Persians, a province of Persia in the S.E. of the modern Iran with its capital Shīrzād, bounded in the N. by 'Irāk 'A'djamī, in the S. by the Persian Gulf, in the E. by Kirmān, and in the W. by Khūzistān. It was divided into five districts in the middle ages: Istakh, Ardashir-Khurra, Daragjī, Sābūr, and Fīnm-Khursaw besides five ramān or camps of Kurds. — In the caliphate of 'Omar, al-Ála b. al-Ḥādrami, governor of Bahraīn, made an attempt to conquer the land by sending 'Asfandā b. Ḥarbāmān al-Darjikī thither by water; but the latter was recalled soon after his arrival. On the death of al-Ála his successor 'Oṯmān b. Abī l-ʻĀṣ renewed the attempt by sending to Fārs his brother al-Šakam, who seized two islands and the town of Tawwādī. It was only under 'Oṯmān that the complete subjection of the province was attained; the Marzbān Shahrakī conducted the defence against the Muslim invaders but was defeated and slain in the sanguinary conflict at Šahrābād near Tawwādī (664); Baladshīrī, p. 386). Abī Mūsā al-Šahrī, who had set out with an army from Bahriyā, invaded Fars from the west at the same time. After joining forces 'Oṯmān and Abī Mūsā captured Shīrzād and Sinīz; 'Oṯmān alone took Daragjī, Fasa and Sābūr. Soon afterwards 'Abd Allah b. 'Amir, who had been appointed commander-in-chief by the Caliph 'Oṯmān forced Ištakh, which was defended by Māhek to surrender (2 = 648) and in the following year he took Djūr (Fezāl-Abād). — The Ḵūz Ḵūz was fixed at 33 million dirhams and raised to 35 millions under Mutawakkil; the Dījīyā yielded 18 millions. The country was covered with fortresses; the best known are the three citadels, which were built on the three peaks above Ištakh and notably that of Uṣkuwān, the castle of al-Dījā, where a knowledge of Iranian tradition and its archives was preserved (Inostrancev, Etudes Sassanides, p. 8; Ištakhī, p. 118, 2—4).

Bibliography: Baladshīrī, p. 386 et seq.; Spiegel, Erinnische Alterthumskunde, i. 214; Ḥājjī Mirza Ḥasan Farsā, Fars-Name (lith. Teherān 1313); Barbier de Meynard, Diction. géog. de la Perse, p. 410—413; G. Le Strange, Études Caliphate, p. 248 et seq.; da, Description of the Province of Fars (xii. Jahrh.), from the MS. of Ibn al-Balkhi in the Journ. R. As. Soc., January 1912; F. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, i.—iii. (CL. HURST.)

FāRS解散, an Arabic loanword derived from a North Iranian form (proved by the Armen. ḵrānḵ and the Syr. ḥrānḵā, modern Persian ḥrānš, Old Persian in herodotos and Xenophon ḥarānky, a Persian measure of length, equivalent to the distance covered in an hour by a horse walking. This farānān contains 6000 trade-ells (ḏirānt or dīrāz-ramān) of 1.0357 metres each = 6232.2 metres. The Arab farānak was three Arab miles or 12000 ells = 5762.8 metres. Bibliography: P. Horn in the Grundr. der islam. Philol., i. 2, p. 127; J. A. Decourcmanche, Traité prat. des poètes et musiciens, p. 89; A. Querry, Droit musulman, i. 88 and 126; Note; Keyser, Précis de jurisprudence musulmane, p. 73; H. Saunier, Numismatique et métrologie musulmane (Journ. As., 8th Series, viii. 520); A. Meillet in the Mémoires de la Soc. de Linguistique, xvii. (1911), 247. (CL. HURST.)

FĀRSISTAN. [See PERSIA]

Al-FāRŪKH. [See 'OMAR B. AL-KHĀṬĪBL].

Al-FāRŪKH, 'Abd al-Fārūkh, an Arab poet, born at Mawṣil in 1204 (1790), took pride in being a descendant of the Caliph 'Omar I. and therefore bore the nisba al-Fārūkh and al-'Omarī. Little is known of his life; we only know that he accompanied his cousin Ḥaṣim Pasha, when the latter was sent by the Sublime Porte to Baghdad to destroy the power of the Mamluks there, and when this expedition was unsuccessful he went with the next expedition for the same purpose under 'Ali Riṣā Pasha. The latter succeeded in putting an end to the rule of Daʿād Pasha and the Mamluks, and al-Fārūkh remained with him in Baghdad as kethkhoda of the wilayet till his death in 1275 (1852). 'Oṯmān al-Mawsīli published in Cairo in 1316 (1896) al-Tīrāyīq al-Fārūkhī min Mawṣi'at al-Fārūkhī of his poetry. Besides this Divān he composed another entitled Aḥlāl al-Afsār fi Magāni 'Iltikār and a biographical work Nasīlat al-Dahr fi Tarājam Fudātā al-Aṣr. Bibliography: G. Zaidān, Māzākhir al-Sharq, ii. 193 et seq.

Al-FāRŪKH, MūLĀ MAḤMūD B. MUḤAMMAD was born 993 = 1585 at Djawānpūr. He received his early education from his grandfather and Šādād al-Mulk Muhammad Afḍal al-Djawnpūrī and after completing his course at the age of 17, began to deliver lectures to the students who then thronged in Djawnpūr from all parts of India. His literary fame and scholarly attainments soon came known to the Emperor Shāh Djiāhān who asked the Mulk to adorn his court. He accepted the invitation. When he came near Dilli, Šādād Al-Khān, the minister, was sent to receive him and he was brought into Dilli with all the honours due to him. The Emperor gave him a appointment in the Mānṣāb (office) of Šīyāḥ (three hundred per month) and showered royal favours upon him. He was one of the most eminent 'ulamā, not only in India, but in the whole Islamic world of his time. When he went with the Emperor to Lahore and visited Šāh Mir Lāhorī, the saint reproached him for being too much engaged in worldly affairs and advised him to abandon the Emperor's
service. Accordingly he resigned the royal service and went to his native land where he passed his last days in delivering lectures to Muslim students and writing books. As a scholar in philosophy and rhetoric, it may be said that Mahmūd was one of the most distinguished scholars in the Islamic world and his works on these two subjects have been adopted in the final courses in all the Indian Universities, and certificates of competency are awarded only to those students who are found proficient in his works. He died 1062 = 1651.

He is the author of the following works:


II. Al-Farūqī fi Sharḥ al-Fawāʾid, a commentary on ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAbbās al-Dīrjānī’s work, on rhetoric entitled al-Fawāʾid al-Ghiyābīyya, Printed, Cawnpore.

III. Rūḥān al-Iḥāḥāt al-Hayāliyya, a treatise on the first matter (Hayyāl); Ind. Off. 561.


Farūqī Dynasty. This dynasty was founded by Malik Rājdā, son of Khāndajān Fārūqī, who claimed descent from the second Khalīfa, ʿAlī al-Farūqī (the Discriminator) and was one of the amirs of ʿAlī al-Dīn Khālid b. Muhammad b. Taghkhīr. Fīrūz Tagkhīr gave Malik Rājdā a djāfīrī Khāndajān and afterwards made him governor of that province. On the disruption of the empire after the death of Fīrūz in 1388 he became virtually independent and his eldest son Nasir Khān, who succeeded him on his death (April 9, 1399), formally proclaimed his independence. Having established his authority throughout his small principality by capturing Asirgār from a Hindu chiefman he gave to his dominions the name of Khāndajān, derived from his own title of Khān, and founded, as its capital, the city of Burhānpūr. In 1436-1437 Nasir Khān invaded the dominions of his son-in-law, ʿAlī al-Dīn Afṣād al-Mardūqānī of the Dakhān, but was defeated, and Khāndajān was laid waste. He died on Oct. 1, 1437, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Mirān ʿAdil Khān I. who was murdered on April 30, 1444, and was succeeded by his son Mirān Mubārak Khān I. who died, after a peaceful reign, on June 5, 1457. His son, Malik ʿAinā (or Ghānī) entitled his son ʿAdil II., was one of the most powerful of the Farūkī princes and attempted to free his state from its condition of semi-dependence on Gudjarāt, but was compelled by Mahmūd I to purchase peace by payment of arrears of tribute. He died on Jan. 15, 1492, and was succeeded by his brother, Dāūd Khān, who died on Aug. 28, 1508. After a civil war Dīrūz’s cousin, ʿAdil Khān III. was placed on the throne (April 1, 1509) by his maternal grandfather, Mahmūd I. of Gudjarāt. ʿAdil Khān III. died on Aug. 24, 1520, and was succeeded by Mirān Muhammad Shāh, his son by a princess of Gudjarāt. After an eventful reign in Khāndajān Nūrān Muhammad was raised to the throne of Gudjarāt on the death of his maternal uncle, Bahādur Shāh, but died (May 4, 1536) before he could succeed in Khāndajān by his brother, Mirān Muḥārāk Shāh. On Dec. 19, 1566, Muḥārāk died and was succeeded by his elder son Mirān Muḥammad II. on whose death in 1576 his infant son Ḥasan was proclaimed Shāh, but Muḥammad’s younger brother Rājdā ʿAḥ, who had entered Akbar’s service, hastened from Agra to Khāndajān, deposed his nephew, and ascended the throne as Akbar’s vassal, eschewing the title of Shāh, which had been in use since the elevation of Muḥammad I to the throne of Gudjarāt. His policy of preventing, by means of conciliation, imperial intervention in the Dakhān was frustrated by the dissensions in Ahmadnagar and the appeal of one party to Dihlī. He resisted Akbar’s first act of aggression but was compelled to support the emperor in the campaign which ended in the annexation of Berar and lost his life in the battle of Sonpat (1556) fighting on the imperial side against the eunuch Suḥail Khān, who was attempting to recover Berar for Ahmadnagar. His son and successor Bahādur Khān, a dissolute and feeble ruler, reversed his father’s wise policy and measured his strength with that of the emperor. Asirgrār fell (1599-1600) after a siege of ten months, Khāndajān was annexed and Bahādur died, a state prisoner in Lāhor, in 1623-1624.

Khāndajān never enjoyed complete independence under the Fārūqī dynasty but was always tributary either to Gudjarāt or Māwā, usually to the former, and owed its existence as a separate state to the mutual jealousy of these two Kingdoms and their common fear of the Kingdom of the Dakhān.

Bibliography: Taʾrīkhī Firāshṭa, II. (T. W. Hales).

Farwān or Pārwān, a small town on the Panjshir River north of Kābul and south of a pass bearing the same name which crosses the Hindū-Kush range into Afghān Turkestan at a height of 12,300 ft.

Farwān was a mint of the Ghaznavids, coins having been struck there by Alpīgīn, Sabuktīgīn, Ismāʾīl and Mahmūd. It seems to have been in Alpīgīn’s possession as early as 365 when he struck coins in the name of Muḥammad b. Nūḥ his Sāmānī suzerain. It is mentioned also by Idrīsī (as Karwān), Iṭṭāqī and Abu l-Fīdā. Bābur calls it by its modern name of Parwān, which is used by all recent travellers such as Lord, Masson and Holdich. In 618 Dālāl al-Dīn Mangbānī Khwārizm Shāh inflicted a defeat at Parwān or Farwān on the Mongol forces.


(M. Longworth Dames.)

FARWARDIN (v.) the first month of the Persian solar year, also the name of the 19th day of each month which was observed as a feast.

FAS (Fez) from the old Spanish spelling a town in Morocco and one of the residences of the Sultan, situated in 42° 54' 30" Long W. of Greenwich and 34° 6' 20" N. Lat.; it has about 100,000 inhabitants (Eckermann 50,000, Guillaud 90,000, Lamartiniere 100,000, Budgett Meckin 120,000).

Fas lies at a height of 1155 feet above sea level in the centre of the plain of Saïs, in part on a plateau which lies in front of the outer spur of the Djebel Zelâgha and in part in the hollow through which the waters of the Wadi Fas run to the Sebû which flows about 5 miles to the east of the city. The latter is about 150 miles S.E. of Tangier, 40 N.E. of Meknes, 105 E. of Rabat, 250 N.E. of Marrakûsh. Its geographical situation is a most fortunate one; "Fez," writes A. Bernard, "lies almost in the centre of the depression which separates the mountains of the coast from the Atlas and is on the natural road which runs along the base of the Atlas so that the two great and historical roads in Morocco cross one another there. It commands the road from Morocco and Tafilet by the Innawen the road from the Atlantic by the Sebû, the largest river of Barbary." (A. Bernard, Les Capitales de la Berbérie, Recueil de Mémoires et de Textes publié par l'École des Lettres d'Alger, Algiers 1905, p. 137). We may add that the development of the city has been facilitated by the abundant supplies of water and by the existence in its neighbourhood of building materials (lime and stone, clay etc.).

Fas really consists of two towns differing considerably in situation and population: Fas al-Djadid, the new town, and Fas al-Bâdi, the old town.

Fas al-Djadid is built on the east on a spur of the plateau which bounds the plain of Saïs and dominates the old town. It is surrounded by walls flanked on the south by two small forts called Burdj Twil and Burdj Sidi bu Nafa, which command the valley, at the bottom of which runs the southern arm of the Wadi Fas. In the north rises the kasba of the Isherda, a broad rectangular enclosure the interior of which is covered by huts of clay and reeds, the silces containing the grain supplies of the Makhenz or the enclosures for the sheep. The suburb of Bu Djelid lies in the northeastern part; it is waste land where the troops and caravans encamp. The walls built in the reign of Mûlay Hasan have transformed it into a kind of passage connecting the old town with the new. It includes the palace and gardens of Bu Djelid as well as the Kasba of the same name. In the northeast, at some distance from the walls, is the mazella where on feast-days the Sultan says prayer in the presence of representatives of the tribe.

Fas al-Djadid is a city of government offices. The Dar al-Makhenz alone occupies more than half of it. This is an assemblage of buildings and courtyards where the government of Morocco has its headquarters. It includes the old Meshwar, the Dâr al-Makhenz in the narrower sense, including the benika [q.v., i. 697] or offices of the viziers, a pavilion for the Sultan etc., the palaces which form the Sultan's private residence recognizable by their roofs of green tiles, the pavilion reserved for the reception of foreign envoys, the imperial menagerie, the Arenal, the new Meshwar, the gardens of Lalla Amina and Aguedal. The town itself which is traversed from N. to S. by a street of shops, is rather wretched in appearance. The houses often half in ruins are, as a rule, only of one story and their interiors lack the luxurious adornment which characterises the houses of Fas al-Bâdi. Several mosques rise from among the hovels; the most notable are the "Great Mosque," the "Red Mosque" and the "Green Mosque" so called from the colour of their minarets, all three built by the Marinids, and lastly the mosque of Mûlay 'Abd Allâh built in the xviith century by the ruler of this name which is used as a mausoleum for the Shorfa of the ruling family. The population (membering 6000—7000) consists for the most part of soldiers who live in the town with their families in the intervals of military expeditions so that Fas el-Djadid is half empty when the Sultan and the Makhenz are absent. Finally, separated from the Muslim town and adjoining the Christian quarter or "Mellah" the population of which, numbering perhaps a third more than that of the Muslim town, is crowded together in narrow streets with houses several stories high and forms a striking contrast by its animation to the quiet of the Moorish quarters.

Fas al-Djadid is really only an annexe of Fas el-Bâdi, which the inhabitants call "Medina" ("the city"). Its site is much more irregular and picturesque than that of the new town. The difference in level between highest and lowest points is 600 feet. The town lies along the narrow valley of the Wadi Fas; its houses, mosques and gardens rise up the steep slopes of the hills that enclose the Wadi from its bed to the walls that crown the ridges. A wall, of which the oldest parts date from the Almoahd period, completely surrounds the town; it is flanked at some distance to the north and south by two stone bastions, called Burdj al-Gisa and Burdj Futûh from the names of the adjoining gates. Built in 990 (1581) by 'Ahmad al-Mansûr on the model of European fortifications by Christian slaves, these forts command the whole town. In spite of the dilapidated condition of these defences they suffice to protect the inhabitants from the attacks of the Berbers of the neighbourhood, of which they live in constant fear; they have even on many occasions enabled them to resist the Sultan himself. Access to the town is obtained through the gates into the massive walls. These are in the north, Bâb al-Gisa, in the N.E., Bâb al-Mâhrûk (the "Gate of the Burnt Man") so called in memory of a Berber chief whose body was burned there when the building was completed, and where since then the heads of rebels slain in course of the Sultan's expeditions are exposed; in the S.E., Bâb al-Futûh, in the S. Bâb al-Djadid below which runs the main arm of the river, in the S.E. Bâb el-Djadid.

The space marked out by the walls is divided into three quarters (qasna or ferba): al-Lemtyun, al-Andalus and 'Adwa. The quarter of the Lemtyun takes its name from the Lente Berber tribe of the neighbourhood who people it originally.
It occupies the southern part of Fās and corresponds to the ʿAdwaʿ al-ʿAmmāl of the Idrīsīd period. In it is the Kašā of the Filala, a fortress built by the Almoravid Muhammad al-Nāṣir and allotted by Mūliyy al-Rāshīd in the xviiith century to his compatriots from Tafilet as a residence. The whole of this quarter, which is principally inhabited by members of tribes who have settled in Fās, is well provided with gardens. The Andalus quarter comprises the part of the town that adjoins the river and a zone of gardens stretching between Bāb al-Djasida and Bāb al-Ḥadd. It is the heart of the city and contains the principal mosques (Kārawiyyīn, Mūliyy Idrīsī); it includes the network of alleys of the Kāsariya bazaar, occupied by all kinds of merchants and tradesmen, noisy and animated during the day but deserted and silent at night and the ḫanṭūrī or warehouses of the merchants. Lastly the ʿAdwa quarter which corresponds to the ʿAdwaʿ al-ʿAmmāl of the Idrīsīds lies all along the right bank of the Wādī Fās. It is a quiet and thinly populated district. *Marabouts, Zāwiya and old and peaceful mosques abound* writes Gaillard. "Its quiet and picturesque streets are sought at by *folha* and pious believers who give themselves up to their devout meditations sheltered from the bustle of the age". The streets of the different quarters are as a rule very narrow and shut in by houses which almost meet overhead and shut out the sun. The majority are on slopes and, as they are not paved, after rain become regular sewers. Still narrower alleys branch off from each street.

The abundance of running water is one of the features of Fās. The Wādī Fās never dries up even in summer and the situation of the city enables its water to be used for all domestic purposes. The Wādī, which rises half a day's journey to the west, flows undiminished into Fās al-Djasida; it then sends off on the right a number of arms which fall in cascades into the Wādī al-Zītna to reunite again, flow into Fās al-Bāli under the name Wādī al-Kabīr and feed an artificial channel called the Maṣmūda. The Wādī Fās itself, on leaving Fās al-Djasida, divides into two streams which in their turn break up into an infinite number of brooks which after flowing through the various quarters reunite beyond the walls. Special conduits supply the inhabitants with drinking water; others irrigate the gardens, drive the mills, flush the sewers and clean the streets. This last is a very ancient practice for it is mentioned by Ibn Ḥawkal: "In summer water from the river is allowed to run through the city to clean the ground and refresh the air" (Description de l'Afrique, transl. de Slane, Journal Asiatique, 1842, p. 286). The richness of Fās in running water is one of the themes on which the Arab authors delight to dwell; they even claim that the water of the Wādī has marvellous properties. According to the author of the Kīrīfūs it cures of stone in the bladder, it dispels foul odours; it softens the skin and destroys insects; it makes the pleasures of the senses more agreeable, etc.

Fās is celebrated throughout the Maghrib not only for the beauty of its site but also for the number and importance of its religious monuments. The various dynasties that have succeeded one another there, have devoted great attention to enriching it with monuments of this kind so that there are no less than 850 religious edifices of all orders and of all sizes in the city, mosques, madrasas, oratories, and zāwiya or chapels built on the tomb of some holy person. The mosques all present the same general arrangement; an outer court with a fountain for ablutions, opening on to a central court surrounded by arcades forming one or more naves. They differ in size, in the form of the minarets which flank them and in the details of the ornamentation. The type of minaret, for example, has sensibly changed in the course of centuries. At first squat and without ornament, such as may be seen in the mosque of the Kārawiyyīn, it becomes more elegant in the Almoravid period. In imitation of the Moorish minarets of Spain, it affects a quadrangular form and terminates in a lantern. The sides have majolica borders and the panels are decorated with designs in relief forming trellices. This type was retained under the Almohads and Marinids. From the xviiith century on, the trellices in relief disappear; the borders of minarets of many colours give place to others in green faience; sometimes even the panels are inlaid entirely with enamelled bricks of one colour. At the same time the porches of carved wood which sheltered the doors were abandoned and replaced by plaster mouldings which could be more easily worked. Nevertheless the main principles of architecture (arcades, arches etc.), the processes of construction and decoration which were handed down from generation to generation remained the same as in the middle ages.

The chief mosques in Fās al-Bāli are the mosque of the Madrasa Bū Āināniya, the mosque of the Kašā of the Filala, those of Sidi Ṭāhid al-Shāwi, Sidi Ṭāhid al-Fākīth, of Bāb al-Gūsma and lastly in the Kesdān quarter, the Dājmī al-Nuwarī, the most ancient sanctuary in Fās, also called the mosque of the Shāfī and built near the well where tradition says that Mūliyy Idrīs used to come and sit with his Shaikhīs to watch the building of the city. Three mosques are much more celebrated than any of the others, viz. the mosques of the Andalusians, of Kārawiyyīn and the greatest of all that of Mūliyy Idrīs. At first a simple oratory in the time of the Idrīsīds the mosque of the Andalusians was made a Kārangi mosque in 321 A.H. (933 A.D.) by the Zenāta Emīr Ahmad al-Ḥamānī, provided with a minaret by the Emīr Ahmad b. Bū Bakr, then enlarged by the Almohad al-Nāṣir to its present dimensions. The mosque of al-Kaʿrawīyīn (of the people of Kārwarān) dates like the preceding from the Idrīsīd period. Begun in 248 A.H. (861-862) it was enlarged by the Emīr Ahmad b. Bū Bakr, who built its minaret and finally greatly altered in the reign of Yūsuf b. Tāṣfīn. The author of the Kīrīfūs says that at that time it covered a whole quarter of the city and contained 270 pillars forming 16 naves. Al-Kārawiyyīn is the largest mosque in the whole of the Maghrib. It is also the official mosque, in which the people are summoned to hear the Sultan's proclamations. But if al-Kaʿrawīyīn is the most important mosque in Fās, the Zāwiya of Mūliyy Idrīs is certainly the most venerated, for it is built on the tomb of the founder of Fās. As the original sanctuary had fallen into ruins, it was rebuilt in 1308 A.D. on the same site and restored in 1720 by Mūliyy Isāmī. Finally in 1820 Mūliyy ʿAbd al-Raḥmān built a new mosque beside the old one. The Zāwiya of Mūliyy Idrīs thus comprises the Kūba or tomb of the saint, two mosques, with various
buildings attached to them among them one to lodge persons who seek refuge within the bounds of the Zawiya. Like the majority of the religious edifices of Fas, the Zawiya of Mulay Idris and even the quarter surrounding it are haram or sacred and access to them is forbidden to unbelievers. The Zawiya is besides an inviolable sanctuary where individuals passing by the Makhlzen, debtors fleeing from their creditors find a safe asylum. Muly Idris has a position apart, among all the saints of Fas. As the patron saint of the city, mausole al-bilad, he is the object of a veritable cult on the part of its inhabitants. "He is", says Michaux-Bellaire *the very genius of Fas*, the supernatural power which makes it a city unique in the world and its inhabitants superior to all other men." This cult is relatively modern; it oddly dates from the Marrani period and seems to have been particularly developed by the descendants of the Jews who became converts to Islam at that time. The reputation of the tomb of Idris attracts pilgrims thither from all parts of Morocco and enriches the Idrisid Shorfa who share amongst themselves the gifts, in money and kind brought by the faithful. The Zawiya possesses in addition considerable bethem, the revenues from which are exclusively used for the upkeep of the sanctuary. Other saints also invite the piety of the faithful, who come to visit their sanctuaries on fixed days and often purchase very dearly the privilege of being interred near their tombs. Their Zawiys are scattered up and down the city or in the cemeteries of Bab al-Mahruk, Bab Futuh and Bab al-Gisa. These saints or "Saiyids" are the glory of Fas. Their number is so considerable that entire works like the *LAWAQAT al-ISTIBAH IBN AL-KADI* (18th century A.D.) and in our days the *SAWAT AL-ANFAZ* of Sharif Muhammad al-Kattani are consecrated to recording their names and virtues. Among the most celebrated may be mentioned, Abu Bakr al-"Arab al-Masri (died 533 A.H.), Sidi Mas'ud al-Fikhi, Sidi Abd Allah al-Tawdi, Sidi Muhammad b. al-Haraz (died 395 A.H.), Sidi Bughalem (died 518 A.H.), whose tomb is visited by women and sick persons; Sidi Harazim (Herzhizm), a famous professor in his day whose "barak" drives evil spirits away; Sidi Aymad al-Shawli, Sidi al-Lijdja, Sidi Aymad al-"Arnasi etc., whose tombs are a valuable asset to the Sharif families.

The population of Fas forms, as regards its natives, a typical bai"riyya, i.e. a settled city-population, comprising merchants, scholars, officials, which has long ago attained a fairly advanced level of civilisation. It is composed of various elements which in the long run have mingled with one another to form a new type, the Fasi. In the first place from its geographical situation and secondly by its fame as a city of culture and sanctity, Fas has at all times been a centre of attraction for the Muslims of Morocco and the adjoining countries. "Since its foundation" says the Kifas, "Fas has always been kindiy to the strangers who have settled in it". The companions of its founder were joined by the Berbers of the neighbourhood (Gueraw, Luwatta, Awara and Madaida) whose descendants in time have mingled with those of families who came originally from Cordova and Kairawan. For centuries political, economic and intellectual relations were maintained between the north of Morocco and Spain and contributed to introduce and maintain the civilisation of Andalus at Fas. After the fall of Grenada numbers of Muslims came to settle in the Moroccan capital where they soon attained a prominent position. It was the same with the Jews, who were converted in the times of Yacub b. Sidi al-"Iflak, while the descendants of the Bnei Shaktar, the Cohenes, the Bessis etc. are numbered among the richest citizens at the present day. In the 16th century the outrages by the Turks followed by the French occupation forced numbers of Algerians to move to Fas. The Tlemcenis, for example, form a body of 2500 in Fas at the present day. To these diverse elements must still be added isolated individuals who have come from all parts of Morocco, Filala, Briber, Licedea etc., who form the population of certain suburbs. Finally in a class by themselves are the Shorfa, some belong to various branches of the Idrisid family, others came with the present dynasty from Tafilt ("Alawi Shorfa") and others again came from other countries long ago, like the Skalli and the "Iksi, the former hailing from Sicily originally and the latter from Mesopotamia. These Shorfa are organised in corporations each of which is governed by a chief or meswar. There is nothing to distinguish them from the other inhabitants except the appellation Sidi or Mulay that is usually given them. They may practice all manner of trades but not fill any public offices except those of adil (notaries) or secretaries to the majlis. In addition to the gifts which they are assured of from the piety of the faithful or the generosity of the Sultan they enjoy certain privileges of which the chief is exemption from taxation — even from the market duties on the produce of their lands — when they possess property or estates.

The Fasi are celebrated throughout the Maghrib for their piety and also for their fondness for a life of elegance and self-indulgence. Their religious feelings express themselves not only in the rigorous observance of the ordinances of the Koran but also in countless acts such as visiting the tombs of saints and joining religious orders. Ordinary people prefer to join the "Aissa or Hamdasha; the comfortable middle classes rather adopt the rule of the Dajjays, Faibiyin, Tajjaniya or Kadyia. These religious pre-occupations do not, however, make them neglect more worldly pleasures. The Fasi are fond of luxury in dress and at table, receptions or musala enlivened by recitations of poetry or songs by celebrated artists, known as shair or shaikh. The houses of rich citizens are remarkable for the sumptuousness of their interior decorations, their pavements of enamelled bricks, their panels of plaster moulded in arabesques, their ceilings of carved and gilded wood, their marble fountains sometimes inlaid with mosaics. The houses of merchant princes or of certain officials of the majlis have thus, the appearance of veritable palaces. A much appreciated luxury is that of gardens, planted with orange, citron or banana trees. These gardens are very numerous in the higher parts of the city and sometimes enclose pavilions in which the owner takes up his abode for the summer. In politics the people of Fas frequently show themselves rebels and hostile to authority: the history of their city since the 16th century is a series of rebellions. Public opinion, very often in-pired by the Shorfa or the "Ulama,
is a power with which the Sultan has had to reckon, often at their cost.

The administration of Fas al-Djadjil is distinct from that of Fas al-Djadjil. It differs in certain respects also from that of other towns in Morocco. The amount of power to protect the inhabitants has left the Fes a semi-autonomy. The three fezs which we have already mentioned are themselves subdivided into 18 hawas or quarters, each administered by a chief of a quarter (mujaddam al-hawa), elected by the inhabitants and approved by the makhzen. This personage has numerous functions; he sees to the maintenance of order, the opening and closing of the gates which close the streets, controls the water-supply, has jurisdiction over women of loose living and finnly presides, with four prominent citizens, at recruiting and the levying of taxes. The Sultan's authority is represented by a pasha or governor; two kads, supreme officers of justice, and a mujaddid whose duty is to supervise the markets, fix the market price of food and be the final judge in commercial suits. The multiplicity of his duties enables him to interfere at any moment in the lives of those under him, whereas the name al-fezzi, the intruder, given him by the people. He is all the more feared as he possesses the right of imprisoning those in his jurisdiction and because, as he receives no salary, he is naturally tempted to enrich himself by his exactions. As to the administrative authority in Fas al-Djadjil, it consists of two pashas (of Fas al-Djadjil and of Sharika), a mujaddid and a kadi.

The Jews form quite a considerable body beside the Muslim population (8000 according to Asselin, 10,000 according to the statistics of the Alliance Israélite), but less important than those of Mogador and Marrakush. The origin of this colony of Jews dates back to the foundation of Fas. It was diminished in numbers under the Mamluks by the conversion of a large number of its members to Islam but was reinforced in the 16th and 17th centuries by the arrival of Jews fleeing or expelled from Spain, whose descendants form at the present day so great a majority of the Jewish population that there is no longer a synagogue of the native ritual in the city. As in all the towns of Morocco, the Jews live in a particular quarter or mellah, which has now become too small for them and is periodically ravaged by epidemics. They are obliged to wear a distinctive dress and are subject to various restrictions from which their co-religionists on the coast are beginning to free themselves. The majority are merchants or artisans but, although a number of well-to-do people are to be found among them, large fortunes are rare. They are under the authority of the Pasha of Sherika; but the effective authority is in the hands of the Sheik al-Yahid appointed by the M'annad or assembly of prominent citizens. This council also possesses the right to fix the taxes imposed on the Jews, in particular the abattoir tax, the proceeds of which are devoted to public purposes and the maintenance of schools. Justice, as far as personal statutes are concerned, is administered by the rabbis. These are on the whole ignorant and fanatical. The instruction given in the Talmud Thora is exclusively religious and the efforts made by the Alliance Israélite to introduce a modern system of education into the Mellah have been received with the greatest suspicion.

There are two schools, however, founded by this association which have about 300 pupils.

As to Europeans, they have long been banished from Fas by the fanaticism of the Muslim populace. According to Chenuir (Recherches sur les Moroc., Vol. III, p. 61), it still required in his time the express permission of the makhzen that they were allowed to enter the city. In the course of the last fifty years several Europeans, diplomats or merchants, have made stays of some length in Fas. Some even took up their abode there. American and English religious missions were established there in 1887 and in 1896 but without exercising any influence on the inhabitants. Vice-consulships filled by Europeans were created there by England in 1892, France in 1893, and by Germany in 1902; French and English military instructors were placed at the disposal of the makhzen and a number of Italians commissioned to organise an arsenal. In the reign of Abd al-'Aziz, the European colony comprised about thirty individuals (officers, diplomats, doctors and merchants). The establishment of the French protectorate will probably soon alter this state of affairs.

Fas is not only a holy city, it is also a commercial city where trade is held in no less honour than piety. Goods manufactured in Europe or in Fas itself are here exchanged for the products of the south notably the hides and dates of Taflet. The trade with Europe is carried on via Tânger and the harbours of the Atlantic coast, with Algeria by the road through Tâza and Udja, at least when communication is not cut off by rebel tribes. This traffic is in the hands of the Moroccans and not of Jews as is the case in the towns of the coast. The merchants of Fas are energetic, prudent and enterprising men; they have put themselves in direct communication with Europe; they have offices in Manchester for the purchase of cotton goods; others have founded establishments at Genoa and Marseilles. They are to be found in Orania, Algiers, Tunisia and even on the Senegal. Some are bankers as well as merchants, like the Christian merchants of the middle ages. Some of them make large fortunes and as soon as they do this, hasten to build themselves luxurious houses. This commercial middle class enjoys great influence and forms with the Ulema the controlling class in the state. Local industries also are quite prosperous; besides the articles of every day requirements they furnish several things famous throughout Morocco, which are even exported beyond the limits of the Sharif empire. The most flourishing industries are the manufacture of pottery, of the enamelled squares used in the interior decoration of houses, the weaving of silk and wool, dying, leather-working (dressing of skins, tanning and shoemaking), which occupies over 2000 work people and lastly the mills, which use the waters of the Wâdî Fas and its various branches as motive power. The mills which belong to the abattoir but are let to private industry, number 160. This industry is very old and Gailhard is wrong in its introduction to the Almoravid Vissâb b. Tâshân; as a matter of fact it is already mentioned in Ibn Hâwîl's description of the city in the 9th century A. 11.

A city of sanctity and commerce, Fas is also a city of learning. Its reputation on this score is very old. "Since its foundation" we read in the Kifâr, "Fas has been a great centre where sages,
Jurists, literary men, physicians and other scholars meet in large numbers. Although scholars of repute had taught in Fās under the Almohad dynasty, it was only under the Marinids that the university was constituted, which still exists, although it has fallen from the splendid position it once occupied. It retains the organisation which it had in the middle ages but the instruction given in it, instead of embracing all human knowledge as it did then, is now reduced to strictly religious subjects (zikr). Out of the 20 chairs in the university 10 only are filled at the present day (hadith, jurisprudence, law, theology, grammar, rhetoric, logic, provody, practice of law and belles-lettres). No attempt has been made, as has been done in Egypt, either to introduce modern sciences alongside of the ancient studies or to bring the latter themselves up to date. Sidi Khlâlî's treatise and the works of his commentators still form the basis of the teaching of law, as in the past, and the Aljûrânîyya and Alfiyya in literature. Their aids to study are also defective. The libraries were, however, at one time famous. That of the Madrasa al-Saffârîn once included the Arabic works sent as tribute to the Marinid Ya'qûb b. 'Abd al-Hâkîm by Sancho, king of Castile. These afterwards went to swell the library of the Mosque of al-Kara"wîyn in the xvi\(^{\text{th}}\) century A.D. European scholars used to come to Fâs in the hope of finding ancient works there. But even in the beginning of the xvi\(^{\text{th}}\) century, 'Ali Bey (Bayâqas, Vol. I, Ch. viii.) mentions the confusion in which this library was and now it hardly seems to contain more than 2000 volumes. Some scholars, it is true, possess quite well equipped libraries. A certain number of works, on the other hand, have been lithographed in Fâs itself and thus made accessible to European scholars. The lectures of the professors still form the main elements in the instruction. They succeed one another daily from morning till evening in the arcades of the al-Kara"wîyn mosque. The students (jābûs) begin to attend them on the completion of their elementary studies; i.e. after having obtained the title kāfîn, showing that they can read, write and recite the whole of the Korân. After several years' study, a number of jābûs succeed in gathering hearers around them and thus acquire the title kâfî or savant. It is from the latter that the professors (mudarrisîn) are chosen. The latter were at one time exclusively appointed by the kâfîn, but, since the reign of Mâliy Hâsan, their nomination is subject to the approval of the Makhzen. They are divided into five classes, and receive fixed salaries paid out of the revenues of the qubbâs as well as presents in money or kind given on certain occasions by the Makhzen. The professors of the first class are the only ones who actually have chairs. Scholars, whether professors or simple jāfûs, inîns, preachers in the mosques and Zâwiyas play a preponderating part in the life of Fâs in spite of their scanty means. The majority of the secretaries to the Makhzen and officers of justice have studied under them and are under their influence. They also form a kind of religious council of the empire. “It is to them” says Gailliard “that the Makhzen applies to know if such and such a government measure or manner of levying taxes is contrary to religion or the good of the Muslim community... It is they who after the death of the sovereign ratify the choice of his successor... They should not hesitate, if occasion demands it, to give their views or just protestations.” The moral influence of this small body of some seven or eight hundred scholars, for the most part members of Moorish families in Fâs, is thus considerable and sufficient to form a check on the Sultan's authority.

The students live in “madrasas”, buildings erected to house the jāfûs, somewhat analogous to the colleges of the mediaeval universities. Originally certain courses of instruction were sometimes given in them but this practice has almost entirely disappeared. The poor jāfûs receive a daily allowance of bread furnished by the qubbâs and also benefit from presents sent by persons of importance or pious individuals; if necessary they solicit the charity of the public. The period of their stay in the madrasas, which was at one time ten years, is now reduced to three. The oldest madrasas were built by the Marinids; others were built by the Shârîfî rulers. The madrasas which are still inhabited number 91 (viz. al-Saffârîn, 1323), by Aбу Sa'îd 'Othmân, al-Ăllârîn built by the same ruler, al-Misbâhîyya, built by Abu 'î-Hasan (731—752 A.H.) for a professor called Abu 'î-Diya Misbâh, al-Ăshârî (built in 721 = 1321), Bû 'Ainainîyya (built by Abu 'î-Ainain in 752 = 1351 A.D.), al-Sâla'în; Mulay 'Abî Allah, built in Fâs al-Djadid in the reign of Muhammad al-Âshârî al-Dîlî (1051—1070 A.H.), al-Shârîfîn, built by Mulay al-Rashîd (1061 A.H.) and Bâb al-Gisâ, built by Mulay Muhammad (1171—1205 = 1757—1790). According to the most recent reports they house 350—400 students (Budget Meakin's figure of 1500 jāfûs seems therefore too high). Boisterous distractions break the monotony of study. Every year in the spring the students celebrate a festival in the course of which one of them is proclaimed “Sultan of the jāfûs” and for a week enjoys the honour due to a sovereign. This custom dates back to the reign of Mulay Rashîd. It commemorates, we are told, the capture of Tanza, which was taken from its possessor, the Jew Ibn Masha'âl, by 40 jâfûs, partisans of the Shârîfî. They succeeded in smuggling themselves into the fortresses, hidden in chests, slew Masha'âl and handed the place over to Mulay al-Rashîd who, as a reward for this service, resolved that they should have a sultan of the jâfûs once a year.

The foundation of Fâs coincided with the establishment of the Idrîsî dynasty in Morocco. Abandoning the Berber town of Walli, situated on the S.W. flank of the Djebel Zarhûn, where his father Idrîs I. had settled, Idrîs II. resolved to build a capital. After having examined several sites in the neighbourhood of the Wâdi Sebîl with the help of his vizier Omairî, he finally settled on a valley watered by abundant streams and overhung on the north by the Djebel Zelîg. This territory belonged to two Berber tribes, the Zuwaâgha and Bâna Varghish, from whom Idrîs purchased the land on which the city was to be built. According to tradition, 3500 dirhams were paid to the former and 1500 to the latter. According to the Kibrî, on the first Thursday of Râbi' I. 192 (3rd Febr. 808 A.D.) Idrîs himself, it is said, traced out the line of the city walls and decided on the position of the gates. He built the Mosque of the Sha'âb in the high part and the Mosque of the Shârîfî nearer the Wâdi
at a spot called Karmada; he was buried in the latter. The new town received the name of Fâs, the origin of which is still very uncertain, in spite of the explanations which Arab writers have attempted to give. Some say the word is derived from fâs, a pick, in allusion to the instrument used by Idris to trace the line of the walls; others say that it is the name of an older town Sif inverted, the name of which then existed in the neighbourhood. Another story is that the city took its name from the first person met by Idris. He was called Fâris, a word which, in consequence of a defect in his speech, was understood as Fâs. In any case, Fâs was peopled rapidly. The Arab companions of Idris were joined by Berbers from the neighbouring tribes, Awarra, Huwarâ and Istâa and immigrants came from Spain and Ifriqiya. For example, 309 families from Cordova settled there, as a result of the suppression of a revolt against the Caliph al-Hakam b. Hishân. Three hundred families of Kairawân who had left their native land for similar reasons also settled there. The first families took their right bank of the Wad Fâs, which then took the name of Adinin al-Anfalus (bank, or district of the Andalusians) and the second on the left bank which was henceforth called Adinin al-Karaawiyn. Each of these quarters was endowed with a mosque by Yahyâ b. Muhamma, grandson of Idris II.

The history of Fâs during the early centuries of its existence was a very troubled one. On the death of Idris, Fâs fell to Muhammed his eldest son; then its possession was disputed among the descendants of this prince and the representatives of other Idrisid families. At the beginning of the third century A.D., we find the inhabitants of the city of the Andalusians expelling Yahyâ II. and placing 'Ali b. Idris b. 'Omar, ruler of the Rif, in his stead, while the people of 'Adwat al-Karaawiyn proclaimed Yahyâ b. Kâsim b. Idris who in the end was victorious. In the next century Fâs suffered much from the rivalry of the Idrisids and Fâtîmids. In 308 = 920 Yahyâ b. Idris b. 'Omar, successor of Yahyâ b. al-Kâsim, besieged by Meşâlî, chief of the Mihkânas, found himself forced to recognise the suzerainty of 'Ubayd Allah al-Mahdi; in 309 = 921, Fâs was definitely occupied by the Fâtîmid army, Yahyâ exiled to Arzila and a Kâtimi governor placed on his throne. The people of the Andalusian quarter, however, remained faithful to the Idrisids. One of them, al-Husain regained (313 = 925) possession of this part of the town for a period and remained there till 314 = 926, when an ally of the Fâtîmids, Musâ b. Abi 'l-'Alîya, succeeded in taking it. Musâ's revolt in favour of the Omayyads brought the Kâtâmî armies to Fâs once more; Musâ was expelled and authority in the city again passed to an Idrisid; this ruler having then recognised the suzerainty of the Omayyad Caliph, a Spanish governor was set over the city (335 = 949). Ten years later the Fâtîmids took the offensive; their general Dâwâr seized Fâs (347 = 958) and sent the Omayyad governor prisoner to Kairawân. The triumph of the Fâtîmids was not of long duration, for in 362 = 973, Fâs was replaced under Omayyad rule by Ghalib b. 'Abd al-Rahman the Caliph al-Hakam's II. general. Two Spanish officers were appointed to rule the town, one to each quarter.

The rivalry between the Omayyads and Fâtîmids was followed by a struggle between the Omayyads and the Zanata. Zirî b. 'Atîya, chief of the Maghârawa, governor of Fâs on behalf of the Omayyads (since 381 = 991) rose against the regent al-Manṣûr but was defeated at Tangier by the latter's son, 'Abd al-Malik, in 388 (998) and driven from Fâs; Zirî's son al-Mu'tizz was however given the governorship of Fâs by 'Abd al-Malik in 397 (1006) and bequeathed it to his son Hammâmî in 416 (1025). Soon after, the Maghârawa had to defend themselves against another Berber tribe, the Banû Ifren, whose chief Tamim seized Fâs (1033 a. H.). He plundered the town and wrought particular devastation in the Jewish quarter. He was expelled in turn by Hammâmî (1038). Zirî b. 'Atîya's descendants held out in Fâs till the Almoravid invasion, in spite of the brief occupation of the town by the Hammâmî Bulukkîn (1063). After a first attempt in 445 = 1053, which failed, Yûsuf b. Tâshfîn succeeded in taking Fâs in 452 (1069-1070). The city was sacked by the conquerors. The Maghrîbî, Banû Ifran and Zanata commentators say 3000 persons were, we are told, slaughtered in the mosque of the Andalusians and in that of al-Karaawiwn.

In spite of these troubled times, Fâs developed rapidly under the Idrisids and Zanata. At the end of the ivth (xth) century Ibn Hawkal says that "in the abundance of its fruits, vegetables and provisions... in the quantity of merchandise and other articles to be found there and in the considerable revenue, which it yields to the sovereign, Fâs surpasses all other towns of the land of al-Halâj." Al-Bakî, a century later, mentions that it contains 300 mills, which presupposes a considerable population. "The Jews", he adds, "are more numerous there than in any town of the Maghrib." The two quarters of the Andalusians and the Kairawânis formed at that time two separate towns each surrounded by a wall: their inhabitants were often at daggers drawn with one another. On the death of the Zanata prince Dumas we find, for example, the Andalusians proclaiming one of his sons, al-Fatâh, Sultan, while another son al-'Alîja reigned over 'Adwat al-Karaawiwn. The people of the two towns moreover had different customs and occupations. The people of 'Adwat al-Anfalus, writes the author of the Kifâs, were very brave and for the most part engaged in various trades and agriculture, those of 'Adwat al-Karaawiwn, on the contrary, loved luxury and ostentation in their houses, in their dress and at table; they were occupied only with commerce and the arts.

Under the Almoravids, the aspect of Fâs began to be modified. Yûsuf b. Tâshfîn built the walls which separate the two 'Adwa (462 = 1070) and the space between gradually became filled up with buildings. The mosque al-Karaawiwn was enlarged and a fortress built on the site of the present kaşba of Bit Djelât. This transformation continued under the Almohads whose leader 'Abd al-Mu'min had captured Fâs after a very arduous siege (540 = 1145-1146). To overcome the resistance of the inhabitants he was forced to build a dam across the Wad Fâs which enabled him to deflect the waters and flood the town. When master of the town, 'Abd al-Mu'min's first task was to destroy the kaşba of the Almoravids as well as a portion of the ramparts. Fâs could not, however, remain without defences; Ya'qûb al-Manṣûr ordered the walls which his grandfather had destroyed to be
rebuilt, a work which was finished in the reign of his son al-Nāṣir b. al-Mansûr in 600 = 1204. Al-Nāṣir also rebuilt the citadel. The period of the Almohads seems on the whole to have been a prosperous one for Fas. According to the Kifārār there were at that time 785 mosques or chapels, 93 public baths and 472 mills in the city. In the reign of al-Nāṣir there were 99,235 houses, 908 shops, 2 bazars and 3064 workshops. Houses covered with white plaster, the streams and gardens disappeared to make room for buildings. Industries flourished, copper and leather were the chief manufactures and paper was also made. The population probably numbered more than it does at the present day.

The succession of the Marinids to the Almohads made no alteration in this state of affairs. It was in 640 = 1243 that the Marinid Abū Yaḥyā took possession of Fas and received the oath of fealty from its inhabitants. The latter, however, were not long in rising against him and were so successful that he had to lay siege to the town for seven months before he could enter it again. The execution of six of his slaves had been the immediate cause of this rebellion. The people of Fas of any desire to offer further resistance to their new master. For the three centuries that the Marinid dynasty lasted, Fas had a less troubled history than in the previous period. Fas was for a few days in 1309 however in the power of the Christian militia whose chief Gonzalvez rose against the Sultan; in 1316 Abū 'Ali won it for a time from his father Abū Sa'īd. After a period the death of Abū Aīmān, the pretender al-Mansūr succeeded in taking Fas al-Bālī and shut al-Sa'īd b. Abū Aīmān and the regent al-Hasan closely up in Fas al-Djādir. They were able to hold it long enough for Abū Salīm, brother of the late Sultan, to come and relieve them. In 1334 the pretender Abū l-Abbās Ahmad was put in Fas al-Balī with the help of the king of Granada occupied Fas. He was driven out of it in 1384 by another pretender, Māsā, but entered into permanent possession of it again in 1387.

The period of the Marinids is none the less the most brilliant in history of Fas. The city then regained the position of capital, which it had lost under the Almohads and Almoravids in favour of Marrākush. It was further embellished with new buildings of all kinds, which have perpetuated among the people the memory of the rulers who built them. They built a new town, Fas al-Djādir to house their soldiers and government officials. The first stone was laid on the 3rd Shawwāl 674 = 1276 by Ya'qūb b. Abū al-Hājj. He built a mosque there, a palace, mint and an aqueduct; he allotted a special quarter to the Jews who were forced to leave the ancient city where they had hitherto lived unless they would become Muslims. The new town, was first called Madīnat al-Ba'īlā, the "white city", because of the colour of its buildings, but afterwards received the name of Fas al-Djādir in opposition to Fas al-Balī. The ancient town was not, however, neglected by the Marinids, who delighted in endowing it with religious buildings. Six of the madrasas at present existing date from this period and five of them are in Fas al-Balī. The immigration of Andalusian Moors also helped to increase the prosperity of Fas.

We may obtain a good idea of it from the description given in the beginning of the xvith century by Leo Africanus. According to him the population was 125,000 including 10,000 Jews. Among the sights of the city were "700 temple or churches, of which 50 were very beautifully built, ornamented with columns of marble and fountains in mosaic", 600 public fountains, 100 baths, 200 schools for children, 200 hostleries, of which many were disorderly houses, an asylum for lunatics which is still carried on practically as Leo describes it. Private houses attracted attention by their decoration of "mosaics and bricks of ancient type diapered and variegated in colours". Commerce and industry flourished if we may judge by the innumerable lists of workshops and shops which filled the fifteen sections of the Kāsarsiya and the environs of the mosque of al-Kāraviyin. Industry on a large scale was represented by the textile factories, employing 10,000 hands, the tanneries, bleaching works for the spun wool, mills etc. Among the merchants frequenting the city of Fas, there must certainly have been Christians: Marmol says a special quarter was reserved for them in Fas al-Djādir. Around the city were suburbs that have now disappeared, such as al-Mansūrīn, not far from the Bāb al-Gisa, near grottos in which lepers used to be interned by order of Abū al-Hājj; such are in the west the suburb of Bājlād, of Mars l-Khīm and of al-Qātān, peopled by potters. In the north, on the spur now called Kollā, rose the Ksar or castle of the Banū Merin, of which traces still remain with the tombs of four princes of this dynasty, Abū al-'Azīz b. Abū 'l-Hasan (died 794 = 1392), Abū 'l-Abbāb b. Abū Salīm (796 = 1394), Abū al-'Azīz b. Abū l-'Abbāb (799 = 1397) and Abū al-Hājj b. Abū Sa'īd. Gardens, where the rich people spent the summer from April to September, occupied large areas in the south of the town and beyond the walls stretched other orchards which formed a public park for the citizens. Whatever Leo Africanus may have exaggerated, Fas none the less appears to have been in the xvith century the metropolis of western Maures and the heir to the civilisation of the Moors of Spain.

Decadence set in with the coming of the Sa'di Sharifs. In 1550 Muhammad al-Mahdi took Fas from the Marinids. The city had been valiantly defended by Bā Ḥassān, brother of Sulṭān Ahmad; but a section of the Shaikhīs were won over by the Sharīf by bribery and persuaded the inhabitants to capitulate. Bā Ḥassān having succeeded in inducing the Turks of Algeria in his cause, attempted to regain Fas. Sāliḥ Ra'ís's army defeated Muhammad al-Mahdi at Ta'am on the banks of the Sebīb and again under the very walls of Fas. On the 6th January 1554 Bā Ḥassān re-entered Fas which the Sharīf did not even attempt to defend. The Turks sacked the city and then withdrew leaving Bā Ḥassān with his own troops only. The Marinid restoration was thus of short duration. On the 25th August 1554, Muhammad al-Mahdi regained possession of Fas after a battle in which the Marinid prince was slain. The Sharīf rid himself of the partisans of Bā Ḥassān by wholesale executions, then abandoned the city, contenting himself with leaving his son Mūlāy 'Abd Allāh as governor there.

The people of Fas bore this change of government with a bad grace and their discontent found vent in their participation in the disorders which in the first half of the xvith century ruined the
Sa’d power. We find them alternately proclaiming and disowning Zul‘an, next recognising him, then fighting against his son al-Ma’man. Two competitors Siman and Shihab al-Marbihi disputed the power until Siman was assassinated by his rival. In the meanwhile ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ma’man had entrenched himself in Fās al-Djaddīd and was blockading Fās al-Bilāt. In the end the Fāsīs opened their gates to ʿAbd Allāh. Al-Marbihi, who with the help of his fellow tribesmen, the Lemeš, had tried to foment renewed disorder, was put to death. ʿAbd Allāh, however, could not long hold out in Fās al-Bilāt; he was driven from it and held Fās al-Djaddīd till his death in 1624. In the same year, ʿAbd al-Malik, another son of Zul‘an, set himself up in Fās al-Bilāt but was dislodged by his brother Abu T’Abbaḥ Abīyād.

Soon Fās itself passed completely from the Sa’dis. Muhammad al-Ḥajjāj, the mameluk of Dīlaḥ, succeeded in making himself master of it and placed a governor in it in his name. Humiliated by this situation, the Fāsīs rebelled (1649) and called in the help of Mūlay Muhammad, Sharif of Sūs. But the latter was defeated by Muhammad al-Ḥajjāj and had to evacuate Fās, the inhabitants of which found themselves again forced to recognize the authority of Dīlaḥ. On receiving news of this rebellion, al-Malik ordered his soldiers to sack the Zawiya of Mūlay Idrīs and scatter the remains of the Sa’dī Sharifs who were buried in the tombs of the Idrīsids.

He remained master of the town undisturbed till 1662, when a certain Dīrīḍ succeeded in taking it for a time. Victorious over this rival, Mūlay Muhammad was however forced soon after to retire to Fās al-Djaddīd, while Fās al-Bilāt acknowledged B. Salāb, chief of the Andalusian quarter and B. Ṣagḥir, chief of the Lemeš quarter.

The occupation of Fās by Mūlay al-Rashīd put an end to these disorders. He had previously tried in 1666 to gain the city, but it was not till 1667 that after two months’ siege he took Fās al-Djaddīd. The two chiefs of Fās al-Bilāt fled; the people opened the gates to the Sharifs and swore fealty to him. Al-Rashīd built the Ḷaṣba of Khemis (now the Ǧaṣba al-Sharardā) for his troops. To him also the city owes the Madrasa al-Sharrātīn and the bridge over the Ǧelū, which facilitates access to Fās to caravans coming from the Tāẓī district. The inhabitants did not yet resign themselves to submit to the rule of the ʿAlawi Sharifs and never missed an opportunity to show their discontent. Thus, on the death of al-Rashīd, they refused to recognise Mūlay Ismā’il as his successor and proclaimed his nephew ʿAbd al-Malik b. Mahrez. Ismā’il was put to death and the frontier was once more invaded by the Sa’dis.

The operations, conducted by the Spanish renegade Pinto, lasted a year. At the end of their resources, the Fāsīs opened their gates while the pretender fled to the south. Mūlay Ismā’il retained a grudge to the end of his life against the Fāsī for their hostile attitude and, while adorning his favourite residence Meknes with magnificent buildings, all that he did in Fās was to restore the Zawiya of Mūlay Idris. Restricted in the path of duty by the energy of the Sultan, the Fāsī lost no time after his death in satisfying their instincts for independence and opposition. They refused homage to ʿAbd al-Dhaḥabī and recognised as chief another son of the late Sultan, ʿAbd al-Malik, as their sovereign. ʿAbd al-Malik was only able to force an entrance to Fās after five months’ bombardment (1728). Ahmad’s successor, Mūlay ʿAbd Allāh, was not more fortunate and had to entrust Riyyīda with the task of besieging Fās from May to October 1729. While these operations were going on, he established his camp at a place called Dar Dubabibīgh (“the house of the little Tanner”). He afterwards built a palace surrounded by gardens here and made it his usual residence till his death there in 1757. The rebellion of Fās was severely punished; the fortifications were dismantled and the citizens suffered a great deal from the extortion and cruelties of the governors appointed by the Sultan. Many of them emigrated to Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, and even to the Sa’dis. It is therefore not surprising that they rose again in 1735 and that in 1756 they proclaimed a brother of the Sultan, Mūlay al-Malik b. Arība, at the tomb of Idrīs then deserted by him in favour of another son of Mūlay Ismā’il, al-Mustaṣīf. Tired of the latter they drove him out and restored Mūlay ʿAbd Allāh, Al-Mustaṣīf. In revenge laid siege to Fās, at the head of an army furnished by the Beber tribes of the neighbourhood and was repulsed in 1746. As to ʿAbd Allāh, the people of Fās al-Bilāt refused to receive him and even supported his son, Mūlay Muhammad, in his rebellion against the Sultan. While the latter rebelled with the support of the Sultan. The reconciliation of father and son brought peace to Fās again. Mūlay Muhammad restored order by expelling the Ǧudīya, who had made themselves notorious by their turbulence and replaced them by the ʿAbdis.

Mūlay Muhammad’s reign was peaceful but renewed troubles broke out in the reign of Mūlay Simān. In 1234 A.H., the people rose in rebellion to obtain the dismissal of the governor; in 1235 the Ǧudīya took advantage of the absence of the Sultan in Marrakūš to rise and sack the Mollās; in 1256, dissatisfied with the recall of the Mufti, the Fāsīs took up arms once more and proclaimed two pretenders in succession. Mūlay Simān was forced to besiege Fās al-Bilāt for ten months before he could reduce them. The beginning of the reign of ʿAbd al-Ṛaḥmān (cf. this article l. 54 et seq.) was marked by the rebellion of the Ǧudīya who held Fās al-Djaddīd for ten months (1247 = 1831). In the second half of the xixth century a rebellion not less serious broke out on the accession of Mūlay Hasan (1260 = 1873). The people of Fās al-Bilāt led by the Ǧudīya and the prophecies of a blind Sharif refused to take the oath of obedience to the new Sultan and closed the city gates against him. Old Fās was once more besieged but Mūlay Hasan did not dare to proceed to bombard the capital for fear of injuring the mosque of Mūlay Idrīs and thus rousing the fanaticism of the citizens to boiling-point. The blockade dragged on till the imperial troops succeeded in making a breach in the Ǧaṣba of the Filala and thus entering the town. After Mūlay Hasan had regained his capital he carried out considerable improvements there (erection of the palaces of Bā Djeсуд and Laila Amina and the new Ǧeshwār, connection of New with Old Fās etc.; cf. ii. p. 72).

The improvements attempted by Mūlay Hasan’s successor, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, aroused great excitement among the people of Fās. In December 1907 troubles again broke out while the Sultan was away to Kabīt on a journey. As Mūlay Ǧhīz.
had risen in rebellion against his brother soon afterwards, the Fāṣ at once decided to take his side. On the 4th January 1908 the 'Ulamā and notables declared that 'Abd al-'Azīz had forfeited his authority by selling himself to the unbelievers who had led him astray; they then proclaimed the Fāṣīr who, after the defeat of 'Abd al-'Azīz at Sidr, had seized on the 15th August 1908, became undisputed ruler of the kingdom. But the triumph of Ḥāfiz was to have quite unforeseen results. The extortion of the ministers and agents of the new Sultan provoked a general rising of the tribes around Fāṣ in February 1911. The herbers of the neighbourhood (Bāt Mār, Ait Yūsī, Bāt Warānīn etc.) laid siege to the town in March and the Shaīfī Mahalla was unable to raise it. At the end of his resources the Sultan called on the help of France, whose troops had occupied the Shāwīya district since 1907 [cf. 194 A.D.-195 A.M., p. 915]. A column under General Moi- nier reached Fāṣ on 21st May 1911 after two fierce encounters on the 5th and 11th May and scattered the rebels. Thus the holy city of Mūlīy Idris was entered by Christian troops for the first time.


**FASĀ**, known in earlier times as BAṢ-SIṣ, a town in Fāṣ, 4 days' journey S.E. of Shīrāz, was the most important town in the district of Darābdīr (Iṣṭākhṛ, p. 97, 127); it was a well built town, with houses of clay and cypress wood, surrounded by a wall outside which lay a suburb in which the markets were. In the centre of the town was a mound formed of the ruins of an ancient tower of unbaked bricks, the mound was still exists. It had at one time flourishing industries (the manufacture of various cloth stuffs which were exported in large quantities, notably brocades, fīrāz al-wusqy and al-ṣukar and shān-ṣīrīf for the use of kings, Iṣṭākhṛ, p. 153, Muḥaddas, p. 442). In Muḥaddas's time it was attached to Shīrāz (p. 52) and had a chief mosque of brick built after the plan of that in Baghdād (p. 431). It was taken by Othmān b. Ali 1-A by the same circumstances as Darābdīr in 23 (644). It was laid waste by the Shaībānīs and rebuilt by the Aṭībīs Khaṭīb. **Biography:** Yākūt, Geogr. Worterb., iii. 891; Karalaczek, Die persische Nadelmaterie Samtendcher, p. 107; Hāfizī Miḥrān Ḥasan Fāṣī, Fāṣ-Nāme (Irbī, 1313 Teherān), ii. 228 et seq.; Barbier de Meynard, Dict. géogr. de la Perse, 422-423; P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, ii. 97 et seq.; Le Strange, Eastern Caliphate, 290, 293, 294. (CL. Huart.)

**FAṢĀḤA (Ar.), properly, "clarity, purity," abstract noun from ḡāṣ, clear, pure. In Arabic rhetoric ḡāṣ means: 1. a single word, when it is not difficult to pronounce, is not a foreign or rare word and its form is not an exception to the usual; 2. a whole sentence, when it does not contain an objectionable construction, discord, obscenity (through a confusion in the enunciation of the words) or a metaphor too far fetched and therefore incomprehensible. The first kind of ḍaṣāḥ is called ḍaṣāḥat al-munfīl, the latter ḍaṣāḥat al-ḥalām. There is also a ḍaṣāḥat al-mutaballim. This is peculiar to a person whose style conforms to the above conditions. The adjective ḍaṣāḥ denotes a word or a sentence only when free from objection in itself and is distinguished from bādī', which also implies...
that expression is relevant in the passage in question.


(A. SCHAULE)

FĀŠHODA, the former name of a large province and its capital on the west bank of the White Nile in the Anglo-Egyptian Sūdān, in 32° 30’ E. Long and 10° N. Lat., 469 miles from Khartūm.

The district of Fāshoda had been reached as early as the third decade of last century by Sūdān expeditions of the Khedive Muhammad ‘Ali Pāša but it is only since the period of the great explorers of the Nile, from about 1856 onwards, that our more accurate knowledge of it dates.

Fāshoda was then, as it still is, the centre of the great Shilluk people, who inhabit the banks of the White Nile for a stretch of 200 miles from Kaka in the N. to the mouth of the Bahr al-Ghazāl and Sobat in the S.; their territory measures 5-6 hours’ journey in breadth. Their subjection to Egyptian rule took place in the “sixties” but although it cost no battles of importance could hardly be said to be completed till 1871. The number of their villages was estimated at 3000 with a population of 1,200,000. To secure the possession of the conquered territory the fortified station of Fāshoda was built at the time of Th. v. Heuglin’s visit in March 1864 and made the administrative centre of the newly constituted province (mutāriye). The name Fāshoda is believed to have been given by the Arabs while the Shilluk called the new town Dānā while their last king. The new province was divided into four large districts: Dānā, N. of Fāshoda with 14 ‘nāhiyā’; 2. Fāshoda itself with 31, 3. Bādār, the south on both banks of the Nile, with 15 4. al-Dānīka on the east bank of the river with 5 ‘nāhiyā’.

After the expansion of Egyptian power southwards, the importance of Fāshoda lay mainly in its position, as it formed the only connecting link between the Sūdān proper and its capital Khartūm with the Equatorial Province and Bahr al-Ghazāl. When Fāshoda was left to the hands of the Mahdis in 1884 these two provinces were cut off from Egypt and lost. In the Mahdist period Fāshoda was of great importance for the provisioning of Omdurarman (Umm弥rman) as the agricultural population was almost entirely exterminated in other parts of the Sūdān; it was, however, only in 1891 that the Mahdists succeeded in completely subjugating the Shilluk.

After Egypt had officially and formally given up all claim to the Sūdān provinces, Fāshoda was occupied as res nullius on the 10th July 1898 by a French expedition which had reached it from the west under Major Marchand; a number of attempts by the Mahdists to dislodge them were easily repulsed. On the 19th September Kitchener appeared before Fāshoda after his victory over the Mahdists. The ultimate possession of the place was only decided after long diplomatic negotiations in Europe; on the 11th December 1898 the French had to vacate Fāshoda which now became a province again, this time of the new Anglo-Egyptian Sūdān. After Kitchener had left the Sūdān and the entente had been concluded between England and France, the name of the town of Fāshoda was changed to Kolda which had previously been the name of a group of Shilluk villages in the north. Since 1904 the name Fāshoda, officially at least, has ceased to exist.

The modern town lies about 100 yards from the Nile; its chief building is the Mullitya. A bazaar has been built in the Egyptian fortress, which was restored by Major Marchand. The town is hardly destined to a great future, on account of its low situation within the area of high water. On the other hand, when agriculture has been further developed, the province may attain considerable prosperity, if the Shilluk can be persuaded to work regularly; but this has not been brought about by the order to wear clothes.

Bibliography: Schweinfurth, Im Herzen von Afrika; Supplement of the Handbook of the Sudan; Count Ghiechen, The Anglo-Egyptian Sūdān; Wallis Budge, The Egyptian Sūdān; Westermann, The Shilluk people.

(B. MORITZ)

AL-FĀSĪ. [See Iṣr aṣ ṣābā’i.]

AL-FĀSĪ, MUHAMMAD B. AḤMAD B. ‘ALI ABUʾL-TAYYIB TAṢĪ AL-DIN AL-MAKKI AL-MĀLĪKI AL-HĀDRAMĪ, an Arab historian born on the 10th Rabi’ I 775 = 31st August 1373 at Mecca, where his early life, with the exception of six years in Madīna, was spent. In 797 = 1395, he began to travel for purposes of study and visited Cairo, Damascus, Jerusalem, Alexandria and Yemen. In 807 = 1405 he became šāfi of Mecca and in 814 = 1412 received a Maliki chair in addition. He was twice deprived of these offices for brief periods in 817 = 1414 and 819 = 1417 and had to resign the judicial office in 828 = 1425 through blindness, but the Maliki Mufti in Cairo at his personal request granted him a certificate that he was capable of exercising his judicial duties. Nevertheless, two years later he was deserted and died on Wednesday 3rd Shawwal 832 = 7th July 1429. His literary activity was almost entirely devoted to the history of his native city. His first work on this subject was the Kitāb al-‘Id al-Thamin fi Tu’dūra al-Balad al-‘Arabī with special reference to toponomy and biography, printed Mecca, 1314 a.h.; on the margin is his Kitāb al-Riḍā wa l-‘Aṣr al-Dīn al-‘Imām a‘lā Muhammad, printed Cairo 1321. He made two epitomes of it. Of the second edition of the second epitome entitled Shīfa’ al-Gharām bi Aḥhār al-Balad al-Ḥaram several chapters are given by Wüstenfeld in his Chronique de la Stadt Mecca, ii. 55 et seq. He made five further abridgments of the Shīfa’.


(C. BROCKELMANN)

FĀṢĪK (i.e. slander) means not only one who has committed a great sin but also one who has been guilty of everyday trifling offences against the law. In the latter respect, in the unanimous opinion of the faṣik almost every Muslim is to be considered a faṣīk.

The testimony of a faṣīk has no legal weight; only the irreproachable Muslim (‘adil) is a credible witness. This is the origin of the custom of having certain persons of good reputation to act as professional witnesses at the conclusion of all contracts (of marriage also). Such persons are often called ‘adil or šāḥid; cf. the literature quoted by
Marriage is also invalid, according to the Shāfī‘ī (and some Ḥanbalī) schools, if the nearest relative (waalī), who gives the bride in marriage, is faṣīk at the conclusion of the marriage contract; it is therefore the custom in some Shāfī‘ī districts to precede the conclusion of the contract by the "conversion" of a waalī; for one who is converted from his sins to a better way of life is again considered 'adil. Cf. Snouck Hurgronje in De Indische Gids, 1884, i. 770.

(Th. W. Juyndoll.)

FāṣILA (a), "interval", a term in prosody, applied to a group of three or four vocalised consonants following by a quiescent consonant. There are two kinds of fāṣila, the kubrā, the greater and qubrā, the lesser. The former is composed of five consonants, four of which are vocalised and the fifth quiescent e.g. samatātun (a fish), bātālumun (with a quill), ḥuṣayna Aḥmadun min halabihii (Aḥmad went out of his town). The latter consists of four consonants, of which the three first are vocalised and the fourth is quiescent, e.g. Kuratun sarabat biwāsala. (a ball was thrown with bent sticks).

(Moh. Ren Chener.)

FASKH means in general the annulling of a contract, e.g. of sale on the ground of hidden defects which the buyer discovers in the article, after he has bought it, or of a political treaty which is declared void by one or both parties. In the first case one speaks of faskh, in the second case of musafakhah. Cf. Ibn Fādil Aḥmad al-Umari, al-Taʾrīf bi l-Muṣafal al-Shafik, p. 170 et seq. A marriage contract in particular can be declared null and void, if after the completion of the ceremony it transpires that one or other of the parties does not fulfil certain conditions. Legal grounds for faskh in the latter case (notably in large part of the Dutch East Indies) which makes the man pronounced a certain faṣih (repudiation) over his wife immediately after the marriage contract is signed. He must, for example, say: "If I do not maintain my wife" (or: "if I beat her") etc. "She is repudiated by me".

Bibliography: Besides the chapters on marriage in the collections on Tradition and the Fākh books: Dimiššiyyah, Ṭabaḥt al-ʾumma fi ḳiṭṭātīf al-ʾumma (Būlāk 1300), p. 108; N. von Tornauw, Das Moslemische Recht (Leipzig 1855), p. 77 et seq.; A. Querry, Droit musulman (Paris 1851), i. 708 et seq.; M. Perron, Précis de jurisprudence musulman, par Khālid Ibn ʾAbd al-ʾAznān, trad. de l'Arabe (Exploration scientifique de l'Algérie, Paris 1849), xi. 404 et seq. (de l'option en fait de mariage); C. Snouck Hurgronje, De Atchāres (Batavia, 1893), i. 381 et seq., 403 et seq. (= The Aḥchehnes, i. 349 et seq., 367) and the Hanbook des islamischen Gesetzes by the author of this article (Leiden, 1910), p. 226 et seq., 233 et seq. (Th. W. Juyndoll.)

FATH (a), literally "opening", a term in Arabic grammar for the pronunciation of a consonant with the vowel a; the sign is therefore called faṭḥa. In Sībawayhī (e.g. ed. Betzenberg, ii. 281, etc.) faṭḥa is still occasionally applied to the pronunciation of the faṭha without "umlaut", i.e. the opposite of imāda (q.v.) — In Arithmetic faṭḥa means the square of a number — There are other technical uses of the word for which see Muhammad Aḥmad Aṭlī, Dict. of Techn. Terms, ed. Sprenger etc., ii. 1104 et seq. v. (A. Schaaede.)

AL-FATH (a), "victory", title of Sūra xviii. and one of the titles of Sūra cx. usually called al-Nasr.

AL-FATH, ĀBŪ NASR B. MUḤAMMAD B. ʿU₇AD ALLĀH B. KHAḤAḤ B. MUḤAMMAD B. ḤABALLAH AL-KAṢĪ, better known as al-FATH IBN KHAḤAḤ, for the biographers do not agree as to his genealogy, was born at Sakhrah al-Walad, a village near Alkalī al-ʿIṣrā (Kalaf Yāḥyā), a district in Granada.

Among his teachers are mentioned Aḥī ʾAbḥāṣ (Abū al-Sarrādī, Abū ʾAbṭayyib b. Zarkūn, Abū ʾAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Abū Ḥāfan, Ibn Durād al-Kītīb, the celebrated scholar Abu Muḥammad Abū Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Al-Sīd al-Bāṭalaywāsī, etc.

In his youth he was a shameless vagabond, almost always half tipsy till he obtained a position as secretary to the governor of Granada, Abū Yūsuf Tāṣhīfīn b. ʿAlī. He went to Marrākush and was assassinated there in a funduq on the 29th Ramāḏān 528 (24th July 1134?) or Sunday 22nd Muḥarram 529 = 13th November 1134 or according to others again, in 535 (17th August 1141—17th August 1142) by order, it seems, of Sultan Abū ʾAbḥāṣ (Abī b. Yūsuf b. Tāṣhīfīn, brother of Abū ʾAbṣīr ʾIbāḥāyīn b. Yūsuf b. Ḥaballāh, to whom he had dedicated his "Vaselut". He was buried in the cemetery of Ṣabāl al-Dabāṭīnī. He composed the following works: I. Kālid al-ʾIṣbān (or fi Maḥsīn al-Aʾzān, a kind of biographical anthology of those who had lived some time before him and particularly of his contemporaries who had sheltered him or who had quarrelled with him (notably Ibn Bāḍājī whom he placed at the end of the work), divided into four parts: a. kings and princes, b. viziers, c. ʾāʾāsh and scholars, d. men of letters and poets (publ. at Paris in 1277 by Sulaimān al-Ḥarīnī in the journal al-Bīrūjī, at Būlāk in 1283, 1284. A commentary was written on the Kālidī by Muḥammad b. Kāsim Ibn Zākir (died 20th Muḥarram 1120) entitled Tafsīr Kālid al-ʾIṣbān (there is a copy in a private library in Algiers; the French translation announced by l’Abbé E. Bourdage in 1865 has never appeared, in spite of the statements by Denenberg, Brockelmann and Huart. — 2. Maṭnaḥ al-Inṣār wa Maṣraḥ al-Tawwaṇnīs fi Muḥāṣ Abī al-ʾAṣīla, a kind of appendix to the preceding work; there were, it seems, two or three editions or rather recensions of it, a large and a small or a large, a medium and a small, of which the
small was published at Constantinople in 1305 (al-Dzu'wâlî press) and at Cairo in 1325. — 3. A biography of his teacher, 'Abd Allâh b. Muhammâd b. al-Sid al-Bâtalyawî (different from that dedicated to him in the third part of his Kalâlî' preserved in the Escorial (Derenbourg, Les Mss. ar. de l’Escorial, 448?); this biography is followed by a kind of anthology containing letters and poems by Ibn al-Sid and other scholars, the majority his contemporaries. — 4. Makâmûna on Ibn al-Sid al-Bâtalyawî, preserved in the Escorial (Derenbourg, Les Mss. ar. de l’Escorial, 539?). — 5. Bîdâyât al-Majlîsîn wa Ghâyâyat al-Mi‘tâsîn, thought to be lost. — 6. Mûjûmî ‘Rasîlîtki, also thought lost.

Al-Fath Ibn Khâqân more often wrote in rhymed prose, in which he is usually excellent, and also in verse which is mediocre. He seems to have plagiarised his contemporaries or even appropriated their works bodily; they did not dare accuse the thesaurus of plagiarism. He showed himself as much in his everyday life as in his literary doings. In any case, we need not look in his Kalâlî' or Majmû'a for historical facts; the working of the life does rather in the elegance of its style.


(Moh. Ben Chenel.)

AL-FATH B. KHÂQÂN, a favourite of al-Mutawakkil, Al-Fath and the vizier 'Ubad Allâh b. Yahâyâ, exercised an extraordinary influence over this cruel and frivolous Caliph, particularly in the latter years of his reign. Both were ardent supporters of his second son al-Mu'azzz, and exerted all their efforts to exclude the Caliph's eldest son, al-Muntasîr, from the succession. The latter was publicly insulted and had to put up with all sorts of nicknames like al-Mustâdâjîl (the "premature"), al-Muntasîr (the anxious one, i.e. for the throne). On one occasion he was even ill-treated by al-Fath by his father's orders. Other influential men were also thrust aside by al-Fath till the Caliph himself by his lack of foresight prepared his fall. When he ordered al-Fath to have the property of the Turkish general Wa'isî in Isphahân and Mâdâ, confiscated, the latter learned of the Caliph's intentions, and with him allied himself with al-Muntasîr and several others to get rid of the Commander of the Faithful. Al-Mutawakkil was assassinated in Shawwal 247 (December 861); al-Fath attempted to defend him but was defeated by superior forces and shared his master's fate.

Bibliography: Tabari (de Goeje), ii, Index; Ibn al-‘Athîr (Tornberg), vi, 60—68; Weil, Geschichte der Chaliften, ii, 368 et seq.

(K. V. Zettersten.)

FATH-ALÎ AKHTUNDA (Russ. Akhundov), an Azârî-Turkî dramatist, was the son of a village schoolmaster, took service in the Russian army and attained the rank of captain. When the governor-general, Varansoff, of the Caucasian territory built a theatre in Tiflis 1256 = 1850, the Turkî officer wrote 6 comedies for it, besides a historical dialogue in the Turkî dialect of 'Alavî-lai’dânâm, which he dedicated to Field-Marshall Baturin and which were printed in 1256 = 1859 at Tiflis under the title Tavâlahîât. They have been translated into Persian by Muhammâd Djalâr Munshî.

The following is a list of them:
1. Mollâ İbrâhîm Khalîl Kiiîyâ-ger (1267), transl. into French by Barbier de Meynard (L’Alchimiste, Journ., 1886);
2. Mousîque Journâl, Hékîmî-nilbâlût (1267), transl. into German from the Persian version by A. Wahrmand, Vienna 1889, and into French from the Turkî text by Baois 1906 (Bibl. Orient. Electrisée de Leroux, t. 81);
3. Khîrî Khalî-dîbân, transl. into French by Barbier de Meynard (L’Ours et le Voleur, extract from the Recueil de textes et de Traductions, Paris 1889);
4. Wîzîn Khâ’î Sîrah (presented at Tiflis, for the first time on the 13th November 1903);

6. Murâsîdî askâlî (1272), Les Procureurs, transl. into French from the Persian by M. Cillièrè;
7. L’histoire de Yusuf-şâh (1273), published and translated in French by L. Bouvat (Journ. 1903).


(Cl. Huart.)

FATH-ALÎ-SHÀH, a Persian Shî‘ah of the Kâfîrî dynasty, was born in 1185 (1771), succeeded his uncle Aţâ Muhammad-Shâh in 1212 (1797) on the throne and died in 1250 (1834) after a reign of 38 years and five months (which won him the title Shî‘î-kirîn) and was buried in Kumm. He was at first known as Bâbî-Khân. The murder of Aţâ Muhammad had thrown the army into the greatest confusion; Mirzâ Muhammad Kâfarî closed the gates of Tehêrun till the arrival of Bâbî-Khân who was then in Shirz; he was at once proclaimed king but only enronched at the beginning of the following year. After his victory over his brother Husain-Kuli-Khân, Muhammad-Khan Zand and 'Adlî-khan Sha’kâbî he succeeded in winning recognition from the chiefs of Khorasân. After a long war with the Russians he lost Georgia, which was finally ceded by the peace of Guliştân in Oct. 1813. He had sought the support of Napoleon I. who sent Romieux and Faubert on a mission to him and later General Gardane with the title Ambassador (1806); but thinking that France could not be of any help to him at that time he sought the friendship of England, who sent Sir John Malcolm, Sir Harford Jones Bridges and Sir Gore Ouseley to his court. The rebellion in Khorâsân, fomented by Muhammâd-Shâh of Afghanistân, gave Fath ‘Ali an opportunity to seize Herât (1813), but he could not keep it. A war with the Porte (1821—1823)
was ended by a treaty advantageous to Persia. In 1826, seeking to take advantage of the death of Alexander I, it reconquered Georgia and invaded by his eldest son Abbās-Mīrzā. Fatḥ-ālī Shah declared war on Russia; his son was defeated near Gandja by General Paskivitch (25th Sept.), and again before Abbās-ābād (July 1827), the Shah was forced to abandon Armenia (treaty of Turkman-çı 22nd February 1828), Erivan and Nakhchewan. He died at Ispahan a few months after the death of his son Abbās-Mīrzā and left the throne to his grandson Muḥammad Shah. His keen and deeply sunk eyes were overhung by very thick bushy eyebrows; he wore a long, bushy beard dyed with ʿinnā. The Biblieography: o. Abd al-Razzaḥ b. Nadjaf-ḵuli, Maṭḥīḵ-i Ṣulṭānīyā, Tabriz 1241 and Tehran 1245 (translated by H. T. Brydges, The Dynasty of the Rajaş (London 1853); Mīrzā Taḵī Sipīhr, Tāriḵīḵ-i Kāḏūrā, extract from the Nāʾīḵī al-Tawārīḵ, Tehran 1273; Amédeé Jaubert, Voyage en Arménie, p. 238 et seq.; Fonton, La Kaszlie dans l’Asie Mineure, p. 251 et seq.; L. Duleux, Persie, p. 376 et seq. (portrait, pl. 58 and pls. 84; Grundr. d. Iran. Phil., ii. p. 590 et seq. (Cl. Huart.)

FATḤ-PUR ŚIKRī, a deserted city, 23 miles from Agra, situated in 27° 5’ N. and 77° 40’ E., on a ridge of sandstone rocks near the ancient village of Sikri. In 1550 when Akbar visited Shaikh Salmān Čishti, who was living in a cave on the Sikri ridge, the saint foretold the birth of a son to the childless monarch, and in 1570 Sulṭān Salmān, afterwards known as the Emperor Dji-hānḡir (q. v.), was born there. Akbar then commenced building a city, covering an area of about 37/4 sq. m. and enclosed by a wall (still standing) 37/4 m. long. On his return from his campaign in Gujarat in 1574, he found his new capital ready for occupation and named it Fatḥpur (the City of Victory); he resided here until 1586, when he abandoned it, possibly on account of the brackish nature of the water obtainable there, and shortly after his death, began to fall into ruin. Many of the buildings, however, still remain in an excellent state of preservation; among these may be mentioned the official buildings, such as the mint, the treasury, the record office, and the hall of public audience, and the royal palace, including the private apartments of the Emperor and the residences of several of his wives. The house of the Turki Sulṭāna is remarkable for the elaborate carving with which it is covered, both within and without; the interior is decorated with dado, 4 ft. high, divided into eight oblong panels, richly decorated with carvings representing forest and garden scenes. The two-storeyed building, known as Bihārd’s house, (though it was undoubtedly the palace of one of Akbar’s queens), is similarly covered with carving exhibiting a profuse variety of patterns executed in minute detail. In close proximity to the royal apartments are some curious buildings, of a unique design, e. g. the Panč Mahāl, a five-storeyed pavilion, each storey of which is smaller than the one on which it rests, and the so-called Diwān-i-Ḵāṣ (or private audience hall), a building consisting of one room only, in the centre of which rises an octagonal column surmounted by an enormous circular capital, from the top of which radiate four narrow causeways, each about 10 ft. long, to the corners of the building: the top of this capital is thus connected with a gallery, running round the upper part of the room and communicating by staircases (made in the thickness of the wall) both with the roof and the courtyard below. It is not possible to enumerate here the many other buildings connected with the emperor and his court, but special mention must be made of the great mosque, which is one of the finest monuments of Mughal architecture. It covers an area of 438 ft. by 542 ft., having a central court (360 ft. by 439 ft.) enclosed by cloisters, except at the three gateways, of which the Bāland Darwāza (facing the South), erected by Akbar in 1602 to commemorate his victories in the Dākkān, ranked as one of the noblest gateways in India. In the court of the mosque stands the tomb of Shaikh Salmān Čishti, a single-storeyed building, encased in white marble and surmounted by a dome: the marble lattice screens which enclose the veranda of this building are of extraordinary delicacy and intricacy of geometrical pattern; over the cenotaph is a wooden canopy inlaid with mother-of-pearl arranged in beautiful geometrical designs.


FATĪḤA, the first and most popular Sūra in the Ḥorān). Its name means the “opener” (i.e. of the Ḥorān). This short Sūra which only contains seven verses has a certain number of peculiar features; it is at the beginning of the book, while all the other short Sūras are at the end; it is in the form of a prayer while the others are in the form of a sermon or lecture; in reciting the word amīn (amen) is added to it, which is not done in any of the others.

In Sūra xv. 87 there is an allusion to the Fatīḥa under the name of the seven (i.e. verses) which ought to be constantly repeated (sāḥān min al-Majāzūh); and these seven verses occupy a special position with reference to the portion of the Ḥorān revealed at that time. “We have already given thee the seven verses which ought to be constantly repeated as well as the great Ḥorān”. At the period then, when Sūra xv., which is Meccan, was revealed, the Fatīḥa was already the favourite prayer of the little community of believers.

It has been said that this Sūra is the oldest or one of the oldest in the Ḥorān. Noldeke has urged against this view that it contains expressions which are not found in the Sūras of the first period; notably certain epithets of Allāh, “the merciful, the compassionate, al-Raḥmān, al-Raḥīm” appear there for the first time. Nevertheless the Fatīḥa is relatively old and should be placed at the end of the first Meccan period. It is, as we have just mentioned, quoted in Sūra xv. which belongs to the second period; and its first verse “glory be to God, the lord of the worlds.”
is repeated at the end of Sūra xxxvii. (verse 182) which also belongs to the second period.

The words al-Maghīlūs alaḥum “those against whom God is enraged”, and al-Dālīn, those who err, in verse 7 of the Fāṭiḥa, refer respectively to the Jews and Christians.

The Fāṭiḥa forms part of the daily prayer (Namāz) of the Muslim; its recitation is a divine order according to Shāhī, while Abū Ḥanīfa says it is only obligatory by canon. Various pious scholars combine the isolated view with this Sūra.

Bibliography: Th. Nöldeke, Geschichte der Qorān, 2, p. 110 et seq.; d’Ohsson, Tableau général de l’Empire Othman, ii. 79, 85; the annotated translations of and commentaries on the Ḵūrān.

(B. CARRA DE Vaux.)

AL-FĀTIK, the name of three rulers of the Nādījī dynasty [q. v.]

FĀṬIMA, the daughter of Muḥammad and the aged Khādijā, born in Mecca. Unlike the other children of the Prophet, we have solid grounds for believing in her existence, not so much in reliable documents as in her descendants. She possessed a biographical literature of her own, which however, historical facts are rather scarce, a slight but appreciable advantage over her sisters, notably Rukayyā and Umm Kūlūb, always associated as sisters and confused even in the most trifling incidents of their lives. The poetry of the first century A. H., however, entirely omits to mention her. The date of her birth still remains to be settled. This question implies another, also still unsolved,—the place in order among the four daughters of the Prophet occupied by Fāṭima? All except Umm Kūlūb have been claimed to be the eldest. In this controversy the compilers of the Sūra and of Tradition thought that the advanced age of Khādijā ought to be taken into account. On the other hand, they wished to avoid too great an age for Fāṭima at the time of her marriage with ‘Alī. According to the degree of importance accorded to these two considerations, so difficult to reconcile, the various writers have sometimes brought forward and sometimes set back the date of her birth. It is principally among the Shī‘ites, who endow Fāṭima with all physical graces and all mental gifts and virtues, that it has been found more suitable to make her the youngest. Her sisters are supposed by the Sūra to have been married before Fāṭima, for “as a good pater familias”, so they reason “the Prophet must have settled the elder daughters first”. This insistence on the youth of Fāṭima is quite natural; otherwise it would have to be admitted that Muḥammad was indifferent to his daughter, that the companions showed a shocking lack of enthusiasm to enter the Prophet’s family and finally that Fāṭima was a nonentity if she remained unmarried for a period far beyond the ordinary period of celibacy, so dreaded by Arab women.

In this chronological discussion, in the absence of any direct information — it is useless to suppose with Sprenger that traditions have been lost — the starting-point is furnished by the death of Fāṭima, which all agree in placing in the year 11 A. H. Thus 11 years thus obtained are added the three separating the Ḵūrān from the death of Khādijā. Above this figure 14 there is no agreement among our authors. If some of them have represented Fāṭima as the eldest or one of the eldest of her sisters, it is because they wished to avoid the objection arising from the advanced years of her mother. Others, thinking only of the lateness of her marriage to ‘Alī, have sought to place the birth of Fāṭima about the period of the “prophetic calling” of her father, shortly before or shortly after. The boldest supporters of this view are the writers devoted to the house of ‘Alī. Mas‘ūd places the birth of Fāṭima “eight years before the Ḥijrā” i.e. at a date when her mother must have been at least 60 years of age. This isolated view, which is inspired by the statement in the Sūra that ‘Ā‘ishah was married at an age of nine, is an attempt to give Fāṭima the same advantage. In more than one respect Fāṭima is the Shi‘ite counterpart of the very prominent figure of ‘Ā‘ishah.

The oldest historians and the early Sūras such as that of Ibn Ḥishām devote relatively little attention to Fāṭima. In Ibn Ḥanbal’s compilation, the Musnad of Fāṭima only occupies a page against the 250 devoted to ‘Ā‘ishah. The Tabakht of Ibn Sa‘d manages to give an account of ‘Alī without ever even mentioning the name of his wife. She hardly appears in the Khidr al-Dī‘lahi in spite of the pronounced ‘Alī tendentiousness of this compilation. We know nothing of Fāṭima for the pre-Ḥijrā period except her kunya “Umm Abīhā” and her grief at the death of Khādijā. No one among the persons in the Sūra weeps as much as Fāṭima except perhaps Abū Bakr: tears are a manifestation of physical pain in the daughter of the Prophet and of religious fervour, a veritable ẓawār, in the rough Kurāshī trader. Fāṭima seems to have had a melancholy temperament always wrapped as it were in gloom. Physically she was no better endowed; her weak constitution, her thinness, her frequent illnesses made her unfit for the hard tasks allotted to Arab women. Unlike her sister Rukayyā, there is rarely any allusion to Fāṭima’s beauty and nowhere does Muḥammad declare, as he does for Zainab, that she is “the most capable (affal) of his daughters”. All this explains why she waited so long before finding a husband. One asks, without being able to explain, why this heiress of “the wealthy merchant Khādijā” had no dowry. Tradition would attribute all the delay not to the absence but to the number and exceptional qualities of her suitors, Abū Bakr, ‘Omar etc. Muḥammad, in expectation of a divine command, decided on ‘Alī. She is usually said to have been 15 years of age then; others speak of “18 years or more”. As a matter of fact this last figure must have been exceeded if she was about thirty at her death, but it is a very probable mean. As a rule writers avoid dwelling on this point, for girls in Arabia usually married between 9 and 12. Here again there is an allusion to ‘Ā‘ishah who was married at the age of nine.

After the Ḥijrā, ‘Alī or rather Zaid b. Ḥārīrā undertook to bring her to Medina, while her sister Zainab remained in Mecca. As to her marriage, it is as rule not placed before the battle of Badr; others place it after Uḥud. If Abū l-Kāsim settled his daughters in the order of seniority. Fāṭima, supposed to be the youngest, could not marry before her sister Umm Kūlūb who was married to ‘Omar in the period between the two battles.

Other authors claim to reconcile all discrepancies by distinguishing, as in the case of ‘Ā‘ishah, between the conclusion of the marriage before Badr and its consummation after Uḥud but this is again
an artifice to tone down the lack of eagerness for the marriage on both sides. Ali at first declined the match on the ground of his poverty. Muhammad had to remind him of the beautiful curass, won at Badr; this has been made an argument for placing the marriage immediately after this victory. Fatima on her side showed no more enthusiasm. Although a brave soldier Ali was poor and was even said not to be particularly intelligent.

A union concluded under such auspices could hardly promise to be a happy one. Discord soon found a place beside poverty in the home. Muhammad settled the newly married pair near him. Her quarrels with Ali caused him a great deal of pain. Muhammad had continually to intervene without succeeding in restoring peace. The birth of Hasan and Husain, one born a year after the other, probably in 4 and 5 A.H., did not mark any turn for the better. Their mother did not feel strong enough to nourish her children herself and Tradition has turned this fact to the advantage of the Caliphs of Bagdad, by saying they were nursed by one of the wives of Abbas, who had remained in Mecca with all his family till the surrender of the town. The existence of a third son, Mu'assas, who died young, is problematical; it is affirmed principally by the Shiites. There were also two daughters, Zainab and Umm Kuhlum, the latter born in the last year of Fatima's life.

No outstanding event interrupts the course of this monotonous and obscure life. Fatima had little influence with her father and was thrown into the background far behind the enterprise and formidable Aisha and even the other female members of the Prophet's household. Her relations with the former were particularly strained. For the sake of peace, Muhammad found himself forced to close up the door leading to the adjoining house of Fatima. After Uthman she is depicted as tending her father's wounds. On the deaths of Hamzah and Dja'far she resumes her lachrymose role. She tried to intervene, but without success, in the intrigues that divided the "mothers of the believers" and had to retire before Aisha. Tired of monogamy and the trying temperament of Fatima, Ali meditated doing her the grave wrong of marrying a Makhmante and a daughter of Abu Lahab. Muhammad was very indignant and offered his own law the choice between Fatima or divorce; "she is", he added "a portion of my flesh". Other details given by Tradition and obviously biased show us the poverty and weak health of Fatima, forced to do the hardest tasks without her father or husband offering to assist her. Cruel and harsh to his wife and exasperated by her constant reprimandations, Ali is said to have so far forgotten himself as to maltreat his invalid wife, forcing her to take refuge with her father. On his part he began to avoid the conjugal domicile preferring to sleep in the mosque.

The period of the greatest foreign activity in the Prophet, now head of the state, begins with the fifth year A.H. In the interval between the defeat at Uthman and the siege of Medina by the Arab confederates or Jaffa. The period coincides with the married life of Fatima. Absorbed in his wars, and his great schemes of political organisation, he began to neglect his daughter, so poorly endowed by nature and constantly worrying him with her troubles and appeals to his generosity. Not having the help expected from her husband, a brave soldier, but un distinguished for intelligence, he turned to the circle of Abu Bakr and Omna; this was to put himself completely under Aisha's influence, openly hostile to Ali and Fatima. The Jaffa and the Masmud do then begin to close away this unfavourable impression. Thus we are told that the Prophet when he used to go to announce the hour of prayer at Fatima's door. These collections are fond of insinuating the affection shown by him to his grandsons. A whole cycle of traditions of the Prophet's family life has put around the pair near Muhammad, who in his day displayed even at prayer with the "two Hasans". The Sayyids on the other hand emphasizes the marks of tenderness lavished by Abu Talib on his children Zainab, on those on Zaid b. Jarihah, of Dja'far and even of Zuhair ibn Awam, not to mention the little Alabids: orthodox tactics to neutralise the dangerous exaggerations of the Shi'a. The sons of Fatima do seem nevertheless to have won back: their grandfather's affection, particularly when he saw all his children taken from him one by one. These repeated blows may well have extracted from him the disconsolating words "Ali shall perpetuate my line!".

A passage in the Koran (vi. 60) has furnished the framework of an anecdote which has been cleverly exploited; it is Muhammad's interview with the Christian envoy from Najran. Wishing to test the effect of his imprecations (nabala) against them, he arrived, surrounded by Fatima and her family. This scene has inspired another, still more celebrated in Shiiite literature, that of the Jaffa al-Kusai ("privileged ones of the cloak"). He is said to have called out one day while covering Ali and Fatima and the "two Hasans" under his cloak: "These are the members of my family". Since then that group of five persons has been known to Tradition as the "people of the cloak". We can see the object of this, to associate the "Ali" with the Prophet, vindicate for them the privilege of forming, to exclusion of all others, the "people of the house" (ahl al-bait), and the sole possession of the special purity, as announced in the Koran (xxiii. 33): "Ali will cleanse you, people of the house, and purify you", a verse that is directly addressed to the wives of Muhammad, and not to the "Alids and Fatima who are nowhere mentioned in the Koran.

When he became owner of the rich oasis of the northern Hijaz, Muhammad decided to allot to Fatima the annual allowance of 85 loads of wheat, as he had done for his wives. Abu Sulaym arrived in Mecca to renew the treaty of Hudaybiya. Fatima is mentioned among the people whom the Omayyad chief sought to interest in the conclusion of this treaty: the first act of a comedy which was to end in the fath, the surrender of Mecca. She accompanied her father on the military outing, in which, without striking a blow, he became master of the Kuran capital. She is also said to have been present at the farewell pilgrimage. Towards the end of 11 A.H. the Prophet was overtaken by his last illness. Fatima made her way to the bedside of her dying father over whom Aisha was jealously watching, to hear the prediction that she would be the first of the family to rejoin him.
New trials were to mark the last months of Fatima’s life. Fervently at being set aside by the triumvirates, ‘Ali shut himself up in his house with his partisans. Their adversaries led by ‘Umar came to use force against them. Fatima came out, threatening to uncover her hair, the greatest sign of distress among Arab women. A dispute followed regarding the division of her father’s estate, who had, it appears, died intestate. Among the numerous estates of the Prophet, she had particular claims to the oasis of Fadak, which had been her father’s private property in the strictest sense of the word. All this landed property had been declared state land by Abû Bakr. He answered Fatima’s request with the words of the Prophet: “Prophets do not leave heirs.” To this decisive refusal Fátima, after quoting Koran xxviii. 16: “Solomon received Davíd’s inheritance,” is said to have added this obvious distinction: “Prophets and the exalted gifts, attached to this dignity are not heritable, agreed! But the estate remains.” Overruled by Abû Bakr, she swore never again to speak to him and refused even to see him on her deathbed.

Her death is unanimously placed in the year 11 as “six or eight months” after that of her father, a variation that ought to be noted. Not knowing the exact date, the ancient annalists adopted that of the year 11 in conformity to the prophecy quoted above. They must also have argued from the impossibility of granting that Fátima could have survived beyond the year 11, after the behaviour of ‘Ali, who hastened to make peace with Abû Bakr and to collect a complete harem for himself: these were gratuitous insults to the memory of Fátima and could not (they thought) be decently laid to her husband’s charge. We always find the same a priori reasoning: the whole chronology of Fátima’s life has been obtained by this method. Fátima died of exhaustion, perhaps of consumption; this disease was later to carry off her eldest son Hasan, whom some allege to have been poisoned by Mu‘awiyah. By a strange coincidence, ‘Ali, who was away from home, was not present at her deathbed, but he was summoned back to prepare for the funeral which was carried out at night and with the greatest haste. The estimates of her age vary between 25 and 35 years: it depends on the terminus a quo, the date of her birth. The lowest figures owe their origin to authorities chiefly concerned with making her as young as possible at her marriage. The exact site of her tomb was soon forgotten as was to be the fate of those of her husband and the martyrs of Uhud also.

In the eyes of Shī’ites, Fátima represents “the embodiment of all that is divine in womanhood,—the noblest ideal of human conception.” (Syed Ameer Ali) Her birth was miraculous; her union with ‘Ali decided by a divine decree. After having been the poison most dear to the Prophet, she could not survive the grief caused by his death. Without going as far as this, the Sunnís do not reject the hadiths, in which she is declared “the queen of the women of Paradise next Maryam, the daughter of ‘Imrán”; they give her the enigmatical title of babîl, virgin. The ancient orthodox school was inclined to accord the pre-eminence to ‘Ali in choosing between her and Fátima. But the farther we come down the series of collections of Tradition, the larger becomes the list of her faḍā‘il (virtues) and khâlîfîs (privileges).

The number of her devotees increases as Islam begins to feel the need of a hagiology for the use of the weaker sex. Her story, being vague, lent itself much better to edifying amplification than the too well-known story of the romantic daughter of Abû Bakr. On the day of the resurrection Fátima will be on the same level as her father and the two will form a group. When she passes, an angel will cry: “Lower your eyes, ye mortal.” “The Mahdi will be born from her posterity. The above is a modest glimpse into the fontelegium of the specifically Fátimid literature, cultivated by later orthodox writers; it will give an idea of the rest. The real and only importance of Fátima consists entirely in the fact that through her Muhammad’s line has been perpetuated. She participates in the reverence accorded by Islam to its founder. Veneration for Fátima cannot be earlier than the tragedy at Karbala (61 = 680). This cult developed laboriously. Ancient orthodoxy rightly detected in it a danger to the unity of Islam and the Arab empire: the Caliphs of Bagdâd, after having exploited it, endeavoured to turn the veneration for the Mahdi aside to the descendants of ‘Abbás. It is difficult to explain why the descendants of Muhammad’s other daughters did not participate in this veneration to the same degree as the Fátimids, a name frequently given to the descendants of Fátima.

Fatima is a name that covers a real personality but one that eludes the investigations of the critic. Around this inconstant figure the struggle between Shi‘í and Sunnís has centred; it has been an irregular battle with underhand stratagems and parallel tactics, in which the details conceal and distort our view of the whole conflict. This strife, lacking in sincerity and grandeur, a regular guerrilla warfare of partisans, a war fertile in surprises, utterly distracts the eye of the historian, who desires to fix his attention on this fleeting figure, the lightly painted portrait of the heroine, the cause of and the stake in the struggle. When the two great Muslim parties had taken the field, the dispute was further complicated by the quarrels of the schools, or by particular tendencies, each claiming to be authorised by the example of this daughter of the Prophet, to make a doctrine, a rule of conduct, or moral or ritual prescriptions prevail. Under pressure of the Shî‘a, the school of Kûfâ, the rival to that of Medina, developed the exaltation of Fátima, in opposition to the glorification of ‘Âishah, elaborated in the Hijâz, just as it transformed the brief history of her husband ‘Ali into an answer to the Medina legend of Abû Bakr. Relying on the precautions, which it believed itself to be secured by, orthodoxy seems to have set its mind at rest by thinking of the honour which would be reflected from the cult on the Prophet and his family. While filling up a lacuna in the Sîra, they at the same time freed him from the reproach of indifference to his family. Even the ‘Abbásids found it opportune to abandon their hostile neutrality: this was not a disinterested change of attitude but one in which their easy policy is quite apparent. They must henceforth have tolerated the glorification of Fátima and Fátima among the authors, who worked under their supervision, but on condition that they emphasised the obligations of the ‘Alids to their powerful ‘Askimî cousins, and depicted them as
having always lived under their protection on the
cremains that fell from their tables. Posteriority thought
that this edifying antithesis should be taken se-
riously, in which the personality of Fátima is
used as a pretext, a basis for further developments,
a pious make-believe, destined to further recog-
nition of the cult. From these elements has arisen
a vast biographical literature, a heterogeneous
mixture of elements, for the most part spurious
and frequently contradictory. Fâtima was not the
idea dreamed up by Ali and his circle; perhaps
she did not play such a humble part: she may
have been a less insignificant individual than her
adversaries make out. This last impression is the
one obtained from an impartial study of the an-
cient documents, which are more sober and contain
less fabulous additions. One can understand why
the piety of later ages has sought to embellish
the figure of the Prophet's daughter, but it is less
easy to understand why Tradition should have
deliberately sought to misrepresent it, if it did not
believe in doing so it was doubtless the result
of the fabrications of partisans.
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FĀTIMIDS. The origin of the Fātimid move-
ment is to be sought among the ʿIsāmīs, whose
centre was from about the middle of the third
century A.H. the small town of Salamīyah between
Ḥamāt and Ḥims. Among the ḍāris [i. v., i, 895b
et seq.], who went forth from here to the various
Muslim countries, particularly to Mesopotamia,
Persia and the Yemen, to engage in very success-
ful missionary work, Abu ʿAbd Allāh [i. v., i,
74], who became famous under the name al-Shīrī
was the first to gain a firm footing in the
Magrib at the Berber tribe of Ṛta in (from
the end of 272 = 895) and gradually under-
mined the power of the Aghlabīs. This induced
the then head of the Ismāʿīlī sect, ʿUbaydallāh
(who seems originally to have been called Saʿīd)
to go first to Egypt about 289 = 902, and thence
to the west when he found him-self
subject to constant persecution instigated by the
Aḥlabīs; but, however, he was thrown into prison
in Sīdīmānī by order of Ziyādat Allāh. Al-Shīrī's
brilliant and victorious campaign, which after
the capture of Tāberh and Raḵkkāda, made an end
of Aghlabī rule, led to his rise, and, on the 29th
Rabi' II, 297 (15th January 910), he was able to
make his ceremonial entry into Raḵkkāda and
take the name al-Mahdī and the title Amīr al-
Muʾinnin. They at once set to work in the most
earnest fashion with the introduction of the Shiʿi
creed but they never succeeded in overcoming
the Malikītism of the natives for more than a
brief period. Al-Mahdīya (on the coast not far from
Raḵkkāda), which received its name from that of
the Caliph, was made the capital in 306 = 920.
The next generation of Umayyads were the
residences of their own — Abu ʿl-Kāʾim (Muḥam-
dad) al-Kāʾim, while still a prince, built al-Mu-
hammadīya, while al-Manṣūr built al-Manṣūrīya —
but these never attained any particular importance.

Such was the origin of the Fātimids. Their
name refers to the descent, which they claimed
from ʿAlī and Fátima, a claim the justice of which
cannot even now be decided with certainty, al-
though there are undoubtedly grave rea-ons against
it, so that ʿUbaydallāh's descent from Māṁṣān, a
Persian occultist, which is upheld by the other
side, is not improbable. In any case, it appears
that suspicion of the dynasty only appears at a
comparatively late period in literature: the unre-
liability of certain important authorities like Akhū
Muḥasṣin (see C. H. Becker, Die age zur Geschichte
Egyptiens, p. 4 et seq.) is likewise demonstrable:
It is obvious also that any means must have seemed
legitimate to the Aḥlabīs for overthrowing their
dangerous and superior rivals but, if it was upheld
by the defenders of the legitimacy of the Fātimids,
among whom Maṣrīqī and Ibn Kūhānī are pre-
eminent, that ʿUbaydallāh would never have had
to suffer from the plots and persecution of the
Caliph of Baghḍād already referred to, if the latter
had not feared him as an ʿAlī, it can be said
in reply to this argument that ʿUbaydallāh was at
that time no obscure or utterly unknown per-
sonality, but well known as the grand-master of
the Ismāʿīlīs and that this might be the reason
why he was suspected. Nor is the objection quite
convincing that, with the great number and wide
dispersion of the ʿAlīds at this time, it would have
been impossible for their adherents to attach
themselves to the descendants of a Magian (the
occult Māṁṣān) or Jew. This latter assertion, that
ʿUbaydallāh was of Jewish descent, is certainly to
be traced to the hatred of his enemies (cf. J. Gold-
zieher, Muḥammadische Studien, i, 205), but it
must not be forgotten that the ʿAlīds themselves have
repeatedly attacked the genuineness of the Fātimid
pedigree with great vigour and have also taken
up a directly hostile attitude to them. What is particu-
larly surprising, however, is the absolute un-
certainty of tradition everywhere regarding the
genealogy of the Fātimids (cf. Wustenfeld, p. 12
et seq.). August Müller (i, 597) has already shown
how their genuineness is shaken by the contradiction with the view of the Druse, who simply make Manṣūr an ally. The energies of the new ruling house were for the next two generations constantly occupied with an unending series of domestic troubles. Ubaidallah’s treacherous murder only a year after his accession of the strongest supporter of his rule, al-Shīfi, who was threatening to obtain by force the recognition hitherto denied him, was severely avenged. The principal trouble was the rebellion of the Zenāta and of the Kitāma with them. The wars with the former were only brought to an end with the conquest of their city Tāhert by Maṣāla in 299 = 911; the latter then conquered the Idrīsids but Fāṣ was left to a prince of this house; soon afterwards he conquered Sīdjīmās also. His power thus formed a bulwark of the Fāṭimid interests in the west till his death in 312 = 924. But his successor, Ibn Abī l-ʿAfiya, although at first able to win more brilliant successes by subduing the whole of the Maghrib as far as Cæuta where a few Idrīsids still held out, thought it better to submit to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III., who had occupied Cæuta, in view of his threatening proximity. It was only in the reign of ʿUbadal-laḥ’s son al-Kaʿīm (322–334 = 934–946) that the deserter was conquered, his territory restored to the Idrīsids and rebellion in Tāhert put down. But these troubles passed into insurrection before the rebellion of Abī Yaqzīd [q. v., i. 113 et seq.], which broke out in 322 = 934–944 and threatened to be the greatest danger to which Fāṭimid power had yet been exposed. He was able to win considerable support, particularly among the Ḫarījītī elements in the Awrās and the greatest cities of the empire fell one by one before the onrush of his Berber hordes. He was so successful that he laid siege to the Caliph in al-Mahdiya. Although he was forced to raise the siege after blockading the city for a year, al-Kaʿīm was again besieged soon afterwards in Sīsa where he succumbed to the hardships he had endured. His son al-Manṣūr (334–353 = 946–965) prepared for the campaign against Mahdiya in the civil war after severe fighting in which Abī Yaʿqūb was slain. The always uncertain attitude of the Idrīsids and Zenāta in the West also became rather more settled about this time so that for once the empire could find a breathing space after a long period of internal convulsions.

These decades of unrest, to which were added earthquake, plague and famine, naturally impeded to a considerable degree the efforts of the early Fāṭimid power to expand their power. From the beginning they devoted most of their energies to advancing eastwards against Egypt, but the attempts to conquer the country in this series all ended in failure. In the reign of ʿUbdallāh his son Abu l-ʿAṣām twice (301–302 = 913–915 and 307–309 = 919–921) invaded the Nile valley, but both times initial successes were followed by severe defeats, in the second campaign again. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān was retained as a permanent conquest. When he became Caliph, Abu l-ʿAṣām sent a third expedition against Egypt in 322 = 935, but this was unable to break down the vigorous resistance of the Ikhsī. Much less attention was devoted to Sicily [q. v.] where a Fāṭimid governor had been installed immediately after the overthrow of the Aḥyābids. Although after his expulsion
977 the new Caliph al-'Azîz (365–386 = 976–996) defeated him, but the city still remained Egyptian in name only. It was only in 378 = 988 that it was finally won for the Fāţimids by the enunç Mu'nîr. Tripolis then remained the most northern point in their Syrian possessions. Repeated attempts to capture Aleppo failed however, as it was energetically supported in its defence by the Byzantines; in the great siege of 383–384 = 993–994 it was relieved by the Emperor Basil II in person. It may be said that the empire attained its greatest extent towards the end of the reign of 'Azîz. In 382 = 992 even the Uqailîd Abu l-Dhâwâb b. al-Musayyib had prayed in the name of 'Azîz, although for but a brief period. But in North Africa even with Bulukkin's successor the bonds that bound the empire began to loosen till in 347 = 1054–1056 Mu'izz b. Bâdis finally broke off from the Fāţimids and had prayers pronounced in the name of the Caliph of Baghûḏ. The Egyptian authorities thereupon induced the tribe of the Banû Hilal to invade the Maghrib and although they advanced victoriously as far as Kairûnâ, the land remained irrevocably lost to the Fāţimids. Nor did further developments of affairs in Syria ever lead to the latter regaining a secure possession of the Egyptian Caliph; on the contrary we have a long series of great and small risings, sometimes of the Syrian emirs themselves, sometimes also of the governors and generals sent from Cairo besides wars against foreign powers; the cause was the lack of one powerful controlling will at the head of the central government. The Byzantines were at first disposed of with comparative ease; after they had suffered two defeats at Tyre by sea, and at Apamea by land, a ten years' truce was entered into in the early years of the Caliph Hâkim (386–411 = 996–1021). Temporary successes were marked by the homage of the Uqailîd Kûrîsh b. Ma'allûk in 401 = 1010–1011 and the transitory occupation of Aleppo (402 = 1011). On the other hand the rising of the Banû Djarraḥ, who set up an anti-Caliph in the person of the Shâfiʿ of Mecca, Abu l-Futûḥ, into whose hands the greater part of Syria soon fell, caused a good deal of anxiety. The Egyptian troops were defeated and it was only by bribery that the trouble was finally settled and the Shâfiʿ allowed to resume his position in Mecca. The utter weakness of Egyptian rule came to light under Hâkim's successor al-Zâhir (411–427 = 1021–1036). Three enemies threatened it at the same time: Hâsân b. Daghâlî, one of the main figures in the above mentioned rebellion, took in Palestine, Sinan besieged Damascus, while the Mirdâsî and Šâliḥ captured Aleppo from the Egyptians, which they had held for the last few years: (definitely probably since the end of 417 = 1027, cf. Becker, Beitrag, p. 45 et seq.). Then an officer of exceptional ability, al-Dîrizî, took command and his vigorous measures were crowned with success. Hâsân and Šâliḥ were defeated by him at Uqîwânâ (420 = 1029) and the latter fell in the battle; he regained Damascas and by a further victory over the Banû Mirdâs on the Orontes (429 = 1038) entered into possession of Aleppo. He devoted himself to the restoration of law and order. A ten years' peace was again concluded with the Byzantines and al-Dîrizî even succeeded in having the Fāţimî Caliph recognised in Hârsân, Sarıqâ and Raʾka. This distinguished soldier fell all too soon a victim to the intrigues of the vizier al-Djurjûrâ and the rapid downfall of Fāţimî power could no longer be averted. Palestine rebelled again under Hâsân, Aleppo at once fell to the Mirdâsî Muʿizz. The Egyptian twice, in 440 = 1048 and 441 = 1049, sought in vain to regain it; although the prince above mentioned submitted again in 449 = 1057, the town was lost to Fāţimids, — this time for ever, in 452 = 1060. The apparent success, which will be recoded elsewhere, such as the submission of Baṣîrî in Baghûḏ (450 = 1068), the surrender of al-Šulâîlî, who was able to enforce the recognition of their Caliphate in the Hijâz and Yemen from Mecca to Hadrâmawt, went but a little way to balance the loss of their power in Syria; for a new danger was already steadily advancing from the east in the rising might of the Sâmûlîs. In 463 = 1071 Jerusalem fell to them, in 468 = 1076 Damascus, and after this date it is impossible to speak of Fāţimî power in Syria, although there was no lack of attempts to restore it and numerous battles on Syrian soil, of which more will be said below.

Egypt was therefore the only land left of which the Fāţimîs could really maintain a permanent hold, in which they impressed the stamp of their characteristics, and which formed the basis of their rule in the Nile valley which will only be dealt with in its main outlines here; for the details the reader is referred to the separate articles and to the article EGYPT [ii. 4th ed.]. Their power was placed on a sound basis by the cautious and deliberate policy of the two first Egyptian Caliphs al-Muʿizz and al-'Azîz as well as by the careful organisation of the mechanism of administration and finance in which they found a most valuable adviser in Ibn Killîs in spite of many faults. Under the second of these rulers he received the rank of vizier, an office which in course of further developments became of the highest importance. He was a Jew by descent, although a convert to Islam; one of his immediate successors, Isâ b. Nestorius, was a Christian; the Jew Masmush was appointed to govern Syria, so that an early and marked sign of the oscillating favouring of the Abî al-Ktâb, particularly the Christians, which is characteristic of the Fāţimîs. By the time of 'Azîz, however, we find a rather strong reaction from the Muslim side, but even under his successor al-Hâkim, the son of a Christian mother, whose tyrannical moods repeatedly found expression in rigorous oppression of Christians and Jews, we find Christians in the highest offices. The reign of this Caliph forms in other points also a marked contrast to those of his two predecessors. Although many meritorious institutions and important foundations such as the "House of Sciences" are due to him, his cruel despotism caused on the whole a great misfortune for the land and led to the utter disintegration in the country. This showed itself in the rebellion of the Spanish Umayyad Abu Rakwa, which was only suppressed with difficulty. The danger formed by the mercenary troops of Turks and negroes now became visible; they had first been employed in addition to the Berber troops by al-`Azîz, and their insubordination and constant quarrelling among themselves became the chief reason for the gradual collapse of the kingdom. After the ruler, following up the extreme development of the Ismâ‘îli system had claimed to be a deity, and conditions in the capital had become unbearable, he disappeared in the night of the 27th Shawwâl 411
(13th February 1021) in a mysterious fashion. Henceforth it became almost without exception the rule, for children and unripe youths to be placed on the throne while viziers and generals held the actual reins of government in their hands. At first, however, it was a clever and energetic woman, Hâkim’s sister, the so-called Sitt al-Mulik, who took over the regency for her sixteen-year-old nephew al-Zâhir and soon brought order out of chaos. But she cannot long have remained at the helm of state, for her name is no longer mentioned during the severe famine of 415 = 1025, which led to countless riots in Cairo and threw a lurid light on the lack of discipline among the mercenary bands in which bloody battles were constantly being fought between the negroes on the one side and the Turks and Berbers on the other, and the utter helplessness of Mustanîr, whose rich treasures were ruthlessly plundered by the barbarous soldiery, gradually led to events, which revealed the lowest abasement of the Fatimid Caliphate and the political and economic fortunes of the land at their lowest level. The land was severely ravaged for seven years by a terrible famine, which was in the first place the result of the low level of the Nile in 457 = 1065 and secondly of the devastation of the Delta and the prevention of any importation of provisions by the rebellious commander-in-chief Nâzîr al-Dowla. In the midst of the crusades and the Crusader crusades the country suffered an irreparable loss by the brutal destruction of the unique library of the Caliph by the Turkish mercenaries. It was not till 465 = 1072-1073 that there was at last a good harvest and at the same time the country found a saviour in Badr al-Djamalî [q. v., i. 560 et seq.], a general of Armenian descent, who had hitherto been employed in Syria and was raised to the highest military and civil offices in 466 = 1073 by the vacillating Caliph. He restored order throughout the country with a strong arm, the power of the Turkish emirs was broken, and prestige of the Fatimids once more assured as far as Asuan. Under his two regents quelled the decadence of the whole government, restored peace and order, but he was no longer able to save Syria. In 468 = 1076 Damascus, as above mentioned, had fallen and all attempts to regain it were in vain. In the end only a few towns in the south remained in Egyptian hands. When the great vizier died in 487 = 1094, his son Shâhânshâh took over administration of the country with equal energy, and was likewise able to assure its material prosperity. The name al-Mulik al-Afjal given him clearly shows the powerful position he held. After al-Mustanîr’s death in the same year he had appointed his youngest son, al-Mustâ’îz, Caliph, who during the few years of his Caliphate (he died in 495 = 1001) remained a powerless puppet in the hands of the all-powerful vizier. The rebellion of his elder brother, Nâzîr, was suppressed. Al-Afjal resumed his father’s attempts to regain Syria, but now there was a further enemy to be faced, the Crusaders, whose importance he does not seem to have recognised in time, till the capture of Jerusalem (492 = 1099), which he had won from the Urtujids only a short time before, by the Christian knights opened his eyes to this new danger. The next two decades were filled with battles with varying results between the Egyptians and the Crusaders, but finally only Tyre and Ascalon remained in the hands of the Fatimids, when the vizir was murdered in 515 = 1121 at the instigation of the Caliph al-Azîz (495-534 = 1101-1139) who wished to escape from his tutelage. His by no means incapable successor, Ibn al-Batâ’îli, was not able to replace him; al-Amîr, a malignant despot, then sought to govern alone, to the country’s misfortune till he perished at the hands of the Assassins in 524 = 1130. After a brief interregnum by a son of al-Afjal, who had prayers said in name of the “expected Imam”, his cousin al-Hâfîz, a man of mature years, ascended the throne, for the first time by a break in the direct line of succession, as the murdered Caliph had left no son. He also attempted to govern independently and to maintain his brilliant vizier Yânis. Revolts of the troops and constant humiliations of the powerless ruler mark the beginning of the end and the atrocities, which history relates of the brief reign of his young son al-Zâhir (544-548 = 1149-1154), make it clear how far the degeneration and decline of the dynasty had proceeded by this time. Once more, however, a strong personality took over the reins of government in the courtly Ta’lî ‘b. Ruzzîk, whom the panic-stricken women of the palace called upon after al-Zâhir’s tragic end. The country had need of such a man. Al-Ta’lî, a sickly child of five, chosen Caliph by his father’s murderers, sat on the throne; in Palestine Ascalon, the last bulwark against the Franks, had fallen in 548 = 1153; the Egyptian coast-towns were burned in 550 = 1155 by a Sicilian fleet. The new dictator first of all saw that law and order were successfully restored in the land and his general Dirghâm [q. v., i. 978] won a great victory over the Franks at Ghazza in 553 = 1158. Shortly after the accession of the last Fatimid, al-Afîd, Ta’lî also was all too soon treacherously murdered, his son and successor soon afterwards met the same fate and Egypt now became a pawn in the game between the two great Syrian powers, Damascus, where the Zangîs now reigned, and Jerusalem, where the Franks were in a strong position of aggression the quarrel developing between the two most powerful races in the declining state, Shâwar and Dirghâm, coincided. The young Caliph, one of the few figures among the later Fatimids that awaken sympathy, was too weak to avert the approaching downfall of his house and the appointment of the Damascene general Shirkhû as vizier, with which the independence of the dynasty practically ceased, put an end to all these protracted wars and turmoil. Shirkhû’s successor, Saladin, formally put an end to the dynasty when, in the beginning of 567 = September 1171, he reintroduced the prayer for the ‘Abdâds. A few days later the unfortunate al-Afîd died and with him the Fatimid family disappears from history.
'Ubaḍallāh’s successors, although not very successful in their foreign policy after their conquest of Egypt, nevertheless were able for long to maintain a position of splendor and power. This they owed not, as Lane-Poole supposes, to their foreign guards, who on the contrary very soon showed themselves a source of danger, but to their extraordinary ability of the two first great Caliphs in Cairo, to the mild rule of most of their successors, as well as to the energy of great viziers and generals, of whom more than one raised the kingdom to a new prosperity after grave periods of depression. Traces of the Shī‘ite fanaticism of the early decades are only rarely noticed in the Egyptian period. The great endeavour of the dynasty, whose legitimacy was always disputed, was, after it settled in Cairo, to create a punctiliously regulated ceremonial and carefully graduated categories of officers and officials, as well as to develop an unwontedly luxurious way of living and an extraordinary splendour at court. In this respect, as William of Tyre’s accounts of two days of al-‘Aḍīd show, they have been equalled by few Muslim rulers, and to this day the Azhar, Ḥākim, Aḵmar and Djiyūḏīs Mosque, as well as the great gates, Bāb al-Naṣr, Bāb al-Futūḥ and Bāb Zuwarail testify to the grandeur of the buildings erected by them.


(Ε. Gαβεέν.)

FATĪN EFDŅI, a minor official (kādī) at the sublime Porte, died at the end of the “fifties” of last century, wrote the biographies of Ottoman poets and versifiers from 1135 to his own time under the title Tərekčee khāsīmat ālaḥār as a continuation of the Tekeere of Muṣṭafā Saftā (ends at 1132 A.H.) and of Mirzāzādeh Sālim (ends at 1134 A.H.) at the request of several patrons of high rank. The work, which the author completed in 1269, was lithographed in 1271 (1854-1855) in Constantinople and deserves notice for its biographical data concerning contemporary writers.


(J. H. Morydman.)

FATRA (Α.) latitudine, feebleness or Luke-warmness; the interval of time between the disappearance of a prophet and the appearance of another; also the period between Jesus and Muhammad; and more generally, a relapse in religious feeling. In the life of Muḥammad it signifies the interval between the revelation of Sūrā 96 and 74 of the Korān. Feeling that inspiration had forsaken him, the Prophet suffered great mental depression. He began to wonder whether, after all he was not possessed” (majdhūba), and meditated suicide by casting himself from mount Hira. But a mysterious power is said to have restrained him and the suspense of length was ended by the revelation of the Sūra entitled “The Enwrapped”. This period of “intermission” lasted 2½ or 3 years.

(A. S. Fulton.)

AL-FATṬĀH (Α.), the “Opener”, one of the names of God [cf. i. 304].

FATTAH, YāḥYĀ SIYĀKH, a Persian poet of Nishāpūr, died 852 (1448-1449) or 853 (1449-1450), had at first the name Ṭūfakkāh (in allusion to Siyāk a “little apple”); he also took the names Khayārāt and Arzārāt. He wrote a prose work entitled Ḥasan u Dil “Beauty and Heart”, a romance for which many allusions to local expressions, transl. into English by A. Browne (Dublin 1801) and W. Price (London 1828), into German by R. Drofak (Vienna 1880), and imitated in Turkish by Lāmī, Aḥī and Wālī; his Shabīs-tān Khayāl (in the London and Paris Ms.: Nikāt “Abode of Fancy”, is a collection of tales, stories and jeux d’esprit in rhyme and prose, of which the first chapter has been published and translated by H. Ethé (Leipzig 1868).


(C. Huart.)

FATWĀ. A fatwā is a formal legal opinion given by a mufti or cano lawyer of standing, in answer to a question submitted to him either by a judge or by a private individual. On the basis of such an “opinion” a judge may decide a case, or an individual may regulate his personal life. It must be rendered in precise accordance with fixed precedent; a mufti cannot now follow his own judgment. But inasmuch as these opinions deal with actual cases, as opposed to the abstractions of text-books of canon law, published collections of which are numerous, are valuable as exhibitions of real situations. In the ideal Muslim state, where cano law would rule absolutely, all these decisions would be equally backed by state authority, and would be the law of the land. But as the case is, in practically all Muslim states, a distinction has entered and the cano law, expressed in these fatwas, rules only in such matters as marriage, inheritance and divorce. All other legal questions are decided by other codes or by the will of the sovereign. And fatwas on the side of cano law, which regulates the details of the personal religious life, have validity only for the pious. Further, there is a tendency in some Muslim states to favour some one or other of the four legal schools. Thus Turkey everywhere upholds the Hanafi school and appoints Hanafite judges only. It may appoint muftis of all four schools; but only the fatwas of Hanafite muftis are admitted in the law courts. The others are purely for the private convenience of the followers of the other schools.
FAWŻI (£.) "troop" is the name given since the reorganisation of the Persian army to the tactical unit of infantry, the battalion, which is commanded by a colonel (sarkār) and sometimes by a brigadier-general of the third class sañi-o- ðalih). Each battalion should contain 800 men but in practice is much below this figure. It is not denoted by a number but by the name of the city or tribe of its origin.

Bibliography: Polak, Persien, i. 42; San'ī al-Dawla Muhammad Ḥasan-Khan, Matḥo' al-Shams, p. 25 et seq. (section on infantry).

(CL. HUART.)

FAWŻIDĀR was the title of the chief military and police officer of a sarkār (revenue district) under Muḥammadan rule in India. His duties were the maintenance of order, the punishment of rebels and rioters, and, frequently, the collection of the revenue. Though subordinate to the provincial authorities, the fawżidār enjoyed the privilege of direct correspondence with the imperial court and the appointment was often a stepping-stone to the highest offices.

The title of fawżidār was also given, under the house of Timūr, to subordinate officers in the elephant stable.

(TE. HAIR.)


Among places which belonged to the Fazāra, there are mentioned: 'Adama, al-Akādir, Qādir, Baldah, Parāq, Djiṣhī A'yr, al-Dul, Djiṣāna, al-Dji'nā (between Medina and Faid), Dārā Djiṭhr, Yarā'a, Kunaib, al-Luṣṭa, Kinn, Sināb (on Mount 'Urfa, a place of some size), Shu'ā'ab, Ural and Urainā. Among mountains: Abān al-Aṣwad and Abān al-Abyad (between them the Wādi l-Rumma), al-Ahūd, al-Akāwī, Dha' Ur (in Wustenfeld Register, p. 167 wrongly Dha' Waral), Dha' Ghārid (in common with the B. Muḥbarī), al-Mudajmar and 'Urfa l-Adjshāl with the hill of Djišt al-Ālun, among watering-places: Abākārī, Arwa, Bāṭin al-Liwa (only the lower part), Djiṭhr, al-Duṭhāna, Dīghāna, al-Ḥas, Kharza, al-Rima, Rās, Shijarī, Urāwā, Uraïnāt and Ur-Ṭaimīn.

History: —The Fazara under Ḥudaybīya b. Badr and his son Ḥiṣn played a prominent part in the war which lasted for decades between the 'Abs and the Dhubyān, the so-called Djiṭhr war. They took part in the battles of the Dha' l-Muraqbilīb, Yam'ṭariya, Ḥabībā, Rakm etc. In the early years of Islam they gave a good deal of trouble to the Prophet, who, according to tradition, bought his first horse, which he rode at Ḥudaydah, from one of the Fazara. In the year 5 (= 626) under 'Uyainā b. Ḥiṣn they besieged Medina in alliance with other tribes of the Ghatafān and the Jews of Qhaibār (the so-called "Battle of the Ditch"). In the following year a number of the Fazara raided a herd of camels belonging to the Prophet at al-Qaibā, a few miles from Medina, plundered a caravan from Medina and wounded its leader Zaid b. Ḥiṣn, whereupon the latter in revenge took prisoner Mālik b. Ḥudaybīya's widow, Umm Kirfa Fajja, and put her to a cruel death. In 8 (629) they were about to help the Jews of Khaibār against the Prophet but were prevented by the latter. In the so-called "Year of the Deputations" (9 = 630) they appeared before Muhammad under Kharidja b. Ḥiṣn to tender their submission. After the Prophet's death they, like the 'Abs and other tribes, renounced Islam, but were conquered by Abū Bakr.


FĀZĪ ĤUSEIN BAY, a Turkish poet, celebrated for his erotic works, also called Enderûn Fāzī. He was a grandson of Tāhir Ḫūrshīf Akkā, who rebelled against the Porte in the seventies of the eighteenth century; after his grandfather in 1775 and his father Tāhir Ėli in 1776 had been slain in battle against the Kapudanpasha Ḥāzī Ėsna, he was taken to the capital by the latter and brought up in the royal serai (endem.) On leaving the serai, he filled various posts in the Office of the Treasury, and in 1790 was banished to Rhodes. There he became blind; after he returned to Constantinople, where he died at the age of 1225 (beginning of 1811). His poems Ženâhim (Book of Women) and Khabâhanâme (Book of Beauties) were lithographed in Constantinople in 1835 [v. Hammer, Osma. Dichtkunst, iv. 603; Zunker, p. 596; Flügel, Handschr. d. Hofbibl. zu Wien, i. 422 et seq.; Fazil-Bay, Le Livre des Femmes (Zenan-Nauch)], trad. du turc par l. Decourdemanche etc. (Paris 1879); but Mustafa Rashid, the Minister of the Exterior of the day, had the whole edition confiscated on account of the offensive subject-matter, so that only a few copies got into circulation. A new edition with various other similar works of the author was published in 1826.

Bibliography: Faţīn, Tēzkere, p. 321 et seq.; Sīdīji, 'Othmânî (ed. v. v. Hammer, Osmanische Dichtkunst, iv. 428–453; Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry, iv. 219–215 et passim; cf. also: Şahînî, i. 407; Djevedet, i. 105; i. 219; (J. H. Mordmann.)

FĀZĪL (FAZIL), MUHAMMAD, known as Kâra Fāzīl (Faţîli the Black) or Fāzīl Ėlif, an
Ottoman poet. The son of a saddler, born in Constantinople, he devoted himself to the study of mysticism as a pupil of Zanfî and, according to 'Ahî, entered the Khalwati order. He soon showed himself a poet of talent. His teacher, Zâtî, himself celebrated as a poet, succeeded in drawing Sulṭân Sulaimân's attention to him in 1550, at the festival on the circumcision of Princes Mehemmed, Muştafa and Selim. The Sulṭân liked him and appointed him secretary of the daiwân to his son Mehemmed who was going off as governor of Magnesia. He remained in this office after Mehemmed's death, with Prince Muştafa till the latter's execution in 1552, when prince Selim, afterwards Sulṭân, took him into his service as secretary of the daiwân. Fażîli died in 970 (1562-1563). Unpretentious and ascetic in his life, he displayed a glowing passion as a poet. Fażîli is one of the more important poets of the reign of Sulṭân Sulaimân, not unjustly called the golden age of Ottoman poetry. He wrote a Divân, as seems to be the unwritten law with all Ottoman poets, with ghazals, kazâdas and quatrains (rubâţî) and a nâbdîstân (passion-grove), a mixture of prose and verse, modelled on Ṣâ'dî's Mathnâvî; he gives his great importance as a poet lies in his Mevlevî's: the history of love-affairs in 5,000 verses entitled, Hûnûn u Hüsûnîyân, in the style of Khusraw u Shârîn, is probably an imitation or reproduction of the poem of the same name by the Persian poet, Khwâja of Kûrmân. Fażîli's most celebrated work is the romantic allegorical Mesnawi, Gûl u Bûblû (the Rose and the Nightingale), in the style of the Gûl u Nûrînâ, the allegorical story of the love of the nightingale for the rose. Written in 960 (1552-1553) the poem is dedicated to Prince Muştafa. Its language is one of the most beautiful of its kind, although Fažîli cannot entirely be credited with originality in the subject. It is ingeniously treated and its language is particularly brilliant. It has become known in Europe also through Hammer's text and translation. But he no longer suits the modern taste with his fondness for subtle allegory.


FÂZULULLAH. Turkish pronunciation of Fażîl Allâm.

FAZOĞLÎ. A mountainous district in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan situated between lat. 10 and 11 N. and extending from the Blue Nile to the Abyssinian frontier and beyond. The chief places are Fazogli and Fämaka on the Blue Nile. The district is inhabited by backward Negroid tribes among whom Islam and the Arabic language have spread to a certain extent since the time of the Fung conquest; their ethnological position has not yet been determined, the principal tribes are Burûm, Barta, Hamadî (Hameg) and Mignello. The Fung who once ruled the country have now almost completely died out. There are also a certain number of Arabs who migrated into the district from other parts of the Sudan.

Since an early period Fazogli was famous for its export of slaves and gold. A certain quantity of the latter is still obtained, but the principal gold-producing district, that of Banî Shankûl (Shangûl) is in Abyssinian territory.

In the time prior to the Egyptian conquest Fazogli was a vassal state of the Fung kingdom of Sennâr. The Fung are stated to have conquered it under their king Unsa, the son of Nâṣir who reigned at the close of the 17th century. The traveller Bruce who visited Sennâr and Abyssinia in the 18th century states that the Fung left the old ruling family in possession, only forcing them to acknowledge their sovereignty and to pay tribute. This is contradicted by the French traveller Cailliaud (quoted by Shukair) according to whom the kings of Fazogli belonged to a branch of the royal family of the Fung. A list of the kings extending over 215 years prior to the Egyptian conquest is given by Cailliaud (quoted by Naʿûm Shukair).

Fazogli was occupied by the Egyptians under Ismâʿîl Pâshâ in 1822. Ismâʿîl visited the gold district of Banî Shankûl, which disappointed his expectations. Since then the district shared in the history of the Egyptian Sudan, but during the time of the Mahdi and his successor Fazogli was independent of the Omdurman government and part of it became subject to Abyssinia.

Under the present administration the greater part of Fazogli belongs to the Sennâr province of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

Bibliography: James Bruce, Travels to discover the sources of the Nile, 2d ed. (Edinburgh 1804), vol. VI passim; Naʿûm Bey Shukair, Turâṣh as-Sûdân (Cairo, 1903) see index; The Anglo-Egyptian Sudan: a compendium . . . ed. by Count Gleichen (London, 1905), vol. II, see index; E. A. Wallis Budge, The Egyptian Sudan (London 1907); on ethnology cp. I. Waterston, Report upon the physical characteristics of some of the Nilotic Negroid tribes in Third Report of the Welcombe Research laboratories at the Gordon College Khartoum by Andrew Balfour (London, 1908), p. 325 et seq. (S. Hilleson.)

FEĐÜ. [See F&B.]

FEHIM, an Ottoman poet and scholar; his full name was FEHİM SULAIMÂN EVENDI and he is also known as KHOĐJA FEHİM. Born in 1203 (1787-1788) in Constantinople, he first of all became an official in the Divân, then in the Mint and Customs service, and ultimately a ġâ'immašûn in Rumelia. He retired from office and obtained a reputation as a teacher of Persian in Constantinople. He died in 1262 (1845-1846). Fehim principally composed ghazals and his Divân has been printed. He wrote a commentary (Saḥîh) on selected ghazals of the Persian poet Śâh's Saḥîh and translated the 'Biographies of Poets' (Tercer-i) of Dawlat-Shâh under the title Safiâz-ı Şanâ'î into Turkish (also printed).

Bibliography: M. Nâdji, Mejmûa-i Meşîlîn (Constantinople 1304), No. 40; Mehemmed Thuriyya, Siyâsî Othmânî (1308-1315), iv. 30; Şâmi, Kamûn-i A'îâm (1306-1315), v. 3456. (Th. Menzel.)

FEHİM UNUZ-LADE MUŞTAFA ÇELEBI, known in literature as Fehim of Constantinople, an Ottoman poet of the late classical period (under Murad IV. and Ibrahim 1623-1648), and one of the few more important representatives of
the period. A simple scholar, without any proper calling, he attached himself to men of note. He came to Cairo in the train of Eyyub Pasha who had been appointed governor of Egypt. But he could not accustom himself to life here, as the bitter verses, veritable Trisitia, which he wrote there against Egypt, show. When he lost the favour of the Pasha, absolutely penniless, he had to appeal to a prominent citizen of Cairo who sent him home with the annual caravan bearing the Egyptian tribute. But he was doomed never to see it again, for he died at Ilghun near Konya of the plague, it is said, in 1054 (1644) or 1058 (1648); the statements on this point vary.

Feihm's works are throughout lyrical. He compiled his Divan at the early age of 18. The spirit of the new school is already active in Feihm, who lived at the beginning of the struggle between the Persian and Turkish schools. He sought the subjects of his ghazals in the trivial events of everyday life. His influence down to the most recent times is undisputed. Kemal, for example, began his career as a poet with verses in imitation of Feihm's.


(TH. MENZEL.)

**FELEKE,** properly falaqa, an instrument of torture, consisting of a wooden pole to the two extremities of which a cord is attached to form a bow; the legs of the victim are passed between the pole and the cord; the instrument is then turned round several times to bind them tightly and make criminal motionless. In this position he is beaten with a stick on the soles of the feet. Schoolmasters and heads of workshops use it to punish children and apprentices. In Turkey, when the Agha of Janissaries used to make his tour of inspection in the capital, he was always accompanied by soldiers carrying the falaqa, called falakits; every week, one of the latter was at the service of the Porte in the retinue of the grand vizier. He had to see to the execution of the punishments ordered by this minister.

**Bibliography:** R. Dory, Supplement, ii. p. 280, after Cherbonneau, Dictionnaire lexicographique; Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire turco-français, i. 425; Polak, Persien, i. 330; Moira Carla Serena, Hommes et choses en Perse, p. 118, n. 1.

(CL. HART.)

**FELLANI. [See Pub.]**

**FELLATA. [See Kult.]**

**FERHAD II SHIRI. [See Farhad Ushirin.]**

**FERDUN AHMED BEY, Nishândji (Keeper of the Great Seal) and Keeper of the State Archives. We know nothing of his birthplace or his ancestors. He was educated in the house of the Defterdar Çiwaâde 'Abd Allah Çelebi and entered the service of Mehmed Sokollu Pasha as Secretary in 960 = 1552-1553. He afterwards became Secretary to the Privy Council (Divan Kâtipçî), took part in the campaign against Kâkbejewân (1554) and particularly distinguished himself at the siege of Sziget (1566). On the 8th Muharram 978 (12th June 1570) he became Ra's al-Kuttâb, and Nishândji on the 3rd Ramadân 981 (27th Dec. 1573). When, after Selim II's death, his successor Murad III. was hastening from Manissa to the capital, he crossed from Mudania to Constantinople on a galley belonging to Ferdün, which happened to be lying ready to sail in Mudania. (7th Ramadân 982 = 21st Dec. 1574). A month later on the 9th Shawwâl (22nd Jan. 1575) Ferdün laid his life's work, the Münâ'ahât al-Salâtîn before the Sultan.

Only a year later he lost the Sultan's favour and was dismissed on the 10th April 1576 (Gerlach, Tagebuch, p. 175). In August 1577 he went as sanjakbeg to Semendria where he arrived at the end of the year (Gerlach, p. 375; Schweiger, Reisebesch., p. 39); from there he was transferred to Kostendil about 1580, see von Hammer, Gesch. der Osm. Reiches, iv. 82 note c). In Muharram 989 (February 1581) the Sultan recalled him to the capital and restored him the office of Nishândji. On the 12th Rabî' 1. 990 (6th April 1582), he married 'Aïshe Sultan, daughter of Rustem Pasha and the princess Mihrimâh; he died on the 21st Safar 991 (16th March 1583).

The Münâ'ahât al-Salâtîn (chronogram for the year of its completion, 982 A. H.), according to Selânîksi (p. 137), contained 1880 historical documents in 11 volumes from the foundation of the Ottoman Empire to the accession of Murâd III. The work has been twice printed in Constantinople in 1824 (1848-1849; cf. Zeitscr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., vii. 469) and 1274-1275 (1858). The first edition contains 735 documents, including 41 from the beginnings of Islam, the second a number of translations of Arabic and Persian documents, 100 more than the first edition. If Selânîksi's figures are correct, the two editions contain much less than the original work; on the other hand they contain a large number of documents of a later period, which have apparently been added by later writers in continuation of the work. The book is prefixed by an ethical treatise Miftâhi Lâmmât (chronogram for the year 982 A. H.); as an appendix there is a long essay on agrarian affairs in Egypt, written by the scribe of Murad III. Ferdün mentions a historical essay, Nuchat al-Abkâr, in his preface; the translation of a work on the history of France, which Ferdün ordered to be prepared while Ra's al-Kuttâb, exists in manuscript in Dresden.

**Bibliography:** Our chief authorities are Ferdün himself in the preface to the Münâ'ahât and Selânîksi; they are the authorities used by the bibliographers 'Atâ'i, i. 336 et seq. and Ahmed Resmi, Sefînet al-Rûtsâ, p. 12 et seq.; v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Osm. Reiches, iv. passim; on the Münâ'ahât-i Salâtîn and its MSS. cf. Langles in Not. et Extraits etc., v. 663 et seq.; v. Hammer, op. cit., i. xlii. 586 et seq.; ii. viii. iv. 16; ix. 197 et seq.; Flügel, Hstscr. Hofbibl., i. 282 et seq., 293 et seq.; Krafft, Or. Ac., no. 83; Rieu, Cat. Brit. Mus., p. 80 et seq.

(J. H. MORDTMANN.)

**FERMÂN** ([p.]; Old Pers. fra'mân, Pahl. fra'mân), properly a command thence "written order," "letters patent" or "diploma"; the word has passed from Turkish into French and English with the pronunciation fermân. Such documents were always written in the chancellories in a special hand and to this day the nasta'lit is used in Persia for this purpose and the divanî in Turkey.

Several princes of the Persian Royal Family,
e.g. Fath 'Ali Shāh's eldest son who was governor of Fārs for 40 years, beautified Shīrāz with the garden Bāgh-i Naw and wrote several works, have borne the title Fer'ān-farmā ("issuing orders").

Bibliography: E. G. Browne, A Year amongst the Persians, p. 272. (Cl. Huart.)

FERÖZ. [See FERÖZ.]

FERÖZKH. [See FERÖZKH.]

FERÖZPUR. [See FERÖZPUR.]

FERÖSZHAH. [See FERÖSZHAH.]

FES (written Fez in Spain), a red cap worn by the Turks, takes its name from the city of Fes (Fās) where it was first manufactured. The introduction of reforms (tankišār) in Turkey was marked in dress by the abolition of the turban, which was only retained by the 'Ulamā. All civil and military officers and private individuals in the capital now wear the fez; in the provinces, however, the turban has to a great extent survived, so that a distinction is made between feḏli (wearer of a fez) and şarīķi (wearer of a turban). In 1247 (1832) a decree of Şulfān Mahsūd II. declared the former to be the Turkish national head-dress, which was to be worn by all religious communities alike to abolish all external distinction between Muslims and non-Muslims. These caps came from Tunis and France, although Austriá carried on the greater part of the import trade. To put a stop to this foreign competition Mahsūd II. founded a factory, called fez-ḵāné, which still exists in combination with a cotton-mill, and with the latter is under the supervision of the Minister of War.

Bibliography: A. Ueberlin, Lettres sur la Tunisie, i. 390. (Cl. Huart.)

FEZWA. [See FATWA.]

FEZ. [See FAS and FES.]

FEZZĀN is the name of the largest group of oases in the Central Sahara. While Tripoli is the name given to the country that slopes from the Sahara to the Gulf of Syrtes, Fezzān is a part of the Sahara plateau itself; it has an average height of 600—1500 feet above sea-level. It is bounded on the north by the tablelands of Djebeł al-Sūdā, Djebeł Shakhīya and Hfarūd al-Aswād, in the south by the eastern arm of the Tassili of the Adīr Ṭuāreg and by the Tūmūr or War mountains. The eastern and western frontiers are undefined, but may be said to be approximately delineated by the Acacus range in the southwest, in the northwest by the source of the Wādi 'l-Shātī, and the east by Wādī 'l-Saḡhir (area 186,000 sq. miles). The country consists almost entirely of horizontal deposits of palaeozoic sandstone and limestone, which are in part bare stony deserts (hāmmāda), but in other districts (south and northwest of Murzūk) covered by extensive areas of sandhills. In many places there are deep fissures or cauldronlike hollows in the ground, which form ditches and depressions in which the surface water can collect and form soft crumby earth (hīţa), saliferous alluvial sand. It is here that agriculture is pursued as in these places alone there is any possibility of a permanent settlement being made. But Fezzān is almost entirely (c. 95% of the area) bare desert which does not even yield enough vegetation for the inhabitants who have to send their cattle to Tripoli to pasture there. — The climate is only known in its main outlines, for meteorological observations have not yet been systematically made. On account of its central position in the midst of the Sahara its cool winters are followed by long hot summers, the nights in which are sometimes quite cold however. Great drought characterises both seasons (there are no floods or bogs,) and the annual rainfall must be under four inches. There is therefore practically no wild vegetation. At the same time the wild fauna is exceedingly scanty and is limited to a few lizards, snakes, scorpions and the varanus niloticus.

The inhabitants of Fezzān first appear under the name Garamantes and the land as Phasania with the capital Garama (the modern Djerma in the Wādī 'l-Charbī), which Cornelius Balbus won for Rome in 19 B.C. About 100 A.D. Fezzān utterly disappears from our knowledge and does not re-appear till 643 A.D., when 'Uqba Ibn Nāfi' al-Ṣifri won it for Islam on an expedition from Basra, so that Arab blood was thus introduced among the Garamantes. In the beginning of the xiith century the power of the al-Khaṭṭāb family of the tribe of Huwārā was in the ascendancy, they made Zawīla (east of Murzūk) their capital and reigned till the end of the xiiith century, when a Turkish adventurer Shāfīr al-Dīn Kārakōsh came from Egypt and overthrew the dynasty. Only a few decades later the kings of Kāmān extended their sway over Fezzān, which was governed for them by a governor who lived in Trāghēn and afterwards became very independent. It is probably since then that there has been a large infusion of negro blood. The family of Kārmān, who also chose Zawīla as their capital, next (when is unknown) ruled Fezzān. In the beginning of the xvith century they were followed by the Awlād Muḥammad dynasty, whose capital was Murzūk and in the seventies of the xvith century history sheds a brighter light on Fezzān, for it sought to defend its independence in battle with the rulers of Tripoli. Peace reigned after the first invasion from Tripoli (1570-1577) as long as the rulers of Fezzān paid their tribute regularly, but invasion always followed their refusal which happened regularly every few years. It was not till 1744 that the suzerainty of Tripoli was definitely recognised and peace reigned for half a century. But in 1804 the rule of the Awlād Muḥammad came to a violent end at the hands of al-Mukni. During his rule he led many campaigns against the lands of Tubu and as far as Bagirmi [q.v., i. 570b et seq.] and also destroyed the prosperity of the Arab Bedouin tribe of Awlād Sollānī. A member of the latter, Ḍabd al-Djallāl, seized Fezzān about 1831 and fought bitterly against the Turks who had occupied Tripoli and were trying to conquer Fezzān also. In 1842, he, the last ruler of Fezzān fell in the disastrous battle of al-Bagha. Henceforth till 1912, Fezzān was a Turkish Muṭeṣārīflik until it was ceded to the Italians at the end of that year. — These events have strongly influenced the constitution of the present population of Fezzān. In the south there are pure black Tedda, in the west light coloured Ṭuareg and pure Libu Berbers in the north and east with negroes from the central Südān. In the larger oases it is almost only these readily recognisable races that are to be seen side by side with types which are the results of intermarriage among them. In consequence of its situation which commands the caravan route from Tripoli to Lake Chad so important only twenty years ago, the population of
Fezzan is readily exposed to modification by immigrants and people passing through the country. Nevertheless, remnants of the ancient Garamantes seem to be preserved in many remote oases (e.g. of Wadi 'I-Shiit), the inhabitants of which are large-boned, black-brown and fairly honest (cf. the similar Batfira of Nubia). Their mother-tongue is Arabic, they call themselves Fezelsius (sing. Fezelsius). The population of Fezzan is about 40,000 of whom about a fifth are nomads. The average density of population is thus about 1 per square mile.

The scarcity of soil (only 2% of the whole surface) and of pasture (3.6%), as well as its remoteness in desert wastes, prevents any considerable development of agriculture. Cultivation is still carried on entirely by the spade (without the plough) and is limited to the oases and is only possible by artificial irrigation. The chief wealth of Fezzan is in date-palms among which grow wheat, barley, durra, dukka, vegetables, lucerne, clover and fig-trees. The only domestic animals are the indigenous camel, poultry and pigeons, while cattle and a few horses have been imported from Tripolitania and sheep from the Tuareg and Tedda countries. Industries are very few, in keeping with lamentably low level of civilization generally. Trade with the Mediterranean lands and the Sudan gave Fezzan quite an important position from ancient times to the beginning of the last decade of the 19th century, while the traffic in goatskins, ostrich feathers, ivory, cotton goods, indigo, civet, tamarinds, horn and negro-slaves passed through it from the Sudan to the north. Since the opening of new waterways and railroads in the Sudan, however, by far the greater part of this trade has been diverted to the Guinea coast and the roads across the Sahara, always very insecure, are now deserted. — None of the settlements has attained to any size on account of the way in which the small patches of arable land are scattered. Mururuk [q.v.] in the centre of a series of oases running from east to west has become the capital with a population of 20,000 as it lies at the intersection of the roads from Tripoli to Lake Chad and to Ghad and Cyrenaica. The only villages with 1,500 inhabitants are Semau and Djalid in the north and Katri in the south, which all lie on the main line of traffic from north to south.

Bibliography: Hornemann, Tagesbuch seiner Reise von Cairo nach Murzuk (Weimar 1802); Lyon, A Narrative of Travels in Northern Africa (London 1821); Ritter, Die Erdkunde u. s. w., I, 1. Afrika (2nd ed., Berlin 1822); Denham and Clapperton, Narrative of Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa (London 1826); Richardson, Travels in the Great Desert of Sahara etc. (3 vols., London 1848); Richardson, Narrative of a Mission to Central Africa (London 1853); Barth, Travels and Discoveries in North- and Central-Africa (5 vols., London 1857-1858); v. Beurmann Reise von Bengasi u. s. w. nach Murzuk (Peterm. Mitt., Ergb., Gotha 1863); Duveyrier, Exploration du Sahara. Les Touareg du Nord (Paris 1864); Rohls, Land und Leute von Fes in Petermanns Mitt., Ergbd. V. N°, 21, p. 1; do., Briefe aus Murzuk in Peterm. Mitt., 1866, p. 3; do., Quer durch Afrika (Vol. i. Leipzig 1874); Nachtigal, Von Tripolis nach Fezzan in

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, II.
dirt and verdigris are contained in silver seems to be a late addition to Aristotle's *Petroleia*.

Mas'udī, on the authority of a Copt, says that in consequence of the heat and drought in Ḥabash the silver in the land is transformed into gold. Numerous silver-mines are mentioned by the geographers and cosmographers. The medical application of silver in the form of filings, which are mixed with drugs, is based on the belief that it dries up all, so that the plural of aqīfah is also said to be of use against palpitation of the heart.

**Bibliography:** Ikhwan al-Safa' (ed. Bombay), ii. 79; Steinhöfel des Arabisten (ed. Ruska), p. 58; Kazwini (ed. Wustenfeld), i. 206; Mas'udī, Murūj al-Dhahab, ii. 378 etc.; Dimishki, *Cosmographic* (ed. Mehren), cf. the Index s. v. (J. Ruska.)

**FIDJĀR.** The Fidjar days, which are said to be so called because they fell in the holy months during which war could not be waged (wherefore the participants said faqarna, "we have sinned"), are discussed in the literature of the *Siyāsa al-ʿArab* [see above i. 218 et seq.]. There were 4 fidjar days a year, so that the plural of aqīfah is also used. The last of these days was fought between the Koraishis (and their allies, the Kināna) and the Ḥawazin [q. v.]. Tradition varies as to the date; according to some Muḥammad, who is said to have been present, was 14, according to others, 20 years of age at the time. Cf. Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ed. Mitwacho, i. 80 et seq.; Yāqūt, *Muḡālan*, in. 579.

**Bibliography:** See under the article AYĀM AL-ʿARAB and also Causin de Perceval, i. 296—318.

**FIDYA (A.),** "ransom". Sūra ii. 180, 192, demands a fidya on the omission of certain religious duties (fast, pilgrimage). The same passage indicates of what it should consist and further details are given in the commentaries. Cf. Juynboll, *Handbuch des Islam*, Gesetze, p. 122; on the fidya (= fidya) in Java and Sumatra, for šalāts omitted in a lifetime, cf. Snouck Hurgronje, *The Atheneum*, i. 435 et seq. — See also the article KAFFARA.

The people of Syria and the country east of Jordan give the name fidye or fidde to a bloody sacrifice, by which it is hoped to protect children or property (house or cattle) from misfortune or destruction, or which is offered for (to) the dead, cf. S. I. Curtis, *Ursemitische Religion*, Index s. v., fidye; Jansen, *Comtines des Arabes*, p. 357 et seq. and 361 et seq.; Mission arch. en Arabie, i. 472.

In Morocco fidya is the name of a peculiar ceremony, also performed in several parts of Algeria under the name fiqayat, at which a man, in the hope of securing freedom from punishment in the next world, has all the preparations for his burial made, after which a number of fidya recite the sections of the Qur'ān used at burials, cf. W. Marçais, *Textes arabes de Tangier* (Bibl. de l’École des Langues Orient. Vinc., Vol. iv.), p. 409 (glossary).

**FIGHĀNĪ (Βαφά), a Persian poet; the son of a cutler in Shīrāz, whence his first pen-name Sabkāt, the creator of a new style, which was imitated by his successors, but did not meet the taste of his contemporaries. He left Ierat and the court of his Sultan Hūsin to go to Tabrīz, to enter the service of Sultan Yāḵūb of the Aḵ-Ḵuyunlū dynasty (883—896 = 1478—1491), who gave him the title Fīḥā-i Ṣḥārār, "father of poets." After the death of the Sultan he went to Abiward in Khorsān and died in 922 (1516) or 925 (1519) at Meṣḥed. His *Dīwān* contains ghazals of which ten have been published by Bland in his *Century* (p. 34—37), rubātī and fardāyī (quatrans and distichs).**

Fīghānī is also the pen-name of a Turkish poet Rāmaḍān of Trabzon, who began by studying medicine and then devoted himself to literature. An epigram composed by him on the grand vizier İbrahim Paşa on the transporting of three statues from Buda-Pest brought about his execution by the bowsstring (932 = 1526). Cf. von Karabacek, *Zur Orient. Altertumskunde*, 98 (Sieber, d. K. Akad. d. Wiss. u. Wien, Vol. 172). He left ghazals and ḵaṣiṣās.

Fīghānī was further the pen-name of an older poet, Fīghānī of Karaman, secretary to prince Ābd-Allāh, son of Bāyāzīd II, who composed an *Iskandar-Name* among other works.


**FIGUIG (Figg), an oasis in Morocco, 76 miles S. of Ain Sefra and 3 miles W. of the French station of Beni Uuf (32° 18' 54" N. Lat. and 10° 26' 54" W. Long., Greenwich). For long closed to Europeans, it was visited only by the two travellers, Rohlf and Schaudt; the district was practically only known from information collected by the Service des Affaires Indigènes and remained somewhat mysterious down to the beginning of the xxi century. Since then the progress of the French occupation of the Sahara, the conclusion of the Moroccan agreements and lastly the building of a railway have dissipated this mystery and rendered access to Figuig possible even to tourists.

The group of oases known by the general name of Figuig, lies at a height of about 3000 feet in a mountainous hollow surrounded by serrated peaks separated from one another by rather narrow passes. On the north rise the Djebl Cruz, the Djebl Haimer and the Djebl Djermān Tāḥūnī. On the south the hollow is bounded by the Djebl Melias and the Djebl Muḥjāhidīn, between which runs the Teniyet (pass) Muḥjāhidīn, then, above the Pass of the Jewess, the Djebl Zenāga (3490 feet), the Djebl Taghla (3730 feet), cut off from the preceding by the Pass of Zenāga and lastly above the Pass of Mazzura, the Djebl Sidi Yūsuf. All this region is, as it were, surrounded by a natural rampart which protects it from the incursions of the tribes of the Sahara or of the high plateaux of Morocco. The bottom of this hollow thus marked out is, with the exception of a deepened zone called the plain of Baghdād (a name given throughout South Morocco in general to flat areas devoid of vegetation), covered with palm-groves which cover a space of about 4 miles by 2 and enclose about 300,000 palms. Their irrigation is secured by two rivers, the Wādī Sheggaret al-ʿAbīd and the Wādī al-ʿArūda and also by a subterranean sheet of water which gives rise to numerous springs. The water is led through the palm-groves by a system of canals, some above ground (ṣākiya, segua) and some subterranean (foggar, plur. foggaʾīr). They also fill reservoirs, the contents of which are used in
the dry season (July to October). As in all the oases the water-supply is administered after an ancient and complicated system of laws. The khurriya or perpetual right of disposing of two-thirds of the water furnished by a spring, twice a month for one hour, costs about 2.4. Disputes over the water supply have on several occasions provoked bloody conflicts between the inhabitants of different oases, who had sought to divert the course of the water to monopolise it to the detriment of their neighbours. The gardens thus watered are planted with fruit trees and vegetables; a few poor patches of barley and wheat are scattered on the plains of Jdeida. The gardens are worked either by the owners with the help of labourers or khammes, who receive one-fourteenth of the produce, or by khammes alone, who in this case receive a seventh of the yield.

The population is distributed among seven villages or kür forming five groups: 1. Udaghirt and Al-Abid in the N.W. — 2. Al-Ma‘iz. — 3. Ulaa Sliman in the N. — 4. Al-Hammam Al-Fugan and Al-Hammam Al-Tahani in the N.E. — 5. Zenaga in the S. All these kür are built around springs, except Zenaga whose inhabitants have recourse to the waters of Ain Tadert, which springs up from the village of that name and which of which the ownership has been the cause of frequent quarrels between the two kür. Each of these towns is surrounded by walls, within which the houses of unbricked brick are huddled together, sometimes several stories high and forming a labyrinth of narrow, tortuous streets often vaulted over by the houses. The most important of these kür is that of Zenaga, which is divided into five quarters, Benti Dafir, Ulaa Mous or Tidir, Ulaa Sliman or Mohammad, Atsamaa and Ulaa Saida. Daghirt is the next in importance to Zenaga. The others are much smaller, that of Al-Abid being almost entirely in ruins. It may be added that the inhabitants of Figuig, notably those of Zenaga, possess a certain number of small races in the neighbourhood, such as Al-Ardja, Taghla, Meaghtr, Tarsa, Meslu, Takruin, Melias, Al-Kheneq and Beni Unif.

The total population of Figuig is about 15,000, the great majority of Berber origin, of whom the Fenaza, a section of the Ulaa Sliman or Mohamad, according to tradition, represent the oldest established element in the country. Among the inhabitants we find many harratun (cf. the art. haka, i. 1074β et seq.) reduced, as in all the Berber regions of Morocco, to a condition of social inferiority. They are particularly numerous in Zenaga, where they live in a separate quarter, called niajdida. The slaves owned by the people of the kür used at one time to come from Twat but since the occupation of this country by French troops, they are now bought in Tafsielt.

Finally may be mentioned various nomadic tribes who come regularly to encamp in the neighbourhood of the kür; such are the Amur, the Ulaa Abdallah, the Benti Guif and the Ulaa Sidi Shaikh Gharaba.

The Jews number about 5000 and live in separate quarters or meluz at Daghirt and Zenaga. They each have a master to whom they pay tribute but their lot is, however, not too hard one, that of their co-religionists in Southern Morocco. They are for the most part engaged in various industries, particularly goldsmith's work in which they have a practical monopoly. The other industries practised by the people of the kür, the weaving of burnouses and carpets ornamented with geometrical designs, the manufacture of pottery, and embroidery on leather, are dying out. On the other hand, from its geographical situation at the intersection of the routes from the High Plateaus to the Sahara oases on the one side and from Tafsielt to the central Maghrub on the other, and also on account of its proximity to the railway, which facilitates the importation of European goods, Figuig is still a commercial centre of considerable importance.

Although the mosque of Udaighirt contains the ashes of three rather celebrated saints, Sidi Aissa (Tsia), Sidi Muhammad or Brabam, Sidi Abd al-Waif and although the instruction given in the mosque of Al-Maiz attracts a certain number of folob, the religious influences that predominate in Figuig are foreign.

Marabouts calling themselves Sharifs, but readily marrying the daughters of the kürins and others less numerous but more exclusive, attached to the Ulaa Sidi Shaikh Gharaba, form a religious aristocracy. The brotherhoods of the Sidiya governed by the Shorfa of Wazzan, of the Kerzaiya, which is under the mukhtar of Kerzaiya, attached to the Zawiya of Kenadsa, and lastly of the Naufiy, attached to the Zawiya of Sidi Ahmad al-Nasir in Tamagraut, number among their members the great majority of the people of the kür. The other brotherhoods, Tidjaniya, Kaidiriya, Deurgawa and Aisawa only find a very few adherents.

The languages in use at Figuig are Berber and Arabic. Besides the learned men, a certain number of men have some knowledge of the latter but practically all the women are ignorant of it. The language in common use is a dialect of Shilha mixed with Zenata elements and with Arabic, sufficiently allied to the dialect of Ain Safra and of Moroccan Sius for the natives of these regions to understand the people of Figuig without difficulty, but on the other hand quite unintelligible to the Berbers. "This language" says Mr. Basset "is very poor. It seems to be a kind of patois strongly mixed with Arabic, but, nevertheless, is one of the most interesting, as under this seeming primitiveness it is the sole relic of the dialect spoken on the high plateaus and in the Sahara of Algeria, Oran and Morocco before the invasion of the Beni Hilal and the emigration of the Ibadis, which was spoken for a time also at Tlemcen at the court of Yaghouar and the Beni Ziyâ, who originally belonged to the Waisinian tribe of Abd al-Wad."

The history of Figuig is very uncertain. For ancient times, the only evidence we have of the existence in these regions of a settled population is contained in rock inscriptions. The country was perhaps peopled by Berbers of the Shanhaiga family. At the time of the Arab conquest, all the land between the Mzaib, the Djeibel Amur and Figuig, was occupied by the Beni Badin, a branch of the Beni Waisin. The name Figuig itself only appears in the sixteenth century A.D., when this district seems to have inherited the commercial depressed of Sidjumasa. It was then governed by the Beni Sid al-Mulak, of the Matghara family, a section of the Beni Faîne. "Figuig" says Ibn Khaldun, to whom we owe this information "consists of several town-
ships quite close to one another and forming a large town into which flow the products of the desert and, owing to its distance from the Tell, it enjoys complete independence (Histoire des Berbères, transl. de Slane, Vol. 1, 240). In the viiith century, Leo Africanus mentions “the three castles of Figuig built in the desert” (Leo Africanus, ed. Schefer, Vol. iii, 240). In the viiiith century the pilgrim al-‘Ayyash, who visited Figuig in 1074 (1663 A.D.), describes the district as prosperous and possessing celebrated libraries (Berbuger, Voyages dans le Sud de l’Algérie et des Etats Barbaryques, Paris, 1846, p. 159). About this time, Figuig fell into the hands of the Saltans of Morocco, who were seeking to extend their power over the oases of the Sahara. According to the Tarjumân (transl. Houdas, p. 32), Mûlay Ismâ’il conquered Figuig in 1679 A.D. and established a negro garrison there. The name al-’Abid borne by one of the qudr to this day is perhaps connected with this event. Moroccan rule, in any case, was established in the oasis in the beginning of the viiiith century A.D., for a Sharif kâïd, named Muhammed al-Saghîr al-Djâshîrî, was in command there in 1101. He died in 1111 and for one year and a half the kâïd was in conflict with those under his rule. The qûsirians succeeded in recovering their independence, however, no doubt favoured by the troubles that followed the death of Mûlay Ismâ’il. They retained it throughout the whole of the viiiith century. A second expedition was sent against them in 1806 by Mûlay Slimân, who had taken up the plans and policy of his ancestors. A third expedition was perhaps sent in 1839. These various attempts had no effect on the country however and Figuig remained independent. Each of the qudr was ruled by a djamanâ or assembly of notables elected for life. This assembly decided matters of general interest, notably the levying of the necessary provisions to constitute the makhzen or storehouse, to supply food in time of war and provide for the expenses of hospitality, etc. The various djamanâ were independent of one another; they could unite however in case of a common danger, but did not elect a chief. The agreement of Lalla Maghnïa (18th March 1845) which divided the qudr of South Orania between France and Morocco granted Figuig, without any real reason, to Morocco. The suzerainty of the Sharifs, however, remained purely nominal. The Makhzen could not instil a permanent representative in the oasis: it did not succeed in obtaining regular payment of tribute: it proved utterly incapable of repressing the excesses of the qûsirians. The latter, indeed, on every opportunity lent their aid to Algerian malcontents (Uld Sidi Shaikh, Bî Amânî) and encouraged the incursions of the Zegdû or marauding bands who, after being organised in Figuig, raided the Algerian tribes and returned to get rid of their booty in the qudr. The French government, although the treaty of Lalla Maghnïa conferred on it the right of pursuit on Moroccan territory, declined on grounds of international policy to punish the people of the qudr. Napoleon III. in 1867 refused to authorise General Deligny to conquer Figuig and, in 1870 at the time of the High-Guir expedition, forbade General de Wimpfen to go near the oasis. Demonstrations alone were tried but without effect. In 1866, for example, Colonel de Colomb’s troops advanced as far as al-Dirja, in 1868, Colonel Colonieu’s encamped at Taghla, a mile from Zenaga. Encouraged by their impunity the qûsirians continued their misdeeds, until the French government and the Sharif Mahâzen decided to come to an agreement to put an end to the state of affairs. By the protocol of Paris of the 30th July 1911, the two governments resolved to take the necessary measures to “establish peace and security on a more solid basis and initiate a commercial scheme destined to render the border regions of Algeria and Morocco richer and more populous. Two commissions, one French and the other Morocco were appointed to find the practical means of obtaining this result. Their labours ended in the agreement of the 20th April 1902 which decided on the installation in Figuig of a Moroccan amîl supported by a Sharifian garrison and of a French commissioner in Beni Ounif, the establishment of outposts to guard the different passes and the method of collecting the customs dues etc. Difficulties still continued however. The amîl did not succeed in enforcing his authority and remained blockaded with his garrison in the kasa of Oudâghir. Finally on the 70th May 1909, the governor-general of Algeria, M. Jonnart having come to examine the situation on the spot and confer with the amîl, was attacked by the qûsirians near the Zenaga pass and lost several of his escort. This attack was severely punished. A French column under General O’Connor appeared before the walls of Zenaga, the kasa was bombarded in June 1903 and the djamanâ sued for peace. They had to hand over to the French the culprits who had taken refuge in the qudr, to deliver hostages and pay an indemnity of 2,400. The memory of this punishment, above all the progress and consolidation of the French occupation in the whole region, and the advantages which the qûsirians themselves have reaped in being able to trade freely with the French established in their neighbourhood, have since then assured perfect tranquillity to Figuig.


(F. Veyer.)

PIHL [See FAHIL.]

AL-FIHRI, ABU ISHâKH IBN IBN ABD-EL-HÂSAN AL-ÁHMAD, compiled in 632 = 1234 a selection from the works of Spanish poets and a selection of the witty and witty in the 7th and 8th century A. H. entitled Kanz al-Kuttab wa Muntakhab al-Adab (s. H. Krafft, Die Ar. Pers. und Türk. Hds. der k. Orient. Akademie zu Wien, Vienna 1842, Nr. 147).

(C. Brockelmann.)
FIHRIST (P.) "list", particularly a catalogue of books; hence the title of several bibliographical works, s. AL-NAIMM, TUS.

FIKH ("intelligence, knowledge") is the name given to jurisprudence in Islam. It is, like the jurisprudence of other human law (mu'amalat), it also includes criminal law and procedure and finally constitutional law and laws regulating the administration of the state and the conduct of war.

All aspects of public and private life and business should be regulated by laws recognised by religion; the science of these laws is Fikh.

In older theological language the word had not this comprehensive meaning; it was rather used in opposition to ilm. While the latter denotes, besides the Koran and its exposition, the accurate knowledge of the legal decisions handed down from the Prophet and his companions (Ibn Sa'd, II. ii. 127, v. 121, iliyar yata la'ilm, synonymously), the term fikh is applied to the independent exercise of the intelligence. The decision of legal points by one's own judgment in the absence or ignorance of tradition bearing on the case in question. The result of such independent consideration is ra'y (opinion, opinio prudencæum), with which it is also sometimes used synonymously. In this sense ilm and Fikh are regarded as distinct qualities of the theologian (in Nawawi, Tahdhik, ed. Wüstenfeld, 793, s); fikh va-risqya (Ibn Sa'd, v. 327, 10). The sum total of all wisdom is defined by Muhammad in (explanation of Sura, ii. 27, man ya'lin 'l-hikma) as composed of the following elements: al-furqan wa-la'ilm wa-1-fikhr. Hara`n al-Radih instructs his government Harhama to consult the ufi al-fikhr fi din Allah and the ufi la'ilm bi-kitab Allah in doubtful cases (Tabari, Anwa'is, iii. 717, v). Further passages are quoted in Muh. Stud., ii. 176, note 6.

In this sense the 'alim (plur. 'alamun) is distinguished from the fakhr (plur. 'fakharun) or the combination of both sciences in one individual is expressed by the combination of these two epithets or their synonyms. Ibn `Umar was djiyiyid al-fakhid but not djiyiyid al-Fikhr (Ibn Sa'd, ii. 125); on the other hand Ibn 'Abbâs was 'alamun with reference to decisions handed down by Tradition and at the same time 'afkhun (or 'Afkhun ra'yib) in new cases that arose, for which no precedent could be found in Tradition and in which it was necessary to use one's own judgment (ibid. 124, 4; 124, 8); the same is true of Zaid b. Thabit (ibid. 165, 10). Vgl. fakhr 1-ilm ay la-1-mana (ibid. 110, 22). Sa'd b. al-Musayyab is 1-fikhr al-Fakhr (ibid. ii. 129, 5; 130, 47; 10; v. 90, 5) on the other. Among the Tabarsi there were 'fakharu wa-la'manu i.e. those who were authorities on the chain of evidence of hadith and ijma as well as on fikhr and were competent to give (independent) decisions, fatwâ (ibid. II. i. 128, 14). Abi Thawr was ahad al-imam al-Khanna fikhr va-ilmun (in) Zaid b. Tabarî, al-Tafi, viii. 106).

In the oldest period of the development of Islam the authorities sanctioned with the administration of justice and the conduct of the religious life had in most cases to fall back on the exercise of their own ra'y owing to the scarcity of legislative material in the Koran and the dearth of ancient precedents. This was regarded as a matter of course by every one, although they were naturally very pleased, if the verdict could as far as possible be based on ijma. When 'Aâ'idh b. 'Abî Rabah (died 114 = 732) was giving a judgment, he was asked: "Is this 'ilm or ra'y?" If it was founded on a precedent (arîf), he said it was 'ilm (Ibn Sa'd, v. 345, 26). The ra'y was not, however, thereby discredited. It was considered an equally legitimate factor in the decision of a point of law and was destined in the near future to be regarded as the undoubted opinion of old authorities and in later times to be actually considered an element of the 'ilm. From the very beginning one could have recourse to it as soon as 'ilm failed. According to an old story which certainly reflects the conditions of the 'Umâyid period, although it does not actually date from the time in which its scene is laid, Mu'awiyah finally applied to Zaid b. Thabit on a legal question, on which neither he nor other companions to whom he propounded it, could quote any ancient evidence (jâlam yu'jud 'indahu -- or 'indahu -- 'ilmun); the latter gave a verdict based on his own independent ra'y (Tabari, Tafi, ii. 250, 5). On all the kings of Egypt asked the advice of the Caliph 'Omar II. on a point not provided for in Tradition; the latter wrote to him: Nothing has reached me on this matter, therefore I leave the verdict to you to be given according to your opinion (hirâ'ika). (Kendi, Governans and Judges of Egypt, ed. Guest, 334, 8 = Gottheil's ed., 29, 2) [cf. the article iJmâH].

Correspondingly ra'î is as approved of a source of law are the instructions ascribed to the Prophet and the early Caliphs, which they gave to the officials sent to administer justice in the conquered provinces; the principles to which they gave their approval, in so far as they were actually proposed by the judges sent (Zâhirîn, 8 et seq., cf. il-rid al-Qibla, i. 314, 15; Mubarrad, Kâmîl, p. 9, 10 et seq.; Ibn Khatîb, 'Uyûn al-Akhbâr p. 87), in the digests which were developed from these simple origins we find deduction from decisions in allied cases expressly mentioned (al-ghabîh, al-naqa'ir, cf. 'Uyûn al-Akhbâr, p. 72, 9) i.e. the application of analogy (bihâr) as a methodical adjustment of ra'y (equity). In the investigation of the 'Ilah el-jârî, the motive of law (ratto legis) and the resulting reduction of doubtful cases to a rational point of view, we find this principle given systematic validity. We thus have — there is evidence of it at a very early period — a kind of popular element adopted among the constitutive sources for the deduction of laws. The conception of igma (consecratio) i.e. the general usage of the community which has been established by agreement in the larger circles of believers independent of the written, traditional or inferred law. As in Roman law, the principle was applied,
that: constutudinem aut rerum perpetuo simili
litter judiciarum auctoritatem vim legis obtineri
debit; also: nam diuturni mores consensu utentium
comprehendit legem imitantur.

It was quite natural from the changed condi-
tions after the conquests that the formation of
the law, not only in its special provisions, but
particularly in its formal parts, should not be
their method of deductive operation (Muh. Stud.,
i. 75) as laid down in Fikh, was greatly influ-
ced by what the authorities on the development
of law in Syria and Mesopotamia were able to
learn of Roman law, sometimes of the special
laws for the particular provinces. It was obvi-
sous that a quite uncultured people coming from
a land in a primitive stage of social development into
countries with an ancient civilisation, where they
established themselves as rulers, would adopt from
among their new surroundings as much of the
customary law of the conquered lands as could
be fitted in with the conditions created by the
conquest, and be compatible with the demands of
new religious ideas. The detailed investigation
of this fact in the history of law, which, although
emphasised and established in its main outlines long
ago, has only been sporadically investigated within
a limited field, is one of the most attractive
problems of this branch of the study of Islam. San-
tillana has collected much material for the investi-
gation of this subject in his plan for a Code Civil
e Commercial Tunisia (Tunis 1899). The compara-
tive study of one chapter of private law has yielded
the most conclusive proofs of the thorough-
going adoption of Roman law by the jurists of Islam
(Fried, Friedrich, Die Geschichte im
Islamischen Recht [reprint from Der Islam, I], Stra-
sburg 1910). The present writer had previously in this
connection made the suggestion that even the names
of legal speculation (fikh = intelligence) and of its
students fushāh (intelligent) have been influenced by
the Latin terms (juris) prudencia and (juris) prudens in their special application to the study of
law and teachers of law. An analogous example in
support of the influence of Roman Law is the use of the

Roman Law, however, does not exhaust the sources
drawn upon in the development of Muslim Law. The receptive character that marks the for-
mation and development of Islam also found ex-
pression, naturally first of all in matters of ritual
(Wensinck in Der Islam, i. 107) in borrowings from
Jewish Law (cf. Recue de l'Étude juive, xxvii. 78: xliii. 4; E. Mittwoch, Zur Entstehungs-
geschichte des islamischen Gebets u. Kultus [Ab-
handlung der Kon. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften],
Berlin 1913). According to Kremer (Culturgesch.
d. Orients, i. 535) even many of the provisions of
Roman Law that have been adopted by Islam only
found a place in Fikh through the inter-
mediary of the Jews. It still remains to be
investigated, however, if and in what degree Persian
influence can be traced in the development of many
details of Muslim Law.

We thus have four "roots" in operation for the
deduction of laws, as methodical principles from
which legal prescriptions may be legitimately laid
'Uṣūrī. With the gradual recognition of the sour-
ces of legal knowledge the terms fikh and fushāh gradually lost their original limitation to deduction
not based on tradition. Fikh next became the
science which co-ordinated and included all the
branches of knowledge derived from the four roots;
similarly those who are masters of this science
were called fushāh, i.e. jurists. - Fikh was also
introduced under the condition from the positive
sources of law, the sum total of the deductions
derived from them, e.g. wa fi khiyā 'l-ruhdh
barāh min al-Fikh (Mubarrad, Kāmil, 529, cf.
Wiener Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenl., iii.
84). In a still wider generalisation fikh was used for
religious science in general (al-Kurūn wa
'l-Fikh in opposition to the study of poetry, Alāmī,
ii. 55, 29; lāsī bihim raghābut fā-l-din wa fā
raghābut fā-l-fikh, Mūsād Aḥmadī, 1155), fushāh
likewise was applied to students of religion,
thecologians (not only students of law) e.g. Ṭa-
barī, Taṣrifī, xii. 73; fushāhuma wa-maṣayyī-
kham; ibid., 112, 9, where Abū 'Ubayd al-Kāсим b.
Ṣallān says with reference to an explanation by Abū
'Ubayd Māhrūqī (fl. 928), whose dictionary to the traditional explanation: al-fushāh
ā'lam bi 'l-tawlī minahu, "the fushāh are more
conversant with exegesis than he" (who is not a
theologian but only a philologist); cf. also Zāhīr-
itūn, p. 19. In eastern and western dialects of
spoken Arabic the word fāsh, fāsh, fāsh (all from
fashīkh) has come to mean an elementary school-
teacher of the lowest rank (W. Marquis, Textes
Arabes de Tanger [Paris 1911], p. 415, where fur-
ther references are given).

The sporadic attempts that were made during
the Omayyad period in the field of Law did not
lead to a systematic codification of the material in existence. It was only with the rise of the
'Abbasīd caliphate that this attempt was made,
favoured and indeed even furthered by the
pronounced religious character of the govern-
ment. From the very beginning of this process of
codification it was always these four "roots"
that were recognised as authoritative by the the-
ologians who made the first endeavour in the
beginning of the second century A.H. in Medina,
Syria and the 'Irāk, to evolve a finished system
of Muslim law. According as they made a limited
or free use of one or other of the "roots" or
selected one in preference to another of the con-
tradictory traditions, they attained different results
on particular points of law. Only names have
survived to us from the literature created by these
early efforts. We learn a good deal in the Arabic
sources about theologians who changed the 'ilm
or sunan in chapters and then deduced the fikh
inferences (Muh. Stud., ii. 214, cf. also Allah
b. al-Mubārak: Dawsaw al-'ilm fā 'l-ahāb
wa fā l-fikh [Dhahabi, Tadhkiran al-Hufūj, i. 250,
71], Abū Thaur: Sanafa al-kutub wa-saraffā
ta'sa l-sunan [ibid., ii. 95, et]). Little value can
be attached to the statement ascribed to Ḥishām
b. 'Urwa that many kutub fikh of his father's
perished in the flames on the day of Ḥarra (Bi-
graphien, ed. Aug. Fischer, p. 41). At that ancient
period ('Urwa died in 94 = 712, the so-called
'Uṣūrī year = 5 years after the death of many
fushāh = Ibn Sa'd, vi 1155, et) there could be
no real kutub fikh existence; the reference must
therefore be to rough notes only. We might also
mention the statement that Zāhīr's Fašānī
were collected in three, Ḥasan Bašri's in seven
books
(asfūr) arranged in the order of the abūzib al-
ākkī (Ibn Kayyim al-Jawziyya, Flām [Cairo 1325], i. 26). E. Griffign has recently discovered among the South Arabian treasures of the Ambrosian library in Milan a compendium of Fikh attributed to the founder of the Shī'ite sect of the Za'diya, entitled the Madīmarta of Zaid b. Ali (died 1221)

[La più antica codicizzazione della giurisprudenza islamica in Recensioni del R. Ist. Loub, di Sc. c. Lette, Ser. ii. Vol. xlv. (Milan 1911), 260 et seq.) This would be the oldest attempt at a codification of Muslim law in existence; in any case it is to be reckoned with in the literature of the older Fikh. If it should be a direct product of the circle of Zaid b. Ali himself, we should have to recognize the priority of the Shī'ite (Zaidi) branch of Islam in Fikh literature among the works that have survived. It has not yet, however, been fully investigated what position this collection holds in the history of Fikh literature.

The oldest corpus juris of the Sunni branch of Islam that has survived from the early period of Fikh is the Musawāta ("paved path") of the Medina teacher Mālik b. Anas (97–179 = 715–795), who easily surpassed all his contemporaries with this work (Muh. Stud., ii. 215 et seq.) and created an organic synthesis of the four roots of jurisprudence in the chapters on private law. His work represents a codification of the Fikh as it developed in the Hijāz in its theocentric legal Medina. Almost at the same time the Fikh was being methodically systematised in other lands of the Muslim empire also. In Syria Abū al-Rāḥmān al-Awzā'ī (died 157 = 774; v. i. 524) was teaching Fikh in Hijāz, which remained in force, even among the Muslims of Spain (al-Dahbāt, ed. Codere, No. 751) till the Medina system was introduced there by disciples of Mālik and became supreme. The most vigorous efforts to create a code of law were made in the Īrāt, where about the same time studies in other branches (philology, philosophy, exact sciences and dogmatics) were being industriously pursued. Although the Hijāz school recognised the validity of ra'y without restriction and made free use of it in establishing legal principles, the Īrāt school excelled them in many ways in their use of this source of law. Hāmād b. Abū Sulaimān (died c. 120 = 738) may here be mentioned as the pioneer who first to gather a circle of scholars around him, to whom he taught a system of Fikh in which ra'y had a predominant influence. To his school belonged Abū Ḫanīfa [q. v., i. 903 et seq.] who is regarded as the patron of the Īrāt school of Fikh, which was placed in a firmer footing by his two great pupils Abū Yusuf (died 182 = 795) and Muḥammad b. Abū Ḫasan al-Shābāni (died 189 = 804), who also distinguished themselves by monographs on important chapters of constitutional law (C. Brockelmann, Gesch. d. Arab. Litt., i. 171 et seq.). The name of the former of these scholars is also associated with the recognition of canon law in the government of a system of a state request of the Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd, Abū Yusuf compiled his Kīṭāb al-Khurādī, which, however, covers much wider ground than is indicated in its title, for it includes the whole field of administration in consonance with canon law, and was imitated by writers in later reigns. The Caliph al-Muhtadī (869–870 A. D.) entrusted the jurist al-Khāṣṣaf with the compilation of a similar work. The administration of

the state was, theoretically at least, to be brought into absolute harmony with canon law. The starting-point was naturally always the sunna; but in spite of a most generous recognition of apocryphal traditions there was of necessity ample scope left for the use of ra'y. The school of Abū Ḥanīfa laid no restrictions on the use of ra'y. A certain amount of frivolity was even allowed in the pronouncement of an opinion in face of methodological analogy (fiqīr) by allowing practical considerations also to be taken into account. This is expressed in the term istiḥkām (holding for better). The legal authority is justified in deviating from a ruling suggested by the ġayūr, if due consideration showed him that another procedure was more suitable to the conditions in question. (Early examples of istiḥkām are given in Abū Yusuf, Kīṭāb al-Khurādī [Cairo 1302], p. 109, 112, from below, 117, 121; 91 ḍī ġayūr kānā . . . illa inni ṣaḥābatu . . . ; Shābāni, al-Dīnī al-
ṣaghīr [printed on the margin of the Khurādī], p. 17, from below: Abūzīh al-ṣaghīr al-
uḍaylūkūnum ṣa 'istiḥkām; 72, 5; Bukhārī, Kīṭāb al-Khurād, N. 7, ed. Juyonbīl, 338, etc.). In the school of Mālik also a similar subjective element in ra'y has been recognised as legitimate; it is called istiḥkām (consideration of what is beneficial or expedient — muṣālaḥa) — muwrī ṣa 'al-ṣaghīr. This right to set aside the ruling based on methodological analogy in favour of the judgment of a competent jurist, when considerations of expediency suffice, it reminds one of the Roman corrigere jus proper utilitatem publicam (in the Talmudic law: meivpo tīshān ḫāvālan). The Īrāt school of Fikh had another important teacher in a theologian Sayyān al-
Tabwīr (died 161 = 778), whose system remained for long authoritative even among the Muslims of the Maghrib (Abū ʿAl-Mahdānī, ed. Popper, p. 120, etc.); his system has, however, like that of the above mentioned Awzā'ī, not survived in its entirety but is only known in its application to isolated cases, particularly in points where it differed from other schools (īṣāḥālāf).

Although the foundations of Muslim jurisprudence as outlined above met with the approval of authoritative circles in the Muslim world, from the very beginning of its development it had to contest with a hostile minority who refused to recognise ra'y as a proper basis for the deduction of laws. This opposition was largely due to the subtle casuistrys (Ṭuṣamm Abū Yusuf wa-Mu-
ḥammad, Kazwīnī, ed. Wūstenfeld, i. 151–153; 211 at the foot) which the Īrāt jurists exercised in a most sophistical fashion in their use of ra'y (cf. the author's Vorlesungen über den Islam, p. 67 et seq.). Āra'āta . . . (what do you think (i.e. a case propounded in a sophistical fashion)?) is the formula with which such tests of ingenuity were introduced (early examples in the Kīṭāb al-Khurādī, 36; Muṣawāta, ii. 37, 330; iii. 19) and therefore the wrath of those, who regarded this legal skill as idle abuse of the law, was vented against this formula (v. Zḥirītenen, p. 17; cf. Ibn Ṣaddām, vii 68, ṣā ḏū ḏū ḍī ġayūr ʿarā'āta ʿarā'āta) and a host of traditions on the point in the Sunan al-Dirāmī, p. 37; Abū Dāwūd, i. 17). Although the Hijāz school did not entirely decline the use of ra'y, it made a moderate use of it in comparison with the Īrāt school, from which it differs in many ways in its results, and the Hijāz school had many objections to the application of Ḥadīth by

[The text continues...]

[End of transcription]
the jurists of 'Iraq (cf. Muh. Studien, ii. 78–83). This distinction is antedated to a time when it did not yet exist to the prejudice of the 'Iraqi school; even the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik is made to fulminate against the eastern school in favour of Medina (IbnSa'd, v. 160, 487 19 et seq.).

There were also individuals who would not agree to recognise the opinion of any mortal (unless of the Prophet himself) as having the force of legislation. It was not conceivable, they said, that God and the Prophet had not provided legislation for all contingencies that might arise. "We have omitted nothing in the scripture" (Surâ, vi. 38) and if a point is not expressly provided for in the Korân, Muhammad has certainly expounded it in a hadith by God's command. They quoted in this connection the combination al-kîthâb wa l-lukmâna (cf. Zeit. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellsch., ixi. 286 et seq.), which appear in so many passages in the Korân, which the adherents to this view explained as referring to the Korân and Sunna (in Tabari, Tâfzir, ii. 275, xix. 7). With the vast number of hadiths being heard and the fact that there was quite easy to quote a hadith on any point and thus readily to dispense with ra'y and kifâa. To be able to give a ruling from hadiths on all cases that arose, one had, however, to refrain from the exercise of strict criticism and be ready to use badly authenticated, interrupted and isolated traditions. To be correct, in form at least, an opinion, which was honestly admitted to be ra'y, was clothed in the form of a hadith, given a pompous tinâd and traced back to the Prophet. Thus arose the distinction between Al-Sâ'îd al-Hâfizî and Al-Sâ'îd al-Râ'i; a mediator between the two who appeared in the persons of Muhammad b. Idrîs al-Shâfîî (died 280 = 820).

His great claim to fame is that he systematised the method for the deduction of laws from the sources of law (Uyûn al-Fikr) and laid down the exact limits within which each might be used. In his Kiskala (two editions, Cairo, ed. Kubrìî, 1610; Mâshîa 'Ilmîya, 1912) he created the science of the use, which could be made of speculative deduction without lessening the undisputed prerogatives of Scripture and Tradition; he regulated their application and limited their arbitrary use by strict rules. For example, he did not approve the subjective view (2nd ed., p. 131); on the other hand, with the principle of 'irtifaq (q. v.) he opened up a fruitful source for juristic presumption. His school might be said to belong to the Al-Sâ'îd al-Râ'i or as readily as to the Al-Sâ'îd al-Hâfizî, but out of it, through preponderating attachment to the latter, there again developed a tendency to overemphasise fikr which was based on traditional sources, first of all in the school of A. h. b. Hanbal (died 241 = 855; v. i. 158 et seq.); and this tendency was even more marked in the Zâhiriyâ school founded by Dâwâd b. 'Ali al-Fâhâmî (died 270 = 883; v. i. 928), which set aside speculative elements and carried the regulations for the deduction of law traditional sources to extremes, but had soon to confess that it would soon be at a standstill without a moderate use of kifâa.

Among the opponents of kifâa at this time is mentioned Yahyâ b. Aktham (died 242 = 856), an older contemporary of Dâwâd and celebrated 'Shâfîî and Kâlit of Baghdad under Ma'mûn; he wrote a work (Kitâb al-Tunâth), which is wholly devoted to an attack on the 'Iraqi school; he constantly exchanged ideas with Dâwâd b. 'Ali (Ibn Khallîkân, N., 303 ed. Wustenfeld, x. 24). Such attacks, however, were only of theoretical importance; they were quite without influence on the practical administration of law.

Down to the beginning of the third century then, the historical development of the study of law had produced two divisions of the science of Fikr, viz. 1. the science of the Uyun al-Fikr, i.e. the doctrine of the "roots", the sources of law and the methodology of their application; 2. that of the Furo'î al-Fikr, the doctrine of the branches, i.e. applied Fikr, the systematic elaboration of positive law under its separate heads. The latter can show authoritative works even from the period of the founders of the schools; its important Furo'î works were published by immediate pupils or edited and handed down by them as lectures of their teachers (see the separate articles).

At the present day Fikr has developed in four directions within orthodox Sunni Islam. Each of which goes back to codifications of the law, differing in little details, by the independently developing schools of the above mentioned founders of the second and third centuries A.H., and which in course of time were considerably developed along these lines. These four schools (ma'dhâbîh; sing. ma'dhâb; only utter ignorance can call them sects) which have survived to the present day and prevail in different parts of the Muslim world are called after the Imams on whose teachings they are founded: 1. the Hanâfî, which is followed in by far the greater part of the Muslim world (the Turkish empire, Central Asia and the Indian mainland); 2. the Shâfi'i (Egypt, South Arabia, the Indian Archipelago, East Africa and Syria after it had supplanted the Wa'îfî ma'dhâb there in 284 = 897; cf. Sukkî, 6 tabà 'Abî al-Shâfi'i, ii. 174 at the foot; 214; and the extremely important data given ibid., v. 134 et seq.); 3. the Malîkî (the Maghrib, to a great extent in Upper Egypt also, German and English West Africa) and the 4. Hanbalî, strongly represented (down to the viiiîth = xivth century) in the 'Iraq, Egypt, Syria and Palestine (cf. the article Ahmad b. Hanbal), now limited to Arabia (Nadjî) (cf. the article Wahhâbi). The Hanafî ma'dhâb has become the only authoritative code of law in the public life and official administration of justice in all the provinces of the Ottoman empire. All the other prominent schools of Fikr have disappeared from the field after a brief existence; for example, at a very early period the school of the Wa'îfî (see above), that of Sufyân al-Thawrî (in 405 = 1014 the last muftî taught according to this ma'dhâb, cf. Abu I-Mâshîin, ed. Popper, p. 120, et seq.), that of the Zâhirîs already mentioned and the school founded by the celebrated historian Tabari [q. v.] called Dârâriya, which this scholar ex- pounded in numerous works which no longer exist (Wien. Zeit. d. d. Kunde des Morgenl., ix. 368). The teachings of these obsolete schools are not taken account of in the Ijmâ'a of Sunni Islam: the four ma'dhâbîh above mentioned are considered equally orthodox elements of it; they differ from one another in only details of Furo'î which according to the orthodox conception do not form fundamental differences. In the Azhar mosque [q. v., i. 532 et seq.], the most impor-
tant Muslim university of the present day, all four schools are still represented by teachers and pupils. The teaching of Ottoman supremacy, whereby the Hanafi madhab became supreme, and all four systems were represented in the great centres of Islam by judicial functionaries, who gave their decisions in important cases at a joint conference. Each of these four madhābi has produced an enormous literature of codices, commentaries and commentaries in the schools of the lands in which its adherents are found.

Cases not provided for in such codices, as well as new points of law that crop up, are decided by professional jurists in fatwa's (decisions) of which considerable collections have been and are still being made. Since various European countries have extended their authority over Muslims, in their possessions and protectorates in the east, handbooks of Fikr of the madhāhab prevailing in the respective countries have been published in western languages also, and in this connection editions and translations of the best known works on fiqh have been prepared by European scholars.

The dissenting sects of the Khāridjīs and Shi'as have also developed the legal system along lines parallel to the Fikr of the Sunnis. The most fundamental differences between these systems and that of the Sunnis are naturally to be found in questions of constitutional law (Khilafate). The Shi'as also show differences in their law of marriage (mu'aša; marriage with women of the All al-Kītb) and are more rigid in their laws regulating intercourse with unbelievers. In their liturgy (adilām) triving departures from the usage of the Sunnis may also be noted; in their calendar of feasts also there are certain feast days peculiar to them. Otherwise the differences in law between these sects and the Sunnis are scarcely more considerable than those of the different orthodox madhābi within Sunni Islam from one another (cf. Vorlesungen über den Islam, p. 237—239). Among the Shi'as, besides the Imāmat "Twelvers" the sect of the Hashimīs (particularly strong in South Arabia) has developed a very rich Fikr literature, of which R. Strohmeier has lately given a very thorough account (Der Islam, i. 354—368; ii. 49—78; Das Staatsrecht der Zaiditen (Strassburg 1912); Der Kultur der Zaiditen (Ibid. 1912).

In giving an appreciation of Fikr one must not forget to mention the fact that the codifications from a very early period for the most part represent an academic code of law, a system given ideal validity, a doctrine of duties, as Snouck Hurgrone, the creator of the historical criticism of Fikr, so admirably described it, which the theologians represent as alone corresponding to the ideal demands of religion. History teaches us, that, as is the case at the present day, even so in the oldest period of Islam, the actual practice assumed in many instances a different form from that required by the demands of canon law (Sharī'a), certain parts of Fikr have been quite obsolete for centuries; on the other hand in many districts customary law ('urf, 'aqa), which for the most part can be traced back to pre-Muhammadan times, has retained its validity [cf. the article 'Aqa, i. 121st et seq.]. Modern conditions have also produced many reforms of legal practice in Muslim countries and have produced a system of civil law different from the religious law (Sharī'a) alongside of the latter. This dualism in the administration of justice can be traced back to an earlier period in which it also existed. (Zákirl, pp. 206; an example from Egypt, 8th century A.D.; ibn Kawai al-Djāwīyā, al-Turk al-schikīnī fi 'l-Sīyās al-Sharīya [Cairo 1317], p. 218, dual system of law in Syria; Massignan, Mission en Mesopotamie, ii. [Cairo 1912], p. 30, the Kafāya yarqānīya were in operation in the Irak under Mongol rule alongside of the Kafāya sharīya; ibn Baṭṭūta, (Paris), iii. 11, from Khārizm.)


Islamische literature on Fikr according to the different Madhābi and the European editions see Juynboll, I. c. p. 350—363 and the pertinent sections in Brockelmann, Geschichte der arab. Literatur. (I. Goldiher.)

FIKRI, 'ABD ALLĀH ẒAFHA, Egyptian statesman and man of letters, born in Mecca in 1250 (1834), where his father, Muhammad Bani Baligh, who had entered the profession of arms and reached the rank of sākhāl agasi, was stationed at the time of his son's birth. His grandfather, 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad, however, was professor at the Azhar university at the time of the French occupation and the grandson followed in his steps. As he lost his father in 1261 (1845), when only eleven years of age, he was brought up by a relative, studied at the Azharyya and at the same time studied Turkish industriously to qualify for a place in the Divān. In 1267 (1851) he entered the civil service, held positions in various diwāns and accompanied Ismai'īl Paša to Stamīl in 1279 (1861) when the latter went
the elephant becomes reproductive in its fifth year. Its testicles are inside its body near the kidneys. When the animal has conceived she is no longer covered by the male. After two years the young one is born and one every seven years afterwards. As the female brings forth in a standing position and has no joints, it goes into a river with an abundant flow of water; it drops the young one into it to avoid letting it fall on the hard ground. The male elephant watches by it and protects it and the young one from snakes, which it tramples upon with its feet. It also eats snakes when it is ill. The elephants exported to 'Iraq do not increase their numbers there and soon die out; in India they may live to be several hundred years old.

The elephant cannot bear the rhinoceroses and flees from its neighbourhood; when they fight with one another, both are often killed. But its most deadly enemy is the sahrāb, an animal smaller than the lynx, of reddish-yellow colour with fiery eyes, exceedingly agile in jumping; it skirts its urine on elephants and men so that they fall dead if it touches them. The elephant is also afraid of the cat; it is said that the kings of Persia when fighting with the Indians used to let cats loose on the elephants to put them to flight; a similar stratagem is related by the poet and freedman Hīru bin Mūsā.

Dimishki tells us how wild elephants are caught; a long pit with steep sides is dug, which slopes gradually downwards to a depth equal to the height of the elephant and so narrow that, though it can easily go in, it cannot turn round or come out. Rice and other fodder is then scattered round this pit, most thickly around the entrance and in the pit itself. When a young elephant comes along, it follows the fodder in its greed until it reaches the deep end of the pit and then does not know what to do. The hunters then come dressed in dazzling colours red, blue and yellow and beat it with clubs; the elephant tries to trample those who attack it with its fore feet but cannot get out of the narrow pit. A man dressed in white then comes to its help, drives away its tormentors, brings food and water and remains near it to accustomed the elephant to him. After a time it goes away and the others return and beat the elephant still more unmercifully wherever on the moon in white appears for the second time and repeats the process of driving off the tormentors and feeding the elephant. This alternation is continued till the elephant has such confidence in the watcher that it allows him to touch it and mount it. When the elephant has become sufficiently used to him, the earth in front of the elephant is dug out so that it can come out of the pit. The elephant-driver (fayāl) sits on the elephant's back and has a crooked stick (mithjān) in his hand, with which he touches the elephant's head when he wants it to do anything.

Numerous stories are told of the vindictiveness of elephants; it is said to be as great as that of the camel. For example, a fayāl had beaten an elephant severely; the latter waited till one occasion he was bounded to a tree while the driver lay down to sleep a little distance off. The elephant broke a branch off, twisted it through the driver's bushy hair till it was quite entangled, then pulled him towards itself and crushed him.

Its docility, patience and tractability are, however,
quite as great as its vindictiveness, when it is well treated. In its native country it is a most valuable beast of burden and labourer.

War-elephants are of special importance and the kings of India possessed an astounding number of them. It is related of king Kshatrapa Parvata that he had 1000 white elephants, each 20 feet high. The elephants knelt before him, as soon as they became aware of his presence in the midst of countless troops of cavalry. A war-elephant is a moving fortress; it carries men on its back and its body is protected by a cuirass of iron and horn; a bent sword is fastened to its trunk and with this it cuts horses and camels in two. Around it are 500 men, who protect its rear and on its back are valiant soldiers who break through the ranks of the enemy; one of these elephants is a match for 5000 horsemen. Ibn Battuta gives his experiences as an eyewitness of elephants trained to act as executioners.

African elephants are not tamed but are all wild and only hunted for their ivory. They are particularly numerous in the land of Zanzibar. When the people go to hunt them they throw the leaves, bark and branches of a certain tree into the water and conceal themselves near the elephants are intoxicated by the water, fall down and are slain with a long spear. The tasks are exported to Oman and thence to India and China. Ivory is used most extensively in China, for example for sedan-chairs and for burning before altars; in India it is made into sword and dagger handles, chessmen and draughtsmen. Shields are made of its skin in India and Africa. Kazwin and Ibn al-Baithar discuss the uses in medicine of parts of the elephant.

Bibliography: Mas'udi, Turjïd-al-Dhakaab (ed. B. de Meynard), particularly i., ii. iii.; Ibn Battïta (ed. Defrémery et Sanguinetii), iii. 330, 354; iv. 45; Kazwinii (ed. Wustenfeld), i. 400; Dimishki, Cosmographie (ed. Mehren), p. 156; Damirz, Hayât al-Hayawan, ii. 182; Ibn al-Baithar, Traité des Simplex (ed. Leclerc), iii. 51; M. Perron, Le Náfrí, etc., ii. 404—417; 469—473.

FIL (Ar.; literally “action”), a technical term in Arabic grammar: the verb. According to al-Zamakhshari, Mufassal, p. 108 (§ 402) it is “that which indicates the association of a hadâth (event) with a time”. Muhammed Âlî adds the “reference to the agent” in his Dictionary of Technical Terms (ed. Sprenger etc., ii. 1142 et seq.). But this addition is only correct for the active verb. On the other hand the emphasis laid on the notion of time, which is found as early as Ibshâwâil (chap. I), shows that the Arabic verb had for long been not so tenseless to the linguistic feeling of these old grammarians as the original Semitic verb perhaps was. — Among the characteristics of the verb are that it is root and stems, and similar particles may be placed before it, that one can affix the allied pronouns etc. The pertinent grammars teach the division of the verb into fi' munganif and qumânî, thułatâh and rahbâh, muta'dâdî and ghair muta'dâdî.

Among the scholars (mutakallîmûn) fi' practically means “realisation, actuality”; among philosophers (bûkûmât) it also means “effect”. (A. Schade.)

FILALI, a line of sheriffs [q. v.] in Morocco. FILÂSTÎN, i.e. PALESTINE, is the name given by the Arabs to the Roman Province of Palaestina Prima, practically Judea and Samaria with Caesarea ad Mare as capital. De Goeje, Wellhausen and Caetani have brought order into the confused accounts of the conquest of this district by the Muslims, notably by disputing and correcting Saif's account, although various details still remain uncertain; for example, the date of the outbreak of hostilities. While the Arab historians do not make Abd Bakr send an army to Western Palestine via Aila under 'Amr b. al-'Asî till the year 13 (began 7th March 634), according to a Syriac authority published by Land, the first conflict between Greek and Muslim arms took place as early as February 634 at a place about three hours east of Ghaza [q. v.]. Although this source is not very reliable otherwise, in favour of its accuracy on this point it may be urged that it gives more time for the operations of the Arabs before the battle of Adînâdash [q. v. i. 111] and that Kâhâlî, who had been summoned from Syria to assist, could thus have actually arrived during Easter in April in Marjî Râhî as Tabarî, Annals, i. 2109,11 (although in contradiction of l. 2) says. The Greeks were defeated in this battle and their leader slain while retreating. Âmîr was now able to take Ghaza and then advanced on Caesarea with his troops and began to besiege it in July 634 (IJumâdâ l. 13). He was, however, forced to retire to 'Arâbâ by the approach of a larger Greek force; here he was joined by the troops coming from the district east of the Jordan and thereupon advanced against the Greeks who were utterly defeated at Adînâdash at the end of July or in August. It was probably immediately after this victory that 'Amr conquered the towns in Filâsten, detailed by Baladhuri, Samaria, Sichem, Lydda, Jahne, 'Amwâs, Bait Djjibrin and Raphia. After joining the main army and taking part in the deciding battles, he was able to return in August 636 after the battle of Yarmûk and proceed to the siege of Jerusalem which finally surrendered in 16 or 17 (637 or 638). Caesarea, which was strongly fortified, now alone remained. 'Amr began the siege of this city, which is called in the Bible Jerusalem, and sailed to Egypt in 640 and had to leave the conduct of the siege in the hands of Yazîd b. Abî Sufaysîm the commander-in-chief in Syria; but it was only after the latter's death that his brother Mu'awîya succeeded in taking the town with the help of a traitor (according to Wâkidî and others in 19, according to Ibn Ishâk not till 20). The conquest of Filâsten was finally completed by Mu'awîya's capture of Asqalân.

The Arabs, as they usually did elsewhere, here retained the organisation they found there and Palaestina Prima remained a separate province under the name Jundus (military district) Filâsten, although its centre was shifted from Caesarea to Lydda. After a later period the place of Lydda was taken by the new foundation of Ramla which is a part of Filâsten. Ishâkî defines its length by the frontier towns of Raphia and Lod-Jîlîn and the breadth by Yâfâ and Jericho, Idnî and, at a later period Khâlî al-Zâhirî, give similar state-
ments, although the latter, like the author of the *Mishir* (middle of the sixteenth century), gives al-Ārīṣ as the extreme southwestern point. ʾIṣṭakhri gives the following dependencies of Fīlāstīn, the southern part of al-Ḡawr [q.v.], al-Djibāl and al-Shārait as far as Aila. In Muḥammad on the other hand al-Šūrā at ʿīrāb as an independent ʿīrāb along- side of Fīlāstīn with Ḫajar as its capital, while in ascertainment, as it were, he reckons Ṣamānā, the capital of al-Balṣa, to Fīlāstīn. ʾIṣṭakhri says that Ramla is the largest town in the province, with Jerusalem second, which in Yāḳūṭ is the capital.

ʾIṣṭakhri describes Fīlāstīn as one of the most fertile parts of Syria and emphasizes the fact that it depends for its irrigation entirely on the rain-fall; there is running water only at Sichem. Yāḳūṭ remarks on the generally mountainous character of the land. Muḥaddasī knows the following exports of Fīlāstīn: olive oil, small figs, raisins, carobs, different sorts of textiles, and soap; of Jerusalem especially: cheese, fine sorts of raisins, apples, pine apples, looking-glasses, lamps and needles, from Jericho indigo (cf. al-Ḡawr). He also mentions the quarries of white stone and the marble quarries at Bait Dījīrīn.

The statements on the public revenues of this province in the ʿAbbāsīd period are of special interest. Ibn Khālidūn gives a list from the second half of the ninth century A.D., according to which the annual revenue of Fīlāstīn was 310,000 dinārs besides a payment in kind, of 300,000 rās of olive oil. In Ḥārūn al-Raṣīd time, 310,000 dinārs with a payment in kind of raisins. In 820, according to al-Ḥārīmī’s Kihāl al-Khawāṣṣ, 195,000 (in another passage 259,000) dinārs. According to Ibn Khudaddīhī in 864, 500,000 dinārs and the same figure is given by Ibn al-Fākīh for 903, while Yaḥyā who flourished in the interval only gives 300,000 dinārs.

The old provincial division was abolished during the Crusades and from the Ayyūbīd period onwards replaced by a division into mamalikā which we find in Diminishī and Khālid al-Zāhirī. The mamalik of Ghazza practically corresponded to the ancient Fīlāstīn.

**Bibliography:** von Rohden, De Palestina et Arabia in baroccis Romanis questiones selectae (1885); Land, Anecdota Syriaca, i. 116 (p. 17 of the text); Balādhūrī (ed. of Goeje), p. 109, 138—144; Tabari, Amadīs (ed. of Goeje), i. 2078 et seq., 2107, 2121—2125, 2506, 2579; Fragmenta Histor. Arab., (ed. of Goeje), p. 34; Yaḥyā, Historiae (ed. Houtsma), ii. 351; Masʿūdī in Bibl. Geogr. Arab. (ed. of Goeje), viii. 359; ʾIṣṭakhri ibid., i. 56—59; Ibn Ḥakīl ibid., ii. 111—113; Muḥaddasī ibid., iii. 154 et seq., 178, 180, 184; Ibn al-Fākīh ibid., v. 92—103; Ibn Khudaddīhī ibid., vii. 75 et seq.; Kudāma ibid., p. 247, 251; Yaḥyā ibid., vii. 235—330; Yaḥyā, al-Muǧāfīn, iii. 193; Ibn Khaldūn (ed. Cauro), p. 150; Kremer in the Verhandlungen der 7. Orientafengkongresse zu Wien, Semitic. Section, p. 11; de Goeje, Mémoire sur la conquête de la Syrie (1864); Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, vi. 41 et seq.; Noldeke in the Zeitscr. d. Deutsch. Pal.-Ver., vii. 1401; G. A. Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land. (FR. Buhl.)

**Fīrāwī** (from the Arabic ʿārār “flight”) (T.), “deserter.” This word has been recently applied by the partisans of the government to Young Turks who have taken refuge abroad to escape the vigilance of the police. (CL. HuCR.)

**Fīrāsā** is apparently an Aramaic loanword. The lexicon notes no old evidence for it; ʾāris in this sense in Ḥamāṣ (p. 564, v. 5, need not be the old (Wellhausen, Reste, p. 152), nor does it occur in the Kurʾān but it is used by the commentators (in the form tafarrasa) to explain tawwasa in Kur. xv. 75. The general meaning is “insight” and it occurs quite normally in this sense of judges and rulers as to cases before them (Ibn Katīm al-Djauziya, al-lārīḥ al-ḥakimiya, p. 24 et seq. of ed. of Cairo, 1317). (ii) More narrowly of physiognomy as a science (Doutte, Magic et Religion, p. 370) for which the older Arabic is ṣīfāṣa (q.v.). (iii) As a ʾṣūṭi expression for the divinely given intuition of saints. The basis is the tradition, Ḭaṭīrī ṣūṭa al-muʾmin feʾinahu yaṣṣur binārīlāh. “Beware of the intuition of the believer for he beholds in the light of Allah.” To this some forms of the tradition add, Ḫaṭīrī ṣūṭa ʾal-yakīf al-kabīrīlāh; Ḫaṭīrī ṣūṭa ʾal-yakīf al-kabīrīlāh; Ḫaṭīrī ṣūṭa ʾal-yakīf al-kabīrīlāh. “It is a thing which Allah casts into their minds and upon their tongues.” For the different forms of this tradition, see the Ḫaṭīrī-āl-Djauziya with the ʾṣūṭa of the Saiyid Murāda, ed. Cairo, vol. vi. p. 544—545; and on ʾṣūṭa ṣūṭa in general see the Ḫaṭīrī al-Ṣūṭa of al-Balṣ, 1290, with ʾṣūṭa al- Ṣūṭa of al-Anṣārī, vol. iii. p. 174—185. Ibn al- Ṣūṭa (Lūṣūn, viii. p. 40, ll. 7—10) says that the above tradition was understood in two ways: — the first, the literal (ṣūṭa) meaning, that it was something which Allah put into the minds of his saints and so they knew the condition of certain people by a ʾṣūṭa and they righteously judged minor and conjecture; and the second, that ʾṣūṭa is something learned from indications and experiments and make (ʾṣūṭa) and character [evidently physiognomy]; further, that in the addition to the tradition quoted above there is drawn a distinction between the ʾṣūṭa which the saints consciously exercise and a ʾṣūṭa which appears in automatic speech, the saint not knowing, or at least not understanding what he says. An example of the latter is the story of the elephant cub, told in Damirī’s Ḥayawan, vol. ii. p. 188 of ed. of Cairo, 1313; for the same phenomenon in Muḥammad himself, see Macdonald, Religious Attitude in Islam, p. 47 and 99.

**Bibliography:** is given above.

(D. B. MacDONALD.)

**Fīrāwīn** (Plur. Fīrāwīn), Pharaoh. The word is explained by the commentaries on Sūra ii. 46 of the Korān as a ʿārār or ʿalum of the Amalakite kings, like Khirāt and Kaṣīr of the Kings of the Persians and Romans. The verb taṣarʿa means “to be arrogant and tyrannous”, hence the Korānic Fīrāwīn is called al-Djauziya “the tyrant” by al-Yaḥyā (ed. Houtsma), i. 31. A number of Fīrāwīns are mentioned in Arabic literature; their number is very differently given. In the Korān, however, Fīrāwīn is always the king with whom Mūsā and Ḫaṭīrī had to deal; the word is here clearly understood as a proper name. The Korānic data concerning Fīrāwīn are on some points fuller than the Biblical. The most important are the following, a. place of his daughter his wife, ʾĀsīya (q.v. v. 487?), is mentioned; a certain Ḥāmān is also mentioned who (Sūra xxvii. 38, xl. 38) is commissioned to build a tower (ṭārib).
which shall reach to heaven, by which Fir'awn will ascend to Mūsā's God. There are obviously several confusions here; Hāmān is an echo of the vizier of this name in the Book of Esther; the tower and its description recall the Tower of Babel. It is probably the Biblical account of the building of the "treasure cities, Raamses and Pitom," that has given rise to the confusion last mentioned.

Another member of Fir'awn's suite who appears in the Korān is not mentioned by name. When Fir'awn wanted to slay Mūsā, "then a believer among Fir'awn's people, who had concealed his faith said: Will ye slay a man because he says: My Lord, when he heard the manifest signs from your Lord? If he be a liar, against him is his lie; but if he speaks the truth, there will befall you something of that with which he threatens you" etc. (Sūra xl. 29 et seq.).

Fir'awn is twice called "he of the pegs" in the Korān (Dhū l-ʿĀrād, Sūra xxxviii. 11, lxxix. 9). This expression is variously explained by the commentators; some say that it means, that his dynasty is firmly established as by tent pegs, while others say that his armies are meant by the pegs. Others again say that he bound people to be punished hand and foot to pegs driven into the ground.

A further addition to the Biblical narrative is the statement, which conjoins three events, with dreadful punishment by Fir'awn when they became converts (Sūra vii. 111 et seq.; xxvi. 45 et seq.). Finally Fir'awn himself is said to have become converted the moment he was being drowned; but God did not accept his conversion and caused his body to be cast upon land as an example for others (Sūra x. 90 et seq.).

It is said of him that he had himself worshipped as a God (Sūra xxviii. 38). On the day of the resurrection he will go into Hell at the head of his people (Sūra xi. 100). The Korān makes no distinction between the Pharoh of the Bondage and of the Exodus. This is clear from the fact that when Mūsā and Hārūn come to him Fir'awn recognises the former (Sūra xxvi. 17).

Muslim Tradition gives the following account of the Fir'awns. In contrast to the Korānic account, Fir'awns are mentioned as early as the stories of Abraham and Joseph and some even tell us that Joseph's first Fir'awn was called al-Ra'ayn b. al-Walid and his successor Kābūs b. Muṣ'ab. According to others Joseph was the vizier of al-Walid (or Dārim) b. al-Ra'ayn. Tradition is not unanimous with regard to the Fir'awns between Joseph and Mūsā. The sources which are less directly influenced by the Bible say that the above mentioned Kābūs b. Muṣ'ab became the first husband of Kāsiya and Mūsā's foster-father. When Mūsā received the divine mission, Kābūs was already dead and his successor was his brother Walid b. Muṣ'ab (Tabarī's Tafṣīr and Baidāwī on Sūra ii. 46; Tabarī ed. de Goeje, i. 443 et seq.).

Ibn Iṣḥāq in Tabarī (ed. de Goeje), i. 444 et seq., closely follows Exodus, i. 8; when Joseph and his Pharaoh, al-Ra'ayn b. al-Walid, had died, the throne was occupied by Amalekite Fir'awns to the time when al-Walid b. Muṣ'ab ascended it; Mūsā was sent to him; he was the most arrogant and cruel of all and reigned for the longest period. — Is there perhaps a reminiscence here of the reign of Rameses III. over Egypt in the thirteenth century? — According to Aḥaṣāb (i. 211) and Muḥṣīdī (ii. 397) there were two kingsbe-

FIRDAWSI is an artificialy formed singular to Firdāsī which was taken by the Arabs from فرداس (is understood by them as a plural (G. Hoffmann in Zeitscr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., xxxii. p. 761). The rare measure فرداص (Lumsden, Arabic Grammar, p. 365, 368) was probably chosen to distinguish it from a form (perhaps firdāsī) derived from the genuinely Arabic root fardās (Lišān, viii. p. 45; Lane, s. v.). Firdayus occurs in old Arabian poetry in the sense of a fertile hollown of land (Bekrī, Geogr. Wörterb., ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 514; Yaḳūt, iii. p. 870 et seq., and twice in the Kūrān (xviii. 107; xxiii. 11) and was evidently for Muḥammad a synonym for Gejmā in the ordinary sense, a garden). Firdāsī occurs as a proper name at Hamaceus and Aleppo (Yaḳūt, iii. p. 862 et seq.). It is curious that the fundamental sense of the Zend pairirdira, *a place walled in* survives even in the remotely derivative Arabic, and a firdāsw is defined by the lexicons more narrowly as firdāš. It also suggests grape-vines and palm trees (Baid. on Kūr. xviii. 107). In Ṭabarī (xvi. p. 25–27) are given the guesses of the earliest expositors, only two points having any basis—that it is a rūmān word and indicates a vineyard. Otherwise they say that it is the lordliest, finest, widest and loveliest part of the Garden, the abode of those who in life commanded kindness and forbode disliked actions. To Muḥammad himself tales are told that it is the uppermost story of the Garden, that from it the four rivers of Paradise divide, etc. On this last see more details in the abbreviation by al-Šaḥrānī of the Taḏkira of al-Kūrtubi (Cairo ed. 1324), p. 83, and on al-Firdawsī generally on p. 84 and 86. But the Saiyid Murtaḍā in his commentary on the Ḥiyā (vol. x. p. 525) says that it is the second story of Paradise below the ʿarḍ of Allāh, and that above it comes Djinnaṭ ʿAṣim. Others, again, hold that Ḥiyā was the loveliest; see a long discussion, involving the doctrine of the vision of Allāh and the presence of Muḥammad with his people in the Garden, in the Ibriz of Ṭabarī, p. 277 et seq., ed. of Cairo, 1316.

Bibliography: is given above. (D. B. Macdonald.)

FIRDAWSI (Anūf-ʿL-Kābîm), a Persian poet, whose proper is uncertain (Mansūrī, or Ahmadī, or Hasan), probably born in 320 (932) at Ṭabarān, one of the quarters of the town of Ṭūs (Ḵorāsān). His father had left him a small estate on which he lived in a modest way. He received his education from his compatriot Asādī. A dīkān or landed proprietor, who was a friend of his, gave him a Book of Kings to put into verse; it was this that set him to compose the Shāhānawā (book of kings), an epic of about 60,000 lines, in which this incorporation consideration already versified by Dāvūdī (v., i. 900). The composition of this gigantic work lasted thirty-five years and was completed on the 25th February 1010 (400 A.H.) when the poet was nearly eighty years of age; it must therefore have begun when he had reached a fairly mature age. The poem was dedicated to Sultan Maḥmūd of Ghazna, who had conquered Khorāsān in 389 (999), and presented to him by his minister Ḥasan b. Ṭabarī; the Sultan ordered a present of twenty thousand dirhams to be given to the poet but the latter, who expected a much more munificent reward, gave half of it to a bath attendant and the other half to a seller of ṣulq (a kind of meat). Threatened with being trapped to death by elephants, Firdayus in revenge composed a scathing satire and took refuge with the Ispahbād Shahrīyār b. Sharīn, ruler of Ṭabaristān, after remaining six months in concealment in Herāt. This prince purchased the satire from him for 100,000 dirhams, at the rate of 1000 for each line, and had it destroyed; nevertheless, the text has survived and is usually published with editions of the Shāhānawā.

After writing the poem Ṭuṣuṣ u Zalīqā (publ. by Ethē, Anekdota Orientiensa, Aryan Series II; German transl. by O. Schlechter-Waschek, Vienna 1889) for the Blyth Bahāʾ al-Dawlā or his son Sultan al-Dawlā, he returned to his native town where he died; he was buried near Ṭūs in a piece of ground that belonged to him; as he was looked upon as a heretic, he could not rest in the Muslim cemetery. It is said that, while his funeral cortège was passing through the gate of Pādzān (the name of a neighbouring village) a caravan entered by that of Rūdzār bringing the 60,000 dinars that the poet had hoped for. His daughter refused to accept this sum and the Sultan devoted it to pious works (the viṣāṭ of Čāha). Dowlāt-Shāh gives the date of his death as 411 (1020–21).

The Shāhānawā, which comprises the whole mythical and legendary history of Persia down to the Arab conquest, is a national epic which has rendered its author immortal. Firdayus possessed the epic sense in a high degree; his descriptions of battle show an extraordinary vigour and movement; he felt the heart of his native land beating within him. The poem Ṭuṣuṣ u Zalīqā written to show suspicious Muslims that ancient Persia was not only his love, is no whit inferior to its predecessor in spite of the advanced age at which it was written by the author.

The Shāhānawā has been several times published; Lumsden's edition, The Shah Nameh (Calculta 1811) only contains the first volume; Turner Macan's (Calculta 1829) and Mohil's (Paris 1878) are complete while that of Vullers (Leiden 1877–1884) lacks the fourth volume. There have also been lithographed editions published in the East.

FIRDAWSI — FIRISHTA.

and Rogers, London 1907: German by Von Schick, Berlin 1851—1865 and by F. Ruckert, Berlin 1890—1895. For further bibliography we may refer to the works quoted below.


FIRDAWSI (Firdawesi), an Ottoman poet of Brusa in the time of Sultan Bayazid II (1481—1512), to distinguish him from the great Persian poet Firdawesi, called Firdawesi-i Rumi or more frequently Uzun Firdawesi or Firdawesi-i Taiwil ("Long" Firdawesi), probably in allusion to the length of his chief work. His chronograms (taʾrikh) were celebrated. His masterpiece is the Sulaimân-Nâmâ, composed for Sultan Bayazid by his command, in 360 or 360 volumes, in prose and poetry, a complete encyclopaedia in which he included all the knowledge of his time in philosophy, astrology, genealogy, history etc. The Sulân, however, only choose 80, or, according to others, 99 volumes and had the others burned. Firdawesi was deeply hurt, and like his Persian namesake, is said to have revenged himself by lampoons and went to Persia, where he died.


FIRDE (from farда "to impose", so pronounced in the Egyptian dialect, while in the middle ages far'd and more usually farida was used) is an extraordinary imposition usually levied for some special purpose. Lane in his Manners and Customs (see below) says that Muhammad ʿAli Pasha [q. v.] in the first half of the sixteenth century levied a firde of one twelfth of the income of each subject, without distinction of religion, up to a maximum of 500 piastres to meet the expense of increasing the army and navy. When this expense diminished, the tax was abolished. A similar farida was levied at the same time levied on provincials, the members of the government. As already mentioned, the term farida is almost always used with the sense of firde in the historians and inscriptions of the middle ages.

Bibliography: Dozy, Supplément aux Dictionnaires arabes under "fard" and "farida"; Quatremère, Sultans Mamlouk, II, 186, 187; E. W. Lane, An Account of the Manners and Customs of the modern Egyptians, 5th ed., 1871, i. 165; ii. 91, 298. (M. Sobernheim.)

FIRISHTA. [See Mal'ak.]

FIRISHTA, MOHAMMAD KASIM HINDU SHAH, known as Firishta (born 960 = 1552, died after 1033 = 1625), of Astarabad in northern Persia, as brought to Ahmadnagar as a child in the reign of Husain Nâṣir Shah I and, while yet a youth, entered the service of Murtâzâ Nâṣir Shah I. The persecution of foreigners which followed the murder of Husain II drove him to Bijâpur where, in January 1590, he entered the service of Ibrahim ʿAdil Shah II. Shortly afterwards he wrote Iktizâvârî-ī Fârsi, a work on medicine, and Ibrahim, pleased with its style and aware of Firishtâ's devotion to historical studies, urged him to undertake a comprehensive history of Muhammadan rule in India. Firishtâ at first declined the task as being beyond his powers, but eventually offered to submit for approval a few chapters of such a work as he could undertake. Among the specimens passages thus presented was an account of the disappearance and death of the death of ʿAli ʿAdil Shah I, Ibrahim's father. Ibrahim correctly interpreted the selection of this subject as a hint that the historian demanded unfettered liberty in the relation of facts, and gave him permission to proceed with his work.

Firishta, who was an industrious compiler, mentions in the preface to his history no less than thirty-two books which he had collected and consulted, and adverts to some others in the body of his work. The iṣpiṣina verba of his authorities are so often found in his pages that he has been stigmatised, with scant justice, as a mere copyst. He was, however, uttering the critical faculty and made severe glaring errors even in the annals of the Dakhân, which were his own peculiar province. The value of his work is further impaired by his gross ignorance of geography, and it is unsafe to follow the example of Briggs, his best known translator, in accepting it as a thoroughly satisfactory account of the rise and progress of the Muhammadan power in India. The history, which was begun in 1606 and finished in 1611, consists of an introduction, twelve sections dealing with the Ghaznavid kings of Lâhor, the emperors of Dihlî, the independent Muhammadan dynasties of the Dakhân, Gurgân and Muzafâr, and the Badshâhs (including Qâjârâpûr), Multân, Sind, Kashâr and Malâbar, and the sânts of India, and a conclusion, and embraces the whole history of Muhammadan rule in India, excepting that of the ʿArab conquerors of Sind, to the beginning of the seventeenth century. Firishtâ complained with truth that until his time the only work which pretended to deal comprehensively with the subject was Nizâm al-Dîn Ahmad's Taabarî-ī Akbari, which was too brief and condensed to be of much value to the student of history, and boasted with justice that he had produced a work the like of which had not previously appeared in India. His History (ed. Bombay, 1831; 2 vols., 1831 and 1835) has, despite its many defects, is valuable not only as a summary of known authorities, but also because it embodies fragments of works of which the originals have been lost. A critical translation (those existent in English are enumerated Morley, Cat. R. As. Soc., p. 67; the best is that of Briggs, London 1829), or, at least, a careful and intelligent edition of the text is much to be desired.

FIRISHTE-ZÄDE, 'Abd al-Majid iyy al-Din, in Turkish also called Firịsi̇te-ğahu and in Arabic Ibn Firīṣṭa, one of the principal disciples of Faḍl Allāh q.v., p. 37) the founder of the Hārūnī [q. v.] sect, died in 1474 (1409). In 1535 (1430) he is described in a book on the doctrines of the sect in Turkish, entitled Ishk-nāme (Book of mystic Love), which is placed by the adepts on a level with Faḍl Allāh's Dīwān-i lādī, so that this name is also given to it. There also exists from his pen a Hidāyet-nāme (Book of Conduct) in Turkish and an Akhīrət-nāme (Book of Future Life). The Ishk-nāme has been lithographed at Constantinople (1885 = 1871).


FIRMA, [See FERMAN.]

FIRŌZA, Arab. al-firūzād, the turquoise, a well-known precious stone of a bright green or "mountain green" to sky-blue colour with a gloss like wax; in composition it is a hydrated clay phosphate with a small but essential proportion of copper and iron. The colour is not permanent in all stones, and is said to be particularly affected by perspiration. It is almost always cut as an ornament en cabochon i.e. with a convex upper surface; only stones with an inscription are given a flat upper surface. The provenance of serviceable stones is limited to a few places whose history may be traced back for thousands of years. Turquoise mines were worked by the kings of Egypt in the peninsula of Sinai. Major Macdonald discovered them again in 1845 in the Wādi Maghāra and its neighbourhood and worked them again for a number of years. The hieroglyphic inscriptions at the mines date, according to H. Brugsch, from King Senefu of the third dynasty to Rameses II. Brugsch takes the word mafkat to be the name of the mineral. No mention of the stone or the mines has survived from the Hellenistic period; on the other hand in addition to the wonderful details of the method of procuring the pale green calis of Carmania, Pliny knows a good deal about its properties, which can only refer to our turquoise; for the statement that the calis loses its colour when affected by oil or ointment is found in al-Kindī on the firūzād and in all later mineralogical works. It can hardly be doubted that the turquoise was obtained in the Sānādīd period and even earlier in the mines around Nīshāpur. Tīfāshī says of the kings of Persia that they adorned their hands and necks with turquoises, because they averted danger of death by land or water; but we often meet with the assertion that the turquoise detracts from the majesty of kings. It was considered to contain copper and was formed in the vicinity of copper mines. Different kinds are distinguished according to the different colours (sky-blue, milk-blue, green, spotted); the best kind is considered to be the būqāšī (i.e. Abū Ishāṣī and the finest variety of this is the sky-blue azharti. Large pieces are very rare and are correspondingly costly, small pieces on the other hand are very common. The best specimens retain their colour, apart from the influences detailed below; after 10-12 years many lose their colour entirely and the stone is then said to be dead. All stones, however, show a certain variation in colour. They are brilliant in a clear sky and dim when the sky is clouded; they alter their colour with the state of health of the wearer, and when affected by sweat, oil or musk; fat restores the colour again.

Taken intently it is a poison, but in collyrium it is useful for clearing the sight, also if it is stared at for some time. Gold takes away its beauty (unlike lapis lazuli), i.e. probably, the greenish blue colour does not harmonise as well with the yellow of the gold as the dark blue of the lapis lazuli. Aftānī explains the name firūzā as "stone of victory"; whence it is also called ḥadjar al-ghalāba. The word firūzād is found in many corrupt forms in the Latin translations of the middle ages (Jasæpín, žirogūn, porzāqī etc.), but none of these can be considered the original of the word turquoise: for as early as the 13th century we find the terms turcoys, turques and turqoises, and it may safely be assumed, that this was a new name given to the stone from the land of its origin, the ancient home of the Turks; cf. Arnoldus Saxo: "Turcoys... dicit a regione Turcya in qua nascitur." Certainly the name did not first appear in connection with the trade between Venice and Turkey.

General (now Sir) A. Hountam-Schindler who was governor of the mining area and director of operations at the mines in the "eighties" of last century has given a detailed account of the Persian turquoise mines at Meshhed in Khorāsān, which is quoted in Bauer's Eideckenkunde (2nd ed., p. 190 et seq.). The stones procured are usually roughly cut en cabochon on the spot and brought to Meshhed by the village elders. Thence the turquoise, fastened to pieces of reed with black wax, which are tied in bundles, travels to Nijini Novgorod or Moscow, usually through the intermediary of Bukhārā traders, whence it is distributed all over the world. Many of the "lucky stones" are sold to pilgrims in Meshhed. In Nīshāpur the stone is seldom to be seen. Many are also exported via Yezd to Baghādād and Constantinople. The value of the exports varies from 20,000—15,000 annually, which is believed to be about a third of the total yield.

H. Brugsch states, that, according to present day belief, the alteration in the colour of a stone presented indicates increase or decrease in the friendship of the donor. The large, quadrilateral turquoises polished flat, which were at one time engraved with inscriptions and arabesques in gold and worn on the upper arm, are no longer held in such estimation. Stones for rings are always mounted in silver or tin, never in gold; Brugsch connects this with the Muslim prohibition of the wearing of the most precious metal or with a very ancient notion of the demonic meaning of gold. I am rather inclined to believe that the real reason is good taste, as has been mentioned above, for religious prohibitions are not mentioned by any writer; besides diamonds also are only mounted in silver.

In 750 (1349) he studied under Taḫšīl al-dīn al-Sulṭān in Damascus and accompanied him to Jerusalem. There he acted for ten years as professor and then undertook a series of journeys which took him to Asia Minor and Cairo. The accounts of his travels given by his biographers vary a great deal. According to the best authenticated statements, those of al-N先前, he moved to Mecca in 770 (1368) and remained there about 14 years, which were interrupted by a journey to India and a five years' stay in Diyarbakır. About 794 (1392) he accepted an invitation from Sulṭān Aḥmad b. Uways to Baghdaḍ. From there he went to Persia, and was honourably received by Timur when the latter took Shirāz in 795 (1393). But as his native district had been devastated by the Mongols he could not stay here but took ship in Hormuz to South Arabia, which, owing to its remoteness from the scenes of the great events in history, afforded him the peaceful resting-place required by for a scholar's activity. After his arrival there in Rabī‘ I 796 (Jan. 1394), the Sulṭān al-Malik al-Aṣḥaf invited him to Ta‘izz, where he remained for 14 months. On the 1st Di‘ār 1-Hidajja 797 (12th Sept. 1395) he was appointed Chief Kāfī of al-Yaman and given a daughter of the Sulṭān in marriage; after this he claimed to be a descendant of the Caliph Abū Bakr. In 802 (1400) he again made the pilgrimage and constituted his house in Mecca a Mālikī Madrasa with three lectureships. During his stay in Mecca, his father-in-law died in 804 (1401). He made a second journey to Mecca in 805 (April 1403), but soon returned to Zābīl where he died on Tuesday the 12th (according to others the 20th) Shawwāl 817 (26th Dec. 1414). His great work, the dictionary al-Ḳāmūs, which he had extracted from his (now lost) al-Lāmi‘ al-Ma‘lid al-Qal‘ah al-Jānīs bain al-Muḥakam (of Ibn Ṣdni) wa‘l-Qal‘ah (of Shaghānī) in 60, according to others in 100, volumes, in which however, as Graf Landberg suggests, he perhaps included many words from South Arabian dialects, became a classic throughout the whole Muslim world, in spite of the fact that, although it contains a very large number of words not been critically examined and the explanations are very brief. It has been printed at Calcutta 1817, 1270, Bombay 1884, 1272, Lucknow 1885, Bālūk 1274, 1301–1303, Cairo 1281, 1319. A Persian version by ‘Alī al-Raḥim Muntahā ‘l-ʿArāb fi Lugḥat al-ʿArāb appeared at Calcutta 1841 (another al-Ḳābīs by Muhammad Ḥabīb Allāh, s. Catalogue of the Pers. Ms. in the Brit. Mus., No. 1016–1017). A Turkish translation by ʿAsım Efendi al-ʿUṣaynīs al-Bāṣīr fi Targīmāt al-Ḳāmūs al-Muḥīṣ was printed with the Arab, text, Stamboul 1272 and alone at Bālūk 1250, and several times, last in 1505. Among the commentaries the fullest is the Taṣāfi al-ʿArūs of Sāyidī Murtada al-Zābīdī, died 1205 (1791), 10 Vols., Bālūk 1307-1308. Fāris al-Shidyak [s. v.] published a critique entitled al-Ṭūsīs ala‘l-Ḳāmūs, Stamboul 1299. Of his other works, of which al-Balṣha fi Ta‘īrikh A’mat al-Lugha (s. Ahlwardt, Verzeichnis der ar. Hds. der Kgl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, No. 10060) is probably the most important, there have been printed the Kitāb Taḥīr al-Mawādāhīn fi ‘a‘mal waḥdāt li l-Sīn wa‘l-Shīrīn, Vo- cabulaire des mots arabes s'exprimant indifféremment avec un s ou ch, Alger 1900, and the stories from the life of the Prophet, Ṣīfī al-Sa‘īda, which he
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(C. Brockelmanx.)

FRÎZKÖH (Fîrûzkûh), a mountain fortress in the Country of Ghôr, now the Haźâra highlands of Afghanistan. It was founded by Khêl al-Dîn Muhammad (known as the Malik al-djîbâl or mountain-king), in a territory known as Warshâdahâd and continued by his brother Bahat al-Dîn Sâm who succeeded in 544. It remained the capital of Ghôr as long as that kingdom lasted, and was much embellished during the victorious reign of Mu'izz al-Dîn Muhammad b. Sâm from the spoils of India. The Citadel or Kâshî is described as of great magnificence. It was taken by 'All al-Dîn Khwârizm Shâh in 607, and finally destroyed during the Mongol invasions under Ogotai son of Čingiz Khân in 619-620. The exact position of Fûrûzkûh is doubtful. It was on the bank of a river which may have been the upper Murgâb or the upper Hari-rûd or one of its tributaries. Raverty favours the latter view, but Holdich, who surveyed the country in 1884-1885, could find no site corresponding with it in these valleys, and identifies it with the extensive runs of Taîwâra on an affluent of the Farâh-rûd, still locally known by the name of Ghôr. The tribe bearing the name of Fûrûzkûh now inhabits the Murgâb valley, but it is not known if it is not therefore necessary to suppose that Fûrûzkûh was in that valley. Taîwâra is in the country of the kindred Taimani tribe, and has easy communications with Herât, Farâh and the upper Hari-rûd valley. It may therefore with some confidence be accepted as the actual site of Fûrûzkûh.


(M. Longworth Dames.)

FRÎZPÛR (Fîrûz Pûr). A district in the Panîjûb which takes its name from the principal town. It forms part of the Djalânghar division, lying between 30° 55' and 31° 9' N. and 73° 52' and 75° 26' E. Area 4302 sq. m. Population 958 072 of which 447 015 are Muhammadan. The principal Muhammadan tribes are Râjûpûts, Arajais, Dogars and Wattus; there is also an ascetic tribe known as Boddal, who are believed to possess powers of incantation. The ancient site of Dûrân, supposed to be the Hađînir of Bâlîkâst, was the capital of the Panûr Râjûpût. Soon after the Muhammadan invasion the Bhâjî Râjûpûts adopted Islam and invaded the district from the south. The Gil, Dâhîwâl and other Dîjû tribes entered it later. The Dogars, a wild and predatory tribe, are more recent immigrants. The town of Frûzpûr was founded in the time of Sulîmân Fûrûz Shâh III of Dîhil and named after him. In Akbar's time it was part of the Sûbâh of Multân and not of Sîrînd, and probably lay on the right bank of the river Sâtîl, and not on the left as at present. The Sîhâ Shâîs appear towards the end of Akbar's reign and soon adopted the Sîkhi religion. It was in this tract that Gurû Govind was defeated after a three days fight by Awrangzêb's army; the site is now held sacred and the tank (Mukêtâr = Tank of Salvation) has become a place of pilgrimage, where a 3 days festival is held in January. Round it the important town of Multân has grown up. The Sîks have possession of the country after the retirement of A'mâd Shâh Durrânî, the Dângi Misl under Gûdîj Shâh took the principal part in the conquest. Randjît Singh threatened this country with the minor Sîk states, and this move (1806) led to British intervention. Frûzpûr was occupied, and annexed in 1835, thus interposing between Randjît Singh's kingdom and the minor states, which have been preserved to the present day. The Musulmân Nawâbâs of Kâsâr also found a refuge at their estate of Mâdôt near Frûzpûr in 1807, and were recognized as ruling chiefs. Their territory was annexed owing to mismanagement in 1855, but was afterwards restored and is still held by the Nawâbâs. It is a large and wealthy estate. The present Nawâbâ Shâlâm Khân al-Dîn Khân is a minor.

The first Sîk war between the British and the Khâtûsa army was fought in this tract. The Sîk army crossed the Sâtîl in Dec. 1845. The battles of Mûdki and Pêrûtshah (often wrongly called Frûrîs-šahr or Frûrîs-shâh) were fought soon after. The Sîk army was repulsed but not crushed, and recrossed the Sâtîl, only to invade British territory again higher up the river near Lûdîhânî. The decisive battle of Alîwâl was fought outside the district of Frûzpûr, but the desperate struggle of Subârwâh (Sobârun) which ended the war, was fought within its limits.

In more recent times the district was enlarged by the addition of the Taûlîf of Fazîlîa in the south from the former district of Sirsa (1884). The sandy tracts to the east and south of the district have been rendered fertile by the irrigation from the Sirhind canal, and the inundation canals constructed by Col. Grey in the riverain tract have also added greatly to its productiveness. The Sîk Dîjûs are excellent farmers and take full advantage of these conditions; the Muhammâdan tribes in this part are inferior cultivators. There is at present a large export of wheat from the Frûzpûr district.

Bibliography: Various provincial and district Gazetteers and settlement reports issued by Panûjûb Govt. Press Lahore; Cunningham, History of the Sûbâhs of Multân, London 1849; Ibbetson, Outline of Panûjûb Ethnography, Calcutta 1883.

(M. Longworth Dames.)

FRÎZ SHÂH KHÎLJÎ (Dîlâmî, al-Dîn), the twelfth Muhammedan emperor of Dîhil, was an Afgân of the Khîlî or Khîlî tribe who first rose to eminence in Balbân's reign and later became governor of Sâmân. When Mu'izz al-Dîn Kaikûbâd fell sick, he was summoned to Dîhil to assume the direction of affairs, but encountered much opposition from the Turki amîr, who, as the emperor grew feebler, proclaimed his infant son, Shâms al-Dîn Kaikûmâr.
Fürüz acknowledged the child but removed him from the custody of the Turks and seized the palace of Kilâghari where, with his connivance, Kâthubâd was assassinated. The child disappeared shortly afterwards and, on 13 June, 1290, Fürüz ascended the throne. His chief difficulties were the disaffection of the people of Dihl, who resented the rule of an Afgân, and a rebellion headed by Malik Châdji, a nephew of Balban, who claimed his uncle’s throne. The prejudices of the citizens were conciliated by mildness and the rebellion was crushed, but the old emperor’s culpable leniency both to rebels and robbers was much resented by his amirs, who refused to accept his plea of conscientious objection to bloodshed. A conspiracy of the disaffected amirs was detected and pardoned, but more severity was shown towards Sidi Mâwilâ, an influential darwîsh suspected of plotting the emperor’s assassination, who was put to death. Fürüz had appointed his nephew and son-in-law, ‘Àlî al-Dîn, governor of Karra, and this adventurous prince, hearing of the great wealth of Dehârî in the Dakhân, led a daring raid into that kingdom and returned laden with plunder, but declined to visit his uncle at Dihl engaged apprehension of punishment for having undertaken such an enterprise without permission. The doting old emperor was at length persuaded, against the advice of his counsellors, to visit his nephew in Karra, and on 19 July, 1296, was stabbed to death on the bank of the Ganges before the eyes and under the orders of ‘Àlî al-Dîn, who immediately caused himself to be proclaimed emperor.

Bibliography: Tâhirî, Fâhîshât, ed. Briggs (Bombay 1832), i. 154 etc. seq.; transl. Briggs (London 1829), i. 285 etc. seq.; Dîya al-Dîn Barâni, Tarîkh-i Fürûz Shahî (Bibl. Ind.) p. 174 etc. seq.; Nîzîm al-Dîn Ahmad, Ta’abârî-î Akbarî. (T.W. HAIG.)

Fürûz Shâh Taghlâk, son of Malik Râdjab, brother of Chîyâhâr al-Dîn Taghlâk, and the last of a long line of the dynasty of Taghlâk, born 1262, was educated and advanced to high rank by his cousin, Muhammad Ibn Taghlâk, on whose death near Thâtha on 20 March, 1351, he was induced to ascend the throne. He extricated the army then encamped at Sind from its difficulties and led it back to Dihl, where in the meantime Ahmad Ayûz Khândârî, whom Muhammad had left in charge of the capital, too hastily crediting a report that Fürûz had been slain in an encounter with the Moghuls, had placed on the throne a supposititious son of Muhammad. Fürûz would have pardoned and reinstated Ahmad, but was overruled by his advisers, who caused the aged minister to be put to death. The wars of Fürûz Shâh’s reign were two expeditions into Bangâl in 1353 and 1359, one into Urjza in the latter year, one against Nargarokh in 1361, and one to Thâtha in 1362. A certain measure of success attended all these campaigns, but Fürûz’s generalship in each was beset by much need, and after the submission of the Dhâm of Thâtha he wisely abandoned the quest of military glory. The rest of his long reign was passed, if the suppression of one or two unimportant rebellions be excepted, in the indulgence of his passion for architecture and the chase. His public works included cities, palaces, tombs, irrigation works, mosques and colleges, but he compounded for his activity in this direction by neglect of all other public business and tolerance of corruption and inefficiency in others. He had so little of the jealousy which is a usual attribute of sovereignty that at different times he associated two of his sons to himself in the imperial dignity. He was applauded by his people by his suppression of many vexatious imposts and by the general lenity of his rule, which contrasted strongly with that of his predecessor, He distrusted, at the age of more than 80 years, in the latter half of September, 1388, and was succeeded by Taghlâk II, the son of his deceased eldest son, Fath Shân. The proximate cause of the ruin of his empire was Timur’s invasion but the inefficiency of his own administration contributed largely to its disruption.

Bibliography: Shams-i-Sirâj ‘Âfîf, Tarîkh-i-Fûrz Shâhî (Bibl. Ind.), (Calcutta, 1888—1891); Fürûz Shâh, Fâhîshât-Fûrz Shâhî (MS., Brit. Mus., Kev., iii. 920); Dîya al-Dîn Barâni, Tarîkh-i Fûrz Shâhî (Bibl. Ind.); Elliot-Dowson, iii. 266—388. (T.W. HAIG.)

Fîsîk. (See Fâsîk.)

FIÎNET, a Turkish poetess, whose real name was Zubaida, the daughter of the Shâhî al-Islâm Mehmed Esâedd Efendi, died 1194 (1780). Of her life we only know that she made an unfortunate marriage with Derwîsh Efendi, Kâdi’sgar of Rumelî under Selim III. Her Divâns (printed Stambul 1286 = 1869 and often since) consists chiefly of lyric poems, ghazals, shairâs and a few riddles; some poems show a philosophic strain, which according to Gibb, is due to the influence of her friend Râghib Pasha [q. v.]. Her total writings were of small bulk.

Bibliography: Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, iv. 151 et seq. (the Turkish sources are also given there).

FIÎTR. (See ‘Âd al-Fîtr.)

FIÎTRA is a "noun of kind" (Wright, i. 123, v.) to the infinitive fitr and means (an Ethiopic loan-meaning, Schwall in Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., iii. 199 et seq.; Noldeke, Neue Beiträge, p. 49), "a kind or way of creating or of being created". It occurs in Kûr. xxx. 29 (khâbâh, Bâtîd) and other forms of its verb in the same meaning occur 14 times. But though Muhammad uses derived forms freely, it is singular to hear his hearers. Ibn ‘Abbâs did not understand it until he heard a Bedawi use it of digging a well, and then the Bedawi probably meant the genuinely Arabic sense of shâkh (Lisan, vi. p. 362, l. 20). Its theologically important usage is in the saying of Muhammad, "Every infant is born according to the fitr (câla v-fitrâ; i.e. Allah’s kind or way of creating; “on God’s plan”, cf. Macdonald, Religious Attitude in Islam, p. 243); then his parents make him a Jew or a Christian or a Magian". This is one of several contradictory traditions on the salubrity of the infants of unbelievers. On the whole question the theologians were uncertain and in disagreement. This text evidently means that every child is born naturally a Muslim; but is perverted after birth by his environment. But in this interpretation — that of the Mu’tazilites (cf. Khašâfî, ed. Lees, ii. p. 1094) — there were found serious theological and legal difficulties. (i.) It interferes with the sovereign will (mash’âr) and guidance (hidâyâ) of Allah. Orthodox Islam, therefore, holds that the parents could be only a secondary cause (sabab) and that the guiding aright and leading astray must come from Allah himself. (ii.) This view, and indeed
almost any view of the tradition, would involve that such an infant, if his parents died before he reached years of discretion, could not inherit from them, and that if he died before years of discretion, his parents could not inherit from him. For this presupposes that he is a Muslim up to years of discretion, and canon law lays down that a Muslim cannot inherit from a non-Muslim or vice versa (ḥādiyya of al-Bāḏjrāni on the šārīʿ of Ibn Kāsim on the mawāniʿ of Abu Shujāʿ, ed. Cairo 1307, vol. ii, p. 74 et seq. and Sachau, Muhammedanisches Recht, p. 186, 204, 206 — a favorite subject for hair-splitting). Two attempts have been made to escape this. (i) This statement of Muḥammad is to be regarded as a decision (ḥakīma) and was abrogated by the later decision as to inheritance. But it is pointed out that it is not really a decision, but a narrative (khabar) and that narratives are not abrogated. (ii) The being made a Jew, Christian or Magian is to be regarded as not actual, but figurative, and takes place in this figurative sense from the point of birth; the legal religion of the infant is automatically that of his parents, although he comes actually to embrace that religion only with maturity of mind. Another view was that being created according to the fitra meant only being created in a healthy condition, like a sound animal, with a capacity of either belief or unbelief when the time should come. Another was that fitra meant only “beginning” (badʿa). Still another was that it referred to Allāh’s creating man with a capacity of either belief or unbelief and then laying on them the covenant of the “Day of AlLAST” (Kur., vii. 171). Finally that it was to which Allāh turns round the hearts of men.


**Fomalhaut (also fomalhot and samohol) = fam al-ẓāt (“the fish’s mouth”) is the star α of first second magnitude in the Southern Piscis. Potency and following him al-Battānī, however, reckon it to Aquarius, but add that it lies in the mouth of the Southern Piscis. According to Kayzawi and Ulugh Beg it was called al-Dīdār al-ʿawwat = the first frog, according to Arab nomenclature, to distinguish it from a second in the Whale. It is also called al-ʿalim = the ostrich by Kayzawi.


(H. Suter.)

**Fuʿād Pasha (Muḥammad Kāmil-ˇZâde) = an Ottoman statesman, born in 1230 = 1815 in Constantinople, the son of the poet ʿAziz Molla [q.v.], who mentions him in his Muhit-kelebi, studied medicine after leaving the school of Galata-Serai and entered the army medical service with the rank of yazbāshī (captain) and was sent to Tripoli in North Africa. Returning in 1253 = 1857 to Constantinople, he entered the service of the Porte as interpreter, was sent to London in 1256 = 1850 as first secretary to the Embassy and in 1261 = 1854 attended the coronation of Queen Isabella of Spain as Envoy Extraordinary. In 1265 = 1847 he became Dragoman of the Imperial Dwan, in 1265 = 1849 referendum, then was sent on a special mission to Wallachia and Moldavia and finally appointed ambassador in St. Petersburg. In 1266 = 1850 he was under-secretary of state to the Grand Vizier, in 1268 = 1852 he went on a mission to Egypt and on his return from there became Minister of Foreign affairs, but in the following year resigned in consequence of the intrigues of Mentchkoff. In 1270 = 1854 he was entrusted with the task of suppressing the unrest provoked by Greek bandits in Janina and Venice-Shehr, and succeeded in restoring order. As a member of the Grand Council for Reforms he drew up a series of laws and regulations and on his appointment for the second time to the Ministry of Foreign affairs, became at the same time President of this body. He was deprived of both offices in 1273 = 1856, but was given them again in the following year. He attended the Paris congress as the delegate of Turkey and after the massacres of Christians in Lebanon (1276 = 1860) he was sent to Syria as commissioner extraordinary with civil and military powers. In this capacity he had Māḥṣīr Ahmed Pascha shot to remove any pretext for General Beaufort d’Hautpoul to march on Damascus with the troops under his command. After the accession of Sultan ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz (1278 = 1861) he became President of the High Court of Justice (mudīl-i aḵbār-i adīlī), Minister of Foreign Affairs for the fourth time and Grand Vizier in the same year. After filling this office for fourteen months he was dismissed in 1279 = 1862, but soon afterwards appointed Seraskier and Adjutant-general and, retaining this title, Grand Vizier for the second time 1283 = 1867. He retained this position for nearly three years and introduced reforms during his tenure of office. On his dismissal he retired to his palace on the Bosporus (yəht). He accompanied the Sultan on his journey to the Paris Exhibition of (1867 = 1284), remained in Europe for his health and died at Nice in Shawwal 1285 (Febr. 1869) at the age of 55. His remains were interred in Constantinople in a mausoleum beside the small mosque built by him in the Gedik-Pasha quarter. Fuʿād played an important part in the history of modern Turkey; with ʿAlī Pascha he is held to be among those who were eager for reform, with Djeweder Efendi (afterwards Pasha) he compiled the first grammar of Ottoman Turkish that was ever printed (Kaʾūuni es’hāmiya, 1851; trans. into German by H. Kellgren, Helsingfors, 1855). The political testament (wasiyyet nāme-i siyiṣ) addressed to Sultan ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, ascribed to him is a literary skit probably from the pen of the Persian envoy Malcom-Khān.

**Bibliography:** Ch. Mismer, Souvenirs du monde musulman (Paris 1892), p. 12; Sāmī-bey, Kaʾūuni al-ʿalāmā, v. 3449; J. Lewis Fairley,
Turkey (London 1866; with Fuad's Portrait on the title-page), p. 121 et seq.
(C. L. HART.)

AL-FUDAIL b. IVĀD ABD AL-MUNTAZIM TARIKHAN, one of the most celebrated Sāfīs of the older period, a contemporary of Hārīn al-Raḥīd, died 187 = 803. His nisba shows that he was born in Khorassān, which agrees with the story that he began his career as a member of a robber band which rendered the roads between Abīward and Sarakhs insecure. He happened on one occasion to hear some one reciting Sūra lvi. 1:5: "Is it not time for those that believe, to humble their hearts before God's warning" and in consequence became converted. He then went to Kūta, where he studied Tradition, and afterwards to Mecca, where he remained till his death. From the anecdotes related of him, it is clear that he was one of those pious ascetics to whom worldly greatness and pleasures are as nothing; no original opinions and views ascribed to him have been handed down, but he is considered one of the most reliable and prolific transmitters of Tradition.


FUḌŪLĪ. [See Fuḍūlī.]

FULBE. [See FUL.]

FULK, the usual name for ship in the Korān (ṣafīna is only found four times). Navigation seems to have made a profound impression on Muḥammad's mind; numerous passages in the Korān (xiv. 37; xvi. 14; xvii. 68; xxxiii. 30; xxxv. 13; xxxvi. 41 etc.) the fact that God has given man power over the waters (ṣakīhkarā), so that they bear ships, is quoted by Muḥammad as a special proof of God's grace.

Fulk is more particularly Noah's Ark. The Korān does to some extent but it is rather the histories of the Prophets that give all sorts of interesting details of the building and equipment of the ark. By God's command Nūḥ had first of all to plant the trees necessary for the building of the ark and he planted plane-trees (ṣāgī). During the forty years that these were growing no children were born on earth. Being asked what form the ark was to assume, God answered that the upper part and the back were to be like that of a cock and the hull also to be like the body of a bird, and that it was to have three stories (ṭaḥāfūtī). The dimensions are variously given; according to the "possessors of a scripture" it was 80 (sic) ells long, 50 broad and 30 high; according to other statements the dimensions were 660, 330 and 33 ells. The ark was nailed in the ordinary way (dīḥat duṣārī, Sūra liv. 13) and covered with pitch internally and externally; God caused a spring of pitch to well forth for this special purpose. — On one occasion the disciples of Jesus asked their master to raise a man from the dead who would tell them what the ark was like. Jesus raised up Sām (according to Tābari, i. 197 it was Šāhīm), the son of Nūḥ, from a piece of earth, and told them that the ark was 1200 ells long, 600 broad and had three stories, one for quadrupeds, one for birds and the third for human beings. When the accumulation of excrements became a nuisance, Nūḥ seized the tail of an elephant and from it was produced a pair of swine which devoured the excrement; the mice became a plague, so he struck the lion on the forehead and a pair of cats came forth from its nose and destroyed the mice. — According to the Korān (Sūra xli. 46), the landing place of the Ark was the mountain Ṣūr. (Cf. this article i. 1059 et seq.)


FÜMĀNī. [See 'ABD AL-FAṬTAḤ.]

FUNDUK, "hazel-nut." The fundūk is the fruit of a tree, round like a nut, enclosing a kernel like the pistachio-nut (Liāna). Also (in the dialect of Syria and Morocco) a house at which travellers alight, by the way side or in a town; an inn or hostel, corresponding to the Persian ḥām. The derivation is probably from the Greek πανδοκείον. (A. S. FULTON.)

FUNDUKĻ or FUNDUKĻY, the name of the old gold coin of Turkey, said to be derived from the pearl border, which was likened to grains of corn (funduk) (Isma'il Ġalībī, Tağīmī, p. 274). This name only came into general use when two different gold coins began to be struck. The Turkish gold coin that had been in use till then, usually called simply altyn based its weight on that of the ducat. Down to the conquest of Constantinople, European ducats, usually of Venetian origin and later Hungarian and Dutch ducats, circulated almost exclusively in the Ottoman dominions. To make them pass current in Turkey they were countermarked ṣebb by the authorities. The oldest native gold coin dates from 883 (1478) and was struck in Constantinople. These gold coins were to be of the same value as European ducats and are therefore of about 231/2 carat fine, and weigh 3.49 grammes (Hungarian ducat 3.491 grammes, Dutch, 3.494), but well preserved specimens run from 3.43 downwards. This coin bore the most different names: Altyň, Zekin (Zecchino), Flīnī or Flīnī (Florenus), Ṣebb (in the provinces bordering on Persia), Aghrafī (in 'Aqṣyah), Sūfīnī (in the Barbary States), Fudhrahī, Zendjīrī, from the ornamentation etc. A second gold coin was introduced alongside of the ducat in the reign of Sulṭān Ahmad III. (1115-1143 = 1703-1730), of the weight of 2.6 grammes, and was called ser-mahbūb [q. v.], and the old gold coin received the name funduklī. The latter has not been struck since the reign of Mahmut III.

FUNG (FENDY), a tribe or mixture of tribes in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. The name is said to be derived from a Shilluk word denoting "stranger" and is originally applied to a negroid race related to or identical with the Shilluks on the White Nile. They became prominent at the end of the 19th century A.D. by conquering an extensive portion of the eastern Sudan where they founded the famous kingdom of Sennar. At the time of the conquest and subsequently to it their kings and notables intermarried with Sudan Arabs and ultimately Arab descent which they or their court genealogists traced back to the Ibazun Dia. It is noteworthy that all the names borne by their kings a considerable proportion are non-Arabic and non-Muslim.

The Fung dynasty of Sennar was founded by 'Amara Dunkas (Amara, the son of Dunkas) who reigned from A.D. 1505 to 1534. In alliance with 'Abd Allah Djamna, the chief of the Abdalati tribe, he conquered the country between the White and Blue Niles and established himself at Sennar, while 'Abd Allah founded a semi-independent dynasty at Kiri, north of Khartum. The Fung dynasty lasted down to 1789 in which year the throne was usurped by the Hamdali tribe who held possession of the time of the Egyptian conquest. Lists of the Fung kings are given by Shukur (see below) and the French traveller Calliaud. The two differ in details while agreeing on the main features. During its most flourishing period in the 18th century the Fung kingdom extended from the third Cataract in the north to Fazoghi on the Blue Nile in the south, and from the Red Sea on the east to the White Nile and Kordofan in the west. Only the country between the White and Blue Niles was directly governed by the Chinese kings, while Fazogli and the Northern Sudan had their own tribal rulers who were tributary to the Fung.

The Fung seem to have embraced Islam at the time of their rise to power, but, even in the days of Bruce (see below), many pagan practices survived among them. The use of Arabic was general only among the upper classes.

The present Fung are a Negro people in the Sennar province. Their district, called Dar Fung, extends south of North Lat. 12, from the Abyssinian frontier to the White Nile. Their head (shaihk) is a direct descendant of the old Fung dynasty, but the tribe is small in numbers and unimportant.

Even in their most flourishing period they seem to have made little advance in civilization, and their kings cultivated Muslim sciences only to the extent of occasionally attracting Arab scholars to their court.

Bibliography: There are several MSS. histories of the Fung kingdom, e.g. the Br. Mus. Ms. Or. 2945; others were used by Na'Am Shukair, but their mutual relationship has not been studied.


(S. Hillelson.)

AL-FURAT is the Arabic name of the Eufrates, called in Sumnerian BUR-NA-NU, Assyry Par-ruitu, Hebrew תימ, Syrian شن. On the name and the notices by authors in antiquity cf. Weissbach's article Eufrates in Pauly-Wissowa, vi. 1195 et seq.; we need only note here that, according to modern travellers, it does not seem absolutely certain that the names Karasu and Muradislu are applied respectively to the northern arm, the "Western Eufrates" and the southern, the "Eastern Eufrates"; Muradislu, like Frat, is rather applied to both tributary streams (cf. Geogr. Journ., viii. 1896, p. 333 note), and perhaps Belké's (Beiträge zur Alten Geographie, i. 45) supposition, that Murad is only a popular etymology for Parat [cf. also the name Djebel Marad in Pseudo-Wâkidî (see Tomaseck, Sâli, p. 17), which is to be located in the district in which the "Eastern" Eufrates rises), is not to be dismissed offhand.

The Arab geographers, to whose notices this article is limited, regard the northern tributary arm as the true upper course of the river. It rises in the district of Kâlikâla (cf. Lasserem, ii. 31) in a mountain called Tibrîkh or some such name, in which we may probably recognise the Pâmuâbis, ëros of Ptolemy, and the Moss Parmurder of the Tabula Peutingeriana. For the upper course of the river we have the very important description by Ibn Serapion, whose text has been published with translation by G. Le Strange in the Journ. R. As. Soc., 1895 and more recently his statements have been discussed by Tomaseck in a valuable paper in the Pesti-schrift für H. Kiepert (1893), p. 137-149.

The Eufrates receives from the west below Kamkab the waters of the Nahr Lûtîya (probably the modern Armûdan-Caï), the Nahr Abrikîr (the Caila-Imaâk flowing from Abrikiâb = Diwirîgî) and the Nahr Ånû (the modern Angû-Caï, the lower course of the river, that is known above (Ibn Serapion wrongly says above) the mouth of the last named river the Western joins the Eastern Eufrates, the Nahr Arsanân rising in Tarâm (Tarunis), which not far from Shimsâh (Arasmosata, cf. R. Kiepert, Formae orbis antiqui, text to sheet 5, p. 84) is augmented by the Nahr ad-Dhibîb and the Nahr Salâît (according to Tomaseck, the rivers Peri-Sû and Sângüt). The united stream now flows past Hûn al-Mînâqîr (the modern Mûshêr-Dagh: Khâbî al-Zahirî, Zubû, p. 125: Mûghârî), receives on the west bank the Nahr Djarqarîya (probably the Kûru-Caî) which flows from the neighbourhood of Khârzhana, further the Nahr Kûbûbîb i.e. the Toikhâm-Sû. The latter, into
which flow the Nahrl Kūrākīs = Sulṭān-Ṣū and the Nahrl al-Zurālīs, which irrigates by a branch Malatya, is crossed by the celebrated Ḑantār Kūhadī, the modern Kūrgoskopor (see Yorke in the Geyg. Fourn., viii. 1890, p. 238 et seq.; Lehmann-Haupt, Armenien, i. 486). On the east bank the Euphrates receives the Nahrl Henzī (Boyūl-Caik) which still preserves the name of the capital of the old district of Anzitene and then enters the cataract district, which it does not leave till it reaches Gerger (see von Moltke, Briefe über Zustände..., in der Türkei, p. 305—310; E. Huntington in Zeitschr. für Ethnol., 1901, p. 183—204).

Leaving the mountainous country the Euphrates divides the flat tableland into two, and forms the boundary between Syria and al-Djazīra below Sūmaṣṣī. At first the river continues as before to receive important tributaries from the west only. Of these the most important is the Nahrl Sandja or Nahrl al-Az̃aḳ crossed by the famous Ḑantār Sandja, which, like the Singas of the ancients (cf. R. Kiepert, Formae Orbis Antiqui, text to sheet 5, p. 15), is certainly to be identified with the Gök-Su and not with the Būlam-Su, on account of the Roman bridge that still survives in the latter (see Humann and Puchstein, Reisen, p. 393 et seq.). Below the rocky citadel of Kaft al-Rūm and the crossing of al-Bтра, of particular importance since the Crusading period (cf. Heydik, i. 723 et seq.), there is still the Nahrl Sāḍur to be mentioned. In the early middle ages Dīsr Manbīd, the later Kaft al-Nadīm, and al-Raḥṣa were the main places where the Euphrates could be crossed. Below the last named place the al-Balîgh, rising in the neighbourhood of Harrān, joins the al-Raḥṣa al-Sawda, the modern ruins of al-Sanbr (see Sarre and Herzfeld, Archäol. Reise im Ueuphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet, i. 160). It is true that the modern very important crossing at Dīr al-Za’r [q.v., i. 346] seems to have had a predecessor in an ancient Birta [see above i. 724 infra seq.] and is probably mentioned by Yaḳū, ii. 662 as Dair Rumman, but it has only become of any considerable importance in modern times. The place of Dīr al-Za’r at the present day was held in ancient times by Circesium, the Karkisiya of the Arabs at the mouth of the Ḑahrūr, which flowing from Ra’s al-Ain, according to the repeated statements of the Arab authors, formed with its tributary the Hirman from Tūr ʿAbdin, a navigable connection between the Euphrates and the Tigris in the Nahrl al-Thahrīr, but, according to the recent investigations of Sarre and Herzfeld, op. cit., i. 193, this must be regarded as more than doubtful. The place of the ancient Circesium, the modern Dīr al-Za’r, was filled, particularly in the later middle ages, by the double village of Raḥṣa, or the Daliya of Malh b. Ṭawṣ, a little south of the former, the lands of which were watered by the Nahrl Sāḍ, which began before Karkisiya, and was called after Sa’td b. ʿAbd Malh b. Marwān (see Peters, Nippur, i. 127 and 129 et seq.; A. Musil, In Nordwestarabien und Südsyrienausgrabungen, p. 10 of the reprint from the Anziger der phil.-hist. Kl. der Wiener Akad. 1913, Dux). While modern geographers make Minn Murmantoa and Minn Mešopotamia begin at Ḍana [q.v., i. 344 et seq.], already cultivated in the middle ages for its palms, the valley begins, the writers of the middle ages as a rule place the boundary between al-Djazīra and al-

Träf much farther south on the Euphrates. The Čert Sa’d, which was led out of the Euphrates downwards from Hiṭ, the course of which can be traced almost as far as Neqef (see Peters, Nippur, i. 166 and 312; ii. 327; Meissner, Von Babylon nach den Ruinen von Šurra und Šauram, p. 13), has unfortunately not yet been sufficiently explored for its real importance and relation to Khandāk Šābūr (see Noldeke, Sasaniden, p. 57; G. Le Strange, Eastern Caliphat, p. 65) and to the Wādī ‘Ain al-Tamr (see Musil, op. cit., i. 11), which, according to Ibn Serapion, flowed into the Euphrates at Hiṭ. According to Ibn Serapion a canal, called Nahr Dūdjael, flowed from the Euphrates at al-Rabb (7 farsakh from al-Anbār, 12 from Hiṭ; possibly the Umm al-Ru’ūs in Peters, Nippur, ii. 45) to the Tigris near ʿUkbarār (see Streck, Die alte Land eschaft Babylonien, p. 24), but it seems soon to have been silted up, as the later geographers give this name only to a Tigris-canal perhaps originally connected with the ancient Dūdjael (see Streck, op. cit., p. 33 and 220 et seq.).

Only a little farther down, at al-Anbār [q.v., i. 348], begins the great network of the Babylonian canal system which dates back to remote antiquity, although only the remains survive to day. The usual identification of the four main canals, Nahr Ṭār, Nahr Šarṣar, Nahr al-Malik and Nahr Kūthā, led from the Euphrates, is given in the article Dīlā, i. 969 et seq. (for details see Streck, op. cit., p. 25 et seq.), but in the present state of our knowledge of the country it can only be regarded as highly hypothetical. Shortly after they branch off, the Euphrates divides into two arms, the western arm according to the main stream of the river proper, which flows past Kūfa and is finally lost in the Baṭāla [q.v., i. 673 et seq.] west of Wāsīt, is also called al-ʿAlkamī, which Musil (op. cit., i. 13) has found E. N. E. of Kerbelū as the name of an ancient canal, perhaps forming the northern continuation of the modern Hindīye arm. The eastern arm of the Euphrates, which even in Ibn Serapion’s time held a greater stream of water, for the first part of it corresponded to the bed of the modern Euphrates proper, until since about 1889 the river began to pour the greater part of its waters into the Hindīye arm (see Peters, Nippur, ii. 335; Sachau, Am Euphrat und Tigris, p. 38 and 57), again divides near Bābil. Its eastern arm, which flows to the Tigris under the name Nahr Sūrā al-ʿAṣra, Sarāt al-Kabīra, Nahr al-Nil, or Nahr Šabūs via the town of al-Nil, the modern Nīlīye, has been thoroughly explored by Sarre and Herzfeld (Arch. Reise, i. 234—247) except for its eastern extremity. How far the western branch, the Nahr Sūrā al-Asfāl, corresponds to the modern course of the Euphrates or the canals Ṣaḥṭ al-Nil, Ṣaḥṭ al-Kār which flow to the southeast, cannot yet be exactly determined. This arm likewise ends in the great swampy area of the Baṭāla, the outflow from which, Nahr Abī ʿAsad, which runs into the Dīlāl al-ʿAwra, may in a way be described as the lower course of the Euphrates.

This is in its main outlines the picture drawn by the Arab geographers, particularly Ibn Serapion. By the details which they give us, we are always intelligible, is not remarkable considering the deficiencies in our knowledge of the country; that contradictions seem to be found in them, need not cause surprise, when we consider how much the river has changed its course, of which the
shifting to the south in quite recent times of its confluence with the Tigris is a striking example (see Geogr. Journ., xxxv. ii with map). The Arabs themselves knew of considerable changes in the course of the Euphrates; for example, Mas'ūdī (Marāj̣ī, i. 216), says, that in the period of Hira's prosperity sea-going ships came up as far as Nadsif in the old riverbed (al-Adhaim). A detailed account has already been given [i. 675 et seq.] of the Arabs' knowledge of the history of the Raṭīfa. It is perhaps evidence of the gradual alteration in this area of swamps that, according to certain authors (see Ptol. Geogr. Inv., iii. 20, note 1; cf. also Vajih, iii. 860 et seq.), an arm of the Euphrates — it can probably only be the Nahr Sūra al-Asfal — entered the Tigris at Wāsaj. Not only is the history of the Euphrates in antiquity and the middle ages still very obscure, but we have only very meagre information regarding the changes in its course in recent times. For what is known on this subject we can only refer the reader to the general textbooks on geography and the encyclopaedias as well as for the economic importance of the river.

Bibliography: The Arab geographers and the more important western works are given under 'Alī, and the same account as a cartographical aid R. Kiepert's excellent Karte von Kleinasien (1:400,000). Important monographs are mentioned in the text. For further details cf. the separate articles.

(R. Hartmann.)

Fūrkān (A.), Discrimination, revelation, salvation. The word is found in Arabic literature as an original Arabic word and also as one borrowed from the Aramaic. The meaning of the word in various passages in the Korān cannot always be exactly determined; Muhammad made a wide use of it; he was fond of words with a long vowel in the last syllable on account of their solemn sound.

1. The Arabic word means separation, distinction, proof. Probably, however, this meaning is not found in the Korān, although the commentators constantly expound it as having the theological shade of meaning of "discrimination between true and false". It is not impossible that Muhammad came by this means to use it in the meaning of

2. Revelation, as this meaning of the word is not found in Aramaic. Thus it is applied in the Korān to pre-Mohammadan revelations, e.g. Sūra vii, 49, iii. 2, where, according to Zamakhshari, it is a name for the whole class of heavenly books. But it is used of the Korān in Sūra xxvi. 1, where it is said: "Blessed is he that hath sent down the Furū' to his servant, that he might be a warner to the creatures"; and among later writers it has become a synonym for Korān.

3. In the meaning "salvation" the word is certainly an Aramaic loanword. Thus in Sūra viii. 42 and what we have revealed to our servant on the day of the Furū', on the day when the two hosts met". Here the battle of Badr is called the "day of the Furū'". Some of the commentators on this passage give the meaning al-nagr "victory". But this is the Aramaic tarīghī, synonymous with the Hebrew yēsha' "salvation".


(A. J. Wensinck.)

Fūrū'. [See the art. Fīrū' in ii. 104.]

Fūrūḍ. [See Farūd and Ferūde, ii. 614 and 1116.]

Fūrūgh (Abū'l-Kāsim Khān), a Persian poet, born in Kāshān, descendant of Fath 'Ali Kāshān, the prince of poets, lived for long in Khorāsan, then settled in Tehrān, where he lived a retired life only associating with mysteries. He lived in the sixteenth century; we do not know the dates of his birth or death. Among his poems he wrote verses on the death of Muhammad Shah and the accession of Nasir-Ad-Din.


(C. Hart.)

Fūrūgh al-Dīn (Muhammad Mahdi), a Persian poet, born in Tabriz in 1223 (1808); an ardent student from the age of seven, he entered the service of various individuals of high rank, among them Ferīdūn Mirzā, a prince of the royal family, who had written poems under the name Farrūkh (a name of the hero Ferīdūn being Firdawsi's Shāhnamah, from whom he took the name Farrūgh-i Farrūkhī). In Tehrān he held a high position in the offices of the chancellery. He collected his Arabic and Persian poems in his Tadkhirat al-Shāhāb ("Memoirs of Youth"), which forms a kind of autobiography.


(C. Hart.)

Fūrūghī. i. Surname of the Persian poet Muhammad of Isfahān, who had studied the Almagest of Pтолем in and became poet laureate to Timūr Shāh Durrānī after spending his youth in travel.

2. The surname of a janissary of Avlona in the time of Sultan Sulaimān, skilled in music and the composition of riddles.

3. The surname of Mirzā Muhammad Husain Ḥāfżīn Zākā al-Mulk, a Persian poet and editor of the Tarbiya, who died in 1908.


(C. Hart.)

Fūstāt. [See Cairo, i. 816 et seq.]

Futā Djallon, a district in West Africa, in the N.W. of French Guinea, to which it is politically attached. It consists of a mountainous area, the most important in West Africa with an average height of 3000, 3500 feet. These highlands border in the E. on the mountains of the Mandingo territory; in the S. they slope in a series of shelving spurs to the level of the Atlantic Ocean, while in the N. they gradually slope down to Bondo. The geographical and orographical conditions of the land are only slightly known at present. The most recent journeys of exploration have merely established, that the south and west borders are formed of sandstone plateaus, while the older kinds of stone, granite and gneiss, occupy the centre. The structure of the mountains is rather irregular; the general picture is of a plateau from which rise peaks 600 to 1000 feet high, bordered by a sandstone range deeply cut by erosion.
The average elevation of Futā assures the land a more moderate and healthy climate than the coast lands. The temperature is lower than on the coast and the thermometer shows considerable variations at all seasons of the year. During the dry season (December to June) differences of 25, 30 and 32° C. may be noticed in the course of a single day; during the winter or rainy season (May to November) the nights are always fresh. Nor does rain ever entirely stop during the dry season, but falls very heavily in winter, and reaches its maximum in spring when the south winds laden with moisture from the Atlantic Ocean set in. Although Futā D żallon has a smaller rainfall than the coast, it has a better supply than the neighbouring lands on the Upper Senegal and the Upper Niger.

Futā D żallon is one of the most important hydrographic centres of Africa. We may distinguish two great watersheds, one in the S. in the district of Timbo, where the Baleo (Bafing), the Tene, the Kinkissó, a tributary of the Niger, and the Konkoure, which flows into the Atlantic Ocean, rise, and another in the N., in the neighbourhood of Labe, from which flow the Gambia, the Salla (Kossa) and the Komba (Rio Grande). To get beyond the boundaries of Futā the rivers with a S. or S.W. course have to cross the mountain wall, which they do in numerous falls, rapid and deep ravines, usually running from N.E. to S.W. Although the slope of the country is much more gradual to the N., the valleys here are quite as narrow and often overhung by steep cliffs.

Futā has long been regarded as a country with a rich and luxurious vegetation, but it does not seem to deserve this reputation, at least not everywhere. The most frequent feature in the structure of the country is the "bowal"; a rocky plateau covered with ferrierous boulders, sometimes overgrown with thin scrub, but sometimes so bare and stony that some travellers compare it with the hamadas of the Sahara. During the rainy season the ground becomes covered with grass and vegetation which varies in thickness with the nature of the country and lasts for longer or shorter periods. Trees are lacking except in the immediate neighbourhood of the water-courses; nevertheless, the valleys are very well wooded; on the slopes and in the cavities which collect the necessary soil, little wooded islands (dantare) are formed which, where they are found in large numbers, seem to form an extensive continuous forest. The villages are surrounded by orchards of orange, melon, kola and mango trees. The karité or butter tree and various kinds of bamboo are widely diffused, but the palms are small and few in number. Finally in some granite districts we find meadows, cultivated fields and plantations beside one another which give the country a certain similarity to parts of Switzerland and the Auvergne. But this is the exception.

The fauna is not so rich as in the Soudan; it is represented by antelopes, gazelles and especially monkeys, the latter being so numerous that the inhabitants have to institute "drives" to protect their crops from being ruined by them. The scarcity of large carnivora has favoured the development of cattle-rearing so that at the present day there are three kinds of sheep and four of cattle in Futā, of which one, the buffalo, used as a beast of burden, was introduced into the country by the pastoral Fulbe.

The number of inhabitants is unknown; it is tentatively estimated at 600,000-700,000. The principal settlements are Timbo, the residence of the Almamy (9000 inhabitants?); Labe (5000?), Medina, Kate and Fugumba (10,000), the holy city, where the rulers are consecrated. The population is composed of various elements, among which the Mande predominate. We find representatives of the different branches of this race here, Dialonne, Susu, Soninke and half-breeds like the Khassonne and notably the Fulā, who are the result of a mixture of the Mande and Fulbe and during the last 150 years have become supreme over the other groups. There are also Peuhl or Fulbe, but they are less numerous in Futā than in the surrounding territories and follow the pastoral life of their forefathers, although there is a marked tendency among them to exchange a nomadic for a settled life.

The social divisions of the people correspond to some extent to this diversity of origin. The highest class consists of an ecclesiastical and military aristocracy, the former composed of marabouts, the latter of prominent Fulā, the descendants of Muslim immigrants or native chiefs who have become Muslim. To these nobles who have special titles (alpha, shiekhu etc.) are grouped in families like the Roman "gozere" and take an active part in the political life of the country; they have seats in the assemblies and supply the Almamys with their civil and military officers. Next to them are the negroes and the Muslim Fulbe; they attend the assemblies as vassals of the nobles but as a rule take no part in their deliberations; they live in villages which are called gor. A third class comprises the non-Muslim freemen. These are usually artisans (weavers, carpenters, shoemakers) and live in separate groups in the gor or near them. They are endogamous and are excluded from any share in political life. Lastly slaves are very numerous, because the conquerors of the Soudan, e.g. al-Hadjij Omar and Samory used to exchange their kind in exchange for the spoils of Futā. These slaves fall into two classes: domestics, whose position is fairly comfortable and who enjoy a relative independence, and agricultural labourers, whose lot is a much harder one. The latter are settled in special villages (runde), are supervised by overseers and severely punished if they attempt to escape. Since the establishment of the French protectorate, however, slavery is no longer legal.

As to religion the population of Futā is divided into Muslims and fetish worshippers. A few negro tribes have remained idolaters, for example, a section of the Fulbe which has retained its original beliefs. The predominant religion, however, is Islam which the Fulbe brought into the land and whose progress coincided with the political victory of this race. The Islam of Futā Dżallon is fairly orthodox and less penetrated by heathen customs than among the Mande. Hecqgard describes it as Maliki; according to Lechatelier, it is a "kind of national church formed from the mixture of Kâdrinya and Tidjâniya doctrines". Although Futā was and still is a centre of proselytising activity, the inhabitants are not at all fanatical. This lukewarmness is attributed to the predominance of the Kâdrinya whom the Tidjâniya, the representatives of Muslim intolerance in the Soudan, have not been able to supplant in spite of all their efforts. The marabouts hold a very im-
important social position. They form a kind of hierarchy; at the top are the fédé who have often studied among the Moors of Tagant, next come the taufir or heads of mosques, then the sérin and the jab, who have charge of the schools.

The government is a kind of aristocratic republic with an elected sovereign. The executive power is in the hands of an almamy (al-imān) who is at once head of the army, judge and high priest. Before the establishment of the protectorate the almamy was chosen by the Council of Elders, acclaimed by the assembly of freemen, and received the turban of investiture in the town of Fugumbra. He was chosen from among the descendants of the two founders of the Fulé state, the Alfayas (descendants of Karamoko Alfa) and the Soryas (descendants of Ibrahim Sory). In principle the elected sovereign ruled for two years, after which he retired for two years in favour of a representative of the rival family. Devised to prevent rivalry and civil war, this rule of alternation was not always regularly observed. The Council of the Elders which chose the sovereign, could also on occasion depose him; in normal times it decided, under the presidency of the almamy, all questions of any importance of politics, law and religion.

Futé was divided into provinces or diwal (9 in the xviith century, 13 in 188f, 17 in 1887), to which tributary regions were attached, whose number varied with the success or failure of Fulé arms. Each diwal was administered by a governor (lamhab), appointed by the almamy and assisted by a council of notables. The villages obeyed the authority of chiefs who likewise were assisted by a council. In this organisation, which some European travellers have compared to that of the Carolingian Empire, the central power was very weak. Some governors, those of Babé for example, were masters of territory more extensive than that of the sovereign and had at their disposal resources greater than his. Ruined by the largesse necessary to secure his election, impoverished by the necessity of keeping open table for his adherents, the almamy was very often incapable of maintaining his authority respected.

The history of Futé Djallon down to the xviith century is obscure. About this time we find the Djallonke in the land, who had driven out the original inhabitants, besides them a body of Fulbe attracted by the extensive pastures, and finally the Fulé already in such numbers that their name was applied by Europeans to this part of Africa (the name "Fouta Guialon, land of the Fulé", is found in a map by d'Anville of the year 1717). Among the Fulé were many Muhammadans, who undertook the conversion of the fetish-worshipping tribes to Islam under the leadership of marabouts. They overcame and formed small communities of them whose chiefs recognised the authority of the Djallonke. In the second half of the xviith century the Fulé succeeded in librating themselves and founding an independent state. This transformation was the work of two men, the marabout Ibrahim Sambeco, who claimed to be of Arab and Sherif origin, and his cousin Sory celebrated for his energy and bravery. A holy war was proclaimed against the infidels and the lands to be conquered promised as spoil to all the chiefs who took part. The Fulbe adopted Islam en masse, but the Djallonke resisted and were conquered. Their lives were respected, but a third of their lands and cattle divided among the conquerors. An assembly at Timbo then chose Ibrahima as almamy, and he took the name Karamoko Alfa. The new sovereign received the turban of investiture at Fugumbra from the hands of Alfa Othman Serianke, governor of the town; he made the Fulé chiefs swear fealty to him and gave Sory command of the army. The conquered country was divided into provinces or diwal to the number of 9 in memory of the companions of the Prophet.

Karamoko became insane in 1791 and was replaced by Sory as almamy. But the victories and riches of the new ruler aroused the fears and jealousies of the chiefs, who deposed him and appointed in his stead Alfa Salifu, son of Karamoko (1801). This youth of fifteen proved incapable of securing order in the interior and could not prevent the invasion of Futé by the Wassoulonke. Sory had to be recalled; he drove out the enemy and ruled the country without opposition till his death (1814). Power passed to his son Sadu but Alfa Salifu protested and was supported by a party of nobles. Two rival soft's were thus formed, the Alfayas and the Soryas, whose rivalry deepened Futé in blood for fifteen years. An agreement was finally reached between Abdalaye Badumba, chief of the Alfayas and Abd al-Gaderi (Abd al-Kadir), chief of the Soryas, it was decided that each of the two chiefs should govern alternately for periods of two years each. This arrangement was violated almost as soon as it was concluded. Abdalgaderi had his colleague assassinated and remained sole master of Futé for 15 years.

On his death (1847) disorder again broke out. The Soryas and Alfayas each chose an almamy and flew to arms. Al-Haddji 'Omar attempted without great success to bring about a truce between the two parties and it was only after 1856 that peace was finally established in the country. For 26 years, Alfayas and Soryas lived on good terms and furnished almamys by turns. This was the most brilliant epoch in the history of Futé. The almamys succeeded in restraining the turbulent spirits of the nobles and subjected the lands and joining Futé to their authority. The people of Dinguiray, the fetishworshippers of the upper Casamance, the Gambia and the Rio Nuñez had to become tributary to Futé.

Europeans had for long been trying to enter into relations with Futé. During the first half of the xixth century French and English travellers setting out from the "factories" of Gambia and Sierra Leone penetrated into the interior. Such were the Frenchmen Mollien (1819) and René Caillié (1827), and the Englishman Cooper Thomson as well as various missionaries. In 1850 Hecquard spent a year there and collected valuable information on the history and civilisation of the country. Lambert explored it in 1859. From 1880 on French missions began to increase in number. Olivier de Sanderval, Gaborit-Chabrard and Anseladi endeavoured to find accessible routes to Futé, entered into commercial relations with the natives and made preliminary surveys for the building of a railway into the interior. In 1881 Doctor Bayol signed a treaty with the almamy giving the French the exclusive right of establishing commercial depots in Futé and its dependencies.

The disorders that again broke out about this time facilitated the task of the French agents.
The almanach Ibrahim Sory, having to give up his powers after his two years of office, was abandoned by every one, but, arming his slaves, he overcame his adversaries and reigned alone till 1887. On his death two Sory rivals, Alfa Mamadu Paté and Bokar Biro disputed the title of almanach. Bokar won and, feeling the need of support against his enemies, fell back on the French. He gave a good reception to the mission under Plat and Fras and concluded with them a treaty which placed Futa Djallon under the protection of France. For several years he remained faithful to his agreement, but then adopted a hostile attitude and tried to impede the passage of caravans through his country. Wishing to get rid of the Council of Elders, he aroused the discontent of the nobles, who deposed him and proclaimed his brother Abdulaye in his stead. Bokar triumphed over the rebels, took Abdulaye prisoner and put him to death; but some of the partisans of this claimant appealed to the French who, having already cause to complain of Bokar’s misdeeds, invaded Futa. Bokar tried without success to repel their resistance; he was conquered and slain (November 1896). The French chose a new almanach, the provinces of Timbo, Baria and Kalen were left to him while the other “diwal” were declared independent. A French resident was installed in Timbo. Since then the geographical and economic survey of the country has been pursued by several expeditions of which the most important have been those of Dr. Maclaud (1888-1889), while a railway, which has now reached Timbo, was begun to connect the Upper Niger and French Guinea through Futa.


FUTUWA. (A.). In ordinary usage this word means all the honourable qualities that distinguish a noble youth (fati), particularly generosity (karam, zakat).

The members of the family of the Prophet regarded themselves as the true representatives of futuwa, which they inherited from their ancestor and in course of time received the meaning of chivalry, knightly rank; they based this claim on an alleged saying of the Prophet’s “futuwa illa Ali (awwa la saif illa Dhu ’l-Faqih)” ; cf. Chronique de Tabari, trad. Zotenberg, ii. 27: according to another tradition it was called from heaven by an angel on the day of Badr, Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Muhammad (al-Riʿād al-nadira [Cairo 1327], ii. 190 infra. — On the use of this saying cf. Reinaud, Monuments, ii. 153, 307; Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Indië, 1873, ii. 333 et seq.). It is related of the Caliph al-Nāṣir (575—662 = 1180—1225), who according to the Kit. al-Faḍārī was an Imāmi, that he granted several princes and nobles the rank of futuwa, with which he associated the privilege of rāmiy al-bunduk. Installation consisted in the ceremonial putting on of a pair of trousers, called sarwāl al-futuwa or libīs al-futuwa, and drinking the knight’s cup (ka’s al-futuwa). The knight, whose rank was hereditary, had the right to depict the cup or trousers or both on his arms. — According to the Kitāb Um- dad al-Tālib, the ‘Alī family of the Al-Mu’āwya had from the time of al-Nāṣir the right to grant futuwa. The Naṣīb, Tāj al-Dīn Muhammad, who belonged to this family, also granted the khirka al-talqawwam.

Ibn Djibair (2nd ed., p. 280, where on l. 11 the reading جُوْدَمْ). The Miss. is to be retained.

It mentions a brotherhood in Syria who proved their futuwa by ruthlessly attacking the Rāfidīs; an oath sworn by them at the futuwa was kept in all circumstances.

In Asia Minor Ibn Baṭṭuta found brotherhoods whose members (fīyān) had for the most part the same trade and lived together in a monastery (zāwiya) under a superior called aṭīl on the earnings of the work which they did outside. After dining together they spent the evening in song and dance. Their dress consisted of a cloak (kabā), a white woolen cap (jalansawa), to the upper of which was fastened a strip of cloth an ell long, and shoes (ādja): in the girdle they wore a knife two ells long. They were hospitable to strangers and were ruthless in their opposition to tyrannical governors and their followers (ed. Paris, ii. 260 et seq.). — In Kōniya the same traveller stayed in the zāwiya of the ḫāṭ ḫīn Kālam Shāh, whose inmates (fīyān) wore sarwāl and traced their futuwa rule to ‘Ali. They were distinguished for their hospitality (ed. Paris, ii. 281 et seq.). — During his travels Ibn Baṭṭuta frequently found hospitality in such fīyān monasteries [cf. ibid., 270—268 passim].

In the language of the Sūfis futuwa is the expression for a disposition which is manifested in dif-
different ways and therefore cannot be expressed by a single word. In general futūwa is described as "placing others above himself" ʾīṯār al-ʿālā najšūhā, which, according to al-Ghazzālī, Iṣṭīḥāl iii. 213 (Cairo 1282), is the highest stage of šākhah. This finds expression in liberality, selflessness, self-denial, self-effacement, superiority to disappointment, indulgence to the faults of others etc. Al-Kughālī gives some idea of the scope of the notion in a series of illustrations and anecdotes.

For further information on futūwa and its relation to the guild-system the reader may be referred to H. Thurneysen’s work in the xviith volume of the Türkische Bibliothek.


FUGZULI, MUHAMMAD B. SULAIMAN, a Turkish poet of Kurdish origin, born in Bagdad (date unknown), died 963 (1556) or 970 (1562).

After the capture of Bagdad by Ibrahim Pasha, Sultan Sulaiman’s grand vizier (941=1534), he offered the vizier and the Sultan his congratulations, whereupon the latter granted him an annual allowance at the expense of the town. His Divān is written in Adharbaidjānī Turki; the style is original and lacks the artificiality which characterises Turkish literature of the period in imitation of Persian, although in passages the influence of Persian rhetoric cannot be mistaken; the expression is passionate. Among his contemporaries he found little favour; it is only modern Turks that have begun to appreciate his merits. He also wrote a Persian Divān (lith. Tabriz). His Turkish Divān was printed in Balik (1545=1538), and his Latinus et Martynus in Constantinople (1524=1548); a collected edition of his works also appeared in the latter town in 1591=1874. He also composed a Sāḥānānā in Persian and a Beng u bide (Hemp and Wine) in Turkish, which is dedicated to Ismail Shāh and must therefore have been composed between 907 (1501) and 930 (1524). Under the title Mutāṣhal al-Shahādah ("Garden of the Blessed") he translated from the Persian Ḥusain b. al-Wafa’al-Kašfi’s legendary description of the martyrdom of ‘Ali and his family (Rawdat al-Shahādah, "Garden of Martyrs"). We also possess from his pen a Turkish work in prose entitled Shiṣḥet-Subbānī, which contains a complaint addressed to the Porte on the holding back of his year’s allowance by the civic authorities. A well at Kerbelā bears a metrical inscription composed by him.

Bibliography: Cl. Huart, Hist. de Bagdad, p. 38 et seq.; Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iii. 70 et seq.; Hammer, Gesch. der omm., Dichtkunst, ii. 293; Ethé, in the Grünér, der iran. Philol., ii. 358.

(C. V. ARENDONK.)

GABAN, properly GINNOPERT (cf. Abu ’l-Faradj, Chron. Syr., ed. Bruns, p. 329 and Kastner, ʿIswān, Cinnamus, i. 8), an Armenian mountain stronghold on the Tekir-Su, a tributary of the Dijahān, now called Geben and belonging to the ʿArab of Anderin in the sandjak of Marash. Here the kings of Armenia kept their treasures and retired in the case of need; the last king Levon VI. of Lamian entrenched himself here in 1374, for example, but had to surrender after a siege of nine months to the Mamlik Sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf Shahānī.

Bibliography: Ritter, Erdkunde, ix. 2, p. 36, 157; Defrémery in Documents arméniens, Recueil des historiens des croisés, s. Index; Cuenet, La Turquie d’Asie, ii. 243.

GABES (Kānis), a town in Southern Tunisia, in 33° 52′ 58″ N. Lat., 10° 4′ 6″ E. Long. (Greenw.), 80 miles south of Sfax and 250 south of Tunis, on the west coast of the Gulf of Gades or Lesser Syrtis, on the side of a rocky isthmus, which separates the sea from Djerid al-Fedjedjī. It is the capital of the district of Arad.

Gabes includes three settlements: the town of Gabes, a European suburb with 1200 inhabitants of whom 500 are French, and the native villages of Djar (4000 inh.), Chenini (1000) and Menzel (1500). The European town lies on the right bank of the Wādī Gabes about half a mile from the sea. The mouth of the river has been made into a harbour which ships of small draught can enter. Larger ships have to anchor in the open sea in an insecure roadstead, full of shallows where the tide rises 9 feet. The traffic in the harbour is not very considerable as the total exports and imports scarcely exceed 25,000 tons. The native settlements lie in groups up the river along the Wādī Gabes. This stream, which rises about 8 miles from the sea, sustains the vegetation of a beautiful oasis the verdure of which forms a striking contrast to the barrenness of the surrounding country. The gardens which contain about 10,000 palms and about 200,000 other trees, cover an area of 7000 acres of which 3000 are watered by the Wādī itself. This area is about 4 miles long by 1/2 to 1 broad. The distribution of the water is regulated by mechanical means, some ancient and some modern. The palms are of very fine quality but the dates are only mediocre. Fruit-trees on the other hand grow in a marvellous fashion, whence the oasis of Gabes has always been the admiration of visitors. "It has been said with reason," writes the Shaikh al-Tidjānī in the xviith century, "that Gabes is an earthly paradise and a little Damascus." The oasis, it is true, is extremely unhealthy and the dwellinghouses have had to be built outside the gardens in which only a few negroes live regularly. Beyond the palm-groves lie areas which are at present practically desert but might be fertilised by irrigation works. Gabes deserves the description "a town which is both maritime and Saharan" given it by al-Tidjānī, from its geographical situation and appearance.

In ancient times the town of Tacape stood on the site of Gabes. Founded by the Phoenicians this town was one of the most flourishing emporia
of the “Syrte.” It passed to the Carthaginians, then to the Romans and under the empire was raised to the status of a colony. Nothing else is known of the town however; some of its ruins were still standing in Shaw’s time (Travels, Ch. iv.), and were used in the building of Gabes. We are equally ignorant of the circumstances under which Gabes fell into the power of the Arabs. After the triumph of the Fatimids the town was placed under the governorship of the Kettâni Lomân, whose descendants still exercised their authority in al-Bakri’s time. Under the rule of the Fatimids and Zirids Gabes seems to have enjoyed great prosperity. Ibn Hawkal extols the fertility of the oasis, the excellence of the silk and wool manufactured in it, the activity of its trade and the number of the merchants who frequented the port. A century later al-Bakri adds a few details to this picture, the main outlines of which are unchanged. “The town”, he says, “surrounded by a wall of large stone’s from ancient débris, possesses a magnificent mosque, and numerous bazaars and caravanserais”. The gardens included, besides innumerable fruit-trees, mulberries and also plantations of sugar-cane which is no longer found there. The population was composed of Arabs and Afişat, i.e. the descendants of Latinised Berbers. The envoys of the town were occupied by sections of the great Berber tribes of Uwaṣṭa, Lëmâya, Nejissa, Zughâ etc. These natives, who were rude and uncultured, had most probably retained Abâdî doctrines. Ibn Hawkal indeed describes them as “people, inclined to evil and professing a religion which is corrupted by an admixture of heresy”.

The Hilâlî invasion introduced new Arab elements to Gabes and its neighbourhood. According to Ibn Khalûd (Berbères, transl. de Slane, i. 33, 34 and ii. 21) the Caliph al-Mustânṣîr granted the district of Gabes to the tribe of Zoghla when he sent the Hilâlîs against the Zirid Sulâîn. Whatever be the truth of this statement, it is a fact that the Zoghla, after inflicting a severe defeat with the help of the Râyâ, ʿAbî and Djasheh on the Zirid Mu’izz on the plateau of Haiderîn, settled in Gabes. One of the Zoghla, Ibn Djamîn, organised a little state there, which remained independent down to the middle of the xiith century A.D. After the capture of Mahdiyya by the Sicilian fleet Gabes recognised the authority of the king of Sicily for several years (1148—1150 A.D.) until in 553 (1159-1160) it was taken by ʿAbîd al-Mu’îmin, who exiled the last representative of the Beï Djamî in Morocco.

The Almohads, however, had great difficulty in enforcing their sovereignty on the people of Gabes. From the end of the xiith century they constantly tried to throw off the yoke and took an active part in the struggle of the Banû Ghâniya against ʿAbîd al-Mu’îmin’s successors. ʿAli b. Ghâniya and his ally Kârâqîsh became masters of the town (581 = 1185 A.D.). The defeat of this adventurer and the Almoravid pretender al-Hamdam enabled the Almohad Caliph al-Mansûr to regain possession of Gabes (584 = 1187 A.D.), but Kârâqîsh was not long in re-entering it again. He was again driven out in 591 (1195); but Yâḥîyâ b. Ghâniya installed himself there in his turn and it was only in 601 (1204-1205) that the Almohad al-Nâṣîr definitely recovered the town. The allegiance of the people of Gabes nevertheless remained very uncertain: throughout the xiith and xivth centuries they showed themselves as independent of the Ḥâfsîd as they had been of the Almohads. From 1282—1344 the Beni Mekkî who ruled at Gabes freed themselves of their allegiance to the sovereign of Tunis. Ḥâfsîd authority had hardly been re-established when the Marinid expeditions into Ifriqiyâ gave the people of Gabes an opportunity to rebel once more. Revolts again broke out in 1379 and 1387, stirred up by a certain ʿAbî al-Wâhâb, a descendant of the Beni Mekkî. To put an end to this state of affairs Abu l-ʿAbbâs had to lay waste the oasis and cut down the palm-trees, but a century later in 1490 a rebellion once more gave evidence of the turbulent spirit of the inhabitants.

The constant turmoil seriously affected the prosperity of Gabes without however destroying it. The Hilâlî invasion does not seem, however, to have produced in Gabes the disastrous results that it did in the rest of Tunisia. Idrisi is still able to describe Gabes as a considerable town with a large quantity of merchandise in its bazaars. He notes, however, the disappearance of the silk industry; but trade by sea was still active and remained so throughout the middle ages. It attracted to Gabes merchants from all parts of the Muslim world and even Christians such as the Pisans were allowed to trade there. The tomb of one of the companions of the Prophet, Abu l-Bâhâ al-Ansârî, was also a much frequented place of pilgrimage. Nevertheless, from the beginning of the xivth century A.D. manifest signs of decline may be noted in Sheikh al-Titdîn’s account. A number of buildings had fallen into ruins, for example the palace al-ʿArûsîn, built in the Kaṣba by Rashîd b. Djamî, and the al-Menâra tower mentioned by al-Bakri. In the xviith century it was still worse. “This city”, writes Leo Africanus, “has much diminished in honesty and good manners since it was sacked by the Arabs . . . . The inhabitants are negroes, poor labourers and fishermen who are much oppressed by the kings of Tunis and of the Arabs”.

The lot of Gabes hardly changed under Turkish rule, although the harbour continued to export the products of the ʿArûsîn which were brought thither in caravans.

Gabes was occupied by the French in 1881. After the conclusion of the treaty of Kaṣr Saâd, great unrest was manifested in the south of Tunisia. Immediately after the bombardment of Sfax, therefore, French troops were sent to Gabes, the inhabitants of which had taken of arms. Dîara and Menzel surrendered almost without resistance on the 23rd July. A camp was pitched at Râs al-Wâl to command the river on whose waters the existence of the oasis depended. When peace was established a European town arose between the oasis and the sea. Since then Gabes has become the headquarters of a military command which extends over the whole of Southern Tunisia and is the residence of a civil command. But the attempts made to bring back to this part the caravans which, since the French occupation, have been deflected to Tripoli and thus to restore the town its former economic importance have as yet only produced insignificant results.


(G. YVER.)

GAFSA (KAFSA), a town in Tunisia, 146 miles S. of Kairouân, 26 miles from Tunis and 130 from Sfax, with which it is connected by a railroad built to serve the phosphate deposits of Medenî, 26 miles E. of Gafsa; it lies in 36° 24' 32" N. Lat. and 8° 46' E. Long. (Greenw.). It has a population of about 5000 including 360 Europeans and 370 Jews.

Gafsa occupies a remarkable geometrical and strategic position. The town, built on a rounded eminence 1150 feet high, commands the ravine of the Wâdî Bâchîsh between the mountainous massif of the Djebel Orbata in the S.E., the Djebel 'Assala and Djebel Yunes in the N.E., and therefore the route between the steppes of Central Tunisia and the Djèrid and Shott country. An oasis watted by the cypress drawn from the Wâdî lies at the foot of the town covering an area of about 2500 acres. This oasis includes 75,000 palm-trees, numerous fruit-trees notably apricots and figs as well as a number of fields of cereals. The town itself offers little of interest. The only notable buildings are the kasba built in the middle ages on Byzantine foundations, the Chief Mosque with pillars crowned by ancient capitals and finally the baths or _fornida_, watted by hot springs used even by the Romans. The native population speaks Arabic only. The Berber language has almost entirely disappeared and is only represented by the dialect of Sened, a village 32 miles E. of Gafsa. (Cf. Provostelle, _Étude sur la Tamazhit ou Zemaitia de Qalâdî es-Sened_ (Paris, 1911, _Publications de la Faculté des Lettres d'Alger_, T. xlvii.).

Gafsa occupies the site of the ancient town of Capsa. The latter was one of the strongest places in the kingdom of Numidia and was destroyed by Marius in the course of the war against Jugurtha (106 A.D.). Rebuilt under the empire it became municipia, then a colonia. The Byzantines made it one of their strongholds to protect Byzacene from the inroads of the nomads. The Arabs ravaged its surroundings after the defeat of the Patricius Gregory, and took it at the time of 'Okbâ's invasion in 49 = 669 A.D. Down to the Hillaï invasion, Gafsa passed through the same vicissitudes as the rest of Irikiya. Al-Bakri describes it as a prosperous town, still retaining remarkable relics of an earlier epoch. It was surrounded by a wall, certainly built by the Byzantines, but which legent attributed to "Shentiyân, slave of Nimrûd"; the houses were built over marble porticoes, the intervals between the pillars of which were filled with light masonry. The oasis produced pistachios in abundance which were exported to Egypt and Sidjîmâsa, and fruits of all kinds which served to provision Kairawân. The surrounding country was dotted with equally prosperous villages. Over 200 could be counted which were called the "K-âr of Gafsa." The general wealth was attested by the amount of taxation which annually reached 50,000 dinars (€25,000); al-Bakri confirms al-Bakri's account.

"The inhabitants" he adds "have become Berbers, the majority of them speak African Latin." Many of them had still remained faithful to Abâdî doctrines. Al-Bakri in fact mentions their custom of fattening dogs for food, as was the custom in various regions, particularly Sidjîmâsa. Cynophobia is still practised by the Abâdîs of Djerba.

The Hillaï invasion introduced a new element into the population of the country round Gafsa. The Abîbadî tribe settled near the town. With the help of these nomads, who after devastating the country remained and entered the service of local chiefs to be enabled to live, a certain 'Abd Allâh b. Muhammed b. al-Rend founded a kingdom in 1449 (1053–1054) which comprised in addition to Gafsa the greater part of Kaštiya and lasted for over a century. The dynasty of the Banû Rend, although overthrown by 'Abd al-Mâ'min in 554 = 1159 and restored only by his death, did not finally disappear till 576 (1180). The rule of the Almohads and Hâfsida was, however, never solidly established in Gafsa. The inhabitants of the town, like those of the Djèrid, were distinguished for their turberulence and their rebellions. In the course of the wars between the Banû Ghâniya and the Almohads 'Acarîshî installed a garrison there under the Kurî Karyatin. The Almohad Caliph after retaking the town destroyed its walls, but they soon rose again. In 1282 Gafsa fell into the power of the pretender Ibn Abî Amara; in 1328 a new rebellion broke out under Abû Bekr b. Yemîlî. During al-Hasan's invasion of Irikiya, the people of Gafsa hastened to recognise the authority of the Marinid sovereign. At a later period the Hâfsîd Abu 'l-'Abbâs had to suppress several rebellions but he only put an end to them by cutting down the palm-trees. During the second half of the 14th century Gafsa finally made itself independent under princes of the Banû Khalef family. The town suffered considerably from these disorders. "The town", says Leo Africanus at the beginning of the 15th century, "is for the moment inhabited but the buildings are ugly except the temple and some other small mosques... The inhabitants are courteous but very poor because they are much oppressed by the king of Tunis." Turkish rule was not of such a nature as to restore Gafsa its former prosperity; it was a very wretched little town when it was occupied by French troops under the command of General Forgemont on the 20th November 1881.


GAGAUSES, a people of Turkish origin speaking a pure Turkish language but professing the orthodox faith; their numbers are small. They live in isolated colonies and at the present day are found chiefly scattered over Bessarabia (mainly within the triangle formed by lines joining Ismafil-Bolgrad-Kagul, in the district of Trajan’s wall and also at Bender and Alckenman), on the west coast of the Black Sea from the mouth of the Danube and Siliistra to Cape Emine, in the Dobrudja in Roumania (Nioitiol and Taita) and in Bulgaria, also in the wilayah of Adrianople particularly in the keza of Hawsa, in the sandjak of Seres (Sihna and Selhovo) and in keza Karafere. In the Balkan Peninsula they seem to call themselves Surjak or Surjak in preference to “Gagauze” which is, however, also used there.

The origin and early history of the Gagauz are somewhat obscure. As in the East it is not linguistic or ethnological features that are considered essential but religion alone, they were classed by the Ottomans as Christians with the Christian Bulgars. It seems remarkable that in Russia also, even in Bessarabia, where the great mass of the Gagauzes now reside, their proper name is little known and it is only at a comparatively late period that the name Gagauzes appears in Russian authors. They were officially and usually still are simply identified with the Bulgars and in all statistics classed with them. In consequence of this confusion accurate figures cannot be obtained. In popular language on the other hand they are correctly called pravoslavniye Turki (Orthodox Turks).

The Gagauzes are certainly Turks and probably the descendants of the so-called Kara Kalpak and therefore, like the Ottomans, descended from the Oghuzes or Uzes, as is already suggested by their name Gogaus, in which arc is a contraction for oghu while gac (probably equal to gak or gok) is a distinguishing mark of the clan. The Oghuz hordes while still heathen separated on their westward migration. While one section, the Saldjaks and later after them the Kangly, the present Ottomans, went through Persia to Asia Minor and adopted Islam, other sections went to the steppes of South Russia where they led a nomadic life: first the Pećenegs who were next pressed westwards by the Uzes or Torks, who were related to the Turks till finally the Kumas or Polowzes, who came last in the middle of the xiiith century, forced the main body of the Pećenegs and Uzes over the Danube, where they settled in Byzantine territory, the majority in the Balkan Peninsula. One section, however, which settled in Russian territory, was conquered by the Russians and at the same time, it seems, converted to Christianity, and served like the Cossacks as frontier guards against the Pećenegs, Torks, Kuyer and Berendeyer under the collective name of Kara Kalpak (Černije Klobuki “Black-caps”). But before the Slavifying process which began with the conversion to Christianity had been completed, the great Mongol invasion took place in the xiiiith century, which forced the tribes already Christian to migrate to the Balkan Peninsula, Hungary, the Caucasus and even to Asia Minor (Phrygia) and Egypt. The remnants that settled in the Balkans retained their language and religion even under Ottoman rule, while their relatives who had settled there as pagans in the xith century became Muslims and were merged in the Ottomans; the other branches that had broken off also lost their identity.

From 1750 to 1846 an interesting migration took place of the Gagauzes of the Balkans — along with a similar movement among the Bulgars — back to Russia over the Danube (till 1769) into the New Russian district, 1787–1791 (and in largest numbers in 1801–1812 to Bessarabia), this seems to have taken place without the co-operation of the Russian government, which did not till a later period begin to allot lands and provide for their administration systematically. The reason for this emigration was presumably the persecutions, still commemorated in Gagauz songs by the robber bands (the Daghly and Kyrdjaly) of Fazvanofghi (Hasan ogluh "Othman") the notorious Pasha of Siliistra, Widdin and Kara Feji.

In the sixth decade of last century there were 24 Gagauz colonies in Bessarabia numbering over 26,000 souls (34¾% of the total population), which has now grown to over 70,000 according to Moshkov’s estimate, but this is certainly exaggerated. Roumania contains about 3600 Gagauz to which may now be added 3,377 Gagauzes in the recently ceded district of Siliistra. The figures for Bulgaria and Turkey are unknown to me. In any case the total number of Gagauzes including the Surjak does not exceed 100,000. As they live in isolated groups and have no common intellectual bond they are destined to be slowly but certainly merged in the peoples amongst whom they dwell.

The administration of the Gagauzes of Bessarabia still enjoys certain colonial privileges (according to the colonial statute of 1819) and certain liberal institutions which date from the period of Roumanian rule in Bessarabia.

On the whole they are comparatively poor and are almost entirely engaged in cultivating vegetables and the vine. At an earlier period they were also shepherds and cattle-rearers. They are no longer distinguished in dress or manner of life from their neighbours. The position of women among them is a relatively low one.

The most striking features in the character of the Gagauzes are frugality, an extraordinary avarice and want of hospitality. To these are added cunning and a certain pride and independence of spirit, which prevents even the poorest from entering a position of servitude among the neighbouring peoples. They seem to have displayed very little intellectual activity. They are scorned as stupid and among the Roumanians “Gagauz” is used as a synonym for “blockhead” and it is said to be used as an epithet of contempt among the Albanians, like türk among the Ottomans. The Russian Gagauzes therefore are fond of calling themselves Bulgars after the official example. The Gagauzes have a great contempt for the Ottomans. Numerous popular etymologies attempt to explain the remarkable phenomenon of the combination of the Christian religion and Turkish language by former despotic measures on the part of the Ottomans.

The language employed in the home is exclusively Turkish. The women as a rule under-
stand no other language, while the men are forced to know several languages. The divine service of the Gagauzes who live in Turkey is after the Greek rite and that of those in Russia Slavonic. The priest often can only communicate with his congregation through the medium of Russian which is unintelligible to the majority of them. The Russifying process has, however, made great progress by the foundation of the school in Ismail, the compulsory use of Russian as the language to be used in all church and country schools and above all by military service.

The language of the Bessarabian Gagauzes as well as that of those across the Danube is, apart from Christian elements, practically identical with primitive Ottoman Turkish, which is explained by their common origin. The vowel harmony is very strictly carried out except in loanwords. One peculiarity is the tendency to weakening. With weak vowels all consonants are weakened, even when the latter are weak already. The numerous peculiarities of pronunciation and the different colonies are explained by their isolation from one another. The language is not a rich one: a certain laconicism and a certain poverty, particularly in synonyms, is noticeable in it. There appears to be no written literature, although there is no lack of tales and songs handed down by oral tradition.


**GAIKHATU.** A Mongol prince (ilkhan) of Persia (690—694 = 1291—1295), brother and successor of Arghun (q.v., i. 430; entry), he received the name Irangin Turjat (in Wusaf Turjat) "most precious jewel", which he bears on his coins, after his accession from his Buddhist priests (according to Wusaf from Chinese); the same name was, according to Wusaf also placed on the currency notes issued in Gaihath's reign. Before his accession he was governor of Asia Minor. Muslims were particularly favoured in his reign unlike that of his predecessor: Sadr al-Din Ahmad al-Khulidi (also called al-Zanjani from his birthplace, and al-Çwî after his unfortunate experiment with paper money), he was appointed minister (Sâhib-Diwân) on the 6th Dhu l-Hijja 691 = 18th November 1292, received the title Sadr-Diwân and the military rank of a commander of 10,000. His brother Kûb al-Din Ahmad as chief Kât bör the title Kûb-Diwân. The Mongol Emirs were completely excluded from any share in the administration of the empire by Sâdr-Diwân; no distinction was made between the revenues of the royal estates (injûj) and the state revenues proper (dâli). All attempts of the Emirs to overthrow the minister failed; the malcontents were delivered into the hands of the minister by Gaihath's orders, and pardoned by him; it was strictly forbidden to bring such complaints in future. Unlike all other rulers of this dynasty, particularly his predecessor Arghun, Gaihath did not stain his brief reign by any atrocities; on the other hand he plunged the land into a critical condition by his extravagances and excesses; matters were made worse by a severe murrain (yât); the treasury had to borrow large sums to meet the expenses of the court and was not in a position to repay them. In these circumstances the first and last attempt in Western Asia was made to force a paper currency (lûw) after the Chinese model into circulation (693 = 1294), but the crisis was only intensified by this measure and the prestige of the ruler and his minister undermined. After only two months the notes had to be withdrawn; as Dorn (Grußdr. d. Iran. Phil., ii. 575) has pointed out not even the word lûw has survived in Persian; European paper money is always known by the Arabic name kâma; but lûw is still found in Persian literature of Central Asia in the thirteenth century with the meaning "debased coin" (F. Teufel, *Quellenstudien zur neueren Geschichte der Chânate,* p. 74).

On the deposition and murder of Gaihath cf. *KIOE,* i. 591.

**Bibliography:** *Turkshi Wusaf,* Ind. edition, p. 259 et seq.; *D'Ohsson,* *Histoire des Mongols,* iv. 82 et seq.; *Hammer-Purgstall,* *Geschichte der Ikhjan,* i. 396 et seq.; Howorth, *History of the Mongols,* iii. 357 et seq. (W. BARTHOLOMD.)

**GAKHAR.** The Gakhar tribe occupies parts of the districts of Rawalpindi, Atal and Djehlam in the Pandžab and of Hazará in the north-west Frontier Province of India, also in Djamón Territory, West of the Činâb. They are all Muhammadans and have a high social position among the agricultural tribes of North-west India in the mountainous and sub-mountainous tract, and are generally considered to stand apart from the practices of Râdîpût descent. Some of them call themselves Mushkâhs but the late Râdîa Djâhândâd Khân (Chief of the Gakhars of Hazará) claimed descent from Naughirwân and Yazdigird and claimed the title of Kâyânî, stating that after being driven from Persia they ruled Tibet under the Chinese, adopted Islâm and returned to Kâbul, ultimately entering India with Mahâmîd Ghasnâvi. This account is evidently unhistorical, but points to a tradition among the Gakhars of Central-Asian origin. It is most probable that the Gakhars represent one of the invading races from the period of the Kushâns to that of the Epiphilates, but evidence is not forthcoming for any exact identification. Cunningham held them to be Kushâns. In later times they have been supposed by most historians to be the tribe called Gakkurs in Briggs's translation of Firûsta's history i. 46 and 182, who joined the Indian confederacy against Mahâmîd Ghasnâvi in 399 (1008) and fought against Muhammad b. Sâm in 602 (1205) and were charged by Firûsta with his assassination. There is good reason however for reading the name of the tribe in question Ḳoḳar (for Khôḳhar) instead of Gakhar; the whole ques-
tion as regard the events of 602 is discussed fully by Raverty ("Ṭabašt-i Naṣīrān" trans., Vol. I, p. 485 and notes). As regard the events of 399 in Māḥmūd’s time, however, it seems possible that the brave band who stormed his camp near Pešmahwar were Gakhar rather than Khōķhars as the locality is close to Gakhar territory and the Khōķhars belong rather to the central Panjāb. There is, however, no mention of the tribe in the early historians such as the Tārīḵ-i Yamānī or the Ṭabašt-i Naṣīrān, the only authority is Fīrishta who spells the name Khakar (فیشریها). Balbān’s expedition against the tribes of the Djūd Mts. may have been directed against them. The Gakhar s again emerge from obscurity in the time of the Emperor Bābur who in 925 (1519) intervened in a dispute between two Gakhar chiefs in the Salt range (Koh-i Djūd). Bābur took their fort Parhāla, and Hātī Khān Gakhar submitted to him, but afterwards again revolted. The chiefship seems to have remained in the family of the rival chief Tātār Khān who was supported by Bābur, as in Akbar’s time we find from the A’in-i Akbarī that his sons Sulṭān Sārang and Sulṭān Ādam ruled the tribe, and Nazar Khān, grandson of Sārang Khān, was a commander of five hundred (afterwards one thousand in the year 1900). Dājarānī in his memoirs describes his journey through the Gakhar country in 1816, and was himself married to a daughter of Sāyiḏ Khān father of Nazar Khān. Dājarānī described the territory of the Gakhar s as ending at the Margalāh pass between Rawalpindi and Ḥasan Aḥ)dāl, and alludes to them as a troublesome and turbulent race. Under later Mughal sovereigns several Gakhar s attained distinction. They suffered a good deal under the rule of the Sikhs, but have since recovered, and now hold a good position. They are especially given to military service under the British Government.

The Gakhar s mainly belong to the Shi’a sect. They are divided into five clans, the Bugtāl, Iskandarī, Fīrishta, Ṭabarqan and Sārang; these are the patronymics, the last two being derived from Adām and Sārang the chiefs in Akbar’s time. The Sārang s are found in Ḥazāra Aṭakh, the Adāmats in Rawalpindi and Dājarānī. The chiefs formerly bore the title of Sulṭān, but since Sikh rule of Rājād. The late Rājā Dājarānī Khān C. I. E. was one of the leading men of his day, and has been succeeded (in 1906) as chief of the Ḥazār Gakhar s by his son Rājā ‘Ali Ḥaidar Khān.


GALATA, a suburb of Constantinople [q.v., i. 574b et seq.].

GAMRON, also written Gomron etc., see above i. 604 infra seq., a seaport on the Persian Gulf, called Bender ‘Abbās since the reign of ‘Abbās I. To the Bibliography given above i. 605 may be added, Yule and Burnell, Heath-Johnson, s.v. Gombroon.

GANDĀPUR, the name of an Afghan tribe living in the Dāmān of the Derā Ismā’īl Khān District [see Art. DāMĀN]. The tribe is said to be of Sayyid descent, and like the Bākhtiyārīs who also claim the same origin, was originally attached to the Usturān tribe. In the time of the Durrānī kings they descended into the plains and settled in the Dāmān. Their country extends from Darāb in the south to Pāhārūp in the north. Kulār is the principal town, and the residence of the Chief. The country is barren but receives some irrigation from mountain torrents, especially from branches of the Gumāl River. The name Gandāpur is accounted for by a legend that Tarai son of Solor (eponymous founder of the Usturān tribe) married without his father’s consent a girl of the Shērānī tribe, and hence was called by him Gandā pār or ‘evil son’. This story no doubt points to the fact that the tribe is of mixed descent. The Gandāpur, though formerly turbulent, are now a peaceful tribe living entirely in British territory. Their language is the Kandahāri variety of Pashto.

Bibliography: Muhammad Haytī Khān, Afgānīstān (the Haytū Afgānīstān), trans. Priestley (Lahore 1874); H. Edwards, A Year on the Panjāb Frontier (London 1851); Raverty, Notes on Afghanistan (London 1880).

(M. Longworth Dames.)

GANDJA, Arab. Dājana, Russian Jelisawetpol, since 1804, (the old name alone is still used by the native population), a town in the Caucasus. The town was first founded under Arab rule, according to the Armenian Moses Kalankatoug (transl. by Patkani, p. 270; cf. J. Marquart, Ostrobothnische und ostasiatische Streifzüge, p. 462) about 845, according to Ḥaṭam Allah Każmīn (in Schefer, Sittet Namh, supplement, p. 227) in the year 393 (probably for 839–850). It is not mentioned by the oldest Arab geographers like Ibn Khordāḏbih and Yaqūt; it seems to have taken its name from the pre-Muhammadan capital of Adharbaḏājān (now the ruins of Tahk-i Sulaimānī, cf. i. 134 infra seq.). Istakhri (ed. de Goeje), p. 187 and 193, only mentions Gandja as a small town on the road from Bardža’a to Tiffah; according to him the distance between Bardža’a and Gandja was 9 far-sakh, according to Yaqūt (ii. 132) 16 far-sakh. After the decline of Bardža’a (cf. i. 461 and 656) Gandja became the capital of Ar-rān; the Shaddāḍī dynasty ruled here from about 340 = 951–952; after it had been overthrown by Sulṭān Malik Shāh (405–408 = 1057–1092) Muhammad, son of the Sulṭān, was granted Gandja in fief. In 533 = 1133–1134 (so correctly in Imād al-Din Iskandār, Recherches du Textes etc.), ed. Houtsma, ii. 190; according to Ibn al-Ṭabīr (ed. Tornh.), xi. 51, in 534 = 1139–1140) the town was destroyed by an earthquake in which, according to Imād al-Din, about 300,000 people, to Ibn al-Ṭabīr about 130,000, perished including the wife and children of Kārā-Sonḵor, Emir of Adharbaḏājān and Ar-rān, who was absent at the time.

(M. Longworth Dames.)
Demetrius, king of Georgia, sacked the ruined town and carried off one of its gates. 'Imād al-Dīn says that the Georgians built a new town in their country, gave it the name Djaza and set up the gate they had carried off there; soon afterwards Karā-Sonkor destroyed the new town and brought the gate back to Gandja. The latter statement does not agree with the facts; the gate that was carried off still exists in the Gelati monastery in Kutais; a Georgian inscription gives an account of its removal; and there has also survived on the gate itself an Arabic inscription of the year 455 = 1063 (the year of its erection) which has been deciphered by Früh (Mitt. d. Akad., xvii. Ser., Science politiques, iii., 1836, p. 531 et seq.).

Karā-Sonkor died in 535 = 1140-1141, his successor Dschw in Dschumādār I, 541 (9th Oct.— 9th Nov. 1146); Rawdhī is now mentioned as ruler of Ahrān (Receuil, etc., ii., 252); but a few years later we find Ahrān again united with Adharbai-джan under the rule of the Pahlawans. The town of Gandja is said to have been rebuilt by Karā-Sonkor "in all its splendour" (ابن الفدائی); in the viii. = viii. century it was considered one of the most beautiful cities of Western Asia (cf. the verses in Hamd Allah Kazwīnī (c.); the poet Ni'āmi Gandjāvi belongs to this period: Ibn al-'Arīf (xl., 251) calls Gandja "mother of the cities of Ahrān" (امام البلد ابران). When the Mongols appeared before Gandja in 618 = 1221, they dared not attack the strongly fortified town, the inhabitants of which had proved their courage in frequent battles with the Georgians; but the retreat of the enemy had to be purchased with money and cloth. In 622 = 1225 Gandja, whither the last Pahlawan, Uzbek, had fled from Tabriz, was taken by Djalal al-Dīn Khārīzūshā; a few years later all the Khārizūs were massacred in a rebellion of the inhabitants; nevertheless, after suppressing this rising Djalal al-Dīn refused to allow his troops to sack the town and only had the ringleaders, 30 in all, executed (628 = 1231). Four years later (1235) the town was captured and burned by the Mongols. On this occasion again the town was soon rebuilt, since it does not seem to have ever attained great importance again. After the foundation of a Mongol empire in Persia, Ahrān with Gandja as capital became one of the provinces in it; the land afterwards usually shared the lot of Adharbai-джan and from Itsamīl Shāh Safawī's reign formed part of the Persian kingdom; under Persian rule the governor of Gandja bore the title Khânī. In 1583 Khân Imām Kuhī was defeated by the Turks, the town itself taken in 1588 by them; invested in Jūmāwīl 1014 (19th Febr. — 9th March 1605) by Shâh Abbas I. It was won for the Persians again after a six months' siege. Shâh Abbas transferred the town to another site about 1 farsakh "higher," i.e. to the southwest. The new Gandja had to surrender to the Turks in 1723; was taken by Nadir Shāh in 1733; remained after his death under the rule of Khānī who were practically independent, passed into the power of the Kājarīs towards the end of the 18th century, was stormed on the 3rd (15th) January 1804 by the Russians under Prince Gjūrjan and definitely ceded to Russia by the Peace of Galiánin (p. vi.).

On the 13th (25th) Sept. 1826 Paskevič defeated a Persian army under 'Abbās Mirā in the neighbourhood of Gandja (about 5 miles from it). As a Russian town Jelisawetpol had, according to Ritter's Geographisch-statistisches Lexicon (5th ed. 1864), only 13,169 inhabitants, in 1891 20,794, while, according to the census of 1807, the number had risen to 33,190.

The modern town (the writer visited it in 1908) lies on both banks of the Gandja Čai, a tributary of the Kur (called by the Russians Gandžinka), which is connected by a bridge. The western part of the town is inhabited by "Tatars," (Adharbai-джanis) and Persians, the eastern mainly by Russians and Armenians; there are government offices and the gymnasium are in the latter; in the former remains of fortifications (illustrated in Jackson, Persia Past and Present, p. 3) and the so-called "Tatar" mosque have survived from the time of Shāh 'Abbās; the "Persian" mosque belongs to a later period. The ruins remain (2-3 miles east of the town; illustrated in Zap. Tost. Otd. Arkh. Obšč., xxi., 634 et seq.) of the mausoleum (turbe) of the poet Ni'āmi, mentioned by Isakhan Munshi (Tārīkh-i 'Alam Ārāb-Abbās, Pers. ed., p. 496 et seq.). South of the town (456 miles) lies the right bank of the Gandja-Čai, which has the flourishing German colony of Helendorf. The climate of Jelisawetpol is regarded as unhealthy and malarial; on the other hand the climatic conditions favour the development of vegetation, particularly the horticulture; the town garden (near the ancient fortress) is one of the best in South Russia; wine, tobacco and silk are also produced. (W. Barthold.)

GANDO, the kingdom of the Fulbe in the Western Sudan (cf. the article MILK.

GAO. [See Gogo.]

GARDIŢI, Abū Sa'īd Abū al-Hayy B. al-Abbāb b. Māmūn, a Persian historian. Nothing is known of his life. As his nāma shows he was born in Gardiz (usually written Kardiz in Arabic, e. g. Yāqūt, iv. 258; but sometimes also Dżardż as throughout al-Uthīb's Tārīkh Vamīd), which confirms the spelling with ج, a day's journey from Ghaza on the road to India (Mukaddasī, ed. de Goeje, p. 349). His work (Zain al-Abhārī) was written in the reign of 'Abd al-Rasidl the Ghaznavīd (440–444 = 1049–1053). It contains a detailed history of the kings of Persia, of Muhammad and the Caliphs to the year 423 = 1032 a detailed history of Khoršān from the Arab conquest to 432 = 1041; included are essays on Greek sciences (Dun Mārīfāt-i Rūmīyān), on chronology and the religious festivals of various peoples. The final chapters deal with genealogy (anāba) and sciences (wīdāfī); it also includes a chapter on the Turks of great value for the geography of Central Asia and one on India. No historical sources are quoted by Gardizī in the chapter on the Turks he relies on Ibn Khudrīzīb, Džištānī and Ibn Mūkhassīn. He says he received information about Indian festivals from Albirūnī so that he is regarded as a pupil of the latter. Gardizī exercised little influence on historical tradition in the east and is seldom quoted (cf. Rieu, Catalogue, p. 220); the manuscript in the Bodleian (Ouseley 240) of the year 1196–1222 is the one that has been generally used by European scholars and is frequently (even in the Grundr. d. frasi, ii., 356) described as unique; from this MS the chapter on the Turks has twice been edited (W. Barthold, Östl. o persetka v Srednyym Azym, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 78 et seq.; Gča Kuun, Kellet Kütçif,
The history of the Muhammadan kings of Bengal, and some account of Gaur will be found in Ghiyāth Husain Salām’s A’lā-qi S̱alāf̱īn, translated, by Abd us-Salam, Calcutta, 1902, and in Stewart’s History of Bengal.

(B. Beveridge)

GAYOS, a tribe in Atīch [q.v., i. 566).

GAZA. [See GHVAZA.]

GAZULI. [See IGZULI.]

GEBER. [See JADAR, i. 987 et seq.]

GEBER (t.), the name of the Persian Zo- rumstani, the origin of which is not quite certain. The word is usually considered to be an Arabic کیار (unbeliever; Turk. gani). For other etymologies see the Grundr. d. Iran. Phil., ii. 697. Cf. art. FARS.

GEGA, an Albanian tribe, i. p. 453b.

GEORGIA (Russ. GRUZIIA, Pers.-Turk. GURDUSTAN, GURJISTAN, GEORG. SAKHRATHEVLO), in the wider sense an area in Western and Central Transcaucasia, inhabited by people who speak Kharthwelian languages, stretching from the Black Sea to somewhat over 60 miles N.E. of Tiflis, in the narrower sense practically the government of Tiflis. From the point of view of historical geography, which is still to some extent valid, it comprises the provinces and districts of Kakheti with the mountain districts of Tushetia, Papazia and Khosvuria, Karthia, Imeretia, Swanetia, Guria, Mingrelia and Meskhia. The Kharthwelian languages include the Georgian, Mingrel, Lasi (the latter only spoken in the extreme southwest corner on the Turkish frontier while the majority of the Lases, also called Tā’ans, live in Turkey) and Swanetian; the latter spoken in Swanetia and Mingrel in Mingrelia. Georgian is spoken in all the other provinces. The greater proportion of the Kharthwel peoples profess Christianity in the Greek Orthodox form, only in a few places have they adopted Islam, namely in the extreme east, in the district of Sakathal, the Engloes (Georgian language), also entirely in the southwest, in the Batum circle, the Adjars (the Lases are likewise Muslims). Georgian has lost a considerable number of adherents in the Coroch district and on the upper course of the Kura, i.e. in the Ardagis district and in the districts of Akhalekh (q.v., i. 230) and Aghkhalakh, where Georgians was still spoken two hundred years ago and has now been supplanted by Turkish. The people have forgotten their language and origin and call themselves Turks.

The beginnings of Georgian history are wrapped in obscurity. Kartlia and Kakhetia formed the nucleus for the formation of a new state. The western Kharthwel country had an early period passed under Byzantine rule and from it Christianity in its Eastern Roman form spread over the Western Transcaucasia. Saint Nino is regarded as the bringer of Christianity. She is said to have converted King Mirian in the beginning of the fourth century (the dates given vary). The Georgian church was granted its independence at the sixth council in 680 at Constantinople.

As Georgia lay in the centre of a circle on the circumference of which powerful states had grown up, it suffered terrible vicissitudes till it became Russian territory in 1801. Down to the seventh century Byzantium and Persia were fighting for its possession; soon after 627 (Heracleus’s victory over the Sasanians) the Arabs advanced on Georgia. From the end of the viii century
the power of the Bagratids began to increase with Byzantine help in the 11th century. George, in the 12th century, the Seljukids conquered the land. It was only after the Crusaders had entered Jerusalem in 1100 that David the Renovator drove out the Turks in 1109. Under this king (1080—1125) a period of prosperity for Georgia began which lasted till the death of Thamar (1184—1212). A great decline in the fortunes of the land set in from the 12th—13th centuries, the Mongol invasion (Timur alone was six times in the country between 1387 and 1405) had most disastrous consequences. Scarcely had the country been united under the Bagratids, when it broke up in the 13th century into three kingdoms, Kartli, Kakhetia, Imeretia and three principalities and eventually its history is not that of a single country. After the fall of the Byzantine empire Georgia was left without a protector and the inroads of the Tatare, Turks, Persians and Georgians became more frequent. Persian influence in particular became very strong and in the 15th century the king of Kartli and Kakhetia became a mere governor for the Shah of Persia.

Russia was the only hope and to it Georgia had turned at quite an early period. In 1558 Lewan II. of Kakhetia besought the Czar Ivan IV. to send help against the Persians; in the time of the terrible Shah 'Abbâs Alexander turned to Boris Feodorovich Godunow, in 1619 Teimuraz sent an embassy to the first Czar of Moscow, Michail Feodorowitch. But Georgia was not yet within the sphere of Russian interests and the old state of affairs continued. It was only in the 18th century that Georgia regained strength once more under King Wakh-tang VI. Heraclius II. (1702—1705) was once more able to stem the tide of Persian-Turkish-Georgian invasion, temporarily at least, but when he died the country had been weakened by domestic troubles, the plague (1770), the destruction of Tiflis by Agha Muhammad Khan of Persia (1755) and other causes, that George XII., the successor of Heraclius resolved to place his kingdom under Russian protection (1801). A few years later (1804) Imeretia also became a Russian province; a year previously Mingrelia had also become a Russian possession and after the last Russo-Turkish war, the Muslim south-western districts of the Khat-khais, Kaghizinian, Aragvan, Olyt, Artinian, Batum and Kars also passed under Russian rule. [Cf. "Bibliogr.," 443.]

Germiafoglu, or Germiafogli, or Germainshgh, is the name given to thehot coasts region of Fars and Kirman in opposition to the cooler highlands (Sardest). These words have been arabized by the Arab geographers in the forms Germian and Sarit or Sarid.

GEMIANOGHUL, the name of a Turkomans dynasty, which made itself independent on the fall of the Seljuk empire in Asia Minor and made Koutaia, the ancient Ctyeum, its capital; Germian was originally the name of a tribe and afterwards was applied to the dynasty (cf. Houtsma, "Romil", iv. 229, 326 et seq.; and the expression Läwir, or Læwir, of Kâutâsia in Pachymeres, ii. 421, as well as the title: Suliân al-Germâniyâ in Suleiman-shâh's inscription). The pronunciation—Germân or Ger- miân—is doubtful; the Byzantines write Këmmiâ, Këmmiâvî, or Këmmiâvî (through confusion with Kâmmân); Schultberger (ed. Langmuart), 54; Küm- miân; on the other hand Ahmad Welfi, Lebâe 1046, writes Germiân, (_GRmn), and Leunclavius (xv. Jahrb.) transcribes Germîn throughout; the form Germian, given by Ibn Batuta, ii. 271, also seems to be in favour of Germân. At the end of the xivth century or the beginning of the xvth Alâshîr (written "Lwirî, Lwirîvî, Lwirîvî for the Byzantines), "the satrap of Ctyeum" (Kantakuzenos, ii. 82), is mentioned by Osman, Surâshân, Menteşeh etc. as one of the invaders of Byzantine lands in Asia Minor; amongst other places he had seized Kula and Tripolis on the Maeander and attempted to take Philadelphia (Alâshîh) but was severely defeated in battle with the Katalans and Almugavars (1304; 1306 according to Murad) (see Pachymeres, ii. 421 et seq.; Münchner, c. 205). According to Turkish sources, in the time of Erteşhrul "Alishîr, father of Germiân" was reigning over aifan Karahisâr (Neshîr and his copyists). Shihâb al-Dîn, a contemporary of Ibn Batûta, draws out from Germiân, son of Alâshîr, a grandson of Koutaia, and Ibn es-Seûb, the son-in-law and vassal of Germiân as lord of Karahisâr. This agrees with a coin of Germiân Khân of the year 797 (1307), struck at Shahr Germiân (unique, described by Ismaîlghalib in the Catalogue of his collection of Saltûn coins, No. 175).

Our knowledge of the history of the dynasty of Germiân to the end of the xivth century is lamentably small. Menejîddimbashî, iii. 34 et seq. gives the following list of rulers: Germiânâb, Alâshîhêb, "Alemshîb, "Ali, Yaşûb; this cannot be reconciled with other statements of contemporary historians and manuscripts. We learn from an inscription of Koutaia of the year 779 (1377) that Suleimanshah, son of Mohamed, grandson of Yaşûb, ruled over Germiân about this time. According to Haiil Edhem this Yaşûb is identical with the "great Emir" Yaşûb. "Alişhir, who is mentioned in an inscription of Angora of the year 699 = 1200. Yaşûb's father, "Alişhir, might thus be the lord of Germiân of this name mentioned by the Byzantine and Ottoman historians but can hardly be identified with Karim al-Dîn Alâshîr (Houtsma, "Romil", iv. 299) who was slain in the reign of Kêlitl Arslân IV (655—665). According to the waif document of his grandson Yaşûb II, Mohamed conquered Koutaia and Simonâr; in his reign or that of his successor Suleimanshah the districts of Karahisâr and Denizlî were incorporated in the kingdom of Germiân. Suleimanshah (in the Turkish historians simply called Germiânoglu) married his daughter Khâtun Sultan in 783 (1381) to Prince Bayazid, son of Murad I, and granted her as dowry the most important towns in his land, including the capital. His son, Yaşûb (II), who succeeded him about 790 (1388), was taken prisoner by Bayazid in 793 (1391), interned in Ipsala in Roumelia, and his lands confiscated in 795 (1393). Yaşûb escaped from Ipsala to Timur and after the battle
of Angora was restored by Timur like the other petty rulers who had been dispossessed by Bâyâzîd. When Timur left Anatolia, he gave Yağûb the task of guarding the corpse of Bâyâzîd I, and his captives son, Mîhr Câlebi; Yağûb then handed both over to Mehmedmed Câlebi. He was on friendly terms with the latter and with Murâd II, and remained in undisturbed possession of his lands till his death. When he died without male heirs in 832 (1428-1429) the land of Germân was confiscated by Murâd II. A Pretender, who rose in rebellion in 1453 on the accession of Mehmedmed II, supported by the Karâmanoghlu, was quickly disposed of. The Germân country has since then been divided into two sângâjâs, Germân and Karahîzârî Şâhîb; Kutahia in 1455 became the seat of the Béglerbeg of Anadolu. The following dynasty table is based on the material available:

'Alişhr (about 700 A.H.)

Germân Khân (about 707-730 A.H.) = Yağûb (1)

Mehmedmed

Suleimânşâh (about 779 A.H.)

Yağûb II. (790-793; 805-832 A.H.)

The chief critical authority is Halîl Edhem in the Revue Historique publié par l'Institut d'Histoire Ottoman, I., p. 112 et seq.: the exceeding rare copy of Suleimânşâh and Yağûb II, are described by Ahmed Tewhîdî in the fourth part of the Catalogue of the Mok. Coins in the Ottoman Museum, p. 204 et seq., 529. (J. H. MORDMANN.)

GHÂDAMES, a town and oasis in the Sahara, 300 miles S.W. of Tripoli and 280 miles S.S.W. of Gades, in 30° 7' 48'' N. Lat. and 8° 28' E. Long. (Greenw.), with 5000-6000 inhabitants.

The town occupies the south-western part of the oasis. It forms a ksr of about 1500 houses surrounded by a dilapidated wall and intersected by narrow streets which are vaulted over almost their whole length. The only architectural monuments are the mosques (14 in number) of unpretending exterior. According to al-Hasâshîî the tombs of two companions of the Prophet, Sidi al-Badrî and Sidi ʿUţba b. 'Amr are honoured there. The oasis, which is protected by a wall around it with only one gate, is about 4 miles in circumference, 3/4, - 1 mile broad and has an area of 400 acres of which not more than 190 are planted with palms. Water procured from an artesian well and two warm and seven or eight ordinary springs assure the irrigation of the gardens, each of which contains five or six palms. The total number of trees estimated by Duveyrier in 1860 at 63,000 seems in reality not to exceed 25,000.

The free inhabitants fall into four groups: a. the Berber Beni Wâsit and Beni Ullî, who consider themselves the descendents of the founders of the town; b. the Arab Ulad Bellî; c. the Atriya, i.e. negroes or mulattoes descended from manumitted slaves; d. ʿUţreg Ifoghas, who are permanently encamped round the town as caravan leaders or bandits and "protectors" of the traders.

The predominant language in Ghâdames are: Arabic as the language of commerce, second Hausa spoken by a number of slaves and lastly a Berber dialect, the language of everyday life, which is between the dialect of the Djebel Nefusa and the Tamâshk, but is more closely connected with the former. The women only know the last of these.

The indigenous industries are of little importance although Ghâdames has always been celebrated for its leather work (Spanish Ghândamei). The situation of the town however between the sandhills of the Eastern Erg (cf. A.-S., p. 428) and those of Edeyen has made it a great centre of exchange for the traffic of the Sahara; but its importance from this point of view has considerably decreased since the abolition of the slave trade and the estimates of Duveyrier and Largeau, who put the annual value of the business done in Ghâdames at 12 million francs (£ 48,000), are much exaggerated. According to more recent investigations the annual value of the goods sold in the city hardly reaches £ 4000. The inhabitants nevertheless are very busy and clever tradesmen. We find them not only in Tripoli and Tunis, where the young men serve their apprenticeship, but in all the trading centres of the Sûdân from the shores of Lake Chad to the banks of the Niger.

Ghâdames is the Cydamus of the ancients. Native legends ascribe its foundation sometimes to Nimrâd and sometimes to Dhu 'l-Karnân (Alexander). According to Pliny (Hist. Nat., v. 5) Cydamus was inhabited by Egyptians from Libya. Possibly it is to these original inhabitants that we owe the buildings called al-Ayûn (the idols) by the natives, which Duveyrier regards as evidence of a civilization which he calls Carthaginian. In the year 19 B.C. Cydamus was occupied by Cornelius Balbus, under the empire it was garrisoned by a detachment of the Legio Augusta, stationed in Lambaesis, and under the Byzantine it was the see of a bishop. Ibn Khaldûn is therefore wrong when (Hist. des Berbères, transl. de Saine, iii. p. 303) he ascribes the foundation of the town to the Banû Wîssâ, a branch of the Beni Merin, who built Ghâdames in the early days of Islam.

In the year 46 (666-667) 'Uthma b. ʿÂfi sent a detachment from his army to occupy Ghâdames. In the following century, however, the inhabitants eagerly adopted the Abâdi doctrines introduced by their countrymen Abu ʿIyâd Ta'ârar. This Ismâ'il was one of the five "transmitters of knowledge" who spread heretical doctrines in Africa. When Ghâdames returned to orthodoxy it is not known, but the Abâdi heresy seems to have disappeared by al-Bakri's time as this author describes the inhabitants of Ghâdames as Muslim Berbers (De la, de l'Afrique Septentr., trans. de Saine, p. 397).

During the centuries that followed, Ghâdames seems to have retained its independence, as the few historical statements, that we possess of this period concerning the town refer to attempts made by the rulers of Ifrîqiyâ to take the town. For example in 609 (1213-14) Ibn ʿUâm Idrîs occupied Ghâdames for a brief period and in 809 (1406-1407) the Hafsîd Abû Fâris forced the inhabitants to pay him tribute. The latter seem soon to have freed themselves of this burden, as in the second half of the nth century we find the princes of Tunis undertaking three campaigns against Ghâdames. Leo Africannus (ed. Schefer, Vol. iii. p. 265) in the beginning of the xvi th century mentions that the people of Ghâdames were independent. The Turks of Tunis in spite of several campaigns undertaken by Derwis Bey
(1592) and Ramadan Bey (1609) were, like the Haçısids before them, not able to enforce their authority on Ghadames. During the xvii\textsuperscript{th} and early xix\textsuperscript{th} centuries Ghadames was an independent republic, but in 1830 the inhabitants had to recognize the suzerainty of Yüsuf the last Karamanlı Bey of Tripoli. After the expulsion of the Karamanlı, Ghadames passed into the possession of the Turks and a vâdi who was afterwards (1862) replaced by a gădamaş was appointed to govern it and a small garrison was stationed there.

The commercial importance of the place attracted the attention of Europeans to it in the xix\textsuperscript{th} century. The following travellers visited it, Lévi (1823), Richardson (1845), Dickson (1852), Captaine de Bonne main (1856) and Duveyrier; in 1862, a French mission (Mircher, Vatonne and Polignac) concluded a commercial treaty with the Tuaregs; they were followed by the travellers Kohlfra (1864-1865), Dournaux-Duperc, Joubert, Largue (1876) and Yater Richard (1878); since then, however, Ghadames has remained closed to Europeans owing to the jealousy of the Turks. The French have vigorously disputed their claim to the town since the establishment of the protectorate in Tunisia. The Anglo-French treaty of 1899 decided that Ghadames must be considered outside French territory and the Franco-Turkish agreement of 10\textsuperscript{th} May 1910 regarding the delimitation of the frontier between Tunisia and Tripolitania laid it down that the frontier should pass 10 miles west of Ghadames. The cession of Tripolitania to Italy, made Ghadames an Italian possession.


\textit{Vide:} \textit{Ritter}, \textit{durch die grosse Wüste nördlich der Khadames und nach Tripoli} (Bremen 1865); F. Fagan, \textit{L'afrique septentrionale au X\textsuperscript{e} s. de notre ère} (Klib al-Istibâ), Constantine 1900, p. 60 et seq.; al-Hachachi, \textit{Voyage au pays des Senussi,} trans. Serre et Laram (Paris 1903); V. Largue, \textit{Le Sahara Algérien} (Paris 1881); ibid., \textit{Second voyage à Ghadames} in \textit{Le Pays de Khira} (Paris 1879); Leo Africanus (ed. Schefer), iii. 265; Larton, \textit{Note sur l'oisivé de Ghadames et ses antiques} in \textit{Rev. archéologique}, iv. 301.


\textit{Al-Ghadanfar} ("the lion"). A name of the Hamdanid \textit{Ubayt al-Dawla Abú Taghlib ibn Allah b. Nāsim al-Dawla} ruler of al-Mawāli (511 358-369) (968-979), Abū Taghlib, who was born in 328 (939-940), quarrelled with his father and afterwards with his brothers, when on the death of the Būyālī Mu‘izz al-Dawla in 356 (967) they attempted to attack Mu‘izz al-Dawla’s successor Bakhšīyār [q.v. i. 602] against their father’s wish and therefore threw their father into prison. On the latter’s death in 358 (970) two of the brothers, Hamdan and Ibrāhim, took Bakhšīyār’s side while a third, al-Husain, stood by Abū Taghlib. The latter conquered Harrān in 359 and made peace with Bakhšīyār, whose daughter he married; he also took Murās from his brother Hamdan. Unfortunately for him, a powerful enemy of his father-in-law entered the field in the Būyālī ‘Aṣāl al-Dawla, who took Baghdad in 364 (975) and finally, on the death of his father Rukan al-Dawla, forced Bakhšīyār to surrender the ‘Iraq. Hamdan thought he would seize the opportunity to drive his brother Abū Taghlib out of al-Mawāli with Bakhšīyār’s help but only succeeded in getting himself imprisoned by Bakhšīyār as soon as Abū Taghlib had promised him his help in recovering Baghdad. In the war with ‘Aṣāl al-Dawla that followed, Bakhšīyār was taken prisoner and put to death while Abū Taghlib had to take refuge in flight. The victor soon appeared before al-Mawāli and the ‘Alamān and the Hamdanids sought in vain to treat with him: he was not inclined to restore this important city to the Hamdanids, so that Abū Taghlib, pursued by Būyālī troops, sought refuge with Bardas Skleros, to whom he was related by marriage and bound by ties of friendship. But just then the latter was engaged in a struggle with the Byzantine general Bardas Phocas, in which he came off second in 368 (979), so that Abū Taghlib, who was awaiting the result of the war in Hēn Ziyād (Khartbeh), as in the meanwhile ‘Aṣāl al-Dawla had occupied Masyaf and Amid, went to Damascus and sought the help of the Fātimid al-‘Aṣirī b. Bishār. The latter pretended to take his part and made him the most generous promises through his general al-Faqi b. Ṣalih. But while Abū Taghlib was looking in vain to Egypt for troops to help him, he fell out with Mafarrīb d. Daghbal b. al-Djarrīb, who ruled over Raml and South Palestine while nominally recognizing the suzerainty of the Fātimids and was seeking to drive out the Bani ‘Uqail who were settled there. The latter thereupon turned to Abū Taghlib, who was taken prisoner in a battle near Raml by his rival and put to death in 369 (979).

\textbf{Bibliography:} Besides the sources mentioned in the article \textit{Hamdanī} the following deal particularly with Ghafarī: Yahya b. Nāsim al-‘Antūkī in \textit{von Rosen Imperator Pustīlī Bulgakrostes}, p. 10 et seq. and Ibn Kathīrīn, \textit{Wafayāt} at the end of the article \textit{Nāṣir al-Dawla}.

\textbf{Ghadir al-Khum} is a pond or marsh formed by a spring in a wādi on the left of the road from Medina to Mecca, three (according to others one or two) Arab miles from Dhu‘afa. The Arab geographers mention the thick trees that surround it and the mosque of the Prophet lying between it and the spring; the few inhabitants belonged in Yūsuf’s time to the Khuzā‘ and Kishā‘. Near it was al-Khārijār, to which Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqas was sent in the year 1 A.H. with a few followers by the Prophet.

The place has become famous through a tradition which had its origin among the \textit{Shī‘a} but
is also found among Sunnis, viz., the Prophet on journey back from Hudaybiyya (according to others from the farewell pilgrimage) here said of Allah: "Whosoever I am lord of, his lord is. Allah also."

In memory of this in later times a feast was observed by the Shi'is.


**GAFFAR (A.),** "Pardoning," one of the beautiful names of Allah, cf. i. 304.

**GAFFAR (A. M. MUHAMMAD),** a Persian man of letters, a descendant of the Shahīt jurist Jāmān al-Nādir 'Abbād al-Gaffar al-Kazwī, who died in 666 = 1268. His father, who was a Khātūn of Rāy, wrote poetry under the pseudonym Wāsālī and died in 932 = 1527. Ahmad al-Gaffarī was likewise a Khātūn and died in 975 = 1567 at Dābul (Sīnd) on the return journey from the pilgrimage to Mecca. He dedicated his Niẓāmī, ("picture-gallery"), completed in 959 = 1552, to Tahmāsp 1: it is a collection of anecdotes collected from works of different periods (lith. Bombay 1245 and 1275 and also Calcutta): he also wrote a history of the world in two books entitled Nashīkhī Dīvān-Ṭūr (972 = 1664).

**Bibliography:** Hammer, Gesch. der schonen Künste Persiens, p. 307; Elliot, Hist. of India, ii. 504; Krafft, Catalogue, p. 87; Rieu, Catal. Pers. Mis. Brit. Mus., i. 106, 111; Grundriss der iran. Philologie, ii. 267, 333 et seq. (CL. HUART.)

**GAHIR (A.).** One of the titles of xl. Sūra. **GAFUR (A.),** "Pardoning," one of the beautiful names of Allah, cf. GHAIB.

**GAIB** is generally used with the same sense as ghāib, *what is absent or hidden*, and al-ghāib has come to mean the unseen spiritual world; thus ʿAllam al-ghāib is opposed to ʿAllam al-ghāida, the world perceived by the senses. This sense is normal in the Korān (Mufradāt of al-Rāghib, ed. of Cairo, 1324, pp. 372 et seq.) and it is explained by the commentaries (e. g. Baidawī on Kor. ii. 2, ed. Fleischer, p. 10, ii. 6 et seq.) that al-ghāib is what is not reached by the senses or required by intuition: it is of two kinds, one made known to man by the prophets and one known only to Allah with whom are the treasuries or "its keys"; according as Kor. vi. 59 is real. It thus came to be used in the broadest way as "the Unseen" by occultists among us. Al-Rāzī found the Korānic phrase Mafāṭīḥ al-ghāib a possible name for a commentary on the Korān, Ibn al-Arabi for a Sūfī work and Ahmad al-Zarkāwī, a modern Egyptian writer, for a collection of treatises on magic and divination (Cairo, 1327). Kifāl al-ghāib means the saintly hierarchy presided over by the Khātūn (Lane, Arabian Nights, chap. xxx, note 17) and Ibn al-ghāib can mean a youth conceived without father and gifted with mysterious powers of insight (C. Wells, Mehnem der Kurf, p. 129). In

Sūnism ghāib al-ḥāwinya and ghāib al-muṭṭak means the essence of the real, *qua* unconditioned (al-latī, ḫāyī).

**Bibliography:** To the references above add Tafsīr of al-Jirijjānī, ed. Cairo, 1321, pp. 109, 177; Dict. of tech. terms, pp. 1053 et seq. (sub 'āleem), 1090, 1539 et seq. (sub ʿāleem); Hirtzen, Theologie des Islam, p. 239 et seq. (D. B. MACDONALD).

**GAIBA** is used as infinitive in its root, ghāib having come to equal ghāib. It thus means "absence," often "absence of mind." This latter force was developed by the Sufis into absence of the heart from all except Allah, expressed, on the other side, by ḫāyī, "presence in a mystery." It is a stage on the passage to ḫāyī, complete "ceasing" or passing away of self. For details of the development of this idea see Nicholson's translation of the Khāf al-Mahjūb of al-Hujwīrī, pp. 248 et seq. and index. Also the Risāla of al-Khāshānī with the commentaries of Zakarīyā al-Anṣārī and al-ʿArūf, ed. Billāg 1290, vol. i. pp. 66 et seq. and the Saiyid al-Murtada's commentary on the Ḥāfī of al-Ghazzālī, vol. vii. p. 248 and Macdonald, Religious Attitude and Life in Islam, pp. 260, 262.

Another common use of the word is to describe the condition of any one who has been withdrawn by Allah from the eyes of men and whose life during that period (called his ghāib) has been miraculously prolonged. Of this the outstanding example is the Hidden Imam, or Mahdi, of the Shi'ite Twelve. And this, though kept generally invisible, still lives on earth (cf. al-Khādīr), has from time to time been seen by some and been in correspondence with others and maintains a control over the fortunes of his people (Goldziher, Vorlesungen, pp. 252 et seq., 269 et seq. and Arabische Philologie, ii. pp. 121 et seq.). (D. B. MACDONALD.)

**GAHILAN B. KHIJA, see ABU 'L-KUMMA.**

**GAHIN,** the nineteenth letter of the Arabic alphabet (numerical value 1000; cf. the article AKIBAT); the character ʿāin, in most modern dialects, it is pronounced as a voiced v lar aspirate. The old Arab writers on phonetics describe it as a guttural; but it seems very doubtful if it ever really was pronounced as a post-avular. ʿAin has become ʿain in many modern dialects (for details see the article ARABIA, ARABIC DIALECTS, i. p. 396). Cf. A. Schade, Sibirwolte's Lautlehre, particularly p. 19, No. 3 and note 48; and the index. (A. SCHADE.)

**GAHITA (GAHITA, GHAITA),** an Arab musical instrument, very popular in North Africa and some districts of Southern Europe, a kind of cylindrical bagpipe with a movable wooden mouth-piece (qanūn) and rather wide bell-mouth. The cylindrical portion has seven holes on the upper side. The first hole below the mouth-piece is called yahwīd, the second yaĥhīka, the third bandujab, the fourth dhashīka, the fifth sīka, the sixth dīka and the seventh yka. On the lower side about midway between the yahwdwa and the yaĥhīka there is a hole called kofabā, the names of these holes are used by native musicians to denote the finger required in playing the instrument and also to denote the key of a piece or a scale. In playing, the player puts the mouth-piece in his mouth as far as a kind of a catch (arrabā) in the form of a disc 1/4 inches across. The compass of the instrument is about an octave.
The ghaita is used by the Arabs particularly as a military musical instrument. It is almost always accompanied by the qam, a kind of drum, which is beaten with two sticks and the jambur, a kind of large drum, which is beaten with the bone of an animal.

The ghaita is often called zemedra; in the south of Tunisia and the province of Constantine it is also called zemala, whence the Turkish word zemedra, ghaita-player. Ibn Khaldün describes it under the name zemaled, perhaps a metathesis of zemedra. (Prol., ii, 533; ed. Quintempec, Paris 1834). But the name ghaita was well known to the writers of the middle ages, as well as to those of Muslim Spain (cf. Des. Suppl. aux Dict. Arabe, ii, 235; Simonet, Glosario de vocab. Mus. Madrid 1888, p. 239).

This instrument still exists in modern Spain under the name gaita or vihia. In lands where Turkish is spoken it is fairly common and is called ghaita (cf. Barbier de Meynard, Dict. Turc-français, ii, 392).


GHALAFIKA (Ghalafka, Alafaka, the Ditto Sabaeorum of Pliny), at one time a flourishing seaport in Yemen, near Bait al-Falih [q.v., i, 507 et seq.]. It was an important emporium and was known as the harbour of Zebid. About a century before Niebuhr's journey in Yemen the harbour of Ghalafika became inaccessible through coral reefs, whereupon the rich traders of this coast-town moved to Bait al-Falih, which rapidly became a flourishing commercial town. During his stay in Yemen, Niebuhr saw on one or a few walls, a mosque and several tombs, remains of this once prosperous town.


GHALCA. The name Ghalka is applied by the Turki-speaking population to the group of tribes of Iranian origin inhabiting the country near the sources of the Oums, the Pamir, and even (in the case of the Sarikol) the upper Varkand, and (in the case of the Yudkh) the southern slope of the Hindú-Kush. These races belong to a type differing from that of the ordinary Tadiks of Badakhshan etc.; they are closed by anthropologists as a branch of the iranophelic Alpine race and known as Highlnd Tadiks (cf. Afghanistăn, i, 154). The word Ghalka is Persian, and according to Vullers means a nomad or uncivilized peasant, and the form Ghara or Ghara suggests a possible connection with the old form of the name Ghardjšan. Geiger suggests that the original meaning may be 'mountaineer' from the word ghara 'mountain' used in these languages, and also in Fāsāt. They are Shīrāh by creed and therefore sharply separated from their orthodox neighbours, and speak a number of distinct dialects of an Iranian language, each valley having its own speech. These districts are as follows: Wahlahn on the upper Pāndj river, under Afghan rule. The language and people are called Wakhār. A distinct dialect of Wakh is that spoken in Tishāshūn lower down the Pāndj river, known as Ishkāshīmī.

The valleys of the Warōḏ and its tributaries the Koka are occupied by the people of Sanglī, speaking Sanglī and of Mindjān speaking Mindjān. These territories are under Afghan rule. The upper Warōḏ valley leads to the Dōrāh Pass the principal route through the Hindū-Kush into Čitāl, and on the southern side of this pass dwells the Yādhk tribe, speaking the Yudghā language which comes within the British sphere. Where the Pāndj joins with the main stream of the Oums are the territories of Shīghnān and Roshān (in the Russian sphere) in which the Shīghnī language in spoken, and nearly related to it is the Sarikol spoken by the Sarikol people on the Eastern slope of the Pamir. Still farther north, lies the valley of Yaghmāh on one of the upper affluents of the Zarakshān, where the Yaghmāh language is spoken (cf. Afghanistan, i, 156).

Little is known of the history of this inaccessible region or its inhabitants. It is probable that they formerly extended farther into Badakhshan, and gradually retreated from the open country at the time of the Muslim conquest. Islam spread among them in its Shīrāh form at a later date. Idrīs mentions Wahlahn as the country which supplied Badakhshan with musk. Lapis lazuli was also found in the neighbourhood, and this no doubt refers to the mines still worked at Dārm in Mindjan (cf. Badakshan, i, 554). Wahlahn also produced gold and silver and slaves. In modern times the travels of Wood, Forsyth, Gordon, Bonvalot and Sven Hedin and the visits of English and Russian officers, especially Holdich, employed in boundary demarcation have thrown much light upon this region, and the researches of Shaw, Ulfyvly, Biddulp, Tomashchek and Geiger have elucidated the ethnicity and languages of the whole Pamir tract.

Bibliography: Wood, Journey to the Source of the Oums (London 1872); Gordon, The Roof of the World (Edinburgh 1876); Biddulp, Tribes of the Hindo-Kush (Calculta 1880); Ulfyvly, Les Arcs du Nord et au Sud de l'Hindon Kouch (Paris 1896); Iden, Quelques observations sur les Tadjiks des Montagnes appelés Gorkhas in Bulletin Soc. d'Anthropologie de Paris, 1887; Shaw, High Tarbary, Varkand and Kusghar (London 1871); Iden, On the Ghalekh languages in Journ. As. Soc. Beng. 1876—1877; Tomashchek, Central-Asiatische Studien lii. Die Pamir-Dialektik (Berlin 1886); Iden, Yudghā in Beiträge z. Kunde d. indo., s. 198, 1885; Geiger, Die Pamir-Dialektik in Grundzüge der Iran. Phil. (Stuttgart 1901); Sven Hedin, Kirgez och Tadschiks på Pamir (Stockholm 1804); Stein, Sand-buried Ruins of Khwar (London 1904), p. 53 et seq. (For full
bibliography on the Ghalia languages see Geiger, supra.)

(M. Longworth Dames.)

GHALI (a.), plur. ghalî̄, “one who exaggerates or goes beyond all bounds,” particularly in reverence for certain individuals, notably Ali and the ʿAlî̄s, and connotes them incarnations of the Deity. What heads of sects are to be called ghalî̄ depends on the point of the writer, but as a rule those who have adopted such notions, originally foreign to Islam as incarnation (khuṭa), metempsychosis (tā-ānâk), etc., are considered to be ghalî̄. Cf. Friedlander in the Journal of the Amer. Orient., Sec., XXIX, 12.

GHALI, the poetical name of Nâzî̄-ul-Dawla Dâhir al-Mulk Mirzâ Asâd Allah Khân, a distinguished Persian and Urdu scholar and poet, famous for his excellent and polished style of composition. In his Persian Dwarin he has occasionally taken the taḥallūl, Asad, and is also called Mirzâ Noshâ.

Ghalî was of Turanian descent. His grandfather left his ancestral home and came to Dîhil during the reign of Shah ʿAlam. His father, ʿAbd Allah Beg Khân, lived for some time at Lucknow, and went thence to Hyderabad in the service of Nauwâb Nâzî̄m ʿAlî̄ Khân. After a time he went to Alwar and served under Râdâ Bahâkhtâwar Singh, where he was killed in battle. His son, Asâd Allah Khân, then only 5 years of age, was adopted by his uncle Nâzî̄ Allah Beg Khân, Sâbedar of Agra. In A. D. 1806, when the district of Agra was made into a Commissionership under General Lake, his uncle was pensioned off, and, on his death, Ghalî, then 9 years old, received an allowance of Rs. 50 per month from the Emperor of Dîhil. After the accession to the throne of Wâdjid ʿAlî̄ Shâh in A. D. 1847, Ghalî received a yearly allowance of Rs. 500 in recognition of his poetical abilities. The Nauwâb of Rampur, hearing of his fame as a poet, sent his own poetical compositions to Ghalî for correction, and in A. D. 1859 assigned him an allowance of Rs. 100 a month. After living some time at Rampur, Ghalî returned to Dîhil, where he died in A. D. 1869, at the age of 73.

(J. F. Blumenhârâd.)

GHALI DEDE, after Fuyûlî, ʿNîfî̄ and Nedîm, the last of the four great poets of the old school of Ottoman literature; his real name was Shaikh Muhammad Esâf, but he is best known by his pen-name Shaikh Ghalî or Ghalî Deâde. Born in 1171 = 1757-1758 he was the son of the secretary, Muṣṭâfa Reshid Efendi in Constantinople and early became connected with the Mevlevi order in whose monastery, in Yeâni Kapu, his father is also said to have acted as kettle-drummer. Following his father’s example he first entered the service of the state but soon left it to devote himself wholly to the order. He began his novitiate in the parent monastery of the order in Konîya. Home-sickness drove him back, however, to Constantinople, where he remained in the Yeâni Kapu monastery till in 1205 (1790-1791) he was appointed Shaikh of the Mevlevi monastery in Galata, which is probably the best known to Europeans of all the monasteries of the “dancing dervishes”. The favour in which he was held by Sultan Selim III., the Sultan-Mother and other high personages, greatly benefited this monastery, which was entirely rebuilt at his request in 1210 (1796). Ghalî died at the early age of 42 on the 26th Radjab 1213 (3rd Jan. 1799). He is buried in the Galata monastery in a separate tomb.

Ghalî, who numbered among the excellent scholars, who were his tutors, Khodja Neshîy, who was himself not unknown as a poet, composed the work which has given him an abiding place among the poets of first rank in his nation, at the early age of 26 (in 1197) — the figure 21 seems to be wrong; this is the romantic and allegorical Mesnewi, Ḥasan u ʿAṭâk (the pronunciation ʿAtâk is foreign to Turkish). “Beauty and Love”. It was written as a kind of protest against Nâbi’s Mesnewi Khwârîjâbâd which was extravagantly Persian in style, and stands alone on a level never attained before or after in an Ottoman Mesnewi through its originality of thought so rare in Ottoman poets, its inspiration which recalls the Divina Commedia and the loftiness of its fancy, the beauty and relative simplicity of its language. In the struggle between the Persian and the Nationalist schools Ghalî unhastenly took the side of the latter and developed a simple yet dignified language more fitting the Ottoman spirit in the happiest way than the artificial language which was then so much in vogue. The influence of this Mesnewi on Turkish literature to the present day has been enormous; the number of Ghalî’s admirers is still large; according to them the Ḥasan u ʿAṭâk is the noblest work not only of the romantic school but of all that Ottoman poetry which draws its inspiration from Asia.

Ghalî’s Divâns which contains a large number of ghazals, ḍaṣās and rubâîs is on the other hand, relatively unimportant, that is to say, it is both better and no worse than the numerous Divâns of his time; it has, however, a certain historical value on account of its rûs d’occasion.

Prose writings also exist from Ghalî’s pen; he translated and wrote a commentary on Shaikh Kose Ahmed Ded’s (who is buried in Konia) work, al-Tâhfa al-manâkib fī ʿl-Tarīḥ al-Muʿaṣṣa, entitled al-Sûhâb al-Sâfîya. He also wrote a commentary on the Divvân al-Mathnawî of Yusuf Sînevâl, and a collection of biographies (Tâkîvâ) of Mevlevi poets, which was continued by al-Sâyiid. His Divân with the ḍaṣās, terqîbân and ṣarkîs and the Ḥasan u ʿAṭâk was printed at Balkî in three parts in 1252; the Mesnewi has often been printed in Constantinople e. g. in 1304, the greater part of which is also given in Fuzûl Pasha’s anthology of Mesnewîs, Khwârîjâbâd Turki-Mesnewî, 1292. A biography of Ghalî is given by his contemporary Khâlid Nâbi Rey, the poet and historian, in his history.


GHALI, Ismâ’îl, son of the celebrated Ottoman statesman Edhem Pasha, born in Constantinople on the 2nd Rabi‘I‘ 1263 (11th November 1847), entered the service of the Sublime Porte early in his career, became a member of the Privy Council and ultimately became nâṣîḥ-i vaṣîh (counselor) for the province of Crete; he died in Constantinople on the 15th December 1895. Ghalî
Bey was the founder of the scientific study of numismatics among the Ottomans and enormously advanced this science by his standard works on the coins of the Ottomans (Taşcemî Mevkûkâtî Osmanlı, Constantinople 1307) and of the Seljuks (Taşcemî Mevkûkâtî Selçuklu, ibid. 1309); also in French under the title Études de Numismatique Selçuklîe, Constantinople 1892). Of equal importance are his catalogues of the Cretan coins and the Caliphate in the Ottoman Museum (Mevkükat Türkmanîe Kataloqü, Constantinople 1311, also in French, Catalogue des monnaies Turcoman, Constantinople 1894, and Mevkûkâtî Kadımi-i İslâmîe, ibid. 1312); finally several smaller treatises may be mentioned (Quelques mots sur les monnaies musulmanes à monogrammas hampurtas, Constantinople 1894; Sur une monnaie Mengendlische, Constantinople 1894: Une monnaie d’Ilâ eddîn Qâhîhîd III in the Recue numism. belge, 1895). Ghali Bey’s collections were purchased by the government after his death for the Imperial Mint Collection (sarbghânî-ı sÎrî). (J. H. MÜHLMANN)

GHALÎB PASHA, Muhammad (b. 1768), the son of Ahmed Efendi, Grand Vizier of Turkey under Muhammad II, 13th Dec. 1822—16th Sept. 1824. Ghali was born in Constantinople in 1777 (1763-1764) and entered the service of the state in 1802 (1785-1788). In 1816 (1801) he went to Paris to conduct the peace negotiations with France; he also conducted the negotiations with Russia which ended in the Peace of Bucharest, 25th May 1812. Soon afterwards he was dismissed and banished to Asia. He met the same fate some years later when he was deprived of the grand vizierate, but he afterwards acted as governor of Erzerum and commander of the garrison troops. In 1841 (1828-1829) Ghali died at Bâleân. Bibliography: Lifeglet Efendi, Tahâ, vii. 228 f. sqq.; v. 96 f. sqq.; Sani Bey, Kâmir el-‘Alî, v. 3245.

GHALZAI, a large and important Afghan tribe with numerous subdivisions which occupies the country near Ghaznî and eastward as far as Khost and Waziristan, also the upper valleys of the Tamak, Arghandab and Arghand i.e. Afghanistan, t. 153]. They are largely nomadic, and migrate in enormous numbers annually at the commencement of the cold weather mainly via the Gojal Pass. There they camp in the plains of the Indus valley while their traders spread throughout India. At the commencement of the hot weather they march back to their upland homes. These nomadic trading communities are known by the name of Pashas. The most numerous section is the Sulaiman Khel. The origin of the Ghalsiz is doubtful. They are at the present day one of the most important elements in the Afghan race, and speak the Pashto language, but there is good ground for believing that they are of mixed blood, and have absorbed both Tajik and Turkic elements. Attempts have been made to identify them with the Khalidi Turks who entered Afghanistan and took service with the Ghaznavid monarchs, solely on the similarity of the name Khalid (sometimes written Khalid) with Chalzai (sometimes written Chalzai or Khalid). But there is no evidence of this, though the appearance of the Ghalsiz favors the idea that there is a Turkish element in the race, which is historically probable, considering the large bodies of Chah, Khabdi and other tribes which entered their country from the 11th to the 14th centuries, many of whom fought as mercenaries under the Ghaznavid and Ghurid kings. According to the legends in the Mehdî-î Îfshâhî the Ghalsiz are descended from Mato daughter of Batan who had an illicit connection, afterwards legalized by marriage, with Shâh Husain a refugee prince of Ghur. Owing to the clandestine nature of his birth the son who was born was called Chalzai the thief’s son, whence the name Chalzai. The great Lodi tribe (including the Suri and Ishâhî) was of the same descent [cf. Khânî-î Khânî, l. 153]. This legend does not conceal the mixed Afghan and Tajik origin of these tribes. The Ghalsiz proper do not emerge from obscurity until after the Lâdis and Súns who founded dynasties in India in the 15th and 16th centuries. They come into notice during the 17th century when their power and influence in zamindâwar increased owing to the transportation of a large section of the Abdâtî to the Herât province by Shâh ‘Abbas I, and at the commencement of the 18th century under their chief Mir Wais they began to intrigue with Shâh ‘Alî I, the Emperor of Dihî. Mir Wais was arrested and taken prisoner to Isfahân, while the Ghalsiz were severely treated by the Persian governor general Gurgin Khan. Mir Wais, however, obtained the confidence of Shâh Husain, and was allowed to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca. On his return he obtained permission to return to Kandhar. Gurgin Khan, to humble him, demanded his daughter from him. Mir Wais pretended to submit and substituted another woman for his daughter, but murdered Gurgin Khan and his followers at a banquet to which he had invited him. The Ghalsiz now openly rebelled, drove out the Persian garrison and took possession of Kandhar. Mir Wais became master of the province, but died shortly in 1127 (1715). His brother ‘Abd al-‘Azîz succeeded but was soon murdered by Mahmûd, eldest son of Mir Wais, who became ruler himself, and gathered strength during the next few years. He was encouraged by the weakness of the Persian government and the success of the Abdâtîs of Hazârâ who rebelled successfully in 1129 (1717). In 1132 (1720) Mahmûd ventured to invade Persia itself, and occupied Karmân almost without opposition, but was soon expelled by Lutfi ‘Ali Khan, and retired to Kandhar. Next year, however, he again invaded Persia, assisted by large bodies of Abdâtîs and Balûsîs, took Karman and Yezd and arrived before Isfahân in 1134 (March 1722) and overthrew the Persian army at the battle of Gulâmî. He did not obtain possession of Isfahân, however, till October, when Shâh Husain abdicated and Mahmûd became Shâh of Persia being invested by Shâh Husain himself in 1135 (1722). The Ghalsiz rule in Persia lasted for some years, 1135 to 1142, (1722 to 1729). Tahmâsib II. maintained his claims to the throne throughout this period, and was ultimately restored through Nadir Shâh’s help. Mahmûd began his rule well, but soon showed himself a saugnâgin tyrant. The invasions of the Turks and Russians apparently deprived him of all self-control, and wholesale massacres in Isfahân followed. He seems to have lost his reason and died (or was killed) while insane. He was succeeded by Ashraf, son of his uncle ‘Abd Allah, during whose reign the wars with Turkey and Russia continued. Persia losing many provinces. Ashraf made peace with the Turks by appealing
to their sympathies as a Sunni who was restoring the true faith among the Persian Shi'ahs. Kandahār had meanwhile fallen into the possession of Mahmūd's brother, which caused a division among the Ghailais in their own country and weakened them in Persia. Nādir's victory at Dāngān in 1135 (1729) and at Marāza-khur the same year put an end to the Ghailai rule. Ashraf fled; his army melted away and was attacked everywhere by the local tribes, and finally Ashraf himself was slain by 'Abd Allah Khān Bāsā. He was a brave warrior but unsuited by nature for the rule of a great country. Very few of the Ghailais ever found their way back to their native land. The tribe relapsed into obscurity and has never since produced a ruler with the exception of Aḥmad Khān, a Sultanān Khān of Ghailai who obtained ephemeral power at Tabriz between 1166 and 1169 (1753 to 1756) and disputed the supremacy with Karim Khān Zand, by whom he was defeated and captured, but well treated. In Afghanistan, after the time of Nādir Shah, the power fell into the hands of the Durrānis and the Ghailais have been obliged to submit to their rule from the time of Ahmad Shah to the present day. Nādir Shah took the Durrānis into favour and expelled the Ghailais from the lands which they had occupied near Kandahār. They were nominally banished to the Herāt country, but soon in reality to have returned to their old homes near Ghuristan, and were settled in the Kābul province, still part of the Moghul Empire of India. It was this settlement which led to Nādir Shah's invasion of Kābul, which was followed by that of India itself. In the disputes which took place between the members of the Sadžāi family after Timūr Shah's death the Ghailais took the side of Shah Shujā against Mahmūd and assisted him to take Kābul in 1218 (1803). The celebrated Bārakzai chief Pānda Khān, father of Dost Muhammad, married a Ghailai wife among others, and her sons Khandil, Pārdī, Sherdil and Mīrādī long held possession of Kīna nr. Kandahār and had great influence with the Ghailai tribe. In more modern times the principal incidents in their history are the battle of Ahmad Khel (1850) when a Ghailai force attacked and was defeated by the British force under Stewart which was marching from Kandahār to Kābul, and the rebellion against the Emir 'Abd al-Rahman in 1856 (see Art. ABD AL-RAMAN KHAN, i. 60).

The Ghailais have a very democratic constitution and pay little obedience to their nominal chiefs. They are divided into two main sections known as Turān and Burhān (or Ibrāhīmzai). (Possibly some of them are of Turkish origin as implied by the name Turān). Each of these sections comprises several important clans: among the Turān the principal are Hūt (from which the Persian invaders sprang) and the Tōkhi. The Nāsir and Khārtū are sometimes included, but they are generally considered not to be Ghailais at all. Among the Burhān the principal are the Sulaiman-khel (now the most important of all Ghailai clans) the Tarakki, the Andar, the Išāık, and others of minor importance.

Bibliography: Muhammad Hayāt Khan, Hayāti-i Afgān (Eng. trans. Afghanistan; Lahore 1875); Bellamy, Races of Afghanistan (Calcutta 1880); Nīmadī, Aḥmad Maḥmūd-i Najābī (M.S. R. I., Soc., ed. Dorn, History of the

**GHĀNA, an ancient town in the Western part of Persia which has now disappeared. According to Barth it lay in 18° N. Lat. and 7° 8' W. Long. (Greenw.) not far from Wajīna. M. Delafose however, relying on certain statements by Arab geographers, notably al-Bakri, places Ghāna in the Awsār district within the triangle Wajīna, Nema, Baskūšī, i.e. about 240 miles north of the Niger on the middle of Sun-sanding; Martin Hartmann (and this is also Dusborough-Coleby's opinion) thinks that Ghāna must have been nearer the Niger, not far from Timbuktu. [Cf. in addition J. Marquet, *Die Perso-Sammarke des Nieders. Reichsmus., J. Volker, Kunde (Leiden 1912, where this question is fully discussed, particularly pp. exx et seq. and cxlv et seq.; Editors].

Barth and Delafose agree in placing the foundation of Ghāna about 300 A.D. and ascribe it to men of some white race, Barth suggests that Fulbe. Delafose on the other hand makes the bold suggestion that immigrant Jewish-Syrian tribes, from Cyrenaica were founders. One of the leaders of these immigrants named Karrar established himself in Kāna and founded a state there which remained under the rule of his descendants till about the end of the viii. century. This dynasty was succeeded by another of Soninke negroes whose first ruler was called Kaya-Maghān. His successors, the Sissou-Tankara extended their kingdom in the east as far as the Niger, in the west to the Atlantic Ocean, in the south to Tekār and in the north to the Sahara. In the x. century these kings had to wage long wars with the Berbers who had settled in Tagant, notably the Lemptane, the lords of Awdghošt (q.v., i. 516). But they finally won the upper hand, took the town of Awdghošt in 900 A.D. and elevated a negro as governor there. During the next fifty years the kingdom of Ghāna was the most powerful state in the Sudan.

According to al-Bakri's description (written in 1065-1068) Ghāna consisted of two townships in a plain. One of these was inhabited by Muslims and contained twelve mosques and numbered jurists and other scholars among its inhabitants. The other town six miles distant was the royal residence. The king's abode consisted of a palace and a number of huts with round roofs; a wall enclosed the whole. Near the royal court of justice was a mosque allotted to Muslims who appeared as witnesses. The houses were built of stone, probably the only ones of their kind in the Sudan, or of the wood of the gum tree. The royal residence had received the name ghāba (the wood) from the woods around it. In these woods were the dwellings of the magicians and priests, whose duty it was to guard the idols. There also were the royal tombs and the prisons. The people like their rulers were both worshipers, but the latter thought highly of Muslims and therefore chose his interpreters, his treasurer, and the majority of his ministers from among them.

Its situation between the Sudan and Sahara made Ghāna an important trading centre at an early period. Copper and clothstuffs were imported from
the Maghrib, while caravans laden with salt came from the Sahara. The most important article of commerce however was the gold obtained in the mines of Wangara (the area drained by the Upper Senegal and the Falémé), which the merchants obtained in Ghirâr, eighteen days' journey from Ghâna.

In spite of its wealth and power and although al-Bakr says that the king commanded 200,000 soldiers, including 40,000 archers, Ghâna could not resist the attacks of the Almoravids. 'Abd Allah b. Yasîn [q.v., i, 32b-33a] seized the town of Awadghin in 446 (1054-1055). While one section of the Almoravids were conquering the Maghrib, other troops invaded the Sûdân under Abû Bakr. After fifteen years of war Abû Bakr finally succeeded in taking Ghâna in 1076. The inhabitants in part were forced to adopt Islam and in part massacred. The king had to pay tribute. The death of Abû Bakr gained the kings of Ghâna their independence once more but did not restore their former power. The tributary lands regained their independence one by one, so that at the end of the 12th century A.D., the state of Ghâna only consisted of Awkâr and Basakâmû. It led a bare existence for a century more until, in the year 1203, Sumangûrû-Kante, chief of the Sûsî conquered Ghâna and incorporated it in his dominions. Soon afterwards a number of the inhabitants, led by a Shaikh named Ismâ'iî, left the town and founded Wâlata at some distance to the northwest. Finally in the year 1240 the Malinké chief Sundjata overthrew the kingdom of the Sûsî and levelled Ghâna to the ground.


**GHÂNI (v.),** "the self-sufficing", one of the beautiful names of God. Cf. ALÎ, i, 304.

**GHÂNI b. Âwâr, a tribe in North Arabia**, a branch of the Kais b. 'Âilân and related to the Ghaţâfân [q.v., i, 144b-145a]. They lived around Himâ Darîa in Nadjî and were neighbours of the Taîy with whom they were constantly at feud. In the time of the Gâshânîya they wor-shipped the idols al-Lat, Manat and al-‘Uzâ, all of whom are mentioned in the Korân (Sûra II, i, 2). The great pre-Islamic poet Tufâlî b. Âwâr, called Tufâlî al-Khail (on account of his skill in depicting the horse) belonged to the Ghâni.

Among the settlements of the Ghâni were: Ayyâb, Awâlî, Adhûrûtâ. Banû Dhî-‘Adî, Amîd Ghiyâfat, Duqâyîr, Ghâma, Huç (a fairly large tract in the W. of Himâ Darîa), Kiunless, Ma’dîn al-Awadîn, Mi’nâ, Mûsîhî, Sâ’d, al-Shâbî (between A’brak al-‘Azâf and Medina), Tûrân. Among the mountains, that belonged to them, are mentioned: Ufâkh (a large mountain), Kabîd, Kabîsh La-

---

**GHÂNI,** Takhallûs of the Persian poet Muhâmmad Tâhir at Kashfîr, who died in 1079 (1668-1669). His *Dîwân* was printed in 1261 (1845) and 1887 at Lakhmâr (photographed).

**GHIJÂNA,** spoils of war, by *zahîma* Muslim scholars mean the weapons, horses and all other movable possessions taken in battle from conquered unbelievers (cf. Fât. ii, 38b et seq.). Four-fifths of the booty were to be divided among the troopers, who were present at the battle whether they actually fought in it or not. Horsemen could claim a share three times as large (according to Abû Hanîfa's view only twice) as that of a foot-soldier; one who had slain an enemy in battle also received his equipment (*Sâlik*).

The remaining fifth belongs to Allah: “Know that a fifth of what ye have won belongs to Allah — to his apostle, his family, to the orphans, the needy, and the traveller — if ye believe in Allah”. This verse in the Korân (Sûra viii, 42), was revealed shortly after the battle of Badr. From ancient times Arab chiefs had been accustomed to receive a certain portion of the booty and it was thus nothing new when the Prophet had one fifth of the *zahîma* granted him in God's name in this verse of the Korân to defray the expenses of the state.

After Muhammad's death the Imam was at first considered qualified to apply the fifth of the spoils, in the way that seemed to him best to further the general interest of the Muslims. This was also the teaching of Malik Ibn Anas. But most of the later Muslim scholars have interpreted Korân viii, 42 literally. In their view the fifth allotted to Allah must be divided into five equal portions among the five categories expressly mentioned (in Abû Hanîfa's view however only among three of the categories mentioned in Korân viii, 42: the orphan, the needy and the traveller); the portion originally allotted to the Prophet himself is, according to the Shaîth school, to be applied to the general good of the Muslim community. Prisoners of war are also included in the *zahîma*.
GHAJINA -- GHARDJISTAN.

Unbelievers, who are taken prisoners of war by Muslims — women and children as well as men — are divided as slaves among the troops who are entitled to the booty. The Imam may, however, dispose of freeborn, male, adult prisoners of war in other ways. He can, as the good of the Muslims demands it, also set them free on payment of 400 dinars or surrender of any amount of property. He can exchange them for captured Muslims, or on the other hand he may put them to death: according to Abu Hanifa, however, he may not set them free.

The rules regulating the division of gharnā, in the view of most Muslim scholars, do not apply to the division of lands in the conquered countries (cf. FAY, ii. 39).


(Th. W. Juyonoll.)

GHANĪMĀT, MUHAMMAD AKRAM, a Persian poet, who was governor of Lahore from 1106—1108 (1695—1697). He is the author of a Mathnawī, very popular in India called Naṣīr-i Ṭabād or Shāhīd-ā ‘Āzī (lithographed at Lucknow).

Bibliography: Ethel in the Grundriss der Iran. Philol., ii. 251.

GHRĀB and Magribī, i.e. v. are synonymous, and the opposites of “Shārqiyy” and “Mashriqiyy.” Gharāb is a modern gharāb, Magribī being derived from the same verb in the sense of “to set,” used of the sun or of a star. Then both come to mean the place of setting, the West. The dual, as used in the Korān, 45, v. 17, in the expression “the Lord of the Mashriq and the Lord of the Magribī” means the two extreme points at which the sun appears to set, the most northern in summer (26° N. in Central Arabia) and the most southern in winter (26° S. in Central Arabia). The plural, on the other hand, as used in the Korān, 70, v. 40, “the Lord of the Mashriq and the Magribī” denotes the daily points of setting of the sun between these extreme points. There are, therefore, one hundred and eighty of these.

Geographically, Gharāb is used as a name of Morocco or of the northern part thereof. It survives in the name of the southern province of Portugal, Algarve, which occurs also in the plural, Algarves for the province just named together with the north-western part of Morocco.

The district south of Bāiyūr in Syria is also named al-Gharāb.

(Th. H. Weir.)

GIBRIYA, A PROVINCE IN THE DELTA OF EGYPT, lying between the Rosetta and Damietta arms of the Nile, bounded by the north by the sea, in the south by the Menāfiya (q.v.). It has existed since the division of Egypt into dīmāl (cf. Becker in the article EGYPT, section 2 et seq.). According to Abu Šālah it was divided into 149 districts, included 15 villages and yielded a revenue of 470,955 dinars. When the administrative and financial were increased in size, the Ḥusayn ibn Samad and Dandijā (q.v.) were incorporated in the Gbriya province, so that Ibn Dīfān about 250 years later mentions 471 villages and a revenue of 1,844,080 dinars. Kalkashtani praises the great fertility and flourishing condition of the province. At the present day (according to Poinet Bey, 1899) it has 1,297,656 inhabitants, 515 towns and villages and is divided into the following 11 circles (mahārik): 1. Burāli; 2. Sīrāt; 3. Deblāk; 4. Fīlān; 5. Kāf al-Shāb; 6. Kāf al-Zayāt; 7. Mājjala al-Kubār; 8. Sūr; 9. Tāltāk; 10. Taqta; 11. Zafarī (q.v.).

Bibliography: Abu Šālah (ed. Fawzi), vol. 2: Kalkashtan, Geographie und Verwaltung von Ägypten, transl. Westenfeld, p. 114; Ibn Dīfān, Kitāb al-Idār, v. 433; Mazzārī, Kitāb, i. 72 et seq.; Ibn Dīfān, al-Tulba al-Sarīya, p. 4; Poinet, Bey, Dict. géographique de l’Égypte; Baeleker, Egypte.6

(Th. H. Weir.)

GHADEER, a town in Algeria, s. Ait. Smar.

GHRĪB (q.v.), strange, rare, foreign”, whence a technical term in lexicography for rare words, in the Korān and Hadith; in the science of Tradition for such traditions as are isolated, but not from one another. From the latter, for the modern custom ofimitation. Cf. the dictionaries.

GHRĀM or GHRIM, i.e. debtor. The ghārāb is formally claim a share of the yield of the zākāt if he has brought the debt upon himself for a legitimate purpose and especially if he has voluntarily taken upon himself to pay it off “for God’s sake.” Cf. Korān ix. 60.

In some districts of Sumatra people who leave their homes to study law, are regarded as ghārīm; they receive something from the zākāt. See Snouck Hurgronje, Die Acheh, 1. 269.

(Th. H. Weir.)

GHAJISTAN (GHAJISTAN, GHAJISTAN), a tract on the upper valley of the Murghab in Afghan Turkestan, it seems to have corresponded with the country now occupied by the Fīrōzkūhīs, although a passage in the Masālik wa Manālik speaks of the town of Bāamūnā being on a mountain from which flows the river which passes through Ghajistān, which if correct would locate Ghajistān on the Surkhab River; Bāamūnā however seems to have been rather the name of a country than a town, and Ghajistān was undoubtedly further west, north of Ghur and close to the Ghirī capital Fīrōzkuh, from which the modern Fīrōzkūhīs probably derive their name. When Khāsraw Malik the last of the Ghaznavids was taken prisoner, he was taken to Fīrōzkuh and imprisoned in the fort of Balkarw in Ghajistān, and we learn that Fīrōz son of Yezdijird fled from Surjistan to Turkistan by way of Ghajistān.

Ghajistān was a separate state under its own rulers who bore the title of Shāh i.e. king (from Old-Iranian Ḥāshāhrīya, cf. Marquart, o. e. and see BUMVAN i. 634). They were under the suzerainty of the Sāmaidīs, and afterwards of the Ghaznavides. Mahmūd received the submission of the Shāh in 389 H. and was again at war there in 401 when his son Māstūd took part in the expedition. The Tādīq leader Warmēch or Warmēsh-bat (apparently not yet converted to Islam) had had to surrender the castles he had taken in Ghajistān. The Shāh is stated to have sold his rights to Mahmūd and died in imprisonment in 406. The dynasty however seems to have continued, for Bāhi al-Dīn Sām, who
began to reign at Firuzkoh in 544, made an alliance with the Shans of Ghurdistan; he built the forts of Bīndār and Bīrār in that country, and it afterwards formed part of the Ghūr kingdom. When 'Ali al-Dīn Dājahānīzād attacked Ghazni, he assembled the forces of Ghūr and Ghurdistant. He afterwards made over the kingdom of Khwārizm to his half-brother Fakhr al-Dīn, and it remained separate from Ghūr until the invasion of 'Ali al-Dīn Khwārizmī. After the disappearance of the Ghūrs, Ghurdistant no longer formed a separate province, and its name does not appear to be known to modern travellers.


**Ghashb**, i.e. usurpation. By this term the law in general understands the illegal taking possession and illegitimate exercise of the rights of another (e.g. when some one rides on a horse without the owner's permission). The purloining of a thing in secret is not called ghōby but akrih (theft).

In learned discussions (ādab al-khath) ghāshb, means to seize suddenly upon some one's words and contest his opinion without giving him time to explain himself fully.

**Bibliography:** Lādurān, Tarīfet (ed. Flugel), p. 108: E. Sachau, Mūhammad, Recht nach Schiitener Lehr, p. 475 et seq. (W. Jevonolle.)

**Ghashiya** (Ar.), "the covering," particularly a covering over a saddle. Among the Saljūqs, the royal ghashiya was one of the insignia of royal rank and was carried before the ruler in public processions. C. C. H. Becker, La Ghashia comme emblème de la royauté in the Centenaire de M. Amsar, II, 148 et seq. — Ghashiya is also used metaphorically of a great misfortune that overthrows some one: in this sense it is found in Sūrā lxxxviii. 1 for the day of the last judgment or for the fires of hell and from this the feel has received the name Ghashiyā.

**Ghashān** (Ghashānī), an Arab dynasty in Syria, of Yamani origin. They were monophysite Christians and were under the suzerainty of the Byzantine Emperors, whose frontiers they had to defend against the Persians and their vassals, the Lamhids of Hira. Their rule extended approximately over the province of Arabia (roughly the Ḥawrān district and Rābā'), Phoenicia ad Libanum, Palestina Prima and Secunda. In contrast to their relatives and natural enemies, the Lamhids, to whom they were far superior in culture from their contact with Greek civilization, the "Ghashānī" had no fixed residence. Dājahān [q. v., 1. 1039 et seq.] with the town of Dājahān [q. v., q. v., 986 et seq.] in Palestina Secunda is sometimes mentioned by the Arab poets as their capital, and sometimes Dīklīk [q. v., ii. 1035] et seq.] near Damascus.

The history of this dynasty is one of the most obscure portions of Arab history. The statements of the Arab historians Ḥanẓa Ḥabshānī, Ibn Ku-taibah, Ibn al-Kalbī, Mas'ūdī, Abū 'l-Fidāh (Tabari hardly mentions them) concerning them are limited to a few lists of rulers and brief accounts which are full of contradictions; e.g. Ḥanẓa and Abū 'l-Fidāh give thirty-one rulers of this dynasty, while Ibn Ku-taibah and Mas'ūdī only give ten of them: Ḥanẓa makes king Ḥārīth b. Ḥabshānī [q. v.] about whom we are fairly well informed by the contemporary Byzantine chronicler Nābālūs, Procopius, Theophanes etc., reign only ten years, while as a matter of fact he reigned forty years. According to the usual Arab tradition the Ghashānī were descended from the South Arabian tribe of Aṣz. The latter is said to have left the Yamani after the breaking of the dam at Mārib and to have gone to Mecca (Bāṭn Mārib near Mecca). At a later period one section of the Aṣz led by 'Amr b. 'Amir Murawaiya went to Syria; they are said to have received the name Ghassān from a stay of some considerable time at the pond of Ghassān in the Syrian desert (this name however had already been borne by Māzīd son of Aṣz). According to Ḥanẓa and Ibn Ku-taibah, it was Šaḥlāb b. 'Amr, a great grandson of 'Amr b. 'Amir, who led them to Syria. Dījahān (Greek Ɗαψάνης, a son of Dījahān) was considered the founder of the dynasty. In Syria they had to pay an annual tribute to the Roman phylarchs there, the Ḫādżima of the tribe of Salḥ, probably descendants of the Syrian phylarch Ṭāḥās, mentioned by the ecclesiastical historian Sozomenus. Ultimately they refused to pay this, conquered the Ḫādżima and took their place, in which they were recognized by the Byzantine emperor Anastasius (probably about the end of the fifth century A.D.), who made use of them as frontier guards against the Lakhmids of Ḥira.

The most important and the first ruler of this dynasty, whose existence is certain, was al-Ḥārīth b. Dījahān (Greek Ɗάψανης τοῦ γιάρας), an enthusiastic patron and protector of the monophysite church. His genealogy is al-Ḥārīth b. Dījahān b. al-Ḥārīth b. Ṭaḥlāb b. 'Amr b. Dījahān. His father Dījahān may be identified with the Ṭeḥlās mentioned by the chronicler Theophanes as making raids into Palestine about the end of the fifth century A.D. In 529 A.D. he was appointed lord over all the Arab tribes in Syria by the Emperor Justinian and received the titles Phylarch and Patrician, the highest rank next to the Emperor in Byzantium at that time. In the same year he took part in the suppression of the rebellion of the Samaritans on the side of the Byzantines. The greater part of his reign was occupied with wars with al-Mundhir III. of Ḥira. In 548 he was victorious over his opponent. About ten years later he again quarrelled with al-Mundhir over the so-called "Strata," the land on both sides of the military road from Damascus to Palmyra as far as Serjopolis, to which both laid claim. In 541 al-Ḥārīth fought in the Byzantine army under Belisarius in Mesopotamia. But when he returned home to Syria by a different route from the Byzantine army without having won any successes worthy of mention, he was accused of treachery to the imperial cause. In a later war between al-Ḥārīth and al-Mundhir (about 544) the latter took prisoner a son of the former and sacrificed him to the goddess al-Ġ-Za, the Arab Aphrodite. In June 554 al-Ḥārīth won a decisive victory over al-Mundhir, who fell in battle in the district of Kimmēsēr (Chaléis), probably at al-Ḥiyyān. This battle is perhaps identical with that celebrated by the Arabs.
as the “Day of Halima” (according to the common Arab tradition, so called because Halima, daughter of al-Harith, anointed the warriors with her own hands with khaâls, a perfume containing saffron; but it is very probably a place-name). His son and successor afterwards sought to avenge al-Mundhir’s death and made a raid into Syria. In 563 al-Harith went to Constantinople to give an account of these doings to the Emperor and to advise what measures should be taken. He also took advantage of his stay there to discuss the appointment of his successor with the Emperor. He died in 569 or 570. We may here mention the Arab tradition according to which al-Harith besieged the Jew al-Samawal b. ʿAdîy in his citadel of Abkal in Taima and slew his son because al-Samawal would not over the cucumbers left with him by the poet ImruʾIʾ ʿIšâq [q.v.] before his journey to Constantinople.

Al-Harith was succeeded by his son al-Mundhir (Greek Ἀλλάμονδηρ) who, after his accession the Persian Arabs invaded the Ghassanid territory. Al-Mundhir defeated their king Kabbū, apparently in the battle of ʿAin Uthāgh so often celebrated by Arab poets. The Emperor Justinus was not well disposed to al-Mundhir, who, like his father, was an ardent protector of the Monophysites, and tried to have him assassinated by underhand means. After the attempt on him had failed, al-Mundhir rebelled and refused allegiance to the Emperor for three years. On account of the renewed inroads of Persian Arabs into Byzantine territory, the Byzantines were forced to make peace with al-Mundhir and供应e by several unsuccessful overtures at the tomb of St. Servias in Raṣāṭ (Sergiopolis) by a special envoy from Constantinople. Two years after Justin’s death (568) al-Mundhir came with two of his sons to Constantinople and was received with great honour by Tiberius from whom he received the actual crown (tâbû) in place of the previous diadem (kīlūd). In Constantinople he also held an assembly of his co-religionists and endeavoured to smooth over the disputes among them. In the same year al-Mundhir raid Hira, burnt the town and brought back rich booty. This success did not serve to dissipate the general mistrust of him or the suspicion that he had a treacherous understanding with the enemy. He was sent away into Persian territory, undertook with Mauricius, Comes of Anatolia, and the Syrian Magnus was commissioned to make him prisoner. Magnus was early able to attain his end at the dedication of a church in the village of Huwwâr (between Damasacus and Palmyra), to which al-Mundhir had come as a guest, and he was taken prisoner to Constantinople (581). The incarceration of al-Mundhir and the suspension of the payment of subsidies (anomone) at the same time to his family provoked his four sons under the leadership of the eldest, al-Nuʿmân (Greek Νουμέναν, who after a raid Byzantine territory which they laid waste in a terrible fashion. The Emperor Tiberius therefore equipped an expedition under the leadership of the above-mentioned Syrian Magnus. The latter succeeded in capturing al-Nuʿmân who was likewise brought to Constantinople.

After the capture of al-Mundhir and al-Nuʿmân anarchy broke out in the Syrian desert, the various tribes chose their own chiefs and some went over to the Persians. With the capture of Jerusalem and Damasacus (613-614) by the Sassanian Khosrow Parviz, the power of the Ghassanids seems also to have collapsed. Whether the phylarchate was restored on the reconquest of Syria by the Byzantines (629) is uncertain. According to the usual Arab tradition Djabala b. Ayham was the last king of the house of Ghassân. In the battle of the Yanmâm (655) he fought on the right side of the emperor Heraclius against the Muslims. When the defeated Emperor then retired to Constantinople, Djabala is said to have submitted to the Caliph ʿUmar and adopted Islam but to have afterwards taken revenge with the Byzantines in Constantinople and adopted Christianity again.


**GHÂT, a town in the Sahara of Tripolitania, belonging to the sanjak of Fezzân, 400 miles S.S.E. of Ghadames and 280 W.S.W. of Murzûk in 24° 57’ N. lat. and 10° 17’ 30” E. Long. (Greenw.), at the intersection of the caravan routes which lead to the Südän via Fezzân and Ghadames. This exceptional position at the intersection of important commercial routes has caused it to become one of the busiest trade centres in the Sahara. It is one of the starting points for trade with Central Africa.

Its toponymy is a mix of Arabic and Berber words. The town is well described accurately from the accounts of the European explorers who have visited it, notably Duveyrier and Erwin von Bary. There is nothing remarkable in it. Like all towns in the Sahara it is surrounded by a wall with six gates which wind around it; three of these bear the name Tamelghat in common, a fourth is the gate of Tagelghat, a fifth Bâb Kelala and the sixth is Bâb al-Khair. The streets are narrow,
tortuous and full of sand. The houses are very primitive. Among the public buildings are a school and a mosque with a minaret. In the centre of the town is a little square called Idrisi, from which radiate six streets to the six gates, cutting the town into six sections.

Ghâât owes its importance entirely to the caravan traffic. The town itself has barely 600 houses and 4000 inhabitants. Its suburbs are the two little villages al-Tâdarmât and Tûn, about half a mile beyond the town wall.

The ground between these villages and Ghâât is a scene of great animation when the caravans arrive from the Sudân. Dates, skins, cotton-stuffs, salt and natron are the principal articles traded here. Industry is limited to local needs. The chief manufactures are furs, wooden vessels, trappings and cases for weapons.

The population of Ghâât consists of about equal elements of Berbers, Arabs and Sudânis. It includes: a. The Kil Ghâât or Ghââtans proper, grouped into 8 sections: Inmekammazen, Kil Khifa, Yadjenen, Kil Talâq, Kil Yanan, Kil Tarâmghit, Kil Turirt, Kil Tata; b. Colonies of foreign traders, chiefly from Ghââmâse; c. Transitory bodies of Tuareg, who are caravan leaders and lastly; d. Harrâtânine, negroes who till the soil.

The Ghââtains speak Arabic and Hausa in their business transactions with foreigners. Among themselves they use a peculiar Berber dialect called Tumagh, which is not connected with the groups of Tuareg dialects.

For the history of Ghâât there is an absolute dearth of documents. Its origins are obscure. Duveyrier (Touareg du Nord, p. 267) proposes to identify it with the oppidum of Rapas mentioned by Pline the Elder among the centres conquered by the Roman general Cornelius Ballbus about the year 19 a. d., but his hypothesis, which is not based on any certain facts, has still to be verified. Nor can any more be made of the local legends which attribute the foundation of the town to the Berber tribe of Yadjenen with the help of the Kil Khifa, the Kil Tata, the Kil Talâq and the Inmekammazen. There are no historical texts to support this tradition.

Ghâât in fact only began to play a part in the history of the Sahara about the middle of the sixteenth century, at the time of the great expeditions of exploration in the Sahara. The majority of the travellers who have attempted to reach Central Africa from Tripoli have chosen it as the centre of their negotiations with the Tuaregs, from whom it was necessary to obtain permission to traverse the Sudân.

From 1845 to 1876 it was successively visited by Richardson (1845), Barth, Richardson and Overweg (1850), Jactat Bî Delâ (1858), Duveyrier (1860) and Edwin von Bary (1876-1877). Before it was ceded to the Turks by Italy, it was ruled by a Berber chief whose power was hereditary, according to the Tuareg custom.

In 1875 the Turks took advantage of a war which broke out between the Alger and Hoggar, two Tuareg tribes, to instal their authority in Ghâât. It passed from them for a brief period in 1886 as a result of a rebellion of the Algiers, fomented by a sheik named Al Farâk. Ghâât fell into the hands of the Tuareg and a portion of the garrison was massacred. In the end the Alger made peace with the Turks and the town was again occupied by Ottoman troops. It was governed by a Kâîmâkchân for civil matters and by a Nâzîrî for military affairs.


On the Berber dialect spoken at Ghâât, cf. Stanhope Freeman, A Grammatical Sketch of the Tamahug language (London, 1862); Rene Basset, Notes de lexicographie berbere, 1er serie (Paris, 1887); Krause, Sprache von Ghât in der Sahara (Leipzig, 1884); Nehill, Einude sur le dialecte de Ghât (Paris, 1909).

(NEILL.)

GHÂÂTÂFÂN, thought by Reiske to denote a kind of bird, apparently in error (Lane), the name of two Arab tribes, Ghââtâfân b. Sa‘d b. Malik b. Hanâm b. Dhuqâm, a south Arabian tribe, and Ghââtâfân b. Sa‘d b. Kâ‘îm ‘Alîan. The latter alone is important. The pasturing-grounds of the Ka‘îsam Ghââtâfân extended eastwards from Khaiabar and the borders of the Hijâţ to Adhân and Salâm Mountains of the Banû ‘Asî. (For their camping-places see Wustenfeld, Genealog. Tabellen. Register, p. 171.) Ghââtâfân was divided into two large branches, ‘Ashqâja, which inhabited the country in the neighbourhood of Yathrib, and Bahshl, subdivided into ‘Abs and Dhubyân, whose territory lay round about Sharabba and Rabaghâ. Their neighbours were branches of Khâsâfân b. Kâ‘îm ‘Alîan, the most important being Sulaim on their south border, and further south Hâwâzân, brother-tribe to Sulaim.

History: The history of the tribes of Khâsâfân and Ghââtâfân commences from the middle of the sixth century, when the dominion of the Yemen over the Ma‘add tribes came to an end. The chief of all Ghââtâfân at this time was Zuhair b. Dja’dhrama of ‘Abs [q. v., i. 73]. He held the title of king (makk), and received tribute from Hâwâzân also. He was assassinated by a Hâwâzân, who became independent chief of that tribe. Zuhair was succeeded by his son Kâ‘îm, as chief of ‘Abs only. Dhubyân, choosing Hadhâsha b. Badr of Fâzâra, who was much the more powerful and influential of the two. The endeavours of Kâ‘îm to avenge the death of his father were interrupted by the famous war of the Horse-race between the tribes of ‘Abs and Dhubyân (see art. ‘ABS). During the war Kâ‘îm, who had killed
Zuhair was himself slain by Ḥārith b. Zālim al-Ḏubyānī, whilst both of them were guests of the Lakhmid prince. Ḥārith took refuge with Ḥaṭafān who refused him protection, but after some wanderings he returned secretly to them, but brought upon them the vengeance of ‘Umayr b. ‘Abd al-Wadha, whose son he had unwittingly killed. Owing to the slaughter of Ḥujāfā and other chiefs by ‘Abs, all the remaining clans of Ḥaṭafān became united against ‘Abs, who migrated and after many wanderings became guests of ‘Amîr b. Sa‘āda who were at war with Tamim. Ḍhubyān joined Tamim. Thus two tribal wars became merged in one and the situation may have been further complicated by the outbreak of a third war between Ḥawāzin and Kināna (see art. FIJKĀ). ‘Abs having quarrelled with each of their hosts in turn became reconciled to the rest of Ḥaṭafān.

No sooner had Ḥaṭafān become re-united than they were involved in a war with Khaṣfa (Ḥawāzin and Sulaim), which consisted largely of skirmishes and assassinations rather than pitched battles and was ended only with the rise of the power of Muḥammad. A principal figure in the early stages of this war is that of Darād b. al-Ṣimma [q.v., i. 1082] of Ḥawāzin [q.v.]. At that time the opponents of Ḥaṭafān were chiefly Ḥawāzin, but in the later stages, Darād growing old, Sulaim took the lead under Mu‘awiyah and Ṣakhir, the brothers of the poetess al-Khansa‘ [q.v.].

When this war had burned itself out Ḥaṭafān joined with Sulaim against the rising power of Muḥammad. Year after year mutual raiding took place between these two opposing powers. In the second year of the Ḥidrja Ḥaṭafān and Sulaim joined in an attack upon Madina, but Muḥammad marching out to Ka‘barat al-Ku‘dār dispersed them. In the following year occurred the expedition to Ḥubi Ḍār which had a similar result, Ḥaṭafān again retiring into their mountains. And again in the fourth or beginning of the fifth year the raid of Ḍhāt al-Rikā produced the same result. In the fifth year also Ḥaṭafān was amongst the tribes which took part in the investment of Madina known as the battle of the Trench. In the following year ‘Uyayna, the chieftain of Fazāra, raided the camels of Muḥammad close to the city. Muḥammad pursued the robbers as far as Ḍhū Karad. In the seventh year Ḥaṭafān set out to the relief of Khābaṣ but finding Muḥammad stationed between them and the town they fell back. Muḥammad's guide in this expedition was an Asṭādī who also divulged the whereabouts of a party of Ḥaṭafān against whom Bashir b. Sa‘d was sent. At last in the year viii. Sulaim threw in their lot with the Muslims and was followed by Ḥaṭafān, and the wisdom of their action was shown by the conquest of Mecca shortly afterwards.

That their faith was not very deep is also shown by the celerity with which they fell away upon the death of Muḥammad, and the leading part played by ‘Uyayna b. Ḥiṣn, the Fazāran chief, together with ‘Abs and Ḏubysān in threatening Madina, the Asṭādī ‘branch alone holding back. Their attack on the city was twice repulsed by Abū Bakr. In retaliation they put to death those of their number who were Muslims. As soon as reinforcements had reached Abū Bakr (through the reduction of Tripolī), he again attacked them and drove them out of the district of Ra‘adān, in which they had congregated. They took themselves to Ṭula‘a, the prophet of the Asad tribe, and, when the latter was defeated by Kha‘lid b. al-Walid in the battle of Burāq, Ḥaṭafān, and especially Fazāra under ‘Uyayna, bore the brunt of the fighting. Ḥaṭafān then once more became Musliμ, and those who had put to death the faithful believers of their tribe having been executed, were pardoned.

In the year 14 a.H. we find the tribesmen of Ḥaṭafān swelling the forces of Sa‘d b. Abī Wālī. They took part in the battle of the Camel in the year 56, and sided with the Umayyads against the ‘Abbasids, being present at the battle of the Zab in 132.


**Ghawāzī** (N.), Plur. of Ghawāzī [q.v.].

**Al-Ghawār** is, "depression", "low lying ground among hills", is often found as an Arab geographical term.

1. The best known is Ghaww in Palestine, the Ḥadīk of the Greeks, i.e. the deep hollow through which the Jordan flows, the south end of which forms the Dead Sea. The Arab geographers define its boundaries as Tiberias in the north and Zughar in the south. The portion north of Baisān belonged to the province of al-‘Urdum, the remainder to Filastīn [q.v., ii. 107 et seq.]

It is described as a very hot, unhealthy district with bad water, but there were a number of springs, rivers, palm-groves and villages in it. Ya‘qūb says that its principal product was sugar-cane, Idrīs indigo. Besides Jericho, the capital, the following towns are mentioned, Tiberias, Baisān, Amātā and Zughar. Al-‘Arabāt in the Ghaww of Filastīn, where, according to Ibn Ishaq (Ṭabarī, i. 2125; 6; on the other hand 2107, 10 Ghaww al-‘Arabāt). Amr b. al-‘Āasi joined the army which came from east of Jordan before the battle of Adjarān, is probably to be sought for at the south end of the Dead Sea.

2. Another Ghaww is Ghaww Tihāmat al-Yaman or Ghaww Tihāma (Faradaq, ed. Boucher, p. 20, 143; also as a dual: Ghawr Tihāmah (Ṭabarī, ii. 210, 11)). The statements by the geographers regarding it are very vague, for it is sometimes identified with Tihāma and sometimes described as a district adjoining it; for example, according to Kūdām b. Ḍafar it stretched from Najjād to the extreme borders of Tihāma; according to a passage in al-Rasīl it lay between Tihāma (the district from Ḍhāt ‘Irk to two days’ journey beyond Mecca) and al-Sarāṭ.


**Ghwath** (succeur, deliverance) is an epithet of the Kūth [q.v.], the head of the Shi‘ī hierarchy of saints. It is used of him only when he is thought of as one whose help is sought; but that, from the nature of the Kūth, is practically always. Thus it is a normal sequent to Kūth. Others say that the Ghwath is immediately before the Kūth in the hierarchy.

**The Encyclopaedia of Islam, II.**

GHAZAL (A), a short poem of more than four but less than fifteen lines. The first two have the same rhyme, which is repeated at the end of the fourth, sixth etc. lines; the poet usually mentions his own name (takhallus) in the last line. The matter is usually erotic, but other subjects, wine, spring, fate etc. are not excluded. The form should be the most perfect possible, especially from the point of view of language; vulgar and kakophonous words are to be most rigidly avoided. The ghazal is the kind of poem most favoured in Persian and the Indian and Turkish literature influenced by it.

Bibliography: Garčin de Tassy, Histoire de la littérature hindoue et hindistanee (Xv. 31; Goh, A History of Ottoman Poetry, t. So. et sep.)

AL-GHAZALI. (For the evidence at present available on this name see the Journal of the Royal As. Soc., 1902, pp. 18–22. Apparently Ibn al-Samani preferred the double Z). ARAB HAMID MUHAMMAD IBN MUHAMMAD AL-TUSI AL-SHAFI'I was the most original thinker that Islam has produced and its greatest theologian.

1. Life. He was born at Tus in A.H. 450 (A.D. 1058) and was educated there and at Najafabur, especially under the Imam al-Haramain with whom he remained until the Imam's death in 478. A sceptical attitude showed itself in him from the first. Although in a Sufi environment and practicing the Sufi exercises, no impression was made on him by these, and he preferred rather to investigate theological and legal subtleties. This began when he was under twenty; with salat (acceptance of religious dogma on authority) he had broken from his earliest youth. From Najafabur he went to the court of Nizam al-Mulk, the Seljuk waizir, and formed part of his regime of canonicalists and theologians until 484 when he was appointed to teach in the Nizamite madrasa at Bagdad. During this time he became an absolute sceptic, not only as to religion but also as to the possibility of any certain knowledge. This scepticism he never overcame so far as philosophy was concerned. At Bagdad he taught and wrote on canon law; he wrote also controversial books against the Talibuntes (Rämiya, Imamiya, Isma'iliya) Nizam al-Mulk and Malik Shah were assassinated by them in 485. For himself he laboured to recover a posilic intellectual and theological position and from 485 to 487 studied diligently the different schools of thought around him, especially philosophy. Finally he turned seriously to Sunnism. Intellectualism had failed him; what of religious experience? He had returned to belief in God, prophecy and the last judgment — or, as he put it, God had restored to him these beliefs — and fear of that Day of Wrath seized him. From Raddjab to Dhu l-Ka'da 488, he was in the throes of a conversion wrought by terror, and under it he collapsed physically and mentally. Finally, in Dhu l-ka'da he put behind him his brilliant position and worldly ambitions and fled from Bagdad as a wandering dervish. By giving himself to the ascetic and contemplative life he sought peace for his soul and certainty for his mind. And these he gained. From that time his position was pragmatic and he taught that the intellect should only be used to destroy trust in itself and that the only trustworthy knowledge was that gained through experience. A purely philosophical structure could have no base. On that his dialectic was as inexorable as that of a flame. Even the systems of the speculative theologians had no intellectual certainty, although their doctrines were correct. By speculative methods they could not be proved; but only by the direct knowledge with which God floods the heart of the believer. By that personal experience (ma'rifah) the fact of prophetic revelation is established and the truth of the theological structure assured. Yet there can be no question that his thinking had been indefinitely clarified by his philosophical studies and that with him the forms of Greek dialectic made their final entry into Muslim thought. What al-Ash'ari had consciously begun, al-Ghazali wittingly finished. Further, that he used the forms of Greek dialectic to found a pragmatic system is his originality and distinction. The later theologians did not always understand or follow him in this, but modern Islam seems to be recovering his method. That the account which he himself gives of all this in the Munjihin min al-falâd is true cannot be doubted; the philosophical necessity, both for al-Ghazali as an individual and for the development of Muslim thought, both of which had got into a cul-de-sac, is plain. As in al-Ash'ari's case only a great emotional experience can break the fetters of tradition and give the personal force needed to turn the current of the age. Political complications may have helped to bring on his nervous breakdown. Barkiyaruq became Great Seljuk and killed his uncle Tutush immediately before the flight of al-Ghazali, and the Khalifa at whose court al-Ghazali held important place declared for Tutush. Similarly his return to active life in 499 followed the death of Barkiyaruq in 498. About two years he passed in strict retirement in Syria, finally pilgrimaging at the end of 499. Then came nine years of wandering, places, with, from time to time, periods of return to his family and the world. The Ihyā and other books were written, and he preached at Bagdad and taught the Ihyā there and at Damascus. Finally "the Sultan of the time" (Munkid, ed. of 1303, p. 42) compelled him to become a teacher in the Nizamite madrasa at Naisabur, and he consented in Dhu l-Ka'da 499. The times called for some strong re-ordering influence. That he had himself recognized and also that there was need of a powerful and religious-minded ruler who would crush heresy and unbelief. Such a ruler was apparently found in Muhammad, the brother of Barkiyaruq, who became Great Seljuk in 498, and to whom he addressed the original Persian form of his Tihb al-maslah, a manual of ethical guidance for kings. The immediate influence in his recall was, however, Fakhr al-Mulk, the son of his old patron, Nizam al-Mulk, who was waizir at Naisabur to Sandjar, the governor of Khurasan. But he did not long stay in public life. His yearnings to quiet and contemplation continually drew him and there are stories, too, of friction. He returned to Tus and lived there in retirement with some personal disciples, having charge of a madrasa and a Shankh or Sufi monastery.
There he died on the 14th of Djamādž II 505 (Dec. 19th 1111).

2. Doctrine and influence. Although a formative canon lawyer of a rank short only of the first, he yet deposed Fikhr from the position it had usurped, lashed its casuistry and refused it a place as a part of religion. He dealt similarly with the intellectual subtleties of Ḫalīm and especially denounced the tendency to make the faith of the masses a structure of logically demonstrated articles (ḥalilīf). In this he followed the founder of his madhab, al-Shāfīʾī. He opposed the Muta-kallimīn also in the interest of the faith they had developed. All, he taught, who agreed in the broad principles of Islam were believers. This he lays down in his Taḥfīṣa, but he taught also in the Ilāhīm (ed. of 1303, pp. 31, 32, 51, 62) and the Minūzhīs (ed. of 1303, p. 42) that the religion of the unlearned should be protected by the secular arm of the state. These reforms his high rank as a scholar and popularity as a preacher carried through. They have been accepted by the Agreement of the Muslim people (al-Īṣfahānī) and he himself is reckoned as not only the mutu-ṣbhd (renewer) of his century, but as the great restorer of the faith. Of course both canon lawyers and speculative theologians and still continue to spin their systems and to try to enforce them. He also brought philosophy into the open and dissipated the glamour of mystery which had surrounded it. It was simply "thinking", and the philosophers and their systems could be understood by any intelligent man. Further, by philosophy the ultimate and unconditioned could not be reached; there could be no metaphysics on a basis of pure thought. This agnosticism was a development into more perfect form of the system of the later Ashʿarītes. On the positive side he continued the work of al-Kushāfī and gave Sāfīism a firm standing in Muslim orthodoxy. In this al-Ghazzālī marked the second great epoch of development as al-Ašʿarī with his applying of logical argument to the defence of orthodoxy had marked the first. Thus for al-Ghazzālī the basis of all religious certainty was ecstatic experience. By it he and all ṣaḥifīs (those who have direct experiential knowledge, perhaps a translation of "gnostic", v. Bauer, Dogmatik al-Ghazali's, p. 35) learn that the theological positions of the Fathers (al-talaf) are true, and how these should be interpreted. To that age of simple faith he looked back with longing. This led him to what might be called a Biblical theological-study of the Kurʾān and of the record of the teachings of Muhammad. Practically he endeavoured to assimilate men's thought and lead them back to the old ways by preaching the Wrath to come at the Judgment. His own conversion had been under the pressure of fear. Strongly contrasted and forming the paradox of his position is the emphasis which he laid on the love of Allāh. It is part of the contrast between the emotional life of the saints with Allāh which he had known and the inhuman dogmatism of the theological system which he felt compelled to accept. In spite of the curiously intolerant passage as to the faith of the masses referred to above, his influence has been and is for charity, the stimulation of free enquiry and inductive life. His indirect influence on European thought, even the most modern, has also been marked. It flowed through the Pugio Fidei of Ramón Marfí and affected, first, Thomas Aquinas and, later, Pascal. For his alleged relationship to the "Ālids and to the book Ḳaṣfī, see Ṭabārī above (vol. i. p. 9958) and references there and for his real relationship to magic, see Ṭabārī above (vol. i. p. 7708) and Descr. of Ar. and Turk. MSS. in Newberry Library, Chicago, pp. 6 et seq.

3. Sincerity. Even by his contemporaries the reality of his conversion was doubted; the change, it was felt, was so great from the pugnacious, sceptical canonist to the ecstatic saint with his sermons on the fear of God. Later, the philosophers others, hard hit by the dialectic, would be unable to believe that a man who knew philosophy so well should not be, at least secretly, a philosopher, sought in his writings proofs of an esoteric teaching. Two things aided them in that. 1. He had openly preached an economy of teaching and had written a book with that publicly as its title, al-Maṣnūn biʿli al-ghāṭir aḥlāhī — "That which is to be concealed from those who are not worthy of it" — a book, however, in which there is no heretical doctrine. In his Ṭabārī, an answer to attacks on his Ḳaṣfī, he formally defends, with the example of the Prophet and the Companions, the practice of keeping the contents and developments secret from those who are not in a position to understand them and who might thereby be led astray either in faith or in practice (ed. on margin of Ḳāf al-aṣīdā, Cairo 1311, pp. 45, 159-164, 279 et seq.), and Ṭabārī (ed. of 1339, pp. 25 et seq., esp. 30 et seq.) all very important passages on the order in which his books were written; the Miṣḥat (ed. of 1322, pp. 54 et seq.) and the Minūzhīs (ed. of 1328, pp. 21 et seq.) on which the Asbāb of al-Ṣābīn and what a man has a right to keep to himself. And this had really been the practice of Islam from the beginning. Even al-Shāfīʾī, while denouncing kalām, had admitted that some should study it for the defence of the faith. The position of Ibn Khaldūn, at the extreme end of the development, was similar, only in his day the need had passed (ed. Quar., i. 43; de Slan, i. 63). It was always a fard kifaya and not a fard 'ain and had a similar origin with the bi'a kif'a of al-Āṣhārī. Thus the advanced doctrine did not contradict, but only developed, based and deepened the simpler faith, and knowledge of it was open to all who would fit themselves for it. In the end, this led most ironically to the Averroistic doctrine of the two-fold truth. That was only a special case of the multiform truth which Islam has always admitted. 2. Those direct perceptions of religious truths which al-Ghazzālī had reached in ecstasy he was compelled to express in language by means of metaphor and symbol. He teaches consistently that there are ideas which language cannot render in exact terms and the content of which can be suggested only by pictures. When, then, such expressions were examined and held to account as intellectually exact statements, misunderstanding was certain to follow. Thus Ibn Rushd was led by the metaphor of the sun in the Miṣḥat (p. 55) to believe that al-Ghazzālī was there teaching the Neoplatonic doctrine of emanation (ju'ūr). But the context is in the teeth of such an explanation, and the metaphor is one frequently used by al-Ghazzālī to suggest the relationship
between God and the world. On this point and on the *Majātī* generally I would refer to a paper by W. H. T. Gairdner of Cairo, shortly to be published. I am indebted to him also for several chronological and bibliographical suggestions.

4. Works. Our knowledge of al-Ghazâlî's works is still incomplete both as to extent and relative order, not to speak of dating. For lists approximately complete reference can be made to the introduction by the Saiyid al-Murtâda (based on al-Subkî) prefixed to his *Iṣâf al-ṣādā*; a commentary on the *Iṣâf* (ed. Cairo 1341, vol. i. pp. 41–421), and to the Brocklission, *Gesten d. arab. Litt.*, i. pp. 421–426. The following is an attempt at a classified list of the works which have been printed and are accessible. The *Iṣâf* 'ulûm al-ṣin (the title expresses al-Ghazâlî's consciousness of the part the book was to play, cf. Bauer in *Der Islam*, iv. 159 et seq.) as a compendium of his whole system stands by itself, although it does not go into the ultimate details, either on philosophy, kalâm or Şûfîsm. On its date see above. It divides into two parts, each consisting of two quarters (*rubûb*); the first is on external acts of devotion and religious usage, the second upon the inner side. The first is an exhortation of good and evil. The four quarters are *Rubûb al-tahdhîb* (Acts of a creature towards his Lord); *Rubûb al-tahdîd* (uses of life); *Rubûb al-mukâlah* (Destructive matters in life); *Rubûb al-munfîqiyyah* (Saving matters). Each contains ten Books; the first of the forty is on *ṭilm*, the second on kalâm and the last on eschatology. Otherwise all is experiential, traditional and practical. The present writer has translated Book viii. in *Rubû* ii. on the relation of music and singing (*zâni") to the Şûfî ecstasy, in the *Journal of the Royal As. Soc.* for 1901–1902; he has analyzed with extracts Book ii. *Rubû* iii. on the marvels of the human heart, in *Lectures*, x. of his *Religious Attitude*, and Book vi. of *Rubû* iv. on the love of Allâh, in *Hasting's Dict. of Religions*, vol. ii. pp. 677–680. A great part of the *Iṣâf* is also analyzed by Miguel Asin in his *Al-Ghazal*; a translation of the whole work is being prepared by H. Bauer. Another compend of introduction on *ṭilm* in general is his *Fâṭiḥat al-tahdîm*; it resembles the first book of the *Iṣâf*. His remaining printed works may be classified as follows.

1. Canon Law: *Khatâb al-wažîd*, the smallest of his general treatises on fiqh; *Muṭâṣarât min 'ilm al-wâji'f*, written after his return (ed. of 1322, i. pp. 5 et seq.). 2. Logic and Books against the philosophers: *Mi'yar al-ʿilm*, an elaborate treatise on logic; *Muṣâhak al-wâjir*, a smaller book; *Maṣâṣid al-falāṣīfâ*, statement of their teachings on all subjects absolutely demonstrable, projections to be a *ḥikâya* only partly ed. by G. Beer, diss. 1888; *Taḥṣif al-talâṣīfâ*, demonstration that they could not by reason prove their system (cf. de Boer, *Widerspruche der Philosophie*; there are translations also in Asin's *Al-Gazal*, pp. 735–880; also a translation begun by Carra de Vaux in Mainz, vol. xvii.). 3. Contra ʿAtîniyya: *al-Kūṣīs al-muṭâṣām*. 4. Speculative theoy: *Risâla al-budâyah*, incorporated in *Iṣâf* as *Kawād al-ṣâdîd*; an abridged translation of it in H. Bauer, *Die Dogmatik des Ghazalis*, (Halle a. S., 1912); *al-Ikhwâs al-tâbîâ*, an expansion of the preceding and his most elaborate treat- ment of kalâm. 5. Books to be kept from those unfitted for them: *Muṣânât bîhi' al-
GHAZĀLĪ, Muhammad b. Kāli, called GHAZĀLĪ (probably after the gazelle's skin, peculiar to the Shaikhs of many orders), usually quoted as Deli Birāder (crazy brother), an Ottoman poet of the early Sulaimānian age. Born in Brusa he became a professor (muḥādīr) in a Madrasa there, on the completion of his studies, but his bright nature, full of the joy of life, his love of pleasure, his skill as a conversationalist, a ready wit, his extraordinary imperceptibility, an inexhaustible fund of anecdote and a great readiness in versatility marked him out for a life at court as an entertainer and companion to a prince almost without a rival. He therefore soon gave up his academic position and went to Magnesia, the residence of Bāyāzīd II's ill-fated son Korkud. He soon succeeded in becoming the prince's secretary and inseparable companion which he remained till Korkud's execution. After the death of his patron he retired deeply affected to Brusa to the monastery (Gowyā) of Geikli Baba (also called Ahuly Baba). But he did not long adhere to a life of meditation. He became muḥādīr in a number of Anatolian towns, till he finally had the good fortune to receive a pension (1000 aspers monthly) from the Sultan. He now settled in Būshkāsh in the Bosphorus where with the help of several patrons he built a mosque, which still exists, a hermitage and a bath with a marble basin and laid out a garden. The bath soon became the rendezvous of all the dissolute youth, so that finally the grand vizier Ibrāhīm Pāsha had it levelled to the ground by his Adjemi-Oghlans. Ghażālī then found it advisable to escape to Mecca in 938 (1434-1435). There also he laid out a garden and built a mosque. He died over 70 years of age in 941 (1437-1438), according to others in 942 (1438-1439) and was buried beside his masjid.

Ghażālī enjoyed a not unusual fame as a poet in his lifetime but it was for the most part due rather to his winning personality than to his verses. His chronogram (tāriḵ) were particularly celebrated. He wrote a book called Din al-Ghawām wa khuṭā al-Ḥumāma (Dispeller of sorrows and dissipator of troubles), also known as Mālaḵt-i Ghażālī (Anecdotes of Ghażālī), and Hikayāt-i Birāder (Tales of the crazy brother), according to Lattifi a version of Azaṅi's: Afsīya wa-Shalīfya with additions of his own, in which all sexual pleasures and excesses are discussed in the greatest detail. Later prudish biographers say that Korkud therefore would not accept the dedication and dismissed Ghażālī from his court, but this is rather improbable. Ghażālī's poems were not collected till after his death by his friends into a Divān, which is rather rare.

Bibliography:

GHAZĀN MAHMūD, a Mongol ruler (Ilkhan) of Persia (694‑703 = 1295‑1304) born in the year 670 = 1271. On the accession of his father Arghān (q.v., i. 430) he was appointed govern­or of Khorāsān, Māzandarān and Raz; he administered these provinces in the reign of Gai­khaṭū also (cf. above p. 128). Ghażān had been brought up as a Buddhist and, while governor, ordered a Buddhist temple to be built in the town of Kūsān; shortly before his accession, during the war with Ikrīdū (q.v., i. 591), his general Nāw­rūz persuaded him to adopt Islam. In his reign Islam was recognised as the State religion, the Mongol empire organised on a basis of Muslim culture, splendid buildings erected in and around the new capital Tabrīz, notably charitable endow­ments, mosques, theological schools etc., the descend­ants of the Prophet sometimes mentioned in the first place in the state records before the princes and princesses of the ruling house, and lastly the turban introduced as the court headgear. But Ghażān was more a Mongol than a Muslim; as a ruler and law-giver he displayed great activity entirely free from biased piety, of which his physician and actual minister Rashīd al-Dīn (the vizier Sa'd al-Dīn al-Sāwī filled this office in name only and had in reality no say in the government) gives a detailed account. Particular attention was devoted to the finances of the country, the currency etc.; Ghażān no longer appears on his coins (the inscriptions on which are in three languages Arabic, Mongol and Tibetan), like his predecessors, as representative of the Great Kūsān who lived in Pekin, but as ruler "by the grace of God" (Mong. Tengri Kulanurd = the ruler of heaven). Ghażān carried out his plans with vigour and bloodshed in the teeth of the opposition of the Mongol Emirs and even against the princes of the ruling house; every one whom he believed to be dangerous to the peace of the country or to his autocratic rule, was dis-
posed of with ruthless cruelty; among these was the Emir Nawruz himself, to whom he owed his throne. On the other hand Ghāzān's measures increased the prosperity of the country and in particular protected the country people from oppression and extortion. The revenues of the state rose and in Ghāzān's reign amounted to 2100 tūmāns (before only 1700), i.e. about £2,500,000.

Like other Mongol rulers Ghāzān particularly esteemed these arts and sciences which might be useful to the State; he is himself said to have been conversant with natural history, medicine, astronomy, chemistry and even with several trades; an observatory was built by his orders in Tabriz with a school for secular sciences (kilmāy) in connection with it. Ghāzān is said to have known several languages in addition to Mongol, his mother-tongue, and to have been acquainted with the history of many lands and peoples. He devoted particular attention to the history of his own people and had all that could be learned about it collected by Rashid al-Din in a great work to which the name Tūrīk-i Ghāzānī was given; the author says that he received much of the information embodied in the work from his royal master. Ghāzān's activity abroad was less successful; he did not succeed in effectively defending the eastern frontier from invasion by Central Asian tribes invading Syria.

**Bibliography:** O'Bohoo, Histoire des Mongols, iv. 143 et seq.; Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der Khânate, ii. 1 et seq.; Howorth, History of the Mongols, iii. 393 et seq. The section of the Tūrīk-i Ghāzānī dealing with Ghāzān's activities as a ruler and law-giver has not yet been published in the original; in the Grundzüge der Iranischen Philologie, ii. 376, Ghāzān's legal code is quoted according to the extract from Köhenderlir translated by G. Kirkpatrick (New Asiatic Miscell., i. p. 149 et seq., Calcutta 1789). On Persia under Ghāzān Khān cf. also W. Barthold, Persische madrasa nasta'īvī Amīrī-bāyī mizāli Mīnsū, St. Petersburg 1911 (Amīrī-bāyī serīya, No. 5) and in Mīr Islāmī, i. 76 et seq. (W. Barthold).

**GHAZĀT or GHAZWA (A.).** Razzia against unbelievers.

GHAZĀ (A.), plur. ghażā, one who undertakes a ghazwa, particularly the leader of one; hence an honorary title for one who distinguishes himself in war against the unbelievers. For other meanings of the word cf. Dozy, Supplément, s. v. GHAZĀ, Saif al-Dīn, son of Zangi, born 500 (1106-1107), an atabeg of Māsūl (al-Mawṣil) 541-544 (1146-1149). When the Atabeg Zangi was murdered by his own men in 541 (1146), the most prominent of his followers, including the vizier al-Qarawī al-Jahānī (q. v., i. 1025), attempted to persuade the troops to recognise the authority of the Saľāji Aḥrār b. Maḥmūd. But they were only successful with a section of them; another section went to Syria with Nūr al-Dīn (q. v.) the son of Zangi, afterwards so famous. Those who paid homage to Aḥrār took the road to al-Mawṣil where Zain al-Dīn 'Ali Kaṭīb was in command as Zangi's representative. But because

and henceforth ruled over this town and Dijār Raḥifa. There is not much to be told of his short reign — he died in 544 (1149). — The inhabitants of Damascus besieged by the Crusaders called him to their help and he went thither with his brother Nūr al-Dīn, but no fighting resulted as in the meanwhile the people of Damascus had succeeded in forcing the Crusaders to retire. Ghāzā is further celebrated because he was a friend to learning and founded a madrasa in al-Mawṣil, which was called al-Atiḳa and became his last resting-place. Among his panegyrist was the poet Haḳa-바ḳa. He was succeeded as Atabeg of al-Mawṣil not by his son, who was brought up by his uncle Nūr al-Dīn and died young, but by his brother Kūb al-Dīn Mawdād [q. v.]

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Asbīr, Hist. des Atabes de M continué in Recueil des historiens des croisades, Historiens orientaux, T. ii. 2e partie, 116, 152-168; do., al-Kāmil (ed. Tornberg), xi. 74 et seq.; Ibn Khallīkān, Wafa'yī, s. v. Ghāzā; Abū Shāma, Kitāb al-Kawdātān (ed. Cairo), i. 40 et seq.; Well, Geschichte der Chafīen, iii. 290 et seq.

GHAZĀ, Saif al-Dīn, son of Kūb al-Dīn Mawdād [q. v.], Atabeg of al-Mawṣil 556-576 (1170-1176). On Mawdād's death it was not his eldest son 'Imād al-Dīn that was recognised as his successor, but Ghāzā, through the influence of his mother, a daughter of Timurtasch, who had the powerful support of Fakhr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Masch who held the reins of government in Mawdād's reign. 'Imād al-Dīn had spent almost all his life with his uncle Nūr al-Dīn and married the latter's daughter and for this very reason was hated by 'Abd al-Masch, apparently a Christian by birth. But 'Imād al-Dīn appealed to the powerful Nūr al-Dīn and the latter at once marched against al-Mawṣil, conquered Raḳḳa, Nisibin and Singjar, but made peace with Ghāzā, when he reached al-Mawṣil, by the terms of which Ghāzā was left in power and Singjar alone given to 'Imād al-Dīn. When Nūr al-Dīn died in 569 (1174), Ghāzā seized the towns of Harrān, Nisibin, Raḳḳa, Edessa, Khabūr and Sarūd, but had to come into conflict with Šālāh al-Dīn as a result. The latter came to Syria in the following year and as soon as he had dealt with the Syrians and the Christians, he put the Mōgušans to flight near Ğamāt (19th Ramadān 570 = 13th April 1175). Ghāzā had in the meanwhile besieged his brother 'Imād al-Dīn, who naturally had not taken part in the campaign against Šālāh al-Dīn, in Sintjar, but, when he heard of the defeat at Ğamāt, he raised the siege and retired to al-Mawṣil. In the following year (571) he again set out against Nisibin to fight Šālāh al-Dīn again in company with the Syrian rulers who were his allies, but he had again to take refuge in al-Mawṣil after the battle of Tell al-Sulṭān (between Ğamāt and Ḥalab). He held out here till his death on the 3rd Šafār 572 = 11th July 1176. His brother ʻizz al-Dīn Mawdūd [q. v.] succeeded him.
GHÂZÎ GÎRAY, name of three Khâns of the Crimea. Ghâzî Gîray I. reigned only about six months in the year 929 = 1523. Ghâzî Gîray II. twenty years (996–1016 = 1588–1608), Ghâzî Gîray III. three years (1116–1119 = 1704–1707). Only the reign of the (Ghâzî Gîray II.) is of importance; he was known as Borz = storm from his impetuous bravery and was the son of Dewlet Gîray I. and reigned after his brothers Muhammed Gîray and Islam Gîray. Before his accession he had taken part with the Turkish army in the campaigns against Persia and spent seven years as a prisoner in the Persian fortress of Kahkaha; he afterwards came to Constantinople and enjoyed the favour of Sultan Murad III. (982–1003 = 1574–1595). As Khan he undertook a campaign in 1591 against Moscow, was defeated and wounded; in the following year he sent his brother, the heir-apparent (Farzand) Fath Gîray, to lay waste the Russian frontiers and on this occasion a larger number of prisoners were taken than had even been taken before. At a later period Ghâzî Gîray took part in the campaigns against Hungary. About 1005 = 1596–1597 he lost the favour of Sultan Mehmed III. (1003–1012 = 1595–1603) for a short time, was deposed in favour of Fath Gîray, went to Sinope, where there received a grant of confirmation from the Sultan, returned to the Crimea and was recognised as Khan again without opposition; his brother had to pay a large bribe in order that he might be reinstated. Ghâzî Gîray took advantage of the decline of the Turkish empire under Mehmed III. to adopt a more independent attitude to the Porte than before; he is said to have meditated founding an independent kingdom and introducing transmission of the throne from father to son into the Crimea. He was actually succeeded by his son Tozkamish, but the latter was not confirmed by the Porte and could hold out against his uncle Saîfat Gîray. In Ghâzî Gîray II.'s reign Gozlew (the modern Eupatoria) was made capital for a short time in place of Taghe-Serai (q. v., i. 562 et seq.). Cf. V. Smirnow, Die Kriege des Peter des Großen, p. 444 et seq.; O. Rotowski, Die Münzen der Gîray, Moscow 1905, p. 100 et seq. (W. Barthold.)

GHÂZÎ AL-DIN HAIDAR was second son of NAWWÂB Saîdat 'Ali, nominally Wazir of the Mughul Empire, in reality ruler of Audh. Saîdat 'Ali died in 1229 (1814) and the children of his eldest son were set aside as mughalî al-îthth. In 1234 (1819) he took the title of Padghâh or king of Audh with the consent of the Governor General of British India, the East India Company having now become de facto suzerain of Northern India. His government was not successful. The king, although of an honest character, was dissipated and very much under the influence of unscrupulous ministers, especially Aghâ Mir (MUSTAMAD al-Dawla), and the administration of the land-revenue led to much discontent. He died in 1244 (1827), and was succeeded by his son Nasir al-dîn Haidar. His coinage, struck at Lakhna, commences in 1235 and continues till 1242. Lakhna is alluded to as Dâr al-saltanat or Dâr al-imârat, and the coins are stated to have been struck in the Șîbâ of Audh. They bear a coat of arms in imitation of European heraldry; two fishes (the badge of Lakhna) supported by tigers bearing banners. A fine silver medal (weighing 1125 grains, 72.9 grammes), bearing the king's portrait crowned, full faced, wearing a moustache but no beard, was issued also in the first year of his reign.

Ghâzî al-dîn Haidar was a man of considerable literary attainments and learning. He was the author of a valuable Persian Dictionary and Grammar called the Hafez Kalamu or "Seven Seas", published at Lakhna in 1822; cf. Persch, Grammatik, Poetik und Rhetorik der Perser. According to H. Ethé, Grundr. d. iran. Philol., ii. 265, 348 infra, the real author is Kâbul Aḩmad.


GHÂZÎ L-DIN KHAN was the title bestowed by AWRANGZÎB on Mir Sîhab al-Din, elder son of 'Abîd Khan, entitled Khîljî Khan, who rose to the rank of commander of 5,000 horse and held more than one provincial government under Shâhshâhîn. Sîhab al-Din came from Turkistan to AWRANGZÎB's court in 1669, and was appointed commander of 300 horse. During AWRANGZÎB's reign he served with distinction in the suppression of Prince Akbar's rebellion and in the long campaign in the Dakhan, especially at the sieges of Bajjâpur, Golkonda, and Adhwani. He received the title of Ghâzî L-Din Khan in 1759 and that of Firuz Djang in 1685, and died in 1709, in the reign of Bahâdur Shâh, being at the time of his death, the governor of the province of Gudjarât. He left a son, Mir Kamar al-Din, entitled Cin Khîljî Khan and, later, Nizâm al-Mulk and Âsaf Dîjâh, who became, in the reign of Farrukhsâiyâr, viceregal of the Dakhan, and founded the line of the Nizâms of Haidarâbâd.

Bibliography: MA'UZIR-AL-Âlamirî, Muntakab al-Luthbî. (T. W. HAIG.)

GHÂZÎ KHAN was one of the sons of MA'LÎK SÛRÂB KHAN DÔDAI BALOÇI who emigrated from Mekrân to Multân in the time of Shâh Husain Langâtî, King of Multân from 974 to 988 = 1502 [cf. BALOÇÎSTAN, i. 628, 630]. He obtained dîjâs (positions) in exchange for military service in the country below the junction of the Indus and the Çinâb, although owing to a change in the course of the Indus a large part of this tract, formerly west of the Indus, now lies between that river and the Çinâb. Another Baloçî leader Mir Çâkur Rind, who also came with his followers to Multân, was on bad terms with Sûrâbî and his sons, who perhaps were forced to move further north. Bâbar met Balocës as far north as Bêhra in 925 (1519) and twenty seven years later Shêr Shâh in his pursuit of Humaîn was met at Khûshab by Ismâ'îl Khan, Fath Khan and Ghâzî Khan, sons of Sûrâbî who were confirmed by him in their possessions along the Indus. The towns of DêRâ Ismâ'îl Khan, DêRâ Fath Khan and DêRâ Ghâzî Khan were founded by these three sons, and Ghâzî Khan became founder of a line of Nawwâbîs of the Mirfânî branch of the Dôdâs, who ruled there till the middle of the 18th century. They bore the names of Ghâzî Khan and Hâjîjjî Khan [cf. BALOÇÎSTAN, i. 629, 630] alternately. Ghâzî Khan was buried at Curâtta near DêRâ Ghâzî Khan where his tomb still exists bearing an inscription of Akbar's time but undated. The tomb is octagonal with towers at the angles and is decorated with fine glazed tiles. Ghâzî Khan II. built a tomb in memory of the
saint Pir 'Ādil which still exists a few miles north of Dēra Ghāzī Khān and is a place of pilgrimage. His own tomb is near it.


(M. Longworth Dames.)

**GHĀZĪ MIYĀN.** This celebrated personage is venerated by both Hindus and Muhammadans, and his gūbdā, or his wedding, is a popular institution among the Untouchables throughout Hindustan. In the northwestern parts of India he is identified with Sālār Ma'sūdī, the nephew of Māhūd of Ghazni, who was born at Ādījmīr, A.H. 405 (1014) and after performing prodigies of valour in battle against the infidels, and capturing Diliā and Ayedhā, settled at Bahārīā in Oudh. Here he was attacked by the Hindus under Rāi Sahār Deo and Har Deo, and in the battle that ensued he was killed and his army destroyed. This occurred in the 13th Rajab, A.H. 424 (1033).

Around this warrior's name many marvelous stories have accumulated. It is believed in Oudh that only the bones of the hero were discovered in the 14th century, and that, whilst being exhumed, many miraculous events occurred; but a native historian informs us that Sikandar Lōdi in the 15th century abolished throughout his dominions the annual procession of the banner of Sālār Ma'sūdī because of its being contrary to orthodox belief. No legislation, however, could stop such a popular festival as this has always been.

It is perhaps impossible to explain the meaning of the ritual performed by persons while celebrating the gūbdā of Ghāzī Miyān.

At Gāsāyān in the Bandā district, a fair is annually held in the month of Baisakh (April—May) in honour of Ghāzī Miyān, at which Daffālī faqīrīs (mendicant beggars who sing and dance to the accompaniment of a drum) tied coloured rags and horseshow about the top of a large bamboo, round which they sing and often burn incense.

In some parts of India Ghāzī Miyān is described as the son of a famous general who served under the King of Diliā, and subsequently adopted the garb of a faqīr (mendicant), retired from the world, and shortly afterwards died, whereupon the son, Mādar, joined the troops of a Pathān leader, and distinguished himself by his bravery and hatred for the Hindus. Hence his name has come to be regarded as a symbol of warlike prowess, and is used up to present times as a battle-cry by Hindustānī soldiers. While his nuptial ceremonies were being celebrated, the enemy appeared, and in his attempt to drive them back he was himself slain. The present day celebrations in honour of Ghāzī Miyān are hence supposed to represent the incident of his untimely death and the capture of his nuptial banners and emblems by the enemy.

On the first Sunday of Djāīth (May—June), a great fair is held at the tomb of Sālār Ma'sūdī, at Bahārīā when crowds of pilgrims make liberal offerings at the shrine; at Monār also, near the junction of the Son and the Ganges, the anniversary of the death of Ghāzī Miyān is celebrated. The history of this fair is interesting as showing how legends about one holy man come to be ascribed to another quite different from him.

Van Graaf, sailing up the Ganges in 1669, stopped at "Monir." The inhabitants were poor cultivators, and the country was formerly a desert until a very holy man, "Hīa Munera" (Yahya Muniari, a famous sufi who is the author of the Sharaf Nāma and died A.H. 782, see Rieu, *Cat. of Persian Ms. Br. Mus.*, p. 492) struck by the general features of the place, fixed his abode there, and after having exterminated the wild beasts, erected a small chapel where he performed many miracles. At his death he left much money, with which, his followers built a mosque and a tank, frequented by fakirs, who pretended to work miracles. The mosque still stands, but the fakirs, finding the worship of Ghāzī Miyān more profitable, established a fair in his honour instead.

The festival of Ghāzī Miyān is not popular in Eastern Bengal, but few villages are without a shrine dedicated to Ghāzī Śāhīb. This spot is usually a diminutive Darzāsī (shrine), with a raised mound of earth in the middle, before which every Muhammadan and Hindu makes obeisance as he passes, and, whenever his family is attacked with any malady, the villager makes votive offerings of flowers, fruits and sweetmeats. Along the banks of the Jalīkha, on the outside of villages, a mound of earth, stands beneath a grass turtha. This mound has generally two knobs on the tops, said to represent the tombs of Ghāzī Miyān and his younger brother Kālū. On the 22nd day after a cow has calved, the first milk drawn is poured over the mound as a libation, and in time of sickness rice, plantains, and sweetmeats are offered.

**Bibliography:** Elliott, *History of India*, vol. ii. App. 515—549, and supplemental Glossary, i. 251; *Asiatic Annual Register*, vi. (1801); *Asiatic Journal*, iv. 75; *Statistical and descriptive Account of the North-West Provinces of India*, i. 118 (Allahabad, 1874) and *Voyages de Nikolaus Van Graaf aux Indes Orientales*, (Amsterdam, 1719). (M. Hidayet Hosain.)

**GHĀZĪ MUḤAMMAD,** called Kaži-Mulla by the Russians, a Muslim leader in the war of liberation in the Caucasus. [See the article DAGHES-TAN, i. 801.]

**GHĀZIPUR,** district of India in the United Provinces, lying on both sides of the Ganges below Benares. Pop. (1911), 383,725, of whom 10% are Muslims. It includes the site of the battle field where Shōr Shāh decisively defeated Humāyūn in 1539. The city of Ghāzipur stands on the N. bank of the Ganges. Pop. (1901), 93,429. Before the opening of railways, it was a considerable centre for river traffic. It contains the Government opium factory for all the poppy products of the United Provinces, and is also famous for rose water and ottu of roses, made from roses grown in the neighbourhood. The name is traditionally derived from a Saiyid named Ma'sūd Malik al-Sadāt Ghāzī, who is said to have founded the Hindu Rajā and founded the city about 1330. The only notable buildings are the tomb and tank of Pahār Khān, governor in 1580, and the Chihī Suttān, or "House of forty pillars", the palace of 'Abd Allāh Khān, governor in the 18th cent., which is still owned by his descendants.

**Bibliography:** District Gazetteer of Ghāzipur (Allahabad, 1909).

(J. S. Cotton.)
GHĀZIYA (A.), plur. ghawālī, a name given to the caste of dancing-girls in Egypt, who call themselves Bārāmīka. The origin of these two names is not quite certain; cf. Krone du Monde Mitas, Vol. xx. 110, 125. According to Lane, the Ghawālī only keep themselves distinct from other classes and marry only within their tribe; the men are household servants or sometimes also follow a trade when they do not accompany the women as musicians; one of the latter is called ghawālī. They used to perform in the public streets, but this was prohibited in 1834 because they were notorious as prostitutes.

Bibliography: Burckhardt, Arabic Proverbs, p. 495; Lane, Manners and Customs of the Moors in Egypt, pls. ii. Ch. xix.

GHANZA (otherwise known as GHAZAN, GHANZI), is an ancient town in Afghanistan situated in lat. 8° 18' E. long. 35° 44' N. on lofty ground 7280 ft. above sea-level on the watershed of the Arghandāb and Tanaak rivers. It is now an insignificant town, its place as the northern capital of the country having been taken by Kabul, but has some importance still as a centre of the Ghilzai traders who work annually between India and the Indus and Gomal routes. It is still fortified and the ruins and tombs are to the north-east testify to its former importance.

Its early history is obscure. Suggestions have been made of its identity with Ptolemies' Gacara and with the Greek Gazae, but there is little to support these conjectures. On the other hand the He-si-na of Hiuen Thsang (which V. de St. Martin first identified with Ghazna), seems to correspond with it accurately. He approached it from India either by the Gomal via Wano or by the Toon via Peshawar. The tombs and Gencs might represent Varana, which is designated by the Chinese Fa-la-na. According to the Buddhist pilgrim it was the capital of the kingdom of Tso-in-ko and of great extent. Buddhism still flourished there at that period (the 7th cent. A. D.). It is not however till the rise of the Ghaznavid dynasty which took its name from the town that Ghazna became famous. It is doubtful whether Ghazna was included in the Sāmārāni dominions. It was certainly not one of their mint-towns. Alp-tigin conquered it from India and transferred the mint to Lawik in 904 (998). After his death his son Ishaq was driven out of Ghazna by Lawik, but recovered it with the aid of Mansur b. Nuh Sāmāni. Balkātgin his slave succeeded him in Ghazna, and was himself succeeded by Piri who allied himself with Lawik and the Hindū Shāh of Kābul, but Subuktigin another servant of Alp-tigin attacked them and became master of Ghazna in 366 (976). It was the head quarters of Subuktigin in his Indian expeditions. In 380 (990) he imprisoned his son Mahmūd for some time. After Mahmūd had become an independent sovereign in 389 (998), Ghazna rose in importance owing to its commanding position towards India, although the actual capital of his empire was Balkh. It was to Ghazna he brought the idol from the Somnath temple, part of it being thrown in from the great mosque and part in front of his palace. It was one of his mints, although the coinages of Nushāpūr, Herat and Balkh are more important. Farwān, his father's only mint, was quite given up. Mahmūd does not seem to have coined at Ghazna, but after his time the Ghaznavids were confined by the rise of the Saljūq monarchy and the growing strength of the Ghūrī Chiefs to the eastern part of Afghanistan, and Ghazna became the actual capital and the principal mint-town. During the reign of the later kings of this dynasty the town underwent a series of misfortunes. In the time of Arslān there was a destructive fire said to have been caused by lightning, and in the same reign it was taken by Sultan Sandjar Saldijāk and made over to Bahram Shah. In the wars between Bahram Shah and the Ghūrī chiefs it was more than once taken, and in 544 (1149) Alā al-Dīn Husain sacked and destroyed the town, thereby earning the name of Djahān-sūz. It is stated by chroniclers to have been utterly destroyed, nevertheless it continued to be an important capital under the Ghūrīs Muizz al-Dīn Muhammad b. Ṣām became governor here under his brother in 569 (1173), and began his expeditions into India. It was to Ghazna he brought the last Ghaznavīd king Khusraw Malik before sending him to Firuz-Kuh, and here in later years he accumulated the treasure obtained from his Indian conquests of which fabulous accounts are given. After Muhammad b. Sams death in 602 (1205) Ghazna again became an object of dispute, Yalduz held it for several years and after his death in 612 it fell into the hands of Alā al-Dīn Khwārizm Shah, who in his turn was driven out by the Mongols. All these events are marked in the coinage of the Ghūrīs, Yalduz and Alā al-Dīn at the Ghazna mint, but after their time it relapses into obscurity. Djalāl al-Dīn Mangubarti held it till driven out by Cingiz Khān. The great conqueror sent his son Ogotai who took the city, massacred the greater part of its inhabitants and carried the remainder away as prisoners, and names might represent Varana, which is designated by the Chinese Fa-la-na. According to the Buddhist pilgrim it was the capital of the kingdom of Tso-in-ko and of great extent. Buddhism still flourished there at that period (the 7th cent. A. D.). It is not however till the rise of the Ghaznavid dynasty which took its name from the town that Ghazna became famous. It is doubtful whether Ghazna was included in the Sāmārāni dominions. It was certainly not one of their mint-towns. Alp-tigin conquered it from India and transferred the mint to Lawik in 904 (998). After his death his son Ishaq was driven out of Ghazna by Lawik, but recovered it with the aid of Mansur b. Nuh Sāmāni. Balkātgin his slave succeeded him in Ghazna, and was himself succeeded by Piri who allied himself with Lawik and the Hindū Shāh of Kābul, but Subuktigin another servant of Alp-tigin attacked them and became master of Ghazna in 366 (976). It was the head quarters of Subuktigin in his Indian expeditions. In 380 (990) he imprisoned his son Mahmūd for some time. After Mahmūd had become an independent sovereign in 389 (998), Ghazna rose in importance owing to its commanding position towards India, although the actual capital of his empire was Balkh. It was to Ghazna he brought the idol from the Somnath temple, part of it being thrown in from the great mosque and part in front of his palace. It was one of his mints, although the coinages of Nushāpūr, Herat and Balkh are more important. Farwān, his father's only mint, was quite given up. Mahmūd does not seem to have coined at Ghazna, but after his time the Ghaznavids were confined by
since Forster in 1783 described it as maintained only by a few traders. Vigne’s description in 1836 was more favourable. It was garrisoned by a small force of sepoys under British officers and was besieged from Nov. 1841 to March 1842 when it was taken by a Bázárak force. Nott re-took it in September of the same year, and returning to India brought away, by Lord Ellenborough’s orders, the supposed gates of Súmánáh. In more recent times Ghazna was the scene of the imprisonment of Aftád Khan by Sírh ʿAlí and his rescue by ʿAbd al-Rájmání after defeating Sírh ʿAlí at Saidúbdú close by. In 1868 however Ghazna was again the scene of the fighting when Aẓam and ʿAbd al-Rájmání were defeated by Sírh ʿAlí’s forces. In 1850-51 Ghazna was traversed by Stewart’s force marching from Kandahár to Kábul and by Roberts from Kábul to Kandahór.

The name Ghazna is found on coins and in Arabic chronicles. The form Ghazznín is used in the Taḥáfaṭí-Šírí and other Persian chronicles such as Fírúža up to modern times. The final ān has been dropped and the form Ghazna is now generally used.

**Bibliography:** al-ʿUthí, Tuṟ̌ihí-Ṣamání; Bálíhákí, Tuṟ̌hí-Ṣubúktígn; Míną́jí-rí Sírađí, Taḥáfaṭí-Šírí; Bárūn-aus, Erskine’s transl.; Vigne, Ghazni and Afghanistan (London 1840); Holdich, Gates of India (London 1910); Thomas, Coins of the Kings of Ghazni (London 1848); Kaye, Hist. of war in Afghanistan, 3rd Ed. (London 1874); Masson, Travels (London 1844).

(M. LONGWORTH DAMES.)

**GHAZNAVIDS.** The rise of the dynasty known as Ghaznavid or Ghaznaví (from the capital Ghazna) is connected with the struggle between the Iranian and Turkish races for the mastery of the borderland of Islam in the 4th century. The Samánids, an Iranian or Tátkíjk stock from Sughd, had risen to power at the commencement of the 9th century, becoming practically independent of the authority of the Khalífs. After the year 300 however, Turkish names begin to appear among their governors and generals; these were the so-called Turkish slaves, who distinguished themselves in war, and, gradually rising to positions of importance, paved the way for the Turkish and Mongolian invasions which swept away the independence of the Iranian races of Persia, Mú varáž al-Nárí, Tuṟ̌hárístán and the regions included in Afghanistan. The most important of these was Alp-tígn [q.v., l. 321], who became Ẓáhrún al-Šírí, and in 344 (955) governor of Herát. At the accession of Mansúr b. Núh he fell out of favour and betook himself to the eastern border of the kingdom, where he not only resisted all attempts to subdue him but himself conquered Ghazna, where he died in 352 (963). There is no evidence that Ghazna had previously formed part of the Samání kingdom. It had been overrun, with the whole of Zábúlístán and Kábul, by the Sádáfírs by 260 (875), but it is doubtful how far their power was permanent, and even when the Samánídes became paramount there is no evidence that Kábul and Ghazna were under them. The ruler of Ghazna is described as Pádsháh and was allied to the Hindú Sháhí of Kábul. These titles were not as yet used by Muhammadan rulers. The Pádsháh Lawík was probably a Hindú Chief, even though some Miss. of the Taḥáfaṭí-Šírí give him the name of Abú Bakr or Abú ‘Alí. Alp-tígn was succeeded by his son Išhák, but the power fell into the hands of other Turkish slaves Bálá-tígn and Subúktígn. Bálá-tígn was the first to obtain the power. He was an old servant of the Samánídes, and had struck coins in his own name under their suzerainty at Kábul as far back as 935 (very possibly 933). His coinage of 359 (966) at Ghazná is that town’s first appearance as a mint-town. The mountain-fort of Farwán in the Hindu-kúsh was also used as a mint by Alp-tígn and Bálákítín. Bálákítín was succeeded by Pírí, who was perhaps a local man, as he allied himself with Lawík, the former ruler of Ghazna, and with the Hindú Sháhí, Subúktígn, who had perhaps remained at Farwán, attacked the allies and routed them, obtaining possession of Ghazna in 357 (967). He continued to issue coins (which are still abundant) at Farwán in his own name with that of Núh b. Mansúr. Subúktígn rapidly spread his power through Tuṟ̌hárístán, Zábúlístán, Zamín-dávar and Ghor, and even Kábúr (now in Baločistán), and then turned his arms against the Hindú Sháhí Djiáálpál who is described as Pádsháh of Hind. This title may be due to confusion of Hind (India) with his capital Ohind or Wáhínd on the Indus, still locally known as Hind or Hund. This expedition against Djiáálpál marks the commencement of the wars which ended in the destruction of the powerful Hindú kingdom of the Sháhís, commonly spoken of as the Hindú kings of Kábul. Kábul, however, had at this time passed out of their possession, though they still held the lower Kábul valley and the territory between the Indus and Díjhlám. Their dominions in India extended far beyond these bounds to the east, along the line of the Himálaya as far as Kóngra, and through the northern and central Pandůb to Báhtínda on the Hákrá river (now day owing to the diversion of the Sátáhd to join the Báb). It has been held by some writers (see Ravery Notes on Afghanistan, p. 370, followed by V. Smith, Early Hindus, 3rd Ed.) that the kingdom of the Central Pandúb, with its capital at Báhtínda, was distinct from that of the Sháhís, and that Elliot and Dowson were mistaken in treating them as one. Nevertheless there seems to be no good evidence in support of this theory, which involves the supposition that there were two Djiáálpálės reigning side by side, both of whom were simultaneously at war with the Ghaznavids, and both of whom were succeeded by sons named Anampé Párálv. Ravery himself says that Djiáálpál of Báhtínda lost both Langhán and Nangáñáh to Subúktígn, yet these territories were an integral part of the Sháhí kingdom, the last part of the Kábul valley held by them after the loss of Kábul itself. It seems most probable that the first Hindú kingdom of Kábul was distinct from that of the central Pandúb, but that the earlier kings whose names end in dēva had been replaced (by succession or conquest) by the Rájdúp dynasty of the central Pandúb who adopted the ancient Kushán title of Sháhí. Their names all end in pál like those of other Rájdúp sovereigns of the time. Djiáálpál appears to have succeeded to Bhíma Dēva and to have been allied to the kings o Kashmír who had married into Bhíma Dēva’s family and afterwards assisted Tíločán Pá́l (Djiáálpál’s grandson) in his war with Mahmúd. It is evident therefore that the wars of Subúktígn and Mahmúd with Djiáálpá
and his successors were directed against the most powerful kingdom of northwestern India. In 369 (979) Subuktigin defeated Djiapal and plundered Laghnaf, and there was war again in 378 (988) when Djiapal seems to have been the aggressor. He was defeated, probably in the Kura valley, and forced to surrender some forts in the neighbourhood of Ghazna. Mahmud first came prominently forward during these wars, and was more inclined to extreme measures than his father. There was some disagreement between them, and Mahmud was imprisoned for some time in 350 (990) in the fort of Ghazna. During this period Subuktigin, although practically independent, admitted the suzerainty of the Samanid kings and fought their battles for them, especially in 382 (992) and 385 (995) against Abi ‘Ali Simjdir. He was made governor of Khorasan with the title of Nāṣir al-Din, and Mahmud was at the same time given the military command with the title of Sāf al-Dawla, which is commemorated in a coin struck by him at Nishāpūr in 385 (995). Subuktigin died in 387 (997) having by his conquests and firm character laid the foundation for the wider empire of his son Mahmud.

Ismail I. Subuktigin was succeeded by his younger son Isma’il who, however, was speedily put aside by his energetic brother. Mahmud, Mahmud succeeded in 389 (999) at the time when the Samanid king had been dethroned by a rebellion. Mahmud ostensibly sided with his suzerain, but utilized the opportunity to assume the title of Amir and to obtain investiture from the Khilafah al-Kadîr billah as Yamin al-dawla and Amīn al-mulâ, and these titles henceforth appear on his coins. Mahmud finding himself now an independent ruler, and the once powerful Samanid monarchy having vanished, proceeded to consolidate his authority over the greater part of the dominions of that monarchy, and in addition to carry out a systematic series of invasions of India which had been beyond its scope. The position of his new and rising capital of Ghazna on the crest of the high plateau overlooking the plains of Northern India with which it possessed easy communications by the valleys of the Kabul, Kura, Tochi and Ghinal rivers, gave him a natural advantage for such expeditions. Nevertheless he did not at first make Ghazna his capital. He chose rather the ancient centre of Turkistan, Balkh, and issued his coinage there, as well as at Walawis in the same province, and Herat and Nishapur in Khorasan. Expeditions against Ilak Khân in Turkistan, who had captured the last Samanid prince, and also against the Malik of Sijistan and Ghur consolidated his home power and left him free for his almost annual cold weather raids into India. For further details of these expeditions which occupied the greater part of his reign see art. MAHMUD.

At the end of his life a danger which was soon to threaten the security of his successors made its first appearance. The Sâljuq Turks over the Buysids, till then the dominant family and masters of the caliphate, and Shâhs by creed. After layouting Persian ‘Irâk Mahmud re-established the Sunni faith and made his son Ma‘mûd governor over Ifshân and Rayy. He returned to Balkh and afterwards to Ghazna but was attacked by a severe illness and died soon after his arrival in 421 (1030).

Mahmud’s dominions at the end of his reign comprised the whole of Khorasan and Persian ‘Irâk in the west, Turkistan and part of Mawjûd al-Nahr in the north, Sijistan, Zaminâwar and Kûsdar in the south, and the Pandjâb, Multân and part of Sindh in the east, with an admitted suzerainty over the Hindu kingdoms of the Ganges valley and the south coast. His authority was admitted too by the chiefs of Ghor and Ghardjistan and the mountain Afghans. From the time of his accession he had recognized the nominal authority of the Khilafah al-Kadîr billah instead of the deposed Khilafah al-Rasûl whom the Samanids and Subuktigin had acknowledged. The only part of his Indian conquests which was permanent was the establishment of a strong kingdom with its capital at Lahore, which now first becomes known in history as a centre of government. The Ghaznavid rule in the Pandjâb outlasted that in the northern and western provinces of the empire, which fell into the hands of the Khâns of Turkistan or the Great Saljuqs of Persia, or in the centre, where the growing power of the Chiefs of Ghor gradually overshadowed that of Mahmud’s descendants; and Lahore was the last refuge of the kings of the dynasty. Mahmud’s fame is mainly based on his Indian conquests, and beyond the actual realization of his projects they had the effect of showing that, in spite of the bravery of the Râdjahs, Indi lay open to a resolute invader from the northwest, who, himself screened by an impenetrable mountain barrier, was able to strike the disunited tribes of the plains with such devastating speed and force, that they led to the final overthrow of the Hindu states of northern India by Mu‘izz al-Din two hundred years later. The weakness of the Ghaznavid monarchs was the want of a strong central body of supporters of their own race. They were themselves intruders, and were obliged to recruit their armies from various sources, wild Ghôrî and Afghàn tribesmen, Khoaj Turks, and even Indians from the new Pandjâb dominions. Such a rule could only be held together by strong personal influence, and no king after Mahmud was able to exercise such authority. In religion Mahmud was a strong Sunni. He admitted the authority and sought the recognition of the Khilafah al-Kadîr billah, even when he was a powerless tool in the hands of the Shî‘ah Buysids, and when he himself occupied the Bâyid territory in Persian ‘Irâk he put down the Shî‘ah creed with severity. In the same way he acted towards the Karâmî, whom he found still powerful in Mâltân and Manjura. In the eyes of his contemporaries his greatest glory was the spreading of the faith of Islam in pagan India and the destruction and plunder of celebrated shrines like Mathurâ and Sâmânthâ. His name is a household word in the east to the present day, and innumerable tales of a folklore type are told about him and his faithful servant Ayâz, some of which began to find their way at an early period into chronicles like the Djamî al-Ilâhâyât. His ill-treatment of the poet Firdausi is not mentioned by early writers, but some probability is lent to the story by Firdausi’s fierce denunciation of Mahmud in his ode.

Mu‘ammad On Mahommed’s death the process of disintegration soon began. Muhammad was ab-
sent in his government of Diwājdžan and Mas‘ūd (his twin brother) in his government of Ifshān. The supporters of the former called him to Ghazna and he was declared Amir, but he was rejected by the army, with whom Mas‘ūd as a bold leader was popular. Mas‘ūd on receiving an invitation to return proceeded towards Ghazna; a deputation went to meet him and Muhammad sent a force to stop them headed by a Hindū commander named Siwān (Siūn Nād?) but he failed to do so. The deputation met Mas‘ūd at Herāt and offered him the crown. Muḥammad was soon de-throned, blinded and imprisoned.

Mas‘ūd I. Mas‘ūd was declared king in Shawwal 421 (1030). His history is related in considerable detail by al-Balḥakī. He was of a bold and generous but rash disposition, a brave warrior but given to excess in drinking. He attempted to rival his father’s fame both to the east and west, but was more successful in India than in Mā wara al-Nahr where he was opposed by the rising power of the Sāljuqs under Ṭughrīl Beg. For details of his Indian wars see art. Mas‘ūd. Mas‘ūd engaged in various warlike adventures in the west in the intervals of his Indian expeditions. He took Kar- mān from the Bīyids in 424 (1032) but lost it again soon afterwards. In 428 (1036) he had visited Mā wara al-Nahr with a force containing a large Indian element, but without effecting much. Near the Sāljuq invasion was in greater force and Mas‘ūd made a desperate effort to arrest it. He met Ṭughrīl Beg at Dandānākān 431 (1040) and, after a hard-fought battle which lasted three days, met with a disastrous defeat. He retired on Ghazna through the hill country of Ghardjān, and immediately collecting his family and treasures marched into India, leaving his son Mawdūd to defend Balkh, while Madjdūd was sent to Lahore. His blinded brother Muḥammad accompanied the march, and a conspiracy was formed to dethrone Mas‘ūd in favour of Muḥammad. On reaching the Mārgala Pass between the Indus and the Dzhadhād, Mas‘ūd was seized and bound. [See art. Mas‘ūd.]

Muḥammad (2nd reign). Muhammad became Amir a second time, and his son Ajmad killed Mas‘ūd in prison at Ghala in 433 (1041). Mawdūd on hearing the news marched from Balkh to Ghazna and thence by the Kābul valley where he met Muḥammad’s army and defeated it at Nagrāhar in 434 (1042), and afterwards took vengeance on all his father’s murderers, “both Turk and Tadjīk”. Fathjābād, near Djalalābād, was founded by Mawdūd in honour of this victory.

Mawdūd. 433—441 (1041—1048). Mawdūd now succeeded to the throne, but displayed no qualities calculated to delay the disruption of his kingdom. His brother Madjdūd immediately rebelled and seized on the Sawārak province, lately annexed by Mas‘ūd, but he died suddenly not under suspicion of poison. The Hindūs were not slow to take advantage of the discord, and the Rājdā of Diḥī (a town recently founded) took not only Hānsi and Thānēsar, but recovered the Four and One code of Nagrad, Kānrā, and then advanced on Lahore, which was saved with difficulty. Three Rājdās are said to have joined in this attack. Mawdūd made no move to assist his harassed servants. On the western side the Sāljuq invasions continued. Mawdūd sent one general after another against them, but did not take the field himself. In 434 (1042)  Ṭukhrānī was invaded and the Ḥājbī Ṭariqīn who was sent against the enemy failed to save Balkh, and was disgraced and beheaded. In 436 (1044) we hear of the Sāljuqs as far south as Bāsī, and the next year they plundered both Bust and Kū- bāḏi Amir in Zanindawar, and advanced towards Ghazna. The general sent against them was named Ṭughrīl Beg. He inflicted a defeat upon them, but himself joined in traitorous plots and fled. The Ghōrī Maliks now took advantage of the Sāljuq invasion to throw off the Ghaznavide yoke. The general who succeeded Ṭughrīl Beg was named Bāsī-tīgīn. He obtained the alliance of one of the Ghōrī Maliks named Yāhā and attacked the other, ʿAbī ʿAli, who possessed a strong mountain fort. After this fort was taken Yāhā was executed as well as ʿAbī ʿAli. The Sāljuqs under Bahram Nīyā were defeated by Bāsī-tīgin near Bust, and he also put down a rising in Kūdār. The check to the Sāljuqs was only temporary and Mawdūd at length marched against them in person, but was taken ill after starting and returned to Ghazna where he died in 441 (1049).

Mas‘ūd II. An infant son of Mawdūd named Mas‘ūd was enthroned through a palace intrigue, but quickly deposed by ʿAbī ʿAli, a son of Mas‘ūd I.

ʿAbī ʿAli only reigned for two years, during which the process of decay continued, and the mountain Afghans, regarding whom we hear nothing since their punishment by Muḥammad, now began to take part in the internal discord. In 443 (1051) a successful rebellion was headed by ʿAbī al-Raṣīd.

ʿAbī al-Raṣīd. He was a son of Muḥammad and was with Mas‘ūd I at the battle of Dandānākān. He was declared Amir with the assistance of Nosh- tīgin Karkhi who became one of his generals and recovered the fort of Nagarkot from the Hindūs who had taken it in Mawdūd’s reign. Ṭughrīl Beg in spite of his treacherous conduct under Mawdūd is found still in command of the western army. As the former occasion he inflicted a fruitless defeat on the Sāljuqs and put down a rebellion in Sidjāstān, but immediately put his treacherous plot into execution, took possession of Ghazna, murdered ʿAbī al-Raṣīd and declared himself Amir.

Usūrpation of Ṭughrīl. Nosh-tīgin on hearing of these events marched from India towards Ghazna. Ṭughrīl was killed before his arrival, and he installed Farrukhzād, a son of Mas‘ūd I, who with his brother Ibrāhīm had long been imprisoned.

Farrukhzād. This prince relied mainly on Nosh-tīgin who successfully repelled an invasion of Cağhrī Beg (Dīwād) Sāljuq and his son Alp- Arslān. (The Ţaḥākārī Nāṣīr says nothing of this invasion which is recorded by Fīrāṣṭa). Farrukh- zād is also said to have earned popularity by remitting the taxes of Zabulistān ruined by frequent invasions. Farrukh- zād died in 451 (1059), like Mawdūd from a disease which seems to have been cholera.

Ibrāhīm. Ibrāhīm, his brother, succeeded to the throne peacefully. About the same time Alp-Arslān succeeded his father Cağhrī Beg (Dīwād) as governor of Khorasan, and, in 455 (1063), he succeeded Ṭughrīl as sultān of the whole Sāljuq empire. Khorāsān and Ţukhrāstān were now permanently lost to the Ghaznavide kingdom, which seemed on the point of extinction. Ibrāhīm’s long reign however restored some measure of prosperity. He
made peace with the Saldjûks, and married his son Masûd (afterwards Masûd III) to a daughter of Malik Shâh who succeeded Alp-Arsân in 405 (1072). This marriage had a great influence on subsequent history. He pursued the arts of peace with success and also strengthened his position in the Pandjab. He took the fort of Adshân on the Beas, now known as Pak-pattan and celebrated for the shrine of Bâba Farid (Shakarganj). Firishta mentions two other strong places which he took, Rûdpâl and Dêra. The latter was situated in a mountainous country, and may be Dêra Dîn. Ibârânîn is the first Ghaznavid monarch to use the title Sulţân on his coins in imitation of Tughrîl Saldjûk. He died in 492 (1099) after a reign of forty-one years.

Masûd III. His son Masûd succeeded and reigned for sixteen of those years. The conditions of his reign were similar to those of the preceding one. He enjoyed peace at home, and sent expeditions into India, one of which under Tughlîg-îrgân Hâdîjî of Lahore penetrated beyond the Ganges and brought back great spoil. The rise of the Ghûrî Malikis becomes noticeable in this reign. Izz al-Dîn Husain received the government of Ghûr in 499 (1099). Masûd III died in 508 (1113).

Shârîzîd. His son Shârîzîd who succeeded him was killed next year by his brother Asrânî. Asrânî assumed the crown in the Garmâr of Zamândâvar in 509 (1116) and the remaining brother Bahram Shâh fled to the court of the Saldjûk monarch Sandjâr who took up his cause. Asrânî insulted his father's widow, the sister of Sandjâr, the alliance with the Saldjûks was broken, and the temporary prosperity of the Ghaznavids came to an end. Sandjâr invaded Zâbulstân and advanced on Ghûr. Asrânî was defeated and retired on his Indian dominions. Bahram Shâh was set up in Ghûzna, but Asrânî returned and drove him out as soon as the Saldjûks had departed. Sandjâr returned and again took Ghûzna. This time Asrânî was captured, and appears to have been put to death. Cf. i. 463.

Bahram Shâh. [q. v., i. 580-1] Bahram Shâh's reign began in 511 (1117) and lasted till 547 (1153) but the independent monarchy of Ghûzna was now at an end. Sandjâr was his suzerain, and his name was placed on Bahram Shâh's coins below that of the Khalîfa (except on the coins of Indian type struck at Lahore). The Indian dominions were in fact the only part of the monarchy free from the Saldjûk power. Bahram Shâh's downfall was however due not to his Saldjûk suzerain but to the rapid rise of the chieftains of Ghûr. In the beginning of his reign he had to deal with the rebellion of Muhammad Bâhîm who had been governor of the Indian dominions. He attempted to assert his independence and built a fort at Nigor in the most remote part of Sâlta, a province which had been conquered by Masûd I, lost by Mawdûd, and apparently reoccupied afterwards, although of this there is no record. (For the importance of Nigor see Cunningham, Epithalites, in Transactions of Oriental Congress, 5th Oriental Congress, p. 241 and Thomas, Chronicles of Fathân Kings of Delhi, p. 47. Bahram Shâh encountered Bâhîm near Mulk and defeated him, returning to Ghûzna in 523 (1128). The rebellion of the Ghûr Chiefs was due to the murder of Kûb al-Dîn who was a refugee at Ghûzna by Bahram Kham's orders. His brother Sûrî, the principal malik, after driving Bahram Shâh out of Ghûzna for a time, was himself driven out by the latter who collected a force of Afgân and Khaljî Turks in the Kugûl valley. Sûrî was himself captured and executed with great ignominy, 543 (1148). Then Sûrî's successor Sâm with his brother Husain advanced towards Ghûzna, and Sâm having died, Husain ('Alî al-Dîn Husain, nicknamed Dzhâr-i-Dîn-sâzâ) took Ghûzna and ravaged it in a merciless manner, hence earning his nickname. Bahram Shâh probably recovered possession of Ghûzna for a short time after his departure, but accounts are contradictory. Husain, on his return march through Zamândâvar, destroyed the celebrated city of Bust, capital of that province. It has lain in ruins ever since, and Kandahâr soon took its place as the capital. Bahram Shâh died in 547 (1151).

Khusraw Shâh. His son Khusraw Shâh succeeded and would no doubt have received the support of his suzerain Sandjâr who had been at war with Husain, had not Sandjâr himself been defeated and taken prisoner by the Ghûz zôrd in 548 (1153). He died soon after his release four years later. The Ghûz rapidly overran the whole country, the Ghûris in their mountains alone being untouched. Khusraw Shâh was not in a position to resist them. He abandoned Ghûzna for the last time and the Ghaznavid kings henceforward held only the Indian territory. Khusraw Shâh died at Lahore in 555 (1160).

Khusraw Malik. He was succeeded by his son Khusraw Malik. (There is a good deal of discrepancy as to dates in the chronicles but the date 555 is fixed as being the year of the death of the Khalîfa al-Muktafî whose name appears on the coins of both Khusraw Shâh and Khusraw Malik). He was the last of the Ghaznavid Sulţân, and ruled the Pandjab till 583 (1187). The Ghûr Sulţân Mu'izz al-Dîn b. Sâm, who recovered Ghûzna from the Ghûz in 569 (1173), almost immediately began his invasions of India, but did not attack the Lahore kingdom till after his expeditions to the south. After the campaigns of Mûldâr, Nährwâla and Dêshâl he made his first attack on Pe-sâwar which belonged to Khusraw Malik, and threatened Lahore. He occupied and strengthened the fort of Sûyûkht in the country of the Khûkhârs, a powerful tribe, and made it an outpost of his rule. Khusraw Malik tried to retake it with the help of the Khûkhârs, and the Râdji of Djamân, who considered the Khûkhârs his own subjects, turned against Khusraw Malik and took the side of Mu'izz al-Dîn. The latter finally entraped Khusraw Malik by pretended negotiations, surrounded him and took him prisoner. Lahore and the Pandjab fell into the hands of the conqueror. The unfortunate Ghaznavid king was sent first to Ghûzna, then to Ghîyâs at Firishta and lastly to the fort of Balârwâm in Ghârdjistân, where he and his son Bahram Shâh were put to death in 587 (1191).

Thus the great Ghaznavid empire came to an inglorious end. Had it not perished when it did, it must inevitably have been swept away, like its successors, by the Mughâl flood, for it had no stability. It was a purely military rule with no national force behind it, and in absence of such a force must be fatal. Its fame is due to its having commenced the Muḥammandan conquest of Northern India, and established a firm foothold in the Pandjab which made Mu'izz al-Dîn's later conquests possible.
The coinage of the Ghaznavids is full, and affords a numismatic record of the principal events from Alp-tigin's rise to Khusraw Malik's fall. Particularly noteworthy are the small issues of Sabuk-tigin at Farwân, imitating in size and weight the coinage of the Hindu Shâhis, followed later by Muhammad and Mas'ûd I who adopted the horseman type used by the same kings, with their own names above the horseman in Kufic letters. Later kings assigned the half-bull from the same coinage and even borrowed the title 'Sâmanat Pêwa in Nâgâri letters from the Shâh coinage. Very remarkable also is Mahmûd's bilingual tânka in Arabic and Sanskrit struck at Mahmûdîpurg (Labore). Side by side with these Indian coins the regular issue of dinârs and dirhams, following the models of the 'Abbasid Caliphs, went on. Mahmûd's early assumption (during his father's life) of the title of Saif al-Dawla under the Sâmanids is illustrated by a dirham struck at Na'Hâpûr in 185, which bears the figure of a sword and the title Saif al-Dawla Mahommed b. Sabuk-tigin. The extensive coinage of Khurshûd and Tughârîstân issued from the mints of Herât, Na'hâpûr, Balkh and Walwaîz comes to an end in the reign of Mas'ûd I, as these places fell into the hands of the Saljûqs. The title Awdâr was the only one used at first. The chroniclers give Mahommed and his immediate successors the title of Saifân, but it does not appear on the coins till Ibrahim's reign.
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(M. LONGWORTH DAME.

GHAZZA, the ancient 'Azza, Greek Ταζα, an important commercial town in southwestern Judæa, near the coast at the intersection of the chief route to Egypt and several caravan routes from Arabia. The town belonged to the Phœnicians and was not taken by the Jews till the time of Alexander Jannaeus who had it destroyed. It was rebuilt by Gabinius somewhat farther south than the ancient town the ruins of which were still visible in the fifth century. The harbour of Maiuma (cf. Mitteilungen u. Nach- richten des Deutsch. Pal. Vereins, 1901, p. 62) was 2-3 miles away. Under Roman rule it belonged to the province of Syria Palestina and later to Palestine Prima. In Mahmûd's time it is described by Antoninus Martyr as a splendid and luxurious city, whose inhabitants gave a kindly welcome to foreign visitors. The town was of very great importance to the merchants of Mecca who sent their great caravan to Syria every year. According to Tradition the Prophet's great grandfather Hâshîm [1. v.] died in Ghazza and is buried there, which gave “Hâshîm's Ghazza”, as it was called, a particular sanctity in the eyes of Mus- lims; 'Omar also is said to have won his wealth there. When 'Abî Bakr sent a section of the Arabian troops to Palestine, the Patriarch of Ghazza was defeated at Dakhîn (Dâlîkhûrî, p. 169; cf. 'Abîrî, Amâulas, where this battle is confused with one in al-Ôrâbi or Tâdûn (Eutychius, Amâulas, ed. Pococke, ii. 258), about three hours east of Ghazza (cf. the article Dakhîn, which was soon afterwards taken by 'Amîr b. al-Ôsîy). Whether Sa'd's account of the siege of Ghazza by 'Allamûn b. Mudjahîzir has any historical value, remains to be proved; at any rate its details are a repetition of what is related of 'Amr himself. In 767 the celebrated jurist al-Shâhî was born in Ghazza. Towards the end of the viiiith century the town, like several others in the neighbourhood, was devastated by the bloody feuds of several Arab tribes. It recovered, however, for in the viiith century Ibn Hawîk al-Mukaddasî describe it as a large and wealthy city with a beautiful chief mosque. It must, however, have been laid waste again for, when the Crusaders came there, it was in ruins. In 1152 it was rebuilt by the Christians and a fortress built in it, which was granted to the Templars and garrisoned by them. It is from this period that Idrîs's brief mention of the city dates. The unfortified part of the town had been sacked with great cruelty by Salîh al-Dîn in 1170 but it was only after the battle of Hattin in 1187 that the citadel fell into his hands. Richard I. Coeur de Lion succeeded for a while in holding it again, but it was finally taken by the Muslims again who held it henceforth. On the division of country into mamlûkî Ghazza became the capital of one of them. In the xivith century Abu l-Fîdâ describes it as a town of medium size with a small fort and flourishing orchards which were separated by sandhills from the sea; Ibn Battûta on the other hand calls it a large, thickly populated town without a wall and with many mosques, including one newly built by Amir Džîwâlî, which had taken the place of the old chief mosque (perhaps the modern chief mosque, which it may be added, was originally a Johanne church of the xiiith century). In the xvith century Khalîf al-Ôzâhîrî speaks of Ghazza as the capital of an extensive mamlûkî and calls it a beautiful town in a flat country, rich in fruits and having mosques, schools and other fine buildings worthy of admiration.

At the present day Ghazza is very prosperous (about 40,000 inhabitants); the surrounding orchards yield a rich harvest and the market is a very busy one. Many pieces of marble from the ancient buildings are built into the houses but otherwise the town is not rich in relics of antiquity. The above mentioned harbour of Maiumas is certainly mentioned by Mukaddasî, al-Bakri and Idrîs as Mâmus or some such name. The last named, however, says that the harbour of Ghazza is Tela, which al-Bakri merely mentions along with Maimûs; it is the ancient Anthedon, the site of whichGatt has discovered an hour's journey N.W. of the town.


GHÉBA. A MUSLIM tribe of Râjdâ'it origin associated with the Dājjāl tribe, and occupying a considerable part of the Pindi Ghēb Tābiṣ of the Aṭār District, Pandājāb. Though not a large tribe they have a good social position. They are a branch of the Puwar Râjdâ'it and related to the Tiwâna and Siyâl tribes. Legend provides them with three founders, sons of Râj Shâqar Puwar, named Taqī, Muhammad and Ghōs; the first ancestor of the Tiwânas, the second of the Siyâls and the third of the Ghēbās. The Ghēbās were nearly independent till subdued by Randjī Singh. The period of their conversion to Islam is not known.


(M. LONGWORTH DAME) GHIJĀR, an Arab tribe, belonging to the Mādâ'ī (lám̄a'dī) group. Their genealogy is: Ghijar b. Mulāqī b. Daṣīr b. Bakr b. 'Abd Manṣūr b. Kīnāna; they were closely allied to the Hughail.

They lived in the Hidjâz. The following places belonged to them: Âdīnā (near Mecca), Baṭn (near Usfān, also given as a hill), Shadakh (in common with the Uslam), Ghika, Wadān (both the latter between Mecca and Medina), al-Tanāšāb and the hill of Muslih.

In the year 6 (629) the Ghījar adopted Islam. In the same year they took part in the conquest of Mecca by Ommāna, Ihwâna, Dhu'lainīn, Sa'la'nain, Asad, Kâis and other tribes under Khaṣīd b. al-Walid. After the death of the Prophet, they recognised the Caliph Abī Bakr and fought for his party against the rebel tribes.

from Dihīl and persuaded his father to take up arms against the outcast. Khusraw was defeated on Sept. 5th 1320, and on the following day Taghlāk was proclaimed emperor. The restoration of order in the capital occupied him but one week, and, after modifying the harsh laws of the Khālidī and founding his new capital of Taghlakābād, he dispatched his son, now styled Ulugh Khān, into the Darakhan. Details of Ulugh Khān’s campaigns cannot be given here but he carried his arms to the extreme south of the Indian Peninsula. The defeat of an expedition against Warangal has been variously attributed by historians to a military mutiny and to the failure of Ulugh Khān to persuade the whole army to join him in a rebellion against his father, but he had no difficulty in convincing Taghlāk of his innocence, and in 1324 was summoned from Telingān to act as regent during the absence of Taghlāk, who had resolved to lead an expedition into Bangāl, where two brothers, Shihāb al-Dīn Bughrā and Ghiyāth al-Dīn Bahādur, were contending for sovereignty. The former submitted and the latter was captured, and on his return towards Dihīl Taghlāk was received with great pomp in a temporary pavilion which had been erected by his son at Aghānpūr, six miles from Taghlakābād. The building fell and crushed its occupants, and Ulugh Khān has been accused by some historians of having contrived the disaster, but many circumstances, besides the clumsiness of the structure, combine to render his guilt doubtful. Taghlāk died in February or March 1325.

**Bibliography:** Barani, Tūrīkī Firuz-Slāḥī; Niẓām al-Dīn Ahmad, Taḥqīqāt Akkārī; Bāḏānī, Muntakhab al-Tawāruqī; Firishtā.

**GHIYĀTH AL-DĪN TAGHLĀK II.** Fourth emperor of Dihīl of the Taghlāk dynasty, was the son of Fath Khān, eldest son of Firuz Shāh Taghlāk. On the death of Firuz in Sept. 1388, his second son, Muhammad, was in rebellion, and Taghlāk was placed on the throne in accordance with his grandfather’s will. He attempted, without success, to crush his uncle’s rebellion, and, after he had reigned five months, he and his minister Malik Firuz Khāndžāhān were put to death (Feb. 19th 1389) by Malik Rukn al-Dīn Canda, and his cousin Abū Bakr was raised to the throne.

**Bibliography:** Niẓām al-Dīn Ahmad, Taḥqīqāt Akkārī; Bāḏānī, Muntakhab al-Tawāruqī; Firishtā.

**GHMĀRĀ.** (Gumera in Leo Africanus.), a Berber tribe in the western Maghrib. Ibn Khaldūn says it lived along the Maṣṣātīn coast and traces it back to Gomār, a son of Maṣṣātī, or, according to another tradition, son of Meṣṭāl b. Mellī b. Maṣṣātī. The Ghomārā are divided into a large number of clans (Beni Hamid, Mettwa, Beni Nal, Aqīshāwa, Beni Wazzawāl, Medjikassa etc.), which are still to be found at the present day among a number of Rif tribes. It is rather difficult to define exactly the territory occupied by the Ghomārā. According to Ibn Khaldūn, it was five days’ journey in length (from the “plains of Maghrib” to Tangier) and about the same in breadth (from Ḫsanām to the Wādf Wergais). It ran down the coast between Aṣṣāl and Aqsa and here adjoined the lands of the Berghawāṭa. Al-Bakrī no longer reckons the district of Tangier and Ceuta to the Ghomārā and gives Nukrū in the east and Karūšā in the west as their boundaries.

The Ghomārā were settled in this part of the Maghrib long before Isām was introduced into these regions. Conquered by Mūsā b. Nuṣair, they became converts to the new religion, but in the second century A.D., they adopted Khaṭṭāridi doctrines and took part in the rebellion of the Mārās. Even after the defeat of the Khaṭṭārids they still showed themselves disposed to heretical doctrines however. “Their rudeness and lack of culture”, writes Ibn Khaldūn, “prevent them recognising the truth in matters of religion.” It therefore followed that they attached themselves in great numbers to the false prophet ʿAbd al-Muṭṭāfīr “the forger” (cf. the art. Ṣaḥāmī). He belonged to the tribe of the Meṣākka, appeared in the district of Tetuā in 913 (915) and fell in 915 (927-928) in a battle against the Maṣṣātī. Ḥamīm gave his followers civil and religious laws, limited the fast of Ramāḍān to three days, abolished the command to make the pilgrimage and composed a ʿĀrān in the Berber language, from which al-Bakrī and Ibn Khaldūn quote a few passages. At a later period another prophet named ʿĀsim b. Ṣafī al-Yazadjūnī appeared; in 1285 (1288) a rebellion broke out instigated by a certain Abū ʿIṣāwādžīn, who claimed to be a prophet and magician. The Ghomārā have always had a particular fondness for magic. Al-Bakrī makes a number of references to it and Ibn Khaldūn says that the black art was particularly practised by young women.

As to the political history of the Ghomārā, they have undergone many changes. From the iiith-ivth (viith-xith) centuries the eastern part of their lands belonged to the kingdom of Nukrū. One of their chiefs named ʿAbd al-Muṭṭīn attempted in 971 (761) to seize the reins of government there held by the Beni Ṣāḥīb, the descendants of the founder of the Nukrū kingdom, but failed. On the division of the Idrisid kingdom, the eastern tribes passed under the Idrisids and their descendants. They remained loyal to them even after the Idrisids had been driven from Fāris by the Fāṭimids and stood by them to the last in their wars with the Spanish Umayyads. After the disappearance of the Idrisids from the scene (264 = 974) the Ghomārā first recognised the suzerainty of the Umayyads, then that of the Ṣaḥmādīs of Ceuta until the coming of the Almoravids. On the rise of the Almohads the Ghomārā hastened to adopt the new teaching and assisted ʿAbd al-Muṣūmin in his expedition against Ceuta (541 = 1146). But this loyalty to the Almohads the particular city of the Caliph, did not last long. Abū Yaḥṣīb in 562 (1166-1167) had to take the field in person to suppress a rising led by a Ghomārā chief named Ṣebā b. Manṣūrāḥ. The rebel was defeated and slain and Abū Yaḥṣīb appointed his brother to govern Ceuta and watch the Rif.

The Marinids also found it difficult to conquer the unruly Ghomārā. They only succeeded in subduing them by taking advantage of the feuds between the various ʿAṣiffs. But this conquest was by no means permanent. “At the present day”, writes Ibn Khaldūn (trans. de Lane, ii. 157 et seq.), “the Ghomārā have become powerful tribes; they are numerous; they pay homage and tribute however to the Marinid government as far as the latter
can extort it from them; but as soon as the government once shows itself weak, it has to order troops from the capital to bring the tribes back to their allegiance. Protected by inaccessible mountains, they do not hesitate to offer an asylum to members of the royal family and to all rebels who seek refuge with them. From the xvth century onwards details of the history of the Ghomāra are entirely lacking; their name is still mentioned by Leo Africanus, however, in the xviith century and it is still borne by a powerful tribe of Djebala.

Bibliography: al-Bekri, Description de l'Afrique septentrionale, transl. of Slane, p. 288 et seq.; Ibn Abī Jahlīn, Bergeffès, transl. of Slane, ii. 153, 144, 156 et seq., 197 et seq.; Leo Africanus (ed. Schefer), i. 19 et seq.; E. Fagnan, L'Afrique septentrionale au xixe siècle de notre ère (Kīṭāb al-lahshī), Constantin 1900, p. 45 et seq., 144-147; Moullères, Maroc inconnu, ii. 291-355. (G. Yver.)

GHÔR a mountainous country now included in Afghanistan [q.v. i. 149] occupying the block between the Helmand valley and Herat, and corresponding roughly with the modern Hazarastan, occupied by the Hazara and Căhār Aimaq tribes. The country gave its name to the Ghōrīs [q.v.] who succeeded the Ghaznavids in power. Ghōr formed part of the kingdoms of the Sāmānids and Ghaznavids. The Ghōrīs themselves were conquered by the Shāhs of Khārizm and shortly afterwards, in the early part of the viiith = xiiiith century, the country came under Mongol rule, and Firūz-kōh the capital was destroyed. The population, formerly Iranian, became from that time largely Mongolian, as it still remains, [see under art. AFGHANISTĀN i. 151, 154]. The name Ghōr gradually disappears from history, and has not been in use in modern times.

Bibliography: For authorities see under art. FIRUZKHÔ, p. 142 and GHÔRIDS. (M. Longworth Dames.)

GHÔRIDS. The family of the Maliks of Ghōr claimed an illustrious Iranian descent, and took the name of Shansabānī from Shansab a supposed descendant of Zuhāk, but nothing is known of their actual history before the time of the Safāfīs, when Yaqūb b. Laith invaded Zamīndāvar and Būst. At that time the mountain region of Ghōr (sometimes called Mandēsh) was under a Malik named Sūrī, and the population were not yet converted to Islam. His son Muḥammad who was attacked by Muḥammad Ghaznavī was also stated in the Rawat al-Safā'ī to have been still a pagan, in spite of his name, and al-ʿOtbi calls him a Hindū. Muḥammad took his stronghold in the year 400 (1009) and carried the chief into captivity, where he is said to have poisoned himself. His son Abū ʿAlī, who was put in his place by Muḥammad, no doubt had embraced Islam, and is said to have built Masjdids. Nevertheless he was seized and imprisoned by his nephew Abū bābās after Masjd had succeeded to the throne of Ghazna. ʿAbd Allāh seems to have been built himself a strong castle in the mountains of Mandēsh. Masjdids himself is stated by Bāyhaḵī to have conducted warlike operations in the Ghōr country against chiefstains named Abu l-Ḥasan and Warmāsh, but all alliance is made to Muḥammad, Abū ʿAlī or ʿAbdābā. It is probably that there were at that period several tribes in Ghōr under separate chiefs, and that there was no central government. ʿAbbās seems to have continued in power under Ghazna suzerainty until he was dethroned by Sulṭān Ibrāhīm who put his son Muhammad in his place. Through this comparatively peaceful period, when the raids of the Saljūqs were suspended, the power of the Ghaznavid monarchy was evidently sufficient to exact obedience from the hill chieftains. The maliks who succeeded Muḥammad were Kūṭ b al-Dīn Ḥasan and ʿĪzīz al-Dīn Ḥūsain. The latter came into collision with Sulṭān Sandjar the Saljūq ruler in 501 (1007), and was taken prisoner but released after two years (strange to say a similar story is told of ʿAlī al-Dīn Masjīdīs, and as both were called Ḥūsain it is probable there has been some confusion). After this his allegiance appears to have been divided between the Saljūqs on the west and the Ghaznavids on the east. Maṣūd III confirmed him as chief in 493 (1099). After his time the family divided into the two branches of Ghōr and Bāmiyān. ʿĪzz al-Dīn is said by Ṣafṣī to have died in 545 (1150), but this is evidently too late a date. His son, Saʿīf al-Dīn Sūrī, succeeded as principal chief, being the eldest of the sons by a mother of high status. They had another brother, however, named Ṣafīr al-Dīn Maṣūd, the son of a Turkish woman, and another, the son of a serving woman, named Kūṭ b al-Dīn Muḥammad. Sūrī made a division of his father's dominions awarding a part of the mountain tract of Ghōr called Warṣāhā (perhaps corresponding to the Taimani country of to-day) to Kūṭ b al-Dīn, who founded there the fortress of Firūzkōh and was known as Malik al-Dībāl. Fakhr al-Dīn received the northern territory of Bāmiyān with Ṭūkhrāstān and, according to the Ṭābrīzī Naṭrī, even Shāhān, and the country up to the boundary of Wāskh and Badakhshān, but it is clear that his authority over the more remote parts of this region must have been very slight. The later history of the Maliks of Bāmiyān may be here briefly given before continuing that of the main Ghōrid family. Fakhr al-Dīn was succeeded by Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad who is said to have extended his power to Balkh and Badakhshān, and to have subdued Ṭūkhrāstān, which evidently had not been really subdued before. He took the title of Sulṭān with the consent of his uncles of Ghazna who had, by this time risen to great power as will be seen. His son Bahāʾ al-Dīn Sām succeeded him in 588 (1192) and reigned till 602 (1205) when he died (soon after the murder of Muʿizz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sām). His son Djalāl al-Dīn ʿAlī who held power after him, assisted his brother ʿAlī al-Dīn to seize the throne of Ghazna, and himself obtained greatbooty. ʿAlī al-Dīn having been expelled from Ghazna by Valduz, Djalāl al-Dīn again assembled a force said to consist of Ghōrī, Ghuz and Beghū (or Eastern Turks), but met with no success. He was himself taken prisoner by Valdūz, but was released and recovered possession of Bāmiyān which he had meanwhile been usurped by his uncle ʿAlī al-Dīn Maṣūd. Djalāl al-Dīn continued to reign till the invasion of ʿAlī al-Dīn Khwārizm-Shāh, when he was defeated and put to death 612 (1215). Bahāʾ al-Dīn and Djalāl al-Dīn were rulers of great importance and the last of the Shansabānī race to enjoy real power. Coins of both of them are known. It is necessary now to return to Saʿīf al-Dīn Sūrī and carry on the story of the main line. The origin of the insurrection of the Ghōrī
Maliks is not very clear, but apparently the Malik al-Djibâl quarrelled with his half-brothers and took refuge with Bahram Shâh in Ghazna. It is probable that this was connected with the enmity between Bahram Shâh and Sultan Sanjar who had been making overtures to the Ghûrî Maliks. Whatever the cause, Bahram Shâh became suspicious of the Malik al-Djibâl and put him to death by poison 54 (1140). Sûrî, who had marched on Ghazna which he took, Bahram Shâh retired into Kâram and there assembled an army of Afghans and Khâlîjî. Meanwhile Sûrî had declared himself Sultan at Ghazna and made over Ghûr to his brother Bâhâ al-Dîn Sâm, but on the approach of Bahram Shâh the leading men of Ghazna rose against him. He attempted to retreat to Ghûr, but was surrounded, captured and executed.

His brother Bâhâ al-Dîn Sâm who succeeded him in 544 (1149) had already taken charge of Ghûr in his absence and completed the unfinished town and fort of Fûrûzkoh abandoned by the Malik al-Djibâl when he went to Ghazna. On learning of the death of Sûrî he collected an army and marched towards Ghazna, but died at Kidān on the way in the year of his accession. His brother 'Alî al-Dîn Hûsain succeeded him, and took up the work of avenging his brothers. Bahram Shâh's army met him near Tughnaibâd in the province of Zamindawar but was defeated, Daulat Shâh, son of Bahram Shâh, being killed. The chroniclers enlighten upon the valiant deeds of two champions in 'Alî al-Dîn's army both named Kharmis, who fought with Bahram Shâh's war-elephants. Nearer to Ghazna Bahram Shâh's troops twice attempted resistance, but 'Alî al-Dîn defeated them and took Ghazna by storm. His revenge was terrible. The city was laid waste and its inhabitants slaughtered; and the remains of the later Ghaznavi monarchs were dug up and burned. The name of Djalâh-soz was given to 'Alî al-Dîn on account of this terrible event. He did not attempt to hold Ghazna, being threatened on the west of his kingdom by Sultan Sanjar Schîlût. Some chroniclers assert that Bahram Shâh was dead and had been succeeded by Khusrâw Shâh before the fall of Ghazna but this is improbable. The author of the Tabakât-i Nâṣîrî states that he recovered Ghazna after 'Alî al-Dîn's departure. The latter, after leaving Ghazna, marched by way of Hâst, which he utterly destroyed so that it has been a ruin ever since, and then spent some time in his capital Fûrûzkoh till roused by Sanjar's advance. The armies met at Nâb in the valley of the Hari-rûd. 'Alî al-Dîn was deserted by his Turkish and Khâlîjî Ghuzz troops. The Ghûrîs were defeated and 'Alî al-Dîn taken prisoner. After a time he found favour with Sanjar who restored him to the throne of Ghûr. He re-established his power and extended it northwards, getting possession of the Murqijbâb valley (Ghârdjîstân) and the plain of Tâlûk. The retreat and capture of Sanjar by the Ghuzz probably made this development possible, and 'Alî al-Dîn was himself at Herât at the time of his death in 551 (1156). His son Saif al-Dîn Muhammâd succeeded at Fûrûzkoh. The two sons of Sâm, Ghiyât al-Dîn and Mu'izz al-Dîn, who had been imprisoned by his father he set at liberty, and also began a persecution of the Malâhidâ who had obtained influence in 'Alî al-Dîn's time. He was soon recalled by the incursions of the Ghuzz who were rapidly increasing in power, and was defeated and killed in a battle with them near Marv in 558 (1162). It is said his death was due to the treachery of his general Abu'l-Abbâs in revenge for his brother Warmâsh whom Saif al-Dîn had killed through jealousy, Ghiyât al-Dîn b. Sâm was with him at the time, and was brought back and raised to the throne by the army at Fûrûzkoh. Mu'izz al-Dîn who had been at Bâmâyâm with Fakhr al-Dîn joined his brother and became his principal support. They soon killed Abu'l-Abbâs, and then had to meet an attack from their uncle Fakhr al-Dîn assisted by Tâdž al-Dîn Yâlûz of Herât. Fâkhr al-Dîn considered that the Ghûr territories should belong to him and not to his nephew, and obtained the support of the rulers of Herât (Yılduz) and Balkh (Kimûdî), no doubt Turkish chiefs. The Ghûrî chiefs met their army at Râgh-i Zarîs in the Hari-rûd valley and defeated them. Both Yûlûz and Kimûdî were killed and the latter's head was sent to Fâkhr al-Dîn. The defeated uncle was received with ironical courtesy by his nephews, who however released him and restored him to his own territory of Bâmâyâm. Ghiyât al-Dîn then proceeded to liberate other parts of his territory from the intruding Ghuzz, who had taken possession of Ghazna after the death of Saif al-Dîn Muhammâd the year before, and retained it till 569 (1173) when Mu'izz al-Dîn conquered them and got possession of the old Ghaznavî capital. The last Ghaznavide kings had abandoned it and made Lahore their capital. Ghiyât al-Dîn then installed his brother Mu'izz al-Dîn as Sultan at Ghazna, himself retaining the suzerainty over that kingdom and the actual rule over Ghûr, as may be seen from the coins, on which Ghiyât al-Dîn appears as al-Sultan al-zâ'im and Mu'izz al-Dîn as al-Sultan al-mu'âsa'dam. Ghiyât al-Dîn himself operated against Herât which had fallen into the possession of one of Sultan Sanjar's descendants named Tughril, and obtained possession of the city in 571 (1175); but no doubt it was recovered by Tughril who was not finally disposed of till 588 (1192). Ghiyât al-Dîn also received the admission of Tâdž al-Dîn Harîb, Malik of Sîdjiştân, who accepted his suzerainty, though it is not the case as stated by Râverty in a note on p. 192 of his translation of the Tabakât-i Nâṣîrî that the name of Sultan Ghiyât al-Dîn was put on the coins (see B. M. Cat. Oriental Coins, Additions, vols. i. to iv. p. 268). Mu'izz al-Dîn after consolidating his authority at Ghazna began to conduct expeditions into India where the Ghaznavi king Khusrâw Malik was still reigning at Lahore, while Mûlûtân had fallen back into the hands of the Karmâtians who had been expelled by Ahmed. He took Multân in 570 (1174) and Ueth soon after. The latter place was held by a Râdž of the Bâstî tribe, and according to Fîrîstâ Mu'izz al-Dîn obtained possession of it through an intrigue with the Râdž's wife. In 574 he marched to attack Bihm Dîv king of Nahâvûl (Ahnahûla on the Gwârjîstân coast), but was defeated and forced to retreat. In 575 (1179) he took Peshâwar and threatened Khusrâw Malik at Lahore, and in 578 (1182) he turned south again and took Dûbûl on the sea-coast of Sind. In 582 (1186) or perhaps the following year he defeated Khusrâw Malik and obtained possession of Lahore (see under Ghaznvîs), and from that time onwards the Ghûrî kings,
having destroyed the last remnants of the dynasty of Mâhmûd, considered themselves heirs to all his conquests. In 588 (1192) Mu'izz al-Din joined his brother in repelling an attack of Sultan Shâh, a son of the Khwârizm Shâh, who was finally defeated at Râdâbâr on the Murgâb River. Tughril of Herât who had joined Sultan Shâh was killed in this battle, and the unfortunate Khwârazm Shâh was put to death the same year. Nâşâpur was taken from the Khwârizm Shâhīs in 596 (1199) or perhaps the year after, but was not held for long, and the rising power of 'Alâ' al-Din b. Takash, the Khwârizm Shâhī, soon became predominant in Khurâsân, although Ghîyâth al-Din and Mu'izz al-Din were able to hold him at bay as long as they lived, and Mu'izz al-Din was able to prosecute his Indian conquests.

Ghîyâth al-Din died in 599 (1202) at Herât leaving a very wide-spread empire. His brother Mu'izz al-Din was at that time in Khurâsân. On succeeding to the throne he bestowed the government of Ghôr on his cousin Ziyâ' al-Din, who took the name of 'Alâ' al-Din Muhammad. Mu'izz al-Din during his brother's life had been pursuing his schemes of Indian empire since his conquest of the great state of Ghaznâvids. Immediately after his occupation of Lâhore, in 597 (1191), he took the strong fort of Bhâjinda on the Hârârâ and leaving Ziyâ' al-Din in charge advanced towards the Jâmmâ to attack the Râdâj of Dihîlî. (It may be noted that in many histories of this period Mu'izz al-Din is alluded to by his earlier name Shâhâb al-Din).

Since Mâhmûd's invasions the great kingdom of Kânâdûj had recovered some of its former prosperity under the Ghahârwâr dynasty which had succeeded to the Pratihâtras. Dihîlî, a recent foundation, had been taken a short time before from the Tomara or Tuwar tribe by the Çauhâns whose capital was at Adîmîr. The Çauhâns Râdâj at the time of Mu'izz al-Din's invasion was Prithvi Râdâj, popularly called Rai Pithûrâ, who was married to the daughter of the Râdâj of Kânâdûj with whom he had eloped. He was a bold and successful warrior, and is still famous in folklore. The kingdom of Adîmîr and Dihîlî stood in the way of a conquest from the northwest, and must first be subdued before Lâhore. In 597 (1191) he took the strong fort of Lâhore, in 598 (1192) he attacked the Râdâj of Dihîlî. It was therefore against this kingdom that Mu'izz al-Din's efforts were directed, and in Prithvi Râdâj he met a worthy antagonist. Prithvi Râdâj met him at Tirîrât, accompanied by his brother Gobind Râi (or Khandi Râi), governor of Dihîlî. A desperate battle ensued in which Mu'izz al-Din was wounded by Gobind Râi, and saved with difficulty by one of his Kâhdûj followers. His army met with a defeat and was forced to retire on Lâhore.

Prithvi Râdâj advanced on Bhâjinda to which he laid siege, but Mu'izz al-Din appeared in the field again in 598 (1192): Prithvi Râdâj who had just gained possession of Bhâjinda thereupon fell back to his former position at Tirîrât. (The name is given as Tarân by some chroniclers and Tallâwari by others, but Tirîrât is the actual name and was so in Firîsha's time. It is situated between Kurnâ and Thânêshar). Here he was again attacked by Mu'izz al-Din, this time with complete success. Gobind Râi was killed in the battle and Prithvi Râdâj in the pursuit. This last battle restored the power of resistance. The whole territory of Sâwâlakh southwards to Adîmîr, including Hânsi and Saisût (now Sirsâ) fell into the conqueror's hands. The Sultan returned to Ghaznâ leaving his general Kûb al-Din Aibâk to prosecute his conquests, Mîrâj was soon taken by this commander and Dihîlî the next year. In 590 (1193) Mu'izz al-Din again took the field and advanced against Kânâdûj. He was met by the Râdâj Djaîê-ând at Chandwâr near Ištâwa not far from Kânâdûj and on the banks of the Djaîâmâ. Djaîê-ând was killed in the battle and over 300 elephants taken. Next year he took Thânêshâ (now Bîhâna); and Gwâîfîyâr soon followed. Kûb al-Din carried on the conquests south of the Adîmîr kingdom into Ujîjâjâin and Anîllîwârâ (Nahrâwâ) where Bhîm Dîr who had once repulsed Mu'izz al-Din was now defeated. Another Khwârazm Shâhî, Kâhîlîîîî called the war into Bûhâr, which he subdued, destroying Hindu and Buddhists shrines in great numbers. He also took Nadîa (Nadia) and drove out its king Râi Lakhmania, who took refuge in Bâng (Bengal). Lakhnauti now became the Muhammadan seat of government. Kallândâr was also taken by Kûb al-Din in 599 (1202) and succeeded to the supreme government. In 601 (1204) he organized a powerful army to invade Khwârizm and put an end to 'Alâ' al-Din Muhammad's depredations, but was unsuccessful and had to retire followed by the enemy. He was defeated by Izz al-Din Husain, one of his principal maliks, and was for a time in great danger. He escaped to Ghaznâ with the wreck of his army. An outbreak then took place among some of the Pandjâb tribes, especially the Khokhars near Lahore; the same tribe that had turned against Khwârazm Shâhî in favour of Mu'izz al-Din. The Sultan marched into the Pandjâb and punished this tribe. On his return march while encamped at Damyâk on the bank of the Indus he was assassinated by a fanatic of the Malàhîda, whom he had persecuted at an earlier period. The Khokhars have also been accused of the actual assassination by confusion of names, but responsibility has been placed on the Gakhars; but the Tâbâkî-kî Nâjîrî, by far the best authority, supports the account here given.

The death of Mu'izz al-Din broke up the Ghôrîde empire. The power in India passed to the Turkish slaves and generals. Kûb al-Din remained at Dihîlî and Tâdâj al-Din Yâldûz who was in Kûrmân (the Kûrm valley) took possession of Ghanâ, defeating the Ghôrîde maliks of Bûmîyân. Ghîyâth al-Din Mâhmûd, son of Ghîyâth al-Din Muhammad succeeded to the chiefship of Ghîyâth and was replaced to something like its original importance, and deposed and imprisoned 'Alâ' al-Din Muhammad who had been installed by Mu'izz al-Din. Sultan Mâhmûd continued to rule at Firîshkîh, and at the request of the Khwârizm Shâhî imprisoned there the latter's brother 'Ali Shâh. He was assassinated by 'Ali Shâh's followers in 609 (1212). His son Bâhâ al-Din succeeded and 'Ali Shâh was set at liberty, apparently as a defiance to the Khwârizmî monarch. The latter then turned on the attack and took Firîshkîh and added to the whole of Ghôr to his kingdoms. 'Alâ' al-Din Utmuz, a son of Djaîê-ând, became nominal Sultan under Khwârizmî suzer-
aignty; he was attacked by the Ghaznavi forces by order of Valdzu in 611 (1214) and killed. Ala’ al-Din Muhammad who had been imprisoned in 602 was again made nominal sultan by Yaldzu, but after the latter’s death next year he surrendered to the Khwarizm-Shah and was taken in 612 (1215) to Khwarizm where he died some time after. In the same year, as already related, the last of the Bâkap Khan branch of the Ghorid family were swept away by the Khwarizm-Shah, and the dynasty was now extinct.

The territories in Ghur, Ghazna and Khorasan now formed part of the Khwarizm kingdom, soon to disappear before the advancing Mughals. The Indian conquests although they passed away from the family were still more permanent. The Turkish slave generals continued its traditions, and took from Mu’izz al-Din their title of Mu’izz Sultan. The most faithful of these slaves Tadj al-Din Yaldzu who reigned in Ghazna, Kâramân and Banîyân (Banû) till 612 (1215) continued to put Mu’izz al-Din’s name on his coins as suzerain, and called himself ‘his servant’ (âhrâm). Kutb al-Din never even struck coins in his own name, but called himself “Mu’izz al-Din Nâsir of Minhâj-Dî Siradj” (Raverty’s trans., London 1881); see also Thomas, Chronicles of Pathân kings of Delhi, London 1871; Depréry, Histoire des Sultan ghorides, extrait de Mirkhor, Paris 1844; Hamd Allah Mustawfi, Ta’rikh-i Gucida (ed. Browne), 1, 406–413; Elliot and Dowson, Hist. of India, London, 1869; Firîsta’s History (text of Lucknow). For coins, see B. M. Catalogues (Oriental coins, Additional Vol. i. to iv. and Sultan’s of Delhi); Elphinstone, Hist, of India, London 1866; Raverty, Notes on Afghanistan, London 1880 (M. Longworth Dames).

GHORI DYNASTY, the, of Mâliva, was founded by Husain, entitled Dilawar Khan, an amir of Firuz Shah Taghlab of Dihli claiming descent from Shihâb al-Din Muhammad b. Sâm, Dilawar Khan, having been appointed governor of Mâliva by Muhammad Shâh, son of Firuz, became independent in 1401, after the overthrow of the empire of Dihli by Timur. He died in A.D. 1405–1406, and was succeeded by his son Husâh, who was suspected of having poisoned him. Husâh, who built the fortress of Mâlûd, was chiefly occupied during his reign in unsuccessful warfare with Gadjurât. In 1420 he reduced the Gond kingdom of Kherla to the condition of a tributary state, and in 1422 led a raid into the distant Hindu kingdom of Djânjâd and returned with much plunder. In 1423 he besieged Gâlvâsî without result, and in 1428, having forced Ahmad Shâh Bahmanî I to raise the siege of Kherla, pursued him, but was defeated. In 1433 he captured Kâlpî. The last years of his reign were embittered by disputes between his sons, the eldest of whom, Ghazân Khan, was, not without opposition, raised to the throne under the title of Muhammad Shâh on Hûshân’s death in July 1435. Muhammad Shâh’s debauchery and his cruelty towards his brothers and their sons alienated the affections of his subjects, and he foolishly quarrelled with his powerful cousin and brother-in-law, Ma’mûd Khan Khâlaâd, to whom he owed his throne. Ma’mûd Khan caused him to be poisoned and the amir’s proclaimed Muhammad’s elder son, Ma’sûd, a boy of thirteen years of age, king, but Ma’sûd and his brother ‘Umar Khan fled the throne, after having been declined by Malik Mughîth. Ma’mûd’s father, was usurped by Ma’mûd, and the kingdom of the Ghorids, passed in A.D. 1436, to the Khâlaâds.

Bibliography: Firîsta; Ta’rikh-i Akbari. (T. W. Hâig.)

GHRUSH (T.), ghirsh or birâh (L.), the name of the heavy silver coin of Turkey, translated by piastre in European languages. The Oriental nations borrowed this name from the Slavonic-German form of the word grossus (gros, gros, groot, Groshen). The national coin of the early Ottoman empire was the âkâs, a small silver piece, which had evolved from the half and third dirhem of Western Asia and weighed about 15 grains at the time of the foundation of the Ottoman empire but fell in weight very rapidly. The last âkâs’s, which were struck at the end of the xviii century, weighed only 2 grains. So small a coin, the only piece intermediate in value between the gold and copper coins, could not serve the purposes of commerce, so that silver coins of all the countries of Europe also circulated in Turkey. Soon after the appearance of the great in Europe (the earliest was the gros tournois of Louis IX., struck in 1250, weighing 60 grains = 12 deniers) it must have found its way to Turkey also, for we find the word ghrush officially mentioned as early as a berât of Sultan Bayazîd I. of the year 795 (1392). The same must have been the case with this talar, but it has not yet been clearly explained why the Ottomans never gave the same name ghrush to the talar as they had formerly given to the given. Perhaps the transition of the name was facilitated by the “Guldengroschen” (uncliess) struck in South Germany at the end of the xv century or by the “Dickgroschen”, the immediate predecessor of the talar. In any case it is certain that the word ghrush had already undergone this change of meaning as early as the reign of Selim I. (918–926 = 1512–1520). Sulimân II. (1099–1102 = 1689–1691) was the first to take the final step of striking this large silver piece in his own mint, at least no Turkish piastre of an earlier reign has as yet been found. This national ghrush was struck on a standard of 6 (Constantinople) dirhems (296 grains), i.e. considerably lighter than the Austrian taler (valued at 9 dirhems) which was then the pre-dominant coin in Turkey. (This Austrian taler was struck at the rate of 9.75 to the Vienna mark of 4380 grains and therefore weighed 442 grains, from which weight divided by 9 we actually get the Constantinople dirhem weight of 49.4 grains). After the âkâs had been finally supplanted by the new small silver coin, the pâra (q. v.) the relationship between the ghrush and the pâra was fixed at 40 : 1, which still holds. The fractions of the piastre were the sozola (q. v.) of 30 pâras, the sirmilık or half piastre, onbâšík, onbaşik and bešlik; its multiples were the altinshyk, ıskılık.
in the reigns of Mahmud I. and Opthan III. (1143–1171 = 1730–1757) the weight (although not the value) was temporarily raised and the ghirsh approximated to the Austrian taler (c. 475 grains) with the accession of Selim III. (1503 = 1789) a rapid depreciation of the weight and value of the alloy began, which lasted till the currency was definitely reformed by Sulthan Abul-Majid in 1250 (1843). This last reform transformed the piastre to a small coin weighing 19 grains of .83 fine silver and worth about two pence.

Ghirsh were struck not only in Constantinople but in the North African vassal states of Turkey also, in inconsiderable numbers however and only after the reign of Mustafa III. (began in 1171 = 1757). The first ghirsh were issued in Egypt under Ali Bey in 1183 (according to the inscriptions but probably not till 1185), on a standard of c. 5 drachms = 2.4888 grains and halves of c. 2.52 drachms = 1.24 grains; they were to contain .5 fine silver but hardly attain V/4. They were worth 40 and 20 pâras (called medina [q. v.] in Egypt) respectively. The same coins but still more reduced in weight and value were also struck at the mint in Cairo during the French occupation.

**Bibliography:** See the authors cited in the article FUNDUKLY, ii. 116b.

(G. E. ZAMBAI.)

GHUBAR (A.), "dust," an exceedingly fine kind of writing, the lines of which are finer than hairs and which requires to be read with the aid of a glass. It may be used in any of the various calligraphies. — It also is the name of a kind of decimal figures, which are very similar to the Hindu-Arabic numerals.

**Bibliography:** Cf. Huart, Calligraphes et Miniaturistes, p. 53; S. de Sacy, Grammaire Arabe, i. 91 and vii. (C. Huart.)

GHUDDUWAN, a large "village like a town" (according to the Rakhâtât Ain al-Hayât of 'Ali b. Husain al-Kâshî, MS. of the University of St. Petersburg, Or. 293, f. 123) six farsakh from Bukhârâ, the birthplace of the saint ‘Abd al-Kâhlîk Ghudduwânî (viţ = xiiî century) is mentioned at an early date by Nâshrâhid (ed. Schefer, p. 56) and in his account of Muhammedan Bukhârâ (second = viiiî century) and probably dates from the pre-Muslm period. In the viţ = xiiî century there was a much frequented weekly market there (cf. the text of Samânî in Barthold, Turkestân ve epokhu mongolskogo muzhestviya, i. 123, note 6).

In the xîî = xviî century Ghudduwânî appears as a strong fortress and the key to Bukhârâ (‘Abd Allah Bâkhrî in Barthold, Zapiski vest. otd. arkh. obsh., xv. 202); Bâbur was defeated here by the Uzbeks in 918 = 1512 and this ended the rule of the Mirzâs in Mâwarî al-Nahr. At a later period Ghudduwân is mentioned as one of the seven tâmen in the neighbourhood of Bukhârâ (‘Abd al-Karim Bâkhrî, ed. Schefer, p. 77) and there is still a tax-collector (Amâlkâtî) stationed there.

(W. BARTHOLOD.)

GHUDDUWÂNI, KHWÂJÂ ‘ABD AL-KÂHLÎK, a famous Sufî, born in the village of Ghuđduwân (see preceding article); almost nothing is known of his life except that he studied under Shaikh Abû Yaḵtîb Yûsuf Hamâshânî in Bukhârâ and died in 575 (1179–1180). Hâjî Khâlâf, vi. 444 mentions his waqâyî (admonitions) and some of them are given in Dîmâni, Naṣrâhî al-‘Unî, ed. Lees, p. 431, and in Cod. Leid. 1051 (2). The Nakshbandis hold him in particular reverence, whence his name appears in the sanad of this order. Further material for his biography may perhaps be found in the manuscripts described by Peri eddine, (which exist elsewhere however also but are not accessible for publication): Cod. Gothanus, Cat., p. 123 and Cod. Berol., Cat., no. 260. Cf. also Rieu, Cat. of Persian MSS. (Brit. Museum), 862a and Heribet, Bibliothèque orient., s. v. Aqduani.

GHUFRÂN (A.), pardon (of sins).

GHUL. For the ancient Arabs the ghlû (fem. pl. ghulûn and aghwal) was a peculiarly bestial, diabolic and hostile variety of the mûrids of the dîjîn which allured men from their path by assuming different forms, then fell upon them unawares, destroyed and devoured them. In the root seem to lie two ideas: 1. changing into different appearances and 2. treacherously assailing and destroying. There are many references to them in the early poets. According to the Aghânî (vol. xvii. 209 et seq.). Ta’áb-baţa-Sharran spoke frequently in his verses of them; see especially his description of one (ibid., p. 212 foot) and his boasting of his companionship with them as a wanderer of deserts (ibid., p. 210 top). It was said to be the same as the sâli (pl. sâliûn) which had a similar power of transforming itself and which was called on that account the sorceress (râhîa) of the djîn. The masculine of the ghlû was said to be the kûfrûk. It is plain that the word ghlû is a descriptive, for it can be used, and not apparently as a metaphor, of any destruction which comes upon a man; so even of spiritual things in the Tîrâq ‘alî, ed. Dâjûghânî, sub voce and Horton, Theologie des Islîm, p. 335. Otherwise a man could hardly have been called Abu ‘l-Ghul (Hamâsa ed. Freytag), p. 12) and Ka‘b b. Zuhair in his Burdu-poem could not have compared Su‘âd, even in her changeableness, to a ghlû. For some reason Muhammed disliked the word, and only one derivative from the root occurs in the Kurân (xxvii. 46) ghlûn, "insidious destruction," used of the effects of wine (cf. Mufradât of al-Kâhî, p. 375). In a tradition also, he declares that there is no such thing as ghlû (Isâ, xix. p. 21, il. 10 et seq.). This has justified Muslims, especially Mu‘tazilites in denying the existence of the ghlû altogether, e.g. Zamakhshari on Kur. xxxvi. 46 (ed. Calcutta, p. 1205). But others held that it was only the changing of appearance (taqâhwawil) which the Prophet denied, and they quoted traditions from him telling how to drive away the ghlû by reciting the alâhân. For the mediaeval system in which the ghlû is fully accepted, see Damiri sub voce, also under sâliût and kûfrûk; Jâyakar’s transl., vol. ii. 47 et seq. Kazvîni classifies the ghlû among the diabolic (mutsakhâjâna) djîn (ed. Wüstefeld, i. 370) and that is overwhelmingly the later attitude. In the popular mind ghlû (also ghulâ; similarly kûfrûk) was an ordinary word for cannibal, whether human or demon, and thus became equivalent to the European ogre, and the standard ‘Mîrînî’ told elsewhere of ogres are connected with them. For Persia see Sir John Malcolm’s Sketches of Persia, chap. xvi.; for Egypt, Spitta’s Contes arabes, by vocab. under ghul; for North Africa, Stumm, Miräch en Triopolis, passim; for Turkey, Kuno, Türkische Volksmärchen, by index under Dew and Dohîn and passim. See also in Arabian
Bengal. This work, entitled Riqāḍ al-Salājīn, was completed in 1788, and is the fullest account in Persian of the Muhammadan history of Bengal. It was published in the Bibliotheca Indica, (1890-1891). Ġulám Husain died in 1233 A.H. (=1817). 

**Bibliography:** The Riqāḍ al-Salājīn, a history of Bengal by Ġulám Husain Sālim, translated from the original Persian, by Maulavi Abdūl Sālim. (Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1902—1904), pp. 2—5.

**ĠULĂM HŪSAIN KĀN B. HĪDĀYĀT ĂLI**

**KĀN AL-ĠUŚĀNI AL-ṬĀṬĀRĀBI, histōriān,**

born 1140 A.H., author of Siyar al-Mutu‘akhhīrin (or Manners of the Moderns), a history of India from 1118 to 1195 (=1707—1781), comprising the reigns of the successors of Awrangzēb [q.v.] and an account of the progress of the English in Bengal, together with a critical examination of their government and policy; printed in India several times, e.g. Calcutta, 1836, Lucknow, 1866; translated into English by Raymond (Hāji Muṣṭafā), Calcutta, 1789; a revised translation by J. Briggs (only one English edition published), London. 

**Bibliography:** Asiat. Annual Register, (Characters, p. 28—32) (London, 1802); Elliot-Dowson, viii. 194 et seq.; Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS. Brit. Mus., i. 260.

**ĠUMDĀN, a castle in Śaṅcā, in the Yaman, famous for its size and splendour. Hamdān and other contemporary geographers give very full descriptions of it, but by that time it had long been merely a gigantic ruin. It is said to have been already destroyed when the Abyssinians conquered the Yaman in 325 A.D. It was then rebuilt, however, for, according to an oft quoted verse, which is ascribed by some to the father of the celebrated Aμaiya b. Al-Salīl, it was the abode of Da’h Yāzān’s son, after the Persians had conquered South Arabia about 570. Several authors say that it was the Caliph Othmān who finally destroyed it, but D. H. Müller considers this to be probably a malicious invention. In any case its destruction was connected with the Muslim conquest of the country. From several poems, whose South Arabian origin is confirmed in an interesting way by a number of technical expressions which are also found in Sa’abi inscriptions, we learn that the castle was built on a rock and that the lower part was built of freestone and the upper part of polished marble. According to Hamdān, the ruins lay opposite the two first east doors of the chief mosque; he was still able to see a stronghold on the top, where the Karmatians had encamped in 908. E. Glaser has actually discovered, northeast of the chief mosque, a large mound of ruins in the lower part of which were many beautiful freestone blocks; the large mosque has been built of the debris of the ancient castle as the style and size of the stones show. 

**Bibliography:** Ibn Hīṣām (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 26 et seq.; Tābarī, Annals (ed. de Goeje), i. 928 et seq., 957 (cf. the commentary under nām); Kāmīl (ed. d’Hervey), 239—245; D. H. Müller, Burgen und Schlösser Sudarabias (Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, phil. hist. Cl., xxiv., 1879, p. 345—351, 385—390; Behri, Geogr. Wörterbuch (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 299, 464, 698; Biblioth. geogr. arab., i. 24; li. 31; v. 35 (cf. the commentary under dir), vi. 136; vii. 110 et seq.; Yākūt, Al-Muḳādām (ed. Wustenfeld), iii. 811 et seq.; Corpus in-
AL-GHUMDAN — AL-GHUTHULLI.

schriftumsemitticarum, Vol. iv. part i. 3 et seq.; Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien, i. 418, 421. (FR. BUHIL.)

AL-GHURAB (A.), "raven", the name of a constellation in the southern sky (corvus), cf. Karwint, Kosmogronie (ed. Wustenfeld), i. 420.

GHURABIYA, a branch of the Shī'ıi "exaggerators" (ghalāt q. v.). Its adherents believe that 'Ali and Muhammad were so like in physical features as to be confused, as alike as one raven (ghurāb) is to another. (A proverbial expression, cf. Ziteckher, f. Ayyub., xvii. 55), so that the Angel Gabriel when commissioned by God to bring the revelation to 'Ali gave it in mistake to Muhammad. 'Ali was, they say, appointed by God to be a Prophet and Muhammad only became one through a mistake. It is related that in the fourth century A.H. the holders of this view in Kūm raised a serious revolt against the decision of the judge Abu Sa'id al-Jaṣārī (died 328 = 940) when he divined an inheritance equally between two claimants, one of whom was the daughter and the other the uncle of the deceased. The Ghurabiyā demanded that the whole estate should go to the daughter and the uncle be quite excluded; as our authority rightly observes, this was the result of their political creed, according to which the succession to Muhammad was only legitimate in the line of his only daughter Fātima and not in that of his uncle ("Abbas") (Subki, Tabāsir al-Ghurabiyīn, ii. 194). Cf. the regulations made by the Caliph al-Muzāz regarding the inheritance of daughters in Ibn Hādjar, Ras' al-Isrā', ed. Guest (in the appendix to al-Kindi, Governors and Judges of Egypt, Gibb-Memorial, xiv.), p. 587, 3 from below. Ibn Dji-bair, who visited Damascus in 580 = 1184, mentions the Ghurabiyā among the minor sects to be found in Syria.


GHARAMA. [See GHARIM.]

GHURSH. [See GRUSH.]

GHUSL is the so-called "major" ritual ablution, which the law ordains for a ghunbat, i.e. a man who is in a state of major ritual impurity (cf. the article DAINABA, i. 1012). The ghusl consists in washing the whole body. The formulation previous to the niyya (intention) is indispensable for this and the believer has to be careful that not only is every impurity removed from his body but also that the water moistens every part of his body and his hair.

Bibliography: The chapter on purity (tabaqu) contains much tradition and the Fiḳh books, R. Strothmann, Krönitz der Zaiditen (Strassburg 1912), p. 21 et seq.; A. J. Wensinck in Der Islam, i. 101 et seq.; iv. 219 et seq. (TH. W. JUNGBOLL.)

GHUTA is the name given to the girdle of gardens that surrounds Damascus; it is the intensively cultivated area, watered by the delta and the canals of the Baradã (q. v., i. 652b), extending from the exit of this river from the gorges of the Anti-Lebanon to its disappearance in the Lake of 'Ataba, the ancient "Sea of Damascus", a number of lakebeds only intermittently filled with water. The Ghūta is protected by this network of ponds with their reedbeds from the advance of the desert. The area reclaimed on the east looks like a green mountain spur thrust boldly into the sea of sand" (Maspéro). The name Ghūta is found in the Umayyad poets, Ibn Kās al-Ruṣayfī and in Ḥādhīḵ, where it is designated by the Prophet as the scene of a future great battle (Mardzā Kāhī, i. 313). It is the rich oasis that Damascus [q. v., i. 902b et seq.] owes the glory of ranking as one of the four "paradises on earth." Tradition said that Abraham was born here and points out the hill which served Iṣkā and his mother as a refuge (kūrān, xxiii. 52). Its greatest diameter is from west to east. The statements of the authorities on its area vary: 18 square miles or 2 days' journey (masūha) in length and one in breadth. It is entirely covered with gardens and plantations — particularly orchards, from which come the celebrated fruits of Damascus, notably apricots, which are exported great distances — with villages buried among them, quite recalling the "dībāt al-ghūṭa wa l-'ilām" of Ibn Kās al-Ruṣayfī (ed. Rhodokanakis, p. 209). Several of these villages, says Sāliḥ, possess the importance of towns, such as al-Mizza, Dāraya, Ḥarasta and Dūmnā. Others have disappeared like Dair Mūrān (q. v., i. 587), Bait Lāḥīja, which Sāliḥ proposes to identify with a quarter to Damascus. The same writer also mentions the Druzes, Tāyūnīna (i.e. those who come from the Wadi 'l-Ta'm, on the western slope of Hermon) as already here. According to the old geographers, the Ghūta was occupied chiefly by the Banū Ghassān (cf. GHASANIDS), then by the Banū Khāl and various groups of the Kās, Sāliḥ counted 5345 bots or estates and 530 vineyards in his day (5th century A.H.); cf. the interesting monograph which he has devoted to the Ghūta: Dar al-faqqā, favourablely distinguished from the mass of these books by its contents. He deals with the house and its parts, with all the pleasures of life and sport and the accessories required for these. He illustrates these subjects by anecdotes and verses from the later poetry, thereby giving us a very rich wealth of material, which is still far from being exhausted, for the study of the history of Muslim culture, similar to the Kitāb al-Mawāridhī, to which it is superior.
however in the greater area covered by its subject matter. The book was printed in two volumes in Cairo in 1299-1300 A.D. (C. Brockmann).

GUZZ, the Arabic name for the Oghuz branch of the Turkish people. This seems to have been the name of the great people who united all the tribes from China to the Black Sea into one nomad empire in the viiith century A.D.; in the Orkhan inscriptions of the viiiith century they are also called Torkuz-Oghuz (“the nine Oghuz”) so that they were divided into nine tribes. On the linguistic and ethological relationship of the Oghuz to other Turkish peoples opinions differ; Kamber is in favor of the Sogdian-Turkic etymology C. P. Petrona, Zaşski Imp. Kuzuk Gogr. Okul., po otdeleniym etnografii, Vol. xxxiv. p. 547 et seq.) to prove that Oghuz is to be identified with the Mongol oirat (properly oyirat) has found no support, any more than the equation to Ughor and Uighur proposed on the same philological grounds by different scholars (B. Munkacić et al.). The Torkuz-Oghuz (called Tughuz-guzh by the Arabs) are mentioned for the last time in the west in 930 = 820-821, when they are said to have invaded the land of Qara-Turkestan (Tabari, iii. 1044). The geographers of the viiith century and later call the people living in the west Guzhu alone without the addition of a numeral. These Guzhu were the immediate neighbours of the Där al-Islām from Djarlān on the Caspian Sea to Fāraib and Asbīdāb in the Sir-Darya territory; in the west their territory was bounded by the lands of the Khazars and Bulghar, in the east by the lands of the Khūrāsh, in the north by the lands of the Kaimak (in Turkm. Kirgiz), cf. Ištakhi, ed. de Goeje, p. 9; on the other hand they reached the land of the Taghughuz from the Där al-Islām, who had to traverse the whole of the broad territory of the Khūrāsh, more than 30 days’ journey, setting out from the eastern frontier of Farghāna (Ibn Hawkal, p. 11). The boundary between the Guzhu and the Kaimak was formed by the upper course of the river Ilī, i.e. the Kama (Ištakhi, p. 222); in the same century a section of the Guzhu had separated from their fellow-tribesmen and migrated to the previously uninhabited peninsula of Siyāılak (Manqhaš) (ibid., p. 219). The headquarters of this people were on the lower course of the Sir Darya (Ibn Hawkal, p. 393). According to Ibn al-Athir (ed. Tornberg, xi. 177), these Guzhu had separated from the Tughughu in the time of the Caliph al-Mahdi 158-169 = 775-785 and even at this early period adopted Islam; in reality Islam only began to spread among the Guzhu in the viith = viith century; one section of them had adopted Christianity perhaps even earlier (Aṣifinar, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 394). The Muslim Guzhu were also called Turkmān (Turkman): this name (of uncertain origin), which was later to supplant the name Güzhu utterly, first appears in Muğaddas (ed. de Goeje, p. 274 et seq.). The migration of the Guzhu to Muslim Turkistan began towards the end of the viiiith = viith century; they first settled at Nūr in Būkharā; at an even earlier period Constantine Porphyrogenetos mentions the advance of another branch of the Güzhu (Oguz), called Torki in the Russian annals) westwards over the Volga against the Pečenegs. In the viith = viith century considerable bodies migrated in both directions; in Western Turkistan the Güzhu or Turkomans, sometimes as robber bands and sometimes under the leadership of their chiefs, penetrated all the civilised lands up to the Mediterranean sea; in the west the Uz crossed the Danube in 1065 and ravaged the Balkan peninsula as far as Thessalonica and Hellas but were soon afterwards almost exterminated by the Pečenegs and Bulghars; the remainder entered Byzantine service and seem afterwards to have become merged in other peoples. The campaigns of conquest of the Güzhu had nevertheless great influence on the ethnographic conditions of Western Asia. The Saljūq dynasty which arose from among the Güzhu gradually succeeded in subduing all the land from Chinese Turkistan to the frontiers of Egypt and the Byzantine empire. The Saljūqs seem to have been fond of settling their unruly relatives on the western frontier of their empire and thus Asim Minor and the northern provinces of Iran received their Turkish population. Only one movement of the Güzhu in the east of any importance is mentioned; in 548 = 1153 the tribes settled around Balkh rose against Sultan Sanjar, a rising which resulted in the taking prisoner of the Sultan and the devastation of Khwarasan and several other provinces, but these events only affected periodical conditions for a brief period and ethnographic not at all, as far as can be seen. The lands abandoned by the Güzhu on the Sir-Darya and north of the Caspian Sea and Sea of Aral were occupied by the Kipchak (also written Khīfchak), a branch of the Kaimak (40 Gardizi in Barthold, Oetc. v Poljedke v Srednymi Aziyu, p. 82). As early as 421 = 1030 we find the Kipchak mentioned as neighbours of Khwārizm (Baihaqi, ed. Morley, p. 91 at the foot); Najīr-i Khwāsaw (in Browne, A Literary History of Persia, ii. 227) already uses the term “desert (daghat) of the Kipchak” afterwards adopted by the Muslim geographers, in the same sense as Ištakhi (p. 217 et seq.) at an earlier period uses the term “desert of the Güzhu” (mazfisat al-Güzziyā). Ibn al-Athir (xi. 54) mentions the division of the Güzhu into two groups of tribes, the Usuk and the Bukuz; we do not learn further details of this division, or of the 24 tribes of the Güzhu and their common ancestor, the eponym hero Güzhu Khān till the Tu’rrikhi Ghusāni of Rašid al-Dīn (cf. the article GHAZAN, ii. 149b et seq.); the same authority gives the totem (onghūr) and seal (lamgha) of each tribe. Oghuz Khan appears as early as this as a Muslim hero; geographically also the saga is for the most part localised in Western Asia, Egypt and Europe (even the Franks are subdued by Oghuz Khān). Another version of the same saga, still free from Muslim colouring, in the Uighur script, but composed in a dialect differing from Uighur (such Persian words as dōst and dūshman are also found in it), has been published by W. Radloff; nothing is known of the origin of this version or the date of its composition. The geographical proper names mentioned in it refer mostly to Eastern Asia and suit the Mongol period; a similar saga was utilised by Rashid al-Dinn in another section of his work (in the section on the Turks; cf. Baran Rosen in Collections Scientifiques, iii. 99 et seq.) and by Abu-l-?khāzī. All that is given by later Muslim writers on the last-mentioned Khan and the 24 tribes of the Oghuz may be traced to the Tu’rrikhi Ghusāni; this is particularly true of the Tu’rrikhi Alī-i Saljūq, whose author has taken the alleged claims of Chingiz Khan from the Tu’rrikhi Ghusāni and simply substituted Oghuz
GHUZZ — GIBRALTAR.

Khan for Çingiz Khan. Led astray by this falsification, a Turkish scholar has recently propounded the thesis that we have the foundations of the celebrated fātā of Çingiz Khan in the book of laws of the Oghuz Turks (cf. M. Hartmann, Der Islamische Orient, iii. 37 et seq.). As late as the xiiith century the Turkmans of the Caspian Sea still considered Uz Khan (for Oghuz Khan) as the ancestor of their people (Galkin, Etnografiske i istoriske materiali po srednii Asii i Orenburgskomu krayu, St. Petersburg 1865, p. 5); popular legends of his life and deeds are not yet known.

In Asia Minor even in the Ottoman period the "times of the Oghuz" (Oğuz-namâ) were for long remembered: every sanga handed down by the hards (ażain) about the past was called an Oğuz-nâmâ; a collection of such legends is preserved in the Kitâb-i Dede Korkud which is preserved in a unique manuscript in Dresden (Fleischer, N°. 86). The Korkud or Korkut, who appears in this book, is also known on the Sir-Daryâ (the erstwhile abode of the Oghuz) and in the Turkoman steppes as a saint, bard and sage; similar legends were also current at one time in Ağhar-dağlıjan, at Derbend (cf. i. 943, 2601 et seq.) and in Asia Minor.

The view propounded by Inostrezzew (Zapiski vost. отд. archh., xx. 040 et seq.) that this Korkud may be identical with the Korkud b. 'Abd al-Hamîd, mentioned by 'Imâd al-Dîn Işfâhânî (ed. Houtsma, p. 281 et seq.) and by Ibn al-Athîr (xi. 54), will hardly hold; the sanga must certainly be older and have been known to the Oghuz even at the beginning of their wanderings; its wide dissemination cannot be otherwise explained.


G'aur Dagh, the Turkish name for the Amanus mountains, to be more accurate, for the northern part of the range [cf. i. 312].

GIBRALTAR, a rocky limestone peninsula belonging to Great Britain in the S.E. of the Spanish province of Cádiz [q. v., i. 810] almost the most southerly point in Spain (3 miles from N. to S., greatest breadth one mile with an area of 2 square miles and greatest height 1439 feet) with a town and harbour of the same name lying along the gentler western slope, with 28,000 Spanish, English, Jewish and Moroccan inhabitants (including a garrison of 7000 men). Being the key of the Mediterranean it is very strongly fortified and honeycombed with batteries; in the Bay of Gibraltar or Algeciras (q.v., opposite it in the west) there was in ancient times the European pillar of Hercules (Herakles = Phoenician-Punic Melqart from Malkart = king of the city), also called Calpe or Alyba Mons, opposite (15 miles) the African Columna Abyla or Abenna, the modern Ceuta [q. v., i. 836 et seq.] with Castillo and Monte del Acho (600 feet high) and Punta de la Almina (but not along the strait like the whole chain of the Sierra Bullones [as Haedonis still has it] or of the Djebel Müssî [called after Müssî b. Nuṣair]. The very ancient Carteia (Calathes) on the most northerly point of the Bay of Gibraltar, east of the mouth of the Guadarranque, seems to have been of Iberian origin in spite of the Phoenician name, and played a part in history under the Carthaginians as a seaport; in 171 B.C. it received the first Roman colony on the peninsula and under the Arabs was called Karşadîne or Cartagena, Nova, in the xviith century by Inostrezzew (Zapiski vost. отд. archh., obh., xx. 040 et seq.) that this Korkud may be identical with the Korkud b. 'Abd al-Hamîd, mentioned by 'Imâd al-Dîn Işfâhânî (ed. Houtsma, p. 281 et seq.) and by Ibn al-Athîr (xi. 54), will hardly hold; the sanga must certainly be older and have been known to the Oghuz even at the beginning of their wanderings; its wide dissemination cannot be otherwise explained.


G'aur Dagh, the Turkish name for the Amanus mountains, to be more accurate, for the northern part of the range [cf. i. 312].
the Guzmans de Medina Sidonia till 1502, when it lapsed to the crown. In 1540 Gibraltar was plundered by the Algerian corsair Khaïr al-Ajdâr, but strongly fortified by Charles V till 1552; after this it was from here in 1610 that Admiral Don Juan de Mendoza shipped the banished Moors back to Africa. During the war of the Spanish Succession Gibraltar was taken over by the English in 1704 and had subsequently to suffer severe sieges, notably in 1779–1783 under General Elliot against the French and Spanish.

**Bibliography:** Idris, Description de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne, p. 177 = transl. 213; Geographie d’Alvisefda, p. 68 = transl. 85; Marzâd al-İşqârî, v. 23 et seq.; Ibn Khaldûn, Histoire des Berbîres (Slane), iv. Index, Encyclopædia arabica (Dâ’îr al-Mâ ARRî), vi. 383–386; Seybold, Zur spanisch-arabischen Geographie: die Provinz Cádiz, Halle 1906 (s. Cádiz); Baederker, Spanien und Portugal 4 (with plan); Gayangos, History of the Muhammadan Dynasties in Spain, ii. 355 “Gibraltar was afterwards taken from the Bení Merin by Muhammad, surnamed al-Ghântal-bilâh” and Index s.v. Jâhal-Târik, “recovered by Mohammed 11” has misunderstood Ma’kûrat’s text i. 295; it is rather the conquest of Algeciras in 1369 by Muhammad V (not IV) that is referred to (G. F. Seybold).”

**GILÂN** (properly land of the Gils, Gilâr, 1824), a province of Persia, south of the Caspian Sea and north of the Elburz chain. It is bounded in the east by Tabarestân or Mazandaran, and its northern limit is marked by the junction of the Kur and the Araxes; its political boundary with Russia, however, is marked by the Astara stream. The chief town is Resht. The interior is swampy (whence the popular etymology of the name from gîl “mud”) and covered with woods and mulberry groves; the mountainous part bears the name Dâlîlam; the natives call themselves Gilanîk. The Safíd Rûd flows into the sea near Lâhijân. The silk industry and the cultivation of rice flourish in it. The perpetual moisture of the climate has a relaxing effect; the mild and wet winter is broken by the bîdî garm (warm wind). Seen from the above, the forests have the appearance of a vast sea of green; in them a kind of tiger, resembling that of India, is found.

According to the recent reforms Gilân forms an independent wilyâyat of the first class with Resht as capital and its seaport Enzelî [q.v., ii. 28] ranks as a village. The population numbers about 250,000 and revenues amount to 20,278 tûmanî. The province is divided into 4 bâlis: Tawâlis (chief town Kergâne-rûd), Lâhijân, Lenge-rûd (with Rûdar and Râhîk) and Mandjîl with (Râmestâbâd). It was formerly divided into five districts: Râneku, Lâhijân, Resht, Fûmen and Gesker. Fûmen was once considered the capital and the most important places were Tûlem, Lâhijân, Bimashar, Kütûm, Salûs and Dëjsâm. The natives, however, only recognise the geographical division of the province into two districts by the Safíd-rûd: Biye-pâ (district of Resht) and Biye-pâchi (district of Lâhijân); in the dialect of the country riverine, a river (Ahmed Rûst, Haft Iklâm, quoted by Scheler, Ghazân, Pers., ii. 104; cf. Melgunof, p. 230, note: Dorn, Caspia, p. 45). After remaining for long independent Gilân was conquered by Hâlûqî, who raised the fortifications of Shamîrân to the ground in 1227, and was finally incorporated in Persia by the Safawids; under

**ʿAbbas I the capital was Resht. Ṭâlîsh in the north was separated from it and the greater part ceded to Russia by the Treaty of Gulistân (1813).**

Vâdît mentions a tribe named Djilân, which emigrated from İstâkhr to Bahrain; according to a verse by İmrû’ al-İkás they entered the service of the rulers as miners and masons (Van Vloten, Wien. Zeitschr. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenl., viii. 1894, p. 62); it is probably Gils that are referred to.


**AL-GILDâRÎ** (DîlÎdâkî) ʿAllî b. Aidâmîr b. Ṭâlî, according to other authorities, ʿIzz al-Dîn Aidâmîr b. ʿAllî, author of a number of works dealing with occult sciences, notably alchemy which are detailed by Brockelmann, Gesch. der arab. Litterat., ii. 139, who gives the following as printed: al-Miṣlîhî fî Arrâr ʿIbn al-Miṣfût, Bombay 1812, and Nâṣîrûdî al-Fîkîr fî Awâl al-Haǧrûr, Bûlât n. d. Almost nothing is known of his life; all that is certain is that he composed one of his works in 740 (1339) in Damascus and another in 743 (1342) in Cairo. 743 (1342) is usually given as the date of his death; Brockelmann, however, also gives 762 (1361). **Bibliography:** See Brockelmann, op. cit.

**GILGIT.** A province in the extreme N.-W. of the Indian empire, the capital of which is the small town of Gilgit, situated in a valley 4800 feet above sea-level on the Gilgit R. which is a tributary of the Indus. It is surrounded by great mountain ranges, and is opposite to the gap leading to Hazna, beyond which the northeastern Hindî Kush separates it from Wakhân and the Murâgh from Chinese territory. The population belongs to the Sinh race, and the Sinh language, one of the Pâkštâ group, is spoken. This race is probably mainly Hindu, the people are good cultivators and fond of sport, light-hearted and cheerful, but with a reputation for treachery. The routes by which Gilgit is approached from India lead down the Gilgit R. to its junction with the Indus near Bundji, and hence to Kâshmîr by the Trâgbal and Burzil passes or to Abbottâbâd by Cîlás, the Bûbasar pass and the Kâhglân valley. In Gilgit the whole population is Muhammadan, mainly Şî‘â, and not fanatic. Little is known of the earlier history. In Pârânúúa lists the Cînas (or Sinhs) are classed with the Dardas. Al-Bîrûnî mentions Gîlût, and says that the people speak Turkish and their king is called Bhatta Šâh. It is improbable that Turkish was actually spoken, but the Sinh still claim relationship with the
Mughals of India. Till recently Gilgit was under kings of the Trakhán family, from a former king Trakhán who reigned in the 14th cent. and established the Muhammadan faith. The title of the kings before that period was Šah, but since then it has been Šāh-rah. The country is also said to have been formerly called Sârgin, and afterwards Gilût.

In 1841 the last of the legitimate rulers Karim Khân was expelled by Gauhar Khânum (or Gauhar Aman) a member of the Khânghâwti family of Yâsin who made himself master of the country, and proved to be a cruel tyrant. The expelled ruler took refuge with the Sikh governor of Kashmîr, who invaded Gilgit and set up Karim Khân again in 1842. He ruled under Sikh suzerainty, and when Gulâb Singh Dôgra became Mahârâjâ of Kashmîr in 1846, Gilgit passed to him and the other Sikh possessions. In 1852 however, Gauhar Khânum attacked and routed the Dôgras while they were invading Hanza, and Karim Khân was killed. The Dôgras recovered possession in 1860, and shortly afterwards Ala'dâd Khân, an infant, was installed by them as Khán. He was a son of the ruler of Nâgra, but was considered to be a representative of the Trakhân family. The Gilgit agency under Biddâlpur was first established in 1877, and renewed afterwards under Durand in 1889. In 1895, at the time of the Citrâl war, Gilgit was occupied by a small force which advanced on Citrâl via the Shândur Pass. (See art. Citrâl.) The country has continued to form part of the Kashmir kingdom, but the relations with the local chiefs are controlled by the British agent at Gilgit. Bibliography: Biddâlpur, Tribes of the Hindu Koosh (Calcutta 1880); Hollich, The Indian Frontierland, London, 1901; Capt. W. R. Robertson, The Citrâl Expedition, Calcutta 1898; Grierson, The Piarâ language, London 1906. (M. Longworth Dames.)

Gîmbrî, Gînîbî. [See Çinbûr.]

Gîrây, a Tâtar dynasty, which ruled the Crimean peninsula for three centuries (ixth—xiiith — xvth—xvith). The accounts of the beginnings of the dynasty and the deeds of its founder Hâddjî Gîrây b. Ghîyâth al-Dîn b. Tagh-Timûr, a prince of the kingdom of the Golden Horde are very meagre and contradictory. His earliest coins are of the years 845 (1441-1442) and 846 (1441-1442). He laid the foundations of his power at a considerably earlier period with the help of the rulers of Lithuania and Poland, on whom he afterwards continued to rely till his death (871 = 1466). We have no reliable information on the origin of the name Gîrây. According to local tradition the tutor (âtâdî) of the prince is said to have belonged to the tribe of Gîrây (this tribal name is still known in Central Asia where it is pronounced “Kirîy”). Ahmed Waffik Pasha says in his Dictionary (p. 1043), without giving authorities, that Gîrây is a Mongol word, pronounced “Garîy” in Mongol and used with the meaning “meritorious, worthy, qualified” (mustâhâkah, ﮒﯿﮐﯿﭘ, ﮒﯿﭘ). Hâddjî does not seem to have intended to transmit this name to his descendants; only one of his sons, Mengli, and he not the eldest nor the immediate successor of his father, bore the name Gîrây; on the other hand this name was given to every prince of the ruling house from Mengli’s time onwards. After the conquest of Kaffa by the Turks (880 = 1475) the Crimea nominally belonged to the Ottoman empire. The southern coast passed directly under Turkish rule while the Gîrây retained possession of the remainder as vasals of the Porte; but neither the relations of the Pasha stationed in Kaffa to the Khân nor the relations of the Khân himself to the Porte were accurately defined. It was only after the reign of Isâm Gîrây II (992—996 = 1584—1588) that the Sulîk’s name was mentioned before the Khân’s name in the Friday service; the coins were afterwards struck in the name of the Khân only. The earliest Khân (Hâddjî Gîrây, Nûr Dawlat and Mengli-Gîrây before the Turkish conquest) bore the title “Sulîk” on their coins; they afterwards contented themselves with the title Khân; the word “Sulîk” denoted, as among the Uzbek and Kızâk, a prince of the reigning house, who was not actually ruling. The seal (tamgâ) is characteristic of the coins and documents of the Gîrây. Several Khâns extended their power far beyond the bounds of the peninsula, sometimes independently and sometimes by authority of the Sulîks of Turkey: northwards to Moscow, eastwards to the Volga and the Caspian Sea. In 1736 the peninsula was occupied temporarily for the first time by Russia, in 1771 it was permanently conquered and has not been vacated since then, although, according to the terms of the peace of Kucîk-Kainardje (1774) and of the treaty of Ainali-Kawa (1779), the Khân was to be chosen freely by the Tatar population and was to rule his land as an independent prince, free of the Porte and Russia alike. In 1793 the Crimea was incorporated in the Russian empire whereupon the rule of the Gîrây came to an end; the last: Gîrây to bear the title Khân, Bakhtir-Gîrây died in Bôdamân 1215 = January 1801 on the island of Mytilene. Cf. also article Kâghî’sarî (i. 562 et seq. where Bibliography is given).

Gîrâ, a province (mu‘ilmîya), district (markaz) and town in Upper Egypt. The etymology is uncertain. The name of Saint Girgis (George) is presumably concealed in Gîrây. All Mubarak connects it with a Dagîr or Dîgîr known in the same district (the latter place is also mentioned by Ibn Dîrîn, p. 189 and Ibn Dûkmâk, v. 27). The older Egyptians say that Dûkmâk quailed with Gîrây so that it is not mentioned in Kûdà’s list of kûrâ’s; it is given by Vàghût however. The name first appears as that of a province in the Description de l‘Egypce (1212 = 1798); it is not yet found in the Rûk Nâṣîrî of 715 = 1315. The province of Gîrây therefore probably first arose in the Ottoman period. In the Ködîval period Sûhâg became capital of the province of Gîrây, while Gîrây itself declined to the level of the chief town of a district. The town was celebrated for its industries in wood and leather, which, like all Egyptian industries, were in the hands of Christians. Its large Christian population is evidence of its age. The town flourished as long as the pilgrims’ caravans went via Khursî, as its inhabitants provided the pilgrims with provisions, particularly bâkûndî (mâznîydîn “biscuit”). With the alteration in the route Gîrây began to decline; cf. the similar fate of Aîdab [q.v., i. 2109]. Under Muhammad “All the town, which was well built, suffered from the inundations of the Nile, but it was saved from destruction by protective works under Isma’il. At the present day
the population of the town is 19,893, of whom
5443 are Copts, and that of the province about
3/4 of a million. Bibliography: 'Ali Mubarak, Khatat ja-
dida, x. 53; Yakut, Mu'jam, ii. 48; Boinet
Bey, Dictionnaire Geographique de L'Egypte, p.
214 sub Guerra; Baedeker, Egypt, v. Index.
(C. H. Becker.)

GIZEH (Djizada), town in Egypt [s. i. 821* in-
fra seq.].

GO-G and MAGOG. [See Yadvilj].

GO-G, a town in the Sudan, on the left bank
of the Niger, about 250 miles east of Timbuktu in 16° 12' 4" N. Lat. and 42° 53' E.
(Greenw.). The name Gogo (گوگو) has been writ-
ten in various ways by the European translators of
the Arab geographers; we find the following forms,
Kaoqua, Caucau, Kaokao, Kao, and Gogo in Leo Africanus. Barth writes Gao or Gogo.
The etymology of the name moreover is obscure. Al-
Basir (Description de L'Afrique, transl. de Saine,
p. 39) gives a fantastic explanation of it. "The inhabitants say that the name Kao Kao has been
given to their town because their drums make this sound very distinctly." According to Houdas,
(Tarikh es-Soudan, transl., p. 6, Note 3), these various forms are corruptions of Koky Korya
"the king's town", the first of these two names having been taken for a place-name.

Gogo was the capital of the Songhai empire
(cf. the articles Soudan, Songhaï). It was founded in the 9th century A.D. When Dia (Za) al-Aimân
had settled at Gugia (Kukiya of the Arab authors),
on the right bank of the Niger, a section of the Songhai, the Sorko-Faran, who lived in these regions,
had to go northward and build a new town,
Gogo, about 100 miles up the river on its left bank. About 890, according to Barth, the sovereigns
or Dia of Gogia seized Gogo. Even at this time Gogo was an important commercial centre to which
the caravans from Tripolitania and Haratika flocked. This is how (according to Ibn Khaldûn, Hist. des
Berberes, transl. de Saine, iii. 201), Abû Yazid,
the adversary of the Fâtimids, came to be born in this town during a business journey which his
father had taken into the Soudan. The presence of these merchants from the north made Gogo a
centre of Muslim propaganda. The fifteenth prince
of the dynasty of the Dia, Dia Kossio, became a
convert to Islam, perhaps during a journey to
Gogo, about 400 = 1009-1010 and moved his capital to the latter town. M. Delafosse thinks that
this change of residence was brought about at
the request of Arab and Berber merchants,
whose caravans ran the risk of being pillaged be-
tween Gogo and Gugia by the Sorko or by the
Tuaregs of Awelmenen, and for whom the pres-
ence of the sovereign was a guarantee of security.

In any case, we find Gogo one of the most
prosperous cities in the Soudan in al-Bakir's time.
It consisted of two parts, the native town inhabited
by inidels in the midst of which rose the royal
palace and the merchants' quarter occupied by
Muslim traders. The population consisted of negroes,
Berbers, and Arabs. The Arabs called the natives
Bwargan, a word which Slane (L.C.) connects with
the Persian words bwargan (the great) or bârgân (merchants). Although the rulers had
adopted Islam, the mass of the people had re-
mained pagan and never abandoned their ancient
beliefs. Commerce was active but money was un-
known; its place was taken by salt, which came
from the mines of Taotek in the middle of the
Sahara, 6 days' journey beyond Tadmekka (es-
Sîkîh). Idrisi likewise emphasizes the economic
importance of Gogo and describes the part taken
by the natives in the trade. "Personnage of

importance and the notables (transl., p. 13) far from keeping
apart from the merchant class, visit them, associate
on equal terms with them and supply them with
means for their commercial undertakings by entrus-
ing them with merchandise and receiving from
them in return a share of the trade. In Baten, Ba-
Bâtûa, who spent some time at Gogo in 752 (1355) says that it is "one of the fairest and largest cities of
the land of the negroes and the best supplied with
provisions".

About 1325 A.D., the king Dia Assilai had to
acknowledge himself a vassal of the empire of
Mall (Melle), but by 1339 his son, 'Ali Kolen,
escaping from the court of Malli where he had
been kept as a hostage, recaptured Gogo and restored its independence. 'Ali Kolen was the founder of the Sonni dynasty, of which 19 sove-
ereigns ruled from 1335-1493. Limited in size under the early rulers of this dynasty, the terri-
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Gogo's reputation for wealth attracted the atten-
tion and covetousness of the Sherifs of Morocco.
Profiting by the disensions in the second half of
the xvi th century, which were enfeebling the power
of the Aska, Almâd al-Manṣûr al-Dhahabi appointed
Djâder Pasha to conquer the Soudan. The Aska
Isâbakh II's army was routed on the 12th April
1591 at Tangier-ibós, about 35 miles N. of Gogo.
By their ruler's orders, the inhabitants then evac-
uated the town and retired to the opposite bank of
the Niger. The Moroccan troops entered the town
without resistance and only found in it an
aged khatib, several students and foreign merchants.
Djâder Pasha was then able to confirm how exag-
gerated was the reputation of the Soudanese capital.
"The palace of the Askia" he wrote to the Sherif "is not equal to the house of the chief muleteer of Marrakush".

Djedder's expedition put an end to the Gogo empire. The Askia of the north who continued to reside in this town till the xviiith century were now subordinated to the Moroccan pashas of Timbuktu. A garrison was installed in the town to protect it from the pirates of the south, who had succeeded in maintaining their independence in the region of Say and against the incursions of the Tuaregs. The Tuaregs ultimately however succeeded in taking Gogo from which they expelled the Moorish garrison in 1680. The Paşa Mansûr Senîber retook the town in 1688 but did not leave a garrison in it. After 1770 (according to Barth) all trace of Moorish domination disappeared and the Awellimden were henceforth masters of Gogo.

The town continued to decline more and more. When Barth passed through it in 1854 it was only a village of 300–400 huts, built on the edge of a dry arm of the Niger and inhabited by Songhai, Tuareg and Ruma, degraded descendants of the Moorish conquerors. Of the monuments of architecture praised by I. O. Africanus there only survived a tower about 60 feet high and some traces of the great mosque (Djingereber) where Muhammad Askia was buried. Barth, however, claims to have recognized the site of the ancient town, the circumference of which must have been about 4 miles. At the present day Gogo is "a collection of large villages of straw huts" (Hourst). As a result of the occupation of the Timbuktu region by the French, a station was established at Gogo (1898) which has become the centre of a region and of a military circle in the Sudan.

**Bibliography:**

Hartmann considers Bakri's كوبو to be Gogo and the Kûçî (كونو) of the other geographers to be the land of Wadai.

Marquart, Bein-Sammlung, p. cxi, observes that no fewer than seven places in the Sûdan are to be distinguished which have names written in the same or similar ways and proceeds to discuss them in detail.

**Gökçai,** Turkish Gökçe-tengiz ("blue sea"), Armenian Sewanga (Sew-Wank = "Black cloister"), a freshwater lake in Russian Armenia (governmental name, the Askia, 700 feet above sea level, covering an area of 62 square miles and drained by one stream, the Zanga, which flows into the Araxes. As Le Strange (The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 183) points out, the name first appears in Ḩamd Allâh Kazwîni; in the Muhammedan sources of the pre-Mongol period the lake is not mentioned at all. The monastery from which the lake has received its Armenian name lies on an island near the north-western shore. At the present day the Gökçai is best known for its wealth in fishes (trout, Turk. ishkan, Armen. eggarbani). Cf. F. E. Weidenbaum, Pateroditul po Kavacho, p. 31.

(W. Barthold)

**Göklân,** a Turkoman tribe who dwell in the mountains between the upper course of the Görge and Atrek [q. v., i. 512th et seq.]. I.e. in Persian territory; but some are said to live on Russian territory in Khiwa, Karakalpa, and Candir. They are divided into the following clans, Çakur, Kirik, Bayandir, Kayi, Yangak, Saghri, Kara, Balkhan, Ay-derewish, Arkakli and Shaikh Köjdja. The total number of the Göklân cannot be accurately ascertained; Schuyler gives 3000 köbita = 15,000 souls, with which Vambéry agrees, while Yate gives only 2000 köbita (10,000); in other accounts quoted by Vambéry higher figures are given, which is perhaps explained by the fact that these records date from an earlier period and the numbers have meanwhile decreased. The Göklân are not nomads but follow agriculture and grow silk. They are fairly prosperous and pay the Shah a fixed annual tribute. It cannot be ascertained how long they have been in these lands, but probably they were there as early as the Saljuq period. They often come to blows with their neighbours on the west, the Yomuts, and with the Kurds of Badjurd. The Göklân seem to be rather lax Muslims but they hold their religious leaders (khodjas) in great respect.

**Bibliography:**
- Vambéry, Das Türkenvolk, p. 393 et seq.; Schuyler, Turkistan, ii. 382; Yate, Khurasan und Sistan, p. 212 et seq.; Sykes, Ten thousand miles in Persia etc., p. 18, Note (varying statements).

**Göksu,** the "blue river", a name given to several rivers by the Turks. The best known is the river of Seljuk, also called Cremenek, i.e. the Caledonius of the ancients, the Saleph of the mediaeval authors in which the Emperor Frederick was drowned on the 16th June 1190.

**Bibliography:**
- Ritter, Erdkunde, xix. 2, p. 306 et seq.

**Göksun** (the ancient Cucusus), a village in Turkey in Asia, the capital of a nahiya of the kaâr of Andrin in the sandjak of Marash in the province of Aleppo. It lies in a low, swampy plain, surrounded by argillaceous hills and consists only of huts built of tree-trunks. On the heights there still stand the ruins of several Armenian castles; the land around is almost entirely desert. St. Chrysostom spent some time here in...
who cultivate the gardens of the oasis. A subterrestrial water supply fed by the Weds Segger, Zergun, Mehaiggen and Lii assumes the irrigation of the palmyros containing about 7000 date-palms. It would also suffice to put a valley 7 miles long and 2 broad under cultivation. The water brought to the surface by wells, springs and wells, give rise to a small lake called Bel Aïd, the neighbourhood of which renders the oasis very unhealthy. The Shaiba Moudj lead a nomadic life around al-Goléa and are divided into five sections.

Little is known of the history of al-Goléa. This kasr seems to have been first occupied by Zenâta Berbers, and to have enjoyed a fair amount of prosperity, owing no doubt, to its situation between the eastern and western Erg on the road leading from the Mzab to Tnatt and Tisselt. In the eighteenth century, according to the traveller al-'Aiyash, al-Goléa belonged to the Sultan of Warnak who maintained a governor there. In the sixteenth century the kasr was visited for the first time by a European, Duveyrier, in 1859. In 1873 a French column reached it under General de Gallifet and a permanent garrison was established in 1891. With its outpost, Foiz Miribel and Fort MacMahon (Hassi Shebaba), al-Goléa was the most advanced French station in the Sahara till the occupation of the Saharan oases in 1900.


GOLETTA, the harbour of Tunis [q.v.]

GOLKONDA, a city and fortress in the Dakhân, formerly the capital of the Muhammadan kingdom of Telengana. Its site was originally occupied by a mud fort built by the Hindû rulers of the country and the primitive structure was strengthened and improved by the Bahman kings of the Dakhân. Sultán Kirk Kâlid al-Mulk, who was appointed governor of western Telengana in 1495 by Mahmûd Shâh Bakhshani, made Golconda the headquarters of his administration, rebuilt the fortifications with stone, and called his city Muhammadnagar, a name which never replaced the older appellation. In 1512 he became independent and made Golconda his capital. It remained the capital of the Kûtû Shâhì kings until 1591, when Muhammad Kâlid Shâh, fifth king of the dynasty, built Dhâmgâhar, afterwards named Hâdarâbâd, at a distance of seven miles from the old fortress, and moved his court thereto. Golconda remained, however, the citadel, and the court moved thither when danger threatened. 'Abd Allâh Kûtû Shâh, seventh king of the dynasty, was besieged there in 1656 by Awrangzib, when viceroy of the Mughal province of the Dakhân, but the
prince was obliged by his father’s orders to raise the siege. Awarangreb, after his accession to the throne, set himself in due course to extinguish the two remaining independent dynasties of the Dakhkan and, having captured Bighapour, in 1687 besieged Abu ’l-Hasan Kuch-Shah, eighth and last king of the Kuch-Shah dynasty in Golkonda. The fortress fell after a siege of eight months and the king was sent captive to Daulatkhâbâd, where he ended his days twelve years later.

Golkonda was famous as the diamond mart of southern India, most of the mines being situated in the kingdom of which it was the capital.


GÖRDÖS, the capital of the kâza of the same name in the sandjak of Şirakhan, in the wilayet of Aïdin, important for its manufactures of carpets (particularly seğêde, the socalled prayer-carpets) originally belonged to the territory of the Karasioglu and passed with the rest under Ottoman rule in 1340; the modern town has about 5000 inhabitants of whom 4000 are Muhammadans and 1000 Greeks (Münecezdîbâshî, iii. 36; Lâhikân-nümâ, p. 635; Câinet, Turquie d’Asie, iii. 556 et seq.).

GOUM (in written Arabic KAWM), the form and pronunciation usual in the Arab lands of North Africa of the name given to the body of armed horsemen or of fighting men of a tribe. Its derivative gouma means “a levy of goum or troops” or “a bold raid, rebellion, or revolt.” The written Arabic form kawam is also found in the dialects of North Africa with the meaning of “people, nation, tribe” etc. (Beaussier, Dict. pract. arabo-français des dialectes parlés en Algérie et en Tunisie). It should, however, be noted that kawam in written Arabic may also mean “enemies” or a “body of men going out to plunder” (Dozy, Supplément, ii. 443). The Goum of the old Barbary states of Algiers and Tunis received their official position in the army from the Turks, who based on them their system of military occupation of the country. All the tribes were divided by them into mahzen or auxiliaries, exempted from most of the taxes and qa‘iya, who were subject to all taxation. When one or more tribes of the latter class refused to pay taxes or for any cause rose in rebellion the Turkish army speedily moved to the territory of the rebels. This army supplemented its small numbers by exceedingly mobile bodies of horsemen of the goumes. As soon as the enemy was sighted, the goumes of the mahzen tribes, under the leadership of the chiefs of the tribe or kâids, charged straight upon those in front of them and continued the pursuit till they had overtaken them. The regular army followed as quickly as possible in the direction of the goumes to assist to form a position where these horsemen could reform if they were driven back by the rebels; as a rule, however, the little body of Turkish regular troops only arrived in time to be present at the triumph of the goumes of the mahzen.

Soon after the occupation of the regency of Algiers the French saw the advantage to be derived from these goumes. But once the country was pacified the mahzen or auxiliary troops disappeared. The organisation of goumes was then extended to all tribes without exception. The goumes under the command of chiefs, kâids or aghas invested with authority by France, had to co-operate with the military police in the maintenance of security in the country, to protect nomad tribes on their migrations and the passage of trading caravans. In military territory the number of goumiers or members of a goum varies with the requirements of the district from time to time. The goumiers draw a monthly allowance and encamp on the state lands, which are at their disposal, but they must pay the cost of maintenance of their equipment and horses. On service they have also a claim on the mûna, a special allowance for rations.

In civil territory the goumiers equip and mount themselves at their own expense. They receive no pay but when they are called up for service they receive the special allowance for rations. The goumes of civil territory are only called up in case of rebellion or a European war. It is a regular territorial militia under the command of the chiefs of the tribes and receiving its orders from the government. The goum of each mixed or native commune contains 120 horsemen. The goumiers have the right to carry arms. Their distinctive badge is a green and red cord rolled round the tibtan. The goumier’s horse is exempt from the war-tax and the goumier himself is exempted from the sakât or cattle-tax. The natives consider it an honour to be a member of a goum and any condemnation for a serious crime or habitual evil living causes their exclusion from the body.

The French government has been encouraged by the warlike valore of the goumes to use their services in case of war on the Algerian frontier or in Moroccan territory. It was the goumiers of the military circle of Mâcheria who, under Commandant Fen, took Udjda by surprise in 1907. Other goumes have successfully co-operated in the conquest of Western Morocco with the regular French troops. When in this latter case the government calls up the horsemen of the goumes, service is voluntary and the period does not exceed six months, the expenses of the march and of any sickness being paid by the state. The men are subjected to medical examination before their departure. On the other hand the goumes are only employed as auxiliaries and retain their own organisation. On an expedition they camp apart from the regular troops; they bring their own provisions and maintain themselves on the country occupied.


GRÂN, İmâm of Harar [q.v. and above i. 120].

GRANADA, capital of the modern Spanish province and of the former kingdom of Granada, which, besides the present province, included in addition practically the province of Málaga in the west and that of Almeria in the east, has at the
present day 80,000 inhabitants, while at the end of the Moorish period it sheltered half a million within its walls. It lies 2200 feet above sea-level at the foot of the northwestern spur (Sierra del Sol) of the Sierra Nevada (Cerro de Mul[al]hacén 11,600 feet high, called after 'Abi Abu 'l-Hasan 1461—1485) on the right (north) bank of the Genil (Jeníl, Latin Singílis, Arabic سينيل) which rises to the southeast and on both sides of the Darro (Arab. in the older period Kuzun, not Calom, Salom or Salun, and later called Hadarro, cf. Dozy, Recerches, 3, i. 340—344), a tributary from the northeast which flows into the Genil south of Granada, almost at the east end of the broad, extremely fertile and healthy upper valley of the Vega (probably from the Arabic bašfa, بسفة, cf. bašfa (Vocalistula: wašfa = campus), which runs 35 miles westwards to Loja (Arab. لوجا, the ancient Laus [Halos], Ilipula major); usually however called el-Фaij; el-Majd, el-Batba, by the Arab authors; cf. also el-Bâ'kî = Colesesria, the upper valley of the Leontes = el-Lišāni between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanus). Whether the Arabic Gharnatâ or Aghranatâ (Aghranatâ; the corresponding noun is Gharnâfâ and in popular language Gharnāfî, Granadine), is connected with a Berber place-name Kernâta (Idrîs, Description de l'Africq et de l'Espagne, p. 56, 79) or perhaps merely represents the Roman romance Granata and is connected with the Hîsh el-Românîn = pomegranate citadel, the ancient Alcazaba, el-Kaṣbah al-kadîma, the oldest settlement in Granada on the hill to the west afterwards and still called Albaicín, while the new Alcazaba, el-Kaṣbah al-qaddâda, gradually advanced eastwards down to the Darro and became linked up with it (especially in the time of the Zhîrîds 1012—1090), whose residence Dôr Dîk el-Rîsh (house of the weathercock) is perpetuated in the names at least Calle and Casa del Gallo [= de la Lona] near Santa Isabel la Real), just opposite the corresponding fortress-topped hill of the Alhambra (afterwards the residence of the Nasîrîs 1232—1492) east of the Darro, which is mentioned occasionally at quite an early date, can no longer be definitely ascertained; the true connection with the ancient Iberian and Roman Iliberris is also difficult to ascertain, cf. the article ELYVIRA, ii. 249. The only certain fact is that Granada has gradually extended itself from the two parallel hills, commanding the Darro-Genil plain (afterwards called Albaicín and Alhambra (al-Hamrâ the red fortress) in the north, as it is again doing at the present day, southwards on both sides of the Darro towards the Genil. Besides the Alhambra [q. v., i. 278 et seq.] on the whole well preserved, with the summer residence of the Nasîrîs to the east of it, the garden palace of Generalife (older Ginnarife = Arab. دنيانط al-Årîf, garden of the architect) the relics of the Arab period are very few in number; of the walls which surrounded el-Kaṣbah al-kadîma and el-Quadîda, for example, there only remains the northwest side with several gates on the north side of Albaicín which at the present day is mainly occupied by gipsies; Bib Cleda, Bib al-Bonaïda, Bib Elvira, and farther north the outer wall on the hills which included the later northern suburbs with the Bib al-Bayzin (the falconers' gate) whence comes the name Albaicín (Bib and Rabâb al-Dâiyâsîn is not so called from immigrants from Baeza, which would be el-Dâiyâsîn [with sin] in Arabic) and Bib Fadîjal-

lauzu, Fajalauza (=: Almond-ravine gate, Bib Fadîjal al-Lauza), while gates and walls have entirely disappeared in the south on the Darro-Genil plain and only el-Funduk al-Djâdirî (Al-hâdirîa Nueva) in the Casa del Carbon has survived. Of the nine Arab bridges over the Darro the majority of those in the south have been incorporated in the covering in of the river, while the old bridge over the Genil, Kanfarat Sênîl, in the east above the mouth of the Darro, is still in existence (Puente del Genil). The old mosques have mostly been turned into churches, e. g. the great mosques Dûnîmî (with Genil in place of Ljîmî, e.g. Bib = baš, hammâm = hammâm etc.) el-Kabîr is represented by the modern cathedral (particularly by the Sagrarîo); northeast of the great mosque was the high school (madrasa) southeast the great bazaar or market, Alcaicería (al-Kaṣîârîa), burned down in 1843 and afterwards rebuilt with the old pillars; the great street of second-hand shops El-Zacatîn = el-Sâkîstân runs southwards. Both led westwards to the great Plaza de Bimbarrambla (Rubbat Bib al-Ramlâ), where the Rabâd al-Ramlâ, on the other side of the city wall on the west, with the Bib al-Ramlâ (destroyed in 1875 near the modern Plaza de Reyes joined the Rambla of the Darro. Of the many Arab baths there only survives perhaps the "nut tree bath" Hammâm al-Geuzâ (Baño del Nogal) at the Kanfarat al-Kaṣî (Puente del Alcalde). As the whole of the hilly northeast part of Granada is now called Albaicín so is the southeastern slope called Antequeruela, so called after the immigration of the Muḥâdírî from the town of Antequera (Arab. Antaṭîra, the ancient Antiquaria, S.W. of Granada, north of Málaga; Yâkî, i. 370). On the southwestern hill which runs parallel to the Alhambra, the modern Campo de los Mártires there lay also the Jewish quarter with a synagogue (Ljîmî al-Yahûd) which is also called Gharnâfî or Madinat al-Yahûd. On the N.W. spur lay the Hîsh Maurîr, the still surviving Torres Bermejas of the southwestern fortifications of Greater Granada, while on the slope and in the valley of the Darro there lay Râbita and Rabâd Mâourî = Bib Axarc (Bib al-Shârî, Eastgate, Puerta del Sol): the whole range of the Campo de los Mártires is now called Monte Mauror after these Muḥâdírî of Mauror = Moron de la Frontera between Seville and Ronda. On the history of Granada cf. the articles ALHAMBA, ELYVIRA, ZHÎRÎDîS and NâSRÎDîS. Bibliography: Cf. the article Alhambra (where there should be added to the bibliography, the large plan (the best) by the Arqitecto Director de la Alhambra D. Modesto Cendoya, 1909), ELVIRa (Córdoba); Idrisi, p. 204 et seq.; Ūkî, iii. 788; Mârâṣîd l-Ilîfîlî, ii. 307; Kazwîni, ii. 367 (i. 193 'Ain Gharnâta); Abu 'l-Fîda, p. 176; Ibn Battîta, Index; Bibliotheca Geograph. Arab., Indices; Madoz, Diccionario s. v.; Baedeker's Spanien und Portugal (with good plans); L. Seco de Lucena, Guia práctica y artística de Granada, 1909; do., Plano de Granada árabe (preceded by a prólogo por D. Mariano Gaspar Remiro [Director del Centro de Estudios Históricos de Granada and of the Revista de this Centro] 1909, in which previous studies on Moorish Granada are comprised and made clear to the eye on the excellent plan although there are several errors still in it, as for example when Mauror (Moron see above)
is explained by del Moritano, de los Mauritianos, Rabaq al-Gomera (Calle de Gomeres or Gomeles), Rabaq al-Zenata (cf. Calle del Zenete) appears wrongly with the article, compared with the classical Ghomara, Zenatta, cf. however, south of Granada, Alhindin = Karaj al-Hamdan and class. Hamdan (without article); Duzy, Recherches, i. 345. The uncritical Historia de Granada, 1843 (analtered reprint: Granada 1904—1907), by Miguel Lafuentes Alcántara is useless as it is based on Conde's make-shift of 1820. The next best would be a good edition and critical translation of Ibn al-Khatib's (died 1374) Ḥaṭa fi Tārīkh Gharbī (Cairo 1919, i. ii. it is only the synopsis Merkez al-Ḥaṭa, which still lacks Vol. iii.).

(C. F. SEYBOLD.)

GUAD ... GUADI ... in a large number of Spanish river-names like Guadalquivir [q. v.], Guadiana [q. v.] from the Arabic wādī = river, valley, particularly a river which dries up in summer, which is the case with the majority, especially the smaller Spanish rivers. It is derived from the Arabic ramla, a dry sandy bed, which becomes used as a road, cf. La Rambla de Cataluña, the Corso of Barcelona = the Italian giunara (secca); wādi in the west is usually wādī, wād (French oued), in Granada wādī (Pedro de Alcalá, like bīb for bīb etc.) e.g. Guadalquivir (also contracted to Gualaiyar) = Wād al-abayd, white river = Turia at Valencia and = Segura of Murcia; Guadalete from Wād Lekk; Guadalmedina and Guadalhorca at Málaga; Guadaira (Alcáal de Guad.) at Seville; Guadiaro (with Guadalevin) rising at Ronda = Arab. Wādī ārā or ārā, also yārū, yārūd; Guatli-ĩ in a mountain brook of Madeira, without, in a solitary instance); Guajara (Guabac from Guadajara, Guadibacar; Guadarrizas, Guarrizas, a mountain brook east of Linares; it is readily transferred from rivers (valleys) to towns: e.g. Guadal-ajara [q. v.], Guadix [q. v.], Guarrumán, contracted from Wādarrumān, pomegranate river, a small town north of Linares; also transferred to mountains, e.g. Guadarrana from Wādarramāla (sand-river); still as the name of a river, village and mountain, e.g. Guadalupe, from Wādālulāb (lobb, Spanish lobo, Latin lupus, Wolf, while the Spanish adibe, Portuguese adibe, borrowed from the Arabic al-ḥiib as in North Africa means not "wolf" but "jackal") a mountain and village, while the stream is called Guadalupes and Guadalupejo; Guadalupe is also the name of a southern tributary of the lower Ebro; Guadelfu a mountain at Serpa on the lower Guadiana; Guadelim = Alcarache, a stream on the borders of Spain and Portugal south of Badajoz. In Portuguese, Spanish Guadi(ə) is usually represented by Odi ... Ōde, e.g. Odião = Guadiana [q. v.], Odivelas, Odiseixe, Odiarca, Odemira, Odellite, Odeolouca, Odega; Odigebe = Odiogebe; Divor = Odivor; cf. the Odile with its tributary Odívarga in the province of Huelva, adjoining South Portugal with the Guadiel between Linares and Bailén, Guadiela, Guadielop, Tejo, and many others.

GUADALAJARA, the capital of the Spanish province of the same name, on the plateau (2000 feet high) of northeastern Castile, with 12,000 inhabitants, is the ancient Arica (from arri, Basque "stone") on the left (eastern) bank of the Henares, which the Arabs called Wādī l-Ḥiṣarūa "Stone-river" (amnis laإقليم in Rodericus Toletanus), whence the name Guadala- lasara, the modern Guadalajarca, which was then transferred to the town and used particularly of it; the latter was also called Medinat al-Farādī, which might be translated "city of joy", if a note by al-Ya‘qūbī did not inform us that it was the site of a Berber family, the Banū Farādī (Bibliotheca Geogr. Arab., vii. 335). In 714 Guadalajarca was taken on the joint campaign of Māsā and Ţārīk and remained an Arab possession, till it was surprised by Ferdinand I of Castile in 1060, although not permanently captured till 1081, when it was taken by Alvar Fañez de Minaya, a cousin of the Cid, for Alfonso VI of Castile. Like Toledo (Toleitula till 1085) and Madrid (Madjīr), it is said till then been an important Arab fortress on the northern frontier and the home of many scholars as is testified by the Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana (ed. Codera, 10 vols.) and al-Maḳṣari passim; the nība is Ḥiṣarūn (cf. also al-San`ānī, p. 156, Moqtabi and Ṭabbūl al-Luwāb) and is best known as that of a celebrated historian born in Guadalajarca.

Even under Aramaic it was a Christian element in Guadalajarca (cf. Simonet, Histoire de los Mézahobec). Of its later history as a Spanish town, which does not concern us here, we need only mention that it was the residence (with a Gothic-Moorish palace) of the (Basque) family of Mendoza, the Duques del Infantado, whose most celebrated member "el Gran Cardenal de España", the Cardinal-Primas of Toledo, Don Pedro González de Mendoza, the soul of the last phase of the Reconquista, the recapture of Granada by the Reyes Católicos in 1492, died in Guadalajarca in 1495.


(C. F. SEYBOLD.)

GUADALQUIVIR, the ancient Baetis (Tar- tessos, Perces, Certis), whence the province of Baetic (with Baetia in the north) = Andalusia, is the most southerly of the four great rivers of the Iberian peninsula flowing from N. E. to S. W. into the Atlantic Ocean. The Spanish name is derived from the Arabic Wādī al-Kābir, popular for al-Wādī or al-Nahr al-Kābir, the "great river" also Nahr al-Asam the "greatest river" (there are several Wādī l-Kābir just as there are a number of Rio Grande). We find the popular form as early as Yākūt, i. 275 (Nahr azīm yu-bāla lāhu Wādī l-Kābir) and Kazwini, ii. 275 (al-Nahr al-akbar al-lāhādi yu-wāfi bī Wādī l-Kābir) The Guadalquivir proper rises in the Sierra del Pobo between the Sierra de Cazorla and Segura.
describes the Guadiana as al-Nahr al-Ghaṭar, the disappearing river, with a subterranean course, and also mentions a Ḷayrat Yana above Calatava, on which cf. Kazarini, i. 177 = Ethê's translation, p. 361. Dimişki (Cosmographie, 112 = 139 et seq.) speaks of the Guadiana as the combination of the Nahr Uṭliš (river of Ucles = Bedjila = Rianesares = Gigüela) with the river of Ḷaṭr al-Rabāb (Calatrava, q. v.) = Guadiana Alto + Bajo + Záncara. Mehren says "the river of Rabāb (Guadalaviar)," but instead of al-Bahr al-Rummi = Mediterranean, as the terminus of the Guadiana one ought to course of reading al-Bahr al-Muṣlim = Atlantic Ocean. In Dimişki's second reference to the Guadiana, ibid. (only in the Paris Codex), and p. 246 = 353 Uṭliš should be read for Ṭuṭrîša (Tortosa) and (Ḳaṭṭ al-) Rabāb for Dalāya (= Dalas W. of Almería). The Guadiana is also called, as here, Nahr Rabāb al-Rabāb, the river of Calatrava, or also Nahr Uṭliš, river of Ucles, still oftenter Nahr Mērida, the river of Mérida, and Nahr Baṭaḥyās, the river of Badajoz after the principal towns on its banks.

Bibliography: Madoz, Diccion. Geogr., ix. 27; Aboulfeïda, Géographie, p. 172 = 247 b., but where it is wrongly said of Mérida: ʿala ḥajābi nahr Baṭaḥyās "south of Guadiana" for ḍawī “north” [جوبو] and [جوبو] often confused, particularly in the Maghāribī script]; Crónica del Mero Rasis (ed. Gayangos 1852), p. 62, where probably Ucles should be read for the puzzling Richin.

(C. F. Seybold.)

GUADIX, the capital of a district in the Spanish province of Granada on the northern slopes of the Sierra Nevada (Djebel Shušir = Solorius Mons, Djebel al-Thuñ = "snow-mountain" like Hermon), the ancient Iberian Acic (Colonia Julia Gemella, which was however 7 miles N.W. [Baederker wrongly S.E.] of the modern Guadix and is distinguished as Guadix al Viejo), one of the oldest bishoprics in Spain (Sedes Aciciana), with 13,000 inhabitants, on the left bank of the stream of the same name which rises to the south (Río de Guadix), with a Moorish castle (Azzaba), in Arabic called Wadisquây, alternatively Wādisquây (and Ṣawādisquây) also in poetry Wādī l-Aṣghar and Wādī l-Aṣbūh, with miṣr ʿish (from ʿish), wrongly explained by Mârmol as “water of life" (an explanation which is still given everywhere, e.g. Baederker, Spain and Portugal, 1913, p. 330) and confused with ʿāshi = life, whereas ʿāshi, ʿāshī is of course = Acic. In the Barrio (suburb) de Santiago there are remarkable cave dwellings inhabited by gypsies. West of Guadix on the Fardes (Anchon) is the ancient Arab bath Graena (from the Arabic Diļyena = Juliana), celebrated for its apples, hence called Diļyinaš al-Tuffâh (Yākūn, Geogr. Wurtbergs, ii. 109). Dimişki (Cosmographie, p. 84 = transl. p. 99, speaks of black antimony (al-kūṣah al-arwaq wajnasuma al-latīmi) which is obtained near Guadix. The whole of the northern slopes of the Sierra Nevada around Guadix are called in Arabic Senuk Wādīšah = slopes of Guadix, which still survives in the Spanish Marquesado del Zenete (cf. Jeres del Marquesado, S.W. of Guadix, N.E. of the highest peaks of the Sierra Nevada and the citadel built in 1510 for Rodrigo de Mendoza, Marqués del Zenete, south of Guadix above Alcuadra (Arabic. kudya = hill) de Guadix in the little town of La Calahorra arabised from the Iberian Calagurris, cf. Gröber,
Grundr. der Rom. Phil., I, 3, 522). In 1323 the first Naṣrīr or Ahmārīd, Muḥammad I of Granada made himself master of Guadix. In 1351 the Christians under the Infante Don Pedro of Castile were severely defeated before Guadix. In 1489 it was conquered by the Reyes Católicos, after having been previously made tributary in 1413. The name is in Arabic Wādīšāfī or Wādī-Ghrāzī; for example it is that of the poet Abu 'l-Hasan b. Niẓār who was born there.

**Bibliography:** Simonet, Descripción del Reino de Granada (*1872*), p. 98—101; do., Historia de los Mozárabes, Index; Madoz, Diccionario geográfico, p. 9; 43; Idrisi, Descripción de l'Áfrique et de l'Espagne, p. 202—247; Marreños, History of the Almohades, p. 269; Maḵkāri, i. 94—95; Yaḵkūt, i. 279, where Kašr ash (rather Kašrāsh = Cáceres) is confused with Guadix. — Soler, Sierra Nevada y las Alpujarra, Madrid 1903, p. 92—106, where however Jerez is known to be of Madoz writes Jeréz. (C. F. SEYBOLD.)

GUARDAFUI, the most eastern cape in Africa, the Ḡawāliya ṣāḥibīyāt of Ptolemy, and the Arabic Ra'a ʿAsfīr. The origin of the name is uncertain; the only certain point is that the name Ḥafūn (Opona) is concealed in it; indeed there is another cape about 60 miles southwards which the Arabs call Djar or Gard (Gard) Ḥafūn. It is doubtful if this Djar or Gard, which cannot be explained from the Arabic, has not been taken over from Europeans because the earliest name given by the Portuguese is rather to be traced to Western Saracen, but more likely from being of Arabic origin. It may be possible that the name did not originally denote a cape but the whole land of Ḥafūn (Arj Ḥafūn) and was erroneously limited by the Portuguese to the Cape.

**Bibliography:** Yule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, *p. 398 et seq.

**GU崁AR (GUḌAR, GUḌYUR). The name of a very widely spread tribe in Northern India akin to the Rājpūṭ and Djas and like them probably descended from Scythian immigrants about the 6th century A.D. Their physical characteristics show them to be of the purest Indo-Aryan type without Dravidian admixture. It has been shown by V. A. Smith (*Journ. Roy. As. Soc.*, 1909), by A. M. T. Jackson (*Bombay Gazetteer*, 1896, Vol. i. pt. i.) and by D. R. Bhandarkar (*Epigraphic Notes and Questions, iii.*) that the Guḍjaras entered Northern India about 550 A.D. with or soon after the White Huns. The Guḍjaras are first mentioned in Bāpa’s Harṣacārīta which couples them with the Huṇa as enemies of Harṣa’s father. They founded a powerful state with its capital at Bihimāl near Mt. Ābū. From the southern branch of this kingdom comes the name of the southern Guḍjūrṭ, while the ruling families of the central part developed into Rājpūṭ tribes, especially the Pratihāra or Parāhīr clan. But the bulk of the Guḍjaras are represented by the Guḍjaras of the present day, and their wide distribution bears witness to the former extent of their rule. The Guḍjaras were mainly a pastoral race given to war and plunder, and the same tendencies are found in many at the present day. They have not the same reputation as steady cultivators as their near kindred, the Djas, but still they have mainly adopted a settled life. In the extreme northwest of India, especially in the outer fringe of the mountains in Ḥażārā, Ḫamnī, Kāṅgra and Cibhār they are still nomad herdsmen and speak a dialect of their own, known as Guḍjūrṭ or Guḍjīr, in which Grierson finds a strong resemblance to the Mewāt dialect of eastern Rājpūṭāna. This seems to show that, during the days of Guḍjūrṭ power, when their headquarters were in Rājpūṭāna, they adopted the language of that country, which has been retained by their least civilized outlying northern branch even now though isolated among speakers of Pandjābī and Western Pahlavi dialects. In Peshāwar the name Guḍjūr is often used as a synonym for ‘herdsman’ in general. The more settled Guḍjaras are most numerous in the modern district of Guḍjūr, where they are an important element in the population numbering 111,000 in 1901. In Ḥażārā (settled and pastoral) they number 91,670, and in both districts as well as in the whole of the North and West Pandjāb they are all Muslims. Further east Guḍjaras are numerous in Hoshamārpur and in the districts along the Indus both in the Pandjāb and the United Provinces, but here the majority remain Hindu. In the Pandjāb the Guḍjaras number 739,622 and in the U. P. 344,000. In the whole of India they number 2,103,000 and are found in most provinces especially (in addition to those already mentioned) Rājpūṭāna, Central India and Bombay.

It is generally believed that most of the pastoral Guḍjaras of the plain were forced to settle in fixed villages in Akbar’s time, and that the Pandjāb Guḍjūr obtained its name at that time. The conversion to Islam is attributed to the reign of Allārūghān, but the tradition places the time of Timūr, which is very improbable. In addition to the Northern and Southern Guḍjarats the tribe has given its name to Guḍjūrānāla in the Pandjāb (where however Guḍjaras are not numerous) and to a part of the district of Sāhrān-pur formerly called Guḍjūrāt. The Guḍjūrāṭī language derives its name from the Southern Guḍjūr province, and has no connection with the tribe.


**GUḌYARAT in the present 20th century denotes the tract of country immediately east of the Peninsula of Kathiawār; but at the time of the Muhammadan power in India it included not only that, then known as Sūrāth, but also the districts as far as Sūrāt and even Bombay on the south, part of Khandesh and Malwa to the East, and the south-west corner of Rājpūṭāna round Anhilwāra to the north. It was first known to the Muhammadans when Sūrān Ṭīmūr marched from Malwa to Anhilwāra and Sūmarūth on the south coast of Sūrāth in 1354 A.D. The Sultan Shihāb al-Dīn met the Sultan Shihāb al-Dīn with a check at Anhilwāra in 1178, but 16 years later this was avenged by the Dīlī vicerey, Kūṭ al-Dīn Aibak. One hundred years afterwards the place was taken by Ulugh Ḵān, general of Sultan ‘Alī al-Dīn Khaljī; and between 1347 and 1351 Sultan Muhammad Taghliāk waged several campaigns in Guḍjūrāt from Sīnd.
GUDJARĀT — GUDJARĀT.

where he died. His successor, Sultan Firuz Shah established his authority in the country, which thenceforth remained under Muhammadan governors, of whom, Zafar Khan, became an independent ruler of Gudjrāt, under the title of Muṣaffar Khan; after the central power at Delhi had been crushed by the invasion of Timūr. This man was a notable general and in his time destroyed Sūnnāth for a third time, and subdued Idrāz, Dhar and Mandū. He also saved the Dihlī rulers from the attack of Ibn Khārībī of Djaynūr. He was succeeded by his grandson Ahmad I who founded Ahmadābād in 1413 A.D. These rulers attacked at different times Cānāb, Dīnābād, Idrāz, Cītur and Kāch, and greatly extended their power; but towards the close of the dynasty they became embarrased by the Turks and Portugese.

The country was invaded in 1573–1575 by the emperor Akbar, who came in person to Ahmadābād, Barōda, Cambay and Surat, and from that time forward the Gudjrāt country remained under Muhammadan viceroys of the Delhi court until the rise of the Marāṭhās and the advent of the English put an end to the Muhammadan domination of these parts. The revenue settlement of it was made by the famous Tūdar Mal. Among the best known viceroys were Mirza 'Azīz Kūktāsh, foster brother of the emperor Akbar; Mirza Khān, afterwards dignified with the title of Khān Khānān; Prince Khūrram, afterwards the emperor Shāh Jīhān; Prince Awrangzēb in 1644, and his brother Dārā Shīkōh in 1648–1652, and Murūd Bāshā in 1654–1657. In 1659–1662 Mūrūdji Dīssawnt Singh of Dīssāhpūr was governor. Early in the 18th century the power of the Marāṭhās became more and more aggressive, and the government fell more and more into confusion, Sūrat being sacked once by Malik Aμbar and twice by Sivāḍži. An attempt by the Muhammadans to recover Ahmadābād after the battle of Pānpīt (1761 A.D.) failed, and the Gakwār making terms for himself apart from the Peshwā, the British took possession of the Gudjrāt country of the mainland in 1818.


GUDJARĀT, a modern Indo-Aryan vernacular language, spoken by over 9 million persons in Western India and by more than 1 million persons from Gudjrāt who have settled in other parts of the country; it has a printed character of its own, a modification of the Deva-selfrī, and its literature extends back to the fourteenth century. It is the chief commercial language of Western India, and, as such, acquires modifications according to the class which uses it; while most of the Muhammadans of Gudjrāt speak Urdu, those who are descended from Hindu converts speak Gudjrātī, and the educated members of this class introduce into the vocabulary of their native language a large number of Urdu (and, through it, of Arabic and Persian) words. The Muhammadans have employed Gudjrātī but little as a medium for literary expression, and have preferred to write either in Persian or (in more recent times) in Urdu. The few works written in Gudjrātī by Muhammadans consist mainly of translations from Arabic, Persian and Urdu, or of religious tracts and elementary books of religious instruction.


GUDJĀRNĀVA. A district in the Panjāb, 3198 sq. miles in extent with a population in 1901 of 809,577 of whom 603,464 are Muhammadans. The district lies in a level plain between the Cānāb and Rāvī rivers, but does not extend to the latter river. Like Gudjrāt it obtains its name from the Gudjar tribe, but there is not now a large Gudjar element in the population. The district took its name from the town which was founded by Gudjars. Rādājēpurūs (especially Bhaṭīis), Dīssāpūra and Amūnīs are now the most numerous tribes. There are Buddhist remains at Tāki which has been identified with the "Tse-kēi" of the Chinese pilgrim Hōuen Thāng. The ruins of Shākāt in the south perhaps represent the Sākāla of the Hun king Mihrākula. Under the Moghul emperors this tract was prosperous, and some of the principal towns were founded. Esmā’īlī (properly Aminābād) was founded by Muḥammad Amīn, and Hājībābād by Hājīb, both in Akbar’s reign, and Shekhābāpur (properly Shīkōh-pura) by the prince Dārā Shīkōh, son of Shāh Jīhān, who made an irrigation channel there while his grandfather Dīssāhpūr was still living. In the eighteenth century the country was nearly deserted, and was afterwards colonized by the Sikhs. Randīl Singh was born at Gudjārnāvā and erected there a mausoleum to his father Mahān Singh. The principal towns are Gudjārnāvā (pop. 29,224) and Wazrābād (pop. 18,069). The Cānāb canal has its head in the Cānāb river and irrigates a large tract in the Hājībābād and Dīssāhpūr tahsils. Wazrābād is an important railway junction.


M. LONGWORTH DAMES.)

GUDJĀRĀT (Pandīb). The name of a district in the Panjāb in British India lying between 33° and 32° 8' N. and 73° 17' and 74° 30' E. It contains an area of 2051 sq.m. and a population of 750,458 (in 1901), of which the greater part (87 per cent.) is Mūsālān. It is a submontane district lying between the Cānāb River to the S. E. and the Dīssāhpūr to the N. W. The outer fringe of the Himalaya bounds it to the N. E. and the open waste of Shāhīpur to the S.W. A great part of the waste land of Gudjrāt and Shāhīpur is now being brought under cultivation through irrigation from the Dīssāhpūr canal.

The district was traversed by Alexander who crossed the Hydaspe (Vitasta, Vēhat or Dējsam), near the modern town of Dējsam, and skirted the mountains crossing the Acesines, (Cānāb), near the point where it issues into the plains. It seems to have formed the central portion of the kingdom of Pūrūs. It afterwards formed part of the kingdom of the Mauyras and the Kushans, but does
not seem to have been included in the Gupta kingdom nor in that of Harša. The prevalence of the Gujjar tribe and of the name Gujjar makes it probable that the great Gujjar kingdom which had its centre at Bhimāl in Rādjāpurāṇa included this tract. But the local princes had not quite been long separated from the central kingdom, which had its capital at Kannauj when the territory known as Gujjar-dēs corresponding roughly with the Gujjarāt district was ceded by the king reigning at Jammū to the king of Kashmir in the 9th century. In later times this tract from its position must have been the thoroughfare of every invading army including those of Mahāmud, Muḥammad b. Sām, Timūr, Bābār and Nadir Shāh. Its population, whether Džat, Rādžpūt or Gujjar, was gradually converted to the Muhammadan faith; the Sikh religion has never made much progress and the country remains mainly a Muslimmān tract. In modern times a rather lax heretical sect known as Ditte-Shāhī has arisen in this district. They consider the founder Ditte-Shāh Arain to be a true rasūl and disregard the strict doctrines and ceremonies of Islām.

Although the Sikhs did not spread their religion in Gujjarāt they obtained possession of the country from the time of the abandonment of the Central Pandjāb by Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī. The Bhangī Misl occupied the country up to the Dchehām, and in 1768 they went even further, as far as Rāwāl Pindi. The dominions of the Bhangi confederacy were soon absorbed by Randjīt Singh. After his death Gujjarāt continued to be part of the Sikh kingdom till 1849, when it was the scene of the most furious fighting in the Second Sikh war. The battles of Saḍadulāpur, Čilānwāla and Gujjarāt took place within the limits of the district, and Gough's victory at the latter place led to the annexation of the whole Pandjāb to British India.

The town of Gujjarāt near which the battle took place is now the district headquarters and has a pop. of 19,048. It is well known for its damascened work (kōfgārī). Here is the shrine of Shāh Dawla celebrated for its semi-idiotic mendicants with heads artificially shaped, known popularly as "Shāh Dawla's rats".


(M. LONGWORTH DAMES.)

GUINEA, a land on the coast of West Africa. Yākūt, Mdu'jam, iv. 307, mentions a land Kīnāwā (Giināwā), which, according to him, received its name from its inhabitants; the Giināwā are said to have been a Berber tribe who had penetrated into the land of the negroes (Sūdān) and become neighbours of Ghāna [q. v., ii. 139 and sqq.]. It seems to follow from this that the usual derivation of the name of Djennē (see above i. 1035 and sqq.) is incorrect. As far as we know, Marquart was the first to call attention to this passage in Yākūt (Benīn, p. 136v).

On the penetration of Islām among the peoples of Guinea cf. the article Westmann in Die Welt des Islams, i. 85 and sqq., and the literature quoted there. For further details cf. the article SUDAN.

GUL (r.) the rose. The rose plays a great part in Oriental poetry, whence its name frequently appears in the titles of Persian, Turkish and Indian books. The relations between the rose and the nightingale have already been discussed above (art. Bulbul, i. 785). There are therefore numerous poems with the title Gul u Bulbul, but the rose is also associated with other things; cf. the indices in the Grundris der Iran. Phil., ii, and in Gilb, History of Ottoman Poetry. Here we will only mention Gul u Šanawbar, "the Rose and the Pine tree", a subject which has been chosen mainly by writers in India. A Persian version is mentioned by Ethé in the Grundris der Iran. Phil., ii. 321; on the versions in Hindustān and other modern Indian dialects cf. Garcin de Tassy, Histoire de la Littér. Hindoustic, i. 157 and sqq. The same author published a complete French translation of this poem in the Revue Orient. et Améric., vi. 69-120; on the original editions that have been published in the East, cf. Ethé, p. 323.

GUL-BABA, a Bektṣhī der vish, a native of Marziyān (Marsiawan in Asia Minor in the wilāyat of Siwās) took part in several wars waged by the Turks in the reigns of Sulṭān Mehmed II, Bayazīd II, Selim I and Sulaimān II and fell during the siege of Buda (1456) in a skirmish below the walls of the city on the 29th Rabī' 1 948 = 21st August 1541 (Iccewī, i. 227). After he had been buried on the spot where he had fallen, Sulaimān II declared him the patron saint of the city (gulbanī). His name was also borne by a Bektṣshī monastery near the hot springs of Welibey outside the Khoros gate, which was founded for charitable purposes by the descendants of Ghāzi Miḳtājī. The tomb of the saint still stands in Buda: it is in the Turcubassa (Torokuteca) and in the form of an octagon, on which is a dome covered with lead plates and wooden tiles, on the top of which is a lantern. Its exterior is covered by creeping plants. Tōth Bēla discusses this saint in his Saïjroel Saïyo.

Bibliography: Ewliyā Celebi, Şevvalname, vi. 225, 244 (his authority is information given him by his father). (Cl. HUART.)

GULBADAN BĒGAM, daughter of the Empēror Bābur, half-sister of Humāyūn, and aunt of Akbar. Her mother was Dildār Bēgam, whose real name, apparently, was Sālīya Sulānā, and who was daughter of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Mirzā the ruler of Samarqand. Gulbadan was born in the city of Kābul, and as in her charming Memoirs she tells us that she was eight years old when her father died, i.e. in the last week of December 1530, she must have been born in 1522 (1523). She remained in Kābul when her father went off to the conquest of India, but she joined him in 1529 and she was in Agra when he died. She was there also in 1539 when Humāyūn returned, defeated, from Bengal. By this time, apparently, she had been married to Khāzir Khwāja Khān, a Cagāhāti Moghul and a great-grandson of Yūnus Khān. Rieu states that the marriage took place in 942 (1545), but I do not know on which authority. By her husband, who was an officer of Humāyūn and of Akbar, and who was at one time governor of the Pandjāb, she had at least one son, Muhammad Yār, and one daughter. When Humāyūn was driven out of India, she did not accompany him to Persia, but remained in Afghanistan with her brothers Kamān and Hindāl, and did not see Humāyūn again till 1545. She did not leave Kābul
for India till after Humayun's death, arriving there in 1557, the second year of the reign of her nephew. In 1570 she went on pilgrimage to Mecca in company with her niece Salima Sultan Begam and other royal ladies. On her way back, she was shipwrecked at Aden, and did not return till 1581 or 1582 (Badü‘un, Lowe's translation, 216).

In 1590 she went to Kâbul in company with Akbar's mother, in order to visit the emperor. She died at Agra on 6 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 1011 (7 May 1603), not long after the death of Queen Elizabeth of England. She was then 82 lunar years of age. The correct date of her death is given in Rieu's Catalogue, iii. 1053. She was greatly respected, and Akbar himself took her bier upon his shoulders.

The interesting thing about Gulbadan is that she wrote her Memoirs. The work is called the Humayyunnamah and has been edited and translated by Mrs A. Beveridge for the Royal Asiatic Society (London 1902). Unfortunately, the only known MS. is that described by Rieu in his Catalogue of Persian MSS. I, 247, and it is imperfect, and breaks off in the middle of a sentence. She wrote the Memoirs at the request of Akbar in order to furnish his secretary Abu 'l-Fazl with materials for his history. Probably this was in 1587. Her book is valuable on account of its domestic details, and gives a pleasing picture of the author, and of Court-life in Humayun's time. There are several references to Gulbadan in the third volume of the Akhbarnamah.

(H. Beveridge.)

GULBARGA, spelt Kalburga in Marathi, was a town of little importance until 'Ali al-Din Bahman Shah made it his capital in 1347 on establishing his independence as sulthan of the Dakhan. It remained the capital of the Dakhan until 1429, when Ahmad Shah I, ninth king of the Bahmani dynasty, rebuilt Bidar and transferred his court thither. On the dissolution of the Bahmani kingdom in 1490 Gulbarga was in the possession of the African eunuch, Dastur Dinâr, but ten years later he was defeated and slain by Yusuf 'Adil Shah and the city and province were absorbed in Bidjapur and remained part of that kingdom until it was annexed to the Mughal empire by Awrangzib ('Alângir) in 1686. The city is famous for its great mosque and for the shrine of Muhammad Gistâ Darâz, a saint who flourished in the early years of the fifteenth century. Bibliography: Historic Landmarks of the Deccan, by Major T. W. Haig.

(GULBAHAR) (T. W. Haig.)

GÜLEK BOĞHAZ, the Turkish name of the celebrated Pylaie Ciliciae of the ancients, which have already been often described. The name is derived from a place named Gülekk in the neighbourhood which, according to Cuinet, has including some other adjoining villages a population of 1850. In the Armenian notices we find Guglag in place of Gülek, latinised as Guglat or Goglagos, although the Latin chroniclers always speak of the Forta Juda. In the Arab chroniclers we find simply Darb or Darb al-Safâma. For a more detailed description see the works quoted below. Bibliography: Ritter, Erdkunde, xix. 2, p. 273 et seq.; Ramsay, Histor. Geogr. of Asia Minor, p. 349 et seq.; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliph., p. 133 et seq.; Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, ii. 49.

GÜLİSTÂN, a place in the Caucasus (in the government of Elisavetpol), famous for the peace concluded there (Peace of Gülîstân) in 1813. Instigated by Napoleon, Fath 'Ali Shah had declared war against Russia. After the victories of the Russian general Koliarevsky at Aslanduz and Lenkoran the treaty of Gülîstân was concluded on the 12th (24th) October 1813, by which Russia came into the possession of the khanates of Karabagh, Shirvan, Derbend, Kuba, Baku and Talish. The khanate of Gandja [q.v.] had been previously occupied by the Russians so that the treaty only ratified what was actually a fact. At the same time Persia pledged herself not to maintain any warships on the Caspian Sea. (A. Dhillon.)

GÜLİSTÂN (v.), "land of roses, rose-garden," the name of a celebrated didactic work, a mixture of prose and verse, by the Persian poet Sa'di of Shiraz, consisting of a preface, eight chapters (the lives and doings of kings, manners and customs of the derelict, frugality, advantages of silence, love and youth, infancy and old age, importance of education and rules of conduct) and an epilogue. A number of anecdotes interwoven give us information on the personal experiences of the poet. The Gülîstân was completed in 1256 (1858), one year after the Bostân; it bears a dedication to the Atabeg of Fârs, Abû Bakr b. Sa'd b. Zangi and his son Sa'd and has appeared in numerous editions (the best European ones are by E. B. Eastwick, Hereford 1850; Johnson, ibid. 1863; J. T. Platts, London 1874) and translations; of the latter we may mention: Latin: by G. Gentius (Rosarion Politicum, 1651, 1655); French: by D'Allègre (1704), Gaudin (1789, 1791), Semelet (1834), Defrémy (1858), Franz Toussaint (with a preface by Comtesse de Noailles, 1913); German: by A. Olearius (Persianisches Reisenbuch, 1654, 1660), Schummel (1775), B. Dorn (1827), Ph. Wolff (1841), K. H. Graf (1846), G. H. F. Nesselmann (Berlin 1864); English: by Gladwin (Pers. text with trans., Calcutta 1806, 1809); Dumoulin (1807), J. Ross (1823), Eastwick (1852), J. T. Platts (London 1873), E. H. Whinfield (Pers. text with trans., London 1880); Italian: by Gerardo de Vincentiis (selection, Naples 1873); Arabic: by Djabir b. Yusuf al-Mukhaßa (1263—1847); Hindustâni: by Mir Shir 'Ali Asfand under the direction of John Gilchrist (Bâgh-i Udî, Calcutta 1802). Bibliography: H. Ethé in the Grundr. der iran. Philol., ii. 293—296, 297, 570. (T. Curtis.)

GÜLKHAÎNE, the "house of roses", Gül-khâné Meidâni, is the name of a part of the gardens, which lie along the Sea of Marmora on the east side of the old imperial Serai in Stambul; the name is derived from the fact that in olden days the building, in which the rose sweetmeats for the use of the court were prepared, stood there. The place is famous in history because the celebrated firmân of Sultan 'Abd al-Majid, the so-called Khatir-i shîrî promulgating the reforms, was publicly proclaimed there on Sunday the 26th Shawwal 1255 (3rd November 1839); cf. the description in Rosen, Geschichte der Türken, ii. 4et seq.; Lutfi, Ta'rikh, vi. 50 et seq.; on the place itself cf. White, Three Years in Constantinople, i. 110, and Recueil Hist. publ. par l'Inst. d'Hist. Ott., i. 291 et seq. (J. H. Mordtmann.)
GULPÁYÁN, a town in Persia at the foot of the Zagros range in the fertile valley of the Kūm. The Arab geographers give the form of the name Djarbaḏhákân, i.e. Gurbadákân. Hadžidi Khaļ, *Dhikḥammuq*, p. 299 still knows both forms for his Sulaimán. It is probably only a misprint for Gurbáyán. It is only in the modern times that the place is frequently mentioned; the Arab geographers only refer to it as a station on the road from İspāhān to Hamadẖān. Although Gulpáyán is the capital of a Persian province, which exports opium, tobacco and cotton in addition to agricultural produce satisfying the local requirements, it gives one the impression of considerable decay. Among the 12,000—15,000 inhabitants are a few Jews, about 150 families.


GÜLŠHENI, a Turkish poet, born in Șarukhān (Asia Minor in the wilayet of Aydın), a contemporary of Muḥammad II, to whom he dedicated his book, led the life of a hermit. His Șafīāt consists of series of moralising dialogues in verse illustrated by anecdotes.


(ČL. HuAкT.)

GÜLŞHENI (ŞarKü İdrāhīm), a celebrated mystic of the Khwālīw order, a native of Șahbaḏāḡān, studied in Tabriz and migrated to Cairo after Shāh Șāh’s had proclaimed the Şīa creed the state religion of Persia. After the capture of the city by the Turks he was treated with the greatest respect by Sulṭān Selim I. In 935 (1528-1529) he went to Constantinople on Sulṭān Sulaimān’s invitation, where he was received with unusual distinction. He died in 940 (1533-1534) in Cairo. He wrote a Persian mystic poem of 40,000 distiches entitled ฿eşwârî in answer to Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmî’s ฿eşwârî. Of his numerous pupils particular mention may be made of the poet Usūlī of Ye’dijde-i Wardar and the mystic Șuaff of Sinc-eč. An order founded by him bears his name Gülşheni or sometimes is also called Rüşheni after the epithet of his teacher and successor Dede Əmar Rüşheni. This order is distinguished by the form of its turban of eight folds.


(ČL. HuAкT.)

GUMAL, a river in Afghanistan formed by the junction of the Gumal proper which rises near Ghazni, with the Kundar in the Wān territory. It then flows eastward and, after being joined by the Żoḥb from the south, passes through the Gomal Pass into the plains of the Indus valley. Its water is here diverted into irrigation channels, and does not reach the Indus except during high floods. The Gomal Pass is one of the principal passes from India into Afghanistan, and is more used than any other by the Powindahs or nomadic traders of the Ghilzai and other tribes.

**Bibliography:** Vigne, /GPLHe, London, 1840.

(ČL. Longworth DAmES.)

GUMUSKHâNE, the “silver house” (translated into modern Greek as *Άργυρόπολης*), capital of a sandjak of the wilayet of Trepazantas, and till 1913 see of the Greek Metropolis of Chaldia, is said to have been founded only 250 years ago and according to Ewliya (ii. 343) identical with Shāhān which is known as a mint for silver currency from Sulaimān I to Khuṭbān II. Gumush-khâne was formerly the centre of the mining industry in the coast lands of Pontus famous even in antiquity for its silver; in the xviiith century (under Muḥammad I) 16,000 (dollars) were struck there for a time. During the war of 1828-1829 the Russians temporarily occupied the district of Gumush-khâne; after their departure the greater part of the Greek inhabitants, who were engaged in working the mines, migrated and the mining industry declined. Recently attempts have been made, but without marked success, by European enterprise to set the flooded mines at work again; argeniferous lead is exploited there. The present population is about 3000 of which are Greeks. The rich decorations of the five Greek churches, which date from a time when the Greek population numbered 5000 families, testify to the prosperity of the earlier inhabitants (cf. *Dhikḥammuq*, p. 622, 623; Hamilton, *Researches*, i. 234 et seq.; *Triantaphylides*, Τὰ Ποιήματα, p. 97 et seq.; Sava Joannides, *Ιστορία Τραπεζούντα*, p. 141, 248 et seq.; Cuinet, *La Turquie d’Aïre*, i. 122 et seq.; view in Texier, *Dester de l’Arménie, la Perse etc.*, Pl. 2.)

(׳. J. MordtmAn.)

GURČANI. A Baloch tribe located partly in the plains of the Dera Ghazi Khān District of the Pānjiāb, and partly in the adjacent mountains called Ṣari and Ṣalāmān, and the upland plains of Shām and Phālāwāgh. They are of mixed origin, some sections being Dōdās of Sīndh Rādippit extraction, and others being Rīd Baloch of pure blood. The Chief’s family belongs to one of the Dīda sections. The tribe was till lately very turbulent and often at war with its neighbours and with the Sikhs. In 1848 they joined Edwards against the Sikhs. The Lashārī and Dūrkānī sections are mountainers occupying a very difficult hill country.


(M. Longworth DAmES.)

GURDI. GURDI, GURDХAN. [See Georgia.]

GURGANDI, Arabic Djurdjānīya, a town in the northern part of Khuṭbān; on the situation of the town and the arm of the Oxus which flows past it, cf. the article AMU-DARYA, i. 3416. Although the town is first mentioned by the Arabs, it was undoubtedly founded in the pre-Muhammadan period; the oldest Chinese name for Khuṭbān (Yüe-kien) is apparently to be traced to the name Gurgandj. In what condition the Arabs found the northern part of the country is not narrated in the sources dealing with the Arab conquest (93 = 712). In the ivth = xth century Khuṭbān broke up into two independent kingdoms, the land of the Khuṭbānshāh with Khuṭbān, the ancient capital of the country, and the land of the Emir of Gurgandj. According to the chronicle of Şahbān (Chronology, ed. Sachau, p. 36), the dynasty which had its residence in Khuṭbān only retained the regal title (Şāhīya) after the Arab conquest; the real power (wilāya) was henceforth sometimes in the hands of the members of the dynasty itself, sometimes in the
hands of others, until under its last ruler both (the žāhātya and višlāya) were finally taken from it. This statement is interpreted by Sachau (Sitz.-Ber. Wien. Ak., lxxiii. 499) to mean that the old dynasty resided in Kāth and the Arab wāli in Gurgānd and that the political separation of north from south was brought about by this system of dual rule. In the year 385 = 995 the Emir of Gurgānd succeeded in conquering Kāth, overthrowing the dynasty which had held it since pre-Muhammadan times, uniting Khaʾrīzim once more into a single kingdom and transferring the title of Khaʾrīzimi to his own house.

Gurgānd is described as the second largest town in Khaʾrīzim by the Arab geographers of the ivth = xth century (cf. W. Barthold, Turkestam, ii. 146 et seq.; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 447 et seq.); in contrast to the ancient town of Kāth it was then a rapidly rising city of commerce and industry. After the union of the two kingdoms Kāth and Gurgānd are described as the two capitals of this kingdom each enjoying equal privileges; under the later rulers and governors, Kāth gradually became quite overshadowed by Gurgānd. The period of Gurgānd's greatest prosperity coincides with the rule of the Khaʾrīzim khans of the ivth = viith and viith = xiith century Yākūt (ii. 54, 876-879). It gives most of the notices, unfortunately however very scanty, of the brilliant capital of this dynasty; 3 farāsāk from the capital there was in this period another town called "Little Gurgānd". Djuwaini's account of the siege and capture of the city by the Mongols in 618 = 1221 contains much information on the topography of Gurgānd in the viith = xiith century; cf. the text in Schefer, Christomathie Persane, ii. 136 et seq. and the comparison with other sources in W. Barthold, Turkestam, ii. 467 et seq. The city is said to have been rased to the ground on this occasion, the dikes destroyed and the whole district inundated by the Amu-Daryā; on the contrary other sources (Djūrijīn, Tabākh-ī Nāṣirī, transl. Raverty, p. 251, 1000; cf. also Ab al-Karim Bukhārī ed. Schefer, p. 78), say that several buildings, including the tomb of Sultan Takash escaped destruction. The inscription found in a mineret (cf. the picture in H. Landseid, Through Russian Central Asia, p. 517) giving the date of erection as 401 = 1010-1011, published by Katanow (Zapiski vost. otd. arkh. otd., xiv. 015 et seq.), actually shows that some remains of pre-Mongol Gurgānd have survived to the present day. On the commercial city rebuilt on another site a few years later, cf. Urgenci. (W. Barthold.)

GURKHAN, a title of the rulers of the Kārat Khitāi [q. v.]. The word is said by the Muslim authorities to mean "Khan of Khans" (Khān-i Khānān). This explanation is rejected by Grigoroyev (Vostochny Turkestam, i. 398) and Gurkhan equated to Mongol Gurren = "son in law"; the founder of the kingdom of the Karā-Khitāi is said by him to have adopted this title because he was related to the former Emperors of the house of Liao (in North China). Documentary authority on which this view might be supported has not yet been found; nor do we know any better how far the language of the Khitāi was related to Mongol or had adopted Mongol words and whether a form "Gurkhān" for "Gurren" could be explained by any phonological peculiarities of this language; indeed the Persian accounts of the Karā-Khitāi show that the Chinese word su-ma was used for son-in-law at the Gurkhān's court (cf. Defrémery's note to his edition of Mirkhond, Histoire des Sultans du Kharezm, p. 124). Chung-Khān's rival Djamūkhy (cf. the article Čingiz-Khān, i. 857a infra) adopted the title "Gurkhān" in the early years of the xiith century, apparently in imitation of the title of the Karā-Khitāi; the title does not seem to be found later.

GWALIOR, (Gwāliyār), the capital of the principal Native State of Central India, ruled by the Maharāḍājī Sindhis, is chiefly famous for its fortress, situated on a great table rock of Vindhyana sandstone. This rock rises 300 feet above the plain, and stretches two miles from north to south, and is half a mile broad at its widest point. It was threatened by Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazni in 1032, and was captured in 1196 for Sultan Shihāb al-Din Ghūrī, by his Dhihi deputy, Kūṭ al-Din Aībak from the Pāhrās, who had ousted the Kaʾbāwā Dājīpūtī. It was recovered by the Pāhrās 14 years later, but was reconquered by the emperor Ilutmish in 1232 after a long siege, which ended in the immolation of the women of the defenders at the Djawār tank at the north end of the fortress. After capturing the fort, the emperor destroyed the famous Sūrū Dīvān temple, which stood near the Sundā Kund at the south of the tableland. During the confusion caused by the invasion of the emperor Timūr, the place was seized by the Tūnārā Dājīpūtī, who held it till 1518, in spite of several sieges by Hūshāng Shāh of Māwa, Husain Shāh Shārī of Dājīpūtī, and the Lūdī Kings of Dīlī. During this century and a quarter the place rose to high renown, especially under Rādāj Mān Singh, who built the famous Mān Mandir (palace), and the principal gate leading into the fort. When the fort surrendered to Ibrāhīm Lūdī he carried off from it Dīlī a famous brazen bull, which was afterwards transferred to Fathpur Sikri, and there broken up. The emperor Bābur visited Gwallīar in 1526. In 1542 it fell to the Pāhrās Sultan Shīr Shāh Sūr, and under him and his son Islam Shāh, who died there in 1552, it was practically the capital of India. It was surrendered to Akbar soon after his accession, and the fine tomb of Muḥammad Gāhwīn near the foot of the fortress is, with the mausoleum of the emperor Humaỳn at Dīlī, one of the earliest important works of Mughal architecture in India. Under the Mughal emperors the fortress became a state prison, and many inconvenient members of the royal family died in the Naw Cawk cells near the north-west gate of the fort, known as the Dhowānā-pūl. The Mughal governor Muʾtamid Khān built a small mosque by the Gānēsh Gate, and deepened the Nur Sāgar Tank; he also destroyed the shrine of the hermit the Guālipī, from whom the rock is said to derive its name. The Dājīmī Masjīd, a fine building, was begun about 1605 and finished 60 years later. The Dājīngī-Mandīr (about 290 by 180 ft.) was built in the reign of the fourth Mughal emperor, north of the palace of Mān Singh, and upon the site of that of the Sūr emperors; the Shāhādāh Mandīr (520 × 170 ft.) stands north again of the former on the spot where the palace of the emperor Humāyūn once stood. After the defeat of the emperor Aḥmad
H.

HÄ, the 26th letter of the Arab alphabet with the numerical value 5, our h; it has survived everywhere except in Maltese where it has become haorra or h. As a feminine termination (hā' al-ta'ānī) with the pronunciation t the character receives the two points of the letter ṭā’. In reality the written form is here based on the ᥱ pronunciation of the feminine termination at in pause, while the pronunciation t (as in Hebrew) has survived in combination with a vowel following. The transition from at to ᥱ in pause did not, however, take place at the same time throughout the whole of the Arabic language wherever spoken, but appeared earlier in the west, where the pronunciation was authoritative for the orthography, than in the east (Noldeke, *Beitr. zur Sem. Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 10), so that the Persians have adopted Arab words with the pronunciation at. In Arabic itself this h was afterwards dropped everywhere so that the spelling with h has now only a historical interest.

HÄ, the 6th letter of the Arab alphabet with the numerical value 8. It is a guttural characteristic of the Semitic languages, approximating to the unvoiced sound corresponding to 'ain [q.v., i. 211], as 'ain passes into ḫā’ where it dialectically drops its voiced pronunciation; e.g. in Egyptian Arabic by assimilation (arbaḥṭādar, 3 from arbaḥṭādar) and in Maltese throughout when final (dumāq from dumāq). Our knowledge of the nature of this sound is no more complete than that of the related ‘ain. A discussion of the various views may be found in E. Mattessson, Études phonologiques sur le dialecte arabe vulgaire de Beyrouth (Upsala 1910), p. 41 et seq. — In South Arabic the sound approximates to hā’. The Persians and Turks also pronounce ḫ for h in words borrowed from the Arabic. — In various African names e.g. that of the Hausa people the spelling with ḫ (hs) is simply an affectation, it is really h.

(H. BAUER.)

Al-ḤABAT, the name in South Arabia for a sacred area, which is under the protection of a saint, who is usually buried there, and is a place of refuge. No one who seeks asylum on this holy ground may be slain or attacked there. The verb ḥabat in South Arabia means "to hold back" or "to restrain". The most important ḥabat in South Arabia is that of Djebel Kadjir, which lies to the south of the village of Liyya (Lahiya) on the Wādī Ḥabban in the land of the Wāhidī [q.v.]. Four saints (mugāṣṣib) of the tribe of Bā Marhūl, to whom Liyya belongs, are buried there. This ḥabat therefore is also known as Ḥabat al-Arba’ā. It is uninhabited, and the surrounding tribes only allow their cattle to pasture there after the rains. Besides places of refuge which are called ḥabat there are others which bear the name ḥawaṣa [q.v.].

1857 till 1886, since when it has been in the hands of the Maharājā Sindhia.


(J. SCHLEIFER.)

ḤABBÁ, literally grain or kernel, a fraction in the Troy weight system of the Arabs, of undefined weight. Most Arab authors describe the ḥabba as 1/60 of the unit of weight adopted, as 1/10 of the dānuṣ (which in Arab metrology is a sixth part of the unit, see i. 912), but there are other estimates which vary from 1/96 to 1/84. The ḥabba thus means something very different according to the unit of weight: there is a ḥabba of the silver measure, a ḥabba of the gold measure, a ḥabba of the mithqāl, later of the dirham etc. On the supposition that the oldest Arab unit of Troy weight was the mithqāl [q.v.] of 4.25 grammes (65½ grains Troy), we get as the most probable weight of the ḥabba in the early days of ʿĪlam about 70—71 milligrammes (1.1 grains), which approximately agrees with the European apothecary's weight of the gramun (gram, γ., of the pound) as it was used throughout Europe down to the most recent times (cf. the English Troy grain of 64.8 milligrammes). The statements regarding the subdivisions and multiples of the ḥabba also vary; the ḥabba is usually divided into 2 grains of barley (ḫabṣir) or 4 grains of rice (ṣaruz) or about 100 mustard-seeds (khurādat); sometimes 3 and sometimes 4 ḥabba on the other hand make a kīrat [q.v.].

At the present day in Constantinople in Troy measure (for precious metals, jewels and drugs) the ḥabba, of which four make a kīrat, weighs 50.04 milligrammes (0.75 grains) (the drachm of 64 ḥabba thus weights 3.2025 grammes = 49.4235 Troy grains); in the coinage system it is somewhat heavier: 50.11 milligrammes (the coin-drachm = 3.207 grammes = 49.497 grains Troy). In Cairo the ḥabba, of which 3 go to the kīrat, is the same for all measures: 64.3417 milligrammes (one drachm = 3.0884 grammes = 47.66 grains Troy).

and the metrological text books; e. g. F. Noback, *Mumaz-, Mass- und Gewichtsbruch*; Kelly's *Universal Cambist*, etc. (E. V. ZIMMERMANN.)

**HABBAN (ABBA),** a town in South Arabia, the capital of the territory of the Upper Wajidi [q. v.], situated in the wadi of the same name. According to Miles it has about 4000 inhabitants, but this figure seems to be too high. The Sultan of the Wajidi dwells here in the Castle of Masa'n a Hakir, which is built on a small isolated hill in the midst of the city and surrounded by a wall. The town itself has no walls and only two watch-towers at each end of it. The houses are strongly built like little fortresses and, as usual in the land of the Wajidi, often five stories high. In the houses of the better families the second storey is used as a madrasha (reception-room). Besides one large mosque, Habban has eight smaller ones and an important library. The town is divided into four quarters: 1. the quarter of the Hadram and Ra'yiya; 2. that of the Jews; 3. that of the family of the Fakhir Muhammad b. Hasan al-Shihli (of the prominent family of Muhammad b. Umar in al-Hawta and al-Rawda) and 4. that of the carpenters who here form a caste and are descended from the ancient great carpenter family of al-Aww, who came originally from Jeddah and are now scattered throughout almost all South Arabia. The Jews (about 200 in number) are mostly goldsmiths and, as usual in South Arabia, are subject to many restrictions; they may not carry arms, nor acquire land and have to pay a kind of poll-tax (*furqah*) to the Sultan. Miles saw many inscriptions, which he describes as Hebrew near Habbân in the little wadi of Shuhab.


**HABESH,** see ABBYSSINIA, ii. 263, 268 sqq.

**HABIB B. AWE.** (See ABU TAMAM.)

**HABIB B. MAS'LAMA,** a Meccan of the clan of Banî Fiz, one of the Caliph Mu'awiyah's greatest generals. He is generally recognised as a companion of the Prophet except by the Medina school, who are infatuated by their anti-Umayyad prejudices. The chronology confirms the correctness of this view. For, as he must have been about 15 years old at Muhammad's death, there is no reason to suppose that he was not personally acquainted with him. He very early took part in the first fighting in Syria and vigorously championed the cause of the Umayyads. Under the governorship and later the Caliphate of Mu'awiyah he distinguished himself by his numerous incursions into Asia Minor and particularly Armenia. Tradition ascribes to him the conquest of the latter country. He is also known as Habib al-Rum, Habib of Byzantium, on account of his frequent raids into Byzantine territory. He was also a madhhab al-darur i.e. he possessed the privilege of having all his prayers and requests answered by God. He was also dead at the age of about 55 early in the reign of the Caliph Mu'awiyah; but he seems to have played no part in history after this date.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Hadjir, *Ishāa* (Egyptian edition), i. 309. A complete bibliography is given in my *Etudes sur le règne du Calife Omeyyade Muawya Jr.* (H. LAMMENS.)

**HABIB AL-NADJ'JR (the carpenter), the saint of Antakya, after whom Mount Silpius is called by the Arabs, because a much visited grave, alleged to be his, is said to be there (cf. above i. 360). This Muslim saint is no other than the Agabus mentioned in Acts xi. 27—30 and xxi. 10 et seq., and his legend, which is related in *Sura* xxxvi. 12 et seq., although his name is not mentioned, is consequently of Christian origin. When Allah, as is the tradition, sent two apostles (according to the expositors, Yahya and Yunus) and afterwards a third (Sham'un) to convert the inhabitants and the latter threatened them with death if they did not give up preaching, a man came running from the most distant part of the town, who warned his fellow-citizens to believe the messenger and proclaimed himself a believer. The wrath of the people was thereupon turned against him and, when they were putting him to death, they cried in screeching tones to him: "Enter thou into paradise!" but he rejoiced that he was worthy of the high honour of martyrdom. Allah thereupon put all the blasphemers to death and without sending an army against them: a single cry (a voice from heaven) was heard and all were dead.

That man, say the expositors of the Kor'an, was Habib al-Nadj'jr, a carpenter who made idols but had become a convert, when he saw the miracles performed by the apostles. As it appears from the Kor'anic account as if Habib had prided himself on his martyr's death after he had suffered it, we find in al-Dima' (ed. Mehren, p. 206) the fantastic story, that Habib took his decapitated head in his left hand and placed it in his right and walked for three days and nights through the city in this fashion, while the head cried with a loud voice out the verses mentioned in the Kor'an.

**Bibliography:** The commentaries on Kor'an, *Sura* xxxvi.; cf. also the bibliography to the article ANTIKYA.

**HABIL and KABIL,** the names given by Muhammadan to the two sons of Adam, mentioned, but not by name, in the Kor'an, who brought an offering to God. Jealous that his sacrifice was rejected the one slew his brother. A raven sent by God, which scratched upon the ground, showed him how he could dispose of the body (Sura, v. 30—34). As this account in the Kor'an, following the Bible narrative, appears bald and uninteresting, Kor'anic exegesis, like the Biblical, endeavours to discover the psychological motives underlying the affair. According to it, the sons of Adam were all born with twin sisters; Kabil's (also sometimes called Keb, Kabin and Kayin) was called Aklima, Habil's, who was two years younger, Labadad (the names are given in varying forms). According to one tradition which is traced among scholars bi 'l-Kitab al-Auwal (presumably the book of Genesis is meant), Kabi first saw the light in Paradise and Habil was born on earth, just as also Pirke de K. Eliezer, 21. Adam demanded that each should marry the other's twin sister; but Kabil wished to marry his own sister who was the fairer. It was to be decided by a sacrifice to which of the two the fairer sister was to go (so also Hellenoth, 62, *Gen.* X., 22 etc.). According to another version, to which the marriage with a sister was abhorrent, Habil was to have married a hourly of Paradise, while Kabil had to marry a woman of the Djinn, with which he did not agree. Nor did the rejection of his sacrifice
Habi and Kabil — Hadd.
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(according to Tabari, i. 144 infra, he had sacrificed frits of the field of little value, while Kabil slew his favourite sheep). Kabil slew his twenty-year-old brother, according to one account following the example of Iblis, who appeared with a bird in his hand and struck off its head (a similar story is given in Sanhedrin, 30). As Habi was the first man that had died, the murderer did not know what to do with the corpse; he therefore carried it for a year on his back in a sack to protect him from the birds and wild beasts. He then noticed a raven fighting with another kill his opponent and burying the earth over him. Kabil did the same with his brother (similarly in Pirke de R. Eliezer, 21, while according to Gen. R., 22, the birds and beasts buried Abiel). When God said to him: "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto Me from the ground. Wherefore hast thou slain him?" Cain replied: "Where is his blood, if I have slain him?" thereupon God forbade the earth ever again to drink human blood.


Habos (A.), properly ḫūbūs, a pious endowment, synonymous with waqf (q.v.).

Hadath (A.), ritual impurity. The law recognises two conditions of ritual impurity which are distinguished from one another as "major" and "minor" hadath. A Muslim in a condition of hadath may not regain his ritual purity (ḥilāla) by the prescribed ritual ablutions (ṣuqūf or waqf) respectively; cf. Djanāba, ḡhusul and wudū'. Not only is a muḥādith (a person in a condition of "minor" hadath) forbidden to perform the salāt, but also he is not allowed to make the fawāf around the Ka'ba nor to touch a copy of the Korān; further the salāt and fawāf of a muḥādith are legally invalid. The same regulations apply to a case of major hadath; but there are a few additional rules applicable to the latter, cf. Djanāba, i. 1013.

(Th. W. Juvinsboll.)

Al-Hadath, also al-Ḫanwāk, a border fortress often mentioned in the wars between the Arabs and the Byzantines. The exact situation of al-Hadath, the "Adas of the Greeks, has not yet been ascertained, because the town (see below) has been utterly deserted for over six centuries, but there can be no doubt that it is to be located not far from Inekli on the Akṣu. It is the Akṣu that Yakūt (iv. 838) means by the Nahr Hūrīṭh, which according to him rises in the lake of al-Hadath and flows into the Djiāhān. Ibn Seraphius's statement that the river flows through several small lakes, which are now called Goink Göl, Azabli Göl and Bash Göl, is more accurate, although, as Le Strange points out, this author is wrong, when he says that the river is a tributary of the Nahr al-Kubākīb (Melas). In Ramsay, A Sketch of the Historical Geography of Asia Minor, p. 278, Adatta is wrongly placed a short distance to the north of Germanicia (Marāsh). The fortress was captured by a body of Arab troops under lyd b. Qāhan as early as the reign of ʿOmar I (cf. 162—179): it was destroyed by the Byzantines but rebuilt in the same year by command of the Caliph al-Mahdi. It was then called al-Muham-

Madiya and al-Mahdiya in his honour, but these names could not supplant the old one. The town was of great strategic importance to the Arabs, because it commanded one of the great military roads from Halab (ʿAtītab) to Ellībatān (Asia Minor), while another led thither via Marāš. Al-Hadath was therefore garrisoned by Hāfrīn al-Rashīd and was reckoned one of the most important towns in the frontier provinces (al-Thughūr). The fortress proper was built on a hill called al-Uhadab, while the town itself was of the same size as Marāš; it was much harassed in the campaigns of Basil I (882) and Leo VI (904). It suffered still more when in 979 Harūq Phokas burned it, which induced the inhabitants to call in the help of Saif al-Dawla (q.v.). The latter did not hesitate to answer their appeal, won a great victory in the neighbourhood of the town in 343 (954) and had it rebuilt. But the building was not completed, because soon afterwards the Byzantines were again victorious and won the upper hand in those regions. It was not till 545 (1150) that Masʿūd, the Saljuq ruler of Konīya, again won the town for the Muslims, who held it till the Armenians of Sis under Constantine, the father of Haiṭhum, captured it. This caused Baḥars to send a body of troops against it in 671 (1278), who took the town and castle, massacred the inhabitants and razed the town to the ground so that it was henceforth known as Gūmīk "the burned" (so the various readings in al-Maqrizi and al-Dimashqī are to be emended). This name survives to the present day as that of the lake and plain where Adatta once lay.

Bibliography: Bibliotheca Geogr. Arab., s. Index; Badʾī al-Maʿṣūm, i. 514; ii. 228 et seq.; iv. 838; Balāḏūrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 189 et seq.; Tabari, Ibn al-Athir, s. Indices; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, p. 443; do., The Lands of the Eastern Caliph., p. 121 et seq.; Vasilev, Vizinatia i Arabi, i. 79 Note; Ibn Ṣalīḥ Allāh in Quatremère, Notices et Extraits, xiii. (1838).

Hadd (A.), plural ḥудād, boundary, limit, stipulation, also barrier, obstacle. As a scientific term the word is used in several senses.

In the K.Pāḥa, where it is always found in the plural, it means the "limits" laid down by God, i.e. the provisions of the Law, whether commands or prohibitions. It appears in this sense at the end of several verses, which contain legal provisions, e.g. Sūra ii. 183, where it is said after the exposition of the rules regarding fasts: "These are God's ḥudād (the bounds prescribed by God), come not too near them" (lest ye be in danger of crossing them). Cf. also Sūra ii. 229 et seq., where the law of divorce is laid down and other passages. According to Kazimī, Sūra ii. 283 the expression recalls the saying ṭeṣṣā ṭala, the hedge drawn round the Mosaic law.

In Muslim criminal law hadd means an unalterable punishment prescribed by canon law, which is considered a "right of God" (ḥaṣk Allāh). (Cf. the article ʿA dhād, i. 132 et seq.). These punishments are 1. stoning or scourging for illicit intercourse (ṣināʿ, q.v.); 2. scourging for falsely accusing (ḥḍafīq, q.v.) a married woman of adultery; 3. the same punishment for the drinking of wine and other intoxicating liquors; 4. cutting off the hands for theft (cf. the article ʿaṣār); 5. various punishments for robbery which differ
according to circumstances, cf. Korâân, v. 37-38. — Although the above mentioned breaches of the law are considered very serious, the criminal can nevertheless hope for the mercy of God, because he has offended against Him. If he denies the deed and refutes the accusations brought against him, the judges are recommended not to press him further, but to give him every possible opportunity to clear himself; for further details see Juynboll, Handbuch des islamischen Gerichtes.

In philosophy hâdd means definition; the qualities that differentiate an object are called târsîfât. The definition is perfect when it gives the genus proximum and the differentia specifica, e.g. man is an animal rational. There is a kind of definition, which places the object to be defined between two limits so that it is the end of one and the beginning of the other.

Hâjiyl is also the name given to the definitions which stand at the beginning of various sciences, e.g. at the beginning of Euclid's geometry; the postulates are called muṣâdarât (Codex Leidenis 999, t. Euclides Elementa, ed. Besthorn and Heiberg, 1893).

In astronomy hâdd means certain areas under each sign of the zodiac, which are each allotted to one of the five planets.

Among the mystics hâdd and particularly the participle malâdîd means the finiteness of creatures in contrast to the infiniteness of God; man is limited and bounded (mahdûd) in space and time. (B. Carra de Vaux.)

HADENDOA, a Hamitic tribe in N.E. Africa belonging to the Bedja [q.v., i. 687] group and closely allied to the Bhâjârî, Hâlanga and Bani 'Amir tribes. They live in the country between the river Atbara and the Red Sea and extend towards the South as far as the borders of Eritrea and Abyssinia. Politically nearly the whole tribe belongs to the Red Sea and Kassala provinces of the Anglo-Egyptian Sûdân.

They are a nomadic or semi-nomadic tribe of camel-owners and caravan-guards; in their general characteristics and customs they do not differ materially from the rest of the Bedja tribes with whom they also share the use of the Bedawye language. Their claim to Arab descent must be rejected, but there is little doubt that they have at various times received considerable admixture of Arab blood. Although they have been Muslims for centuries their Islâm is of the primitive African type and often only skin-deep. At the same time there are scholars among them who have acquired a certain amount of Islamic learning through intercourse with Egypt and more especially the Hâjdâi.

Historically the tribe has never played an independent part until the most recent times. Although the Ottoman Turks have held Saûkin since the time of Sultan Selim the 3rd, they seem to have exercised little authority in the interior and have left no traces of their influence. During the revolt of Muḥammad Aḥmad, the Mahdî of the Sûdân, the Hadendoa took a prominent part in the fighting against the British and Egyptian troops and won a reputation for reckless courage and fanatizm. Their adherence to Mahdism was however less inspired by religious motives than by the personal influence of their well-known leader 'Osâmân Dîqna ('Osmân Dikna), a man of semi-Turkish descent. Since the occupation of Saûkin and Tôkær by the Anglo-Egyptian troops and more especially since the defeat and death of the Khalîfa, the Hadendoa have gradually become reconciled to the new régime, under which their material prosperity has increased considerably.


(H. Weir.)

AL-HÂDI (-i), the guide, one of the names of God, thence a favourite epithet of Shi'i rulers, e.g. of the Imâms of Ǧânâ and Ǧâda; it was first adopted by the 'Abbâsîd Mûsâ. The full expression is al-Hâdi ila 'l-Hâdî, the guide to truth (God).

HÂDÎ SABZAWÂRÎ (Hâdî Mulla), son of Hâdî Mulla, a Persian philâsopher and poet, born in 1212 (1797–1798). He was a pupil of Hâdî Mulla Ǧusâin and wrote a short treatise when only twelve years old. He then went with his teacher to Meşhâb and devoted himself for five years there to study and the practice of asceticism. He spent the next seven years in Ispâhân studying under Mûlî Ǧâli'î Nûrî, then made the pilgrimage to Mecca and returned via Kirmân to settle in Sabzawâr, where his reputation soon assembled a host of students around him. He delivered two lectures a day, of two hours each. In 1295 (1875) he died suddenly while engaged in teaching. The grand vizier had a mausoleum built over his grave before the gates of Meşhâb, which is much visited by pilgrims. According to his teaching, the world is an emanation, manifestation or projection of God; it is a mirror in which the Deity regards himself, the scene on which his attributes unfold their activities. It is a brilliant ray emanating from the source of light. The farther these emanations go from their source, the thicker and coarser they become until they finally form the material world. This he calls Ǧâwâ'î mawûd (descending arc); the human soul is able to rise again on this ladder again by the different steps of the Ǧâwâ'î Ǧîdâ'îd (ascending arc). He adopted a system of metempsychosis (tanâsûk), but only within the world of the uniform (��ّمّ-مثّî) in which every one assumes the form suitable to his qualities. It was mainly the teaching of Mûlî Ǧusâin that he continued. He laid down his views in his book Ǧusâr al-Hîsâba; he took the pen-name (ṭakkhalûs) of Ǧusâr and under
it published a collection of poems of which two lithographed editions exist (1299 and 1300). The British Museum possesses his autograph (Rieu, Sapph. p. 258, n°. 31).

**Bibliography:** E. G. Browne, *A Year among the Persians*, p. 130—144; Comte de Gobineau, *Religions et Philosophies* p. 99.

**Al-HADID**, iron. According to the Sūrat al-

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


(R. Ruskā.)

**HADĪD** (A.), the lowest part, in astronomy, the perigee or the nearness to the earth of the sun, moon or a planet; its opposite, the apogee, or distance from the earth is usually expressed by the Persian word awfī [q. v., i. 517] which corresponds to the Sanskrit *teca* (height, highest point). These are the points in the eccentric orbit, i.e. the orbit in which the sun, or in the case of the moon and planets the centre of the epicycle, move, which are least or most distant from the earth, the termini of the Apis. In the later astronomers, al-Bārījāndī, al-Dijāhnīnī, etc., several varieties of hadīd and awfī are distinguished.


**Al-HADĪNA**, a small independent territory in South Arabia, north of the Wādi. It is one of the most interesting and most fertile territories in South Arabia. The products of the soil, which is artificially irrigated by canals from the Wādi ‘Abādān are khāwir (indigo), dhūra (a kind of maize) and dūkhān (millet). Al-Hadīna is inhabited by the tribe al-Khālīfa, which claims descent from the Hilāl [q. v.]. On the migration of the Hilāl they remained in South Arabia, whence their name Khaifa. They number about 1000 fighting men and are ruled by an ʿĀkil whose residence is in the little town of al-Līmābya. In case of war they serve under the banner of the Sultan of the Upper ʿAwwālīk [q. v., i. 514] in Niṣābūr. **Bibliography:** H. v. Maltzan, *Reise nach Sudarabien*, p. 248; Comte de Lamberg, *Arabica*, iv. p. 57—60.

(J. Schäfer.)

**Al-HADĪRA** (al-Iwawādira), a surname of the pre-Islamic poet Kūba b. Abī Al an tribe of the Thulāba (ţaţafān). He is said to have flourished about 600 A. D.; Hassān b. Thābit knew some of his verses. He exchanged lances (hījād) on several occasions with the poet Zabbān b. Sāyiyr al-Fāzāzī, who on one occasion had treated him very contemptuously. His epithet is said to be taken from a verse of the latter's in which his form was compared with that of a frog. It is also related of him that he took part in a battle between his tribe and the B. ʿAmīr.

His poems, that have survived, are very few in number; he probably composed very little altogether; it is said that he was muqīl. One of his ḥażāda's has been incorporated in the Musafidātīyāt (ed. Abū Bakr b. ʿUmār Ījāhstāni al-Madāni, Cairo, 1324, i. 1, 10—12 = Engelmann's edition, p. 5 et seq.). His Ḥawān is collected and annotated by the philologist Abī ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Abāhāb al-Yazīdī (died 310 A. H.). **Bibliography:** Agānī, liii., 81—84; W. H. Engelmann, *Specimen literarium exhibens al-Hadīrac Divānum*, Leiden Diss., 1878; Broeckelmann, *Gesch. d. arab. Lit.*, i. 26.

(C. van Arendonk.)

**HADĪTH** (A.). Tradition. The word hadīth means primarily a communication or narrative in general whether religious or profane, then it has the particular meaning of a record of actions or sayings of the Prophet and his companions. In the latter sense the whole body of the sacred Tradition of the Muhammadans is called "the Hadīth" and its science "ilm al-Hadīth.

1. **Subject-matter and Character of Hadīth.** Even among the heathen Arabs (see I. Goldziher, *Muhammad*, Stud. i. 41, note 8) it was considered a virtue to follow the "sunna" of one's forefathers (sunna is properly the way one is accustomed to go, i.e. use and wont, ancient tradition). But in Islam the sunna could no longer consist in following the customs and usages of heathen ancestors. The Muslim community had to hold up a new sunna. Every believer had now to take the conduct of the Prophet and his companions as a model for himself in all the affairs of life and every endeavour was made to preserve information regarding it.

At first the Șāhībī's (i.e. people who had lived in the society of the Prophet) were the best authority for a knowledge of the sunna of Muhammad. They had themselves listened to the Prophet and witnessed his actions with their own eyes. Later the Muslims had to be content with the communications of the Tābīʿīn (i.e. "successors", people of the first generation after Muhammad), who had received their information from the Șāhībī's and then, in following generations, with the accounts of the so-called "successors of the successors" (Tābīʿīn al-Tābīʿīn i.e. people of the second generation after Muhammad, who had mixed with the successors), and so on.
The traditions retained the form of personal statements for several generations; every perfect ḥadīth therefore consists of two parts. The first contains the names of the persons who have handed on the substance of the tradition to one another; this part is called the isnād (or also sanad) i.e. the “support” of the Prophet in the trustworthy of the statement. He who communicates the tradition (A) says “I have heard from B (or “B has told me’) on the authority of C”, and so on, whereupon the whole chain of transmission should follow, beginning with A, the last authority, and ending with the original authority. The second part is the matn or text, the real substance of the report. For details see Goldzibter, op. cit. ii. 6—8.

After Muhammad’s death the original religious ideas and usages which had prevailed in the oldest community could not remain permanently unaltered. A new period of development set in. The learned began systematically to develop the doctrine of duties and dogmatics in accordance with the new conditions. After the great conquests Islam covered an enormous area. New ideas and institutions were borrowed from the peoples conquered, and not only Christianity and Judaism, but Hellenism, Zoroastrianism and Buddhism also influenced the life and thought of the Muslims of the day in many respects. Nevertheless the principle was steadfastly adhered to, that in Islam only the sunna of the Prophet and the oldest Muslim community could be a rule of conduct for believers. This of necessity soon led to deliberate forgery of Tradition. The transmitters brought the words and actions of the Prophet into agreement with the views of the later period. Thus numerous interested traditions were put into circulation, in which Muhammad was made to say or do something, which was at that time considered the proper view. Christian texts, sayings from the Apostles and the Apocrypha, Jewish views, doctrines of Greek philosophers, etc. which had found favour in certain Muslim circles, appear in the Ḥadīth simply as sayings of Muhammad (Goldzibter, Neutestamentliche Elemente in der Traditionsliteratur des Islam in Oriens Christianus, 1902, p. 390 et seq.).

No scruples were felt in making the Prophet expand in this form the legends or stories, only briefly outlined in the Korān, or proclaim new doctrines and dogmas, etc. A very large portion of these sayings ascribed to the Prophet deals with the Ahkām (legal provisions), religious obligations, ḥalāl and haram (i.e. what is “allowed” and “forbidden”), with ritual purity, laws regarding food, criminal and civil law and also with courtesy and good manners; further they deal with dogma, retribution at the last judgment, Hell and Paradise, angels, creation, revelation, the earlier prophets, and in a word with everything that concerns the relations between God and man; many traditions also contain edifying sayings and moral teachings in the name of the Prophet.

In course of time the records of Muhammad’s words and deeds increased more and more in number and copiousness. In the early centuries after Muhammad’s death there reigned great diversity of opinion in the Muslim community on many questions of the most diverse nature. Each party therefore endeavoured to support its views as far as possible on sayings and decisions of the Prophet. He who could base his view on these was certainly right and thus arose the numerous utterly contradictory traditions on the sunna of the Prophet. In the great partisan struggles also, both sides used to make an appeal to Muhammad (Goldzibter, Muhamm. Stud. ii. 88 et seq.). Thus for example the Prophet was said to have pronounced the founds of the Abbāsids. In general not only the course of later political events and religious movements but also the new social conditions, that only first arose out of the great conquests (the increasing luxury etc.), were made to have been prophesied in apocalyptic-prophetic form to justify them in the eyes of the community. A special branch of these prophetic traditions is formed by the sayings ascribed to Muhammad regarding the merits of various places and districts in the lands which were only at a later period to be conquered by the Muslims. (Goldzibter, op. cit., ii. 128 et seq.).

The majority of traditions then cannot be regarded as really reliable historical accounts of the sunna of the Prophet. On the contrary, they express opinions which had come to be held in authoritative circles in the early centuries after Muhammad’s death and were only then ascribed to the Prophet. Scholarship is deeply indebted to L. Goldzibter (see his Muhamm. Stud., Halle 1890 and other works) and C. Snouck Hurgronje (cf. among other works his treatise Le Droit Musulman in the Revue de l’histoire des Religions, xxxvii. 6 et seq.) for having first clearly demonstrated the true character and historical importance of the Ḥadīth in this respect.

Although the invention and wanton dissemination of false traditions was condemned by Muslims, alleviating elements were recognised in certain circumstances, particularly when it was a question of edifying sayings and moral teachings in the name of the Prophet. For details see Goldzibter, op. cit., ii. 131 et seq., 152 et seq.; do., in the Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, Ixi. 860 et seq.)

The Ḥadīth is held in great reverence next to the Korān throughout the whole Muhammadan world and the scruples which were originally raised in certain circles against the dissemination and recording in writing of Muhammad’s words (cf. Goldzibter, Klänge um die Stellung des Ḥadīth im Islam in the Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, Ixi., 860 et seq.), were soon overcome. In some cases it is even believed that the actual “word of God” is to be found in the Ḥadīth as well as in the Korān. Such traditions, usually beginning with the words “God said” are designated Ḥadīth kudsi (or also Ḥālā, i.e. “holy” or “divine” Ḥadīth) by Muslim scholars in opposition to the ordinary Ḥadīth nahawi (Ḥadīth of the Prophet). A list of such holy traditions is given in the Leiden MS, n. 1526 (Catal. Cod. Ori. iv. 98).

II. Muslim criticism of Tradition. According to the Muslim view, a tradition can only be considered credible when its isnād forms an unbroken series of reliable authorities. The critical investigation of isnād has caused the Muslim scholars to make thorough researches. They endeavoured not only to ascertain the names and circumstances of the authorities (ridāj) in order to investigate when and where they lived, and which of them had been personally acquainted with the other, but also to test their reliability, truthfulness and accuracy in transmitting the texts, to
make certain which of them were "reliable" (ṣaḥīḥ). This criticism of the authorities was called al-
dжарк по ʿl-ḥaddī (wounding and authentication). (Goldziher, Mehmud, Stud. ii, 145 et seq.) The so-called "knowledge of the men" (mārifat al-
ridāj) was considered indispensable for every student of Ḥadīth; all the commentators on the
collections of Tradition therefore contain more or less copious details concerning the authorities.
Special works are also devoted to this subject, among them many of the so-called Ṭabaqāt works
(i.e. biographies arranged in "classes" of various scholars, transmitters of Tradition and other per-
Gesellschaft, xxiii, 593—614), for example the famous "class book" of Ibn Saʿd (died 230 = 844)
and the Ṭabaqāt al-Hufayl of al-Dhahabi (died 748 = 1347). To this class also belong the works
on those "weak" in transmitting, e.g. Nasāʾī's Kitāb al-Duʿāfāʾ (Goldziher, ii, 144 et seq.) and
the biographies of the Ṣaḥābā's, e.g. al-ʿIṣābā fī inayāt al-Ṣaḥāba of Ibn Ḥadjar (died 852 = 1448)
and Usd al-Ḡirba fī Maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥāba of Ibn al-ʿAthār (died 630 = 1232).

Now opinions on the reliability of the authorities might differ very considerably. The same person,
whose communications might be implicitly trusted in the view of one party, was sometimes considered
by others exceedingly "weak" in transmission or even as a liar. Originally even the authority of many
highly respected contemporaries of Muḥam-
mad was not generally recognised; for example the truthfulness of Abū Hurairah was hotly disputed by
very many. The verdict usually differed with the standpoint of the party, and this often gave rise
to bitter quarrels. We must, however, remember in this connection that the substance of the trans-
mittted statements was really always the main thing. If the truthfulness of the authorities was disputed,
it was in reality almost always the bias of their substance that aroused opposition. The ultimate
decision then rested not on the reputation of the authorities but rather on the substance of the
accounts transmitted by them.

But at a later period, after the ritual, dogma and the most important political and social insti-
tutions had taken definite shape in the second
and third centuries, there arose a certain communis opinis regarding the reliability of most trans-
mitters of Tradition and the value of their state-
ments. All the main principles of doctrine had already been established in the writings of Mālik
b. Anas, al-Ṣaḥābī and other scholars, regarded as authoritative in different circles, and mainly on
the authority of traditional sayings of Muḥam-
mad. In the long run no one dared to doubt the truth of these traditions; nor was it any longer possible
to regard men like Abū Hurairah, who had put
these accounts into circulation, as liars. Even tradi-
tions which contained the most obvious ana-
chronisms were generally considered reliable. Only
such traditions were rejected as could not be brought into agreement with what had been long regarded
by the majority as well established. But on the
whole the inclination was to give credence to
such traditions also, at least when it was possible
to explain them in a conciliatory spirit. The old
quarrels had now in course of time lost all prac-
tical interest for the younger generations and it
was found that the majority of the traditions con-
nected with them, although sharply opposed to
one another, could very often be reconciled to
one another by skilful interpretation of the con-
texts. The rejection of a tradition thus came to
be considered an extreme measure, only to be
resorted to in desperation (cf. Snouck Hurgronje,
op. cit.); the many contradictory traditions on
the same subject, which have been adopted side by
side as reliable in the great collections of Tradition
thus often form priceless evidence to the historian
of the internal development of Islam. The tradi-
tions were not, however, all considered of equal
value by Muslim scholars, but divided into cate-
gories distinguished by definite technical terms
according to the completeness of their isnaʿād's,
the reliability of their transmitters.

III. The classification of Tradition.
a. In the first place the three following categories are distinguished: 1. ṣaḥīḥ (sound); this name is
given to the utterly faultless tradition in whose
isnaʿād there is no ṣulḥ (weakness) and whose ten-
dency does not contradict any generally prevalent belief; 2. If a tradition is not absolutely faultless,
e.g. because its isnaʿād is not quite complete, or
because there is no perfect agreement regarding
the reliability of the authorities for it, it is called ḥasan (beautiful); 3. On the other hand every tradition is considered weak (weak), against which serious doubts can be raised, e.g. by reason of its contents or because one or more of its trans-
mitters is considered unreliable or not quite or-thodox.
b. Further it may happen that the value of a statement is uncertain because some remarks by a
transmitter have been interpolated among the words of the Prophet and it is impossible accurately
to separate these two components of the text; such a tradition is called muḥāṣṣa. — If a tradition is
transmitted by only one informant, whose authority
besides is considered weak, it is called muṭāḥāk
("abandoned", "no longer considered"). — If a tradition is considered absolutely false, it is called
muḥāṣṣa ("invented").
c. All traditions do not deal with sayings or doings of the Prophet; we also find in the Ḥadīth
information regarding the Ṣaḥābī's and Successors.
In this connection a distinction is made between:
1. muṣafī a tradition which contains a statement
about the Prophet; 2. muḥāṣṣa, a tradition that
refers only to sayings or doings of the Ṣaḥābī's;
3. muṭāḥāk, a tradition which does not at most go
farther back than the first generation after Mu-
ḥammad and deals only with sayings or doings of the Ṭābiʿūn.

d. The following distinctions are made according to
the completeness of the isnaʿād. If a tradition can
be traced through an unbroken chain of trust-
worthy authorities to a companion of the Prophet,
it is usually called muṣtaʿd ("supported"). If it
also contains special observations regarding all
the authorities (e.g. if it is expressly mentioned
that all the authorities swore an oath as they
handed on the tradition, or that they all gave
one another the hand), the tradition is called
muṣnaʿāl (in the first case muṣnaʿāl al-ḥāl in the
second muṣnaʿāl al-yad, etc.). Cf. W. Ahlwardt,
Katal. der Arab. HSS. der Kgl. Bibliothek zu
Berlin, ii, 267—273.

If the isnaʿād, although complete, is comparatively
very short because the last authority only received
the statement from the original authority through
the intermediary of few persons, the tradition is called ʿahhā. This is considered a great advantage, because the possibility that errors have crept into the tradition is very small in this case. On long-lived transmitters of tradition cf. Goldziher, op. cit., ii. 170, 174.

If the chain of transmitters is unbroken and complete, it is called mutaṣṣil, in the opposite case manṣūf (in the general sense), but as a rule manṣūf (in the particular sense) means a tradition in whose isnād the authority in the second generation (the Tābīʿī) is wanting. — Murṣal is the name given to a tradition handed down by a Tābīʿī about the Prophet, when it is not known from what Ṣaḥābi he received his statement. The question whether such traditions are valid was answered in different ways; the older teachers such as Abū Ḥanīfa and Mālik b. Anas answered in the affirmative but the later ones in the negative (cf. among others, Zeit schrift. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, xxi. 595 note 3). — If two or more transmitters are lacking anywhere in the isnād (or, according to some other scholars, if they fail consecutively), the tradition is called muṣʿalā. If the authorities in the isnād are only connected by the preposition ʿan (e.g. A nav B, i.e. A from B), it is possible that they were not personally acquainted with one another, but only heard the statement through the intermediary of other persons not mentioned in the isnād. In this case the tradition is called muwaʿṣam (for further information cf. Goldziher, Muharr. Stud., ii. 248). — Muḥāzam is the name of a tradition in which one of the authorities is only indicated in the isnād as ʿalā islam ʿan muḥāzam of his name.

e. The following categories are distinguished according to the gurūk (*ways* i.e. according to the different chains of transmitters): 1. mutawātir is a communication handed down on many sides, which was generally known from very early times and to which objections have never been raised; 2. muğhif is a statement, which is handed down by at least three different reliable authorities, or, according to another view, a statement which, although widely disseminated later, was originally only transmitted by one person in the first generation; 3. aziz is the name of a statement which is transmitted by at least two persons and was not so generally disseminated as those traditions which are called muwatāṣir or muṣʿalā; 4. šāhād are traditions given by only one authority; 5. gharīb is in general a rare tradition; with reference to the isnād, gharīb muṣʿalā means a tradition, which is transmitted in the second generation only by one Tābīʿī (cf. also Fard, ii. 612 and Gharīb, ii. 1453); if a tradition is transmitted by only one definite person of later generations, it is called gharīb "in reference to that person" (gharīb bi l-nimāt i-lā ṣāḥibin muṣʿalā-in). A tradition which contains foreign or rare expressions in the text is also called gharīb (with reference to the contents).

These technical terms were not originally understood in the same sense by all Muslim scholars. For example it is expressly mentioned that the Imām al-Ṣaḥābi made no distinction between muṣʿalā and manṣūf; in later works also there is no absolute agreement concerning all these definitions. For details see F. Riesch, Kommentar des Ṣaḥīḥ al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh über die Kunst der Übersetzungen. Leipzig dissertation 1895; cf. Dürrejahn, Kitāb al-Farṣīf (ed. G. Flagel) and: A Dictionary of Technical Terms (ed. A. Sprenger and others).

The division of traditions into different categories is also discussed in the general introductory works on the principles of ʿIlm al-Risāla (i.e. science of transmission). Such introductory works are amongst others the three following: 1. Tūn al-Ḥadīth of Ibn al-Ṣaḥābi (died 643 = 1245); cf. Goldziher, op. cit., ii. 187 et seq.; Brockelmann, Geschichte der Arab. Litt., i. 359; 2. al-Tābiʿī wa l-Tayyir of al-Nawawī (died 976 = 1277), with its commentary the Tābiʿī al-Rawi of al-Suyūṭī (died 911 = 1505; 3. Nihāyat al-Fikr of Ḥasan Ḥadīth (died 852 = 1448) by the author himself, published by N. Lees in the Bibli. Indica, N. S. 37 of the second series, Calcutta 1862.

IV. The Collections of Tradition. Numerous collections of traditions have been prepared by different scholars. Some of these works have obtained almost canonical standing among later Muslims. An official codification of Tradition, which would be exclusively valid, has however never been made.

At the time it was not possible to arrange according to their contents but only according to their transmitters (ʿalā islam ʿan). Such a collection was called muṣnad after the traditions with complete isnād incorporated in it. This name was thus transferred from the single tradition to the whole collection. The best known of these works is the Muṣnad of Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥanbal (died 241 = 855). For further details on this collection see Goldziher, Neue Materialien zur Lutheratur der Überlieferungs- wesens bei den Muhammedanern in Zeitschrift. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, L. 465—506.

Such muṣnad were also formed at a later period; some scholars, for example, arranged the traditions contained in the great collections for greater convenience in alphabetical order, others incorporated the traditions which were mentioned in the Muṣnad of Mālik b. Anas or other similar works not planned as proper collections of Tradition in separate collections etc. (see Goldziher, Muharr. Stud., ii. 227).

But as a rule the later collections of tradition were almost all arranged according to the content of the traditions. Such a collection arranged "according to chapters" (ʿalā islam Ṣaḥāba) or muṣnad maṣnaʿ (i.e. arranged). Six of these Muṣnad works were in course of time generally recognised by the orthodox Muslim world as authoritative; they all arose in the third century A. H.; they are the collections by 1. al-Bukhārī (died 256 = 870), 2. Muslim, (died 261 = 875), 3. Abū Dāwūd (died 275 = 888), 4. al-Tirmīzhī (died 279 = 892), 5. al-Nasāʿī (died 302 = 915) and 6. Ibn Mādhā (died 273 = 886). These works are usually called briefly the six books (al-Kutub al-ṣittah or also the six Ṣaḥābi) i.e. the "sound" (i.e. the correct, reliable collections). They were, so to speak, looked upon as sacred books of second rank next to the Kurān, God's own word. The collections by al-Bukhārī and Muslim were held in particularly high esteem. They are known as the two ʿaṣaḥāb (or ʿaṣaḥāb) i.e. the two collections particularly recognised as authoritative. Only traditions which are recognised as absolutely ʿaṣāb are included in these works. In this respect, however, the ṣawāṣ (i.e. the "stipulations") of Bukhārī were not the same as those of Muslim (Goldziher, op. cit., ii.,
Al-Bukhari has besides often added fairly copious notes to the headings of his chapters, which are quite lacking in Muslim's Sahih. Both trace the traditions where possible to different ṭurāḥ and both collections contain not only traditions according to "permitted" and "forbidden", but also many historical, ethical and dogmatic traditions (for details, see Goldziher, op. cit., ii, 234–248).

On the other hand the traditions included in the works of the four other compilers deal almost exclusively with the sunna's, i.e. use and wont. Hence their collections are usually put together as "the four sunna's works". They further contain not only the traditions which are considered sahih, but also the "beautiful" ones and in general all traditions on which the learned have relied in their deduction of the law even if doubts can be raised against their isnād. When the collectors think that one of the traditions given by them should be rejected they usually call the reader's attention to the fact. Cf. Goldziher, op. cit., ii, 248 et seq.

The prestige enjoyed by these six books in Islam is readily explained. In the third century circumstances were peculiarly favourable for the work of the collector of traditions. A certain unanimity had been attained on all questions of law and doctrine and a definite opinion regarding the value of most traditions had been formed by the majority of Muslim scholars. It was thus now possible to proceed to collect all that was recognised as reliable. The merit of al-Bukhari and the compilers of the other Sahih's therefore lay not so much in the fact that (as is often wrongly stated) they decided for the first time which of the numerous traditions in circulation were genuine and which false, — for the personal opinion of the compilers would have had scarcely any appreciable influence on the prevailing opinion — but rather in the fact that they brought together everything that was recognised as genuine in ortho-doxy circles in their time. (Cf. Snouck Hurgronje, loc. cit., 187.)

Although other famous collections arose in the third century, e.g. the Sunan of 'Abd Allāh al-Dārimi (died 855 = 868), these works were never permanently able to attain such great prestige in the Muslim world as the six Sahih's. Even the general recognition of the latter works themselves was only attained very gradually; Ibn Mādiya's collection in particular was for long viewed with suspicion on account of the many "weak" traditions in it. Besides, in spite of the great authority of the "six books"; it was not considered improper to criticise these traditions, which, although included in the great collections, were not universally recognised as sahih. 'Ali al-Dāraqūṭni (died 835 = 995) for example compiled a work in which he proved the weakness of 200 traditions given in al-Bukhari and Muslim (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., ii, 257).

Even at a later period new collections were made by many scholars. The work of these late collectors of tradition was limited chiefly, however, to the preparation of more or less comprehensive compilations in which they excerpted the contents of the "six books" (and sometimes at the same time of other famous collections like that of Ibn Ḥanbal) and arranged them in different ways. One of these is Baghawi's (died 510 = 1116) collection called Maqābiḥ al-Sunnah (i.e. the lamps of the Sunna), which, on account of its fullness and convenience, has always been popular among Muḥammads. It contains a selection of traditions which are taken from older collections with the isnād's omitted. The recension of this collection by Wādi al-Dīn al-Tibāri is particularly well-known; it bears the title al-Muḳhtār al-Maqābiḥ (the name is taken from Qur'ān xxiv. 35 and is usually interpreted the "niches of the lamps"). Among large collections of the later period we may mention al-Suyūṭī's (died 911 = 1505) two works entitled Liṣān al-Ḍawwālī and al-Iṣām al-ṣaḥīḥ. Suyūṭī's main object was to give a comprehensive compendium of extant collections (for details see W. Ahlwardt, Katalog der Arab. HSS. der Kgl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, ii, 155 et seq.). Other compilers confined themselves to a definite section of the traditions contained in the larger collections (e.g. to the "moral"), or to a definite number of important traditions. Thus arose, for example the numerous so-called "Arba'in" works (i.e. collections which contain 40 important traditions).

As the substance of the Ḥadīth was in many respects no longer intelligible to the later generation of believers, many scholars felt compelled to prepare commentaries on the collections of Tradition. Obsolete words and expressions required explanation; in particular many contradictions had to be explained, or rendered harmless by artificial "explanation". Most commentators further dealt with the prescriptions to be deduced from the traditions and the divergent opinions which had been championed by different scholars in this connexion. Among the best known copious commentaries we may mention those of Ibn Ḥadjar (died 522 = 1488) and al-Kaṣālānī (died 932 = 1527) on the Sahih of al-Bukhari and of al-Nawawi (died 676 = 1277) on the Sahih of Muslim (cf. C. Brockelmann, Gesch. der Arab. Litt., i, 156 et seq.).

The Shi'a judged Ḥadīth from their own standpoint and only considered such traditions reliable as were based on the authority of 'Ali and his adherents. They have therefore their own works on this subject and hold the following collections in particularly high esteem: 1. al-Kaṣīf of Muḥammad b. Ya'kūb al-Kulaini (died 328 = 939); 2. Man la yastaḥdirulu la-ḥabībī of Muḥammad b. 'Ali b. Bābūya al-Ḳamīmi (died 381 = 991); 3. Tahâfut al-Ahkâm and 4. al-Isâqābānî's famous 'Agāḥaṭa fihi 'l-Ahkâḥ (extract from the preceding) of Muḥammad al-Ṭāwi (died 459 = 1067); and 5. Nahj al-Balāqah (alleged sayings of 'Alī) of 'Ali b. Ṭahir al-Sharīf al-Muṭarja (died 436 = 1044) or his brother Râfî al-Dīn al-Baghdādī; cf. C. Brockelmann, Gesch. der Arab. Litt., i, 157, 404 et seq.; S. Schütz, The Intellectual History of Islam, London 1880, p. 69, note 2; Goldziher, op. cit., ii, 148, note 4; do., Beitrag zur Literaturgesch. der Schī'a in Sitz.-Ber. Wiener Akad., Phil.-Hist. Clr., lxxviii. (1874), p. 508.

V. The Transmission of Tradition. The general view of Muslims that a knowledge of sacred learning could only be obtained through oral instruction from a teacher, who had himself acquired his knowledge in this way (cf. C. Snouck Hurgronje in the Zeitshr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, l. 145), was from ancient times held to be particularly applicable to Tradition. The traditions had to be "heard" and students even used to take long journeys to attend the lectures of such
persons as were famous as reliable authorities (hamāla, i.e. properly "bearers") of Tradition. In many sayings of the Prophet, travel "fi talab al-ʿimā" (i.e. to search for knowledge) is recommended as work pleasing to God. For finding information regarding those talab journeys and their degeneration (how, for example, vain scholars prided themselves on having travelled through far distant lands to "hear" a few almost unknown traditions) see Goldzeder, op. cit., ii. 175–193.

In transmission, the traditions were delivered orally by the teacher. It was also very usual for one of the students to read out a copy while the others listened and the teacher when necessary improved what was read and gave explanatory notes. In this case also it was the custom to say of traditions learned in this way: N. N. (the teacher) told me (qabdathāni or ʿāghbaran only kānwāt or ʿalākhi, i.e. while the tradition was read in his presence). One who had heard traditions in this way under the direction of a teacher, could now in his turn again communicate them to others and often received from his teacher a so-called idgāza (i.e. sanction, permit, namely for further transmission of these traditions) for this purpose.

The old method of transmitting traditions, however, was not always held in respect. The copying and collation of written texts often became the main object and oral transmission fell quite into disuse. The traditions were then simply copied and permission was obtained to transmit them with the usual formula hadithāni (i.e. "N. N. told me"), just as if the contents had been acquired by direct oral intercourse from the teacher. For details of the idgāza custom and its degeneration in Jāfīm cf. Goldzieder, op. cit., ii. 188–193; A. Sprenger in the Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, x. 9 et seq.; W. Ahlwardt, Katal. der arab. HSS. der kgl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, i. 54–95.

In certain circles the copying of traditions (biḥāṭat al-hadīth) was originally regarded as actually forbidden. Credence was only given to those traditions which had been preserved in the memories of reliable men and orally transmitted by them, but not to texts copied often without sufficient care or from unreliable records; cf. Ibn ʿAbd ʿĀsīkī's saying, "Strive eagerly to obtain traditions and get them from the men themselves, not from written records, lest they be affected by the disease of corruption of the text" (in Goldzieder, op. cit., ii. 200). Nevertheless, scholars, who utterly abstained from paper and books, are always quoted as the exceptions only, and the recording in writing of Tradition seems to have been the general custom even in the most ancient times. At the same time it could of course be acknowledged in this connexion that the writing only served to aid the memory and that the knowledge was really to be preserved "by heart" and not on the paper. For details on the writing down of Hadīth and the objections to it, see Goldzieder, op. cit., ii. 194–202; do. in the Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, i. 475; 489; kān. 862; A. Sprenger, op. cit., x. 1 et seq.; do. in Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, xxv. 303–329.


HADĪTHA (A.) = Newtown, the name of several cities. I. Hadīthat al-Mawṣīl, a town on the east bank of the Tigris. One farakh below the mouth of the upper (Great) Zab. Its ruins are still recognised in the mound of Tell al-Shārır. Various accounts of its origin are given. According to Ḥishām b. Al-Kalbī (in Ibn al-Makdisī, p. 129 and Ballādhī, ed., Bulaq, p. 340) Harthama b. ʿAfrājī, after making Mawṣīl the capital came to Hadīthah in the reign of ʿOmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb where he found a village with two churches in which he settled Arabs. That this story is authentic (it is also given in Yāṣīṭ, ii. 222) is confirmed by ʿĪbārī (i. 2807), according to whom in 24 Wālid spent some time in Hadīthah on his way back from Armenia. Ḥanża says that Hadīthah is the translation of the Persian Nokār. If it is not an invention of Shūṭābī's bias, the best explanation of the name would be that of ʿAbd ʿĀsīkī, viz., that inhabitants of the "Newtown" of Ankār Fairuzbahār migrated thither and transferred the name to their new abode. When Ḥanża and others ascribe the "foundation" of the town to the last Umayyad Marwān II. b. Muḥammad or Bar Bahlūl to his father Muḥammad b. Marwān I., these rulers may have built there but nevertheless the explanation of the name "Newtown" as "newer" than Mawṣīl is inventions (cf. Yāṣīṭ, ii. 22, Hoffmann, Syr. Akte des pers. Mürs., p. 178; E. Reitemeyer, Städtegründungen der Araber, p. 83). The town's period of greatest prosperity falls into the early ʿAbbāsid period when the Caliph Al-faḍlī stayed there before his mortal illness and when the rebel general Miṣṣ b. Bogha made it his headquarters in the reign of al-Muhtadī (Ṭabari, iii. 578, 1827). The population remained Christian. Mār Aḥāmāb was bishop of Hadīthah before he became Patriarch and Katholikos (837–850), (Budge, Thomas of Marqūa, ii. 103; Assemani, Bibl. Orient., i. i, p. 508 note 1.)

The town lay on the terraced east bank of the Tigris in the form of a semicircle. Its mosque lay close to the river and the buildings, with the exception of the mosque, were of brick. The tomb of ʿAbd Allah b. ʿOmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb was shown there but probably wrongly as he died in Medina (Muḥammad, p. 139, Marqūdī, p. 292). It is remarkable that Hadīthah is sometimes described as
the northern extremity of Sawād, which had a greater extent than the province of Ṣawrā (Yaḵūt, iii. 174; Dimidkī, p. 185). Elsewhere it is mentioned as a station on the postroad from Baghdaḏ to Mawšīl. The distances are as follows:

Baghdaḏ—Baradān . . . . . 4 farsakh
Baradān—Uḵbarā (now ʿUḵbarā). 5
ʿUḵbarā—Bāḥmāla (now Nuhār-ū Hamāla). 3
Bāḥmāla—Kāḍisīya (now Kāḍīsīya). 7
Kāḍisīya—Surr man raʾ (now Sīmarra). 3
Surr man raʾ—Djiġištā (opposite Takrīt, now al-Kaʿnaʾ). 7
Djiğištā—Sūdākānīya. 5
Sūdākānīya—Bāirimā (near al-Fatḥa, really 6 farsakh). 5
Bāirimā—Sīn (at the mouth of the Lower Zāb). 5
Sīn—Hadīṯa (1 farsakh below the mouth of the Upper Zāb, really 16–18 farsakh). 12
Hadīṯa—Banū Tamayān (?). 7
Banū Tamayān (?)—Mawšīl. 7

But when Ḥamd Allīh al-Mustawfī gives this itinerary in the xiiith century he is only copying older figures, no longer true of his time. This is clear from the fact that the Tigris has only occupied its modern bed between Sāmarrā and Baghdaḏ since the beginning of the xiiith century. Hadīṯa like many other places was already in ruins by that time. The invasion of the Tatars had made an end of it.

II. Hadīṯa al-Furāṭ, also called Hadīṯa al-Nūn (Lime-Newtown) on the Euphrates, south of ʿĀna in 34° 8' N. Lat. and 42° 26' East Long. (Greenw.), a nāhiya of the kāḏar of ʿĀna. The town itself is built on an island, only the caravan stations being on the western river bank. It has very much declined since 1910, when the reefs and dams in the river were blown up in order to make way for packet-boats which have never come; it had formerly 400 houses, 2 djāmā and 3 madḍjūl, 2 corn-mills, gardens with 1500 date palms (about 6000 in the whole nāḥiya). It was irrigated by great water wheels called nāṭara, which were put up at the rapids of the river. There are limestone quarries on the western side of the Euphrates valley which are of importance for future engineering works in the ʿArāḵ. There are three saints' tombs of the xiiith—xiiiith centuries there, from N. to S.; 1. Shaikh al-Hadīṯa (a certain Muḥammad b. Muṣṭ al-Kāḏim); 2. The Awlād Saiyid Aḥmad al-Kīfṣā; 3. a certain Nadjin al-Dīn, said to have been one of the occupants of Noah's ark. As to the history of the town, Yaḵūt (ii. 223), following Aḥmad Bad-Ḥayyā b. Djābiṛ, observes that it was taken even before ʿOmar's time in the government of Ammār b. Yāṣir. It had a strong castle on the island which was of importance as late as the Caliph al-Kāḏim's time (Marāṣīd, p. 292). According to al-Sharafī al-Saʿd al-Samānī the inhabitants were Christians.

The place is now a usual stopping-place on the Euphrates route from Baghdaḏ to Aleppo, which will probably soon fall into disuse after the completion of the Baghdaḏ railway and therefore deserves to be recorded, more particularly because several of its stations, which are also found in the ancient itineraries, are not marked in modern maps.

The following are the distances according to my itinerary:

Baghdaḏ—Nukta . . . . . 6 hours
Nukta—Fahadja . . . . . 6
Fahadja—Kāf al-Rumālī 10
Kāf al-Rumālī—Hit . . . . . 11
Hit—Baghdaḏ . . . . . 8½
Baghdaḏ—Hadīṯa . . . . . 8½
Hadīṯa—Fuḥaima . . . . . 6½
Fuḥaima—ʿĀna . . . . . 7
ʿĀna—Nuhīya . . . . . 7½
Nuhīya—al-Kāʾim . . . . . 9
al-Kaʾim—Alba Kamāl. 5½ (frontier of the wilāya)
Alba Kamāl—Ṣaḥāliya . . . . . 7
Ṣaḥāliya—Mayādīn . . . . . 10½
Mayādīn—Dāʾir al-Zawr. 9½
(cf. the Damascene edition of the Kūnānam-i Baghdaḏ, by Senior Lietn. Muzaffar Dīyār, 1314 H.)

The old itineraries are in part badly preserved as regards names and their order, but they are mostly corrected in de Goeje's editions.
on the death of the Prophet a man named Gharūr, a member of the royal family of Hira, raised the standard of revolt in Hadjar, but was overcome by al-'Ali. During the Karmaštān troubles Abū Sa‘id conquered the towns of Bahrain (cf. the article AL-DJANNAH), among them finally Hadjar, shortly before his death in 915-914. Abū Sa‘id’s son Abū Tahir made al-Ahsa’ (q.v. i. 207 et seq.) the capital of the land. It should be remembered that Hadjar (or with the article al- Hadjar) is very often used as the name of the land itself (instead of Bahrain).

Hadjar should not be confused with Hadjir, which appears as the name of several towns, including one in Yamāma inhabited by the descendants of ‘Ubaid b. Varūb’ (of the Banu Ḥamīfa, q.v.), cf. e.g. Nābihīa p. 98, Labid (ed. Huber) p. 303. Bibliography: Bakri, Geogr. Wörterbuch, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 827; Bibl. geogr. arab., ed. de Goeje, i. 154, 5; viii. 393 et seq.; Vāskī, ed. Wessels, i. 53; Hamdān, Djaïsra, ed. D. H. Müller, i. 86, 136, 168; Balāḏūrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 78-86; Ṭabarī, Annals, ed. de Goeje, iii. 1743 et seq., 1916; Yaḥyīb, Historiae, ed. Houtsma, i. 233, 313; ii. 89 et seq.; de Sacy, Exposé de la religion des Druses, Introduction, p. 213 et seq.; de Goeje, Mémoire sur les Carmathes, 1862, p. 12 et seq. (second edition, 1886, p. 36 et seq.); Wellhausen, Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten, iv. 117 et seq.; vi. 19 et seq.; Rothstein, Die Jachmiden, p. 131 et seq. (FR. BUHL.)

AL-HADJAR AL-ASWAD. [See AL-KÂRA.]

HADJAR AL-NAṢR (the eagle’s rock), a fortress in the Rif, in the land of the Ghomāra, built in 317 (929-930) by Ibrahim b. Muhammad Kāsim b. Idris II. The sons of Kāsim, called Gnuūnūn (Djimānūn) or Hannūn (so al-Bakri, ed. de Slane, p. 129) settled here. When Mūṣa b. al-‘Ayya had driven the Idrisids out of all their possessions in the Maghrib, he wished to besiege this fortress and destroy the survivors of the Idrisid family who had taken refuge in it; but he was dissuaded from doing so by the remonstrances of the most prominent men in the Maghrib. After Mūṣa b. al-‘Ayya’s fall, one of Gnuūnūn’s sons founded a kingdom with Hadjar al- Naṣr as capital under the suzerainty of the Umayyad Caliph of Cordoba. The Spanish sovereigns and the Fātimes disputed the suzerainty over it in turn, till the former finally succeeded in destroying all the petty kingdoms of the Idrisids. Hadjar al-Nāṣr was taken by Ghālib, the Umayyad general, and the last king, al-Jasam, taken prisoner to Spain. The decline of Hadjar al-Nāṣr dates from this time (369 = 975-976).

The fortress lay three days’ journey from Ceuta on the top of a steep cliff; it could only be reached by a very narrow way which only allowed access to one person at a time. The surrounding country was very fertile and covered with gardens (Ibn Ḥawkal, ed. de Goeje, p. 56; al-Idrīsī, Description de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne, ed. Doby and de Goeje, p. 96 of the text).

Its situation is not exactly known. An attempt has been made (by Beaumier) to identify it with Alhucemas, but without any real evidence. According to the statements collected by Moulières (Le Maroc inconnu, ii. 390-391, note), the ruins of the fortress still survive under the name “Hadji rat en-Nasour” in the district of Djunān Medjber (Djūnān Madjber) between al-Branes, ed-Dsoul (Tsoul) and Šanhdja on the summit of a very high cliff.


(RENÉ Basset.)

HADJAREN (HADJARIN), a town in Ḥadramīt on the ġebel of the same name, S.W. of Mesghed ‘Ali (q.v.) on the Wādī Dāwūn (Dūḏān) situated in extremely picturesque country. It is surrounded by extensive palmerous and reminds one of many mediaeval castles on the Rhône. As a centre of traffic between the coast and the interior of Ḥadramīt it is of importance. The houses of the town are built of bricks and are large but the streets are narrow and dirty. It belongs to the Kūʿaiti of Shiham (q.v.), who are represented in it by a member of their family, who bears the title nādiḥ and lives in a splendid palace on the summit of the hill. The town probably has about 1500 inhabitants. There are relics of the ancient Himyaritic period around Hadjarin, when the trade in frankincense still flourished in this district. Ruins of an ancient town, Raḏīt, with inscriptions are still to be seen about the valley.

Hadjarin is an old town, known even to Hamdān; al-Hadjarīn (al-Hadjaron, dual of Ḥadjar “town,” as he writes it), consisted in his time of two towns of Khashūn and Dammūn lying on opposite sides of the wāḍī; Khashūn was inhabited by the Saḍaf, Dammūn by the Kinda. At the foot of the fortified hill, on which Hadjarin lay, there were palmerous groves and fields with ḍhūra (a kind of maize) and ḍarr (a kind of corn or wheat), which were watered by a ḍhai coming from the top of the hill.


(J. SCHLEIFER.)

I. THE ISLAMIC HADJAJ.

a. The journey to Mecca. — According to the law every adult Muslim, of either sex, has to perform the Hadjaj at least once in the course of his life, provided he is able to do so (cf. Sūrat iii. 91). The fulfilment of the last proviso depends on various circumstances. Lunatics and slaves are exempted from the obligation; likewise women who have not a husband or a relative (ḥāḏa madre) to accompany them. The want of the necessary means of subsistence, the inability to provide beasts of burden, the precariousness of the journey are circumstances which relieve one of the obligation to perform the pilgrimage. The Ḡairī school further allows its followers to postpone the pilgrimage beyond the grave provided
a deputy is hired out of the estate of the deceased. This explains how the majority of Muslims die without ever having seen Mecca. Even among Caliphs and Sulṭāns many have remained at home all their lives while others have made the pilgrimage several times; even some, who were not Muslims, have taken part in the Ḥajj; their works are invaluable sources for our knowledge of this subject.

Since Muhāammad instituted an absolute lunar year, the Ḥajj runs in time through all seasons as it is fixed for certain days in the first half of the month Dhu 'l-Hijjah. When it falls in summer the toils of the journey prove fatal to many a pilgrim. Muhāammad is therefore said to have said: “The pilgrimage is a sort of punishment” (Sūrat ībū Ma‘ṣūṣ, Bāb āl-Khurāṣṣa jīla ‘l-Ḥajj). Those pilgrims suffer most who have to come from their homes to Mecca by land either on foot or on horseback. The steamship traffic from Djiđda to other Muslim lands which was instituted specially for the Ḥajj, as well as the Hijāz railway has however considerably diminished their number. The pilgrimcaravans only survive out of religious conservatism. The following may be mentioned.

The Syrian caravan follows the ancient trade-route from Damascus (or Constantinople) through the trans-Jordan territory, the ancient Moabitis, via Māṣūr, Māda‘īn Ṣafīḥ and al-Medīna. It is the largest of the caravans (in 1876, according to C. M. Doughty’s estimate, it contained about 6000 persons) and is accompanied by a muḥāmat [q.v.]. Blockhouses are built at the stations where food is kept ready and facilities for refreshment provided. According to Burchardt (Travels, i. 3), the journey from Damasqua to al-Medīna takes 30 days.

The Egyptian caravan is likewise accompanied by a muḥāmat; in it is the new khawāṣ [q.v.] for the Ka’ba. According to Lane (Manners and Customs, London 1899, p. 493), it usually leaves Cairo in the last week of Shawwāl and reaches Mecca in 37 days, following the route along the sea-coast. (A favourite route for pilgrims from Egypt and the Maghrib used to be from Cairo or somewhere else in the north to one of the harbours on the Red Sea opposite Djiđda; cf. Ibn Djiḥāb’s journey and al-Batānī, al-Khāda al-ḥaqq al-ba‘aṣī, p. 493.)

A caravan from the ‘Irāq makes its way across Arabia. Burchardt, in Appendices I and II to his Travels, gives the stations of the caravan from Yemen as well as further geographical notes. Pilgrims from the Maghrib, Persia and Yemen, however, come for the most part by ship, not to speak of those from more distant lands.

The caravans are composed of the most diverse elements; princes, beggars, traders with their wares, Bedouins, travellers on foot and on horseback find their place there, which is usually settled by their place of origin, so that people from the same town travel together. Most pilgrims make an arrangement with a muḥbarawī who for a definite sum provides for all the necessities of the journey.

The danger of attack by Bezuins has always been an unpleasant feature of the pilgrimage; if the pilgrims submit to being plundered, they usually escape with their lives, but otherwise not always. The Meccan authorities have finally been forced to conclude agreements with the chiefs through whose lands the caravans come, whereby the pilgrims are allowed to travel freely. The authorities have to pay a fixed sum (called yurra q.v.) for this privilege. In the history of the Ḥajj there have been many other powers obstructing the pilgrims, e.g. the Karimans, the Egyptian authorities, pirates and the Wāḥhābiyān.

The arrival of the Syrian and Egyptian caravans with the two muḥāmatā is always a great event for the Meccans. Both are received with ceremony; they encamp on certain spots outside the town proper (see the plan of the town in C. Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, i.); as a rule they arrive only a few days before the Ḥajj.

The number of the pilgrims who arrive via Djiđda are fairly well known, since the international sanitary commission has instituted a quarantine station there. As each pilgrim has to pay a certain sum for what professes to be hygienic control, but really is quite superficial, the number of persons arriving is accurately noted. We find that in recent years the number has varied from 36,000 to 108,000 and averages 70,000. If Burchardt could now accompany the pilgrimage again, he would not be able to repeat his observations (Travels, ii. 1) made in 1814 on the number of the pilgrims and the pious zeal of the Muslims.

Most pilgrims arrive shortly before the time of the Ḥajj; a considerable number, however, even spend the month of Ramaḍān of the year in Mecca, which is considered particularly meritorious. Many Ḥajjis also remain in Mecca after they have completed the Ḥajj, either to pursue sacred studies or to die in the holy city. The number of pilgrims is usually particularly large when it is expected that the principal day of the Ḥajj, the 9th Dhu ‘l-Ḥajj, will fall on a Friday (ḥudūd abār). It is further the custom that the Shi‘is also take part in the pilgrimage; but travellers report that the adherents of ‘Ali do not always have a peaceful time in the holy city. Interesting data on the Ḥajj of the Shi‘is are given in Kazem Zadeh, Relation d’un pèlerinage à la Mecque, in the Revue du Monde musulman, xix. 1912, p. 144 et seq. (has also appeared separately).

b. Arrival in Mecca. The holy ceremonies are performed in a state correspondingly holy, the law therefore recommends the pilgrim as soon as he sets out from home to assume the īṭrām [q.v.]. But as in most cases this is not convenient, they generally enter the holy condition when they approach the holy territory. One should enter Mecca as a muḥrin and then perform the ‘umra [q.v.]. Almost every pilgrim does this as well as the other sacred duties, accompanied by a guide (ṭawāk, dālī, muṭawwīf), who on each occasion pronounces the prescribed formula, which are then repeated by his protégés. These guides further do all sorts of business for the pilgrims who in their ignorance of the language, of local customs, etc., would be for the most part quite helpless without them.

When the sevenfold circumambulation (jauwāf, q.v.) of the Ka‘ba and the sevenfold running (ṣaw‘, q.v.) between Ṣa‘āra and Marwa has been performed the pilgrim may cut his hair and come out of the īṭrām, till the Ḥajj proper begins. But if the īṭrām has been assumed for ‘umra and Ḥajj (īṭrām), this is not allowed (on these and related questions cf. the article īṭrām).

c. The Ceremonies of the Ḥajj. On the 7th Dhu ‘l-Ḥajj there is usually preaching in
the mosque of the Ka’ba, by which the pilgrims are prepared for the holy ceremonies. In the evening of the same day or on the morning of the next, the pilgrims leave Mecca. The 8th is called yawm al-harirāya (“day of moistening”), because (according to an improbable explanation) on this day the pilgrims provide themselves with water, and the art of Muzdalifah. There is no mahu’mah, and the cupboards outside the town and lead the way; then follows the variegated seething mass of representatives of different races, on foot and in litter, on asses and horses, perpetually pushing and struggling. The plain of Arafat, where a halt is to be made (wukuf), is reached via Minâ (now usually pronounced Muna) and Muzdalifah (also called Djamsh and al-Ma鲨ar al-Harâm). Here the representative of the caliph used to plant a standard, whose place is now taken by the mahu’mah (see Amīr al-Hājij, i. 330).

The description of the thickly covered plain in modern travellers agrees in its main features with those of the old Arab annual markets in the classical authors. Tents and booths (see C. Snouck Hurgronje, Filders aus Mekka, No. 13–16, cf. also 10–12) are everywhere, in the latter the numerous traders expose their wares as in the bazaa; jugglers and fakirs entertain the crowd with their skill. Many pilgrims ascend the sacred mountain (Duṣtil al-Kabâha, see the illustration opposite and the article ‘Arafat, i.), and repeat the prescribed formulas after their shahīd at the proper places; loud cries of labbaika [q.v.] are heard everywhere. Thus the time is passed till the evening, at which brilliant illuminations take place. Pious pilgrims spend the night in the repetition of prayers, others amuse themselves in worldly fashion.

The wukuf proper takes place on the 9th and lasts from the time when the sun has crossed the meridian to its setting. Almost the whole period is filled by two khaññas, celebrated as a rule by the khāñ of the holy city. The latter rides up to the platform on the holy hill, from which he reads pious commonplaces out of a book, which are not audible to the greater part of those present, or, if heard, could not be understood by them. But this does not prevent them being much moved and continually calling labbaika loudly, waving the holy garments in the air and weeping and sobbing. But as soon as the sun disappears behind the western hills, the jīfâla (or disf, nofî) i.e. the running to Muzdalifah begins. Amid the greatest confusion as the horses are spurred on by the rushing crowd, amid continual shooting and din, accompanied by military music, everyone rushes to Muzdalifah. The alautān, which mark the boundary of the jīfâla [q.v.] are passed; the evening darkness soon falls and torches are kindled; firelocks are discharged and the soldiers keep lining off their guns. In this fashion, rarely without accidents, Muzdalifah is reached, where the Maghrib and Ṭaḥā añifâr are celebrated together and the night is spent. The mosque here is illuminated. On the morning of the 10th (yarum al-harâr) a sale is again held at the mosque before sunrise and the kâba of Mecca again preaches a khâfia. After the completion of the morning service the crowd goes to Minâ.

Here quite different duties have to be performed. Each pilgrim has on this day to throw seven small stones at one of the three so-called dzamìs here [q.v.], the Dümmar al-Aṣâba. For this purpose he has previously gathered the stones in Muzdalifah. Amid a tremendous crush a rush is made for this Djamn, which stands at the west end of the valley of Minâ. A picture of it is given in Kazem Zadeh, op. cit., opposite p. 222. Only the stoning of this Djamn is prescribed for this day in the law and the turn of the other Djamn’s day (‘Arafat) till the following day.

The accounts in ‘Ali Bey and Burton agree very well with this prescription. It should, however, be noted that Burckhardt (Travels, ii. 578) and Keane (Six Months in Meccah, p. 161) expressly state that the pilgrims on the 10th Dhu ‘l-Hijdijâ throw seven stones, which they have brought from Muzdalifah, first at the eastern Djamn (Djamrat al-‘alâ), al-ṣughârâ), then at the middle one (al-wustâ; see the picture) and finally at the western (al-ṣuñfâ, al-aṣâba, al-ṣa‘ibâ); perhaps however this is an error of the two last-named travellers.

According to the Muslim explanation, this stoning is really a stoning of Satan, who is said to have appeared here to the patriarch Ibrâhîm and to have been driven away by him in this fashion. After the stoning the crying of labbaika ceases and the hajjij proper is at an end; various ceremonies, however, have still to follow, first that of the sacrifice, which has given this day its name. Thousands of sacrificial victims, chiefly sheep and goats, are kept ready in Minâ by the Beduins and merchants and sold at high prices. Only people of high rank slaughter camels. The pilgrim, who does not dare to kill the animal himself, may get a butcher to do it for him. Although there is no place specially prescribed by the law in Minâ for the sacrifice, a rock at the west end of the valley near the Aṣâba is preferably used for this purpose (Burckhardt, Travels, ii. 59; Burton, A Pilgrimage, ii. 240). It is considered meritorious to give the flesh of the animals sacrificed to the poor as kazâkah; what they do not use is left lying. The sacrifice, which is celebrated on this day throughout the whole Muslim world, is suña (see the article Al-Ṭa‘âl al-Kabir). Its omission may be made good by fasting.

It is usual to have the head shaved after the sacrifice; for this purpose there are quite a number of taxi drivers’ booths in Minâ. Both the barber and the pilgrim observe certain rules during the process, such as turning towards the kibla etc. Thereafter the īfrâm may be discarded and a return made to a secular condition (īfâl); but the pilgrim is not yet allowed to transact all the business of everyday life. The series above described, stone-throwing, sacrifice, shaving, is described in the law as suña (Minâhâjji, i. 331); but it should be noted that there is no time legally prescribed for the sacrifice, and the two other ceremonies are only limited as to time in so far that they must be performed on the 10th day.

It is usual to return to Mecca on the same day to perform a wukuf there, on which occasion the ka‘ba is seen for the first time with its new covering. Ordinary garments are donned if this has not been done in Minâ already; the pilgrims bathes and washes, which is usually very desirable after being the previous “holy state”. It is usual also to drink from the holy Zamzam water or to have oneself sprinkled with it; but this may as well be done on any other day.

The following days 11–13th Dhu ‘l-Hijdijâ are called ajiyam al-labani (on the explanation
of this name see below) called by Muhammad "day of eating, drinking and sensual pleasure," are spent in Mina; the three Džamá’s have each to have seven stones thrown at them each day, after midday. It is also the custom to sacrifice at a granite block on the slope of mount Thālīb (cf. Burckhardt, Travels, ii, 85; al-Batānānī, al-
Ka‘ba, p. 669). Abraham is said to have prepared his son for the sacrifice here. The law itself (cf. Sūra ii. 199) permits departure from Mina even on the 12th Dhu ‘l-Hijjah. It seems from the works of the travellers that this permission is usually taken and the pilgrims return to Mecca on this day. It is the custom to throw stones at the alleged grave of Abū Lahab in the vicinity of the town. Finally the ‘umra al-wada‘ (fare-
well ‘umra) has to be performed. For this purpose the pilgrim goes to Ta‘im, again to assume the ibrā‘. Modern travellers thus often call Ta‘im also “al-‘umra.” With the performance of ibrā‘ and sa‘y the Ḥadjj is at an end. Some days later the caravans leave Mecca and go to Medina to honour the tomb of the prophet with a visit.

From what has been said above it is clear that the law divides the ceremonies of the Ḥadjj into various categories; but it should be noted that the various schools differ from one another in almost all details. A good survey is given in the table on p. 178 of al-Batānānī’s work.

II. THE ORIGIN OF THE ISLAMIC ḤAJJ.

Muhammad’s attitude to the Ḥadjj was not always the same; in his youth he must have often taken part in the ceremonies. After his “call” he paid little attention at first to the festival; in the oldest sūras it is not mentioned and it does not appear from other sources that he had adopted any definite attitude to this originally heathen custom. If many obviously polytheistic practices had been usual at it, he would hardly have been so silent about it and Tradition would probably have preserved expressions of opinion from which we could ascertain more clearly the attitude of the Prophet.

Muhammad’s interest in the Ḥadjj was first aroused in al-Medina. Several causes contributed to this, as Snouck Hurgronje has shown in his Mekkaanse Reis. The brilliant success of the battle of Badr had aroused in him thoughts of a conquest of Mecca. The preparations for such a step would naturally be more successful if the secular as well as the religious interests of his companions were aroused. Muhammad had been deceived in his expectations regarding the Jewish community in Medina and the disagreements with the Jews had made a religious breach with them inevitable. To this period belongs the origin of the doctrine of the religion of Abraham, the alleged original type of Judaism and Islam. The Ka‘ba now gradually advances into the centre of religious worship; the father of monotheism built it with his son Ismā‘il and it was to be a “place of assembly for mankind.” The ceremonies performed there are traced to the divine command (Sūra ii. 119 et seq.). In this period also the Ka‘ba was made a kibla (cf. Sūra ii. 136–145) and the Ḥadjj is called a duty of man to Allah (iii. 91). This is the position of affairs in the year 2 of the Hijra. It was only after the unsuccessful siege of al-Medina by the Meccans in the year 5 that Muhammad was able to attempt to carry out his plans. The first effort was made in the ex-pedition to Ḥudaybiya, which, although it did not bring him to Mecca, by the treaty with the Kurāish brought an ‘umra into prospect for next year. In the year 7 Muhammad instituted the ceremonies at the Ka‘ba; but it was only after the conquest of Mecca in 8 that the opportunity was afforded of publicly celebrating the festival. But he did not take advantage of this occasion himself; for in the year 9 he sent Abū Bakr in his stead as leader of the pilgrim caravan to Mecca. While the latter was on the way, he was overtaken by Ṣā‘īd b. Abī Tālib, who had been commissioned to read out to the pilgrims the Sūra ‘a‘ (Sūra ix. 1 et seq.) which had been revealed in the meanwhile; in these verses the performance of the pilgrimage was forbidden to unbelievers except those with whom the Prophet had made special treaties.

In the year 10 Muhammad himself led the Ḥadjj. Tradition has much to tell on the subject of this so-called farewell-pilgrimage (ḥadījat al-
Wada‘). These accounts of the ceremonies performed by Muhammad agree essentially with the later practice. The arrangements, which he made on this occasion, are of importance, however, for the history of the Ḥadjj, notably the abolition of the “intercalation” (māsī‘) and the introduction of the new lunar year which is mentioned in the Kūran with the words: *Verily the number of months with God is twelve months in God’s book, on the day when He created the heavens and the earth; of these four are sacred; that is the true religion. In these shall ye do no injustice to one another. But fight the unbelievers, as they fight you, one and all, and know that God is with the righteous. The intercalation is but an increase of the unbelief, in which the unbelievers err, for they make it (i.e. the time in which it falls or should fall) lawful one year and unlawful the next” (Sūra ix. 36 et seq.). On other ordinances of Muhammad on this occasion see below.

III. THE PRE-ISLAMIC ḤAJJ.

The investigation of the original meaning of the root Ḥ-D-J goes no further than hypotheses—some however probable. The Arabic lexicographers give the meaning “to betake oneself to;” this would agree with our “pilgrimage.” But this meaning is as clearly demonstrative as that of the Hebrew verb. Probably the root Ḥ-D-J, which in North as well as South Semitic languages means “to go around, to go in a circle,” is connected with it. With this we are not much further forward; for we do not even know whether religious circumambulations formed part of the original Ḥadjj. We do know that in the pre-Muslim period two annual markets were held in the month of Dhu ‘l-Ḥadīj by that of Dhu ‘l-Maddz and thence the people went direct to Ḥaḍramawt. The Muslim practice of going out from Mecca to Ḥaḍramawt is therefore probably an innovation; and Islam knows nothing of religious circumambulations in Ḥaḍramawt and we little.

This Ḥadjj in Ḥaḍramawt was not a local peculiarity; pilgrimage to a sanctuary is an old Semitic custom, which is prescribed even in the older parts of the Pentateuch as an indispensable duty. *Three times a year shall you celebrate for me a
three times a year all thy males shall appear before the Lord Jahwe" (ib., 17 and xxxiv. 22). But in Arabia also there were probably several places of pilgrimage where festivals like that of the Ḥadjdj of 'Arafāt were celebrated. The month of Agghatālahi mentioned by Epiphanius seems to presuppose a sanctuary in the north.

The Ḥadjdj of 'Arafāt took place on the 9th Dhu l-Hijjāja; the most diverse Arab tribes took part in it, but this was only possible when peace reigned in the land. The consecutive months Dhu l-Ka’dah, Dhu l-Hijjāja and Muharram thus formed a sacred period during which tribal feuds were at rest; weapons were laid aside in the holy territory.

It may be regarded as certain that in Muḥammad’s time the sacred festival fell in the spring. Wellhausen has, however, made it appear probable that the original time of the Ḥadjdj was the autumn. If, as is probable, the above mentioned intercalary month had for its object to maintain this time of the year, the intercalation did not affect its purpose: from what we do not know. If the Ḥadjdj originally fell in the autumn, it is natural, when inquiring into its original significance to compare it with the North Semitic autumnal festival, the "feast of booths" (or day of atonement), a proceeding which finds further support in the fact that the feast of booths in the Old Testament is often called briefly the ḥag (e.g. Judges, xxi. 19; 1 Kings, viii. 2, 65). We will actually find several features in agreement.

Great feasts were from early times associated with the Ḥadjdj which was celebrated on the conclusion of the date-harvest. These feasts were probably the main thing to Muḥammad’s contemporaries, as they still are to many Muslims. For the significance of the religious ceremonies had even then lost its meaning for the people. The following may be stated. A main part of the ceremony was the ṣawāf “the halt” in the plain of ‘Arafat; in Islam the Ḥadjdj without ṣawāf is invalid. This can only be explained as the survival of a pre-Muslim notion. Houtsma has compared the ṣawāf with the day of the Israelites on Mount Sinai. The latter had to prepare themselves for this by refraining from sexual intercourse (Exod. xix. 15) and the washing of their garments (Exod. xix. 10, 14). Thus they waited upon their God (אֶלָּלוּ, פַּעַם), in the same way the Muslims refrain from sexual intercourse, wear holy clothing and stand before the deity (_surface = _= _ _ stand) at the foot of a holy mountain.

On Sinai, the deity appeared as a thunder- and lightning-god. We know nothing of the god of ‘Arafat; but he probably existed. Muḥammad is related to have said at the farewell pilgrimage: "The whole of ‘Arafat is a place for standing (marawif), the whole of Muzdalifah is a place of standing, the whole of Miḥā a place of sacrifice". Snouck Hurgronje has explained these words to mean that the particular places there, where heathen ceremonies were performed, were to lose their importance through these words. A little is known of these heathen places in Muzdalifah and Miḥā (see below).

It is uncertain whether the day of ‘Arafat was a fast-day or not. In Tradition it is several times expressly stated that Muḥammad’s companions did not know what was his view on this question. He was therefore invited to drink and he drank. The ascetic character of the Ḥadjdj days is clear from the ḥrām prohibitions. That these were once extended to include food and drink is clear from Muḥammad’s explanation. "The Tashriḥ days (11th—13th Dhu l-Hijjāja) are days of eating, drinking and sensual pleasure". In early Islam ascetically disposed persons therefore chose the Ḥadjdj as the special time for their self-denials (cf. Goldscher in the Revue de l’Histoire des Religions, xxvii. 318, 320 et seq.).

The ṣawāf lasts in Islam from the moment after midday till sunset. Tradition records that Muḥammad ordered that ‘Arafat should not be left till after sunset, while it had previously been usual to begin the ḥṣāda even before sunset. But the Prophet is said not only to have shifted the time, but even to have suppressed the whole rite by forbidding the running to Muzdalifah and to have ordered that it should be slowly approached. But how tenacious the old custom is, is clear from the above description of the ḥṣāda. Snouck Hurgronje thinks that he sees a solar rite in the latter, a view which has been definitely formulated by Houtsma in connection with the character of the Ḥadjdj (see below), viz. that it was originally considered a persecution of the dying sun.

The god of Muzdalifah was Kuẓāḥ, the thunder-god. A fire was kindled on the sacred hill also called Kuẓāḥ. Here a halt was made and this ṣawāf has a still greater similarity to that on Sinai, as in both cases the thunder-god is revealed in fire. It may further be presumed that the traditional custom of making as much noise as possible and of shooting was originally a sympathetic charm to call forth the thunder.

As soon as the sun was visible, the ḥṣāda to Miḥā used to begin in pre-Islamic times. Muḥammad therefore ordained that this should begin before sunrise; here again we have the attempt to destroy a solar rite. In ancient times they are said to have sung during the ḥṣāda, asbī n ṣabī ‘ainā mukām ṣawāf. The explanation of these words is uncertain; it is sometimes translated: "Enter into the light of morning, Thabr, so that we may hasten".

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

According to a statement in Ibn Ḥisham (ed. Wustenfeld, p. 76 et seq.), the stone throwing only began after the sun had crossed the meridian. Houtsma has made it probable that thestoning was originally directed at the sun-deamon; important support is found for this view in the fact that the Ḥadjdj originally coincided with the autumnal equinox; similar customs are found all over the world at the beginning of the four seasons. With the expulsion of the sun-deamon, whose harsh rule comes to an end with summer, worship of the thunder-god who brings fertility and his-
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vocation may easily be connected, as we have seen above at the festival in Muzhīlīm. The name tarwīya "moistening"; also may be explained in this connection as a sympathetic rain-charm, traces of which survive in the ligation of the body. These are again parallels to the feast of bohūts (or day of atonement): the goat, which was thrown from a cliff for ʻAzażel, is not difficult to identify as the type of the sun-demon; and the ligation of water from the holy well of Siloam was also a rain-charm, for the connection between the feast of booths and rain is expressly emphasised (Zach. xiv. 17). Further we may call attention to the illumination of the temple on the feast of booths, which has its counterpart in the illumination of the mosques in ʻArāf and Muzhīlīm, as well as the important part which music plays at both feasts.

Quite other explanations of the stone throwing are given by van Vloten (Foesthundel ... van Prof. M. J. de Goeje aangeboden, 1891, p. 33 et seq.) and Chauvin (Annales de l’Acad. Royale d’Arch. de Belgique, 5th Ser., Vol. iv. p. 272 et seq.). The former connects the stoning of Satan and the ʻArāfī expression al-Shàfiţān al-rādījm with a snake, which was indigenous to the ʻĀkāma. The latter finds in it an example of scopelism: the object of covering the Ḥadjīdī ground with stones thrown on it was to prevent the cultivation of it by the Meccans. But these theories have been satisfactorily refuted by Houtsma. Cf. also Dotté, Magie et Religion, p. 430 et seq. — On the significance of the shaving in connection with the history of religions, cf. the article ʻIrmām.

On the Ṭaqrīb days some of the pilgrims dry the flesh of the animals sacrificed in the sun to take it with them on the return journey. This custom agrees with the meaning of the word Ṭaqrīb, given by the Arab lexicographers, i.e. "to dry strips of meat in the sun"; but it may be doubted whether this is the original meaning of the word. A satisfactory explanation has not yet been given. Cf. however Th. W. Janssens, Über die Bedeutung des Wortes Taschirī (Zeitschr. f. Assyrische, xxvii. 1 et seq.). It must also be noted that Dozy in his book De Israelitischen te Mecca, traces the words taqrīb and tarwīya as well as the whole Ḥadjīdī to a Jewish origin; but his thesis may be considered definitely refuted by Snouck Hurgronje’s Het Mekkaanseche Feest.

Bibliography: On the whole subject: C. Snouck Hurgronje, Het Mekkaanseche Feest (Leiden 1880); the pertinent sections in the monographs and standard works on Islam; F. Wüstefeld, Die Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, passim.


On II: The biographies of Muḥammad and the works on Tradition.


HADJĪDĪ, Ḥadijīdī, one who has performed the pilgrimage to Mecca. [See AL-HADJĪDĪ.]

AL-HADJĪDĪ HAMMŪDA (b. ʻArūd ʻAZĀdī), an Arab historian of Tunis, accompanied ʻAlī b. Ḫusain into exile in Algiers, during the reign of ʻAlī b. Muḥammad (1740) and became his first secretary when this prince succeeded to power (1782–1799). He retained this office also under ʻAlī Bey’s son, Ḫaṃmādī Bey (1782–1814) who had been his pupil. He composed a history entitled ʻIṣāb al-Baṣāqā, in which he gives a brief survey of the history of the ʻAlīdī and of the Turkish governors of Tunis and many details of the reigns of ʻAlī Bey and Ḫusain b. ʻAlī. The text which is still unpublished exists in numerous copies in the Great Mosque of Tunis. A section dealing with the wars of Khair al-Dīn and of ʻArūdī was published by Houdas in his Christomathie Maghrībīne (Paris 1891), p. 14–96; another section dealing with the French expedition against Tunis in 1770 was translated by Rousseau (Algiers 1849) and a third dealing with Murād Bey’s campaign against Constantine by Cherbonneau (Journal Asiatique, July 1851).


(RENÉ BASSET.)

AL-HADJĪDĪ ʻOMAR, a religious fanatic and conqueror in the Sudan, founder of the Tucular kingdom (1797–1864). Born at Almor in Futū on Senegal, ʻOmar Saidā Tal began his theological studies under the direction of his father, a celebrated marabout, completed them in Wabata among the Moors of Tagant and made the pilgrimage to Mecca about 1820. He then stayed in the holy city he attached himself to Shāhīḥ Muḥammad al-Ghāfīḥ, a pupil of Ṭiḍāānī and entered the Ṭiḍāānī order. On his return to Africa he spent some time in Bornū and Sokoto and posed as a reformer of Islam there, showing himself particularly hostile to the members of the Kādirīya order, censuring them severely for their laxness and tolerance. He was kindly received by the sultāns of both kingdoms and was presented by them with wives and slaves; on the other hand on continuing his journey to Segū he was kept prisoner for a long time by the ruler of Bambara. He then went to Futu Djanon (q.v., ii. 120 et seq.), where he won the sympathies of the Dijallonke, who were striving to shake off the yoke of the Fuli (Falbe) and the Sorya faction. The zāwiya founded by him in Diegunko was much visited and he himself was soon recognised throughout the country as its spiritual leader.
From 1846 to 1848 al-Hādjī ʿ Omar undertook a missionary journey in the lands bordering on Futā and won a great number of the tribes dwelling within the curve of the Niger and on its southern tributaries and even on the Senegal over to this region. Built up by his continually growing influence, the Alfa ʿAmr advocated him to enter the land of Futā whereupon al-Hādjī ʿ Omar settled in Dingiray. Here he built a fortress, collected weapons and munitions and began to preach a holy war against the unbelievers. At this time he had at his disposal about 700 guns and a small body of men composed of his pilëbe (Arabic pilo° pilipt) and sofâ (stiblemen); the latter were young slaves, converts to Islam, who began their military training by looking after the horses of the warriors. This small body was continually increased by new converts who were attracted by the hope of booty.

In less than fifteen years al-Hādjī ʿ Omar was lord of an extensive territory. In 1849 he conquered the districts of Bure, Bamhik and Belidjiqué, then turned against the Massais of Kaarta and invaded their land on annihilating their forces. Their ruler Kandiya was forced to submit with the principal chiefs of his land after a vain resistance and in 1854 the capital Niror was occupied. The victor obliged the inhabitants of the land to adopt Islam, forbade them to keep more than four wives and divided the remainder among his soldiers. It was only after five years’ hard fighting, however, that Kaarta was completely subdued. Risings broke out in many places, while the Pūl of Massina besieged Niror. Al-Hādjī ʿ Omar had farther to defend himself from the attacks of the Moors and against ʿAmmādī, ʿUlama of Segu, and finally came into conflict with the French on the upper Senegal. The military station of Medine defended by Paul Hoff without aid from his attacks from the 20th April to the 18th July 1857, till his whole army was put to flight by Colonel Faidherbe.

When he had finally become undisputed lord of Kaarta, al-Hādjī ʿ Omar turned against the Bamhikas of Segu and the Pūl of Massina, whose rulers had formed an alliance against him. He occupied Sansanding, defeated the Allied forces of his opponents at Tio (January 1861) and entered the city of Segu on the 10th March 1861 and fortified it. After another victory over ʿAmmādī, ʿUlama of Segu, and Ali, ruler of Massina, ʿAlīdāli, the capital of Massina, fell into the hands of the Tuculors. ʿAmmādī was overthrown while fleeing across the Niger and slain, and ʿAmmādī Shaykhah, son of al-Hādjī ʿ Omar, appointed ruler of Segu.

Al-Hādjī ʿ Omar then undertook a campaign against Timbuktu, which he gave over to plunder. Soon afterwards, however, a general rebellion broke out in Massina, instigated by several Pūl chiefs, who were supported by ʿAmmādī Bekkai, chief of the Kunta. A second attack by al-Hādjī ʿ Omar on Timbuktu failed. Disturbing the rebellion, ʿAmmādī Shaykhah and other local chiefs in the south. The rebellion in Massina assumed still greater proportions. Besieged by the rebels in ʿAlīdāli, al-Hādjī ʿ Omar succeeded in escaping after eight months’ siege by setting the town on fire. Pursued by his enemies he fled into a cave where he committed suicide rather than fall into their hands alive. According to another story he was suffocated by them with smoke (Sept. 1864).

The kingdom founded by al-Hādjī ʿ Omar soon after his death broke up into the independent states of Segu, Kaarta and Massina. ʿAmmādī Shaykhah endeavoured in vain to regain his father’s heritage but was only successful in winning back Niror in 1885 and Massina in 1891. In 1890 the French occupied Segu and in 1891 they took Kaarta and in 1892 Massina.


(G. VERN.)

**HADJİĐI b. YUSUF, an Omanyad statesman, was born at Tarif about 41 = 661, the grandson of the Thabashi ʿAbd al-Malik. He was a poet, and a patron of the arts, and a patron of learning. He was a patron of the arts, and a patron of learning. He was a patron of the arts, and a patron of learning.**
bib [q. v.] Hadjdjidj had to call in the help of Syrian troops, as those of the 'Irak refused to act. Shabib thereupon seized upon the absence of Hadjdjidj in Basra to advance against Kufa. The viceroy only reached it a few hours before him and step by step he fought his way into the capital; after several days of fierce fighting Shabib had to vacate the field and being pursued by the 'Irak cavalry was drowned in crossing the Daudjail. In the same year (77-78 = 696) Hadjdjidj succeeded in putting down the rebellion of a provincial governor, Mu'tarrif, son of Mughira b. Sh'a'b.

He had just begun to recuperate a little after this heavy task when suddenly a rebellion broke out which was immeasurably more serious than all the earlier risings. It was fostered by the jealous aristocracy of the 'Irak and was directed not only against the viceroy but against the Umayyad dynasty; it was decided to separate the separatist movement against the preferential position of Syria in the Caliph's empire. After the overthrow and death of Shabib, the Syrian troops had remained in the country and were overwhelmed with tokens of Hadjdjidj's favour. The Kurr什 ("Koran reciters") made common cause with the political malcontents.

A leader for the dissatisfied arose in the person of 'Abd al-Rahman, a grandson of Abī 'Abdallāh b. Ka'b, [q. v., i. 56]. Sent by Hadjdjidj to Sijljatin at the head of 40,000 men, he rebelled against the viceroy, returned and soon had 100,000 men under him. With these he drove back the troops sent against him and captured the cities of Kufa and Basra. Hadjdjidj had once more to appeal to Syria. besieged in a suburb of Basra, he held out for a month against the onslaughts of the rebels. In the early days of March 710 he succeeded in inflicting a sanguinary defeat upon them, which was crowned by his victories at Dair al-Djamādi' and Masmik [q. v.]. The 'Irak was now utterly exhausted and lay at the feet of the powerful statesman; his tenacity had crushed the spirit of rebellion.

Thereupon (83-86) the tireless governor proceeded to found a new capital, Wāsi't [q. v.]. Situated almost halfway (whence its name!) between Kufa and Basra it was so to speak a detached camp of the Syrian troops garrisoning the country. From the year 78 he united to his governorship of the 'Irak that of Khorasan and the whole Arab east, a territory which had been considerably increased by the conquests of the famous general Muhallab [q. v.]. He finally incorporated 'Oman on the Arabian peninsula in the empire, which had hitherto been independent and his generals penetrated even into the valley of the Indus. Hadjdjidj prepared the way for the brilliant empire of Walid I by these extensions of territory abroad and the restoration of peace in the 'Irak. In spite of his autocratic rule he actively supported such important generals as Muhallab and Muslim b. Kutaiba. As a statesman his activities were not confined to reforms but were creative also. *His administrative regulations on the currency, measures and taxes and in the improvement of agriculture were epoch-making* (Wellhausen, p. 159). He has been reproached with corrupting the Koran. But his work was limited, it appears, to a critical revision and the introduction of orthographical signs which were to prevent incorrect readings in the recitation of the sacred text. He also endeavoured to use Arabic in place of the local dialects which had hitherto been in use in the chancellery of the 'Irak. After putting down the rebellions, it was his first care "to heal the wounds, which a twenty years' war had inflicted on the prosperity of the country" (Wellhausen, p. 157). He dug new canals and restored the old ones.

His fidelity to the Umayyads knew no bounds; the grotesque manifestations of it related of him are inventions of historians writing in the service of the 'Abbasids. The Marwānids rewarded it by their constant favour. Hadjdjidj has therefore also been numbered among the "sins of 'Abd al-Malik". His influence continued to increase under Walid I. Hadjdjidj had energetically supported the candidature of the young prince to the detriment of his uncle 'Abd al-'Aziz [q. v., i. 36], the successor designate of 'Abd al-Malik. Walid delighted in seeking the advice of his lieutenant; on his death he received official expressions of condolence as if a member of the ruling house had died. Matrimonial alliances further attached the family of the powerful governor to that of the Umayyads.

Hadjdjidj's eloquence has become celebrated. The histories and literary collections have preserved numerous specimens. He laid great weight on purity of language and aimed at a kind of Arabic Atticism. From the point of view of prosody, he insisted one as being a sincere Muslin. He protested however against the exaggerations of the extreme parties and against the disproportionate importance which even then was being accorded to Tradition. "In his life and in his death he showed a good conscience" (Wellhausen, p. 160). Did he deserve the reproach of cruelty? We read of 150,000 victims handed over to the executioner; at his death his prisons are said to have held 50,000 men and 30,000 women. Such enormous figures are their own refutation. In this period of political anarchy, of incessant risings, nothing authorises us to say that his repressive measures passed the limits of severity. *The kindness of men to good citizens, he showed himself pitiless to the rebellious* (al-Dhahabi). But even in these cases a frank confession or a show of spirit frequently sufficed to disarm in a moment, this officer of justice, who "dominated the majority of his contemporaries by the breadth of his intellectual outlook" (al-Dajā'ī). On the other hand his excessive vehemence rendered him liable to be impatient with his best friends (al-Mubarrad); his great general Muhallab in particular had to learn this. The whole character of Hadjdjidj betrayed a jealous tendency — he was the first to covet the power and to concentrate all authority in his own vigorous hands. It resulted in his "showing himself bursque, sometimes harsh, but never cruel, still less mean or narrow" (Wellhausen, p. 159). He has been often compared with Ziyād b. Abīhī, minister of the Umayyads, a Thāqafī like himself and his most famous predecessor in the 'Irak. His excess of vigour, his feverish nervousness and his crushing and provocative eloquence were not to Hadjdjidj's advantage. He lacked the smiling and somewhat sceptical spirit, which characterised the statesmen of the school of Mu'awiyah; whence arose complications, which a more pliant nature might have avoided.

If Hadjdjidj at the end of a long period of political anarchy applied himself to the amelioration of the material situation of his vast vice-
royalty, his character, embittered by family bereavements, by the injustice of an unintelligent opposition, made him forget to staunch the moral wounds and to work efficaciously for the pacification of the minds of men.

The interests of the state had forced him to take harsh measures against Yazid, son of the celebrated Muhallab. This gained him the enmity of Sulaiman [q.v.], the guardian of Yazid and successor designate of Walid I. Hajjadj had incurred the blame of inducing this monarch to exclude his brother from the succession in favour of his own son — the victry thereof vowed not to survive Walid. He had just completed his 52nd year, prematurely aged and worn out by the labours and disappointments of his tumultuous life when he died of a cancer in the stomach in the month of Ramadan 95 = June 714. He was buried at Wasiit and to prevent posthumous vengeance all traces of his grave were removed. Feared in his lifetime the inexecrable officer of justice was regretted by the wisest and fairest of his contemporaries, such as Muslim b. Kuttiba [q.v.] and Khaliid al-Kaari [q.v.]. The hatred in which later tradition holds him testifies to the important part he played in his lifetime; holding him up to opprobrium as the greatest supporter of the Marwanids, it places him with Yazid I among the few Muslims, for whom it believes eternal damnation to be assured. "It is always a moral sentence of death for a governor, if he is compared to Hajjadj even in the remotest feature" (Becker, Fehyri Schott-Reinhart, Vol. I. 17). Unbiased history gives him his place beside Ziyad b. Abihi and reckons him among the statesmen of the Umayyad period who have deserved most of their country.


**Hadjadj Beg.** [See Rizwan Begovic.]

**Hadjadj-Girai, the founder of an independent Tatar kingdom in the Crimea.** Of his origin we only know that his grandfather Tash-Timur, a prince of the Golden Horde, ruled in the Crimea for a short period (his coins are dated 797 = 1394-1395) towards the end of the 14th century. According to native tradition Tash-Timur had entrusted the education of his son Chiyat al-Din to a member of the tribe of Girai, Dawlat-Geldi; Dawlat-Geldi afterwards went on a pilgrimage to Mecca; on his return a son was born to him and his former pupil, and therefore received the name Hadjadj-Girai. According to Polish sources, Hadjadj-Girai was born in Lithuania, whither his family had fled and thence subdued the peninsula of the Crimea with the help of the Grand Duke Witold. In the year 1434 he won a victory over a Genoese army under Carlo Lonellini. Down to his death in 871 = 1466-1467 he appears as an ally of the Poles and Lithuanians and as the enemy of the Genoese in Kaffa and of the kingdom of the Golden Horde on the Volga. In 1465 Pope Paul II. sent an embassy to him with the singular proposal that he should declare war on Sultan Muhammad Fatih. Cf. also Rugi-je-sarak-i (i. 502 et seq.) and Giray (ii. 171).

(W. BARTHOLOM.)

**Hadjadj Khalifa, i.e. Moustafa b. Adb al-Laih, also known as Kafi-je Celari, the famous Turkish encyclopaedist, was born in Constantinople in 1528-1529 = 1137 h. (February 15 March 1608). At the age of fourteen he enlisted in the picked corps of the Sultans, in which his father also was serving; at the same time he was admitted as a junior clerk in the so-called Anatolian audit office (anadolu muskiehe kalemi). From 1533-1545 he stayed continually but for two short intervals with the Imperial Army at the Eastern frontier of Asia Minor; he joined in the first campaign against the rebel Ahaza Pasha (battle of Kaisaniye end of 1533 h. = beginning of October 1624) and against the Persians (unsuccessful siege of Bagdad from Safar 11th till Shawwal 7th 1035 h. = Nov. 1295 till July 2nd 1626) as well as the second and third campaigns against Ahaza Pasha (repeated siege of Erzerum, beginning of Moharram till 16th Rabii I. 1037 h. = middle of September till Nov. 25th 1627 and from Moharram 6th-22nd 1037 h. = Sept. 5th-21st 1628) and only returned to Constantinople with the army at the end of Rabii I. = beginning of December 1628. His father had in the meanwhile died in Mogul in the I'll-Ka'da 1035 h. = August 1625, during that campaign, as the army was retreating from Bagdad; at this same period he himself became a clerk in the Office of Control of the cavalry (cemii baf muskiehe kalemi). In the beginning of Shawwal 1038 = end of May 1629, he again joined the expedition, under the grand vizier Kosrew Pasha against Persia (conquest of Hamadan end of 1039 h. = beginning of June 1630, and siege of Bagdad from Safar 22nd till Rabbi 5 I. 8th 1040 h. = Sept. 30th till Oct. 15th 1630) so that he only returned to Constantinople about the middle of 1041 h. = end of 1630. Finally he took part in the great expedition against Persia
1045—1045 H. (Sept. 1638 till end of 1635) under Murad IV., himself (conquest of Erivan, Safar 22d 1045 H. = August 7th 1635). At this time he made the pilgrimage to Mecca, whilst the army was wintering in Haleb (1633-1634). After his return to Constantinople a considerable fortune which he had inherited enabled him to give himself up entirely to his favourite hobby, his scientific studies. He gave up his post in the Office of Control in 1055 H. (1645) as he did not advance as his merits deserved, but three years later his friends secured him the post of second Khalif (assistant) in the same Office, and henceforth he called himself Haidji Khalifa. He died in Constantinople in Dhu l-Hijjah 17th 1067 H. = Oct. 6th 1657 not yet fifty years old. The list of his works as given here, is drawn from his own autobiography, with the exception of No. 5 and No. 12, which the author does not mention for unknown reasons:

1. Fadilika, a sketch of the history of about 150 dynasties, and at the same time an extract of the historical work of al-Dhanabili (died 999 H.); written in Arabic in 1051. The author mentions it incidentally in his biographical encyclopaedia under No. 2195 and 5496 (see No. 13); this is probably lost.

2. A compilation of two commentaries upon the Koran, one of them being the commentary of al-Baijawi (1052 H.); seems lost.

3. A commentary to the Muhammadiya of Ali Kushdji the astronomer; this was not finished and seems likewise lost.

4. Ta'ziim al-tawariikh, chronological tables finished in 1058 H.; the introduction and the different appendices are written in Turkish, whilst the tables themselves relating all historical facts from the creation up to the year 1058 H. are written in Persian (see Lex. Bibl., No. 3496); it was printed in Constantinople in 1146 H. (1732) together with the following tables that go as far as 1145 H., and other additions; Italian translation by the Venetian dragoman Rinaldo Cailli, Venice 1697 (see Zenzker, i. No. 924; for other translations see Kriuk, Catalogue of Turkish manuscripts in the British Museum, p. 33; and Pertsch, Verzeichn, der türk. Handschr.. . zu Berlin, l. No. 193).

5. Djhambunji, i.e. Cosmography, first edition, beginning 1062 and continued by the Sultan and Mehemmed IV. (see Lex. Bibl., No. 4355); this work was already considered as lost in the time of the printer Ibrahim (cf. below No. 10).

6. Sulahn al-wun'i il-talabat al-fahhib, i.e. biographical encyclopaedia of famous men, in Arabic. The fair copy of Vol. I. was finished in 1061 and 1062 H.; the holograph of the author is now to be found in the library of Shahid 'Ali Pasha in Constantinople.

7. Tufhat al-akhâyur fi 'l-hikam wa 'l-anthol wa 'l-jarir, an anthology containing maxims, aphorisms, proverbs and poems, composed in 1061 or 1063 H., quoted in the Lex. Bibl., No. 2537; a copy of it exists in Es'ad Efendi's library in Constantinople.

8. Kutub al-zun'âm 'an asâmi 'l-kutub wa 'l-fununi, is the celebrated encyclopaedia in Arabic, the author's most important work, for which he spent over twenty years in gathering the material; Vol. I. concluded in 1064 H., standard edition published by Fludgel, Leipzig 1835—1858; and further in Bâle, 1747 H. and Stambul, 1310—1311 H.

9. Lokami al-sân wa 'l-sinmet al-basim manur, a translation into Turkish of Mercator's and Hondius's Atlas Minor, following the Arnhem Edition of 1621; the translation was completed in 1064 and 1065 H. with the help of the French renegade Akhliji Shahîd Mehemmed Efendi; copies are to be met with in several libraries in Constantinople.

10. Dîjhamunji, second edition of No. 5, founded on quite a new plan, the author having in the meantime largely used the European standard work of that epoch (Mercator, Ortelius, Cluverius). Of the original work, which the author never brought to end, we know those parts treating of Asia Minor, by the publication of the printer Ibrahim Muteferrika (Dîjhamunji, Constantinople 1145 H. = 1732, only the first part; the second part intended to contain the description of Europe, Africa and America, was never published; for translations of the printed text by Norberg, Armain, v. Hammer, Charmoy, and others see Fludgel, Die urab. pers. u. türk. Handschr. der K. K. Hofbibl., No. 1282 and Rieu, o.c., p. 111) and by two important fragments, both by the author's own hand, one of them in the British Museum (Or. 5398) and the other in the Court Library of Vienna (see Fludgel, o.c., No. 1282). Further we possess the description of the Ottoman dominions in Europe, in several copies, three of which are to be found in the library of Râghib Pasha, in the Mewlewî-kâne of Perä and the Kutuhkâne-i 'Ummüni in Constantinople; the fourth one is in the Court Library in Vienna; the fifth copy by the author's own hand has disappeared, and it is from this last, that von Hammer translated some parts in his Kunelli und Bosna, Vienna 1812.

11. A translation into Turkish of the Latin translation of the Byzantine historian Khalkokondylas, or as the author himself styles it, of a "Frankish Chronicle"; no copy of it extant.

12. Rawânûk al-Safajun, i.e. History of Constantinople, supposed to be a translation of a work originally written in Arabic by the same author; now lost.

13. A Turkish translation of Fadilika (see No. 1); a manuscript of it is said to exist in the library of Es'ad Efendi in Constantinople.

14. Al-khâm al-mu'ahaddas min al-fa'is al-khâbâs, a treatise on different rites and rules of Islam, that cannot be observed under the certain circumstances. A copy of it exists in the Kutubkhâne-i 'Ummüni in Constantinople.

15. Düsür al-um'al li-shâh al-khalif, a treatise on the financial reforms, written in 1063 H., but published only three years after. It was printed in Constantinople 1280 H. (1863) and translated into German by Behrmaier, Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Geselsch., xi. 111—132.

16. Kadîm erradim bil-sin wa 'l-tumam, a collection of curious cases of law and of the different decisions given upon them.

17—19. Extracts of about 200 miscellanea (madâniye), and two small volumes containing historical and literary anecdotes; have all disappeared.

20. Fadilîhat al-tawariikh, the continuation of the Fadilika, No. 1 and 13, in Turkish, containing the history of the Ottoman Empire from 1000 H. till beginning 1065 H.; printed in Constantinople 1286—1287 H.

22. Mizān al-šaḥīṭ fī ikhšāṣ al-ʿaḥālī, the author’s last work written in Şafar 1067 H. (Nov. 1656). A treatise concerning several theological disputes of that epoch. In this treatise he breaks definitively with his first teacher, Kādirzāde, the head of the orthodox party. Published in Constantinople in 1634, 1656, 1826 and 1851.

Bibliography: The autobiography of the author at the end of No. 22, very incorrectly edited by Wickerhauser, Wegweiser etc., p. 150—167, and the autobiographical note at the end of the first part of the Sultan al-waṣīl (No. 6); the Monakht-i Kādir Celi, which precedes the print of the Tāʿwīl (No. 4); the 15th century biography in the Dhačl-i ʿAṣbita by ʿUthmān (see von Hammer, Orn. Gesch., vi. 47); Sīdqi-i ʿOmar, iv. 395; Kādir Celi by Bāsili Mehmmed Tihār b. Rifaʿat, Stambul 1331 H.; and the older European authors who treated of Ḥāджjb, and his works are quoted by Fluegel, Handbuch der K. K. Hofbibliothek, i. 48 and Rieu, o. c., p. 33; compare also Wustenfeld, Die Geschichtsrechercher der Araber etc., No. 570, and Brockelmann, Gesch. der arab. Liter., ii. 125.

(3. H. Mordtmann.)

Ḥāджjb Pasha (Abdinlī Ḥāʤjb Pasha), whose real name was Ḥāʤjb b. ʿAli b. Ḥāʤjb, a contemporary of Sultan Bayazid Yildirim, a Ottoman jurist and student of medicine. He went to study in Cairo where he studied under Shaikh Mubarak Shah Shāh Münatake and went through his theological and legal courses in company with Shaikh Ekmel al-Din and Shaikh Bādr al-Dīn Shāhī. An illness, which he went through, turned his attention to the study of medicine and he soon attained fame in it. He ultimately became chief physician at the Cairo Hospital Ashār-i Mihr. Returning to Aydın he settled in Birgi on the invitation of Aydın Oghlu Mehmmed Bey, and died there in 1820 (1417). He also placed his services at the disposal of the conqueror Timur and is said to have instructed his physicians. He also spent some time at the court of Prince Sultan in his service.

In his early days he wrote theological and legal works: e.g. a Tasfi fī İkhšāṣ al-Anwaar fī Dhimma as-Sirr in two volumes, a commentary on Bādawī’s commentary on the Kurān dedicated to Yāsī Bey, one of the sons of Aydın, entitled ʿAvāl al-Anwaar fī Kāhḥām, and marginal notes on Fakhr al-Dīn Kāzī’s commentary on the ʿAkhbar al-ʿAzcār (f. ʿArabī) of Kādir Sirādī al-Dīn Muhammad al-ʿUmarī. His medical works are more important and have maintained their authority down to modern times. The largest is the al-Sha’faa, a work on therapeutics in Turkish written for Aydın Oghlu Mehmmed Bey which is divided into three sections treating respectively of a. physiology and dietetics, b. foods, drinks and medicaments and c. causes, diagnosis and cure of diseases. A brief similarly divided handbook for the layman is his Tehsil al-Tibb (The facilitation of medicine). Both works are said to have been translated into Latin. Less known are his: Şhīfah al-ʾAskām wa Dīwān al-ʾĀlam ("Cure of disease and alleviation of pain"), his Ferisī fī ʿIṣbāh al-ʿAḥāṣīyat al-Ḥābid, al-Wadāʾ, and al-Ki:mī al-Dīnāb.}

Bibliography: Shaʾkī b. Ṣaʿdaʿ, Constantinople 1269, p. 74; Thureiya, Siddīqī, Ṣenwāni (1311), ii. 94; M. Tihr, Aydın Wilcliyetine Memari Mehmmed, "Ulemā, Şahārā, Muwārīqīn ve Atlînîn Terâşix-i Ahlî, Constantinople 1324, p. 174—177; Hammer, Geschichte des Osmank, Reicher, i. 276; do., Geschichte des Osman. Dichtkünst, i. 73; Fluegel, Die arab. pers, u. türk. Handschriften der K. K. Hofbibliothec, ii. 356 et seq. (Theodor Menzel.)

Ḥāʤjb can be a character in the shadow play, the inseparable companion of the Kurāgō (q. v.).

Ḥāʤjb (from Ḥāʤjb, to prevent any one entering) is the name of the office of doorkeeper e.g. Ḥāʤjbat al-Bait (the doorkeepers of the Ka‘ba, see Lane’s Lexicon). It corresponds to the office of chamberlain in our time. We may here mention the theoretical explanation of Ibn Khaldūn that the chamberlain should protect the ruler from troublesome visitors so that he may remain undisturbed in his important labours. In the western kingdoms (e. g. in Cordova) he frequently became representative of the Caliph and chief of the viziers. The petty, practically independent kings of Spain took the title of Ḥāʤjb. Among the Ḥāʤjbds (q. v.) he was superintendent of war-minister and as being the chief official the real ruler, among the Zayānīs (q. v.), superintendent of the palace and minister of finance. In the eastern kingdoms (Mesopotamia, Syria and Egypt) he had a position at court similar to that of chamberlain and was also given this title even if he served the ruler as commander of the army. He received quite different duties in the Mamluks period. To relieve the Sultan’s governor in Cairo (al-Dīvān al-Miṣr), and in the provinces or perhaps to diminish his influence, the Amir Ḥāʤjb or Ḥāʤjb al-Dīvān was entrusted with Balkārs reiga (658—676 = 1260—1277) with the decision of questions between the emirs and the soldiers, at a later period, when the office of the Sultanate in Cairo was abolished, he was placed at the head of the administrative military court in the reign of Sultan Nāṣir Muhammad and his sons. In difficult cases he consulted with the Sultan. He gradually from being a judge in military matters began to encroach on civil cases also which belonged to the kāfī’s province; the parties concerned seem to have resisted this at first, as Maḥrīzī vividly describes how they ultimately became reconciled to it and often preferred the civil jurisdiction of the Ḥāʤjb to the ecclesiastical of the Kāfī. Khalqshandī (in the time of Sultan Muṣayyed Shaikh 815—824) ranked him as the eighth official, the author of the Dīwān al-Iṣfahān (in the reign of Sultan Barsbe, 825—842) calls him the twelfth in rank, and Khalīl al-Zāhīrī (under Sultan Dājakm 842—857) the seventh; and, according to him, the second Ḥāʤjb was Tabākhānī (Amir of 40 Mamluks, q. v.), the third Ḥāʤjb Amir of twenty or ten Mamluks; there were also 20 subordinate Ḥāʤjbds without the rank of Amir. In the provinces, according to Khalqshandī, the Ḥāʤjb came third next to the governor and the commander of a corps (Atabég), and, according to Khalīl al-Zāhīrī, he was likewise third after the governor and the commander of the citadel, when there was one, and second when there was no other citadel. He was the deputy of the governor in his absence, in case of his death till the appointment of a successor. The Sultan himself only corresponded with officers here mentioned; to the Amir Ḥāʤjb of the great provinces of Damascus, Aleppo and Tripolis he called himself in the signature his father Sultan.
N. N.}}, while the Emir Ḫāḍīj in Ḥamā, Ṣafad, and Ḥanṣā had to be content with the simple suffix Ṣafad Ṣafad.


ḤADRAT, the ancient Ḥatra, "Arab on the Tābi Tharthār in the desert, three short days' journey S.W. of Mūṣul, now in ruins, on which cf. the works mentioned in the Bibliography. The town's claim to be mentioned here is that the Arab historians give a certain amount of information about its former extent and rapid decline. Ḫadr, says Yākūt, *Muḥaddis*, ii. 282, was built entirely of hewn stone; there were sixty strong forts there and 9 smaller ones between every two; there was a palace and a bath near every fort. During the reign of the Sāsānid Šābūr I. (240–271) a man of the name of Sāṭīr (according to Noldeke = Satruces) ruled here; the Arabs called him Ḍaizan. As the latter had made a raid on Persian territory, Šābūr resolved to besiege him in his capital, but could not take the strong fortifications until Ḍaizan’s daughter fell in love with him and betrayed him to the secret by which he could make powerless the talisman that protected the castle. He thus succeeded in taking the town and utterly destroying it. He took Ḍaizan’s daughter with him to marry her; soon however he became so disgusted with her ingratitude to her father, who had certainly treated her more tenderly, that he had her bound to the tail of a wild horse so that she died a terrible death. Firdawsi and several Arab historians wrongly say that it was Šābūr II, who destroyed Ḥatra, for it is certain that the town was already in ruins by 856. (Rīḵāt, p. W. Arendt, *Nack Aufschnitten der Ausstr.-Expedition der Deutsch. Orient. Gez.*, Leipzig 1908; O. Oppenheim, *Vom Mittelmeer zum Pers. Golf*, ii. 3 etseq.; where the earlier literature is also given; Noldeke, *Geschichte der Perier und Araber*, p. 33 et seq. (according to Tālabi, ed. Goeje, i. 827 et seq., with occasional references to the accounts of other writers); Pauli-Wissowa, *Real-Enc.*, s. v.; Herfeld in Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gez., Vol. 41, 1897.)

**Ḥadrat, „presence”, is used broadly as a mystic by a synonym of ḥāḍar, “being in the presence of Allāh”]. Its correlate is ghaib (q. v. with its references) “absence” from all except Allāh. On the controversy as to whether in expressing this relation to Allāh ḥāḍar or ghaib is to be preferred — that is, which is the more perfect, final element — see especially Nicholson, *Ḳaṭṭat*, pp. 245 et seq. The term was later extended by Ibn Ṭurğān, working out his monistic scheme, to the Five Divine Ḥaḍarāt, stages or orders of being in the Neoplatonic chain (cf. above, vol. i. pp. 62 et seq., 986). There is a short statement of these in the *Ṭurğān of Ḥurğān*, p. 6 (Cairo 1321), which has been translated by Horton in his *Theologie des Islam*, pp. 294 et seq., where, and on p. 151, he also gives some minor uses of the term. See, too, Massugga’s *Ḳaṭṭat al-Mobāṣṣar*, p. 183 with a reference to Ibn Ṭurğān’s *Fatūṣ al-ṭāḥān*, and Hughes, *Dict. of Islam*, p. 169. In consequence, the Plotinian scheme of dynamic emanation was called in Islam mdhaḥkab al-ḥaḍarāt (Ibn Khaldūn, *Muhaddis*, ed. Qastremèr, III, p. 69; de Slane, III, p. 100). Derives their regular Friday service from (above, Vol. I, 1898). The use of ḥaḍra (ḥaḍar) as a title of respect — the Deity, saints, prophets, any educated man — belongs to the Lexicon. (D. B. Macdonald.)

ḤADRĀWĪT (the Ḥadrāwīt of the South Arabian inscriptions), now pronounced Ḥadrāmūt, a land in Arabia in the east of Yemen between 49° and 53° East, Long. and 15° and 19° North. Lat. It is bounded in the south by the sea, in the southeast by the land of Maḥra, in the N. E., N. and W. by the great Central Arabian desert, in the S. W. by the land of the *Abālīk* [q. v.] and of the Ṣuḥāfī [q. v.]. The name Ḥadrāmawt is according to Arab tradition derived from Ḥadrām b. Ḥimyar ... b. Yaʿrub b. Ẓaḥī (Ḥṣarāməwet, the son of Yūkta in *Genesis* x. 26).

In ancient times Ḥadrāmawt was celebrated as a land of frankincense and was greater in extent than it now is. The Ḥadrāmīt (Ḥadrāmīt) of Strabo (Atarinate in Pliny) were one of the most powerful tribes of the great South Arabian kingdom; their metropolis was Ṣabata (Ṣabata). According to Greek legend, the scent of the frankincense tree was deadly and the valley in which it grew was therefore called the "land of death". The Arab lexicographers also connect the name Ḥadrāmawt with the alleged unhealthy situation of the land, for they explain it as a combination of ḥaḍr "town", land and muwat "death"; but, apart from the fact that the land has only borne the name Ḥadrāmūt in modern times, the climate of Ḥadrāmawt has always been regarded as healthy. In the pre-Muhammadan period Ḥadrāmawt was inhabited by the Ṣaḥār or Ṣuḥāfī. To these the Kinda [q. v.] attached themselves, who migrated from Ḥadrāmāt to Ḥadrāmawt to the number of over 30,000 men about the time of the birth of Muḥammad; their most important clan at this time was the Ṭuḏih, who numbered 1500 men in Ilhumān’s time. In the time of the Prophet princes with the title Ḥāhilah ruled in Ḥadrāmawt; the Kinda prince Ṭaḥā b. Ṣahāthi adopted Islam in Muḥammad’s time; after the death of the prophet he succeeded but was soon afterwards conquered. The land is now under Turkish suzerainty, but this is merely nominal for the Forte keeps 20 service ḥaḍra.

Ḥadrāmawt is a mountainous land traversed by a great valley with several wādīs of considerable size branching off from it. Along the coast there are hills. These are followed by a high chain of mountains, of which the highest is the Ḥiḥbāl al-ʿArāb (a vast plateau). A second chain of mountains adjoins the main valley on the north and this runs up to the great desert. The two chains consist mainly of limestone and are as a rule barren; only here and there do we find small ṣib (aloe)-trees, thorn-bushes and pastures.
The main wadi runs from west to east and then to the south where it flows into the sea near the fishing-village of Sahūt, which belongs to the land of the Mahāri. The most western town in the main valley is Shābwa. From Shābwa the road runs through a sandy and sparsely populated district to the isolated mountain al-Kaʿīma.

To the left of this road to al-Kaʿīma lie the wādīs Dhhīraya (well cultivated) and Sārer, and on the right the wādīs ʿIrma, Dhuhr and Rakhīya (the latter on the important valley of Sahāwā [Sahwah in Wrede]); to this wādí also belong the Bahr al-Ṣafī mentioned by Wrede, where in the midst of the desert, according to the observations of this explorer, all that is thrown into sinks; in the S. of the W. Dhuhr and Rakhīya begins the land of the ʿAwahlī. S. E. of al-Kaʿīma lie the two towns Kaʿūthā and Hainin (Hainan, Ḥaninem in Nibāub, on the wādí of the same name, in Hamdānī’s time a large village with kūn and a market inhabited by the Ṭadhīlī). Sometimes Kaʿūthā rises (on the right of the main wādí) the three wādīs ʿAmid (formed by the union of the two wādīs Nīr and Ra’idā Arḍīn at the town of ʿAmid), Dāwān and al-ʿĀlīn (in Hamdānī also called ʿAbr). The important Wādī Dawān (a town of Dawān, mentioned by Hamdānī [Dawān in Ptolemy], no longer exists) has a right (western) arm Dawān al-Aimān and a left (eastern) arm Dawān al-Aimin and Dawān al-Aisār; the northern part of the Wādī bears the name Ḥadājrān after the isolated mountain Ḥadājrān with the town of the same name near it (q.v.). The Wādī is thickly populated. The most important places in this wādí are: al-Ḥaribālī (the most southern town in the wādī), ʿĪsā (Seif, Saṣīf in Wrede), Biḥā, Kāḏūn (Kāḏūn in Nibāub and Wrede with the tomb of the greatest saint of Ḥadramawt, Ahmad b. Ṭūsī, called ʿAmīd al-Dīn), Meshhed ʿĀli (the so-called tombs of the kings), we may further mention the other localities: al-Qarrān, ʿAwrā, Ḥādīn, Ḥalbān, Ḥabhū and Ar-samā. Not far from the village of al-ʿĀlīn in the confluence of the Wādī Dawān and Wādī ʿAmîd, on the twenty-five miles west of the town of the same name, in the same region of ʿAmid, is the town of Ḥadīr (mentioned in Hamdānī’s time, an important town inhabited by the ʿAqāf in ʿAmid, ʿAqāf), called a large town by Hamdānī.

On the Wādī ʿAmid the important town of Ḥawara (q.v.). From the town of Ḥawara up to the ancient and still important town of Shībām (q.v.) the main valley is called Wādī al-Kasar (in Hamdānī also Wādī Ksar Kāshākū or Kāshākū after the town of this name built on the top of a hill), to Shībām Wādī bin Ṭadhīlī and Wādī al-Aḥāṣ (also called Kāšākū); briefly the Wādī (Ḥadramawt) or Wādī Masila. The most important towns in the main valley east of Shībām are: al-Gharra, Tarīs (Tris in Nibāub, Tertiary in Wrede, in Hamdānī’s time a large town), Saiʿān, now the largest town and chief centre of learning, the very ancient town of Maryama, Būr, Tāriha (Tarba in Nibāub, Tyrābi in Wrede), the ancient capital Tarīm (q.v.). Ināṣ (Eināt, on the Wādī of this name) and al-Kasm. From al-Kasm ʿAbhū Hūd is reached, the tomb of the prophet Ḥūd on the Wādī Barahat (q.v. i. 653 & 829). West of Shībām in the main valley we may further mention the important town of al-Katīn. From Ḥawara to the city of Ḥawara the valley is thickly populated and covered with date-groves, gardens, fields and many villages, from al-Kasm to ʿAbhū Hūd it is less populated and from ʿAbhū Hūd to Sahūt the population is very small. Of side-wāḍīs of the great valley there are still to be mentioned: (in the north) Wīdān Sarr (with ʿAbhū Ṣālīḥ), al-Naṣrān, al-Djūlāʿāmah (both the latter east of Shībām), Madar (east of Saiʿān), Thībī (Thībi), ʿAidīd (with the tomb of the saint ʿAidīd), both west of Tarīm, and al-Ḥabān (east of Tarīm), (in the south) the two important wādīs Bin ʿAlei (east of Shībām) and ʿAinīd (Odam in Wrede, not far from Tarīm). The more important localities on the coast in addition to the two great harbours al-Makālān [q.v.] and al-Shīḥr [q.v.]: are Būrūm (Būrūm, Burūm, with an important harbour, according to Sprenger identical with the Pirontus of Ptolemy), Fūwa (with 50 houses including a few of some size), Ghaṭl Bawāzīr (with very fine tobacco plantations), al-Ḥamīn, al-Shirma and Kusārī. Of wāḍīs on the coast may be mentioned: Ḥūrīn, Huwaira and al-Maidī. The chief wāḍī and the side-wāḍīs are usually dry and only swollen with floods in the rainy season.

Among the many mountains we may mention Huwaira (on the wādí of the same name), ʿAbd Allāh Qarīn, al-Skīra, the Plateau al-ʿArāṣa already mentioned, ʿAmān (all in the north near the coast), Raʾīdā al-Dājrīn (in the north of the Wādīs ʿAmid and Dawān), Ḥasīn, al-Ḥūṣā, Raʾīdā al-Māʿrā (in the south of the Wādī ʿAmid), Suwāqūn (with Ḥṣān al-Kaʿī, in the south of the Wādī Bin ʿAlei, Dijhānān, Ḥoumadān, al-Gaḥawīr (in the north of the Wādīs ʿAmid and Dawān), Dijhāl al-Abīt (between the Wādīs Djjīhā and Wādī Hainin), Dijhā (with Ḥṣān ʿArkaḥū), Dijhīma (both south of Saiʿān), Wādī (in the north of Tarīm), al-Munābiʿāz (south of Tarīm), Ghaṭl Bin Rūn (N.W. of ʿAbū Hūd). In the west of the northern mountain chain rises a large plateau, Raʾīdā al-Saʿīr (called after the ancient Bedouin tribe Saʿīr, a clan of the ʿAmbāq, whose name was borne in Hamdānī’s time by a fine breed of camel), to which a larger plateau Nadjad (Nayid, Nadjad al-Kaṭāhr̀ and Nadjad al-Awāmīr is linked up. Both bound on the great Central Arabian desert in the north. In neither of these mountain ranges is there any place of the slightest importance.

The climate of Ḥadramawt is dry and healthy; in summer it is very warm and in winter very cold; even in summer it freezes on the high mountains. The rainy period lasts from October to February, in which however it hardly rains four times; in many years there is absolutely no rain; in the coast the rainfall is more abundant. The products of the soil are: cereals, dhara (a kind of maize), dakh (a kind of oats), dates, grapes, figs, nebāk fruit, indigo, sesame and tobacco. The irrigation of the soil is artificially performed by artesian wells. The houses are built of bricks, sometimes in the style of a ḥijāć; they are from two to four stories high and are loopholed. The Bedouins live in mud huts or caves; there are no tents in Ḥadramawt; nor are there coffee-houses (kahwa) here, such as are found everywhere else in Arabia.

The ruling class in Ḥadramawt is the tribe (kaḥḍām). The chiefs of the tribes called muḥkāmān live in fortified palaces and maintain small garrisons. The free citizens of the towns, who control the trade and industries of the town are raʾīya of the muḥkāmān, who levy oppressive taxes on them. The most powerful prince on the coast of Ḥadramawt is the ruler of al-Ṣhir, to
whom the towns of al-Makalla, Ghail Bawtizir, al-Hadjareen, Hawra, al-Ka'tan and Shibbam also belong. In the interior the greatest smashed is the town of Sultân and owns the towns of Tarim, Tats and al-Ghurfa. Hadramawt is inhabited by the following tribes: I. Baraik, Bedouins with the hereditary title Shaikh in the country Shabwa (a portion belongs to al-Shihr); II. Al 'Am, in the wadis of 'Irma and Duhr; III. Bait Kinda, Bedouins, divided into: Al Sai'ar (in the Ra'id al-Sai'ar and the mountains around) and 2. Al Mat'hûf (formerly in Hadjareen, now scattered over the adjoining mountains); IV. Al al-Karab, Bedouins around Rakûn on the Wadi D'jibya; V. Al-Nahdi, on the lower part of the wadis Rakhîya and in the main valley as far as Ka'asha and Hainin (with ten subdivisions, of whom the Hukman are the most important; the chief of the Hukman, who lives in Ka'asha is in muqaddam of the whole tribe); VI. Al Ballalîh and VII. Al Haïdara (both Bedouins on the upper part of the Wadi Rakhîya); VIII. Al Dja'da, almost all Bedouins, on the Wadî 'Amd; IX. Al 'Amûd or Bani 'Isa (called after Shaikh Ahmed b. 'Isa, 'Amûd al-Dîn) with the hereditary title Shaikh, on the Wadî dawân and on the Ra'id al-Dai'în (with 22 subdivisions; the most important are the Al Matju'h, whose chief lives in the Dja'da; X. Al 'Asha'ib (sing. Al 'Ashab) and XI. Al B. Sai'd (both Bedouins, on the Wadî Ain and in the surrounding mountains); XII. Al Yâbî, on the coast and in the towns of al-Hadjareen, Hawra, al-Ka'tan and Shibbam, divided into: 1. Al Thobai (with 8 minor divisions); 2. Al Labûs (sing. Al Bu'si), with 4 minor divisions; 3. Al al-Ma'sin (with 8 minor divisions, of which the most important is the Ka'ta [sing. Al-Ka'atî], whose chief is head of the whole tribe); XIII. Sai'ibân, a large Bedouin tribe, divided into: 1. Sai'ibân proper in the north and northwest of the Djebel Houara; 2. al-Akâbîra (sing. Al-Akâbîrî), in the south and S.W. of the mountain mentioned; 3. Al-Awâbîthâ (sing. Al-Awâbîthûnî), in the S.E. of the Wadî Dawân; 4. Al Bahsas (sing. Al-Bahsasî), on the Wadi Djibra and the surrounding mountains; XIV. Al-Hamûd, Bedouins in the mountains of 'Abd Allâh Gharib, al-Fikra, al-Arsha, Tabha; XV. Al-Sa'ina, descendants of Shanfarl al-Hamâni (according to the legend the first prince of Hadramawt), a large tribe, divided into: 1. Al Kathir (Khatiri), between Shibbam and Sai'ûn (with five large subdivisions, among them the Al 'Abd al-Wodûd, around Ko'sarî); 2. Al-Awâmir (al-'Amûrî), in the large valley between Sai'ûn and Tarim and the mountains to the north; 3. Al Djibir, Bedouin tribe, in the mountains of Djidja and Dji'mma and the Wadis Bin 'Ali and 'Adim; the chief of the Shanfarra is the Sultan of Sai'ûn; XVI. Al Bâdjair, in the N.E. of Sai'ûn between the Kâbir and 'Awâmir; XVII. Bani Thanna (see Al-Thanna), divided into: 1. Al Tamim, in the large valley between al-Kasm and Kâbir Hûd (their chief resides in al-Kasm); 2. Al-Manâkilh (Minâhil), a Bedouin tribe on the Wadi Maslala between Kâbir Hûd and Saihjût and in the mountains to the east and west (their chief lives in Saijût); 3. Al-al-Simäh (sing. Al-Simâhî), a Bedouin tribe in the hills to the north of Wadî 'Ināt.

Besides the kâbûl and ra'îya there is Hadramawt another separate class of society, the Saiyids, who represent the religious aristocracy of the land. They are very numerous and enjoy a great prestige among the people, surpassing that of the muqaddams; the other inhabitants kiss their hands in token of respect. They are exceedingly conservative and averse to any innovation; they bear the title hâbîb and are divided into families whose hereditary superior bears the honorific title munjib. Many of the Saiyids are reverenced as saints and presents are lavished on them, many again enjoy a great reputation as scholars. They bear no arms and as a rule pay no taxes. They consider themselves the highest nobility in Arabia. They trace their descent from the Shaikh Ahmed b. 'Isa mentioned above, who in his turn is said to have been a descendant in the seventh generation from Muhammad's grandson Husain. According to tradition, Ahmed b. 'Isa came several centuries ago from Basra to Hadramawt with eighty men, who became the ancestors of the Saiyids.

The number of inhabitants of Hadramawt is not accurately known. According to Van den Berg's investigations, the total population is not more than 150,000, viz., from the Wadî Duhr to the Wadî Rakhîya 20,000, in the Wadis 'Amîd, Dawân and al-'Ain 25,000, from Shibbam to Tarim 50,000, from Tarim to Sai'ûn 60,000, in the north of the great valley to the Central Arabian desert 15,000, south of the great valley to the sea 16,000, Shihr and the neighbourhood 12,000, Makalla and the neighbourhood 6000.

The trade is of importance on the coast particularly in the towns of Shihr and Makalla. It extends to the east coast of Africa, British India, the Red Sea, the south coast of Arabia (particularly Aden, Masqat and Zafar) and the Persian Gulf. The exports are: fish-fins (to British India and China), dates, cloths dyed with indigo, gum-arabic and resin. Imports are: cereals, coconuts, coffee, sugar, rice, cotton, iron, petroleum etc. The trade by caravans with the interior is slight. It stretches on the west as far as Yemen on the one side and on the other eastwards as far as Omân. In the larger towns there is a market every Friday (the largest is at Sai'ûn). The tribes have their representatives at the markets of the larger localities, called adâlât. [q. v.] (brokers, called kiiyâb al-suk market-dogs by the people), who are appointed to sell their goods and who form a separate guild under an adâs (superior). The chief industry is the textile, which is now on the decline on account of the competition of cheaper European products; its great centre used to be Tarim. Besides the textile industry we may mention the manufacture of indigo and shipbuilding on the coast. Agriculture is in the hands of the Kâbûl and the Saiyids, who have their fields tilled by slaves. The latter are as a rule Somalis or Nubians and are usually Muslims; they bear special names, which are distinct from the usual Arab names, e.g. Ma'brûk, Murdjan etc.

The Hadramâris are an able, industrious people devoted to their native land. On account of the increasing power of the country many are forced to leave home and seek their fortune in foreign lands; many Hadramâris are to be found at the present day in the trading centres of Arabia where they earn a living as porters and petty traders, in Egypt and particularly in the English and Dutch Indies. As soon as they have acquired a modest
fortune, they return home often after an absence of twenty to thirty years. They are Şahānīs and are exceedingly fanatical and superstitious; they believe in spirits, who haunt places where treasure is buried; Christians and Jews may not even make a temporary stay in their land which they call Ḥudīl (q.v.) - vilāyāt ("land of knowledge and of faith"). Their women, who are even those of the Saiyids (as a rule ignorant of reading and writing, enjoy a better fate than their kinswomen in other parts of Arabia. Divorces are exceedingly rare; nor is polygamy practised among these Bedouins.

Ḥadramawt was first visited in 1843 by Adolph v. Werde, who could only explore a part of the land, as he was recognised as a European in the town of Ṣif and only managed to escape the death that threatened him by a hurried flight. Fifty years later Leo Hirsch and Mr and Mrs Th. Bent visited the country but could not explore the land to its full extent.


ḤADŪR (Ḥadūr Nabi [Nebi] Shu‘aib), a mountain in South Arabia, belonging to the Sarat group of Aḥān, to the west of Su‘a (q.v.) between the Wādī Ṣahām and the Wādī Sūrād near the Ḥudr range (q.v.) from which it was separated in Hamdānī’s time by the Balad al-Ḫabrāt (now Ḥaṁmā [q.v.]) inhabited by the Saiyids (branch of the Hamdānī). The name Ḥadūr is derived from Ḥadūr b. ʿAbd b. Maḥlib, an ancestor of the prophet Shu‘aib b. Maḥdam, mentioned in the Kūran (cf. Sūra vii. 83 et seq. and xi. 85 et seq.) who was sent to preach and to warn his people on Mount Ḥadūr and was thereupon slain by them.

The mountain is about 9400 feet high; according to Arab tradition, Ḥadūr Shu‘aib was the highest of the three mountains (the other two were Lijebel Shāhār [Shu‘aib] and Kanīn in Ḥawālān [q.v.]), which remained above the waves during the Deluge. The highest peak on Ḥadūr is the Ḥijāb Kāhār, also called Lijebel Bait Kāhān, on which is the celebrated tomb (with mosque) of the prophet Shu‘aib, which is always much visited (particularly by young women who hope to be cured of barrenness here); on the last day of Ramaḍān and on the festival at Ṭārlāt, great festivities are arranged here. From the terrace of the mosque a splendid view is obtained over the whole Yemen. 700 yards W. by N. W. of Ḥijāb Kāhār lies Ḥijāb ʿIzām, south of which are the mountains of Ḥabba, Manṣūra and Ḥabbaṯ (with the village of the same name and ancient ruins). Ḥijāb ʿIzām leads to the south of Kāhār.

To the east of Ḥudhr lies the Kāna Ṣahām, with the villages of the Meten (Mottene in Niebuhr), called Ḥanān Sīnāt by the Turks (8000 feet above sea-level, with a teemeter [shelterhouse] said to have been built by Sinān Pāshā, who is open free to any traveller), Sahmān (also called Mīrīyū), Bait Mahdam, Bait Radam, Dāʾer, Mīsib (Maysāb), Bait Kāhān, which now belong to the so-called Ḥiṭāl al-Būṭānī.

The following localities in Ḥudhr may also be mentioned: al-Kaṭra ("the village"), Ḳark or Ḳark (north of Kārya), Ḏaṭal (in the N.W. of Ḥudhr), the Sāda (Ḥudhr) village Zuhār or Dūhr in the south. The range is traversed by numerous wāḍāi (among them the Ẓahr Dūhr and Ẓahr Jāzil, which latter is often mentioned in the South Arabian inscriptions), which flow into the large Wādīs Kāhrīd, Ṣurād and Ṣahām. In the valleys of the range excellent vines are found in addition to various fruit-trees; in the deeper parts of the Ḥudhr the cedars particularly grown are Ḏiṭura (a kind of mellet), barley and burr (a kind of wheat or corn.

On the Ḥudhr Shuʿaib it snows almost every winter and the snow often lies for days several feet deep so that the inhabitants cannot leave their houses.

In Hamdānī’s time the Mikhāl Ḥaḍhr comprised amongst others the districts of al-Maʿṭal (so Muḥller, Ḏiqāra, in several passages, which he equates with the Ḏiqāra of the South Arabian inscriptions, for Glaser’s Ḏiqāra, consisting of Ṣādī, Ṣahmān and Ḥudhr proper [al-Ḏiqāra]), Maṭīna (including the two gardens of Yemen), Dāyr and Ḏaṭal, and Rīfān or Rīfānān, Ṣhamm (lower part), Maṭīkh, Sahīb, al-Maḥām, Baraṣḥ, Maysāb, al-Šaṣyād. The hard white honey of Ḥaḍhr was famous in Arabia, it is even mentioned by Ibn’u-l-Kaṣi in one of his poems. The people of Ḥaḍhr according to Hamdānī spoke bad and clumsy Arabic (Hinayāri).

The Ḥaḍhr of the Banū ʿAzid, called Ḥaḍhr al-Shaḥiḥ, is distant from Ḥaḍhr Shuʿāib and is the largest mountain of the Sarat group of al-Maṣānī (al-Maṣānā’s). It is about 9500 feet high.

The Ḥaḍhr Shuʿāib and that of the Banū ʿAzid have been visited and explored in modern times by the explorer Eduard Glaser.


Al-ḤĀFIZ (a.), the guardian, the protector, one of the names of God, cf. 303. When used of men a Ḥāfiz is one who knows the Korān by heart, literally "preserves" (in the memory).

ḤĀFIZ, a Persian lyric poet. His real name with jāḥiṣ was Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad.
He seems to have been born in Shiraz, not earlier than 1326 A.D. Practically nothing is known of his parents or other relatives; he never explicitly mentions them in a way that is free from ambiguity (a sister and her children are referred to without mention of names over two centuries later in Ferishta's History). In his youth he learned the Koran by heart (hafiz), devoted himself to the study of theology and allied subjects and obtained an excellent knowledge of the Arabic language and literature. In later years he mentions (Divan, ed. Brockhaus, p. 579) as a reminiscence of the reign of the Turk Shahik Abû Ishaq-i Indji (see the article INDJ), king of Fars, four notables of Shiraz whom he had apparently known personally: Aghul al-Din ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Ijadi, died 1355; (cf. Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt. ii. 208-209), probably his tutor; the chief judge of Shiraz, Maqdî al-Din Isma'il b. Muhammad b. Khudâdad (died 17th July 1355, Divan, ed. Brockhaus, No. 604; cf. Ibn Baṭṭaṭ, ed. Deffrey, ii. 54-63); the dervish, otherwise unknown, Shahik Amin al-Din, who had perhaps an influence on the development of Hâfiz's more liberal outlook; lastly Hâjji Kiwâm al-Din Hasan (died 11th May 1355), a high favourite at the court, a noble, spirited philanthropist, to whom Hâfiz seems to have been indebted for material support, either directly or indirectly (Brockhaus, No. 610; Mirkhwând, Rawât al-Šâfi, Bombay 1271 A.H., iv. 142).

In 1353 the vigorous Sultan Muḥârîz al-Din Muḥammad (q. v.) of the Muṣaffarîd family conquered the petty principality of Fars and finally took Shiraz also (2nd Nov. 1353) to the great misfortune of its citizens. Hâfiz himself was unable long to put up with the changed conditions. Muḥârîz al-Din was a strict ruler who forbade the people of Shiraz the enjoyment of wine. There was also a religious ground for discomfort in his reign. Hâfiz was a Shīʾî (Divan-i Hâfiz, ed. Calcutta 1791, text fol. 1 r–2 v), although no fanatic. Aḥī al-Ridâ is celebrated by him as Shâh-Sultan of Khorassân; Hâfiz belonged to the Shīʾa sect of the Twelvers (Iǧâlaʿ ʿAḫariyya, cf. the kâṣida in Cod. Pers. Monacensis, No. 69, fol. 9 r–10 v; also Cod. Pers. Monac., No. 68, fol. 138 v). In one passage his belief in the Korâb having existed from eternity (kādim) appears (Brockhaus No. 686, Bait 119, which belongs to the last two years of the poet's life). Hâfiz breathed more freely when the relentless Muḥârîz al-Din was deposed by his son Djalâl al-Din Shâh Shâhjasâ (1358) and the new government again allowed greater freedom for the free enjoyment of life. Hâfiz by this time was a notable literary figure. He had previously sung the praises of Muḥârîz al-Din's vizier Burhân al-Din Fâṭḥ Allah and now lamented the death of the vizier Abû Naṣr Lutf Allah (died 20th Oct. 1359, Cod. Pers. Monac., No. 67, fol. 135 v). It is therefore no cause for surprise that among Hâfiz's friends was the new vizier and former master of the mint Kâhâdja Kiwâm al-Din Muḥammad b. ʿAli (1358-1359-26th August 1363), a man who steered the ship of state with dignity and great authority. When the minister was ultimately executed with great barbriety by his sovereign, he was lamented by Hâfiz (Brockhaus No. 605) although the latter is careful to avoid the wrath of the tyrant. Hâfiz was professor of Kurâb exegetes in a madrasa in Shiraz (Divan-i Hâfiz, ed. Calcutta 1791, 2 v–4th introduction, p. 8) and tradition credits one of the two Kiwâm al-Din's, either the above mentioned Kiwâm al-Din Hasan or the minister Kâhâdja Kiwâm al-Din Muḥammad with having given the appointment to Hâfiz.

Hâfiz excelled in the ghazal. He ultimately collected his ghazals into a Divân, which he expanded by the addition of kâṣidas and other smaller poems, completing it in 770 (1365-1369) (ed. Calcutta 1791, text fol. 2 v, line 9). Now for the first time the poet's name became widely known beyond the bounds of his native town. The ruler of Hormuz (Turk-Shâh, according to Münedjiddin bâshi, Şârzâf al-İkhkûr, Turkish edition, i. 23; for other accounts of the genealogy and order of succession see the more reliable account of the great Portuguese historians Lasio de Barros, Decaydas da Ásia, Vol. ii. 1, Lisbon 1559, fol. 15 v–17 v, and Conto, Decaydas da Ásia, tomo i. 1, Lisbon occidental 1876, p. 579–583) likewise showed his appreciation of the poet, while the Muṣaffarîd Naṣrat al-Din Yahyâ, the ruler of Khorassân, who had once a very considerable influence (1351 to 1392), noted in his life-time as a miser, would have nothing of the impious singer of Shiraz (Brockhaus No. 577). In the reign of Muḥâmid Shâh I. (1378–1397), a ruler of the Bahâmid dynasty of the Deccan, Hâfiz was invited to his court by his minister of justice; but Hâfiz did not in the end accept. The Ikhlâs Ahmad, himself a poet (cf. above s. v. AHMED İHLÎ, i. 106 et seq.), is also said to have invited Hâfiz to Baghdad. Hâfiz, who in his time had sung the praises of Ahmad's father Sultan Lewis (Brockhaus No. 204) cautiously declined the invitation of his bloodthirsty son.

He was deeply affected in 1383-1384, when he lost his "brother" Kâhâdja Adîl at the age of 59 (Brockhaus No. 600). On the 9th October 1384 Sultan Shâhjasâ al-Din died; the period of Hâfiz's poetical activity lies practically within his reign. Hâfiz had often sung his praises and many anecdotes are related of their friendship. Before as well as after the latter's death Hâfiz was on remarkably good terms with the all-powerful vizier Djalâl al-Din Turâkanîh (died 25th Aug. 1385; Brockhaus No. 602), who had once devotedly served Sultan Shâh Shâhjasâ and on his death had secured the succession for his son Zain al-Abîdîn (1384–1387) against another claimant to the throne of Fars. In December 1387, on the conclusion of his great campaign of conquest in Persia, Timür came to Shiraz and spent two months there. It is possible that on this occasion the celebrated dialogue about one of the poet's verses, alleged to have been held between him and Hâfiz, took place (cf. Brockhaus, No. 577), though at the end of his life Hâfiz once more found a patron in the Muṣaffarîd Shâh Manşûr who seized the province of Fars shortly after Timür's departure and was celebrated by Hâfiz more than any of his predecessors in a tone of most devoted affection. Hâfiz who seems to have filled an office at the court of Shâh Manşûr (ed. Calcutta 1791, 2nd Intro., p. 8, l. 8) had need of patrons of high rank; for his property had long since slipped away from him, and too many, who professed to be his friends, did not hesitate to cavil at this grey-haired old man bowed down by debts (Brockhaus No. 639; No. 418, Bait 10). In 791 (1389), perhaps however not till 733 (began 20th Dec. 1389), Hâfiz died in Shiraz.
Hāfiz clung with touching affection to his native city of Shiraz, which he only rarely left and even then apparently only for short journeys. The story, however, that his travels abroad were confined to a journey to Yazd and the Persian Gulf seems to be a legend. He himself mentions his pilgrimage to the tomb of 'Ali al-Riḍā in Māshhad (Cod. Pers. Monac., No. 69, l.c.). Hāfiz never tires of singing the beauty of the women and boys of Shiraz, the charm of its river Ruknābād and the promenade of Muṣālla. He is buried on the latter in a beautiful tomb.

Hāfiz is the greatest writer of ghazals and the finest lyric poet that Persia has produced. He is restrained in his love-scenes and avoids the obscene. As a singer of the joys of wine he is unequalled by his predecessors or successors in the east. Of contemporary authors Hāfiz only mentions the panegyrictist Salmān (Brockhaus, No. 562) and of the older poets Firdawsī. The general line of thought in his poems raises the question whether Hāfiz's unflagging praise of love and wine is to be interpreted in the Sufi fashion as a profession of Muslim Pantheism. Apart from occasional exceptions, the answer is in the negative. It is also said that Hāfiz belonged to a Dervish order (which?) but we have no reliable literary authority on this point.

A number of Hāfiz's poems particularly of the earlier period have certainly been lost. After his death, his friend Muḥammad Gul-anāmī collected the scattered poems, arranged them in the original Diwān and gave the whole a preface. This fact of the posthumous arrangement of the Diwān by a strange hand explains the numerous variations in the number, the order as well as the text of the poems in the manuscripts, a circumstance which moreover is of importance for selecting the contents of the original Diwān of the year 770 and completing the poet's biography. Relatively the most complete is the printed edition of Abū Tīlib Khān (Calcutta 1791; 725 poems) but it is full of errors. The most carefully prepared from the point of view of textual criticism is that of Hermann Brockhaus, based on Süli's recension (Leipzig 1854—1863; 692 poems). Of commentaries four Persian and three Turkish are known with their authors' names (Eṭḥ, Grundr. d. iran. Phil., ii. 303, 304; cf. also Nos. 1142 and 1143 of the Catalogue of the Hamidiye Library in Constantinople, 1300 A.H.). The best of all the commentaries on Hāfiz is the Turkish of Süli (died 1591-1592), which has been often printed; he however omitted the few Shi'i poems of Hāfiz.

We possess three complete translations of the works of Hāfiz; two in German: 1 by Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (2 vols., Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1812-1813) and 2 by Vincent Ritter von Rosenweig-Schwanau (in 3 vols., Vienna 1858—1864) as well as 3 an English one by H. Wilberforce Clarke with valuable notes (3 vols., Calcutta 1891). Hāfiz has inspired Western literature in Goethe's Westöstlicher Diwan (1819) and in Friedrich von Bodenstedt's Die Lieder des Mīrā Schaffa.

Besides his poetical works Hāfiz left glosses on Zanakhshār's Kāshf and on the Miʿrāj (see Diwan, ed. Calcutta, 1791, p. 8).


Al-Hāfīz, the eleventh Fātimid Caliph, whose real name was Abuʾl-Maimān (al-Maimūn) 'Abd al-Maḍjīd. He was born about the year 467 = 1074 (there is no general agreement about the exact date) at Ascalon, whither his father, Abuʾl-Kāsim Muḥammad, a son of the Caliph al-Mustaʿṣir, had gone on account of the famine then raging in Egypt (Abuʾl-Abbār, x. 468). But it was not till late in life that he began to play an active part in politics. He was a comparatively old man when in 524 = 1130 al-ʿĀmir [q.v., i. 320 et seq.] fell a victim to the Assassins without leaving a male heir and he was elected regent as the prince with the nearest claim to the succession, under the name al-Hāfīz Li-Dīn Allāh but not Caliph, as the imāmāt could only descend from father to son according to the Shi'i views then prevailing and as the accouchement of al-ʿĀmir's widow was shortly expected; in the end however she gave birth to a daughter. The new ruler had hardly taken up the reins of government when they were torn from him, when AbūʾAli Ahmad, son of al-ʿĀḍāl [q.v., i. 146], known as Kīlīfīt, rebelled against him with the support of the troops, overthrew the vizier appointed by al-Hāfīz and took over the office himself; he imprisoned the regent in the palace and having little regard for the legitimacy of the dynasty had prayers offered for the exalted Imām and coins struck in his name. For a year he ruled the supreme title of the new al-Majdīd succeeded in putting him out of the way and ascending the throne as Caliph. His first vizier was the Armenian Yānīs, who however soon seemed to be too powerful and was disposed of by poison after only three months of office. The Caliph now sought to govern the state alone — not unsuccessfully it appears — until the quarrels of his own sons, Ḥasan and Ḥādīrā, shook his power to its very roots. The corps of Ḍūyūṣhya took Ḥasan's side, while the Ṣafawīs championed his brother and after fierce fighting the latter were defeated. The arrogant attitude of Ḥasan, who was now practically omnipotent, and even treated his father in a most humiliating fashion, finally led to his fall and al-Hāfīz found himself forced, yielding to the clamour of the army, to have him poisoned by his Christian physician. The troops now effected the appointment of a new vizier, the Christian Armenian Bahnūm, but he favoured his countrymen and fellow Christians too much, so that he was disposed of after two years of office. With his exit closes the "Armenian period" of the later Fātimids which had begun with the rise of Badr al-Djamlī. He was followed by Rūḏawān, who however likewise soon quarrelled with al-Hāfīz, as he tried to arrogate all power to
himself and being himself a Sunni also cast doubts on the genuineness of his claim to be Imām. At the same time the Caliph was enraged because the vizier, to win popularity with the people, repealed the market dues and thus deprived him of a source of revenue. Thus new turmoil arose in which Rûdwan was finally slain. In the next year, the aged Caliph died of acute colic — the beating of a drum made of seven metals at the culmination of each one of the seven planets is said to have given him relief — at the age of about 75 (Ljumadād 544 = October 1149) in the midst of a period of mutiny and unrest. His reign already shows all the signs of the approaching end of the dynasty...

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Ṭibrī (ed. Tornberg), s. Index; Ibn Khalilīkān (Cairo 1299), i. 389 et seq.; transl. de Slane, ii. 179 et seq.; Abu l-Fidāʾ (ed. Reiske), iii. 438 et seq.; Maḥrūlī, Khust, i. 357; ii. 16 et seq.; El-Kafrounī, Hīd. de l’Afrique, transl. Pellissier and Remusat, p. 120; Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Fatimidischen, vol. 300 et seq.; S. Lane-Poole, A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, p. 166 et seq.; (E. Greffe).

**Ḥāfīz Ābrū, a Persian geographer and historian.** His proper name was Shihāb al-Dīn Ābū Allāh b. Lūf Allāh b. Ābū Rashīd al-Khwāfī (not Nūr al-Dīn Lūf Allāh b. Ābū Allāh al-Hāravī, as is stated in European catalogues following an erroneous statement of Ābū al-Razzāk Samārākī). According to Ābī al-Razzāk, he was born in Herāt and educated in Hamādān. From his own works we only learn that he was considered an expert chess player, was at Timūr’s court and was on terms of personal intimacy with the sovereign himself and was able to write of the last campaigns and death of Timūr and probably of Shāhrukh’s campaigns also as an eyewitness. In 817 = 1414-1415 he was commissioned by Shāhrukh to write a geographical compendium based on an Arabic manuscript (probably a copy of the Bahkhī-Īṣākī), which had come into that monarch’s possession. The work (its title is nowhere given) is divided into two volumes: Vol. I contains, besides a cosmographical introduction, a description of the various lands (geographically following the direction W. to E.) from the Mahgrib to Kermān; in the two last chapters (on Fars and Kermān) the geographical description is followed by a compilation of the accounts of the political history of the districts concerned down to the author’s time. The author intended to deal in much greater detail in the second volume with the geography and history of Khorāsān and Mā warāʾ al-Nahr (the chapter on Khorāsān alone exceeds in extent the whole first volume), but no complete copy of this volume has yet been discovered; the Codex Fraser 155 (in the Bodleian Library) ends with the geography of Mā warāʾ al-Nahr (the history is wanting), while the other manuscripts only contain the section on Khorāsān. The cosmographical introduction was written in 820 = 1417, Vol. I concluded in 822 = 1419, while in the second volume the date of its composition is given as the following year. By command of the same ruler, Ḥāfīz Ābrū was in 820 = 1417 to combine in one work the most important chronicles of the world’s history; to prepare himself for this task he had the Persian Ṭabarī, the greater part of the Dīmāp al-Tawārīkh of Rashīd al-Dīn and the Zafar-Nāma of Nīgām al-Dīn al-Shāhī copied word for word; Ḥāfīz Ābrū himself only wrote the continuation of the Dīmāp al-Tawārīkh (from 703 = 1304 to the accession of Timūr) and of the Zafar-Nāma (events of the year 806—819 = 1403—1416) for this work. A complete copy is preserved in Constantinople (Dāmad Ibrāhīm Pāsha, No. 919). In 826 = 1423 Ḥāfīz Ābrū began to write a history of the world in four volumes for prince Bāsīnghūr (q.v., i. 596 et seq.); the two first volumes (prehistory, history of the Prophet and Caliphs) and the second part of the fourth (history of Shāhrukh up to 830 = 1427) have survived, the latter (certainly the most important part of the work) exists only in one very carelessly written manuscript (Elliot 422 in the Bodleian); ‘Ābū al-Razzāk gives most extracts from the lost portions (cf. i. 639 infra et seq.). A Persian writer of modern times, Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān, claims to have a complete copy of the Zabīdat al-Tawārīkh in his possession; but nothing has as yet been discovered about this copy. In 824—825 Ḥāfīz Ābrū by order of Shāhrukh published a new edition of the Dīmāp al-Tawārīkh; the portion of the work then considered lost was replaced by the first part of the Zabīdat al-Tawārīkh. The composition of his history of the world was interrupted by the death of the author on the 3rd Shawwāl 833 = 25th June 1430. As a compiler Ḥāfīz Ābrū incorporated much information in his work from writings which have since been lost; for the events and conditions of his time the pertinent sections of his work are an authority of the first rank. Cf. W. Barthold, ʿIḥāṣī ʿĀbrū i tāgī Sočinīānī in al-Muṣafīṭarī, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 1 et seq.; cf. also Žapikski, ed. arkh. obšč., xviii. 138 et seq.

(Edward William Mark Huntington)

**Ḥāfīz Āḥmad Pashā** was the son of a muʿāddhin native of Philippopolis. Owing to his rare accomplishments as a musician and a poet he was employed at the imperial Serai and became the confidant (muṣābiḥ) of the Sultan. After quitting the court service he was appointed dākhīnī bašī (at 22nd Shawwāl 1016 = 12th December 1607), but was dismissed in 1018. After this he became Governor-General (keleşbeg) of Damascus and remained there till 1027 (1618). Whilst he was there the first insurrection of the Druzes headed by Fāḵr al-Dīn broke out and Ḥāfīz Āḥmad Pashā specially distinguished himself at this period. He remained governor of several more Anatolian provinces, till we finally find him governor of ʿIyābībekir. In this office he managed to suppress the revolution headed by Bekir Şubashi, who had seized Būghdād, but he could not prevent Shāh Abbās from entering the city on the 28th November 1623. After the death of Ėrke Kāhmed Pashā (died 18th Rabi‘ II 1034 = 28th January 1625) Ḥāfīz Āḥmad Pashā became his successor as Grand Vizier; he was at the same time commander in chief of the Ottoman Army at war against Persia. In the following year he besieged Būghdād for 8 months (from the 12th ʿAṣar to the beginning of Shawwāl 1035 = 13th November 1625—beginning of July 1626) but without success. Owing to his lack of success he was relieved of his functions and returned to Constantinople where he made second Vizier of the Cupola. Though 60 years of age he now married a sister of the Sultan.
A few months after having been appointed Grand Vizier for a second time (29th Rabī’ 1 1041 = 25th October 1631) he was put to death in a most atrocious manner by mutinous Shi‘ahs (19th Redjeb 1041 = 10th February 1632); the presence of the Sultan himself, who had in vain tried to rescue him. Historians and men of his time especially note his strength of will, his upright and generous character, qualities that raise him far above the other statesmen of his era; it must be confessed however that both as Grand Admiral and commander-in-chief he had nothing but defeats to report.
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(See Hāfīz al-Dīn; Hāfīz al-Mulk; for Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān; Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān. During the latter part of the 17th century, and the first part of the 18th, extensive settlements of Afghāns were made in the fertile lands of the Ganges valley. In the troubled times which followed the death of Awdāh, and especially after the invasion of Nadir Šāh, these brave and turbulent settlers began to form states under successful leaders of their own race and were generally known by the name Rohilla (properly Rōhīlā) or Highlander, a western Pandājabī adjective from rāh “a hilly country”; and the territory lying between the Ganges and the Himalaya, now comprised mainly in the Bareilly Division of the United Provinces, obtained the name of Rōhīlkhand, although the intruders spread beyond its limits. Three families in particular stand out among these chiefs, the Bare‘ of Aonla, and Bareilly, the Bangash of Farrukhābād, and Naqīb Khān of Bedghoor who was also connected with the Bare‘. Among these Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān Bare‘ was perhaps the most important. He was the son of Šāh ‘Alām, a Bārdā, whose family, originally from Shōrāwāk (now included in British Balīcūstān) had settled first in Čād Iyālā on the Indus, and afterwards in Hindūstān. A slave of Šāh ‘Alām’s (his son according to some writers) named Dā‘ūd rose to a position of importance in the country of Kāţēr (afterwards Rōhīlkhand), and was succeeded by his son (or adopted son) ‘Alī Muḥammad, commonly believed to be by birth a Hindī Dūst. Šāh ‘Alām followed Dā‘ūd to his new country and there Raḥmat Khān was born about 1708. Four years afterwards, probably at the beginning of Farrukhsiyār’s reign, Šāh ‘Alām was murdered by Dā‘ūd’s orders, and Dā‘ūd himself was killed soon afterwards. ‘Alī Muḥammad continued to develop the new state, and after his services against the fallen Sāyyīds of Bārīhā at the siege of Dājānath in 1150 (1737) he received the title of nawwāb. Raḥmat Khān was now associated with him and by his ability and courage contributed to the increase of his dominions especially after Nadir Šāh’s invasion. ‘Alī Muḥammad was soon at enmity with Saḍfār Dījāng, and after the fall of Awadh, whose influence in the Empire was now paramount, and in 1155 (1746) he was defeated and taken as a prisoner to Dījāng. Raḥmat Khān however by a bold stroke suddenly appeared at the capital with all his forces at a moment when it was destitute of troops, and not only obtained the release of ‘Alī Muḥammad but his appointment as Governor of Sirhind, so that when Aḥmad Šāh Durrānī invaded Indīs in the following year he was in a position to recover his lost dominions. After the accession of the Emperor Aḥmad Šāh to the throne of Dījāng in 1161 (1748) ‘Alī Muḥammad made peace with Saḍfār Dījāng to whom Raḥmat Khān rendered important services in obtaining the post of Ważīr of the Empire. In this year ‘Alī Muḥammad died having appointed Raḥmat Khān to be Hāfīz or Guardian of his sons, Dūnd Khān his cousin to be commander of the troops and other relations to other important posts. The elder sons ‘Abd Allāḥ and Faţī Allāḥ were hostages with Aḥmad Šāh Durrānī, and the others were minors. Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān became the actual ruler, and continued so throughout his life, his recognition of the claims of ‘Alī Muḥammad’s family being little more than nominal, Saḍfār Dījāng soon resumed hostilities, as the Bārdāh states stood in the way of his ambitions. After failing in a direct attack on Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān he induced Kā‘īm Khān the Bangash Nawwāb of Farrukhābād to attack him, offering him the Sā‘ā of Kāţēr as a reward. Kā‘īm Khān however was defeated and slain at Bādān, and Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān annexed that part of his dominions which lay north of the Ganges. Saḍfār Dījāng without any scruple immediately began to insult and plunder the family of his late ally, and the Rohillās chiefs incensed at this (being nearly connected with the Bangash Pākhāns) joined in the war. Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān himself was at first unwilling to take part in it, but did so after a force of Sa‘d Allāḥ (a son of ‘Alī Muḥammad) had been defeated. The Ważīr Saḍfār Dījāng was supported by a powerful Mahāṛtā army and by the Dūtās, and the forces of the two Pākhān States could not make head against them. Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān lost Aonla and Morādābād and was forced back to Lādhāng in the Terāi on the skirt of the Himalaya. The advance of Aḥmad Šāh Durrānī however in 1166 (1752) induced the Ważīr to make terms, Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān agreeing to pay tribute to him as ruler of Awadh, and also giving a bond for 50 lākhs of rupees to be paid to the Mahāṛtās. Aḥmad Šāh insisted on the recognition of the rights of ‘Alī Muḥammad’s sons who were with him, and a partition of the territory was made, an arrangement which did not last long. Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān extended his rule over Pilibhit (renamed Hāfīzābād by him), and this town with Bareilly becomes his principal residences. After his misfortunes he soon became more powerful than before. His adversary, Saḍfār Dījāng, who had lost the post of Ważīr, retired to his dominions in Awadh and died there in 1167 (1754). His son Shādīja al-Dawla was for a time allied with Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān, and the two combined to resist the Mahāṛtā army which had been in-
stigated by the new Wazir Ghāzi al-Dīn to attack the powerful Rādhan leader, Nadjīb al-Dawla, in Bidiārū. After the murder of the Emperor 'Alām-gir II. by Ghāzi al-Dīn, the Durrāni king again entered Indīs, calling upon all Muḥammādī chiefs to combine in resisting the growing power of the Mahrattās. Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān contributed a large force, and his son ʿĪnāyāt Kẖān and his cousin Dūndī Kháns took part in the battle of Fīnpāt 1174 (1760). In reward the conqueror assigned the Etāwā district in the Dūndī to Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān, but it was still held by the Mahrattās and he had to conquer it for himself. The Awadh attacks on the Bangash chiefs of Farrukhābād soon recommenced, and Nadjīb al-Dawla, now Wazir, was allied with Shujāʿ al-Dawla in this enterprise, but Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān took the side of Farrukhābād, and was able to prevent its accomplishment. In the following year however he allied himself with Shujāʿ and Kāsim ʿAlī Kháns of Bengal against the English, taking part in the attack on the fort and the battle of Buxar (Bakṣar). After his defeat the Nawawīs of Awadh found refuge with Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān at Bareilly, and after his further defeat at Kārā he made terms with the English, but no attempt was made to interfere with Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān whose prosperity continued for some years longer, although the Mahrattā danger was never absent. His administration was good and he was especially praised for his abolition of transit duties. His position was however precarious, and no reliance could be placed on any treaty or alliance among the rulers of that period. Nadjīb al-Dawla in 1184 (1771) joined the Mahrattās in the Farrukhābād State, and Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān was not able to retain his late acquisition of Etāwā. His son ʿĪnāyāt Kẖān rebelled against him at this period, and died soon after.

The death of his cousin Dūndī Kháns was a blow to him, and the death of Nadjīb al-Dawla made matters worse, as his son Zābīta Kháns to save himself became an agent of the all-powerful Mahrattās. To understand the events that followed, the universal terror inspired by the Mahrattā power must be realized. The English East India Company considered that the best course to prevent the whole of Northern Indīs falling into the hands of this race was to establish a strong Muḥammādī State capable of resisting their perpetual raids, the Empire of Dīlī having ceased to fulfill this function, and the State of Awadh under the Nawāb Shujāʿ al-Dawla was the only one likely to develop the necessary power. Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān to promote this object bound himself to pay 40 lakhs of rupees to the Nawāb to be used against the Mahrattās. This agreement was made in the presence of the British General, and by the joint efforts of the allies the Mahrattās were for the time repulsed. Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān, however, did not pay the stipulated sum, and the dispute speedily developed into war in which the Awadh army was assisted by a British force. Some of the Rōhīlās condemned their leader's action, especially Faqīr Allāh Kháns, son of ʿAlī Muḥammād, and the sons of Dūndī Kháns took no part in the war. The Awadh army and the British forces after expelling the Mahrattās from Etāwā invaded Rōhilkhānd. Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān met them at Mīrānpūr Kārā, but was defeated and killed in the battle 1188 (1774). His territories with the exception of Rāmāpūr were annexed to Awadh, and Rāmāpūr was given to Fāqīr Allāh Kháns, and continues to the present day to be ruled by his descendants.

The stories of whole-sale desolation of the province which were circulated at the time by the opponents of the Governor General, Warren Hastings, are void of foundation: the mass of the population was unaffected by the change of masters, and Mustaʿṣāb Kháns, son of Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān, in the Gulkānī-ī Rāḥmat, gives no countenance to such charges. The whole subject has been fully dealt with by Strachey.

**Bibliography:** Gulīsī-ī Rāḥmat by Mustaʿṣāb Kháns (trans. C. Elliot, Life of Ḥāfiz Rāḥmat Kẖān, O. I. F., London 1831); Saʿādat Yār Kháns, Gulīsī Rāḥmat (trans. in Elliot and Dowson, Hist. of India, London 1877, vol. VIII); Frankclln, Reign of Shah Aḥūm (London 1798); Mill and Wilson, Hist. of Ind., 5th ed. (London 1858), vol. III; Keene, Fall of the Mogul Empire (London 1887); Ne-vill, Gazetteer of Bareily (Alhambād 1911); Imperial Gazetteer of India (Provincial Series, United Provinces and Oudh., vol. I); Strachey, Hastings and the Kohli War (Oxford 1892); Hamilton, History of the Rohiīls Afghans (London 1878).

(Μ. Longworth Dames.)

**Ḥāfiz-ābād.** Town in the District of Gudrānwāla, Pandīs Jāb 32.4 N., 73.41 E. Founded by Ḥāfiz, a favourite of Akbār, and mentioned in the Aʿīn-ī Akbārī, as the chief town of a Mahāl. Formerly the Taḥil of Ḥāfiz-ābād was entirely in Gudrānwāla, now partly in Dīhāng. The dry tracts are now irrigated from the Cinīl canal, and there is also a fertile millet belt near the river.

**Bibliography:** Aʿīn-ī Akbārī, trans. Blochmann (Calcutta 1873); Imperial Gaz. of India, vol. XII.

(Μ. Longworth Dames.)

**Ḥafrah, a district in Fārs, in the plain at the confluence of the Pulwar Rād and the Kurr. It is only mentioned by Ḥamād Allāh al-Musawīfī (Le Strange, p. 66 and 113) and seems to be unknown to the older Arab geographers. At one time it was sought to recognize in it ʿḤafīrānī, the name of a district derived from the name of the Elamite people Ha-pi-ri-ti. This was in the first place erroneous and very unsuitable, but it is now quite untenable, since V. Scheil has shown that the character "pi" in the name Ha-pi-ri-ti is also transliterated "ta-am" and the Elamite name of the Elamites is to be read "Ha-tamī" and not Hāpirī, cf. Scheil, Or. Lit. Zeit., viii. (1905), 203 and 250 et seq.; Dīlīg, en Perse Men., Vol. ii. n. xxiii. and xxvii. (1911); Weissbach, Keilschr. d. Achaim., in Ford. As. Bibl., (1911), p. 143; Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgen. Ges., lxvii (1913), 292 et seq.; Noldeke in Grundr. d. iran. Phil., ii. 540. Ḥafrah is not identical with the district and towns of the same name of Kẖabar, the modern Kẖaf (south of Sarwīstān, west of Fās) on the map compiled by Ḥadjīlī Mirzā Sāyīd Ḥasan al-Šīrāzī. From the Arabic Kẖabar and the modern Kẖaf the original name may be supposed to have been Kẖapīr. The etymology of the name may therefore be connected with Ḥafrah.

(E. Herzfeld.)

**Ḥafṣ b. Sulaimān.** [See Aḥbāl al-Ṣalāma, i. 106].

**Ḥafṣ al-Fard.** Aḥb āmr or Aḥb Yāḥyā, an Arab theologian, according to the Fīhibīst, p. 180, was a native of Egypt and went to Baghdad
where he became a pupil of the Mu'tazilite theologian Abū Hudhayl [q.v.]. According to another account (in al-Murājda, Ḥāfīz al-Sādī, ii. 47) he had previously studied under the kāfi Abū Yūsūf and afterwards went over to the Mu'tazilis. He had many disputes with the Imām al-Shāfī'i, who had little good to say of him and his kalām and called him Munfarid ("isolated, solitary") in stead of Fard). (See H. Bauer, Die Dogmatik al-
Ghazālī's, p. 19). But he is said to have afterwards returned to orthodoxy, as did al-Aszārī after him, and to have preached the khāṣṣ al-qaf'al (that man's actions are caused by God). The Fihrist (and al-Shahrūši also) numbers him with Naḍīdār to the Mu'tahibūr school (absolute determinism) and quotes six works by him, including one against the Mu'tazilis and another against the Christians. Cf. also Horten, Die philos. Systeme der spek.
Theologen, p. 499, and the literature given there. (H. BAUER.)

HAFSA, daughter of the Caliph O'mar and wife of the Prophet. She had first married the Kuraishi Khusain b. Hudhayl, who had died childless in Medina soon after the battle of Badr. She must then have been about 20 years of age. Muhammad, who wished to secure O'mar's co-operation, married her after the "day of" Uḥad. She was once repudiated, it is not known on what grounds, but was restored to favour by divine command in consideration of her Muslim virtues, i.e. her devotion to prayer and fasting. In reality the Prophet feared to estrange O'mar. In Muhammad's ḥarīm Hafsa took the side of 'A'īsha against his other wives and threw her whole influence into the service of the "triumvirate" i.e. the party, which was endeavouring to secure the succession for Muhammad for Abū Bakr and O'mar. Like the other wives she received her share in the booty of Khaibar and on Muhammad's death an annual revenue which was entered in the Diwan and amounted to about 10,000 dirhems. On the whole, even in her father's Caliphate, she played a very modest part in striking contrast to the versatile 'A'īsha. On the occasion of the ḥuṣnāma, of the "judgment" of Adhrū [q.v.] Hafsa induced her brother, the insignificant 'Abd Allāh, to appear as a claimant to the Caliphate. She is agreed to have died in 45 in the reign of Marwān b. al-Hakam aged about 60. Her marriage with Muhammad was a childless one.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, Tabakat (ed. Saha-
cou), iii. 1, 285-286; viii. 56-60; Ibn Ḥadjar, Ḥābū, iv. 273-274; H. Lammens, Le triumvirat Abū Bakr, O'mar et Abū' O'haida (extract from the Mé. facul. orientale de Beyrouth, iii. 120); Ibn Hishām, Sīra (ed. Wüstenfeld), p. 321, 1001; H. Lammens, PASIMA et les fêtes de Mahomet, p. 15, 23, 46, 56, 86; Ibn Ḥanbal, Munā-dat, vi. 283-288; Sprenger, Das Leben des Muham-
med's, ii. 74 et seq. (H. LAMMEN.)

HAFŠIDS, a Berber dynasty of northern Af
erica, which ruled ifriqiya for over three cen-
turies (626-981 = 1228-1574). It took its name from Shāikāb Abū Hafṣ; O'mar, chief of the Hintāta, one of the first disciples of Ibn Tūmart and one of Abū al-Mun'in's most faithful lieutenants. (Cf. the article ALMOHADES, i. 317b). His descendants enjoyed such esteem that, according to Ibn Kha
dūn, they alternated with the descendants of Abū al-Mun'in as governors of Spain, the Maghrib and Ifriqiya. It thus came about that Abū Mu-
hammad b. Abū Hafṣ was appointed governor of Ifriqiya by the Caliph al-Nāsir in 603 = 1207. He won great successes over Ibn Ghāniya (q.v., i. p. 285 et seq.) and retained his command till his death in 618 = 1221-1222. His son Abū Zaid chosen to succeed him by the Almohad chiefs in Tunis was dismissed, then replaced in office by lastly two of his other sons Abū Muhammad 'Abd Allāh and Abū Zakariya who were given office by the Caliph al-Abdal, the first being appointed governor of Ifriqiya and the second of Gabes.

Cf. till then the Hafṣids had remained subject to the authority of the Almohads, Abū Zakariya cast it off and founded an independent dynasty. Appointed governor of Ifriqiya by al-Mu'min in place of his brother, who had refused to recognise this caliph, he installed himself in Tunis (1228). Soon afterwards, giving the violent deeds and heterodox innovations of the Caliph as his reason, he left his name out of public prayer and himself took the title of Emir. In 634 = 1236-1237 he finally had prayers read in his own name. Successful expeditions won him Constantine, Bougie and Algiers. The Hwāra, who had risen, were severely punished, Tlemcen taken (639 = 1242) and Yagh\n\n
orānse forced to pay tribute. The Marinids and the people of Mīknās likewise recognised the suzerainty of the Emir of Tunis, whose sway now extended from Tripoli to Ceuta and Tangier and from the Mediterranean to the Zāb and Si
djīmānas. Valencia, Murcia, Seville, Xeres and Tarifa, being threatened by the Christians, summoned him to their help and placed themselves under his rule. When he died at Bône in 647 = 1249, he was highly regarded as the most powerful ruler in Muslim Africa.

The reign of his son and successor Abū Abū' Allāh al-Mu'tanṣir billāh (647-675 = 1249-1277) was not less brilliant. Emerging vic-
torious from the rebellions raised against him by his cousin al-Liyāni, by the Arabs Riyāh, Dawā\nwa etc., he succeeded in maintaining Hafṣid authority throughout the Central Maghrib. In 1270 he successfully resisted the expedition sent against Tunis by St. Louis and Charles of Anjou. His fame spread far and wide. At his court assembled the envoys of the Marinids, ambassadors from the King of Kānem and also Christian princes, who had sought refuge there and who took part in the expeditions into the Maghrib by the side of Muslim chiefs. While Abū Zakariya had been content with the title emir, al-Mu'tanṣir took that of Caliph and Amr al-Mu'min. After the capture of Baghād by the Tatārs (1258) he actually had a diploma granted him by the Grand Sharif of Mecca designating him the heir to the 'Abbasid Caliphate.

The foundation of the Hafṣid empire assured Ifriqiya some years of real prosperity and made Tunis not only the political capital but also the political and intellectual centre of the whole country [cf. Tunis]. The two first rulers of the dynasty erected numerous buildings the palaces, mosques, zāwijās, aqueducts and libraries. They attracted poets and scholars from all parts of the Muslim world, notably from Andalusia. The friendly rela-
tions which they maintained with the Christians, gave a new impetus to commerce between Europe and Africa. Treaties were concluded with Frederick II. of Sicily (1231), with Marseilles, Pisa (1234) and Venice and renewed in the reign of al-
Mu'tanṣir.
This brilliant epoch was followed by one of disorder and anarchy. Al-Wâhihi, al-Mustanṣir's successor, was deposed by his uncle Abū ʿIshāq (678 = 1279); the latter driven from his capital by the usurper, Ibn Abî ʿAmara, was slain near Bougie in 682 = 1283. The Ḥafṣids empire itself soon became divided into two kingdoms; that of Tunis, where Abū Ḥafs ruled, and that of Bougie (c. i. 766 c.e. etc.), held by Abū Zakariyya (683 = 1284). After twenty-three years of internecine warfare, in which the Arab tribes of Ifriqiya, and the Central Magrib and the ʿAbd al-Wādīs of Tlemcen joined, peace was finally restored. An agreement concluded between the king of Tunis, Abū ʿAsâda Muḥammad b. al-Wâhihi, and Abū Ṭabakâ, Sulṭân of Bougie, stipulated that the whole empire should fall to one of them on the death of the other. Abū Ṭabakâ was thus able to restore Ḥafṣid unity to his advantage only but for a short time, for in 1311, Abū Zakariyya b. al-Lihyāni, a Ḥafṣid prince, seized Tunis and slew Abū Ṭabakâ; while another, Abū Ṭabakâ, set himself up in Bougie. In 718 = 1318, however, Abū Yaḥyâ succeeded in regaining Tunis and reunited Ifriqiya and Central Magrib under his sway. His position still remained very precarious however. Forced to fight the Kabr and other Sulaimi tribes allied with the ʿAbd al-Wâdīs, as well as Abū Dorba, the ex-Sulṭân of Tunis, Abū Yaḥyâ was driven from his capital on four occasions. He finally overcame his adversaries with the support of the Marinids, with whom he contracted a close alliance. A Ḥafṣid princess married Abū ʾl-Ḥasan, son of al-Saʿîd, Sulṭân of Fâs. By the end of his reign, Abū Yaḥyâ had succeeded in restoring order in Ifriqiya; he had reduced to obedience the towns of the Djarâb, which, taking advantage of the disorder had constituted themselves independent principalities, and, although Tripolitania slipped from him, he at least succeeded in regaining Djarâb, which the Christians had seized at the end of the preceding century (cf. ʿDjarra, BILĀD-EL-DJARÂD). On his death in 747 = 1346, disorder broke out once more. The massacre of the Ḥafṣid princes by Abū Ḥafs, who had usurped the power to the detriment of the legitimate heir Abū ʾl-Abbas, provoked Marinid intervention. Sulṭân al-Ḥasan advanced on Ifriqiya, occupied Constantine and Bougie and entered Tunis, which had been abandoned by Abū Ḥafs (748 = 1347). But being defeated in the following year near Kairawân by rebel Arabs, and recalled to his own country by the rebellion of his son Abū ʿInâ, the Marinid Sulṭân could not retain his conquests. Ḥafṣid princes re-established themselves in Bougie, Bône and Constantine. One of them, al-Fadl, even re-entered Tunis, but fell a victim to a plot led by his vizier Iba Tâfarîdîn. The Marinids besides were again able to invade the Ḥafṣid kingdom. Abû ʿInâ seized Bougie in 1353, Constantine, Bône and Tunis in 1357 (758), but when he attempted to check the excesses of the Arabs, who only saw in these wars a pretext for devastation and plunder, he found himself abandoned by his army and had to evacuate Ifriqiya. The Ḥafṣid Abû ʾIshâq II. seized the opportunity to re-enter Tunis. The situation of the kingdom nevertheless was still deplorable; anarchy continued. Three princes were reigning simultaneously, Abû ʾIshâq II. at Tunis, Abû ʿAbd Allâh at Bougie, Abû ʾl-ʾAbbas at Constantine. The latter finally remained sole ruler (770 = 1368-1369). He, endeavouring during his reign to restore peace and order, placed a curb on the turbulence of the Arabs, forced the Shaikh of the Djarâb, Gafsa and Gabes to submit to him. This restoration of Ḥafṣid power continued in the reign of his son Abû Fâris ʿAli (797-837 = 1393-1434), with the exception of a narrow power in the Magrib. He was thus able to intervene at Tlemcen, first in favour of the pretender Abû ʿAbd Allâh against the Sulṭân Ṭabâb al-Malkî, and again in favour of ʿAbd al-Malkî himself. After the death of this king he seized Tlemcen and placed a Zayânî prince on the throne, who recognised the suzerainty of Tunis (1431). Reviving the tradition of his ancestors, Abû Fâris was a literary ruler and friend of the arts. Al-Kârâwânâ gives a long list of all kinds of buildings (mosques, āwiyâs, schools, libraries and hospitals), built under his auspices.

His successors, Abû ʿOmar ʿUlûmân (834-893 = 1434-1494), Abû Zakariyya Yaḥyâ (893-932 = 1488-1494), Abû ʿAbd Allâh Muḥammad (889-932 = 1494-1526), patrons of literature but lacking vigour, allowed the Ḥafṣid power once more to decline. By the end of the xviith century Constantine, Bône and Bougie had regained their independence; Tripoli, Gabes and the townships of the Djarâb had constituted themselves republics, and the Arab tribes of the interior refused allegiance to the Sulṭâns of Tunis. During this period the Ḥafṣid sovereigns observed a policy towards Christians identical with that of their predecessors. The treaties of commerce concluded in the xxiith century with the Genoese and Pisans were renewed in the xviith, others were concluded with Aragon, Majorca, Montpellier, Venice and Florence. Tunis, Bône, Bougie, Sfax, Gabes and Djarra had fundûks (q. v., ii. 117b) where Christian merchants stored their goods. But the acts of aggression committed by Christian powers (occupation of Djarra, attack on Mehdiya etc.), on the one hand, and the increase of piracy on the African coast from the last years of the xviith century on the other, rendered friendly relations more and more difficult to maintain. The ports of the Ḥafṣid kingdom became the regular refuge of the corsairs; the king himself, who held the bajârân power itself exposed to the reprisals of the Spaniards, when they thought of establishing themselves on the most important points of the African coast.

They were, however, anticipated by the Turks. In 1534 Khâireddîn [v. ḪAIR AL-DÎN], in response to an appeal by a Ḥafṣid prince, who had escaped the massacre of his brothers by Mûsâ Ḥasan, successor of Abû ʿAbd Allâh Muḥammad, seized Tunis. Mûsâ Ḥasan was able, however, through the support of Charles V., who took Tunis in 1535, to regain possession of his kingdom, but he had to pay tribute to Spain; he was moreover only able to maintain his position in his capital with the help of the Spanish garrison of La Goulette. With the loss of a strip of land between Tunis and Bizerta, the whole of Tunisia slipped from his rule. He was finally dethroned and blinded by his son Ahmad Sulṭân (1542). This ruler retained the reins of power till 1569, when Eulji ʿAli took Tunis to prevent the Spaniards using the town as a base of operations against the Turks. As a result of the victorious expedition of Don John of Austria the
Hajids regained the throne for the last time in 1573, but the next year Sinān Pasha took Tunis and La Goulette (q.v. = 1574). The last representative of the Haṣids, Mullā Muḥammad was led captive to Constantinople and the Turks definitely established themselves in Tunisia.


Haidar. A mem. on the life of Haṣīd, is of constant receipt in the histories of Islam. During this period a woman is ritually impure, may not perform the ṣalāt nor the ṭawaf, nor fast, nor touch a Kūrān, nor repeat a verse from it nor enter a mosque. Cf. Juyboll, Handbuch des Islam. Gesetze, p. 174 et seq. She only becomes ritually pure again on the completion of her course after a major abortion (gḥal, q.v. ii. 167). According to Kūrān, ii. 222, sexual intercourse with her during this period is forbidden, but it does not, like the Jewish law (Lev. xv. 19 et seq.), prescribe seven days’ separation.

Haidar, son of the Narrak of the 1101 in Arabic, which was given him on account of the strength of his neck and forepaws (Lisān al-ʿArab, v. 249). ‘Ali’s mother first of all gave him the name Asad after her father; she herself was called Fātimah bint Asad; but when Abū Ṭālib returned from his journey he gave him the name ‘Ali. In some poems ascribed to him he gives himself the name Haidar, but Ibn Makarim thinks this is only to suit the metre; nevertheless Haidar is supported by a poem, which Ibn Abī Majāṣ al-Murādī, of the same tribe as his murderer, composed on the occasion of his death (Tabari, Annals i. 3466, 11). (Cf. Huart.)

Haidar (Shāhīk Haidar), son of the Sāfawi Shāhīk Dnund of Ardabīl (grandfather of Ismā’īl Shah) and of Khadiżeh Begam, Uzun Ḥasan’s sister. On the death of his father, who was killed by an arrow in a battle against Khalīf, Sulṭān of Shīrāz (shortly before 860 = 1456) he was recognised as his successor by his followers. His uncle Uzun Ḥasan gave him his daughter Ḥamāma Begam, who was called ’Alam Shāh, to wife. She became the mother of Sulṭān ‘Alī, Sālid Ibrāhīm and Shāh Ismā’īl. When Uzun Ḥasan died, Haidar collected his retainers ostensibly for a raid into Georgia, in reality however to wreak vengeance on Shīrāz; but the ruler of this land, Farrukh Yasar, supported by his son-in-law, Yākūb Beg, offered a stubborn defence; Haidar fell in battle at the head of his army in 898 = 1498. He wore a scarlet turban with two white peaks, according to the story, on account of an appearance of All to him in a dream; whence the name Tāwīrī Haidarī, which was given to this headgear, which he also prescribed for his followers. It is from this that the Turkish term kyzyl-bāş (redhead), applied to the Persians of the Safawī period, is derived. This story, however, may be entirely an invention to give the name kyzyl-bāş an honourable origin (Noldeke).

Bibliography: Khodemīr, Ḥabīb al-Siyar, iii. Part 4, p. 12, 16; E. Denison Ross, Early Years of Shah Ismā’īl (Journ. Roy. As. Soc., April 1896, p. 253); Johannes Ros, Physicis, Vera, costitus et statuatur, de’s Soft (Venetia s.d.), i. 1; Chardin, Zoro, Commentarii del Viaggio in Persia, Venice 1557; Mehemdji dismissing, Tūrīq, iii. 118; Schefer, Chrönsthmathe psacrai, ii. 76. (Cf. Huart.)

ḤAIDAR 8. ’Ali Ḥusainī Rāzī, a Persian historian, author of the Tūrīkh-i Haidarī, begun in 1020 = 1611–1612 and concluded in 1028 = 1618–1619, when the author was 35 years of age; cf. Persch, Verzeichnis etc., Berlin, No. 418 (p. 408 et seq.); Ch. Rieu, Supplement to the Persian Catalogue, p. 20 et seq. The author himself gave no title to the work and did not dedicate it to any ruler; this fact as well as its explanation in the preface shows, as Persch has pointed out, independence remarkable in an Oriental”. The arrangement of events is also peculiar in that it is not chronological but geographical; the work is divided into five parts (bāb), each of which is devoted to a separate area: 1. The Arab world; 2. The Persian world; 3. Central and Eastern Asia; 4. The West; 5. India. The chronological order is observed only within each bāb. The first volume which is devoted to the "Prophets, Caliphs and Sultans” was to be followed by a second on philosophers, scholars and poets’. Rieu’s assertion that the work contains "no original matter” but can only be described as "comprehensive and useful compilation of standard historical works" does not quite agree with the facts; the narrative is frequently brought down to the author’s time and therefore contains much information which could not have been taken from written sources. The preface was published by Wilken (Mirdadndi Historia Gasperidarium, p. xii. et seq.). The three chapters given by Ch. Schefer as an appendix to his edition of the Tūrīkh-i Nartshahk (p. 230 et seq.) from what he calls an anonymous "Madīma al-Tawārīkh” composed towards the end of the xvith century” are in reality taken from the Tūrīkh-i Haidarī. No details of the MS. are given by Schefer; it is therefore not known whether it is identical with one of the two mentioned by Blochet (Catalogue de la Collection... formées par Ch. Schefer, p. 60, No. 1330–1331) Madīma al-Tawārīkh (sic), which are said to contain a "history of the Mongols down to Shāh Ṭahmasp” (sic) or with a manuscript in the British Museum; in the latter the author’s name is certainly not mentioned and the work has been given the title Madīma al-Tawārīkh by the first owner of the
HAIDAR — HAIDARĀBĀD.
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manuscript. Cf. also Elliot, History of India, vi, 574; W. Barthold, Turkestan, ii. 57 et seq.
(W. BARTHOLD.)

HAIDAR ’ALI KHĀN BAHĀPUR, founder of the short-lived Mughal dynasty of Māisūr, was born in 1722, the son of Fatḥ Muḥammad Khān, a soldier of fortune, and a Nāvēštā lady. He first distinguished himself at the siege of Devanhalli, captured in 1749 for the rādja of Māisūr by his minister Nandjarādī, and was rewarded with the command of 50 horse and 200 foot. His advancement was rapid and he soon became fawāyiddār of Dinīgul and ḍajūřārād of Bāngalor. He gained great credit by the success of his operations against the Mārāḥās in 1759 and was saluted as Faṭḥ Ḥaidar Bahādur. He enriched himself by indiscriminate plunder and expropriation and by the enforcement of the most extravagant demands against the state which he served. He was instrumental in degrading his former patron, Nandjarādī, and after this service added four districts to his fīqeh, which already included more than half of the Māisūr state. In 1760, when Ḥaidar had sent most of his troops to assist the French against the British, the rādja’s party made a determined attempt to rid the state of a servant who had become its master. Ḥaidar was defeated by Khande Rāwā who had succeeded Nandjarādī as minister, and reduced to great straits, but by means of strenuous exertions and the expedient of enlisting the assistance of Nandjarādī, whom he afterwards ignored, succeeded in making himself stronger than ever, and imprisoned Khande Rāwā in an iron cage. Ḥaidar was now the real ruler of the state of Māisūr and it was only from policy that he retained the rādja as a pageant. On his death he formally acknowledged his son, but kept him in confinement. Ḥaidar now coined money in his own name and extended his dominions westward to the coast, where he established an arsenal, but, having encroached on some districts claimed by the Niẓām and the Mārāḥās, was involved in hostilities. Though defeated by the Mārāḥās he contrived to retain his conquests when the allies invaded his territory he bribed the Niẓām to join him against the British. He and the Niẓām were defeated and the British compelled the latter to enter into an alliance with them. In 1769 the British made peace with Ḥaidar but during the next thirteen years he was frequently at war with them, in alliance with the French, and died in camp near Arkā in Dec. 7, 1782, while invading British territory. He was succeeded by his son Tīptū.

Bibliography: M. Wilks, History of Mysoor; Kārīnāma-yi Ḥaidarī; Siyār al-Maṭbāt al-khāfīrīn; J. Grant Duff, History of the Mughal Empire (T. W. HALL.)

ḤAIĐAR-MĪRZA, a Persian historian, author of the Ta’rīkh-i Raḵšābī, born in 905 = 1499-1500, died in 958 = 1551. On his descent cf. the article DUGHLT (i. 1079 et seq.); through his mother he was a grandson of the Cāgḥātāi Khān Yūns and a cousin of Bābūr. Most of our knowledge of his life is gleaned from his own work; Bābūr (ed. Beveridge, p. 11) devotes a few lines to him; the Indian historians Abu ‘l-Faḍl and Fīrāqta give some information about his later years. His real name was Muḥammad Ḥaidar; as he himself says, he was known as Mīrza Ḥaidar; Bābūr calls him Ḥaidar Mīrza.

After the assassination of his father (914 = 1508) he had to flee from Bakhshārī via Badakhshān to Kābul, which he reached in 915 = 1509. Received like a son by Bābūr, he took part in the victorious campaigns against the Uzbeks and in the reconquest of Bakhshārī and Samarkand, but abandoned his benefactor in the black year 918 = 1512, betook himself to Fargāna to the Mongol prince Saʿīd Khān, received from him the title Gūrgān (son-in-law) and went with him to Kāshghar and Yarkand. In the Mongol empire as restored by Saʿīd Khān he held a prominent position; by the Khān’s orders he carried out several campaigns to distant lands like Badakhshān, Kāfarīstān, Lakād and Tibet. On the Khān’s death in 939 = 1533 and the accession of his successor ʿAbd al-Raṣḥīd, who was no friend of the house of Dughštā, Ḥaidar Mīrza had to leave the country and go over to the Tūmūrīs, against whom he had fought as recently as 936 = 1529-1530 in Badakhshān. In 948 = 1541 he succeeded in conquering Kašmīr and founding a practically independent kingdom for himself there, although his coins were struck first in the name of the native prince Nāzūk Shāh and later in the name of the Emperor Humāyūn; in 958 = 1551 he was slain during a rising of the native population.

It was while ruler of Kašmīr that Ḥaidar composed his work which was called after his former sovereign ʿAbd al-Raṣḥīd. The second part, which describes the vicissitudes of the author’s life and the events of his time, was written as early as 948-950 = 1541-1544, the first (history of the house of Carghātā from the accession of Khān Tughrūlk Tūmūr in 748 = 1347-1348) not till later (951-953 = 1541-1544). As Bābūr testifies, the author had received a good literary training, and this is also apparent in his work; the book had a great success not only among Ḥaidar’s compatriots (it was twice translated into Eastern Turk) but in other countries also (India, Turkestan and Persia) and was used as an authority by all authors, geographers and historians who have discussed the events of the xii. = xvi. century. The historical narrative as well as the geographical sections inserted in it (descriptions of various provinces, towns etc.) give a wonderful picture of the conditions of his time. In Russian extensive excerpts from the Ta’rīkh-i Raḵšābī have been published, in particular by Velaminov-Zernov (Izvestovaniye o kaspovskikh carakh i carevichax, ii. 130 et seq.) and Salesmann (Mélanges asiatiques, ix. 321 et seq.) while an excellent English edition has been prepared by N. Elias (The Ta’rīkh-i Raḵšābī of Mīrza Muḥammad Ḥaidar Dughštā, an English version, edited by N. Elias, the translation by E. Denison Ross, London 1895; cf. the review by W. Barthold in Zapiski vost. obš. obsčeh. x. 215 et seq.). No complete edition of the text has yet been published. Cf. also Elliot, History of India, v. 127 et seq. (W. BARTHOLD.)

ḤAIĐARĀBĀD, now the capital of the Niẓām’s dominions in the Dakhān, was founded in 1590 by Muḥammad Kull Kūṭh Shāh, fifth king of the Kūṭh Shāhī dynasty of Golkonda, who at first named it Bhānagār after his favourite Hindu mistress Bhāgnātī, but afterwards, regretting his infatuation, changed its name to Ḥaiḍarābād, the city of Ḥaidar, or ’Alī. In 1591 he made it his capital and it remained the capital of the kingdom until the extinction of his dynasty in 1687.
Haidarabad then became the chief town of a sultanate of the Mughal empire and in 1724 passed into the possession of Cîn Kâîh Khan (Aasf Dîjâh, Nîjân al-Mulik) who made himself viceroy of the Dakhân and established his virtual independence of Dîhîl by defeating Mubâzîr Kâhan at Shâkarakhâля, renamed Fathâkheljâ by the victor, in Bêrjâr. The principal buildings in Haidarabad are the Cîr Nîmâr, a large building originally designed as a college but now a central police station, the Dîjîmâheid, built by Muhammad Kûlt, the Cîr Kâmîn, a market place, and the Mûkkâh Masjid, a magnificent mosque founded by Muhammad Khammâd, sixth king of the Kuth Shâbi dynasty, but left unfinished until after the capture of the city in 1687 by Awrangzib, who completed it.

(T. W. HAIG.)

HAIDARÂBÅD (Sindhi). The name of a town and district in the province of SÎndh. The district lies between lat. 24° 13' and 27° 14' N. and long. 67° 52' and 69° 22' E. It has an area of 8291 sq. m., and a population of 689,030 of which 75 per cent are Muslims, chiefly Baloche and Sindhis of Râjîpât and Dîjât origin, of whom the Sâmâ and Somrâm are the principal. There are also many persons claiming Arab descent. The Hindu population is concentrated in the towns. The Balochees have been to some extent naturalized and have mostly lost their original language. The Indus bounds the district to the W. and it extends eastwards to the dry tracts of Thar and Pîrjâr and southwards to the Rann of Kâch. The soil is barren except near the Indus where it is irrigated by the Jamrâo and Nâsrat canals.

The city of Haidarabad is of modern origin. Under the Mughal Emperors Thatta was the capital of the sultanate of Sindh. Haidarabad was founded in the middle of the eighteenth century by Ghulâm Shâh Kâlhûrâ, and soon after his death the Kâlhûrâs were superseded by the Tâlpur Balochees, whose Amirs made Haidarabad their capital. They continued to rule there until 1843 when Sindh was annexed to British India after the battle of Mîjâni. The capital was transferred to the port of Karâtî, and Haidarabad lost the importance it had obtained as the seat of government.

(M. LONGWORTH DÂMES.)

HAIFA, a port at the foot of Mount Carmel. The name is not found in the Old Testament and is first found as Haîfâ in Eusebius and as Haifa in the Talmud. After the Arab conquest of Palestine Haifa, which was overshadowed by Akka, did not play an important part and it is not till the middle of the 6th century that we have a brief description of it by Nasir Khusraw, who mentions the palm groves and the large barques built by its inhabitants. In 1100 the town was taken by the Crusaders and attained some importance, as is clear from Idrisi's account of it, during the Frankish period as the harbour for Tiberias and a good anchorage. But by 1177 Salâh ad-Dîn regained it for Islam. In modern times Haifa has risen at the expense of Akka as a place of call for steamers and terminus of the railway. The modern town does not occupy the site of the ancient Haifa but lies to the east of it.

Bibliography: Eusebius, Onomastica sacra (Lagarde), p. 267, 270; Neubauer, Géographie du Talmud, p. 107; Bibliotheca Geogr. Arab., ed. de Goeje, vii. 329; Yâkût, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 381; Idrisi, Zeitscr. des deutschen Pal.-Vereins, viii. 129; Guy le Strange, Palestine unter den Muslim., p. 446; Robinson, Palestine, ill.; N e u e r h i s t. Forbungen, p. 129; Guérin, Samarie, ii. 251 et seq.; Zeitscr. des deutschen Pal.-Vereins, xii. 175 et seq.; xxi. 19 et seq. (Fr. Bult.)

Hâik (hâik), a piece of cloth of rectangular form, on the average about ten yards long and three breadth, which is worn as a garment by men and women in North Africa. Dottûe distinguishes: 1. the hâik for men, made of wool, which is worn alone or also as the principal garment; it is more frequently called kâthan hâik; 2. the over- hâik of silk or fine wool, which townspeople wear over their other garments; it is worn more for decorative purposes and is likewise often called kâ than also; 3. the irûr, likewise a rectangular piece of cloth, without seams, usually of linen or cotton, worn by Beduin women in North Africa; 4. the hâik, which women, particularly in the towns, wear above their other clothes when they go out.

The hâik is worn in North Africa itself by men on the looms with low warp by women with high warp; but in Lyons also a highly prized hâik cloth (of silk and wool) is manufactured, which is destined not only for North Africa and sold nowhere else, not even in Lyons itself.

On the manner in which the hâik is put on and worn, cf. for the men the illustrations in Dottûe (Maurâkêsch, i. 255—259, Paris 1905), for women of the towns, see A. Bel and P. Riaud, Le Travailler de la Laine à Tlemçen (Algiers 1913), p. 107.

There is an excellent treatise on the hâik in the above mentioned work of Dottûe (p. 248—252). On the manufacture of the hâik by native weavers, cf. Le Travail etc. p. 109 and pass. This book as well as Archives Marocaines (Vol. xv. part 1) is now to be added to the excellent bibliography given by Dottûe. (ALFRED BEL.)

HAIMA AL-KHÂRIDJĪYA (“Outer-Haima”), in Niebuhr Heime al-Alsafl “Lower-Haima”), also called Hûdîrî, a district in South Arabia, between Harîz [qv.] and Hoodîr Shûhaib [qv.]. It is an isolated (small district) of the kâlad (large district) of Manîkha [qv.] and stretches from Bawân (probably Yoûn in Niebuhr, 8570 feet above sea-level, with a market) to Bait al-Mâdhî. The capital is Mehfâk (Möfâh in Niebuhr with hisân). North of Mehfâk at Dîbel Manâr (8700 feet above sea-level) lies Sîk al-Khâmîs, a spur of the Karn al-Wal (“deer-antlers”, which it resembles; highest pass 9186 feet) which is connected with the Hûdîrî. Between Bawân and Sîk al-Khâmîs on the Wâdî Abîr al-Hâjî (tributary of the Wâdî Saḥâm) lies the village and citadel of Kûmânî. Of places in Haima we may also mention: I’djî al-Dîjâhdîb, Alkassân and Ruhiuniya (the two latter now in ruins). There are few coffee plantations or cornfields in Haima. In Niebuhr’s time the district of Haima was rich in vines.

Haima al-Dakhâliyya (“Inner-Haima”) in Niebuhr Heime al-Ala “Upper-Haima”) adjoins Haima al-
Ka'fridjiya, with the villages of Yanā' and 'Ur (Urr). Haïma al-Ka'fridjiya corresponds to Balad al-Akhūrūd in Hamdān. It belonged to the Sarāt Alhān and lay near the Wādi Shāhām between the Maḥāsa and Haïma (Haïf). It took the name of Akhūrūd from Akhūrūd b. al-Ghawāh b. Sa'd. The Balad was inhabited by the 'Uṣalāh, a clan of the Hamdān, who still live in Kumlān. Ḍhāt Djīrīn (which E. Glasser proposes to identify with Mefāk) lay in the centre of their land. Besides Ḍhāt Djīrīn, Hamdān mentions the villages already mentioned of al-Djāhāḍib, 'Alasān and Yanā', (he reckons the two latter to Lower Jādūr.) The language of the people of Balad al-Akhūrūd was intermediate between good and bad Arabic.


**ḪAI'R or ḪAIR,** originally a place-name; for example the sacred district of Hebron (Ḫabrūn or Ḫabrā'), which contains the graves of the Jewish patriarchs (Yāתק, i. 195, wrongly pointed Ḫair), Makaddās, p. 172, 10); also the area sacred to Ḫusain in Kerbelā (Yāתק, ii. 189-190, 282; Ṭabarī, iii. 752). The passage in Ṭabarī is also historically important as it testifies to the existence at so early a period of the cult of Kerbelā with official priests, who were supported by endowments founded by Umm Mūsā', mother of the Caliph al-Mahdī. A large quarter of Samarrā was also called Ḫair; it included the whole hinterland of the central town and consisted of lands which had originally formed part of Mu'tasim's great zoological garden. The latter bore the peculiar double name Ḫairān (cf. Ṭabarī and Yā لكم, Ṭabarī, s.v. Ḫair). Hair is also found as the name of a park in the ʿUṣūn al-Tawwālīḥ of Muḥammad b. Shaẖīr (in Sauvage, Journ. Asiat., 1896, May-June, p. 377), where a park, Ḫair Sarḥān, belonging to Sarḥān b. Manṣūr al-Rūmī, Mu`tawwila's secretary is mentioned; it lay at the Kaṣān-gate of Damascus and was afterwards called Bustān al-Ḳīṭṭ, the "Cat-garden." There was a Ḫair al-Haḍājīdā in Baṣra and it is mentioned this was dry, with which fact is probably connected the erroneous meaning "basin," which was given to the word (according to Farāḥī in Yā لكم and Maḥāḥīd, p. 282). There was a "day of the Arabs" at a Ḫair Mahma in Yamāma (Yā لكم and Maḥāḥīd, l. c.). Lastly Makaddās calls the harbour of Tyre Ḫair (p. 164 Cod. C); and according to Ṭabarī, i. 745, Buḥkattānas built a hair in Ḫira as a market for the Arab merchants there.

From these illustrations it is clear that the meaning of the word is "enclosed area, tenement;" i.e. similar to that of the originally descriptive name al-Ḫira. Ḫair might therefore also be a loan-word. As in the case with Ḫayyār the plural varies as well as the singular: Ḫirān, Ḫirān, Ḫuwār. The lexicographers give the meaning "park, pen." An etymology goes back to Asmāʾ, according to which the word means "a place with a depression in the centre and higher round the edges" (read Ḫưr statt Ḫuṭr in Yāたく, i. 188). This etymology must be described as false as well as that which attempts to explain the word from the motion of water in it (yaṭaḥāfa), or connect it with the many variants of the word Ḫûr (cf. Lane, Fieytag, s.v., de Goeje's glossaries to Balāḏūrī and Bibl. Geogr. Arab., ii.).

**ḪAIṢA BAĪṢA,** the nickname of the Arab poet Șīhāb al-Dīn ʿAbū ʿl-Fawāris ʿSād b. Muḥammad b. Saʿd b. ʿAl-Šāfiʿī al-Ṭamīmī, who claimed to be a descendant of ʿAqīm b. Saʿīfī (cf. ʿUṣr al-Ǧibāl, Cairo 1286, i. 117 et seq.). He is said to have received the name Ḫaiṣa Baīṣa because he once used the expression (cf. Liān,
viii. 274 and 285 et seq.; Grünert in Verhandlungen der VII. Orient. Congresses, Vienna, 1888, Sem. Sect. p. 202 et seq.,) to express the great excitement of a crowd. He does not seem to have known the date of his birth himself; according to a note in Kharidat al-Kārīf, f. 70v, 2, he was in the fullness of manhood (fi rai‘ān ‘umrīhi) in 520 (1126). He studied Fiḥṣ under the Shāfi‘ī Қaḍī Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Wazzīn (cf. al-Subkī, Tabākīt al-Shāfi‘īyya, iv. 77 et seq.) in Ḳayy, but at the same time followed his inclination for belles lettres and attained a great reputation as a poet and writer of the classical Orients. In his dictionary, the Ẓahīrīn, he was considered an authority on poetry as well as on Bedouin dialects and used always to speak pure Arabic; he was also fond of dressing as a Bedouin, which gave an opponent subject for a satire. He had many a "flying" with the poet Ibn al-Kaṭānīn [477(8)—558] celebrated as a satirist and is said to owe his nickname to him. Among his patrons special mention may be made of the vizier Shāraf al-Dīn ‘Ali b. Ṭārād al-Zainabī (under the Caliphs al-Mustarshīd and al-Muqtasīf), Ibn ad-Dīn al-Ţibrānī’s Khāridat al-Kārīf contains a long series of fragments of his poems. In addition to a number of verses descriptive in matter, there are a large number of panegyrics addressed to Caliphs al-Mustarshīd, 512—529 = 1118—1135, al-Musta‘fī, 566—575 = 1170—1180, Shāṭījk Şayāt (e.g. Muḥmād b. Muḥammad b. Malik Shārī, 511—525 = 1117—1131, Ma‘ūd b. Muḥammad b. Malik Shāh 527—547 = 1133—1152), viziers, particularly the vizier al-Zainabī, and other nobles; cf. above ii. 150; fragments of elegies (Maraštī) and specimens of his letters are also preserved in al-Ţibrānī’s work.

The Berlin manuscript, Ahlwardt, Versetznick, No. 8628, 3, contains 7 short beggling letters from the poet to the Caliph and the latter’s reply.

Haïsa Bâïsîa died on the 6th Shâbân 574 (17th January 1179) in Baghdaad.

Biographical: Ibn Khallîkîn (ed. Wûstenfeld), No. 257, 724, 780, 817 (transl. de Slane, i. 559 et seq.); 337, 589 et seq.; 237 (v. 119 et seq.); al- Kittûbî, Ṭahrîr al-Wâlayât (ed. Bûlûk, 283), ii. 392 et seq.; Imam ad-Dîn al-Ţibrânî, Khāridat al-Kârîf, Ma. in Leiden, 21st. Goli. (Cat. Cod. Orient., ii. 208 et seq.), f. 44v—75v (p. 77—138); Houtsma, Recueil de Textes relatifs à l’Histoire des Séjourcides, ii. 175, 212; Ibn Abî Usâfîbî (ed. A. Muller), de Slane, i. 285 et seq. (ed. Ahlwardt, xi. 91, 106, 215, 300; al-Îštâkî (ed. Ahlwardt), p. 355 (C. Van Arendonk), Ĥâîya (A.), the snake. When God sends a serpent on the ground, it falls on the land of Siǧfjân, so that to this day there are still many snakes there. The land would be uninhabitable if large numbers were not devoured by the ‘irbadd, a large snake.

There are many kinds of snake. The most notable is al-ajzā‘ or al-sīlī; it is exceedingly large and has a human face; it said to retain the same appearance for thousands of years and can slay a man by looking at him. The kind called al-mukhštala‘t by Damirî and al-mukhš by Khawānî, who has a little crown on its head, is the most deadly. It burns up all that it crawls over; no plant grows near it, birds fall dead when they cross its path, and no animal can pass without having its nails driven into its body. It kills by its hissing even a bowshot off, its look also is mortal and whoever is bitten by it dies at once. Similar things are told of other kinds.

Snakes reach the age of 1000 years; they cast their skin every year. They lay 30 eggs after the number of their ribs (l), but the ants collect on the eggs and destroy them so that only a few are hatched. The eggs of the snake are longish and dirty in hue, or green, black, white or spotted. In copulation the snakes wind themselves round one another. The female snake remains beside the eggs till the young ones are hatched, while the male is constantly crawling around diquieted. The tongue is split, so that many people think that a snake has two tongues. The snake swallows its prey without chewing it; to break bones, it winds itself firmly round a tree so that the bones are broken in its stomach. It will under no conditions eat a dead animal; if it can find nothing to eat, it lives on air. It can go for a very long time without food, particularly in old age, when it then becomes lean. It does not require water; but when it has once began to drink, it takes too much and poisons itself with it so that death often ensues. The eye is firm and immovable like a nail in the head; if torn out, it grows again, while the fangs if taken out grow again in three days, as does the tail if cut off. When the snake becomes blind or comes blinded out of the ground, it rubs its eyes on fennels and regains its sight.

Snakes are attracted by fire but flee before naked men. They have extraordinarily strong backs; for although it has neither claws nor limbs with which to hold on, no man is able to draw a snake out of its hole by its head.

According to al-Dājib, three groups of snakes are to be distinguished according to their poisonousness. No remedy nor treatment can avail against the bite of the first; antidotes and medicines are of use against the second, while the third kills through horror which opens the pores of the body, by which the poison takes effect. There are naturally numerous charms and amulets against snakes. He who kills a snake performs a work as meritorious as if he had slain an unbeliever. Not all snakes are aggressive, many only bite when aroused or trod upon, others are harmless. The medical applications are numerous.

Snakes play an important part in folklore and superstition, for they are one of the most usual forms in which Dinn appear.

Al-awawā‘, the snake-charmer, is the Arabic name of the ՝awawā‘ and al-‘aiyā the name of the snake he holds.


Hâiyân b. Khala‘f. [See Ibn Hâiyan.]

Ĥâkam (A.) “judge, arbitrator”; one of the names of God.

Ĥâkam b. Sâd al-Âshîra, a tribe in South Arabia. They lived in Tîhâm in the district of Abû Arîsh and were neighbours of the Ḥâshid (Ḥadîr [see Ḥawṣ] and Khawānî [q. v.]. Their land the Balad Ħâkam was five days’ journey in length. The following places belonged to them, al-Sûd, al-Sâkikatîn (or al-Sâkikatîn, Yâkût, Mu‘jam, iii. 104, Šakîfâtîn probably misprint), al-Kaṣâfî (all three on the Wâdî Khulab or Khilâb),
al-‘Aḍāya, al-Ḥadjar, the group of villages of al-Makharif (watered by the Waḍīs Zāīra and Shāyā) and besides the Waḍīs just mentioned, those of Ḥaraḍ, Ḥaḍair, Ḥaḍir, Ḥaḍbar, Dājir, Ḥaḍir or Dāmīd, Ḥaḍrān, al-Ḥaḍar, Tashar, Liya and Sabya, most of which flowed from the land of the Ḥashid and Ḥawālid. The chief town of the Ḥakam was al-Khasūf (usually called Madīna Ḥakam); in Hamdānī’s time the coast town of the Baḥal was Sharrajā. Sprenger identifies Ḥakam with the ‘Arab an qaṣīs of Tolomey. Their chiefs are descended from ‘Abd al-Lajjād (Dzdjād or Dzdjād), whence their name Al (or Bani) ‘Abd al-Lajjād (Dzdjād).

**Bibliography:** Hamdānī, Dīzairā, Index; Yūkūt, Muḥammad, ii. 450; iii. 104, 874; H. W. U. W. U. Arabian, Table 7, 13, and Register, p. 197; A. Sprenger, Die alte Geographie Avo- linus, p. 44-45 (§ 45), 247 (§ 379), 254 (§ 384). (J. S. L. S.

**Al-Ḥakam**, the name of two Spanish Omayyads:

1. **Al-Ḥakam I b. Ḥishām, third Omayyad Amir of Cordova** (180-206 = 796-822), waged continual warfare for almost twenty years against the pretensions of the Faqih and the people incited to rebellion by them, notably their superior Yahyā b. Yahyā. After the first rising in Cordova (189 = 805) and Mērida (190 = 806) had been soon suppressed and Toledo (Tolalpa), strongly fortified which was endeavouring to win independence, had been finally taken by stratagem and the treachery of the governor ‘Amrūs, a renegade (191 = 807), a second, much more dangerous, general rebellion broke out in Cordova in Ramadan 198 (May 814; according to Ibn Adhārī and Ibn Khaldūn in 202 = 817, cf. Dozy, Musulmans d’Espagne, ii. 353 et seq.) which ended with the utter destruction of the southern suburb by al-Ḥakam (whence his name al-Raḥbājī the subburner), the massacre of the greater part of its inhabitants and the expulsion of the remainder (about 60,000) from Spain. The exiles found a new home in Egypt and afterwards in Crete [q. v., i. 873, and Abu Ḥafs ʿOmar, i. 87b] or in Fāṣ [q. v., ii. 77]. Al-Ḥakam punished a last rising in Toledo similarly by the destruction of a quarter of the town (199 = Autumn 814). All these domestic troubles naturally favoured the advance of al-Ḥakam’s enemies abroad, Alfonso II of Asturia and Gāliacia gradually extended his kingdom to the south and east and al-Ḥakam lost Barcelona in 185 = 801 to Alfonso’s ally Louis the Lion, then Viceroy of Aquitania.


2. **Al-Ḥakam II b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III, called Al-Musṭanṣir bi-llāh (“he who seeks his help in God”), the ninth Omayyad Caliph as second of Cordova** (350-369 = 961-976), fought successfully against Sanche I, king of Leon and Castile, and Garcia, king of Navarra, and forced them to make a lasting peace in 355 (966). In the same year his fleet victoriously repulsed a Norman invasion on the Rio de Silves, after the latter had almost annihilated a Muslim army on land near Lisbon. The war with the Fāṭimīd al-Mu’tazz and his allies, the Idrisids of Tangier, ended, after the Fāṭimīd governor Bulqashī [q. v.] had unsuccessfully attacked Ceuta (356 = 971): with the conquest of Tangier by al-Ḥakam’s admiral ʿAbd Allāh b. Riṣālah in 361 = 972 and the capture of the Idrisids who were brought prisoners to Cordova by al-Ḥakam’s general Gāḥāl b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (363 = 974). Al-Ḥakam II thought more of the prizes of peace than of war and was an enthusiastic and liberal patron of art, science and education; indeed he was himself probably the most scholarly ruler Islām has known. The university of Cordova became the first centre of learning in the western Muslim world by his foundation of a splendid library (about 400,000 volumes); mathematicians, astronomy and medicine particularly flourished there. On his architectural activity see Córdoba, i. 878. With al-Ḥakam’s death on the 3rd Safar 366 = 1st Oct. 976 the decline of Omayyad power in Spain began.

**Bibliography:** Ibn ʿAdhārī, al-Bayān al-Muqhrī, i. 236; ii. 248-269, 274-276 (transl. by Fagman, i. 331; ii. 384-418, 427-429); Ibn Khaldūn, Tarār, iv. 144 et seq. (Hist. des Primord. et des Besœurs, trans. by de Meniles, ii. 149, 152; iii. 215 et seq.); Makkarī, i. 247-257; s. Index and Introd., p. xxxix; Dozy, Musulmans d’Espagne, iii. 95-135, 188; do., ‘Recherches’, ii. 286-299, 434-436; Müller, Islam, i. 618, 621 et seq.; ii. 528 et seq., 534-536, 540-546, 548 et seq. (M. Schmidt.

**Ḥaṭīka** (A., pl. ḥaṭīqīyāt) is (a) an abstract noun meaning “reality”, so a thing which has no reality, la ḥaṭīka lāha, then “the reality of a thing”, meaning that by which the thing is what it is with respect to its reality (distinguish kwuwayt “individuality” and ʼaḥyāya “quiddities”) or, broadly, what distinguishes it from other things; this is called also its ḥaṭīya. Then (b) “a reality” in the sense of a thing which certainly exists; using the verb you say, ḥaṭīq-ʾa-taʾah, “the thing certainly exists.” Hence ʾahl al-ḥaṭīka are the mystics who know the real nature of God, as opposed to ʾahl al-ḥaqq, the orthodox followers of the Sunna, and al-ḥaqq is the last thing reached at the end of the derwish tariqa (W. H. T. Gairdner, The way of a Moh. mystic, pp. 19 and 23). Also ḥaṭīq-ʾa-taʾah is Allāh as the stage of unity which embraces all realities, otherwise called the ḥadrat al-djmāʾ, “Presence of joining” and ḥaṭīq-ʾa-taʾah, “Presence of Being” (see art. ḤAḌRA). The ḥaṭīqa of Allāh is distinguished by Sūfīs from his ʾaḥk; it indicates his Qualities (irişaʾ) while ḥaṭīq indicates his ḏāʿ (Dict. of tech. terms, pp. 333 et seq.). With this apparently connect the following definitions belonging to the system of Ibn ʿArabi, but formative for all later mysticism in Islam (Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam, ed. of Cairo 1309 with comm. of ʾAbd al-Rażāk al-Kaḥānī [q. v.], ’asām, and Quṣūr al-Din, p. 62). The ḥaṭīq of the Names of Allāh are individualizations of his essence and are its relationships to the things of the world; by relationship to these things, which are called also the Qualities (irişaʾ) and which are infinite in number, the primal unity is broken up. Also the ḥaṭīqa al-ḥamāmadtīya is the divine essence taken along with the first of these individualizations (i.e. Muḥammad); it is also the Most Great Name (al-ʾazzm al-ʾaʾām; Fuṣūṣ, p. 428, l. 9). ʿAḥka also
indicates (c.) a descriptive noun or phrase used in a primary or real sense as opposed to a metaphor (magās). When, however, the metaphor has been used so often as to have become conventional, the word or phrase may be called ḥākīma 'wrfiya. (Mehren, Rhetorik, pp. 31, 78).

See also Ḥakkīm.

Bibliography: Djurdjuri, Tarīfīt, Cairo 1321, p. 6 et seq.; Dict. of tech. terms, pp. 320 et seq.; Rāghib, Muṣarradīt, p. 125; Lane, Lexicon, p. 609; Horten, Théologie des Islam, pp. 152 et seq., 295 et seq.; Nicholson, Kašf al-Muḥjīhūn, by index; Kūshī, Ṭīlāla with comm. of Arūsi and Zakarīya, ii. 92 et seq. (D. B. MacDonald.)

ḤAKIM (pl. ḥukamāʾ) the Arabic name for "physician, doctor". The root-meaning of the word, is "wise, skilled, clever"; cf. the Hebrew and particularly the Aramaic meaning of the root ḥ-k-m. From this original meaning ḥakīm ("governor, judge") has developed as well our Ḥakim. (Cf. the French sage-femme, midwife, and sage-homme, jurist). In the same way the second Arabic word for "doctor" tāḥīb (pl. ṣāḥībāʾ) is ṣāḥīb "to be wise, to understand", whence ṣāḥīb has been particularly developed in Ethiopian. In the older period ṣāḥīb is more frequent particularly in the literary language; in the later period and particularly in popular language ḥakīm is preferred, sometimes with the subtle distinction that ḥakīm means a "doctor", ṣāḥīb rather a "physician". In addition to the general term ḥakīm there are other names for specialists; e.g. al-dājrāḥi the "surgeon", al-kāḥfāl "the oculist"; in the modern language it is usual to use compounds of ḥakīm for these, thus ḥakīm al-ṭuṣīa "oculist", ḥakīm al-asānān "dentist". Tārīkh al-Ḥukamāʾ "history of the physicians" is the title of several works on the history of medicine, of which the best known is that of Ibn al-Kīfi (q. v.), which has been edited by J. Lippert (Leipzig 1903).

(Ε. ΜΙΤΤΒΟΧ)  

ḤAKIM (A.), who he decides, the authority.

AL-ḤAKIM BI AMRI LLĀH, sixth Fāṭi-mid Caliph, his pre-accession name was Abū ʿAlī al-Manṣūr. To get as clear as possible an idea of the character of this enigmatical ruler three periods in his life must be sharply distinguished: first, the period of his minority, from his accession as an eleven-year-old boy till the assassination of Bardjawan in 390 = 1000; the second period runs from this event till 408 = 1017, when he declared his divinity; and the last covers the period to his disappearance in 421 = 1031.

386—390 (996—1000). It is very likely that al-ʿAziz died in Bilhis, his only son al-Manṣūr (born of a Christian mother on the 23rd Rabīʿ I 375 = 13th August 985) received homage as Caliph; he was then given the title "al-Ḥakim bi Amri LLāh". His guardian by the will of his late father was the slave eunuch Bardjawan but he could not maintain his authority against the Maghribi Ibn ʿAmmār, commander-in-chief of the troops, to whom Ḥakim had given the rank of "Wāṣifa" and the title "Amin al-Dawla". The way in which the general gave his kinsmen, the Kitāna, preference among the troops, led to a most intolerable state of affairs. Finally the Turkish troops resorted to force of arms against the aggressions of their Berber comrades-in-arms, conquered them and thus brought about the fall of Ibn ʿAmmār, who although pardoned, was soon afterwards disposed of by assassination. Bardjawan was now all-powerful, but becoming overbearing, he allowed his grasp of power to slacken and gave himself carelessly up to the enjoyment of his immense riches neglecting the education of his ward, whose feelings he had deeply hurt by nicknames ridiculing him. Only too soon, however, he was to learn the latter's true character; in 390 = 1000 Ḥakim made short shrift of his guardian and although after this bloody deed he appealed to the people, who had theretofore rebelled, to stand by him in his helpless youth, he soon showed that he no longer required any one to wait on him by actions which showed an alarming independence.

2. 390—408 (1000—1017). The character of the Caliph, in the form in which it developed soon after the death of Bardjawan, becomes intelligible perhaps, if we see the motives of his whole attitude in an extraordinary religious fanaticism, which endeavoured to exert itself not only in the most rigid enforcement to the utmost letter of the law of certain prescriptions of Islam in general but especially in the promotion of Shīʿī ideals in particular among the people, throughout whom Sunna views still prevailed. If this is the striking feature of his whole attitude, it was complicated by a sense of unrestricted power, which grew more and more in this strange personality, and a boundless capriciousness, with which cruel traits were strongly mingled. The first mentioned tendencies may explain the rigorous edicts (such as the prohibition of intoxicating liquors and certain foods, as well as the regulations regarding women etc.) which were published up to 399 = 1008—1009, some obviously directed against the Sunna; they also explain the harsh and ruthless oppression of the Aḥl al-Kīthā, e.g. the laws regarding dress passed against the latter and the destruction of their places of worship. That at the same time Christians continued more and more to fill the highest offices, shows how impossible it was even now to do without their ability. To Shiʿī enthusiasts also al-Ḥakim's buildings owe their origin: the Rāshida mosque, the mosque of al-Maṣṣ and the great university called Dār al-līm (Dār al-Hikma), opened in Djiμādā II 395 = March 1005. The "Ḥakim mosque" was completed in 393 = 1002 or 401 = 1010, (which had been begun by al-ʿAziz). — But the Caliph always displayed a tendency to despotic deeds of brutality, of which the highest officials and officers of the kingdom, of whom hardly one died a natural death in this period, were particularly the victims. The dangers of this provocative rule of tyranny soon showed themselves in the rising of the Spanish Omayed prince known as Abū Bakar who threatened Egypt and the capital itself with disasters and found ready support from the Banū Kurra and Banū Zakīta, driven desperate by Ḥakim's violence, and later from the Kitāna also. It was only with great difficulty that the doughly al-Faḍl was finally able to overcome this dangerous enemy (396 = 1006). Probably influenced by these events as well as by the failure of crops for several years in succession, the Caliph saw the necessity for milder measures and for conciliating the Sunnis to a considerable degree; indeed he went further and abolished those customs that were peculiarly Ismaiʿī and went right over to the Sunna. We so far have the possibility of suggesting motives
for Hakim's actions, it is quite impossible to do so in the years that follow, which show alternately a leaning to Islamism or to the Sunni in the constantly changing stream of edicts issued by the Caliph. Only the persecution of the Christians and Jews remained unchanged and the cruel treatment of those in authority without distinction of creed.

III. 408—411 (1017—1021). At all events the Caliph carried Ismaili secret doctrines to their farthest conclusions when in 408 = 1017, dominated by the influence of al-Akrham, Imam al-Zara'ani [q. v.] and the Batinis of Darasati [q. v.], he agitated to the peculation of his own district. Considering Hakim's psychology, this step is really not very surprising; it should also be remembered that his father and grandfather before him seem at least to have claimed supernatural powers (de Sacy, Druzes, p. ccxxvii. and Wustenfeld, Fatimiden-Chalifen, p. 160). — It was quite in accordance with the dogmas of the Isma'ilis under whose influence he was, that Hakim finally showed the greatest tolerance in religious matters; the penal enactments were repealed and Christians and Jews now began to breathe freely. (The Jewish story given by Kaufmann in Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., li. 442 et seq. is characteristic.) On the other hand the Muslim population rebelled against the heresies openly proclaimed by the heralds of the new teaching, and the result was that the ruler was imprisoned in his palace in which the agitator Darasi was known to be concealed. Hakim, however, facilitated the latter's flight to Lebanon where he founded the sect of the Druzes, who still revere Hakim as an incarnation of God and look forward to his return (cf. Druzes, i. p. 1076 et seq.). — The Caliph did not hesitate to wreak terrible vengeance with his negro troops on the town of Fușat, where the rebellion had originated. Fierce battles between the Turkish and Berber troops on the one side and the arrogant black soldiery on the other followed, the confusion in the capital was becoming worse and worse, when suddenly deliverance came in the mysterious disappearance of the Caliph in the night of the 27th Shawwal 411 = 23rd February 1021. The suggestion, often put forward, that he was murdered at the instigation of his sister Sitt al-Mulk, has not sufficient basis in fact (see de Sacy, Druzes, i. p. ccxxvi. et seq.) on the other hand, considering the whole development of his character, A. Muller's (i. 693) hypothesis that, recognising the impossibility of propagating his views in Egypt, he retired into concealment, is not without probability.

In Hakim, whose final self-deification prejudices them before hand for a fair appreciation of his personality great in its way, Muslim historians and also the naturally biased Christian authors see only a madman and a blood-thirsty tyrant, around whose strange figure they hastened to gather a mass of stupid anecdotes, which have yet to be carefully investigated. Most European historians also are influenced by the same view; Dozy alone, and following him A. Muller, has endeavoured to give a just appreciation of his character; it combined fanatic religious enthusiasm with truly oriental notions of despotism, yet is not without its ideal trait. Many of his much abused regulations were clearly intended to check the immorality of his people, to whom he set an excellent example by his own stainless conduct and a contempt for all pomp. Even in the second period of the reign we constantly find edicts in which he orders his name to be mentioned in prayer only in the simplest manner possible and forbids the usual tokens of respect to be paid him. His liberality is nowhere denied and scenes have been preserved from the years of the low Nile for example, in which he is depicted in the midst of his people, accessible to every request and anxiously endeavouring to check the ravages of famine. Nevertheless it cannot be denied that his administration guided as it was solely from his one-sided point of view and subject to his capricious will, particularly in the last years, was on the whole disastrous to the country.

On the political events which had their scene outside of Egypt during al-Hakim's reign and hardly concern us here in discussing his personality, cf. the article Fatimids [ii. 90].


HAKIM AṬA', a Turkish saint of Khunarim, a pupil of Ahmad Yasawi (cf. i. 204 et seq.) who died in 562 = 1166-1167. His proper name was Sulaiman Bakurghânî and he is also called Sulaimân Aṭa or Hakim Khodja; this Bakurghânî is not identical with the Baghirkânî mentioned by Muḥaddass (ed. de Goeje, p. 343, vi) but lay considerably farther north, a little below the modern town of Kungrad; the tomb of Hakim Aṭa there is still visited by pilgrims; according to a biography of the saint, the name is said to be a corruption of Apâk Kurgân = "very white fortress". We find the same place-name in another part of Turkistan; at Khodjand there flows into the Sir-Daryâ, the river Khodja-Bakurghânî, on which, as the name shows, the cult of a saint has likewise been localised. We have only legends of the life of Hakim Aṭa. The works ascribed to him (besides the collection of hymns called Bakurghânî Kitâbî, also Hadfrat Maryam Kitâbî, Akhîr Zamân Kitâbî etc.) have frequently been printed in Kazan; old manuscripts have, as far as is known, not survived. Cf. C. Salemann in Bulletin de l'Acad. Imp. etc. 1898, Sept., ix. No. 2, p. 105 et seq.; cf. also W. Barthold in Turkistan etc., ii. 149 and Nachrichten über den Aral-Stie (Leipzig 1910), p. 33; P. Komarow in Protokol Turk. Krûča Ljub. Arch., vi. 105 et seq. (W. Barthold.)

HAKK. The original meaning of the root  hakk has become obscured in Arabic but can be recovered
by reference to the corresponding root in Hebrew with its meanings of "cut in" or "on," hence "prescribe," "fix by decree" (Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebrew Lexicon*, pp. 349 et seq.). We have thus in Arabic to begin with the primary idea of permanence, fixity (thubāt) and not with that of correspondence, suitableness (mūyāḥa, mawwāfākūn) which is essentially secondary and a discovery of the rhetoricians (al-ʻalāmānī; Dārjānī, *Tārīṣīh*, p. 61, 11 et seqg. of ed. of Cairo 1321). This point is unfortunately confused in Lane (s. v. pp. 605 et seqg.), following some of the native lexicons. Al-ḥakkēk, then, means that which is fixed, permanent, real, and is regularly paraphrased in the commentaries on the Kur 'an as al-thabīb. Thus Baidawi explains al-ḥakkēk, meaning Allah, as al-thabībat rubūḥiyatūn, "he whose lordship is fixed, real." (Kur. x. 33; Baid. ed. Fleischer, i. 414, 12.) Similarly al-thabībat itthākhiyatūn, "whose divinity is fixed," contrasted with that of false gods which is ṣāṭīl, "vain," "unreal." (Kur. xxii. 29; Baid. ii. 116, 10 et seqg.); in Kur. xx. 113, he is thabīr in his essence and qualities (Baid. i. 607, l. 5); further, on Kur. xxii. 6, Baid. explains 658 on him because he is the thabīr in himself by whom things become realities," hūk tatḥuḥabbu-l-taḥṣīātīn. On this last passage, Rāzī explains (Masūfī. Vol. vi. p. 144, l. 3 of ed. of 1308) "he is al-mawydīd al-thabībi." The Śāhāb (s. v.) content itself with defining ḥakk as the opposite of ṣāṭīl, and that is the fixed usage in the Kur 'ān and elsewhere. This is Pre-Islamic as in the well known verse of Loeb (Heber, *Dispens des Leibes*, xli. verse 9), Alī kullu ẓār'in mu khāṭā-tūn āḥīūn, "Lo, everything is vain except Allah alone." Ibn Iṣāq in his *Shajara al-ḥadīth* connects also with Hebrew conceptions of nothingness, vanity, unreality contrasted with that which is sure, real and trustworthy. So, ṣāṭīl stands in Arabic over against ḥakk and al-ḥakkēk is most suitable for a name for Allah, the absolutely real, even as nečmīn, "trustworthy" is said of Yâhweh (cf. al-mawīn' of Allah in Kur. lxx. 25). Allah is real of himself and of necessity (Baidawi on Kur. xxii. 61, vol. i. p. 638, l. 15), while other beings depend for their reality on Allah (see Baidawi above on Kur. xxii. 6). "The Real," or "The Reality" is therefore the nearest rendering of the word when used as one of the Names (asa'īsa; see above) of Allah, and "the Truth" as it is often translated is misleading. All the native authorities distinguish carefully between ḥakk and ṣāṭīl with its opposite kīḏāb, and lay down the rule that ḥakkēk is equivalent to ṣāṭīl only when used of a judgment (ḥukm). Thus an event (waṣīf) really took place, so it is ḥakk; but a judgment or statement about it is ṣāṭīl, though the statement may also be called in this sense a ḥakkūn. Used as one of the Names, al-ḥakkēk is frequently explained as Creator, but for this the only basis seems to be its constant contrast with al-ḥakūk "creation," e. g. in Ithāf al-nūdā, vol. x. p. 556, l. 20, asīnīt al-ḥakūk aṭālūn al-ḥakkēk. "Vox populi, vox dei." Yet see another explanation suggested in Massignon, *Kīfāb al-Ṭawāsun*, p. 174. Besides the above meanings of "reality" — used absolutely of Allah and derivatively of his creation — and "truth" used of a statement corresponding to reality, ḥakkēk means also "right," "valid," going back to the idea of prescription. Thus, ḥakkēk li "a right due to me" and ḥakkēk ʾalāsiyya, "a right obligatory on me." From this comes the ḥakk of Allah — as distinguished from the ḥakk ūdāni, ḥakk al-tawās — the punishment for trespasses against Allah by which no man is injured in his rights (see Juynboll, *Handbuch des Islam*, Ger., p. 292 and by index). Again, just as al-ḥakībēk is the last thing reached by the Šuff on his journey, after even ma'rifā is passed, so ḥakk al-yaṣīn is that real certainty which comes with the passing away (fana) of the creature in his ḥāl in the Reality after he has had visual certainty (ainw-yaṣīn) and scientific certainty (ainw-yaṣīn). On this see Nicholson, *Kāfṣ*., pp. 36, et seq., Kuhiqari, *Riṣāla* with commentaries of *Arāsī* and Zakariyyā, ii. pp. 99 et seqg. and Dārjānī, loc. cit., the phrase is derived from Kur. lvi. 95. Among Șīfs the ḥakkēk al-nafs are such things as are necessary for the support and continuance of life as opposed to the ṣāṭīl, things desired by the nafs but not necessary to its existence (Dict. of tech. terms, pp. 311, 330 and 417, l. 10 et seqg.).


**HAKKĀRĪ (HEKKĀRĪ), now the name of a sandjak in the wilāyat of Wān in the Persian frontier, which formed an independent wilāyat before 1876. According to Cuinet, *La Turquie d'Asie*, ii. 716, it now has an area of about 11,000 sq. miles and about 300,000 inhabitants, most Kurd or Armenian in origin. We may also mention the Syriac Christians (Nestorians), who reside at Kočanes, 11 miles N. of Djalāmran. The land is mountainous and difficult of access as much on account of the predatory character of its inhabitants as on account of the nature of the country and has therefore been little explored. The Turkish government, which only instituted a certain amount of order here after the middle of last century, has its representative in Djalāmran [q. v., i. 1091]. With the possible exception of ʿAmadiya [q. v., i. 321 et seq], there are no other towns of importance.

The name Ḥakkārī is derived from the inhabitants, the Hakkāris, a branch of the Kūrīs, who have inhabited the wilāyat of Wān and the surrounding Turkish and Persian provinces with other Kurdish tribes from ancient times. They are mentioned as early as Ibn Ḥawkāl and the land is called Hakkārī after them by Arab geographers and historians. These Hakkāris led a practically independent existence in their almost inaccessible mountain fortresses. The celebrated Aṭābeq Zangī was the first to attempt to bring them into subjection and took several of their mountain fortresses, to one of which he gave the name ʿAmadiya (cf. *ʿAmadiya*). But the country soon returned to its previous state. The all-conquering Timūr alone was able to force the Hakkāris to own his sway, when he besieged their Emīr in the fortress of Wān in 787 = 1385. Later they fought with the Aḵ-ḵuyunlī, but even after the rise of the Șafaws in Persia and under the rule of the Ottomans they remained the real masters of their country.

There is much controversy as to the possibility of the continuance (dawâm) of aḫwâl. To be distinguished also from the hâl is the waḥât. It is that “Now” of the present, with its content of presence with or absence from God, and with it alone the Sâfi should be occupied. It belongs to the murîd and is his religious experience under the effect of an ever renewed Now, while the hâl comes from God and enters that Now like a soul in a body (Nicholson, Kâšf, pp. 367 et seq.; Kâshârî, Râbî’ al-Âkâm, ii. pp. 21 et seq.).


HALAB (Alep). A. A Turkish vilâyet in Northern Syria, bounded on the N.W. and N. by the vilâyet of Adana and Siwâs, in the N.E. by the vilâyet of Ma‘mûriyat al-Azîz, in the E. by the sandjak of Dîr el-Zîrî, in the S. by the vilâyet of Damascus, and in the W. by the vilâyet of Bârit and the Mediterranean sea. The district presents no marked geographical features; it is divided into three liwâ‘s or sandjak’s, a. Aleppo, with 24,000 square miles, 672,500 inhabitants; b. Mar‘a­shî [q. v.] and c. Urfa [q. v.]; the whole vilâyet has an area of 36,000 square miles, 995,800 inhabitants (792,500 Muslims, 49,000 Armenians, 154,300 Syriac Christians, according to Brockhaus’ Con­versiones lexico). Aleppo may be considered the name of an administrative area since the time of the Hamdanid Sa‘îf al-Dawla (about 420 A. H.); he was the first prince of Aleppo. From this time on the district of Aleppo (whether principality, suljânate or province of the Mamlûk or Ottoman empire) continued to stretch over the Euphrates to Hârrân, till in the last quarter of the sixteenth century its area was diminished by the creation of the independent sandjak of Dîr el-Zîrî; in the south however Hamân was separated, as early as the Fâtimid period. It reached its greatest extent in the Mameluke period in the 13th century A. H., when it stretched as far as Dîrîrgi in the N.F. of Asia Minor and for a time included Hîms in the south. In the Byzantine period down to the 15th century A. H. Kiînîrî [q. v.] was the capital of the province; Antioch and the lands attached to it, which had been ruled by the Crusaders for over a century, was taken from them by Sultan Baibars in 668 and added to the province of Aleppo.

We have a certain amount of information (collected in A. v. Kremer, Kulturgeschichte des Orientes under the Chalifen, Vienna 1875, p. 359, 351, and in Le Strange, Palestine under the Muslims, p. 43-48) about the total of the taxation, which the province had to pay in the time of the “Abbasid governors. The province of Aleppo and al­Awâmî paid, according to Ibn Khaldûn’s quotatio­n from the Dîrîr al-Dawla, 400,000 (in another Ms. 420,000) dinârs (the dinâr may be estimated at ten shillings following Le Strange) in the reign of al-Ma‘mûn (158-170); 470,000 dinârs (according to a quotation from al-Djâshshîyarî’s Kîrî al-Wa‘zûr) under the Caliph al-Rashîd (170-193); 360,000 in the year 204, according
to Kûdama, Kitâb al-Khaṭrî; 400,000 dinârs in 259, according to Ibn Khurdadhîb and Ibn al-
Fâkih, 360,000 dinârs in 371 (al-Muṣâdâdî). The revenue under Nûr al-Dîn (541—569) was smaller; it is given by Carlyle from the Cambridge MS. of the Ta'ârîkh Bani 'Ayyāb on p. 17 of his notes to his edition of the Maw'rûd al-Latâ'if of Ibn Taghribardi. He gives 402,733 dinârs as the revenue for the whole kingdom, which included Syria as far as Damascus and Mesopotamia to Mûsul, but did not include the 'Awyâm (or Aleppo and the immediate neighbourhood 96,186). The revenues were considerably higher in the reign of Sulṭân al-Zâhir Ghâzi, they are given for the year 609 by A. v. Kremer in the Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad. Phil. Hist. Klasse, 1850, p. 245—248 in the translation of Ibn Shîna (on authority of Ibn Abî 'Tâyî), viz. 6,584,500 dirhems = 4,655,613 dinârs for the town of Aleppo (including its fields and gardens) and at the close of the reign of Sulṭân al-Nâṣîr Yusuf II (about 656 A. H.) they approached 8,000,000 dirhems = 533,333 dinârs.

The administration of the province of Aleppo, our authorities for the Mamlûk period are good. According to the 'Asâr al-Sulûb of Kâshâshâdî (cf. the article Hâdîb (ii. 206 et seq.), Aleppo was the largest province next to Damascus. At the head was the governor, an Emîr of 1000 Mamlûks, the representative of the Sulṭân, with the title Malik al-Umârî (Chief Emîr). Next to him came a. the governor of the citadel independent of the former (an Emîr of 40, who was often promoted in this position up to an Emîr of 1000), the Atâbâg, the commander of troops stationed in the province (at this period 6000 mercenaries and 500 Mamlûks); and the president of the military administrative court ('âdâb al-'âdâbî), who was assisted by three hâджîbs (q. v.) of lower rank. These were the military officials, almost always chosen from the Turkish corps of Mamlûks, 6.) The religious officials: the chief kâ'lîs of the four recognised schools; a Hânâfi and a Shâfi'i military kâ'lî, each with a mufti; the administrator of the treasury (baî't al-Mâârî, q. v., i. 598 et seq.), c.) civil officials: the vizier, who bore the title "in-
spector of the province" in Aleppo, the private secretary (in Aleppo called "chief of the corres-
pondence-office"); these two officials were of lower rank than the corresponding officials in Cairo); the chief of the commissariat the inspector of offices; the mayor; the postmaster; the inspector of government lands; the inspector of buildings; the chief of police; the superintendent of the market (who was often chosen from among the ecclesi-
asical officials). d.) Medical officers: (mi'n al-
tâqâf'îf al-tâqâf'îf; the chief physician, the chief oculist and the chief surgeon. — This complicated administration, which was a copy on a small scale of the central government in Cairo, was based as regards the mercenaries and Mamlûks to some extent on a system of feudâlism. It remained similar in constitution under the Turks, although the titles and the divisions were slightly altered. It was only after the destruction of the Janissaries in the first quarter of the xîth century and the introduction of the reforms that the administration was simplified. The province of Aleppo in the Mamlûk period was governed by sub-governors of different ranks, who were in part directly under the gov-
ernor, while the more important were appointed by the Sulṭân. The frontier fortresses were under Emîrs of 1000, other towns according to their military importance under Emîrs of 40 and 10 or under officers of the mercenary troops. Two Bedouin tribes, 13 Turkoman tribes and a few tribes of Kurds were ruled by their own chiefs who were appointed by the Sulṭân. On the modern administration cf. the article Tûrkeyya.

b) Halâb (Aleppo), the second largest city in Syria.

I. Topographical and General.

Aleppo is situated in 37° 2' E. long. (Greenw.) and 36° 11' N. Lat., 1335 feet above sea-level, on the river Kuwaîk (Gök Sû) on the border between the areas into which Northern Syria may be divided, mountainous west and the flatter east. The climate is cold in winter (for accurate meteorological ob-
servations see Russell's Natural History of Aleppo, London 1794, i. 83—96), but the spring begins in February; the heat is very great from May to September; the average temperature for the year is 68°, in winter 42°, in summer 87° Fahrenheit. Aleppo's commercial importance rests on the fact that it lies on the great route from north to south and on the roads from the Mediterranean to Mesopotamia; it thus concentrates upon itself (cf. Karl Andre'Geographie der Weltande, new ed. 1912, ii. 278) the trade of a great part of Northern Syria and Northern Mesopotamia as far as Dîyarbakir and Mârdîn and on the Euphrates as far as 'Ana. Although the commercial importance of Aleppo began to decrease after the discovery of the sea-route to the East Indies, it was still a flourishing centre of trade in the xviith and xviiiith centuries. A large number of French, German, Dutch and Venetian merchants traded in exports and imports there under the protection of their consuls, chiefly through the intermediary of Jewish middlemen; the most numerous however were the English who possessed a great factory there from the reign of James I (1603—1625). In 1775 80 European firms were represented in Aleppo. In the middle of the xixth century Aleppo had almost entirely lost its prosperity and trading connections through the insecurity of the Mediterrane-
nian during the time of Napoleon I, through particularly bad government, the mutinies of the Janissaries in 1814 and 1826, the terrible earthquake of 1822 (and smaller ones in 1827 and 1832), the ravages of cholera (1832) and plague (1837), as well as the incredible misgov-
ernment of the Egyptian officials from 1831—
1837, which did not affect other parts of Syria so unfavourably (see F. Perrier, La Syrie sous le gouvernement de Mehemmed Alej Ali jusqu'en 1840, Paris 1842), and the return of the Turkish régime. While in 1775 the imports amounted to about 8½ million francs and the exports had risen as high as 9 million, in 1844 the imports had de-
clinued to 5½ million frcs. and the exports as low as 2½ millions (see Henri Guy's instructive work, Essai de l'état politique et commercial de la Syrie, Paris 1862). It was not till the eighties of last century that Aleppo began again to revive, the number of inhabitants and the totals of exports and imports are increasing and the favourable railway connections (Aleppo—Rayâyk—Damascus—Bairût; Aleppo—Hims—Tripoli; Aleppo's proposed connec-
tions as a station on the Baghdâd railway; and its future direct connection with the harbour
of Alexandretta) make it certain that the town is destined to have a great future.

At the present day the imports amount to 58½ million francs (of which 20 millions is cotton etc. alone); the exports 20 million francs (sesame, liquories, gall-apples, butter, olive-oil, wool, silk, hides etc.). Before the earthquake of 1822 the population was estimated by travelers at 150,000, after 1822 it sank to 50,000. In 1882 (Guido Joanne for 1887) it is said to have been only 90,000—100,000, in 1894 it had risen to 130,000 (Meyer's Reisebuch) while in 1912 the figure is estimated (Baedeker, French ed.) at 200,000—150,000, which is probably too high. The old city was a quadrangle (4½ miles round) enclosed by walls but even by the time of the Arab conquest there were suburbs around it (see below). The city and the suburbs had gates. Of the city-gates several are well preserved, but nothing has remained of the gates of the suburbs except the inscription at the former Bāb al-Malik (Pl. x). The Europeans live in the Arzitaya quarter (see Pl. 23), the native Christians mostly in the Muššārka (see Pl. 23) and Kuttāb quarters (see Pl. 22), the Jews in the Bahšita quarter (Pl. i; also called Shākhjah). The inhabitants are protected from rain and heat by vaulted bazaars; these are so extensive that a walk of 4½ hours' duration may be taken on their roofs. Aleppo is notorious because its inhabitants are liable to a disease, the Aleppo scab, an ulcer (jabhū), which disfigures the skin. The germ of the disease seems to enter the body through slight wounds in the skin, children are particularly liable to it, while adult Europeans are seldom attacked by it. Cf. v. Luschian, Mitteil. über die Therapie des Aleppo-Knotens, in Verh. d. Wien. Anthrop. Gesells., xiv. 71; Globus, Vol. vii.

II. History of the City.

1. Before Islam.

Aleppo, one of the oldest cities in existence, perhaps a Hittite foundation, is first mentioned as early as the second millennium B.C. under the name Hallab (Hallaw, or Halvan) in the documents of Boghazkoi, among which is a treaty with Aleppo. In Babylonian texts Aleppo is mentioned in the treaty between Asšur-nirari and Matu-itu about the year 750 B.C.; there and in Assyrian on Salmanasar's monolith inscription of 850 the god Ramman of Hallab is mentioned (information supplied by E. Weidner). In Egyptian texts Aleppo (Hērū) is mentioned in the xviith century B.C. in the biography of the general Amenemheb (Sethe, C.r.-kundten, iv. p. 890 et seq.) and in the accounts of the battle with the Hittites at Kadeshe in 1288 B.C. (information supplied by Dr. Bürckhardt). In the Old Testament Aram Šōba seems to correspond to Aleppo. In the Seleucid period it was given the name Berodia (Bërdīa, Berōia, Berđīı etc.) by Seleucus Nikator, who favoured it exceedingly. It suffered severely at Khusraw 1's conquest in 540 A.D. (not Khusraw II. as is wrongly stated in Van Ess-Wissman and Baedeker). In the Byzantine state we find the old name reappearing in the Greek form Χαλεπον.

2. Under Arab Rule.

Aleppo seems to have been predominantly a Syrian town with a strong admixture of immigrant Arabs in contrast to the more cosmopolitan Kin-
meeting any serious resistance he occupied Damasc
 curs and Aleppo, where he was hailed as a libe
tator. His son Khumārwaḥ [q. v.] appointed
Toghd b. Dżaff (father of Muḥammad al-Ḫiṣṣid, q. v.) governor of Aleppo in 275. Khumārwaḥ
Dżaff died in 280. He was succeeded by his son Dżaff, and
his own city of Hārān after protracted hostilities peace was finally made in 286
between the Caliph and Hārān; Aleppo remained to the Caliph. In 290 an invasion of the Karma
țians [q. v.] took place, they defeated the governor and besieged Aleppo but were forced to retreat
after a sortie in which the troops were assisted by the citizens. To reconquer the lost provinces of Damasc and Egypt, the Caliph al-Muktafi
sent a strong army under Muḥammad b. Sulaimān,
which received accessions in Aleppo from the tribes of Kīlāb and Tāmīm. He routed the Kara
țians in Central Syria, conquered Egypt and
new Hārān in 292 A. H. This victory secured the
Caliph’s hold on Syria for a considerable
time. The governors and deputy governors were
changed frequently by force of arms. In 325 Syria became dependent on the governor of Egypt, Muḥammad al-Ḫiṣṣid [q. v.], who
appointed Ahmad ibn Sa’īd al-Kīlābī, chief of the
Bedouins of the tribe of Kīlāb, to be governor of
Aleppo. The Kīlābīs flocked thither in large
numbers. The Caliph granted Syria to Muḥammad
b. Ra’iḵ [q. v.] to rid it of al-Ḫiṣṣidis who did
not recognize his authority. Ibn Ra’iḵ drove out
the al-Ḫiṣṣid governor, Ahmad al-Kīlābī, and took
the field against al-Ḫiṣṣid himself. Muḥammad
al-Ḫiṣṣid was defeated, surrendered Damasc and to
ibn Ra’iḵ and fled into Egypt. In 329 Muḥammad
al-Ḫiṣṣid sent his general Kāfūr with a large
army into Syria; he defeated Ibn Ra’iḵ’s governor
and conquered Aleppo. In the following year peace was made between al-Ḫiṣṣid and Ibn Ra’iḵ, who
now received Aleppo and Hīmā also. In the same
year Ibn Ra’iḵ was slain by the Ḥamdānī Naṣrī
al-Dawla; the latter became Amir al-Umarā’, and
his famous brother ‘Ali received the title of honour
Sa’īd al-Dawla. The history of Aleppo for the next
few years is so closely bound up with his career that we must refer the reader to the article Sa’īd
al-Dawla. After the death of Sa’īd al-Dawla in
356 (967) his descendants continued to rule there
till 406 (1015) if we include the sequel of
Ḥamdānī rule under the Ḥamdānīs Mamlūk Lulu’
and his son Maṇṣūr. During this period, the history
of which is given in greater detail in the article Ḥamdānīs, Aleppo had developed with the lands
attached to it into a practically independent prin
cipality and was now the most important city in
northern Syria. Its importance in the world’s history lies in its successful struggle with the Byzantine
empire. By his extraordinary abilities Sa’īd al-Dawla
had retained Syria for Muslim culture; in the above
mentioned year, however, the city fell directly under Fāṭimid rule, for which it had already been prepared
under the Ḥamdānīs and Lulu’ and Maṇṣūr.

The Caliph al-Ḫākim remitted the taxes for 407
of the province which had been so impoverished by
continual warfare and appointed ‘Aziz al-Dawla
Fāṭik governor of Aleppo and its citadel. The
latter built himself a fortified residence connected
with the citadel and renovated the walls (see architec
ture). He was also able to come to good
terms with the Byzantines. At this time the Em-
peror Basil had forbidden trade with the “infidels”
in Syria and Egypt in reprisal for al-Ḫākim’s
cruel treatment of the Christians, but he made
an exception in favour of ‘Aziz al-Dawla. Relying
on his twofold power as governor of the city and its citadel and a friend of the Byzantines,
he showed his independence of his brother by stringing
up pagans in payment of revenue to him.
The Caliph enraged prepared to take the field
against him, but before the preparations were com-
plete he was murdered [see the article al-Ḫākim] in
411. ‘Aziz al-Dawla is said to have made peace
with his successor al-Zahir and Ījākim’s sister
who conducted the government; but it is related
that he was murdered in 413 at the queen’s
command. Others throw the guilt on Bāḍr, com-
mander of the citadel in Aleppo, who wished the
power for himself. His plan miscarried however.
The regent drove him out of the city with her
troops and as a precaution in 414 appointed two
independent governors, one for the city and an-
other for the fortress. But no one in Syria was
satisfied with Fāṭimid rule. We thus come to
have in the next year the remarkable phenomenon
of the chief of the three great Bedouin tribes of
North Syria, the Kīlābīs (led by Sa’īd b. Mirdās,
q. v.), the Kāfūrīs (led by Sa’īd b. al-Mufarradā’) uniting for joint
action. Sa’īdīs was to attack Aleppo, Siṣmān Damasc
and Hāṣān Palestine. In face of this danger
the Caliph’s best general, Anuṣṭiktīn al-Dibzārī,
was sent to Palestine to put down the rebellion.
Anuṣṭiktīn was overcome by superior forces. Sa’īd
was thus free to advance on Aleppo and after
two months the city was delivered up to him
through disension between the two governors.
Sa’īdīs left a portion of his army behind to capture
the citadel, and went southwards with the remain-
gerain defeating Anuṣṭiktīn and taking Hīmās,
Bā’albek and Sidon in 416; Raḥbā, Bābaḡī, Bālaḡ
and Raṣānīya in the east also submitted to him.
Syria thus regained its independence. When the
situation in Egypt had improved the Caliph al-
Zahir in 420 sent a new army to Palestine under
Anuṣṭiktīn, this time successfully; Sa’īdīs b. Mirdās
fell in the battle of Uḫwānā on the Jordan.
His sons, who had stayed behind in Aleppo,
shared his power; Mu’tāz al-Dawla Thāmil
received the citadel, Shībī al-Dawla Naṣr the city, but in
the next year he seized the citadel also and
inherited his brother elsewhere. He again began
the famous summer raids on the Byzantines and
severely defeated the governor of Antioch. To
revenge himself the Emperor Romanus advanced
against Aleppo, but his army, which had suf-
dered severely from the great heat of summer and
the scarcity of water, was defeated and forced
to retreat. The new governor of Antioch was more
successful in plundering towns belonging to Aleppo and
capturing numerous Muslims. Naṣr thus found
himself forced to submit; he promised to pay
tribute and observe peace. The next few years passed peaceably enough apart from a few trifling
outbreaks. In 437 the new Fāṭimid Caliph, whose
favour he had won by vast gifts taken from
Byzantine booty, confirmed his investiture and
granted him the highest rank of vizier. Two
years later, Anuṣṭiktīn, who had been governor
of Damascus since 420, resolved to take Aleppo
with Fāṭimid troops aided by the irreconcilable
Kīlābīs. Naṣr advanced to meet him with his
followers. In the battle of DāPräs Thīmul took to
flight and Nayr was killed. His brother Thimāl took his place as ruler of Aleppo, but went off to Cappadocia leaving representatives in the city and citadel. After his departure anarchy and plunder reigned there till Anushītkin besieged the town, which surrendered by agreement; the citadel also surrendered shortly afterwards. Anushītkin placed governors in Aleppo both for the city and citadel and further strengthened his power in Northern Syria. His successes aroused the mistrust of the Fāṭimid vizier, who prevented the general's family in Cairo from going to see him. Vigorous protests from Anushītkin widened the breach, till finally they were so close that Diāb had to leave him and again granted Aleppo to the Mādīsī Thimāl. Abandoned by the ka’ids Anushītkin went with a small following to Aleppo, followed by Thimāl; Anushītkin, despondent and ill, died in 433. His successor handed over Aleppo to Thimāl on receipt of the Caliph’s firmān to that effect after fighting several battles with him. He was on good terms not only with the Caliph in Cairo, who in 436 again confirmed the firmān granting him his position, but also with the Empress Theodora, who granted him and his successors titles and presents in return for payment of a yearly tribute. He was also able to avoid war with the powerful Turkish chief al-Bassārī who had fled from Baghdad before the Saldūj Sultān Thoghirl Beg and granted him Rāqṣa. The demands of the Kilābīs continued to cause great difficulties to Thimāl and their insolent attacks hurt him so much that he exchanged Aleppo for Djiboua, Bairūt and ’Akka in 449 with the permission of the Fāṭimid Caliph. The Caliph appointed two governors in Aleppo one for the town and one for the citadel and peace reigned for the years. But in 452 the Kilābīs under Thimāl’s nephew Mahmūd collected their forces to capture Aleppo. After long fighting with varying success (Aleppo on one occasion saw three different masters in three days) Mahmūd finally occupied the city and its citadel. But he could not long enjoy its possession; by command of the Caliph, Thimāl retook it from him in 453, without however having defeated him, as the Shaikhs of the Kilābīs decided that it was improper to support a nephew against his father’s brother; Mahmūd received compensation elsewhere. Towards the close of the reign of Thimāl fighting with the Byzantines went on continuously with varying result. About the end of 453 Thimāl fell very ill and died; during his long reign he had been able to maintain for Aleppo a fairly independent position between the Byzantine and Fāṭimid empires. Shortly before his death he appointed his brother ’Arīya his successor, but Mahmūd declined to recognise his uncle and revived his old claim to the inheritance as Nayr’s son. After four years of fighting Mahmūd, who had obtained Turkish mercenaries with Byzantine money, succeeded in taking Aleppo in 457. In 459—462 pestilence and the continual ravages of Turkish hordes brought about destitution, famine and great loss of life in Northern Syria. By this time the power of the Fāṭimid had declined. The ‘Abbāsid Caliphate, supported by the arms of the Saldūj Sultān, had won new influence, so that Mahmūd found himself forced to mention the Caliph al-’A’īm and Sultān Alp Arslān in prayer, hoping for their effective support. While the Shaikhs understood the changed political situation and put on black (‘Abbāsid) garments, the people rebelled and took the straw mats out of the mosques, saying these were ‘Ali’s praying carpets. Abū Bakr could get new ones for himself. Alp Arslān then demanded of Mahmūd that he, like the other vassals, should join his army at the head of his followers. When Mahmūd declined, Alp Arslān, although he advanced against Aleppo, contented himself with surrounding the town hoping to take it without storming it, in order not to weaken it unnecessarily so that it might serve him as a bulwark against the Byzantines. At the last moment Mahmūd surrendered the city, but received it back at once from the Sultān in the Ka’ids’ desire to expel him, which had reached Bṣalbek when he had to return Aleppo to protect his kingdom from the raids of his uncle ’Arīya, who had formed an alliance with the Byzantines. Against the latter Mahmūd enlisted the leaders of Turkish mercenaries from Palestine in his service and the Byzantines retreated; ’Arīya went with them to Constantinople, where he soon afterwards died. In 466 Mahmūd died, in the latter years of his reign he had become avaricious and autocratic; he was succeeded by his eldest son Djalal ad-Dawla Nayr, a cruel tyrant. When he was slain in 468, the Turkish mercenaries chose his brother Sābīk as ruler, while soon afterwards the Kilābīs took the side of another brother, Waththāb, and advanced on Kinnisrin. They dared not face the advancing Turks however and fled in disorder. The Turks took possession of their camp with their women, children and flocks as booty of war. Waththāb and his followers then turned for help to the Sultān, who himself was unable to assist them; however he granted Syria as a fief to his brother Tutush and ordered the leaders of the Turkish mercenaries to place themselves under his banner. Tutush entered Syria and made an alliance with the Kilābīs and with the Oğalīl chief Sharaf ad-Dawla Muslim. The united forces besieged Aleppo for three months in 471 but the alliance between the Arabs and the Turks was not a close one. The Kilābīs and the Oğalūls kept aloof from them, Muslim returned homeward with Sābīk, took leave of Tutush and advised the other Kilābī chiefs to seek safety. The remaining Kilābīs went over to Sābīk. After further Turkish auxiliaries who were approaching Aleppo had been defeated by the Bedouins, Tutush raised the siege and went to the Euphrates. Next spring he again advanced on Aleppo, but was once more defeated and went to Damascus, which was given him by the Turk ’Aziz. From this centre he ravaged Northern Syria and plundered the country of Ma’arrat al-Nū’mān to Aleppo so that many of the inhabitants fled to Mesopotamia. As Sābīk felt he could no longer resist, he surrendered Aleppo at the end of 492 to the Oğalīl Muslim against his brother’s wish. Muslim came with fresh troops and munitions and compensated the three brothers by granting them smaller towns. An Arab ascended the throne of Aleppo for the last time in the person of Muslim b. Kūraish [q. v.]; after he had fallen in 477 in battle with the Saldūj Sulaimān b. Kutalimish [q. v.], the city was henceforth ruled only by dynasties of Turkish origin. Ibn Kutalimish proceeded to besiege Aleppo, but the inhabitants led by the Sharīf al-Tutāli (who had built an outer fort at the southern side of the city wall, called *Kār al-Sharīf*) resisted in the hope of receiving
support from Malik Shāh. They next sent for help to Tutush, who hurried at once to their relief; Ibn Kūلمūnīsh advanced to meet him. In an encounter near Aleppo his troops were put to flight and he in despair committed suicide. Tutush came up to Aleppo to occupy it as had been agreed but when Sharīf al-Ḥusaynī refused to surrender the town, he forced his way into it after a week's siege with the aid of traitors in the town. Shāh b. Kirāshī, the commander of the citadel, who had been pledged by Muslim to surrender the citadel only to Sultan Malik Shāh himself, alone successfully resisted Tutush. Meanwhile Malik Shāh was approaching with a large army, subjecting all the strongholds on his route. Tutush retired to Damascus and Malik Shāh marched unopposed to the shores of the Mediterranean. In Aleppo he appointed his faithful friend Kāsim al-Dawla Aṣ-ṣonḵūr [q.v., i. 226b infra seq.], the founder of Zangid line, as governor in 479. The trade and commerce of Aleppo [see Architecture sect. iii.] flourished during his reign and during almost ten years of peace security reign and his subjects were mildly treated. Unfortunately he was taken prisoner in 487 in battle with Tutush and executed, Aleppo passed to Tutush and, on the latter's death soon after, to his son Riḍwān [q.v.].

Period of the Crusades. For the next few years devastating wars raged continuously between the rulers of Syria so that they were unable to resist the invasion of the Franks at the beginning of the Crusades in 490. HowBoemund of Tarentum captured Antioch, defeated the powerful army sent to its relief in consequence of the dissension among the Syrian Emirs and founded the kingdom of Antioch, which formed a continual danger to Aleppo for many years is well known. Although Riḍwān, being hated as a member of the Ismā'īli sect of the Assassins, received little support from his fellow Muslims, the Crusaders were unable to take Aleppo itself while he lived. On their raids however they frequently came up to the very gates of Aleppo. He died in 507. After the short reign of his feeble-minded and debauched son Alp Arslān, who was assassinated in 508, his son, the infant Sultan Shāh, came to the throne under the regency of Luṭf, who met a violent death in 511. In the same year Ilgāhāz b. Urtuq [q.v.] was chosen regent, but he could not at first maintain his army in consequence of the devastation and destitution of Aleppo, so that it was not till 512 that he obtained a firm footing by alleviating the famine to some extent by a favourable treaty with the Franks. Ilgāhāz, occupied in constant fighting, spent little time in Aleppo, where he had left his son Sulaimān as his representative. As the latter rebelled against his father in 514, Ilgāhāz deposed him and put his nephew Sulaimān b. 'Abd al-Djabārī in his place. The latter built the first madrasa (a theological school of the orthodox, Sunni creed) in Aleppo and aroused such wrath among the Shīʿi population that they are said to have destroyed by night what he built by day. Sulaimān, who succeeded to power on his uncle's death in 516, was deprived of it the next year by his uncle Balak b. Bahram [q.v., i. 612], when he failed to defend the province successfully against the Franks. Balak deposed the king of Aleppo, the Sālīḏūk Sultan Shāh, and exiled him to Harān. In this year the ravages of the Franks brought them up to the gates of Aleppo; plundering the sanctuaries they tore the sarcophagi out of their consecrated tombs. In reprisal the Kāfī ibn al-Khāshshāb turned three churches in Aleppo into mosques [see Architecture]. In the next year Balak fell at the siege of Manbijī, and his inheritance passed to his cousin Timūršāh [q.v.] of Mardin, who appointed a governor for Aleppo. Timūršāh was not strong enough to protect his new possessions against the Franks, who advanced on Aleppo with Sultan Shāh and Dubais [q.v., i. 1077 et seq.] of Hilla; the latter, a Shīʿī, hoped that the inhabitants, of whose enthusiasm for the Shīʿī we have already had two examples, would surrender to him without striking a blow. But he was deceived in this expectation; for the inhabitants led by the Kāfī ibn al-Khāshshāb defended themselves valiantly. As their lord Timūršāh had left them in the lurch, they had applied for help to Aṣ-ṣonḵūr, ruler of Mṣūl. The latter advanced with a large army and forced the Franks and their Muslim allies to retreat. Wisely refraining from following up the enemy's retreat, he contented himself with making his hold on Aleppo secure in the closing days of 518. His brief reign was occupied with wars with the Franks till in 520 he was murdered in Mṣūl by the Assassins. He had shortly before appointed his son Masʿūd his representative in Aleppo. The latter succeeded him in the government of his lands but, when he died the next year, utter anarchy reigned in Aleppo. Kūṭlūgh, to whom Masʿūd is said to have ceded the town, took possession of it, but was thereupon besieged by the dissatisfied inhabitants in the citadel, till finally Kāraḵīsh, the lieutenant of the new lord of Mṣūl, the Aṭābḫī Zangi [q.v.], arrived with an army and put an end to the strife. When Zangi himself arrived, he restored order but severely punished the culprits. In the next year (523) he was granted Aleppo by the Sālīḏūk Sultan. Aleppo itself was never endangered during his reign, filled with fighting as it was; security and prosperity were restored. He increased his territory by the conquest of Ǐılmāʾ, Ǐīmī, Ǐalābīk etc. When he was slain in 541 at the siege of Kaft Dīṣīr, he was succeeded by his son Nur al-Dīn Mahmūd [q.v.] in the government of Mṣūl and Aleppo (including the Syrian appanages). He improved his position against the Crusaders, by taking Damascus from the incapable Bārīd [cf. e. 800] Abāk and prepared the way for the end of the feeble Fatimid rule in Egypt through Saladin. His son al-Malik al-Sāḥib Ismāʾīl, who succeeded to power on Nur al-Dīn's death in 569, had repeatedly to purchase a shameful peace from the Franks and to cede Damascus to Saladin. Ismāʾīl soon afterwards died in 577 and Ǐrā al-Dīn Masʿūd I of Mṣūl, whom he had designated to succeed him, ceded Aleppo in the following year to Ǐmād al-Dīn Zangi II of Sindjār, but the latter was not able to defend it against Saladin. In the beginning of 579 the latter again advanced on Aleppo; but although the troops offered a valiant defence against the besiegers, Zangi II finally saw that he could not hold Aleppo, as he lacked provisions and money to pay his soldiers. After secret negotiations the two princes came to an agreement whereby Zangi II received Sindjār, Niṣībin and other lands, while Aleppo in return was ceded to Saladin.

The Aiyūbīds (579—658). Saladin at first granted his eleven year old son al-Malik al-
Zahir Ghazi Aleppo, but a few months later he transferred the government of it to his brother al-Malik al-Adil [cf. i. 138]. In 581 Saladin fell ill that his death was hourly expected. On this occasion he became convinced that he could not trust his relations absolutely and, when he had recovered, decided in 582 on a new division of his lands. Al-Adil was removed from his Syrian post and sent to Egypt as Atabeg of Saladin's son; Ghazi was again granted Aleppo and betrothed to al-Adil's daughter Dulta Khatun. Ghazi, like a faithful vassal, supported his father against the Crusaders and on the latter's death recognised al-Malik al-Adil as his suzerain. The aim of his policy was to maintain the balance of power of the Ayyubid chiefs by alternating alliances. He strengthened the defences of Aleppo to defend himself against all attacks. Ghazi died in 615; he had previously designated as his successor his younger son al-Malik al-Aziz Muhammad by his marriage with al-Adil's daughter, in order to influence al-Adil in his favour. Al-Adil's son al-Malik al-Asfah Musa took over the command of the troops in Aleppo and was successful in warding off an attack by the Saljuk Sultan Kalkawus; the civil administration was in the hands of Ghazi's trusted lieutenant the Atabeg Tughril (see architectural notes and the famous Kadi Bahri al-Din Ibn Shaddad [q. v.]). Al-Adil and his son and successor al-Malik al-Kamil each confirmed al-Aziz in his throne. In 628 he took over the command himself, appointed new officials in Aleppo and commanded in the fortresses of his vassals to strengthen his position. With the support of al-Kamil he captured the fortress of Shajzar; he inherited al-Bira (on the Euphrates) from his uncle al-Zahir Daud (a son of Saladin). Ghazi and al-Aziz brought great prosperity to Aleppo and extended their territories in Mesopotamia and Syria. Al-Aziz died young in 634 and left the throne to his seven-year-old son al-Malik al-Nasir Yusuf II (by his marriage with Fatima, daughter of Sultan al-Kamil). Yusuf's grandmother Dulta Khatun [see above] became regent during a period of political crisis. Mistrusting al-Kamil of Egypt, she formed an alliance with al-Asfah of Damascus. She was easily able to defend herself against the Templars who were raiding her territory and her troops under the command of al-Mu'azzam, son of Saladin, on several occasions inflicted such losses on them that they were forced to retire. To strengthen her power the regent made a close alliance with the Saljuk Sultan Kai-Khusraw of Rum (Asia Minor), recognised him as suzerain (in khutba and on coins) and betrothed her youthful grandson to his sister. A great danger was at this time threatening Syria. The wild, warlike people of Khazarim, driven by Chingiz-khan [q. v., i. 859 et seq.] out of their lands on the Caspian Sea had come to Mesopotamia and occupied the lands of al-Kamil's son al-Salih Aiyyub. Unfortunately the Ayyubid princes in consequence of their eternal rivalries were not united and when it suited their interests allied themselves with the Khazarim. In 638 the armies of Aleppo were severely defeated by much superior forces, their leader al-Mu'azzam taking prisoner all their baggage fell into the hands of the enemy, who laid the whole country waste from the Euphrates to Hamah in their raids up and down the country; finally the Aleppo army reinforced by the king of Hamah and a body of Beduins, who had deserted from the enemy, felt strong enough to offer battle to the Khazarim troops. They had to follow the enemy, who evaded them, as far as Haran, and the armies met not far from there. The invaders were utterly routed and retreated via Hajarra to Anah on the Euphrates, where they remained in the Caliph's territory. The plains of Mesopotamia were taken from them and the captives left in Harran set free. In 640 the Aleppo troops again utterly defeated the Khazarim, plundered their camp and took rich booty. A few months later the regent died; her grandson al-Nasir Yusuf took over the government and extended his power over almost all Syria, but just when it had reached its zenith, the end of his kingdom was at hand. The Tartar Khan Hulagu advanced on Aleppo in 658. Sultan Yusuf, who had relied in vain on help from Egypt, fled to Damascus and had afterwards to surrender to Hulagu. The latter took Aleppo, which was given over for days to plunder, conquered the Syrian cities of Hamah, Hala-bek, Damascus and appointed governors in them. Later Period. The rule of the Tutara lasted but a short time. In 659 they were utterly routed by Sultan Kutzuz at 'Ain Djallat [q. v.] and forced to retreat. Kutzuz placed a governor in Aleppo. Soon afterwards a body of Tartar troops succeeded in taking Aleppo once more and maintained themselves in it for three or four months practising the greatest cruelties. At the end of the year they were defeated at Hims and had to abandon Syria. Sultan Yusuf then is said to have been executed by Hulagu (not after the battle of Ain Djallat as is often stated). Aleppo now passed under the sway of the Mamlik Suljan; in 660 it once more suffered terribly from Timur Lenk's invasion. It was restored after the retreat of the Mongols and now became a bulwark against the hereditary enemy Armenia, against which the governors waged countless wars, later against the Turkoman rulers of the Ak and Kara-Kuyun ot and of Ablisin, as well as against the Ottomans. The territory in Asia Minor conquered from time to time by the Mamlik was always added to the province of Aleppo. The city itself was strongly fortified by its governors, notably its citadel by Abrak, the governor of the second last Mamlik Sultan Ghazi. It passed to the Ottomans by treachery; the citadel was so strongly fortified that the rebel Djembari could not take it in 926 in spite of a siege of several months' duration. The scheme of its defences has remained almost unaltered to the present day. Under the Ottomans Aleppo continued to be a flourishing commercial centre although it suffered a great deal from the misgovernment of the Pasha. From 1851-1839 Aleppo was held by the Egyptians. Ibrahim Pasha [q. v.], an enlightened man, although he had the best intentions, oppressed the city by heavy war-levies and conscriptions as well as by a system of monopolies, which were only beneficial to his officials. Matters became even worse on the return of Turkish rule. Since 1880 however the city has made great steps and will once again regain its ancient importance as a commercial centre.

III. Notes on the Architectural History. (Based on the joint researches of Dr. Herzfeld and the writer).

Aleppo is rich in monuments of a military, religious and civil character. The majority are
well preserved and almost all bear inscriptions defining their date and origin. In addition to these we have the numerous architectural notes in the historians. The buildings of Aleppo thus afford a complete picture of the architectural development, which is authoritative not only for the town itself but for the whole of northern Syria.

1. The City-walls. Aleppo was a strongly fortified town even in the Seleucid and Byzantine period and it is probable that its walls formed a rough rectangle with a gate in the middle of each side. Khusraw I captured Aleppo on his campaign of conquest in Syria (540 A.D.) (Procopius, ii, 7, and Niceph, Kalisth., xiv. 39), and destroyed the walls but spared the citadel. Between the Bab al-Di‘ân (see plan iii.) and the Bab An‘âkiya (see plan iv.) portions of the walls built with Persian bricks, said to date from the restorations by Khusraw, were still to be seen in Ibn Shaddad’s time. The name “The Ditch of the Greeks” of the ditch, which the walls now follow in much the same way, does not go back to these ancient times however, for it was dug by the Emperor Nicephorus when he besieged Aleppo in 351 A.D. When the Arabs captured Aleppo, Abû Ûbaida entered through the Antioch Gate in the year 16 A.H., so that it is evident that the position of the main gate has not been altered. The old line of defence was apparently always followed by the wall in the first four centuries of the Hijra, for which we have but few notices of it, while architectural remains are entirely absent.

The oldest part of the defences that still survives is the inner wall in the parapet between the two towers of the Antioch gate, built by the governor ‘Aziz al-Dawla in the reign of the Caliph al-Lâ‘îm (407—413 A.H.). It cannot be ascertained with certainty how much of the wall proper dates from an early period, as inscriptions only exist on the gates and towers. The architectural history of the wall is therefore based on the latter.

Saladin’s son, Sulţân al-Zâhir Ghâzî, in 600 built the north gate of the city the Bab al-Nâṣr (Pl. i.), which was called Bab al-Vahd before his time. It has not altered: it consists of two strong towers forming a gate way, the entrance is through one of them by a zig-zag path (barâbkhâmû, dergâh, cf. van Berchem, Notae d’Arch., p. 42, Note 2). More has survived of the restorations undertaken by Sulţân al-Mu‘ayyad Shâhîk after the destruction by the Mongols under Timûr Lenk. The Bab An‘âkiya (West Gate) in its present form dates from his time (823). Two inscriptions of Sulţân Barûk (792) and Farâdî (804) replaced on the gate by al-Mu‘ayyad bear witness to the restorations carried on between 807 and 823, which had been rendered necessary by earthquake and the Tatars. This gate is from the point of view of architectural technique the most advanced in Aleppo and shows the type in perfection viz., the two towers, both of which jut out with flattened corners, with lofty vaulting within, a narrow gateway and barâbkhâmû in the right tower is protected by a crenellated way between the towers. The gateway is defended by loopholes in its three walls and machicolations. The gates had folding gates and draw gates in front of them. In the tops of the vaultings were openings through which missiles could be hurled on the enemy from the upper storey if they penetrated so far. There was a sanctuary in one of the great niches of the gate way. A portion of the Bab Khînnesrin (Pl. v. south gateway) also dates from the time of al-Mu‘ayyad, namely the courtyard between the two towers, also the second tower south of the Bab al-Di‘ân (west wall) and the fine towers at the southwest corner of the city (south wall). Al-Mu‘ayyad intended that his restorations, which were never completely finished, should cover the whole of the old line of defence. Under Barsîyeh (825—842) this was definitely abandoned and an outer wall which followed the “Greeks’ ditch” was added to the city wall, with the Makâm (Pl. vi.), Nîrâb (Pl. vii.) and Hadîd (Pl. viii.) [in place of the earlier bab al-Kânat] gates.

About 803 A.H. Sulţân Khât Bey built the Bab al-Farâdî (Pl. ii.) at the south side, of it only the south tower, now quite built over, survives. Unlike the older gates the entrance is through the courtyard between the two towers. The Bab al-Makâm also, built on the same principle, may be essentially the work of Khât Bey although it also bears Barsîyeh’s cartouches. Barsîyeh built the Bab Nîrâb.

At the close of the Mamlûk period Sulţân Kanâ‘î Khûrî, once more repaired the fortifications of Aleppo to defend it against the Ottomans. From him dates the modern form of the Bab al-Di‘ân (918) and the fine Bab Khînnesrin which resembles the Bab An‘âkiya; several towers of the east wall, the Bab al-Ahmar (Pl. viii. east gate) and the Bab al-Hadîd (Pl. ix.) were entirely renewed by him (northeast corner 915). The town soon afterwards passed to the Ottomans through treachery, but they allowed its fortifications to fall into decay. Only one slight tower, the third to the south of the Bab An‘âkiya bears an inscription commemorating repairs by Sulţân Ahmed (1015—1026) and on the Bab Nîrâb Sulţân Ma‘mûd (1143—1165) has perpetuated his name by some immaterial improvements.

As Syrian architecture is essentially moderate in character, avoiding all superfluous ornament and only seeks effect through the solidity of its freestone work and the beauty of its proportions and disposition of its masses, we naturally find these features particularly well marked in defensive works. Apart from the inscriptions and their frames there is hardly the slightest decoration on the walls of Aleppo. A frieze on the Bab al-Nâṣr may be mentioned as quite unique; it shows an arabesque undergrowth through which a hare is running (see ARALESQUE, i, 363 et seq., Pl. ii. 15). There are Mamlûk escutcheons on a number of towers, lions or leopards in the rudest relief, which can scarcely claim to be works of art but are only placed on the walls as heraldic emblems (perhaps with talismanic significance).

2. The Citadel. The citadel is a natural mound with its slopes artificially steepened and a deep ditch. Its form is oval, about 300 yards × 150 in area at the top, while the ditch encloses an area of 500 × 350 yards, its height above the bottom of the ditch is 100 feet. The mound does not lie equidistant from the city walls but near the centre of the east wall. The only entrance (Pl. 2.) is in the south.

The citadel was certainly in existence at a very early period, the period when we find Aleppo mentioned in Assyrian and Hittite monuments; from this time date two Hittite sculptures of lions in basalt. It is to be presumed that its sanctuaries also date from this remote age. Although Aleppo
was only a provincial town in the Byzantine period it was fortified. A relic of this period is a vast cistern almost in the centre of the citadel hewn out of the rock and covered with nine cross arched vaultings resting on four pillars. The ‘Abbasid and early Arab dynasties have left no monuments. The deep well on the north side, around whose cylindrical shaft a staircase winds, was built in the Seljuk period as an inscription of Malikshah found in a passage below, near the steps, shows.

The existing fortifications must have been rendered useless by earthquake in 568 as Nur al-Din instituted great works of restoration, of which several inscriptions have survived on towers on the west side (568). In the interior Nur al-Din (563) built the lower sanctuary of Ibrahim al-Khalil (Pl. g) (Abraham is said to have visited Aleppo on his travels) with a splendid mihrab carved in wood, one of the finest examples of this branch of art. The celebrated minbar of the Agha mosque in Jerusalem was also originally designed for this sanctuary. The space on which Sultan Ghazi undertook restorations already shows the type usual in the Ayyubid period, a rectangle carried up by a cupola between two broad girders.

In the reign of al-Zahir Ghazi the citadel was entirely transformed and to him in the main it owes its present form. In the years 606—608 he deepened the moat and repaired the slopes, parts of which he probably also cemented. He built the high arched entrance bridge and the great gate (Pl. p), which, according to the style of city-gates then in vogue, consisted of two much projecting towers close together. A well-known talismanic relief of a snake above the gate in the archway certainly dates from him. The vaulted gateway is broken into five pieces. The entrance was closed by three heavy hammerd iron gates. This edifice of Ghazi’s is the most perfect example of a fortified gate in the east, nor indeed is there anything like it in the west. Considerable portions of the outer walls also date from Ghazi, particularly in the north where there is a small sortie gate with a hammered iron door. This wall had a vaulted parapet along it and only rectangular towers projecting slightly. Inside the citadel in addition to the restorations of Makam Ibrahim in 610 Ghazi rebuilt the great mosque with its minaret z. It was a very ancient sanctuary and had been a church down to the time of the Mirdasids. Nur al-Din had restored it, but in 609 it had been entirely destroyed by fire. Ghazi’s building is a rare type of mosque: a large central area with a cupola between every pair of cross-vaults, and a court in front of it surrounded by barrel-vaulted halls. The minaret, like all old Syrian minarets, is square in plan and divided by ceilings into stories (here three); at the top is a gallery with a cupola supported by four pillars.

In 650 Hulagu captured and destroyed the fortress so that it had to be entirely restored under Sultan al-Ashraf Khalil (inscriptions on the great gate of 691). By 786 the portions of the walls repaired by Khalil required restoration, which was carried out by Barkh in anticipation of attack by the Mongols. This building was severely damaged in 803 by the Mongols under Timur. In 809 the governor Djakam began to rebuild the walls, when he proclaimed himself Sultan in opposition to al-Nasr Faraj. He vaulted the gate-way and above the rectangular area thus obtained he built a great hall which is still the characteristic feature of the citadel. He further built two isolated talus towers connected by the citadel by posterns in the north (Pl. g) and south (Pl. g). This period of the development of the citadel closes in the reign of al-Mu’ayyad about 820. In 877—880 Saleh Bey began improvements in the hall and built a square bastion with considerable projection in the centre of the north wall (877). Then followed the period of the decisive struggle between the Mamluks and the Ottomans. For his defence Ghazi repaired the citadel and the city walls in a most thorough fashion. In 916 he repaired the hall, deepened the moat in 911—915 and cemented its sides anew, repaired the bridge and built the lofty tower at its head (913). He seems to have entirely rebuilt Djakam’s two talus towers (Pl. g and g) (914) and in 915 built a high storey on Saleh Bey’s north bastion. The main object of these comprehensive additions and restorations must have been to fit the citadel for the use of the new artillery.

Although the citadel was built entirely with a view to defensive operations, the architects of various periods substituted new art upon it. The splendid freestone architecture and the imposing dimensions of the buildings are enhanced by the many valuable materials used and by the use of decorative elements marked by excellent taste and artistic feeling. All things considered, the citadel is one of the most impressive and important monuments of Syrian architecture.

3. The Great Mosque (Pl. g). — The Great Mosque of Aleppo, also called the Mosque of Zachariah after a tomb in it, lies in the bazaars to the west of the citadel. It was founded in the reign of the Umayyad Sulaiman Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik and is said to have been built on the cemetery of the chief church (see Halawiya). No traces have survived of this early building, which is said to have built after the plan of the Umayyad mosque in Damascus. According to a tradition (Ibn Abi Ta’iy), partly confirmed by inscriptive evidence, the present edifice was first begun by the Kadi Abu l-Hasan Ibn al-Khasshab under the Mirdasid Sabil Ibn Mahmud. In the troubled period that preceded the taking of Aleppo by Aksunqur, Malikshah’s governor, little progress seems to have been made with the building. The lower storey of the minaret bears the date 483 and its inscription mentions Malikshah and the Kadi Ibn al-Khasshab, that in the upper ceiling mentions Malikshah’s brother Tutush. The remains of an inscription in a medallion, which we found in 1908 during repairs of the east wall of the east hall belongs to the same period (since plastered over and now invisible). The architecture of the whole building and the absence of later inscriptions show that the appearance of the whole mosque has remained practically unaltered for centuries. Kalain built its mihrab (664), as the old one had been destroyed during a fire begun by the Armenians allied with Hulagu. Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad built the minbar. Four Mamluk maqsuras, which we were still able to see in 1908, have been removed except the Maqsurat al-Khatib (746) during the repairs since undertaken. The central door of the haram dates from the early Mamluk period, in spite of their later inscription (Sultan Murad III, 996).
The ḥaram consists of a hall of three naves each with 18 cross vaultings on solid quadrangular pillars. Malik Śāh’s time the hall is said to have had marble pillars. The mihrāb is a simple, deep, round niche. On the left beside it in the south wall is the tomb of Zachariah. Before the ĥaram lies the splendid wide court with old decorative marble pavement, two roofed wells, a sundial and an open prayer estrade. Around it are halls similar to the ĥaram. The two-naved east hall belongs to the architectural period of Malik Śāh. The north hall with a large water reservoir has also two naves; it was restored by Barākū in 797 but he preserved the old front. The one-naved west hall is a modern building. At the northwest corner of the mosque the four cornered minaret of five stories rises above the flat roof of the halls. Entirely a work of the fifth century, with its rich classicising ornament and its inscriptions in kūfī and naskhi it is quite unique in the whole of Muslim architecture.

A work of the same period, but afterwards essentially altered is the mosque with tomb of ‘al-Ṣāliḥin’, south of the city built by Ahmed, a younger son of Malikshah designated as his successor in 479, with an old and interesting mihrāb.

4. The madrasa al-Ḥalāwīya (PL. W). — The Madrasa al-Ḥalāwīya lies to the west of the great mosque from which it is separated only by a narrow street. During the Arab conquest this was the cathedral church of Aleppo. On its ancient remains Dr. Samuel Guyer writes: “The Madrasa al-Ḥalāwīya contains in the south remains of an ancient Christian ecclesiastical building. The tradition which mentions a church built by Helena, points in this direction and the exedra-like vesting borne on pillars adjoining the main cupola in the west, which strikingly recalls similar motifs in the central churches of Dīyarbekr and Rusafa, must on account of the form of its pillars etc. be traced to a building of the end of the vii century. According to Herzfeld’s investigations, the cupola itself was built contemporaneously with this exedra and the same holds of the aisles north and south of it. We have apparently to recognise in this complex the most western part of a basilica covered by two or three cupolas, parts of the choir of which abutted on the street still running between the madrasa and the chief mosque (cf. Guyer’s article in Bulletin de l’Inst. Franc. d’Archéol. au Caire, 1914)”. It was not till 517 that the Kâdi Ibn al-Khashshāb transformed this church into a mosque in revenge for the destruction of Muslim tombs by the Crusaders. In 543 Nūr al-Din made it a madrasa. The first Madrasa in Aleppo was the Madrasa al-Zadjudjiyya built by Salāmān b. ‘Abd-al-Dabār b. Ortuṣ (510—517) of which no traces have survived (a generation later than the Ṣū‘a’imya of Bagdad). Almost at the same time in 509 the first ḥanḵāh, Ḥanḵāh-al-Balāt was built by a freeman of Rūdān’s under Alp Arslān b. Ibn Rūdān.

5. The Shu‘a‘ība. — Close behind the Antioch gate lie the remains of a building which later writers describe as an ancient arch with a Kufic inscription of later date, called Djamī al-Tūn. In reality it is the Madrasa al-Shu‘a‘ība built by Nūr al-Din in 543, which occupies the site of the oldest mosque in Aleppo built by Abū Ḫaibā (see history). The importance of this building with its luxurious ornament, its architectural features which seem quite archaic for so late a period and its Kufic inscriptions lies in the fact that it is one of the chief evidences for the still unexplained radical change, which took place in the reign of Nūr al-Din, in the epigraphy and style of his inscriptions and in the style of architecture.

6. Ayyūbīd buildings. — The whole wealth of Ayyūbīd buildings in Aleppo can only be touched on here. But as even Cairo itself, otherwise so rich in monuments, is poor in religious buildings, of this period we may here at least mention the chief buildings viz.: the Masjid ‘Aḥi in the west of the city, part of which is older in origin, the sepulchral mosque of al-Zāhir Ghāzī, the Sulṭāniyya (PL. H.) to the south, at the foot of the citadel, and the Zāhiriyya in the Makāmat (PL. 48), the sepulchral mosque of Firdaus (PL. 47) in the same place, the Kāhnāk in the Farafra (PL. 14) and that of Abū Rūdān in the Kallās (PL. 24) as well as the sepulchral mosque of Shaikh Fāris in the north of the city in Bābilā.

7. Mamlūk buildings. — A large number of the buildings belong to the period of the Mamluks and Ottomans. In addition to the many mosques, Djamī Utīrā(i) (PL. I), Alṭunghāli (PL. K), Taqāšt (PL. M) with their varied minarets, which cause the prospect of Aleppo to remind one of Cairo, a beautiful Mārstan Arghīn (PL. f) of the year 755 and a whole series of large warehouses and shops (Khan) (PL. t-e), dwellings, baths and public wells have survived.

Bibliography: No comprehensive modern account of the history and topography of Aleppo has yet been prepared. I have collected the necessary material for the purpose of editing the inscriptions there. Dr. Herzfeld has undertaken the description of the buildings as well as the history of the architecture. The preparatory studies for Aleppo are almost completely and the volume will appear in about two years as a section of Van Berchem’s Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum in the Mémoria de l’Inst. Français d’Archéologie du Caire. The same holds of Ḥama and Damlas. — On the topography of Aleppo: Muhammad Ibn Shaddād al-Ḥalabi (not Saladin’s Kāfī) about 674 wrote al-‘Ālāb al-ḥajīra fī Diwān ‘Umar’s al-Ṣa‘īb’s wa l-Djazira (cf. Sobermann, Ibn Shaddād’s Darstellung im Mittelalter in Centenaria della Nascita di Michele Amari ii. 152—163). His history of the rulers of Aleppo has been lost. The works by Ibn Ḥaṭṭab al-Nāṣirīya and Ibn Shīhna are based on him. The Kādi Abu l-Yumna al-Baṭrīn, a teacher in the mosque of Ḥusna Raw Pasha in Aleppo, produced a version of Ibn Shīhna in the vii century A. H. (the manuscripts of Ibn Shīhna in Berlin, Vienna, Gotha and Copenhagen are copies of it; C. Brockelmann, Geschichte der arab. Literatur, ii. 42), printed in Baitur 1909 by the Jesuits. A. von Kremer translated several chapters in Sitzungsberichte d. Wiener Akadem. Phil. Hist. Klasse, Vol. iv. 1850, p. 212—250 and 304—316; the anonymous Ms. 1683 in Paris is also based on an edition of Ibn Shīhna; Blochet has translated several passages from it in his Histoire d’Alep (see below, p. 226—245) as is Dr. Bischof’s Geschichte von Aleppo (Arabic, written by a Shaikh) an uncritical book without the slightest claims.
to accuracy; the Turkish geography Djjihân Numû, Constantinople 1732, p. 593, and Ritter's detailed account of Aleppo in his Erdkunde. Vol. viii., part. ii. 1733-1777, were the principal older sources that are quoted and digested. Plans of Aleppo, prepared by Rousseau in his Recueil des Mon. de la Soc. de Géogr., Paris 1825, ii. p. 194-244, by Niebuhm, published in his Travels in and Russell's above-mentioned Natural History of Aleppo; as well as a new plan prepared by the engineers of the wilâyêt, which is given here. On the geography cf. also M. Hartmann, Das Läwû Halâb in Zeitschr. d. Geogr. Ges., Berlin 1894: Le Strange, Palestine under the Muslims.

On the History of Aleppo: on the history of the conquest by the Arabs: Leone Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, Milan 1910, Vol. iii., which contains a list of the works consulted (the most important are the writings of Wellhausen and de Goeje), as well as a critical investigation of the sources. For the history to 640 'Omar b. al-Adîm's work is the fullest; of the Arabic text there have been published: the years 16-336 by G. W. Freytag, with Latin translation, introduction and valuable notes (Bonn 1819); Die Regierung des Sâd al-Dawla (356-361), Arabischer Text mit Deutscher Übersetzung und Anmerkungen (Bonn 1820); the text for the reign of Ibn Sâd (381-392) and for the years 634-641 in the Bonn Christomathia (Lokmani Fabulae) 1823, p. 41-46, the text for the years 577-588 in the Christomathia Arabica, Bonn 1834, p. 97-138; the history from the death of Ibn Sâ'd to the end of the Mirdâsids (394-472) from the same work by N. Müller, Bonn 1830, in a Latin translation often abbreviated and inaccurate; the history of the Hamândâs, in German in extracts by G. W. Freytag, Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., x. 432-498; xi. 177-252; the years 488-569 in a French translation by Silvestre de Sacy, printed in Rührich's Beiträge zu den Kreuzzügen, Berlin 1874, Vol. i. 209-246 (see also Recueil des Historiens orientaux, iii. 57-96, 690); Blochet's translation of the years 541-640, entitled Histoire d'Alep, Paris 1900; further extracts in Defrémery, Mémoires d'Histoire orientale, i. 35-65; in the edition of Leo Diaconus, Bonn 1828, p. 359-391. The Christian-arabic sources (Euchychus and his son Yahyâ b. Ba'trik) and the Byzantines are best utilised in Schlumberger, Un Empereur Byzantin au xivme siècle: Nécrophore Phocas, Paris 1890, l'Épêche Byzantine à la fin du xiième siècle, 1896-1905, 1-3. For the Crusading period: Wilken, Geschichte der Kreuzzüge; Reinaud, Extrait de l'Histoire de France, Paris 1839; Recueil des Historiens orientaux, Paris, 1-5; Rührich, Geschichte des Königreiches Jerusalem, Innsbruck 1898; Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Fatimiden-Chalifen, Göttingen. Also the standard works of Weil, A. Müller and Clément Haurt. — Arabic authors: Ibn al-Adîrî, Balladurî, Abu 'l-Fidâî, Ibn Halîb (extract in Orientalia II by Meursinge and Weigers, Amsterdam 1846). Ibn Iyâs (printed in Cairo, except the years 906-922, for this gap cf. Miss. in Paris and Petersburg); Ibn Khaldûn (particularly Vol. iii., History of the separate Dynasties); Makrizî's Sunûk (translation from the beginning to 648, by Blochet, Paris 1908, with valuable extracts from Ibn Wâsî); Quatrémère (translation of the years 648-708 under the title Histoire des Sultanînas Mamlûkînas with valuable notes, Paris 1837); Nuwairî (Miss. in Leiden and Paris); Ibn Taghribîrî's Nuwâ'im, edition of the text from the beginning in 365 by Schwimmer and Mathes (Leiden 1852-1851), p. 365-564 by Popper, Leiden 1909-1915. — For biographical notices: Kamal al-Dîn'omar, Burzûyât al-Tâlib (a few biographies printed in the Recueil des Historiens orientaux, i. 691-782; Ms. in Paris); Ibn Khallânî's well-known work; al-Sâfîdi, Ayyûn al-Ârî (Ms. in Berlin) and al-Wâfi bi 'l-Wâfiyât, various portions of the Ms. in Paris, London etc.; Ibn Taghribîrî, Manhal al-Sâfî (Ms. in Cairo, Paris, Vienna). — Epigraphy in Blochet's Histoire d'Alep, translation of the inaccurate texts of inscriptions by Bischoff. A few inscriptions in M. Freyher von Oppenheim, Inschriften aus Syrien, Arabische Inschriften, edited by M. van Berchem; also Sobernheim in Mélanges Deroenbourg, p. 379-390: Das Heiligtum Shi'îch Muḥâsin in Aleppo.

(M. Sobernheim.)

AL-HALÂBî, IBRAHîm b. MUHAMMAD, an Arab jurist, author of a handbook on the Furû'a, according to the Hanafi school much used in Turkey and often annotated. Its title is Malûka l-ahâr (printed with Šâhîhâ's commentary, Stambul 1241, 1310, by al-Hashâfî, ibid., 1258, 1287, 1310; French transl. by Sauvare, Marseilles 1882, Turkish transl. by Hamid Râghib, printed in Bulaq 1254, Stambul 1269; cf. Hâdîddi Khâlî, vi. 102 et seq.). Al-Halâbî, a native of Halâb (Aleppo) studied in his native city and in Cairo, then came to Constantinople where he filled the offices of preacher and professor and died in 956 (1549) at the age of 90. Besides the textbook already mentioned he composed other works detailed by Brockelmann, Gesch. d. Arab. Lit., ii. 432.

Biographie, cf. Brockelmann, b.}

AL-HALÂBî Nûr-AL-DîN B. BURHân AL-DîN 'Ali b. IBRAHîm b. AHMAD b. 'Ali b. OMRAN AL-MA'âRÎH All. a. 10TH. — Arab author, born in 975-1567 in Cairo, was a professor in the Madrasa al-Šâlîyiya there and died on the 30th Sha'bân 1044 = 17th Febr. 1634. The best known of his numerous works is the biography of the Prophet, entitled Mînân al-Îyâni fi Sirât al-Amin al-Ma'mûn, usually called al-Sira al-Halâbîya, an excerpt from al-Sira al-Shâmilîya of Shams al-Dîn al-Shâliî al-Shâmilî (died 942 = 1536), considerably expanded by numerous additions, completed in 1633, printed in Cairo 1286, 1398. We also still possess from his pen the Sûfî treatise al-Nawî'a al-Awamîya fi Bayân Hunân Turâkh al-Sâdî al-Âdîmîya, see Ahwardt Verzeichn. d. Arab. Hlst. der Kgl. Bibl. zu Berlin, Nr. 10104, and the Odd al-Mardîjîn fîmâ yata'allâk bi 'l-Đinn, a digest of Suyûtî's digest of Shîbi's work, discussed by Nûrêde in the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellsch. (Vol. iii., p. 439 et seq.; see also lxv. 155), see Fihrist al-Kutub al-'Arabiya al-Mahfûzîya fi 'l-Kutubîn 'ala al-Sawâfînîya, vi. 157; vii. 302, Bibl. de l.'Ecole française de St. Sâcy, Paris 1842, Vol. iii., Miss. p. 5. No. 31, 2. Of the many commentaries and supercommentaries which he wrote on textbooks current in his time, the only one that has survived is that on Zakariyâ al-Anṣârî's commentary on Nawâti's Minâhîd al-
HALABI — HALI.

HALETI ʿAZMI-ZADE MÜYÆFQ EKRN, known as ʿAZMI-ZADE or by his pen-name Haleti, a famous Ottoman scholar and poet, born in 977 on the 15th Shabān (23rd Jan. 1570) in Constantinople, the son of Pir Mehmed ʿAzmi Efendi, a literary man of some importance, the tutor of Sultan Murâd III. He had the good fortune to study under the most distinguished scholars of his time, notably the historian Khodja Sâd al-Dîn. Under their direction he laid the foundations for his later encyclopedic knowledge of history. He was a munidirs and kâdî in various places, Damascus, Cairo, Jerusalem, Brusa, Adrianople and Constantinople and reached the highest office viz. Kâdî ʿAsker of Anatolia and later of Rumelia. He died on the 26th Shabān 1040 (30th March 1631) and was buried in Constantinople near the Süleyman Çârşëyy.

Haleti was one of the most cultured and best read men of his time, and rivalled 'Ali Čelebi in intellectual knowledge. He left a library of 3000—4000 volumes, all of which he had annotated in his own hand. As a poet he occupies an honourable place among Ottoman poets of the second rank; to the first he does not belong, however much he may have been esteemed in his own time. His language is fine and dignified. His poems are pitched on a tender key. They are characterized by a certain pessimism of tone. Haleti's main importance in poetry lies in his nihâ and even more in his râbiz (quatrain), composed after Persian models and forming a separate Divân, in which he successfully imitated ʿOmar Khayyâm and won a special place in Ottoman literature from which he has never been ousted. He also left a fairly good Divân which is still popular (printed Bûlak 1528), and a Sâbî-Nâmë (Book of the Cup-bearer) in Maâhmarî verses, after the Persian model, a typical example of this style of poetry, and a Fend-Nâmë in Mathnawi verses (moral precepts). He added a considerable number of new verses to it, although he did not complete the romantic Maâhmarî Mihr e Muḥfiz (Sun and Jupiter), the translation of the work of the Persian poet Muḥammad ʿAssâr, which his father had left unfinished.

His prose works are all those of a professional scholar: marginal notes on the Minâr Ibn Malîk and the Dürer see Çihans, a commentary on the Maâhmarî 'L-Lâh, additions to the commentary on the Höyây, the Miškâ-i Şahrûk and the Mişbâh, further treatises on the exegesis of the Úrûn and collections of letters (Munshâsî ʿAzmi-zâde Efendi) as models of style.


HALF, HALI [see HILF.]

HALI (Haly, Hal, al-Hâli), a town in Arabia, lying to the south of Kufa and near the border between the Hidjaz and Yemen on the Wadi 'Aqsh, with the small harbour of Marsâ Hali and the mountain spur of Ra's Hali (the latter according to Niebuhr in N. Lat. 18° 36'). Ibn Baṭûta, who visited the town on his journey to Yemen in 1311 A.D., gives it the name Hali b. Yaʿqûb and
describes it as a flourishing seaport with fine buildings and a splendid mosque. The Saifan, who was at that time ruling the town, belonged to the Kinana [q.v.] and was a gifted poet and a model of Arabian hospitality. In Niebuhr’s time it was a dependency of the Sharif of Mecca, who had a large garrison here. In 1805 or 1806 the town with the whole coast was taken from the Sharif by the Wathibis [q.v.]. In 1815 Muhammad ‘Ali’s Egyptian troops regained it after having been driven out in the preceding year by the neighbouring mountain tribes of ‘Asir [q.v.] and in the same year Burckhardt during this stay there found the tax-collectors of the Sharif of Mecca again installed in it. In 1824 and 1825, on their campaigns against the tribes of ‘Asir, the Egyptian troops passed through Halil. During the Egyptian campaign against ‘Asir in 1834 Halil was burnt to the ground by Ahmad Pasha’s troops.


HALIL, Sayyid AlṬaf Husain Angārī, the foremost living Urdu poet, was in his youth a pupil of the poet Ghālib [q.v.]; at the age of 40 he came under the influence of Sir Saiyid Ahmad Khan [q.v.], at whose suggestion he wrote his Musaddas, entitled Maddu ‘ajar-islām (“The flood-tide and ebb of Islam”), first printed in 1296 (—1879); this poem embodies the ideals of the reform movement in Muslim India and has exercised a wide spread influence on contemporary thought and activity; it has frequently been reprinted and later editions have been considerably enlarged. In 1903 he published his Divān, accompanied by a prose introduction on the nature of poetry and the characteristic features of poetic literature in various languages, including Urdu. Among his prose writings are Ḥayā‘ī-Ṣiḍ‘ār (1886), ‘Īḏgār-‘Īḏgār (1897), and Ḥayā‘ī-Īḏgādār (a life of Sir Saiyid Ahmad Khan) (1901). He has been living for some time past, in retirement in his native town, Pānpat.


Al-HALIM (a. s., the mild, one of the names of God, see i. 304).

HALIMA, a woman of the Banu Sa‘d b. Bakr, according to Tradition, Muhammad’s nurse. In a year of famine she came to Mecca with other women of her tribe to seek foster-children and finally adopted the orphan Muhammad, who soon brought great happiness to her household. During his stay with her, two angels came to him, opened his breast and took out a black clot of blood. Although in the later accounts of Muhammad’s wars there are one or two illusions to his foster-kinship with the Banu Sa‘d, the whole story is simply an evangelistic infantiae, the motif of which, as the story itself shows, is that every true prophet should have once been a shepherd. The custom of sending children to Beduin nurses is occasionally mentioned (Tabari, i. 851; cf. Burckhardt’s Reisen in Syrien, p. 344 et seq. for the Sharif-families), but was only practiced by rich or distinguished people. The cleaning of the breast, which is placed at a different period in other traditions (Tabari, i. 1154 et seq., 1157) is apparently only a materialising of Sura xxiv. 1.

Bibliography: Ibn Higham, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 105—107, 355; Wellhausen, Wakte, p. 350, 364; Ibn Sa‘d, ed. Sachau, i. 69—71; Tabari, Annalen, ed. von Goethe, i. 960—972, 1143; Causin de Perceval, Essai sur l’histoire des Arabes, i. 286 et seq.; Sprenger, Muhammad, i. 119, 163 et seq.; Caetani, Annali dell’Islam, i. 154 et seq. (Fr. Bühl.)

HALIMA, the name of the daughter of Al-Hārith b. Dījāhala, king of the Ghassān, celebrated for her remarkable beauty. It was from her — or according to others, from a monkey, called Marūd Ḥalima after her — that the Yawm Ḥalima, one of the most celebrated battles of the pre-Islamic Arabs, the Ayyūn al-Arab [q.v.], received its name. It was a battle between the Ghassānids led by the above named king and the Lakhmids commanded by al-Mundhir b. Mā‘ al-Samā‘. The cause and the course of the battle are differently given in the different accounts. The fray is said to have been so fiercely fought that the dust raised hid the sun and the stars became visible by day. A well known proverb says: Ma‘ yawm Ḥalima hā‘īr “the day of Halima is no secret”. This is said of anything which every one knows.

Bibliography: al-Maidānī, Ma‘ṣūma al-Anthālī (Caio 1284), ii. 189 and 334; cf. Freytag, Arabische Proverbia, ii. 611, iii. 531; Ibn al-Ṭabari, Chronik, ed. Rhummel, ii. 104; Mittwoch, Freiheit Arabumm paganorum (Berlin 1899), p. 22. (E. Mittwoch.)

Al-ḤALLĀDI (the carder) Abu ‘l-Muqīth al-Ḥusain b. Manṣūr b. ʿAlā‘amī al-Baḥrī, a Persian mystic and theologian who wrote in Arabic. He was born about 844 (858) at al-Tār near al-Baṣrā (Fārs), the grandson of a fire-worshipper, or descendant, it is said, of the Shafti Abu Aiyūb. From 260 (873) to 284 (897) he lived in retirement (ḥalawma) with Sufi teachers (Tustari, ʿAmr Makki, ʿUmaīn). Then he broke with them and went out into the world to preach (dāʿawā) asceticism and mysticism, thus assuming the part of a Kūrti (Ṭalikī), Ahwāz, Fars, India (Gudjarāt) and Turkestan. On his return from Mecca to Baghdād in 296 (908) disciples (Hallādīya) rapidly gathered round him. He was then accused of being a charlatan by the Muʿtazila, excommunicated by a ta‘wīfī of the Imāmīya and a fatwā of the Zāhirīya, and twice arrested by the ʿAbbāsid police. Brought before the vizier Ibn Ḥāṣim and put on the pillory in 301 (913), he spent eight years in prison in Baghdād. The patronage of Shaghab, mother of al-Muktadr, and of the ʿAbdīl Naṣr brought upon him the hatred of the vizier Ḥāmid, who had him executed after a seven months’ trial on a fatwā approved by the Mālikī Kādi Abū ʿUmar. On Tuesday 24th Dhu ’l-Ka‘da 309 (26th March 929), on the esplanade of the new prison of Baghdād (on the right bank of the river) opposite the Bāb al-Tāk, al-Hallādī was flogged, mutilated, exposed on a gibbet (maṣṭūf) and finally decapitated and burned. This “sacrification” gave rise, as in the case of Christ, to legends of substitution (cf. Rev. Hist. des Religions, i. xi., 195—207). His persecuted disciples gathered round
Abū 'Umrān al-Hāshimī in al-Ahwāz, and Fāris al-Dinawarī in Khurāṣān. It was from this last group that the mystic revival of Persian poetry originated with Abū Sa'īd [q.v.] and of Turkish with Ahmed Yesevi and Nesimi [q.v.].

Madākh (doctrines) of the Hallidjīya:

a. in Fīkh, the five farādī, even the Ḥadījī may be replaced by other works (＝ ishāf al-wasātī).

b. in Kalām, God’s transcendence (tanāzī) above the limits of creation ( áll, 'ard), the existence of an uncreated Divine spirit (rūḥ nāfṣka), which becomes united with the created rūḥ (spirit) of the ascetic (khatāl al-hikmat fi l-rūḥānī); the saint (qayyūl) becomes the living and personal witness of God (kwāna kwānā) whence the saying: Amīn 'l-Hāshī, “I am Creative Truth” (cf. Tawāsin, VI, 32).

c. in Taṣawuf, perfect union with the divine will (‘āin al-dīn) through desire of and submission to suffering. The ḥikr given them by Shaikh Sanā'ī is modern.

Few men in Islam have been so much discussed; in spite of the iṣma of the judges who condemned him, popular devotion has canonised him. The following are the principal doctors who have taken part in this cause célèbre: (k = taufīk, w = wiliyāy, i = tauswīyī):


Among European scholars different verdicts have been passed upon him. A. Müller and d’Herbelot think him to have been secretly a Christian; Reiske accuses him of blasphemy, Tholuck of paradox; Kremer makes him a monist, Kazanzki a neoplatonist, and Browne “a dangerous and able intriguer”. Halādīj, a dialectician and exoteric, (cf. Lullius, Swedenborg), endeavoured to bring dogma into harmony with Greek philosophy on a basis of mystic experience; he was in this a precursor of Ghaszend, and although he would have repudiated their caustic esoterism, the Sufis have made them their “martyr” par excellence. — Of his works (cf. Kitāb al-Fihrist 1, 192) there remain the Kitāb al-Ta‘wūsīn (ed. Massignon, Paris, 1913), 27 Riwāyat of the year 290 (902); 400 fragments in prose and 175 in verse of rare beauty.


(LOUIS MASSIGNON.)

ḤAMĀ (also called Ḥamāt or Epiphania) is built on both sides of the Orontes (Nahr al-Asī); the larger part of the town lies on the left bank (cf. Plan), which in places rises as high as 120 feet above the river. Three bridges connect the two sides. No traces remain of the mediaeval citadel and only a mound of ruins marks the site of the palace. Their stones are said to have been used to build the palace of the family of ʻAbd al-Kādir al-Gilānī who immigrated from Baghdad; in this palace and also in that of the palace of the ʻAmā family there are two fine ǧūr (rooms built for the hot season) ornamented with wood carvings. The water of the Orontes is led to the gardens and fields through aqueducts, to which it is raised by water wheels (nībīra), whose singing noise has a peculiarly soporific effect. There are also small aqueducts in Antioch (The Crusaders brought them to Germany; they are still used in a little valley in Franken near Bayreuth). In Abu ʻl-Fīdā’s time there were 32; now there are about 9 such water wheels. Ḥamā has 51,000 inhabitants (about 6000 Christians, the remainder Muslims); it is connected by railroad with Aleppo, Ḥimṣ (where there is a branch line to Tripolis) as well as with Damascus and Bārat. A high road leads to Lattakya via Dījas al-Shughīr. On the prospects of Ḥamā see M. Hartmann’s Reisebriefe aus Syrien (Berlin 1919), p. 50–57.

Historical. Ḥamā was first settled by Ḥittites; it is the most southerly place where Ḥittite inscriptions have been found. In the wars against Salammassar II in the years 855 and 845 B.C. king Irkhuleni of Ḥamā took part as an ally of Hazad of Damascus; in 738 King Eni-El paid tribute to Tiglath Pileser. In 720 a rebellion by king Iltu-Bidu was put down by Sargon and the town incorporated in the Assyrian empire. Ḥamā called the “great” in the Bible is frequently mentioned there. In the Hellenistic period it received the name Epiphania from Antiochus IV Epiphanes. In 16 A.H. (unlike Ḥimṣ it was a little town of no importance) it was surrendered to the Muslims and remained till the 17th century under the administration of the dīnār (military district) of Ḥimṣ. In the time of the Ḥamādīn Saif al-Dīn (333–356, q. v.) it was incorporated in the administrative district of Aleppo, in which it remained till the death of Ridyān, in 507. The ruler of Damascus the Atabeg Tughrīk (q. v.) seems then to have taken the town. It was taken from him in 509 by the Saldjāk general Bursbūk and given to Khirkhān ibn Karājdī, governor of Ḥimṣ [q. v.], who transferred it to his brother Shīhāb al-Dīn Māmādī. During his reign the Franks in 511 took advantage of an eclipse of the moon, to penetrate into the suburb of Ḥamā but they had to retreat without taking the town itself. When Māmādī died in 518, Tughrīk at once marched his troops into the town and took possession of it. On his death in 522 his son Būrā [q. v.] succeeded him. In 524 Būrā made an alliance
with Zangi and sent the governor of Ḩamā, his son Sewindj, to his support. Zangi treacherously imprisoned him, entered Ḥamā with Khirkiān and handed the city over to the latter, as had been agreed, but soon afterwards made him a prisoner to gain Ḥamā for himself. Once more he lost the city for a brief period. Būrī’s son Ṣunā’il took possession of it in 527 and held it till 529. Zangi again took it in the latter year and placed a strong garrison there. The ownership of the city next passed to Nūr al-Dīn and to his son Ṣunā’il, till Saladin took it in 572. Two years later he granted Ḥamā in fee to his nephew al-Malik al-Muẓaffar, whose descendants retained it in their possession and made it their aim to keep on good terms with the great Ayyūbīd rulers. Recognising their weakness they did not attempt to resist Hūlāghī Khān and after his defeat they acknowledged the Mamlūk Sultāns as overlords. The main line became extinct in 698; the nephew of the last Sulṭān was the celebrated author Abu ‘l-Fīda’ Ṣunā’il [q. v.] who accompanied Sulṭān Muḥammad al-Nāṣīr on his campaigns and was bound to him by ties of the closest friendship. Al-Nāṣīr Muḥammad granted him Ḥamā with the rank and title of Sulṭān. Under him the town enjoyed great prosperity. His tomb is still preserved in Ḥamā (see Graf Milline in the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, 1908, p. 657—660). His son al-Malik al-Afdal Muḥammad drew the wrath of the Sulṭān upon himself by his incompetence and was finally banished to Damascus. After his death (742) Ḥamā was ruled by governor of the Mamlūk Sultāns. In importance it was overtaken by Tripolis and about 750 was considered a governorship of the second class. Under Ottoman rule Ḥamā at first continued to be a province under a Paḫā. At the present day it is a sandjak under a mutaṣṣarīf of the wīlāyet of Damascus.

The Great Mosque. The Ḥaram has been evolved from a Christian basilica of unusual form: 3 naves of different breadth, 8 supports with 5 cupolas in the centre and covered by five cross vaultings on each side. The west wall seems to have been the narthex wall of the church. The south wall dates from the pre-Christian period so that, as in Damascus, the building is temple, church and mosque. In the east, standing alone, is an old four cornered minaret with ūṭūr inscription, probably of the 4th century.

The beautiful court is surrounded by vaulted halls, an estrade with two mihrābs before the Ḥaram, a second with a basin and isolated mihrāb at the north hall, a khazna on 8 ancient pillars. In the east hall a turbe and a hall of prayer with heavy bronze windows of the Mamlūk period. From the west hall one enters through a room the mausoleum of al-Malik al-Muẓaffar III (683—698) with splendid cenotaphs carved in wood; a second minaret rises outside in the centre of the north hall; its form and inscription proclaim it a Mamlūk building. A peculiar feature of the architecture of Ḥamā finds marked expression in the mosque: the adornment of the walls by mosaic in sections or the alternation of black basalt and white limestone.

The Djiām al-Nūrī is built on the left bank of the Orontes on sloping ground and high substructions. The building was founded by Nūr al-Dīn and, in spite of the many alterations, still contains considerable portions of the old building, for example, the long haram, the cross vaulting of which belongs to a later period, three cupolas of different forms in the east hall, the substructions of the east and north sides and the north outer wall of the mosque. The lower part of the minaret with its square white blocks is perhaps also old. The mosque contains the beautiful remains of a wooden mihrāb given by Nūr al-Dīn, and a richly decorated mihrāb with decorated marble pillars given by Malik al-Muẓaffar Taklī al-Dīn (626—642) and in the eastern ante-room a mihrāb of marble columns the capital of which bears an inscription of Abu ‘l-Fīda’.

Bibliography: See under Ḥalab. Some of its numerous inscriptions have been edited by van Berchem in Freih. v. Oppenheim’s Syrische Inschriften (see under Ḥalab), p. 22—34. (M. Sofferneiheim).

ḤAMADHĀN, the Hagmatān of the Old Persian inscriptions, NOBTS OF THE BIBLE (Ezra vi, 2).

Aṭṣārīn in Herodotos, Ecbatana in the classical authors, lies in a fertile plain at the foot of Mt. Elwend [q. v.]. This is not the place to discuss its pre-Muslim history for which the reader may be referred to Pauly-Wissowa, v. 2155, and Streek in Zeitschr. f. Assyir., xx. 367 et seq. Perso-Arabic tradition still knows of the age and ancient greatness of Hamadhān. A Persian author quoted by Yākīt (cf. Mūgām, iv. 983) says that Dājiw created Sārū (Sārū, Sārīk is the name of the citadel of Hamadhān). Sārū surrounded it with a girdle, Bahman b. Isfandiyār completed it, i.e. Dājiw (Dijāshīd, Vima) built the citadel (in the old Persian tradition also Vima is the builder of the castle, Vara), Darius fortified it with walls, and Bahman, the ancestor of the Sāsānids, completed it. According to another tradition, Darius rebuilt the city, which had been lying in ruins since the time of Bokht-Naṣr in order to have a safe asylum for his harem and treasures during the war with Iskandar. For this purpose a palace was built in the centre of the town with not less than 500, according to others, as many as 1000 treasure-rooms and 28 double iron doors fell high. Whether the other citadel of Hamadhān actually dated back to such early times, must remain uncertain; it is certain, however, that it was destroyed by Aqgh Muḥammad Khān in 1789 and that the remains, now called al-Muṣallā (the place of prayer) are to be seen outside the town.

Another monument of ancient times, of which the Arabs give an account is the Lion Gate (Bāb al-Asad), which gave entrance to the town from the Elwend side and was adorned by a colossal figure of a lion. The inhabitants looked on this figure as a talisman, which protected the town from misfortune and cold, so that no wall commotion was aroused when the Caliph al-Muṭṭaf ordered it to be brought to Bagdad in a car drawn by elephants. Fortunately they were able to convince him of the impossibility of carrying out his plans so that the lion remained in Hamadhān. Shortly afterwards (319 = 931) the Bāb al-Asad was destroyed by the rude Dailamī warriors of Merdawīd and the lion thrown down. (Mas‘ūdī, Murūdī, ed. Paris, ix. 21). The inhabitants, however, to this day esteem a figure of a lion lying outside the town as a talisman against hunger and cold (Curzon, Persia, i. 568). Cf. the picture in Jackson, Persia Past and Present, p. 197.
Other old buildings mentioned by the Arab geographers were not in Hamadhān itself but in the neighbourhood, e.g. the fire-temple of Barāhān or Furđāgān which was destroyed by the Turk Burūn in 858 (958) (cf. Vākūt, op. cit., i. 540; iii, 380); buildings erected by Bahram Gōr at Dēwān from foundations, with Persian inscriptions and others besides. The fullest account of these is given by the geographer Ibn al-Fakīh, a native of Hamadhān (ed. de Goeje, p. 217 et seq.). Old Persian inscriptions of Arta xerxes II have, it need hardly be mentioned, been found in Hamadhān and others of Darius and Xerxes on Mount Elwend.

As the centre of a well populated district Hamadhān developed at a very early period and is said to have been four parasangs in length and in breadth to have stretched as far as where later the villages of Zainawbāb, Sangbāb, Bar dāhān etc. lay. After the battle of Nehāwānd in 23–644, the town fell into the hands of the Muslims (cf. al-Baladhurī, ed. de Goeje, 309 et seq.), but continued to be the market of the country round. According to Ibn Haḵḵal, it was one parasang square and consisted of the town proper and suburbs (rābaḵ). Four gates led into the town. The cold climate and the heavy snowfalls during the long winters did not make it a very inviting residence so that it played the modest part of the chief town of a province until, in the last years of Saddāb power, it was chosen as a residence by these Turks, who were used to a cold climate. Royal palaces were then built in the city, but nothing has remained of these. They were all destroyed by the Mongols when they took and sacked Hamadhān in 617 (1220) (cf. Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornborn, xii. 248 et seq.).

The town however afterwards recovered, as is clear from Ḩam Allāh Mustawī’s description, but remained what it had been under the Arabs and still is, the market place of a fertile district. The local industries are leather and metal (gold, silver and copper) work. According to Ker Porter, the population in the beginning of the sixteenth century was about 40,000, according to Curzon in 1889, there was no more than 20,000. Among these are a considerable number of Jews (1500–2000), who are attracted not only by the favourable conditions of trade, but also by the alleged grave of Mordecai and Esther in the middle of the town, not far from the Masjīd-i Džum’a to which also many Jews from other countries make a pilgrimage. Cf. Jewish Encycl., v. 233; at Hamadhān there is also the tomb of the celebrated philosopher Avicenna who died here in 428 (1037). Cf. the picture in Brugsch, Keis nach Persien, i. 362. Bibliography: The History of Hamadhān by Abu Ṣuḏāḥī Sirīyā b. Shahardār has unfortunately not survived. Cf. also: Bibliogr. Arābī, ed. de Goeje, particularly Vol. v. 217 et seq.; Vākūt, Muṣḥām, iv. 951 et seq.; Kazz wini, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 323 et seq.; Ḩam Allāh Mustawī in Schefer, Sissatennameh Suppl., p. 198 et seq., and Le Strange in the Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 1902, p. 240. The older travellers in Ritter, Erdreise, li. 95 et seq. and Curzon, Persia, i. 568, Note 2; Brugsch, Keis nach Persien, i. 362 et seq.; J. de Morgan, Explication scientif. etc., iv. 235 et seq.; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 194 et seq.; Jackson, Persia Past and Present, p. 144 et seq.

Hamadhān (358–398) Abu ʿl- Faḍīl Abū Ṣuḏāḥī b. Abū Fāris Abū Ṣuḏāḥī b. Abū Fāris, called Bāḏr al-Zamān, poet and elegant writer. He studied at his native place Hamadhān with the grammarian Abū Ṣuḏāḥī Abū Ṣuḏāḥī Abū Ṣuḏāḥī. He then worked in Fars and Ctesiphon, from where he for a time acquired the favour of the Sāḥib b. ʿAllādī b. ʿAllādī. He then went to Dārūs, where he found a patron in Abū Saʿīd Muhammad b. ʿAllādī. In 382 he went to Nisābūr, where he joined the Šāhīrīzī, the leading adīb of the time, and was invited to contribute to his periodical Al-Qāṣem, which was published in the various branches of Al-Qāṣem, which was published in the various branches of adab; in the account which he gives of the match (transl. by v. Kremer, Kulturgesch., ii. 471 et seq.) he represents himself as victor; but though this appears doubtful, the affair brought him credit and when Ḥāfiz al-Ṣāḥīf b. ʿAllādī died in the following year he succeeded to his honours. He found patrons in the Itilāf b. Ḩalīm and in the cities of Khurāsān and Chezān, and finally settled at Herāt, where he married the daughter of Abū Saʿīd Abū Saʿīd Muhammad b. ʿAllādī. Muhammad b. ʿAllādī.

Of the works by him which have come down to us the Maḥānāt would seem to have been dedicated to Kāla b. Abū Ṣuḏāḥī, prince of Saḵtaḵt, whose honourable treatment of the author is also described in the Letters (no. 173). The word Maḥānāt which before his time seems to mean “sermon” (Murādī al-Dhahabī, v. 421) or “discourse” (Dāḥīr, Būḥārī, p. 218, 19) from its employment as the title of Hamadhān’s compositions came to mean something like the Greek Mimes, i.e. an entertaining dialogue. Hamadhān claims to have composed 400 of these, no two alike; this boast is not borne out by the surviving collection, which numbers 51 pieces, some of them duplicates. The subject is ordinarily kudāya, i.e. ingenious devices for obtaining money, wherein the hero displays some learning, eloquence or wit; some however might better be described as scenes of contemporary life in Baghdaḵ, while some are placed in the past, e.g. one in which the poet Ḥāfiz b. Ṣaḵtaḵt figures, one which deals with Muhammad b. Ṣaḵtaḵt b. Ṣaḵtaḵt b. Ṣaḵtaḵt (died 257), and one which reproduces a scene in the life of Saʿīd al-Dawla (died 356). The subjects include theological discussions, sermons, poetical pieces, as well as the devices of beggars and thieves. According to Ḥusṭī (Zahr al-Adāb, i. 254, 1505) they were suggested by the Arbaḵ’, the letters of Ibn Durūd.

The collection of Letters (233 in number) consists mainly of private communications, written however with sufficient elaboration to justify publication. The persons to whom they were addressed were in most cases men of some eminence, though only a few are still remembered, e.g. the historian Ibn Miskawī, and the adīb Abū Bakr Ḥāfizī. The contents are usually only of private interest, e.g. requests for the loan of books, or complaints of the amount of the harrādī; some however deal with matters of more general importance, e.g. no. 167 which describes the spread of the Shiʿī heresy.

Selections from his poems were made by Ṣaḵtaḵt (Yatmaa, iv. 195–214), and some others are inserted by Ṣaḵūt in his biography; the divān which has been published (Cairo 1903 as ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Ṣeḵwān and Muhammad Ṣeḵwān) fills
The European literature on Hamadhanī is enumerated by Brockelmann (i. 94). The biography by Yaṣṣūṭ (Udalib i. 94–118) is based chiefly on Thālabī, but also on Shirūyā’s History of Hamadhanī. (D. S. Margoliouth)

Ḥamā’il, talismans. The use of amulets is very widespread in the lands of Islam. In North Africa they are called ḥurṣ, among the Arabs in the East ḥamāyā or ḥātṣ, ṣāḥba or ṣāḥiba, and in Turkey, yafsa, niqka or ḥamāil. They are often carried in little bags, lockets or purses, which are worn round the neck or fastened to the arm or turban. Among rich people they are of gold or silver. Children are given these amulets as soon as they are forty days old; the crudest articles may be used as amulets, such as a shell, a piece of bone, sewn into leather and fastened under the left arm (see Emily Ruete, Memoirs of an Arabian Princess, trans. by L. Strachey (New York, 1904), p. 68). Bedouin girls have an amulet which they call ṣāḥba and prize highly; it is a book of prayers 7 cm. long and 4.5 cm. broad enclosed in a gold or silver box and is worn as a brooch.

The prayers, signs and figures on these talismans are of very different origin and their investigation offers great difficulties. We find on them divine names, names of angels, verses from the Korān, astrological symbols, Kaballistic letters, magic squares, signs of geomancy, figures of animals and men (cf. Dżądwal, i. 992 et seq.). According to Muslim tradition, God has 99 names, which in reality are only epithets, such as “the Great,” “the Wise,” “the Knowing,” “the Merciful”; some authors like Tirmidhī and Ibn Māḏja enumerate them all. (The Douay Magic and Religion dans l’Afrique au Nord, p. 200; see also Redhouse in Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 1880; cf. the article Allāh, i. 302 et seq.). These names may be used as one pleases or arranged according to the numerical value of the letters composing them. Besides these, God has a name not to be spoken, which men do not know but which is revealed only to prophets and saints.

The names of the angels are also numerous. The best known are those of the four archangels Michael, Dżābrā’il, Azizā’īl and Israil, which are found on many amulets. Besides these there are host of others, which are given in the angelologies. There are several works of this kind in Arabic which are ascribed to supposed authors like Andrūn or Andahirush; they contain a doctrine, which is derived from the notion of the gnostic aeons. There are angels who preside over the planets; others preside over the months or the days of the week. Seven are given for each day; their names, barbaric in their sound, frequently appear in pairs e.g. ‘Ṭalīkh and Iṣḥq, ‘Īṣṭar and Māṭar, ‘Īṣṭahsh and Yākintah, a kind of combination such as we find in the Gog and Magog of the Bible and the ‘Īṣṭāḏu and Maḏāḏu of Arab Tradition. An angel very prominent in the world of magic, who presides sometimes over the planet Jupiter and sometimes over Mercury, and whom the Arabs seem sometimes to have confused with Mīkhā’īl, is Meṣṭaḥrīn. He is one of the great figures in Kaballistic literature. We find him also in the Zohar, where he figures as part of a kind of demiurg. (Cf. Renan, Vie de Jésus, p. 247, note 4; Les Aphorès, p. 170; Schwab, Vocabulaire de l’Angélogie, p. 170).—Two other angels, who have a history of their own, are also mentioned in the Korān likewise appear on talismans, namely Hārūṭ and Mārūṭ [q. v.].—Besides the angels, several mythical beings are also invoked, notably the seven sleepers (Aṣḥāb al-Kāfī, q. v., i. 478 et seq.).

Of the verses of the Korān the most efficacious as amulets are the short sūras exlii. and cxiv.: *Say: I take refuge (d’āḥa) in the Lord of the dawn etc.*—Say: I take refuge in the Lord of men, the king of men etc.” These two sūras are called al-muṣrūwūdhetān ("the two who preserve"). In the first the evil women are mentioned "who blow upon knots", it is believed that it is particularly efficacious against theills of the flesh; the other is credited with more power against psychic afflictions. Besides these the Sūrah Yāsīn is highly esteemed by pious Muslims. This is also true of the Pāṭika, the Ayat al-Kurūs (Sūra II. 256) and the verse-name, Ayat al-ʿArš (Sūrah IX. 130). Other verses than these are also used in special circumstances.

The astrological signs, the signs of the planets and of the zodiac are well-known; they are naturally used for talismans. We often find quite peculiar signs which may be traced to different Kaballistic alphabets; these frequently turn out to be transformations or corruptions of Hebrew or Kufic letters. Kaballistic alphabets are given by Ibn al-Walīṣiyah in his Kitāb Shawk al-Muṣṭahām. Small circles, or rings or ornaments are often found behind the Hebrew letters; these scrolls are called "little moons" or "crows". According to the Sefer Yetzirā, every letter in a talisman ought to have its crown (Sefer Yetzirā, transl. by Mayer Lambert, p. 114).

Geomantic figures formed by points arranged in different groups are also sometimes used. Geomancy, Arabic ʿImr al-Ramāl, is divination from points formed in sand. Four lines are drawn in the sand, points marked at regular intervals and some of them wiped out at random. The remainder form definite figures to which names and different meanings have been given. These figures are used on talismans; for further details see RAMĂL.

Magic squares (waṣṣ, wīṣ, q. v.) are also often met with. They consist of 9 or 16 compartments. Usually the same number is added to each of the 9 or 16 numbers of which they consist. This gives the thing a more learned look. Thus they begin with 9 instead of 1 and run from 9 to 24 instead of 1 to 16. Instead of numbers, letters are often written in the squares, e.g. the four letters of the name Allāh, aṭḥ, four times in different order. The name of magic squares has been thoroughly studied by the Arabs, for we see from the Ikhāṣa al-Ṣafā that squares of 9 columns were known.

Forms of men and animals are rarely found in North Africa on talismans; but in the East we find them on amulets and charms, which have been produced under the influence of Persian art. Looking-glasses, cups and seals to which magic
power is ascribed, are often adorned with them. For this purpose figures of angels or animals, particularly griffins with human heads or the signs of the zodiac are used. A talisman, which Reinaud saw, represented a man drawing something out of a well; this talisman had the peculiar property of helping to locate hidden treasure. Several other examples are given in Herklotz, The Customs of the Musulmans of India, p. 339 et seq.

The human hand is a very popular symbol among Muslims. It is carried around the neck, cut out of gold or silver or engraved on a medallion; it is said to avert the evil eye. This charm is usually called “the hand of Fāṭima.” The Shiṣis interpret the five fingers as the five saints; Muḥammad, ʿAlī, Fāṭima, ʿAbdul and Hūsain.

To sum up, it may be said that the subjects used, except the verses from the Korān, may for the most part be traced back to Gnostic or Talmudic sources. According to Arab tradition, Adam himself discovered or rather revealed the talisman. According to the Abrégé des Merveilles (transl. Carra de Vaux, p. 142), ʿAnāḵ, the son of Adam, stole from Eve, while she slept, the charms she used to conjure spirits; but he made a bad use of them. Solomon was a great magician, according to Muslim belief; his ring plays a great part in Talmudic legends and Arabic tales. The djinni, who appears in the story of the fisherman in the “Arabian Nights,” was confined in a vase, which had been sealed with Solomon’s ring. The talisman, still known as Solomon’s seal and worn by Muslims and Jews alike, represents a six-pointed star. The Berbers also, according to the Abrégé des Merveilles, were very skilled in magic and, when they threw their talismans into the Nile, they were able to bring numerous plagues upon Egypt.

In Arabic literature, there are various treatises on the science of talismans. The most celebrated writers on this subject are Maslama al-Majriti (died 1007 A. D.), who brought the Ikhwan al-Safa to Spain, the “forger” Ibn al-Wahshiyah, the author of the Agriculture of Nabataa; and al-Buni (q.v., i. 793). A number of amulets preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris are ascribed — certainly wrongly — to the great theologian al-Ghazālī.

Muslim theology, which prohibits sorcery, tolerates the use of amulets. They are usually prepared by dervishes, who belong to various brotherhoods, and are only of value when they are received from their hands.


**AL-ḤAML (A.), the Ram (Aries), the first constellation of the zodiac, after the Greek μισθ. It contains 13 stars which make up the figure and five others outside it. The ram is represented with its body facing the west but its head is turned back. The two bright stars on the horn (β and γ) are called al-Sharafān, “the two signs,” because they betoken the approach of the equinoxes; the bright star α outside the ram is called ḫalijil, “the burls”; sometimes it is included with α and β under the name al-Aghāṣ, “the signs.” The stars δ, ε, κ in the tail, which form an equilateral triangle with δ on the thigh, are called al-Batāin, the belly, i.e. of the ram. Al-Sharafān and al-Batāin are also the names of the first two stations of the moon.

Bibliography: Kaswin, Adybi,’ al-Makh- tālit, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 35, 42; L. Ideler, Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der Sternnamen, p. 132. (J. RUSKA.)

**AL-ḤAMĀN (A.), the dove, particularly the ring-dove. A distinction is made between tame doves which live in dove-cotes and wild doves. The dove is one of the cleverest of birds and one can find its way home from the most distant parts. To find its bearings, it flies upwards in spirals like a man climbing a minaret; when it finds the direction of its home, it darts off thither in a straight line and reaches its goal in the shortest possible time. Only clouds, which obscure its view, or birds of prey can cause it to lose its way.

According to Muḥannā b. Zuhair, there are no tokens of love between man and woman which are not also to be observed in doves. The cock knows the brooding-place of the hen and alternates with it in sitting on the eggs; they also build the nest together in proportion to the size of their bodies, by first scraping a hole and filling it with straw and leaves. The dove lays two eggs after fertilization, one containing a cock, the other a hen. The feeding of the young is done principally by the cock. Even the young ones can distinguish between eagles and hawks; if they see a white hawk (hākin), they die of fright. The worst enemy of the doves is the marten (al-dalāj). It enters the dove-cots and leaves not a dove alive, although there are hundreds of them.

Allāh sent two wild pigeons to the opening of the cave in which Muḥammad was concealed; the pigeons of the sacred area in Mecca are descended from these. Proverbial expressions are “safer than the doves of Mecca” and “tamer than the doves of Mecca.” The use of pigeons as letter-carriers and as objects of the chase is often mentioned. Ḥārūn al-Raschid is said to have been very fond of doves. The medical applications are numerous.

Bibliography: Ikhwan al-Safa, ed. Bombay, ii. 133; Kaswin, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 410; Da-miri, Ḥayāt al-Hayāwām, ed. Cairo, i. 215; Ibn al-Balṭār, in Leclerc, Notices et extraits, i. 457; G. Jacob, Studien in arab. Geographie, iii. 104. (J. RUSKA.)

**ḤĀMĀN, the Persian minister hostile to the Jews in the book of Esther, according to the Korān (xl. 25) acted with Ḫārūn (Korāḥ) on Fir’aun’s council and filled the office of grand-vizier. These two learned of the approaching birth of Mūsā and advised that the boys should be slain and the girls allowed to live. When Mūsā appeared as a prophet of God, they called him a liar. Fir’aun said: “O Ḥāmān, build me a tower, on which I shall reach the paths, the paths to
heaven and ascend to the god of Moṣū" (Sūra xl. 38 et seq.). That Muḥammad places Ḥamān in this period betrays his confused knowledge of history, of which many other examples may be found in the Korān. Indeed, the Talmud (Sanh. 105b) and Midrash (Exodus R. 18) contain a similar anachronism when they make Balaam, Job and Jethro all members of Pharaoh’s great council which advised that Moses should be disposed of. Another passage in the Midrash (Num. R. 22) describes Hāmān and Koḥrā as the richest men in the world. The Koḥrān commentary on the above passages (xx. 25 and xxviii. 38) is interesting; it gives the following account of the building of the tower by Hāmān: 50,000 masons worked for seven years on the building and when it had reached an extraordinary height Ḫūbrīl overthrew it. In any case it is remarkable that neither Koḥrā nor commentary nor the Arab historians know anything of the true Hāmān of the book of Esther. It must be presumed nevertheless that the story of Hāmān was not quite unknown in Arabia. This is irrepeatably established from the frequent mention of the name Hāmān.

Bibliography: The Commentaries of Zainab Khāshārī and Bādawī; Thālabī, Kitāb al-Anbāya, Cairo 1213, p. 110-111; al-Kisā, Kitāb al-Anbāya, p. 212-214. (J. EISENBERG.)

ḤAMĀSA (A.), bravery. Poems, which celebrate valor in battle, form a considerable portion of the ancient Arab poetry and therefore occupy pride of place in anthologies; the collections by Aḥū Tāmīm (q. v.) and al-Būṭīrī (q. v.) are therefore briefly called Ḥamāsā.

ḤAMAWAND, a notorious tribe of Kurds, which rendered the banks of the Tigris south of Mōṣūl unsafe by their robberies in the second half of last century. According to Cuiinet, La Turquie d’Aasie, ii. 768 they migrated thither from Southern Persia; according to Curzon, Persia, i. 557, they are a small body of the settled Kurds of Kermanshāh. It was only after several expeditions that the Turkish authorities succeeded in putting an end to their depredations.

Bibliography: In addition to Cuiinet: Cholet, Arménie, Kurdistān et Meopotamié, p. 128 et seq.

ḤAMAVI, SAʿD AL-DIN MUḤAMMAD B. AL-MUʿTADIR. B. ḤAMAVI was born in 650 (1252) in Khorasan, a famous Arab mystic. His ʿUlim al-Ḥaṣābī were published in Kurdi’s Madjamʿat al-Raṣālīl, Cairo 1328 (p. 494 theory of Lāhūt and Nāṣīrī). Cf. Djiami, Nafaḥat al-Uns, ed. Lees, p. 492 et seq. (LOUIS MASSIGNON.)

ḤAMD (A.) Praise. Cf. the article Ḥamāda.

ḤAMD ALLĀH MUSTAWFI. [See AL-KAZ-WIMI.]

Al-Ḥamāla means the saying of the formula, al-Ḥamdu lillāh (for the different vocalizations — ḏu, ḏi, ḏa — see Līlān, iv. 133 ll. 7 et seqq.). "Praise (in its whole genus and of every species) belongs to Allah"; for from him all praise-worthiness proceeds and to him it returns. Ḥamād is the opposite of ḥamāh, being praise for something dependent on the will of him who is praised and it differs in this from madh which is not so limited; it is thus different from, although it may be an expression of thukr, "gratitude", the opposite of which is kusfrān; ḥamān, often rendered "praise", more exactly "taking account of", is used both of praise and disparage. The phrase is formally ḥamār or ḥabār, "narrative" but in its use it is inshār, "assertive", for the speaker makes it an expression of the praise which he at the moment directs towards God (Muḥammad ʿAbdū in Taṣārīf al-Fātiḥa, Cairo, 1325, p. 28; see, too, the elaborate discussion by Moḥammad b. Ḥusayn on the Kifāyat al-Awāmūd of Faṣāḥ, p. 3 et seq. of ed. of Cairo, 1315). In Lane’s translation, "Praise be!" (Lexicon, p. 638) he meant an emphatic affirmation, not a ḏu'; this is plain from his letter to Fleischer on the translation of tabīraka etc. in the Zeitisch. d. Deutsch. Morg. Gesell., xx. p. 187. But this use of "be!" is misleading and hardly defensible as English. Perhaps the inshār force could be indicated by a mark of exclamation as Palmer does in his translation of the Kurān. As the phrase occurs twenty-four times in the Kurān, besides other forms such as inhu ʿḥamād, it naturally became frequent in Muslim usage. All things come from Allāh, and for all things, pleasant or grievous, he is to be praised. Yet the verb ḥamāda does not seem to belong to the classical language and is thus later than basmāla, which may even be pre-Islamic. In the Sāḥih and the Liṣān it does not occur, though basmāla is in both, in the latter fortified with a verse from ʿOmar b. Aḥbār (Schwarz, Diwān, N°. 413, ii. 241; the evidence for the line and the usage is fullest in the Taḥfī, s.v.). In the Mīṣāḥ (finished a. h. 734) ḥamāda is mentioned, but only under basmāla; it has no entry of its own. Finally, it is entered in the Sāḥih so slowly did it win recognition as a word. Besides its broad, devout usage the phrase is statedly a part of the ṣalāt and of the supplemental tasīb being repeated thirty-three times in the latter (Lane, Modern Egyptians, chap. iii.; Lexicon, 1290). Further, as one of the seven Mathāni, in the sense of the verses of the Fāṭifa, it has part with the Fāṭifa in various mystical and magical usages and meanings. Thus it is the Mathāni assigned to the first of the seven stages of the Ṣafīya ʿṣārī (W. H. T. Gairdner, Way of a Mohammedan Mystic, p. 12, 25). Even in an orthodox tradition the Fāṭifa has been to have magical value: cf. in Bukhārī (Kitāb al-Taṣārīf; Ṣafī Fāṭihat al-Kitāb) the story of the man who used it as a charm (rubay) against snake-bite, and the Prophet approved. For later elaborate developments in magic, see al-Būnī, Shams al-Maʿārif, Faṣā, X, and Aḥmad al-Zarqāwī, the modern Egyptian magician, Mafāṭīḥ al-Ghāšīb, p. 175. But the Ḥamāda does not seem to be used by itself in magic as is the Basama. Again, the tendency to use the phrase as an introductory formula soon expressed itself as a tradition from the Prophet: "Whatever speech (or thing of importance) is not begun with praise of Allāh is maimel" (cf. Baslama). Thus the Ḥamāda became one of the three required things at the beginning of any formal writing. But this requirement was distinctly later, for, while the use of the Baslama in this way held from the earliest times, we do not find the Ḥamāda prefixed to the Sirā of Ibn Ḥīṣām nor to the Aẓhamī nor even to the Fākrist. See on this usage and the traditions supporting it, the commentary of the Sāyiṭ Murtuḍā on the Iḥyāʾ, i. 53 et seqq. On the praisefulness of this exclamatory see especially ibid., v. 13 et seqq. (Kitāb al-Adhākār).

Bibliography: References as above and also Bādawī, ed. Fleischer, i. 5, ll. 26 et seqq.;
HAMDÂN (†Ham) of the South Arabian inscriptions), a large Arab tribe, belonging to the Yemen group. Their genealogy is Hamdân ( Awsala) b. Mālik b. Zaid b. Rābi’a b. Awsala b. al-Kāhiyār b. Mālik b. Zaid b. Kalīḥ. Their chief Balad Hamdân, a centre of civilization in ancient Arabia, was five days’ journey in length and breadth and lay to the north of Ṣa‘īn [q. v.]; it stretched eastwards as far as Mārīt [q. v.] and Nadhrān [q. v.], northwards to Ṣa‘da [q. v.] almost up to the desert and westwards to the coast (Abī Arīḥ). It was divided into two parts, the east belonging to the Bakil and the west to Ḥashīd, who still form two powerful groups of tribes in their ancient abodes [cf. Ḥashīd and Bakil]; but Ḥashīd clans also lived in the land of the Bakil and vice versa. In addition to the Balad Hamdân proper there were also four tribes in Ḥazīr [q. v.], the clan of Nāshā, on the ‘Dha‘al Barang’ in the south of the Kūbih country on the Wāḍī Ṣabāh, in Ḥadramūṭ (e.g. in the village of al-Maqāʾīl) and in the large fortified town of al-Kīra (the clan of Nāshā), in Kaḥmā (a town near Zabīd), al-Yabūsān (belonging to the South Arabian Mihkhāl al-Saḥil), Ḥulā (a fortified town in the Mihkhāl Sībah Aqān [Upper Sharaf, the Lower Sharaf belonged to the Ḥashīd], inhabited by the clan of Mārātīn) and Falaḍja, which belonged to the district of Damasūk. The land which now bears the name Balad Hamdân is only a portion of the great area once known by this name (cf. E. Glaser in Farnamans Mitteilungen, xxix., 1886, Table 1). In the time of Dāhkhāh the Hamdân worshipped the idols Yaghūth and Ya‘āqūb. The idol Ya‘āqūb was the cause of a battle at Mulaḥā (Ruzm, in the Djawf) in the land of the Murād between the latter, who were carrying off Yaghūth, and the Hamdân, on the same day as the battle of Badr (17th or 19th Ramaḍān 2=624). The Hamdân with their allies, the Balḥārīh (Harīb b. Ka‘b [q. v.]), inflicted a severe defeat on the Murād; another battle between them and the Murād was fought at al-Ka‘ (in the Djawf). On the “second day of Kulāb”, fought between the Balḥārīh and the ‘Ad tribes Kībāb and Sa‘d b. Zaid Manāt, the Hamdân fought on the side of the Balḥārīh along with the Kinda and Kūfā. When the Abyssinian ruler Abraha (in the “year of the elephant”) tried to destroy the Ka‘ba, the Hamdân at the instigation of the Yemen chief Dhū Nafar took the field against him with other tribes whom Dhū Nafar had roused to defend the house of God. In the “year of the deputations” (9=630-631) a deputation from the Hamdân under Mālik b. Namaṭ and Abū Thawr, called Dhu ‘l-Mishār, was on those that appeared before the Prophet. In the year 10 (631-632), when the greater number of tribes had already been subdued, the Hamdān were among the few who did not yet absolutely recognise the Prophet. Muhammad therefore sent ‘Alī against them at the head of an army, whereupon they submitted without resistance. In 37 (559) 12,000 of the Hamdân fought on the side of the Caliph ‘Alī in the ‘Irāq. In the same year with the aid of the Hamdân, whom he called his “spear and cuirass”, ‘Alī revenged the death of Āmmār b. Yūsuf, who had fallen in battle against the ‘Irāqis. Under the Caliph ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī and under the Umayyads the Hamdân numbered with the Muhājirīn and the Ḥiṣāmīn (†al-Qādis). Dār al-‘Imārah (49-9=545; 53-9=545), or 87, 11-12, 127-2, 85, 6, 5, 101, 1-2, 103, 2, 105, 17, 117, 106, 16-17, 107, 9-10, 108, 28-29, 115, 127, 1-7, 132-3, 283, 293, 190, 1-2, 194, 21-22, 198, 13-16; Yākūt, Muḥammad, i. 129; ii. 158, 407, 478, 776; iii. 115, 283, 413; iv. 38, 301, 438, 751, 1022; Taqīṣ, Annals, i. 1953, 1994, 2489, 2495, 3312, 3321 and Index; Ibn Hishām, Sīra, p. 52, 950, 963-964; Aḥqāf, iv. 132, x. 82; xiv. 26; xv. 73 and Index; Caussin de Perceval, Essai sur l’histoire des Arabes avant l’Islamisme, i. 202, 268-280; ii. 582; iii. 294-295, 308, 313; F. Wustenfeld, Genealogische Tabellen, T. ix, 9, and Register, p. 200; O. Buxan, Arabien im sechsten Jahrhundert, in the Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, x. 562. (J. SCHLEIFER.)

HAMDÂN KARMĀT b. AL-‘ASĪ‘ĀTH, an Imamī missionary, the founder of the Karmātī sect, was a peasant in the neighbourhood of Kūf; his nickname karmīţākh, which belongs to the Aramī dialect spoken in that district seems to mean “man with red or fiery eyes” (Tabārī, Annals, iii. 2125). He was converted through meeting Ḥusain al-Ahwāzī, ‘Abd Allāh b. Māmān’s missionary, whom he succeeded at his death. He settled in Kālābdhā near Bagh- dād, from which he could easily keep in touch with the mission in Khorāsān and with the Grand Master, who resided in ‘Askar-Mukram (261 = 875); near Kūf he built himself an official residence called Dār al-Hīḍra (place of refuge); this became a centre around which his followers settled and from which they undertook their raids (297-390). He was a man of keen intellect, who was never without a loss of composure and manner, very capable and full of ambition. On the death of ‘Abd Allāh he declined to recognise his son Ahmad as Grand Master and remained faithful to the Imam Muhammad b. Is- mā‘īl. He went to Syria where he died soon after. His brother-in-law ‘Abdān who composed most of the sacred books of the sect was murdered soon afterwards by Ḥizbarwālī, one of Ahmad’s followers. To obtain funds Karmāt had introduced, a series of taxes, each heavier than the preceding, the first, a silver piece per head, then the hīḍra, one gold piece per head, which was changed to the budgāh or seven gold pieces; finally he demanded al-Fā or community of wives and property.

Bibliography: See the article KARMĀTIANS.

AL-HAMDĀNĪ, Abū MUHammAD AL-ḤASAN b. AHMAD b. YĀKŪB b. YUSEF b. DĀWĪD b. SULAYMĀN DHI b. ‘L-DUMAINA b. ‘AMR b. AL-HARĪTH b. Aḥb DHIṣāt? b. Munkhid (according to al-Dhahābī, op. cit.), called IBN AL-HAṬIK, a versatile South Arabian scholar. He was also called Ibn Abī (or Dhi-) ‘l-Dumaina after his ancestor, for the quotations from Ibn (Abī) al-Dumaina al-Hamdānī in Yaqūt (Muḥammad, see Index), who elsewhere quotes our author as al-Ḥasan b. Ahmad and most usually as Ibn al-Haṭik, are almost all to be found in the Qdāira. According to al-Khāraḍī quoted in al-Suyūṭī, he was born — the

Tabārī, Taṣfīr, i. 45 et seq.; Rāzī, Mafāṭīh, i. 115 et seqq. (ed. of Cairo, 1307).

(D. B. MACDONALD.)

AL-HAMDĀNĪ. A Ṣaḥīḥ, or a collection of traditions compiled by al-Hamdānī, a student of the Prophet, and transmitted by him to the world. The contents of the Ṣaḥīḥ are divided into four parts: (1) The life of the Prophet; (2) The life of the Companions; (3) The life of the Successors; (4) The history of the world. The Ṣaḥīḥ is a valuable source of information regarding the life and times of the Prophet, and is particularly interesting for its detailed account of the events of the early days of Islam.
year is not given — in Şanâvar and grew up there. He then went on his travels, spent some time in Mecca, afterwards returned to Yemen and settled in Șa'da. He is said to have been thrown into prison there on the accusation of the local poets that he had composed a lampoon on the Prophet. From the Berlin MS., Ahlwardt, Verschieden., No. 9664 (fragment of the Chronicle of Muslim al-Labadi, cf. Strothmann, Die Littetaten der Zadilik in Der Islam, l. 363 et seq.), f. 45b infra, 45b supra, it is clear that he was in prison in the time of the Zaidi Imâm Ahmad al-Nâsir (died 315) and Șa'd b. (Abi) Ya'far al-Hiwi (died 332) for Șanâvar or Șanav and that he appealed for assistance from his cell to Abu icious șAli, the son of the Karâmtian dâ'î Abu 1-Kasim al-Hasan al-Mansûr (the latter died in 322; cf. al-Djandâni in Kay, Yaman etc., p. 140 et seq. of the text) and dedicated panegyrics to him, which are said to be in his Dîwan. From f. 217b infra, 218b supra of the Paris MS. Bibl. Nat. (Blochet, Catalog. de la Coll. . . . Schefer, Paris 1900) No. 5982, said to contain the 800 (cf. al-Labadi, Muzaffar, this is giving among others a synopsis only of the Berlin fragment, it may be deduced that his imprisonment was connected with the desertion of two of al-Nâsîr's officers and the rebellion of the people of al-Ashba. A reference is here made to a detailed account, which appears no longer to exist. Al-Hamadânî died in 334 (945-946) in prison in Șanâvar, according to tradition. It is hardly to be supposed, however, that he had been continuously deprived of his freedom since the time of al-Nâsîr.

Al-Hamadânî crowned himself with honour in several fields of knowledge. He had a reputation as a philologist, poet, historian and genealogist (he is also given the name șNaṣîhah) and had also studied astronomy and geometry. His native land was the focus of his interests and his works are of the utmost importance for the study of the geography and tribal relationships of Arabia and particularly South Arabia. In his Iktil, of the 10 books of which only vii, [ed. and annotated by D. H. Müller in Sitzungsber. d. kais. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien, phil.-hist. Cl., xciv. (1879), p. 335 et seq.; xcvii. (1880), p. 955 et seq.] and x. have survived, he discussed the ancient history, genealogies of the tribes and antiquities of Yemen [cf. D. H. Müller, Sûdarab. Studien in Sitz.-ber., Vol. 86 (1877), p. 108 et seq.]. His Geography of the Arabian Peninsula, Sîfa Dîjarat al-arab (ed. D. H. Müller, Leiden 1884-1891) was written after the Iktil and at the earliest in the reign of the al-Nâsir already mentioned (cf. p. 58,4 et seq.). Al-Hamadânî's poetical works formed a Dîvan in 6 volumes, which was collected and annotated by Ibn Khâlîla (died 370) (al-Dhahabi, op. cit.); in addition to this there is also mentioned his Al-Kaṣida Al-Dâmîgha (according to Ya'qub "fi fa'dl șa'dîn", according to șNaṣîlî șNaṣîhah "fi l-šu'ârah"), on which he himself wrote a very full commentary. On astronomy he left tables (Zijd); his work Sîr (Șarâ'ir) al-šâmka (Ibn al-Kiftî, op. cit.) dealt with the science of the heavens. He also wrote a Kitâb al-Šuyar al-ṣufîsî (also: Ya'âbî șa'îr), (to his Kitâb al- Šuyar min al-Ya'âbî he refers in Dîzan, p. 203, 190) wâ șkâma wâ ș-nidâl â Kitâb al-Șu'ârah. Except the two books of the Iktil and of the Sîfa Dîjarat al-arab, all these works seem to be lost.


**Hamadânîs.** The Hamadânîs took their name from șHamdân b. șHamdân, a member of the great tribe of Taghlib (cf. his genealogy in Wustenfeld's Tabellen, C. 32). We find him as early as 272 (885) a close ally of the Khârîjîs Harûn and a few years later in possession of the fortress of Mâšîn. When in 281 (894) the Caliph al-Mu'tâdîd advanced against this town, he found Hamadân no longer there; he had given over the fortress to șUlûm. [q. v.] behind. The latter occupied the gates of the fortress of Dâr al-Zafarân to the Caliph, who soon afterwards captured șHamdân also. Cf. Ibn al-Mu'tazz in Lang, Mu'tadid als Prinz und Regent in Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesell., xii. 243. The Caliph kept Hamadân a prisoner in Baghdad as long as the Khârîjîs Harûn was in the field, but when he was defeated by șHusîn in 283 (896) and rendered harmless, șHamdân was pardoned and honoured were heaped on his sons, notably șHusîn. This was the beginning of the future greatness of the Hamadânîs. șHusîn distinguished himself in the wars against the Karâmtians, but had to become a refugee and live in the reign of al-Mu'tâdîd, as he had taken part of the unfortunate poet șAbî Allâh b. al-Mu'tazz against the Caliph. Through the intervention of his brother șIbrâhîm, he was pardoned by the Caliph and received the governorship of șKham and șKâshân, which he had administered by a deputy. In 303 (915) he again quarrelled with the Caliph and ended his days in prison in 306 (918-919).

His brothers Abu 1-l-šûr șA'dîd șIbrâhîm, șA'dî and Abû 'l-1-Hâjî'â șAbî Allâh [q. v.] prospered no less than he during the nominal reign of the insignificant Caliph al-Mu'tadîd. Honoured by the important governorships, they did as they pleased and thus occasionally came in conflict with the Caliph, but at once pretended to submit and were left in their offices or received others not less important. The swashbuckler Abu 1-Hâjî'â distinguished himself most; by 293 (905) he was appointed governor of al-Mawilî and ruled this important city with short interruptions till his death in 317 = 929, although from 308 (920) he entrusted the actual administration to his son șHasan. șHasan, who afterwards received the title of honour, șNâ'îr al-šawla [q. v.] was able to keep his position there till his death in 358 (968) and to extend his power over the whole of Dîyâr șA'dîdâ and Dîyâr Mu'dhar. He was succeeded in al-Mawilî by his son Abû Taghlib șFadhîl șA'dîl, better known under the name al-Ghâdânî fâr [q. v.], but he became involved in the conflict between the various Bayüd rulers and was unfortunate in the struggle so that he had to vacate Mesopotamia and soon afterwards met his death in Syria (369 = 979). The rule of the Hamadânîs in al-Mawilî seemed to have come to an end with him, for al-Ghâdânî's brothers,
Abū Tāhir Ibrāhīm and Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Husain, entered the service of the Būyids. After Sharaf al-Dawla’s death, however, they obtained Bahā al-Dawla’s permission (379 = 989) to return to al-Mawṣil and, although the Būyid at once saw the false step he had made, they succeeded in obtaining the city with the help of its inhabitants. But their rule did not last long, for they had to fight with the Kurds and Okālid; in the struggle Abū Tāhir and his sons were taken prisoner by Muḥammad b. al-Mustawfiyy and slain in 380 (991). Abū ‘Abd Allāh had before this been taken prisoner by the Marwānid Abū ‘Ali and was only liberated on the intercession of the Fāṭimīd al-‘Aziz, who sent him to Syria. The last we hear of him is that he plundered ‘Tyre in 386 (996); his descendants, however, long occupied high positions at the Fāṭimīd court till in 465 (1072-1073) the last of them, Nāṣīr al-Dawla Abū ‘Ali and his son Fakhr al-‘Arab fell victims to a conspiracy.

The Hamdānīs did not however rule al-Mawṣil and Mesopotamia only; by 333 (944) they had extended their rule over Ḥulab and Northern Syria also. It was “Ali, the brother of Ḥasan, afterwards famous as Saif al-Dawla [q.v.], who won the first-named town and Ḥims also from the Ikshidīs al-‘Aziz in this year. But it was some years before the Egyptians under Kāfir left them in peaceful possession of Northern Syria. Saif al-Dawla, however, owes his fame to his wars with the Byzantine unbelievers. Even before 333 he had made raids into Byzantine territory, but it was not till he had made his position secure in Ḥalab that he devoted himself entirely to war on the infidels, with varying success, it is true, as is detailed in the article SAIF AL-DAWLA; here we will only mention further that another member of the Hamdānī family, the famous poet Abū Firāz [q.v.], cousin of Saif al-Dawla, also distinguished himself on these campaigns. Saif al-Dawla’s claim to fame as a patron of Arabic literature and science is no less great, than as a warrior; but this also is dealt with below. Saif al-Dawla died in 356 (967). (Editors).

His sole surviving son, Abū ‘l-Ma‘ālī Sharīf, who afterwards received the title of honour Sa’ād al-Dawla from the Caliph in Baḥdād, was at once recognised by Karghiyā and the other chiefs and went from Maiyāfārīkīn, where he had buried his father in the family tomb, to receive homage in Aleppo. He then advanced against his father’s cousin and companion-in-arms Abū Firāz, his vassal in Ḥims whose subjects had lodged complaints against him. They met at Sa’dād where the latter was slain; Ḥims was then taken by Sa’ād al-Dawla. The first encounter with the Byzantines took place in the second year of his reign. Byzantine troops attempted to surprise Aleppo; Karghiyā who went against them was himself captured but managed to escape. Soon afterwards the Emperor Nicephoros, with a large army, took all the towns between Aleppo and Ḥims and conquered Lāṭaġỹkīa and Ḫabala. In the beginning of 358 he blockaded Antioch, occupied Baghārīs and fortified it as a base for the Byzantine troops. He returned to Constantinople and left Petras Phokas (in Arab authors Torbasi or Atrābasi, probably derived from ταρηκ) in command of the towns conquered in Mesopotamia and Michael Burzīs in command of Baghārīs. Sa’ād al-Dawla went via Bālis to his mother in Maiyā-
Ka'lát Sim'án and take its monks as prisoners to the slave market. A roar of rage went up from the whole Byzantine world. Bardas Phocás at once raised the siege of Apamea and advanced on Aleppo. Sa'id was unable to offer any serious resistance, had to submit and peace was only granted him in 576 on condition that he paid all the arrears of tribute. Bardas Phocás treated him very leniently, as he wished to be free for the war against the Bulghars. Sa'id had peace for five years, till in 581 (991) Bakdžur, who after a quarrel with the Fāṭimid Caliph had been living peaceably in Raḳṣa, once more marched on Aleppo, in the vain hope of obtaining the support of the Fāṭimid Governor. Sa'id and his general Lu'lû' defeated him with the aid of Byzantine reinforcements at Nā'ura and had him executed on the spot. Soon afterwards Sa'id in 581 fell sick of a colic. To some extent recovered he held his triumphal entry into Aleppo but died the same night, as he had not taken sufficient care of himself. He was succeeded by his son Sa'id al-Dawla under the regency of Lu'lû', whoabouts the latter afterwards married. His reign was occupied with battles with the Fāṭimid troops under Bandjuttin (Manūtugin), whom he defeated with the help of the Byzantines. He had to sustain long sieges. When he was hard pressed in 584, he appealed for help to the emperor Basil, who, although occupied with the Bulghar war, arrived with incredible rapidity before the walls of Aleppo with 17000 men and this alone was sufficient to disperse the enemy. Although Sa'id could have offered him no serious resistance, the Emperor remained faithful to the treaty and scorned to occupy Aleppo. Sa'id on his side also observed the treaty till his death in 592 (1002); he with his wife was poisoned by the latter's father Lu'lû', who coveted the throne for himself. At first he ruled in the name of Sa'id's sons, but two years later he sent them with the whole Ḥamdānid harem to Cairo and made his son Ma'nūṣ his co-regent. When in 599 (1008) Lu'lû' died at a great age, he was succeeded by Ma'nūṣ under the name Murtaḍa 'l-Dawla, a title granted him by al-Ḥākim (Journ. As., ix. 160), when he began to mention the latter's name in the kūhba, so that Fāṭimid rule in Ḥalab may be said to date already from this time, although Ma'nūṣ afterwards quarrelled with Ḥākim. A brother of Sa'id rose against him with the help of the Kūlābīs but was defeated, when Ma'nūṣ won the latter to his side with bribes and promises, and fled to the Byzantines. To get rid of the Kūlābīs, who pressed him to fulfill his promises, Ma'nūṣ invited their chiefs to a great feast, at which he seized them. Many perished in the noxious dungeons, half-starved; Ṣālīḥ b. Mīrūd alone succeeded in escaping. He then led his Bedouins against Ma'nūṣ and forced him to make terms favourable to the Kūlābīs which he once more did not observe. Through all this he aroused great dissatisfaction; Fāṭih, the commander of the citadel, abandoned him and by a stratagem made him believe that Ṣālīḥ had entered the town, Ma'nūṣ fled in terror to the Byzantines. On the further history of Ḥalab see the article Ḥalab [i. 229 et seq.].

**Bibliography:** The sources for the history of the Ḥamdānids are detailed by Freytag, Geschichte der Ḥamdāniden in Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesells., x. 190 et seq., xi. 1 et seq.; Tabari, ed. de Goeje, iii. 214 et seq.; Arib, Tabari continuatus, p. 8 et seq.; Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, viii. and ix.; M. Wickerhauser, Wegweiser zum Verständniss der türk. Sprache, p. 11 et seq.; Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen, ii. 400 et seq.; Muller, Der Islam etc., i. 562 et seq.; Huart, Histoire des Arabes, i. 328 et seq. Cf. also the bibliography to the articles Ḥalab, Abu l-Ḥāṣim, El-Ḥamānfar, Naṣir al-Dawla and Ṣaíf al-Dawla. (M. Sobernheim.)

---

**ḤAMDĪ, ḤAMD-ALLIḤ ČELERI,** the youngest of Şaikh Ak Şams al-Din (cf. i. 226), a famous Ottoman poet. He was born in Goinik about 852 (1448), 12 years before his father's death in 864 (1459-1460). The early death of his father proved detrimental to his education, for his brothers bore him no goodwill. At first he devoted himself to a theological-legal career but had only advanced in the official hierarchy as far as the office of muddirs in Bursa before he went into retirement in a life of quiet meditation and follow up his literary inclinations and the study of mysticism and poetry. He is said to have obtained the means for his modest subsistence by copying his own chief work. Little esteemed in his life-time, which explains the scanty notices of him in the biographers, he died in Dhu l-'Ka'da 914 (February-March 1509, according to others in 900 or 909) and was buried beside his father in Goinik.

His earliest works are a number of mystic tracts Meğjalis al-Tefsār (the reunions of the commentaries); a treatise on a hadīth, taken from the New Testament, that God had prepared for the believer "what eye hath not seen, nor ear heard etc." and another, "The sweetness of this world is bitterness for the next and the bitterness of this world is sweetness for the next". Of much more importance are his poetical works. He was not a great creative genius, but rather an industrious and clever imitator and editor. When he relies entirely on himself, his usually so brilliant language begins to halt. He does not seem to have composed a regular Dirāwān, unlike the usual practice of scholars, but only a collection of ghazels. His fame as a poet is based almost entirely on his romantic matnawīs, of which he is said to have written five in imitation of Niẓāmī's Khamsa: Yüsuf u Zalikha, Leila u Meşgūn, Mevleli-i Nobi (Mevlendi-dî jamûni and Mevlendi-rûfûni), Tuhfet al-Usâhikha and Muḥammediye.

Yüsuf u Zalikha marks an epoch in the history of the Ottoman matnawi. It has become by far the most popular and best known Turkish matnawi. From the point of view of language it is the most perfect work in Ottoman literature up to the appearance of Fuḍūl's Leila u Meşgūn. In the first part it appears to be a version of Firdayest's simple work of the same name, while the second part is a brilliant translation, expanded by additions and lyrical pieces scattered through it, of the almost contemporary work of Ḥārim, the head of the rhetorical and allegorical school in Persia. The subject "the story of Joseph", taken from the Kur'an, which has always been popular throughout the east on account of its Süfî interpretation, was particularly popular in this version, as Ḥamdī followed the most scrupulous commentators on the Kur'an. The work, which was completed in 897 (1491-1492), bears no dedi-
HAMDÍ—HAMDÍ

cation. Hamdî is said to have fearlessly withdrawn the dedication to Bâyâzîd II. It has never been printed but numerous manuscripts exist.

His Lezîr u Medjûîn is the oldest version of this likewise popular motif after Nişâmi's Persian model, but it was soon displaced in popularity by Fuzûlî's work. Copies of the Mathnâwi, Medîî-t-Nebî are very rare. The only one of his works that can lay any claim to originality is the Tâthjît al-Uthâshâ (Present for Lovers) which is distinguished by simplicity of language.

His much praised and popular Kiyâfît-Nâme is also written in simple Turkish mathnâwi verses: it is a book on the science of physiognomy for the discernment of character, which seems to be the oldest of its kind. An Evâr-nâme is also ascribed to him.


Cf. also the Catalogues by Flügel, Pertsch, Kien.

(Theodor Menzel)

HAMDÌ, a coast-town in Hasrâmât, about 18 miles N.E. of Shibîr [q.v.], near Baba's Shamra, in a very picturesque and fertile district. Like Makalla and Shibîr it belongs to the Ku'aît of Shibâm [q.v.] and has, as the name shows, thermal wells of the temperature of boiling water. The houses of the little town are low and built of mud; in the centre of the town and on the shore there are two important bâsîns. The inhabitants are mainly fishermen; and their number was estimated by Capt. Haines at 500 in 1839. Behind the town lie thick palm groves and fields with luxuriant crops of Indian corn.


HAMDÎ b. al-Âbeds Abû Muhammād, born in 223 (637), died 311 (923), according to the satirist Ibn Buzaim, in early life a waterseller and vendor of pomegranates, was one of the ablest financiers of the ʿAbbasid Caliph al-Muwaffak and al-Muṭṭadid. He combined the collection of the Khorâd and diwâr of Wâṣîf (from 273 = 886) with that of Fârs (from 287 = 900) and Baṣra. In 306 (918) he was appointed vizier, and afterwards was given Ali b. al-Djarraḥ as his naqîb. His financial administration resulted in riots in Baghdad and his strong measures with dissenters like the Karmâṭians, Sûḥâ (execution of al-Ḥallâd [q.v.] and particularly the ʿImâmîya (imprisonment of Ibn Rûh, the ʿImâm's nakîl) finally brought about his fall. He was tortured by the new vizier's son, Ibn al-Furât and put in the pillory; he died in Wâṣîf soon afterwards, apparently of poison.

Bibliography: Hilal al-Ṣâbi, Historical Romances, ed. Amelroz, Index s. v. (In his preface, p. 18, the editor gives as a vivid picture of this cunning and ruthless financier).

HAMDĪ (the Maṭûna of Khalkokomyleon, p. 65, 66, and Maṭûn of Phrantzes, p. 82; for Hamdî al-Dîn), was the founder of the dynasty called after him ʿIṣâmî-oghlu. He had been the leader of the Turkoman tribes on the Byzantine frontier of the Seljuqid kingdom of Konia, "in the mountainous region between Adalia and Konia" (Abû l-Fidâ), corresponding to the ancient Pisidia; we find him finally independent by the end of the viith century of the Hijrâ. Of his successors we know: i. his son Felek al-Dîn Dândâr bey, who took up his residence in Ėgèerdîr, since then known as Felekâbâd. In 724 H. Timûrî, the governor of Edûmân Abî Saʿîd Bâhâdîr in Asia Minor, put an end to his rule. Shortly before this ʿIṣâmî-oghlu had conquered Adalia (Abû l-Fidâ), which remained under the rule of the ʿIṣâmî-oghlu till the Teke-oghlu took possession of it: 2. Khiḍrîr bey of Dândâr. During his reign, which began in 728 H., he conquered the districts Akhshir, Beyshehri and Seidsehir. We suppose him to be identical with Seif al-Dîn Kaidar, mentioned in the Kitâb al-tuḥfâ, Not. et Exs. xii. 361, Note 3), and his name-sake the governor of Adalia quoted by Şihâb al-Dîn reigning in 728 H. Nâdîm al-Dîn Abû Ishâk, son of Dândâr, Ibn Baṭûta visited him in Edûlî (Voyages, ii. 267), as well as his brother Mehemmed Celebi who was residing in Gîl-i-jâr, and Eychârî Bey, who was continually at war with his neighbours, the Kâramân-oghlu, and was defeated by them several times. 5. Këmîl al-Dîn Ùsîsîn Bey, son of Ùsîsîn, who sold the greater part of his dominions to Sultan Murâd I in 783 H. The latter's successor Bâyâzîd I put an end to Ùsîsîn Bey's rule in 793 H. Of his son Meṣṭafa we know only that he had been following Murâd I a year before, and that he fought in the battle of Kossova. The provinces in the Eastern part of the country with the cities of Aṣîshêhri, Beyshehri and Seidsehir were then occupied by the Kâramân-oghlu and afterwards formed a source of continual dispute between them and the different Ottoman Sultans. During the invasion of Asia Minor by Timûr (1402-1403) the country was devastated several times by his troops, and Timûr ended his expedition by storming the fortresses of Uluboru and Ėgèerdîr (Şâraf al-Dîn, Zafarname, ii. 448, 464, 446, 484 et seq.). Under Turkish government the dominion of the Hamidoglu was formed into a sandjak of the eyalet Anadolu called Hamdî-eli, and Isparta became the residence of the Sandjak-bey (cp. the description in the Dîwân namâ, p. 639). Nowadays it figures as a sandjak of the vilayet Konia under the name of Hamdî-âbâd. After Isparta we may turn as towns of importance Uluboru, Ėgèerdîr, Burdur, Keçiçîl, Aṣî Karağah (= Ağaçsus) and Yalovât; then the lake of Burdur and the lakes of Ėgèerdîr and Hûrâm, and the lake of Beyshehri, the country being an important lake district. The chief products of the country are "Hamdîwheat", opium, tobacco, traganth (bete), carpets, cotton and cloths of mixed fabric (alâdja and bighast), leather and silver goods.

Since the conclusion of the Smyrna—Dinler Railway the country has been opened up to commerce and civilisation, as far as the lake district.
The numerous mosques and madrasas in Ispara, Eğirdir, Olsaburu, Burdur and the collections of manuscripts in these towns belong to the older period.


(J. H. Mordtmann)

**HAMÌDÎ, HAMÌD AL-DÎN ABÛ BAKR OMAR B. MAHMÛD BALKİ, a Persian writer of makâmas, died in 559 (1164); he wrote his makâmam, some of which are to be considered munâzârât, in 551 (1150) on the model of his Arab predecessors Al-Hammâdi and Al-Hârîrî. Their number is 23 or 24; printed, Cavnâpur 1268 (1852), Lucknow 1879, Tehran (1889).

**Bibliography:** Ethê in Grundzüge der Iran. Phil., ii. 228; Browne, A Literary History of Persia, ii. 346 et seq.; Rieu, Cat. of Pers. MSS. in the Brit. Mus., p. 747.

**HÀ-MİM B. MANN ALLÁH B. HÂRÎZ B. 'AMR, of the Berber tribe of Zerwâl in the Rif, known as Al-Mustârî (the forger). He attempted to introduce a new religion among the Chômâras, which, although not exactly in its practices, at least in its dogmas proceeded from Islam. His period of activity covered the years 313–325. Of the canonical prayers he only retained those at sunrise and sunset; he abolished the fast of Ramadân and replaced it by fasting on the three (or ten) last days of this month, on two days in Shawwâl and on the Wednesday forenoon and Thursday of each week. The breach of this rule was punished by a fine of 6 head of cattle. He abolished pilgrimage, purification and complete ablation and allowed the eating of pork; on the other hand, he forbade the eating of fishes, which were not killed in the lawful fashion; the heads of all animals and birds' eggs were likewise forbidden food. To this day the Tuareg and the Berber tribe of Shûnûr near Tispa will not eat hens' eggs. Hà-mim wrote a book which the Muslim historians call a Qûrân. His aunt Tâyât (var. Ta'yân, Tâhî) was suppliant in the prayers of the faithful and regarded as a prophetess, as was her sister Dûdji. He won many adherents and fell in a battle with the Mâhâmâd near Tan- gier in 319 or, according to others, 329. But the religion which he founded did not die with him.


(RENÈ BÂSET.)

**HAMMAD, a Berber ruler, founder of the Hammadid dynasty, son of the Zirid Balukkîn [q. v.], chief of the Sanhâdja and governor of the Maghrib under the Fatimid Caliph al-Mu'izz, was given the governorship of Asir [q. v., i. 452 et seq.]; in 377 (987–988) by his brother al-Manûr, Balukkîn's successor. For several years he valiantly championed the cause of the Sanhâdja, continued the war against the Zanût, who had invaded the central Maghrib, with the aid of his brother Itû- wîn, and in 391 (1000–1001) put down the rebellion of his uncle Mâkîn, Zaïûna and Hâin, whom he besieged in Shenhwa and forced to submit (cf. KâBîS AND MEENAD, i. 556 et seq.). In 395 (1004–1005) he raised the siege of Asir which the Zanût, the allies of the rebels, were trying to take, thus restoring the supremacy of the Sanhâdja throughout Central Maghrib and in 398 (1007–1008) built himself a strong mountain fortress, al-Ka'a [q. v. and ALGERIA, i. 265] as a secure place of refuge in case of another hostile invasion. But soon afterwards his feudal lord Bâdis Abû Menad, successor of the Zirid al-Manûr, abolished the renunciation of the Hammadid's governorship over the district of Tidjân and Constantinople in favour of his son al-Mu'izz, the latter thereupon rose against Bâdis, at the same time revoking his allegiance to the Fatîmids and declaring himself a vassal of the 'Abbâsids. Bâdis marched against the rebel and shut him up in al-Ka'a, but died during the siege (406 = 1016). The war continued between Hammad and al-Mu'izz, the son and successor of Bâdis, and was concluded by a treaty, which was negotiated by al-Kâdî, a son of Hammad, (408 = 1017–1018). It resulted in the dismemberment of the Zirid kingdom: Hammad received Mîla, Tobna, the Züb, Asir and all the lands of the central Maghrib, which he was likely to conquer. "From that hour" writes Ibn Khalîdân "the two rivals laid down their weapons and allowed themselves by marriages, after dividing the kingdom between them. The Sanhâdja dynasty was thus divided into two lines, that of al-Manûr in Kairawân and of Hammad in al-Ka'a". Hammad died there in 419 (1028).

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khalîdân, Histoire des Berbères, transl. de Slane, ii, 16 et seq., 43; Fournel, Les Berbères, ii. (G. YERK.)

**HAMMAD AL-RÂWIYA, i.e. the transmitter, namely of old Arabic poetry. He was born in 75 (694–695); Ibn Khall.: 95 in Tabân; his father, whose name is differently given (Harmuz, Maisara, Sâdrî) and who bore the kunya Abû Lâlah, was a Dailami prisoner of war. Hammad's speech also betrayed his origin.

He won great fame from his comprehensive knowledge of pre-Islamic as well as of Islamic poetry, of battles and Bedouin dialects. It is even said of him that he could recite kasîdas of the Djahiliya of considerable length, rhyming in each letter of the alphabet, a hundred for each letter, and that he could at once decide whether a poem was old or modern. Great value was placed on his judgment on poets and poetry. He was almost always able to detect plagiarism and borrowings. He himself was less conscious however in transmitting and used his gifts to smuggle verses of his own into ancient poems, a proceeding for which al-Muâfaddal al-Dabîs censured him and for which al-Madhi took him to task (Alûhâ, i, 172, 16 et seq.).

As Nûdeke has pointed out, Hammad's great merit is that he collected the Mu'allâkât [q. v.]. He was one of the three Hammadûn (with
Hammâd 'Adîrîd and Hammâd b. al-Zibrîkân), who, bound by ties of closest friendship, caroused and worshipped the Muse together and were all suspected of zandaqa. Among his friends were also the poets Mu'tî b. Iyâs and Yahyâ b. Ziyâd.

He enjoyed the favour of the Calif Yazid II; he was afraid of Hishâm, but the latter is also said to have once invited him to court and richly rewarded him. This story, however, is doubtful on account of an anachronism and features similar to those of an anecdote related of Wâlid II. This last Calif in particular often entertained himself by listening to Hammâm's recitations, and his recitation was greatly admired by the 'Abbâsids. He was one of the poets who left Baghdad in the reign of al-Mansûr "to seek a livelihood"; he then went to Kûfa; the Calif however is said to have invited him back to Baghdad from Basra. But the latter's son Dja'far, into whose presence Hammâm allowed himself to be taken by his friend Mu'tî at the latter's solicitation, treated him shamefully, when a verse recited by the poet proved distasteful to his superstitious notions.

The date of his death is differently given: 155 (Ibn Khallîkân), 156 (Fihrist) or in the Caliphate of al-Mahdi, i.e. 158 or later; in Aga', iii. 80 infra, he is even associated with al-Râshîd.


Hammâmâd (also called gada in the Sahara Almohads), who, according to the eulogies of the ground in the Sahara, according to E. F. Gautier (Sahara Algérien, Chap. I), "the form assumed by the rock in the plateau", usually appears as a broad flat surface which is sometimes slightly undulating but rarely traversed by ravines. The edge of the plateau often consists of long series of steep slopes with rather well marked contours which are called bâten or ûbel. The upper surface is devoid of vegetation on account of the utter absence of soil and covered with stones, which sometimes are broad and flat and sometimes consists of small splinters which are formed by the breaking up of the rock through the sudden changes of temperature and severely impedes the progress of men and animals. The Hammâmâd thus forms an almost insurmountable barrier to traffic through the Sahara, so that the caravans prefer to go round rather than cross them. The most important Hammâmâd are, the Hammâmâd al-Hasîn, south of the Tripolitania, which is 140 miles broad and 400 long, and reaches an elevation of 1600–2000 feet.

Bibliography: See the article Sahâra.

(G. Ver.)

Hammâmids, a Berber dynasty in Central Maghrib, which was founded in 405 (1014) by Hammâmî b. Bulukâkin [q. v.] and overthrown in 547 (1152) by the Almohads. They had to wage continual warfare on the Zenata, who threatened them from the west, the Zirids, the former lords of the central Maghrib and later from the second half of the 12th century onwards against the Hilâlî Arabs also. Al-Kâlid, Hammâm's successor (419–446 = 1028–1154), was deposed Hammâm, son of Muizî b. Ziri b. 'Ayya, and forced his cousin, the Zirid al-Mu'izzî b. Kâlid, the ruler of Kairawan, who had besieged him in al-Kâlid to sign a truce (412 = 1040). To show clearly his independence of his Zirid cousin, when al-Mu'izzî had cast off the suzerainty of the Hammâmîs in the Caliph, he had the khatża read in the latter's name. Soon afterwards the invasion of the Hilâlî Arabs by destroying the power of the Zirids of Kairawan in 445 = 1051, ensured the supremacy of the Hammâmîds in the Maghrib. After Bulukîn b. Muhammad, second successor of al-Kâlid, had suppressed the rising of the Beni Komman of Biskra [q. v., i. 732], he penetrated in the extreme Maghrib and seized the town of Fez, the notables of which he carried off as hostages. On his return from this campaign he was murdered by his cousin al-Nâsîr, whose sister Tannahîrt he had put to death.

The reign of al-Nâsîr b. 'Alâ'annas (454–481 = 1062–1088:1089) on the variants of the name 'Alâ'annas, see al-Râysân al-Maghrîbî, transl. by Fagnan, i. 445, note 3) and that of his successor al-Manûrî (481–498 = 1088:1089–1104:1105) form the golden age of the Hammâmîd dynasty. After al-Nâsîr had become lord of Algiers, Milîya, Hamzâ, Nîguss and Constantine, the government of which he entrusted to his sons or brothers, he endeavoured to extend his kingdom eastwards by taking advantage of the feuds that had broken out among the Arab tribes. For a time he was recognised as their ruler by the people of the districts of Kastîliya, Kairawan, Nusa, Maa and Tunis. After his defeat at Sbeitla in 457 = 6704, however, he was not present in the districts of Zab and Hôdna by the Hilâlî Arabs and their allies, the Maghrëbîs of Tripoli, led by al-Mustansîr b. Khâzûrîn. In the end, however, al-Nâsîr won the upper hand; the Zab was reconquered and Hammâmîd troops penetrated to the Sahara as far as Wargla. These successes made him the most powerful ruler in the whole Maghrib. To raise the prosperity of his subjects by increasing trade, he eagerly endeavoured to attract Italian merchants to Bougie [q. v., i. 766 et seq.] which had been founded by him. He also corresponded with the Pope Gregory VII through the intermediary of the priest Seripandus, afterwards Bishop of Bôna.

Al-Mansûr, al-Nâsîr's successor, moved his residence to Bougie in 485 = 1090:1091, being continually threatened in al-Kâla by the inroads of the Arab Bedouins. He regained the cities of Bôna and Constantine, which the Hammâmîd rulers had given over to the Zirids, subdued the Kabyls of the district round Bougie and paid particular attention to the defence of his lands against the Almoravids. When the latter had taken Tenmen (474 = 1081:1082) they won the Benû Wammûn, who had till then defended the western Hammâmîd frontiers, to their side and threatened the central Maghrib. Al-Mansûr, who had taken bands of Hilâlî mercenaries into his service, took the field
repeatedly against them, till the defeat of the Almoravid general Ibn Tanimert at Djebel Tessa{"e}l and the recapture of Tlemcen by al-Man\={u}\={s}\={u}r 496 = 1102 checked the progress of the Almoravids. Successful campaigns against the Berbers, who had risen in several districts, finally completed the restoration of order.

Soon afterwards however, the decline of Ham\={u}\={m}\={a}\={d} power began. The successes of al-A\={i}z\={i}z (498–515 = 1104–1121), al-Man\={u}\={s}\={u}r's successor, whose fleet captured Liptar and who defeated the Arabs who had invaded Hodna, were only temporary. His successor Yah\={y}a, devoted to women and the chase, proved utterly incapable of coping with the ever increasing danger that threatened his kingdom from without. In 1136 the Genoese plundered Bougie, the Berbers again became restive, the Hilali Arabs continued their raids, and finally the Almohads invaded the central Maghreb. On the approach of Abd al-Munim, the Ham\={u}\={m}\={a}d al-K\={a}\={i}d, governor of Algiers, abandoned the city without offering any resistance. S\={e}ha, another brother of the Sultan, suffered a defeat at Bougie, while Yah\={y}a himself fled from his capital which was thereafter occupied by Abd al-Munim [q.v., i. 51] without opposition. After its fall al-Kal'a was razed to the ground by the invaders. Yah\={y}a, who had first of all fled to B\={o}\={n}a, and then to Constantine, finally surrendered to the conqueror without striking a blow (547 = 1152). He was taken a prisoner to Marr\={a}k\={u}\={s}\={u}ch and then to Sale, where he died in 558 (1163).

Chronological Survey of the Ham\={u}\={m}\={a}d Dynasty.

List of the Ham\={u}\={m}\={a}d rulers.

\begin{itemize}
  \item H\={a}m\={m}\={a}d b. Bulakkn. \(405–419 \) (1014–1028)
  \item al-K\={a}\={i}d, son of Ham\={m}\={a}d \(439–446 \) (1028–1055)
  \item Mu\={s}\={i}m, son of al-K\={a}\={i}d. \(446 \)
  \item Bulakkn b. Mu\={s}\={a}hm\={a}d. \(447–454 \) (1055–1062)
  \item al-N\={a}\={s}\={i}r b. A\={e}lm\={a}n\={a} s. \(454–481 \) (1062–1088)
  \item al-Man\={u}\={s}\={u}r, son of al-N\={a}\={s}\={i}r \(481–498 \) (1088–1104)
  \item B\={a}\={d}\={s}, son of al-Man\={u}\={s}\={u}r \(498 \)
  \item al-A\={i}z\={i}z, son of al-Man\={u}\={s}\={u}r \(498–515 \) (1105–1122)
  \item Yah\={y}a, son of al-A\={i}z\={i}z. \(515–547 \) (1122–1152)
\end{itemize}


\textbf{HAM\={M}\={A}L} (Ar. \textit{hamada} "to carry"), messenger, porter. In countries where the roads and means of transit are still very primitive, the porter is indispensable for the transport of all kinds of goods. In Muslim lands the \textit{ham\={m}\={a}l} are therefore numerous and much employed; sometimes they carry burdens, which in other countries would only be dispatched with the help of beasts of burden or conveyances. The simplest equipment used by the \textit{ham\={m}\={a}l} is a fairly thick rope which he ties round the object to be carried and thus keeps it firm on his back. But where the \textit{ham\={m}\={a}l} are organised into gilds as in Constantinople, they carry on their backs a padded saddle (\textit{zemir}) covered with leather resting on a piece of leather on the back (\textit{ark\={a}k\={e}}). On this the weight of the burden rests and it takes the place of a porter's crate. If however the burden is too heavy for one man, several work together by taking a long stick (\textit{zyry\={e}}) between each two from which the trunk or bale is hung by ropes. — When the \textit{ham\={m}\={a}l} are going through a crowd carrying burdens they pass and shove the people aside, at the same time calling out in Arabic: \textit{Oa r\={a}\={s}"{a}k (dahrah) "Mind your head (or back)", or in Turkish: \textit{Dokunmasyn (look out) or varda (Ital. guarda).} In Persia the European women are carried in sedan-chairs (\textit{ze\={d}eh}), like those which were used in Europe in the xvith century; this service also is in the hands of the \textit{ham\={m}\={a}l}.

(\textbf{CL. Huart.)}

\textbf{HAMM\={A}M} (lit. "heater", Ar. \textit{hamma} "to heat"), Hebr. \textit{hamam} "to be warm"). a hot steam-bath. These are isolated buildings communicated with the street or market place by one or less imposing door; they consist of a number of large rooms surrounded by little chambers and crowned by domes pierced with holes to admit the light, which filters through little glass bells like bottle-bottoms. The first room to be entered is the \textit{maslak} (\textit{apodyterium, spoliorium}), where the clothes are taken off and put up into a bundle which is entrusted to the owner of the bath; in the centre is a basin with a jet of water (\textit{faz\={i}ya}). The \textit{har\={a}ra} (\textit{caldarium, sudatio}) is next entered, a large room filled with steam; to avoid touching the superheated marble floor, wooden shoes or slippers with high heels are worn (\textit{ha\={k}\={a}k\={i}a}). Here the bather stays till he perspires; the attendant then takes him into one of the little chambers with a basin (\textit{magh\={a}\={t}, piscina}), which surround the \textit{har\={a}ra}, or into one where there are hot and cold taps (\textit{ha\={n}afiyah}), and rubs his body, after making all his joints crack, with a horse hair-glove (\textit{k\={i}b}), which removes the epidermis in grey rolls, and covers him entirely with frothy soap, beaten up to a lather by means of a \textit{tij} (palm-fibres), till he is quite clean. All that is now to be done is to wash in hot water, dry and wrap oneself up including the head, in clean linen and go back to the \textit{maslak} to rest there smoking and drinking lemonade or coffee. On days, when the bath is reserved for women, a piece of cloth is hung across the outer door. In winter, the clothes are taken off in a room between the \textit{maslak} and the \textit{har\={a}ra}, which corresponds to the \textit{tepidarium} and is called \textit{bait awsal} (first room).

In Persian the \textit{ham\={m}\={a}m} is called \textit{garm-\={a}be}, the apodyteryrium binæ (H. Fert, \textit{Journ. As.}, 8th Ser., vii. 391, note 2) and in Turkish \textit{g\={i}mekn} (Vers. \textit{g\={i}mekn}.


(\textbf{CL. Huart.)}

\textbf{HAMM\={U}DIDS}. The Ham\={u}\={m}\={a}dids are the successors of the two sons of the descendant of the Prophet \textit{Hamm\={u}\={m}d b. Maim\={u}n b. Ah\={m}d b. \textit{Ali b. Ub\={a}id All\={a}h b. Omar b. Idris b. \textit{Abd All\={a}h b. al-\={I}s\={a}n b. \textit{Ali b. Abi \={T}alib}, who are connected with the Idrisids of Morocco (172–375 = 788–958) through Idris b. \textit{Abd All\={a}h} [q. v.] founder of the dynasty. In the confusion of the civil war that preceded the fall of the Umayyads...
of Cordova, the elder brother, al-Kaṣim, obtained the governorship of Algeciras [q. v.] and his ambitious younger brother 'Ali that of Tangier and Ceuta. After conquering Malaga the latter overthrew the feeble Umayyad Sulaymān al-Mustawwir (407 = 1016) and made himself Caliph in Cordova. After his assassination the brother al-Kaṣim did the same (408 = 1018), in 412-413 = 1021-1022 he was driven from the throne by his nephew, Yahyah b. 'Ali, but regained it in 413-414 = 1022-1023, at the same time ruling Malaga 1018-1021 and 1022-1025. 'Ali's descendant's (8) maintained themselves in Malaga from 1025 till 1057, when it passed to the Berber Zirid prince 'Ališ [q. v.] of Granada, while Algeciras remained under the sway of al-Kaṣim's son Muhammad al-Mahdi (431-440 = 1039-1048) and his grandson al-Kaṣim al-Walīgh (440-450 = 1048-1058), when it was taken by the 'Abbāsidis [q. v.] of Seville, 'Ali's son Yahyah ruled Malaga 416-427 = 1025-1035 and was succeeded by Idris I al-Mutā'aīyid 427-431 = 1035-1039, Hasan al-Mustā'zīr 431-434 = 1039-1042, Idris II al-'Alī 434-438 = 1042-1046, Muhammad I al-Mahdi 438-444 = 1046-1052, Idris III al-Mawaffaḳ 444-445 = 1052-1053, Idris II (second reign) 445 = 1053, and lastly Muhammad III al-Mustā’lī 446-449 = 1054-1057. Just as the half berberised early Ḥammūdids shared a glory reflecting from the dying Caliphate of Cordova, a century later the dynasty has the darkness into which it was sinking illumined by the scholarly efforts of the court geographer of the Norman Roger II of Sicily in Palermo, al-Sharīf al-Idrisī [q. v.], the grandson of the kindly but feeble Idris II of Malaga.


(C. F. SEYBOLD)
at the battle of Uḥud where he wrought wonders of valour. The negro Waṣḥi pierced him with a javelin, tore his breast open and brought him still beating heart to Hind, the mother of Muʿawiyah, who buried her teeth in it. So at least says one story hostile to the Umayyads and without much support. Ḥamza is said to have been about 57—59 years old. But if our view is correct, that ten years should be deducted from the 60—65 years usually given to the Prophet, it will be necessary to reduce ten years younger also. None of Ḥamza's children left issue. Cf. also the articles BAKD and OHOD.


(HELMANN.)

ḤAMZA b. 'Ali b. AHMAD, founder of the theological system of the Druses and author of several treatises, which have obtained a place among the sacred books of the Druses. Little is known of his life with certainty. According to al-Nuwairi, he belonged to Zawzan (Zarzaran) in Persia and was by trade a maker of felt (labbāf). In 410 (1019) he is said to have first publicly put forward his doctrines but, according to Ḥamza's own statements, this took place two years earlier in 408 (1017), from which year the Druses date the manifestation of the divine incarnation in the person of the Fāṭimīd caliph al-Ḥākim b. Amr Allāh [q. v. ii. 225] and the beginning of the Druse era. It is not certain when he came to Egypt, possibly in 405 or 406. But after he publicly proclaimed his doctrines in a mosque in Cairo, a riot broke out and Ḥamza had to remain in concealment for a time under the Caliph's protection. What became of him after the latter's disappearance (411 = 1020) is unknown. He plays a still greater rôle in the religious system of the Druses as Kā'im al-Za'mān or last incarnation of the universal intelligence (āḏī). According to al-Makīn and other authors, he was usually called al-Ḥādi i.e. Ḥādi 'l-Maṣṭafātībn, leader of those who obey (the divine call).

**Bibliography:** De Sacy, Exposé de la religion des Druses, Introduction p. 37 et seq.; Texts i. 98 et seq., ii. 2 et seq.; Blochet, Le Missionnisme, p. 94 et seq.

ḤAMZA, called the Sīliḥdār, was born about 1140 in the district of Dewelū Karahisar, the son of a landed Agha, called Mehemned; he began his career in 1156 in the halwa-ghāne (honey-bakery) of the Imperial kitchen (cf. v. Hammer, Staatsverfassung etc., ii. 31), but soon his gifts won him a position among the pages (enderum-ḥumayd), where he won the favour of Mustafā III. When the latter came to the throne in the 21st Safar 1171, he at once appointed Ḥamza his sīliḥdār (sword-bearer), see v. Hammer, l. c. ii. 238 note, afterwards granted him the rank of vizier and betrothed him to the infant princess Hibetullah, who died however on the 15th Dhu 'Hijja 1175. From 1172—1182, he filled in quick succession no fewer than twelve governorships in Rumelia and Anatolia, in accordance with the system then in force in annual change of office; in this period he fell into disgrace for a few months in 1178 and was banished to Demotica with loss of his rank. As wali of Egypt in 1179 he came into conflict with the Mamlik Emirs and the celebrated Shāhī b. Bendī 'Ali Bey (v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Osman. Reiches, viii. 292) and was finally driven out of the country by them. When in 1182 (1768) the Sultan was eager for a breach with Russia, but found his bellicose plans opposed by the Grand Vizier Muṣḥin-zade Muḥammad Pasha and the Shāhī al-Īslām, he dismissed the former on the 21st Rabī' II 1182 and appointed in his place his old favourite the Sīliḥdār Ḥamza, who was at that time governor of Anadolu. A few days after his arrival in the capital the new grand vizier had the ultimatum to Russia approved at a great council and imprisoned the Russian resident Obreschok, who declined to fulfil the demands of the Porte, in the Seven Towers (4th and 6th October 1178, see v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Osman. Reiches, viii. 312 et seq.); in consequence the unfortunate war with Russia broke out, which was only concluded by the peace of Kīčuk Kainardja in 1774. Ḥamza Pasha did not live to see the beginning of hostilities; he was suddenly dismissed from office on the 8th Djamād I 1182 (20th Oct. 1768), the cause given being insanity, but others say at the instigation of the Khān of the Crimea and sent to Crete as governor of Canea; on his way thither he died at Gallipoli in the same month.


(J. H. MORTMANN.)

ḤAMZA ḤAMID PASCHA, son of a merchant of Dewelū Karahisar, named Ahmed Agha, was born in Constantinople in 1110 and entered upon his official career in the offices of the Sublime Porte. Owing to the protection of the celebrated Raṣḥib Pasha (Grand vizier 1170—1176), whose pupil he was in the elaborate prose of the official style, he received a secretarial appointment to the Grand Vizier on the 10th Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1153 (5th January 1741), which he held for many years. On the 15th Muḥarram 1169 he was appointed Raṣḥ al-Kutbah (i.e. Minister of Foreign affairs) and, in addition to other high offices in the years following, three times filled the office of kānyū to the Grand Vizier, i.e. Minister of Home affairs, but only for short periods and without further distinguishing himself. After being appointed "vizier of the dome" in Rabī' II 1176 he took the place of the Grand Vizier Raṣḥib Pasha, when the latter fell severely ill in Ramaḍān 1176, and on his death (24th Ramaḍān 1176 = 8th March 1563) he succeeded him. But he was not a strong enough man for this position, for, as his biographers say, he was slow in coming to a decision and was too fond of ease and comfort. The only note-worthy event of his period of office was his sending Ahmed Resmi Efendi to the court of Friedrich II in response to Graf Rexin's embassy (cf. Zinkeisen, Gesch. d. Osman. Reiches, V, 907 et seq.). After less than a year of office he was deposed on the 24th Rabī' II 1177 = 2nd Nov. 1177 and sent to Crete, where
he remained, except for a brief interval, till 1183. In this year at his own request he was given the governorship of Dijād and Ḥabesh and died in Mecca in Dhu Ḥijjah 1183.


**ḤAMZA AL-HARRĀNĪ,** a prominent family in Damascus of 'Aliid descent, which for so many centuries filled the office of Ḥākib al-Aṣghārī there, so that the family is sometimes simply called Bait al-Ḥākib. Muhībī Khulqūt al-Āthīrī (ii. 105) gives the complete genealogy down to the xīth (xvith) century. As early as 330 (941-942) a member of this family, Ismā'īl b. Ḥusayn al-Naffī, who was Ḥākib, and this office has passed from father to son to the present day. Several members of the family distinguished themselves by their learning and literary gifts, as may be seen from Muhībī, ii. 105 et seq., 125 et seq., iv. 124 et seq. One of the best known members of the family in later times was Maḥmūd Ḥamza, born in Damascus in 1236 (1821), who became Mufīt of Syria and won the thanks of the oppressed Christians during the massacres in his native town (1860) by his conduct. He was the author of an imposing series—35 titles are enumerated—as writings, mostly on theological and legal subjects, of several have been printed. He was also an excellent calligrapher; in his leisure-hours he used to amuse himself by writing the fatīha on a grain of rice or the names of those who fell at Badr on the stone of a signet ring. Maḥmūd Ḥamza died in 1305 (1887).

**Bibliography:** G. Zaidān, Muhībī al-Sharkī, ii. 165 et seq.; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Lit., ii. 466.

**ḤAMZA AL-ISPHAḤĀNĪ.** This is the shorter name by which the philologist and historian Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ḥamza b. Abū ʿIsān al-Iṣphaḥānī is usually known. He was born in the viiith decade of the third century A. H. in Isfahān in Persia and spent his life—except for a few journeys for purposes of study—in his native town, where he died between 350 and 360 (971-971). Although on his journeys he attended the lectures of the most important traditionalists of his time, his own special field was philology and history. His „Annals“ which became known comparatively early in Europe, have caused him to be described almost exclusively as a historian. The majority, however, of his works deals with questions of philology and lexicography. Of the twelve works, which he is known to have written, three have survived to us viz. „the Annals“ (Hamzās Iṣphaḥānīs Annalium libri x, ed. I. M. E. Gottwaldt, Tom. i., Text. Arab., Tom. ii., Transl. Lat., Petrograd 1844-1848), the Kitāb al-Amthāl al-Afʿal, is a collection of proverbs in the form of comparisons (e. g. more general than Ḥaṭīm) preserved in the Munich Codex Anmer 642, and his edition of the Diwan of Abū Nuwās (Berlin Ms., Ahlwardt, Nr. 7531, and Cairo, iv. 239, besides 3 incomplete MSS.). Ḥamza’s writings are characterised by a strong personal note. A characteristic of his is his habit of paying particular attention to Persian affairs, readily explained by his Persian origin. He did this in his „Annals“ as well as in his philological works, in which he delights to discuss Persian words that have found their way into Arabic, and Pehlevi etymologies. All his works moreover bear evidence of a critical attitude, which often expresses itself very pithily. His criticism however is not, one might perhaps expect, one-sided or directed against the Arabs and Ḥamza cannot be described as a representative of the linguistic Shī′īyya, the „philological reaction against Arabic influence“—Ḥamza’s works soon found approval and have been much copied. In particular, al-Maʾṣūmī has copied almost literally Ḥamza’s collection of „comparative“ proverbs in the second section of each chapter of his Maṣūmī al-Amthāl.


**ḤANAFĪS.** The Ḥanafīs are those Sunni Muslims who follow the teaching founded by Abū Ḥanīfā (f. 701-76, see above i. 908 et seq.) which has been collected and contained in several authoritative, more or less detailed writings of his pupils. Abū Ḥanīfā [q. v. i. 1149] and al-Shābānī [q. v.] in particular were the direct pupils of Abū Ḥanīfā who developed the system of Fīqḥ on their master’s principles and placed the Ḥanafī school on a firm basis. Although rival systems arose in opposition to the Ḥanafī school, at once in the case of the school of Malik and later in that of Shāfiʿī, which found more support in certain parts of the Muslim world, it was always able to assert itself in the eastern lands of the Caliphate and finally to attain an unchallenged supremacy in the Ottoman empire. In Central Asia also and in the Indian subcontinent and in the Sunnīs the majority of the Sunni Muslims belong to it.

The necessary preparatory work for a history of the Ḥanafī school has not yet been done, so that we will not here attempt to define the relationship of this school to the others. The usual view, however, is certainly wrong, namely that the Ḥanafīs represent more liberal views than the other schools; as regards principles they are on exactly the same ground as the others. For the rest the reader may be referred to the article Fīqḥ [ii. 103]. The Arabs have been content to collect biographical and bibliographical data in the so-called Ṭabābāy (class-books) among which the best known is Ibn Kullubūgha’s [q. v.] compendium edited by Flügel. Cf. Die Klassen der Hanefitischen Rechtsgelehrten by G. Flügel in Abhandl. der Königl. Sächs. Gesells. der Wissenschaft, vol. 8, Leipzig 1861. For works of the kind cf. Ḥadīṯī Khūṣīd, s. v. It may therefore be sufficient to mention here a few of the most famous legal compendiums, which are considered authoritative within the madhab and whose authors are all dealt with in separate articles. Such are the Kitāb al-Khārijī of Abū Ḥanīfā, the Qāmūs al-arṣād of al-Shābānī, the Muḫtaṣar of al-Kudūrī, the Ḥṣāya of al-Marrūnī and its commentaries notably the Wāḥidā of Burhan al-Dīn Maḥmūd, the Faraḍī of al-Saʿdāwī, the Kitāb al-Majmūʿ al-Raḥīm of Ibn
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all cases of the plane and spherical triangle with the aid of the rules discovered (rule of the four quantities, theorem of tangents, rule of the plane and spherical sines etc.).

On purely practical geometry (mensuration, geodesy) the Arab mathematicians as a rule did not write special treatises, but discussed such problems in their works on the construction and use of the astrolabe and quadrant, on which cf. E. Wiedemann's work quoted below.


Händüs (i. e. brass or basse silver), the name of the base small money of the Magrib in the 7th to 9th centuries, the delasped copies of the square Almohad silver coins, which had long enjoyed great popularity and were struck by many Christian rulers as monetae militarem, milliaries. — The rūnātayya are small, irregularly cut little coins of base silver weighing from 7 to 14 grains. As a rule they bear neither ruler's name, mint nor date, but only a religious legend (a variant of Qurān, x. 47) and probably owe their origin to the Zird, Hāsfī, Marinid and other rulers of North Africa and the smaller Spanish dynasties of this period. They attained a certain importance as a standard coin in the petty commerce of the western Mediterranean and were therefore also imitated by the Christian mints of Spain and south-eastern France.

Bibliography: al-Bayān (ed. Dozy, i. 265, transl. E. Tafoin, i. 376); De Slane, Histoire des Bâbères, ii. 354; J. Sauvage, Matières etc., i. 152; Longprérier, Oeuvres, v. 320; H. Lavoix, Catalogue des Monnaies musulmanes, Espagne et Afrique, Préface, p. xxxix, and p. 202; Dozy, Supplément, i. 331. (E. V. Zambara.)

Hānī, b. Īrwa, one of the principal chiefs of the Banū Murād in Kufa, in the early years of the governorship of Ubaid Allah, son of Ziyād. He was a devoted adherent of the Ālids and was numbered among the ḫurrān, or distinguished reciters of the Qurān. When Muslim b. Āqīl, the cousin and secret agent of Husain b. Ali, in Kufa, learned of the arrival of the new governor Ubaid Allah in this city, he hurriedly left his previous place of refuge, the house of Mkhṭār, to find a new asylum with Hānī b. Īrwa. The latter had, although unwillingly, to agree to receive the fugitive for whom the authorities were searching, but he was denounced to Ubaid Allah and a few days later hanged beside Muslim b. Āqīl on the public square of Kufa.


Hānīf (A.) "May it do you good", is said by one who denies an invocation (made by saying taḥfīd al-bismillāh) to a meal. The omission of this wish would be not only a gross discourtesy but would expose the meal itself to the danger of the evil eye; so Lane, Manners and Customs, chap. v. — According to Hartmann, Arab. Sprachführer, p. 39, in Syria, people, who still retain old customs, say to one who has drunk, "Hānīf", whereupon the latter answers bānāk allāh or alla yāhanni. — An invitation to eat is declined in Syria with the word afḍāl or afḍalū "thou art (you are) very kind".

(H. Bauer.)

Hānīf (pl. ḥunafā‘) appears repeatedly in the Korān as the name of those who possess the real and true religion; e. g. in Sūra, x. 105; xxii. 32; xxx. 29; xviii. 4 etc. It is used particularly of Abraham as the representative of the pure worship of God. As a rule it contrasts him with the idolaters as in iii. 89; vi. 79, 162; x. 105; xvi. 121, 124; xxii. 32; but in one or two passages it at the same time describes him as one who was neither a Jew nor a Christian; e. g. ii. 129: they (the Ahl al-Kitāb) say, become Jews or Christians that ye may be rightly guided! But thou shalt say: the religion of Abraham as a hānīf; he was not one of the polytheists, and iii. 60: Abraham was neither Jew nor Christian, but hānīf muslim and was not one of the polytheists. The simple collocation of hānīf and muslim found in this passage is sufficient to show that for Muhammad the word was not the name of a particular religious body, which is still clearer from the phrase hunaṭa‘ il-lāhī, xxii. 32, so that the existence of Ḥanīfism as an organised body as insisted particularly by Sprenger has no support in the Korān itself. Sūra, xxx. 29 is of special importance for the understanding of the Korān meaning of the word, where is said: "Turn thy face towards religion as hānīf, (namely) Allāh's creation (fiṭra) according to which he has created man; there is no change in the work of Allāh;" cf. also vi. 79; x. 105. It is clear here that the word means the original, innate, primitive religion in contrast to the particular which arose later, polytheism on the one hand and the in part corrupt religions of the possessors of scriptures. As to the period of composition of the passages quoted, they may be mainly ascribed with certainty to Medina, only in vi. 79, x. 105, xviii. 4, it is doubtful, but here also we must consider the possibility that they were afterwards put into another form. The later Islamic application of the word depends on the linguistic usage of the Korān. The Ḥanīfyya (very rarely Ḥanṣafyya) means the religion of Abraham, e.g. Ibn Ḥishām, p. 143, 8, 147, 4, 822, 1. But as Muhammad renovated the pure religion of Abraham, hānīf is frequently used in the sense of muslīm (Mussulmanan), e.g. Ibn Ḥishām, p. 982, 18, 995, 11, cf. also p. 871, 5, where hānīf is used of religion itself in the sense of "pure, orthodox" as well as the obsolete verse of Farazdāk, Naṣirī, i. 379, 11, where the variant offers a different reading.

In various traditions the Prophet describes the religion proclaimed by him as al-ḥanīfiyya al-samāḥa, the mild or liberal Ḥanīfism, in opposition to ascetic movements, e. g. Ibn Sa'd, i. 1, 128, 13; ii. 1, 287, 8. The verb ḥannūn means sometimes the purer exercise of religion in the pagan period (Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, iv. 156),
sometimes it is practically the equivalent of "to adopt Islam", Kāmil, p. 526, 8 (a poem by Dārā); Lisān al-'Arab, x. 404, 17. It is the same with the verb tabannath, which Hirschfeld and Lyall as previously E. Deutsch, wish to derive from the Hebrew teḥannath, but it perhaps rather derived from tabannath (cf. Nöldeke, Neue Beiträge zur Semit. Sprachwissenschaft, p. 72); for the latter is explained by Ibn Hāšām, p. 152, 9, and Tāhānī, i. 1149, 12, by tabarrnū, to practise piety, but means also, to become Muhammadan, Tāhānī, i. 2827, 17.
The above mentioned passage also (Sīra, xxx. 29) where the word means the innate religion is found in later Arabic authors, e.g., Kāmil, p. 244, 3: What is a hanīf ala 'Iṣfārī... or Diyārkāri, ii. 177; if I die 'ala ẓāri'ī 'l-Ībā, Connected with this, but at the same time remarkably modified is the use of the word by some authors as the designation not of the pure primitive religion but of the ancient paganism, which preceded the later separate religions. Thus Ya‘qūbī calls the Philistines, who fought against Saul and David, ḥanafī and adds that they worshipped the stars; and particularly Mas‘ūdī in his Tanbūh uses the word as identical with zāhītan [q.v.] of the people of Persia and the Roman empire, before they adopted Mazdaism and Christianity respectively, and distinguishes this step in religious development as the first hanīfīya from the pure hanīfī religion. At the same time he says that the word is an arabicised form of the Syriac hanīfī, in which connection it should be remembered that the Syriac hanīfī is actually used particularly of the Šabians (e.g. Barhebraeus, Chron., p. 176).
If we now inquire into the origin and earliest history of the word hanīfī, the first thing to do is to look for passages which may possibly contain a use of the word independent of the Korānic usage. But unfortunately most of such passages present great difficulties either because their genuineness is doubtful or because they are so indefinite and uncertain that different interpretations are possible. Scholars have thus arrived at utterly different results, e.g., Wellhausen deduces from such passages, that hanīfī originally meant a Christian ascetic; de Goede explains the word by "heathen", and E. Mayer (in A. H. 51) thinks the word everywhere means Muslim. This last meaning undoubtedly best fits an oft quoted verse of the first century A. H. (Yākūt, ii. 51; Kitāb al-agāhā, xvi. 45 etc.), where the hanīfī is distinguished from the Christian priest and the Jewish rabbi. On the other hand, it is doubtful if this meaning is also found in the story of the death of the Baki Christian Bīstām, the scene of which is laid in northeast Arabia (Kāmil, p. 131, 5; Naqātī, ed. Bevan, i. 314). Bīstām called, when his brother wished to return to him: I shall become a hanīfī, if thou wilt return! However, Mubarrad shows, by his remark to the effect that Muḥammad had then appeared as a Prophet, that he understood hanīfī to mean Muslim; but the sense is much more forceful if one translates it by "heathen" (Nöldeke) or "apostate". In Şāhī’s verse (Ḫūṣraw, Kosegarten, xxvi. 11), where the wine-drinking Christians are making a noise around a hanīfī, one of the scholars suggests Muslim; but the passage would equally fit an ascetic who refrained from wine. The same holds of the hanīfī in the verse of Dūḥi Ṭūma, Lisān al-‘Arab, xiii. 206, who turns to the west when praying, unlike the Christians, cf. the comment.

The Hadīth verse, Lisān al-‘Arab, vi. 133, where there is a reference to a stay for worship made by a hanīfī is quite colourless, Greater value might, on the other hand, be attached to some verses where the verb tabannūf appears in the above mentioned sense of performing acts of worship. One is by a heathen poet Dārān al-‘Awd of the Hawazin tribe of Numair in Nadīj (Lisān al-‘Arab, x. 404, cf. Kāmil, i. 198), and mentions as-‘ābil al-muṭaṭāḥānīfī, who observes his prayers (ṣalāt), by which he can only mean an Arab ascetic; Dārān (Naqātī, ii. 595, 18) must also be thinking of such a one when he says of a tribe, that they have allied themselves with some of the Christians with the religion him who yataḥannūfī. The poems, which are ascribed to certain contemporaries of Muḥammad, would bring us an essential step forward, if their genuineness were only to some degree certain, but this is unfortunately not the case. This is particularly true of the verses placed in the mouth of the Awst opponent of the Prophet, Abū Kāsīb al-Aslāt, in which he invites the foundation of a din hanīfī, a pure faith (Ibn Ḥāšām, p. 180, 5), and contrasts this primitive religion to Christianity and Judaism (ibid., p. 293). The genuineness of the poem of Umayyā b. Ḥabīb, and the salt, very doubtful. Even if we set aside these poems, however, the verses quoted above are sufficient to show, what must be considered quite certain, namely that Muḥammad in his use of this word was simply following a recognised usage, and it may be suggested as highly probable that hanīfī even before his time denoted the people, who, although influenced by Christianity, had refused both Christianity and Judaism in favour of a simpler and more primitive religion. But the historical development of such a movement is wrapped in an obscurity, which cannot be cleared up with the material at present available. That it was connected with the religious movements of South Arabia, as modern scholars suppose, is possible, but by no means certain, as the most reliable of the verses quoted belong to the north.

As to the etymology of the word, as has already been mentioned, even Mas‘ūdī had seen in it an Arabic loanword and his opinion has also a number of champions in modern times, who derive the word from the Canaanite-Aramaic hanūfī "hypocrite, godless, heathen, heretic". That this view would find substantial support, if the meaning "heretic" in the above-mentioned story of Bīstām were correct, is illuminating. The word would then be a foreign name for heretic, which those to whom it was applied, had somehow adopted in Arabia in a good sense. In any case, we should have to be content with this derivation from the Aramaic, as the corresponding Ethiopic word to which H. Winckler proposes to trace it as a foreign loanword only found in literature. Schulthess has, it is true, rightly pointed out that the Aramaic hanūfī, hanūfī cannot become the Arabic hanīfī, but this probably only shows that we must presuppose an intermediate form, and this is supported by the form of the word in Mandaean, cf. the Syriac abstract noun hanīfū, mentioned by Mas‘ūdī. Besides we might, if forced, attain the meaning "sectarianist" from the Arabic hanūfī "to break off" which would give a similar development of mean-
ing; and of course the possibility must not be excluded that new South Arabian texts may throw light on the word and its history.


ḤANIFA b. Luʾājām, an important branch of the great North Arabian tribe of Bakr b. Wāʾil [q. v.], consanguineous to the Ḥidj. During the Ḥijāţ they were in part heathen, in part Christian. The pagans honoured an idol in the form of a cake of butter and honey, which they used themselves to consume in time of famine.

They led a settled life in Yamānā, where they built the fortified town of Ḥadjr, which later became the capital. The Ḥidj l-ʾIrād and among others the following places belonged to them: al-ʾAwša (inhabited by the clan ʾAdi), Faiṣān (belonging to the clan ʾAmīr), al-Kirs (on the lower Wādt l-ʾIrād, inhabited by ʾAdi), Khidrīma (a large town with many villages, inhabited by the Suḥaim and ʾAmīr along with the Ḥidj), Kurran (belonging to the clan Suḥaim), al-Mansūf (a fortified town, belonging to the ʾAmīr), Talāʾ b. ʾAtā (inhabited by ʾAmīr), al-Thāq (so Hamdānī, Dīẓārī, p. 141, 7; Dīẓārī, p. 162, 25 has al-Nakb; al-Nakb and al-Thāq appear to be identical and there is either a misprint or error in the manuscript; the place belonged to the Ḥidj), Tuʾām (in common with the Azd and ʿAbd al-Kaṣīr), Ubād (a battle took place here between Ḥālid b. Ṣalīh and Musailama) and ʿUthāl. There was also a settlement of Ḥanifa in Ṣanāʾ, the mines of the Numair b. Kaʿb.

Historical. In the last years of the Basīs war [see BAKR b. WĀʾIL] the Ḥanifa separated from the Bakr and went over to their opponents, the Taghlibī, on whose side they then fought. Like the Taghlibī, they recognised the sovereignty of the Lakhmīds [q. v.] in Ḥira, the vassals of the Sasanids. In the famous battle of Ḥāḍir Kār between the Bakr and the Persians [see BAKR b. WĀʾIL] the Ḥanifa took no part.

Ḥawdā b. Ṣādī, chief of the Ḥanifa, resided in ʿAṣār. He had to lead the Persian caravans coming from ʿIrāq to Yemen to protect them from attack on the way. On one such occasion he was attacked by the Tamīm in the ʿAṣār. This was by no means the only occasion on which the Ḥanifa had to fight the Tamīm. When the ʾAmīr, who migrated to Yamān to the Ḥanifa after the battle of Ḥabāʾa (with the Ḥabīyān) quarrelled with the chief of the Ḥanifa Ḥālid b. Musailama, they went to the Saʿd b. Zaid Manāt of the Tamīm and found asylum with them. In the battle of Sītār Ḳaṣī b. ʿĀṣim of the Tamīm slew Ḥālaṭa. Of other battles with the Tamīm there may be mentioned that of Ḥusaynī (near Yamānā) and that of al-Zahr.

In Muḥarram 6 = 628 the chief of the Ḥanifa, Ṣuḥaymā b. ʿUthāl, while on his way to Mecca to visit the holy places (ṣumūr), was surprised by thirty Muslims and taken prisoner. He adopted Islam and was released. Through his influence over the Ḥanifa, out of friendship for the Prophet he prevented supplies of provisions reaching the Kūraish in Mecca from Yamānā whence they were wont to obtain them. In the "year of the deputations" (9 = 631) the Ḥanifa appeared before the Prophet under Ḥālid b. Ṣādī, called Musailama, who later appeared as a rival to the Prophet and proclaimed himself a companion and future successor of Muḥammad. When he, whom Muḥammad called al-Kaḍījīb, the "lār," appeared on the scene in 11 = 633 at the same time as the false prophets Aswād al-Anṣūrī and Tulaḥi, a large section of the Ḥanifa followed him, encouraged by their chief Raḍījīb b. Unfūwā, who declared he had heard the Prophet with his own lips in Medina designate Musailama as his colleague and successor. The majority remained faithful to him in the caliphate of Abū Bakr also. ʾIṣṭrīna b. ʿAbī Ḥālabī, who took the field against Musailama, was defeated. An attack by Shuraḫūb b. Ḥaḍram, who was repulsed by the Ḥanifa. Musailama thereupon collected his forces at ʾAšṣārā, a place near Ḥadjr. Here a famous battle was fought with the Muslims under Ḥālid b. Walīd, which ended in the utter rout of the Ḥanifa. Their two leaders, Muḥammad b. Ṣuḥaymā and Raḍījīb b. Unfūwā fell in battle and Musailama was put to death; the Ḥanifa are said to have lost 10,000–20,000 men on this day. When Ḥālid b. Walīd proceeded to besiege Ḥadjr, the Ḥanifa submitted on the intervention of Muṭiḍa and agreed to adopt Islam and deliver up all their movable property, which was divided among the Muslim soldiers.


(H. SCHLEIFER.)

HANSAŁILYA, plural of hansali, the name given to the members of the ṣāliḥī or religious brotherhood, founded by Sīdī Saʿd b. Yusuf al-Hansašī (known in Morocco as Sīdī Saʿd b. Aḥansal). The epithet Aḥansal or Hansašī is said to be derived from his birthplace Hansala, a border village of the tribe of Bent Mīr (in the Moroccan Atlas).
He belonged to a family of marabouts, whose most important ancestor, Sidi Sa‘id al-Kabir, is buried in Dades (southern Morocco), where his tomb is visited by many pilgrims. After the example of this holy man Sidi Sa‘id b. Yusuf spent the whole of his youth in studying the teachings of the Sufis in the most important zawiyas of Morocco. After spending periods in Fes, Ksar al-Kabir and Tafilt, where the strictness of his conduct became everywhere proverbial, he went to the east, to make a pilgrimage to the tomb of the Prophet. He spent a considerable time in the East and studied successively in Medina and Cairo, where he completed his education in mysticism under the direction of Shāhīkh Sulān, who was popularly believed to have been inspired by the king of the djinn. He then went to Damietta and there became a pupil of Sidi Isā al-Djumali. He received the dhikr (prayer peculiar to the order) from the latter. This dhikr is a kind of poem of great inspiration, usually called damayya‘a. He then went to Alexandria to visit the tomb of the famous Muslim mystic Abu ‘l-Abdās al-Marsi. While he was reading the Kur‘ān one evening by this grave, the saints of the Paradise appeared to him with the Prophet at their head. The latter gave him a whip, to drive away the evil spirit and ordered him to win converts in his native land. Sidi Sa‘id now returned to Morocco and visited the principal zawiyas; he finally settled in Teda, in the zawiya of the Dja‘zuliya and became their ma‘addam. He afterwards founded a zawiya for his own followers in the land of the tribe of Ait-Messat between Teda and the land of the Berbers, on the road to Marrakesh, in the upper valley of the Wādir Dn‘a. There he died on the 1st Rajab 1114 (19 Nov. 1702). He had been able to win great prestige and considerable influence over the Berbers of the Atlas by his conduct.

He was succeeded as head of the brotherhood by his son Yusuf, under whom it developed considerably. Feeling secure in his power he was not afraid to afford shelter to Ahmed Dhababi, the rebellious son of Sulṭān Mulay Isma‘il of Morocco. But this action and the jealousy of the sherifs of the influential marabouts, who were competing with them, cost him his life. His followers were persecuted and some of them entered the other brotherhoods of Morocco.

Yusuf’s successor Sidi Sa‘id flad fled before his persecutors and found safety in the east of the regency of Algiers; there he won a vast number of adherents. His successor was Sidi Mu‘ammār, who was buried among the Talagham, a tribe in the neighbourhood of Constantine. On his death Sidi Zwā‘i became head of the order; he belonged to an old and distinguished family of Constantine and already had a zawiya near this town on the hill of Shattaba. Sidi Zwā‘i’s descendants have since directed the fortunes of the Hansaliya order in an unbroken line. A majority of the adherents of the Hansaliya are to be found in the province of Constantine and the High Atlas.

The chief centres of the influence of the order are: in Morocco the mother zawiya among the Ait-Messat and that of Dades; in Algeria the zawiya of Shettaba, near Constantine, and that of Kef in Tunisia.

The Hansaliya, like several other religious orders, devote great attention to peculiar songs and dances, which produce ecstasy by their effect on the nerves. They also practice flagellation. Their assemblies are secret and only members are admitted. The people credit them with a mysterious power over the djinn. They are therefore often invited to the houses in cases of sickness to drive away the evil spirits, which cause the illness. In Morocco the influence of the head of the zawiya is so great among the Ait-Messat, that in the time of the explorer de Foucauld it was sufficient to afford the traveller protection from Marrakesh to Sfax.

Bibliography: Muhammed b. Taiyib al-Kadiri, Na‘ir al-Maghāni, ii. 170 (Fas 1399); al-Salwī, Kitāb al-Iskā‘i, vi. 57 (Cairo 1312); Kinn, Marabouts et Khouâns, p. 385 (Alger 1884); Depont et Coppolani, Les Conférences religieuses musulmanes, p. 492 (Alger 1897); De Foucauld, Reconnaisance au Maroc, p. 270 with Atlas, Paris 1888.

HANŠI. An ancient town situated 29° 7' N. 75° 58' E. in the Hīsār district of the Panjīāb. Population (in 1901) 16,523. It is the centre of the tāyšil of the same name, a tract partly under irrigation and partly sandy waste, which has a pop. of 128,783.

Hānsi was possibly a foundation of the Kūshāns, but the Tomara Rālpūts held it when historical information is first available. It had passed into the hands of the Cauhāns before it was taken by Mas‘ud I, the Ghaznavid invader, in 427 (1036). It was recovered by the Cauhāns and rose in importance until its conquest by Mu‘izz al-Din in 588 (1192). It was the capital of the country known as Sawalakh until the rise of Hīsār. It does not play an important part in history until it became the headquarters of the soldier of fortune George Thomas in 1758. Thomas ruled a considerable district and struck coins at Hānsi till defeated by Sindia’s army under Perron in 1801. From 1803 till 1857 it was a British military station. Mas‘ud’s first conquest is commemorated by the Shahid-ghandī mosque.

Bibliography: Imp. Gazetteer of India, Panjab, i. 243; Fraser, Military Memoir of Colonel Skinner (London 1851).

HANŻALA b. MĀLĪK, an Arab tribe belonging to the Ma‘addi group. Its genealogy is Hanza b. Mālik b. Zāidī Manāf b. Tammīm. Among its more important subdivisions were the Baradīm (to which the poet Faradāk belonged), Dārim and Yarbi‘. The poet ‘Alkama b. ‘Abada traced his descent from the Hansala.

They dwelled between the two sandhills of Djarud and Marrūt near Himā (Darya) in Yamama. The villages of al-Sammān (with many wells, cisterns and irrigation works), al-Rakāma, the Wādis al-Ghumein and al-Jrik, the lakes Khānī (Wüstenfeld, Register, p. 203, probably by error, Dhābi) and al-Lawāhan, and the mountain Kurfa belonged to them.

Historical. The Hanza played an important part in the ‘Ayyān al-‘Arab. On the second day of Uwara’ (in the Dahna near Bahrain) the Lakhmim king ‘Amr b. Hūd had a hundred Hanza of the clan Dārim buried alive, because one of his brothers, who had been entrusted to the guardianship of the chief of the Dārim, Zurāra b. ‘Udas, was slain by the latter’s son-in-law Suwwāid b. Rabā’ (Amr’s epithet al-Mu‘arrīk ‘the consumer’ dates from this event). When Zurāra’s
lour. The more Somali blood there is in them, the more closely they approach a bright black. The early conquest by Abyssinian kings gave the Amharic language a firm footing in these lands and even when the population had long been Muslim, the Amharic dialect was still retained. This is spoken there to the present day, but it has borrowed more and more from the Galla, the Somali and particularly from the Arabic. It is doomed to decline, as it cannot hold its place against these languages. Quite recently the Shoa Amharic, the language of the governing classes and of polite intercourse in modern Abyssinia has penetrated to the town.

In the period in which the power of the Abyssinian empire stretched far to the south, southeast and southwest, Harar also passed under its sway; but we possess no reliable historical account of this period. The fact that an Amharic dialect is spoken in Harar and Maqetir's statement that Arabic and Abyssinian were spoken in these lands, show that the Abyssinians ruled there in early times; the date may be the xiiith, xith and xith century; for by the xivith century a wave of Islam had begun to roll westward and, although often repulsed, gradually gained ground till for a time in the xviith century it covered all Abyssinia. If we go by tradition, Shekh Abädir is the earliest figure we meet with in the history of Harar. In reality, however, the name Harar is first found in an Abyssinian chronicle, that of King 'Amda Sion (1314—1344); there the governors of Harar are mentioned, who had allied themselves with many others against the Christian king of Abyssinia (Perruchon, *Historie des guerres d'Amda Sion*, Paris 1890, p. 52 and p. 130). At this time Harar belonged to the emirate of Zäila and the chronicle of Harar counts the first Emirs, who were still residing in Zäila, as Emirs of Harar also. The first, to be mentioned in the chronicles, is 'Omar Walshem who may have reigned about 1150. In 1457 Harar appears on Fra Mauro's map, with the name much corrupted however. In 1521 the Emir Abû Bakr transferred his official residence from Zäila to Harar; he was probably forced to do this by the advance of the Turks, who at that time under Selim I were occupying Yemen and the whole African coast to Cape Guardafui and soon naturally came into conflict with the Portuguese, in Zäila also. Meanwhile another man had arisen to seize all power for himself. This was Ahmed called Grañ. This epithet which means "left-handed" was perhaps given him by Christian Abyssinians. He was born about 1505; nothing is known of his origin. He served as a horseman in the Emir's army, but then hatched a conspiracy against him and rebelled. By his victories he made himself independent and forced the Somalis also to follow his standard. His future greatness is said to have been foretold him by a miracle with a swarm of bees and his memory still lives in the popular tales of Abyssinia. He became actual ruler of Harar, but he seems neither to have taken the title *Emir* nor Sultan, but to have contented himself with the title *Ismam*. Beginning in 1576 he waged unceasing war on Abyssinia, soon subdued the whole country, burned monasteries, churches and manuscripts, plundered the treasures of the churches and carried off women, and children into slavery. Many Christians must have then lapsed to Islam, so that later a special ritual had actually to be prepared in the Abyssinian church for the re-baptism of the apostates, who returned to their original faith. In 1543 Grañ fell in battle against the Abyssinians, who were supported by the Portuguese under Christopher da Gama. In 1550—1551, Harar was burned by the Abyssinian general Fämntëll. Several Muslim generals had hostile encounters with the emperor Claudius (1540—1559) and were usually defeated; these battles are celebrated in an old Amharic ballad in praise of the emperor. But Claudius himself fell in battle against Nür, then Emir of Harar. But Nür could make no further progress against the Abyssinians, and at the same time the Galla hordes were pressing forward with all their forces and occupying the lands of Harar. The power of the Emir thus became gradually limited to the town of Harar and the once so mighty kingdom of Zäila. Harar now became an insignificant principality till 1875. In this year Ra'if Pasha of Zäila set out against Harar at the instigation of the Egyptian government, while at the same time Prince Hasan operated against Abyssinia in the north and Münzinger Pasha advanced from Tadjura. The two latter expeditions failed in their object, but Ra'if installed himself securely in Zäila and Harar and began to reorganise the country. The Emir Muhammed 'Abd al-Shakir was pensioned, but murdered in 1876. In 1878 Ra'if was dismissed by Gordon Pasha (General Gordon), as the latter feared that Ra'if might establish himself in Harar independent of Egypt. After several other Pashas had ruled there, it was decided in 1884 to vacate these lands. In 1885 Ridwan Pasha handed over Harar to the Emir 'Abd Allah. But Menelik II of Shoa soon attacked Harar and in the battle of Tshélanken, west of Harar, 'Abd Allah was slain on the 26th January 1887. The correspondence on the occupation of Harar between Menelik II and the king of Italy was published in the *Documente Amaranzi* (Rome 1871), p. 208 and 207. Harar now came once more into the hands of the Abyssinian Christians, who had been driven out of it some 600—700 years before. The celebrated Ras Makonnen was installed as governor, a very capable, clever, energetic and cultured man. He died in 1906; a beautiful church-like tomb was built for him outside the walls of Harar.


AL-HARAWI [See AL-HEREWL.]

**HARAZ** (Haras, Harras, Harráz), a high mountain range in South Arabia, lying to the west of Shaq and the Wadi Surud near Haşar Shu'ayb [q.v.]. It is composed of basalt and is over 8500 feet high. The following mountains belong to the Haraz:
Lahab (with Dhiebeh Mebar, Dhiebeh Medherre, Dhiebeh Shukrafl, Dhiebeh Lakama), Hawzawa (of the South Arabian inscriptions, with the Dhiebeh Karad and Kahil) and Shibam, Masar and joined to the latter, Safan. Of places in Haraz we may mention the large town of Manakha (southeast of Shibam with 3000 inhabitants, residence of the khammak of Haraz, Haima [q. v.]) and the Dhiebeh Aniz southeast of Haraz, Attara (between Masar and Hawzawa, formerly the residence of the da'a of Yam [Nadjran]) the large village of Masar (on the mountain of the same name), Humael, Mityab (both on Mount Safan), Shibam (on the mountain of that name), Lakama (north of Shibam with many Jews), Mawza (three hours from Manakha), Usil (on the mountain of that name near Masar), Birar (Brar, near the latter), Emla or Kusiba (on the Hawzawa); at the foot of the Haraz lies the town of Hudjaila. Among wadies there are Har, Idrub (both west of the Safan, in the land of the Banu Arraf) and Hidyjan (near the village of Birar). There are extensive coffee plantations on the mountains which yield an especially fine quality of coffee. The fruits (apricots, peaches, a small kind of pear, several kinds of grapes and walnuts) are famous far and wide. The people of Haraz are some Shaffiens and some Ismailis.

The Haraz is an enormous district divided as follows:
1. Banu Arraf (on the Safan); 2. Safan proper.
4. al-Maghribia (north of Masar).
5. Banu Ismail (northwest of Masar).
6. Haslwan (on the Wadi Dayyan, a tributary of the Surud).
8. Lahab.
10. Ya'abir (south of Manakha).
11. Muktait (adjoints Thuulith).
12. al-'Ukum (southeast of Manakha).

Down to 1763 the Haraz was (nominally) under the Imam of San'a. In this year, however, it was taken from the Imam by the Ma'rami dynasty of Nadjrjan (Yam) which had just arisen. In 1772 the citadel of the da'a of Yam, Ahmad al-Shalami, at Attara was destroyed by the Turks, whereupon the Imam made peace with the Turks and retired to the lands of their tribe in Nadjrjan.

In Hamdaini's time the Mikhal Haraz comprised the following seven parts: Hawzawa, Kafar (؟؟؟ of the South Arabian inscriptions, Glaser: Kurar, Yakkut: Kira), famous for an excellent breed of cattle, Safan (Yakkut, Safkan, a misprint), Masar (with fortress, well and irrigation works), Lahab, Mudjaliyah (Yakkut: Madjanah) and Shibam (with a fortress and a large mosque). The inclusive name for all these was Haraz and Hawzawa, also called Haraz al-Mustahizriza or briefly Haraz (in Qazwina, p. 105, l. 9-11, to make seven, Haraz al-Mustahizriza and Hawzawa have to be counted as one; in Deza, p. 168, l. 17-19, Shibam and Safan are omitted, but instead Haraz and Haraz al-Mustahizriza are given as two). It is fertile and rich in cornfields, honey and sesame. Among places in Haraz, Hamdaini mentions al-Taim, al-Idrub, 'Adjah, al-Ahaq, al-Dhanabat, al-Arijah, al-Mu'shir, Safwana (a fortifed place). The market of Haraz was al-Mawza. As inhabitants Hamdaini gives the Haraz and Hawzawa whom he describes as two Himyarite stocks; in Haraz there were also Hanatiia, Laif and Nashekh, of the Hamdaini (cf. n. 246). The language of the people of Haraz was midway between good and bad Arabic.

In recent times Haraz has been visited and explored by the traveller Eduard Glaser.

**Bibliography:** Hamdani, Qazwina, p. 68, 179, 21, 103, 28, 105, 9, 245, 15, 126, 10, 14, 17, 135, 7-9, 103, 25; Yakkut, Maqamat, ii. 229; iii. 73, 202, 249; iv. 437, 553; Kay, fawam (London, 1892), p. 18, 19, 145, 175 (transl.); K. Niebuhr, Beschreibung von Arabien, p. 240-250; K. Ritter, Erdkunde, xii. 853, 912, 913, 1009, 1010; A. Sprenger, Die alte Geographic Arabica, p. 248 (§ 880), 251 (§ 882); E. Glaser, Von Hideidza nach San'at (Petern. Mittel., xxiii [1866], p. 6-10; 33-37, 45, and Table I. (J. SIEFFER).**

**Harb,** a powerful Arab tribe of Yemen origin in the Hijaz between Medina and Mecca. They are divided into two great bodies, the Bani Salem and B. Massuh. To the B. Salem belong amongst other clans, al-Jamada, al-Sabib, 'Amr, Mu'ara, Waled Selim, Tamim (not the celebrated great tribe of this name), Muzaina, al-Hawzam (Awaizam, Hazam), and Sa'dan (Sa'din, sing. Sa'dan); to the Massuh, amongst others; Sa'di (Sa'adi), Lahabba (all robbers of pilgrims), Bishr, al-Humran, 'Ali, al-Djaham, Banu Hassayen (al Aghraib), and Banu 'Amr.

Doughty gives amongst others the following villages of the B. Salem (between Medina and Yanbu) and on the great Wadi Fara (in Robey Ferra's), Djedida, Umm Teyyan (Dejeyan), Kaif, Dar al-Hamra, al-Kissa, al-Khorma, al-Wasita, al-Hassanie, al-Safa (with extensive date-palm groves and a large market; besides the chief article of commerce, the date, which is here sold very cheaply and the excellent honey from the adjoining mountains, genuine Mecca balsam is sold here, and is found genuine nowhere else in Arabia except at Badar), al-'Ali, Djedid, Bedur (Beda?), Medus, Shatia (Sweyka); of Massuh: al-Kherebyey (near Mecca), Kyles, RBaeb (not far from here the traveller Charles Huber was murdered by his retinue, the Harz), al-Swerya. A portion of the Harz also lived in the Wadi Al-Ham (al-Ham near Wadi Rumma), the small harbour of Liij and the Dhiebel Figgera (Fiikera between Medina and Yanbu, belonging to the B. Salem). The Harz, who make the pilgrims' route between Mecca and Medina unsafe by their ambushes and are therefore held in terror by the Syrian pilgrims, came from Yemen to the Hijaz (a clan of the Wadi' of the Hishid [q. v.] bears the same name) in the Muslim period. In the beginning of last century they succeeded only after hard fighting in overcoming the Wahhabis [q. v.]. During Palgrave's stay in Nejd, in 1864, the Shammar chief Telaf b. Rashid in person led an expedition against the Harz tribes and conquered a portion of them. Palgrave gives the number of the Harz, who were under the Shammar chief, as 14,000. Doughty on the other hand only 2000. In his Qazwina Hamdaini mentions the Harz as neighbours of the Bal [q. v.] and Djdateina [q. v.] in the country between Khaihar and Medina and near Mecca.

**Bibliography:** Hamdani, Qazwina, p. 82, 20, 110, 17, 120, 201, 130, 15-16; Burckhardt, Travelers, p. 306, 406, 423; K. Ritter, Erdkunde, xii. 153, 154, 207, 1030; xiii. 144-146, 452, 453, 469, 480; A. Sprenger, Die alte Geographic Arabica, p. 153 (§ 225), W. Palgrave, Travels in Arabia, ii. 42, 66; Ch. M. Doughty, Travels in Arabia Deserta (Cambridge 1888),
i. 125, 128, 144, 235; ii. 20, 21, 24, 85, 114, 174, 308, 309, 461, 478, 511, 512-513.

(J. SCHIEFELB.)

HARBA, (plur. hIRaB) spear. According to the Arab lexicographers, the harba is smaller than the ruma means larger than the anaus [v.]. It has the same function as the latter in the Muslim ceremonial, and we therefore find in some traditions that in Muhammad's time an 'anaus, in others a harba was used as sutra [v.] (cf. the chapter sutra and anaus in the different collections of tradition.) It has been supposed that the erection of a sutra at the salat had originally a protective object; in agreement with this is the fact that, according to some traditions, when the Prophet went out to relieve nature he had an 'anaus carried behind him (Bukhâri, Kitâb al-Wud'û, Bâb 17; Muslim, Sa'dîb, with Nawawî's commentary, Cairo 1285, i. 337); for it was just on these occasions that one was most exposed to demonic influence. On the ceremonial significance of the harba, cf. further Rhodonakas in Wetter Zeitkritik für die Zeit des Morg., xxvi. 75 et seq. We do not know what the instrument was called in the Koran. On the use of the 'anaus by the khaibât, e. g. in Celebes (cf. Adriani and Kruyt, De Barde sprekkende Torajása van Midden-Celebes, i. 329 et seq.).

The spear is the attribute of the commander, the chief of a tribe, etc. It is related that Haman, the leader of Fir'awn's troops, held a harba in his hand (Tha'labâ, Kitzâ (1290), p. 172). Tabari (ed. de Goeje, I, 1214, 15, 1215, 19) relates that Idris b. Hujairi, when acting as chief of the Bani 'Abd al-Ash'ul, took the harba in his hand and that Sa'd b. Mu'âshir took his place, took the harba out of his hand. Lane tells us that a long spear is stuck in the ground in front of the tent of the Amir al-Hadjî [v.] in Cairo, perhaps also as a sign of his rank (Manners and Customs, London 1899, p. 443).

The story that Muhammad received 'anaus or harba from Abyssinia as a present, gains in probability when one recalls that such staffs are used to this day in Abyssinian ceremonial (Bent, The Sacred City of the Ethiopians, i. 50, 54, 56).

Bibliography: Besides the works quoted in the text, the bibliography to 'ANAUS (i. 346).

(A. J. WENSCB.)

HARBA (with dIff or yâ), now Djar Harba, a ruined town in the Juddaj district, ½ hour S. W. of the palmgroves of Balad, on the west bank of the ancient Tigris bed, the Shu'ta'i, in about Lat. 34° N.

The name and the town date from pre-Muslim times. According to Yâ'ûtî (i. 187), an older name was Wukhâir, which sounds Babylonian. The Sassanian authorities reckoned the northern boundary of Sûristân or Dil-e Erâghshahr, the later Sawad al-†ârâ, from Harba in the farâdî Maskin (the modern Tell Maskin) and 'Alâh (or 'Luh, the modern 'Alâh) lying opposite it on the east in the farâdî Buzurgshâper). In the north it adjoined the province of Ather. These frontiers were maintained in the early Muslim period down to the 'Abba- sids, for example in Omar al-Kha'tâbî's survey (cf. Khurâshibhî, p. 14; Yâ'ûtî, p. 104; Mas'ûdî, Tabari, p. 38; Yâ'ûtî, ill. 174). Another early mention of the place is found in Tabari, ii. 916, year 76, where the Khârîjî leader Shâbîb on his march against al-†âdajîdajî crosses the Tigris at Harba (an anecdote with pun on Hârba and harb). In Harba there were flourishing manufactories of heavy cotton goods, which were exported everywhere (Yâ'ûtî, ii. 235; and Torajás, p. 295). That pottery was also a highly developed manufacture is clear from the quantity of shards strewn among the ruins; it is usually a ware, identical with the so-called Rakka-ware and belonging to the xiiith—xiiiith centuries.

When the great change in the course of the Tigris is begun in the beginning of the reign of al-Mustanîrillâh and the river left its ancient bed just above Harba and forced a way into the bed of the canal Kâtûl Abû 'l-Djund, its modern course, the Caliph began to build great irrigation-works to irrigate the land rendered waterless. Apart from the fact that at least the whole of the present Djudjail canal is a relic of his scheme, the ruins of the Mustanîrillân canal above Harba and the great bridge at Harba, after which the place is now called Djar Harba are further witnesses of his enterprise. The bridge has already been examined by J. F. Jones and described in his Selections from the 'Arabian旅行 notes, xlIII. (1857), but I have studied it in greater detail. It is solidly built of baked bricks and spans the ancient canal on four arches, 180 feet long and about 40 broad. An inscription about 300 feet long on both sides gives the date of its erection as 629 A. H. and is of particular interest on account of its detail and the unusual, from the orthodox point of view almost blasphemous eulogies. The ruins are rendered conspicuous by the cupola of the tomb of a Shaikh or Saiyid Sa'd, visible afar off. (E. HERSHEY.)

Harba is the side or edge of a thing. Hence 1. a letter of the alphabet (being the edge of the syllable or word), e. g. 'ârîf al-maddâ = dIff, wâw, yâ, and so on; 2. as a grammatical term, one of the three parts of speech, whatever is neither a noun nor a verb ('i'm or fá'il), whether consisting of one letter or more, as bî, kattâ'; etc.; 3. in prosody, the letters alif, wâw, yâ, when they may not be employed as râ'i, are called harîf al-†â'â; 4. a dialect of the Arabs in the hâdih ("The Kurân was revealed in seven dialects (hûrîf)"); or this may mean according to seven readings (kâ'ra'; cf. Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qurâns, pp. 88 et seq.; 5. as a Sub term hârîf is defined to be the language or the medium through which the Truth speaks to one; and the hûrîf al-dâhir potential realities such as that of the palm tree in the date stone: 6. in the cabalistic sense 'î'm al-†â'â (hûrîf) means disposing the letters in magic squares, etc.

Bibliography: Zamakhshari, Muqasbal by index; Djurdjânî, Torajât, etc., ed. Flügel, p. 90, 293; Freytag, Darstellung der arab. Ver- kunst, p. 310; Lees' Dictionary of Technical Terms, Pt. I, p. 318 et seq. (T. H. WEIR.)

HARPUSH, a family of Emîrs in Baalbek, which possessed the doctrines of the Metawâlî [v.] and during the Ottoman period held the power in their hands till the Turkish system of administration was reorganised in the middle of last century. How and when the Harfush attained their influential position has not been made clear; we only possess detailed information for the Emirs Musli b. 'Ali and Yunus, who lived in Baalbek in the time of Fakhr al-Dîn. Cf. al-Muhibbî, Khatîbat al-†athâr, iv. 432; Wüstenfeld,
HARUSH — HARAM.

Fahr ad-din der Drussengraf und sein Zeitgenosse, p. 79; et seq.; Tannis b. Yusuf, Aḥḥār al-Aṣyān fi Djebel Libnān, p. 253; et seq.; Oppenheim, Von Mittelmee zur Pers. Golf, i. 35. Cf. also the bibliography to the article BAALBEK.

HARĪB, a district in South Arabia, about two days' journey east of Maʿrib [q. v.] probably identical with the Caripeta of Pliny, the place from which the Roman general Aelius Gallus on his expedition to Arabia Felix began his retreat to the coast. Harīb, a centre of ancient Arab civilisation, is traversed by a large wādi, the Wādi 'Ain, which receives on its left bank two small wādīs, the Wādi Mūkbal and Wādi Ablāh. Two hours' journey before reaching Wādi 'Ain rises Mount Mablaḥa, to which a series of steps four yards long and fifteen yards broad, hewn out of the rock (by a certain Barghāl, according to tradition) leads, at the end of which is a large South Arabian inscription. At the junction of the Wādi 'Ain and the Wādi Ablāh lies the isolated hill Karn (a hill 1200 feet high), on which the Bani 'Abd, who are mentioned as early as the South Arabian inscriptions, dwell. On this hill is the tomb of the saint Uways al-Murādī al-Karānī, a contemporary of the Prophet, to which pilgrimages are made from distant districts. From the Wādi Ablāh, Timmā, the ancient capital of the Kabbātān, the Thamama or Thunna of Pliny, مکبلا of the South Arabian inscriptions, is reached in a wide plain; a portion of the plain, called al-Djufra, which belongs to the tribes al-Kabasa and al-Sbird, is full of imposing ruins, which bear the name al-Musaima; in their midst rises a large building whose walls still stand with many inscriptions.

The capital of Harīb is Darb Āl 'Ali situated between the Wādi 'Ain and the Wādi Mūkbal. It is mainly inhabited by Aghārīf (notables), about 750 in number (apart from their wives and slaves), who are divided into four families of whom the most important is the Āl 'Ali b. Tālīb, from whom the Emir of Harīb, is always chosen; his residence is in Darb and he is held in great honour by all the people of the land. Besides the Aghārīf there are a few merchants, labourers and artisans (called barsawi) in Darb. Half an hour's journey from Darb Āl 'Ali lies the little town of Darb Bū Tūhēf (Tūha), belonging to the independent tribes (gābšīlū) Āl 'Ali Tūhēf, who claim descent from the Hitāl [q. v.]. An hour's journey from here is a field covered with ancient ruins, called Ḥadjar Harīb. Of places on the Wādi 'Ain (right side) there may be further mentioned: Darb Āl Amr, inhabited by the Āl 'Amr and Āl Mas'ūd, clans of the Bani 'Abd (on the Djebel 'Ain) and their ra'iya, with the Āl Hitāl, the Bani Ḥijār and the Bani Ḥijdrāna (the latter belonging to the Emir of Harīb, who incarcerates in it those who refuse to pay their tithes), and the village of al-Sāja, inhabited by the Āl Ghuthaim, who enjoy a great reputation throughout South Arabia for a kind of padlock (ṣufl ghuthaimāh), made by them which is sold everywhere.

We may also mention the ruined town of Ḥadjar Hitāl at the foot of the hill Karn 'Ubaid above the Wādi 'Ain from the centre of which rises a large building on the forefront of which still stands, and which bears long inscriptions. The ruins are also called Hitāl al-Zarār (Zatir) after a certain al-Zarār b. Sa'āk, who according to tradi-
Christians more than once attempted to regain it but it remained permanently in the hands of the Muslims. In 630 (1232) the Ayyubid al-Azzî built a strong castle on an artificial mound there, the ruins of which still exist.

**Bibliography:** Yâkût, Muṣyim, ii. 184; ʿAllî Dîwâd, Mâmmâlîk ʿothmânî, taʾrikh dje-ğhrâfîa etc., p. 317; Rîter, Erkundungen, xvii. 1643 et seq.; v. Kremer, Beitrag zur Geogr. des nordl. Syria, p. 35; Cuiinet, La Turquie d’Aisie, ii. 211; Le Strange, Palestine under the Muslims, p. 449.

**Hârim (a) forbidden,** particularly the women’s apartments and their occupants (harem). — Certain pieces of ground, which are withdrawn from cultivation or building without the owner’s consent, are likewise called hârim, as the Ḥârim Dîr el-Khîlîfa and the Ḥârim el-Tâhirî in Baghîdâd, which included whole stretches of the town.

**Ḥârirî (born 446, died 6 Râyîb 516), Abu Muḥammad al-Kâsîm b. Ṭâli b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥârisî, grammanian and elegant writer, was born and brought up at Mâshûn near Bâṣra; he also studied at Bâṣra, though the name of his teacher seems wrongly given by the authorities as al-Fâṣî b. Muḥammad al-Kâṣhânî, since this personage died 444. At Bâṣra he held the office of ḍâhid b-khâbar, i.e. head of the intelligence department (cf. Tabari iii. 1260, 13) to the court; and this office remained with his descendants till the time of ʿImâd al-Dîn Isâfînî, who visited Bâṣra in 556. Ḥârirî’s house was in the quarter of the Banî Ḥârum, but his office at Mâshûn. He repeatedly visited Baghîdâd (e.g. in the year 504), and is likely to have performed the pilgrimage; other travels of his do not appear to be recorded. His office brought him into connexion with many of the notables of the metropolis.

His most famous work is the Maḥsûmât, a collection of fifty pieces modelled on those of Bâdî al-Zamân Mâshûmânî, wherein the adventures of one Abu Zaid of Sarṭid are narrated by al-Ḥârisî b. Mâmmânî. The historian Ibn al-Dubâtîhî asserted that this Abu Zaid was a real personage named al-Muṭâhârî b. Sallâm to whom Ḥârirî addressed verses, but this is doubtless a fiction similar to those which are found in connexion with other celebrities of romance. According to one of Ḥârirî’s friends and correspondents, Ḥibat Allâh b. Sâḏî b. al-Tîmîdhi, the Maḥsûmât were commenced in 495 and finished by 504; the first date seems correct since they mention the taking of Sarṭid by the Franks in 490; but the last date too early if Ibn al-ʿĀṣîr be right in stating that the Asadî Dubâsî was a youth in 503; since this personage is mentioned in the work as a well-known man. Different theories were held concerning the person at whose request the tales were composed; the viziers of Mustarsîd Abu ʿAli b. Sâḏîk (512) and Anâṣârâwîn b. Khâlid (cf. i. 357) are both named in this connexion.

The Maḥsûmât became classical in the author’s lifetime; and he claims to have himself “licensed” 700 copies in spite of detractors (such as Dîyâ al-Dîn Ibn al-Āṣîr and the author of the Fâkhrit) they maintained their popular appeal; and an early commentator, ʿĀshîm al-Hillî (died 601), told Yâkût that he had been created in order to demonstrate the surpassing excellence of Ḥârirî; for he had found himself unable to rival the Maḥsûmât, after outdoing all other monuments of Arabic literature. They fall far short of Hamadhâni’s in originality, but excel them in facility, command of the Arabic language and poetical ability. Their popularity spread beyond the Muḥammânî community to Jews and Christians who translated or imitated them in Hebrew and Syriac. Some specimens were rendered into Latin in the eighteenth century by Schlutten and Reiske, and a monumental edition of them was produced by de Sacy in 1822; this was followed by numerous editions both Oriental and European, and translations have been published in several modern European languages, e.g. by Rücevelt in German (Die Verwandschaften des Abu Saʿîd von Seraf, 1826, etc.) and by Chener and Steingass in English (London, 1898).

Of Ḥârirî’s correspondence a selection was made by ʿImâd al-Dîn, which is embodied in his Kha-fira; another selection is reproduced by Yâkût in his life of the author (Muṣyim al-Ulûbî, vi.). Two of the epistles, called Sînîyûna and Sînîyû, because in one every word contains the first of these letters and in the other the second, are also printed in Arzâl’s Anthologica. Some of the correspondence preserved by Yâkût deals with the grammatical poem Muḥ̄âl al-ʿîrânâ, composed at the request of the above-mentioned Ibn al-Tîmîdhi.

His remaining treatise, Dunnât al-Ghawwâsî, is a collection of strictures on the erroneous use of various expressions; an extract of this treatise is published by de Sacy in his Anthology Grammaticale, and the whole has since been printed; to the Constantinople edition of 1299 there is attached the commentary of Sîhâb al-Dîn Khâfîdî, who disputes many of the author’s assertions.

**Bibliography:** Yâkût, Muṣyim al-Ulûbî vi. 179—184; Ibn Khallîkân, tr. de Slane, iii. 400—494. (D. S. MARGOLIOTH.)

**Ḥariyîya, a sect of the Rîfâ’îya in the district of Damascus founded by ʿAli b. Abu l-Ḥasan al-Ḥarîf al-Marwâsi who died in 645 (1147) at Bûṣra in Ḥawrân. His extreme pantheism, as it finds expression in his poet Nadîm al-Dîn b. Isârî, was banned by Ibn Taimiya in a very important fatâwa (vol. xxvii. n. 2 of the collection Tefsîr al-Kawâkhî al-Dâwî, formed by Ibn ʿUrwa, manuscript in Damascus, Tefsîr, n. 151). Cf. also al-Ṭârîḥî (died 649 = 1249) in Abu l-Ḥudîd, Kiltât al-Dajwâhirî, Stambl 1302, p. 326. (LOUIS MASSIGNON.)

**Al-Ḥârisî, Disel.** [See ARARAT.]

**Ḥārîth E. Kaʾb, usually called Balḥarît, an arab tribe belonging to the Yemeni group. Their genealogy is: al-Ḥârisî b. Kaʾb b. ʿAmr b. Qaʾa b. Dîjî b. Maḥbûhî (Mâlik).** They lived in the district of Nadrîn [q. v.] and were neighbours of the Hamân. The following places amongst others belonged to them: al-ʿArâb, al-ʿAdh, Ṭaʾa l-Dhâhîh, Deir l-Marrî, Frûtî (pl. Afrît, between Nadrîn and the Djâwîf, Ḥâdûra (Khadûrâ), Ḥâṣân-a (between Ḥudades and Ṭâmâma), ʿĀṣrâh, Ṣâḥîb, Ṣâbîn or Sawhân, Minnân or Mainân, Shâbī Ẓâyîd (belonging to the clan Zayd); wâdis: al-ʿAwhâl al-ʿālî và ʿAwhâl al-asfâl, al-Nuḍârî, Thâdir; wâters: al-ʿAins, al-Ṭâbirî, Ḥābî, al-Dijîf, al-Ḥarîf, Ḥimmâ, Yâdâmât, al-Kawâkib, Ḥâmata (Khatma, a well in the sand), Khûlâqî, al-Malâḥâṣî, Mîwa, Shîṣâ, al-Shalîla (belonging to the clan Dārîf); mountains: Tuḥûtûm.
Sections of the Bahārīth lived also in Rādāt al-Ṣafār in Ḥadrānūt, in the town of Rādā (inhabited by the 'Anṣ and Khwālān), in the valleys of al-Ṣama and Ḥadākān, which belonged to the Bakil, and in al-Faladja near Damascus. In the Dāḥiliya a section of the Bahārīth worshipped the idol Yaghūth. Another section professed Christianity. The 'Abd al-Madān b. al-Ḍayyān, a prominent family of the Bahārīth, built a large church, Dār Nadjrān, also called the Ka'ba of Nadjrān (according to many authorities, a tent composed of 300 pieces of hide).

Historical. The idol Yaghūth was the cause of a battle between the Bahārīth and the Murād, who claimed Yaghūth for themselves, at al-Razm (in the south of Nadjrān, in the land of the Murād) on the same day as the battle of Baḥr (17th or 19th Ramadān of the year 2). The Bahārīth, allied with the Ḥamādān, inflicted a severe defeat on the Murād and Yaghūth remained in their possession. On the second day of Kūfīt (in the Dāḥīna) the Bahārīth (under Nūmālyn b. Diṣās) fought against the Tamīm tribes Rihāb and Sād b. Zaid-Malā'ī (under Ka'īb b. Abī ʿAmīm). On the side of the Bahārīth were Hamādān, Kinda, Ḥudās and other tribes, in all about 8,000 strong, divided into four divisions, with four leaders, who all bore the name Yezīd and were under the supreme command of 'Abd Yaghūth b. Sa'īd. In this battle the Bahārīth were defeated. The chiefs of the allied armies fell and 'Amīr Muzākiyā' after the burning of the dam of Mār ib. When Muḥammad's call had gone out through all Arabīa, the Christians among the Bahārīth (about the year 630) sent a deputation to the Prophet in Medina, which consisted mainly of ecclesiastics, including a bishop, Abu l-Ḥārīthah. They arranged an interview with the Prophet at a place near Medina, where they were to undergo a trial by the ordeal called mukhāba or ʾīrum (ceremonies of baptism). But when they were convinced of Muhammad's mission and feared a defeat, they begged the Prophet to cancel the arrangement. The Prophet agreed on condition that they paid a larger tribute. In Rabi' 1 of the year 5 (630) Muḥammad sent Khālid b. Walid with 480 men to the Bahārīth to demand that they should adopt Islam. Those who were heathen and a number of the Christians also submitted and Khālid remained among them to instruct them in the religion and the institutions of Islam. After some time Khālid returned with a deputation of the Bahārīth (among them two members of the Christian family of 'Abd al-Madān) to the Prophet. Muhammad gave each member to ounces (400 dirhams) and appointed one of them, Ka'īb b. Al-Ḥusain, emir of the Bahārīth. When in 25 = 633 the false prophet Aḥḥāb b. Ka'b, usually called al-Āsawd al-ʾAnsī, appeared, the Bahārīth influenced by his emissaries, followed him. They drove out the governor of Nadjrān ('Amr b. Ḥaẓm, and al-Āsawd entered the town in triumph. The Muslims remained faithful to Islam under 'Abd Bakr, and the Christians renewed the treaty.


(J. Schleifer.)

HĀRITH B. BADR, of the Tamīm family of the Banū Ghudān, a general and friend of Ziyād b. Abī Hī. He must have been born about the time of the Hijāra. He is said in his early days to have been a follower of the Meccanos Sadājīn. At the battle of the Camel he was on the side of 'Alī's opponents but afterwards entered the latter's service. He early became attached to Ziyād, afterwards viceroy of the Ḵurāṣān. He was an orator and poet, particularly learned in the ancient history of the Arabs, and was of tried valour. He distinguished himself in society by his lovable nature no less than by his intellectual gifts. The combination of so many rare qualities in him won him the name Dāhīya (a term applied to a distinguished man). The only thing with which he was reproached in the days of the caliphate was his lechery. He owed it to his friendship with Ziyād that, although a Tamīmi, he was entered in the tribal lists of the Kuraẓī, a distinction which carried with it a considerable increase in his emoluments. "Ubaid Allah, son and successor of Ziyād, did not show himself so ardent a friend of Hārīthah. In the political turmoil which followed the death of Yazīd I, Hārīthah fought with varying success against the Khāridjī; his failures were usually caused by the lack of discipline among the Bāṣra troops. In the course of one of these campaigns he fell ill in 66. It was not correct, as one source states, that he lived into the reign of Walīd I.

Bibliography: Ibn Duraid, Kiṭāb al-Ḥārī-ḥāk (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 160; Aḥḥābī, vi. 4—5; xviii. 166, and particularly xxi. 20—44; Ṭabari, Anāliṣ (ed. de Goeje), i. 322; ii. 25, 78, 449, 580—582, 585; H. Lammens, Ziad ibn Abī Ḥabīb, p. 120—121, in the Rivista degli Studi orientali, iv., where further references are given. (H. Lammens.)

HARKARN, a Persian stylist, son of Maṭurādās Kanbū of Muṭstān; was for many years muṣīḥ (secretary) to Nawwāb lībār-Khān, a eunuch in the service of the Moghul emperor Ḫānjāhr and was then appointed yubādar (governor of Akbarābād) (Agra) (1031 = 1622). He is the author of a collection of letters (inšād), divided into seven sections, which bears his name and contains model letters as well as official documents (ed. with English transl. by Francis Balfour, Calcutta 1781, 1804, reprinted 1831; hist. Lahore 1869). The work was used by the English authorities as a model for official correspondence conducted in the Persian language with the Indian
sovereigns. The Paris manuscript is dated 1062 A. H., and is entitled Irjīd, al-Talīlīn.

Bibliography: Rien, Catal. of Pers. Miss., ii. 530; Preface to the Forms of Kerkern, p. 3; E. Blochet, Catal. des Miss. persans, ii. 277. (Cf. Huart.)

HARRA, a basalt desert, "a district covered with black broken stones, which looks as if it had been burned by fire". Such harras, which owe their origin to subterranean volcanoes which have repeatedly covered the undulating desert with a bed of lava, are found particularly in the east of Harran and stretch from there to Medina. Samhūl, Khūlaqat al-Wafī bi-Akhbār Dīr al-Mustafā, ed. Mecca, 1316, p. 38 gives a detailed description of a great earthquake at Medina which began on the 1st Djamād II 654 (26th June 1256) and lasted several days. Cf. also Wüstenfeld, Geschichte von Madya. There is perhaps, as Wetzstein has suggested, an allusion to these fearsome stony wastes in Jeremiah xviii. 6 (בַּעֲרָל). Yāzū, Muṣṣāb, ii. 247 et seq., details no less than 29 of these harras with their names (cf. Zetzschke, d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., xxii. 365 et seq.), among which the Harr Wāḵīm at Medina has obtained a place in history on account of the bloody victory won by the Umayyads there over the Medinees in 63 (683). An accurate map with an index of names to the whole territory, in which harras are found is published in the Zeitschr. des Deutsch. Palästinavereins, vol. xii., in the narrative of A. Stübel's journey to Dīr-itt-Talūl and Ḥarrān (1882). The same author has also discussed the supposed origin of such deposits of stones in Die Vulkanberge von Ecuador after v. Oppenheim, Von Mittelmee zur Pers. Golf, i. 90, note 5, as has v. Oppenheim himself in Petermanns Geogr. Mittell., 1896 (Zur Routenkarte meiner Reise von Damaskus nach Baṣrād in dem Jahre 1892). Cf. also the literature quoted in the first named work of v. Oppenheim, i. 89 et seq.

HARRAN, a very old town situated in the Meṣopotamia province of Mesopotamia, near the sources of the Balīgh river, between Edessa and Ra's-Ain. It is familiar as the home of Abraham and Laban, but is especially famous as the chief seat of the Sabians and of their religion. To the Greeks it was known as Ḫalīd, to the Romans as Carrhae, to some Church Fathers as Hellemopolis ('heathen city'), to the Muhammadians as Harrān or Arrān. In its long history Chwolson distinguishes five periods, the Biblical, the Greek, the Roman, the Christian and the Muhammadan. The form of the name found on the cuneiform inscriptions, Harrānū, that is 'route', points to the importance of the place as a trading emporium; but it is chiefly famous all down its history as the seat of the worship of the moon-god Sin, whose temple was adorned by more than one of the Assyrian kings. The overthrow of the Chaldæan supremacy and the rise of Persia wrought no change in the circumstances of the City, but from the time of Alexander a large Macedonian population settled in northern Mesopotamia, which became known as Mygdonia, and the deities worshipped in Harrān received Greek names. Rome, on the other hand, left little trace of her sway in Asia: it was the Eastern civilization which influenced the Western conquerors. About the beginning of the Christian era the indigenous Syrian population of northern Mesopotamia, was largely mixed with Macedonians and Greeks, as well as Armenians and Arabs. As a frontier town Harrān was treated with indulgence by the earlier Emperors, and it was not until Christianity became the religion of the state, that efforts were made to suppress the cult of which Harrān was the chief seat. These attempts were not carried to extremes, no doubt owing to the fact that in Harrān, as in other places, the people depended for their livelihood upon the temple. Hence the Church-fathers speak of Harrān as a heathen city, and, although bishops of Harrān were appointed, the place continued a seat of idolatry, even after the country had become a province of the Caliphate. The same commercial necessity may account for the existence here from the beginning of the sixth century of a Monophysite community with a bishop at their head. The majority of the people, however continued heathen. Harrān capitulated to 'Abd b. Qānām in the year 639 A. D., at which time it was the chief town of Dīyar Muqar. It was the favourite residence of Yazid, the last Umayyad Caliph (744—750), and here Abū-Ḥubbār the Abiwas was imprisoned and put to death. The people, however, appear to have been allowed to continue the practice of their religion, but under Rashid a violent persecution arose, from which the Harrānians sought to free themselves by means of bribes. It was in 830 A. D. that Ma'mūn offered the Harrānians the choice between Islam, the adoption of one of the tolerated religions, and extermination. They claimed that they were Şabians; and by this device they saved themselves from extinction [see ŞABIJN]. Towards the end of the 9th century Muḥammad bin Ǧāhiz describes Harrān as a pleasant town, defended by a fort built of finely cut stone. When Ibn Djābir visited it in 1184 it acknowledged the sovereignty of Sulādīn (Ṣulāh al-Dīn), and its people were noted for their hospitality towards strangers. By Abu l-Fidā'ī's time (d. 1332), however, it had fallen into decay. At the present day the site is marked by a village of sugar-loaf cottages and ruins of ancient buildings of basalt.

In addition to the worship carried on there, Harrān was noted for its honey and for the preserve called Ḳubbait, as well as for the purity of the Suryac spoken there. Chesney states that splendid crops of maize, tobacco and cotton are raised on the plain; but its fame will always rest on the long line of philosophers and men of science who flourished there, of whom Ṭāhāt b. Ḳurra, and his sons and grandsons, and al-Mātīnī are the best known.


HARRAN. [See Harrak.]

HĀRUD. A river in Afghānīstān which rises in the Siyāh Kōh and flows southwards past Sabzawār and Zākīn, discharging itself into the Hāmūn or Lake of Sīstān. It has been identified by Tomasekh with the Pharmacoki of Pliny and the Hyarenañāhiti of the Avesta.

HÄRÜN.

HÄRÜN E. IMRÂN, the Aaron of the Bible, born 3 years before Mūsā, when Fir'awwân's command to slay the male children was given (Tâhâ’l, p. 100; Ṭabârî, i. 448). When Mūsā received the command of God to effect the deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt from Fir'awwân, he asked for a companion of his own kin (Sûra, xx. 30–40). Hārûn, who sat on Fir'awwân's council (al-Kisâ', p. 211, and Taqahuma E.,xxviii. i. 7). He took the greatest share in the erection of the golden calf (Sûra, vii. 134–136, xx. 90–95 and E.,xxviii. i. 7). According to the Talmud (Sanh. 77) he had been forced to do this for fear of the Israelites who would have slain him. But other legends show that the Israelites were particularly attached to Hārûn. For example al-Kisâ', p. 238, Ṭabârî, p. 146 and Ṭabârî, i. 502 give the following story in almost identical words: Mūsâ and Hārûn once noticed a cave from which light streamed. They went in and found there a golden throne with the inscription "destined for him whom it fits". As Mūsâ proved too small, Hārûn sat upon it. The angel of death at once appeared and received his soul; he was 127 years old. When Mūsâ had returned to the Israelites, they asked where Hārûn was. "He is dead", said Mūsâ. "Thou hast slain Hārûn", they answered. Angels then at once appeared with Hārûn's bier and cried: "Do not suspect Mūsâ of such a crime!". According to another tradition (Ṭabârî, ibid., Ṭabârî, i. 505), Mūsâ led the Israelites to Hārûn's tomb, where he called him back to life, and Hārûn confirmed the story of his death. Midrasch, Jebot, 764, Aboth d. R. Nahman, 32, Pirke d. R. El., 12, also give this Arabic legend.


HÄRÜN AL-RASHID, the most celebrated of the ʿAbbâsîd Califîs, born in al-Raî in Dhū l-Hijjâja 145 = March 763 or, according to another, in itself more probable authority, in Muharram 149 = February 766. His father was the Caliph Muhammad al-Mahdi, his mother a slave named Khadzrun, whom Mahdi set free and married in 159 = 775–776. After Hārûn ascended the throne in Rabi' 1 170 = Sept. 786, he appointed the Barmakids Yahyâ b. Khâlid minister with unlimited power, and during the following seventeen years the latter is said with his two sons al-Fadl and Dja'far to have been the real ruler of the great empire; the catastrophe of Muharram 187 = January 803 [cf. Barmâkids and Dja'far b. Yahyâ] was thus all the more unexpected. In 176 = 792–793, an ʿAlid, named Yahyâ b. Abd Allah, raised the standard of revolt in al-Dailâm and won numerous followers, so that the Caliph had to send a great army against him under al-Fadl b. Yahyâ. The latter entered into negotiations and, when he had Yahyâ's presents and Hārûn promised to pardon him, Yahyâ surrendered. But when he arrived in Baghdâd, Hārûn in spite of his promise had him thrown into prison. About the same time a bitter feud between the North Arabsians and the Yemenis in Syria blazed up into open war and it was not till 180 = 796–797 that Dja'far b. Yahyâ was able to restore peace. In 178 = 794–795 the Egyptians rebelled against the governor ʿIsâk b. Sulaimân; but when Hārûn sent his able general Harthama with a great army the rebels were soon routed. Unrest broke out in Kairawan also, but this was quelled by Harthama, for a time at least, but after his return in 181 = 797–798 the unruly populace rebelled again. Order was restored by the governor Ibrahim b. al-Aghlab, who however soon made himself independent, and in 184 = 800 Hārûn had to grant him the country as an hereditary fief on payment of annual tribute. Like so many of his predecessors, Hārûn had also much hard fighting with the Byzantines. At the very beginning of his reign he had the frontier towns fortified and almost every year his governors made raids into hostile territory without however winning any permanent advantages. In 181 = 797–798 the Caliph himself took the field, but soon returned. As usual war again broke out the next year; the Empress Irene, however, on account of internal disturbances in Constantinople had to make peace and pay tribute. Peace only lasted till the accession of the emperor Nicephorus in 186 = 802, who sent the Caliph a scurrilous letter and demanded the return of the tribute that had been exacted. Hārûn at once took the field and forced the emperor to pay a new tribute. The latter, however, paid no attention to the agreement and the war was continued. In 190 = 806 Hārûn took Heraclea and forced the emperor to pay not only a new but also a kind of poll-tax for himself and his family; in the following year however Yazid b. Mâkhdad was defeated by the Byzantines and the efforts of his successor Harthama proved equally unavailing. The years of warfare therefore left the state of the parties in the end practically unchanged. According to western historians, Hārûn was on the other hand on terms of friendly intercourse with Charlemagne and mention is often made of embassies from one to the other. There is however no mention of this in Arab sources and the truth of these statements has even been seriously doubted [on this point cf. Schmidt, Karl der Große und Harun al-Raschid in Der Islam, iii. 409–411, Barthold, ibid., iv. 333 et seq. and the literature there quoted]. The governor ʿAli b. ʿIsâ had made himself generally hated by his exactions in Khorasan. When the people complained, the Caliph went in person to al-Raî in 180 = 805, but allowed himself to be fooled by ʿAli and confirmed him in his office again. About the same time Râfî b. Latîf rebelled in Samarkand. He was defeated by ʿAli b. ʿIsâ; the complaints of the people of Khorasan about the latter's boundless greed became louder and louder and Hārûn had finally to transfer the government of Khorasan to Harthama. By this time Râfî was lord of all Transoxania and as the situation was rapidly becoming more serious, also the Caliph resolved to take the field himself and sent his son al-Maʾmûn in advance to Merv. On reaching Tus, Hārûn fell ill and died, according to the usual account, on the 3rd Dhumâdâ ii. 193 = 24th March 809. He had a long time previously made arrangements to secure the succession for his son al-Amin, but these in the result proved most unfortunate [cf. the article al-Amin. i. 327 et seq.]. Hārûn took a great interest in art and science
and his brilliant court was a centre for all branches of scholarship. In spite of occasional outbursts of Oriental despotism he was undoubtedly one of the best of the Abbâsîds; nevertheless it is from his reign that the beginning of the decline of the dynasty dates. In legend and tradition however he has always been looked upon as the personification of oriental power and splendour and his fame has been spread throughout East and West by the “Arabian Nights”.


(K. V. Zettersten.)

al-Hârûniya i. a village in al-‘Irâq near Djalûla. Yahyât says that an ancient Persian bridge built of stone with leaden joints stood here.

2. One of the chain of frontier fortresses (thugâhâr) between Asia Minor and Syria. The exact position is not known, but it stood one day’s march to the west of Marâsh in the hill country between it and Ain Zarîta. It was founded by the Caliph after whom it was named in the year 183 (799). The fort was ruined by the Byzantines in 348 (959–960), when 1500 Muslims were captured (Yahyât, s. v.). In spite of this it was a flourishing town a few years later when Ibn Hawkal apparently visited it. The town was rebuilt by Saif al-Dawla the Handâmîd of Alexâp (d. 356 = 967). Thereafter it was retaken by the Christians and included in the kingdom of Little Armenia.

Bibliography: Le Strange, Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 62, 125 et seq.

(T. H. Weir.)

Hârûrâ, Hârawrâ, the meeting place of the first Kârîdîs, not far from Kâfûn, where they publicly disclaimed allegiance to ‘Ali and were soon afterwards almost exterminated in the bloody battle of Nahrawân. From it comes the name Hârûniya for the early Kârîdîs (q.v.).

Bibliography: Yahyât, Mu‘jamân, ed. Wûstenfeld, ii. 246; Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 3341 et seq.; and the other Arab chronicles in the passages quoted in Brünnow, Die Charidekten, p. 16 et seq., and Wellhausen, Die religio-politischen Oppositionsparteien, p. 4 et seq.; al-Shahrastânî, ed. Cureton, p. 86 et seq., etc.

Hârût and Mârût, two angels who are mentioned in the Korân (Sûra, 2, 96) in the words “and it was not Sulaimân that was an unbeliever but the devils, who taught men sorcery and that which had been revealed to the two angels in Bâbîl, Hârût and Mârût; but they taught no one without saying “we are but a temptation, therefore be not unbelieving”. People learn from them means by which they may separate man and wife” etc. A number of stories are attached to this passage, the main outlines being as follows. When the angels in heaven saw the sinful children of men, they spoke contemptuously of them before Allâh. But He said: “If you had been in the same position you would not have done any better”. They did not agree to this and received permission to send two of their number to earth as an experiment. The two chosen were Hârût and Mârût, who were ordered to abstain from grievous sins such as idolatry, whoredom, murder and the drinking of wine. But when they saw a wonderfully beautiful woman they were soon led astray and, when they were discovered, they slew the man who had discovered them. Then Allâh asked the angels to look down at their brethren on earth: then they said: “In truth, Thou wast right.” The pair were given the choice between punishment in this world or the next. They chose the former and were incarcerated in Bâbîl, where they have since suffered grievous torments. A. Geiger has already noted that these elements are in the main also found in a Jewish midrash; and it can now be added that many are found as early as the New Testament (2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude, v. 6) and the Book of Enoch, in connection with Genesis vi. This is clear from the following:

The incident is said to have taken place, according to a Muslim version, “when men were multiplying and sinning”. In the same circumstances the sons of God descend to earth in Genesis vi.; and “they took unto themselves wives”. The two angels are called Shâmîzîzi and ‘Azâzîl in the midrash. These names are found in a corrupt form even in the book of Enoch. The ‘alîbî gives the following story: Three angels descended, Hârût, or ‘Azîz, Mârût or ‘Azîz, and Mûsâ’alî. The latter on the very first day felt himself too weak for earthly temptations and was at his own request again taken up to heaven. According to one version, Hârût and Mârût are said to have flown up to heaven at the end of each day; but when they had sinned their wings were disabled. A connected motif is found in the Schatzkohle (ed. Bezdol, 68–69), where the sons of Seth are no longer allowed to climb the holy mountain after their sin. It is also stated that the disabled ones begged their contemporary Idrîs to intercede with Allâh for them. According to Kâzwîn (ed. Wûstenfeld, i. 61), the derision of men by Hârût and Mârût took place while Adam was still alive. As to the woman her name is given as Zuhra, Anâhid (Bâhind) and Bidûkht; in the midrash she is called Işîhâr, in other Jewish legends Nàmâ (the lovely); this all points to Venus. According to some, she was an ordinary woman who brought a dispute with her husband before Hârût and Mârût, who had to administer justice among men. When they both tried to seduce her, she begged them to act contrary to the divine command and tell her the word of might (in the midrash the name of God) by virtue of which they were able to ascend and descend. When she had learned it, she made use of it; but when she was in heaven, Allâh made her forget it and changed her into a star. Hârût and Mârût however remained in Bâbîl and taught sorcery (cf. Enoch, Chap. 8, 9, 95, 97). It is also related that they were kept imprisoned in a well in Demûwend. Their tortures are painted in vivid colours; they are kept in chains, as is already related of the fallen angels in the Book of Henoch (Chap. 14, 26, 69, 69) and in the Jubilees (5, 6). (Cf. also the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, ed. Ceriani, p. 152, col. 2, ult. = Chap. 56, v. 13). Water
also is held in front of their mouths but they cannot reach it (cf. Tantalus). Mention is even made of several Muslims who have seen them by magic means; the prisoners are said to have rejoiced, when they heard of Muhammad's coming as the end of their tortures was believed to be at hand.

In a legendary history of Egypt, translated by Wasetenfeld in Orient and Occident (i. 329) it is related that Harut and Marut lived in the time of the Egyptian king 'Aryak.

The names Harut and Marut are connected by de Lagarde with Haurvati and Arematati. But it is remarkable that the pair of names shows a strong analogy to other such pairs, found in the Korân such as 'Ujdat and Madjan, 'Ulalt and Djalalt. One of each of these pairs may be traced to pre-Muslim tradition, the other was formed by Muhammad by altering the first consonant of the former. Marut is quite a common Syriac word for power, it possibly contains a remembrance of Sin.


HASÁ, HASSÁ. [See Al-Hasan.]

HASAN (A.), beautiful, good; a technical term in the science of Tafsir, see above, ii. 190. Cf. also Goldziher, Forschungen über den Islam, p. 106.

AL-HASAN b. 'Abd Allâh. [See Nashir al-Dawla.]

AL-HASAN b. Abi 'l-Ijjasan al-Baqari, a prominent figure in the first century of the Hijra. During the wars of conquest his father was carried off as a slave from Mâsîn and brought to Medina. There he became a client of the celebrated Za'id b. Thâbit [q. v.] and married a client of Umm Salama [q. v.] named Khairas. Hasan was born of this marriage in 21 (642). Brought up in Wâdi l-Kurâ, he afterwards settled in Basra. There he won a great reputation for strength of character, piety, learning and eloquence. While other men, who were held in great esteem, such as Ibn Sîrîn and al-Shâbâbi, being questioned on Yazid's succession did not dare give their opinion, Hasan frankly expressed his disapproval. He showed the same freedom of speech in his letters to 'Abd al-Mâlik and al-Hâjjâjîd, so that later authors, like al-Shahristâni, who thought they detected a leaning towards the doctrine of free will in them, preferred to ascribe it to 'Abd Allâh b. 'Aṭâ' [q. v.]. It was considered the equal of his contemporary al-Hâjjâjîd as an orator; he was highly esteemed as a transmitter of tradition, because he was believed to have been personally acquainted with 70 of those who took part in the battle of Badr, although his chief authority was Anas b. Malik [q. v.]. He exercised a lasting influence on the development of 'Usâs, by his ascetic piety, which shone all the more by contrast, as by his time a worldly spirit had penetrated all classes in Islam. Numerous pious sayings are placed on his lips and the Sûfis see in him a predecessor, whom they quote as often, as do the orthodox Sunnis.

But the Mu'tazila also openly reckon him one of themselves not only because the first representatives of their doctrine, 'Amr b. 'Uba'id and Wâsîl b. 'Aṭâ', were among his pupils, but because he himself like them inclined to the doctrine of free will. That Wâsîl b. 'Aṭâ' afterwards separated from him, does not alter the case. In this way almost all religious movements within Islam go back to Hasan and we cannot be surprised when we are told that, when he died full of honour on the 1st Rajab 110 = 10th Oct. 728, the whole city of Basra attended his obsequies.


AL-HASAN b. 'Ali, the last Zîrid ruler of Mahdiya (545-543 = 1121-1122-1148-1149). He was still a child when his father 'Ali died and had to leave the administration to his freemen. They were particularly occupied with warding off the attacks of the Normans of Sicily. In 1122 Admiral George of Antioch seized the island of Cossira (Pantelleria) and the castle of Cape Dinas and began to lay siege to Mahdiya, but was forced to return to his ships after severe fighting in which he lost heavily. In 1135 the Christian fleet again appeared before the Zîrid capital, this time however to protect al-Hasan who, being attacked by land and water by the Hamamîdîs, had appealed for help to Roger II. The Muslim ruler rewarded the Christian sovereign for his assistance by allowing him to impose his authority on the chiefs of the coasts and making over to him the yield of the customs in his land. A new naval demonstration, this time effective. Because of Mahdiya by Admiral George of Antioch in 536 = 1141-1142, forced al-Hasan to accept the conditions imposed by Roger II, by which he became to some extent his vassal. This humiliation however did not save the Zîrid kingdom. Under pretext of defending the rights of the sons of Vusuf b. Djamîl, lord of Gabes, who had been dispossessed at the request of the inhabitants themselves, Roger II once more sent George of Antioch against Mahdiya. Abandoned by its ruler and a number of its inhabitants, the town was occupied by the Christians without a blow being struck, at the end of 543 = 1148-1149. Thus spoiled of his lands, for the rest of his life al-Hassan had some years previously cast off the Zîrid yoke, al-Hasan took refuge among the Kyoto, then in Bone, and finally at Bougie whose king interred him in Algeria. He lived there till it fell into hands of the Almohads (547 = 1152-1153). He was kindly treated by 'Abd al-Mu'mîn, to whom he had made his submission and, after Mahdiya had been regained from the Christians in 555 = 1160, al-Hasan returned to his former kingdom as governor. He was later recalled to Morocco by Vusuf b. 'Abd al-Mu'mîn and died at Abar Zellû in the province of Temesna in 563 = 1167-1168.

Bibliography: Ibn Khalîdûn, Berbères, transl. de Slane, ii. 26 et seq.; Ibn al-Athîr,

AL-HASAN b. 'Ali b. Abī l-'Uṣūl al-Kalbî, an Arab general, was sent to Sicily in 948 (336 or the beginning of 337) by the Fātimid caliph al-Manṣūr [q. v.] to put an end to the unrest there, which he did successfully. In Dhu l-Hijjâda 340 (May 952) he won a great victory over the Christians in Calabria, as a result of which the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII made a truce and allowed the exercise of the Muslim religion in Calabria. Hasan himself then returned to the region and built a great mosque there. Al-Manṣūr however died about this time and Hasan at once went over to Africa leaving his son Abū l-'Uṣūl Aḥmad as his deputy in Sicily. He was confirmed in the office of governor of Sicily by al-Mu'izz, al-Manṣūr's successor, and held the appointment until his death in 554 (965). The rule of the Banū Abū l-'Uṣūl was firmly established in Sicily by his resolute and energetic action.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Āthîr, Kâmîl, ed. Tomberg, viii. 354 sqq. 371; transl. in Amari, Bibliotheca arabica-sicula, i. 419 sqq.; Amari, Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, ii. 244 sqq.; Müller, Der Islam etc., ii. 617 sqq.; Vasilev, Vicinanza i Arabi, ii. 303 sqq.

AL-HASAN b. Abī l-Ṭālib, the eldest son of 'Ali and Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet. The exact date of his birth (the year 3 or 4) depends on the date still to be settled of the marriage of his parents. The Sûra represents him as a particular favourite of his grandfather. An abundant apocryphal literature has grown up around this subject, taken from the domestic life of Muhammad. Sensuality and a lack of energy and intelligence seem to have been the fundamental features of Hasan's character. After the premature death of Fāṭima, he was not on particularly good terms with his father and brothers. He spent the best part of his youth in making and unmaking marriages; about a hundred are enumerated. These easy morals earned him the title mitlâb ‘the diviner’ and involved ‘Ali in serious eminities. Hasan moreover proved a thorough spendthrift; he allotted to each of his wives a considerable establishment. We thus see how the money was scattered during the caliphate of ‘Ali, already much impoverished. He was present at the battle of Šī‘fîn, without taking an active part in it; he took no further interest in public affairs during the lifetime of his father.

After the assassination of ‘Ali, Hasan was proclaimed Caliph in the ‘Iraq. His partisans tried to persuade him to renew the war against the Syrians. Their importunities upset the plans of the indolent Hasan, and he henceforth thought only of treating with Mu‘awiya. They led to a rupture between himself and the ‘Iraqis. The latter ended by severely wounding their nominal sovereign. From this time on, Hasan's one idea was to come to an arrangement with the Umayyads. Mu‘awiya left to himself the task of fixing his price for the renunciation of the Caliphate. Besides a pension of two million dirhems for his brother Iṣâṣ, Hasan asked for himself a sum of five millions and the revenues of a district in Persia during his lifetime. The ‘Iraqîs later opposed the execution of this last clause. All his demands were granted and the grand-on of the Prophet had the inpentence to express publicly his regret that he had not asked for double. He left the ‘Iraqi and the jers of the people to retire to Medina.

There he resumed his life of pleasure and foolish dissipation. Mu‘awiya agreed to pay the expense, only stipulating in return that Hasan should not disturb the peace of the realm. At a meeting at Aḥraš [q. v.] he had previously forced him to renew publicly his renunciation of power. Henceforth Mu‘awiya ceased to trouble about him, being reassured by his negligible and indolent personality. Dissension continued to reign among the ‘Alids however. Hasan was not on good terms with Iṣâṣ, while both were in league against Ibn al-Mansîa [q. v.] and the other children of ‘Ali. Hasan died at Medina of consumption, probably hastened by his excesses. An attempt has been made to throw the responsibility for his end on Mu‘awiya; in addition to the stain, which would thus be thrown upon the Umayyads the object of this charge was to justify the title Shâhid (martyr) and ‘Sa‘îdî of the martyrs’ given in compliment to Fāṭima’s insignificant son. Only Shî’i writers, or those particularly favourable to the ‘Alids dare openly voice such a grave accusation. It at the same time gave an opportunity to implicate the family of Āshâth b. Kâ‘î [q. v. i. 481 sq.] detested by the Shi’is on account of his share in the coup of Šī‘fîn. Mu‘awiya was not the man to commit an unnecessary crime and the frivolous Hasan had long become quite inoffensive. His life was a burden only on the treasury of the Umayyads, which was beset by its constant appeals. The sigh of relief heaved by Mu‘awiya on hearing of his decease can be readily understood. He probably died in 49 H. H. at the age of about 45. By his death his brother Iṣâṣ became head of the ‘Alids. In the later history of this faction we generally find that the numerous descendants of Hasan have to give way to the more enterprising Husainids. The two families did not agree any better than their ancestors had done.


AL-HASAN b. ‘Ali. [See AL-ASKAR, IBN MA‘KÜLA, NI‘ÂM AL-MULK, AL-UṬRUSH.]

AL-HASAN b. ḤANÎ. [See AḤN NÂLYKS.]

AL-HASAN b. AL-KHAṢİR, Aḥbî Bakr, an important Arab astronomer, of Persian descent, often quoted in astrological works of the Christian middle ages under the name Albu-bakr. He flourished about the middle of the third century A. H., for Abî Ṭâlib Ta’îfîr (died 280 = 893) mentions him in his Kitâb Baghâdôd as a contemporary. A Liber de Nativitatibus (beginning:
Dicit Albudder magis Alhassili Acharisi filius) by his was translated into Latin by a certain Canonici Salio (2) in Padua in 1218 and printed at Venice in 1492 and again in 1501, and in 1540 at Nürnberg. The words Alhassili Alcharsi are very probably corrupted out of Alchassili Alfarsi, indeed a Munich manuscript has Alchassii. It has not yet been established with which of the works mentioned by the Arab biographers this is identical; two works fit-i-Mawāsid (“on births”) which are in the Escorial (Carsi, n6, 935 and 973), ascribed the one to Ibn ‘Aṣrāl al-Khāṣibī, and the other ascribed to Ibn al-Khāṣib al-Kūlī, are perhaps by this astrologer, although the first may be by Abūrahm b. ‘Ezdī.


Al-Hasan b. Mahmūd. [See Ibn Mahmūd.]

Al-Hasan b. Muhammad. [See Al-Muhālaimi.]

Alī b. Al-Hasan b. Muḥammad, Sultan of Morocco, fourteenth of the dynasty still ruling there, the Ḥasanī [q. v.] Sherīfs of Sidjīmasa, also called Fikhr Sherīfs or Alawīs.

After the death of his father Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān (18th Raḍāb 1290 = 12th Sept. 1873) Mūlāy al-Hasan was chosen Sultan by the most prominent members of the Moroccan court, then in Marrakesh. But disturbances at once broke out on all sides; Fās, the capital of northern Morocco, drove out his governor Ḥāḍīj Muhammad al-Modani Benris; the people of Azemmūr killed their governor Ahmad b. Faradāj; Mūlāy ‘Abd al-Kābīr b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān, the Sultan’s uncle, supported by the Berber tribes Banū Ṭājāl, Ait Yūsī and Ait Aiyāsh set up as a claimant to the throne and occupied the town of Mekeins with the surrounding country. Mūlāy al-Hasan then set out on his long series of campaigns to subdue the various rebellious elements in his kingdom. He turned his attention first to Azemmūr, put down the rising and levied a heavy indemnity on the people. He then marched through the Shāwiya territory, collected the arrears of taxes and reached Ḳāṭāṭ, one of the three most important cities of northern Morocco, where he met with a friendly reception during a festival. Here he visited the most prominent religious leaders and scholars and made them presents. He also gave considerable sums for the benefit of the public libraries and madrasas. This was a clever stroke of policy, to seek his chief supporters among the Sherīfi clergy to which his ancestors had belonged and among the educated citizens.

In the meanwhile his uncle ‘Abd al-Kābīr had been captured and surprised among the Ait Yūsī and delivered up to him. The Sultan now suppressed the rebellion of the Arab Banū Ṭājāl who lived in the plains of the lower Sābīn and then made a pilgrimage to the tomb of Idrīs I on Mount Zahrān. No Moroccan sovereign had previously prepared himself for his campaigns as did Mūlāy al-Hasan by visiting the tombs of saints in the great zawiyas, particularly those administered by sherifs. The pilgrimages to the great sanctuaries showed his zeal for religion and thus increased his prestige among the fanatical masses and assured him the support of agents, who established peace among the tribes or supplied valuable information. Mūlāy al-Hasan for example began his campaigns in Northern Morocco by visiting the tomb of Sād ‘Abd al-Salām b. Mahīš (1306 = 1888), those against Tadla and the High Atlas by visiting the marabouts of Bu ‘l-Dā‘īd (1307 = 1886), the campaigns against Tālīfīt by visiting the tombs of his ancestors (1310 = 1892) etc.

But it was almost always force alone that enabled him to win the upper hand over tribes little inclined to submit and objecting to the payment of badly distributed taxes. To collect the taxes and keep the tribes under control, Mūlāy al-Hasan’s father, Sultan Muḥammad, had tried to create an army on modern lines, on the European model. The wars with France (campaign of Isy in 1844) and with Spain (Tetwān war of 1860) had determined him to this measure by showing him the strategic inefficiency of the Dījīsh [q. v., i. 1047 sg.] contingents. Mūlāy al-Hasan, benefiting by his father’s efforts further developed them by entrusting the instruction of his troops and the creation of an arsenal to bodies of English, French or Italian officers. The new army, the ‘asker enabled him with the help of the Dījīsh to put an end to the interminable rebellions and pursue the collection of taxes. Throughout his reign the Sultan never ceased to march his army or māḥalla up and down his territory. In his twenty-one years’ reign he made over thirty military expeditions, often of long duration. His army used to encamp in a district and, after cutting off numerous heads, eat up the country (to use the Moroccan expression) till the impost levied had been completely paid. This procedure, more feared than actual battle, soon prevailed with the tribes or towns forced to maintain the Sultan’s troops during their stay with them.

There were nevertheless times when the Sultan’s troops were unfortunate. In 1305 (1887) notably, his army under the command of his uncle Mūlāy Sghūr was utterly routed by the marabout ‘Ali b. al-Makki Mahāmah and the Berbers in the High Atlas. This marabout slew the Sultan’s uncle with his own hand.

The expeditions against the Banū Snassīn in (1291-1292 = 1874-1875), those of the Spaniards in the Rif, the settlement of the English at Cape Juby in 1305 (1887) brought the Sultan into negotiations with France and other European powers. Numerous embassies were sent to him to seek all sorts of industrial or commercial concessions in Morocco. Resuming the policy of his most illustrious ancestors, but only after a public consultation with the official jurists (1304—1816) on the possibility on religious grounds of commerce with Christians, he increased the number of ports open to commerce and organised the Sherīfi customs in them. He thus established a source of revenue more stable and reliable than the razzias on the tribes for the collection of taxes.

This ruler, one of the most remarkable for energy and intelligence that Morocco has known, recalls by more than one side of his character the founder of his dynasty, the great Mūlāy Ismā‘īl. Like the latter he was a great builder. In Fās he
built a palace imitated, according to Muslim writers, from the Alcazar in Seville. He built roads, bridges etc. He devoted all his care to the development of Muslim teaching.

He never would grant to Europeans industrial concessions as he feared that their influence would thereby find opportunity to penetrate into the interior of Morocco. Jealous of his rights and authority, all reforms, all improvements that he made, were carried out in the name of the Makhzen [q.v.], even those executed by foreign agents. They were thus as transitory in their effects as the persons enforcing them.

Mūlāy al-Ḥasan died on Thursday, the 3rd ʿIlāhja 1311 (9th June 1894), on the way back in a campaign against the Berbers of the High Atlas. He was succeeded by his son, Sūlṭān ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.

Bibliography: al-Salāwī, Kitāb il-ʿIstīkāl (Cairo 1312), iv. 125 to end; Auhin, Le Maroc d'aujourd'hui (Paris 1905), passim.

A. C. CURTIS.

AL-ḤĀSĀN b. al-ṢABBĀH, founder of the order of Assassins. According to passages in the Dājmī al-Tawārīkh, the Taʾrīkh-i Guzāda and in Mīrkhwānd, based on the Sargūḏḡāhī-ī Sāyīdīnā (cf. i. 491) his genealogy was ʿHasan b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Djiʿfār b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ṣabbāḥ al-Ḥāmīyār. ʿHasan claimed to be descended from the ancient Ḥumayrīte kings, but Mīrkhwānd quotes on this point a statement of Nīẓām al-Mulk that the people of Tūs alleged the contrary and said that his ancestors had been peasants in their country. While ʿHasan is said to have further alleged that his father migrated from Kāfā to Kūz, we find him simply called Rāzī, i.e. native of Rāzī, in Ibn al-Aṭāh. The date of his birth is unknown, but he was still a young man when he was won over for the Fāṭimid propaganda. The chief Dīʿāt in Persia was then Ibn ʿAttāsh, the latter commissioned him in 464 (1072) to go to Cairo to the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Mustāṣirīn. In 471 = 1078 (Ibn al-Aṭāh, x. 304, gives the date as 479) he arrived there after first travelling through Persia, Mesopotamia and Syria. In the struggle as to who was to succeed the aged ruler, he took the side of Nīẓām, while others preferred another of Mustaṣirīn's sons, who actually occupied the Egyptian throne on his father's death under the name al-Mustaʿlī. He then returned to the east and eagerly advocated Nīẓām's cause in different places. Finally, in 483 (1090-1091), he gained possession of the strong mountain fortress of Alamūt [q.v.] although the stories in the Sargūḏḡāhī-ī Sāyīdīnā (also in the Taʾrīkh-i Guzāda) on this point are legendary. According to Ibn al-Aṭāh, x. 216, he was able to win the confidence of the commander, an ʿAllī, and then had him seized by his men and taken to Dūghānān. This same thing happened, although by different means, with other fortresses, probably by Ibn ʿAttāsh's orders, whose son, likewise usually called Ibn ʿAttāsh, himself resided in the fortress of Shaḥzīdīdī at Iṣāpāhān. As long as the latter lived, Ḥasan played no prominent part, although the famous Sālūqūdzī vizier Nīẓām al-Mulk had already long suspected him on account of his frequent meetings with Egyptian missionaries. The well-known story of the early friendship of these two men, in which ʿOmār ibn Khsyūṣān appears as a third, even if, as Browne has shown, it is accepted by Kāšīd al-Dīn also, is however a fable. Cf. Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoucides, ii. Introduction, p. 14, note. To make this dangerous opponent harmless, the Assassins resorted to assassination, a means they were so often to use in the years following. Nīẓām al-Mulk was to be first to fall, being murdered in 485 (1092). It is probably also in this period that the organisation of the Assassins into a secret society falls; on their organisation and aims, cf. the article ASSASSINS (i. 491 et sqq.), which has also pointed out there that conditions were then favourable to them and that it was only after the death of Dīvārīyān, that Sūlṭān Muḥammad could seriously think of putting an end to the Assassins' reign of terror. After Shāhīdīz has been taken in 500 (1107) and Ibn ʿAttāsh executed, the other robbers' nests fell one by one; and finally Alamūt too. During the siege Muhammad died (511 = 1118) and his troops as a result ran away; ʿHasan, who after the death of Ibn ʿAttāsh had presumably been recognised as Grand Master of the Assassins, was saved. Seven years later (518 = 1124) he died after arranging that Kāya Buzurg Umūm Kū Ḍārī should succeed him.

If ʿHasan is considered the founder of the Assassins, it must not be supposed that the main object of his life was to secure his personal power by planning assassinations; it is not even proved that he recommended or used this detestable means. Assassination had, as is pointed out in the article ASSASSINS (i. 491) - already for long before ʿHasan's time been commended as a religious duty by the leaders of certain sects, and shortly before Ḥasan's public appearance it had been practised wholesale, notably in Iṣāpāhān. Cf. also Ibn al-Aṭāh, x. 214. Ḥasan's importance lies much rather in the fact that he gave the Assassins' power a central stronghold in Alamūt, so that it maintained itself there even after his death also. He also devoted his activities to authorship and composed several works in Persian, which were all unfortunately destroyed at the capture of Alamūt by the Mongols. The quotations from them given by Shahrastānī and others go no farther than well-known ʿShīʿī doctrines; the fact expressly emphasised by the authorities that he did not publicly proclaim his teaching to the people, also agrees entirely with the ʿShīʿī principle of taqīya. He only differed from other ʿShīʿīs in that he recognised Nīẓām, son of al-Mustaṣirīn, as Imām even after he had been incarcerated by al-Mustaʿlī in 488 (1095). How far he was responsible for the organisation of the sect as a secret society cannot be ascertained from exact details. That he was held in great reverence by his followers is proved by the title Sāyīdīnā, "our lord", by which he was called by them.

Bibliography: In addition to works quoted in the article ASSASSINS, Shahrastānī, Milāl, ed. Cureton, p. 150 sqq.; Schefer, Siasat Nameh, Supplement, p. 48 sqq.; Müller, Der Islam, ii. 97 sqq.; Blöched, Le Messianisme dans l'histoire des musulmans, p. 105 sqq.

AL-ḤĀSĀN b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣaḥīfī, one of al-Maʿmūn's governors. Like his brother, al-Faḍl b. ʿAbd Allāh, ʿAbd al-Ḥasan was originally a fire-worshipper, but the latter adopted Islam. In 966 = 811-812, when al-Maʿmūn trusted the administration of the eastern provinces to al-Faḍl with almost unlimited power, he appointed al-Ḥasan minister of finance. After al-
Amin's assassination in 1928 = 813, he was appointed governor of Arabia and the 'Iraq through his brother's influence, while the Caliph himself stayed in Merv. But al-Hasan, as a Persian, was unable to win the sympathy of the Arab population and trouble soon broke out. An adventurer, named Abu l-Sarayā, appeared in Kūfa in 797 = 815, and allied himself with an 'Ali, Ibn Ṭabāṭaba, whom he persuaded to set up as a pretender. The government troops were defeated; but Ibn Ṭabāṭaba died suddenly and al-Hasan turned for help to the tried general Harthama b. A'yan, who blockaded Abu l-Sarayā in Kūfa. When the latter tried to escape he was captured and beheaded in Rabh 1 200 = October 815. Soon, however, the mercenaries of Baghdad mutinied, but had to surrender after three days' fighting; but after the murder of Harthama b. A'yan in Dhū l- Ka'bāda 200 = June 816 the governor of Baghdad, Muhammad b. Abi Khalid joined the rebels and advanced against al-Hasan in Wāṣit. Muhammad was defeated and died soon after of his wounds. Meanwhile, however, al-Mansūr, a son of the Caliph al-Maḥdī, had been recognized as al-Ma'mūn's representative in Baghdad. His troops were defeated however by 'Abd al-'Uzzā and, as he drew his adherents mainly from the lowest classes and the town as a result was given over to all possible excesses, the more thoughtful elements of the population sided with Hasan and put an end to the rule of the mob. But peace did not last long. When Ma'mūn in Ramadān 201 = March 817 proclaimed the 'Ali b. Abī Muṣā, called al-Riḍā, as his successor, a rebellion broke out in Baghdad and Ibrāhīm, another son of al-Maḥdī, was proclaimed Caliph. In Rudāb 202 = February 818 the rebels attacked al-Hasan in Wāṣit, but were defeated and had to retire to Baghdad. After the murder of his brother al-Faṣr in Shābān 202 = Febr. 818, al-Hasan became insane. He recovered however and in Ramadān 210 = 825-826, his daughter Hazīma married him. al-Hasan was much esteemed for his liberality to poets and scholars. He died in Sarakhs on the 1st Dhū l-Hijādja 235 (16 June 850) or 236.


AL-HASAN b. USTĀDĪ HORMUZ ABU 'ALI, the son of Abu Dījar far Ustādī Hormuz [v. i. 182], became even in the lifetime of his father leader of the Dailami troops under Samsām al-Dawla. After the murder of the latter (908), Hasan entered the service of the Bayād Bāhī al-Dawla, who sent him as governor to Kūhīzān in 390 (1000) and gave him the title 'Āmid al-Dīyyah. He later sent him in the same capacity to the 'Irāq and there he waged several wars with his predecessor Abū Dījar far Ḥaḍīḍjābī, Abū 'l-'Abbās b. Wāṣil, who had rebelled in the swamp country [see BAṬHĀ], Badr b. Hasanwaih [q. v.] and others. He died before his father at the age of 49 in Baghdaḏ in 401 (1010-1011) and was entombed in the burying-place of the Kurjaḥ. The famous poet al-Sharfī al-Radī dedicated an elegy to his memory.


AL-HASAN b. YūSUF b. 'ALI b. AL-MUṬḤABAR AL-HILLI AL-SHĪ ḌIYAMAL AL-DĪN ABU 'L-MANṢŪR, known as al-ʿAlī, born 648 (1250) at Hilla, was the greatest Shī'a jurist of his day. He successfully represented the Shī'a sect in a discussion which once took place with the Sunnis in the court of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Ul-Dīn Ul-Dīn al-Maḥmūd ibn-Ḥababānd Muhammad (723—716=1324-1316) and the Sūfī was so impressed with his arguments that he adopted the Shī'a doctrines in many respects. He died in Hilla in 726 (1326) and his dead body was taken to Mashhad and buried there.


Bibliography: Muntaṭha l-Maḥlāt fi Amṣa l-Riḍā, p. 105; Amāl al-ʿAmīl, p. 40; Rawḥāt al-Ḥanāfsī fī Ahlāl al-Ummah wa l-Ṣaḥāba, pp. 176—177; Brockelmann, Geschichte der oriental. Lit. ii. 164. (M. HIDAYET HOSAIN.)

AL-HASAN b. ZAID b. HĀSĀN, a great-grandson of ʿAli. He was a pious man, who following the example of his father and grandfather, abandoned all political aspirations and reconciled himself to ʿAbbāsid rule. His daughter became the wife of the Caliph Abū l-ʿAbbās, while he himself lived at the Caliph's court, and is even said to have occasion to communicate the views of his ʿAlīd relatives and their dependants to al-Maḥdī. In 150 = 767 al-Mansūr made him governor of Medina, but in 151 = 772 he aroused the Caliph's wrath and was dismissed, imprisoned and had his property confiscated. But restitution was made to him by al-Maḥdī's successor, al-Maḥdī, who gave him back all that he had lost, after al-Maḥdī's death. He died in 169 = 783 at al-Hāḍir, while on a pilgrimage to Mecca, and was buried there.

Bibliography: Annales, ed. de Goeje, iii. 144, 149, 258, 358 sq., 377, 400, 453 sq. and 2518 (variants); Yaʿqūbī, Historiā ed. Houtsma, ii. 456; Ibn al-Athīr, Chronicle, ed. Tornberg, v. 420, 454; vi. 4, 21 sq., 53. (Fr. Buhl.)

AL-HASAN b. ZAID b. MUḤAMMAD, a great-grandson of the preceding, founder of an ʿAlīd dynasty in Tabaristan. The high-handed and ruthless rule of the Tūhrīs produced such resentment in this country that a number of men, under the
influence of the strong 'Alid sentiment in these regions, looked around for a man of 'Ali's line to whom they could entrust the government. They therefore turned to Hašan who was living in Rayi and had been recommended to them by another 'Alid; the choice proved a fortunate one, for Hašan possessed an energy and sturdy resoluteness of purpose rare in an 'Alid. He was summoned to power by a section of the Tabaristanis and a number of Dalilami chiefs; he succeeded in defeating the Tabarids troops and seizing the town of Āmul and Sāriya and, after an unsuccessful attempt, Rayi also. But Hašan had to be perpetually on his defence against attacks on all sides and was more than once driven out of the country, on which occasions he found it very useful to have a secure refuge in friendly Dalilam. From there he always returned and fortune often favoured him so that in 257 = 871 he was able to take Lārdjūnā and in 259 = 873 Kūms. In this latter year a new and dangerous enemy arose against him in the person of Yaqūb [q.v.], the "coppersmith", whom Hašan, not without humour, called al-Sandān, "the anvil". He succeeded in being dismissed from the Caliph to punish the rebellious 'Alid and easily found a causa belli when Hašan would not deliver up the Sījestānī 'Abd Allāh who had sought asylum with him. Hašan was not strong enough for so powerful an opponent and was again forced to retire to Dalilam but was saved by tremendous rains, which in these lands are particularly dangerous, and brought Yaqūb to such a plight that he could only get out of the country with great loss. Hašan returned and remained for a period unharmed, till 266 = 880 a Khuḍjūštānī, named Ahmad b. 'Abd Allāh, invaded Lārdjūnā and conquered a part of it. While Hašan was fighting with him there, another 'Alid, in order to have himself proclaimed ruler, spread the news in Tabaristan that Hašan was slain, but on Hašan's return he was defeated and killed. Hašan died in 270 = 884 in possession of his territory and his family continued to rule in Tabaristan till 316 = 928. Personally he was a deeply religious man with a taste for poetry and the various branches of jurisprudence and allied sciences.


Hašan Abād. A small town situated in the district of Atak (till lately part of Kāwāl Findi, in the Pāndjāb. Extensive ruins and Buddhist remains in the neighbourhood were supplied by Cunningham to represent the site of Taxila, but recent discoveries make it probable that Taxila was situated at Kālā Sāriā, more to the East. The sacred spring of Elātpatra visited by the Chinese pilgrim Hionen Thsiang in the 7th cent. A.D. is no doubt identical with the spring at Hašan Abād now dedicated to the Saint Bābā Wall of Kandahār. It is full of sacred fish which may not be killed. This spring according to Hiouen Thsiang was 10 li from Taxila to the northwest. The Sikhs as well as the Muḥammadans have a shrine near the spring, named Panjā šāhīb from the supposed impress of the fingers (pandja) of the Guru Nānak on a stone. Here was a halting place of the Mughal Emperors, from Akbar onwards, in their journeys to Kashmir, and a tomb surrounded by cypresses is assigned by tradition to Lāla Rukh, daughter of Awrangzēb. Akbar followed this route certainly and Dājangir on one occasion after arriving at Hašan Abād turned back to Kālānī and entered Kashmir by the Bihmār road. Bernier's memoirs show that later emperors preferred the Bihmār and Fīr-Pāndjāb route. Yet a tomb at Hašan Abād is by tradition assigned to Lālā Rukh, daughter of Akbar, who is the heroine of Moore's well-known poem, one of the scenes in which takes place at Hašan Abād. Descriptions will be found in the travels of Elphinstone, Moorcroft,Burnes and Hügel, and a notice by Cunningham in the Archaeological Survey of India. The name Hašan Abād is undoubtedly, as supposed by Elphinstone, the true name of the Saint now called Bābā Wall, although Cunningham doubted the fact, and said that Bābā Wall was a saint from Kandahār, while Hašan the Abād, or religious madman, was a Ġūjarī whose tomb was at the foot of the hill. The mention of Bābā 'Iṣārān Abād in the Ta'īrīkī Maṣūmi below that he was born at Sabzawār and accompanied Shāh Rukh, son of Timūr, to India and afterwards died and was buried near Kandahār, where his tomb became a place of pilgrimage. Mir Maṣūm, the author of this history, lived in Akbar's reign and claimed descent from Bābā Hašan Abād. The town bore his name and was called in Akbar's time, for the A'bīn-i Akbarī records (p. 446, Blochmann's trans.) that Shams al-Dīn built himself a vault there, and that 'Īsām Abū 'I-Fath was buried in this vault by Akbar's order, also that Akbar himself visited the tomb on his return journey from Kandahār.

Bibliography: Blochmann, Trans. of A'bīn-i Akbarī (Calcutta 1875); Ta'īrīkī Maṣūmi (in Elliot and Dowson, Hist. of India, vol. i. London 1867); Elphinstone, C ŭ b d u l , vol. i. (London 1839); Moorcroft, Travels etc., London 1841; Hügel, Travels in Kashmir etc. (Eng. trans.) (London 1845); Burnes, Bokhara, vol. i. (London 1834); Cunningham, Archaeological Survey of India, vol. ii. (Simla 1871); Price, Trans. of Memoirs of Dāhāngir, p. 137 (London 1829). (M. Longworth Dames.)

Hāsān Agha, Khaīr Al-Dīn in Algiers. He was born in Sardinia and had been taken prisoner by Khaīr Al-Dīn on a raid and enrolled among his eunuchs. He soon won the confidence of his master who made him kīya (major-domo) and entrusted him with the government of Algiers during his campaign against Tunis [see Khaīr Al-Dīn]. When Khaīr Al-Dīn was recalled to Turkey in 1636, he left the government in his hands and Ḥasan filled his office to the general satisfaction. "To this day", writes Haedo, "many of those who knew him say that there never was a more just Paša".

Charles V's attack on Algiers fell within the period of his administration (1541). According to Haedo, Ḥasan showed exceptional valour and personally contributed to the defeat of the imperial
troops. According to contemporary historians, on the other hand, Hasan’s attitude was rather ambiguous. They say that he had been won over by the proposals of Count d’Alcandé, governor of Oran, and only the resistance of several generals prevented him handing over the city to Charles V. In any case, after the collapse of the Spanish expedition, Mawardi met in Khanka, who had made an alliance with the Christians, and forced him to pay tribute and deliver up his son as a hostage (1542). According to Hacédo, he undertook a campaign to the West to protect the king of Tlemcen against the Spanish forces in Oran, but this campaign is rather uncertain. Soon afterwards Hasan fell suddenly into disgrace, retired into private life and died unnoticed in 1549 at the age of 58. He was interred in a silk bag, which his kiaza had built near the Bab-al-Wel and the inscription is preserved in the Algiers Museum. (G. Colin, Corpus des Inscriptions Arabes et Turques de l’Algérie, département d’Alger, Algiers 1900, no. 202).


(On Yer.)

HASAN Baba, Dey of Algiers (1682–1683), usually called Baba Hasan. He was previously a rais (corsair captain) and took part in the revolution of 1671, which put an end to the rule of the Aghas and replaced it by that of the Deys. As son-in-law of Hâdji Muhammad, who was the first to fill the office of Dey, he held the actual power in name of his father-in-law. He made many enemies by his arrogance, mistrust, and cruelty but suppressed with a strong arm all attempts at rebellion. In 1680, under the pretext of restoring the order broken by the rivalry of the sons of Murad Bey, he attacked Tunis; in 1681, he fought in the West against Mula Ismâ’il’s troops. When in 1682 Hâdji Muhammad fled to Tripoli on hearing that the French had sent a fleet against him under Duquesne, Hasan Baba took over the reins of government. During the first bombardment of Algiers (20th Aug.–12th Sept. 1682) he ruled the town with a rod of iron and executed without mercy every one who dared complain or speak of negotiations. In the following year Duquesne again appeared before the city. After several days’ bombardment (26th–29th June) the Dey was brought to negotiate with the French admiral. He handed over the chief of the Ra’is, Hâdji Husain (Mezio Morto), as hostage and released the Christian prisoners. As an agreement could not be reached regarding the indemnity to be paid to the French, Mezio Morto was allowed to go on shore, as he said he would hasten the negotiations. Scarcely had he disembarked however when he called the Ra’is together and forced an entrance to the Djenina, had Hasan Baba murdered, and was thereupon elected Dey (22nd July 1683).

Bibliography: Cf. the bbl. to the articles ALGER, Algérie.

(On Yer.)

Hasan Beyzade, a Turkish historian, son of Kâçek Hasanbey, who had been secretary of state (raîs al-buṭṭāb) during the grand-vizierate of Kâdîm Meshel Süleyman Pasha (Islamic 1053–25th Rabî’ II 583), and later a writer’s career and took part in the Hungarian campaigns during 1598–1603 as secretary to Serdar Sâṣūrdjî Mehmed Pasha, later as tekbâr- eddîjî and, after 1601, as raîs al-buṭṭâb to his successors, the grand-vizier Ibrahim Pasha (died 9th Muḥarram 1010 = 10th July 1601) and Yemeniṣji Hasan Pasha (dismissed 27th Rabî’ II 1012 = 4th Oct. 1603). In 1018 we find him Anadolu dersârî (superintendent of the finance office of Anatolia); according to Hâddji Khalîfî, Lex. Bibl., no. 2160, he died in 1046 (1636–1637). The first part of his history of the house of ‘Osmân (Ta’rîkh-‘âl ‘Osmân), dedicated to Sultan Murâd IV, is merely an extract from Sa’d al-Dîn’s well-known Târîkh al-Tamârîkh, the second part, covering the period from the accession of Suleiman I to the second accession of Muṣṭâfî (1032) is in its later sections based on his own researches and is often quoted by the Turkish historians Pehlevî, Hâddji Khalîfî (Fethîkî) and Naḥîmî as a valuable authority. Manuscripts of this work are not common (Vienna Library, No. 1046–1049, of which 1046 is complete, and 1049 has a continuation down to 1045 a. H.). There is a biography of Hasanbeyzade in Ahmed Resmi’s Sefmet el-Rûsi, p. 26 sq. (copied word for word by Djinâl al-Dîn, Annîsî Zarîfî, p. 21 sq. of the Morêtman, J. H.).

(On Yer.)

HASAN BAZBURG, Tâdji al-Dunyâ wa’l-Dîn b. Husain Gurgan b. Afsuka b. Ilkân Novan, usually called Shaikh Hasan, the founder of the Djâlā’îrîd dynasty in Baghdad after the death of the Ilkhan ‘Abî Sa’îd. He attained a high position while the latter was still alive, as his mother was a daughter of the Ilkhan Arghun. He was therefore spared when accused, probably falsely, in 732 (1332) of having designs on the life of the Ilkhan ‘Abî Sa’îd and the death sentence was commuted to banishment to Kâmâsh. In the following year he received the governorship of Asia Minor. After the death of ‘Abî Sa’îd 736 (1335) a struggle for the throne soon broke out; the newly elected King Arpa lost his throne and life in battle with ‘Ali Pâšâshî, governor of Baghdad, who had paid homage to another descendant of Hulagu, named Mîsa, Shaikh Hasan then rose against him and put forward another claimant, Muhammad. The two rivals met at Al-Bârîgh near Karadere on the 14th Dhu’l-Hijdîja 736 (24th July 1336); Shaikh Hasan was victorious and made ‘Tabriz his headquarters, while Mîsa retired to Baghdad. But as it was not only a feud between Hasan and Mîsa but between two Mongol tribes, Djalâ’îr and Uirât, the Emirs of Khurâsân chose a new King Toğha Timûr, to whom Mîsa submitted. But they were defeated by Shaikh Hasan in a battle near Mârâgha in 737 = 1337. Mîsa was taken prisoner and slain. Meanwhile a new rival to Hasan appeared in “Little” Hasan (see Hasân Kûbîk), who won a battle and even succeeded in capturing and putting to death Muhammad, the Khan recognised by Shaikh Hasan. Shaikh Hasan had saved himself in time by fleeing to ‘Tabriz and was able to come to terms with his rival, while he thought to gain new support by paying homage

**HASAN ÇELEBI KINĀLĪ-ZADE, a famous Ottoman scholar and biographer of poets. Born in 953 (1546-1547) in Brusa, the son of Kinālī-Zade Mīrāmān Āli Celebi b. Emur Allah, famous as a poet and scholar, then mūdīrīs in the Hamza-Bey-Medrese, Hasan, like his father, devoted himself to the study of law and theology. After an active and honourable career as māzār and kādī in Brusa, Adrianopole, Aleppo, Cairo, Gallipoli, Eivān and New Zāgra, he died kādī of Rosetta in Egypt on the 12th Shawwāl 1012 (14th March 1604). Hasan Celebi was, as is the custom with Turkish scholars, also a poet, although only an imitator. He wrote marginal notes on the Durr e Ghiyār as well as additions and notes on some important theological works and certain other writings. But his great work, which was to bring him lasting fame, is his great collection of 607 biographies of poets, the Qādir al-Shawārī, which is dedicated to the historian Khādīja Sād al-Din and was completed in 994 (1586). The work is of inestimable value for its biographical details and the numerous quotations. Of the many Ottoman biographies of poets it is considered the best in spite of its pompous style, its affected bombast and its fondness for anecdotes. Hasan Celebi discusses the poets from the earliest times under three heads, a) Sūfis, b) princes and c) other poets. His little weakness for enshrining all members of his family in his work as poets is not to be taken too much amiss.

HASAN PASHA. Beylerbey of Algiers.

He was the son of Khair al-Din [q.v.] and a Mooress. His father’s influence with the Porte obtained him the office of Pasha of Algiers in 1545. He was entrusted with the task of restoring Turkish power in western Algeria where it had been considerably weakened. In 1546, Hasan conducted a campaign against the Spaniards in the Tlemcen district, but just as he had come face to face with the Christian troops near Arbil he had to return to Algiers as his father had died. He succeeded him as Beylerbey and soon afterwards undertook a new western campaign, this time against the Moors, who had occupied Tlemcen in 1551. An army composed of Janissaries under the command of Hasan Corso and Kabyls under the Sultan of the Beni ‘Abbās (Sultan of Labes in the European authorities) defeated the Moors, followed them up to the Medjila and regained Tlemcen (1552). During this time Hasan was carrying out important works in Algiers; he increased the fortifications, built the Bardj Milały Hasan (Fort l’Empereur), on the Kudyat al-Šābīn, erected public baths and a hospital for the Janissaries. His hostility to French policy, however, induced the Porte to recall him to Constantinople and replace him by Ṣalah Ra’i (1552–1556).

In 1557, he returned to Africa. The disturbances which followed on the death of Ṣalah Ra’i, notably the rebellion of Ṣalah Corso and the murder of Pasha Tekbely and the Sultan to send him once more to Algiers as Beylerbey. In the west the Sherif Muhammad al-Mahdī had taken advantage of this unrest to invade the Tlemcen country again and to occupy the city; in Meghwar alone a Turkish garrison held out under the command of Khādī Saffa. After Hasan had restored peace in Algiers he took the field against the Moors who vacated Tlemcen on his approach. The Turks pursued them up to the walls of Fas, where they inflicted a disastrous defeat on them. The Beylerbey had however to retire hurriedly lest he should be cut off by the Spaniards. On the latter’s request (1557), and under the command of Esmail, the Spaniards besieged Mostaganem in the following year, Hasan came to its aid and routed the Spaniards (26th Aug. 1558). The Christians had now to confine themselves to Oran and ceased to be dangerous to the Turks.

Now Hasan had peace in this direction, he planned the subjection of the Kabyls. In order to be secure against any insubordination among the Janissaries he organised a force of Spanish renegades. By his marriage with the daughter of the Sultan of Kako he secured the assistance of a number of Kabyl tribes and thereupon undertook a campaign against Ahmad b. al-Kāfi, the chief of the Kabyl tribe Ahbās. The latter was bested in battle, forsook his forces and killed in an encounter at the Ka’fa of the Beni ‘Abbās. His brother Mokran continued the war but became a Turkish tributary in 1559.

The intrigues of the Sherifs and the naval preparations of the Spaniards prevented Hasan from completing the subjection of the Kabyls. He therefore resolved to leave the latter opponents alone for the moment. After the destruction of the Spanish fleet under the Duke of Melina Coeli by Piali Pasha at Djerba (15th March 1561) the Beylerbey was able to devote his whole energies to the Moors. He was just about to begin the war with them when the Janissaries, who were discontented with the creation of new Kabyl troops, seized him and sent him in chains to Constantinople.

It was not difficult for Hasan to clear himself of the charges against him laid before the Porte. He returned in 1567, a third time to Algiers where an envoy of the Sultan had already restored order and executed Agha Hasan, the ringleader of the conspiracy against the Beylerbey. Hasan was now determined to clear the Spaniards out of the country and set about the capture of Oran and Mars al-Kabir. At the head of an army of 30,000 men he began the siege of these two towns, while his fleet blockaded them from the sea (April 1567). After two months of vain essays and repeated assaults, in which the Beylerbey himself risked his life, the arrival of a relieving fleet of Spaniards forced the Turks to retreat. Hasan was not able to resume his plan again. Soon afterwards he had to lead the Algerian galleys to Malta which the Turks were besieging. Here he lost a portion of his ships, but the fighting qualities which he showed on this occasion won him the rank of Kapūdān Pasha (1567). He died in 1570 and was buried beside his father Khair al-Din in Büyük Dere.


(G. Véry.)

HASAN PASHA, known as Vezir Pasha, the greengrocer, was a native of Albania and entered the service of the Seni rose from sūfi bulduqi (halderdier) to ṣuqdi baqli (chamberlain). His countryman, the grand vizier Sinan Pasha made him an agha of the Janissaries in the beginning of Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 1002 (8th July 1594) during the Hungarian war; in Rabī‘ II 1003 (December 1594), he was dismissed, but reinstated in Shawwal 1003 (June 1595); in Djamāda I 1004 (January 1596) he became wali of Shārā w and on his return from there Wazir of the Diwan. In this office he carried out the currency reform of Rabī‘ I 1005. On the 1st Shahrī 1009 (16th February 1007) he was appointed deputy (kirmāmām) for the Grand Vizier Ilahib Pasha during his absence in the field and appointed his successor when Ibrahim died on the 9th Muharram 1010 (10th July 1601). As Serdar he continued the campaign in Hungary (defeat at Stuhlweissenburg on the 15th Oct. 1601; relief of Kanischa, recapture of Stuhlweissenburg on the 29th August 1602; capture of Pest and siege of Ofen by the Archduke Mathias late in the autumn of 1602) and only returned in January 1603 on hearing of the unrest in the capital caused by the Sipahis. Although he succeeded in suppressing the riots, he was nevertheless dismissed through the intrigues of his enemies on the 27th Rabī‘ II.
HASAN PASHA — HASANI.

1012 (10th Oct. 1603) and strangled by the Sultan's orders on the 12th Djumâda I (18th Oct.) of the same year.


HASAN PASHA, son of Husain, governor of the Yemen for nearly a quarter of a century, whom he received the name Yemeni, was a native of Albania and held the office of bostângâbâghi in Constantinople when Sultan Murad III sent him in Djumâda I 988 (June 1580) to the Yemen to restore Ottoman prestige in this province, the greater part of which had fallen into the hands of the Zaidi Imâm Muťahhar. In the course of five years he succeeded in subduing the unruly Sheiks partly by force and partly by guile and regained the fortresses which they had seized. To prevent further risings he deported the Al Muťahhar to Constantinople at the end of 1584, where they were kept in custody to the end of their lives. In the next few years he subdued a number of smaller strongholds and conquered the Yâfi and other districts so that by 1591, the land could be considered pacified. Six years later a new and dangerous rebellion broke out among the Zaidis led by the Mahdi al-Kâsim b. Muḥammad; the latter occupied the district of Kaukebân and the fortress of Thulû and was only driven out in 1598 after fierce fighting, but continued to hold out for some years more in Shaţaha. At the end of Redžeb 1012 (beginning of 1608) Hasan Pasha was recalled at this own request and returned to Constantinople. At the end of Safar 1014 (middle of July 1605) he became governor of Egypt, which post he held till the end of Muḥarram 1016 (end of May 1607). A few months after his return from there he died in Constantinople on the 9th or 16th Redžeb 1016 (beginning of November 1607).

Bibliography: Selaniki, Tarîkî, p. 214, 222, 223; Na'mân, Tâbil, i, 122, 197, 249; Kātib Celebi, Tâbilcem, p. 92; Sîdî-grî 'Osmânî, ii. 128 (Biography); dealing particularly with the campaigns in Yemen: Rutger, Historia fœmenae sub Hasanu Pascha, Lugd. Bat. 1838; Ahmed Râşidî, Tarîkî-i Yemen ve Şânî, i. 153—187; Wustenfeld, Fömen im XL (XVII.) Jahrhundert, p. 35—41. (J. H. Mörthmann.)

HASAN PASHA. [See SOROLLI and DJÂZZARI.

HASAN PASHA AL-SEYIYD, a native of a village in the district of Karâshîn-i sharîkh, entered the Janissaries in 1146 at the rank of kûlkâya (lieutenant-general), took part in the Persian campaigns and in the middle of Kâbî 1151 (beginning of July 1738) during the war with Austria was promoted to be aga of Janissaries. After receiving the rank of pasha of three tails for his bravery in this war, he was appointed Grand Vizier on the 4th Sha'bân 1156 (23rd Sept. 1743) in spite of the fact that he could neither read nor write. The continuation of the war with Nâdir Shah, the cessation by the convention of 15th January 1744 of the border warfare with Austria, which had been going on intermittently since the Peace of Belgrade (1739), and various diplomatic steps, which were instigated by the celebrated adventurer Bâneval Ahmed Pasha [q. v.] with a view to the reception of the Porte into the European Concert, all fell within his period of office. As a result of Seraf intrigues he was dismissed on the 2nd Redžeb 1158 (10th April 1746) and banished to Rhodes. In the following year the Beylerbeyi of Itschil and a little later that of Diyarbakir was given him, and he died in the latter town at the end of 1161 (1748).

Bibliography: Tarîkî of 'Izzî, fol. 187 vs. sq.; Hadżâkat al-Wuzârâ, continuation of Dilâwerzâde Omer Efendi, p. 71 sq. Sîdî-grî 'Osmânî, ii. 152 sq. (Biographies); cf. also Hadżâkat [al-Djizârî], i. 89, and v. Hammer, Geschichte der Osmanischen Reiches, viii. 39, 46—75. (J. H. Mörthmann.)

HASAN PASHA SHERIF (in Wâsîf, Cebebi Zâde al-Seydî 'Hasan) was the son of Rûşuk Celebi al-Hasjî Sultanîm Agha, who is mentioned in the year 1770 as leader of the troops of Rûşuk, Sûliman and Turgut Hoca theencer of the regiment of artillerists (1769—1774). He himself took part with distinction in the Krîm-Khân Girâ'i's raid into the Ukraine in the winter of 1769 which war became celebrated in Baron Tott's description (Mémories, iii. 171—201), as serden geldî aghasî (chief of volunteers). In the course of the campaign he was rewarded for the financial support which he had given the Grand-Vizier Muhsin-zâde by being granted the rank of kapûnik bîchtî and on the 23rd Djumâda II 1187 (11th Aug. 1773) was appointed commander of Rûşuk with the rank of vizier. After the conclusion of peace (1774) he fell into disgrace, lost the rank of vizier and spent a number of years in exile in Philippiopolis and Salonica. After the outbreak of war with Russia at the end of 1201 (autumn 1787) he was again given various military commands on the Danube and, after the death of Djâzzâ'rî Hasan Pasha on the 1st Sha'bân 1204 (16th April 1790), he was appointed Grand-Vizier and generalissimo in his place. While his brother Seiyid Mehemmed was able to inflict a considerable reverse on the Austrian and their Russian allies on the 25th Râmâdân 1204 (8th June 1790), his own campaign against the Russians was most unfortunate; towards the end of the year the latter captured in rapid succession the fortresses of Kilia, Tałcha, Isak'dja and Ismîl and, as Sherif Hasan Pasha had moreover brought suspicion upon himself by all kinds of arbitrary actions and the frankness of his reports, he was surprised in the night of 9th Djumâda II 1205 (12—17th February 1791) in his quarters in Shumla and shot by the Sultan's orders.


HASANI, in the plural hasaniyin, a kind of patronymic, or nisha given to the 'Alîd [q. v.] Sheriffs, descendants of al-Hasan son of 'Ali and Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet Muhammad. Hasanî is used in opposition to Hasani, the surname of the Sheriffs, who trace their descent from al-Hasan the second son of 'Ali and Fatima.

In Morocco, however, the surname Hasani is particularly applied to the Sheriffs descended from Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakîya, to distinguish them
from their cousins the Idrisids [q. v.]. These Sherifs, formerly located particularly in the south of Morocco, have played a considerable part in the history of N.-W. Africa. The date and cause of their installation in the country is not known. Legend says that they arrived there at the time of the rise of Marind dynasty. A number of pious Muslims of Sidjilmâsa, a town in the south of the Great Atlas, returning from the pilgrimage to Mecca are said to have stopped at Yanbu', a town on the Arabian coast, to the west of Medina. There they became friendly with a Sherif named al-Hasan. Appreciating the spiritual advantages of attending his discourses and the heavenly benefits obtained by his intervention they persuaded him to follow them and settle with them in their own country. This individual was surnamed al-Dâkhîl, i.e. he who introduces his family (into a country). The expectations of the devout Muslims were fulfilled: al-Hasan and his sons were a source of blessings to their new country.

At this time the people of the Wâdi Dra'a found to their grief that their palms were dying and the fruit would not ripen. It was said to them: "If you bring a Sherif to settle among you as the people of Sidjilmâsa have done, your fruits will undoubtedly be as good as theirs". The people of Dra'a took this advice and brought from Yanbu' the Sherif Mâliy Zîdân b. Âhmad, cousin-german of al-Hasan al-Dâkhîl through his father. Al-Hasan's descendants throughout Tafîlalt and formed the stock of 'Alawi Sherifs, so called after their ancestor 'Ali al-Marrîkashî. Those of Zîdân lived in the Wâdi Dra'a and were the ancestors of the Sa'di Sa'lîns, so called after an ethnic group, the Banû Sa'd b. Âbu Bakr, among whom the sons of Zîdân had settled together.

No less turbulent than the Idrisid Sherifs of northern Morocco, the Sherifs of Sidjilmâsa or the Banû Sa'd had frequently quarrels to settle with the Marinids. But being farther from the seat of the central government, behind the formidable natural rampart of the High Atlas, they were more easily able to organise themselves either to render themselves independent or to extend their influence. Supported by solidly constituted Arab groups, aided by the religious faction, controlled entirely by the Sherifs of different origins, the Sa'dis succeeded in overthrowing the Berber Emir dynasties of Morocco and in guiding the destinies of the country for over a century (1555—1664). Seven years after their disappearance from the centre of turmoil, about 1671, Mâliy Ismâ'il was the true founder of the Sherif dynasty which still rules Morocco.


(Al. Cour.)

HASANWAIH. R. AL-ÎUSAIN AL-BARZIKI, a Kud chief, founder of a dynasty which bears his name, which maintained itself for about half a century. Two other chiefs of his tribe, the brothers Wânâs and Ghânîm were also particularly distinguished. When Wânâs died in 349 = 960-961 he was succeeded by his son 'Abd al-Wâhâb, who had soon to cede his territory to Hasanwaih. The power of the latter now increased more and more. His rule extended over a great part of Kurdistan and included the towns of Duzrawar, Hamadân and Nahawand. Although he forced caravans to pay heavy tribute and made the roads unsafe by his raids, Rukn al-Dawla did not trouble about him, as Hasanwaih supported the Dailamids in their wars against the Khorâsânians. But in Muûarram 359 = Nov.-Dec. 969 Rukn al-Dawla had finally to send an army under the vizier Ibn al-'Amid against him. The latter died on the road and his son had to make peace with Hasanwaih. After the death of Hasanwaih in 369 = 979-980, his son Bu'dar [q. v.] was recognised as governor of Kurdistan by the Bu'yid 'Aqil al-Dawla. In 905 = 1014-1015 Bu'dar was murdered and the dynasty of the Hasanwaihids disappeared with his grandson Zahir ('Tahir) b. Hîlîl, who succeeded him but was defeated and thrown into prison in the same year by the Bu'yid Shams al-Dawla.


(K. V. Zetterstêrn.)
GENEALOGICAL TABLE.

Ḥasanī Sherifs of Morocco.

ʻAbd Allah al-Kamīl b. al-Ḥasan b. ʻAli b. Abī Ṭālib

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Djaqfar</th>
<th>Yahyā</th>
<th>Idris I.</th>
<th>Muhammad</th>
<th>Musā</th>
<th>Shāhīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ancestor of the kings of Gāzanā) (11th century)</td>
<td>(king of Fāṣ)</td>
<td>(ancestor of the Idrīsīs)</td>
<td>al-Nafs al-Zakīya</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sherifs of Tlemcen (9th century)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ḥasanī Sherifs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Djaqālī</th>
<th>Ahmād Musā</th>
<th>Muhammad al-Ka'mīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11th century)</td>
<td>(proclaimed in 955)</td>
<td>(ancestor of the Sa'dī Sultān, who disappear in 1654)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banī Sa'd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ahmad</th>
<th>Zīdān</th>
<th>Makhlūf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʻAli</td>
<td>ʻAbd al-Raḥmān</td>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muḥammad al-Ka’im</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muhammad al-Mahdī</th>
<th>Ahmad al-'Arāj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sultan of Morocco in Fes)</td>
<td>(ancestor of the Sherifs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yūsuf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ulud al-Hamīd of the Wād Retāb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ʻAbd al-Raḥmān</th>
<th>ʻAli Sherīf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahmūd</th>
<th>Ḥāshim</th>
<th>ʻAli al-Marrakushī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ancestor of the Lamrānīyūn Sherifs)</td>
<td>(founder of the ʻAlawī dynasty proclaimed in 1664)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sherif Haṣūd, Ḥadīṯādāj Mahāz Hārūn Fudūl Zākārīyā Mḥārīk ʻAṣīd |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maḥmūd Rashīd</th>
<th>Ismā‘īl al-Ḥarrān Maḥāz Yūsuf</th>
<th>Ahmed Kābir Ḥūmāda ʻAbbās Sā’īd Ḥāshim ʻAli Maḥdī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sultan of Morocco in 1664)</td>
<td>(founder of the ʻAlawī dynasty proclaimed in 1671)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HÅSHID and BAKIL. A large confederation of tribes in South Arabia. The genealogy of the Håshid is given by the Arabs of South Arabia at the present day as Håshid al-Aqghar b. Dju'ashm b. Nâwî b. Håshid al-Akbar b. Dju'ashm b. Hamdân. Bakîl is held by them to be the son of Håshid al-Akbar. Their land, called by Niebuhr Balq al-Kâbâbī "land of the tribes", lies near Sanâ'a [q.v.] and stretches eastwards to Ma'rîb [q.v.] and Naqîfân [q.v.] and northwards right up to the desert as far as eastwards of Sa'da [q.v.].

The Håshid, who number 22,000 warriors, are divided into three main groups; al-Khârif (with three subdivisions [ibidem, "third"]: Dju'jar, Kâlîyin and al-Syadyan), Banû Suraim (north of the Khârif, with nine subdivisions [late "ninth"] including Khâmîr) and al-'Casmât (Uimed in Nîbûhr) to the north of the latter up to two days' journey from Sa'da with three subdivisions, including the 'Casmât al-Watî). At the present day the Beled Hamdân (north of Sanâ'a) and Sanûn (s.w. of Sanâ'a) are also reckoned to the Håshid.

The following are included in the lands of the Håshid, the Kâa' Shams, Kâa' Hais (with an ancient cistern and 'Himyarete cemetery), and the Kâa' al-Bawu (part of the Wâdî Hirzân). The Dju'jar Dhi Bin (Duwan in Nîbûhr), with the Wâdti of the same name (a tributary of the Wâdti Shu'abâ [Hirzân]), the villages of Hût, Arâket (in Syadyan), Khâmîr (an ancient 'Himyarete town, according to Hamdânî, the birth-place of As'ad Tubbâ), the ruins of Ta'far (on the north bank of the Wâdti Shu'abâ with mosque and tomb of a saint. Near the Bawu at Dju'jar Tanlîn [al-'Ikhlî of Hamdân]), on the northern peak of which is a very ancient 'Himyarete mausoleum (with many inscriptions), the tomb of the saint Khârif, to which the Håshid still bring offerings, lies the famous ruin of Na'ît (Na'ît, CnJ6 of the South Arabian inscriptions, formerly with 20 palaces, among them Dham La'wa), which Hamdânî calls the most splendid that he had ever seen.

The Håshid have a bad name throughout South Arabia. The explorer E. Glaser, who visited their territory, on the other hand describes them as frank and kindly in their nature. Unlike the Bakîl there is a certain tribal spirit among them and many gifted poets are still to be found among them, whose productions are not inferior to those of a Nêshân.

The Bakîl (Bakîl of the South Arabian inscriptions), who live to the east of the lands of the Håshid, include the following tribes: Bal-Hârih [q.v.], Bilâd al-Bustân (between the Hâdir Shu'âbî and Hamdân [s. Hâdir]), Khâlân [q.v.], Dju'jar, Arâh (north of the Bal-Hârih), Nîhîm (Nehim, east of Arâh), 'Ayâl Sha'îrî (Sha'îrî, west of Arâh), Dju'jar [q.v.], Nâwî, Dhu Mu'hâmman (in Nîbûhr Dhu Mu'hâmman), Dhu Usain, Sufyân, Murhîba (Murbâbi, the two latter north of Arâh), Wâdî al-Wâdîa (Wâdîa'â, Wadey in Nîbûhr, north of Naqîfân), Hamdân (different from that at Sanâ'a), 'Ayâl Sâmîn, Wâlîa, 'Amânîsa and Ahl Ammâr (perhaps identical with the Al-Amar, which Miles [in a letter to Sprenger] mentions among the tribes of the Wâdti Dawâsir). Sanâ'a itself was at one time considered to belong to the Bakîl. The Bakîl are said to number 80,000 warriors.

Of the tribes mentioned we have detailed accounts in modern times of the Arâh whose land was visited and explored by Glaser in 1885. It is a small territory but rich in ancient monuments. It is bounded on the south by the Balharih, on the east by the Nîhîm, on the north by the Sufyân, Murhîba and Håshid (al-Khârif, the subdivisions Dju'jar and Syadyan) and in the west by the 'Ayâl Sha'îrî and Hamdân. It is divided into two main groups, Zuhâir (with five subdivisions) and Dhu Mu'hâmman (in Nîbûhr Dahâf) with Hisân (with seven subdivisions, among them the Ahl Mansûr and Hâkâm). In the land of the Zuhâir are the following places, Dju'jar, Shâssarîm, Zabîlîd (with 'Himyarete ruins, often mentioned in South Arabian inscriptions), Sîrîshât (different from that near the Dju'jar [q.v.], rich in ruins; in this district, at the so-called Hâdir [stone of] Arâh, the Arâh hold their assemblies on important occasions), Khubbâ (with the ruins of al-Medînîtân and Hîsh Sanad, near the basilisk cone of Durrî, the famous village of Madar (south of Sîrîshât), Shîra, Dara-fât, Bait Marrân, Shâhir, Bawas, and Radjâw. In the land of the Dhu Mu'hâmman lie the famous ruins of Itwa (Etwâ) and Rîyân; in Hîshân is the large village of Hirzân (with the tribe of the same name). Among the wâdis in the land of the Arâh may be mentioned the great Wâdti Khârif. The plateau of Arâh is volcanic in character. The west of the land is stony, basaltic rocks of the kind like the land of the Hamdân and 'Ayâl Sha'îrî.

Like the other once flourishing lands of the Håshid and Bakîl, Arâh is now poverty-stricken and deserted; in the lower parts poor crops of cereals (wheat and barley) are found, in the higher, perhaps dhûra (a kind of millet). The once splendid vinegroves of this district have long since been utterly ruined. In Hamdânî's time Arâh was famous for an excellent breed of cattle.

The Håshid and Bakîl belong to the Zaidi sect and are mostly independent (only the Balharih, Bilâd al-Bustân, Khâlân and 'Ayâl Sha'îrî are under Turkish suzerainty). On account of the increasing impoverishment of their lands many of the Håshid and Bakîl have been forced to leave their territory; we thus find Håshid in the district of Dju'jar Bârâ (in the south of Khu'riya land [q.v.]) and Dhu Mu'hâmman in the land of Ta'izz [q.v.]. They usually enter the armies of the neighbouring rulers (the Imâm of Sanâ'a, and the Sha'ir of Mecca). Even in India they are sought as mercenaries.

During Glaser's stay in Sanâ'a in 1885, a fierce war was raging between the Bakîl and the Håshid. The feud was caused by the Bakîl (Sufyân) who carried off two women of the Håshid, whereupon the latter began massacres in the villages of the Sufyân in Khu'riya. The settlement of the dispute was conducted by the governor-general of Sanâ'a, Izzet Pasha, who thereby won a certain influence over these tribes.

Hamdân in his Djazira gives us a detailed account of the Håshid and Bakîl. He mentions the most of the above-named tribes. In his time they inhabited the same districts as at the present day. They lived in the "Balad Hamdân" [q.v.], which was divided into two parts, the east belonging to the Bakîl and the west to the Håshid; in the lands of the Bakîl there were a certain number of Håshid and vice versa.

In Hamdânî's time the land of the Håshid included Ruhaba (chiefly inhabited by the Wâdti'a),
the great plain of al-Bawm (in common with the Bakil, with the villages of Rai'da [with the citadel of Tal'um], Hamud, 'Ahtar, al-Qhail, Kafa, Uruth), Ziba, the latter belonging to the Hizib of al-Khuraf, the two ruins of I'twa and Rii'am, Ummi (العربية) of the inscriptions, a large town, in common with the Bakil, the ruins of Mudar (Madar, in common with the Bakil), and Yam, 'Ahrab (called Durnain the Djibaliya; here the poet al-Ashia of Hamdan used to live during the date-harvest), the Balad al-Sayed (with al-Khurab, Dha

Bin [البين] of the inscriptions, Yant'a or Yun'a), al-Kharif (الخريف) of the inscriptions, with the market Hamal or Flatim, dating from heathen times and the villages of Asuman and al-Huf or al-Huf), the Balad Wadi'a (with Sanam, Hamdan, [so Dju'a, p. 112, 6, the index on the other hand has Hamadun, 'Amu). Hind and Hauna, Balad Khaiwan (the largest district of the Hishid, the east was inhabited by the Bakil), Khairim, La'a (the beginning of the Hishid in the south, with the two mountains Akaan (between the Wadi La'a and Wadi Sudud) and Aizam or Ajiama, the markets of Tamam and al-Arijka), Balad Hadjar (with 40,000 inhabitants; with the villages of al-Djubrah [large market for Tibama, Mecca, and all Hamdan, which used to be visited by 20,000), Subha, Hajara and Djada'a, Udrar Sha'b, Hisam (a very fertile district, rich in palms and horses), inhabited by the brave and distinguished clan of al-Ashim, which numbered 5,000 warriors), the two fortified hills of Alishan and Shubara or Shabara, with the precious stone called 'Ajud, after Wadi Said near Sana'a, a black stone with white veins), the Djebel Hadjaja, Mawtak and the great mountain Shufar (lower part) the markets of al-Kalabidj, Bara (both belonging to the Djabar), Safir, al-Fakia, Kutaba.

The lands of the Bakil included: al-Sama'a, Ijadaan (both in the west of the Rahm of San'a), Ma'nasa al-Sa'ib, or al-Utham, with numerous wadis, which flow into the Khair, and with many cornfields and vineyards), the Djebel Dharab, rich in vines (inhabited by the brave and distinguished group of tribes Dhaibah b. Aliyan), Hairb al-Radrad (with silver-mines; on the boundary between the Nihm, Murhiba, Bal hiringh and Upper Khairan, the Wadi Ma'sam (inhabited by the Murhiba and Nihm), the Upper Djarf (with the villages of Shuwalta, Herran [on the tributaries of the Khair of the same name], Sawane, the Djebel Warwar (with market), which belong to the Sufyan b. Abih, the Sabib, the villages between Khaiwan and Sada (including al-Khaddiya, 'Iyan, Birklan or Baraka), the Balad Shajir b. Bakil (with the great mountain of Barat [with a very healthy climate, rich in cornfields, inhabited by the clan Dhauma, presumably the Dhulhene or Dom Masu of Nibeher). Djadira, Tubai [Tubaa]; the Wadis of this Balad, which flow to the Ghrab, Djawf and Nadjran, were rich in wild asses, al-Harran, (inhabited by the Wa'il b. Shajir). Markets of the Bakil were the Warwar already mentioned, Ghrab and Rai'da (the latter in the land of the Hishid).

According to Yakut, a very poisonous plant grows in the land of the Hishid and Bakil, which is known only to them and is found nowhere else. The Hishid and Bakil therefore guard it carefully and use it very sparingly, as the Egyptians do with the plants from which they press balsam. Several kings of the Banu Nadhir died of this poison.


HASHIM b. ABD AL-MANAF, ANCESTOR OF THE HISHIDS. The tradition that Muhammad belonged to this family is confirmed by several ancient poems e.g. Alsha in Ibn Histam, p. 256, 11, who calls Muhammad Hashim's son, cf. also p. 334, 199, 19. But whether Hashim really was Abd al-Mutallab's father and Muhammad's grandfather, as tradition avers, is by no means so certain, as the association of the Bani Hashim with the Banu Mutalib, ibid, p. 356, 14, or the enumeration of the Meccan families in Hassain b. Thabit (Kamil, p. 141, 29) do not exactly corroborate it. In any case, all that the Arabs tell of his life is mere legend. He is said to have supervised the provision of water for the pilgrims and to have been a merchant honoured alike by the Emperor and the Nadzih, who first instituted the two annual caravans of the Meccans. He received his name because he had broken (haksama) bread for the hungry during a famine. His wife Salmah bint 'Amr belonged to the Khazraj family of al-Nadjar, but this is probably one of the many mistakes of the Medineans to make their relationship with the Prophet tenable (cf. the articles AMNA and 'ABD AL-MUTALLAB). According to this tradition, Hashim died in Ghaza (q.v.) and was buried there.


HASHIYA (A.) 1. is identical with HASHUV (q.v.) in its third, fourth and fifth senses; 2. the margin of a page: hence a marginal note, superintending upon a commentary (SIRAH, q.v.) upon another (MATIN, q.v.). The whole text is comprised in the sirah, but only a word or two in the hashiya, though the latter may be more extensive than the original text. For other meanings of hashiya see Lane, Lexicon, and Dozy, Supplément.

HASHMET, an Ottoman poet, son of the Kali-Askar Abas Efendi, a contemporary and favourite of Râghib Pasha. He chose a career in law and theology. But before he had passed through the various grades of the Mdcreisiat, he was banished to Brusa with the poet Nevres Efendi for his satirical verses in 1175 (1761-1762) and afterwards alone to Rhodes, where he died in 1182 (1769-1769) and was buried beside Murad Râfis. Hashmet was as good a marksman and swords-
man as he was an excellent poet. His great strength lies in ingenious imitations and adaptations to the ideas and language of his predecessors, not in original works. In him the characteristic feature of Ottoman poetry in general, great skill in imitation, a parasitical kind of poesy, flourishing only on a foreign growth of assured reputation, became a consideration of genuine composition. In his Ḍawād he imitates Naʿfīr, in his ghazals a number of poets. He is only entitled to a modest place as an original poet, which he also tried to be. A vigorous and robust tone marks his more independent poems. The boldness with which he attacks his highly-privileged enemies is striking.

His Dīwān was not published by himself but by the Brusa scholar, Seyyid Mehməd Saʿdī Imāmzāde, with a laudatory preface from the latter's pen in 1180 (1759-1760). It was printed in four parts at Būlāq in 1257 (1841). Of his prose works there have survived: Intisāb al-muṣallāt (The Service of the Kings), a vision which Has̱hi̱met proffers to have had on the accession of Muṣṭaṣf̱ī III; a Sīr-nāme or Wilāyet-nāme, the description of the festivities on the occasion of the birth of the princess Heibet Allāh 1172 (1755); the Sevāl al-Shaʿrār, a work dedicated to Raghib Paşa and accompanied by a metrical introduction by him; lastly the explanation of a sūra of the Kurān and of the Hadīth transmitted in metrical form.


HAS̱R (a), assembly, particularly that on the day of resurrection (yawm al-Haṣr). Cf. the article KIYĀMA. — Title of Sūra lix.

HAS̱HW, the stuffing of a pillow, cushion, vegetable, etc. Hence: i. Mediai. You say *its alfī has become medial (haṣ̱hwāni).* 2. A relative clause. Şhawān calls a sin a haṣ̱hw (Muṣafq̱, ed. Broch, p. 57). 3. A parenthesis, with nothing in the sentence is syntactically connected, synonymous with Firtād (ạṟi, Makḇm, ed. De Saç, p. 85, 86). 4. A redundancy or tautology or otiose expression, as Sinul ạ-raḏ (headache of the head). It differs from tola in that the latter always serves to remove a doubt (ạṟi, loc. cit.). 5. In prosody, the portion of either hemistich of a verse between the first and the last foot. (Freytag, Darstellung der arabischen Verskunst, p. 119, 246, 257). A verse consisting of the foot mawṣūli̱m repeated four times would have no haṣ̱hw.

Bibliography: Sprenger and Lées, Dictionary of Technical Terms, Pt. i. p. 395 sq.; Dujourdja, Tarifīt, ed. Flügel, p. 31 and 92. (T. H. Weir.)

HAS̱HW̱YA, also HAS̱HW̱YIA or AHI AL-HAṢ̱HW̱YA, a contemptuous term for those among the men of Tradition (ạṣ̱ẖib al-Hadīth), who recognised in a peculiar and archaic pronunciation tradiions as genuine, without criticism and even with a kind of preference, and interpreted them literally. A few names of individuals who made themselves notorious in this way and who belonged neither to the Karrāmiya nor to those Shiʿis who did the same, are mentioned by al-Shahristānī, ed. Cureton, p. 77. The Saʿdīmiya (cf. Goldziher in Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Mor.

gen. Gesell., lxxi. 79) are among them. The Muʿaṭṭa scorned the whole of the ạṣ̱ẖib al-Hadīth as Haṣ̱hi̱miya because they tolerated anthropomorphi- ersions expressions, although without the lack of good taste of the Haṣ̱hi̱miya proper and often with the retention of the "how" (baš kafī).


HAŠK (HASEK), a town in the Maharashtra country [q. v.], east of Mirbāb [q. v.], in 17° 21' N. Lat. and 55° 23' E. Long., at the foot of the high mountain of Nās (Lūs), the Aṣ̱ẖwān of the Periplus Maris Erythraei. Before the town lies the "bay of herbs" (Dīnj al-Hashīsh), the bay of Hašk (Ra's Hašk), also called Kurya and Muruya Bay after the two islands lying opposite (Khāryān and Maryān in Idrisi). Idrisi describes Hašk as a small fortified town four days east of Maryān, with many inhabitants, who are fishermen. Ibn Battūta landed here on his way through ʿOmnān and found the houses built of fishbones with roofs of camelskins. In Ibn Battūta's and Idrisi's time there was great intercourse between Hašk and the island of Soksorā [q. v.] to the south. The frankincense, which was produced in the Maharashtra country, was exported through Hašk. The town is now quite ruined. It is called Sūk Hašk and is inhabited by the Korāh (or Korah) and other tribes of the frankincense country.

Opposite Hašk, according to Miles, about 20 miles from it lie the "seven isles of Zeno[h]ia" (the ạṟtī ṭi, al Zewa[h]a, λευκόροι of the Periplus), the Khāryān and Maryān group of Idrisi, called the Džārīn Ibn Khulāfān, after a prominent Mahri family, by the Arabs of the south coast. The most westerly of the islands, Kibīyiya, is covered by a large number of peaked hills mainly composed of red and streaked granite and inhabited by pelicans and diving birds. Hulton, who visited the islands in 1856, found only one of them, Hallaniya, inhabited by men, twenty-three ichthyophagi. He found that their language resembled that of Soksorā. The nuts in which they lived consisted of loose stones above which were laid fishbones covered with seaweed. They belonged to the Bait (Banū) Djanaba (Djenabi = Σωμακός of the Periplus) to the same tribe as lived on the coast between Hašk and Ra's al-Hadd. Their ancestors are said to have migrated thither several centuries ago, after being driven from Hašk and Mirbāb as a result of feuds with their neighbours. Poolemy and Pliny call the people of these islands Asurtrā or Ascidae, a name doubtless connected with Hašk, although the ancients connected this name with ạṟkwa "wine-skin".

HÄSÄN. b. MAlik, grandson of the Kalbi chief Bahd al. Unaf [q. v.] and uncle of the Caliph Yazid I. These qualifications as well as the prestige of his family and of the powerful tribe of Kalb procured him in the reigns of Mu'awiya and Yazid the post of governor of Palestine and the Jordan territory. He has often shown himself in battle in the Syrian army at Siffin. He then accompanied the young Yazid, when the latter went to Damascus to ascend the Caliph's throne. During the reign of his nephew he was the most influential person at court. On Yazid’s sudden death and the succession soon after of Mu'awiya II, his grandnephew, Ibn Bahdal — as he was usually called — became governor of the Dijar of Jordan, the only one which, through his intervention, had remained faithful to the Omayyad cause. He now advanced against Damascus to be able to follow events on the scene and to champion the interests of the younger sons of the Caliph Yazid, who had been entrusted with his guardianship. He took up his abode with them in Dãbiya. From here he is said, by a series of clever manoeuvres, to have succeeded in unmasking Dãhiß b. Kãis [q. v.] who was a traitor to the Omayyad cause. Another story however, given by Ibn Sa'd, ascribes this diplomatic success with more justice — as Fr. Buhl has shown — to the able Ubaid Allah, son of Ziyâd. The latter also persuaded Marwân b. al-Hakam to come forward as a claimant to the vacant throne. When Hãsãn took up the candidature of his grandnephew Khalîd b. Yazid, the Omayyads and their supporters were forced to come to him at Dãbiya. There an assembly was held under the presidency of the Kalbi chief [cf. Uãbiya, i. 988 sq.]

After 40 days' negotiations Marwân b. al-Hakam was chosen Caliph. But before Ibn Bahdãl recognised him, he extorted his consent to the succession of the young Khalîd after Marwân's death, important privileges for his tribe, and the confirmation of all the privileges which his family had enjoyed under the Sufyanids. Henceforth his influence began to decline. When Marwân died, he is said to have pledged him to recognise Abd al-Malik as his successor. On 'Amr al-Aslãhâk's [q. v.] rebellion, Hãsãn took 'Abd al-Malik's side and was among the Omayyads at the murder of this rebel. After this event the name of this Kalbi chief, who had held the fortunes of the Omayyad dynasty in his hand for a long period, is no longer mentioned.

Bibliography:


HÄSÄN b. NA'MAN b. AL-QHÄSSÄN, GOVERNOR OF IFRIQIYA. After Zubair's departure (which is not to be explained by the religious scruples to which it is usually attributed), and his defeat and death at Barqa, Ifriqiya remained without a governor, the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik being wholly occupied with his struggle with Ibn Zubair. On the conclusion of this war Hãsãn was sent to Ifriqiya to pacify or rather to reconquer it. He first of all attacked Carthage, which still belonged to the Byzantines. The city was taken by storm but a number of the inhabitants were able to escape to Sicily. The fall of Carthage produced great consternation at the court of Constantinople. The emperor Leontius equipped a fleet, which appeared before Carthage under the patrician Johannes in 667. [Hãsãn could not oppose it; he had just been beaten on the banks of the Wadi Nimi by the Berbers, who had risen under the prophetess celebrated under the Arabic name of Khâhîna [q. v.] and were cooperating with the Greeks. Hãsãn and the few of his followers who had survived the disaster were hard pressed to Gades and did not stop till they reached Barbàca. There he awaited help from the Caliph. In 698 Carthage was besieged by the Muslims from land and sea and again taken and the patrician Johannes returned to the east with the remnants of his fleet. Hãsãn conquered all the fortresses in Ifriqiya occupied by the Greeks and then took the field against Khâhîna. As usual the Berbers after their first success had been unable to agree among themselves; the heroine was thus defeated by treachery and killed in Awarès at a well which afterwards bore her name (according to others at Tabacco). Hãsãn was next proceeding to levy khurâd on the whole of the conquered country when he was suddenly dismissed by 'Abd al-Azîz, the governor of Egypt, and deprived of all his estates. He died in 80 (699-700). The chronology of his campaigns against Carthage and the Berbers was uncertain even by al-Ishãrî's time; here that of Diehl is followed.

the jealousy of the Ghasānī, but Ḥassān succeeded in allaying his suspicions. On the return of al-
Nābiqha to the favour of al-Nuʿmān, Ḥassān prudently withdrew. At the fair of Ḫāqān his claim to preeminence had been rejected by his Badawi rival, and his inferiority demonstrated. He is said to have been about sixty years of age when he deemed it prudent to throw in his lot with Mu-
ḥammad, who was fast winning his way to the front. This did not alienate the friendship of the Ghasānīs, though Ḥassān, in view of Muḥammad's raids, did not deem it prudent to visit his old friends. To Muḥammad the services of Ḥassān were invaluable in replying to the lampoons of the unbelieving poets; and the Prophet showed his appreciation of them by presenting him with an estate and the Egyptian slave Sīrīn, sister of Mary the Cop, and even forgave the part he played in the matter of ʿAbī Ḥaṭaḥ and ʿAbī Sāvān. His most notable service to ʿIsām was perhaps the conversion of Tamīm, whose champions he worsted in a contest of verse. He survived not only Muḥammad but also Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, upon all of whom he has some fine elegies; but he was especially devoted to ʿUmmān, whom he had lived in his brother's house in Madīnat al-Hidīri [q.v.], and the guilt of whose murder he laid at the door of ʿAli. He is said to have died at the age of 120 years: his family became extinct.

Ḥassān was the founder of the religious poetry of ʿIsām. His verses abound with Kurʿānic phrases, but they are also full of the boasting (jubbūr) of the Ignorance. His forte, however, was satire and sarcasm. It was these qualities which made him a useful instrument to Muḥammad. To European taste his poetry is preferable to that of the desert poets; but his chief value is as a source for the history of ʿIsām.

Bibl.: Divān, Tunis 1864, Bombay 1865, Leyden 1910 (ed. by Hartwig Hirschfeld, Gibb Memorial Series); Ibn Ḥāšāfī ed. Wilstefen, by index. (C. H. WEIR.)

HĀTĪF (A.) means one who cries out, summons, proclaims, with a voice harsh, high, strong. The root is also used to express the ringing sound of a bow, the yearning of a pigeon, a moaning wind, rolling thunder. For these forces see Lām, xxx. 259, but ḥātīf in the sense "thunder-cloud" is found only in Asās al-Balāgha and connects with the modern Arabic use of ḥāṭīf in the sense "steady rain" (Soim, Divān ans Centr. Arab., i. 188, l. 11). More narrowly it is used to de-
scribe a voice which comes, while the speaker remains invisible, bringing mysterious information, or warning; or summoning, or inspiring with poetry. The last is common in Persian, e. g. in Nīṣāmī, see W. Bacher, Nīṣāmī's Leben u. Werke, p. 21, note 23. P. 44. It brings tidings of death (Aghānī, xxi. 126, l. 22); is heard in connection with a family of kāhūn (Aghānī, xv. 76, l. 28); by it a serpent-fox (ṣūfī) shows its gratitude (Aghānī, xix. 86, l. 2). It is thus a method by which the ḏīṃm manifest themselves, and may be contrasted with the ẓāfīr or ẓāfīr al-
khayāl, which is seen, while the ḥātīf is only heard, and which had apparently satanic associations (Aghānī, vii. 131, last l., and Lane, Lexi-
con., 1905-1906a). Yet in Aghānī xii. 65, l. 16, a ḥātīf is heard but not seen. The narra-
tive in Aghānī, vii. 131, of how a ḥātīf brought to Bulhāna news of the death of Dājīm is de-
tailed and psychologically very suggestive. As an auditory hallucination, veridical or otherwise, it could easily be paralleled in Gurney and Myers' Phan-
taoms of the Living (also Encycl. Brit., xii. 802) and explained on their hypothesis. But for the ḥātīf other words were quite commonly used in older Arabic (mamānāt, ṣūfī, ḏīm). and so, while the phenomenon is closely parallel to the Hebrew Sah ḥol (cf. Bat ḥol in Jewish Encycl., ii. 588 sqq.) the word ḥātīf is only one descriptive among others and not a specific name. Goldziher (Arabische Philologie, i. 210 sqq.) distinguishes the more frequent ḥātīm from unintellible sounds of the ḏīm from these other voices carrying a meaning, and Wellhausen even thinks of the ḥātīf as a later development under the influence of the civilization of the towns (Rete, p. 139, note). For a later sceptical atti-
tude, with a rationalistic explanation, see the Mu-
ūzīzīlate Masūdī in Muraḍī, iii. 323 sqq. But this attitude made little way and the ḥātīf in later, and especially in religious literature, lost its vagueness and became more and more defined and frequent. The stories of the lives and expe-
riences of the saints (wulātī) are so full of occur-
rences that separate references are needless. Ḥātīf's gave many testimonies to the truth of the pro-
phesy of Muḥammad, and according to Spreng-
ger (Leben, i. 57), there were at least two books written on these under the title Ḥuwaṭīf al-
Dājīm by Abū Bakr al-Kharaqī and Ibn Abī Dūnīa (d. 281). See on the latter Ḥaḍīdī Khā-
līf (sub tit.) and Brockelmann, Gesch., i. 154;
the Fihrist (p. 185) does not mention this book in dealing with him. In magic such voices can be sent at will by the use of certain rites. This is called irṣal al-huwaṭīf, and the messages com-
mittcd to them will be heard by the persons men-
tioned in the spell (Aḥmad al-Zarkāwī, Mafāṭīb, pp. 175, 198). Finally, we have, in Persian and Turkish, the Perso-Arabic compound ḥāṭīf-i-dīm (mawardi mīrūbeh) (Gibb, Hist. of Ottoman Poetry, p. 513). The medieval usage in the sense of "herald" belongs to the lexicons, see Dozy, sub voc.

Bibl.: It has been given in the article. The important passages are in Gold-
ziher, Arabische Philologie, i., especially p. 212 and in Wellhausen, Rete, p. 139. Cf. Sprenger, Leben, i. 216. (D. B. MACDONALD.)

HĀTĪF, SAVĪD AHMAD HĀTĪF, a Persian poet of Isphahan, died in 1128 (1784). He is the author of a famous ṭarfīf (poem with a refrain), translated by Schlechte-Weswed in the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesells., v. 80 sqq., and was celebrated as a writer of gazelles. Specimens of the latter are given in Band, A Century of Persian Ghazels, p. 38 sqq. Manuscripts of his Divān are rare: there is one in the Bodleian Library, cf. Ethē, Catalog., No. 1188.

Bibl.: Dcrs. in Journ. Asiat., 5th Series, Vol. vii. 130 sqq.; Ethē in the Grund-
d. Iran. Phil., ii. 315 sqv.

HĀTĪF, ʿAYD ALI, a Persian poet, son of Dājīm's [q. v.] sister, born at Khardjird in the dis-
trict of Dājīm, which belonged to Herāt, and died in 927 (1521). He celebrated the conquests of Timūr in an epic entitled Timūr-nāma (also Zafar-nāma), lithogr., Lucknow 1869. He also in-
tended to compose a "fiver" (khamis), i. e. a collection of five long poems, but never carried his plan into operation. We possess, however a
HĀTĪF — HAUSAS.

A brief account of Hátim’s life and deeds was given by Husain Wādi‘ Khāshīf (died 910 - 1504-1505) in Kītāg-i Ābār-i Hátim Tā‘ī or Risāla-i Hátiyya, ed. Schefer, Christlichtheit Persiens, ii. 173 sqq. There is also a Turkish translation of the Kītāg-i Hátim, entitled Arābī-ī Mahīl, which are cited in the Indian Office Catalogues, ii. 2, Hindustani Books, by J. F. Blumhardt, p. 135 sq., cf. also Garin de Tassy, Hist. de la Lit. Hindoue et Hindustanî, i. 552 sq.; on a metrical version of the romance in Hindī and Hindūstānī, cf. Garin de Tassy, op. cit. i. 497, iii. 148.


HATTIN or HIẒṬIN, in the Talmud Kefar Haṭţiyė, a village to the west of and above Tiberias on a fertile plain, the southern border of which is formed by a steep limestone ridge. At both the western and eastern ends of the ridge there is a higher summit called Kurin Haṭṭin. A tradition, known in the x3th century, the origin of which is uncertain, places the tomb of the prophet Shu‘aib (Vitro) here; the little chapel, which has been rebuilt in modern times and is annually visited by the Druses, lies on an elevation in a rocky valley at the western summit. On the uneven tableland southeast of the rocky ridge was fought the battle which destroyed the power of the Crusaders, when Salah al-Dīn won a great victory over the Christians on the 5th July 1187. After the Frankish troops, tormented by heat and thirst, had been some cut down, others put to flight, the remainder retired to the eastern summit, where many were thrown over the steep southern side. In memory of this the victor built a small chapel on the summit, called Kubbah al-Nasr.


HAUSAS, a negro people in the Sūdān. They occupy the zone included between the Sāhara on the north, Bornu on the east, the bend of the Niger on the west and the coast countries.
of the Gulf of Guinea (Togo, Dahomey, Benin and the Cameroons) on the south. It is one of the largest ethnic groups in Africa; according to Robinson it numbers about 13,500,000 souls.

The Hausas are very clearly distinguished in physique from other black races. As a rule they are tall; their hands and feet are small, their features regular and their physiognomy intelligent. They are active and quick-witted and are fond of sport and war. Their physical qualities and their bravery make the Hausa excellent soldiers. Therefore the English in Nigeria and the Germans in Togoland and the Cameroons recruit their police forces from among them.

The Hausas live by agriculture, industry and commerce. The soil, tilled by the hoe and improved by manuring, produces rice, millet and especially cotton, which is manufactured in the country itself. Industry indeed is well developed and bears witness to the relatively high degree of civilization which the inhabitants have attained. The textile industry is particularly flourishing. The cotton thread spun by the women is dyed in various colours, then woven into long narrow strips, which are used to make different articles of clothing (robes, shirts, trousers and tunics). These clothes are famous for their fineness and are exported all over the Sudân. Basketmaking, tanning, shoemaking and saddlery are equally prosperous as well as goldsmithry and the manufacture of metal goods for domestic use or ornament. In all these works the Hausa show a well developed artistic sense.

They are also able and enterprising merchants. Their towns, particularly Kano, have very frequent markets. Every year their caravans make the three months’ journey across the Sahara, carrying to Tripoli the products of the Sudân, clothstuffs, leather, ivory, and ostrich feathers, and returning laden with European products. Other caravans go to Upper Egypt and the shores of the Red Sea. Lastly the pilgrimage to Mecca, methodically organised, furnishes the Hausa with the opportunity and excuse for lucrative trading operations. They were at one time great slave traders but European intervention has considerably reduced this traffic. Colonies of Hausa merchants, numbering sometimes 2000-3000 individuals, are established not only in the principal places of the Sudân but also at Ghadames, Ghibr, Tripoli, Tunis, Cairo, Massawa and in the majority of the towns of the Atlantic coast (Lagos, Akra, Freetown etc.).

Islam is now the religion of the Hausas. Introduced in the 15th century, it made considerable progress in the sixteenth as a result of the conquest of the country by the Fulbe (Fulbe) who imposed it by force on the conquered people. Only the tribes of the forest or mountain districts have remained fetish-worshippers. In religious matters however the Hausas show a singular lukewarmness. According to Robinson, mosques are hardly found, except in Sokoto and Kano. “In the large towns,” writes the same author, “perhaps half the population are nominally Mohammedans, whilst the rest can hardly be said to have any definite form of religion at all” (Hausa and Benin, 184). If the idols have disappeared, overthrown by the Fulbe, ancient superstitions have survived, such, for example, as the belief in lucky and unlucky days, the use of talismans to cure diseases, a custom exploited by the Hadjijis returned from Mecca, who are credited with possessing the power of writing infallible charms. In spite however of the rather unorthodox character of these practices the Hausas are none the less active propagators of Islam among their fetish-worshipping neighbours.

At the same time as their religion they spread around them the use of their language, which has become the lingua franca of the Sudân and even of certain parts of the Sahara. The character and classification of this language has been often discussed since Schon made the first specimens of it known to European scholars. Some philologists (e.g. Miller and Lepsius) relying on certain morphological analogies which it presents with the Berber dialects, proposed to class it in the Hamitic family. According to another view put forward by M. Delafosse and supported by M. Lippert, “Hausa is a language of negro origin on account of its very large number of radicals and vocalic terminations. This negro language has been profoundly influenced in grammar by the languages of the Hamitic family and has borrowed a considerable number of radicals and roots. . . . Semitic influence on this language has been almost nil; not more remarkable, in any case, than on any language spoken by Muslims and equal to the influence of the European languages on the dialects of the coast (importation of foreign words designating new objects)”. The literature consists of a number of chronicles, tales and popular songs which have been collected and published by Europeans.

History. The origin of the Hausas is very uncertain. Barth identifies them, but in a very hypothetical fashion, with the Atarantes of Herodotos. One fact is certain: the Hausas used to live in a more northern region than that which they now occupy, which corresponded to Damergú and the oasis of Air. The Hilâlî invasion brought into these lands Tuaregs driven southwards by the Berber tribes of Northern Africa. For some time these two races lived in harmony and their inter-marriage produced half-castes, the ancestors of the servile tribes who now live in dependence on the Tuareg. Then, the resources of the oasis becoming insufficient, the Hausas migrated southwards and founded various states which were to become powerful when they were driven out of the country by the Barba. According to a mythical genealogy given by Barth, Biram was actually considered the ancestor of the Hausas. His descendants, Gober, Kano, Rano, Katsena and Segrez (Zarâ) were the creators of the kingdoms which still bear these names and which are called the seven legitimate Hausas (Hausa boke). The other states, the population of which has become much mixed with foreign elements (Yoruba, Nupe, Guari, Yauri, Bautshi, Sanfara and Kebbi), were known as bastard Hausas (Hausa banya boke). These kingdoms varied in extent. The oldest, Biram and Kano, were not much larger than their capitals, the others attained a considerable development. The Sultans of Gober and later those of Katsena, Kano and Zarâ conquered vast territories and were able to put in the field armies of 2000 horsemen and 10,000 foot-soldiers.

The earliest mention of a Hausa kingdom, Gober, is found in Ibn Batûtah. When this traveller visited the Sudân (1353), the Hausa were still pagans. Although certain legends ascribe the introduction of Islam to missionaries sent by the Caliph Omar, this religion was in reality brought to the Hausas.
at the end of the sixth century by merchants coming from the countries of the central Niger and Bornu, which had long been Islamised. Their propaganda was perhaps strengthened by the preaching of the celebrated marabout of Tuit, Muhammad b. Abd al-Kadir al-Maghili. In any case, by the end of the eighth century Katsina and Katsena had become recognized centres of intellectual culture. The marabouts of Djenné and Timbuktu stopped there on their return from the pilgrimage to Mecca and taught theology and Maliki law there to the native students. The conversion of the Hausas was not complete however and even in the nineteenth century the people of Gobra relapsed for a time into paganism.

We know very little about the history of the different Hausa states. Their material prosperity seems however to have been remarkable in spite of the bloody wars they had to wage against their neighbours, notably the Songhai and the people of Bornu. As a result of the Moroccan conquest Katsena inherited the economic importance of Gao and, according to Barth, had more than 100,000 inhabitants. Kano became and has remained to the present time the most important market in the whole Sudan.

The political organization of the country was profoundly modified in the beginning of the ninth century. The Sukas, the various states had remained independent of one another. They were now incorporated in the vast empire the foundations of which were laid in 1802 by the Fulbe marabout 'Othman dan Fodio (cf. the article Fulbe). In fifteen years all the Hausa country was conquered, the local sultans were dethroned and replaced by governors dependent on the Sultan of Sokoto, the capital built by 'Othman. On the latter's death the empire was divided into two sultanates with Sokoto and Gando as capitals and the various provinces were shared between the two sovereigns.

The conquerors were however in part absorbed in and assimilated to the conquered. The Fulbe established in the towns mixed with the Hausa and gradually lost their own language and civilization by this intercourse. The extension of the conquest even developed the spirit of initiative and enterprise in the Hausas. They broke their original bounds on all sides and introduced their language and the Muslim religion into the neighbouring countries. This is why we find them settled in large numbers in Togoland, in Adamawa and the Cameroons. Lastly, in the last quarter of the ninth century, Europeans, informed by travellers of the richness of the country, have endeavoured to submit it to their rule. The French and English disputed access to the Hausa country at the same time as to the lands of the lower Niger. The English were successful and the Anglo-French treaty of the fifth August 1890, completed by the agreements of the fifth July 1893, the fourth June 1898, and the Anglo-German agreement of the fifth November 1893, left practically the whole of the Hausa country in the sphere of British influence.
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G. VYER.

HAWĂLA (A.), literally "turn"; in Muslim law the transferrence of a debt from one person to another. The hawala is an agreement by which a debtor is freed from a debt by another becoming responsible for it (N. Seignette, Cote Musulman par Khalil, p. 173). This transferrence of the obligation is the angle around which this legal mechanism "turns".

The word hawala then comes to denote the document by which the transferrence of the debt is completed and next receives the meaning of cheque, or order to pay, to a public chest also.

Biblilographie: N. de Tornau, Das Mus-
limische Recht aus den Quellen dargestellt,
Leip-
zig, p. 139 sqq.; A. Querry, Droit Musulman
(Sfïf), i. 480.

(Ch. HuART.)

HAWARI, apostle. The word is borrowed from the Ethiopic, where ḫawārīyā has the same meaning (see Noldeke, Beiträge zur sem. Sprachwiss., p. 48). The derivations from the Arabic "he who wears white clothes" etc. are erroneous. Tradition delights to give foreign epithets which were current among the "people of the scripture", to the earliest missionaries of Islam. Abî Bakr is called al-Ṣiddīq, Ummar al-Fārāb, al-Zubair Ibn al-ʿAwām al-Ḥawārī.

At the same time we find the collective name al-Hawārīyān for twelve individuals, who are said to have been appointed ṇâhīs of the Medinese at the "second Akaba" by Muhammad (or by those present) as "surety for their people just as the apostles were sureties for Isâ b. Maryam
and I (Muhammad) am for my people). Christian influence is also found elsewhere in the account of the "second Akaba", the total number of those present being usually given as 70 or 72, apparently on the analogy of the Evangelical accounts of the 70 or 72 apostles (St. Luke, x. 117).


From these accounts it is again clear how the rivalry between Anšār and Muhājirūn has influenced Tradition.

The tradition regarding these twelve Muslim apostles has perhaps, like so many traditions, arisen as a deduction from a statement in the Korân. In Sūra 3, 181, 134, Jesus says: "Who are My Anšār for God (is cause)?" and the Hawariyyin answered: "We are the Anšār of God."

The parallel with Muhammad’s own position is here clear enough and it is obvious that Muslim Hawariyyin were found to be a necessity alongside of the Muslim Anšār.

There are statements in several Muslim writers regarding the disciples of Jesus, which for the most part go back to passages in the Apostles. Cf. the articles Isā and Ma’ṣîna.

HAWASHIL. [See HÂSHIYA.]

HAWASHIM or HâSHIMIDE is the name given to those Sherifs of Mecca, descendants of a Ḥasanîd named ‘Abd al-Hâshim Muhammad, who ruled there from 455 (1065) to 597 (1201). Their names are Abi Hâshim Muhammad till 487 (1094), his son Abi ‘Uulfát Kásim till 517 or 518 (1124), Fulafia b. Kásim till 527 (1133), Hâshim b. Fulafia till 543 (1154), according to another statement till 511 (1150), Kásim b. Hâshim till 556 (1161) Isâ b. Fulafia till 570 (1174-1175). The latter’s sons, Mukhîrih and Dâ‘îd, as well as Munṣûr b. Dâ‘îd then disputed the succession, till finally another Ḥasanîd named Kâtsâ (q. v.) took advantage of this family quarrel to seize the town of Mecca and transmitted the Sherifate to his descendants. None of these Hawashim did anything remarkable; at first their ambiguous attitude on the question, whether the Pâṭimid or Abbâsîd Caliph was to be mentioned in prayer, more than once brought great misfortune on the Meccans. For further details cf. Wustenfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Mecka, p. 222 sqq., and Snouck Hurgronje, Mecka, i. 62 sqq., where the native sources are also given.

HAWAZIN, a large North Arabic tribe. Their genealogy is Hawazin b. Masûr b. Ḥirîma b. ‘Abbas b. ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Umar b. Khassaf b. ‘Abd Allâh b. Ḥarûb. Among the important clans of the Hawazin may be mentioned the Thâkîf in ‘Irbâ‘ northeast of Mecca where there is still a powerful tribe of them, the ’Amir b. Sa‘îda (q. v.), the Dhiwash, the Sa‘îd b. Bakr (Haltum b. Abî Dhuwaib, the nurse of the Prophet, was descended from them) and Hîlî. They were of the same stock as the Sulaim. During the Dîhâliya they worshipped the idol Dîlah in Uqât, the large and much frequented market of the Thâkîf between Tarîf and Nakhlâ, where the poetasters recite their poems on the public market-place.

They were scattered through Neflid (on the Yemen border) and the Eastern Hijaz near Mecca. Among places which belonged to them may be mentioned: Amâhâ, ‘Adâ‘ al-Maṭâ‘ül, al-Dardâ‘, al-Dalî‘ân, Fâsib al-Kih; among wâdîs, Awaṣâ‘, Iyya, Turaba and Zabaya (so Yûkî ‘Uthmanî, ii. 917: Hammânî, Dîrayân, p. 59, o gives Rûnîya and Turaba as belonging to the Hîlî, but as the Hîlî are a clan of the Hawazin and as in other districts places which had once belonged to the Hawazin or their clans were later inhabited by the Hîlî, e.g. Ta‘îf, Runiya and Zabaya may be identical in the case where there is a misunderstanding between r and z or b and n); among wâdîs, Dhu ‘Hulaîla and Tiyan (Wustenfeld, Register, p. 220, Tyayân); among mountains, al-Mudâjîlîyâ.

Towards the middle of the sixth century after the collapse of Yemeni suzerainty over the Ma‘addi tribes, the Hawazin had to pay tribute to the chief of the Ghaṭaṣfân, Zabair b. Dîhâma in the name of Ḥasîn. When the latter was slain in 597 (1161) by the ‘Amîr b. Sa‘îda in revenge for a massacre which he had instigated among one of their clans, the ‘Ishaqîn (q. v.), the Hawazin became independent. After the conclusion of peace between the ‘Abs and the Dhû-Abyân, they united for common action against the Hawazin (Dhiwash, ‘Amîr b. Naṣir b. Mu‘awiyah) and the Sulaim their allies. Among the resulting battles were Râkî, Nubî and Liwâ in which the Hawazin were defeated.

In the ninth decade of the sixth century the Fidjîr or sacrilegious wars began (so called because they took place chiefly in the sacred month of Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da, by which the latter was profaned) between the Hawazin on the one side and the Kuraish and other Khannâa tribes on the other. The cause of the first Fidjîr day, which took place on the market place of ‘Ukâz was the aggressive attitude of Badr b. Ma’âshar of the tribe of Qhîfîr, a branch of the Khannâa, towards Aḥmar b. Mâzîn of the Hawazin and the insulting of a man and woman of the Hawazin by the Kuraish and Khannâa soon after. After a cessation of hostilities for some time, war broke out again when Urwa al-Râbahîl, an important member of the Hawazin (of the clan of Kîlîb), whose leading a caravan of Nûmân b. Mundhir, king of Hijrî, to the market of ‘Ukâz, was treacherously murdered by Bara‘îd b. Kâsî, a client of Harb b. Umaiya, chief of the Kuraish, in the land of the Ghaṭaṣfân. The Kuraish, who were in the market of ‘Ukâz at the time, hearing of the murder, left ‘Ukâz surreptitiously before the conclusion of the market to return to Mecca. They were pursued by the Hawazin and the battle of Nakhlî resulted. The Kuraish, fewer in numbers than their opponents, retired to the sacred district of Mecca (qaram) and thus escaped being followed up by their pursuers. The Prophet is said on this day to have been engaged in collecting the arrows shot by their enemies on the battlefield for his relatives, the Kuraish, being then according to some 14 and, according to others, 20 years of age. In the month of Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da of the following year, the Hawazin, reinforced by the Sulaim,
were the first to arrive at the market of 'Ukṣū and took up a position on the hill of Samta. The Kurash, who appeared soon afterwards on the battlefield under Ḥarb b. Umaiya, at first won the upper hand over their opponents but had finally to retire. The fortune of war again proved favourable to the Hawāzin a few months later in the battle of Abīlā (near 'Ukṣū). This was followed by a battle on the field of 'Ukṣū itself. In order not to be able to run away and to make good former defeats, a number of the Kurash had no recourse to their five sons of Umaiya, who hence received the name al-'Arābhī the "lions"), a strategy repeated in modern times in the war between the Egyptians under Muhammad b. 'Abbās b. Rabbabah and the Wahhabis, in which a great many of the Arabs were found dying in this position. They thus withheld the enemy and the Hawāzin had to retire. The last battle between the Hawāzin and Kurash, which was followed by definite peace, was that of Hurarā, in which the Hawāzin put their enemies to flight.

When Muhammad conquered Mecca in 8 = 629, the Hawāzin decided to march against Mecca under Mālik b. 'Awf. On Mālik's advice they were followed by their women, children and cattle. Muḥammad, warned by spies of the intended attack, went to meet them with an army of 4000 men. They met in the valley of Ḥunāṣ [q.v.] (about 10 miles from Mecca behind Mount 'Arāfā). The Hawāzin suddenly fell upon the rear of the Muslīms, who began to flee in panic. Inspired by the Prophet, who collected his most intimate companions (including his uncle 'Abbās b. Ṣufyān, Abū Bakr and 'Omar) around him and in the battle of Badr [q.v.] cursed his enemies by throwing a handful of dust against them with the words "may your face be covered with destruction", the Muslmīns took courage and attacked the enemy. The Hawāzin were put to flight and left many dead upon the field; their women, children and cattle fell into the hands of the Muslims and were brought to Djiţira. A number of the Hawāzin then retired to the valley of Awţā. Abū Mūṣā al-Asghārī, who went against them, drove them to seek refuge among the hills. They then fortified themselves in Ṭīţ. Muhammad besieged the town, but had to raise the siege after twenty days (on account of a dream, it is said) and returned to Djiţira. Here the Prophet received a deputation of the Hawāzin who offered the submission of the tribe, if their families and possessions were restored to them. Mūṣāmmār offered them the submission of his tribe between their families and their possessions. The Hawāzin chose the former and peace was made; Mālik b. 'Awf was then chosen amīl of the Hawāzin. During the general secession under Abū Bakr, a number of the Hawāzin rebelled but submitted to Ḥālid b. al-Walid after the battle of Buţākh in 11 = 32, like the Sulaim and other tribes.

**Bibliography:** Hamdānī, Qaṣira, Index; Yākūt, Muḥyīʾ, Index; Ṭabrī, Annates, i. 1650, 1654—1686, and Index s. v.; Alghānī, xii. 3, 4, 67; xix. 74—82, and Index s. v.; Ibn Ḥīqām, Sirā, p. 117—119, 840—880; Caussin de Perceval, Essai sur l'Histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme (Paris 1847—1849), i. 126—127, ii. 409—423; 537—540, 551—559; iii. 244—262; 288; 345, 355, 486; W. Muir, The Life of Mahomet, i. 224; ii. 1—6; iv. 136—155; do., The early Caliphs, p. 26;


**Hawar,** earlier Hawrāz (diminutive from Ḥajar), a town in the swamp-country (Ḳhūr al-'āṣim) east of the Tigris in a very unhealthy situation. The town and its Nahlātīa population had a bad reputation even among the Arabs. It is clear from Abū l-Waḍā' Zād b. Khūfātk's words quoted by Yāqūt; he draws a repulsive picture of both in language imitated from Korānic phraseology. The older Arab geographers do not mention Hawrāz, because, as Yāqūt says, Dubais b. 'Abī al-Asādī, who died in 386 (996), was the first to build there, while Ḥamd b. 'Alāʾ Mustawfī ascribes the foundation of the town to Shīhūr Dhu l-Akta; according to the latter, in the viith century it was one of the most flourishing towns in Kūhāzīa, by Wāde still is a centre of the Mandāns. Cf. above, i. 678 sqq.

**Bibliography:** Yāqūt, Muḥṣīm, ii. 321 sqq.; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 241.

**Hawar,** see al-Dhirāz (Dhīhān).

**Hawra (Hūra),** a town in Ḥadramūt, N. E. of Ḥadramūt [q.v.] on the Djebel of the same name. The little Wādi Hūra flows past it, running for the earlier part of its course parallel to the large Wādi Anī [see Ḥadramawt, p. 569] and then joining it. At the upper end of the town there is a large ḥarīr with seven stories, flanked by corner towers, which commands the town. Here the ḥākim resides; he is appointed by the Kûšait of Shībām [q.v.], to whom the town belongs. Hawra possesses a small bazaar and two mosques and is surrounded by gardens and fields, on which corn, indigo and tobacco are grown. The streets of the town are narrow and dirty. Leo Hirsch estimates the population at 2000. The figure given by the present author of this town, 5000, is much exaggerated like other figures given by this otherwise very meritorious explorer.


**Hawran,** the chapter of the Bible, Hawrān of the cuneiform inscriptions, Aṣīrīs (Josephus etc., is a district on the other side of Jordan, which has no well marked boundaries. Hawrān proper is the Djebel Hawrān with the plain of al-Nakāra; in the wider sense the name covers the land up to the district of Djādir, the Nahī al-'Alā, a tributary of the Yarmūk, the Wādi l-Shallālā and southwards as far as al-Balkā [q.v.] and the steps (al-'Ashmām). The Turkish name Mutasarārīlik of Hawrān however also comprises the district of Djādir, as well as Djālin (Qulānīs), Adjān (Gilead) and al-Balkā. The governor (muṣarrar) resides at Shaiṭān Saʿd; Buṣr al-Hairī, al-Suwaydā, al-Kunātār, Dārāt (Edrei), Iribd and al-Salṭ are the headquarters of the kā'īn Mikhail's subordinate to him. Under the Mamluks of Egypt the province was called al-Kibīliyya and the residence of the wālī was at Darāt. At an earlier period the ancient Bosra [q.v.] was the capital.
Hawran is entirely a lava formation and is exceedingly fertile, the plain of al-Nu'ra being the granary of Syria; on the other hand, the adjoining trachon of al-Lejla is a dreadful desert. The Hawran range (the Asalamans of the ancients, usually called Djebel al-Duruz) after its present inhabitants, is the highest elevation of the east Jordan country and attains a height of 6000 feet.

Historical. Hawran is rich in historical associations. In so far as these reach back to remote times or belong to the Roman and Byzantine periods, they need not be dealt with here. That even before the Arab conquest there was an Arab kingdom in Hawran is generally mentioned in the article QHASSAN [q. v.].

The capital of Bosra was the first town to be conquered by the Arabs (634) and after the institution of the djund [q. v.] Hawran belonged to the Djjand Dimashq, as it has always since, although this military system of division afterwards fell into disuse and with the introduction of civil administrative divisions the name Wilayet Dimashq appeared. The history of Hawran thus coincides with that of Syria. For a time it attained greater importance during the Crusades, when the Muslims driven out of Palestine migrated hither and were able to make a stand against the Christians here. After the fall of the kingdom of Jerusalem, these immigrants returned to their old homes and Hawran had only a scattered population of Arab tribes left, who are included under the general name of 'Urbân al-Djebel.

In the eighth century the resettlement of Hawran by the Druses of Libanon began. It was brought about by the victory of the Shihâbids over their opponents, the Yemenites, in 711, whereupon the latter migrated to Hawran. At their head was the Hamdan family whose abode was in Suwaidâ. These migrations became more and more frequent in the ninth century, when the condition of Libanon became worse and worse for the Druses. In Hawran on the other hand, they led quite an independent existence, paid no taxes, and in consequence of the fertility of the soil soon attained great prosperity. When the Hamdan, who had hitherto taken first place among the leading Druse families, became extinct, the Astragh took their place. Finally, in 1852, the Porte decided to send troops thither to bring them into submission but they were again withdrawn on the outbreak of the Crimean War, Midhat Pascha [q. v.] therefore sought to come to an arrangement with the Druses peacefully, and appointed one of their sheikhs ka'mma'kân of Hawran with his head-quarters in Suwaidâ; the latter succeeded in arranging the administration of the province on the Turkish fashion, but, although the Sheikhs were quite satisfied as they had now the support of the Ottoman government behind them, the peasants were very discontented and became rebellious, so that utter anarchy soon reigned again in Hawran and the Druses in 1595 even besieged the Muslim population of the village of al-Harîk in the Nukhra, who had taken refuge in the mosque, forced them to surrender and destroyed the mosque. The Porte had again to intervene and bloody battles were fought, which did not however lead to the final pacification of the country, until finally 'Abd Allah Pascha's strong measures succeeded in breaking the resistance of the Druses and introduced a tolerable state of affairs.


HAWSHIBI (plural HAWSHIB), a tribe in South Arabia, of pure Himyarite descent. Their land lies roughly between 45° 45' and 45° 5' East Long. (Greenw.) and between 15° 11' and 15° 30' North Lat. and is bounded in the south by Lahdj (Lahedj) [q. v.], in the west by the land of the Subaili (Sobbi) [q. v.] and of the Haddiyya [q. v.], in the north by the land of the Dja'da [q. v.] and in the east by the lower Yài. The climate is tropical, the land fertile, producing wheat, coffee and cotton. Among the mountains may be mentioned Djebel Shibab (about 6000 feet high). The Wadis Nira and Boma (Bâma) bound the land in the west and east. The capital and seat of the Sultan (Shaikh, 'Akil) is Raha, with a hîsâ and many stone houses. The Sultan receives an annual revenue from England and has to provide 1500 men when called upon. The inhabitants of the country, which is reputed unsafe, are 'Abâbîl (independent tribes) who only obey the Sultan in case of war. They are Shaikhis and mainly cattle-rearers. They are constantly fighting with their neighbours. In 1870 they went to war with the Yâsî with the Sultan. They are said to number 12,000—15,000. Hamdani mentions them as inhabitants of the Djebel Sabîr (Sabh).

Bibliography: Hamdani, Djasira, p. 78, 99, 19; Yâkût, Muq'dam, iii. 367; Ritter, Erdkunde, xii. 676; H. v. Maltrian, Reise nach Südarabien, p. 350—352. (J. Schlieffer.)

AL-HAWTA, the name given in South Arabia to a district which is considered holy and regarded as a place of refuge. The substantive al-hawta denotes a place surrounded by a wall, then a place under the protection of a saint, who is said to reside there. The most important Hawta in South Arabia is that at Inat ('Inât [q. v.], Hadramât, where the famous Shaikh Münasab Bû Bakr b. Sâlim is buried. The second in importance is the Hawta in the land of the Wâhidî [q. v.]. The name Hawta is also borne by the capital of the land of the 'Abâdî, Lahdj (Lahedj) [q. v.], because several saints are buried there. Cf. Lautenberg, Arabica, v. 205—206.

AL-HAWTA (HOTA), a town in South Arabia in the land of the Upper Wâhidî [q. v.] on the Wâdi 'Ama'mân. It has over 1000 inhabitants who belong for the most part to the 'Abâdî family of Muhammad b. 'Umar, who is said to be descended from 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Djâlin (flourished in the viiith century), about 100 forteslike houses and in addition to a large mosque which has seven smaller ones, a large market with shops, many looms and a considerable cotton industry. Al-Hawta is a free, independent town and pays no taxes. Next to Inat [q. v.] it is the most
important place of refuge in South Arabia. The saint of al-Hawṣa who is buried in the great mosque, is the fāṣih 'Ali b. Muhammad, a contemporary of the famous Shāhīn Bū Bakr b. Sālim of Ṣafī. The fāṣih 'Ali is said himself to have planned this town to be a city of refuge and to have laid out its boundaries. The boundary stones (maddām, plur. madāmat) still stand upright. On the birthday of the Mawlid of al-Hawṣa, which is celebrated on three days (Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday) after the appearance of the 6th autumn star at the beginning of the northeastern monsoon, a great market is held in the town, which is visited by people from great distances, e.g. from Ḥarrīb (q.v.) and ʿOmarān. The neighbourhood of al-Hawṣa is very fertile. A mountain of some size rises above the town, where chamois, which are numerous there, are hunted.

**Bibliography:** H. v. Mältzan, Reise nach Sudarabien, p. 130; Landberg, Arabia, v. 189—192.

**HAWWA**, the wife of Adam, created in Paradise out of a left rib from her sleeping husband, which operation caused him no pain. Otherwise no man would cleave to his wife (Thālabi, p. 18; Kiṣā'ī, p. 31). As she was formed from a living being, he called her Hawwa (ibid., also Ṣabari, i. 109; Ibn al-Athir, i. 24, cf. Genesis 2, 21). As Adam was created out of dust and Hawwa out of a bone, man becomes more beautiful with increasing years but woman more ugly (Thālabi, ibid., agreeing with Dent. R., 6, Genesis R., 14 u. 17. Hawwa (Sūra vii. 20) bore the main guilt of the first sin, as, tempt by ibis, she ate of the tree of evil. Tradition relates that Hawwa offered her husband first wine, than the forbidden fruit and so became the cause of original sin (Thālabi and Gen. R., ibid.). Wine is therefore considered the source of all evil. Another tradition says that this meal plunged mankind into eternal grief. (Thālabi and the Midrash, ibid.). Ten punishments, including menstruation, pregnancy and travail, remind the daughters of Eve of their mother's trespass. To console her, Hawwa received the assurance that every pious woman, devoted to her husband, would share Paradise in recompense for the mortal agonies of travail. If she died in child-bed, she would be enrolled in the body of martyrs and united with her husband in Paradise. Jewish and Arab sources mention in almost the same words the marriage of Adam and Hawwa at which God, Gabriel and the other angels were present (Ṣaba B., 75; Sanh., 8, Erubin, 11, Gen. R., 11, 17, Levit. R., 20, Kokhelet R., 8 and Kiṣā'ī, p. 35). After the expulsion from Paradise Adam and Hawwa made the pilgrimage to Mecca, observed several ceremonies and Hawwa had her first menstruation. Then Adam stamped on the ground and the well of Zemzem burst forth and she used it for a bath of purification. Hawwa died two years after Adam and was buried beside him.

**HAYIL (al-HAYEL, ḤAIL, ḤAYIL), the capital of the land of Djebel Shammar [q. v.] in western Nejd in the centre of a long plain called Sāhīla al-Khammasiya, which lies between the parallel ranges of Al-ʿAjā’il (Munīf) and Salmā (Fitti) about 5000 feet about the level of the sea. The town, which is one of the main stations on the route for Persian pilgrims to Mecca, is surrounded by walls about 20 feet high and round and square towers. It is divided into eleven quarters and has a large mosque, a fortified palace with two towers of imposing height, an important market with many warehouses and shops, in which in addition to foodstuffs (rice, meal, spices, coffee etc.) there are exposed clothstuffs, garments, weapons, tools (spades, crowbars), ores (iron, tin, lead ingots) etc., and large parks and gardens. Clothstuffs are imported from Manchester and Bombay, garments from Djeef and Baghdād, tools and ores from Europe. The trade of Ḥayil is important, but industry (chiefly carried on by women, embroidery and needlework) very insignificant. Artisans (smiths, metalworkers, carpenters) are few in number in the town. The houses are well built and mostly of one storey, and the streets clean. Outside the town there are many gardens, palmgroves and single houses, which belong some to the chief citizens of the town, some to the members of the royal family of Shammar. According to Palgrave, the population is 20,000—30,000, while Doughty puts it at only 3000.

The suburb of Ḥayil is Sweifieh (Suweifeh). About the year 1867 after a famine a pestilence raged here which carried off about 200 individuals in a period of two months. During Doughty's stay here the houses were almost empty and the palmgroves quite abandoned. Wāṣīt, a second suburb of Ḥayil, was likewise uninhabited and falling into ruins as a result of this pestilence, when Doughty visited it; the palm trees had shrivelled up and died as a result of this period of neglected irrigation. In Ḥayil itself 700—800 are said to have died of the plague; after the plague a pernicious fever raged in the town for two years. Behind Wāṣīt is the Maṣṣāḥ (cemetery) of Ḥayil, the tombstone of which after the Bedouin fashion are devoid of ornament or decoration and usually contain only the name of the deceased. Between the Maṣṣāḥ and the town is a small colony of nomads, Shammar Bedouins, some of whom are related to the ruling family and stay here only during the spring.

In the beginning of last century the government of Ḥayil was in the hands of the family of Bait 'Alī. Towards the year 1820 'Abd Allāh b. Rashīd, a rich and distinguished chief of the prominent family of Djā'āfīr, attempted to win the throne for himself with the help of his numerous and influential kinsmen. War resulted; 'Abd Allāh lost and had to go into exile but after about ten years he returned to Ḥayil with the help of the Wahhābī chief Faisāl, who owed the conquest of the province of Ḥaṣār [q. v.] to 'Abd Allāh and was appointed hereditary governor (Emir) of Djebel Shammar by the Wahhābī chief out of gratitude for his services. The Arab and European were driven out of the town and almost exterminated by 'Abd Allāh's elder brother 'Ubaid (Abeyd, called "the wolf"). 'Abd Allāh built the great palace. A period of prosperity for Ḥayil began under his son and successor Tefla, who reigned twenty years,
dying in 1864; Téfá improved the defences of the town, built the great mosque and market, and laid out the beautiful gardens of the town: in order to improve trade and industry he invited merchants from Bázra, Wúsí, and other towns, artisans from Moğhán and Yermen and engaged into commercial relations with the other towns of Arabia and Persia. During Doughy’s stay in Hái-yil, Muḥammad b. Rásíh, then the richest horse-owner in Nadjí, (Doughy estimates the value of his horses at £250,000), was Amir.

Hamdání mentions a Wádí Hái-yil in Ilimá (Dariya), which may be identical with our Yákát mentions Hái-yil as a wádi between two ranges of the Taiy (i.e. Asá and Salmá) and as a large district, according to some between Yámánma and the Bód of the Bálíha, according to others in Yamánma itself, inhabited either by the Kúsháír or the Númsír and the Bání Himálm (Hamíán) of the Támír. Sprenger identifies Hái-yil with the ʿAlí Khán in Pólemy.


Házará, the sixth metre of the proseody of the Arabs, has as its scheme two mufášúlm (originally, or rather in accordance with the system, three) in each half-verse. It has one ārūd and two dár: mufášúlm, mufášúlm, mufášúlm, mufášúlm.

The suppression of the n (ka³f) is, except in the dáéré, very usual, while that of the i (ka®b) is rare; but the loss of one necessitates the retention of the other. We also find, though rarely, that mu is omitted at the beginning of a poem. This last omission (ka®rrum) is called qatáár or kbar, when it is combined with ka®b or ka³f. In Persian, Turkish, and Hindustáni a ka®re is found very commonly or rarely of only two feet in the half verse. This metre also shows numerous other irregularities, particularly in Persian, but these cannot be discussed here. For the bibliography, cf. the article Ārūd.

Mát, Ben Chéné.

Házará, Hazárístán (Afghanistán). The name Házará is applied to the race which inhabits the mountain country north and west of the valleys of the Helmand and Tarnák, extending northwards to the Hindukush and Koh-i Bábá and westwards nearly to Herát and the Harúd-valley, but the most westerly tribes in this area are known as the Cábá Aímaq and are distinguished from the Házará proper by creed and language, being Turki-speaking Sunnís while the Hazará are Shi'ís and speak Persian. They are however predominantly of Mongol blood as their features clearly show, although no doubt mixed with the original Ghóri stock of these mountains from which they acquired the Persian language. They are supposed by some to be the descendants of the army of Mángú, but evidence is lacking as to the actual facts. It cannot be doubted however that after the Mongol irruption which fell with extreme violence on the Ghóris, who offered a determined resistance, the depopulated tracts were occupied by Mongol settlers, and that both strains are represented among the Házarás of the present day. They are still a hardy and industrious race, and often employed in other work where physical strength is required; they have also shown a desire for military service in British India. They are on bad terms with the Afghánis under whose rule they dwell, and in 1891-1892 they rebelled against the Amir 'Abbád-al-Ráhnám, but were ultimately suppressed.

The name Házará is no doubt a Persian version of the Turkish mágár, and refers to the "thousands" in which the invading Mongol armies were organized. The whole country is known from its inhabitants as Hazárístán and also as the Házará-djâl or the "thousands".


Házará, a district till lately included in the Pándjáb, now part of the north-west Frontier Province of British India. It consists of a number of valleys and mountainous tracts at the base of the western Himalaya between Kásím and the Indus from lat. 33° 44′ to 35° 10′ N. and long. 72° 33′ to 76° 6′ E. Area 3062 sq. m. Population 528,666, almost entirely Musalmán of the Sunni persuasion. Hindús number only 4 per cent. The most northerly part is the long narrow valley of Kágán watered by the Kúhár K. a tributary of the Djehíán. The remainder of the district is drained by tributaries of the Indus. The Indus is the western boundary in the south, but to the north-west lies a block of mountain country between the district and the Indus. This block known as the Black Mountain is inhabited by independent Páñési tribes. Within the district the population consists partly of Paní tribes (Dááín, Tárín, Utmáznás, Míshwán, Swáiti and Díčáí), and partly of tribes which were at one time Hindús by religion (Gákhar, Tání, Gúdar, Donáli, Kárál, Dááinter and some other). There is a small tribe known as Turk, believed to be the descendants of the Khárághs whom Timúr brought into the district. The Gákharás, Gúdarás and some of the others, are probably descendants of the Suytán (Kushán and Ephthalite) invaders who entered India between 10 B.C. and 500 A.D.

The common language of the country is Hindú, a dialect of the Láhánda or western Pándjáb, but Pashto is spoken by the Míshwán and some of the Utmáznás, Swáiti and Tarikheús. The Gúdarás speak a dialect of their own (see Gúdará).

The ancient name of the country was Uráṣá (still found in the valley of Rásh near Abbótábád). Pólemy mentions it under the name of Asa, its ruler in Alexander’s time was called Arásaka according to Arrian. It formed part of the dominions of Asoka, whose edicts in the Károshthí character are found at Mándaráh. In Híoun Thíang’s time (7th cent. A.D.) by whom it is named Wú-la-shí it was dependent on Kashmir, and is frequently mentioned in the Kádžar tâzgarámi. The town of Pákhlí on the Indus has been thought to represent the Páktyá of Herodotus, and under the Mughal Emperors according to the Aín-i Ābbári the whole country between Kashmir and the Indus.
was comprised in Pahlavi. Invasions from Kshmir continued up till the 12th century. The Mongol
invasions do not seem to have affected Hazara
directly, but the Karlugh Turks who were asso-
ciated with the Shaha of Khwarizm and established
a principality in Kapi and the Kuraun valley,
seem to have spread into the country along the
Indus further north, and were known in Mongol
fashion as the Karlugh "Ming" or Hazara. The
name of Hazara seems undoubtedly to be derived
from their settlement, as were those of the neigh-
bouring tracts of Çaç Hazara and Takht Hazara
in the Atak district from similar settlements of Mongol or Turkish "Hazara". The A'uni Akbari
asserts that Timur left the Turks as a garrison
in Pakhl (Blochmann's trans., p. 454) but it does
not seem that he introduced them into the district.
He probably found them already established and
made them his garrison, as a race of his own
kindred. The evidence shows that their first
settlement on the Indus was two hundred years before
his time. As time went on the Afghan tribes from
beyond the Indus, especially the Swatis and Ta-
náolls, invaded the country and made important
settlements. The power of the Gakkar chiefs and
of the Karluks declined in proportion. From
1748 Hazara formed part of the Durrani kingdom,
and in 1819 was annexed by Ranjit Singh to the
Sikh monarchy. Perpetual wars were with the tribal
chiefs followed. After the first Sikh war in 1845-
1846 Abbott was appointed by the British Govern-
ment to organize the country and he continued
his labours with great success after the annexation
in 1849. Abbottabad, the headquarters of the
district, was founded in 1853 and named after
him. It is now a town of 8000 inhabitants and
the site of a military cantonment. Since his time
the district has continued to prosper, but there
have been frequent troubles with the independent
tribes of the Black mountain, and expeditions
against them were undertaken in the years 1852,
1868, 1888 and 1891 besides some minor opera-
tions.

Bibliography: M. A. Stein, Ancient Geo-

ography of Kshmir (Calcutta, 1899), p. 139;
McCrindle, Invasion of India by Alexander
( Westminster, 1896), p. 129; S. Julien, Voyages
des Pèlerins Bouddhistes (Paris, 1857), i. 166;
A'uni-i-Akbari, trans. Blochmann (Calcutta, 1870),
p. 454; Longworth Dames, Mint of Kurman,
Journ. Roy. Asi. Soc., 1908; Watson, Gazetteer

HAZARASP, a town not far from Khiva but
nearer the Oxus, with which it is connected by a
channel. According to al-Mukaddasi, the town was
of the same size as Khiva and surrounded by a
ditch. It was peculiarly suited to be a fortress on
account of the latter and the many canals, which
cut up the surrounding country and rendered ac-
dress difficult. Atsiz sought refuge here when he
rejected against Sandjar but the town was taken
by the Saidjûk sultan after a two months' siege
in 542 (1147). In the time of Yâkût, who visited it
in 616 (1219), Hazarasp was a well fortified and
rich town. It still exists to-day under the same
name.

Bibliography: al-Mukaddasi, ed. de Goeje,
p. 280; Yâkût, Mu'allâm, iv. 471; Barthold,
Turkistan etc., i. 45, ii. 351; Le Strange, The
Lands of the Eastern Caliphat, p. 450 sq.

HAZARASPID Spe, a name given to the Banu
Fadlîya, who ruled for two centuries in Great
Luristan (543-740 = 1140-1339). For details see
the article LUR.

HAZÎN, Shaikh Muhammad 'Ali b. 'Ali Tâlib,
was born at Isfâhân in 1103 (1692). After visiting
many countries of Arabia and Persia, he finally
settled in India in 1146 (1733). He died at Be-
nares in 1150 (1766). Among his works the fol-
lowing may be mentioned: A Dîwân in Persian;
Farâs Nâma, a treatise on farriery: Khâzâns Maj-
haywan, or Tâfakkir Sâhibiya, a treatise on Zool-
ology; Tâfakkirat al-'Azâd, memoirs of his own
life, with an account of his travels (translation by
F. G. Bouchot, The Life of Shaikh Muhammad
'Ali Hazîn, 1830); Tâfakkirat al-Mu'tânî, notice
son some poets who lived in Persia during the
author's time.

Bibliography: Siyâr al-Mu'tanîkhânî, p. 615;
Ruyâ al-Mu'tâbîqâ, fol. 138-150; Nasagna
Andalîb, fol. 65-70; Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS, Br.
Mus., p. 372; Ethè in Grundriss der Iran,
Philologie ii. 310. (M. HIDA'YAT HOSAIN.)

HAZîNÂN, name of the ninth month of the
Syrian year.

HEBRON. [See AL-KHALÎL.]

HELMAND, The principal river of Afghan-
istan. The name also takes the forms Hir-
mânt and Helmand; it is the Eynamnds of Ar-
riana, the Erymanthis of Polybius and the
Hâzamat of the Avesta. It rises in an elevated
valley on the western side of the Paghman range,
which is part of the lofty system of mountains
to the west of Kâbul connected with the Hindú-
Kush and Kôh-i-Bâba, and after a long course
through the unexplored valleys of eastern Hazâ-
rîstân in a south-westerly direction emerges into
the open plains of S. Afghanistan near Gîrîshk.
Below Girishk, near the ruins of Bus it receives the
joint stream of the Arghandab, Tarnak and Ar-
ghasan which drain S. E. Afghanistan. On
approaching Sistan it suddenly turns north and
finally flows into the Hamûn or Lake of Sîstân
[see art. HAMûN]. The irrigation of the plains of
Sistan is drawn from the Helmand.

Bibliography: Bellew, From the Indus to
the Tigris (London 1857); Ferrier, Caravan
Journeys (London 1857); Holdich, Gates of
India (London 1910); MacMahon, (in Geogr.
Journal, ix. and xxviii.) Survey and Exploration
in Sistan; Molesworth-Sykes, (in Geogr.

(H. LONGWORTH DAMES.)

HÉNNA', the henna shrub, Lawsonia in-
ermis L., a tall slender shrub, reaching a height
of 9-12 feet, occasionally becoming practically
a tree, belonging to the family of Hythrâriacae,
with white clustered flowers yielding a pleasant
odour and smooth, entire leaves; it is grown in
congenial soil all over North Africa, Persia and India.
The flowers are used to prepare fragrant essences
and oils. With the powder made from the dried leaves
the nails, the palms of the hands and the soles of
the feet are dyed orange yellow throughout the
east, in Persia also the hair of the head and
beard. Dark hair assumes a cochinile shade, while
light hair becomes a burning red. The powder is
mixed with lukewarm water and, after the hair
has been carefully cleaned, applied as a paste; it
must remain at least an hour. If a deep black
colour is desired, it must be next dyed with paste

(M. LONGWORTH DAMES.)
made from *roug*, an indigo plant. To preserve the peculiar lustre produced by the *henüa* the hair is often again treated with *henüa* for another quarter of an hour after the application of the *roug*.

The tails of the royal horses are also dyed with *henüa* and white horses are turned to dun coloured, or painted with tassels and tufts with stencils.

The flowers, fruit and leaves of the *henüa* have of course many applications in medicine.

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Baṣir, quoted by Ledlere in *Netwos et Extrōta*, i. 669; E. W. Lane, *Manners and Customs*, i. 44; Polak, *Persien*, i. 357; G. Jacob, *Studien in arab. Dichter*, iii. 50.

(J. Ruska.)

**HENÖCH.** (Sec IDES.)

**HERÀT,** an ancient city in *Afghanistan*, situated 24° 22' N. and 62° 9' E. It gives its name to a province and is the centre of the administration and trade of a large district. Population from 15,000 to 20,000. The Great Mosque built in the 13th cent. is celebrated for its beauty. The Mašalla a group of buildings outside the walls was destroyed for defensive purposes when fortifications were constructed. The history of Herât begins in the Avesta. It is undoubtedly the Haroyu or Harašva of the Vendidā, the Haravia of the Achaemenian inscriptions and the Arica of the Greeks where Alexander founded Alexandria Areion. It retained its importance under the Sassanians and the Khalifat. After the conquest of Persia Herât took part in the general rising against the Arabs in 712 the reign, and was taken in Ibn Amur’s expedition in 714 (622). Its importance continued under the Šāmānids, Ghaznavids, and Seldžuqs. It suffered greatly under the Mongol invasions. It was taken by Tūsl son of Čingiz Kūhā in 619 (1222) and the Muslimān population massacred. The chieftains of the Kūt family, who were of Tadjik descent, retained possession of Herât and ruled the surrounding district under Mongol supremacy till 706 (1307) when the Mongols took the town, but Chiyāt al-Din regained the favour of Uljaitūt, and restored the prosperity of Herât. The Kürts held it until its final destruction by Timūr in 785 (1385). The Timūrids under Shāh Rukh made Herât their capital after Timūr’s death, and prosperity began to return to it. Many fine buildings were erected during this period and the town became a centre of art and learning. Shāh Rukh’s reign lasted from 807 (1404) to 850 (1447) and after some short reigns Ḥusain Bišṭārā obtained the power and ruled from 873 (1468) to 915 (1507), and throughout this period Herât was a great and prosperous centre. Towards the end of his reign the defection of the Arghūns and the invasion of Shābān weakened Ḥusain’s kingdom, and Herât was taken by Shābān in 913 (1507). Bābār tried in vain to recover it, but it did not remain long in the possession of Shābān, who was defeated and slain in 916 (1508) by Shāh Ismā‘il who had just founded the Safawi dynasty and established the Shī‘a creed in Persia. He enforced it with severity in Herât, which had hitherto been Sunni. Henceforward Herât remained under Sufi rule, but did not enjoy security at first for, it was captured by the Shābānids under Ummān Allāh in 941 (1538). After the decay of the Safawi rule Herât was included in the kingdom of the Durrānīs under Aḥmad Shah and his descend dants who held it even after they had lost the rest of Afghanistan. Mahmūd Shāh was succeeded by his son Kāmrān who was murdered in 1258 (1842). The Persians had long had designs on Herât and were, it has been supposed, encouraged by the hope of Russian assistance. In 1837 Mahμammad Shāh Kādmār besieged Herât. The defance was organized by E. Pottinger, a young English officer, and after the siege had lasted a year it was abandoned. After Kāmrān’s death however in 1258 (1842) the Persians renewed their attack and this time with success. The town remained in their possession till 1280 (1863) when Dōst Mohammad retook it, dying himself while in camp before its walls. During the wars between Shī‘a ‘Ali and his brothers Herât remained faithful to him and was held by his son Yaqūb. After Shī‘a ‘Ali’s death and the accession of ‘Abd al-Rahmān another son of Shī‘a ‘Ali ‘Aiyābī still held Herât and there collected an army with which he attacked the English force at Kandahār. ‘Abd al-Rahmān fortified the town strongly in 1885 during the visit which followed the Boundary Commission of that year, and it was during this period that the Musalla was destroyed as Hol dick has related.


(M. Longworth Dames.)


He visited Bāghdād and al-Raiyī and attended the lectures of Abu ‘l-Faṣād Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Dī‘afar, the expositor of the Qur‘ān Yahyā b. Ammār al-Sidžī, Abu Dharr al-Herewī etc. His most notable pupils were Abu ‘l-Waṣī ‘Abd al-Awwal b. ‘Isā al-Sidžī, Abu ‘l-Faṣād Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il al-Kāmi. He was a great traditioinist, a defender of Ḥanbali orthodoxy and a bitter opponent of the Ikā’ī; he was further an expositor of the Qur‘ān and an inspired preacher, he had also a sound knowledge of history, literature, theology and Sūfism. He was banished for a time to Balkh for his continual warfare on the enemies of the Sunna, and was five times threatened with death. Accused of anthropomorphism, he only owed his escape to his devotion to the Qur‘ān and Sunna. He it was also who induced the people of Herât to use names of the form ‘Abd combined with a divine attribute.


**Biography:** Dāhabī, Tadhkīrat al-
Haḍra, Haidarābād, n. d., iii. 375; Sayyūṭ, Ta-

**HERÊ (OR HARI) RUD,** a large river in Af-
ḡānīs[tān which rises in the Kōh-l-i-Hidā and flows westwards through a long narrow valley between the bank and Sulph Kūd. Ms. to Herēt and Ghōrān, where it turns to the North. At Zu l-Hikār it leaves Afḡānīs[tān territory and flows by Sarakhs into the Tisian oasis where it finally disappears, the water being mostly used in ir-
rigation. It forms the boundary for part of its lower course between Persia and Afḡānīs[tān and Turkīs[tān on the right.

**Biography:** Holdich, *The Gates of India.* (M. Longworth Dames.)

**HERSEK (M. L.)** i. e. Heršak, vīzie[r of the caliph al-Mustazhir. Hībat Allah was appointed vīzie[r in Mahārra 501 = Aug.-Sept. 1107 but dismissed in Kamānšā at the instigation of the Sulṭān Mahār b. Malikshāh. The caliph restored him his office soon after on condition that he pledged himself not to take any disimām into his service, but he was again dis-
missed in 510 = 1110-1109 or 513 = 1109-1110 and forced to seek asylum for himself and his family with the Sulṭān.

**Biography:** Ibn al-Ṣahr (ed. Tornberg), x. 305, 309, 318, 330, 335. (K. V. Zetterstēen.)

**HĪDĀD (A.)** A woman’s mourning garment. [See *ʿindā."

**HĪDĀ (A.),' a lam[poon. *The hidā* is originally a ch stirring or curse; the word itself, the etymology of which is not quite clear, perhaps means something like incantation. The origins of the hidā are connected with the old notion that words solemnly uttered by individuals qualified or authorized to do so have a permanent effect on the persons or objects to which they refer. In the original hidā the poet thus appears with the magic power of his verse inspired by the Dīnā."

Goldziher, *Abhandlungen zur Arab. Philologie*, i. 27 sqq., who gives the words of Bahlam as the oldest example of hidā and *op. cit.*, p. 59, note 4 compares the Arabic word with the Hebrew ʿidā (Is. viii. 19). The hidā as a branch of poetry was particularly cultivated by the Arab poets; several poets were masters in this kind of verse but Dījir [q. v.] may be regarded the palm.

**HĪDĪJĀB (A.), any partition which separates two thrones; whence in medicine the diaphragm (Abū ‘Abd al-Lūṭī al-Khwārizmī, Mafāṭib al-ʿAṣām, p. 156; P. de Koning, *Traite Traite d’Anatomie*, p. 350, 816). — In the Kūrān it has the sense of "curtain", "val[", e. g. one should speak with women from behind a curtain (Sūra xxxii. 53); in the next world the elect and the damned will be separated by a curtain (vi. 44); the term here seems to be synonymous with ʿalārāf and was therefore early explained as *wall* (Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, viii. 126; Baidῑānī, ii. 326) in allusion to Kūrān v[iii. 13. The unbelievers said to the Prophet: *There is a hidā between thee and us* (XII. 4). It is not possible for a man to hear God speaking unless by a revelation or from behind a curtain (xii. 50), as was the case with Moses (ʿAbd, according to al-Suddī; Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, xxv. p. 45). Among the mystics hidā means "all that veils the end", signifies the impression produced on the heart by the phenomena constituting the visible world, which prevents it admitting the revelation of truth (Durrātān, Definitions, p. 86; ʿAbd al-Razzāk, *Technical Terms*, p. 33, no. 116). The passions (ʿawāf) are the main cause of the obscurity, but each limb has a special passion that gives rise to a particular veil; substances, accidents, elements, bodies, forms, and qualities are so many veils, which conceal divine secrets. The higher truth is hidden from all men except saints (wāλī) alone. The opposite of hidā is kāḥf; the condition of soul in the former case is called kāḥf (contraction) in the second vast (expansion). Mystic love (wājīd) is aroused on account of the obstacle opposed to it in the first case (occultation), and satisfied by contemplation in the second (revelation). These expressions are borrowed from the Gnostics (Pistis Sophia, in E. de Faye, *Constituts et gnosticism*, 1913, p. 266).


**AL-HĪDĀZ,** a territory in Ar[abia on the Red Sea, with indefinite boundaries, which is at once understood when we reflect that the word hidāz means "harbor" and is applied in Arab topography to the mountains of Sarat, which shut off the highlands (Nedjād) from the flat coastlands (Ṭīhānā). As the name of a district, Hīdāz is limited to that part of the west coast, which does not belong to Yemen, to be more exact, to that stretch of land which extends from Ṭakra to al-
Līth on the Red Sea with the corresponding hinterland. Neither the highlands of Ṭars (q. v.) in the south nor the ancient land of Madīya and Ḥimā in the north belong to the Hīdāz proper, although they are often included in it, cf. above i. 367* in. 199. In the Turkish administrative system, the Hīdāz is a wilayet whose capital is Mecca, and is divided into 3 sandāiq, Mecca, Medina and Dījād. Although this division was never actually carried out in detail and the Turkish institutions and officers existed for the most part on paper only, it is useful as establishing the area of the Hīdāz proper. Recently however the Porte has made the sandāiq of Medina into an independent mutasarrīflīk which is governed by the ʿAbd al-Hamān and a Muḥāfāz, the commandant of the Turkish troops. For further in-
formation see the article MEDINA.

Al-Hīdāz consists of two very different parts, the flat, barren and hot coast land (Ṭīhānā) and the mountainous hinterland. In Ṭīhānā, which is almost devoid of vegetation — for there are no large wādīs in this part of Arabia — the few permanent settlements are on the coast, with the exception of Mecca, which owes its existence to the ancient holy places there (e.g. the Zamzam well). On account of the many coral banks there are no good harbours on the coast, only more or less available anchorages, which in ancient times suf-
faced for small ships and were then more visited than at the present day. Some, like Leukokome, which Sprenger has recognised in Al-Hawârî, and Dîjîr [q. v. i. 1016], the ancient harbour of Mecca, are now quite deserted, while on the other hand Yanbû [q. v.], the present harbour, and particularly Ijdûda [q. v. i. 1641], have developed into important towns on account of the pilgrims lodging there. The seafaring population is in general dependent for its livelihood on fishing.

The mountainous hinterland is in places not unfertile, for example in the volcanic district of Medina and particularly in the beautiful oasis of al-Tâ'if [q. v.] which from ancient times has been a favourite summer resort of rich Meccans on account of its wealth of fruit and its cooler climate. The hills themselves, the Djebel Karâ east of Mecca, reach a height of 6000—6500 feet. The highest are the hills of al-Tâ'if (6168 feet) and Djebel Radjâ west of Medina (5900 feet). Only the latter are of any importance; the land would not be able to sustain its inhabitants if imports from Europe, Egypt and India did not come to its help. The exports are insignificant.

The Hijâjâ gives its real importance to the two holy cities, Mecca and Medina, which occupy quite a special position in the Muslim world and will be dealt with in special articles. In addition to the coast-towns and al-Tâ'if already mentioned, the Arab geographers give the following, Kûh, Khâbûr [q. v.], al-Murwa, al-Hawârî, al-Sûkhiyâl, al-Awâniyâ, al-Djûfânya, and al-Ushâira and of minor importance Badr [q. v.] Khulûsî, al-Hijâjîr [q. v.], al-Durâ, al-Sahâra, Djaibâ, Tâ'if, and Al-Hijâjâ. Besides these there is a fairly long list of names, which owe their fame to the circumstance that Islâm has consecrated them — when they were not already sites of primitive cults — either through historical associations or as outposts of the sacred territory (haram) of Mecca. It would be useless to detail these here; when they are of sufficient importance for religious reasons they will be found either in the articles MECCA and MEDINA or in special articles.

The population of al-Hijâjâ consists of Arab Bedouins, except in the large towns where it is more or less mixed, particularly in Ijdûda, less in Mecca itself, the old tribal names being Tâ'if [q. v.], Awa [q. v.], and Khazrâdj [q. v.] in Medina, Kûraish [q. v.] in Mecca, have their place in history while Tâ'if [q. v.] and Hudhâil [q. v.] are still known as the inhabitants of Tâ'if and the southern Hijâjâ. We may also mention Bali [q. v.], Djuhâaina [q. v.], Sulaim [q. v.], Hutaîm [q. v.], and Harb [q. v.].

The various pilgrim-routes which meet in Mecca have lost most of their former importance, which will be developed with the development of steamships, which has caused the majority of pilgrims to travel via Djiddâ, and will be still more deserted when the Mecca railway, which now runs from Damascus to Medina, reaches the holy city. Cf. M. Hartman, Die Medi- kabahm in Orient. Litteraturzeitung, 1908, p. 1 sqq.

The history of the Hijâjâ is the history of Mecca and Medina so that the reader may be referred to these articles.

Bibliography: Cf. the notes above i. 372 on the geographical literature of Arabia and also the bibliographies to the articles on MECCA and MEDINA. Of recent literature we may mention al-Batânînî, al-Khâlî al-Hijâjâryâ [3], Cairo 1329; 'Abd al-Muhsîn, al-Khâlî al-Ya'maniyya bi-Sâhib al-Dawla Husainîl-Djâhî, Amir Mekka, Cairo 1330, and Lammens, Le Bureau de l'Islam, p. 9 sqq. AL-HIJâJîR (Hadjier, Haascher, Houdschier, Al-Heugr in Ritter) a town in Arabîsia, a day's journey from Wâdi 'l-Kura [q. v.] south of Tâlma [q. v.] identical with the ancient commercial town of 'Eylez in Ptolemy and Egra in Pliny. The town no longer exists. At present the name al-Hijâjîr is given by the Bedouins to the flat valley between Mâbrâk al-Nâ'îka (Marjân) and Bir al-Ghânam which stretches for several miles and has a fertile soil with many wells at which numerous Bedouins encamp with their herds. Two roads lead from al-Hijâjîr to Mecca, the Naqdî road, the modern pilgrim route, and the Marw road, which was in ancient times the road followed by the pilgrims to Mecca.

To the west of al-Hijâjîr is a mountain of five isolated sandstone cliffs, called Athâliyâ (in Doughty, Travels, always written Ethelih), on which are carved a large number of artistic monuments (including the Kaşr al-Biint, Bait al-Sâghîkh, Bait Akhâmî, Mahâll al-Madjalis, and Dîwân, which are adorned with numerous sculptured figures of birds and animals and many inscriptions). Ch. M. Doughty, the first European to visit Hijjur (1876-1877) and to examine closely the cliffs, with their carvings, found the latter (except one, the Diwân) to be exclusively tombs (family vaults) with niches and remains of human bodies. Pilgrims going to Mecca rest on Mount Athâliyâ for a day and offer up prayers here. In ancient times there lived here a godless and arrogant cave-dwelling people, the Yamûdî [q. v.] who were allowed in the Kûrân that they knew their houses out of rock. To convert them God sent a kinsman of theirs, the prophet Sâlih [q. v.], to them, who made a camel and her young one arise out a cleft in the rock as evidence of his divine mission. But when they continued in their idolatry and slew the camel which Sâlih begged them to spare, God sent an earthquake which destroyed them. The sandstone cliffs of al-Hijâjîr with the monuments carved in them are also called Moinân 'Sâlih 'Sâlih's towns' after Sâlih. According to the Arab legend, the patriline of Abraham, by Gabriel's command, abandoned Hejjar and her daughter in al-Hijâjîr. The Mûmâl is also said to be buried here beside his mother. Al-Hijâjîr also finds a place in the history of the Prophet. When Muhammad was going through Tabûk towards Damascus in the year 9 (631) he came with his army into the neighbourhood of al-Hijâjîr. The troops wanted to rest here to refresh themselves at the wells but the Prophet would not allow them to enter this place that had been visited by the wrath of God. In modern times the Wâhâbî chief Sa'd wished to build a town here but the scheme fell through on account of the vehement objections of the 'alamâ to rebuilding on a site cursed by God. Hijâjîr, since Doughty's visit, has been twice visited by the Alsatian C. Huber, in 1879 and again (with Euting) in 1884.


chol. en Arabie, i. 107 sqq.; J. Euting, Tag-

buch einer Reise im Inner-Arabien, ii. 215 sqq.; E. Renan, Documents épigraphiques recueillis dans le nord de l'Arabie par M. Charles Doughty, Paris 1884 (in a special volume of the Académie des Insr. et Lettres); Doughty, Travels in Arabia DESERTA, i. 23, 81—83, 93—96, 102—125, 133—136, 180—185 and Index s. v.

AL-HIDJR, a district in Arabia near Bishá [q.v.] and the land of the Khazázim. It is called after Hidjr b. al-Azd. The land of al-Hidjr was very fertile and rich in fields of wheat and barley and had many fruit-trees (apples, peaches, figs, plums and almonds). Among the clans of Hidjr Hamdání mentions the 'Amir (with the subdivision 'Abd), Aşğibiga, Rabia, Shahr (with the divisions al-Asal, Bal-Harîh, Malîk, Naşr and Nażla). Among places in the land of al-Hidjr he mentions Ashşdan (very important), al-Haţa, Hâchah (the largest town in al-Hidjr), Hâbab, al-

Khadrâ, Na'dinâ, Rhâb, Zasâma, among wâdis Aid, Bâhîn, Dshabâl, Ilî (with the village of Hîbal), Kârib, Khiš, Nişyat (with many fruit-
trees) Raymâ, Sadawân and Tânîmâ (with 60 villages).


(J. Schleifer.)

HIDJR, the name of a village (indeed of several) in South Arabia which is exclusively inhabited by Sâdâ or Azhrâf ("lords", "notables", descendants of the Prophet) and is considered sacrosanct. These villages (e.g. Hâfa in Arhab [cf. Hâshid and Bâkî] may not be overrun in war. The members of the Hidjra, who are chiefly judges (khâḍîr) and jurists (jâhaba), receive from the tribe to which they belong a certificate of their membership of the Hidjra and enjoy great esteem, which surpasses that of a shâhid. Individual members are also found scattered throughout the villages as writers and preachers.

Another Hidjr different from the preceding is that of Djebel Dîn (see Hâshid and Bâkî) of a more monastic character, whose members attend to the tomb of the saint (wafîl) Kûdam b. Kâdir on this hill, cf. also the article HAWA.


(J. Schleifer.)

HIDJRA (HIDJRA), the migration of the Prophet from Mecca to Medina, the starting point of the Muhammadan era.

The Prophet, not having succeeded in overcoming the resistance of the Kuraish and on the other hand having already won friends among the people around Medina (then called Yathrib), resolved to remove to the latter town. The Arabic word hidjra should not be translated "flight", for the idea of fleeing is not properly expressed by the verb hajâra. This verb means "to break off relations, to abandon one's tribe, to emigrate". At the present day in Muslim countries the name Muhâqir is still given to Muslims who have quitted countries in which Christian powers have become established. The word does not imply that there has been precipitate flight but only difficulty in living or repugnance to living in the country abandoned.

Muhâqir, according to Muḥâqir (Tâhir), had ordered his followers to migrate to Medina; they set out in small parties. Among the first to reach Medina was 'Omar, afterwards Caliph. This migration had certainly been preceded by negotiations with the people of Medina, as Tâhir's Chronicle (Persian synopsis ii. 437 sqq.) relates. The Prophet himself set out accompanied by Abû Bakr. He left 'Ali behind to return some property entrusted to him to their owners. 'Ali remained three days behind in Mecca and then joined the other emigrants.

A very popular legend is associated with the Prophet's migration. The Kuraish wished to slay him and appeared in the morning at his house; but they met only 'Ali who drove them back at the sword's point. They then rushed off to pursue Muhammad on the road to Medina. When the latter heard of this, he hid with Abû Bakr in a cave and God willed that a spider should spin its web at the entrance to this cave. When the Kuraish saw the web, they thought it impossible that any one could be inside and passed by. This story explains the allusion in Sûra ix. 40: "when the two were in the cave and he said to his companion: Be not afraid, see! God is with us". (Cf. R. Basset, La Bordade du Châaël el-Bousiri, p. 81—85, and the parallels given there).

Along the road the Ansâr came flocking up to the Prophet: they took the reins of his camel and begged him to settle among their tribes. But Muhammad answered: "Let my camel go; it is obeying God's command". (Cf. Mas'ûd', Prairies d'Or, iv. 139).

The traditions regarding the erection of the first mosque and institution of the Friday service are also connected with this journey. The Prophet is said to have entered the house of Sa'd b. Khai-

ghama in Kûhâ and to have had a mosque built there. He is said to have performed the solemn Friday service (gala al-Djum'a) for the first time with the Bani Zâlim, when he came among them on his way. Arriving in Medina he took up his abode with the Ansâr Abû Ayîb.

Authorities are not agreed about the exact date of the Hidjra. According to the most usual account, it took place on the 8th Rabî I (20th Sept. 622). But this would not be the date of the departure from Mecca but of the arrival in Medina. According to other versions, it was the 2nd or the 12th Rabî I. Al-Birâni says that the Jews were just celebrating the 'Ashurâ festival (Day of Atonement) when the Muslims arrived in Medina.

The 8th was preferred as it was a Monday. According to a tradition, the Prophet is said to have answered when asked why he observed Monday especially, on this day was I born, on this day I received my prophetic mission and on this day I emigrated".

The fixing of the Hidjra as the beginning of the Muhammadan era dates from the Caliph 'Omar. The traditions which try to trace it to the Prophet himself are devoid of all probability. According to another tradition, Ya'la b. Omaîya, Abû Bakr's governor in the Yemen, was the first to use it, but the view that it dates from 'Omar is by far the most prevalent.

*It is related in various forms that 'Omar after
having regulated the administration of finance and made up the registers and the levies of taxes found himself embarrassed about the dating, or rather he was reproached for not dating at all. According to a tradition quoted by al-Biruni, Abu Mas’ud al-Agha’i wrote to him saying: “Thou art sending us letters undated”. The Caliph discussed the matter with his officers and after investigating the customs of the Greeks and Persians it was decided to establish an era. Some proposed to date from the birth of the Prophet, but this date was not certain. All is then said to have proposed to take the Hijira as the beginning of the era, as it marked the date when the Prophet began to assume sovereign power. This decision was come to in the year 17 or 18, some however say 16, but the general view is the year 17.

Before fixing this date the Muslims gave their years names such as “year of the permission”, “year of the earthquake”, “year of the farewell” etc. (Cf. al-Biruni, Chronology, p. 35). When Muhammad began his preaching, the Arabs were reckoning from the “year of the elephant”.

The year of the Hijira was then chosen as the year 1, but the calendar was already fixed by the Kursan, the months were retained and Muham- ram was retained as the first month because business is resumed then after the pilgrimage. The era thus began, not with the day of the Hijira but with the 1st day of the moon of Muharram of the Hijira year. This first day fell upon a Friday and corresponded to the 16th Tammuz (July) 933 of the Seleucid era, and 622 of the Julian calendar.


(B. CARRA DE VAUX.)

HIKAYA has had a varied history, of importance not only lexicologically but also in the development of Arabic literature. In Lane (pp. 618 sqq.) the history is unfortunately confused, but when we turn to the native lexicons (e. g. Lisiin, xvili. 207 sqq.) we are met with the paradox that the meanings are not those found in the great mass of later Arabic writings and that the commonest later meaning, “story”, “narrative”, occurs hardly at all. The root does not come in the Kur’an (there hadith is commonest as a noun and hikayat and nabba’s as verbs; on asabt al-awwalin see Sprenger, Leben, ii. 390 sqq.) and as used in traditions it means to imitate an action, usually in a bad sense (Lisiin, loc. cit.). Hikayat is therefore misused and from that all follows. In the first instance it is mimicking for purposes of amusement; the professional hikayat is a mimic. Then imitation of speech may be reproduction; thus hikayatu ‘anhu ‘l-hadith 2 reproduced from him the tradition”. It then also involve simple re- semblance as though one thing reproduced another by being like it. So the meanings remained for at least the first four centuries. Theologically the distinction lasted much longer. In the Kulliyat (xvili., cent. A. D.; quoted in Muhiti al-nabhi, i. 431”) hikayat cannot be said of Allah since there is nothing like his speech; but see Haidawi on Kür, xxxviii. 164 and Ibn ‘Arabshah, Tafihat al- Khulafa, ed. Freytag, p. 108, l. 25. In the Fihrist (latter part of iv. cent.) narratives are hikayat, sometimes ahadith, and stories told for entertainment are asmur or khwarafat or ahadith but never hikayat; see, for example, the well-known passage on the history of The root Nights (pp. 304 sqq. and cf. p. 313). Asmur, of course, may also be historical, e. g. al-asmur al-tahabiya (p. 305, l. 9) while hadith has, been from beginning to end, the broadest word of all. But hikayat in the Fihrist only makes a reproduction of a statement, transcript, e. g. p. 275, l. 20 hikayat min khifat . . . “a transcript from the handwriting of . . .”, l. 21, nii khidiki hikayaturku, “of which this is a tran- script”. It may often be translated “statement”, and is in avato recita when there is nothing to the contrary. In Hamza of Jihabah (early part of fourth century) the usage of the root is the same, e. g. p. 17, l. 12, p. 64, l. 1, p. 65, l. 13; p. 201, l. 4 of ed. Gottwaldt. In the Aghani (Abu I-Faraj d. 356) hita, hadith and khabar seem to be used indifferently for narrations, but hita as in the Fihrist and by Hamza, e. g. ed. Baldiz, l. p. 44, l. 20: hadiik mutaw’i min abib akhir hikayatu wali-lasfu yisatu wa-yamiki “this is a general reproduction of what I heard from Abib Alkahr although the expression may not be exactly in his words”. Yet the verb hikayatu occurs in the meaning “narrate”. See vol. viii. p. 162, ll. 7 and 10, where the verb and hikayat come side by side, the latter in the sense “imitation”. Apparently the noun retained the original meaning longer. In Mas’udi’s (d. 345-346) well-known passage on the Nights (Muraqja, iv. 59 sq.; de Sacy in his Monographs on the origin of the Nights gives the passage in four forms) khwarif is the word used for such tales; hikayat does not occur. It may be said generally that the older translations of this word (e. g. by Gottwaldt, Kosegarten, Barbier de Meynard) are misleading. Thus in Mas’udi, viii. 16 sq. it is mimicking that is meant and not story-telling. But when we reach Hariri (d. 516) hikayat is used at the beginning of the Ma- gma’ at indifferently with hadatha, aghbara and rawa in the sense “to narrate”. But he also (ed. de Sacy, vol. ii. p. 420) uses hikayat in the old sense of “resemble” which later became so ar- chaic that the commentators had to explain it. With Hariri the change of meaning is complete, and when we turn to the oldest Ms of the Nights (both the Galland Ms and that of the “Story of Sul and Shumal” at Tubingen are of the early xivth cent. A. D., after A. H. 700) we find hikayat in normal use for a story told for entertainment. See Seybold’s Geschichte von Sul u. Schumal, p. 164, and my “Story of the Fisherman and the Jinn”, in the Noldeke-Petschini, passim. Of the words for such tales used in the Fihrist and by Mas’udi, asmur has fallen back to its original use of conversation and tales told at night in the desert life, and khwarafat has developed to mean only ridiculously impossible stories, as opposed to those which are fictitious but pleasing; thus in Damiri’s Hayat al-Hayawan, i. 185, l. 31 of. ed. of Cairo 1313, khwarafat al-ri’yada, and ii. 101, l. 25, khwarafat al-’arab. Only in Tripoli, ap- parently, is it still the normal word for “story”; see Stumme, Moeren aus Tripolit.

We are now left with two questions. Can this
change of meaning be in any way bridged and explained: and, what must have been the character of the first ̣ikāyā in the new sense? There have always been stories in Arabic from those told in the Kurān and the competing translations from Persian by Naḍr b. al-Ḥārīrī ( Ibn Ḥāfīẓ, p. 191), to the modern ḥadīṣī or Marchen, told in colloquial and, so far, reduced to writing and print only by European scholars and some eccent- ric Egyptian and Fāry. The text's multiplicity of names for the different kinds of the story shows how they have been cultivated and how keenly they have been distinguished. Some of these names have been given above. Others are ṛisālā which began by being the oral recital of a narrative or a poem by a ṛāsā and has now become an ordi- nary word for "story" and the normal word for a play, comedy or tragedy, with or without ṭam-tāthīl (tim-tim), maṭḥāl (matthal), the story as an example or illustration of some situation or prece- dence. Kalīla wa-Dimna, is Kalīla wa-Dimna and all beast-fables (dīl al-asāmat al-ḥayawān), sīra (sīyar), "manner of life" and then "biography"; naṣāil, unconnected anecdotes; ḏiṣa (ashing), a story of any kind but specialized by Kurānic usage and that of the professional ṣūgīl (Goldschir, Mah. Studien, i. 161 sq.) to legends of the past and stories about the prophets. To these last the first ̣ikāyā formed an exact opposite. They were not stories of the past but pictures of the present. This is made plain by the only example so far printed, ̣iṣāyāt Abī l-ʿAṣām al-Baghḍādī, edited by Adam Mez under the title, Abūl-Ḥasan abū ǂbagai Sittenbild. The author, Muḥammad Abū l-Muṭṭahhar al-Aṣā’ī, shows in his preface that he knows that he is producing a new literary form. It is not to be a poem or a riṣāla or a maṣāma (he must have known those of Hamadānī) but a realistic transcript of Baghdād manners and phrases in the person of a, for us, very disputable representative who, however, seems to be regarded by the author as of literary refinement. Story there is none, but a day is filled with a dinner party and with scops of verse and of or- nate prose in the current forms of rhetoric, but all concrete and direct, written not for the sake of playing with words but for producing a picture of life. The use of a single figure to mirror the ideas and ways of a city he defends with a long quotation from DMIṣ (Bayān, ed. Cairo, p. 31, ll. 12–24) who seems to have been the first to take pleasure in pictures of classes of the people. Yet it is only a new application of the realism of the old poetry of the desert to the artificial town life, marked, however, with all the coarse- ness of language and idea which distinguished the town from the desert and the new from the old. Of the ̣iṣāyā badāwīya, meant probably as a contrast, which the author says (p. 2, l. 16) he has added we have no trace left. But ̣iṣāyā in the quotation from DMIṣ is evidently used of a mimic and not of a literary artist who creates a representative figure. The development which produced so striking a literary genre as that of Abū l-Muṭṭahhar calls, therefore, for explanation, and I would suggest that it was due to the influence of the Aristotelian doctrine of μιμεσις in art (Poetics, i.–iv.). DMIṣ died in A. H. 266 and Abū l-Muṭṭahhar wrote after 400 (Mez, p. xv.). But it is evident that the Poetics of Aristotle found translators and attention only slowly. There was a Muḥḥīṣar by al-Kindī (d. about 247; Fihrist, p. 250, l. 5 and 257, l. 6) but no full translation until that of Mattāb, Yūnus (d. 328; Fihrist, pp. 250 l. 4; 263, last l.) and his pupil Yahyā b. Abī (d. 364) wrote a ṭafṣīr on it (Fihrist, pp. 250 l. 4; 264, l. 12). In that translation (ed. Margoliouth in his Arabica Orientalia) the word used for μιμεσις is ḥikāyā. The conception of literary art as an "imitation" of life may thus, when translated into Arabic forms, easily have resulted in Abū l-Muṭṭahhar's new literary type. The next development into "story" must have come very rapidly for we find that Ḥarīrī (d. 516) has forgotten so completely the earlier uses that he can apply ḥikāyā even to such amīḍāt as the apologues in Kalīla wa-Dimna (ed. de Sacy, ii. 13). When he implies in the same passage that his own maṣāma are also ̣iṣāyā he is much nearer the true meaning, for they are certainly renderings of contemporary life though treated with artificial rhetoric and a playing with words for the sake of the words. On this side they are the nearest that the Arabic of literature ever reached toward that life of the open road and of living by one's wits that is the mark of the picareseque novel. But in popular Arabic the same motif was taken up and extended in such tales as the cycle that surrounds the name of 'Ali al-Zaibāq. On the picareseque side these are true reproductions of life; there is an abbrev- iated recension of them in the Night and much longer independent forms have been printed at Beyrut and Cairo. But before ḥikāya reached the possibility of being used for any story it must have passed through a stage in which it meant a fictitious story, not of wonderful happenings in the past or in distant lands or by the agency of the djīnum and of talismans, but of such life as its readers themselves knew. Examples would be the cycles in The root Nights known as "The Hunchback" or, very differently, "Ali b. Bakrār and Šahms al-Ṭahār". In this way a specifically new thing entered Arabic literature. There is no trace of it in the Fihrist even as there is no trace of the beginnings of the maṣāma as developed later by Hamadānī and Ḥarīrī. We have record there of professional entertainers (mudhfsan, nādāmūn), pp. 151–155), of wonderful tales, love-stories and stories of the djīnum (pp. 304 sq.), but of nothing which can be identified as belonging to this particular genre. To Abū l-Ṭarāḍī, the author of the Aghānī, Ibn Ḥalīlīkān, in Wünstfeld's text (no. 451) ascribes a "Book of ḥikāyāt", but this elsewhere is read al-ṭarādī, "taevuns"; (Kosegarten, Proc- eins to his ed. of Aghānī, p. 196, and so, decisively, Wright, Christomathy, p. 87, l. 11 from the autograph Ms.). We have thus the appearance, practically at the same time between the fourth and the fifth cen- turies of the Hijrī, of two new forms which in their beginnings were closely akin but which quickly separated into two widely different types. The maṣāma was at first practically a ̣iṣāyā in the original sense, and the ̣iṣāyā of Abū l-Muṭṭahhar is practically such a monologue, though not one delivered standing as was the maṣāma. But to Abū l-Muṭṭahhar his new form was distinct from the maṣāma and was rather a development from the mimetic ḥikāya. The intention in the two forms was different and the difference is expres-
sed in the names applied to them by their authors. The maḫmūma was an oration and therefore ran out in rhetoric; the hikāya was a reproduction and therefore turned to action and life. The latter transformation must have been aided by the rapid development in the verb ḥāk of the meaning "to believe." Muslims "public story-teller" and hikāya came to be applicable to any tale, while still retaining even in the colloquial (see Dozy, sub voc.) the possibility of the original meaning. And probably even in the hikā- wātī there is still some feeling left of the mimetic, as the oriental story-teller always acts out his tale. Yet the terms are sometimes curiously confused. Thus in Nushat al-Abār wa I′Asma fi Aḥbār Dīwān al-Kinā (date?) there is (pp. 82–89) ed. of Cairo, 1905) a short realistic story fi ḍiāmm al-niʿād which is called a maḫmūma.

Only one consideration remains. This development has been conditioned and limited by a constant factor. The professoriated, at least in Arabic Islām, has always, with few and individual exceptions, looked down upon the story and refused to recognize it. He has never condescended to a narrative of fictitious facts and events told for its own sake. Such he left to professional entertainers, buffoons and the vulgar in general. The only stories recognized as forming part of polite literature have been those with an ulterior object. They have been apologues (anīṭāl) as in Khāla wa-Dīmma, Fakhrat al-Aslāf, Saltān al-Muḥsī and the like; or simply vehicles for poetry and rhetorical prose like Laylat al-Shāhāk and the whole range of maḫmūmāt; or collections of historical and literary anecdotes like Ḥām al-Nūr, al-Fārādī beʿd al-Shāhād and Maṣārī al-Uṣhākhā; or stories with ethical or mystical purpose, as Saltānān and Abālā and Hāyī ibn Yākūn of Ibn Sīnā and the Muḥkāmātāt of 'Ali `Azīz of Crete. Yet Muslim writers were early in contact with stories in good literary standing which came to them from without. They had translations of Greek romances and of Persian and Indian tales (Fīrūz, pp. 305 sqq.; Ḥamza of Iṣbahān, p. 41 sqq.). In the time of the compiler of the Fīrūzān and his school it was evidently possible for a reputable author to write stories; on p. 306, ll. 9 sqq. he gives the names of several. See, too, (p. 304, ll. 21 sqq.) how Dījalshīyār, a writer of distinction, could occupy himself with the compilation of a collection similar to The 1001 Nights and a brother of Shāhī could transcribe it. But the popularity of such things under the Abbāsid was so great that the warrāḥān took to writing them and that naturally affected their standing (p. 308, ll. 9 sqq.). The relation also to the professional jester and entertainer was too close to see on these pp. 140 sqq. and especially on Abū l-Tāliba and his standing, partly as astronomer and partly as nādir of al-Mutawakkil and purveyor of kāh literature, p. 151, ll. 23 sqq. So stories tended to be anonymous and to be classified with dubious subjects — stories of the bat-fālān, of Djalāh, of kāh (pp. 313 sqq.). This is well illustrated by The 1001 Nights. We have there stories showing in their structure a technical skill beyond any public reciter; but they are as anonymous as Märchen; their authors did not dare to own them. Such are Kamar al-Zamān and Budār, "The Three Ladies of Baghdad", "The Three Apples" and the realistic novels. The romances of chivalry, on the other hand, in so far as they professed to be biographies (siyār) and not hikāyāt, required the support of the authority of stated authors, but the names given are usually unknown to us and probably always false; cf. above on Ṭantara, i. 362 and on Bārk, p. 589 sqq.

The above holds of Arabic-speaking Islām. In Turkish, apparently, and still more in Persian, stories retained a position of higher literary respect and were treated with greater care as to style, although there also they tend to anonymity. Further, the Turkish medērān corresponds closely to the old Arabic ḥākīa, and in the modern development of a new Turkish literature the art of the medērān is influencing the realistic novel. For many specimens of medērān-stories — strikingly resembling in type the hikāya of Abu l-Mutahhar — see Georg Jacob's Türkische Bibliothek, passim, and on the whole subject the introduction to vol. i. 6 sqq. and Paul Horst, Gesch. d. türk. Moderne, pp. 12 sqq.

Bibliography has been given in the course of the article; but the first reference must always be to the Einleitung of Mez to his Abuḫūṣūm.

(D. B. Macdonald.)

HIKMA. (Hebr. ḥokhmā, Syr. ḥekhemrēkhā, "wisdom". In the ancient portions of the Korān the term is applied to the Prophet's preaching (xvi. 116; liv. 4), then it is used as synonymous with "sacred, revealed books" (iii. 43, 75, 148; iv. 57; v. 110; xxi. 41; the "Gospel" xiii. 63) and applied to the Korān itself (ii. 231; iv. 113; xxxii. 34; lix. 2). Its original acceptance is found in ii. 272; applied to David, ii. 252; xxi. 19, and to the sage Luḵān, xxx. 11. In this last passage it is explained by Ṭabarī, (Ṭaṣfīr, xx. 39) as "knowledge (ḥak) of religion, reason and truth" and by Baidawi (ed. Fleischer, ii. 113), "Hikma in the conventional language of the learned means the perfecting of the human mind by the acquisition of the speculative sciences and complete faculty for doing excellent deeds according to the ability possessed". The same idea of wisdom is already found in the Kāthān inscriptions where H-K-M is an epithet of the moon-god. (Ditlef Nielsen, Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, lxvi. (1912), p. 592, l. 25; H. Deroenbourg, Revue d'Asyriologie, v. (1902), p. 117 sqq.). The lexicographers define ḥikma as "the knowledge of the best things by means of the best science" (Liddān, xx. 30); "to be just in a judicial decision, to know the truth of things as they are and to act according to the requirements thereof" (Ṭāqū al-ʿArūs, viii. 253); "the science in which is sought the true nature of things, as they are in themselves, as far as is humanly possible (Ḥāḍḏiḫ Khalfā, Lex. Bibl., iii. 89)." Hikmat al-ʿIrāq, a kind of neo-Platonic mysticism, is the philosophy of illumination (mujhriyya) [see Falsafa, p. 50b infr.]. Practised as early as the time of Avicenna who wrote a work entitled al-Hikma al-Mujhriyya, it had at that time a secret character which it has since lost. The Alchemists call their science ḥikma (cf. Mafāṭīḥ al-ʿIlm, p. 256).

Bibliography: Ghazālī, Ḥayāʾ Ulum al-Din (ed. 1289), i. 87; Sprenger, Technical Terms,
HIKMA — HILAL.

i. 370; Carra de Vaux, Avicenne, p. 136, 141, 147, 151—153; Gassali, p. 226 sqq.; Town, As., IXth Ser., Vol. xix, 1902, p. 63 sqq.; A. von Kremer, Herrscheide Ideen, p. 89—97; M. Horthen, Philosophie der Erluchtung (Halle 1912); Lane, Lexicon, s. v.  

(HUAR.)

HILADI (or HAILADJ), a Persian word adopted into Arabic, an astrolcal term, associated with kahhādā by Ibn al-Rūmī (died 284 = 897) in a celebrated verse. According to the Burūhan-i ḫāqānī, it is derived from the Greek, and means “elixir of life”. By its asonance to Hailadji, the word has given ‘Aṭār a title for his Hīdāyā Nāmah, a long Persian poem, which describes the ideal of mystic union in the form of the story of a martyr.

Bibliography: Khajjājī, Shīrāz al-ṭalīl, Cairo 1282 s.v.; Rieu, Certal, Pers. MSS. Brit. Mus., p. 577 a,b; Lughat al-ʿArab, iii. (Baghdad 1913), 314—317. (LOUIS MASSIGNON.)

HILĀL, an Arab tribe belonging to the Maʿṣādī (Ismaʿilī) group. Its genealogy is Hiliāl b. ʿĀmid b. ʿAbd b. Maʿṣūm b. Bakr b. Ḥawwāzīn . . . b. Kaʿīs ʿAllān. During the Dāniliya they worshipped at Tabāla the idol Khalsa, called the Kaʿba of the Yemen, which was also worshipped by the Badjilā, Ḥārītī b. Kaʿb and Khaṭṭāb.

They lived in Najd (on the Yemen border) and were neighbours of the Sulaim [q.v.]. The following places belonged to them, al-ʿAbīla, Buraika (with the Ḥarīta of the Banū Hiliāl), Dūmī, al-Futuḥ, al-Kurāhī (the two latter were already ruined by Hamdanī’s time), Gharwās, Ṣarrār (a large town on the road to Ḍaqrā with numerous wells, palms, and cornfields), Ṣirāh b. Darīla and the famous market place of Ḫaṭā (in Hamdanī’s time); the following wādis: Dīdhān, Ṣirāmīya, and Turāba (near Mekka, very fertile; shared with the Dībā and ʿĀmid b. Rabīʿa), and the following mountains: Buṣh [with the lake al-Nakūz; in Wüstenfeld, Register, p. 224, wrongly Boss and al-Baʿa (Baʿba)] and al-Kaṣā. There were also many Hiliāli at Bishā [q.v.]. According to Hamdanī, they spoke good Arabic.

Historical. In the pre-Muḥammadan period, Dānīla b. ʿAbī Ḫurīza, chief of the Hiliāl, on a raid stole several of the Azd; the chief of the Azd, the poet Hāḍīzī, then made war upon them and took many prisoners. On the ‘Ayyād (al-Watīdāt) between the ʿĀmid b. ʿAbd b. ʿAbd and the Tāmm, the Hiliāl fought on the side of the former and lost nearly 80 men killed. During the ‘Abīdī [q.v.] battles between the Kurāsh and Kainānī on the one side and the Ḥawwāzī on the other we find the Hiliāl on the side of their kinsmen, the Ḥawwāz [q.v.]. Just before the conclusion of peace between the Kurāsh and Kurāsh and the Kainānī, at the invitation of Wāḥb b. Muʿāthtib, the chief of the Thilīj, a tribe related to the Ḥawwāzī, they made a raid upon the Banū Lāṭīb, a clan of the Kainānī and stole their cattle, under the leadership of Rabīʿā b. Ābī Ẓabīyān in conjunction with other tribes of the ʿAbbāsid Caliph al-Wāṭḥik (230 = 844—845) his general Būghal al-Kabīr sent an army against the Hiliāl, who were then with the Sulaim creating unrest in Medina, and had three hundred of the malcontents thrown into prison in Medina; they attempted to escape from here along with the Sulaim prisoners but were prevented by the Medinēse and, when they resisted, were massacred to a man. The tribe afterwards migrated to Egypt where they settled at first in the Nile Delta, but were afterwards conquered by the ʿAbbāsid Sulṭān al-ʿAzīz (365—386 = 975—996) and forced by him to take up their abode in Upper Egypt, as they had taken the side of the Karmaṭians. Māriskī tells us that in 797 they lived in the Aswān district in the province of ʿAyd; among their clans in Egypt he mentions the Banū ʿAmīr, Ḥabīb, Ḥadījīr, Ḫudhrīr, ʿIrāq (at Ḥumrin), ʿUkba or ʿAḥba (Wūstenfeld, Mārkhīr (see Bibl.) p. 404 erroneously: Corra) and Ḏamiya near ʿAṣūr (ʿAṣūr; Wūstenfeld, l.c.: ʿAṣūr, a misprint) and Asnā. In the year 444 = 1052, at the instigation of the ʿAbbāsid Caliph al-Mustaʿṣir (427—487 = 1035—1094), they migrated to North Africa (Kairawan) where after considerable fighting they conquered the Ḏārīs, the former governors in the Fāṭimid, then the real lords of the country. Many tribes in Africa trace their descent from Hiliāl.

The migration of the B. Hiliāl to Africa and the wars in which they had to wage during the conquest of the country form the historical background of a collection of heroic tales and love stories, the romance or rather epic, Sira al-Hili (History of the B. Hiliāl) which exists in two recensions (Sira al-Šāmīya and Sira al-Ḥijāyāya) containing three cycles.

The first cycle describes the history (the Sira proper) of the B. Hiliāl, in Bilād al-Sarw wa ʿUbdā. Two sons, ʿAbīrā and Dībārā, are born to al-Mundhir, son of Hiliāl, by his two wives Ḥudhrībā and ʿAdhābā on the same night. Dībārā goes off with his mother and afterwards becomes Sulṭān in Najd.— The Emīr Ḥāzīm and Kirk of the line of Dībār rule in Bilād al-Sarw. Kirk marries al-Khādira, the daughter of the Sheff of Mecca, whom he had aided against the king of Rūm. She bears him a son, the dark Barakāt, afterwards called ʿAbū Zaid (Ẓād). Hāzīm’s successor is his son Sīrīhm (Ṣarīh); the latter is succeeded by his son ʿĀṣān, who marries Kharma, queen of the Yemen, after conquering the fire-worshippers in the land of Bardhakha, against whom Kharma had appealed for help. India is conquered with the help of ʿAbū Zaid and Hasan then goes with Kharma to Bilād al-Sarw wa-ʿUbdā. The second cycle deals with the migration (riḥa) of the Banū Hiliāl to the land of Najd. A famine drove the Hiliāl from Bilād al-Sarw to Najd, where they were received in the most kindly fashion by king Ḳūnum and his sons Dīyāb (Diya, of the line of Dībār) and their people, the Banū Zughba. The Hiliāl conquer the king al-Haiḍāb, who was chief of the seven rulers of Najd; Hasan, who marries al-Naṭīfī, sister of Dīyāb, then rules in Najd with vassal kings. A war breaks out between Dīyāb, who kills two of Ḳūnum’s brothers, and ʿAbū Zaid; Dīyāb submits and peace reigns. The third cycle deals with the migration of the Hiliāl to the west (Taghribah) and their wars with the Zanātī Caliph in Tunis. In 460 = 1068 ʿAbū Zaid, with his retinue goes to Tunis to seek a more productive dwelling-place on account of the famine reigning in Najd. Saʿdā, the daughter of the Zanātī Caliph, falls deeply in love with
HILAL — HILF.

p. 783. Hilal was put to death as a Shafi'ite heretic by U'bad Allah (Shabani's sister's son) in 939 (1532-1533).

Bibliography: Sâm Mirzâ's biographies; Sprenger's Cat. Libraries of the King of Oudh; Bâbur's Memoirs, trans. Erskine, p. 196, and Pavet de Courteille, i. 411; Ḥâšib al-Suyû, ed. Bombay, Part iii., vol. iii. 350, where he is called Mawlaan Nûr al-dîn; Ethè in Grundriss der islam. Philologie, ii. 228, 245, 297, 301. (H. Beveringe.)

HILF (A.), a league or confederacy, originally of tribes or clans, which had previously formed more or less close units. The ceremonial act by which the alliance was usually completed seems to have had for its object the unification of the previously separated groups. Cf. Joh. Pedersen, Den Semitiske Ed etc., Copenhagen 1912, p. 10, 20—32 (German ed., Der Eid bei den Semiten, 1914, p. 7, 21—31), where it is made probable that the idea of "swearing" is not the fundamental notion in the root ū-l-š but has developed out of the notion of the oath of a kîb. Bûrākî, who then takes the throne, by his tyrannical rule auras a general rebellion among the B. Zughba in which he loses his life at the hands of Naṣr al-Dîn, son of Dîbah.

Of the two chief heroes of the romances, Abû Zaid and Dîbah, only the latter is found in history, but there he plays only an unimportant part, like Roland, the hero of the epic of the Charlemagne cycle.

The brief synopsis given here only covers the main outlines of this romance, so highly valuable for philology and the history of Arab culture, which contains a great number of separate stories. Cf. M. Hartmann, Die Beni Hilal-Geschichte in the Zeitschr. für afrikan. und oce. Sprachen, iv. 289 sqq.

Bibliography: Besides the Bibli. to Abû Zaid: Hamdani, Ḫâšib, p. 50, 94, 84, 199, 119, 113, 121, 4—5; 136, 5—6, 283—283; Bakti, Geographisches Wörterbuch, p. 149, 275, 354, 603, 694—695, 751, 764; Yâkût, Mu'âṣir, Index; Tabari, Annali, i. 1591, 1655; iii. 1338, 1339 and Index; Ibn al-Athir, Chronicon, ii. 131, 199; viii. 9, 11—113; viii. 476; ix. 388—390; x. 30—31; xi. 122, 139; Aḥâsh, xii. 50, 52; xiii. 77, 81; xiv. 35, 50; Ibn Khaled. Históire des Bôôr, i. 27, 29; Makrizi, Abhandlung über die Ägypten eingewanderten arab. Stämme (ed. Wüstenfeld) in Göttingen Studien, 1847 (ii.). p. 421, 424 and 461, 464; Causin de Perceval, Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'islamisme, i. 310, 316; ii. 476; iii. 245; F. Wüstenfeld, Genealogische Tabellen, Part. ii., Table F. 15, and Register, p. 223—224. (J. Schleifer.)

HILAL AL-SÂBI. [See al-Sâbi.]

HILALI, the pen-name of BADR AL-DIN. Of Cağhân origin and born at Astârâbâd he was educated at Herât, and was patronised by 'Ali Shâh. The fullest account of him is by Sâm Mîrzâ who was a friend of his. (See Silvestre de Sacy in Not. et Extraits, i. 285). The account there given of his begging to be put to death by a certain young man is not in the B. M. copies of the Tahâfat-Sâmi and may be an interpolation. Hilalî's best known poem is the Shâh Darwish (Shâh u Gâ-dâ), Bûrâb severely criticises its morality, and Rûcû, ii. 656, seems to take the same view, but Professor Ethè claims it to be a spiritual poem, and has translated it into German verse, Morgennâd. Studien, p. 197—282. See Ind. Off. Cât., N. 1426.
A hereditary right of the ḥālif confirmed by Kūrān iv. 37 (according to another view it refers to the brotherhood of the Mūhadžirūn and Anṣār) was abolished by xxxii. 6; cf. al-Ṭabarī, Taʾṣifīr, v. 31—33; Th. W. Juybīlī, Handbuch des islāmischen Gottes, p. 239 note.

In Islamic law which was to make all its adherents brothers the ḥālif was condemned; the Prophet is made to say: "I ḥālif li ʾl-Islām, but he is said to have recommended the fulfilment of obligations of alliances contracted in the Dāḥiliyya (cf. also al-Ṭabarī, o. c., v. 34; 12 sqq.)


Bibliography: In addition to the works already mentioned, Liṣān, s. v. ḥālif, fālīl (p. 42), rūb b (p. 388), būb b (p. 166); Caussin de Perceval, Essai sur l'Histoire des Arabes etc., i. 254 sqq. (al-Muṭṭayyibūn); i. 330—335 (al-Fuḍūd); ii. 287 N., and ṣaṣiṣ (al-Ribāḥ); i. 253 sqq., and ṣuṣuṣ (al-Aġabīṣī); W. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage, p. 53 sqq., Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, p. 314 sqq., 479 sqq.; Wellhausen, Recht arabisch-Heidenum, p. 125 sqq., 128 sq.; Goldzhēr, Muḥ. Stud., i. 63—69.

(C. van Arendonk.)

HILL. [See ḤALIL].

At-Hilla, a town in the wilāyet of Bahdād, the capital of the sandjak of the same name, with 30,000 inhabitants (Cuinet), was founded in 495 (1101—1102) by Šaḍāka b. Mansūr al-Mazaydi and given the name Ḥillat Bān Mazyad (settlement of the B. Mazyad). The site was happily chosen by the vigorous Arab emir on the site which had once been occupied by the famous city of Babel, ruins of which still exist some miles up the river. The river, which flows past the town and which has since about the viii (xii) century been regarded as Euphrates proper, was regarded by the Arab geographers as an arm of the main stream and was called Nahr Šūr al-Asfal. Even before the foundation of Hilla there was a flourishing town here, called al-Djamāʿian, on the left bank, while Šaḍāka built his town on the opposite side. The bridge of boats, by which communication between the two banks was carried on, soon became the main passage across the river on the road from Būhād to Kūfa, which had previously led via Ḫir ibn Hubairah. Hilla as a result rapidly began to flourish and down to the present day has always been a centre of great importance, from the military point of view also.

Bibliography: Yakūt, Muqātdā, ii. 322 sqq.; Ibn Ḫubairah, ed. de Goeje, p. 214; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ii. 97; Ritter, Erdkunde, xi. 783 sqq. (where the older travellers are given); Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 71; Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, iii. 160 sqq.

AL-HILLA, ʿṢārī al-Dīn ʿAbīd al-ʿAzīz b. Saʿīd, an Arab poet, born on the 5th Rabiʿ II 677 (26th Aug. 1278) at Hilla on the Euphrates, settled at the court of the ʿUtrūqī of Mārdīn and sang their praises. In 726 (1326) he went to Cairo to the court of al-Mālik al-Nāṣir but soon returned to Mārdīn and died in 750 (1349) or 752 (1351) in Baghādād. As a rule he only follows in the footsteps of his predecessors in his very numerous poems. Only in popular poetry did he introduce an innovation by inventing a kind of mawṣūlāh, called mānawīān.

The collection entitled Durar al-Nuḥār, in which the name of the ʿUtrūqī al-Mālik al-Maḥṣūr of Mārdīn is sung, contains 29 poems each of 29 distiches, all of which begin with the same letter and end with the letters of the alphabet in order. A poem entitled al-Kāfīya al-bahiyya is devoted to the praise of the Prophet and was annotated by the author himself. The Kāfīb al-ʿṣīl al-kaḥl is a treatise on the metres of popular poetry called saṣāl, muṣāl, kāḥlīn, and ʿāzīzān. His Divān was printed in Damascus (1297—1300) and Bairūt (1300); a poem in honour of Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Abū ʿl-Maḵārim was translated by G. H. Bernini into Latin (Leipzig 1816).


(CL. Huart.)

AL-HILLī, the native of Hilla [q. v.], the name of three esteemed Imāmīya theologians.

1. Nādīm al-Dīn Ḥaḍār b. Muḥammad, called al-Muḥākṣik, died about 674 (1275), author of the Sharḥ al-Islām, the standard handbook on Shīʿī law (translated into Russian by K. Sembegev, into French by Querry).

2. ʿĪṣām al-Dīn al-Dīn al-Ḥaḍīṣ b. al-Muṭṭahar, called ʿAlīn, died in 726 (1326); author of the Kāfīya al-ʿAbdāl, besides other treatises.

3. ʿAbd al-Mabāḥ, died in 806 (1403), "Ṣalih al-Muṭaʾakhkhīrin".

Bibliography: Kūfisīrī, Riwāt al-Djamāʿāt, lith. Teheran 1307, pp. 20, 145, 235; Brockelmann, Gesch. der arab. Liter., i. 466; ii. 164. (LOUIS MASSIGNON.)

HILMEND [See HELMANN.]

HİMİLAL [See ḤİMAL].

AL-HİM ĀR (A.), the ass. Tame (al-ahlī) and wild (al-waṣāhi, al-farād) are distinguished. Some of the tame asses are beasts of burden, others are ridden; many of the latter are very swift. The ass can find its way again by a road even though it has only traversed it once before; its hearing is keen and it suffers little from disease. The ass is of special importance in Persia, Syria and Egypt. Many Arabs will not ride an ass out of pride, and it is not considered proper to mention the ass by its real name in good society. Its bray is exceedingly repulsive; the dog howls with pain when it hears it. When an ass brays, it has seen a devil; when a cock crows, it has seen an angel. If a stone be tied to an ass’s tail, it will not bray. When an ass sees a lion, it stands still or runs at the lion; it is said to be saved thereby. If a man is bitten by a scorpion, he should sit backwards upon an ass and the pain then passes to the ass. The uses of various parts of the ass in medicine are innumerable.

Wild asses are so like one another that no man can distinguish them. The he ass is very jealous; when he sees a young male, he tears his testicles out with his teeth for fear he should cover a she ass, when he grows up. The she ass knows this and therefore shortly before foaling she goes to some inaccessible place and does not return to the herd until her foal has hard hoofs.
and can run swiftly. It is further remarkable that individuals never separate from the herd, even though there are thousands of them. Hunting wild asses is therefore very easy. The hunter hides in a narrow pass and waits till a wild ass comes along and then kills it. The others could escape if they fled back, but as they remain together, the hunter is able to slay as many as he cares. This however does not agree with the descriptions of hunting scenes collected by G. Jacob from the poets.

There is a breed called Abhdariya, called after a king of Ardashir which bred with wild asses or those that had run wild. These are the finest and swiftest among wild asses. According to some authors, the wild ass reaches an age of 200, according to others, 800 years.

**Bibliography:** Kazimi, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 376; Damiri, Ḥayāl al-Ḥayawān, ed. Cairo, i. 200; Ibn al-Baitar, see Leclerc in Notices et extr., i. 458; Jacob, Studien in arab. Dichtern, iii. 115; Polak, Persien, ii. 99; Reitemeyer, Be- schreibung Ägyptens im Mittelalter, p. 73.

(J. RUSKA.)

**HIMS** (pronounced Ḥums) is situated in the great Orontes plains of Central Syria, about a mile from the Orontes (Naar el-Azār) name of stream connected with it. The town, which has 50,000 inhabitants (of whom 15,000 are orthodox Greeks), is the capital of a Levā under a kāmmaḵām and belongs to the wilayet of Damascus. It is connected by railway with Tripolis, with Ḥamā and Aleppo, and with Damascus via Rayḥān. Ḥums (called 'Emeisa' by the Greeks and Romans; on the various forms see the article 'Emessa' in Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyclo.) is not one of the towns founded by the Seleucids; the town is first mentioned by Pliny; in the time of Pompey the adjacent Arethusa (Restan) was the seat of an Arab dynasty (see Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung, i. 245). Emessa was the birthplace of the Emperor Elagabalus, who rebuilt with great splendour the famous temple of the sun-god here from whom he took his name, and furthered the prosperity of the town in every way by granting it privileges. In the Byzantine period also when we already find the name Xwfw; it was a flourishing city and the see of a bishop.

At the end of the year 13 the inhabitants concluded a treaty with the Arabs by which by paying a sum of money they secured peace to protect their trade. In the beginning of 14, with the help of a Byzantine garrison, they were able to ward off an attack on the town, but it fell to the Arabs at the end of the year after two months' siege. They seem to have left the town again next year, at least, it is several times said that it surrendered to Abū 'Ubayda in 16 and received a grant of protection. On the division of Syria into military districts Ḥums became the capital of a jund [i. v.] It rebelled under Marwān II., was taken by storm and severely punished. As a rule the jund's of Ḥums and Aleppo were administered by the same governor. We possess information on the revenues of Ḥums for various periods [cf. Ḥalāb]. While the figures for Ḥums are wanting in the Ljrāh al-Dawla and in al-Muqaddas, we still possess of Ḥums's and of Ḥums's figures. The yield of the taxes of Ḥums (cf. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, p. 44-48) (reconciling the dinār at 10 shillings) was:

a. for the reign of ʿIrān al-Rashīd (787-193), according to a quotation from al-Dāhishiyīn's Kitāb al-Wustār, 530,000 dinars and 1000 camels-loads of dried grapes (the vineyards of Ḥums were famous and were only destroyed during the Crusades).

b. for the year 204 (Kūdāmā's Kitāb al-Khārīj) 310,000 dinars (the same sum is given by al-Ifsafānī, quoted by Ibn Khurdaḡbīb).

c. for the year 250, according to Ibn Khrudaḡbīb, 340,000 dinars.

d. for the year 278, 220,000 dinars (al-Yaḵṣībī, who wrote about this time).

The low figures given by Kūdāmā, al-Ifsafānī and al-Yaḵṣībī are due to a different method of calculating the revenue; they have perhaps deducted the salaries of the officials or other administrative expenses in their calculation.

Under the Ḥamānīd Saif al-Dawla [q.v.] Ḥums passed under the rule of the kings of Halab and was frequently granted by them as a fief. Among those who there held it we may mention Saif's cousin, the famous poet Abū Fīrās ʿAli, whom Sa'd al-Dawla deprived of the town. In 367 he granted Ḥums to his general Bakdūr, whose government of it was highly praised; a minaret of architectural interest with a Kufic inscription dates from his time. During this period Ḥums suffered from the repeated ravages of the Byzantines. In 475 it belonged to the notorious Bedouin chief Khilaf b. Mulaṭīb (cf. M. Hartmann, Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Pal. Verein., xxiv. 49-66), who recognised the Fātimid caliph as his overlord. Enraged at this and moved by the complaints of Khalaf's subjects against his cruelty, the Saljuḵ Sultan ordered the Emir of Syria to take him prisoner. He was besieged in 483, captured and brought in a cage to Isfahān. Ḥums was granted to Sultan Tūṭḥū from whom his son Rīḏwān inherited it. He granted Ḥums to Rūṭḥū from whom his son Riḍwān inherited it. He granted Ḥums in 491 to his stepfather Dānāh al-Dawla, who was murdered by the Ismāʿīlīs in 491. Later we find an Emir Karadžā (perhaps identical with the vassal lord of Ḥarrān, one of Malikshekā's mamluks. After his death in 506 his son Khirbān [see ḤAMĀ] succeeded him and died in 523. His children, who were still minors, suffered a great deal from Zangi's efforts to conquer Ḥums, till their guardian in 530 exchanged the city for Palmyra and Rahba with Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd, king of Damascus. The latter at first granted it in fief to his vizier Onor, but after long negotiations finally transferred it to his stepfather Zangi in 532 (Onor received other towns in compensation). Nār al-Dīn inherited it from Zangi and his son Ismā'īl from him, till Saladin received it in 570. Four years later he appointed his cousin Muhammad b. Ṣhirkūh ruler of it. With one interruption (it was taken by al-Nāṣir Yusuf II of Aleppo in 646 and ceded to him, but seems only to have remained a short time in his possession), his descendants remained rulers of Ḥums till 661; they had readily opened their gates to the Mongol Khān Hulālgī. From 661 it was governed by deputy-governors, sometimes attached to Ḥamā, sometimes to Damascus. In the xviith century an aqā of a native family ruled there, independent of the Paša of Damascus. In the xvith century Ḥums passed, like Aleppo, under Egyptian rule (1813-1914) but it suffered so much from the arbitrary conduct [cf. ḤALĀB] of the officials that a rebellion broke out, which was with difficulty suppressed.
Only a few insignificant ruins of the city wall (see plan) and gates survive, while of the citadel, which was destroyed by Ibrahim Paşa, a tower with an inscription of the year 594 of Saladin’s cousin, Muhammad b. Shirkūh, and a gate still stand (see plan). The mausoleum of the great general Khiḍr b. Wadej, also known as Wadej (plan 15), which formerly stood on the site of the qasba, has recently been rebuilt. (The valuable inscriptions were previously copied by van Berchem, Freiherr v. Oppenheim and M. Sobernheim). A number of mills on the Oronites belong to Himṣ, of which one, as the Arabic inscription shows, belongs to the year 524 A.H. and another with Turkish inscription to the year 975 (N.B. this is the only Turkish inscription of this period in Syria). The most interesting building is the great mosque (plan 11), in which half of the cathedral is said to have been incorporated at the beginning of the period of Muslim rule. Hefeld writes the following note on it: The great mosque lies in the centre of the bazaar and is entered from the south of it. The main entrance, on the west side, leads through a vaulted passage into the court, and a side entrance on the east leads directly into the hamam. The hamam is an oblong space with two naves each with 13 cross-vaultings. There is a small dome above the bay of the window of the mosque. In the west side, a second, older mihrab with gold mosaic, which seems to belong to the earliest Muslim period. The court façade of the hamam shows that the plan has undergone many alterations. This wall was apparently originally the wall between the main and side nave of a basilica church of quite an unusual type: a large arch, alternating with 3 double-storied sections, each of 5 small arches. The columns and capitals, of which many lie in the court of the mosque are remains of the ancient building. This court is oblong, surrounded by narrow cloisters, quite undecorated. An estrade with basin and mihrab almost fill it. Beside it, on the west, is a well with a cupola resting on six antique columns.

Bibliography: See the article Jalar. Epi-
graphy: some inscriptions have been discussed by v. Berchem in Inscriptions de Syrie, Cairo, 1897, p. 54—56 and in Frhr. v. Oppenheim’s Inschriften aus Syrien etc., p. 4—13.

(M. SOBERNHEIM)

HIMYAR, the name of an ancient stock in South Arabia. The form Homeritae, Omey-
irae, in the classical authors suggests a diminutive formation; the Arabic form now usual is only found in Theodorus Anastasios (6th century A.D.), Hist. eccles., ii. ch. 58 (cf. Nicephorus Callistas, Hist. eccles., xvi. ch. 37) in the form Hamsel or Hamsus, Nonnosos, who went to Aksum and South Arabia as the envoy of Justinian, and following him, Malalas use the form Ameyri, which goes back to the Ethiopian Hemer. The form found in inscriptions is Him-y-r-n with nimation and the plural Hm-y-r-n, which presumably is to be pronounced Ahmurd (al-ahmir). According to the Arab authorities, the Himyar, who were divided into a number of smaller tribes, lived around Lajīb, in the district of Zafrār and Rida and also to the east in Sarw Himyar and Nadīj Himyar. The Homeritae are first mentioned in Aelius Gallus’s account of his expedition to South Arabia in 25 B.C., preserved in Pliny, Hist. Nat., vi. § 161, with the note that they are “the most numerous tribe” (numerisimimos esse); ac-
cording to Strabo, xvi, ch. 4, § 21, at the time of the Roman invasion Marib, i.e. Mārib, the capital of Saba’, belonged to Iṣasaros who ruled over the Rhammanites. This statement most probably refers to Turṣarath Yaldbh, king of Saba’ and Dhū Rai’dān, i.e. of the Sabaecans and Himyaries, who are known from inscriptions. When the anonymous Peripitus Maris Erythraei was written (about 80 A.D.), the Himyaries ruled the greater part of South Arabia, namely, the coast of the Red Sea and Indian Ocean up to the frontiers of Ḥḍramawt, with the corresponding interior, including the land of the Sabacans; they also held a portion of the East African coast (Azania). Their king Charibahal the legitimate ruler of the Himyaries and complaint the inscription of Zafrār (Z-y-r n inscriptions; in addition to the form with T — Tahrā, Thadrān, Thadrā, Thadrā and Taphra — the spelling with S, Saphar, is also found, in Pliny and Potomus; Ethiopian Saiš; not to be confused with the port of the same name on the Indian Ocean), which remained the chief city of South Arabia till the Persian occupation. This ruler was on friendly terms with the Romans. He seems to be identical with the Kari-
ba’il Wt-r Yubīn king of Saba’ and of Dhū Rai’dān, of the inscriptions, coins of whom are also known, struck in Raidān. The passing of the hegemony of South Arabia from the Sabaecans to the Himyaries took place about the end of the second century B.C. and may have been partly brought about by the discovery of the sea-route to India by the admirals of the Ptolemies, whereby Saba’ lost its importance as the centre of the overland trade of South Arabia. Greek and Roman sources are all silent regarding the further history of the Himyaries down to the 4th century A.D. The inscrip-
tions so far discovered give a series of kings’ names but without precise dates. In the reign of the Emperor Constantine II. (337—361) Christianity was introduced by the Indian Theophilos, a native of Dūt; he built churches in ‘Aden and Zafrār and other towns; even at this time there were numerous Jewish communities here (Philostratus, Hist. eccl., iii. ch. 4). According to another account in Theodoros Anagnostos, i.e., the conversion of the Himya-
rites did not take place till the reign of Constanti-
nius (491—518). About the middle of the 4th century the Abyssinians, the *ḥ-h-ḥb-h-n of the inscriptions, i.e. the rulers of Akṣum, found a firm footing in South Arabia and Axäana, the king of Akṣum, a contemporary of Constantius II, in his inscriptions includes among his titles that of *king of the Himyaries and of Raidān*. The Abyssinian invasion seems to date back as early as the third century; Marcianus (beginning of the 4th century) calls the Homeritae an Ethiopian people, and this description is often repeated in the older Byzantine writers. The Roman em-
perors were in regular communication with them (see Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellsch., xxxi. p. 73), partly in the interests of trade and partly to secure their support against the Sas-
ianics, who were endeavouring to penetrate into South Arabia through ‘Oman. About 521 the na-
tive princes under Dhū Nuwās (Dūnas, Dinnus, Daminianus of the Greek sources) aroused a serious rebellion against the Abyssinian invaders. Dhū Nuwās, who is said to have had to profess Judaism and to have organised the persecution of Christians in Nefrān, which has become famous through
the martyrology of St. Arethas, fell in 526 in battle with Kaleb Ela-Asbaḥa, king of Aksum, and the land passed under the sway of an Abyssinian dynasty, whose founder, Ela-Abraha, made himself independent of Aksum a few years after the withdrawal of Kaleb Ela-Asbaḥa. We possess an authentic source for his history and his relations with Byzantium, Persia and Abyssinia, as well as with the Ghassānids and other Arab princes, in the great inscription of Marīb of the year 540, in which he also gives an account of the restoration of the great dam. In this period arose the "laws of the Ḥimyarites" and other apocryphal works, which are associated with the name of St. Gregentius, bishop of Zāfār under Ela-Abraha, and his successor (Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* , vol. 86, i. col. 563-784). In the reign of Emperor Justin II, about 570, the Ḥimyar chief invited the Persians into the country. Masrūq, the last ruler of the dynasty of Ela-Abraha (corrupted to Sanatukes in Theophanes Byzantius), fell in battle with the Persians, who placed the country under military occupation, leaving the various districts (miḥlāf) under native princes. The Persian governors (marzubān) resided in Šanā. When Muḥammad sent his first envoy to the Yemen, the kingdom of the Ḥimyar, as such, had long ceased to exist and the new religion was adopted without appreciable opposition by the Ḥimyar chief, as well as by the descendants of the Persians, the so-called Ḥimyarīs.

The inscriptions hitherto found in South Arabia in the local alphabet, which we usually call Ḥimyaritic inscriptions, belong to widely varying periods, from about 700 B.C. to about 550 A.D. and only a few fragments among them owe their origin to the Ḥimyar in the narrower sense of the word. Linguistically they fall into two main groups, the Sabaean and Minæan inscriptions; the Ḥimyar texts belong to the former group. The coins hitherto discovered — almost all silves — apart from a few of the earlier issues, are on the other hand mainly to be ascribed to the Ḥimyar. The alphabet (called muṣnad by the Arabs, which however inscriptions "inscription"), a variety of the Phoenician alphabet adapted to the Ethiopian, contains all the consonants of the Arabic language with the addition of a variant of the sibilant س. The Sabaeans-Ḥimyar language is an Arabic dialect which is distinguished from northern Arabic by certain grammatical peculiarities (mimination instead of nunciation, replacement of the article by the affix -ān, ḥaf'al for ʿaf'al in the 1st form of the verb) and also in vocabulary. On the other hand the supposition of the Arab philologists that the later South Arabian dialects or even the dialects of Mecca and Kādār are offshoots from the ancient language of the Ḥimyar has proved incorrect, although they have preserved in their vocabulary many roots and words, which are not known to Northern Arabic, but which are found in the inscriptions.

Before the discovery of the inscriptions the accounts of the Arabs formed, with the scanty records in ancient and Byzantine authors, our only source for the ancient history of South Arabia. The ṭubbāš of the Yemen are already mentioned in the Kurān and the kings of the Ḥimyar were henceforth known in history by this name; we now know from the inscriptions that the kings of the Sabaeans and Ḥimyar always called themselves malik and that ṭubbāš is a corruption of the name of the powerful family of Bata of the tribe of Ḥamdān. The same inscriptions teach us that the statements in the literary sources on the Ḥimyar, kāṣṣ and adhūyā (kings and feudal lords) are for the most part based on misunderstandings. The lists of kings handed down in this way to us and the doings of individual ṭubbāš are still more unreliable. In the Kurān we find allusions to the Old Testament story of the queen of Sheba, to persecution of the Christians by Dhib Nuwās in Neddīn (not certain, see Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., xxxv. 610 sqq.) and to the expedition of a ṭubbāš against Mecca. At quite an early period the expositors of the sacred book and the story-tellers at the court of the first caliphs began to devote attention to the ancient history of the country (Ibn 'Abbās, Ka'b al-Aḥbar, Wahb b. Munabbih, ʿAbbāb b. Shārya); although several of them belonged to Yemen, they made less use of genuine popular tradition than of foreign legends, e.g. the Alexander romance and Jewish traditions, and added other matter of their own invention.

The last traces of this kind of historical research are popular works still eagerly read like the story of Bilqis and Dhi l-Karnain, the Sira Seif b. Dhi l-Yasam, etc. The works of three natives of South Arabia are much more serious however: al-Fathún fi Maluk Ḥimyar of Ibn Ḥishām, the celebrated biographer of the Prophet, the Ḥillah and the Sīfat Qaṣrāt al-ʿArab of al-Hamdān, as well as the so-called Ḥimyarite kašīda with commentary, and the lexicon Shams al-Ulīm of Nashwān (died 573); they read the ancient musnad's, although their language was no longer entirely comprehensible to them, and used them in their genealogical and historical researches; how far they worked from old native traditions has still to be investigated, but in any case they were also independent of the scholars already mentioned. Only the information regarding the last century before Islam can be used for the writing of history properly.

nello Yemen (Roma 1911); lastly the royal inscriptions of Aksūm (most recently in vol. iv. of the "Deutsche Aksüm-Expedition", 1913).


HIND, daughter of the Meccan Ḫabīr b. Bābīla, of the family of ʿAbd Shams, which was related to the Ḩāshimids. She was the wife of Abū Sufyān, to whom she bore several children including Muṣawiyah, afterwards Caliph. Tradition seems to take a special delight in drawing an unusually repulsive and no doubt caricatured picture of the short, stout woman, who certainly had a very passionate temperament. Her hatred of Muhammad was increased by the fact that Ḥamza killed her father in the battle of Badr. With other women she accompanied the Meccans on their expedition against Medina in the year 3 and was one of the most ardent in urging on the men to battle; when Ḥamza fell in the conflict on the hill of ʿUhad, she is said to have mutilated his body and bitten his liver. When the Prophet attacked Mecca in the year 8, she stormed against her cautious and far seeing husband who wished to hand over the city without striking a blow. According to some narrators, the Prophet on this occasion condemned her and a number of other people to death but afterwards pardoned her; this is probably only a malicious invention, as other writers make no mention of it and in some traditions she makes a very stormy appearance at the paying of homage; it is moreover very improbable that Muḥammad would have injured by such an order the feelings of Abū Sufyān, who had met his overtures halfway. Besides she had every reason to be content with the new regime as her son was made governor of Syria; according to one story, she took part in the battle of the Yarmūk with undiminished vigour by urging on the Muslims to circumscribe with their swords their uncircumscribed opponents. In the end Abū Sufyān divorced her and she is said to have vigorously revenged herself by various intrigues. Some traditions make her die in the reign of ʿUmar, others under ʿUṯmān.


HIND. The general name for India in Arabic and Persian chronicles and geography. The earlier writers generally make a distinction between Sind and Hind; the first name being confined to the countries bordering on the Indus and Mīhrān, and the other to India beyond the limits of the Muḥammadan conquest. This is the use in Ibn Khuradḫibīh, al-Masʿūdī, Ibn Ḥawqāl and al-Biṟūnī, and is clearly shown in Ibn Ḥawqāl’s map (reproduced in Elliot and Dowsen, Vol. I. p. 32). In later times the name Hind was extended to embrace the whole of India, the term Hindūstān being restricted to the Northern plain of the Ganges and Ḥindān, and such is the modern use. After the invasions of the Charnawīds and Ghurīds it became less usual to speak of Sind as a separate country from Hind. The name Hind is originally identical with Sind, the Skr. sinḍu ‘river’ becoming hindū in the Avesta, and having first been applied to the R. Indus was extended to the country adjacent to it.


HINDĀL MĪRZA, fourth son of Bābur, born early in 1519. His real name was Muḥammad Abū l-Nāṣir, but the name Hindāl “Taker of India” was bestowed upon him by his father who was then meditating the conquest of India. Hindāl’s mother was Dildār Begam, so that he was the full brother of Gulbān Begam, the Memoirs-writer. He proved unstable and foolish, rebelling against his elder brother Ḥumāyūn, and had the faḵr Bahlūl brutally murdered in order to show his adherents that he would always be an irreconcilable rebel. He was killed in eastern Afghānīstān, in November 1551, in a night-attack made by his brother Kāmrān on Ḥumāyūn’s camp. By this time, Hindāl had become reconciled to Ḥumāyūn, and died, fighting for him. The good-natured monarch was inclined to lament his death, but Muṣīm Kāhū coolly told him that he was bewailing his own gain, for now he had one enemy the less (Bīyāt al-Bīyāt’s Manuscr. quoted by Erskine). Hindāl was buried at Kābul, near his father. His daughter Ruḵayya Begam was Akbar’s
first wife, but had no children. She brought up Shāh Dājhān, and died in Agra at the age of 84 in January 1626. (Blochmann 309).

Bibliography: Babur's Memoirs; Guha-dan Be-am's do; the Akbarnama; Dżawahar's Memoirs; Erskine, History of Babur and Humāyūn; Mutani'd, tābū nāma, Calcutta 1865, p. 251. (H. Beveridge.)

HINDI, a modern Indo-Aryan vernacular, descended from an earlier Prakrit, and comprising two distinct languages, i. Western Hindi, spoken by more than 40 millions of persons inhabiting the Gangetic Doab and the country to the north of it, and 2. Eastern Hindi, spoken by 22 millions in Awadh (and throughout India wherever men from Awadh have wandered in search of employment), Baghelkhand and Chattisgarh. The chief dialects of Western Hindi are Hindustani [q. v.], Bangari, Bradj Bhāsā, Kāsnavdi and Bandel; only the first of these, under the appellation Urdu [q. v.] has been extensively used as a literary medium by the Indian Muhammadans. The names of a few Muhammadans are recorded who occasionally wrote verses in Bradj Bhāsā. Abu 'l-Faid (commonly known as Shaikh Faidji), the friend of Akbar, and Faidji's younger brother, Pahim, and Akbar's great general, Khān Khānān Mirzā 'Abd al-Raḥīm, all wrote Hindi dīvān's (or couplets), doubtless under the influence of the strong interest which the emperor took in Hindi thought and literature. Less illustrious poets of the same period were Saiyid Muḥārak 'Alī Bilgrāmī (b. 1583), Saiyid Ibrāhīm (b. 1573) who became a Vaishnava and was known by the name of Ras Khān, and his pupil, Kādir Baksh. Such instances however are rare, and when Muhammadan poets, such as Amīr Khusraw, are said to have written Hindi verses, the dialect they employed was Urdu rather than any form of Bhāsā. (Journ. As. Soc. Beng. XXII, 443). The legend that Sa'ūdi ever wrote verses in Hindi has been shown to be without historical foundation (Journ. As. Soc. Beng. xxi. 513 et seq.).

Eastern Hindi has three chief dialects, Awadhia, Baghelkhand and Chattisgarh. Western Hindi by Muhammadan writers are rare; the most notable is the Padamawati of Malik Muhammad Džādī, written in the Awadhi dialect about 1540; it is a romantic epic founded on the story of the taking of Čītōr by 'Alī al-Dīn Khlīdī in 1503; the poet himself explains that the story is an allegory of the search of the soul for true wisdom.

Up to the early part of the nineteenth century all Hindu literature was in poetry; Hindi prose first took its rise under the influence of English officials, but the cultivation of it has been almost exclusively confined to Hindu writers and any account of it would therefore be out of place here.


Hindu-Kush, a lofty and extensive range of mountains which forms an extension of the Himalaya to the south-west from the region of the Pamir. It extends from about 75° E and 37° N. to about 66° E. and 35 N. The continuation of the range further west bears various names (Kōh-i-Bbā, Siyāh-Bubuk etc.) this portion being generally known to modern geographers as the Paropamisus, although the Paropamisus of the ancients no doubt included the Hindu-kush. The name Caucasus was also used by the Macedonians, the name according to Arrian having been bestowed upon this range by Alexander the Great.

The north-eastern part of the Hindu-Kush rivals the Himalaya in the height of its peaks and the extent of its glaciers, some peaks being over 25000 feet in height, among these Rakkhipošh south of Hunza and Tiračmir west of Čital are among the best known. The extreme north-east Hindu-kush at its point of junction with the Pamir forms the boundary between three systems of drainage, those of the Indus, the Oxus and the Tarim, while further west it forms the watershed between the Indus and the Oxus, and can be traversed by several passes. From Hunza the Kilik Pass leads to Sarikōil and Yārānk, and also to upper Wakhān. From Yāsīn and Mastūdji the Barāghīl Pass leads also into Wakhān, and other passes from Čitār into the same country. The most important pass from Čitār is the Dorī Pass leading into Badakhshān by the Warādū and Kökča valleys, and the Mandāl Pass gives communication also between Kāfrīstān and the Kökča valley. North of Kābul the best known passes are the Khāwāk, Kaušān, (or Ghorband) and Bāmīān, passes, by one of which Alexander crossed Bactria from Kābul and back again to that region. The pass over the Indian expedition. The central block of the mountains between the Kābul and Kunar river to the south and Badakhshān, up to the high range between the Mandāl and Khawāk passes, is occupied by the wild and inaccessible country of Kāfrīstān. This has now come under Afghan rule since its conquest by 'Abd al-Raḥīm, and the countries of Badakhshān and Wakhān to the north are also under the same rule, but in the north-eastern part of the southern slopes Čitār, Yāsīn, Hunza-Nagar and Gilgil are politically attached to British India, and the Chinese empire embraces the northern slopes from the Pamir eastwards. The pass over Šāh Džādī was traversed in the 7th cent. A. D. by the Chinese pilgrimage Houen Thang who saw the gigantic Buddhist figures on the face of the cliff which modern travellers have found still in existence. In-vaders of India and Afghanīstān have usually preferred the easier route over the passes near Herāt, but the passes near Kābul have been used from time to time. Timūr travelled by Bāmīān on his return from India. Bābār came from Kunduz to attack Kābul in 910 (1504) probably by the Kaušān Pass, and Humāyūn followed the same route in 953 (1547). Shāh Džādī's army under Rādž Dārgāt Sangīn met with disaster in crossing the Hindu-kush to attack the Ubzags in 1056 (1645), and tradition ascribes the name Hindu-kush "Hindu-slayer" to the losses undergone by his Rādjug troops. Awrangzēb two years later experienced great hardships in his retirement from Balkh in the same region and lost 5000 men. Bābār gives a fairly minute description of the Hindu-Kush passes in his memoirs. He came into Ghorband from the Andarābād valley, evading the army sent to watch for him in the Panḍīshīr valley, by which he would have come out of the mountains if he had made use of the Khawāk Pass. It may be added that Bābār uses the name Hindu-kush which proves that the legendary ex-
HIPPOKRATES. [See BUKRAT.]

AL-HIRé, the capital of the Lakhmid kings, 3 Arab miles south of Kūfa, an hour's ride southeast of Nadjaf (Meshed ʿAli), on the lake of Nadjaf, now almost dry close to the edge of the desert. The name is Aramaic (corresponding to the Syr. ḫeṯa, and Hebr. ḫaṣṭir) and means literally "camp" but was transferred as a proper name to the permanent camp of the Lakhmid chieftains under Persian suzerainty, from which the city gradually developed. The date of its origin, placed by the Arabs in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, cannot be accurately fixed; bishops of al-Hira are mentioned at the synods as early as the beginning of the fifth century A.D. For further information see the articles LAKHM and LAKHMÁ (now found in inscriptions, see Florilegium de Vogüé, p. 389, 463 sqq.). The situation was a favourable one as the country between Nadjaf and the Euphrates was intersected by canals and rich in cornfields and date-groves. The air is also celebrated for its salubrity. Among the inhabitants, as the mention of bishops shows, there were a number of Christians who professed the Nestorian creed. Among them were the family of the Hira poet ʿAdi b. Zaid. The Lakhmid princes themselves finally adopted Christianity and Hira, the mother of king ʿAmr (reigned after 550), founded a monastery in the city. Near Hira were a number of strongholds including the 'white cathedral', built by a Persian king, Ibn Bukišai's cathedral and the citadel of the ʿAdasās of Kalb; cf. also the article AL-KHAWWARNAK. Among the products of the city the saddles of al-Hira are mentioned by the ancient poets (Imruʾ al-Kais, 4, 59; Nābihā, 5, 59). The town reached a certain stage of civilization and poets gathered eagerly round the court of the kings. Traditions also relate that the art of writing was well known in Hira and spread from there to Arabia. After the death of Naʾmān III (602) the Persian kings incunctly abolished the system of Lakhmid vassals and placed Persian governors in the city, to whom the Arab princes were subject. This was still the arrangement in 632, when Khalid attacked Hira at the head of the Muslim army. The town surrendered without a battle and pledged itself to pay a considerable tribute. Its importance henceforth ceased, although it existed till much later and is occasionally mentioned. The ʿAbbāsids did not choose it as a residence and the rise of Kūfa threw it more and more into the background. The Caliph Hārūn al-Rashid however made a short stay in Hira and erected buildings there, but this aroused great resentment in Kūfa, so that he left the town. Under Muʿtamid (906—932) it suffered like the rest of the Sāwīd from the raids of the Bedouins, so that the government had to send an army thither. In the last half of the 8th century, it is described as extensive but thinly populated. The decline of the whole district afterwards affected Hira severely so that in the end it utterly disappeared from the face of the earth. Its site is now pasturage where only a few low mounds and heaps of sherds recall its past.

**Bibliography:** Tabari, Annals, ed. de Goeje, i. 821 sqq., 853, 2016 sqq., 2038 sqq.; ii. 645 (see also the Index); Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 241 sqq.; Dinawari, ed. Guirgus, p. 117; Ibn- ʿAbī-Asīr, ed. Tornberg, vi. 105; viii. 131; Vahlen, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 375—379; Bibliotheca Geograph. Arabiorum, i. 82; ii. 163;
a mountain some three Arabian miles from Mecca in a N. E. direction, facing Thabîr [q. v.], so that these two are often mentioned together, and sometimes compared to two waves of the sea. Both are without water or vegetation other than a few thorns. Hirâ' is higher than Thabîr, and is crowned by a steep and slippery peek, which the Apostle with some companions once climbed. Muhammad was in the habit of staying here with his wife, and it was in a cave of this mountain that he received his first revelation. Hence the present name Djabal Nur. The cave is still shown. On his return from al-Tâ'if Muhammad also hid himself here until he could enter Mecca.

Bibliography: Ibn Hijâmah, p. 152, 251; Wüstenfeld, Die Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, i, 426 sq.; Ali Bey, Travels, II, 65; Burchhardt, Travels in Arabia, i, 320 sq. (T. H. Weir.)

Hirâ or Hurz (A.) A mulet. [See Hamâ'il]

Hîsâb or īlm al-Hîsâb, is the name given by the Arabs to the whole field of arithmetic; al-fâsik, also al-kasâsib, is the calculator, arithmetician. Arithmetic was one of the four prophetic sciences (al-âlâm riyaḍiya or rihâ miya), which, as in antiquity, comprised arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music. It is divided into two parts, theoretic or speculative (nasâri), which was sometimes also given the Greek name arithmatoiê̂s, and is essentially based on the vii, ix, tenth books of Euclid, and practical (camâli), arithmetic proper.

About the year 770 Hindu scholars brought, along with their Siddhântas (astronomical works), arithmetical lore to the court of Baghdad, notably the Hindu numeral system with the zero (Sansk. śūnya; Arab. ʾṣâr = empty). Recent research (see F. Naun, Nachtr. in the Journal Asiatic., x, th series, Vol. 16, No. 2, p. 258 sqq.) however make it possible that a knowledge of the Hindu numerals with the zero had reached Syria even earlier, and that the Omeyyad conquerors of North Africa and Spain perhaps brought the older so-called Ghûbâr figures (al-ghûbâr = dust (on the counting-board) to the west from Syria, before the newer numerals spread in the east from Baghdad.

But although these Indian numerals were known in certain circles of the learned, the great majority of Arab arithmeticians and astronomers were reluctant to have anything to do with this ingenious Indian invention, and during the second and third period in the Christian middle ages the Arabic numerals made very slow progress against the Roman. The majority of the authors of Arabic arithmetics in the xi, th century still wrote all the numbers out. Among the representatives of this conservative school we may mention al-Kârkhî (Abû Bakr Muhammad, c. 970-1036) with his al-Kâfi f 'îl-Hîsâb (the essentials of arithmetic); there is a manuscript of it in Gotha, of which A. Hochheim has published a German translation (Halle 1875-1880). Others, especially the authors of astronomical tables, made use of the old Semitic and Greek practice of using the letters of the alphabet as numerals (Arab. = Hîsâb al-Dînawr, cf. the edition of al-Battânî's tables by C. A. Nallino, 3 parts, Milan, 1899-1907. As a champion of the use of Hindu numerals in reckoning we may mention Muhammad b. Mûsâ al-Khwârizmî (780-850), the author of the oldest Arabic arithmetic known to us (only in a translation however) as well as of the oldest work on algebra and of the oldest astronomical tables. This arithmetic was translated into Latin, by whom is not known, and this translation edited by B. Boncompagni, Trattati d'arietica, i, Rome 1857. — Among these users of Hindu numerals was a contemporary of al-Kârkhî, Ali b. Ahmad al-Nasawi (c. 980-1040), who wrote al-Mu'âbbî f 'îl-Hîsâb al-Hindi [the satisfying (account) of Hindu arithmetic]; this work has not yet been published in its entirety; on it cf. F. Woepcke in the Journal Asiatic., 1863, i, 492 sqq. and N. Suter in Biblioth. Mathem., 3rd series, Vol. vii. (1906), p. 113-119. In these two contemporary works, the Kâfi and the Mu'âbbî, the two schools of arithmetic were striving for supremacy; it seems that in the east the Hindu arithmetic was for long neglected while in the west it was able to hold its own. — Of arithmetical works by Arabs of the west, we may mention the Kitaâb al-Šâghir f 'îl-Hîsâb (the "little book on arithmetic") by Abû Zakâryâ Muhammad al-Ḫâṣār, who probably lived in the xi, th century, of which the present writer has published a translation of the most important portions in Biblioth. Mathem., 3rd series, Vol. ii. (1901), p. 12-40, the Talkhîs, a synopsis of the preceding work by Ibn al-Rannâ (c. 1260-1340) of which A. Marre has published a French translation (Rome 1865, first appeared in the Atti dell' accad. pontif. de Nuovi Lincei, vol. xvii. 1864); Lastly the Kâšîf al-ʿAṭrâr ʿan īlm al-Ghûbâr (revelation of the secrets of the art of the Ghûbâr i.e. of counting with the numbers used by the Arabs of the west) by Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlî al-Ḵaṣādî (died 1456 in Tunis), of which F. Woepcke has published a French translation in the above mentioned Atti etc., Vol. xii. 1859; it was published in Amsterdam in 1887-1898.

We cannot here go into details of the methods of counting as space is limited but shall only emphasise a few points that differ from modern procedure. We may first mention that Muhammad b. Mûsâ, unlike the Hindûs, begins addition and subtraction on the left hand side; the erosion of the left hand figures required for this purpose was facilitated for the Arabs by their custom of counting on the dust-board; al-Ḫâṣār also still begins subtraction (not however addition) on the left; al-Ḵâṣādî was the first to begin both operations on the right; it thus required six centuries for the simplest and most natural way entirely to supersede the others, but we do not doubt that in the interval practical arithmetics had here and there adopted the natural way.

Al-Nasawî still did not use a horizontal line to indicate fractions being content, like the Hindûs, simply to place the numerator over the denominator; al-Ḫâṣâr was the first to write fractions in our present form with a horizontal line. — Astronomers in their calculations chiefly used sexagesimal fractions as the Babylonians and the Greeks had done before them; e.g. 33 1/2 would be written thus = 3 partes, 37 min. 30 sec. (32 37 30") i.e. = 3 + 37 + 30/60.
The square root was extracted in the same way as at present; the Arabs expressed surds approximately in the usual fractional form, as they were not yet acquainted with decimals. For the square root is not found till al-Kaššālī, who uses the initial letter of *djidhr* (= root) for it.

The Arabic arithmetic also contains applications of the principal operations to everyday and commercial purposes, and even to geometry also, i.e. calculation of areas and volumes. — To the domain of the theory of arithmetic but usually also included in the practical handbooks belong the tests of the correctness (proofs by testing out sevens and nines) of calculations, summation of arithmetical and geometrical series, of square, cubic and biquadratic numbers, the theorems regarding perfect and related numbers, etc.

We cannot here go into any details of certain branches of arithmetic like *hišāb al-khaš'ānī* (*regula duorum falsorum*), *hišāb al-dhāran wa l-dīnār* (calculation of drachms and dinars) etc., which in any case belong rather to the realm of algebra. Finally, we have to mention that the Arabs, besides counting on paper or on the dust-board, had also a system of counting on the hands, fingers or "air" (*hišāb al-yad or al-hawā*). There are a number of MSS. in existence on this form counting, cf. Suter, *Die Mathem. u. Astron. d. Araber, and Nachträge (Abhandlungen v. Gesch. d. mathem. Wissensch., x. 203; xiv. 181), and the review al-Maḫšīrī, iii. 1900, p. 171—174.


**Hišār** (A.), castle, fortress, citadel (from the Arabic *ḥasara*, "to compress, to surround in order to capture"); *ḥasara* "to enclose, to besiege").

Anadolu *Hišār* is the name of the fortress, now in ruins, built by the Ottoman Sultan Bāyāzīd I Yildirim on the Bosphorus between Kandilli and Göğüs ("the sweet waters of Asia") to facilitate the siege of Constantinople; in conjunction with Rumble*-Hišār*, which Muhammad II Fīrūz built in 1452 opposite it, it completely commanded the passage and the latter actually earned its name B огромн-Kasan (throat-cutter), [see *Boğaz*, i. p. 737].

*Hišār* is further found as a component of many place-names in Asia Minor: Kāra *Hišār-i Şāhīb* (the minister's black fortress), official name of Ayyūn Kāra *Hišār* in the province of Khudis-wandagār; *Shābin Kāra Hišār* (black alun fortress) in the province of Jāmapū; *Aṭīb Kāra Hišār* in the province of *Tepezant*; *Aṭīb Gūz el Hišār* (the beautiful prince of Aidin), the ancient Trelles; A Ḥišār (white castle), Yatirta in Lydya; Arāb Ḥišār (Arab fortress), Abanlanda; Kūz-i-Ḥišār (Ram castle), near the salt lake of Tuzgöl, near Ak-Sü; *Kilise Hišār* (Church fortress), south of Nigde on the site of Tyana; Kāra *Hišār-i Dewelā*, a village in the kaḍā of Dewelā (sandjak Kaşarïya, province Angora) between Nigde and Kaşarïya, where may still be seen the ruins of an ancient castle, called Zendjār; Eski Hišār (old castle) is a village with ruins at Gebize, the ancient Lybiasa; also the site of the ancient Ladaicea ad Lycum, north of Deinëli; *Hišār-i Djiq* (little castle) is a village in the nāhiyya of Āla-čam (kādā Bāfra, sandjak Samsun, province Trapezent); lastly *Hišār-i Kāršālī*, in the sandjak Bīğāh, marks the site of Troy.

**Bibliography:** A. Djevdet, *Lughātā Djevda*rgiye, p. 329, 330, 603. (C. L. HOART.)

**Hišār**, on Russian maps Gissar, a district in Bukhārā. The capital of the same name lies in a fertile and well-tilled, but damp and unhealthy area on the bank of the Kāhānka which flows into the Kāfārihan; not far from Hišār the Kāfārihan leaves the broad valley and enters a narrow ravine. Cf. the view of Hišār in Fr. v. Schwarz, *Turkestan*, p. 233. The site of the town approximately corresponds to that of the Shāmān of the Arab geographers, cf. *Amū-Daryā* (i. 340). The name "Hišār-i Shādāmīn" or simply "Hišār" is first found in the history of Timūr as the residence of one of the most powerful Turkish—Mongol kings who divided the country among themselves during the troubled times that followed the death of the Emir Kāršīghān (759 = 1358) (*Zafar nāmeh*, ind. ed., i. 40), and later as an arsenal (*zarrādšāhān*) of Timūr (ibid., p. 451). Under the Timūrids as well as under the Uzbek, Hišār owed its importance to its being a strong fortress and the residence of actually independent kings or chiefs. The area ruled from Hišār attained its greatest extent in the second half of the ixth = xvth century under Mahmūd Mīrza (son of Sulṭān Abū Sa'id, i. 105 sq.) whose kingdom included all the lands up to the Hindū-Kush (*Bābar nāmeh*, ed. Beveridge, fol. 26b); yet even in the time of the Timūrids Hišār was considered a small and poor country (ibid., fol. 56b). On the great misfortune, which overtook Hišār during the last battles between the Timūrids and the Uzbeks (only 60 men are said to have left out of the population of the town) cf. the *Ta'irkī-i Qaḏīm*, transl. by E. D. Ross, p. 262. When the kingdom of the Uzbeks in Mā warā al-Nahr had collapsed after the decline of its first dynasty (cf. *Arb Allāh*, i. 25), Hišār passed under the sway of the Turkoman tribe of Yūz. From the beginning of the xvith century till 1669 the rulers of Bukhārā were only able to enforce the homage of the Beg of Hišār by force of arms and for brief periods at a time only; only under Russian suzerainty did the Emir Muṣaffar succeed in breaking the power of these hereditary rulers and permanently uniting the district with Bukhārā (cf. *Bukhārā*, i. 782). About the middle of the xvith century the inhabited land of Hišār, as Muḥammad Wafā Karimnag (Tuḥfat al-Khānī, Ms. of the Asiatic Museum, c. 581, i. 1364) tells us, began at the village of Mir Shādi in the valley of Surkhan; in the xith century districts further to the west, like Bāsūn and Shīrābdā were also reckoned to Hišār; in the south, besides the ancient Cağhañīya (q. v. i. 811), Kabadīyan and a portion of the ancient Kuttāl with Kurgān-Tūbe also belonged to Hišār; on account of the great extent of the former Hišār territory the range, which forms watersheds between the Zarafshān and the upper Amū-Daryā, is called the Hišār range by the Russians. The Beg of Hišār now only rules the land between the upper Surkhan and the Wakhsh; this office is usually filled by a son of
the Emir or by another prince of the ruling house. The people still frequently rebel against the government. The cultivation of saffron mentioned by the Arab geographers is no longer pursued; the chief products are cereals and flax and the land is of some economic importance for Buḵẖārā, although the only method of transport is still by beasts of burden; vehicles are quite unknown. The land was first opened to European exploration by the Russian Ḥišār expedition of 1875 ("Gissarskaja ekspedicija").

**Ḫišār Firūzā, an ancient town in the Fārdāb, the headquarters of the district of Ḫišār, the centre of a tract of country formerly known as Ḥarrān[a], which formed part of the province of Sawālkhār. The district lies in the dry belt between the Satlaj and Djamā on the northern fringe of the Rājdūṭān[a] desert. Part of it is sandy waste but part is irrigated by a branch of the Western Djamā Canal. It lies between lat. 38° 36' and 30° 36' N. and long. 74° 29' and 76° 20'E., has an area of 5271 sq. m. and pop. (in 1901) of 781,717. The western part of the district (Sirsa) is inhabited by the Bṛāṭt Rājdūṭās, and was formerly known as Ḥarrān[a]. The town of Sirsa (formerly Sarsut) derives its name from the river Sarrasut. The Ghaggar river, which receives the north- and west-flowing Sarrasut, is still flows near Sirsa, and its waters have been utilized in modern irrigation works. The Musulmān population (202,009) is mainly of Rājdūṭ origin, and is locally known by the name of Rāngār. Besides Ḫišār the capital and Sirsa the principal towns are Bhīwānī, a large trading centre, Ḥānās[q. v.] and Fathābād (like Ḫišār founded by Firūz Shāh). Firūz Shāh Tughlāk took especial interest in this district, the home of his mother, who was of Bṛāṭt Rājdūṭ descent, and he founded here the town of Ḫišār Firūzā, which took its name from him, in the year 757 (1356), and, to irrigate the land in which it stood, constructed a canal from the Djamā. There was no doubt an older town on the spot, as the fort built by Firūz Shāh is to a great extent constructed of fragments of Hindū buildings. Ḫišār was long a place of importance. It was taken by Bābur in 932 (1526) and bestowed on him (with the district, which yielded a kro of rupees) on his son Humayūn. Humayūn in his turn assigned it for the maintenance of Akbar, and put the ‘father of the coinage under Shēr Shāh Sūrī, Humayūn and Akbar. At the end of the 16th century it came into the power of George Thomas (see under Ḥaṣbā) who built a fort named Georgeftagh, now corrupted into Ḥāḏābī. In 1857 the district fell into anarchy for a time during the mutiny.

**Bibliography:** Imperial Gazetteer of India, xiii. 144; s. v. Panjāb, p. 228; Elliot and Dowson, History of India, Vol. iii. (trans. of Tārīḵ-e Firūz Shāhī of Shams-i-Sirāḏār); Thomas, Chronicles of Pathān Khans of Delhi, p. 274; Erskine, Bābā’s Memoirs, p. 302; Blochmann, Aṯm-Akbari, trans., p. 321.

**Ḫišba, a technical term in administrative law, the meaning of which is, act of counting, office of muḥāṣāsīḥ. The word then acquired the special meaning of police, and finally the police in charge of the markets and public morals. It is in this

latter, the narrowest, meaning that ḥišba is used by those authors who deal with Muslim law (Māwardī, Ibn Khaldūn, Maḏṣīzī etc.), but there can be no doubt that ḥišba meant something more than the office of muḥāṣāsīḥ in the narrower senses. Occasional references in historians (Dār al-Mūḫṣābā wa l-Muvaṯṭaṯ or wa l-Mawād) show that ḥišba was the name of the registry office, where deaths and births were registered and estates and the funds for orphans administered. We also find the ḥišba as office of weights and measures (= Dār al-ṣīyār), as well as the supreme audit office, and finally as army commissariat. [Cf. also the article muẖṣāṣīḥ.]

**Ḫišān b. ʿAbbās al-Malik, Umāiyād Caliph, son of the Caliph ʿAbbās al-Malik b. Marwān and ʿĀʾisha, daughter of Hishām b. Ismaʿil, governor of Medina. He was proclaimed Caliph in ʿĀdibīn 105 = January 744 and began his reign by dismissing ʿUmār b. Ḥubaira, governor of ʿIrāq. Khalīl b. ʿAbbās al-Ḵāṣṣī was appointed his successor and ruled the province for nearly fifteen years and earned the gratitude of the populace by its peaceful development under him. His enemies, however, ultimately succeeded in bringing about his downfall. In Ḍjamādī I 120 = May 738 the Caliph dismissed him and gave the vacant office to ʿUṣuf b. ʿUmar al-Thaqāfī. Khalīl was thrown into prison and only released in Ḡawwāl 121 = September 739. About the same time, Zaid b. ʿAli, a great-grandson of the Caliph ʿAli, set up as a pretender in Kīfah and readily gained numerous adherents among the volatile people of that city. But his plans were unexpectedly frustrated, and he was to raise the standard of revolt, he had to give way to superior forces and was mortally wounded.

In 106 = 742-745 Asad, Khalīl’s brother, had been appointed governor of Khūraṣān, where feuds between the Arab tribes and the activities of ʿAbbāsīd emissaries caused him great trouble. In 109 = 727-728, Asad, who had only held his office under the control of his brother, was replaced by Asbras b. ʿAbbās al-Sulami, who became involved in war with the Ṣoghdians and the Turks and could only hold his position for two years. He was succeeded by al-Ḍjamādī b. ʿAbbās al-Raḥmān [q. v.], who continued to serve against the Turks. During his long reign Ḥišān continued the war against the Byzantines vigorously but with varying success. Naval enterprises were undertaken every summer on a large scale, in which ʿAbbās Allāh b. ʿUṣba and later ʿAbbās Allāh b. ʿAbd Maryam commanded the fleet, while the Caliph’s two sons Muḥṣīwīya and Sulaymān, conducted the land operations. In 122 (740) the Arabs under ʿAbbās Allāh al-Baṭṭāl were severely defeated at Arkoinos in Phrygia and al-Baṭṭāl himself fell in the battle. But when the Byzantines in the following year attacked the capital of Melitene the Caliph himself hurried to its assistance and they had to
retreat. On the Caspian shores the Turkish tribes gave the Caliph's troops much trouble. In 112 = 730-731 the latter were defeated at Ardabil. Hishām's brother, Maslama, then carried out several successful expeditions, but the final triumph of Muslim arms was particularly due to Marwān b. Muḥammad, afterwards Caliph. At the same time ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ghāfikī, governor in Spain, defeated Eude, Duke of Aquitaine, but was in turn defeated by the Franks under Charles Martel, in Ramdān 114 = October 732, between Tours and Poitiers. Further the Berbers were discontented, because they were not treated by the Arabs as fellow-citizens on equal terms but as vassals paying tribute, and the Khaṭrīd propaganda poured oil on the flames. In the end a great rebellion broke out and in 125 = 743 Hishām had to send a Syrian army under Kūljbūn b. Ḥyād against the Berbers. But the Syrians suffered a fearful defeat: Kūljbūn fell and his nephew Bālḏ b. Bīhīr escaped to Spain with only a third of his army.

Hishām died in al-Rūṣāfa on the 6th Rabī' II 125 = 6th February 743. He was an upright and conscientious Muslim. He particularly endeavoured to look after the finances of the state but his economy occasionally degenerated to parsimony. Beside foreign foes, ʿAbbāsid emissaries and Khaṭrīd agitators were gradually undermining Umayyad power and in spite of his merits the Caliph could not prevent its increasing decline.


**HISHĀM B. AL-HAKAM ABU MUḤAMMAD**, one of the most distinguished Shiʿī theologians of the earlier period. He was a client of the Banū Shāhi b. Kūsra b. Kaws, although his actual birthplace is believed to have been Wāsiṭ; he moved to Baghdād in 199 (814-815) but died soon afterwards (according to one tradition however, he is said to have lived into the reign of al-Maʿmūn). He was held in great esteem by the Barmākī Yāḥyā b. Khūlid and presided at all the disputations which were held in his presence; he was also acquainted with Harūn al-Raṣḥīd himself. He seems at first to have been a pupil of Dājām b. ʾṢafwān [q. v.]. His acquaintance with the ʿAlī b. Dīnār who died in 148 (765) made him one of his followers, so that he became one of the most intimate friends of his son Mūsā b. Dīnār. Henceforward the Shiʿī doctrine of the Imāmāte was the central point of his belief and doctrine around which his views on other theological and philosophical questions grouped themselves. His teaching was frankly anthropomorphic as in his view God could not otherwise influence material things. The question of the creation or non-creation of the Kurʿān was in his view an idle one, as the Kurʿān is the word (kalām) of God and therefore a quality (ṣifā), which cannot be defined by other qualities. The same of course holds in his opinion with regard to the other ṣifāt. It is not quite clear what his attitude was to the question of the freedom of human action but, according to the expression testimony of Ibn Kūtayba, (Muḥtaṣīf al-Hādīkī), he belonged to the Dājbārīya, which attitude is probably to be traced to his early intercourse with Dājām b. ʾṢafwān.

Hishām wrote a number of works, the titles of which are detailed in Fīhrīs, p. 175 sq., but they are all lost. The Arab authorities mention his disputations with the Muʿtazilī Abū ʿl-Hudžail [q. v.] and state that his teaching was further developed by his pupils, not however without developments in many points.


**HISHĀM I.** Abu Ḭaʾlāl al-Raḍāʾ or al-ʿĀdīl, son of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān I [q. v.], was the second Umayyad Emir of Cordova (172—180/788—796). Although more humane, just and pious than his energetic, cunning father, he was able to maintain himself against his rebellious brothers and to carry the Muslim arms once more, after an interval of several decades, into the Christian lands to the north and even into southern France, as far as Astorga, Oviedo, Gerona, and Narbonne. It was he who first gave a stimulus to the influence of the stricter school of law and theology of the contemporary Medina teacher Mālik b. Anas in Spain and thus prepared the way for the narrow-minded fanatical views of the Spanish fakīhs. He completed the great mosque of Cordova which had been begun by his father and restored the bridge (Alcántara), built by the governor al-Samḥ [q. v.] over the Guadalquivir, which had fallen into ruins. This capable ruler died all too soon at the age of 37 and was succeeded by his son al-Hakam I (796—822) [q. v.].

**Bibliography**: Ibn ʿAdhārī, Al-Bayān al-muḥqīb, ii. 62—70, trad. 96—100; Aḥkām maḏahīb, p. 120—124; al-Marrākūshī (ed. Dozy), p. 12; Ibn Khalūdūn (ed. Bulāk), iv. 164 sq.; Maḵkāṭī, i. 216—219; Dozy, Histoire des Musulmans d’Espagne, ii. 54—57; do., Recherches, i. 127—139; (Gayangos, History, ii. 95—100); Aug. Müller, Der Islam etc., i. 460; Simonet, Histoire de les Musulmans, p. 277—279; (Lemke, Geschichte von Spanien, i. 356—364).

**HISHĀM II.** Abu Ḭaʾlāl al-Muʿayyād b. Al-Hakam II al-Muṣṭanṣir, was the tenth Umayyad of Cordova (766—399 = 976—1000) and again from 400—403 = 1010—1013. While under his nine predecessors on the throne of Cordova the whole administrative power had been actually in the hands of the rulers (Amirs and Caliphs) themselves, Hishām II’s personality falls into the background and disappears as a mere shadow behind the all-powerful chancellor, the Ḥādījähr (grand vizier) Almānẓor [cf. Al-Maʾṣūr] the great statesman and general (died 1002) and his son ʿAbd al-Malik al-Muṭṭafir [q. v.], (died 1001), while Al-
manzor’s second and incapable son ‘Abd al-Rahman Sancho was soon overthrown (1009). Hishām II was placed in tutelage immediately on his accession, when only ten years of age, by his unnatural mother, the Basque Sūba (= Aurora), al-Ḥakām’s favourite wife, in conjunction with her favourite and lover Almanzor, educated to bigotry, and finally interned in the new Royal residence al-Zahrā west of Cordova, till he became the veriest puppet in their hands, whereby a way was prepared for the rapid decline of monarchical power and the speedy fall of the once brilliant caliphate of Cordova. A pseudo-Hishām, alleged to have reappeared (he was said to have disappeared during the massacre by the Berbers in Cordova in 1013) also served the unsuspicious ‘Abbadīd [q.v.] Abu ‘I-Kāsim Muḥammad ibn Ismā’il of Seville as a figurehead to deceive the people.

HISHĀM III, al-Mu’ta’addī, son of the incapable, ephemeral Caliph ‘Abd al-Rahmān IV al-Murtadā (408 = 1015) great great-grandson of the great ‘Abd al-Rahmān III (912–961), was the sixteenth and last feeble Umayyad of Cordova, who could not prevent the breaking up of the great caliphate into smaller and smaller local kingdoms (Span. Reyes de Taifa, arab. Mātāk al-Ta’awif), which had been going on since the beginning of the xi century: 418–422 = 1027–1031 (died 1036).


HĪSN (a.), fortress, citadel.

HĪSN AL-ÂKRĀD, originally called HĪSN AL-SAF, ‘castle on the slope’, see van Berchem, Journ. Asiat., 1902, p. 446 sq., now often pleonastically called Kalat al-Hīṣ, is situated on the plateau of al-Bukā‘a, which is bounded on the south by Djebel ‘Ākkār and Lebanon, on the north by the Nuṣāri‘ hills. It is the official residence of a kāsimmāl. It takes its name ‘castle of the Kurds’ from a Kurdish garrison established there by Shīb al-Dawla Naṣr, king of Aleppo, in the first half of the fifth century A. H., who were granted the surrounding lands and forests in fief on condition that they protected the important road between Ḥamā and Hīṣ, the great towns of the Oronates plain, and Tripolis, from the enemy. The castle of the Kurds is said to be identical with one built there by Rameses II. It was taken during the Crusades by Tancred of Antioch in 503 (this date is not quite certain) and transferred to the knights of St. John in 537 by Raymon d II of Tripolis. The knights had more and more cause to feel insecure as the position of the Crusaders in Syria became weaker. Their situation was all the more dangerous because they had been excluded from the ten years’ truce of 626 between the Emperor Frederick II and Sulṭān al-Malik al-Kāmil, as they had not taken the side of the Emperor who was conducting the war for the recovery of the territories of the Pope. They had therefore every reason to strengthen the defences of the castle more and more. Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin had endeavoured in vain to capture Hīṣn al-Âkrād. The citadel is protected by two lines of defences, an outer and an inner. It lies on the top of the hill which slopes to the north and east. On the west it is protected by a ditch which is continued round on the south side at no great depth. Thus defined it is approximately a trapezium, of which the south is the most vulnerable. The strongest defences had therefore to be built there. From the description of the capture of the fortress it appears that further earth- and wood works were raised outside the outer surrounding wall, which would have perhaps become quite gigantic, if the Sulṭān had not kept the Knights from increasing them by agreements and threats (the Emperor Frederick II had actually pledged himself to see that the defences of castle of the Kurds were not strengthened). On the north and west it is surrounded by ramparts which at certain distances are strengthened by round towers.

The hall in the tower vaulted with pointed arches and lit by great embrasures is built to accommodate ballistas and a gallery runs along the ramparts provided with protruding sentry boxes. Over this gallery is a pinnacled parapet with shot-holes in the middle. The door of the entrance tower was difficult to take, for in consequence of its low situation it could be defended through the three small rooms projecting over it with openings in the floors. Through the gateway one enters a covered gallery, which turns to the south but turns again on reaching the south of the corner tower and ascends to the upper entrance at the east tower.

A portion of the west side of the open space between the outer and inner lines of defence is so built as to collect water in it. It is connected with the cisterns which are below the castle. The inner defences rise on the south and west side above a masonry escarpment of great strength obviously an escarpment lining the natural rock, while on the north and east side the rock is not escarped. A great open staircase leads from the courtyard to the terrace.

The Knights of St. John were able to maintain a garrison of 2000 men in this strongly fortified castle. With their help they forced the princes of Hīṣ and Ḥamā to pay tribute in return for freedom of passage for their caravans. They had afterwards to give this up and their situation became more and more precarious. Sulṭān Baibars, who wished to free Syria entirely from the Crusaders, decided to take Hīṣn al-Âkrād. After taking advantage of a stay in Syria to make a reconnaissance in person accompanied only by 40 horsemen, he led a great expedition against the fortress next year in 669. On the first day of the attack, 19th Radjab 669 = 3rd March 1271, he took the weakly defended outer works; next he soon succeeded in piercing the earth ramparts and capturing the entrance tower, which was now exposed to attack from the inner gallery as well as the outside. On the 13th March the second tower was taken, on the 29th Baibars fought his way into the courtyard and erected ballistas there to attack the donjon. On the 8th April the Knights were reduced to surrender and were granted a safe conduct to Tripolis. Sulṭān Baibars remained there till the end of the month and conducted the restoration operations in person. Hīṣn al-Âkrād was selected as the residence of the governor of the Syrian ‘conquests’ and it was not till the capture of Tripolis in 686 by Sulṭān Khālīṣ that the governor’s residence was transferred to the latter town. After peace and security had been
restored to Syria with the departure of the last Franks Hisn al-Akrād gradually lost its importance. It suffered nothing from Timūr Lank's invasion (about 803). The fortress, which is the residence of a kā'īm malām, is still for the most part well preserved.

**Bibliography:** The architectural history of the castle has been studied in detail by Baron Rey, to whom the accompanying plan is also due, in his *Etude sur les Monuments de l'Architecture militaire des Croisades en Syrie*, Paris 1841, p. 46 sqq.; extracts from it are contained in A. v. Essewein's *Die Romanische und Gothicke Baukunst*, iv., 1, Military Architecture.

The Arabic inscriptions in the castle (only briefly discussed by Ch. Schefel in Rey) have been fully edited by van Berchem in *Inscriptions arabes de Syrie*, Cairo 1897 (p. 64—69) and in Freiherr v. Oppenheim's *Inschriften aus Syrien* etc., with an account of the capture of the Hisn by Baibars. All the inscriptions of the fortress and town with their history (with extracts from the sources and bibliography) have been edited by Sobermann in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Arabum*, ii. 14—35 (with a plan of the mosque and illustrations).

(M. SOBERMANN)

**HİSN AL-GHURĀB** ('Raven Castle'), a hill with a fortress upon it in South Arabia, near the harbour of Bir 'Alli Madīdahā in 30° 59' 20" North. Lat. and 45° 24' 30" East. Long. in the land of the Wālīlīs [q.v.]. The harbour of HİSN al-Ghurāb in ancient times was the well-known Canis Emporium (Kān ḋāmu) of the *Periplus Maris Erythræi* and of Pliny, the *I* of the South Arabian inscriptions, a very important centre for the frankincense trade of the neighbourhood and an intermediate station for the trade between Egypt and India. The name Hisn al-Ghurāb is derived from the black colour of the hill, which is about 1500 feet high, of volcanic origin and composed of different formations such as basalt, sandstone, trap, and slates. HİSN al-Ghurāb was probably in very early days an island; now it is connected with the mainland by a isthmus of sand, on which a town used to stand, of which now only the ruins are to be seen in the form of huge pieces of basalt lying scattered at the foot of the hill. Ruins of houses, walls and defensive works are also found towards the top of the hill. On the topmost slope is a quadrangular tower. The hill can only be ascended from one side; the route is by a zigzag way (mangal) hewn out of the rock.

Not far from HİSN al-Ghurāb is a group of small, uninhabited islands, of which the most important are Sīhā, also called Kanīsūs, and Barraqa. The little island of Hilliyāna with pearl-fisheries is quite near HİSN al-Ghurāb on the west side. Opposite HİSN al-Ghurāb rises the isolated hill of Shawrān, at the foot of which lies a plain, called Mādinā, at the top of which hundreds of small black, probably volcanic mounds called bāšīka. On the summit of the Djebel Shawrān is a very deep round crater called Karaf (Basin) of Shawrān, surrounded by shrubs.

In the rocky face of the hill four South Arabic inscriptions are engraved of which the most important is the well-known ten-line inscription of HİSN al-Ghurāb which belongs to the time of the Himyar-Ethiopic kings and was inscribed to commemorate the fortification of HİSN al-Ghurāb. It is of particular importance, as it is dated (640 = 525 H. R.). From the inscription it seems that HİSN al-Ghurāb in ancient times was known as Urr Māwiyat.

HİSN al-Ghurāb was first visited by Captain Haines and J. Wellsted in 1834. Wellsted, Cottenden and Hulton made the first copies of inscriptions the same year. In 1870 HİSN al-Ghurāb was visited by Miles and Munzinger who took new and more reliable copies. Lastly Comte de Landeburg took photographs as well as copies of the inscriptions when he visited HİSN al-Ghurāb on the 21st February 1896 along with General Cunningham.


**Bibliography:** In addition to the works already mentioned, J. R. Wellsted, *Account of some Inscriptions in the Abyssinian character, found at Hassan Gharab etc. in the Journal of the Asiat. Soc. of Bengal (Calcutta*, Vol. iii. [1834], 554—556; K. Ritter, *Erdbunde*, xii. 312—322, 624, 862—863; H. Freiherr von Maltzan, *Reise nach Südarabien*, p. 225—227 (also contains translation of the inscriptions); A. Sprenger, *Die alte Geographie Arabiens*, p. 83 (310, 102); Comte de Landeburg, *Abessinien*, iv. (Leiden 1897), p. 65—75 (and appendix with photograph of HİSN al-Ghurāb and neighbourhood and the large inscription) and *Abessinia*, v. (Leiden 1898), 151. (J. SCHIEFFER)

**HİSN KAIFE,** a town in the Dijāzirā (Mesopotamia), on the right (south or east) bank of the Tigris, in 37° 40' N. Lat. and 41° 30' East. Long. (Greenw.), about halfway between Diyyar Bakr and Dijāzirā Ibn ʿUmar, about 3 days' journey (60—70 miles) from either.

HİSN Kaife dates from very ancient times. The many ancient caves and grottos still exist in existence belong to the pre-Armenian (Chaldean) period and show that there was a settlement here as early as about 800 n. c. In the border wars between Romans and Persians during the later Empire the town (Kēfēr, Cepha) played an important part on account of its commanding fortress. As the see of a Syrian bishop it is mentioned at the council of Chalcedon (451); Muḥammad (c. 535—985) particularly notes the numerous churches there. HİSN Kaife during the middle ages also enjoyed no mean strategic and commercial importance. The former was due to its strong citadel, the latter to its position as a centre of trade between Diyyar Bakr and Dijāzirā Ibn ʿUmar. Since about the xith century a fine bridge has existed over the Tigris, the traffic over which had probably been busy for centuries.

When the ʿAbbāsid power gradually declined, the real authority in Mesopotamia as in other provinces of the Caliphate passed into the hands of prominent local dynasties. HİSN Kaife in this way passed in turn to the Ḥamdānids, Marwānids and Urtukids. Under the latter, who had their
Plan of Hiṣn al-Akrād according to Rey.

View of Hiṣn al-Akrād.
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Reconstruction of Hiṣn al-Akrād according to Rey.
The name Hissân Kêf is clearly only the result of a popular etymology. Equally worthless are the "Turkish" etymologies: Hâsan Kêf = Hânas's "delight" and hisân (Hâsan)-Kêf = "good (beautiful) humour".


Hîşân Munsûr, the capital of the kald of the same name in the sandjak of Malatia, usually called Adîmân, with about 10,000 inhabitants, mainly of Armenian origin. The name Hîsh Munsûr is derived from an Omayyad Emir Mansûr b. Dâ'wâna who was slain in 141 (758) by command of the Abbâsîd al-Mansûr. Hûrin al-Raghiq afterwards had the citadel fortified and placed a garrison in it. Hîsh Mûnsûr or Adîmân was thus the successor of the ancient adjacent town of Paro, the site of which is still traceable by aqueducts and rock-tombs. It is nevertheless only rarely mentioned in later times; in the viii (xii)th century it belonged to the Ortoûds.
HİSİN MANŞUR — HİZB.

Trade in bituminous products from Hit, they are carried down the river in boats and the busy shipbuilding trade of Hit is also directly due to the asphalt. South of Hit are several quarries which were worked even in ancient times: at the present day there is a line of rails from them to the Euphrates; cf. A. Musil in the *Ztschr., der Wiss. Akad., der Wissensch.* 1913, i. (L. E. Arabia and Southern Mesopotamia, p. 11). The Arab geographers of the middle ages also note the wealth of datepalms and the extensive cultivation of cereals around Hit. It was further noted for its excellent wine: cf. the poems of Abi Nabi (ed. Krencker, p. 49), and R. Geyers *Mālik b. al-Aswād* (Stud. et Diss. d. Wiss. Akad., Vol. 149, vi), p. 145, i. Near Hit a ruined area, called Ulûya al-Maktila (= "the transformed city"), is pointed out: there is a legend attached to it which, as Mez in the *Zeitschr. für Assyriol.,* xxiii, 220, points out, strikingly recalls the Frau Hitt legend in Inshrub.


HİZB (Apl. pl. aţâba) means "a party, faction, division." It is probably an Ethiopic loan-word, the original Arabic meaning of the root being "to befall" of a misfortune (aţāba) and "be rough, coarse" (gHALIPA); so formerly Noldeke (*Neuf Beiträge,* p. 59, note 3). In the Kur'an the word is used of confederates and mostly in a bad sense. Thus the *Sûrat al-aţâba* (xxiii) deals with the siege of Medina by the Jewish tribes confederated with those of Mecca, Nadţ and Tihâma (*ibid.* pp. 688 sqq. *Ghawwat al-bghtâd*). In a good sense it occurs of the *alb Allâb* in Kur. v. 61, liii, 22. But from "portion, division" it soon acquired the same technical meaning ascribes i.e. a set portion of the Kur'an, or of devotional formulae of any kind, imposed by any one upon himself for recitation; for cases of this use in the traditions see *Liûn,* i. p. 299 ii. 9 sq. As applied to the Kur'an this developed in some Muslim countries until there was a normal division of the text into sixty aţâba, like that into the thirty aţâfa. So in Egypt; see *Lan, Modern Egyptians,* chap. xxvii, *Arabian Nights,* chap. v. note 38. But apparently this did not and does not hold everywhere. Al-Ghazâlî, in the *Ihyâ, in dealing with the tâbil (tibâla)," of the Kur'an (Book viii of Quarter iii. 1 Bb iii.; ed. with comm. of Siâyid Murâdî ii. pp. 470 sq.) speaks of the thirty aţâba, but of the only generally; the
number of ḥibā does depend upon the usage of each worshipper. So still in India, for Hughes' Dict. of Islam, does not recognize the word nor, apparently, does the Dict. of Tech., Terms. With the rise of the derwish fraternities the word became peculiarly associated with them. In Egypt each fraternity is a ḥizb (Lane, Modern Egyptians, chap. xviii) and ḥizb is also used of the "office" of each fraternity recited at the regular Friday service (ḥajrā) in the sāʿiyah or taḥṣilah, and consisting of extended selections from the Kurān and of other prayers (see ḤIJKR above). From this apparently, came a narrower use as applied to forms of prayer (duʿāʾ) drawn up by conspicuous saints and to be recited, either regularly or in special cases of need. Islām has always treasured such forms. The latter part of Book ix of Quarti. of the Ḥayāt (Kitāb al-adhākār; ed., above, vol. v, pp. 62 sq.) consists of a collection of such celebrated duʿāʾyā of authorship from Adam to the Šūf saints; see also, al-Dābījī, Kātab Bayān ī, ii. 127 sqq. of ed. of Cairo 1311). But to judge from the hizb’s described by Brockelmann (Gesch. index unter ḥizb, vol. ii. pp. 622 sqq.) and by Ḥājjī Khalīfa (iii. pp. 56–60) the word ḥizb was not applied to such prayers until well on in the sixth Muslim century. Al-Ghazālī (d. 505 = 1111) speaks only of duʿāʾs and the first recorded hizb is by Ḭâb al-Kādir al-Dīlātī (d. 561). After that there are many: Ibn ‘Arabī (d. 638), Ahmad al-Badawī (d. 675), al-Nawawī (d. 676), etc. The most famous of all is the ḥizb al-bāṣr by al-Shāhīdī, called also ḥizb al-ṣaḥīfīs, to distinguish it from one longer but less celebrated by the same author. It is a favorite with travellers, especially those by sea, as it is in great part a "subjecting" (tasbikh) of the sea to them. It was written in 656, the year of his death, by inspiration from the Prophet, and contains the Most Great Name of Allāh. That same year Baghādād was taken from the Mongols, and al-Shāhīdī is asserted to have said that it could not have been captured if his hizb had been recited there. The text is given in full by Ibn Bāṭṭīṭa (vol. i. pp. 40 sqq.; cf. also Zeitscr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges. vol. vii. p. 251; the transl. by Burton, Pilgrimages, chap. xi. is very incomplete) and is poor structurally, but has many Kurānic references and quotes repeatedly the mysterious letters which occur at the beginnings of certain sūras. This has given it a talismanic value and ensured its popularity. A plural, ḥīzāb, occurs in the Fihrist, p. 307, l. 7 (see also note) with the meaning "spells"; but the text is uncertain. The authority for Ahlwardt's assertion (Verzeichn. der. d. Handschr. zu Berlin, vol. iii. pp. 407–414. (D. B. MACDONALD.)) ḤIZKĪL (EZEKIEL) b. BURĪ, whose mother when advanced in years prayed to God for offspring and had her prayer granted, was the successor of Kālidī. He is not mentioned by name in the Kurān but in Sāra i. 244 ("Didst thou not see those ones who abandoned their dwellings in their thousands from fear of death? and God said "Die!" Then he restored them to life") an allusion to Ezekiel xxxvii, 1–10 is generally recognised. Of the various traditions in Tha‘labī, p. 148 and Tābarī, i. 539, 538, the following, which are of Talmudic origin may here be mentioned. In the days of Ḥijīl a plague carried off numerous Israelites. Many corpses could not be buried and became food for birds and beasts. By God’s command Ḥijīl proclaimed: "Ye dead bones, God commands you to assume again the flesh that rescued you!" At once the bones clothed themselves with flesh and once more had skin, blood, veins, and arteries. Ḥijīl continued: "O breath of life, make these bodies live again!" They were breathed upon by the spirit of life and rose in their dead clothes. They returned to their people again, founded families and multiplied (Sanh., 92, Gen. R., 14, Cant., 7.

According to Tha‘labī, p. 101, one of the members of Fir‘awn’s council in Egypt was likewise called Ḥijīl, while Kīsā calls him ‘Ibrīl. He was originally a carpenter. Mūsā’s mother applied to him to make a small box in which to place her new born son and throw him into the sea; but he hurried to the royal police to tell them of it. His tongue then became paralysed and he lost the power of speech. He only regained it after swearing that he would betray nothing. Henceforward he honoured Mūsā in secret and protected him from all danger. (Cf. Kurān, 40, 29.)


(J. EISENBERG.)

AL-ḤOĐAIMA (Hodāde, Hadīda), a seaport in Arabia, on the Red Sea about 110 miles N.N.W. of Mokha [q.v.], the most important port for the coffee trade in Yemen and a landing-place for pilgrims to Mecca from Central Africa. It is under the protection of a patron saint, Shāhīf Sādik, whose festival is celebrated on the fifteenth day of the month Shaba‘n. In the time of Niebuhr and Rebenstock, al-Ḥođaima belonged to the Imām of San‘ā. In 1837 Ibrahim Paşa was commander in the town. Since 1899, al-Ḥođaima, which was previously a part of the great wilāyat of Yemen, has been a separate wilāyat. The town is fortified and is surrounded by many palmtrees and other fruit trees. It has a considerable garrison and possesses a post and telegraph office, a military hospital and a powder magazine. The streets are small and irregular and densely populated. Most of the houses are straw huts, only the houses of rich merchants being of stone. The bazaar is small and very dirty but well stocked with all necessaries. In the suburbs live, besides Arabs, many Banians, Somalis, Persians, Jews and Abyssinians. The climate of al-Ḥođaima is healthy and the town free from fever. The temperature which is always very hot reaches its height in April, May, August, and September. Among the articles brought to this port to be exported are besides the staple coffee, (the export of which, however, is now considerably diminished particularly on account of the vast supplies exported from Brazil), goat- and ox-hides (for Europe, America and Australia), millet and materials for packing coffee; dried fruits, dates, frankincense, resin, clothstuffs and rose-red pearls, which are obtained among the reefs at al-
Hodaida, were also at one time exported. The imports include English, American, and Indian silk and woollen goods, sugar (from India, China, France and Austria), tobacco, (from Egypt, Turkey and Persia), petroleum (at one time mainly from America, now from Batumi), rice (from India) raisins, dates and honey, which are transported hence to other towns, particularly San'a. The trade with al-Hodaida is mainly carried on by British Indian ships; in recent years Greek and particularly Italian ships have had an increasing share in it. Manzon in 1883 estimated the number of inhabitants of al-Hodaida at 20,000; according to other statements, the town has nearly 50,000 inhabitants. Bibliography: C. Niermth, Beschreibung von Arabien, p. 228; s. Reisenschreibung nach Arabien, i. 324—325; K. Ritter, Erdkunde, xiv. 873—877; Renzo Manzoni, El Yemen (Roma 1883), Chap. viii., 357—361; W. Schmidt, Das sydwestl. Arabien (Halle 3/S. 1913), p. 81—100. (J. Schieffer.)

AL-HODH (Hod), a semi-desert region in Western Africa. It is a plain, lying to the east of Timbuktu between the Sahel on the south and the Tagonit on the north, stretching over a distance of about 200 miles. A zone of steppes called Mafya (mirror) separates the Hodh from that part of the western Sahara known by the name of al-Djuf. Three well-defined divisions may be distinguished in the Hodh. In the south is a region of sand and thorny bushwood, fairly rich in water and sustaining quite a numerous population of Ful and Sarakola as well as Moorish herdmen. To the north of this lies rocky plateau, often ferruginous, separated by valleys with black soil bottoms, which the winter rains turn into impassable marshes. Lastly, the northern part is covered with white sand dunes, separated by basins of black earth. Arab or Arabicised Berber tribes, of whom the chief are the Aghelal, the Udld al-Nasir, the Ida Badjellan of whom some, like the Nomadi, are only Muslims in name, roam freely over the Hodh. Lying outside the main caravan routes, the Hodh is the least known region of the Sahara. Bibliography: Barth, Travels, v.; Le Sahel maure et le Hodh in La Geographie, xii. (1905) 130 sqq.; Arnaud, Chasseurs et echeurs du Tagonit et du Hodh in La Geographie, xiii. (1906), 148 sqq.; Marquart, Beni Samhedin, v. Leyden 1913, p. clxvi. sqq. There is further information on Hodh in two chronicles still inedi, recently discovered in the Sudim, the Tirthik of the Kunta, by Sidi Muhammad b. Sidi al-Habib and the chronicle known as the Chronicle of Ibn 'Isa ibn Sani. (G. Yver.)

HODJAILA, a village in South Arabia, at the foot of Haraz [q.v.] about 1900 feet above the sea level, a border village of the Tahama. It belongs to the kadah of Manakha [q.v.] and to the mudirik of Mitawah on the Jebel Safan (Haraz). It has a market and Turkish barracks. The low cottages (arnawak) of the village are built of large unhewn stones without mortar. The people of Hodjaila are of a chestnut brown colour and resemble gipsies; they belong some to the tribe of Khamil, others to the Ziyadini. Around the village many partridges are found whence its name. Moreover a kind of wild duck called khalat is found in the waters of the neighbourhood and there are also many other kinds of birds. The women of Hodjaila dress their hair in a peculiar fashion: they twine the plait around their ears. Glaser proposes to identify Hodjaila with the Shat al-Hadjal of Hamdani (Quzirra, p. 105, 106.)


AL-HOFHUF (Hoff, Hoof), a town in Arabia, capital of the province of Hasa (Hasa [see Al-Ahsa]. The town, which is surrounded by extensive gardens and date-palm groves, is divided into three parts: I. the Khat (fortress) in the northeast; 2. the Rafi'ya (Refie'yaa, ‘eminenence’ so called on account of its rising ground) in the northwest and west; 3. the Na'far (in the south and west). The Khat, a large fortress with very high, thick walls and towers (about 16 on each side with winding stairways) is about 500 yards long and 400 broad and surrounded by a deep ditch; it contains 2000—3000 people. The governor of Hasa (during Palgrave's stay in Hofhuf he was a negro named Belid) resides in the Khat and the Na'djad zealots (the fanatic members of the Wahhabi sect) dwell there also; in it is the Wahhabi mosque. A second isolated fortress dating from the eighteenth century, called Khutham (‘muzzle’) is situated near the southern gate of the town. The Rafi'ya quarter is inhabited by abbeys and aristocratic families, hostile to the Wahhabis; its situation is a very healthy one and it contains many fine houses and broad, clean streets. In this quarter is the market place, a long pillared hall with an arched roof, al-kaisarya, with workshops of shoemakers, smiths and carpenters, and shops containing weapons, clothes, emboideries, gold and silver ornaments and other wares, partly imported from Bahrain, O'man, Persia and India. The Na'far quarter is the most thickly populated; it occupies about half the town and contains a large mosque; its population is a mixed one, consisting chiefly of merchants, small tradesmen, weavers, artisans and some also strangers from Persia, O'man, Bahrain, Harik [q.v.] and Kusar [q.v.]. In the centre of the town opposite the market place is the public square, a long quadrangle about 300 yards by 80, where the stands of the barbers and the workshops of numerous smiths and shoemakers stand and dates (the fine khalat kind, the best in Arabia, which are grown only in Hasa), vegetables, firewood, smoked locusts, etc are sold in numerous booths. The weekly market of Hofhuf is held on Thursdays on an open space before the north gate of the town. Here coarsely woven clothes, old brass vessels, old swords, sandals, carpet, gromedaries and asses are sold by the country people, while bracelets and anklets, looking glasses, European drinking glasses, strings of beads, also cereals and fruits (corn, meal, khalat dates, sugarcane), coal, wood, etc. are sold by the regular traders. According to information supplied to W. Schimpers by a Wahhabi, in 1836 the town had 40,000 inhabitants; W. Palgrave gives the figure at 23,000—24,000 for the year 1862.

In the tenth century Hofhuf like the rest of Hasa was the scene of the Karmanat wars; it was from here that the Karmanat leaders undertook their raids into Syria and Mesopotamia. In the beginning of last century Hofhuf fell into the power of the Wahhabis who as elsewhere introduced their views here by force. The rule
of the Wahhabiis was a heavy burden on the town and the people of Hofhüf as of the rest of Ḥaṣā enthusiastically welcomed the Egyptians when Nadji was conquered by Ibrahim Pasha; the oppressive taxes which the Egyptians levied on them as well as the servile treatment with which the citizens of the town were treated soon brought about a general rising nominally in the town but throughout the country which put an end to Egyptian rule for ever and restored its independence to Hofhüf as to the rest of Ḥaṣā. After the reconquest of Nadji by the Wahhabiis Hofhüf was only taken after stubborn fighting. The walls of the town, like those of other towns, were partly destroyed, the fortress levelled to the ground, new mosques built and old ones restored.

Before the conquest of Ḥaṣā by the Wahhabiis, Hofhüf was a flourishing emporium of trade. It had busy relations with Oman, Persia and India on the one side and Baghdaḍ and Damascus on the other. Hardware, cloths of the poorer qualities, other goods, gold and silver thread, ironmongery, swords, spears, earthenware, and other articles were imported. Besides khūṭū Dates (which still are a lucrative article of export, particularly to India) and sugar-cane, the robes of Hofhüf highly prized on account of their excellent quality and fine make, were exported and brought the merchants rich profits; the copper and silver vessels (coffee-pots) manufactured in Hofhüf also used to enjoy a great reputation. On account of the fanatic hatred with which the Wahhabiis in the provinces under their rule put down all that is connected with fine raiment (particularly silk) and adornment, trade has now quite declined. The people of Hofhüf before Wahhabi rule had been accustomed from ancient times to make excursions, particularly in autumn, often for longish periods to the Djebel Moghūr, situated to the southeast of Ḥaṣā, where they sought to recuperate themselves, with music, song, and other recreations after their strenuous labours; now Wahhabi fanaticism forbids them to do this openly, under penalty of fines or even imprisonment.


HOLWĀN. [See Ḥulwān.]

HORMUZ (ORMAZD, AHURA MAZDA), the name of the supreme being of the Zoroastrians, at a much later period applied to the planet Jupiter), the name borne by five kings of the Sasanian dynasty.

Hormuz I, son of Shāhpūr, reigned for only a year (272—3). He had previously been governor of Khurāsān and had distinguished himself in war with the Romans; he is also said to have given Māni when persecuted a place of refuge in his palace in Dastagird.

Hormuz II (308—9), son of Nares and grandson of Shāhpūr I, was killed by the Arabs after he had defeated them. He was the father of Shāhpūr II, who was born after his death and of a prince named Hormuz; the latter was kept in confinement but managed to escape after thirteen years and went to Constantinople from which he accompanied the Emperor Julian on his Persian campaign. The ruins of the palace of Hormidas (the Greek form of his name) are still pointed out in Stambul, in the wall which separates the city from the sea of Marmora.

Hormuz III was the son of Yezeqīlid II and succeeded his father. During his brief reign, (457—9) he had to fight his younger brother Frīzū, who had procured the assistance of the Hephthalites (White Huns) by ceding them the cities of Talekān and Tiran in Bactria. Frīzū was victorious and killed his brother. During this war Dinak, the mother of the two brothers, took over the government in Ctesiphon.

Hormuz IV (578—90) was the son of Khusraw Anōshak-Ruwan and the daughter of the khanān of the Turks, whence he was called Turk-zād (prince of the Turks). (Tabari, Annals, i. 965; al-Birūnī, Chronology, p. 123). According to the Byzantine sources, he was a haughty and foolish ruler, who imprisoned the Emperor's envoys and only released them under pressure from the Magi. His troops were several times defeated in battle by the Romans (586). The rebellion of Bahram Čōbin also took place in his reign. Hormuz was deposed, thrown into prison and strangled without his son Khusraw Parviz preventing it.

Hormuz V, grandson of Khusraw Parviz, fought against his aunt Azarm-dōght and maintained his position till the first year of Yezeqīlid III's reign, when he was put to death by his own soldiers in Nišiβin (632).

Bibliography: Fr. Spiegel, Ernährliche Alterthumskunde, i. 254, 262, 369, 463, 532; F. Justi, in the Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie ii. 520, 539, 541, 545; Noldeke—Tabari, Geschichten der Sassaniden, Index, s. v. Hormizd. (Cl. Huart.)

HORMUZ (HORMUZ, ORMUZ), in the middle ages the most important commercial port of Asia, situated at the entrance to the Persian Gulf; about 1300 the name was transferred to a small island opposite the ancient town and is still attached to it. Hormuz was of importance for the lands on the Indian ocean as trade between Western Asia and India passed through it; traffic by sea had also been established between China and Hormuz. A district of 'Araq was first mentioned by Nearchus, who explored the Persian coast from the mouth of the Indus. (Arrian, Indus, 32—35; Onesikritos in Juba's Epitome in Pliny, Hist. Nat., VI, 27—28). The location of this district is established by the fact that the Ananis (An- danis) flowed into the sea here. The town (Har darz) was mentioned by Cl. Ptolemaeus Marcianus. (Peripl. Maris exteri, 27); the Hermopolis of Ammian. Marcellinhus (XXIII, 6, 49) is probably identical with it. The situation of the town is wrongly given in Ptolemy; Marcianus agrees with Nearchus and is perhaps indirectly dependent on him.

The district of Hormuz, the land of Caramania, was very rich in agricultural products (wine, wheat, barley, rice and indigo) as well as in minerals (gold, silver, copper, iron, cinnamon, and salt); but it had no importance in the world's commerce. It was established by the Arabs, who first opened up this district to foreign trade, whereupon Hormuz attained its great importance in the XIV—XVIth century. The medieval accounts, European as well as Oriental, show that Hormuz was a port of world wide
fame. The foundation of the town is ascribed to Ardashir Pāpakān (224–241), founder of the Sasanian dynasty, but it was only after the Arab conquest that it attained prominence. From it huge quantities of goods were exported to India, which was the case as late as the xvth century. The fact that China under the T'ang dynasty (627–961) attained great importance, at the same time as the Arab empire, brought about closer relations between Western Asia and China, in which trade played an important part. The Arabs visited India mainly by the sea route while in return Indian and Chinese ships came to the Persian Gulf to Hir and Hormuz. Hormuz is mentioned by Ibn Khordadbeh as a calling-place on the route from Bassā to China. A Chinese account (of circa 785–805) describes the sea-route from Canton to the Persian Gulf and mentions as the most westerly point the "important market of the Ta-Shi (Arabs)" the harbour of Molo, which Rockhill and Hirth take to be Hormuz, while A. Hermann identifies it with Bassā.

Of the older Hormuz on the mainland, we learn that it was situated one parasang (four miles) from the sea on a river, which ships ascended to the town. Idrisi, Is̱aḵkhārī and Mīkaddāsī describe the town as the chief market of Kirmān. Indigo is mentioned as the most important product of the district. Yakītī particularly notes that Hormuz had attracted all the trade with India.

After about 1100 Hormuz was under Arab rulers, of whom Ruka al-Din Mahmūd (1246–1277) is known to us from Marco Polo. A full history of the dynasty is given from a lost Persian source in Teixeira, Relaciones de P. Teixeira d'al origin descendance y successión de los Reyes de Persia y de Hormuz, etc. After 1262 Hormuz was under the rule of the Ilkhān of Persia. It cannot be certainly ascertained what brought about the transference of the town from the mainland to the island, barren island. Abu 'l-Fida' says that the old town was destroyed by 'Tatars'. But the Mongols hardly touched the coast of Kirmān. Ibn Battūta expressly distinguishes between the Hormuz of the mainland and 'New Hormuz', an island 3 parasangs from the coast. The references of Marco Polo, who twice visited the place (1272 and 1293) are to the Hormuz on the mainland. He describes the business of the port in a striking fashion and particularly notes the export of horses to India. The island town founded by Kūch al-Dīn was, in spite of unfavourable natural conditions, a thriving centre of the world's commerce from the xivth to the xvith centuries. The appearance of the Portuguese in India decided the fate of Hormuz; in 1507 the island was taken by a Portuguese fleet, but the Portuguese allowed the native rulers to remain on condition that they paid tribute. With the help of an English fleet Shâh 'Abbâs the Great won Hormuz from the Portuguese, which, apart from an interval under the rule of 'Oman, had ever since belonged to Persia. It was the will of Shâh 'Abbâs that his new foundation Bender 'Abbâs [s. v. i. 694 sq.]* should take the place of Hormuz. The decline of Hormuz dates from this time and now it no longer exists as a town.

We have brief accounts of the island town in Ibn Batūta who stayed there in 1331 and in 'Abd al-Razzāk. The town was very frequently visited by European travellers, first in 1321 by Odorico of Pordenone. He was followed by Odoardo Barbarosa, Caes. Frederick (1589) and Jos. Salbancke. The account of the Russian merchant Annaasī Niktīn (c. 1580) is of particular interest. The information afforded by these sources on the nature of the town, its trade and its highly developed civilisation, have been collected by R. Stube in his monograph mentioned below.


HORMUZAN, HORMIZDAN. [See HURLANZAN.]

HORUK. [See 'AURUD.]

HOSANGSHĀH GHŪRĪ, the second king of the Ghūrī dynasty of Mālwa, ascended the throne in 1405–1406. In 1407 Mujażar I of Gudjarāt invaded Mālwa, defeated and captured Hosphangshah, and imprisoned him on the ground that he had poisoned his father, who had been Mujażar's friend. Hosphangshah was released and regained his kingdom but throughout his reign was engaged in constant hostilities with Gudjarāt, from which his kingdom suffered severely. In 1420 Hosphangshah annexed the Gond state of Kherla to his kingdom, as a feudatory state, and in 1422 led a most daring raid to Dājjinagar (perhaps Dājjīpur) in Uṣpa, captured the ražā by an artifice and
compelled him to surrender several elephants as the price of his freedom. On returning to his kingdom he discovered that Ahmad I of Gudjarat was besieging his capital, Mándú. Hoshangsháh, seizing a favourable opportunity, threw himself into Mándú, whereupon Ahmad Shih raised the siege and marched towards Sárangpur. Hoshang followed and attacked him but was defeated and shut himself in Sárangpur. He was again defeated when following Ahmad, who retired from Sárangpur. Later in the same year Hoshang made a rash and ineffectual attempt to seize the strong fortress of Gvályár. In 1428 Ahmad Sháh Bahmani of the Dakhán appeared before Kherla, which he claimed as an appanage of Berár, but retreated when he heard that Hoshang was marching to relieve the place. Hoshang followed him and forced an action, in which he sustained a severe defeat. In 1433-34 Hoshang marched against Kálpí and Ibrahim Sháh Sháh Sháhi of Dájpur marched to oppose him, but was recalled by the news that Mubárak Sháh of Díhí was advancing on Dájpur, and Kálpí fell, without a blow, into Hoshang's hands. On his way to Mándú, Hoshang punished some Hindú marauders who had invaded his dominions and then hastened on his way to compose the quarrels between his sons, which embittered his later years. Disputes and intrigues regarding the succession were so virulent as to disturb the unfortunate monarch's last months and hasten his end. He died on July 6, 1425, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Gházní Khán, entitled Múullam Sháh Sháh.

Bibliography: Foríštá, Gulhán-i ibráhími; Niğám al-Dín Ahmad, Tábází-i Akbari. (T. W. Haig.)

HÓT, a Balú tribe, one of the five main divisions of the race. The tribe is still found under this name in Makrán, but those who invaded the Pandjáb in company with the Rinds and Dódáis are better known by the names of the tribes formed at a later date, such as part of the Kóbsa tribe and the Báláčání section of the Mazáris. The Hót ruled as Nawábás at Dera Ismaíl Khán for two hundred years until they were conquered by Afghans. Hótés are still numerous throughout the South Pandjáb.

Forvéry alludes to them as Hótés, but confounds them with the Dódáis, from whom they were distinct.

Bibliography: Hughes, Balochistan, (London 1877); Ravery, Notes on Afghanistán, (London 1886), p. 4; Longworth Dames, The Baloch Race, (London, 1904); Bray, Balochistan Report, Census of India 1911, § 268. (M. Longworth Dames.)

HUBAL, the name of an idol, which was worshipped at Mecca in the Ka'bah but otherwise is only known from a Nabataean inscription (Corp. Insr. Semita, ii. n. 189 = Jassen et Savignac, Mission Archéol. en Arabie, i. 169, 170) where it is mentioned along with Dúghará and Manúttu. It is thus probable that the tradition according to which 'Amr b. Láháy (q. v.) brought the idol with him from Mesopotamia is correct in retaining a memory of the foreign, to be more accurate Aramaic, origin of Hubal, although the substance of the tradition is otherwise quite legendary. The name cannot be explained from the Arabic for the etymologies in Yákbi etc. condemn themselves, but Pocock's supposition that Hubal is equivalent to ʿHubal, although defended by Dory, is hardly better founded. Another tradition indeed relates that Hubal was an idol of the Banú Kifán, worshipped also by the Kuraish, and had been placed in the Ka'bah by Khuzaima b. Mudrika, wherefore it used to be called Hubal Khuzaima. It is further related that the idol was of red carnelian in the form of a man; the Kuraish replaced the right hand which was broken, by a golden one; it was the custom to consult the idol by divination with arrows; this was done for example by 'Abd al-Muṭṭalih with reference to his son 'Abd Alláh, etc. We learn nothing further about the cult of this idol and the legends are quite worthless for the comprehension of the real nature of the deity. After the conquest of Mecca Hubal shared the lot of all other idols and the image was removed from the Ka'bah and destroyed.


HÚD, the prophet who, according to the Kurán, appeared among the 'Ad [q. v.]. He is represented as one of their kinsmen (qáb) and his genealogy (which is transmitted in various forms), therefore coincides in part with that of their founder 'Ad. He is also identified with 'Abir (the Biblical 'Eber, the ancestor of the Hebrews); in another reference he is called the son of 'Abir [q. v.]. His figure is even more shadowy than the picture of his people and like every Warner he is represented in the same position as Muhammad in Meccan, i.e. he found only infidelity and pride among the people and his followers were few. God, therefore punished the 'Ad with a three-years' drought, as the later legend tells us. A deputation was sent to Mecca to pray for rain whereupon threes three clouds appear in the sky, one white, one red and one black. One of the deputation, called Káil, was given the choice of the three by a voice from heaven. He chose the black one with the result that a terrible storm broke over the 'Ad and destroyed the whole people with the exception of Húd and his followers (Súra, 69, 5). Húd is said to have lived 150 years. There are various traditions regarding his grave: there is a Kabir Húd not far from Hi't Barahat [q. v.]; in Ibn Batúta (ed. Paris, ii. 205; ii. 209) it is mentioned that the grave of Húd is in the great mosque at Damascus; according to other traditions he rests near the Ka'bah with 98 other prophets.

In the article 'Ad attention has already been called to the fact that the existence of a tribe of 'Ad is problematic. This is still truer of Húd. The word Húd in the Kurán is a name for the Jews as a body (Súra, i. 105, 139, 134. and the root H.W.D means to profess Judaism (i. 59, xv. 48 etc.). The proper name looks as if it had been derived from the verb and the noun: the tradi-
tional identification of Hūd with the ancestor of the Hebrews probably points in the same direction. Hirschedel is perhaps correct when he calls Hūd an allegorical figure (Beiträge zur Erklärung des Korān, Leipzig 1886, p. 17, note 4). Von Kremer’s suggestion (Über die südasirische Sagas, p. 21 sqq.), that the crater of Barahut was the immediate cause of the rise of the Hūd legend is worthy of note.


Hūd. After the assassination of Mundhir II b. Yahyā (cf. TOPJ) in the year 430 (1039) Abū Aiyāb Sulaimān b. Muhammad seized the government of the town of Saragossa and became the founder of a dynasty which ruled there and, according to Codera, in Lerida, Calatayud, and Tudela also till 503 (1110). The dynasty is known as the Banū Hūd, because Hūd, one of the Arabs who came to Spain at the conquest, was the ancestor of the family. There are various forms of the genealogy of Hūd preserved. The founder of the dynasty was commander of the Christian troops at Lerida in Mundhir’s reign and when he became lord of Saragossa took the name al-Mustāʿim. According to Codera, Estudios críticos de Historia Arába española, p. 562 sqq., he divided his power among his sons so that each of them became governor of one of the above mentioned towns, when Sulaiman died in 438 (1046–7). Of the rulers of Saragossa alone do we possess further details. In it there reigned in succession Abbad al-Muḍṭadir till 474 (1081), his son Yūsuf al-Mustāʿim till 478 (1085), his son Abū al-Mustāʿim (ii.) till 507 (1107). The last-named’s son ‘Amīd al-Dawla ‘Abd al-Malik lost his throne to the Almoravids ‘Alī b. Yūsuf in 503 (1110); authorities differ as to how this happened. ‘Amīd al-Dawla escaped to Rueda and lived there till 524 (1130). Cf. also the article MUHAMMAD b. Yūsuf B. Hūd.

Hūdibiya. A valley a short day’s journey (marbala) from Mecca, i.e. about 9 miles distant. A portion of it was included in the karam of Mecca, which extended farthest in this direction. About the time of the Hijra this barren valley was the centre of a local cult with a well and a sacred tree. A modest village afterwards arose here as the centre of the surrounding lands, which were rich in subterranean water.

It was towards the last months of the year 6 A.H. after the destruction of the Jewish clans and the hambing of the munākhān in Medina, that Muhammad was able to consider himself master of the situation. He therefore thought the moment had arrived for conducting a demonstration against Mecca as an answer to the siege of the Khābiṣ, which had been attempted by the Kuraishi. His persistent policy had made all preparations. He had assiduously concentrated the attention of his people on the metropolis of Mecca; the alteration of the kibāla, the application of the legend of Abraham, who was represented as the builder of the Ka‘ba, and the obligation to pilgrimage, which was now laid upon all believers, had no other object. The Prophet, seems at first to have meditated a military demonstration: 1400–1600 armed men were to have accompanied him. He then altered his plan and expressed his intention of performing the umra (lesser pilgrimage); the sacrificial animals taken with him were to complete the illusion. He would enter Mecca as a sovereign or force the Kuraishi to negotiate with him. His military escort was strong enough to gain the respect of the Meccans but too small to suggest thoughts of an attack. The Kuraishi took no risks and occupied the approaches. Muhammad had scarcely entered the sacred territory when he wasupon their outposts. Before this resistance he returned to Hūdibiya and entered into negotiations with them. He limited his demands to a request to be allowed to visit the national sanctuary with his followers, which was at first refused. Long and wearisome negotiations followed. As ‘Omar did not dare to go to Mecca as plenipotentiary, ‘Othman was chosen for the purpose, as the prestige of his family, the influential Omayyads, protected him. When the rumour of his death became current, Muhammad collected his followers at the sacred tree of Hūdibiya and demanded the oath of fealty from them. This is the ba‘a of Hūdibiya, also called the ‘abā‘ia of the agreement, an ambiguous allusion to a passage in the Kurān (sūra viii. 18) which is traditionally said to allude to these events. All the participants bear the name Shadhārī in the history of Islam, from the tree under which the ceremony took place. A few days later ambassadors arrived from Mecca. The treaty to be concluded was discussed clause by clause and word by word. In the protocol Muhammad had to refrain from using the formulee of Islam and the style of Prophet. He even pledged himself henceforth to send back deserters from the Kuraishi, while the Meccans made no such pledge with respect to Muslims. As to the umra, they were to be allowed to perform this in the following year provided they came without weapons except the swords by their sides.

This agreement severely disillusioned the companions who had already become impatient of the long period of inactivity and the want of water. In reality, however, in his struggle against Mecca the Prophet had here obtained an important diplomatic success. While on his side he surrendered no rights that he had won but only simple claims, he brought the Kuraishi oligarchy to negotiate with him on equal terms. He was for the first time recognised before all Arabia as a power in the land. The Kuraishi entered into negotiations with the former fugitive and leader of a band of fugitives, who had broken all bonds with their homes and the Dār al-Nadwa [q. v.] entirely binned out the past. Abū ‘I-Kāsim would take full advantage of it and be able to make full use of the freedom of movement now guaranteed him by a formal agreement. Medina had nothing more
to fear from Mecca. A means would be found to get round the burdensome concessions and to rescind the treaty. In the meanwhile Muhammad decided to stay in Ḥudaybiya the sacrificial animals he had brought with him and added certain ceremonies of the pilgrimage to the site.

**Bibliography:** Yāqūt, Muḥammad (Egyptian ed.) iii. 335—4; Bakri, Muḥammad (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 128, 272, 521, 813; Muslim, Sahih ii. 64, 65, 91, 92; Ibn Sa‘d, Ṭabaḥṣīb (ed. Sa‘dian), ii. 69. 70—3; 76; iv. ii. 40; Ibn Hanbal, Musnad, iii. 350, 355, 358, 396, 420, 458; iv. 48, 49, 322; v. 326; Caetani, Annali, iii. 139; Ibn Hisham, Sirā (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 740, 743, 745, 746; Wākīdī, Muḥammad (ed. Wellhausen), p. 242, 244, 260; Ibn al-ʿAbṭ, Ṣad al-Ǧāhīda, iv. 59.

(H. LAMMENS.)

**HUDHAIL, a large Arab tribe,** belonging to the North Arabian group. Their genealogy is Hudhai b. Madrika b. al-ʿYās b. Muʿāṣar. They were a brother tribe of the Khurais. They inhabited the mountains of Sarat Ḥudhai, which bear their name, between Mecca and Medina and were neighbours of the Sulaim [q. v.] and Kināna [q. v.]. In the time of Ḥajjāliya they worshipped the idol Suwāt (destroyed by ʿAmr b. ʿĀṣ in S = 630) at Ruhāṭ and, like the Kuraishi, Khuraṣa, and other tribes, also Manḥit (destroyed in S = 630 by Saʿd b. Zaid) at Kudaid, mentioned in Kurān lii. 19, 20. The Hudhai produced a great many poets, of whom the most important are the contemporaries of the Prophet, Abu Ǧussayb (q. v.) and Abu Ǧuraṣh.

The following places are mentioned, with others, as belonging to the Hudhai: Aththal (in Ṭhāmān), ʿĀdh, al-ʿAbdah (Wustenfeld, Register, p. 233, al-ʿAbdah), Ḍūrād, al-ʿAṣwāl, ʿĀly, Allāma, al-ʿArḍj (a large town near Ṭafṣ), Ṭāshm, Ṭan Anf, Batu Nūmān, Ḏjadad, al-Ḍajjā, Ḫudhun, al-Ḥarūda, al-Ḥijāb, Ḥayyār, Durā Farwā, Dabūt, Khaṣṣal, al-ʿArūn, al-Ṭāṭh, al-Manḥit, al-Muʿants, Nun (several villages), Rāy, Ṭarīṯ b. Rāḥib, Ṭarīṣ, Rakhmuṭ, Ṭuraita, Ṭuḥāt (3 miles from Mecca, also given as a wādī), al-Tillah, and ʿUrās; mountains: Arsal, ʿĀṣf, al-Ṣ̄īm (ʿUṣm, in Wustenfeld, Register, p. 133, given both as a mountain and a village), al-Ḍajjā, Fahl, Ghawāṣ (a very high peak, on which the town of Ṭafṣ stands, rich in game and honey), Ḥaid, Ḳabak, al-Karās, Khandhal, Kinthūl, Kurāsah, Ṭabān, Māḏīd (Wustenfeld, Register, l. c. Māḏī), Makā, Numār, Nubās (also given as a wādī), Salām, Sāl, ʿṢAAD, Shamsīr, ʿUṣm, ʿUṣr, al-Muṭṭalib and Khwālid b. Wāḥīla, the chiefs of the Hudhai, and Yaʿmar b. Nufūlha, chief of the Bakr. ʿAbd Manāṭ, then offered to cede him the third part of Ṭhāmān, if he would spare the Kaʿba and leave the country, but Abrah declined.

After the battle of Ḫudaybīya in 4 = 626, the Banū Lihyān, a clan of the Ḥudhai, assembled at ʿArna with other tribes around Mecca under Sufyān b. Khālid, to conspire against Muhammad. The Prophet, being told of this, had Sufyān murdered by ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUwaiss. ʿAbd Allāh brought his head to the Prophet and was presented by him with a stick which, according to the Prophet, was to serve as a mark of recognition on the day of resurrection. ʿAbd Allāh is said to have been buried with this stick, which he carried all his life. In the same year a number of Ḥudhai fell upon six companions of the Prophet at the watering-place of Raḍji; they were on their way from Muhāmmad to the ʿAdal and Khara to instruct them in the principles of Islam. The Hudhai slew four and brought the others to Mecca, where they sold them to the Kuraishi. After the conquest of Mecca by the Prophet in S = 630, a number of the Khuraṣa fell upon a section of the Ḥudhai and slew one of them: the Prophet, learning of this, during the midday service next day before the Kaʿba made an appeal to the Khuraṣa, urging them to refrain from further bloodshed.

The Ḥudhai still exist on the Ṭijbel Kora, a number of ranges round Taʿif, on one of which is the village of Raʾs al-Kora, according to Burckhardt, the most beautiful spot in the Ḥijāz, and far famed for the quality of its water. Here they encamp with their numerous herds and grow wheat and barley in the very charming valleys of these hills. Their clean little houses, scattered over the plain in groups of four or five, are built of stone or earth. There are also settlements of the Ḥudhai at Mabeda, the southern suburbs of Mecca, where they sell dates, corn and cattle. Before their conquest by the Wāḥhābi, they were only provisionally under Mecca and paid no taxes.

**Bibliography:** Hamdani, Dizāra, p. 173, 7—10; 182, 259, 185; Yaḥyā, Magraimin, index; Bekri, Geographisches Worterbuch, p. 198, 201, 207, 209, 408, 425, 488, 619, 709; Ibn Hisām, Sirā (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 15, 52; Aghānī, iv. 41, xv, 72, xviii. 214, 215; Tabari, Annals, l. c. 1431—4, 1684—9, 1753, 1757 and Index; Burckhardt, Travels in Arabia, i. 63—6, 130; C. Ritter, Erdkunde, xii. 37, 150—1, 166; xiii. 40—2, 85; Caussin de Perceval, Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'islamisme i. 93, 193 (note), 203, 273, 276; ii. 241—2; Muir, The Life of Muḥammad, i. 196; iii. 199—200; iv. 133—4; do., Annals of the Early Caliphate, p. 85; Wustenfeld, Genologische Tabellen, sect. ii, Tafel M, and Register, p. 233; Blau, Arabisch im sechsten Jahrhundert in der Zeitscr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges. S. 591; J. Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, i. (Berlin 1884), 2. Lieder der Hudaihititen (Arabic and German), p. 105 sqq.; A. Müller, Der Islam, i. 128.

(J. SCHLEIFER.)

**HUDUD, the hoopoe,** belongs to the order Sturnores and bears a remarkable tuft of feathers on its head. Much is related concerning its habits and character, of which only a part can be mentioned here. Its piety is particularly emphasised.

In Umayya b. Abī ʿSalṭ (ed. Schultes), in Reit- träge zur Assyriologie, viii. 86, 84 sq. cf. also Ibn ʿAbītaiba, Kitab al-Safir, ed. de Goeje, p. 279.
there is a story that the hoopoe enthroned its dead mother and carried the body on its back and head till it found a resting-place for it; this is why its back is brown. It is also related that the tuft of feathers was a reward for this act. — When its mate dies, the hoopoe does not look for a new wife. — When its parents grow old, it feeds them. It bears different kunya’s in Arabic, e.g. Abū Ṭūdād, Abū ’l-Qayyīda, after the numerous bows of its tuft as it walks. It makes its nest in dung so that it has an unpleasant smell. Its feathers, heart etc. are used in various ways. The Prophet is said to have forbidden it to be killed; according to some, its flesh is forbidden, according to others, it is permitted. The hoopoe plays a prominent part in the legend of Solomon and Bilqis. This was apparently already developed by Muḥammad’s time as may be concluded from Sūra xxvii. 20 sqq. In this passage we are told that Solomon assembled the birds and the hoopoe was missing. When he arrived late, he gave an account of the queen of Saba’ and was entrusted by Solomon with the bearing of a letter to the Sa’baeans. The later writers as a rule give the whole story as follows. The hoopoe possesses the power of seeing where water is through the earth. He was therefore used by Solomon on his pilgrimage to Mecca to find water. But on one occasion the hoopoe whom Solomon had appointed for this purpose, named Ya’far or Yaghfir, while on the journey, took a trip to the south and reached the garden of Bilqis where he made the acquaintance of another hoopoe named ‘Ufar. The latter told him a great deal about the queen of Saba’. In the meanwhile Solomon was looking in vain for water for his army (or according to another version for ritual ablutions). He sent the vulture (nasr) to assemble the birds and the hoopoe was missing. The eagle (naṣīb) was sent to fetch him. But he was already on his way back and was brought by the eagle before Solomon, who talked to him severely but finally, after hearing his account of Bilqis sent him with a letter to the Sa’baeans. Another version of the beginning of the story, relates that Solomon on his pilgrimage was being carried with all his retinue on a carpet by the winds to Arabia. The birds were ordered to fly above the carpet in such a compact mass that those sitting on it should be entirely protected from the sun. But Solomon detected a little ray of light in one place; so he concluded that one bird was missing. He then held a roll-call and it was found that the hoopoe was absent; the story continues as before. It is also related that the hoopoe once invited Solomon and his army to a feast on an island. When the guests had arrived, he threw a dead locust into the fire and said “Now eat, 0 thou Prophet of God! If the meat be lacking, there is at least plenty of sauce”. Solomon and his soldiers laughed for a year at this joke. On the relationship of the Jewish hoopoe-legend to the Muslim, see Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge zur Semitischen Sagenkunde. In North Africa, hoopoes are made out of silk, feathers, etc., and used for magical purposes (Doutté, Magie et Religion dans l’Afrique du Nord, p. 270 sqq. Bibliography: Damir, Ḥāyāt al-Hayawan, s. v. ḥudūd; Ǧāḥis, Ḥayāt al-Hayawān (Cairo, 1323), iii. 160 sqq.; Kamm, Ḥayāt al-Malakāt (ed. Wustefeld), i. 425 sqq.; Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge, p. 200 sqq.; do., Zeitliche, Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., xxxi. 206 sqq.; Welh, Bildliche Legenden der Muselmaner, p. 243 sqq.; the commentaries on the Kurān to Sūra, 27, 20 sqq.; Tabari (ed. de Goejé), i. 576 sqq.: Thālāth, Ǧīzā; al-ṣabīrāt (1290), p. 335 sqq.: W. M. Thomson, The Land and the Book (London 1859), i. 105 (with illustration); Salzberger, Die Salomote vergeleichen der semitischen Literatur (Heidelberg Dissertation, Berlin 1907), i. 75 sqq. (A. J. Wessink K.) HUCLUDIYAH. [See Ḥıdāya.]

HUDDR. [See Ḥuduras.]

HUEDJIRA. [See Hīdjiyā.] HUDDJA, e. ‘Adi of the tribe of Kinda, the “first martyr” of the Shī’a. The sect would like to give him the title of “companion of the Prophet” but it is denied by the oldest authorities. The Shī’a likewise, with as little ground, makes him take part in the first Syrian campaigns, when he is said to have conquered the district of Mārdj ’Adhār; but the object of this clearly is simply to connect him from the earliest time with this place, which was to be the scene of his martyrdom. At an early period Ḥudjr threw himself heart and soul into ‘Ali’s cause and fought for him at the battle of the Camel and at Siffin. We later find him in Egypt with Muhammad, son of the Caliph Abū Bakr, who was governing this province in ‘Ali’s name. After Abī’s son Ḥasan had given up his claim to the Caliphate, Ḥudjr became the moving spirit in all the ‘Alid intrigues in Kūfah. The governor Mughira b. Shu’ba had even to offer him money to obtain peace. Mughira’s successor, Ziyād b. Abīhi, endeavoured to bring him to a more reasonable frame of mind; but his efforts failed with this unruly spirit, who always played an important part. On Ḥasan’s death, Ḥudjr entered into negotiations with his brother Ḥusain; the pretender had been invited to take command over the army in Kūfah. During Ziyād’s absence in Basra Ḥudjr had attempted to stir up a revolutionary movement. Ziyād hurried back with all possible speed and endeavoured to settle the affair peacefully. But when the negotiations fell through, Ziyād had Ḥudjr arrested along with those leaders of the Shī’a party who were most deeply compromised. The matter was taken to the courts and an indictment prepared and signed by the most prominent men in Kūfah; finally Ḥudjr was taken with his companions to Mu’āwiya in Syria. After the Caliph had arranged a new trial and asked the advice of the leading men of Syria, he sentenced Ḥudjr to death and had him executed in Mārdj ’Adhār near Damascus. In his last moments ‘Ali’s follower utterly lost his courage. His
death opens the mythology of the She'ā; hence the importance assigned to this rather everyday episode, which was really nothing more than an incident in the domestic troubles of the ʿIraq. ʿAbbās “throughout maintained a correct attitude and Muʿṭawwa even inclined to the side of leniency” (Willenschon), for he pardoned the majority of Ḥudriya’s accomplices.


HUDRA (A.), room, chamber, particularly (with the article) ʿIṣba's room, where the Prophet and his two successors Abū Bakr and ʿOmar were buried, now one of the greatest sanctuaries of Islam. [ Cf. the article MEDINA.]

Ḥudriya is derived from the same word; it was the term applied in Egypt to the slaves who were quartered in barracks near the royal residence. During the Fatimid period, these were organised by al-Afjāl on military lines as an emir, a kind of bodyguard under the command of an emir, who bore the title al-Muwaṣṣal. Their number then amounted to 3000 men: Cf. Makrī, Kitāb, i. 442.

ḤUDRIYA, (Hodjriya, Hodseyrie), the name of a tribe in South Arabia. Their land lies to the north of the land of the Sohbē (Subaih, [q.v.]) between 43° 40' and 44° 42' East Long. Greew. and 13° 5' and 13° 15' North. Lat. and is entirely mountainous. The climate is tropical; the principal product is coffee. Among the mountains we may mention Djbel Sabr (Sabir [q.v.]) which is described by Hamdānī in his Dāʾira as a very high mountain, among wādis, the Wādi Warasan which joins the Wādi Tubhān, the river of Lahji [q.v.], and belonged in Hamdānī’s time to the Sakkār, and the Wādi Muṣka (Moṣka); among towns, Dohban belonging to the important clan of Sherdjib (Shergeb), which at one time had an independent Sultan, with about 500 inhabitants (of whom about a fifth are Jews), an old Hamyder palace, a bazaar and a Saturday market, Dār Shawwar, the chief place of the powerful clan of Hammād, which has an ʿādī of its own, with about 300 inhabitants (including only a few Jews), several hin and a Friday market, Ḥeruwa on the wādī of the same name with about 300 inhabitants (including a few Jews), a small bazaar and a Tuesday market, Dimena, near Taʿīraz [q. v.] with about 600 inhabitants (of whom a tenth are Jews). In the land of the Hammād there is a hot mineral well with a bath, called Birket Hammām, visited by many Arabs, but access to it is forbidden to Jews.

The Ḥudriya claim to be true Ḥumyar, and are said to have at one time formed one tribe with the Soubē. They were earlier under the Imāmate of Sanāʾ, but became independent on the decline of its power. Since the middle of the 9th century they have become for the most part sub-

ject to the Dhu Muḥammad, who are descended from the Bakil (see Khāqān and Bakil), and were formerly in the pay of the Imāms of Sanāʾ, and obtained possession of a large part of the Yemen on the latter’s overthrow.

The Dhu Muḥammad maintain small garrisons among the Ḥudriya, levy taxes on them and administer justice among them. Their chief representative bears the title Khāʾid. Many Ḥudriya seek to escape the rule of the Dhu Muḥammad, who as followers of the heterodox Zaidi sect are hateful to them as Shīʿa, by migrating to Aden, where they earn a livelihood as labourers.


AL-ḤUDRIYĀT, plur. of Ḥudra (q. v.); title of Sara ʿlix.

AL-ḤUDRIYIR. [See ḪĀṬA GANDI KĀRISHI.]

HUDNA, a calm, truce, armistice; al-Hudna denotes especially the truce made between Muḥammad and Kūraishi at al-Ḥudaybiya. [See this art.]

HUDUD (A.), Plur. of Hadd [q. v.]

HUELVA, the ancient Onuba, Arabic Walba, a town in the province of Spain of the same name, on the left bank of the Odiel, an important port, accessible at high tide to seafaring ships, for the copper and sulphur mines of Rio Tinto and Tharsis, which are near it. In the middle ages it was, according to Idriśi, a small, thickly populated, walled town with flourishing trade and industries. The present population is 29,000. After the fall of the Omayyad dynasty, Huelva had its own rulers, the Bakri Abū Zaid Muḥammad b. Aiyūb and Abū Muḥṣab ʿAbd al-ʿArīf. In 1051 the latter ceded the town to al-Muṭājīd of Seville on condition that he was left the little island of Shaliṭ (Saltes), but when he saw that this was of no use to him, he sold his ships and armaments to al-Muṭājīd and went to Cordova. Huelva henceforward shared the fortunes of Cordova.


HUESCA, the ancient Osca, Arabic Waskha, a town in the Spanish province of the same name, 50 miles E. of Saragossa. The number of inhabitants is now 12,600. Huesca was conquered as early as 96 (713) by the Arabs, and seems during the period of Arab rule to have formed for a time an independent principality under Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Malik al-Tawil, died 301 (913–4). Cf. Codera, Estudios criticos de Historia arabe Española, p. 234 sqq. In 1096 the rule of the Moors ended and Huesca became for a brief period capital of Aragon, till the seat of the government was moved to Saragossa in 1118. Idriṣi, op. cit., p. 176, only mentions the name of the town.


HUFASH, a high mountain in South Arabia, belonging to the al-Muṣainī range of the Sarāt group, on the Wādi Surud near Ḥaraz [q. v.]. It is often mentioned by Hamdānī in his
HÜLĂGÜ (also written Hulagü) a Mongol conqueror and founder of a Mongol kingdom in Persia, born about 1217 A. D. Sent by his brother Mongke to be the head of an army against the Iłgāš and the Caliph, he left Mongolia in 611 = 1253 but did not cross the Amū-darīa till the 1st Dhu'l-Hijjah 653 = 1st January 1256. There he received the homage of most of the petty rulers of Persia and the Caucasian lands; in the course of the year 614 = 1256 the greater number of the Iłgāši strongholds were taken without difficulty; on the fall of the dynasty cf. the article ASSASSINS (i. 491). On Wednesday and Thursday 9th—10th Muḥarram 656 = 16th—17th January 1258 the Caliph's army was routed in a pitched battle and on the following day Hulagü stood before the walls of Baghdad, where he met with no resistance to speak of; on the fate of the Caliph, his line and his capital, cf. the article BAGHDĀD (i. 563). An attempt made in 657 = 1260 to conquer Syria failed; Hulagü succeeded in taking Ḥalab and advanced as far as Ḥāṭirn (q. v.) himself, sending his generals to lay siege to Damascas, but was forced to return to Persia on hearing of the death of the Great Khān Mongke; on 25th Ramāḍān 658 = 3rd Sept. 1260 the army which he had left behind was destroyed by the Egyptians. Hulagü later tried to renew the struggle and with this object entered into an alliance with the Franks but was unable to execute his purpose. On the unsuccessful war with the kingdom of the Golden Horde 660 = 1262 cf. BERKE (i. 738).

The petty kingsoms in al-Jīzāra, Kūrtiṣān and Asia Minor as well as the Christian territories south of the Caucasus were incorporated as vassal states in the kingdom founded by Hulagü so that his power stretched from the Amū-darīa almost to the Mediterranean and from the Caucasus to the Indian Ocean. The sovereign took the title Ilkān ("subordinate khan" or "khan of the tribe"); he, like his successors down to Ghāzān Khān (cf. ii. 149), reigned in the name of the Great Khān living in Mongolia (later in China). Hulagü himself was also called "the great Ilkān" (Iltīkān-buzur). The Christian element in his people was particularly favoured by Hulagü and especially by his Christian wife Dōkār Khātūn, often to the detriment of the Muslims. The towns destroyed during his wars were in part rebuilt even in Hulagü's time; he himself in times of peace delighted to live in northwestern Aḏharbidājān, particularly on the banks of Lake Urmia, where many edifices, such as the famous observatory on a hill north of Marāgā, a palace in Aḏātāgh, temples of idols (baḥrānāhā) in Khōl, etc. were built. Most of these buildings were still standing 40 years later when Rāshīd al-Dīn was writing his work; remains have not yet been discovered. Hulagü built or restored (cf. Yākūt, i. 513, on the earlier fortress on the same island) a strong castle on the mountainous peninsula of Shāhī on the east shore of the lake, which had once been an island (whether this was still the case in Hulagü's time is not certain; Rāshīd al-Dīn only speaks of a mountain on the bank of the lake); the treasures won in battle in Persia and other lands were kept there; Hūlägū and his successor Abāk (q. v., i. 4) were
buried there. According to Egyptian sources, the tower in Sīrah collapsed in 681 = 1282-3 and fell into the lake with all its treasures; no such catastrophe is mentioned in the Persian authorities. 1Juflāb ʿAbrū (cf. above ii. 213) only says that in his time the castle was quite uninhabited (cf. Raušid al-Dīn, ed. Quatemere, p. 316 sq.; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 160 sq.). Hūlānī died on Sunday 19th Rabi’I 11 663 = 8th February 1265. According to the Mongol custom, beautiful young maidens were buried with him; this is the last occasion on which this custom is mentioned among the Persians, even in the heathen period. 2Bilbliography: D’Ohsson, Histoire des Mongols, iii. 134 sq.; Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte des Islāmus, i. 79 sq.; Howorth, History of the Mongols, iii. 90 sq.; Histoire des Mongols de la Perse par Raušid al-Dīn, publ. par M. Quatemere, Paris 1836; Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte unserer Völker, 49 sq. (Tartaria Wastyp), 49, edited 1839, p. 275 sq. (W. Barthold.) 3Al-HULUL AL-MAWṣIYYA FT DIHK AL-ĀKU-RAB AL-MARrimonKHAYA, an anonymous work, does begin especially with the history of Merrāskūsh. The author begins his history with the foundation of the city; he deals in detail with the history of the Almoravids and Almohads but on reaching the Marinids, he only gives a summary list of the rulers of this dynasty. We find at the end of the book that he lived in Merrāskūsh. The work has been attributed to Ibn ʿAbīḥā (17) and by its recent editor to Lišān al-Dīn b. ʿAbīḥā (17); but the author himself tells us (p. 136) that he compiled (completed?) the work on the 12th Raušid 11 786 (4th May 1384), Dozy’s manuscripts are dated 783 and Ibn al-ʿAbīḥā was assassinated at the beginning of 776 (1374). The preface and the chapter on Yūsūf b. Tāshirūn’s expeditions to Spain were published by Dozy, Scriptores Arabum loci de Barbadiis, i. 182–209; he has also given the chapter on the Almohad Alūd Yaḥyā’s expedition in his Recherches sur l’histoire et la littérature de l’Espagne (3rd ed., Appendix xxvii). p. lxx-lxxix). A short extract is given in Amari’s Appendice alla Biblioteca Arabo-Sicula (Leipzig 1875), p. 62–63. The text has been published very inaccurately at Tunis (n.d.) with the biography of the supposed author Ibn al-ʿAbīḥā. In the xvith century Spanish translation was made which is now in the Government House at Algiers; it was inserted (without indication of provenance) by Conde in his Historia de la dominacion de los Arabes en España, iii. ch. ix.—lviili. 4Bilbliography: R. Basset, Notice sommest des manuscrits orientaux de deux bibliothèques de Lisbonne (Lisbon 1894), p. 11–24; Jacques ton, Les Archives espagnoles du Gouvernement Général de l’Algérie (Algiers 1894), p. 98–109; Pons Boigues, Estudy bi-bibliogràfico, p. 393–5. (René Basset.) 5HULMĀNYA, a mystic sect founded in Damascus by Abū Hulmān al-Fārisī al-Halabī. He appears to have been a disciple of Ibn Sālim of Basra (died 297 = 909); he was admitted among the Šufī Shīʿahs in the Taʿarruf of Kalażādhī (s. v. sim) but excommunicated by the Shīʿahs. After having maintained the theses 1. that God is present in the person of men endowed with physical beauty (iṣṭāb) 2. that everything is allowed (išāb) to him who knows to worship the presence of God in them. This is perhaps a corruption of the Sālimīya thesis on the divine taʿaffūl. 6Bilbliography: Maktū, Badī Damascus, ed. Huart, ii. 90–92; Salmān (cf. s. v. Hulūl); Baghdādī, Farāk, ed. Badr, p. 245–6; Ḥujjāwīrī, Kašif al-Mahṣūbī, transl. Nicholson, p. 131, 260. (Louis Massignon.) 7HULUL, a philosophical term, derived from ḥalla “to loosen, unfold, alight, settle in a place (maḥshīl),” whence its classical acceptions in Muslim theology, the relation between a body and its place, an accident and its substance. Ḥulūl has also been applied to the substantial union 1. of the body and the soul, Ḥulūl al-nābī f. l-badan, 2. of a divine spirit with man, Ḥulūl al-ʿāk al f. l-nūrī f. l-nūrī (Fārābī, ʿArī Abī ʿAlī al-Mādinī al-qāsimī; ed. Cairo, 1906, p. 86), Ḥulūl al-lāhā f. l-nūrī (cf. al-Hallaj). The Aristotelian doctrine of hylomorphism, like the Christian doctrine of the incarnation, proposed the union to matter of a spiritual substance, its specific form; it may be compared to a force in its sphere of action. Almost all Muslim theologians (Maturākīns) reject it; followers of atomism such as ʿAṣārī, al-Nāṣirī, and Ḥuṣain al-Tabarsi, added Ḥulūl in case 1., for they saw in the raḥ a subtle body, even in the angels and demons, but they rejected it in case 2. as submitting the divine essence to a partition (taṣawwuf), and to transmigration (taḥāyīqa), whence the excommunication both by Ṣunnī and Shiʿa of the following sects as Ḥulūlīya on the same grounds as the Christians: (a) the extreme Ṣūrī (Ẓāhirī): Shāhīya, Ḥaynāya, Ḍaŋānīya, Ḥassānīya, Ṣafāwīya, Tāmrānīya, ʿĀzārīya, Druses, b. ʿAṣārī ʿAlī al-Hulūlīya (q. v.), Fārisīya (cf. al-Hallaj), Shabbāsīya. c. Monists: Iṭḥāḍīya (Inb Taimiyya calls Ḥulūl ʿalā nūrī their “maḥshīl al-nūrī”), cf. “taṣawwuf al-ʿāmīl,” Farghānī, Mūṭahāra ʿl-Mādinī, (ed. Cairo 1293, ii. 84–86; cf. ibn al-ʿArabi.) 8Bilbliography: Sulami, ʿAlāṣār al-Ṣufī, MS. Cairo, Führ. vii. p. 174 sqq., 77–79; al-Ḥujjāwīrī, ʿAlāṣār al-maḥṣūbī, transl. Nicholson, p. 260–4; Gharaib, ʿAlāṣār al-asmāʾ, Cairo 1324, p. 76; Ibn al-Dāʾī, Tunkīra, lith. Teheran, p. 406, 419; Ibn Taimiyya, Awāmiqī, Ms. Damascus xxii, (extrait printed in Alūsī, Ḳulā, p. 54–61); Ḥaṭāmī, Fārāwī šaṭaṭīya, p. 238–9; Dalldī, Sharī ʿal-ṣulāḥīya, chap. iv. 3, n. 5; Ḥa ṭāḏī, id., ibid.; al-Ṭahānawī, Ṣuḥbaṭ ʿal-furūnā, ed. Spenger, p. 349–354; Friedlander, in J. Am. Or. Soc. xxvii. 34, 36, 65– 72; xxix, 13, 52, 98, 99. (Louis Massignon.) 9HULWĀN, Greek Xάλα, a very ancient town at the entrance to the Zagros passes, Zagrī Pylac = ʿAḵāba-i Hulwān, now utterly deserted. The site of the town on the left bank of the Hulwānācāi south of Seri Pūl is still recognisable by the ruins of a building called Tāk-i Gīra (illustrated in Flândin and Coste, Voyage En Perse, iv. Pl. 214), which dates from Sassanian times. According to Arab tradition (cf. Tābarī, in Noldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 138), the town was founded by Kyawād 1 (488–496) but in reality it is much older and existed under the same name (Khalamān) even in the Assyrian period. The surrounding country is very fertile, fruit-trees being particularly numerous, and the figs of Hulwān are celebrated in the east under the
name šāhk anjīr (king’s figs). There are also many sulphur springs around the town.

When the Arabs under Idrīs l. ‘Abd Allāh captured Hulwān in 19 (649), it was a flourishing town and continued to enjoy its prosperity in the early centuries of the Ḥijāra. The Arab geographers sometimes place it in ʿIrāq ʿArab but more usually in the province of Dībāl. The town was surrounded by a wall, which had 8 gates, which are detailed by al-Muqaddasi. The great mosque was in an ancient castle in the centre of the town, and the Jews had a synagogue, which was held in great reverence, outside the walls. Towards the end of the fourth (beginning of the tenth) century an almost independent dynasty was ruling in Hulwān, which was founded by Muhammad b. Anūz and became very important under his son Abū l-Shawk (cf. Fāris b. Muḥammad, ii. 68). In 437 (1046) Hulwān was burned by the Sa’dījīs under Ibrāhīm Ināl; it also suffered severely from an earthquake, for example in 544 (1149), so that by the seventh century it was in ruins. The Arab poets devote much attention to Hulwān on account of two palm-trees which used to be there and on which they have much to tell.

**Bibliography:** Bibl. Geogr. Arab., ed. de Goeje, see Indices; Yākūt, Muḥammad, ii. 316 sqq.; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 196; Ritter, Erdkunde, i. 388 sqq., 470 sqq.

**HULWĀN, a village in Egypt on the right bank of the Nile, 3 farsakh south of Fustāṭ, celebrated by the Arab poet Ibn Khāl Khayyāt (ed. Rhodokanakis, iii. 6 sqq.) in a panegyric on ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān [g.v.], who had a pleasure-garden there. The village still exists and has given its name to the health resort of Helwān, which lies farther inland and is of modern origin; it now has over 8,000 inhabitants and is much visited.**

**Bibliography:** Yākūt, Muḥammad, ii. 321; Baedeker, Egypt 6th.**

**HUMA (v.), the bearded griffon, the largest of the birds of prey of the old world, which lives by preference in the neighbourhood of eternal snows; it is the Lämmergeier of the Alps. It carries off which of those dead animals, smashes them on the rocks and eats the fragments; so that the poet Sa’dī is able to say that the humā is superior to other birds, because instead of feeding on living flesh it only requires bones (Gulista, i. story 15). According to a popular belief, which is ancient, the shadow of a humā falling on a person’s head is a sign that he will be raised to a throne, whence the epithet humayyān, “august”. One who deliberately kills a humā will perish within forty days. The good omen associated with this bird is again shown in another verse of the Gulista (Book i, story 3) “No one shall go to seek the shadow of an owl, even if there were no humā in the universe.”**

**Bibliography:** D. C. Philott, Bāʿr-nāme-i Nāṣīr, p. 27, note 1; Rīdā-Kullé Khān, Farhang-i Nāṣīrī (rationalist objections). (CL. Huart.)

**AL-ḤUMAIDĪ, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Abī Naṣr Fūṭuḥ b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Fūṭuḥ b. Muḥammad b. Yāṣīr al-ʿAzīz, whose father was born in Cordova in the quarter of al-Ruṣāfa, and afterwards went to live in Majorca, was born in the latter place some years before 420 = 1029. After studying in Spain under the direction of Abū ʿOmar Yūsūf b. Abū al-Harrur and Abu Muḥammad Ḥasan b. Ḥasan al-Zahrār, to whom he was particularly attached, he set out for the east in 448 = 1056. During his travels he studied the Rūṣāfa and the Muṣṭafar al-Muṣṭafara, with their author, the jurist Ibn Abī Za‘id. He visited Cairo, Mecca and Medina, Syria and the ʿIrāq and settled in Bagdād where he died in the end of the year 491 = 1098 December 1095. He was buried in the ʿAbāb Ḥabūn cemetery but his remains were removed in 491 = 1098 to the ʿAbāb Ḥabūn cemetery and interred near the tomb of Bishr al-Hāfiz. Among his eastern teachers are mentioned Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī l-Fath, the historian Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb, Abī Naṣr Ibn Māki, and among his pupils, Yūsuf b. Ayyūb al-Nahār, Muḥammad b. Tārkhān, and his teacher Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb, Jurist, tradi-

**HUMAYUN PĀDHĀN. Full name Nasir al-Dīn Humayun, also styled Dāhān bānī, and after his death, Dānāt Ashtiānī (nesting in Paradise), eldest son of Bābur and Māhmūd Begān, born Kabul citadel 6 March 1508, emperor of India end of December 1556, died at Dihlī a fall down stairs from the roof of his library, 27 Jan. 1556; father of Akbar by Miyrām Makhānī, Hāmīdā Bānī. He was a good natured and generous prince, and inherited graceful manners from his father and from his mother who was of a Persian, saintly family and related to Sulṭān Ḥusain. He was also a scholar and a mathematician, but he was indolent and addicted to his opium. In his youth he was an active soldier, and conquered Gudjarat. But he could not control his brothers or himself. He bore with the former for a long time, but at last caused Kāmān to be blinded. He went to Bengal and lived carelessly at Gau. Twice defeated by Ḥīrā Khān he had to fly to Persia. There Ṭāmānšāh helped him to recover his throne. His**
success in regaining India was chiefly due to his general Bairam Khan who won for him the victory at Machtawîr and also that over Sikandar Sûr at Sîrîn in June 1555. He had a poetical talent and wrote a Divân. His widow Hâdîji Begam, erected a massive tomb over him near Dhilli.

Bibliography: Akbarnama; Badardin i. ii. the Tabâhkit-i Abar of Nâzîm al-Din; Firdâsî, the Memoirs of his half-sister Gulbadan Begam; Dâjwâr Afâfî and Bayâzid Biyûtî; Bahîr's Memoirs; Khânjâm, Hâmâyûndînsâc; Elliot, History, Ind. v. v. Elinphisto, deo.; Siddîq Ali Re'sî, Travels, trans. Vâmbéry (Lazze 1899); Erskine, Hist. Ind. v. ii. Notices et extraits, iv. p. 280. (H. Beveridge)

HUMAYûN-NAMA, the title of the Turkish version of the Kitâlî wa-Dimnâ [q. v.]

AL-HUMAZA (A.), the slânderer; title of Sûrâ cîv.

AL-HUMS. This is the same traditionally given to the inhabitants of the haram of Mecca at the time of Muhammad's appearance, in so far as they were distinguished by special customs during the Iftâr, but made waqf in al-Mudâlîfah (according to Arab tradition in Nâmira). Snouck Hurgronje, op. cit., p. 130 sqq.) and from there began the Iftâr (this is said to be forbidden in Kur'ân ii. 195 cf. al-Tabarti, Tâfarî, ii. 163 sqq.), that they only lived in leather tents, made the circuit of the Ka'ba in sandals and did not enter their dwellings through the usual entrance (but, for example, through an opening in the roof). On the last named custom, against which Kur'ân ii. 185 is directed, there are discrepant traditions, according to which it was rather the Ansâr who practised it (see also al-Tabarti, op. cit., ii. 195 sqq.); in al-Azraqî, p. 112 infra; however, the Aws and Kha'rajd included among the Hums.

It is further stated that the clothes of the Hilla, after they had completed the waqf, had to remain at the sacred place. They were thrown around the Ka'ba as lasâfî (in other circumstances also a garment could become lasâfî, cf. al-Azraqî, p. 118, 4 sqq.) and mouldered away under the influence of the weather. One who wished to keep his robe, took it off at the entrance to the sanctuary and made the circuit naked or in a garment borrowed or hired from one of the Hums (cf. Robinson Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, p. 451). It is also said that the Hilla, who came to perform the Hâdîjî or Umrah, were not allowed to wash them while they carried with them from the hîlî. They could only eat food given by or purchased from the people of the haram. Kur'ân vii. 27, 29 is said to refer to these last customs (cf. also al-Tabari, op. cit., viii. 104, 19 sqq., 108–111).

The meaning of the word Hums (sg. AHamaz; also AHamais) is obscure; the opposite Hilla, according to Wellhausen, points to the meaning 'consecrated'; according to Noldeke (in a private letter), who is inclined to doubt the reality of this contract, al-Hums, like al-Áfânîs (Hamâsa, p. 283, v. 1), might mean 'the hot' with reference to the corresponding root; the denominative hamâsa is used in al-Azraqî, p. 123, 123, of a mother, who by a vow dedicates her son to be an áhmas; cf. I Sam. i. 10 sq.


HUMAIN, a deep and irregular valley, with clusters of palm-trees, situated a day's journey from Mecca on one of the roads to Tâif; the scene of the famous battle, the second mentioned by name in the Kur’ân (v. 96) fought soon after the surrender (faţah) of Mecca. The confederate tribes of the Hawâzîn did not wish to await the result of this last trial of strength before mobilising all the forces at their disposal. They posted themselves in the defiles commanding the plain of Hûmain. Their commander Malik b. Æwîf brought their families and flocks with them; their presence, he thought, would make his men invincible.

On the course of the battle we have a number of notices, all inspired by the text of the Kur'ân. The latter testifies that— in spite of the imposing number of Muslim warriors— the action began with a complete rout of the Prophet's forces. His army owed its safety to the intervention of 'invisible troops'. Setting out from this statement each author has set about a compilation representing these two phases of the battle, not forgetting to magnify the valour of his own fellow tribesmen or of individuals of special interest for the early history of Islam. For the rest the confusion and the contradictions of these accounts show that at quite an early period the Sîra found great difficulty in reconstructing the development of the manoeuvres in the battle.

On leaving the narrow oasis of Hûmain the road enters winding gorges, suitable for ambushes. In them Malik b. Æwîf awaited the Muslims, coming along in no order and not suspecting the presence of the enemy. Surprised by the sudden attack of the Bedouin cavalry, overwhelmed by a hail of arrows, the Prophet's soldiers retired in disorder. 'In spite of its size, the earth appeared too small for the fugitives' (Kur'ân ix. 23); for a moment Muhammad, left alone, was in great danger. Tradition has great difficulty in glossing over this cowardly desertion; it throws the responsibility for it on the Bedouin allies of the tribe of Sulaîm and on the faţîb or still insed Meccans. The accounts — according to their Kâraish or Ansâri origin — claim for the Muâhadjîr or Medine respectively the honour of not having given way. Those versions which are inspired by the court of Baghdâd display no less zeal in favour of the Hâshîmids. All authors, except the Shi'îs, endeavour to protect the reputation of the future Caliphs Abû Bakr and Ùmar. In the hagiologies of Islam it is considered a signal merit, indeed a marvel, to have stood firm at Hûmain.
Victory finally rested with the Muslims. On this point we have the statement of the Kur'an, confirmed by the advance of the Prophet to lay siege to Ta'if. The access to this town was therefore open. How then was the advantage restored to the Muslim arms? Here again the Kur'an suggests the answer: "God sent innumerable troops from on high to chastise the unbelievers". Khālid b. al-Walid, who commanded the cavalry, was among the few Muslims wounded that day. He must therefore have been risking his life and it seems legitimate to give him the credit of the victory, equally claimed for the Antioch of the Medesene school. Hunain was not a battle, but two routes; first that of the Muslims, then that of the Bedouins of Hwazān. This account for the large number of prisoners — 6000 women and children are mentioned — and the almost negligible losses of the Muslim troops, about twelve killed. The booty captured was enormous, over 24,000 camels. The fleeing Bedouins sought refuge behind the ramparts of Ta'if.

**Bibliography:** Yāqūt, Muqaddim (Egyptian edition), iii. 354; Bakri, Muṣāmā (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 287; Ya'qūbī, Hist. (ed. Houtsma), ii. 64; Muslim, Saḥīh, i. 289, 291; ii. 61, 62, 76; Ibn Sa'd, Taḥāḥṣīb (ed. Sachau), i. p. 108—109, 110, 112, 113; iii. i. p. 11—12, 124, 195; Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, i. 207, 454; ii. 197, 199, 279, 280; iv. 58, 281, 289, 351; Tabari, Taṭār al-Kūrān, x. 62, 63, 64; Ibn Hishām, Sirā (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 844, 845, 849—850; Ṭabarī, Ananâls (de Goeje), iii. 234, 234; Ibn al-Ṭabīb, Uṣūl al-Dīnāb, iv. 59; Nawawī, Tahāhīb, p. 459; Caetani, Anâls, i. 167.

(From: *H. Lammens.*)

**ḤUINAIN B. ISḥĀKH.** His full name was ABDUZĀDI ḤUINAIN. He was a member of a family belonging to the Christian Arabic tribe of Ḥiyyād and was born at Hira in 194 = 809-810, where his father was an apothecary; he was educated as a physician and as the translator of numerous Greek works into Syriac and Arabic. As a young man he came to Baghdad where he became a pupil of the physician Yahyā b. Māsāwālī. He completed his education in Asia Minor and became particularly proficient in the Greek language, which qualified him for his later translations. On returning to Baghdad he began his literary activity with the support of the Banū Musa, for whom he had collected Greek works, and became physician to the Caliph al-Mutawakkil. On account of his attitude to iconoclasts he was suspected of blasphemy and excommunicated by Bishop Theodore; thereupon took poison out of melanclys and died in Ṣafar 260 = December 873.

Of his own works there have survived the Kātāb al-Mudkhal fī 'l-Tībī, translated into Latin and printed as Itagoge Johannis ad Tegni Galeni or Johannitii Isagoge in artein partum Galeni; another version of the same work entitled Kitāb al-Maṣāzil fī 'l-Tībī li-Ṭūfatulimīn; a Kitāb al-Mawalid; ein Kātāb Idrīmsīrat al-Falārisa fī Būyūt al-Hikmat fī 'l-Ayyād wa-Tayārūd al-Hikma bainahun; several works on physics and astronomy; the "Aphorisms of the Philosophers" in a Hebrew translation. Among translations it is principally those of Platonic, Aristotelian or Hippocratic works that are ascribed to him, also that of Dioscorides' ṭalī 'l눔 nlstnłc, but especially almost all the works of Galen, so that, according to Ibn Abī Usāba, "hardly anything by Galen exists which was not translated or improved by him". In addition, translations of the Quadrupartition of Ptolomy etc., are ascribed to him.

There can be no doubt that of the numerous translations ascribed to him a portion at least are to be placed to the credit of his son Isḥākh b. Ḥuina, his nephew Ḥuibaish and others. It may be particularly mentioned that the translation of Galen edited by M. Simon is ascribed to Ḥuibaish as a result of a critical analysis of its language by G. Bergstrasser. For the details see the Bibliography.


**HUNZA—NAGIR.** The two districts of Hunza and Nagar, which occupy an isolated valley between 36° and 37° N. and 74° 25' and 75° E., are generally considered as one country under the joint name of Hunza Nagar (often written Hunza-Nagyr). This valley communicates by difficult gorges with Gilgit, and is drained by the Kundūr River which falls into the Gilgit River a tributary of the Indus. From the north it can be approached by passes leading on to the Taghua-dambar Pāmir, by which there is communication with Sarikil and Yarkand. On the North-West and South-East the valley is bounded by impassable mountains, spurs of the Hindukush and Muztagh ranges, some peaks exceeding 25,000 ft. in height, of which Rakkipūsh south of Nagar is the best known. The population is Muhammadan, but while the people of Nagar are Shi'a those of Hunza, like their neighbours of Wakhān, belong to the Mawlāi sect. The Hunza people are more warlike than those of Nagar. They are apparently of the same race. They speak two languages; the Shina dialect of Gilgit being spoken in lower Nagar, and the Burushaski, a non-Aryan and non-Turkic tongue of uncertain affinities, being spoken in Hunza and upper Nagar. In the northern district a branch of the Wakhi race, speaking its own Ghalīka tongue, is found. The easy communications with Wakhān by the Kīlīk Pass have led to the intrusion of a Ghalīka race south of the Hindū-Kush. The same cause made it easy for robbers from Hunza to raid the traffic from Yarkand to India by the Karakoram Pass where the so-called Kundūr robbers inspired great terror until restrained by the extension of British power. The name Kandjūt is derived from Kandjūt, the name by which Hunza is known in the Pāmrīs and Sarıkol, a name which Biddulph compares with Hanza, one of the local form of the name Hanza. The people of Nagir took no part in these raids, which were winked at by the Chinese authorities as a reward for assistance given by Hunza in suppressing a rebellion at Yarkand in 1847. The Chinese also paid a subsidy to the ruler of Hunza. The traffic in slaves carried on by the Hanza raiders was a great scourge to the races under Kashmir rule, especially the people of Bīlūtān.
Hunza and Nagir were and still are governed by separate chiefs, each known by the name of Thum, a word of uncertain origin.

Little is known of the early history of this region. The easy passes leading to the north may have been traversed by Kushān invaders from Badakhshān in the second century B.C. but the routes leading into Cītrāl were more probably followed. Buddhism was certainly the prevailing creed from the commencement of the Christian era, and a well preserved tope still exists at Thol in Nagir. The date of the introduction of Islam is not known, but the prevalence of the Shī'a and Mawālī sects seems to point to its having come in by Badakhshān and Wakhān, and not from the south. But few European travellers visited the country before the war of 1891, the principal were Lockhart, Biddulph, Gromshewitsky, Durand and Younghusband. The Sikhs attempted to subdue it after their occupation of Gilgit, in consequence of the perpetual raids from Hunza, but met with a disastrous defeat in 1848. Further unsuccessful attempts were made by the Dogra rulers of Kashmīr, but in 1869 the Thum of Hunza agreed to pay tribute. No Kashmīr was however allowed to enter the valley. After the appointment of British agents at Gilgit the Thums of Hunza and Nagir entered into agreement to put an end to the raids, but in 1891 they recommenced and the chiefs threatened to attack the fort of Ĉalt. A small force of Gurkhas and Dogras under British officers was then sent into the country, and after the brilliant storming of the hill forts of Nith and Thol, the Gorge of the Kandjūt river was forced, the Thum of Nagir submitted and the Thum of Hunza fled over the Pamirs. Since that time the country has been included within the boundary of British India. The internal administration has not been interfered with, but it is traversed by a good road and travellers can pass through it in safety. A body of Kandjātis served under British officers in the Cītrāl campaign of 1895.

The town of Baltit, at an altitude of 8400 feet is the capital of Hunza and the town of Nagir that of Nagir. The territories of the two countries are separated by the Kandjūt River.


(See also: Wensinck, *Hūraimilla*, a town in Arabia in the north of Riyād [q.v.], the capital of the nebris in the province of Sedehy [Ṣadīr] on the borders between the latter and the province of Ḥadramāt, the birthplace of the founder of the Wahḥābi sect, Muḥammad b. Ḥudaydah, which is surrounded by strong fortifications and in 1861 had according to Palgrave, 10,000 inhabitants. Inside the town on an elevation is a large fortified citadel of architectural importance, which was erected along with the other citadels in Ḥudayd after the conquest of Darīya [q.v.] by the Egyptians under Abd-al-Wahhab in 1861.

**Hūrāmīla** (Hūraimila), a town in Arabia in the north of Riyād [q.v.], the capital of the province of Sedehy [Ṣadīr] on the borders between the latter and the province of Ḥadramāt, the birthplace of the founder of the Wahḥābi sect, Muḥammad b. Ḥudaydah, which is surrounded by strong fortifications and in 1861 had according to Palgrave, 10,000 inhabitants. Inside the town on an elevation is a large fortified citadel of architectural importance, which was erected along with the other citadels in Ḥudayd after the conquest of Darīya [q.v.] by the Egyptians under Abd-al-Wahhab in 1861.
Ibrahim Pasha. During Palgrave's stay there in 1861 the governor of the town was a native of the town, a fanatical Wahhabi, named Bejthi.

Bibliography: W. Palgrave, A Year's Journey in Arabia, (1865), i. 362; C. M. Doughty, Travels in Arabia Deserta, ii. 306.

(J. Schieffer)

Al-Hurmuza, King of Susiana. As a commander of a Persian division he took part in the battle of al-Kadsiyah in 16 = 637, but escaped by flight and retired to his country of Khuzistan, from which he offered a vigorous resistance to the Muslims. According to the usual statement, he invaded Maysan and Dauhtu, but was driven out by the united forces of Bagra and Kufa and had to sue for peace and cede the Muslims a considerable portion of his lands. In consequence of a border feud with the Banu 1-Am, he is said to have taken up arms and for a second time was forced to make peace on disadvantageous terms. It is clear at any rate that the cunning and energetic Persian was a very dangerous opponent and the troops of the Arab Caliph were only able to overcome him with difficulty. The population of the two provinces of Fors and al-Ahwaz was stirred up to renewed resistance by emissaries of the Persian king Yazadjiird III and as al-Hurmuza's attitude grew more and more threatening, the Caliph 'Omar sent a small army against him under al-Nu'mān b. Muqarrin. The opposing forces met at Arbuk. After a stubborn resistance al-Hurmuza had to take to flight and went to Tustar, while al-Nu'mān entered Rāmhumuz. He then advanced against Tustar and joined forces with other Arab divisions which had meanwhile come up; al-Hurmuza was blockaded, but only after eighteen months or, according to another statement two years, did the besiegers succeed in taking the strong fortress and then only by treachery. The Arab general, Abū Mūsā al-Aghārī, declined to decide al-Hurmuza's fate himself but sent him to the Caliph. The year of the taking of Tustar is variously given as 17 = 638-9, 19 = 640, 20 = 640-1, 21 = 641-642. When al-Hurmuza was brought before 'Omar, he succeeded in saving his life by his cunning but only on condition that he adopted Islam. He was able to be useful to the Caliph in various ways on account of his knowledge of Persian affairs. But when 'Omar was murdered in 23 = 644 by a Persian Christian, al-Hurmuza, probably without reason, was suspected of being an accomplice and killed by 'Ubayd Allah, son of the Caliph.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, V. 64 sq.; Tabari, see Index; Baladhurti (ed. de Gaerce), passim; Ibn al-Athir (ed. Tornberg), ii. 373, 375, 394, 423-431; iii. 26, 58, 59; Ibn Khaldun, Kitāb al-Babil, ii. App. 111 sqq.; Ya'qubi (ed. Houtsma), ii. 185, 188; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, i. 84-8, 93 sqq., 153; Müller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland, i. 243 sqq.; Muir, The Caliphate, its Rise, Decline and Fall, 3rd ed., p. 178-181, 209; Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, vi. 95 sqq.; Caetani, Annoti dell' Islam, iii. 906 sqq. (K. V. Zettersten)

Al- Hurūf b. 'Aed al-Rahman al-Tagkafi, governor of Spain. His period of office is said to have covered about three years (98-100 = 717-719). During this time he was made many districts of Spain tributary and extended his raids beyond the Pyrenees. The Arab chronicles, however, have little to tell of his rule; the Christian (Chron. Par.,) who calls him Alahor (Alhoto), also give no details. It is clear from their allusions, however, that he was feared by the Christians as well as hated by a section of his countrymen for his extortions and therefore dismissed by 'Omar II.


(Louis Masson.)

Huruf (A.), Plur. of Huruf (n. v.).

Hurufi, a Shī' sect founded by Faḍl Allah of Asṭarābād at the end of the viii. or (xii.) century. A. H., introduced into the Ottoman empire by one of his disciples, 'Ali al-'Attar, and adopted by the Bektash dervishes. Their creed, which is epitomized in the Maḥārīm-nāme, composed in 828 = 1425, is based on the idea that the universe is eternal and moves with an unceasing rotation, which is the cause of the changes observed in it. These changes are divided into cycles, the beginning and end of which are marked by similar phenomena, the appearance of an Adam at the beginning and a last judgment at the end. God is manifest in the person of man, particularly his face, for man was made in the image of God.

This manifestation is produced under the successive forms of the prophet, saint and God; Muhammad was the last of the prophets, then came the saints, from 'Ali to Hasan 'Askari, the eleventh Imām; Faḍl Allah, the last of the saints is also the first of the divine series, he is God incarnate. The distinguishing feature of man is speech or language which is written with the 28 characters of the Arabic alphabet; calculations derived from the numerical value of the letters borrowed from the Ismā'īliya (St. Guyard, Fragments Ismā'īliens, p. 108 sqq.) play a great part in their doctrines, but they also make use of groupings of the alphabet by letters composed of one, two, three or four written characters. The lines in the features number seven (four eyelashes, two eyebrows, and the hair, or else two halves of the moustache, two whiskers, the beard divided into two, and tuft on the lower lip, multiplied by the number of the elements, we get 28, the number of letters in Arabic alphabet. Their chief books are the six Dīwāni, the Ḥaḍrat-nāme, Istīwā- nāme, Ḥadiyyet-nāme and Maḥārīm-nāme, some in Persian mingled with passages in the Asṭarābād dialect, others in Ottoman Turkish (Cf. Faḍl Allah and Pirhāfezādeh). Unlike other dervishes, they have no qoira or sikr; every morning they meet in the house of their spiritual chief, called bābā, and he gives each one by the hands of a servant, a glass of wine, a slice of bread and a piece of cheese, those present make a great noise; the superior takes the glass of wine and gives it to each one present who takes it respectfully, touches his face and eyes with it and drinks it. They have a kind of confession to the bābā.
AL-HUSAIN, the second son of 'Ali and Fāţima, born in Medina in the fourth or fifth year A.H. As in the case of his brother al-Hasan [q.v.] — the two are known together as al-Hasanīn, the 'two Hasans' — tradition pictures the young Husain overwhelmed with marks of tenderness by his maternal grandfather. This is what 'Ali is said to have thought of them: 'Hasan is a spendthrift thinking of nothing but the pleasures of the table and entertaining. As to Husain he is mine and I am his.' Unhappy for a future of his like events were to verify the truth of this judgment of Fāţima's husband; they were to prove the existence in the son of the same indecision and the same lack of intelligence that had been the ruin of the father. During the troubled Caliphate of 'Ali, Husain remained in obscurity. Less lively than Hasan, he did not imitate his life of foolish extravagance and pleasure. After 'Ali's death he followed his elder brother into retirement in Medina and during Mu'awiya's reign, particularly after Hasan's death made him head of the Shi'a, he resisted the solicitations of his partisans in the Irāq and maintained a more dignified attitude to the Umayyads than the dissipated Hasan. The accession of Yazid altered his views and Husain decided to listen to the appeal once more made by his Irāq partisans. But before doing anything he resolved to test how matters stood through his cousin Muslim b. 'Aṣīl [q.v.]. On the latter's arrival thousands of Shi'sis rushed to swear fidelity to Husain. Muslim wrote to the son of 'Ali to persuade him to come to take charge of the movement. In the meanwhile 'Ubaid Allah b. Ziyād [q.v.], being appointed governor of the Irāq, had succeeded in capturing Muslim and executed him. Leaving Mecca, where he had sought refuge after refusing to swear fealty to Yazid, Husain took the road to Kūfā, according to Muslim's instructions. A few stages from this town he learned of the tragic end of his emissary. 'Ubaid Allah had established outposts on all the roads leading from the Hidżār to the Irāq and parties of cavalry were patrolling the roads. The weak escort of relatives and devoted followers attached to Husain came in contact with one of these detachments. Taking advantage of the refusal to halt 'Ubaid Allah's horsemen accompanied them at a short distance. In this fashion they reached Karbalā [q.v.], destined to be ten days later the scene of Husain's death. During these ten days the character of the pretender proved more and more feeble. His former irresolution seized him again. The circle of steel formed by the soldiers sent by 'Ubaid Allah closed in around him. The Omayyad governor wished to persuade or force him to surrender. He cut off all access to the Umayyads, hoping to reduce him by thirst. Husain remained obstinate, being persuaded of the inviolability of his person and hoping for a revulsion of feeling in his favour among the soldiers of Kūfā, who had been secretly won over to the Shi'a but had been terrorised by the execution of Muslim.

The 10th Muḥarram 61 A.H. (10th October 680) dawned. 'Omar b. Sa'd b. Abī Waḳīṣ [q.v.] had taken command of the 4000 men assembled at Karbalā. Husain was summoned to surrender at discretion. The ultimatum being unanswered, 'Omar executed a turning movement to envelope the son of 'Ali. His partisans tried to resist. Husain did not stir; he played none of the heroic parts so fondly described by the Shi'as. An engagement resulted in which Husain fell wounded in many places. His tents were pillaged. At first merely a police operation, the scheme degenerated into a general mêlée. "It did not last long; just time to slay a camel or to take a nap". Thus a verbal report delivered to Yazid describes it. The Caliph deplored this ending; he had neither desired nor ordered it. His instructions were to secure the person of Husain, to prevent him prolonging a dangerous agitation. He treated the 'Alids who survived the catastrophe of Karbalā with honour, provided generously for their needs and gave them an escort to Medina. Husain's descendants venerated there in obscurity, at variance with their relatives the Umayyads. They usually left to their cousins the right of enforcing the political privileges of 'Ali's family in Arabia.

On the significance of the death of Husain in the faith of the Shi'is see this article and the article Muḥarram.

AL-HUSAIN, b. 'Ali, Bey of Tunis (1705—1735), founder of the Husain dynasty still reigning there. He was the son of a Greek renegade and set out the Algerian invasion of 1705-1706 held the office of an Agha. After the capture of the Dey Ibrahim, Husain was elected Bey by the Aghas while Muḥammad Khoji was elected Bey on the 20th Rabi' I 1117 (10th July 1705). After Husain had driven back the Algerians he rid himself of Khoji Muḥammad, who was put to death along with the ex-Dey Ibrahim who had been meanwhile released. When soon afterwards a son was borne to him by a Genoese captive, he had it decided by a council specially summoned for the purpose that his power should be transmitted to his descendants (1710).

Throughout his reign Husain, whose confidant was a Frenchman named Raynaud, endeavoured to live on good terms with European powers. He concluded treaties with France (1710 and 1728), England (1716), Spain (1729), Holland (1728) and Austria (1725). On the other hand he did not succeed in restraining piracy and the attacks of the corsairs forced France twice (1728 and 1731) to send a fleet to Goletta. At first Husain's reign was a very peaceful one at home, and the people enjoyed peace such as they had not known for long. "The roads", writes Muḥammad al-Ṣaḥīr b. Yusuf *were safe and the land flourishing, the country-houses and gardens became populous again and numerous palaces were
built in the country, which had never happened before. The Bey himself undertook important works; he restored the walls of Kairawan, improved the aqueducts of Tunis, erected bridges and reservoirs and finally built mosques and madrasas in Sfax, Gafsa, Sousse, and Tunis (mosque of Bardo and al-Madrassa al-Husainiya).

From 1729, however, Tunisia suffered from severe disturbances. Ali Pasha, the Bey's nephew, discontented because he was excluded from the government, had fled to Tunis with his son Yûnus and stirred up a rising of the tribes in the interior. Defeated by Husain he fled to Algeria where he was imprisoned by the Bey Kurbàbi. The latter's successor Ibrahim released him and by arrangement with him made an attack on Tunisia. Husain abandoned by a portion of his Arab troops was defeated at Smendja (4th Sept. 1735) and had to retire to Kairawan, while Ali entered Tunis and had himself proclaimed Bey after promising to pay a yearly tribute to Algeria. Husain now sought to take the offensive again; after defeating 'Ali's son Yûnus' on 3rd November 1735 he advanced up to the walls of Tunis but did not dare storm the town. Returning to Kairawan he was besieged by Yûnus' troops for five years. On the 16th Safar 1152 (18th May 1740), the town was taken by storm. Husain, who had succeeded in escaping, was brought back by the enemy's cavalry and Yûnus cut off his head.


(G. Yver.)

AL-HUSAIN b. 'ALI. [See Ibn Mâkulâ, al-Maghârî, al-Tughrâti.]

AL-HUSAIN b. Hamdân was the son of the founder of the Hamdânid dynasty (q. v.). At the beginning of 282 (895), when the Caliph al-Mu'tadid was reducing the Hamdânid family to obedience, Husain, who was in the castle of Dair Za'amân, surrendered and was with his father carried to Baghdad. In 283 Husain undertook to capture the fugitive Khârijite leader Hârûn on condition that his father should be set free. In this he succeeded and the Caliph kept his promise. From this moment the Hamdânids occupied a high place at the court of the Caliph Ten years later Husain was in pursuit of Abū Ghânim the Carmatian (Karâmî), who had invested Damascus, but failed to overtake him, but in the following year (294 = 906-7) he defeated the followers of Zikrawi in Syria.

When the end of the Caliph al-Mu'tadid drew near, Husain put forward Ibn al-Mu'tazz as successor. When al-Mu'tadid became Caliph (295 = 908), Husain attacked the palace in order to seize his person. The attempt failed and Husain and the other conspirators scattered. Husain fled to Mosul, but was captured at Takrit. He was, however, pardoned and made prefect of Kumm and Kâşân. From Kumm in 297 (909) he set out against the Şaffârî Lâîth b. 'Amr, but the armies did not meet. Later he took part in the expedition against Sabbâkî the opponent of Lâîth, who was taken prisoner (middle of 298 = 910).

In 301 (913-4) Husain's brother Abû Allah b. Hamdân rebelled, but, on the advance of the Caliph's troops, submitted and was restored to his province.

In the following year Husain, who was now governor of Diyar Kabûr, threw off his allegiance, and Abu Allah was again deposed and imprisoned. The greater part of the Caliph's troops were in Egypt, and as soon as they returned, Husain fled, but he was arrested and his whole family carried to Baghdad. He did not lose heart, as he believed his brothers and himself were indispensable to the Caliph. His brothers were in fact set at liberty and shortly afterwards restored to office. Husain alone was put to death (305 = 917).

Bibliography under Art. Hamdânids.

(T. H. Weir.)

AL-HUSAIN b. AL-HUSAIN, last Dey of Algiers (1818-1830). Born in Smyrna about 1765, Husain was filling the office of Khâbîr al-Khâlîfî when the Dey 'Ali struck down by the plague appointed him his successor. Husain was proclaimed without opposition. He was a well educated man, moderate in his views, who did not desire power and only accepted it with reluctance. He was considered benevolent and just, and hastened to inaugurate his reign by an amnesty and the abolition of various violent measures taken by his predecessors. Nevertheless, soon after his accession his assassination was twice attempted by the Janissaries. He therefore lived in the kâsha under the protection of a guard of Zwâwa.

The situation in the Regency at this time was a very complicated one. The provinces in the east and in the west were in full rebellion. The Nememsha, the tribes of the Awwâs and of the Sûfî, and the natives of Great Kabylia had taken up arms against the Turks. The Derkâwâ marabouts, followed by the Tidjâniya preached rebellion in the Tell and Southern Oman. Husain undertook to restore Turkish authority; in this he succeeded with the help of the Beys of Constantine and Oran and through the military talents of the Agha Yâhûz. Peace was restored in the east about 1826 and in the west also in 1828. At the same time the Dey showed his devotion to the Muslim cause by sending a fleet to the Levant, which from 1821 to 1827 took part in the Ottoman fleet in the struggle against the insurgent Greeks.

Husain's relations with the European Powers were also very strained. His refusal to adhere to the decisions of the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle regarding the abolition of privateering provoked a naval demonstration by the English and French, which however was without result (1819). The expulsion of Macdonnell, the English Consul, had more serious consequences. England sent Admiral Sir Harry Neale to demand reparation; after fruitless parleys (February—March 1824) the fleet bombarded the town from the 17th to 29th June. The damage done was insignificant however and the Algerians imagined they could brave the Christian powers with impunity.

While the affairs of the bankrupt Bakri Bussach were being arranged, the Dey, who felt himself wronged by the French government, made violent recriminations. His discontent made itself manifest in the insult to Consul Deval on the 30th April 1827. Not content with refusing all satisfaction for this outrage, Husain ordered the destruction of the French establishments at La Calle. These outrages resulted in the blockade of the Algerian coast (1827-1830). During this period the French government made several attempts to negotiate with the Dey, but he, probably
relying on the support of the British government, refused to come to any arrangement. He scarcely disavowed the attack on the ship "La Provence" which was fired on by the Algerian batteries on the 30th July 1829, although it was protected by a flag of truce. Unable to obtain any redress by diplomatic means, Charles X's ministers changed their methods. An expedition against Algiers was decided upon the 31st January 1830 and the troops disembarked at Säfi Ferruch on the 14th June. Left to his own resources, and deprieved of the best general Yahya Agha, whom he had himself put to death in 1828, Husain was incapable of resisting for long. On the 4th July, after the occupation of Fort l'Empereur by the French, he resigned himself to accepting the terms imposed by General de Bournon.

Articles 2 and 3 of the capitulation guaranteed the ex-Dey the retention of all his private property and the right to retire whither he pleased. The French government, however, objected to his going to Malta and Husain demanded to be conducted to Naples, where he arrived on the 9th August 1830. After a short sojourn in this city he went to Leghorn from where, through Jewish merchants in regular relations with Algiers, he was able to negotiate with the malcontents of the town and the native chiefs of the interior. Arriving in Paris in 1831 to beg a pension and the restitution of his estates he received an honourable welcome but obtained nothing from the government, now enlightened on his real attitude. On his return to Leghorn he continued his tactics. Then feeling himself too closely watched, he left Leghorn for Alexandria, where he died in obscurity in 1838.


AL-HUSAIN B. MANSUR. [See al-Hallâj.]

AL-HUSAIN B. MUSAEMAD. [See al-Râghib al-Iṣfahání.]

AL-HUSAIN B. NUMAIR. The kindred tribe of Sakhr, leader of the Sufyanids. He fought in the Omayyad ranks at Šîfiḥ. On the accession of Yazid I he governed the important district of Ḥimāṣ. While holding this office he intervened with the Caliph on behalf of Ibn Mufarrigh, the sâristâ, imprisoned by Ubâd Allah b. Ziyâd. When the expedition against the sacred towns of the Hijaz was decided upon, Husain was appointed lieutenant to the commander in chief, Muslim b. 'Ukba [q. v.]. In this capacity he distinguished himself at the battle of the Ḥjarra. On the death of Muslim during the advance on Mecca he took command of the expedition. For two months he besieged the town and was about to take it, when the death of Yazid suspended operations. After vainly endeavouring to persuade Ibn al-Ẓahâr to accompany him to Syria to be proclaimed Caliph there, Husain led his army back to Syria. Mar-
nephew of the murdered Gurgin Khan with Georgian and Persian troops to enforce obedience upon the rebel Afghans, but they were put to flight by Mir Wais. Nevertheless, affairs seemed to be taking a better turn for the Persians when Mir Wais died in 1715 and his brother Abd Allah Khan succumbed later in 1723 with the Persian government, but the latter was soon after murdered by Mahmud, a son of Mir Wais, who continued the resistance to the Persian troops.

In the meanwhile difficulties had been raised also in other parts of the kingdom by the Kurds and Usbeqs, while the Arabs of Maskat seized Bahrain. The Persians hoped to regain this island with the help of the Portuguese fleet, but the commander-in-chief, Lutfi Ali Khan, a brother-in-law of the prime minister, rightly thought it an urgent necessity to suppress the Ghalzai who, under Mahmud, had invaded Kerman. He actually succeeded in defeating the rebels but was prevented from following up his victory by the discontent in Isfahan at his abandoning the Baharin expedition, and was refused the necessary supplies with which to advance on Kandahar. His and the Timurd al-Dawla’s enemies even took the advantage of the occasion to rouse the Shah’s wrath against them with the result that the prime minister was blinded and Lutfi Ali Khan, who had returned to Shiraz, was thrown into prison. Husain thus prepared for his own downfall, for Mahmud immediately occupied Kerman and advanced with his troops against Isfahan. The Safavids once more collected a considerable army to check the Afghan advance but in the battle of Gubanbad, east of Isfahan, the Persians suffered a terrible defeat (1722). Isfahan itself was thereupon besieged and, although it held out for a long time as the Afghans lacked any of the necessary siege artillery—Tahmasp, the Shah’s son had in the meanwhile escaped to Kazvin and Tiflis and was endeavouring to raise a new army with which to relieve the capital—such a terrible famine at length arose in it that Husain was forced to capitulate and resign the Persian throne in favour of Mahmud. The unfortunate prince was forced to be a spectator, when some time later, after the Persians had treacherously massacred the Afghan garrison of Kazvin, which Mahmud had meanwhile captured, Mahmud in revenge instituted a terrible massacre in Isfahan and afterwards put to death over a hundred members of the Safavid family. Mahmud then went mad, and, as a son of the Abd Allah Khan who had been murdered by him, made it a condition that, if he was to succeed to the throne, his father’s assassin should be put to death, which was done in 1725. The new Khan Ashraf was comparatively lenient in his treatment of Husain, but Russia and Turkey had been exploiting the unsettled state of Persia to their own advantage and left him no rest. Although he made peace with Turkey in 1727, he had again to take up arms when the general, later famous as Nadir-Shah, took up Tahmasp’s cause that was supported by the Russians. He was repeatedly defeated by Nadir and had to take to flight. In revenge he had the aged Husain put to death in 1729 but was himself murdered by robbers a year later. On Tahmasp’s fate and the end of the Safavid dynasty see the articles Nadirshah and Safawids.

Bibliography: Krusinski, Tragica vertentis
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HUSAIN ʿAWNĪ PASHA, four times War Minister and once Grand Vizier under Abd al-Aziz, one of the most remarkable personalities of his age, was a native of Isfahan, where he was born in 1820, the son of a tax-farmer. When sixteen he came to Constantinople to study theology but entered the military school in which he ultimately became a teacher of military sciences. On the outbreak of the Crimean War (1855) he entered the army with rank of Lieutenant-Colonel and distinguished himself in the fighting at Balaklava and Çetate. At the end of the war he took part in the Mingrelian campaign as chief of the general staff of the Serdar i-ktest Omur Paşa. On the conclusion of the war he became director of the military school; during the war with Montenegro (1860) he commanded a division under Omur Paşa; for the next two and a half years (August 1863 till the beginning of 1866) he acted as interim War Minister and was in 1867–1868 entrusted with the suppression of the Cretan revolution; on performing this task, he was promoted to be mughir (general commanding). From the beginning of 1869 till September 1871 he was War Minister in ʿAli Paşa’s cabinet; a few days after the latter’s death (6th Sept. 1871) he was dismissed by his successor, the notorious Mahmud Nedim Paşa, and banished to Anatolia, recalled from exile in 1872, and sent to Smyrna in November of the same year as wali of the province of Aydın. The Grand Vizier Muterdjim Muhammad Rüshdi Paşa appointed him the to Ministry of Marine on the 25th January 1873 but he exchanged this for the War Office after a few weeks on the 15th February, when Esâd Paşa became Grand Vizier. A year later — on the 14th February 1874 — he became Grand Vizier in place of Şirwanizade Muhammad Rüshdi, successor of Esâd Paşa, but continued to hold the portfolio of War Minister. On the 25th April 1875 he was dismissed from both offices and a few days later sent a second time as wali to Smyrna. By the 22nd August of the same year he was back at the War Office for the third time; a few days later his enemy Mahmud Nedim became Grand Vizier a second time and dismissed him on the 2nd October, to be sent after a few weeks as wali to Brusa. After Mahmud Nedim’s fall (13th April 1876) he was again summoned to Constantinople as War Minister and in this office along with Midhat Paşa supported by Muterdjim Muhammad Rüshdi and the Şahîc al-Islâm, Ḥasan Khairullâh, brought about the deposition of the Sultan ʿAbd al-Aziz (30th May 1876). On the 4th June the dethroned Sultan committed suicide; Ḥasan Bey, a Circassian officer devoted to him,
resolved to avenge his death and shot Husain 'Awni Pasha in the night of 15th—16th June 1876 in Midhat Pasha's konak, where he and the other ministers had assembled at a council.


HUSAIN DŽAHANOŠ, "ALI" AL-DIN THE GHĐRĐ. [See HAJANOŠ, i. 998.]

HUSAIN HAMADHĀNI, a Bābī author, who wrote the history of the Bāb, edited by E. G. Browne under the title, The Tarīḫ-i-Fudūlid or New History of Mirzā 'Ali Muhammad the Bāb (Cambridge 1893). In his office of secretary to a minister Mirzā Husain accompanied the Shāh on his journey to Europe, spent some time in Stambul and on his return to Persia in 1291 (1874) was thrown into prison but afterwards released. He then entered the service of a Zoroastrian named Mānūkī (or Manudkij) who asked him to write a history of the Bāb. When he had finished this task, he intended to give a full exposition of the Bāb's teaching but was prevented by his death in 1299 (1881-1882). The above information is given by Browne, op. cit., Introduction, p. xxxiv sqq. from Tumanski in Zapiski Vost. Otd. Imp. Arch. Ób., vol. vii, 33-45. In a later publication, entitled Khiid-i Muqaddat-i-Kāf, compiled by Hāji Mirzā Žan'ān-i Khāndān (Gibb Memorial Series, vol. XV), Browne has given a full account of the relationship between the works of Mirzā Husain and Mirzā Dżán Žāshānī, Introduction, xxxiv. sqq. and A New History, etc., p. 339 sqq.}

Husain Mirzā B. Mānsūr B. Bābakār (Black Prince), and styled Abūl Ghuţā. This famous king of Khūšān was born at Herāt in Mūharram 842 A. H., June 1438, and reigned there, with one interruption, from Rāmān 873 (March 1469), to the last month of 911 (May 1506). He was a distinguished soldier and sovereign, and was a munificent patron of letters. He also attempted poetry, and composed a divān, but it does not seem to have been of much value. According to Ţām Mirzā, he is also the author of a book called the Maqālīl Abīl-Usbğāš, which is a mixture of prose and poetry, and contains biographies of a number of mystics and spiritual lovers (Rieu's Catalogue, 1, 351[1]). But though his name appears on the manuscript as the author, both Bābūr in his Memoirs, and Khwāndānī in his Ḥabīb al-Siyār (vol. iii. Part 3, p. 330 of Bombay ed.), say that the real author is Kamāl Husain Gazārgāhī. And this seems probable, for if Sulṭān Husain had written the book, he would hardly have put himself at the end of it as one of the mystics, and have described himself. He was of very high birth for he was a direct descendant of Timūr, both by his father and his mother (Firuzā Bégam). His career resembled that of the emperor Bābūr, for he suffered much distress in his early years and afterwards attained to great prosperity. He had contests with Abū Sa'id and his sons, and it was not until the death of the former that he got possession of Herāt. He was a younger son, and his undistinguished elder brother Bābakār served under him for several years as governor of Bālkh. His court was the most brilliant in Asia, and as Bābūr says, his Age was a wonderful Age. The poets Džamī, Hāfiţī, 'Alī Šāh, Hilālī, Bānbā, the painters Bīzād and Shāh Muqāfar, various musicians, and Husain Wāžī, the author of Awārār-i Suḥailī, 'Abd Allāh Mānīwardī who was a sort of Admirable Creighton, the two historians (grand father and grandson) Mir Khwānd and Khwāndāmīr, and Dāwbāt Shāhī, the biographer of poets, and the famous calligrapher, Sulṭān 'Ali of Mašhad, adorned his court.

One of Sulṭān Husain's greatest feats was his long and rapid march to Herāt in August 1470 which resulted in the capture and execution of his competitor Yādgār Mūhammad, a great grandson of Shāhrukh. Sulṭān Husain was a man of passionate character, and a wine-bibher. He divorced his first wife, although she was the mother of his eldest son, and, according to Bābūr he was so infatuated with one of his pages, that he put his name and all his goods was Bhībūr appears on his coins, but it is not certain if they refer to the page, whose name and title were Bhībūr Beg. Sulṭān Husain had a large family of sons and daughters, but seven of the sons died in his life time, and the others were, for the most part, no credit to him, and only survived him for a year or two. The eldest, Bādī al-Zamān lived the longest, not dying till 1517, when he succumbed to the plague at Constanti-
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Bibliography: Djewdet, Te'tebk,’ xii. So. Lutfi, Te'tebk,’ viii. 178—182: Segiili-'Osmâni, li. 226 (biographical notes); v. Molk, Der russisch-türkische Feldzug in der europäischen Türkei 1828 und 1829; Rosen, Geschichte der Türkei, i.; Djewdet, l.c.; Lutfi, Te'tebk,’ i.—iv. (J. H. Mörkmann.)

HUSAIN PASHA, called Amâkâžâ‘i (Uncle’s son), a name given him by his cousin Fâdîl Ahmad Pasha, was the son of Hasan Agha, the younger brother of the great Koprulu Muhammad Pasha; he grew up during the golden period of the Koprulu and reached the age of thirty without discovering himself further than for his attachment to be delights of a life of careless ease. After the defeat of Kara Muşafa before Vienna in 1683 and the fall of this grand vizier, who was devoted to the Koprulu, he was sent in disgrace from the capital, first of all as governor of Shahbîzir and a year later as muhajî (military governor) to Cârdaš in the Dardanelles, where he spent five years. In Râljeb 1100 (April-May 1699) he received the rank of vizier and was sent as muhajî to Sâdíl al-Bahr at the entrance to the Dardanelles. In Shabân 1102 (May 1699) he returned to Constantinople and was appointed nâzîm ol-âmîn, the affairs of the grand vizier who was absent in the fleet. He fulfilled the same duties again from Djamâdâ II till the middle of Shawâl 1105 (end of January till the 9th June 1694) and then went back to his former post on the Dardanelles. On the 14th Djamâdâ I 1106 (31st December 1674) he was appointed kâppân pasha and entrusted with the recapture of Chios which had been occupied by the Venetians. He succeeded in defeating the Venetian fleet in two battles (9th and 18th February 1695) off the Spalmadoro Islands in the Bay of Chios, whereupon the Venetians abandoned the island without striking a blow. At the end of Râmâdân 1106 (middle of May 1695) he resigned his command of the fleet and remained in Chios as muhajî. In Muharrâm 1107 (Aug.-Sept. 1695) he went as wâli to Könya and Adana; in the early months of 1108 (Aug.-Sept. 1696) he was transferred to Belgrade as muhajî. The grand vizier Emîrsu Muhammad Pasha fell in the battle of Zenta on the 1st Rabi‘ 1109 (11th Sept. 1697); Husain was appointed his successor and led the defeated army back to Adriânpole. In the following year he concluded the fifteen years’ war with Austria and its allies — Venice, Russia and Poland — by the treaty of Carlowitz. After holding the reins of government for five years he resigned on the 17th Rabi‘ II 1114 (4th Sept. 1702) in consequence of an incurable disease and retired to his estate at Siliâvî, where he died on the 29th Rabi‘ of the same year (22nd Sept.). Apart from his attachment to strong waters, with which his countrymen reproached him, and which earned him the nickname of sârboskh (the drunken), there were no serious defects in his character. A contemporary (Paul Lucas, Voyage au Levant, ii. 154) justly says of him: ce l’homme de tout l’Empire qui avait le mieux servi... fort honnête homme, et dont tout le monde parloit bien; the French ambassador Ferriol (Bonnac, Mémoire historique sur l’Arm. de France, p. 116) says: il a gouverné l’Empire pendant cinq ans avec tant de noblesse qu’on a dit que le zèle et l’état étaient avec lui. He was in fact distinguished not only for probity and magnanimity but also for a rare states-
manship; nor was it mere love of ease but a wise self-restraint when he entrusted the execution of his plans to tried men like Husain Mezzomorto, Rəmî Muhammad and Alexander Mavrocordato. His memory is not less honoured for the numerous public buildings and institutions which he left behind him in various towns of the empire, notably in Adrianople. His summer-residence (yaarı) at Anadolu Han on the Bosporus forms one of the sights of the capital and still testifies to the love of splendour and artistic sense of its builder. *Bibliography: Hādiḳat al-Wacara, p. 124 sq.; Sîdīqī, M. Osmānī, ii. 202 (biographical articles); Ta'rīkh of Rashid, i.; the *History of the Ottoman Empire* by Kantemir and v. Hammer (vol. vi. and vii.); Hādiḳat al-Develānî, i. 91. (J. H. Mordtmann.)

**HUSAIN PASHA,** called DELİ (the devil), a native of Yeşilhisır in Anatolia, served in the imperial palace as a common wood-cutter till he attracted the attention of Murad IV by an example of his extraordinary physical strength; his rough pranks and witty sallies were no less pleasing to the sultan, who after a short time made him his muşkât (confidant) and bayyuk nakhrâr (hanger of the Horse). On the 4th Mevlîmâr 1444 (30th June 1634) he was appointed kapudan paşa and accompanied the sultan on his campaign against Erivan; on his way back, on the 6th Dirâmâd I 1045 (21st October 1635), he received the governorship of Egypt, which he held till the 15th Dirâmâd II 1047 (4th November 1637). On the accession of Sultan Ibrahim (Shawal 1049 = February 1640) he was again appointed kapudan paşa and soon afterwards on the 22nd Dirâmâd I 1050 (9th Sept. 1640) muşkât (military governor) of Oczakow. In the following year he besieged for three months Axos, which had been taken by the Cossacks and then went in late autumn to Bosnia as wâli. In 1054 (1644) we find him for a brief period governor of Bagdad; from there he was transferred to Ramadi of the same year (November 1644) as wâli to Būdīn (Oßen). After the outbreak of the war with Venice he went to Crete as muşkât of the fortress of Canaia, taken on the 17th August 1645, and landed there on the 15th Dhu'l-Hijjâ 1055 (1st February 1646). In July of the same year he took over the supreme command of the forces in the island, captured the important town of Rhethymnos and conducted the siege of Kandia in the following years but was unable to take this last bulwark of Venetian power. After being thirteen years in the field and having on the one hand assured the success of Turkish arms by his remarkable bravery, and on the other won over the native Greek population to Turkish rule by diplomatic measures, he was recalled towards the end of 1668 (middle of 1669) and on the 14th Shawal (15th July 1669) appointed kapudan paşa. On the 7th Rabî I 1069 (3rd December 1668) he received the governorship of Rumeli; the grand vizier Köprülü Muhammed Pasha, who had long been meditating the ruin of Husain, was hated by him on account of his popularity and because he was a candidate for the highest office in the empire, succeeded by his intrigues in persuading the Sultan some months later — in the spring of 1669 — to imprison him in the Seven Towers and have him executed for alleged abuse of his powers. *Bibliography: Naḥm, Ta'rīkh (particularly ii. 688 sq.); Hâdiji Khalîfa, Fârdîkî and Taqsim al-Tawârîkh; Kantemir, *History of the Ottoman Empire*, p. 514 sq.; v. Hammer, do., vol. v. and vi.; Zinkeisen, do., vol. v. and vi. The exact date of Husain Pasha's execution is not given. The year and approximate date — shortly after Dirâmâd I 1069 (March-April 1669) — are certain from Na'ma and Levin Warner's letter of the 22th April 1669 (De Ribus Turcicis Epistolas ineditas, p. 57 sq.). (J. H. Mordtmann.)

**HUSAIN PASHA,** surnamed KİCİK on account of his diminutive stature, was originally a Georgian slave, who was offered to Sultan Mustafa III by his master, the Sâlîhdâr İbrahim Pasha in 1767-1768. He grew up in the Imperial Serai together with his foster brother, afterwards the Sultan Selim III. When Selim came to power on the 11th Redjeb 1203 (9. 4. 1789) Husain became his first attendant (baş kadıncı) and a few years later on the 16th Redjeb 1206 (10th March 1792) he was appointed kapudan paşa with the rank of a vizier. In accordance with Selim's plans of reform and with almost unrestricted authority from him, Husain worked hard for the twelve years during which he occupied this post, at the reorganisation of the imperial navy and the arsenal. He succeeded in reorganising the whole Ottoman navy, on the model of the British and the French navies, with the help of foreign technologists, so that he is fully entitled to be called the founder and creator of modern Ottoman naval power. As leader of the fleet he had less occasion to add to his fame. It was difficult to defend the oppressive contributions levied on him by the islands of the Archipelago, during his annual expeditions in the Aegean Sea; these were partly the cause of the Greek insurrections. On the other hand he managed more or less to suppress piracy in these districts; on his first cruise, for instance, he destroyed Lambro Katoou's (Caniati) pillaging fleet (1792) and even captured this latter's infamous lieutenant, the pirate Karakazani. Although he knew little or nothing of military matters, he was entrusted in 1212 (1798) with the command of the army sent against the famous Pas naar oğlu of Widdin. Husain Pasha besieged and blockaded him with a fleet of gunboats, but without success, so that he gave up and returned to Constantinople in autumn. In 1800 he spent several months cruising in the waters of Alexandria, and in the following year he united his forces to the British sent to reconquer Egypt. At the beginning of March he landed in the vicinity of Alexandria at the head of 6000 men, mostly Albanians, and, joining the British forces, took part in the campaign against the French. As is well known, this expedition ended with the latter's retreat from Egypt. At the beginning of Şabbiya 1216 (Dec. 1801) he returned to Constantinople, where he was received and celebrated by the people as the reconqueror of Egypt, and covered with honours by the Sultan. On the 23rd Şabbiya 1218 (7th Dec. 1803) Husain Pasha died in Kuruçeşme (Bosphorus), not yet 46 years of age, in the summer residence of his wife, the Princess Esma Sultan. His mausoleum in Éjyub was long considered a curiosity of the capital, and became famous as did the epitaph on it composed by the historian Wâṣif (cf. v. Hammer, Constantinopolis und der Bosphorus, Vol. ii. p. lxviii.; Wâṣif, Ta'wilük, p. 11).
His first independent work devoted to ridiculing the habits of European customs: İkisiyle Ağıl (The Looking-glass and the Cock) already shows the true character of his talent. In 1315 (1895) appeared the humorous satirical novel, Murahhibe (The Lady Teacher), 2nd ed. 1315: probably on the whole his best work, which at once made him famous. He boldly attacks the system of education in vogue in Constantinople with its usual formlness and artlessness of the surroundings. In his work there is a certain connection with the popular art of the storytellers (matâbâk, q.v.) and their masterly skill in imitating the real, rough everyday life of the people, which Rahmi was the first to introduce into Turkish literature. His scenes from everyday life reproduce the vernacular and form a regular mine for linguistic and ethnographic research with their idioms, the exact wording and meaning of which seems sometimes even to escape the author himself and which will be sought in vain anywhere else. In striking contrast with this natural, realistic style, which assures Rahmi an abiding importance, is his other style supposed to be distinguished and professing to be cultured, which is a hybrid between the language of journalism and the intolerably involved Turkish official language, the notorious bab-i-âliâyî ʻüssîhî, and lowers him to the most ordinary mediocrity. Apart from the composition of his scenes of popular life, the whole of the rest of his artistic technique is on the same level of commonplace mediocrity. In his novels one cannot help receiving the impression of seeing before one's eyes a collection of splendid pictures with a very poor explanatory text.

In spite of his polemical theorising of recent years, Rahmi does not take his work as an author very seriously. His easily won reputation prevented a strenuous, profitable development of his talent and a thorough and artistic working up of his usually licentious themes. The construction of the plot almost always leaves everything to be desired. The plots are too obvious and awkwardly developed. The endeavour to be didactic in the secondary episodes not infrequently destroys the artistic effect of the scenes borrowed from the life of the people. Rahmi who had studied French models, professes to be a realist, although he condemns Zola as too extreme. His humour, his choice of subject and his method have earned him the not unappropriate name of the Turkish Paul de Kock. An ardent patriotism impels him to emphasise the characteristics of his own people which he vindicates in contrast with the sickly imitation of foreign customs and to lay bare the hain caused by slavish imitation of the pseudo-European in Ottoman society. But he firmly avoids any idealising and does not spare with his humour the old types of Turkish society, whom he draws in contrast to the modern excessences. He began his activity as an author with translations from the French of which an example may be seen in vol. iii. of the Arakel kitab-i-khânesî djebe romanlary (Constantinople 1309 = 1891-2), which contains the Parida bir tečâhî (A Marriage in Paris) and a humorous story by Jules Clarétie (İki refîk-i tahvîr) and also a translation of Alfred de Musset's Frédéric et Bernette.
continued, with brief intervals of peace, until Bahāʾ entered Dzhənpur at the head of a victorious army and established his son Bābār there as viceregal. Husain Shāh fled to Bīhār, but was treated with great generosity by his conqueror, who allowed him to retain a tract of country yielding a revenue of five lakhs a year. Bahāʾ died in 894 (1498) and was succeeded by his son Si-
kandar; in 1493 Husain Shāh made a last at-
tempt to recover his kingdom, and collecting a large force marched against Sikandar Lodi; but he was defeated in the neighbourhood of Banfras and fled to Gaur to the court of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Husain Shāh, king of Bengal, by whom he was honourably received; he died there in 905 (1499), but his body was interred at Dzhənpur, close to the superb Džamīʿ Masjīd which had been erected during his reign.

Bibliography: Frischka, Gulshan-i-Ibrāhīmi (Makāla vii); Nīmat Allūh, Muḥāsan al-Aṣfīḥīn (chap. III); Elliot-Dowson, History of India, v. 82 sqq. B. Dorn, History of the Afghans, translated from the Persian of Neamat Ullāh, i. 49 sqq.

HUSAIN_WĀʾIZ KASHIPI. [See Khāsimi.]

HUSAINĀBĀD, the name of a town in Ben-
gal, which was a mint of the Kings of Bengal Husain Shāh, Naṣrāt Shāh and Mahmūd Shāh III between the years 899 (1493) and 939 (1532). It is generally supposed to be a name of the ca-
pital Gaur [q. v.], bestowed on it by Husain Shāh, but Blochmann held that it was near Gaur but not identical with it. The identity of Gaur does not admit of much doubt, and similar titles (Naṣrātābād, Mahmūdābād) seem to have been bestowed upon the same capital by Naṣrāt Shāh and Mahmūd Shāh. The name Husainābād (or Ḥusainābād) on the copper coins of the Mughal Emperor Shāh ʿAlam II probably also refers to Gaur.


HUṢAINĪ, plur. Huṣainiyān, a name borne by those sherifs of Morocco who trace their descent from al-Ḥusain, son of ʿAlī and Fāṭima, the daughter of the Prophet. Unlike the Ḥasanī [q. v.] the Huṣainī came at a relatively late date to Morocco, where they in numbers at any rate never attained the importance of their cousins. They form two main groups, the Ṣaffāliyūn and the Ṣafāliyūn.

The Ṣafāliyūn (i. e. those who came from Sicily) were driven from their original home by the Nor-
man conquest. They fled first to Spain and thence to Morocco in the reign of the Marinid Sultān Abu l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Abū Sālim (end of the xivth century). They trace their descent from al-Ḥus-
ain through ʿAlī al-Riḍā.

The Ṣaḥāliyūn, the descendants of al-Ḥusain through ʿIbrāhīm al-Murtada, left Spain after the conquest of Granada by the Christians and sought refuge in Fās (1492).

wat al-Anfāṣ, Fās, 1316, ii. 218. (A. COUR.)

HUṢAINĪ-preview AMĪR, (RUKN AL-DĪN ḤU-
SAIN B. ʿALĪM ʿABD AL-ḤASAN), born at Guzīl, a village in Ghūr, in 671 (1272), was a famous a-
thor and a renowned Sūfī poet. He came to Multān and became a disciple of Ṣukn al-Dīn Abu l-ʿAṭāʾ (b. 738 = 1335) the grandson and successor of Bahāʾ al-Dīn Zakariyāʾ of Multān (ob. 666 = 1267). He afterwards settled in Herāt where he died, according to the Nafṣār al-Uns, in 738 (1318), according to the most recent researches however not till 729 (1270). Among his works the following may be mentioned: Nafṣāt al-Arwāḥ a Sūfī work in mixed prose and verse, in which the rules of the spiritual life are explained and illustrated by anecdotes and sayings of holy men; Zad al-Muṣafīrīn "Provisions for travellers", rules of the religious life, illustrated by anecdotes and fables, and many other tracts such as Kasr al-
Rumāz, Khūṣ al-Arwāḥ, Shārīʿ muṣafīrīn, Ni ʿAm, Tūrūb al-Muṣafīrīn, all of them treating of mystic love.


(M. HIDAYET HOSEIN.)

AL-ḤUSAIN B. DĪKR AL-KALBĪ, ABU L-KHAṬṬĀB, GOVERNOR OF SPAIN 1255-1277 (748-765). After Bulāq b. Bishr [q. v.] had fallen in battle in 1242 and his successor Thālabā b. Sālāma had sold the Spanish Anāris defeated and taken prisoner by him as slaves for a low price, Ḥanūqālā b. Saʿwān, governor of Ibrīriya, sent Abu l-Khaṭṭār to Spain as governor. According to Ibn al-Kītiya and Ibn al-
aṭīr, this was done at the express command of the Caliph Ḥīṣām, after Abu l-Khaṭṭār, who hated the Syrians bitterly, had sent him a poem in which he reminded him of the enmity of the Kai-
sus. Abu l-Khaṭṭār once set free the imprisoned Arabs and thus broke the resistance of the Syrians by sending a number of their chiefs to Africa and dividing the rest among various towns and dis-

tracts in Spain, where they were allotted for their support one third of the harvest which the na-
tives had to pay to the state treasury. But their discontent continued and became dangerous to the governor, when a certain chief named al-Ṣumail [q. v.], who had been personally insulted by him, undertook the leadership of the Syrians and caused the civil war to flare forth again. When Abu l-Khaṭṭār met them on the banks of the Guada-
lete, a portion of his troops failed him so that he had to take to flight and was captured (745). Soon afterwards, however, he was released by some of his followers but a new attempt to face the Syrians had the same lamentable result except that Abu l-Khaṭṭār escaped his enemies this time. But he had now to agree to make common cause with Ibn Ḥūraith, who had at first been on the side of his enemies but whose claims to be re-

cognised as Emir of Spain had met with the re-

cistance of al-Ṣumail; Abu l-Khaṭṭār had even to grant him precedence. Nevertheless, both were captured in an encounter at Secunda on the Guad-
dalquivir, opposite Cordova, and put to death (130 = 747).

Bibliography: al-Kaṣīm al-Maghribī, ed.
Huta'i was published with an introduction and explanatory notes by the present writer (in vol. 46 and 47 of the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, and repinted, Leipzig, 1893), and later with Sukkar’s commentary and glosses by the editor, Aljadid al-Shajjii (Cairo, Taktaddum press, n.d.). In addition to the ms. mentioned in the former edition the Dīwān (with Sukkar) also exists in Stamboul, Fatih-Library, no. 382 (a copy of it in Cambridge, see E. G. Browne’s Handbook n°. 384); a portion in the catalogue ‘Atīf Ef. no. 2777 (according to Rescher).

Bearers of the name al-Huta’i are also found in later times; an Abu l-‘Abbās b. al-Huta’i is quoted by Subkī, Tāhāt al-Shāfi’īyya, iv. 234. 2, and an Ahmad b. al-Huta’i, ibid., 279, 12 (both in the vih century A. H.). (I. GOLDBERG).

HUTAIM (HETEIM, HETEMI, HETEM, HETO, plural. Hutaimān, Hetaimān), a large tribe of nomads which is scattered throughout the Hijāz, Najd, and Egypt. Their chief settlements are at Djjald, the Wa’ab, and al-Wadż. Smaller bodies of the Hutaim live near al-Hijr, al-Ulah (‘Aliya), Khaibar (there they are called Abi Ameen), in the Harrat al-Ebhnin (near Khaibar), in the Harrat al-Wadi, in the Harrat al-‘Abi, and in the Harrat al-Hafr, where they are neighbours of the Ḥjar, and in the vicinity of Mecca. In Egypt they are found south of Helwān and in considerable numbers in the eastern delta near Za‘ānik. During the spring after the rainy season many of the Hutaim encamp with their herds of sheep and goats on the eastern shore of the Red Sea at the exit from the Gulf of Ḍakaba (Nu’mān [Nasām, Neīmān, etc.]), and on the west coast of the sea at Abū Sha’r, where they catch fish, which are numerous there, and tortoises which yield excellent shell.

In Djjald, al-Wadż, Yamna, and other ports they sell fish, butter, milk, honey, goats, and sheep to the pilgrims and caravans. The following subdivisions of the Hutaim are mentioned: Ibn Barrak, Ibn Damuq (son al-Khulai), Ibn Djellad, ‘Arab, al-Kabid (Gahid), Fehiyt (see Fehiy), al-Khairat, al-Noqābāra, Bedwana (on the Jubbel Dokhan below al-‘Aliyya), Banū Rashid (numbering about 2000 souls), al-Dirabāsiya, Kerabas (al-Wadż), al-Noqām, al-Thiabba or Ibn Simra (Simeri, the three latter at Khaibar), also the so-called ‘Arab al-Hisar (south of Helwān, very prosperous) and the Banū ‘Atha (in the eastern Delta).

The origin of the Hutaim is unknown; they are therefore not regarded as Bedouins and are despised by the Arabs who do not intermarry with them; the ‘Arab (al-Hisar) so feared for their treachery are held to be related to them; the traveller Rappel considers them to have come from Yemen. According to legend, the Prophet once visited a camp of the Hutaim where a dog was served up to him as a meal; Mu‘ammad in anger is said to have forbidden his followers to enter into marriages with them or to eat with them. The travellers Dürkhardt, Ruppel, and Wellsted describe them as industrious, kind and hospitable. The Hutaim on the islands of the Red Sea are poor and live under wretched conditions, they dwell partly in caves and caverns; they pay tribute (two dollars a head) to the Jujwāt (q. v.). The Hutaim in Hijjāz and Najd are more prosperous than Bedouins usually are. Their camels are of the finest. They are well armed and excellent shots. A portion of the Hutaim pays tribute to the Shammar chief Ibn Rashid.
HUWA HUWA, literally "he is he", or "it is it", means:

a. in logic what is represented as entirely identical e. g. "Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah" and "the Prophet": (Peano and the modern logicians express this equation by the sign =).

b. in Mysticism the state of the same which completed personal unity testifies to divine unity in the world.

Bibliography: Ghazzālī, Maḥāsī al-falāšīfīsī, Cairo, p. 116—117; Hallajī, Kitāb al-Wusūsi, p. 129, 175, 189; Ibn Raqīd, Muḥāṣ' al-Ṭabāba, Cairo, p. 12 (Louis Massignon).

AL-ḤUWAṬTĀT (Ḥwētāt, Ḥwētāt, Ḥwētāt, Ḥwētāt, Ḥwāsāt, Ḥwāsāt, sing. Ḥwāṣāt), an Arab tribe in the northern Ḥijāz and on the Sinai peninsula; their settlements in the Ḥijāz reach southwards from al-ʿAqaba to beyond al-Walīdih; they are neighbours of the Balī [q. v.] and Djuhānā [q. v.] with the latter of whom they are on bad terms. Formerly the Djuhānā [q. v.] occupied their settlements.

There is a large settlement of the Ḥuwaṭṭāt on the Wādi Maḥnī, where they have many huts and thick palm groves; they only stay here during the rainy season between Marḥ and Muḥāsī-UNNA and al-Muḥāsībī (Moila), a station for pilgrims on the Red Sea, they have good pastures where they encamp during the rainy season with their numerous flocks of sheep and goats. In autumn they live in the oasis Dḥāt al-Ḥadīdī in the neighbourhood of Djiibel Ṭubālī, north of Tabūk. In the hot season they go back to Ghaza; here as well as in the little villages in al-Ḥiṣmā near al-ʿAqaba they tend their extensive date orchards and cultivate their fields of dhuara. In Yārib and other parts they sell butter, milk, goats and sheep to the pilgrims and travellers along the coast; in Nadīj they exchange dhuara for cattle. Many of the Ḥuwaṭṭāt are camel-drivers and camel dealers; those in Palestine are traders (particularly among the Beduins), in Burckhardt's time they carried on a busy trade with Cairo; every year a caravan of over 4000 camels went from the Ḥuwaṭṭāt to the Egyptian capital, where they brought wheat, barley and clothing. The Ḥuwaṭṭāt are considered descendants of the ancient Nabataeans; according to a common belief among them, they are descended from two brothers of the Harb [q. v.]. The founder of the tribe is said to have been Ḥwēt (Ḥuwaṭ), a native to Egypt, who came to al-ʿAqaba on a pilgrimage and is buried in al-Ḥiṣmā. Of the ten or twelve subdivisions of the Ḥuwaṭṭāt, which were given to him, Burckhardt mentions the following as the most powerful: the Omrān (perhaps identical with the 'Imrān) and northern neighbours of the Ḥuwaṭṭāt al-Ṭāhāma and the eastern desert and number nearly 800 families), al-Mesk and al-
litania and the country of Barak. Some even settled in the Sahara desert near the Lamba and took the name Hoggare (a contraction of Howar, Huwar); they would thus be the ancestors of the modern Tuareg. Others founded the town of Aghmat in Southern Morocco. They became converts to Islam but afterwards apostatized; they later zealously adopted the doctrines of the Khårîjids and shared in all their rebellions, in that of Abyd Yazid also, particularly those who had settled in Hriyliya, a region of Berber. They became so weakened by oppression by the Fàtîmid caliph Ismâ'îl al-Mansûr and later by the 'Abîdîn al-Qaisarî that they played no part in political affairs afterwards. In the sixteenth century we find them spread all over North Africa, between Baraka and Alexandria, from Tebessa to Béja and to the sea, in the valley of the Sîrân where they had founded the town of al-Basrî, which has now utterly vanished and between Mascara and Rlezane where they had built the Ka'âl of the B. Huwar, the modern Ka'âl of the B. Râshîd. One of their families the B. Khâş'-bî had founded a kingdom in Zirila; on its downfall they founded another in Fezzûn, which was destroyed by the Kurî 'Ara'în, who put the last ruler of this family, Muhammed b. Khâş'-bî, to death by torture, in order to gain possession of his wealth. Of those who occupied the central Maghrib Ibn Khaldûn says: (the tribes) graze herds of sheep, but as they are oppressed with taxes they no longer show the pride and independence, which once distinguished them when their armies won bloody victories. Scattered and weakened they are now despised”.


**Huwwärîn** a place on the road from Damascus to Palmyra and Homs, about midway between them. It is celebrated as a resort of Yazid I. The district was inhabited in 'Abîd al-Malik's time by Nabi, i.e. natives who were Christians and spoke Aramaic. This remained the case down to the time of the Mamlûks of Egypt. Yazid died at Huwwärîn and was buried there; this is confirmed by contemporary poetry. The inhabitants still point out a road called ✪Kûrî Yazid, 'Yazid's castle'. This name is probably only an echo of the literary tradition, according to which there were lasting links between Yazid and Huwwärîn.


---

**AL-IBÂDIYYA**, usually called ABDIYYA in North Africa, are the followers of 'Abîd Allah b. 'Abî [q.v.]. A few additions may here be made to what has been written in i. p. 3, chiefly with reference to the North African Abâ'dîyâ. The first rising of the Abâ'dîs took place in the last years of the reign of Marwan II, under 'Abîd Allah b. Yahyâ 'Allâb al-'Aqîq and Abû Hamza (129 = 747). 'Abîd Allah had homage paid him in 'Ahrâmûn, then conquered 'Asmûn and sent Abû Hamza to Mosâqa; the latter defeated the Omeyyad governor at Khûdâd and brought Medina also under his sway. In the following year 130 (748) however, Marwan sent 'Abîd al-Malik Ibn 'Abîyâ against him; Abû Hamza was put to flight in the Wâdî 'l-Ku'ra, took refuge in Mecca, whither 'Abîd al-Malik followed him, and was taken and executed there after a vigorous resistance. A short time afterwards the Abîdî caliph 'Abîd Allah b. Yahyâ met the same fate. According to Shahrastânî, ed. Coreton, p. 100, Abîd Allah b. Abîd also took part in this rising but this statement seems to be inaccurate, as Ibn Ibbâd, according to more reliable statements, died in the reign of 'Abîd al-Malik nearly half a century previously. A second rising under al-Djulandî in 'Oman in 134 (751-2) was put down by the 'Abâbdîs general Khâzîm b. Khuzaîma.

In the meanwhile the Abîdî movement spread to North Africa; on its vicesitudes there cf. the article AWâDÎTTES. In Arabia itself it found a hospitable soil in distant 'Oman and in time became the predominant sect there cf. the article OMÂN. From there it was later brought to Zanzibar.

The ABDIYYA form a separate community in Islam alongside of the Sunnis and 'Âshî'îs and have their own rules of faith and religious laws, which, however, on the whole agree with those of the Sunnis and only deviate on certain questions. They also recognise the Qu'ran and Hadîth as the source of religious knowledge, but instead of Idjmî and Kiyâs they have Ra'î [q.v.]. They show their Khårîjîs origin not only on these points but also on the question of the Imâmî, although in a different fashion from the Ahrârîs. We cannot here enter into details of their conception of Wilâyât, kara'a and walâfîf, especially as they are not agreed among themselves on this. Al-Shahrastânî, al-Baghâdhî, etc., mention a schism of the older Abâ'dîyya into 3 or 4 sects; the Hâfîyya, the Hârîhiyya, the Yezdiyya and those who admit of an obedience which has not God as its object. In the latter history of the community, notably in North Africa, further differences of opinion revealed themselves. Several theological works of their leaders are mentioned in Fihrist, p. 182 sqq., more about which is given in Bibliography to the art. ABDÎTTES. The chief source is the work made known by Sachau, *Mitteil. d. Semin. f. orient. Sprachen*, 21. Abteilung i. i. 99 sqq., and ii. 47 sqq., entitled ✪Kashf al-Ghâmma al-Qâmî 'l-Abhîr al-Ummâ.
Ibīlīs, the personal name of the devil. This name is probably a corruption of *dāhīs*, the native tribesmen derived from the root of *dāḥ*, "because Ibīlīs has nothing to expect (*ubīna* from the mercy of God). He is also called al-Shaṭīfān (Satan), 'Ādīnaw Allāh (enemy of God) or 'Ādīnaw Allāh-Shaṭīfān however is not a proper name. In the Kurʾān he appears mainly in the early history of the world (ii. 32; vii. 10; xv. 31 sq.; xvi. 63; xviii. 48; xx. 115; xxxviii. 74 sq.) as rebellious at the creation of Adam and as the tempter of Eve in Paradise. After Allāh had formed Adam [q.v.] out of earth and breathed the breath of life into him, he issued an order to the angels to bow down before him. The only one who refused to do so was Ibīlīs, because he, being created of fire, thought it beneath his dignity to pay homage to a being made of earth. He was therefore banished and cursed; but he begged postponement of his punishment till the Day of Judgment; he was granted this as well as power to lead astray all those who are not true followers of God. When Adam and Eve were in Paradise, he tempted them to eat of the fruit of the tree. Muḥammad has here combined two independent myths, the creation of Adam and the temptation of Eve in Paradise. It is to be noted that in the story of the creation, the devil is always called Ibīlīs; in the story of Paradise, however, al-Shaṭīfān, at least when not denoted by a pronoun. The story of Ibīlīs is based on Christian tradition. In the Life of Adam and Eve, § 15 (Kautzsch, Apokryphon) it is related that Michael had commanded the angels to worship Adam. The Devil objected that Adam was less important and younger than they; he and his hosts refused and were cast down upon the earth. According to the Schatzkohte (ed. Bezold, p. 15 sq. of the Syriac-Arabic text), God gave Adam power over all creatures. The angels thereupon reverence him except the Devil, who had become jealous and said: He ought to worship me, who am light and air, while he is only earth. He was therefore cast out of heaven with his hosts; then he was called Satan, Daemon, etc.

Muslim tradition has adorned the Kurʾānic account with various features, some well known. The difficulty had first to be overcome that in the Kurʾān Ibīlīs is numbered among the Djinn [q.v.] as well as among the angels, and these are usually considered two different classes of beings. Zamakhshari says that Ibīlīs is only a Djinn and that the name angel in the Kurʾān applies to both classes (Kashshāb on Sūra xx. 115). But it is also said that Ibīlīs was an archangel. Others say that the Djinn were a division of the angels, who had to guard Paradise (al-Djinnah); hence their name (Tabari, Annates, i. 80). These Djinn were created of the fire of Samīm (Sūra, xv. 27) while the angels are created of light (Tabari, ib., p. 81.) In the beginning the Djinn inhabited the earth. But they quarrelled with one another and finally blood was shed. Allāh then sent Ibīlīs who, at that time, bore the name of ʿAzīzīl or al-Jaḥīlīl, with a troop of angels against the brawlers who were driven back into the mountains. According to other accounts however, Ibīlīs was one of the earthly Djinn and was brought back to prison to heaven by the angels sent by Allāh to punish the unruly Djinn; he was still quite young at this time (ib., p. 84). The name al-Hakam is also given to Ibīlīs before his fall, as Allāh had appointed him judge over the Djinn, he filled this office for 1000 years. He then became vain of the name and created unrest among the Djinn, which lasted another 1000 years. Allāh then sent fire which consumed them; but Ibīlīs took refuge in heaven and remained a faithful servant of Allāh till the creation of Adam (ib., p. 85; Masʿūdī, Mawrid, i. 50 sqq.)

But there are other traditions about the pride of Ibīlīs. Tabari (ib., p. 85) relates that he felt himself superior to the other angels, whereupon Allāh said: "I will create a šīta on earth" (Sūra ii. 28); Tabari (ib., p. 79 sq.) further says that Ibīlīs was one of the archangels and ruler over the Djinn on earth and in the lowest heaven. He then became rebellious and was called Shaṭīfān radīm by Allāh.

In the discussion of the story of Paradise in Tradition it is related how Ibīlīs obtained access to Paradise. The view, also found in Christian authors, is generally prevalent that he made use of a serpent for this purpose. According to some authorities, he tried all the animals in vain; according to others, he began with the peacock, which he once saw at the gate of Paradise. He promised to tell him three words which would protect him from death on condition that he let him enter. But the peacock would not and told his experience to the serpent. The latter allowed Satan to sit between its teeth (according to others in its belly) and carried him in. The serpent was on intimate terms with Eve; and Satan now talked out of its mouth. He told the woman of the fruit of the tree which gave immortality, as an angel had told him. When Eve had gone to the tree, Ibīlīs appeared in the form of an angel. According to others he brought her the fruit of the tree himself, with the well-known result. Ibīlīs, Adam, and Eve were banished from Paradise and cursed. (The Kurʾān places the banishment of Ibīlīs after the story of the creation). The serpent, previously a beautiful quadruped was condemned to crawl upon its belly. Ibīlīs was granted postponement of his punishment. Henceforth he had to live in ruins, tombs and filthy places. His food is flesh offered to idols, his drink wine, his pastimes music, dancing, and poetry. His descendants are seven times more numerous than those of men.

In the end Ibīlīs shall be thrown into hell-fire with his hosts and the damned among men. "Then shall they (the idols) be thrown into it (i.e. into hell) as well as those who have been seduced and the hosts of Ibīlīs". (Sūra, xxvi. 94 sq.). The phraseology of this verse recalls Matthew, xxv. 41: 41: "Then shall they say also unto them on the left hand: Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels".

But in the meanwhile he plays many a trick on men, and leads them astray except the believers
(czyć, xxiv. 19). The hájit [q. v.] so frequently mentioned in Arabic literature is often simply the voice of Iblis. For example, he is said to have warned 'Ali in this way not to wash the Prophet's corpse; another hájit then brought the Prophet's son-in-law into the right course again (Tha'labi, Kitaq, p. 44).

Allah once granted John the Baptist an interview with Iblis. He asked the Evil One, when he had the greatest influence on men and the answer was: "when they have eaten and drunk their fill". John thereupon resolved never to reach this stage.

On his propagation it is said that he lays two eggs as often as he rejoices over the rebelliousness of the children of Adam and young are born from these eggs. It is also said that he has both male and female organs and impregnates himself.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources mentioned in the text, the commentaries on the passages quoted from the Qur'an; Weil, Biblische Legenden der Muselmänner, p. 12 sqq.; Gräubaum, Neue Beiträge zur sensuellen Sagenkunde, p. 6 sqq.; al-Diyābākī, al-Khamīs (Cairo 1233), l. 31 sqq.; Bālālī, Sūfī, Būlū Ṣafāt Ilūs wa-Qāmušūdī. (A. J. Wensinck.)

IBN (A.), Son.

IBN 'ABBĀD, Abu 'l-Kāsim Ismā'il b. 'Abd b. 'Abd b. al-'Abbās b. Ḍāhir b. Ahmad b. Ḍīrīs b. al-Tālibānī, vizier of the two Byzids Mu'aiyid al-Dawla and Fakhīr al-Dawla, born in Dhu al-Ka'ād 320 (September 938). His father was Rukn al-Dawla's vizier; he himself received the name 'al-Sāhibī (the companion) on account of his relations with Abu ʾl-Faqīl b. ʾAmīd b. b. Ṣināʾ al-Ahmād) or Mu'aiyid al-Dawla, who appointed him his secretary. After the fall of Abu ʾl-Fāth b. ʾAmīd (B. b. Ṣināʾ al-Ahmād) he was raised to the rank of vizier and when Mu'aiyid al-Dawla died in 373 (984) and the power passed to Fakhīr al-Dawla, the latter confirmed him in his office. He held the grand viziership till his death and during his long tenure of office exercised a very great influence over Fakhīr al-Dawla. In 377 (987-8) he undertook an expedition to Ṭabaristān, arranged affairs there and captured several fortresses. Ibn ʾAbbād died in late 385 (March 995) and was buried in Isfahān.

Bibliography: Yākūt, Isḥāq al-ʾArīsī (ed. Margoliouth), ii. 273–343; Ibn Khallīkān (ed. Wüstefeld), No. 95 (transl. de Slane, I. 212 sqq.); Ibn al-Athīr (ed. Torbergh), viii. 264, 454; i. 4 sq., 18, 39, 44. 72, 77 sq.; Wilken, Gesch. der Sultane aus dem Geschichtliche Bytch nach Mirdsch, Chap. viii.

(K. V. Zettersten.)

IBN 'ABBĀD, Abu ʾabd Allāh Muḥammad b. Abī Isrāʾīl Ḍīrīsī b. Abī Bakkār ʾAbd Allāh b. Mīlāk b. Ḍīrīsī b. Muḥammad b. Mīlāk b. Ḍīrīsī b. Yaḥyā b. ʾAbd al-Nāṣir al-Ḥimyarī al-Rundi, generally known as Ibn ʾAbbād, a lawyer, mystic poet, and preacher, was born in 732 (1332-3) in Spain at Ronda, where he spent his youth, learned the Qur'an by heart at the age of seven and began to study language and law. He then went to Fās and Tlemcen to complete his studies. He returned to Morocco, settled at Sala where he studied under Ahmad b. ʾAshīr; on the latter's death, after spending some time at Tangier under the Šūfi Abū Marwān ʾAbd al-Mālik, he was brought to Fās and entrusted with the post of kāhitīb at the mosque of al-Karawīyīn, which he held for fifteen years, i.e. till his death on Friday 3rd Rādjab 792 (= 17 June 1390). He was buried inside the Būb al-Futūh.


(M. H. Ben Chennel.)

IBN AL-ʿABBĀR, Abu ʾAbduʾllāh ʿAlmāṭī al-Muḥammād al-Ḥabūbī, Arab poet, lived at Seville and died in 433 (1041–42). Besides a Ḍīrāt, there should be attributed to ʿHādhīŷ al-Khaṭānī, who ascribed to him four works usually attributed to the author of the Tāμhīd and of the Ḍīrāt al-Šīrāzī [see next art.]


For over twenty years he was on the closest terms of intercourse with the principal traditionist of Spain, Abu ʾl-Raḥīm b. Sālim, who induced him to compile the Sūra of Ibn Baṣḥīwālī. He was also secretary to the governor of Valencia, Abī ʾAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Abu Ḥāfṣ b. Abī Muʿmīn b. ʾAlī, and afterwards to his son Abī Zaid, and lastly to Zayyān b. Mardanīsh. When Don Jaime, king of Aragon, besieged Valencia in Ramadan 635 (April–May 1238), Ibn al-ʾAbbār travelled with an embassy to the Šūlān of Tunis, Abū Zakariyyā Yāḥyā b. ʾAbd al-Wāḥīd b. Abī Ḥāfṣ, to give him a document, by which the governor and people of Valencia recognized the suzerainty of the Šūlān kingdom. He met Abī Zakariyyā on the 4th Muharram 635 (17th August 1238) and recited to him a poem rhyming in ṣīn, in which he appealed for help for the Muslims. Soon after his return to Valencia, only a few days before or after the capture of the town by the Christians in Šafār 636 (Sept.–Oct. 1238) he sailed with his whole family to Tunis. According to Ibn Khallīkān, he went straight to Tunis, while
IBN AL-ABBĀR — IBN 'ABBĀD RABBĪHĪ

al-Ghubrānī assures us that he went first to Bougie and taught there for a time. The Sulṭān of Tunis received him graciously and appointed him his secretary, with the duty of writing the king's style and titles immediately under the basmāla in his edicts. But soon afterwards this office was taken from him and given to Abu l-‘Abbās al-Ghasanī, who was a matchless expert in Eastern calligraphy, which the Sulṭān preferred to the Maghribi hand. Ibn al-Abbār felt this insult deeply but continued in spite of all warnings to place the king's title upon the documents, which had been drawn up by him. Confined to his own house, he composed an Iṭāb al-Kutāba which he dedicated to the Sulṭān. The latter pardoned him and restored Ibn al-Abbār to office, mainly through the intervention of his son al-Mustanṣīr. After Abū Zakariyyā's death his successor al-Mustanṣīr made Ibn al-Abbār his trusted adviser, but the latter so offended the king and his courtiers by his behaviour that he was finally put to torture. Among his confiscated writings was found a satire against the Sulṭān, which so enraged the latter that he ordered its author to be slain by spear-thrusts. Ibn al-Abbār died on Tuesday morning, 20th Muḥarram 658 (6th January 1260) and on the following day, his body was burned along with his books, poems, and other products of his studies on one funeral-pyre. Ibn al-Abbār, who was called al-Fā'yar (the mouse) for some unknown reason, composed a number of works on history, tradition, literature, and poetry, of which only the following have survived: 1. Kitāb al-Tamāla li-Kitiḥāb al-Silah (ed. Codera, Madrid 1886); 2. al-Muḍjam fi Aṣḥāb al-Kāfī al-Māīn Abī 'Ali al-Sadafi (ed. Codera, Madrid 1886); 3. Kitāb al-Hilāla al-Siyār (one part pub. by Dozy, Leiden 1847—1851, another by Müller in Beitr. zur Gesch. der westl. Araber, München 1866—1878); 4. Tūḥfat al-Kādīm (Caisri, Bibli. Arab.-Asiip., I, N. 354, 3; Derenburg, Let. man. Arab. de l'Extrav., N. 356, 2); 5. Iṭāb al-Kutāba (Caisri, c. c., N. 1726). 

IBN ‘ABBAD AL-HAKAM, ABU AL-RAHMĀN B. 'ABBAD AL-HAKAM B. 'AYYĀN, ABU ‘L-KĀSIM, the earliest Arab historian of Egypt whose work has survived, was a member of a notable Egyptian family. His father, Abu ‘AbdAllah, died 214 = 830, was well-learned in tradition and jurisprudence, and the author of books in these fields; he was the head of the Mālikite school in Egypt, and was also associated with the Kāfī as censor of witnesses. His four sons were all men of importance: Muhammad, widely celebrated as a jurist and author, and his father's successor as leader of the Mālikites of Egypt; Abu al-Ḥakam, and Sa'd, also renowned (especially the former) for their learning; and Abu al-Rāmān. The family suffered in the persecution under al-Walīqī, refusing to subscribe to the doctrine of the created Korān; later, in the year 237, they became permanently disgraced in the community because of an emblems which was proved against them (al-Kindī, ed. Guest, p. 462 sqq., 472, 1 sqq.).

Abū al-Rāmān (generally known as Ibn ‘Abbād al-Hakam) died at al-Fustāt in 257 (871). He was mainly interested in tradition and made extensive collections based on the principal Egyptian authorities, of whom his father was one. His chief work was al-Fustātī, in seven Divisions, as follows: 1. Egypt, and its ancient history; 2. The Muslim conquest; 3. The Khiṭāba of al-Fustātī and al-Dījā, and the Isbādiya of Alexandria; 4. Organization and administration of Egypt under 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ, and the extension of the conquest beyond Egypt to the south and west; 5. The conquest of North Africa after the death of 'Amr, and the conquest of Spain; 6. The Kādis of Egypt, down to the year 246; 7. Egyptian traditions derived from the Companions of the Prophet who came to Egypt. The manner of the whole compilation shows its author to have been an expert collector of traditions and not very critical of his material. His chief interest was in the period of the Companions and their immediate successors; hence in his treatment of the Kādis he gives much space to the earliest, but less and less to the later ones down to his own day; hence also in his important chapter on the Khiṭāba the formal tradition holds a subordinate place, and he simply collects whatever information he can find.

The work of Ibn ‘Abbād al-Hakam was extensively used by the early historians of Egypt. Among the later works, Suyūṭī's Ḥum al-Muḥāḍara is in large part a transcript of it, and it furnishes Maḵzūmī with many chapters; in both cases the text quoted is much inferior to the original. Yākūt cites it in extenso for a considerable part of his Egyptian material. See further the Introduction to the edition of the Fustātī Mīr now (1914) being published in the Gibb Memorial Series, London.

There are ms. of the work in the British Museum, Paris (2), and Leiden (an abridgment). Partial translations have been made by Ewald (Zeitschr. f. Kunde d. Morgenl., iii, 3, 1840, p. 332—352), de Slane, Karle, Jones, La Fuente, and Torrey (in Bibl. und Semit. Studien, New York, 1901, p. 279—330); see Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., with the Nachträge.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallīkān (ed. Wustenfeld), nos. 322, 582 (Trans. de Slane, ii. 14, 598); Ḥum al-Muḥāḍara (lithogr.), i. 134, 156, 206; Abu ʿAmūsāī, i. 629; Wustenfeld, Geschichtschr., 63; Dozy Recherches, 3e ud., p. 56 sqq.; Brockelmann, Geschichte d. arab. Literatur, i. 148, ii. 692; al-Kindī, ed. Rhunov, Guest, introd., p. 22 sqq. (C. C. Torrey).

IBN ‘ABBAD RABBĪHĪ, AHMAD B. MUḤAMMAD ABU ʿOMAR, a Spanish Arab author, born 10th Ramadān 246 = 29th Nov. 860 in Cordova, a freedman of the Umayyads ruling there, died 18th Djuḥadād 1 328 = 3rd March 940. His principal work is the anthology al-ʿIṣdī (the addition al-
farid was made by later copyists); it is divided into 25 books, which are called after jewels; the 13th book is called al-Wasif and the corresponding pairs on either side of it are called after the same jewels, in the second part with the addition of al-Yahya. The matter is taken from the usual adab books, the Ćuyan al-Abdār of Ibn Kutaiba being particularly made use of; the šāhī Ibn ʿAbdād [q.v.] is said to have rejected the book as it disappointed his expectation of finding Spanish history in it. It was printed at Būlāq 1293, Cairo 1303, 1305, 1317, 1321. Among his poems, of which all ʿAbdād was acquainted with more than 20 volumes, there was a Muṣḥaf Ḥaṭīq & Muṣḥaf Ḥaṭīq, which he called Muṣḥaf Ḥaṭīq; they were the love poems of his youth, to which he added in his old age concluding verses of ascetic tenor in the same metre and rhyme.


**IBN ʿABD AL-WAHḤĀB.** [See Muhammad.]

**IBN ʿABD AL-ŽĀHIR, MUIḤIYY ʿI-L-DĪN ABU ʿABD ALLAH b. RASHĪD AL-DĪN ABU MUḤAMMAD ʿABD AL-ZĀHIR B. NISHWAN AL-SAʿDĪ AL-RAWHĪ, born in Cairo on the 9th Muḥarram 620 = 1223, and died there in 622 = 1225 (Durrat al-Aslāk fī Durrat al-Ārāb, Orientalia, i. 148, p. 285; Wustenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber, No. 366). Not much is known about his life but he played an important part under the three Bahri Mamlikūs al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Baibars, al-Manṣūr Kalaun and al-Asfar Khalil as private secretary, Kātib al-Sār or Ṣāḥib Dīwān al-Inṣāq (on this office see Maʿṣūrī, Ḥaṭīṣ, i. 402; ii. 225 sq.; Quatremère, Histoire des Sultanat Mammouks par Maṣṣūrī, ii. 2, p. 222, Note 40, and 317 sqq.). According to some he was the first holder of this office, though others say his son; in other sources the office is said to be much older (see Maḥmūd’s work quoted below p. xiii, sq.) and he is said to have succeeded Ibn Lōqūn in 678 in the reign of Kalaun (Quatremère, i. 1, p. 7, 27). In this office he had to read all letters coming in and to compose all important letters and documents; he seems to have performed these tasks even in the reign of Baibars, for in 661, when Baibars took the oath of fealty to the Caliph, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir was present and composed the caliph’s Khīfa (Quatremère, i. 1, p. 150, 183; Casanova, p. 495) in 662 he drew up the taḥṣil by which al-Malik al-Sādī was installed as heir-apparent (Quatremère, i. 1, p. 241), and later he drew up the marriage contract between him and Kalaun’s daughter (op. cit., i. 2, p. 132) he also wrote the tāḥṣil which declared Kalaun’s son as heir-apparent (op. cit., ii. 1, p. 26). In 666 he was with an Emir in ʿAkkā to receive the commandant’s oath of fealty, but without success (op. cit., i. 2, p. 57) and he looked after the affairs of state when Kalaun’s son was governor during his father’s journey (Casanova, p. 495). He spent some time in Damascus (Maṣṣūrī, Ḥaṭīṣ, ii. 324).

The Amāls which he compiled on the reigns of the three Sultanāhs above mentioned are of great importance. The biography of Baibars (Part i. to p. 663, Brit. Mus., No. 1229) was used by Maḥmūd and al-ʿAṣkalānī, Kitāb histān al-Maṣṣūmī (Noberg, p. xv–xg) and al-Naṣrī Shāhi made an excerpt from it (Casanova, p. 499 sqq.). The history of Kalaun is traced from 681 till his death and official documents are given (Casanova, p. 502). We only possess a third of the biography of al-Asfār (years 690–691), published by Noberg except some waṣṭ documents (see Bibli.). Of importance also is his Kitāb al-Manṣūrī b. ʿAbd al-Muṭawakki il aṣ-Ṣāfīr (J. H. K., ii. 147: iii. 161, 499), which Maḥmūd made great use of in his Khīṣāt chiefly for archaeology (Becker, Beiträge zur Gesch. Aegypten unter dem Islam, p. 23, 30; Guest in Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 1902, p. 120, 125). His Tamāmīn al-Ḥālāt in treatises of carrier-pigeons (Maṣṣūrī, Khīṣāt, ii. 231 Quatremère, ii. 2, p. 118, Note 49; Casanova, p. 505). For his other works see Brockelmann.

His son Fath al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir is also mentioned as Kātib al-Sār and seems to have attained an even higher position than his father in this capacity (Maṣṣūrī, Khīṣāt, ii. 226; Casanova, p. 497). He died before his father in Cairo.


**IBN ʿABDŪN, ABU MUḤAMMAD ʿABD AL-MAḤDĪ IBN ʿABDŪN AL-FIHĪR, a Spanish Arab poet, born in Evora, whose poetical talent early attracted the attention of the governor of the province of Faro, Omar al-Mutawakkil Ibn al-Āfafs, and when the latter became ruler of Idaqaz (see i. 178 sqq.) he became his secretary in 473 (1080). The fall of the Aqṣāṣ kingdom in 485 (1092) forced him to enter the service of Sir b. Abk Bakl, leader of the Arab troops. We afterwards find him again as secretary at the court of the Almoravid Ali b. Yusuf in 500 (1106). He died in his native town Evora in 529 (1134). Ibn ʿAbdūn owes his fame chiefly to a poem, much admired by the Arabs, entitled al-Baghāshīna and dealing with the fall of the Aqṣāṣ, ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd Allah al-Hadrāni wrote a historical commentary on it. The latter is known as Ibn Badrūn and was born in Silves and was still alive in 608 (1211) but nothing further is known of him. This commentary with Ibn ʿAbdūn’s poem was published by Dozy in 1846 under the title Commentaire historique sur le poême d’Ibn Abdoun par Ibn Badroun; Hoogvelt had previously published Prolegomena ad editionem celebrissimis Abn Abnūn poetaeis in luctuoso Aphäsladurum interium, Leiden 1839. The text of the poem itself is also given in al-Marrāṭkūsh’s history. Dozy, p. 53 sqq.; there is a French transl. by Faguer and a Spanish by Pons Boigues (see Bibli.). Imād al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿAlhir [q.v.] also wrote a commentary on it.

**Bibliography:** The Arabic sources are detailed in Dozy’s preface to his edition already
IBN 'ABDÚN — IBN ABI RANDAKA.

355


IBN ABI 'AMIR. [See AL-MANṢŪR.]

IBN ABI 'L-AWḌIJA, 'Abd al-Karim, uncle on his mother’s side of the celebrated Ma‘n b. Šītāda, a crypto-Manichaean, who was taken prisoner by Muhammad b. Sulaimān governor of Khūfa, and afterwards put to death in 155 (772) by him without the Caliph’s authority, for which some sources say the governor was dismissed. When he was being led to death he is said to have boasted that he had invented 4000 traditions which were contradictory to the prescriptions and prohibitions of Muslim law. He is said, for example, to have invented in the name of Dā‘ar al-Shālīk [q. v.] a calculation of the commencement of the fast in the month of Ramḍān, although the law is well known to lay it down that the exact moment for its commencement is not until the new moon has been seen. Among the Shi‘īs however the period of the new moon is fixed by calculation. Cf. Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, lviii. 406.


IBN ABI DINĀR, Abu ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Abu ‘l-Kasīm al-Ru‘ainī al-Ka‘rawīnī, an Arab historian, wrote a history called al-Ma‘ṣī fi Alkhabūr ʿIrīṣīyya wa Tūnīs in 1110 (1698) or according to a statement in a manuscript in 1092 (1681). As he mentions in the preface the work falls into two divisions, the first contains the description of Tunis, the second of the conquests of the Franks by the Muslims, the fourth the history of the ‘Ubaydis, the fifth that of the Shīḥādīs, the sixth that of the Banū Ġāfīr, the seventh and eighth the history of Turkish rule. The final chapter discusses the latest events in Tunisia. The book was printed in Tunis in 1258 A. H. and translated into French by Pellisier and Rémusat, Paris 1845.

Bibliography: Roy, Extr. du Coll., des Manuscrits de la Bibl. de la Grande Mosquée de Tunis (Tunis 1900), no. 4960, p. 50; Brockelmann, Gesch. des arab. Litt., ii. 457. (KEANE BASKET.)

IBN ABI ‘L-DUNYĀ, Abu Bakkar Abū ‘Alā‘ al-Ba‘dūnī (‘Ala‘ al-Allāh) b. Muḥammad al-Ḥorashī, Arab author, born 208 = 828, a pupil of the ‘Abbasids Caliph al-Ma‘ṣūfī, died 14th Djamāda II 281 = 21st Aug. 894. Of his numerous works which were all devoted to Adab the following have survived: 1) al-Farādār bā‘d al-Šīhāda, modelled on al-Maḍīnī’s work of the same title, in Berlin (see Ahlwardt, Verzeichnis der ar. Hīṣāt der Kgl. Bibl., No. 8731), Damascus Žarīra b. Ḥabīb al-Ẓārīyāt, Khāṣṣat al-Kutub fi Dinawār al-Dawārīkhā (Cairo 1902), p. 30, No. 20, 2, printed in Ind. 1333, reprinted Cairo n. d.; al-Suyūṭī’s epitome, al-Arāfāt niṣīfār al-Farādār, in which other sources however were also used has been printed along with Ibn Ḥadīb al-Bā‘īn’s Hāj al-Talí under the title, Thubāt al-Maḥājir bi-Talalīh al-Farādār, Cairo 1317. 2) Kitāb al-Ifrāf, Vol. 2, Damascus, op. cit., p. 40, No. 132, 2. 3) Maḥārīm al-


IBN ABI ḤADJALAH, Ahmad b. Yahyā Abu l-ʿAbbas Shihāb al-Din al-Timīrī, Arab poet, known under the name of Omar b. al-Farāḥ, born in 725 = 1325 in Tlemcen, settled in Cairo after making the pilgrimage and died of the plague as superior of the Safi monastery founded by Manṣūr, on the 20th Dhū l-Ḥaḍād 776 = 5th May 1375. Of his works that have survived (detailed in Brockelmann, Gesch. des arab. Litt., ii. 13), the following are printed: 1) Diwān al-Sabāhā, a history of celebrated lovers with a selection of erotic poems, Cairo 1279, 1291, 1305 and on the margin of the Tāzīyin al-ʿArādāy of Dā‘ūd al-Anājīqī, Bukhār 1291, Cairo 1308. 2) Sāḥīd al-Sulṭān al-Malik al-Ḥaṣīfī, an anthology on the significance of the number 7 for Egypt, composed in 755 = 1355, Bukhār 1288. Bibliography: al-Suyūṭī, Ḥasan al-Muhājira, i. 529; Ibn Ḥabīb in Orientalia, ii. 440; Wüst Consulting, Geschichte der Araber, No. 437. (C. BROCKELMANN.)

that he spent a portion of his life at the court of the Zirid Mu'izz b. Badh, b. al-Mansūr (406–454 = 1016–1062) in Tunisia. It is also probable that he is identical with the Abu 'l-Hasan al-Maghrībi, who attended the astronomical observations made in 1378 (o88) in Baghdad by order of the Bayyid Sharaf al-Dawla under the supervision of the astronomer Abu Sahl Wa'īl b. Rustam al-Kūhī. From a prophecy in his principal astrological work we may conclude that he cannot have died before c. 1040. This book is entitled al-Kāfūr fi Aṭākh al-Naḏīm (the distinguished [book] on horoscopes from the constellations); it still exists in Arabic in various libraries (Brit. Mus., Ind. Off., Paris, Berlin, Escorial, etc.). It was translated by Jehuda b. Moses (1256) from Arabic to Spanish, and soon afterwards from the latter language into Latin by Aegidius de Telaldis and Petrus de Regio. The Latin translation was several times printed first of all in 1485 in Venice under the title: Praccolerisius liber totius in judiciis asterorum, quem editit Abbaohasa Halcy filius Abenragel, etc. He also wrote an Orastra on astrology on which Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Kūnīḏ al-Kusṭāntjīnī wrote a commentary in 1573 (Escorial, Brit. Museum, Oxford, Cairo).


IBN ABI 'L-RIDJAL, Aḥmad b. Sāliḥ, Arab historian, jurist and poet, belonging to the Shi‘ī sect of the Zaidis in Yemen, born in Shabān 1029 (July 1620) at al-Shabāṭ, a place in the Bilad Dhūrā in the district of al-Āhmēdīn, died in the night of Wednesday the 6th Rabī‘ I 1092 (25th–26th March 1681) aged 62 years, and was buried at al-Rāja (an hour’s journey N. of Shāfī‘) near a house which belonged to him. He spent his whole life in Yemen. He studied the Kurān, tradition, and law at Shefi‘a, Sa‘ān, Ta‘īz, Ibb, al-Hardja and Shāfī‘ and studied under all the Zaidi, as well as the Shāfī‘, Hanafi or Malikī scholars, who lived in Yemen or travelled through it, notably the Malikī Aḥmad b. Aḥmad al-Shabīb al-Kairawānī (died at Shāfī‘, where he was excommunicated by the Ta‘wīm of Euclid, on the 22nd Shu‘āb 1 1064 = 10th April 1654). He finally settled in Shāfī‘ where the Imām al-Mutawakkil ‘alā ‘īlah ‘isā b. al-Mansūr b. Khāmīnī (died 1087 = 1672) granted him the period of his reign (1055–1087 = 1645–1677) the offices of preacher in the mosque (Khiṭīb Shāfī‘) and secretary whose duty was to compose official documents as well as the answers to the theological and legal questions laid before the Imām.

1. His chief work is a biographical dictionary, arranged in alphabetical order, entitled Maṭla‘ al-Buljūr wa-Ḥājma‘ al-Buljūr, which contains about 1300 biographies of prominent members of the Zaidi sects of Iraq and Yemen, ranging from the sons and descendants of Zaid b. ‘Ali (died 121 = 739) down to the author’s own contemporaries. It was long thought to be lost and only

(MOH. BEN CHENEH.)
known from the extracts given by al-Muhbib (Kinsayt al-Athar, i. 220; Wustenfeld, Geschichte der, v. 583). It has only recently been discovered in its entirety in Milan (see Griffin, Lista dei manoscritti arabi nuovo fondo della Biblioteca Ambrosiana, in Riv. degli Studi Orientali, iv. 1046–1048, N.° 254–256 of the Lista; 18 of these biographies have been published by Griffin in his notes in an earlier essay, I Manoscritti Slavonica di Milano in Riv. di Stud. Or., ii. 28–38, 135–156; 1909). 

Alaça' al-Bu'dīrī, the author used various biographical collections which only survive in fragments in Milan, Berlin, and London manuscripts, particularly the works of Abīd Allah Ibn al-Wazīr (entitled Tārīkh Abī al-Wazīr), al-Ḥadīl (al-Tuhfa fi 'Ilmāni al-Zaidiya), Ibn Fand (al-Lawḥaṭī al-nadiya), al-Ḥakīm (al-'Uyūn fi Nāṣīr al-Zaidiya), Yalāyī b. al-Maḥdī al-Ḥasan, (Slitat al-Farāwān), the author of the Taḥākhat al-Zaidiya, and others. But he was always careful to call attention to the facts in the authorities utilised did not agree among themselves or with the historical traditions surviving down to his time in Yemen. He had also a good knowledge of the geography and archaeology of those districts of South Arabia in which he had travelled and his dictionary therefore gives information concerning them, which is of importance even for the numismatics and Arabic epigraphy of Yemen.


IBN ABI TĀHIR TAṬĪFIR, Abu l-Fāṣīl AHMAD, Arab man of letters and historian, born 206/821 at 'Abbāsids, died there in 280/903, a descendant of an Iranian family from Khurāsān (Marw al-Rūḥ), which was among the devoted adherents (Abīnā al-Dawāb) of the 'Abāṣīds, was first of all a teacher, then a private tutor in wealthy families and finally followed the trade of a copyist of manuscripts, for which he opened a shop in the Sīr al-Warrāqīn, 'Ahrām, at Qoṣr. A work by him on plagiarism (Kitāb Sārišāt al-Shāhara), now lost, made him several enemies who charged him with superficiality and the lack of a thorough knowledge of Arabic grammar. Al-Maṣāḥīb (Murūqī, vii. 333) thought highly of his poems, some of which he quotes, and al-Kaḥfī al-Baghdādi praised his learning. His father's nickname Taṭīfīr, means a 'hopping little bird', if it is not to be derived from the Old Persian takāpāt, 'son of the crown'. Of his Tārīkh Baghdadī only the sixth volume has survived in a unique manuscript in the British Museum, lithographed and translated into German by Dr. H. Keller (Leipzig 1908); it is the history of the city and the 'Abbāṣīde state from 204 (819) to the death of the caliph al-Ma'Mūn in 218 (833), and is one of the sources of the Annals of Tabari. His Kitāb al-Mamānī wa-l-Maṣāḥīb is an anthology of poetry and rhetoric, of which the eleventh (Bilāghat al-Nisā' wa-Tārīkh Kalamihna etc., Cairo 1326) and twentieth parts (out of 13) are preserved in the Brit. Mus. His 45 other works are lost.

Bibliography: Fikrist, p. 146; F. Wustenfeld, Geschichte der Araber, n. f. 78; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., i. 138; Cl. Huart, Journ. Asiat., xth Ser., Vol. xliii. 1909, p. 533; (Cl. Huart.)

IBN ABI USĀIBĪA, MUWĀFAK AL-DĪN ABU l-A'BĀSS AHMAD b. AL-KAṢIM AL-SĀ'DI AL-KHAṬĪB, physician and biographer, born in Damascus in 600 (1203), studied medicine there and afterwards in Cairo at the al-Nasir hospital. Among his teachers special mention may be made of the famous Ibn al-Baṣīr (q. v.). In 634 (1236) he received a position in a hospital in Cairo, which he exchanged in the following year for the office of physician to the Emir 'Izz al-Def Amedir in Šāfḫād. There he died in 668 (1270). Ibn Abī Usāibīa's chief work are his biographies of celebrated physicians and doctors, which he composed under the title 'Iyān al-Aṣrī' fi Taḥākhat al-Abībī for the vizier Abu l-'Hāsan b. Ghazzāl al-Sāmīrī, ed. A. Muller, Cairo 1299 (1882), Preface, Königsberg 1884.

Bibliography: Leclerc, Histoire de la médecine arabe, ii. 187 f.; A. Muller, Über Ibn Abī Usāibīa und seine Geschichte der Arzte in Travaux du VI. Congr. intern. des Orientalistes à Leida, ii. 259 sq., and other articles, see the references in Brockelmann, Geschichte etc., i. 326.

IBN ABĪ ZAIT RAIKAWNY, ABU MUHAMMAD 'ABD AL-LĀH, ABU ZAIT, ABU AL-RAJIH, a Malikī jurist, belonged to a family which
came from Naṣrā whence the ethnic al-Naṣri, but he was born in 310 (922-3) at Kairuān, where he died on Monday 30th Shabbān 386 = 14 September 996 and was buried in his house.

He vigorously defended his school both in prose and verse and was perhaps the first who clearly expounded the principles of law. He was called Malikī for the younger and was and still is regarded as an authority. His teachers were numerous not only in Africa but also in the east on the occasion of his journey to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca. We may mention here his debt to Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. al-Labbād who is his best authority, Abū l-Ḥasan Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Khwālī, Abū l-ʿArab Muḥammad b. Ṭāwūs b. Tamīm Muḥammad b. Ṭāwūs al-Khwālī, Ibn al-ʿArabī, and others; he received ijāza from the most notable teachers of his time. Among his pupils are mentioned Abū l-Kāsim al-Barāḍī, Ibn al-Fāraḥ, etc. of the thirty works mentioned by his biographers only the following survive: 1. al-Risāla, a compendium of Maḥākī law finished in 327 = 939, publ. several times in Cairo; ed. by A. D. Russell and Abdullah al-Maʿṣūm Suḥrawardī, First Steps in Muslim Jurisprudence consisting of excerpts from Bihār al-ʿAṣwad of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Suḥrawardī, Arabic text, English trans., notes, and short hcter. and biogr. introd., London 1906; Fagnan, La Risala de Kayrawani, French transl., Paris 1914; 2. A collection of traditions. Brit. Mus., Cat. Cod. MSS. Or., n. 888, viii.; 3. A poem in honour of the Prophet, Brit. Mus., Cat. n. 1617, x.


Ibn Abī Zār: Abū ʿl-Ḥasan (var. Abū ʿl-Ḥusayn) al-Fāsī, historian of Maqārib, author of two works, one entitled Zhakaat al-Murūsīhī fī Abūbār al-Zamān, which seems lost, the other Al-Insān al-murūbi bi-Rawd al-Kītāb fī Abūbār Maqāribī wa l-Tirīkīt al-Muqattat fī al-Insānī ilā l-Murūbi, nothing is known of the name of the author, who is also called Abū Muḥammad Ṣaḥīḥ b. Abū al-Ḥasan al-Qarsī. His work, which begins with the Idrisid dynasty, is very important for the history of Morocco to 724 (1324), a date which cannot be much before the year of his death. He is some times quoted by Ibn Khaldūn. He made use, often without naming them, of a certain number of authorities and it seems, at least under the Marīnids, of official documents also. His book forms the basis of a work (or was rewritten) by Muḥammad b. Kāsim b. Zākūr (died 20 Muharram 1120 = 11 April 1078), entitled Muʿaṣīr al-muḥājirīn 'ammā taḥṣamāna' l-Anṣār al-murūbi wa Rawd al-Muqattat fī al-Ālami, al-Anṣār al-murūbī fī al-Murūbī, Fās 1313, p. 258. It was translated for the first time by Tornberg, Annales regum Mauritaniae, with Latin translation and notes, Upsala, 2 v., 1843–1846, and lithographed at Fās 1303 A. H. It was translated in a very unsatisfactory fashion into German by Dombay, Geschichte der mauritaniaischen Könige, Agram, 1794–7; into Portugese by Moura, Historia dos soberanos moza-


IBN ʿADHĀRĪ. [See Ibn al-Dhīlājī.]

IBN AL-ʿADI. [See Kamāl al-ʿAdnī.]

IBN ʿADJARRĀD, Abū ʿAli al-Karīm, a Khārijī sectarian, after whom his adherents are called ʿAdjarīda. We possess no data for his biography; from al-Shahrastānī's account it can only be deduced that he was one of the followers of ʿAtiyāya b. al-ʿAswād al-Hanafī. This ʿAtiyāya however was at first a follower of Nabdīja b. ʿAmīr [9 v.] but afterwards separated from him and became chief of the Khārijīs of Sidjīsīn, Khorsān, Kirman and Kāhānī. His date is thus the first half of the viii. century and although he, like ʿAtiyāya, had separated himself politically from Nabdīja, both belonged, from the point of view of the historian of religions, to that section of the Khārijīs who are called Nabdījīn after Nabdīja or Nabdīja, after the district in which he appeared, i.e. to those who occupy a position midway between the rigid Azațūn and the milder Ibāštīya. According to al-Baghdādī, the ʿAdjarīda were divided into 10 minor divisions; the ʿAmīzīna, the ʿShūʿāʿība, the Maimūnīna, the Khalafīna, the Maʿṣūrīna, the Madhjīna, the ʿShīla, the Ḥaṭāba, and the ʿAmīzīna who are again divided into 6 sections. The tenth not mentioned by him is probably the ʿAtīja, mentioned by al-Shahrastānī. Among these the Ḥaṭāba may be particularly mentioned on account of the part which their chief, ʿImāma b. Ṭaṭa, played in politics for many years, till he finally died of wounds in the reign of al-Maʿṣūm. Ṭabar only briefly mentions him but al-Baghdādī gives many details of him.


IBN ʿADJURRĀM, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Dāwūd al-Sanṣādī, known as Ibn ʿAdjurram, a Berber word which means, according to the commentators, religious-minded and stiff (ascetic, Shīla: agnūram). His grandfather Dāwūd is said to have been the first to bear this name. His relatives belonged to the neighbourhood of the little town of Šafūr but he was born at Fās in 672 (1273-4) and died there on Sunday 20th Safar 723 (1st March 1324). He was buried the next day within the town in the Andalusian quarter near the Bāb al-Djiyāq (wrongly Bāb al-ʿ Ḥadīd) which now bears the name Bāb al-Ḥamrāʾ (it is now closed) to the right of the Bāb al-Futūh.

After studying in Fās he performed the pilgrimage to Mecca and, while passing through Cairo, studied under the celebrated Andalusian grammarian Abū Ḥayān Muḥammad b. ʿUsuf of Gra-
Among the numerous commentaries, it is only necessary to mention only those that are printed. As to those which are in libraries the reader may be referred to the printed catalogues and the monographs mentioned in the Bibliography.

1. Khālid b. 'Abd Allāh al-Azhari, Būlāk 1259, 1280; Amsterdam 1756; published along with the glosses of:
   a. Muhammad Abu l-Naṣrābādī al-Ṭabarānī (XIII) published at Būlāk 1284, Cairo 1299, 1303, 1304; Tunis 1320.
   f. Ḥasan al-Khwārizī, Būlāk 1249, 1278, 1282, 1289, 1291, Cairo 1276. Glosses of Is‘mīl al-Hāmidī, Cairo 1302, 1304, 1320.
   g. Ḥasan Abū al-Fadl Shāhī al-Ashīrāwī, Ḥadīth, Būlāk 1287, Cairo 1302, 1322.
   h. Ahmad Za‘īn Dālānī, a very much abridged commentary with notes and explanations, edited by one of his pupils, Cairo 1319.
   k. Abū l-‘Abīs Abū Ahmad Abū al-Sūdānī, Ḥadīth of Timbuktu, Shārī‘ al-Dārrijīyā, Fās n. d.

11. Shāhī al-Dīn Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Rū‘aynī, better known as al-Hāṣāb al-Makki al-Mashkīl, Mutanāmimat al-Durrārīyā, with glosses of:


(Moh. Ben Chener)
IBN AL-AHMAR. [See MUHAMMAD b. YUSUF.] finally succeeded in driving out the undisciplined
(the modern citadel of the town) for his operations against Tripolis. Ibn ʻAmmār succeeded in defending himself for some years. Raymond died in 498, but his successor drew an even stronger ring round the town. In 501 ʻAmmār decided to seek the help of the Ṣaljūqs Sulṭān Muḥammad in Baghdād and left Tripolis. His absence had disastrous results [see Tripolis]. The inhabitants handed over the town to the Fāṭimid caliph. The latter seized ʻAmmār’s treasures, his followers and his family. Tripolis was thus deprived of him by his resources and his best defenders. ʻAmmār, who had not been able to persuade the Sulṭān to send an expedition to his help, did not return to Tripolis. He occupied Djiyala for a time with the help of the troops of the Āţābeg Toğhtegin of Damascus. In 502 Tripolis and Djiyala fell into the hands of the Franks. ʻAmmār remained for a time at Toğhtegin’s court and was granted al-Zabādānī (in the valley of the Barāda) in fief by the latter. He then went to the court of Maṣ’ūd, prince of Mōsul, and remained his vizier till 512.

In 512 ʻAmmār was later in the service of the ʻAbbāsid caliph (Ibn al-Mtir, ed. Ternerg, xii. 365, 399). The family of ʻAmmār seems to have come to Egypt from the Maghrib with the Fāṭimid caliphs; al-Ḥasan b. ʻAmmār, the chief of the Kiṭāma, is mentioned towards the close of the ivth century A. H. as a high official in Egypt. A member of the family, ʻuṣuf of Alexandria, was executed as a traitor in 487. The name of the Banī ʻAmmār is associated with the zenith of Tripolis’ prosperity. As Aleppo under the Ḥamdīṣūd Saʿīd al-Dawla was a centre of the ʿAbābīd, and Tripolis under his ʻAmmār b. ʻAmmār was a celebrated seat of learning. To the ʻuṣuf al-Mulk ʻAmmār fell the difficult task of defending Tripolis against the attacks of the Crusaders, but he could not hold out permanently on account of the discord among the Muslim chiefs.

Bibliography: As above; cf. also Recueil des Histoires Orientales, iii, Paris.

M. Sobernheim.

IBN ʻA-MMĀR, ABU BAKR MUhammad b. ʻAli, MUHJJ b.-DTN, AL-ʻUXTIMI AL-ŢAIL (as a descendant of Ḥūmāin al-Ţail [q. v.]) AL-ANDALUSI, A CELEBRATED MYSTIC OF PANTHEISTIC DOCTRINE, STYLED BY HIS FOLLOWERS AL-Shaikh AL-AKABAR; IN Spain he was also called Ibn Surāba but in the East generally Ibn ʻArabī, without the article, to distinguish him from the ʻAṭābeg Abī Bāk Ibn al-ʻArabī, the great philologist, 1560 (25th July 1165) at Murcia. In 558 (1172-3) he removed to Seville which he made his home for nearly thirty years. There and also at Ceuta he studied Ḥadīth and Fīkh. He had translated bustān and 591 (1201-2) he set out for the East, from which he did not return. In the same year (598) he reached Mecca: in 601 he spent twelve days in Baghdad, to which he returned in 608 (1212-3), and he was back in Mecca in 611 (1214-5). Here he stayed for some months and at the beginning of the following year finds him in Aleppo. He visited also Mōsul and Asia Minor. His fame went with him everywhere and he was the recipient of pensions from persons of means, which he bestowed in charity. When in Asia Minor he received from the Christian governor the gift of a house, but he presented it to a beggar. Finally he settled in Damascus and died there in Rabī’ 1163 (Oct. 1240): he was buried at the foot of Djiyala, his sons were later buried in his tomb.

As to ritual, Ibn ʻArabī belonged nominally to the Zāhirī school of his compatriot Ibn Ḥadīm (q. v., cf. Goldziher, Die Zāhiriten, p. 185 sq.), but he rejected taḥlīl (recognition of authority in doctrinal matters) and in matters of belief he passed for a ḫāt민 (esoteric). Although conforming to the practice of the Muslim faith and professing its beliefs, Ibn ʻArabī’s sole guide was the inner light with which he believed himself illuminated in a special way, but the belief that all being is essentially one, as it all is a manifestation of the divine substance. The different religions were thus to his opinion equivalent. He believed that he had seen the beatific Muhammad, that he knew the Greatest Name of Allāh, and that he had acquired a knowledge of alchemy, not by his own labour, but by revelation. He was denounced as a Zinidī,
and in Egypt there was a movement to assassinate him.

His principal work, *al-Futiğat al-Mallikia*, which was later epitomised by al-Sha‘rānī (d. 975), gives a complete system of mystic knowledge, in 560 chapters, of which chapter 559 contains a summary of the whole. His contemporary Ibn al-Fārid (d. 632), being asked by Ibn ʿArabī for a commentary on his *Tawīla*, replied that the best commentary was his own *Futūḥāt*. This work was written in Būlāq in 1274, Cairo 1292. Next to the *Futūḥāt* comes the *Fusq al-Ḥikam*, begun in Damascus in the beginning of 627 (May 1229), printed with Turkish commentary, Būlāq 1525, and lithographed with the commentary of ʿAbd al-Razzāk al-Ḵāshḵānī, Cairo, 1509, 1521.

In 598 (1201-2), on his arrival at Mecca, Ibn ʿArabī had made the acquaintance of a learned lady of that town, and, on his return thither in 611 (1214-5), he wrote a small collection of love-poems celebrating her learning and loveliness and their mutual friendship, but in the following year he found it advisable to write a commentary on those, explaining them in a mystical sense. These poems with an English translation of both poems and commentary have been published by R. A. Nicholson (*The Tarjumān al-ʿAshqāq, a Collection of Mystical Odes*, Transl. Fund, New Ser., vol. xx. (London 1911). This is the only one of Ibn ʿArabī's numerous works which has appeared in a European edition with the exception of a small glossary of the terms appended to the *Tarjumān al-ʿAshqāq* edited by Flugel in 1845, and a short treatise, ascribed to him in a Glossary of Authors MS., called the *Kitāb al-ʿAshqāq*, of which an English translation appeared in the *Journal Roy. As. Soc.* for 1901.

Other of his works which have been printed are: *Muḥākara al-ʿArūr*, on literary and critical topics (Cairo 1282, 1305), a *Divān* of religious poetry (Būlāq 1271, Bombay 1890); a commentary on the *Kūrān*, Būlāq 1283, Cairo 1317; *Kitāb al-ʿArūr* Cairo s.a. (= Muhākara). *Arūr*; Turkish transl. of Aḥm. Muhākara, Stratford 1314; *Amr Muhākara*, with Turk. transl., Stratford 1315; *Tuhfet al-Safara* huṣn al-ʿArūr al-cīrara, Constantinople 1300, Turk. transl., Stratford 1305; *Muḥākara al-Raḥiḥ*, Cairo 1325; *Mawāḥib al-ʿAshqāq wa-Muḥākara al-ʿArūr* wa-l-ʿUlmā', Cairo 1325.

Altogether some 150 of his works are known to exist, and this is said to be half only of what he actually composed.

Various theologians took exception to the contents of his writings and charged him with heterodox doctrines such as ḫuṭūt [q. v.] and isthāhād [q. v.]. Still he has found many followers and zealous defenders. Whilst Ibn Tamiyya, al-Taftazānī and Ibrāhīm b. ʿUmar al-Bīkārī denounced him as a heretic, amongst his defenders were ʿAbd al-Razzāk al-Ḵāshḵānī [q. v.], al-Firuzabādī (cf. H. al-Zayyāt *Khawāṣī‘ al-Kutub fi Dimaghīk*, etc., p. 50, nº 20, 2) and al-Suyūṭī.

IBN 'ARABSHAH — IBN 'ASKAR.

(ed. Manger, iii. 181 sqq.) his great qualities are appreciated. The book contains valuable descriptions of Samarqand and its learned world (iii. 355 sqq.). His Fābihat al-Khulafa' wa-Mujahidat al-Zawā'id in ten chapters, written in the month of Safar 852 (Ḥādīdji Khālaṣa, iv. 345) contains a mirror for princes and beast-fables, according to Ḥādīdji Khālaṣa "like Kalīla and Dimnā and Sulaimān al-Mutifū" (see Chauvin, Bibliographie, ii. no. 140—144), but, as Chauvin has shown (sp. cit. ii. 145—149), is actually a version of the Persian Marbnām-e Ṣamāzin in the recension of Šaṭā al-Wāzin (cf. Houtsma in Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Altertums.

Gen. Cult. ii. 350 sqq.; a selection in Freytag, Lomand Fabulas, p. 72 sqq.; complete edition see below). The introductory portion of an edition of his al-Ta'āfif al-Ḡāhir fi Shīyām ..... Abī Safīr Dājbān was published as a posthumous work of A. Strong in the Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 1907, p. 395 sqq. 10 works are mentioned under his name, among them a work on Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, Tarjaman al-Murtadhim (Ḥādīdji Khālaṣa, ii. 278). See also Ḥādīdji Khālaṣa, ii. 158; iv. 190, 232, 276, 311; v. 479, and Freytag's work mentioned above.

Of his sons the following were authors: 1. Abū al-


20. Tāḥī al-Dīn Abū al-Wāhāb, born 853 = 1411 in Ḥādīdji Tarkhān, died 901 = 1495, wrote a commentary on Abū Lāḥiṯ Mūḥammad, and various other works of little importance. See Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., ii. 19 sq.

Bibliography: Freytag, Fructus Imperatorum et fsecatio Ingeniorum, i.—ii., Bonn 1852 (edition of the Fābihat, p. xxv.—xxxiii; sketch of his life based on al-Sakhawī and Taḫrīribīḍī); Ferticho, Verzeichnis der arab. Hadschr. zu Göthe, ii. 94, 139, 1840, 1841, 2696; Wüstenfeld, Geschichtschrifter der Araber, No. 488; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., i. 196; ii. 28—30.

J. Prædelsen.)

IBN ASAKIR, the name of several Arab authors, of whom the following are the best known.

1. The history of Damascus, Abī al-

Ḥasan b. Ḥabīb Allāh Abu l-Kāsim Thīqat al-Dīn al-Sharīf, born in Maharrum 490 = Sept. 1105 in Damascus, studied in Bagdad and the principal cities of Persia, became professor at the Madrasa al-Nīriya in his native city and died on the 11th Radjab = 25th January 1176. In his principal work, the Tarīkh Madīnat Dimashq, he collected, under the fashion of the Tarīkh Bagdad of al-Khāṭib al-Bagdādī, the biographies of all the men who had ever been connected with Damascus. Of the 80 volumes of the original, of which Vols. 1 and 2 were printed in Damascus 1292—1330, only odd ones have survived; in addition to those given in Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., i. 331, there are others in Strassburg (s. Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., xl. 310), Stambul (Dāmīd Ibrāhīm Pāša, No. 87—882, 1846, 1861, 1881, 1889, 1891), Cairo (s. Fikhr ad-Dīn al-Ḳatib al-Maḥṣūğa, bi-Ḳutub al-Ṭuṣūf, v. 25), Damascus (s. Ḥabīb al-Zayyāt, Khāsun al-Ḳutub fi Dimashq, p. 76 sqq., cf. Horovitz in Mitt. d. As. Soc. f. d. Spr., v. 50 sqq.), in Tunis, Zaītuna (Houdas-Basset, No. 65); cf. also the ext

tract by Ismā'il b. Muḥammad Djarrāḥ al-Adabī (1165 = 1754) in Tūbāgīn (s. Seyb, Verzeichnisse, N°. 61; cf. Sauvère, Histoire de Dama

s in the Journ. As., 1894—1896). In addition to his other works mentioned by Brockelmann, loc. cit., we may now mention al-Maḏīqūn, notices of celebrated men, particularly Ḥāṣith, with an appendix, Kīyāb al-Wāḥim, by Muḥammad b. Abī al-Wāḥid al-Muḥaddasī, died 643 (1245) in the Brit. Mus., Or. 3735 (s. Descriptive List of the Arab. Ms. acquired by the Trustees since 1844, London 1912, p. 35), as well as a fragments of his Amāl in Damascus, 20, No. 5.


2. His son al-Kāsim, born 527 = 1132, died 600 = 1203, wrote in addition to other works al-Dāḥim Fī al-Mustahāb fi Ḥādī al-Muṣāfi al-

Khāṣṣ, one of the two main sources of the Burdāt al-Naṣūs of Ibn al-Firdawsī; cf. al-Snḳbī, Taḥābīl al-Shāfiya, v. 148. (C. Brockelmann.)


During his studies he continued to follow the style of a bookbinder and later filled the delicate duties of chief kātib of Granada. His teachers were Abī Sa'id Farādī b. Kāsim b. Ahmad b. Lubāb al-Thālabī, chief mūsī of Granada, the author Abū Abū al-Allāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Al-Kaitaṭū, the celebrated champion of the Sunna Abū Isḥāk Ibrāḥīm b. Māṣṣa b. Muḥammad al-Saḥībī, Abū Abū al-Imām al-Shāfīfī of Tlemcen, etc. Of the works ascribed to him by his biographers we know only two: 1. Taḥāfūt al-Ḫūṣūṣ wa 'l-Nabūsī ni Nukhbat al-Uṣūl wa l-Aḥkām bi-l-Ǧimma wa l-Mūṣāfī, a sketch of Mālikī law in 1698 Radjaz-verses (printed Algiers 1322, 1327 and Fāṣ; published in Cairo publ. in the Maḥṣūğa al-Muṭāfīn; with French transl. by Houdas and Martel, Traité de droit musulman, La Taḥāfūt d'Ibn Aṣim, texte arabe avec trad. fr., comment., jurid., et notes philolog., Algiers 1882—3); 2. Ḥādīx al-Ḳatib fi Mustāhaṣīn, al-Ḍawūja wa l-Muṣāfī, a collection of more or less interesting anecdotes, popular proverbs, answers to which there is no reply, etc., divided into 6 Ḥaddīṣa (garden) of which each includes one, two or three chapters (printed in Fāṣ. n. d.); this edition should be compared with the Paris MS. Bibli. Nat., Catal., No. 3528 and the Brit. Mus. MS., Rieu, Suppl., No. 1145, i.)

Bibliography: Ahmed Bābi, Nājil al-


(MOH. BEN CHABER.)

IBN 'ASKAR, Muḥammad b. Abū Bākra Muḥammad b. 'Ali b. 'Umar b. Ḥusain b. Miṣrāb, was born at al-Hilāb in the district of Kaṣr al-Ṣaghīr in north Morocco. He is known to fame as the author of the Danawat al-

Naṣīrī li-ʾAl-Hāsān min ʾAl-Maṣāfīb
IBN ‘ASKAR — IBN A’TTHAM AL-KULF

min Ahl al-‘Ayn al-‘Asghir, a collection of biographies of learned men and saints which he had known personally or at second hand, composed about the year 1575. The Ijāsān Sharīf ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghālibī was, contrary to custom, succeeded by his son Muhammad in 1573. War broke out between Muhammad and his uncle ‘Abd al-Malik. Ibn ‘Askar threw in his lot with the former and was slain at the battle of Wādī ‘l-Makhzān close to Ka‘rīf al-Kabīr, in which Muḥammad along with Dom Sebastian of Portugal perished, ‘Abd al-Malik dying at the commencement of the battle (August 1578): Wāfrānī, Nuzhat al-Hikāt, ed. Hondas, p. 73 sqq. The Dāwūd is continued by Wāfrānī, Ṣawāfī wa intāqāl min Aḥkām al-Muḥāfazāt al-Kārīf al-Kabīr wa-rā‘īf. Fās n.d. Cf. also Naṣr al-Muḥāfizāt b. al-Tayyib. The Dāwūd has been lithographed at Fās, in 1891, Naṣr al-Muḥāfizāt in 1892. Bibliography: La “Dawūd an-Nakhī.” ... trad. par A. Graulle, Archiv für Marokko, ix. (1913). (T. H. Weir.)

IBN AL-‘ASSAL. During the first half of the xiii century A. D. there took place among the Copts a pronounced religious and intellectual renaissance, arising, by the necessity of the case, from an Arabic form. In it three brothers, known as the A‘wālād al-‘Assāl, were prominent. Al-‘Assāl, the father, to judge from the titles given to him in the MSS., was of high rank and good family, and there is mention also of a dī‘ar, or great house, in Cairo as belonging to an Ibn al-‘Assāl. Unfortunately this name is given in the MSS. to all the three brothers, and the resultant confusion was first fairly disséntangled by Rieu (Suppl. to Cat. of Arab. Manuscripts containing Laws, p. 122 sqq.). Yet much remains uncertain. Of them al-A‘sād Abū ‘l-Faraḍī Hībat-Allāh was the philologist and exegete. He wrote in Arabic a Coptic grammar (Mallon, Une École de Savants égyptiens au Moyen Age en le Beyrouth Milangis, i, 122 sqq.): edited an eclectic Arabic version of the Gospels, in which he calls himself ‘Abū ‘l-Faraḍī Miṣrī (Guidi, Le tradizioni degli Evangelii in arabo e in etiopico, Bologna, 1905). In an anonymous Malay commentary printed in Mecca (1302), is mentioned by Snouck Hurgronje, Mekki, ii, 387, 7. 2) ‘Ārūs wa Karm’ al-Nafīs (or al-Ḥusnī li Tadbīr al-Nafīs), Cairo 1275, 1282, 1305, 1327, 3) Lajīf al-Minān fi Manākiḥ al-Shāhīd Abī ‘l-Abbas wa-Shajīhī Abī ‘l-Husayn, biographies of the Ṣūs Shīhāb al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Mursī (died 686 = 1287) and his teacher ‘Abī al-Dīn ‘Abd Allāh al-Shāhīdī (died 696 = 1297), Tunis, 1327, Cairo 1275, a work, along with ‘Ārūs wa Karm’ al-Nafīs, among the margin of the Lajīf al-Minān of al-Shurānī, Cairo 1321. Bibliography: Subki, Ṣubkī al-Ṣafīya al-kubra, v. 176; Sayyūq, Ḥusn al-Muṣādara, l. 301; ‘Alī Būhārī Mubārak, al-Khitāq al-daghtā, vii. 70; Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichtschreiber der Araber, No. 582. (C. Brockelmann.)

IBN A’TTHAM AL-KULF, MUHAMMAD B. ‘ALI, Arab historian, of whom we only know that he died about 514 = 926 (s. F. Maurice, Indications bibliographiques, p. 16), whom Wüstenfeld (Geschichtschreber, No. 541) erroneously places in the year 1003 A. H. He wrote from the Sūfī point of view a realistic history of the early caliphs and their conquests, Persis, Vorzeichnis der arabischen Historiker, der Persis, der arabischen Historiker, der Persis, der Eunuch der British Museum, v. 150 (where other MSS. are detailed), from which is taken The History of the Conquest of Zarar and The Flight and Murder of Yezidther-transl. from the Persian of Ahmad ibn Azer of Cæsarea, by B. Gerns, in Ouseley’s Oriental Collections, i
IBN AT-TIBI — IBN BAHUYA.


(C. Brockelmann.)

IBN AL-ATHIR. This name was born by three brothers, natives of Dajirat Ibn 'Omar [q.v.] who are among the most celebrated and important Arab scholars and authors.

1. The oldest brother was 1. MADID AL-DIN ABI 'L-ŞA'AĐAT AL-MUBŠRÁK B. MUHMMADMAD, born in 544 (1149), died at Mosul in 606 (1210) cf. Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, xii. 190. He devoted himself mainly to the study of the Karâan, tradition and Arabic grammar. The titles of the works composed by him are given by Ibn Khallikân, Waʃyaʃ, ed. Wüstenfeld, No. 524, Yâkût, Isagãd, ed. Margoliouth, vi. 235 sqq., and by Brockelmann, Gesch. 1. 357. As to the events of his life, he studiously guarded himself from Ibn al-Dahhán at Mosul, and Haʃar, an Arab of Baghdad, who was in the service of the Emir Kaimãz, who acted as regent for a considerable period in the reign of Saif al-Din Ghãzî, and was chief of the chancellery under Ghãzî's successors Mas'ud b. Mawdidi [q.v.] and Nûr al-Din Arslãn Shâh [q.v.], although, as his brother tells us, he was reluctant to assume this high office, and only did so at the wish of Nûr al-Din. He became lame as the result of an illness and is said to have composed most, if not all as Ibn Khallikân tells of, of his works after this misfortune. He made his house a riχât for Sufis.

2. The second brother, 2. AL-HANAN 'ALI B. MUHMMADMAD, born 555 (1160) at Dajirat, died at Mosul in 630 (1234) is the author of the famous history, al-Kamil fi l-Tarîkh, often quoted here. He also wrote the history of the Abãbic of Mosul (ed. in the Recueil des Historiens arabes des Croisades, vol. ii.), an alphabetical dictionary of the contemporaries of Muḥammad entitled Bad al-Ṣâbah fi Ma'rifat al-Ṣāḥibâ, ed. Cairo, 1280, and a synopsis of the Kitâb al-Anṣâb of al-Sanâni [q.v.] entitled al-Lubâb, which was still further epitomised by al-Suyûtî under the title Lubâb al-Lubâb (ed. Veth, Lut, Bat. 1840).

The most important of these works, the chronicle, ends with the year 628 and is a compilation of the greatest value. On the first part of it cf. Brockelmann, Das Verhältnis von Ibn-al-Atissors Kâmil fit-tarîkh zu Tabarí's Abû Ḥârrât erinnert wundervoll. Izz al-Din studied in Mosul and Baghdaad and also travelled in Syria, for the rest he lived only for knowledge as a private scholar. Cf. Ibn Khallikan, Waʃyaʃ, ed. Wüstenfeld, No. 433; Brockelmann, Gesch, i. 345 (where other literature is given).

3. The third brother, DÎYÂ' AL-DIN ABI 'L-FATH NASR ALLAH, born 558 (1163) in Dajirat, died 637 (1239) in Baghdad, was particularly distinguished as a stylist. His work on rhetoric, al-Muhaft al-sawâr fi Adab al-Kâtib wa l-Sawâr (printed Bâlîk 1282), enjoys a great authority in the Muslim world. Other writings of his are given by Ibn Khallikan and Brockelmann, Gesch. i. 397. Unlike his brother the historian, Dîyâ' al-Din led a very active life. Introduced to Salâh al-Din by the Kâdi al-Fâshi [q.v.] he entered his service 587 and soon afterwards became vizier of al-Malik al-Azâfîl, son of Salâh al-Din. When Damascus was taken from him, Dîyâ' al-Din escaped with great difficulty to Egypt in a bolted box, and did not appear again till al-Afdal had become lord of Sumâsînî in compensation for his previous territory. But he only remained a short time here, entered the service of the ruler of Halab in 607 (1210) only to leave it soon after to seek his fortune first in Mosul, then in Irbil and Sinjar. In 619 (1221) he obtained a position as chief of the Dwân al-Injâla at the court of Nâšir al-Din Mahâmid, prince of Mosul. He died there an one of his journeys to Baghdad. His son Shâhîf al-Din Muḥammâm, who was also an author, died in his youth in 622 (1225).

Bibliography: Ibn Khallikân, Waʃyaʃ, ed. Wüstenfeld, N°. 734; Brockelmann, op. cit.; Goldziher and Margoliouth in the references given by Brockelmann.

Still other authors are known under the name Ibn al-Athir e.g. 'Imâd al-Din Abu 'l-Fidâ' Isâmî, died 663, on whom cf. Brockelmann, op. cit, i. 341; Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie, i. 280 and the Catalogue of the Escurial. Ibn Khaldûn mentions him although not being acquainted with his work which he considers a recension of al-Falîka al-Nashîfîya [see Ibn al-Wâṣiqa] and neither Hâdidî al-Kâmil nor Ibn Khallikân quote him.

Casiri in his Catalogue was the first to call attention to the complete manuscript preserved in the Escorial. It was then edited with a Spanish translation in 1802 by his pupil J. A. Banqueri. The book is divided into 34 chapters of which the first 30 deal with agriculture and the last 4 with cattle-rearing. E Meyer gives a summary of it in his Geschichte der Botanik, Clément-Millet published a French translation in 1864. Doss (Sulpit, Introd., p. xivii) and from the time of C. C. Moncada severely criticise both editor and translator.


'IBN BAHUYA', ABU DÂJÂ'AR MUHMMADB b. 'ÂLI b. HUSAjin b. MUSA AL-KÂMãI AL-SÂDÜK, was one of the four greatest of the collectors of the Shi'a Traditions. In the prime of life, 355 (966), he went from Khurâsan to Baghdad and many learned men of the place became his pupils. He died in Rai 381 (991) and is also known as al-Sâdûk. Of his writings the following may be mentioned: 1. Kitâb man fâ ṭarîqat 'l-Fâshî, a work on the Shi'a Traditions. It is one of the four books of Shi'a Traditions, called al-Kutub al-Arbaaš. [The other three are a. al-Kâfi by Abu Dâjâ'ar Muhammad b. Ya'qûb al-Kullâni, d. 328 (939) or 329 (940); b. Thâbâb al-Ahkâm; c. al-Isâbhî both by Abu Dâjâ'ar Muhammad b. al-Hasan b. 'Ali al-Tasî, d. 400 (1067)]. 2. Ma'sání al-Ahkâb, a collection of Shi'a Traditions. 3. 'Uyun Aḥkâm al-Κâna, an ac-
count of the life and sayings and doctrines of ʿAli al-Ridā, the eighth Imam of the Shiʿa. ʿAlī b. Rida b. Musṭafā al-Din wa ʿImām al-Vināa, a work on the Shiʿa doctrine of the hidden Imam, partly edited by E. Möller, Beiträge zur Mahdilehre des Islams, i., Heidelberg 1901.

It is said that he was the author of three hundred works; al-Naḍājī in his work Kitāb al-Ridā, p. 276 (Bombay ed. 1317), enumerates 193 of his works.


(M. Hidayet Hosain.)

IBN BAṬDĪJĀ, i.e. AVEENPACK (according to Ibn Khaldūn bāṭdīja is a Frankish word, meaning silver) or to give him his proper name ʿAbū BAKR MUḤAMMAD b. YĀḤYĀ, also known by the name of IBN AL-SAṬGH, i.e. filius Auricius, a celebrated Arab philosopher. Ibn Bāṭdīja was born in Saragossa towards the end of the 9th (xiith) century and was for about 20 years vizier to ʿAbū Bakr b. ʿIrīḥām, a brother-in-law of the Almoravīd ʿAlī b. ʿUṯām, who acted as the latter's governor in Granada and afterwards in Saragossa. He afterwards went to Fās and there fell a victim to the intrigues of his enemies. In 533 (1138) he is believed to have been poisoned, at the instigation of the physician Ibn Zuhr. His enemies, among whom was ʿAlī b. Ḵᵛāḥān [q. v.], stirred up the populace and the authorities against him by decrying him as an atheist, who had rejected the Kūrahn and the dogmas of Islām.

Ibn ʿAbdīja, who died young, was not only a philosopher but was also well acquainted with natural science, astronomy, mathematics and medicine; he had also a great reputation as a musician. He wrote commentaries on several works of Aristotle and published other treatises also, which are detailed by Leclerc from Ibn Abī Uṣāibā but are for the most part now lost or have only survived in Hebrew or Latin translation. Cf. Die Abhandlung des Abū Bekr Ibn al-Sātgh l. Vom Verhalten des Einzelnen (Kit. Tadbir al-Mutawakkīl), according to Moses Nebraisons synopsis ... ed. by Dr. D. Herzog, Berlin 1896 (Beitr. zur Philos. des Mittelalters, Heft 1). For an appreciation of his philosophical views the reader may be referred to the works of Munk and de Boer given below.


IBN BADRUN. [See Ibn ABDUʿN.]
he had Ibn Rakiya seized and blinded as the latter had shown himself too independent. Soon afterwards the vizier was handed over to his enemy "A'udud al-Dawla, who had him trampled to death by elephants in Shawwāl 367 (May 978). Ibn Rakiya was 50 years of age at the time of his death.


(K. V. Zettersten)  
IBN AL-BALĀDI, SHARAF AL-DIN ABD QIYAM B. MUHAMMAD B. SADID, A-MUSTADJID VIZIER. In 567 (1166-8) Ibn-al-Baladi, who at that time was Nāṣir in Wāsit, was appointed vizier. There was an old feud between him and the Ustād-dār "A'udud al-Din Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh. After the murder of the caliph in Kābi II 566 (December 1170) by "A'udud al-Din and the Emir Kūtān al-Dīn, they forced his successor A-Mustadīd to appoint "A'udud al-Din vizier, whereupon Ibn al-Baladi was executed.


(K. V. Zettersten)  
IBN AL-BANNA ("son of the architect"); whose full name was ABDUL-‘ABD AS-SAMAD B. MUHAMMAD B. ‘UThMANN AL-AZZĀBI, a versatile Moroc-  
co-b cian scholar, especially distinguished in mathematics, astronomy, astrology, and the natural sciences, and also in medicine. He was born in Marrākush on the 4th Dhu ‘l-Hijjah 645 = 38th Dec. 1246 (according to others 639, 649 or even 656). After studying grammar, Ḥadīth, Fikh, and mathematics in his native town, he went to Fāṣ where he studied under the physician al-Mirrīkh, the mathematician Ibn Ḥaddāq, and the astronomer Ibn Makhfīlī al-Sidjīmlī. He was for a considerable time a follower of the Sufī ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Ḥazīmī, who admitted him to his order. He often fasted in complex retirement; his biographers praise his noble character and pure life. Ibn al-Banna died on Saturday the 6th Rajab 721 (Aug. 1321) in Marrākush, where he was buried outside the Bāb Aghmāt; 723 or 1724 is also given as the year of his death. Of the 74 writings which are ascribed to him, a whole series of mathematical and astronomical works are still extant in libraries (cf. the references in Brockelmann, op. cit.). Here we will only mention Tārkīs Amāl al-Ḥiṣāb (Synopsis of the operations of Cac-  
culation), publ. in a French transl. by A. Marre in the Atti dell’ Academy, pontif. de Nuovi Lincei, Vol. xvii. 1864, repr. Rome 1865. Several Arab scholars have written commentaries on this Tārkīs which is said to be a synopsis of the arithmetic of a certain Abū Zakariya al-Ḥasār (cf. Biblioth. mathem. 3rd Ser., Vol. ii., p. 12—40); among these we may mention Abīy al-Madīdī and ‘Ali b. Muhammad al-Kalāṣīdī (cf. Abulhkail, s. Geuch. d. math. Wissenschaft., x. 180—182). F. Woepcke has made an excerpt on the summation of series from the first commentary, entitled Passages relatifs à des sommations de série de cube, Rome, 1864; the same scholar has given several passages in translation from the second in the above mentioned treatise and in the Journal Asiatique, Ser. vi., Vol. i. (1863), p. 58—62. — Ibn al-Banna shows some advance on the older Arab mathematicians of the East in Arithmetic, particularly in counting with fractions; he is also to be considered one of the chief users of Indian numerals in the form used by the Western Arabs (al-Farābī figures). [cf. the article Ησανάκη]  


(H. Suter—Moh. Ben Cenene)  
IBN BARRI, ABU MUHAMMAD ‘ABD ALLAH B. BAKRI B. ‘ABD AL-DJABBAR B. BAKRI AL-MAKDISI AL-MISKI, ARAB GRAMMARIAN AND PHILOLOGIST, born at Damascus 5th Rajab 649 (15th March 1250). He was at Cairo the day of Mawlid at Friday, Saturday 27th Shawwāl 582 (9th—10th Jan. 1187), a scholar of extraordinary repute, who is considered a philological authority and is called by many "king of the grammarians". The author of the Liṣan al-‘Arab has borrowed a great deal from him. His teachers were the grammarians Abī Bakr Muḥammad b. Abī al-Malik al-Ṣaḥābi, Abī Tālib Abī al-Djabbar Muḥammad b. Abī al-Maʾṭar al-Kūṭabi, Abī Shakīb al-Madāni, Abī ‘Abd Allāh al-Kaṭālaṣādī, Abī Mustāʾīb b. Abī al-Azd al-Džazzīlī. He is the author of the following works. i. Kitāb al-Taḥābih wa l-‘Ithā’i anna (var. ala muʾ waʃaʃ min al-Waḥm fi Kitāb al-Ṣaḥāba, corrections and additions to Djawhari’s Dictionary); he is said to have died when engaged on the root wdsn and ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-BAṣṭ completed his work (Derenbourg, Mus. ar. de l’Écroulet, N°. 585); 2. Hawawsh ila l-‘Ithāʾi (Arabic critical notes and additions to Djabbar’s dictionary of foreign words (Derenbourg, op. cit., N°. 776, 51); 3. Kitāb al-‘Ithāʾi al-Džaʃāf min al-Fusahaha, a collection of neologisms or errors of speech in the jurists (ed. by Ch. C. Torrey in Oriental. Stud. Ts. Nukdec gewidmet, Giesen 1906). 4. al-Djabbar on al-Haṭṭīr, a small pamphlet in defence of the Makmās of al-Ḥaṭṭīr against the sharp criticism of Ibn al-Khaṣāshib (pr. Constantinople 1320).  

The thirteen verses on the different meanings of the word dawāʾ, which Brockelmann ascribes to him and which are in the Liṣan, are by Thālāb (cf. Abu Hilal ibn Askari, Kitāb al-Samāʿāt, Constantinople 1320, p. 335).  

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khallikān, Wawfāyat (Cairo 1310), I 268; al-Suyūṭī, Ḥum al-Muḥā- 

gara (Cairo 1321), i. 255; do., Ḥuqūyat al- 
Wuṣāt (Cairo 1326), p. 278; Abū l-Fida, Tāriḥ (Constantinople 1286), iii. 75; al-Sukkī, Taḥābih al-Ṣaḥīfiyya (Cairo 1324), iv. 233 sqq.; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Lit., i. 301 sq.; Thālī al-ʿAra’i s. br (Moh. Ben Cenene).  

IBN BARRI, ABU l-‘IṣAN ‘ALI B. MUḤAM-
MAD B. 'Ali b. Muhammad b. al-Husain al-Rībatī, an Arab philologist, born about 660 (1061-2) at Tāzā, where he died in 730 or 731 and was buried, although some say he was buried in Fās, wrongly. Widely acquainted with Islamic sciences he was particularly esteemed as an authoritative critic of the different recensions of the Qurān and his al-Durar al-Lawāmiṣ is as popular in North Africa as the Aǧurrūmīya.

After being 'adil (professional witness) for a period he was appointed to conduct the official correspondence of the government at Tāzā, an office which he held till his death, on the recommendation of a pupil of his, a kāliji, who did not care to see his former teacher in this subordinate position.

Of his works only two have survived to us: 1. 390 rajjaz verses fī Maḥārīṣid al-Dirāf, in which the author marks the place of articulation of the Arabic letters (Ms. Berlin, Versetische, No. 548); 2. al-Durar al-Lawāmiṣ fī Aṣīr Majrā' al-Imām Nāṣir, a poem of 214 Rajjaz verses, which was completed in 697 (1298) and deals with the recension of the Qurān according to Nāṣir b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Abū Nu'aim al-Madani (d. 159 = 775-6 or 169 = 785), often published in Cairo and Tunis in the collections of treatises on recensions of the Qurān and its orthography.


IBN BASHKUWAL, Abū l-Kāsim Khalaf b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Mas'ud b. Mūsib b. Bashkūwal b. Yusuf b. Dāha b. Dāka b. Naṣr b. 'Abd al-Kārim b. Wāsid al-Aṣṣārī, an Arabic biographer, a descendant of a family belonging to Sharroyon (Xoroyon, Sorrión) born on the 3rd Dhu l-Hijja 494 = 29th Sept. 1101 at Cordova, acquired here and in Seville a great knowledge of Tradition and the history of his native land and was for a period representative of the Kādi Abū Bakr Ibn al-Arabī in a quarter of Seville. He died at Cordova on the night of Tuesday/Wednesday the 8th Ramaḍān 578 = 4th/5th Jan. 1183. His most important teachers were Abū Muḥammad Ibn 'Attāb, Abū l-Walid Ibn Rāshid, Abū Bakr Ibn al-Abārī, etc.; among his pupils all of whom predeceased him, we may mention Abū Bakr b. Kāhir and Abū l-Kāsim al-Kātari.

Ibn Bashkuwal enjoyed a special reputation among all compilers of Arabic biographical dictionaries and, according to Ibn al-Abārī, he was the last authority on Tradition in Cordova and the soundest authority on the history of Spain.

Of the 50 works which he is said to have composed only two are known to us: 1. Kitāb al-Sīla fī Tārikh Aḥmad b. Abdallāh, a biographical dictionary of the Arab scholars of Spain, completed on the 3rd Djamād I 534 = 27th Dec. 1139, a supplement to the biographical dictionary of Ibn al-Faraḍī (ed. F. Codera in Bibl. Arab. Hist., Vol. i. and ii., Madrid 1853); 2. Kitāb al-Ghawāmiṣ al-wal-Muḥammad min al-Asmā', a dictionary of authorities on Tradition, whose names are difficult to spell or are easily confused with others (Berlin, Verö., No. 1673).


IBN BATṬIṢA (Batetī), Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. 'Irāhīm, Abū 'Abd Allāh, al-Lawāṣī al-Tanīj, an Arab traveller and author, born on the 14th Rajab 703 = 24th Feb. 1304 at Tangier, began the pilgrimage to Mecca 725 = 1325. He went via North Africa through Upper Egypt to the Red Sea. As he could not find a safe crossing here he turned back and reached his destination via Syria and Palestine. From Mecca he went through the Ṣafār and thence visited Persia as well as Mūsul and Dīyar Bakr. He next paid a second visit to Mecca where he spent the years 729 and 730. A third journey led him over South Arabia to East Africa and back to the Persian Gulf. From Hormuz he returned to Mecca and thence went via Egypt and Syria to Asia Minor and the Crimea. He visited Constantinople in the retinue of a Greek princess, wife of Sultan Muḥammad Uzbek. From the Volga he went through the Khārism, Bukhārā, and Afgānīstān to India. In Dihlī he undertook the office of kāliji. Two years later he joined an embassy setting out for China but only reached the offices where he filled a judicial office for 13 years. From there he went to Ceylon, Bengal and Further India. Whether he went beyond Zaitun and Canton is uncertain. Via Sumatra (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Arabie en Oost-Indie, Leiden 1907, p. 14 sqq.; French transl. Rev. de lʼHist. des Rel., iivi. 1908, 62 sqq.) he returned to Arabia where he landed in Muḥarram 748 at Ẓafār. After a journey through Persia, Syria and Mesopotamia he made the pilgrimage for the fourth time, from Egypt. He then went back through North Africa and entered Fās in Shahrīb 750. After a very brief stay here he went to Granada. His last long journey took him in 753/4 to the Negro lands, to Timbuktu and Melli. He returned to Foro for via the countries of Agadez and Tāwāt. Here he dictated the account of his travels to the scholar Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Djuza'īy (cf. de Slane, Tourn. Ar., 1843, i. 244 sqq.), who wrote the narrative in a literary style frequently modelled on Ibn Diba’ī’s work. The latter died in 757 = 1356 soon after the completion of his task; his holo- graph is partly preserved in the Paris Ms. Suppl. 907. Ibn Battūta died in 779 = 1377 in Morocco. His work Tārikh al-Nuṣayrī fī Ḡarbā’i al-Asmā’ al-Asfārī, was edited by Debrèmy and Sanguinetti, 4 vols., Paris 1853-1859; 3rd ed. 1893; repr. Cairo 1287-1288, 1322. Further literature given is by H. von Mähl, Die Rel. der Araber Ibn Battūta durch Indien und China (XIV. Jahrh.), in Bibl. denkwürdiger Reisen, Vol. v., Hamburg 1911. (C. Brockelmann.)

IBN AL-BAWWĀB, "the porter's son" a name of Abu l-Ḥasan 'Alī al-Din 'Ali b. Hālib, a celebrated Arab calligrapher, son of a porter of the audience hall of Baghdad. He was also called Ibn al-Sitri. He died in 413 = 1022 or 423 = 1032 and was buried beside the tomb of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal. He had a wide knowledge of law, knew the Qurān by heart, and wrote
out 64 copies of it. One of these written in Riḥāni-script is in the Lālēli mosque in Constantinople, in the place where it is given of Sābūn Selmī I. The Dīwān of the pre-Islamic poet Sālama b. Djaland, copied by him, is in the library of the Aya Sofya. He invented the Riḥāni and Muḥā-validate scripts and founded a school of calligraphy which survived to the time of Yūsuf al-Mustāṣim.

Bibliography: Cl. Huart, Calligraphes, p. 80; Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt, no. 468, transl. de Slane, II, 282; Ḥalab-Efendi, Khiṣṭ u Khafṣūṭ, p. 44. (CL. Huart.)

**IBN BĪBI, NĀṢIR AL-DIN YĀḤYA B. MAJDI AL-DIN MUḤAMMAD TĀRĀMĪ (not to be confused with his son) was a Persian historian. His father was muʿāṣir and interpreter at the court of the Sālijān of Asia Minor and more than once a member of diplomatic missions to foreign princes. He died in 670 = 1272. He received the name Ibn Bībi from his mother, who had a great reputation as a fortune-teller and was therefore held in great esteem by Sultān Kājībūd I (616–634 = 1220–1237); we know nothing of the life of Ibn Bībi himself, but he appears to have been well acquainted with the famous Mongol vizier Ṭāhir al-Makki Djawānīnī ([9. – 15.]). He dedicated his chief work, a history of the Sālijān of Asia Minor in the viii–(xii) century, which is composed in unusually florid Persian, is entitled al-Awāmir al-alānīya fi l-Umūr al-alāniyya, because it deals mainly with the history of 'Ala al-Din (Kājībūd), and survives in a unique ms. (Aya Sofya, no. 2955). An unknown epitomiser composed a synopsis of it, which was published in 1902 by Houtsma in his Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seljoucides, Vol. iv. The latter also published a Turkish version of the same work in the 3rd volume of this collection (incomplete). At the time of the publication of his work, the existence of a manuscript of the original work was known to Houtsma.

**IBN BUTLĀN, JOANNES or ABU ‘L-HĀSAN AL-MUḤTĀR B. ḤĀSAN, a Christian physician in Baghdad. From there he set out in 440 (1049) via al-Raḥāb and al-Rusāfa to Ḥalab and thence to Anṭākiya and Laḏkhiyā, finally reaching al-Fuṣṭṭī in Egypt, where he met his colleague ‘Alī b Riqdūn. Their intercourse led to sharp polemics and produced several controversial pamphlets and theological tracts in Ibn Butlān’s epistle are given in Ibn al-Kīfī Tāʾrīkh al-Ḥukamāʾ, ed. Lippert, p. 298 sqq. Relations finally became so strained that Ibn Butlān left Egypt and went to Constantinople, where the plague was then raging (446 = 1054). It is evident from this that the statement in Ibn al-Kīfī, op. cit., that he died at Anṭākiya in 444 (1052) is wrong, although Ibn Abī Časībīa also tells us that he returned to Anṭākiya. He was still alive in 455 (1063). His principal work is called Tāʾrīkh al-Ālā, of which a Latin translation was published in 1531 at Strassburg under the title: Tacumini sanitatis Elachasem Epitomar medicis de Baldacch. In the following year there appeared at the same place a German transl. by M. Herum, Schachteln von der Gesundheit. Other works are given by Leclerc and Brockelmann, m. the Bibli. Die Darwāt al-Aḥāba’ al-Muhāb Kaitā wa-Dirma mentioned there was published in 1901 by Dr. Bashāha Zalāl in Alexandria.


**IBN BAṬĀBA** was called after his ancestor ‘All b. Yūsuf (Daʿī) is said to mean “white” in Nubian, according to al-Mujibī, Khudāyat al-Aṣr, iii, 192, and Taʿlīk al-ʿArab, v, 325, the South Arabian Historian and Traditi onist Abu ʿAbd Allāh ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. ʿUmar . . . ʿAbd b. Yūsuf, Wajīḥ al-Dīn al-Shaikīnī al-Zābirī, who was born on the 4th Muḥarram 806 (9th Oct. 1461) at Zābid. From his genealogy he has benefited of the tuition of his uncle, Dījāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, Muftī of Zābid, under whose guidance, after learning the Kūrān, he proceeded to study various sciences, notably mathematics and fiqūh. After studying under other teachers and making the pilgrimage in 884 and 885, he became a pupil of Zain al-Dīn Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-Latīf al-Sharījī (died 893), devoting particular attention to history. He afterwards went to Bait al-Faqīh where he stayed and studied Hadīth under two members of his early family of Ibn Dījām. After a third pilgrimage (896), with which he combined a stay in Mecca in order to study Ḥadīth under al-Sakhāwī (d. 902 = 1497), he began to devote himself to literature. Through his work as a historian he won a high favour with the Tāhirīd al-Malik al-Zāhir b. Sālīḥ al-Dīn Amīr (894–923 = 1489–1517), who presented him with robes of honour, allotted him lands and gave him a professorship at the Dār al-Zamān ibn al-Dījābī died in Rāyāt (1444, Dec. 17). His works are: 1. Būḥayat al-Mustāfā tīl ʿAbdār al-Maṣūm, a history of Zābid and its rulers to the year 901 (begins 21 Sept. 1495), the most important part of which is the section on the 16th (xvib) century; it finishes with his autobiography al-Dhālima. This work has been rendered into Latin by C. Th. Johannsen, with introduction and notes, from the defective Coptic manuscripts (Historia Jumanae, Bene 1828, Ms. in Brockelmann, i, 298; Aya Sofya, no. 2988, Bresl., Cat. de Coll., i, Schefer, no. 5897, 6069). Continuing this work down to 923 (1517) he wrote al-Fadil al-maṣīh. A second appendix brings it to 924 (Ms. in Brockelmann, o. c., and Aya Sofya, no. 2988). 2. Kūrāt al-Uṣūl fi Akhāb al-Yaman al-Muṣāmīm, which is in part compiled from al-Khazrāji’s Kitāb al-Kifāya, and in part contains the same material as the preceding work. (Ms. in Brockelmann and Blochet, o. c., no. 5821, 6058); 3. Aḥsan al-Uṣūl fi man (fi naṣṣ man) waṣayla Zabīd min al-Maṣūm, a historical Radjād poem on the princes of Zābid, Berlin, Verz., no. 9763; Brit. Mus., Cat., no. 15935, i; Khed. Bibli., Fīhr., v, 138; Blochet, o. c., no. 5382, ii; Houtsma, Catal. d’une Coll., i, no. 490, iii.; 4. Taṣāʾa al-Waqīf tīl Dījām al-Uṣūl min Hādīth al-Rasūl (cf. Brockelmann, i, 357), printed Cairo 1331; 5. Ṭamāzī al-Taṣāʾa min al-Khāṭīb min ma’dh al-ʿĀlā mi ʿĀlā min al-ʿĀlā (Ms. in Brockelmann, i, c. and Princeton, List, no. 521, p. Cairo 1324); 6. Kit. Fadilat ʿAbd al-Yamen (Cf. F. al-Y. wa-Āḥikī), cf. Grifinī, Zeitzeich., d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, lxiv, 75. Ibn al-Dījābī further mentions in his autobiography Ghiyāyat al-Maṣūm wa-al-Ḥamal lamma yashfuʿr lī Ḥalabī wa-Kūrāt al-Kirba fi Sharḥ Dījāb Abī Hīrū, Ḥadīthī al-Khalifa (iv, N. 24
8176) further mentions al-Ḥārīrī al-bāḥir fi Taʾrikh Daulat Banū Tabarī, which is said to be taken from the Bugyaght al-Mustafid. Bibliography: Johannesen, op. cit., p. 8 sqq., cf. 197 infra sq., 239, 249; Rieu, Suppl., No. 586, i.; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Lit., ii. 400 sq., cf. 185 and 712; (biographical material in ms., which could not be used here, is mentioned in Cat. Col. Misc. Orient. Mus. Brit., ii. p. 672 note a). (C. Van Arendonk.)

IBN DĀṢĀN, a Syrian philosopher of Persian origin, known by his scarcely Syriac name Bardeisan. His father was called Nuḥama, his mother Nahshiram; both migrated from Persia to Edessa after 139 A.D. Their son was born in 154 and received his name from the river Dāṣān which waters Edessa. Brought up at the court of king Maʿnū along with the latter's son Abgar he learned astronomy and astrology; in 179 he was converted to Christianity by Bishop Hūṣūk. Although an opponent of Valentine, Māriq, and the other gnostics, he created a cosmological system closely allied to the gnostic. He died in 232. The Muslims are only acquainted with his speculations on good and evil and light and darkness, from which it appears that his system was dualistic. The school founded by him lasted till late in the middle ages. His followers were divided into two sects, of which one represented the view that light mixed with darkness of its own accord, in order to improve it, but could not free itself again; the others hold that light after it has filled the density and the evil smell of darkness, which involuntarily overwhelms the light, attempts to free itself from it. One section of his followers inhabited the swampy lands (bāṭīq) of the lower Euphrates, others were found scattered as far as Khūraṣān and China. He was regarded as a precursor of Mānī. He actually seems to have been particularly an astrologer (Eusebius, Pædag. evang., vi. 9). As such, he teaches that individual beings are subject to the power of controllers or rulers above them, namely the planets. What is called fate is the mode of activity which God has allotted the planets and elements; this activity modifies the intelligence in its descent to its soul and the soul in its descent to the body. Human life is limited by natural laws and further by fate; human freedom consists in taking up the battle with fate and limiting its power as far as possible.

Bibliography: Fihrist, i. 338; Ibn Ḥazm, Fīqāṭ, i. 36; Al-Shahrastānī, ed. (Cureton), p. 194 sq., transl. by Haarbrucker, i. 293 sq.; al-Maṣūdī, al-Tanbih (ed. de Goeje), p. 130, 135 (Livre de l'avertissement, transl. by Curra de Vaux, p. 182); Mutahhar al-Maḵḍīsī, al-Badʿawī al-Taʾrikh, ed. Huart, i. 91, 142; ii. 8 (transl. by Huart, i. 82, 131; ii. 9); Abu l-Farajī Ibn al-Ḥarīrī (ed. Sāḥib, p. 125); Fīlūgī, Ṣūqūn (Leipzig 1862), passim; F. Neau, Le livre des lois des pays (Paris 1899), p. 8—30; to do., Biographie inédite de Bardeisan l'astrologue (Paris 1897); F. Haase, Zur Bardeisani- schen Gnosis (Texte u. Unters. Gesch. d. altchristl. Lit., xxxiv), Leipzig 1910, and the literature there given. (CL. Huart.)

IBN DĀḤIR, the name of four viziers:

1. FAIKEH AL-Daula ABD AL-NAṢĪR MUḤAMMAD E. MUḤAMMAD B. DĀḤIR, born in Mūṣil in 398 (1007-8). He first entered the service of the Banū ʿUkayl, who had been ruling in his native city since 396 (961); but when the ʿUkaylī Khāṇīqāḥ b. Badrān wished to throw him into prison he fled to Aleppo where the Mirdādī Muʿīn al-Daula b. Śāliḥ appointed him vizier. He next left Aleppo and was appointed vizier to Naṣr al-Daula Aḥmad b. Marwān, lord of Dīyar Bahr. After the latter's death in 453 (1061-2) he was confirmed in this office by his son and successor Niẓām al-Dīn; but he refused to stay and went to Baghdaad. Here the Caliph al-Kāṣīm appointed him vizier the following year. In 460 (1067-8) Fakhēr al-Daula appointed him again vizier to Naṣr al-Daula Aḥmad b. Marwān, lord of Dīyar Bahr. He was restored to office in Ṣafar 461 (December 1068). The Caliph died in 467 (1075) and his successor al-Muqtadī confirmed the vizier in his office but dismissed him in 471 (1078-9). Fakhēr al-Daula was sent in 476 (1083-4) by the Sālждūk sūltān against Dīyar Bahr, to take it from the Marwānis. Muḥāṣir b. Naṣr, the ruler of Dīyar Bahr, thereupon allied himself with the ʿUkaylī Muslim b. Ḥuʾūsain; the latter had however to flee to ʿĀmid where he and Muḥāṣir were besieged by Fakhēr al-Daula. Muslim succeeded in escaping; but as his army was captured about the same time by ʿĀmid al-Daula, Fakhēr al-Daula's attempt at peace and soon afterwards the governorship of Mūṣil was restored to him. After Zaʾīm al-Ruʿāsāʾ, another of Fakhēr al-Daula's sons, had seized the town of ʿĀmid, Fakhēr al-Daula took Ṣanāyāfārīn and was appointed governor of Dīyar Bahr. According to the usual account, this happened in 478 (1085). He was soon afterwards dismissed however, but in 482 (1089-90) Malikšāh sent him to Mūṣil of which he took possession. He died there in 483 (1090).


2. ʿĀMĪD AL-Daula ABD AL-MUNŠĪR MUḤAMMAD B. FAIKEH AL-Daula B. DĀḤIR, son of the preceding, born in 435 (1043-4). By his marriage with a daughter of the vizier Niẓām al-Mulk in 462 (1067-8) he entered into closer relations with the ruling Sālждūk family. After her death in 477 (1083-4) he married her niece and in Ṣafar 472 (August 1079) the Caliph al-Muqtadī appointed him his vizier at the request of Niẓām al-Mulk. In 476 (1083-4) he was dismissed but restored to office in Dīn Ḥūdhdū (January 1062) and held this office for nine years. In Ramaḍān 493 (July-August 1100) he was dismissed through the efforts of Barkiyyūrūk. The latter accused him of embezzling the revenues of Dīyar Bahr and Mūṣil, which his father and he had governed during the time of Malikšāh, and had him arrested with his brothers. ʿĀmid al-Daula had to give up a huge fine and died in prison on the 10th Shawwaal 493 (24th Aug. 1100).


3. ZaʾīM AL-RuʿASĀʾ KĀWĀM AL-DIN ABU L-ḴĀṢIM ʿĀLĪ B. FAIKEH AL-Daula B. DĀḤIR, brother of the preceding. In 478 (1085) Zaʾīm al-Ruʿasāʾ conquered ʿĀmid (see under No. 1, a) and after
Majīṣīrīn had also fallen into the hands of his father, the latter sent him with the booty, found from the Marwānids, to Isfahān to the Sultan Malikshāh. In Shābaḥ 496 (May—June 1103) the Caliph al-Muṭaṣṣīḥ appointed him vizier but dismissed him in 500 (October 1106). Zā'im al-Ruṣāsī, al-Ḥaṣib al-Ma'mūdī, Mayyidī Saif al-Dawla Șādaqa; in 503 (1109-1110) he was again appointed vizier by the Caliph.


4. Nīẓām al-Dīn Abū Naṣr al-Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. Dījārī al-Baghdādī (or 'Abū Naṣr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Dījārī). Nīẓām al-Dīn was first of all Īṣād-dār (master of ceremonies); after the death of the vizier Sa'dīd al-Dawla Ibn al-Anbārī in 555 (1140-1) the Caliph al-Muṣṭakīfī appointed him his successor.

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Tiḳṭāka, al-Fakhrī (ed. Derenburg), 418 sq.; Ibn al-Atḥir (ed. Tornberg), xi. 52; Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seljouqides, ii. 194.

(K. V. Zettersten)

**IBN DJAMĀʾA;** the name of family of schol- ars belonging to Ḥamāt, whose members are therefore quoted by this name only and not in- frequently confused with one another. Here may be mentioned:


He studied at Damascus and was afterwards mu- darrīs there; in 687 (1288) he became kādī of Jerusalem, in 690 (1291) chief kādī of Cairo, in 693 (1294) chief kādī of Damascus. From 702 he again held the office of chief kādī of Cairo, with one brief interruption till 727 (1327). His official duties did not prevent him teaching in several madrasas and also engaging in literary work. His most important work is his book on constitutional law, Tahār al-Aṣkām fi Tadbīr Allah al-Islām, on which cf. von Kremer, Culturgesch. der Orient, i. 403 sq. Through an error in Ḥalâlī Khalīfa, ii. 502, in Flügel, Cat. Wiss. des Hebräerh., N°. 1380, Brockelmann, Gesch. der Arab., ii. 94, he is ascribed this work to N°. 4 below, although he attributes it correctly on ii. 75 (only with a slightly different title which he gives from Cod. Berol. Ahlwardt, N°. 5613). For other writings of Ibn Djama' see Brockelmann.

2. Abu 'Omar Abū ʿAbd al-Azīz, al-Dīn, cer- tainly the son of the preceding, born in 694 (1294) at Damascus, afterwards chief kādī of Egypt and Syria. But when his representative at Damascus died in 765 (1364), he resigned the office and be- came mudarrīs in Cairo. He died in 767 (1366) on a pilgrimage to Mecca. On his writings cf. Brockelmann, ii. 72, and references given there.

3. Ibrahim b. Abū al-Rahmān, Bukhān al- Dīn, grandson of N°. 1, born 725 (1325) in Cairo. He studied in his native city and in Da- mascus, became kātib in Jerusalem in 773 (1371), chief kādī of Egypt and mudarrīs at the Sahāliya, but returned to Jerusalem in the following year. In 781 (1379) he again became chief kādī of Cairo and finally in 785 (1383) kādī of Damascus, where he died in 790 (1388). See Brockelmann, ii. 72.

4. ABU ʿABD ALLĀH MUḤAMMAD b. Aḥī BAKR, grandson of N°. 2, born in 759, became a physi- cian and teacher of philosophy in Cairo. He died in 819 (1416) of the plague. See Brockelmann, op. cit., ii. 94. He wrote a commentary on the dogmatic poem, Bad' al-Ālim, see Brockelmann, op. cit., i. 429.

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

**IBN AL-DIJARRĀH,** the name of two viziers:

1. Abū ʿAṣīr al-Muṭaṣṣīḥ b. Mūsā al-Dāʾī. After the dismissal of Ibn Maṣḥa in 724 (936) the Caliph al-Kādī offered the vacant office to the former vizier 'Ali b. Tās; but as he declined the offer, on the grounds of old age and feeble health, the office was given to his brother Abū al-Rahmān. But the latter was not fit for the onerous duties and only held office for three months; he was then thrown into prison with his brother and condemned to pay a heavy fine. In 739 (941) he again appears in history; after the appointment of Kūrtgi as Ṭumār al-Umar he performed the duties of a vizier for a period at the court of the Caliph al-Muṭaṣṣīḥ but without receiving the corresponding title.


2. Abū ʿAṭī b. Tās b. Dāʾūd, brother of the preceding, born in 245 (859). As a supporter of the pretender 'Abd Allah b. al-Muṭaẓ, 'Ali was banished to Wasiṭ in 736 (940) after the murder of 'Abd Allah, but received permission to go to Mecca from al-Muṭakerī's vizier Ibn al-Furat. In 739 (941-2) the Caliph appointed him vizier and he reached the capital in the beginning of the following year. He materially improved the finances of the state by his rigid economy; the troops were discontented however because he decreased their pay and his measures also brought him into disfavour in other quarters. He therefore asked the Caliph to accept his resignation; but the latter declined. Towards the end of 740 (947) however he was dismissed and imprisoned. Ibn al-Furat was appointed his successor. The latter clung to office for a year or two, until he was replaced in Djumādā I 306 (November 938) by Ḥamīd al-Abūs, who was old and feeble and at first al- lowed himself to be guided by 'Ali b. Tās. 'Ali however soon quarrelled with Ḥamīd and, after a rising in Bagdād in 308 (920-1) on account of the increased cost of living, 'Ali was offered the vizierate but declined it. As Ḥamīd lost the Caliph's favour and 'Ali's economy aroused discontent, the vizierate was again given to Ibn al-Furat in Rabiʾ II 311 (August 923). 'Ali was thrown into prison and after Ibn al-Furat had extorted a con- siderable sum from him, he banished him to Mecca and gave the government three instructions to send him on to Șan'āʾ. On the interpolation of Mu'nis, the prefect of police, 'Ali was pardoned on the fall of Ibn al-Furat and returned from exile in 312 (925). In Dhu 'l-Ka'da 314 (Jan.—Feb. 927) he was summoned to Bagdād from Damascus, where he was then living, through the influence of Mu'nis and given the vizierate. He did not take up office till the beginning of the fol- lowing year; but when it was found that the finances were again in a chaotic condition and the Caliph declined to follow his advice, he asked leave to resign on the ground that he was too old for the duties of the office. The Caliph at first declined but was finally persuaded and in
Rabi' 1 316 (May 978) 'Ali was dismissed and replaced by Ibn Mūkha [q. v.]. The Caliph al-Rādi afterwards twice offered him the vizierate, first immediately after his accession and again in 324 (936). As he refused on both occasions, Ibn Mūkha and the brother of 'Ali, Abd al-Rahmān, respectively were given it. 'Ali b. 'Isā died in Dhu l-Hijja 334 (July–August 946).


(K. V. Zettersten.)

IBN AL-DJAWZĪ, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad Abū 'l-Faḍā'ī (Abū 'l-Faḍā'ī) Djawzī. Abū al-Dīn, an Aryan author, Ḥanbali fāṣih, preacher and universal historian, born in 510 = 1116 at Bagdad, settled there after the usual journey of study, and died in 597 = 1200. His ardent devotion to his master, Ṣa'īd ibn Ḥaḍīth, led to the strictest criticism of Tradition; he even prepared an edition of al-Ghazālī's Ḥayāq purified of all weak traditions. His literary activity covered almost all the knowledge of his time. He exercised the greatest influence as a preacher (cf. Ibn Dzhauhar, 2nd ed., p. 220 sqq.); his numerous edifying works are recommended for public reading even by al-Ṣubki, Muḥammad al-Ḥallī, p. 163; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. i, 502 sqq. gives a list of his writings. Of his history of the world, al-Muntaq̣am wa-Multaq̣at al-Multaq̣am, the most important of his works to us, there have since become known the ms. in Paris, Bibl. Nat. (Blouchet, Catal. de la Coll., Schérer), No. 5909, in the British Museum (Add. 7320; s. Amelrood, Journ. Roy. As., 1906, p. 851 sqq., 1907, p. 19 sqq.; cf. ibid., 1904, S. 273 sqq.), Damascus, Ḥabīb al-Zayyāt, Khosain al-Kutub fi Dimaqāţ etc., p. 78, No. 62; on the Stambul Ms. s. Horovitz, Mitt. Sem. Or. Spr., x, 6. The following works from his pen are now also known: 1) Kaşf al-Nībāh 'an al-Asma wa-Allāh, cod. Leid. 1457 (not yet catalogued), s. Barbier de Meynard, Journ. As., 1907, 173 sqq. 2) Amār al-Āyān, Damascus, al-Ẓayyāt, p. 31, No. 28, 4, vgl. Horovitz, op. cit., x, 43. 3) Mukhabarat 'Udāli, al-Muntaq̣am, Shahr Ḥāl al-Khadîr, Damascus, al-Zayyāt, p. 33, No. 63, 1, 4) Dar al-Ẓanā'īf wa Su'm Yana'm al-Qain, ibid., p. 45, No. 37, 3, 5) al-Muṣṭafān min al-Muṣṭafā (from No. 32 in Brockelmann?); ibid., p. 37, No. 124, 2. 6) Muḥār al-Ṣaḥābah al-Sākīn fī Faqā'īl al-Ṣaḥābah wa al-Āmākin, ibid., p. 82, No. 46. 7) Darāyī al-Dhawāḥib (so to be read) wa-Kaşf al-Rū (so to be read) 'an al-Khālidī, s. C. Crisp Moncada, I Cod. ar. nuovo fondo della Bibl. Vatic., No. 1309. 8) al-Muṣāfājī, s. Völlers, Katal. der islam., 152. H. zu Leipz., No. 166, 9) Nukat al-Muṣāfājī fī 'l-Waṣf, ibid., No. 107, 10) Tadhkira al-Āyān, anon. extract from his Tadhkirat al-Āyān, Damascus, al-Zajīyāt, p. 82, No. 63.


(C. Brockelmann.)

IBN AL-DJAWZĪ, Shih, Shams al-Dīn Abū 'l-Muẓaffar Yūsuf b. Ẓiżghīṭ, grandson of the preceding on his mother's side. His father Ẓiżghīṭ was a Turkish slave of the vizier Ibn Huṣayn [q. v.] and afterwards mansamitted by him. Yūsuf was born in 582 (1186) in Bagdad and brought up by his grandfather; he studied in his native city, set out to travel in 600 and finally became professor and preacher in Damascus, where he died in 684 (1287). He is the author of a universal history (not yet printed) in several volumes, entitled Miqrāt al-Zamān fī 'Irāq al-Aṣfān. The latter part of it covering the years 495–654 has been reproduced in facsimile by J. R. Jewett (Chicago 1907), while some extracts from the years 450–532 were given in the Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens Orientaux, Vol. iii, p. 65 sqq.


IBN AL-DJAWZĪ, Shams al-Dīn Abū 'l-Khaṣr Yaḥyā Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. 'Ali b. Yūsuf al-Djawzī, an Arabologist and authority on the readings (kīrāt) of the Kurān, born at Damascus in the night of Friday/Saturday 25th Ramadān 751 (30th Nov.—1st Dec. 1350), know the Kurān by heart by the year 763 (1363) and a year later was able to recite pieces from it in prayer. After devoted some attention to Ḥadīth, he studied the various ways of reading the Kurān, of which he mastered seven in 768 (1367). In the same year he made the pilgrimage to Mecca and thereafter went to Cairo where by the year 769 (1368) he had mastered thirteen ways of reading the Kurān. Returning to Damascus he devoted himself to Ḥadīth and law and studied under the two pupils of al-Jawzī, al-Abārkhārī and al-Asnawi. He then went back to Cairo to study rhetoric and the sources of law, and then went to Alexandria to hear the pupils of Ibn 'Abd al-Salām. In 744 (1343) he received permission to deliver fatwās from Abu 'l-Ṣa'īd Ismā'īl b. Katīrī, in 778 (1376) from Diyya al-Dīn, and in 785 (1383) from the Shaikh al-Islām al-Būkhārī.

After teaching Ḫirāḍ for a period he was appointed qādī of Damascus in 793 (1391). But when his property in Egypt was confiscated in 798 (1395), he went to Brusa to the court of Sultan Bayazid b. Ḫoṭmān. After the battle of Angora (end of 804 = 1402), he was sent by Timūr to Kūshāh in Transoxania, and later to Samarqand, where he lectured publicly and met the Sharīf al-Djūriet. After Timūr's death in Shāhān 807 (Febr. 1405) Ibn al-Djawzī went to Khorāsān, then to Herāt, Yazd, Isfahān and finally to Šīrāz, where, after teaching for some time, he was appointed qādī by Pir Muḥammad against his will. He then went to Baṣra and thence to Mecca and Medina (823 = 1420). After a stay of several years in these towns he returned to Šīrāz where he died on Friday the 9th Rabi' 1 833 (2nd Dec. 1429).

He is the author of the following works: 1. Khirāḍ al-Nābī fī 'l-Kirātāt al-Asīr (Berlin, No. 657); Escurial, Derensb, Les ms. arab., No. 1239; Constantinople, Nūr-ʾi Osmānī, 97; Khed. Libr., Fīhr, i, 117; Tunis, Maktabā Abādallya, i, 176; 2. Taḥdīr al-Taḥārī fī 'l-Kirātāt, commentary on the Taḥārī of al-Dānī on the readings of the Kurān (Khed. Libr., Fīhr, i, 92; Berlin,
Ibn al-Djazari — Ibn Djubair.

N. 590; Constantinople Nūr-i ʿOsmāniya, N. 60; 3. ʿīṣābiṭ al-ʾNāṣir fi l-ʿKīrāt al-ʾAhār, a poem of 1000 Radjaz verses on the ten ways of reading the Kurʾān, completed in Shāhān 796 = May 1396 (pr. Cairo 1283, 1307); 4. al-ʾDurr al-muṣawwa fī ʿKīrāt al-ʾAdlāt ilāl-lādālāt ilā-l-mardīb, a poem of 241 Tawīl verses, finished 823 = 1420; pr. Cairo 1285, 1308; 5. ʿĪḥāyāt (var. ʿĪḥāyat) al-Maḥṣura fī Ziyādīt al-ʾAgāra, a poem on the same subject (Aya ʿOṣūfa, N. 39); 6. Muḥammad al-Muṣarrabān wa-Muḥammad al-Tālūn, treatise in seven chapters on the same subject (Berlin, N. 656); 7. 41 Tawīl verses rhyming in ʿā on 40 difficult questions of Kurʾān readings (Berlin, N. 529); 8. al-Muḫāddimāt al-Djazariyya, a poem of 110 Radjaz verses on the recitation of the Kurʾān (pr. Cairo 1282, 1307); 9. al-ʾTāḥīḍ fi ʿĪlm al-Ṭaʿlīqīt, treatise on the recitation of the Kurʾān, finished 769 = 1367 (Paris Bibl. Nat., N. 592, ii.); 10. ʿĪḥāyāt al-Muḥallī fī Ayāt yā Ṭarīq al-bāʿ, on the different ways of reciting Sūra xi. 46 (Khed. Libr., Fihār. vii. 578); 11. Muḫṭaṣar ʿṬabarān al-Karrā al-mutamām bi-Ǧāyāt al-Nīkāya, the shorter of two works which the author devoted to the same subject (Constantinople, Nūr-i ʿOsmāniya, N. 85); 12. Muḫṭāṣar Ḥadīth, al-Ḥadīth, on the technology of Ḥadīth (Berlin, Vers., N. 1084); 13. al-Ḥaddīya ilā ʿAlāʾī al-ʾRūyā, a poem of 370 Radjaz verses on the tradition of Kurʾān recitation preserved by the Kurʾān readers (Essāri, Casirai, N. 1756, 1808); 14. ʿĪḥāṣ al-Muḥallī fī al-ʿĀḥidāt il-muṣawwa wa-al-ʾAwūlī, finished 808 = 1405 at Shīrāz (Paris Bibl. Nat., N. 4577, iii.; a similar work is contained in N. 4577, iv.); 15. al-ʾRāʾīs al-baṣayrīa fī Ṭashk al-ʾAbāzāt il-Nābi wa-la ʿAṣīra, a Radjaz poem on the version of the parents of the prophet to Islam (Berlin, N. 10943); 16. al-Mawlid al-baḥīr, a biography of the Prophet (Brit. Mus., Suppl., N. 515); 17. Ṭahr al-Šīrāzī fī Sirat al-Nābi wa la-Khulafāʾ, a Radjaz poem on the biography of the Prophet and the first four caliphs with a brief survey of the history of Islam to the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik and the siege of Constantinople by the Turks, composed at the request of ʿAbd al-Muḥammad, ruler of Shīrāz, and finished on the 25th Dhu l-Ḥijjah 758 = Sept. 1396 (Ms. in Brockelmann); 18. al-Ḥam al-baṣrīn min Kalām Sāḥib al-Murshid, a Ḥadīth collection for use in prayers (pr. Cairo 1309, 1315; Algier 1328); 19. Muḫṭṣāṣar al-Nāṣīḥa bi l-ʾAdlāt il-ʾAṣāfā, a treatise on ethics based on Ḥadīth texts (Khed. Libr., Fihār. vii. 564); 20. al-Zahr al-faḥīb, an exhortation to virtue (pr. Cairo 1305, 1310); 21. al-ʾIṣlaḥ fi Lawāsim al-Kitāb, a short treatise on calligraphy (Berlin, N. 6); 22. 52 Radjaz verses on astronomy (Berlin, N. 8159, iii.);

11th Djamādā II 466 (11th Febr. 1074). On account of his fine handwriting he was employed as copyist by the Ḥanafī šāfiʿī at Baghdaḏ. He learnt medicine from Saʿīd b. Ḥibat Allāh, physician to the Caliph al-Muṭṭakīd. He lived in the Karīb quarter of Baghdaḏ and not only gave his services both to the people of that quarter and to his own acquaintances without reward, but also applied himself to medicine as well. He died in Shāhān 493 (June 1100). His best known work is the Taṣawwur al-Aḥdān fī Taʿlīq al-ʾInsān, tables in which diseases are arranged as are the stars in astronomical tables, of which a Latin version was printed at Strassburg in 1532. He also drew up an alphabetical list of medicinal herbs and drugs called Muḥallī al-Bayān sināʿa yastaʿmilūn l-ʾInsān for the Caliph al-Muṭṭakīd. He composed, besides a treatise against Christianity, and wrote verses.


IBN Djinī, Abū ʿAlī Fathā ʿUthmān, was born in Mūs al before 300 a. H. (Pröster, p. x., ca. 320), the son of a Greek slave belonging to Sulaimān b. Fath b. Ṭalḥa b. Ṭalḥa. He was the Baṣrī Abī ʿAlī al-Farīsī al-Fasawī, with whom he was associated for forty years till the latter's death, partly at the court of Saʿīd al-Dawla in Ḥalab and partly at the court of ʿAḍīd al-Dawla in Persia; according to the Biographical Dictionary, Kitiṣ al-ʾInsān at the court of the latter and his successor. In both places he was on friendly terms with al-Mutanabbi, with whom he discussed grammatical questions and on whose Diwan he wrote a commentary. He also sought other teachers (Rescher, p. 5 sq.). He succeeded al-Farīsī in Baghdaḏ and died in 392 = 1002. He devoted himself especially to grammar and is celebrated as the most learned authority on tāṣīr; he occupied a position midway between the Kūfa and Baṣra schools. His most important works are Kitiṣ Sirr al-Šīrāzīwa-ʾArār al-Balāgha (on Arabic vowels and consonants) and Kitiṣ al-Khaṣṣāṣ fī ʿĪlam ʿUṣār al-ʾArabiyya; besides other philological works he also wrote poems.

Biography: Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur, i. 125 sqq.; G. Flügel, Die grammatischen Schulen der Araber, p. 248—


IBN DJUBAIR, ABU ʿAL-HUSAIN MUḤAMMAD B. AHMAD AL-ḴIRĀN, Arab traveller, born at Valencia in 1040 (1145), studied ʿADDĪT and ʿADDĪT at Jātiva to which his family belonged. As secretary to the governor of Granada Abū Saʿīd b. ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, he is said to have been forced to drink wine on one occasion and to atone for this sin he undertook a pilgrimage. From Granada he set out in 1183 via Tarifa to Ceuta and thence by ship to Alexandria. As the
Christians barred the usual way to Mecca he had to travel by Cairo, Kus, 'Aidhab and Djudda. He afterwards visited Medina, Kufa, Baghdad, Meșul, Aleppo, and Damascus and then embarked at Acre for Sicily to return to Greenland via Constance in 1185. He travelled in the East on two further occasions, 578-587 (1189-1191) and 614 (1217), but on the latter journey he only reached Alexandria, where he died. His description of his travels is one of the most important works in Arabic literature, and also particularly important for the history of Sicily under William the Good. Cf. M. Amari, Voyage en Sicile sous le règne de Guillaume le Bon, texte arabe suivi d'une traduction et de notes, 1840, and his Bibliotheca Arabico-Sicula; edition of the Arabic text by W. Leiden 1852, new edition by de Geose, 1907 (Gibb Memorial, vol. v); Italian transl. by Schiaparelli: Viaggio in Isopia, Sicilia, Siria e Palestina, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Egitto etc., 1906.

Bibliography: Pons Boignies, Ensayo biobílograf., p. 267 sqq. (further references there); Brockelmann, Geschichte etc., i, 478.

IBN DUKMAK, ŞARIM AL-DIN İBRAHİM B. MUHAMMAD AL-MEŠR (the name is derived from the Turkish tuğmaq "hammer", cf. Hâdîddî Khâlifa, ii, 102) was a zealous Hanafi and wrote a work on the fasâ laid of the Hanafî, Nasîm al-Djumân, in 3 volumes, the first of which deals with Abu Hânîfa (Hâdîddî Khâlifa, iv, 136, vii, 317); on account of his depreciatory references to al-Shafi'i he was flagged and thrown into prison. His history of Egypt, Nushat al-Anîm, in about 12 vols. to the year 779, was of the greatest importance (Hâdîddî Khâlifa, ii, 102; iv, 328; G. Weil, Gesch. d. Chafis, viii, 79). By command of the Sultan Malik al-Żahir Barqûk he wrote a history of the rulers of Egypt to the year 805; he further wrote a separate history of this Sultan, Hâl al-Jâwâhir fi Sâvat al-Malik al-Zâhir Barqûk, abbreviated under the title Yánbî al-Muṣâhir (Hâdîddî Khâlifa, i, 102; iv, 230; vi, 514). According to Hâdîddî Khâlifa, his historical works were largely utilised by al-Amin and al-Ashâlînî (i, 442; ii, 118). A work now lost dealt with Cairo and Alexandria. He wrote a large work on 10 cities of Islam, Kitâb al-Injîr li-Wâsâfâr al-Hâl al-İmsûr, devoting one volume to each city; of these the volumes describing Cairo and Alexandria are preserved in Cairo and have been published by Völlers. According to Völlers (p. 4) he used better authorities than al-Maqrizi. The latter, for a time his pupil, did not use his work, according to Völlers. Ibn Dukmaq also wrote a work on Sûfi biographer, al-Kunûz al-makhtûba fî Ta'rikh al-Sûfiyâ, also a book on the organization of the army, Târijmân al-Zamân (Hâdîddî Khâlifa, ii, 277), and a book on the interpretation of dreams, Farâ'îd al-Fawâ'id (i, c., iv, 392). According to al-Suyûtî, Husn al-Muhâjara fî Akhbar Miyâ된다 al-Kâhirî, 255, he died in 790 = 1388, aged over 80; so also Hâdîddî Khâlifa, i, 447; ii, 102; 277; but in any case he was still alive in 793 (S. Völlers, Introduction) and Hâdîddî Khâlifa elsewhere gives the date of his death as 809 = 1406 (ii, 149; iv, 230, 392; vi, 323, 357, 514).


J. PEDERSEN.

IBN L-DUMAINA, 'ABD ALLAH B. 'U'RÂD ALLAH B. AHMAD, ABD L-SARî, an Arab poet of the clan of 6'Amir b. Taim Allâh of Khâljîn. Very little is known of his life. In the Kitâb al-Ârâbîn it is related that he treacherously slew Muzâhîm b. 'Amr, a relative of his wife 'Immâma who had taken his sons with her and had reviled him in a poem, and then strangled 'Immâma and sent to death her little daughter. Ibn al-Dumaina was arrested on the accusation of Djudâh, the murdered man’s brother, but was released for want of evidence. A long time afterwards he was attacked in Tabâla, while reciting his poems, by Mu'âb, another brother of Muzâhîm, and mortally wounded. According to another tradition, a (second?) attempt by Mu'âb on his life in the market place of al-Abâlî was successful. If the Ahmad b. Ismâ’il, mentioned in al-Ârâbîn, xv, 153, 9 sqq., is identical with the governor of Mecca who appears in Tab., iii, 740, Ibn al-Dumaina was a contemporary of al-Râshid.

His poems where highly prized and several were set to music. The Miss. Beri, Verz-n, No. 7476, i., and No. 8255, i., are said to contain several of his kusâs with biographical details. Al-Zubair b. Bakrâr wrote a Kitâb Makhîr Ibn al-Dumaina, as did Ibn Abî 'Alîn Ta'far (Fîrîn, i, 111, 347, 348).


C. VAN ARENDONK.

IBN DURÂID, ABU BAKR MUHAMMAD B. AL-ḤASAN B. ‘ATÂ’IYÂH AL-ÂZDI (on the name Durâid, see 6Hamûsa, ed. Freytag, p. 377 i.), according to a work of Ibn al-Dumaina, v. 118, 134, 137, 140 (left out of his own account, a native of Khâção, was born in the year 430/1039 in 223 = 837 in Basra, (in the Sîkka 6Silîs), he was studying in Basra under such teachers as Abî Hâkim the Sijistâni, al-Riâyashî, al-Ishânndâmî and al-Âzîm’s nephew. In 527, when the Zanj were massacring in Basra, he escaped the danger and went with his uncle al-Ḥasan (others al-Ḥusain), who had undertaken his education, to 6Oman where he spent 12 years. He then went to Dzjirat Ibn Omar (read this for 6Umâra; Ibn Khallîkân has Basra) and thence to Fâs, where he stayed at the court of the Mâkîlîs as their favourite and was chiet of a Diwân. He compiled for them a Kitâb al-Djumân fî Ibn al-Luqâ, which is dedicated to Abu 6Abîbâs Ismâ’il b. 6’Allah b. Mâkîl, Hâdîddî Khâlifa, ii, No. 4202, and he wrote in honour of the Mâkîlîs his famous poem Mâkûra (on the difference between Ibn al-Hâjîm, al-Masûdî, and Ibn Khallîkân with regard to the names of the corresponding Mâkîlîs see Axel Moberg, c. v. 6Dicht von 6Oheisalîh 6Mâklîf al-Ma’sûdî, (München-Leipzig, 1908, p. 10). He had older models for this kind of poetry, in which each verse ends in an 6af mâkûra (see al-Masûdî, Marâjî, viii, 304) and was himself imitated by his successors; this poem has been several times annotated and published. When the Mâkîlîs were deposed in 920 = 992 and migrated to Khurâsân Ibn Durâid went to Baghîd; here he was recommended by al-Khujwârî to the Caliph al-Mukâdîrî and received from him a pension of 50 dinars a month. In spite of the fact that he was a noted spendthrift and winemaker, he reached a great age. When he was 90 he was seized with paralysis; he recovered
however and lived two more years in spite of a second shock. He died in 321 = 933 on the same day as al-Juhab’i and was buried in the ‘Abdul- 
Siyá cemetery in Baghdad. He is represented as the most learned philologist of his time and the best critic of poetry; he is also called d‘ama 
ego 'l-Shu‘ayrá wa-aqğár ‘u’l-Ulumá. Besides the great dictionary, al-Jundhara, he wrote on various special 
branches of lexicography, e.g. Kitab al-Sarjá 
wa ‘l-Lajjam (ed. Wright, in Operaes Arabica, 
Leiden 1859), two books on the horse, one on weapons, on clouds and rain, on amphibious expres-

ious usul of Arabic. One forced to swear six oath (v. Kar 
Malázín, ed. Thomecke, Heidelberg 1882) etc. His philology was to him a patriotic duty; against 
people like the Shu‘aybiya he wrote the Kitab 
al-Iṣṭiháð (ed. Wustenfeld, Göttingen 1854) to 
explain the etymological connections of Arabic names 
(see Goldziher, Muhammadische Studien, i. 209). Among his pupils were al-Shırafl, al-Marzubani, 

Biography: Ibn Khallikan, Wasafat 
al-A‘yan, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 648; Wustenfeld, 
‘Register zu den genealogischen Tabellen, 1853, 
p. 580 sq.; Aṣaṣ and Al-Maṣṣura, see Mühendis, 
Paris 1829, p. 131; 196; Al-Maṣṣura al-Dur-dam 
Diab, Abu Burq, Ibn Durdi, al-Durdi, ed. E. Scheidius, Harderovici, 1768; Carmen Mu-
mura dictum ... Ibn Durdi, etc., ed. L. Nannen-
stedt Boisen, Copenhagen 1829 (with commen-
tary [incomplete] and biography by Ibn Hījām); 
Mas‘ūdī, Mu‘add al-Dhahab, ed. Paris, viii. 204; 
Abu ‘l-Ma‘ṣūm Ibn Tāgrī, Abd, ed. Al-Maṣṣura al-
Zahira, Lugduni 1861, p. 256—258; Flügel, 
Die grammatische Schriften der Araber, 1862, 
p. 111; Yūkūt, Iṣghād al-‘Arab illa Murabit al-
Adīb (Gibb Memorial, vii.), vi., 483—494; Brock-
elmann, Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur, 
i. 111 sq. (J. Pedersen.) 

IBN FAĐL ALLĀH. [See FAĐL ALLĀH.] 
IBN FAĐLĀN, properly Aḥmad b. Fađlān b. 
AL-ABRĪS b. RASĪD b. HAMMAD, Arab author, 
composer of an account (riṣāla) of the embassy 
by the Caliph al-Muktaḍir to the king of the 
Volga Bulgārs [cf. bulgār, i. 876 sqq.]. As he 
was a client (ma‘ād) of the Caliph and of the 
conqueror of Egypt Muḥammad b. Sulaimān [see 
Cairo, i. 818—] he was certainly not of Arab 
origin. He seems to have taken part in the embassy 
as a theologian and authority on religious matters. 
The real ambassador appointed by the government 
was Shu‘ayb al-Rasāl, a client of Nağḥār al-Ha-
rāmi mentioned by Arb (ed. de Goeje, p. 58). 
The embassy left Baghdad on the 11th Safar 359 (21st June 941), went first to Bukhārā, thence to 
Ka‘bārāzam, and only then to the land of the 
Bulgārs, the capital of which was reached on the 
12th Muḥarram 310 (12th May 952). Nothing 
is known of the route or time of the return to Bagh-
dād; as little is known of the life of the author of 
the Risāla. The latter seems to be used as early as the iVI (9th) century by al-Iṣṭakhrī and al-Mas‘ūdī; it is expressly quoted and extracts 
given by Yūkūt (s. v. Itil, Bāṣghird, Bulghār, 
Khurāsān and Rūs); the work is known to later writers from these quotations, al-
though Yūkūt (i. 113, 15) mentions specially that 
in his time the Risāla was extant in numerous 
copies. Cf. C. Brockelmann, Gesch. der arab. Litt.,
IBN AL-FARADI — IBN FARKUN.

IBN FARAH AL-ISHIBILI, whose full name was SHIHAB AL-DIN ABU 'L-ABBAAS AHMAD b. FARA R AHMAD b. MUHAMMAD AL-RAKMI AL-ISHIBILI AL-SHAFI'I, born in 625 (began 10th December 1227) at Sevilla (Ishibliya), was taken prisoner in 646 (began 26th April 1248) by the Franks (al-Franki) i.e. the Spaniards under Perdita 111 the Saint, of Castile (1217—1252) at the conquest of the Spanish capital of the Almoravids [q.v.], Sevilla, but escaped and afterwards went, in the sixth decade of the century (650 sq. = 1252 sq.), to Egypt; after hearing the most celebrated teachers of Cairo, he studied under those of Damascus, where he settled and gave lectures in the Umayyad mosque, as a great authority on Tradition, while he declined the professorship offered him in the school of Tradition, Dar al- Hadith al-Nabawi. Among those whose teachings he heard him were al-Dimyi (cf. al-Kutubi, Fa'izi al-Wafa'i, ii. 17), al-Yunini [q.v.], al-Mu'takil, al-Nasulbus, Abi Muhammad b. al-Walid, al-Birralli [q.v.], and notably the great authority on history and tradition al-Dhahabi [q.v.]. He died in the tahr of Umm al-Sulih of diarrhoea (fi 'l-islah) on the 9th Dhul-mi 640 = 15th February 1300. Nur al-Suyuti, Tabaqat al-Mufassirin (ed. Meursinge), ii. 38, (wrongly) makes our Ibn Farah the son of another, the well-known author of the eschatological Tuhkira bi Ahl al-Malikin wa Umar al-Asbil (a. a. d. 1842—1252) and of the great Kur'anic commentary, Dzammi' Al-Khawam al-Kur'an, Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Abi Bakr b. Farah (al-Makkar), i. 600, wrongly b. Faraj b. Anasari al-Maliki al-Sabti, died 681 = 29th April 1273.

Ibn Farah al-Ishibli’s most celebrated work is the scholastic didactic poem in 28 technical expressions of the science of Tradition in 20 (Hajjardbiy b. Khalifa, vi. 190, wrongly gives 30) 'A'amni verses with the rhyme letter al-'A (hence Lamiya) in the form of a love-poem, so that it was described correctly by al-Safadi in al-Makkar, i. 819, as a Kitab ghassaliya fi Al-Jab al-Hadith (a love-poem on technical expressions of Tradition) (Brockelmann’s quotation, i. 372, al-Makkar, i. 819, l. 819). It is usually called Mun'immat Ibn Farah or Gharani Sahib after the two opening words of the first verse: Gharani suhi sa 'l-Rujab fi hukm mu'adu — wa-Ghariani sa-Dami's murzai wamulsalatu. “My longing is real, but my desire which is set on thee is difficult to gratify; my misery unceasing, my tears uninterrupted.”

The text of the Kitab was first printed by Krehl in al-Makkar’s Analecte, i. 819 sq. (from al-Safadi) and again in Madjmin al-Musnin, Cairo 1313, p. 51 sq., and in al-Suhki’s Tabaqat al- Shafi’iya al-kunbi, v. 12 sq. (Cairo 1324 = 1906-7), where only 18 verses are given. The commentary of ‘Ilz al-Din Abi Abul Allah Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Djama al-Kishti, died 816 = 1413, Zawal al-Turahi fi Sharh Mun'immat Ibn Farah, is published by Fr. Risch, Leiden 1885 (there is another Ms. not yet used, in the British Museum, Cat. Cod. Orient., ii. No. 169, ii.); in the notes there is also published almost the entire commentary of Shams al-Din Abu ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd al-Hadi al-Mukhi, died 744 = 1343 (s. al-Dhahabi, Tuh al-Huffaz, ed. Wüstenfeld, xxi. No. 12) from the MSS. Leiden, Cat. Cod. Or., iv., No. 1749, and Gotta, No. 578 (s. Persch, v. 20). We may also mention that Berlin, Verz., No. 1055, Tush steadin Manzumat Ibn Farah, gloss on Ibn Farah’s poem of the year 894 = 1490, is not a gloss on ‘Ilz al-Din’s commentary, as Brockelmann says, but belongs to the poem itself: Cairo i. 250, contains the commentary of Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. Khayi al-Titi (Boinet, Dictionnaire, p. 154 and 899) al-Maliki, died 937 = 1530-1, al-Bahar bi al-saniya fi al-Hall al-Tabaqat al-Sunnya. The principal nica of the commentator Yahya b. ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Ishahini, i.e. al-Karafi, by which alone he is often quoted, is not given by Brockelmann (Paris 4267, l. 4257, i. (Cat. de Slane). Muhammad b. al-Amir al-Kathir in Brockelmann is rather Muhammad (b. Muhammad) al-Amir al-Kabir, according to Berlin, Verz., No. 1056. Besides Ibn Farah’s didactic poem there is also a commentary by him on al-Nawawi’s [q.v.] 40 Traditions, Sharh al-arbaiin hadithin al-Nawawiy, Berlin, No. 1488-9.

Bibliography: Given in text.

(C. F. Seybold)

IBN FARKUN, BURHAH AL-DIN IBRAHIM B. ‘ALI B. MUHAMMAD B. ABU ‘L-KASIM B. MUHAMMAD B. FARUN AL-YAMARI, a Malik jurist and historian, descendant of a family belonging to Uiyân, a village near Jaen in Spain, was born in Medina, where he died, heavily in debt, on the 10th Dhu l-Hijja 799 = 4th Sept. 1397, as the result of paralyzis of his left side.

In addition to his father, his teachers were his father’s brother, Abi Muhammad Sharaf al-Din al-Ashawi, Djamal al-Din al-Damankari Muhammad b. ‘Arafa, and the latter’s son, whose teaching Ibn Farhan received on his pilgrimage in 792 = 1390, and others. He often visited Cairo and in 792 (1390) Jerusalem and Damascus. In Rabia II, 793 = March 1391 he became kadi of Medina. As a devout Muslim he frequently recited the Kur’an and often repeated the Kur’anic prayers (wird); he also reintroduced the Malikite rite, into Medina. He is the author of the following works: 1. Tahrijat al-Hakikam fi Usul Manhadij al-Akhom, a treatise on legal practice according to the Malik school (pr. Cairo 1301, 1302; Bukh 1300); 2. al-Dhahabi al-mudhakkab fi Mur’ifat Ayin ‘Ulaman al-Mudhakkab, a collection of about 330 biographies of Malik jurists compiled from about 20 works detailed at the end and finished in Shaban 761 = June 1360 (according to Codera, in 857 = 1453 the text was revised cf. also Houtsma, Catal. d’ une Coll. de manusc. etc., Leiden 1889, No. 204; pr. Fas 1316, Cairo 1329). This work is often quoted as Tahrijat ‘Ulaman al-Arab oder Tuhkira al-Dhahabiya; 3. Durar (var. Nukhbat) al-Gharawi al-Mudhakarat al-Khawajat, a collection of riddles on various points of Malik law (Khed. Libr., Fikhr., ill. 187); 4. Tahsil al-mumimmût fi Sharh Dzammi’ al-Ummahat, a commentary on the legal handbook of Ibn al-Hajjib (Brit. Mus., Cat., No. 872, ix.).

Bibliography: Ahmad Babi, Naf al-Tabaqat (Paris 1317) p. 5; do., Nafayat al-Mubadda (Ms. of the Madrasa in Algier), P. 33 v; Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber, p. 191, No. 448; Pons Boigues, Ensayos et biobibliograficos, p. 348, No. 208; Fagian, Les Tabaqat malikites en Homajje a D. Fr. Co- dera, p. 110; Brockelmann, Gesch. der arab. Lit., ii. 175 sq. 263; R. Bassett, Recherches
Alfalah belonged to the district of al-Nahrawan and was first of all secretary of State in Baghdad. After the unsuccessful attempt to place Ibn al-Mu'tazz [q. v.] on the throne, 'Ali was appointed vizier in Rab'ii I 296 (December 908) by the Caliph al-Mu'tadid and became the real ruler. In Dhu l-Hijjah 299 (July 912) he was dismissed on the pretext that he had arranged a raid on the capital with the rapacious Bedouins. To make his former favourite harmless, the Caliph had him imprisoned and confiscated his vast wealth. He managed to 'regain' the caliph's confidence however and was set free in Dhu l-Hijjah 304 (June 917) and restored to office. The wars and extravagances of the vizier brought the finances of the State into disorder and this brought about his fall. In Djamadi I 306 (November 918) he was dismissed for a second time, imprisoned and had all his property confiscated. He succeeded in being pardoned again through the influence of his son al-Mu'azzin and in Rab'ii II 311 (August 923) the Caliph made him vizier for the third time. His avareous and revengeful nature made him so hated however that al-Muktadir had finally to get rid of him. In Rab'ii I 312 (June 924) 'Ali and al-Mu'azzin were beheaded on 13th Rab'ii II of the same year (July 924).


2. Abu 'Abd Allah (or Abu l-Khattab) al-Far, brother of the preceding. After 'Ali b. al-Furat had been appointed vizier in 296 (908), he entrusted his brother with the administration of the finances of the eastern and western provinces. According to the usual date Djaftar died as early as Shawwal 297 (June-July 910). His office was then divided between the vizier's two sons, al-Fadl and al-Muhammad, so that the former administered the eastern and the latter the western provinces.


3. Abu al-Farî al-Fadl b. Djaftar b. Muhammad, son of the preceding, born in Sha'ban 279 (November 892), also called Ibn Hinzaib after his mother Hinzaib, a Greek slave. In 320 (932) he was appointed vizier by al-Muktadir, but absolute anarchy was then reigning in the capital and, as the new vizier was not able to cope with the situation, he had to call in the aid of Mu'nis, the commander of the body guard. When the latter advanced in the town, the Caliph was persuaded to go out against him. Al-Muktadir's troops were defeated and he himself slain. Al-Fadl thus lost his office. He was appointed collector of taxes for Egypt and Syria under the caliphate of al-Fadl; the actual ruler however was not the Caliph but the Amir al-Umara Muhammad b. Râ'îk. In 324 (936) or 325 (937) the latter induced the Caliph to make al-Fadl vizier; but he was weak

IBN FÄHRÄT. — IBN AL-FURÄT. 377


IBN AL-FÄRÄT. [See 'OMAR b. al-FÄRÄT.]

IBN FÄRÄS, Abu l-'HSAIN AßMÄD b. FÄRÄS b. ZAKARIA b. MUHAMMÄD b. HÄBÄR, philologist and grammarian of the school of Kûfâ, died at al-Raiy in Safar 395 = Nov.-Dec. 1004. The date and place of his birth are unknown but it is supposed that he was born in a village named Kursûf in the district of al-Zahrâ. He studied at Kairawân, Hamadân, Bagdad, and on the occasion of his pilgrimage, in Mecca. Among his teachers he may specially mention his father, who was a philologist and Shâfîj jurist. Abû Bakr Aßmad b. al-Hasan al-Khätib, Abu l-Hasan 'Ali b. Ibrahim al-Kaṭânan, Abu 'Abd Allâh Aßmad b. Tâhir al-Munadjamî, etc.

After teaching for some time in Hamadân, where the celebrated Bâdi' al-Zâmân al-Hamadhâni was his pupil, the Bâyiûd Fâkhr al-Dawla summoned him to al-Raiy as tutor to his son Maqûd al-Dawla Abu Tâlib. Originally an adherent of the Shâfî's school, he afterwards went over to the Mâlikî. He was so generous that he frequently gave his students what was wearing to the poor and hungry.

The Shâhîj Ibn 'Abbâd, who out of modesty called himself his pupil, declared that the works of Ibn Fâris were free from error. Although he himself was of Persian origin, Ibn Fâris defended the Arab grammarians in their controversies with the Shû'ûbîs.


Bibliography: Ibn Khallikân, Wafâyât (Cairo 1310), i. 35; al-Suyûtî, Tabaqât al-Mutassîrin, p. 4, No. 6; ibn, Bûchâyot al-Wâsît (Cairo 1236), p. 153; al-Anbârî, Nuhât al-Alîkhâb (Cairo 1294), p. 392; Ibn Farhun, al-Dibajj (Fâs 1316), p. 49; al-Thâlibi, Yāmiyat al-Dahr (Damasus 1304), iii. 214; Yûsûf, Irshâd al-Arib, ii. 6 sqq.; biography of Ibn Fâris at the beginning of the edition of his work al-Sâhîjî fi Fûshâ al-Lughâa etc., see above; Flügel, Die grammatischen Schulen der Araber, p. 247; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. Arab. Litt., i. 130; Huart, Arab. Lit., London 1903, p. 159 sqq.

(Moh. Ben Cheneb.)

IBN AL-FÄRÄT, the name of several persons who filled high offices of state.

and not fitted for such a post and by the next year we find him begging permission from Ibn Ra'āk to retire to Syria to attend to the revenues of that province and of Egypt. Ibn Muṣṭa succeeded him as vizier. Al-Fāḍil died in 527 (939).


4. Abū l-Fāḍil Dja'far B. Al-Fāḍil B. Dja'far B. Muḥammad, son of the preceding, died in Dhu l-Ḥijjah 308 (April 921). Dja'far, who was also called Ibn Ḥiṣnāba, held the office of vizier to the Ikshidids in Egypt. The real ruler however was the Abyssinian Kāfār, under whose protection Dja'far held office and who was soon recognised in name also as king. On Kāfār's death in 507 (926) the minor Ṣaḥib b. 'Abd Allāh b. Ṭuḥdī, the commander of the Syrian troops. In 358 (969) the latter appeared in Egypt, arrested Dja'far and appointed the Ṣaḥib b. Ḍābir al-Naṣībī vizier. Dja'far was soon released and when Ḥasan returned to Syria, he restored the government of Egypt to his hands. In the same year however the Ikshidids were overthrown. Dja'far died in Ṣafar or in Rabi' I 391 (January 1001) or, according to another authority, in Ṣafar 392 (Jan. 1002).


(K. V. Zettersten).

**IBN AL-FURĀT, NṢIR AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD B. ʿΑBB AD-ḤAṢIH ARAB HISTORIAN, b. 735 (1334), d. 807 (1405), author of a comprehensive chronicle, Taʾrīkh al-Dawla wa l-Mulūk. He began with the viiith century and worked backwards but only reached the fourth century A.D. He gave extracts from his predecessors verbatim which adds a high value to his work. The only manuscript (Vienna, cf. Flügel, Die arab. . . . Hist., N. 824) is still unedited, although it has been used by several scholars.

**Bibliography:** See Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., ii. 50 and Nachträge.

**IBN GHĀNIYA, ʿIZZ AL-DĪN ʿΑΒΒ AD-ṢALĀM B. MUḤAMMAD AL-MAKDIṢĪ, author of the well-known Kāfīf al-Aṭrār an Ḥikam al-Taʾyīr wa l-Azhār, which was published in 1821 by Garcin de Tassy under the title Les oiseaux et les fleurs (repr. in Allégories, récits politiques, etc., 1876); German transl. by Peiper, Stimmen aus dem Morgenlande, Hirschberg 1850. Other works are detailed by Brockelmann, Geschichte etc., i. 450 (cf. ii. 793). Biographical details are lacking. The year 678 (1279) is given as the year of his death.

The same name Ibn Ghanim al-Makdisi is also given to a Ḥanāfi jurist on whom cf. Brockelmann, op. cit., ii. 312.

**IBN GHĀNIYA, YAJĪV B. ʿΑLI B. YūsUF AL-MASūF, GOVERNOR OF SPAIN UNDER THE ALMORAVIDS, born in Cordova, according to Ibn al-Khaṭīb, and died in 548 (1153) at Granada. He is best known as Ibn Ghāniya, after his mother, a relative of the great Yūsuf b. ʿΑbād b. Ṭuḥdī, the real founder of the Almoravid empire.

Ibn Ghāniya, as well as his brother Muḥammad grew up at the Almoravid court of Marrakush, where their father seems to have held a high position. In 520 (1126) 'Ali b. Yūsuf appointed Ibn Ghāniya governor of Western Spain. From 520-538 (1126-1143) he successfully warded off the attacks of the Christians and completely defeated the army of Alfonso the Fighter, King of Aragon in 528 (1133-1134) at Fraga. Beginning about 538 (1143) however, the revolutionary movement of the Andalusian Muslims (Agarones) against the Almoravid empire, led by chiefs like Abū l-Kāsim Almad (Abencasí), the Kāfī Ibn Ḥamdīn of Cordova, Abū l-Ḥakem b. Ḥassan of Māgra, Al-Mustanṣir (Zafarola) of Saragossa and many others so shattered Almoravid dominion in Spain that it soon fell to pieces.

The governor Ibn Ghāniya, who lived in Seville, performed prodigies of valour and showed great qualities in organising the resistance. He recaptured Cordova in 539 (Jan. 1146) from Ibn Ḥamdīn, who then obtained the support of Alfonso VII of Castile. Ibn Ghāniya had to retire before the latter's army to the citadel of Cordova in 540 (1146). The arrival in Spain of the first Almohad armies forced Alfonso VII to abandon Cordova to Ibn Ghāniya, who however became his vassal. In face of Alfonso VII's increasing demands, Ibn Ghāniya allied himself with the Almohad general Barra, governor of Seville, with whom he exchanged Cordova and Carmona for Jaén in 543 = 1148.

The successes of the Almohads were rapid and soon Grenada alone remained to the Almoravids, while Ibn Mardanīsh [q. v.], an independent lord, was master of Murcia, Valencia and the whole of Eastern Spain.

One of Ibn Ghāniya's last acts of loyalty to the Almoravid empire was to send to Ceuta the governor al-Ṣabrāwī at the Kāfī Ṭuḥdī's request in 543 (1148). He died soon afterwards in Granada on the 10th Shabwān 543 (December 1148), when the ruin of the Almoravids had been completed in Spain.

Ibn Ghāniya seems to have left no children. If we may believe Ibn al-Khaṭīb in the Ḥiṣnāba, he early sent away his wife, lest her company might diminish his warlike ardour. His brother Muḥammad, appointed governor of the Balearic Islands [q. v., i. 617b] in 520 A.H., left sons, who with their descendants maintained Almoravid rule there till 580 (1188). It was the grandsons of Muḥammad who attempted an Almoravid restoration in Barbary, where they fought till 633 (1235-1236) against the Almohads.

**Bibliography:** See the references in F. Codera, Decadencia y desaparición de los Almoravides en España, Saragossa, 1899; A. Bel, Les Derniers Ghâniya, derniers représentants de l'empire almoravide, et leur lutte contre l'empire almohade, Paris, 1905. (Alfred Bel.)
IBN ḤADJAR AL-ḤĀṬIMI, whose full name was ḤĀDIM B. MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD B. ṬĀLI ḤADJAR, ŚIḤĀB B. ABD B. ṬĀLI ḤADJAR, Abū l-ṬĀLI ḤADJAR, AL-ḤĀṬIMI AL-ṢĀDI (after the Fāṭimah b. Abī l-Ṭābil, where his family was originally settled), a famous Arab jurist of the Shāfi’ī school, was born at Maḥālāt Abī l-Ḥayāt in al-Gharābiyya [q. v.] towards the end of the year (some say Radjab) 909 (1504). While still a child, he lost his father, the latter’s šaiḫs Ṣhams al-Dīn Ibn Abī l-Ḥamādī (died 932), a noted mystic, and Ṣhams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ṣanāwī, a pupil of the latter, undertook his maintenance and education. Al-Ṣanāwī placed him in the Ṣaḵām of Sayyid Ahmad al-Badawī; on the completion of his elementary education he went up to the Kubbah al-Mahmūdiyya.

Ibn Ḥadjar, who was also esteemed as a writer both of prose and poetry, displayed a considerable literary activity; his works, several of which are very important for the study of Islam, were much sought after even in his lifetime, notably his commentary, Faḥī al-Bārī fi Sharḥ al-Bukhāri (Būlāk 1300-1), which was sold for 300 dinars. Of his writings, the number of which is estimated at over 500, we may here mention: al-Biḥārī fi Taʿmir al-Shābā (ed. Spranger etc., Caire 1856-73, and Cairo 1323-5); Taḥdīh al-Tahdīh (ed. Hādār al-Bāb 1325-27); Taḏbīr al-Mansūra bi-Zawājil al-Riyādi al-Amīriyya (Ibad 1824); al-Kawwāl al-musaddad fī l-Dābb an al-Muqaddam li l-Imām Ṣalmān (Ibad 1824); Būlāk al-Mārūm min Adillat al-Ahkām fī l-Imām al-Ḥadīṯ (Cairo 1330); Nuḥkhat al-Fikr fi Muṣnafā Abī l-Ṭābil al-Maṣūm fī l-Maṣūmāt al-Ṣawā'id (ed. Lees etc., Bihl. Ind., New Ser., No. 37, Calcutta 1862); al-Durūr al-kāminā fī Ayyūn al-Muṣtaqa; Ināb al-Qawām bi-Ahkām al-Umm; Ṣafī al-Aʿrār al-Kawākib (printed together Būlāk 1301); Ghiyāsh al-Nāṣirī fi Tādzhimat al-Šāfiʿī Abī l-Kadr, ed. E. D. Ross, Calcutta 1903. — Further information on these works is given in Brockelmann, op. cit., where other writings are mentioned; cf. also Landberg, Cat. de MSS., arāz, etc. No. 31, 32, 53, 67, 88, 98, 106, 228, 279, 319; Houtsma, Cat. d’ une Coll., No. 763, 764 (?), 783 II, 1026 (?); Vollers, Die islam. . . . Hes. (Leipzig), s. Ind., and the list in the Tarjuma of the Tahdīḥ.

Ibn Ḥadjar died towards the end of Dhu l-Ḥidād 582 (Feb. 1449). His pupil al-Sahhāwī wrote the full biography of him entitled al-Dīnawārī wa l-Durūr fi Tādzhimat al-Šāfix al-Islām Ibn Ḥadjar.
IBN AL-ḤADĪJIB, DIJAMI AL-DIN ABU 'AMR 'OTMÂN B. 'OMAR B. ĀBI BAKR B. 'UNUS, an ARAB GRAMMARIAN, son of a Kurdish chamberlain of the Emir 'Izz al-Din Mīsāk al-Ṣālīḥī, born in the village of Panā in Upper Egypt in the closing days of the year 572/1175, studied the Kur'ān and the sciences connected with it, Mālikī law and its sources, grammar, and belles lettres, in Cairo. His chief teachers were the Imām al-Ṣālīḥī, the jurist Ābi Mānsūr al-Ābyārī, etc., He made a journey to Damascus and after spending a long time there teaching publicly in the Mālikī zāwiya of the great Umayyad mosque he went to Cairo and afterwards moved to Alexandria, where he died on the 26th Shavwāl 646 = 11 Febr. 1249.

Although he also wrote works on law and prosody, it is as a grammarian that he is especially celebrated and in this field he differs in many points from his predecessors. As a jurist he was the first to expound the doctrines of the Mālikīs of Egypt with those of the Maghribī Mālikīs. We owe to him the following works, of which those in prose are so clear in their style that they require no commentary: 1. al-Ḳhāfiyya, a short manual of Arabic syntax (nahu); Rome 1591; Cawnpore 1888, 1891; Kazan 1889; Taghkent 1311, 1312; Constantine 1305; Cairo repeatedly; commentary Constantine 1319; 2. al-Ṣhāfiyya, short treatise on Arabic accent (garf); pr. 1805; Constantine 1850; Cawnpore 1885; extracts publ. with notes by F. Buhl, Sprogingt and historisches Bidrag til den arab. Gramm. med ude. Tekst-stykken af Ibn al-Ḳhāfiyya (Schröder); 3. al-Muṣannāf al-dajjali fi Ibn al-Ḳhāfiyy, a didactic poem in the Ṣafī metre on prosody (Leiden, Cat. 2, No. 273; Berlin, Verz., No. 7126; Bodl., Cat. I, MSS. Hebr., No. 36, ii., MSS. Arab., No. 1267, ii.; publ. with transl. by Freytag in his Dorstell, der arab. Verskunst, Bonn 1830, p. 334—371); 4. al-ʿAmāli, discourses on the Kurʾān, on al-Mutanabbi etc. (Berlin, No. 6613; Wien, Flügel, Die arab. . . . Hss., No. 386; Paris, Bibl. Nat., No. 4392, ii.—iii.; Khl. Libr., Führ., iv. 24); 5. al-Ḳāṣīda al-muṭawakkala bi ʾl-ʾAsmaʾ al-muʾammala, on the feminine nouns of masculine form, publ. by Hafner.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khalilīkān, *Wafayāt* (Cairo 1310), i. 314; al-Suyūṭī, *Ḥasan al-Muhādara* (Cairo 1321), i. 125; do., *Baghīyat al-Wiṣāṭ* (Cairo 326), p. 323; Ibn Farḥān, al-Dīwān (Pās 1316), p. 372; Ibn Khaldūn, *Proleg. (transl. de Slane,* iii. 20 sq.; Bahū, op. cit., p. 27–29; Brockelmann, *Gesch. d. arab. Lit.*, i. 303–6, cf. 525, ii. 697; Huart, *Arab. Lit.*, p. 172; Moh. Ben Cheneka, *Étude sur les perso- nages du 'Arab al-Qādir al-Fāṣi* (Paris 1907), N° 191; Morand, *Le droit musulman algérien (rite mâlikite)*, Les origi- nes (Algier 1913), p. 9 sq. (MOIL BEN CHENECHE) **IBN AL-HATHIM**, whose full name was Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan (or al-Husain) b. al-Hathim, in mediaeval European sources usually called ALHazen, was one of the most important mathematicians and physicists of the Arabs, learned also in medicine and the other sciences of the ancients notably in the philosophy of Aristotle. He was born about the year 354 (965) in Basra, wherefore he is sometimes called Abū ʿAlī al-Basri, moved when fairly old to Egypt, where he was for some years in the service of the Fatimid al-Ḥākim, to whom he had offered to regulate the course of the Nile, but soon had to give up this undertaking; on al-Ḥākim’s death he earned his living by copying mathematical and other books. He died in Cairo towards the end of the year 430 = 1039 or soon after as the authorities note. — Ibn Abī Uṣūbī’s quotes about 200 mathematical, astronomical, physical, philosophical, and medical works and treatises by Ibn al-Hathim, for which we may refer the reader to the sources quoted below, particularly (besides Ibn Abī Uṣūbī) F. Woepcke and E. Wiedemann. His chief work on physics is his *Optics, Kitāb al-Manāṣir*, published in a Latin translation in 1572 in Basle by F. Ritsner, together with his treatise on twilight, entitled *Opticae theaurus* Alhazen Arabis libri septem nunc primum editi, Einodem liber de crepusculis et nubium ascensionibus, etc., a Fred. Ritsner. The latter treatise was translated into Latin by Gerhard of Cremona; this is probably true also of the *Optics* but not certain. The *Optics* of Ibn al-Hathim had a great influence in the middle ages on the study of optics in Europe from Roger Bacon to Kepler. There still survives also a large Arabic commentary on the *Optics* by Kamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan al-Fārisi (died c. 1320); on this and Ibn al-Hathim’s *Optics* cf. the works of E. Wiedemann mentioned below.


**IBN HĀYĀN** b. KHALAF, ABU MARWAN HAYĀN AL-KURTURI, usually called after his grandfather Ibn Hāyān, one of the earliest and best historians of Muslim Spain. Almost nothing is known of his biography except the year of his birth 377 (987–988) and his death 469 (1076). He was a very prolific writer; the list of his works contains no less than 50 titles, which include poems and theological treatises. His history al-Matin is said to have comprised less than 60 volumes, but of all his writings only the historical work entitled al-Muḥādab fi Taʾrīkh Andalus has survived; there is one volume in Oxford (Cod. Bodl. in Nicol, ii. n° 137) and a second at Constantine; there are transcriptions of both in Madrid.

**Bibliography:** The bibliography on Ibn Hāyān is given in Pons Boigues, *Ensayo bibl.*, p. 152 sqq. Cf. also Brockelmann, *Geschichte etc.* i. 338.

**IBN ḤAMDĪS,** ABU MUḤAMMAD ʿABD AL-MUḤAMMAD AD-DABBĀR B. ABU BAKR, an Arab poet, born about 447 (1055) in Syracuse in Sicily and distinguished at an early age as a poet. When the Normans captured Sicily in 471 (1078) he retired to Spain and spent some time at the court of the ʿAbbdīd al-Muṭamīd [q. v.] in Seville. He followed the
latter in his imprisonment in 484 (1091) and lived at al-Mahdiya after his death (485–1095). He spent the last years of his life at Bougie where he died in 527 (1132); according to other accounts, he died on the island of Majorca. He left a Divān of which Amari has published specimens. Cf. C. C. Moncada, El Divan del poeta `Abi Muham- mad b. Abī Luft, in the siculo-sicilian publica- tions, Palermo 1883, and El Cancionero de Ibn Hamdūn, pub. by C. Schiaparelli, Roma 1897. According to Ḥadījī Khāla, ii. 196, he also wrote a history of Algæricas.

Bibliography: Amari, Biblioteca Aralo- Sicula, s. Index; Pons Boigues, Ensayo Bio-bibliográfico, p. 156 sqq.; Brockelmann, Geschichte etc., i. 269 sq.

IBN ḤAMDŪN, BAHĀʾ AL-DĪN ABU Ṭ-MAʿĀLĪ MUḤAMMAD B. AL-ḤASAN, an A RAB PHILOLOGIST, born in 495 (1010) at Baghdād. He held several offices at the court of the Caliph, so that he received the title Kāfī ′-Kufī. But his frankness aroused the enmity of the Caliph al-Mustanjidī who threw him into prison in 562 (1167). Soon afterwards he died in prison. He was the author of a large anthology of philological and historical matter entitled al-Tashkīrī. Cf. Améroz, Tales of official life from the Ṭashkīrī of Ibn Hamdūn, etc. in Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 1908, p. 409 sqq. Bibliography: Brockelmann, Geschichte etc., i. 280 sq. (with further references).

IBN ḤAMMĀD, ABU ʿABBĀS ʿALĪ MUḤAMMAD B. ʿALĪ, an Arab historian, author of a history of the Fāṭimidīs. Neither the date of his birth nor death is known; we only know that he flourished after the rise of the Almahad dynasty and before Ibn Khaldūn, who quotes a passage from him about the Banū Khāzrūn of Tripolis (Kīṭāb al-Dawr, vii. 43). The text is still unpublished in a manuscript of the Bibl. Nat. of Paris (n°. 1888) and in another of the Bibl. Nat. of Algiers (n°. 1958, imperfect). Two fragments, one on ʿUbayd Allāh and one on ʿAbī Yaḥyā al-Muṣliḥ that were translated by Cherbonneau (Journ. Asiat., 1862, ii. 470 sqq.; 1869, i. 199 sq.)

(Perne Basset.)

IBN HĀNĪ, ABU ʿL-ḴĀSIM (also ABU ʿL-ḤASAN) MUḤAMMAD B. HĀNĪ B. MUḤAMMAD B. ʿABBAS AL-ʿADĪ, usually called IBN HĀNĪ AL-ANDALUSI to distinguish him from Ibn Hānī al-Hakamī [see ABU NUWAYŚ], an Arab poet of Spain. His father Hānī was a native of a village near al-Mahdiya in Tunisia, who had moved to Elvira in Spain and, according to others, to Cordova. Ibn Hānī was born in one of these two towns. He studied in Cordova and then proceeded to Elvira and Seville. In the latter city his frivolous way of living and too free speech brought upon him the wrath of the people who accused him of agreeing with the Greek philosophers and of heresy, so that he was finally banished from Seville at the age of 27 by his patron, who was afraid of being accused of agreeing with him. He then went to Africa to Ḥaḍāwar, a Freeman and general of the Fāṭimid al-Mansūr. When he received only 200 dinārs from the latter for a kāṣida addressed to him, he went to al-Masla (Msla) in Algiers where his compatriots Ḥaḍār b. ʿAbbās al-Falāḥ b. Abī Marwān and Yaḥyā b. ʿAlī b. Ḥamdūn al-Andalusi were ruling. Treated with great respect by them he composed some notable poems in their honour. The Fāṭimid Caliph al-Munīz Abū Tanīm Maʿādd b. Ismāʿīl, son of al-Manṣūr, summoned the poet to him and attached him to his court, overwhelming him with tokens of esteem. When al-Munīz went to Egypt in 580 (972) to take up his residence in Cairo, Ibn Hānī left him and returned to the Maghrib to bring back his family, but was murdered in Barqa in Cyrenaica on his road on Wednesday 24 Ṣaḥāb 362 = 30th April 973 at the age of 56. Accounts of his mur- der differ. When al-Munīz in Egypt heard of the poet's death, he lamented: "He was a man whom we hoped to rival the poets of the East, but this was not granted to us."

In spite of the gross exaggerations in some of his panegyrics, which made him suspected of in- fidelity among the orthodox, Ibn Hānī enjoyed as great esteem among the Arabs of the West as his contemporary al-Mutanabbi did in the East. Abu ʿl-ʿAlī al-Muṣrī, who esteemed the latter highly used to say of Ibn Hānī: "he is like a mill, grinding corn, so little sense is there in his verse."

His Divān, arranged in alphabetical order, was published at Būlāk in 1274 and at Beyrouth in 1886, 1256. It contains panegyrics of al-Munīz, Ḥaḍār b. Ghaḻān, Abu ʿl-Ḥarārī Muḥammad b. ʿOmar al-Ṣaḥīḥī, Ḥaḍār b. ʿAlī b. Ghaḻān, Fāṭir and Ḥusain b. Muḥammad, Yaḥyā b. ʿAlī, Ibrahim b. Ḥaḍār b. Kātīb, satires against al-Munīz, two elegies, one on the mother of Ḥaḍār and Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā b. ʿAlī, the other on the son of Ibrahim b. Ḥaḍār b. ʿAlī and several impromptu pieces.


(Moh. Ben Cheneb.)

IBN ḤAWKĀL, ABU ʿL-KĀSIM (MUḤAMMAD), an Important Arab Traveler and Geographer. Very little is known of his life. He tells of himself that he left Baghdād in Ramaḍān 331 (May 943) with the intention of becoming ac- quainted with other lands and peoples, and making money by commerce. He travelled through the whole Muslim world from east to west, at the same time studying eagerly the works of his predecessors—Abū Ḥaḍār al-Mahdī, Ibn Khordādhbih and Ku- dāmah. According to Dozy, he was a spy in the service of the Fāṭimidīs. On his travels he met al-Ṭaṣkhrī [q. v.] probably about 340. At the latter's request he made improvements in some of this geographer's maps and revised his work. He afterwards however decided upon rewriting it and completed the new version under his own name with the title al-Maṣāḥif wa l-Manāmākit not be-

**IBN ḤAZM,** whose full name was ABD MUḤAMMAD ʿALI B. AHMED B. SAʿID B. II., a versatile Spanish Arab scholar, a notable theologian, historian and distinguished poet, born on the last day of Ramadān 304 (7th Nov. 994) at Cordova. His family belonged to the village of Manta Lishām (var. M-t-liṣām, according to the Irāhīd al-Arib, v. 88 infra, 49); farrāsh from Huelva (at the mouth of the Odéi) in the district of Niebla; his great-grandfather had been a convert from Christianity to Islam. His father, who had risen to the rank of a vizier of the major-domo al-Manṣūr and his son al-Muṣaffar, assumed a genealogy which he led back to a Persian client of Yazid b. Abī Suffār. As the son of his high official Ibn Ḥazm naturally received a good education; the atmosphere of the court in which he spent his youth did not prevent his active mind striving to develop in all directions. As his teacher in various branches of knowledge he mentions (Ṭawābk, p. 110, 118, 13 sqq.) ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Yaẓīd al-Azdī (left Spain during the civil war, see Ibn Bashkuwāl, n. 753). Before 400 he studied under Ahmad Ibn al-Djasur (died 401, Ibn Bashkuwāl, n. 37, cf. Ṭawābk, p. 136, 144, 9) and in the midst of the political turmoil we find him a student of Ḥadhīth in Cordova (Ṭawābk, p. 127, 16 sqq.).

The revolution which overthrew the ʿĀmirids (cf. Dozy, Hist. des Musulmans d'Espagne, i. 271 sqq.) considerably affected the position of father and son. Especially after Hishām II. was replaced on the throne (Dhu ʿl-Hijjāj 400 = July 1010), both had to suffer many mortifications. Ibn Ḥazm's father died towards the end of Dhu ʿl-Kaʿāda 402. In Muharram 404 he left Cordova, which had been sorely tried by the civil war; the beautiful palace of his family at Bālt Mughīth had been destroyed by the Berbers (Ṭawābk, p. 104, cf. 87 infra sqq.). He next chose Almeria for his home; there he seems to have been able to live in comparative quiet till ʿAll b. Ḥammūd in alliance with Khairān, ruler of Almeria, overthrew the Umayyad Sulaimān (Muḥarram 497). Khairān induced him to suspect him of intriguing in favour of the Umayyads, imprisoned him for some months with his friend Muḥammad b. Isḥāk and then banished them. The two friends went to Ḥīn al-Ḵṣāṣ, whose ruler treated them kindly. On learning that ʿAbd al-Raḥmān IV al-Murtadād had been appointed Caliph in Valencia, they left their host after a few months and travelled by sea to this town, where Ibn Ḥazm met other friends (Ṭawābk, p. 110 sqq.) in the army of al-Murtadād, whose vizier he was, he fought before Granada; he was captured by the enemy but was released after a while (Cat. Cod. Arab., i. 273).

After an absence of six years he returned in Shawwal 409 to Cordova, where al-Ḵāṣim b. Ḥammūd was now Caliph (Ṭawābk, p. 104, 22, cf. 112, 3). After the latter's expulsion, the intellec-

**tual ʿAbd al-Raḥmān V al-Mustāhir was chosen Caliph (Ramadān 414 = Dec. 1023); the latter chose his friend Ibn Ḥazm as vizier. They only enjoyed the new state of affairs for a brief period, for ʿAbd al-Raḥmān was murdered seven weeks later (Dhu ʿl-Kaʿāda 414 = Jan. 1024) and Ibn Ḥazm found himself once more within prison walls. How long he was confined cannot be definitely ascertained; it is certain however that he was living in Jātīva about 418 (1027). According to al-Djaṣayyīnī (in Yāḵtī), he filled the office of vizier again under Iḥṣān al-Muʿṭadd. Only scanty notices of his later life are available. But he kept clear of politics in order to devote himself entirely to sciences, authorship, and the propagation and defence of his doctrines.

One of his earliest works is that which was made known by Dozy (Ṭawābk al-Ḥamāma jī'ūl-Cifā wa 'l-Ullāf, ed. by D. K. Pétrot, Leiden 1914, cf. the review by Goldziher in Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gelehr., lxxx. 192 sqq.), which he wrote from Jātīva (p. 1, 3), about 418 (Ṭawābk, p. 79 sqq.), before the death of Khairān in 419; an attack of Abu ʿl-Djasir [so to be read] Madjāhid on Khai-

rān would suggest after their estrangement in Ramadān 412, or ʿAlī al-Aṭirī, ed. Tornberg, is. 195; a second terminus ad quod, p. 42, 7, Hakam b. Mundhir died about 420 according to Ibn Bashkuwāl no. 332). In this treatise on love and its different phases in which he illustrates his views on psychology by short stories from his own experiences and those of his contemporaries and by his own poems, Ibn Ḥazm shows himself a keen observer, a brilliant stylist and charming poet. He affords us not only a glimpse into his own character, but also throws an interesting light on a little known side of the life of his time. — Probably about the same time he wrote the treatise called Risāla fī Faḍl al-Andalus, dedicated to his friend Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Isḥāk (according to al-Djasur, n. 59), which is given in al-Maḵkārī, ed. Dozy etc., ii. 109, 11–112 (ed. Būkā, ii. 767, 8 sqq.). This Ri-

sāla, composed at the instigation of the lord of Kāfāt al-Bint (al-Maḵkārī, ii. 110, cf. Ibn al-Abbār, al-Tamīn, n. 432), gives an interesting survey of the most important early literature of the Spanish Muslims. — Of his historical works there still survive Nukat al-ʿArūs fī Tawāriḵ al-Khulāṣ (ed. with Spanish translation by C. F. Seybold in Revista del Centro de Estudios históricos de Granada y su Reino, i. 160 sqq., 233 sqq., Gran-

ada 1911) and the Djamhurat al-Anāb (Anāb al-ʿArab) written about 450 (cf. Codera, Misión histórica en la Argelia y Tierra, Madrid 1892, p. 24 sqq., 83) (Miss. Tunis, Masjīd al-Zailūnā, n. 5014, and copy of this Ms. in Madrid, Real Acad. de la Histor., Codera, o. c., p. 165; Paris, Bibli. Nat., Blochet, Cal. de la Col., . . , Schefer, n. 5829, containing the biography of Muḥammad, Berlin, Verz., n. 9510), a work highly esteemed and often quoted by Ibn Khaldūn (Iḫbar, ed. 1284, vi, 8, 89 sqq., 97, etc.), on the genealogy of the Arab and Berber families in Maghrib and Spain, which Codera used as a source for his articles on the Hamīmids, Taṣilibs (three articles also in his Estudios críticos de Historia árabe española, Zaragoza 1903, p. 301 sqq.), Umayyads in op. cit., p. 29 sqq., 41 sqq., cf. 147 sqq., 75 sqq., et passim. But it was particularly as a traditionist and
tractate Kitāb al-Mudāwāt al-Nafis (pp. Cairo n. d.), an exhortation to pious life, which holds up Muhammad's example as the moral ideal (cf. Goldschmied, Vorlesungen, p. 30). This tractate has been discussed and translated into Spanish by Miguel Asín (Les Caractères y la conducta. Tratado de moral práctica por Ibn Hazm de Córdoba, Madrid 1916).

A controversialist by nature, as he was (cf. Tawfik, p. 43, 8), Ibn Hazm challenged Jews, Christians, and Muslims of different schools. He was a doughty opponent: "whoever resisted him bounced off him as from a stone" (Ibn Haiyān). He overwhelmed with scorn and contempt men whom the majority of Muslims held in the highest reverence such as Al-Shafi'i, Abū Hānīfa, Mālik. According to a proverbial saying, Ibn Hazm's pen was like al-Haḍdadhājī's sword in sharpness. Yet he always endeavoured to do his opponents justice; it was against his nature to make intentionally baseless charges against them. In his ethical treatise he ascribes his vehemence to the influence of an illness. He only succeeded to a modest extent in gaining a hearing for his views. For a time he found a supporter in Ahmad b. Rashīd (al-Dabbī, Nūr, 400), Muḥammad b. Wāṣil's wali in Majorca, who was interested alike in theology and literature: Ibn Hazm found protection with him when Cordovan and other theologians deserted him as an opponent of the Mālikī school (Dozy, Notes, p. 190 sq.). Under this patronage he succeeded in winning adherents on the island in the 430's A.H. (cf. Ibn al-Abīr, al-Takmīla, N. 1467, N. 2027; Ibn Dāšiqūwāl, N. 903). He disputed before Ibn Rashīd (died soon after 440) with the celebrated theologian of the school of al-Wālid b. Sulaimān al-Najjī (died 438), who had returned from the East about 440. This same opponent summoned by a Majorcan fāqiḥ afterwards forced Ibn Hazm to leave the island (Ibn al-Abīr, o. c. N. 443; Codera, Estudios críticos etc., p. 264—9).

Ibn Hazm's charge of heresy against the great orthodox authorities brought upon him the wrath of the theologians, some of whom probably also envied him his learning. They warned his hearers against the errors of his doctrine and made him suspect by the princes, who soon no longer tolerated him in their lands. His strong sympathy (tāḥāyyūn, Ibn Haiyān) for the Cairenes was a further reason why he appeared dangerous. This constant baiting forced him to retire to his family estate in Mānta Līḥām. His writings were publicly burned in Seville; their author pilloried the foolishness of this proceeding in sarcastic epigrams. In his retirement he continued to study and write. According to a statement by his son Abū Rāfī' al-Fadl (died 479) as a learned author (Ibn Bashkuwāl, N. 994), Abū Usamah Yaḥyā ibn N. 1407) and Abū Sulaimān al-Muṣṭaf (Ibn al-Abīr, al-Takmīla, N. 1097) as transmitters of their father's learning.

Ibn Hazm's teachings were particularly attacked in writings after his death. When the Lāhūn b. al-Arābī (q. v.) returned from the east towards the turn of the fifth century (al-Dhahabī, Tadhkīrā, u. 99 sqq.), he found the heterogeneous wide-spread in the Maghrib. To confute it he wrote Kitāb al-Kasīsīn wa-l-'Awwāṣin, which al-Dhahabī, Tadhkīrā, iii. 325 sqq., quotes, and other treatises. About the same time Muḥammad b. Hādara (al-Dhahabī, o. c. iv. 52) and 'Abd Allāh b. Ṭāḥa (Ibn al-Abīr, o. c., N. 1330, al-Maṣkārī, i. 955, 3) came to his assistance. About a century later, the Mālikī theologians 'Abd al-Ḥaqq b. 'Abd Allāh (Ibn al-Abīr, o. c., N. 1817) and Ibn Zakān (ib., N. 967) came forward to refute him, the latter with a Kitāb al-Musallā directed against the Kitāb al-Muṣallā. On the other hand, a pupil of Ibn Zakān, Ibn al-Rumīya, the botanist, came forward as a fanatical adherent of Ibn Ḥām and the celebrated mystic Ibn 'Arabī (q. v.) transmitted his works and wrote a synopsis of the Kitāb al-Muṣallā, likewise entitled al-Musallā.


IBN ḤĪBBĀN, MUHAMMAD B. AHMAD AL-BUSTĪ, Arab author and authority on Tradition, born at Bust in Sidjistān, after extended travels in pursuit of knowledge, filled a judicial office in Samarqand, but was driven from it as a heretic, because he had defined the prophethood as a combination of 'Ilūn and Ahamal (cf. Goldschmied on Mūṣālik al-Nāsir, p. 57). After staying in Nāsīr and in 334 = 655 in Nīṣābūr, he settled in Samarqand as a teacher of Tradition and died there at the age of 80 on the 22nd Shawwal 354 = 21st October 965. His chief work is the collection on Tradition famous for its artificial arrangement entitled Kitāb al-Taqāsir wa-l-'Amalūl, see Fīhirāt al-Kutub al-maṣūfugā fi l-ʾAḥmadīyān al-Khadīr
IBN HİBBAN — IBN HİSHAM

IBN HİBBAN, ʿABD AL-MALİK B. HİSHAM B. AYBUH AL-HİMYAK B. AL-BASSİ, an Arab grammarian, born in Basra, died in Fustat in Egypt on the 13th Rabi’ II 218 = 8th May 834, according to other sources in 213 A. H., wrote, besides his version of Ibn Ishāq’s [q. v.] biography of the Prophet, a collection of biblical and South Arabian legends, entitled, Kitab al-Tifāṣ, s. Ahlwardt, Verzeichnis der arab. Handschr. zu Berlin, No. 9735; Rieu, Supplement to the Catalogue of Arab. Ms. in the Brit. Mus., No. 575-579; Tunis, No. 49534; Stambalxi, No. 661; al-Zayyiā, Khaḍ al-ʿAṣāb fi Dinarā, pp. 72, No. 12: Manuscript de la collection Landberg, No. 717.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khallikān, ed. Wustenfeld, No. 390 (ed. Cairo 1299, i. 365); al-Suyūṭī, Enghāyat al-Wūdār, p. 315; Wustenfeld, Geschichte der Araber, No. 48; M. Lidbarski, De prophetae quae dicuntur legem arabicis, Lipsiae 1893, p. 5 sqq.; in Zeitsschr. f. Assyriologie, viii. 271 sqq.

(C. Brockelmann.)

IBN HİSHAM, DIAMAL AL-DIN ABU MUHAMMAD ʿABD ALLAH B. YUSUФ B. AHMAD B. ʿABD ALLAH B. HİSHAM B. ANAṢIRI AL-MIŞRİ, was born in Dhu l-ʿAqāda 708 = April-May 1309 in Cairo, where he died in the night of Thursday-Friday, Dhu Ḥijjah 1194 = 18-September 1360. A pupil of the Spanish grammarian Abū Hāiṣam for the study of the Dīwān of Zuhair b. Abī Salīma, he also studied with Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Lājīfī b. al-Murāshīlī, al-Fākhrī, etc.

As a Shāfiʿī doctor, he became professor of Koranic exegesis at the Kubbat al-Mansūriyya in Cairo; but five years before his death he went over to the Ḥanbali school to obtain the post of professor at the Ḥanbali madrasa in Cairo and for this purpose learned by heart the Maḥṣūṣ of al-Khirākī in less than four months.

Ibn Khallūd sums up his history as: "Ibn Hīshām was profoundly learned in grammar and possessed perfect knowledge of it. He followed in the path of those of the grammarians of Māṣūl who accepted Ibn Djinni’s views and followed this scholar’s method of teaching. The knowledge displayed by Ibn Hīshām is truly remarkable and shows that he had a perfect mastery of his subject and that he was very clever."

Ibn Hīshām has left the following works:

1. Kitab al-Nāda wa-Ball al-Sada, a short treatise on syntax, several times published; 20. Commentary on the preceding, publ. at Tunis in 1281, Būlāk 1253, 1282, Cairo 1274, transl. into French by Goguier, La plume de rois, énumération de la soif, Leyden 1887; 3. Shihāb al-Dīhābī fi Māraṣīs Kālām al-Arab, a short treatise on grammar, less extensive than the preceding; 4. Commentary on the preceding, publ. at Būlāk in 1282, Cairo 1253, 1305; 5. al-Fīrād an Ḥuwādī, a critical edition of the Metamorphoses, published with a detailed exposition of the particles and the rules for the construction of sentences publ. at Constantinople in 1298, publ. and transl. into French by de Sacy in his Anthologie grammaticale, Paris 1829, pp. 79-92 et 155-223 of the transl.; 6. Muḥāfiz al-Kātib al-ʿAṣārīb (the author had written another at Mecca in 749 = 1348) which was lost on his return to Egypt and on his second sojourn in Mecca in 756 = 1353 he wrote this one), a complete treatise on syntax divided into two parts or eight chapters containing a detailed exposition of the particles and the rules for the construction of sentences publ. at Cairo 1305, 1307; 7. Muḥāfiz al-Dīkhān wa-Mūṣīf al-Wāṣanī, the solution of several difficult points in grammar, Paris Bibl. Nat., No. 4115, ii. 4162, 1; Berlin, Ver.,
expedition against the Byzantines in Armenia in 102 (720-721) he was appointed governor of al-Iraq and Khorasan by Yazid II. In the latter, the conflict between the northern and southern Arabs, on account of his lineage he always took the side of the former, while the latter were in consequence neglected. In Shawwal 105 (March 724), soon after the accession of the Caliph Hisham b. 'Abd al-Malik, Ibn Hubaiz was dismissed and Khâlid b. 'Abd Allah al-Kâsri appointed his successor. According to another statement, this did not happen till the following year. His son Yazid is also called Ibn Hubaiz.


IBN HUBAIRA, I. ABU 'L-MU'THYANX OMAR b. HUBAIRA AL-FAZARI, governor of the 'Irâk. Ibn Hubaiz was a native of Kinnarîn and is mentioned in the reign of Sulaimân b. 'Abd al-Malik as one of the leaders in the war against the Byzantines. In the summer 96-97 (715) the fleet was equipped and in the autumn he attacked Byzantine territory with it, while Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik conducted the operations on land. Ibn Hubaiz spent the winter in Asia Minor and the following summer hostilities were resumed. At the end of 97 (August 716) the Arabs began to besiege Constantinople; after the siege had lasted for a year, they had to abandon it and return home. In 100 (718-719) 'Omar II granted him the governorship of Mesopotamia. After a successful
IBN HUBAIRA — IBN ISHĀK.

681, 688, 690, 699 sg.; ii. 11 sg.; Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich, S. 221, 237, 245 sg., 336 sg., 343.

K. V. ZEITERTSEEN.

IBN HUBAIRA, the name of two viziers:
1. 'Awn al-Din Abu 'l-Mu'azzam Yahya b. Muhammad b. Hubaira al-Sa'idani, born in 490 (1096-1097) or, according to another statement, in 497 (1103-1104). He was a native of Dür Bani Amr, a place a few parangsh from Baghdad, and studied in the latter city. After filling several official positions he was installed in 542 (1147-1148) as chief of the Divan al-Zimmi and in Rabih II 544 (August 1149) the Caliph al-Mu'�rafati appointed him vizier. After the death of the Saljuk Sultan Mas'ud b. Muhammad in Radjab 547 (Oct. 1152) the governor of Baghdad, Mas'ud b. Bilall, seized the town of the Hill, but was soon defeated by Ibn Hubaira and had to flee to Takrit, whereupon not only al-Hill, but also Kufr and Wasiit fell into the vizier's hands. When Sultan Muhammad b. Majmud sent an army against Wasiit, the Caliph himself hurried to his vizier's assistance and the Sultan's troops had to retire. In 548 (1153-1154) al-Mu'�rafati besieged Takrit but had to abandon the enterprise. In the following year the Caliph and then the vizier made a renewed attempt to take the town but without success. Nevertheless, Mas'ud b. Bilall was twice defeated in the open field, by the Caliph near Barak'ah and by Ibn Hubaira near Wasiit. After this victory the latter received the honorary title of 'Sultan of the 'Irāq'. When al-Mu'�rafati in the year 555 (1160) died and al-Mustanjid succeeded him, Ibn Hubaira was confirmed in his office. He died on the 13th Djamada I 560 (28th March 1165). He was also celebrated as a scholar.

2. 'Izz al-Din Muhammad b. Yahya, son of the preceding. The latter filled the vizierate after his father's death but was soon thrown into prison and disappeared from history.


K. V. ZEITERTSEEN.

IBN HUBAL, MUHAMMAD AL-DIN ABU 'L-HASAN 'Ali b. Ahmad, a physician, born in Baghdad 515 (1122). Studied grammar and fiqh at the Nijamia but later turned to medicine. He became court physician to the Shahi Arman at Khiit but there amassed great riches; he next entered the service of Badr al-Din I'a'l at Mardin and finally went to Mawsil. When he was 75 years old, he unfortunately became blind but lived till 610 (1213). His chief work is entitled al-Mu'�rafat al-Tibb bi-d-Tibb, from which de Koning has published two chapters in Traité sur le calcul dans l'art, and dans la tessier, p. 186 sqg. Ibn Hubal, who was also a poet, left a son, Shams al-Din Abu 'l-Abbās Ahmad, who was likewise a physician and practiced in Asia Minor at the court at the Saljuk Kaikāwus [q. v.], where he died.


IBN 'IDHARI (IBN 'A'MARI), Abu 'Abbās MUHAMMAD AL-MARAKUSI, an Arab historian of the Maghrib and Spain, about whom we have no information further than that he flourished about the end of the viiiith (xiiith) century, with which his chronicle concludes. The latter is of special interest as it contains portions of lost works. It is called al-Rayún al-mu'�qawib fil Akhdar al-Maghrib and is not preserved in its entirety. Ibn 'Idhari also wrote a history of the East, which we only know by name. Dozy published the text of al-Rayún al-mu'�qawib: Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne (Leyden 1848-1851, 2 vols.); a fragment is given in the Cistomania arabo-espanola of Simonet and Lorchundi (Granada, 1887), No. ixi. The entire work is translated by Faguan, Algiers 1901-1914, 2 vols.; a fragment on the invasion of the Normans by Dozy, Recherches, 2nd ed., ii. 288-289. Cf. also Dozy, Corrections sur le texte du Bayana 'l-Mugrib, Leyden 1883, p. 1-91.

Bibliography: Dozy, Preface to his edition, i. 77-107; Wustenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber, No. 373, p. 151; Pons Boigues, Ensayo de bibliografia, p. 414 sq.

K. V. ZEITERTSEEN.

IBN ISFANDIYAR, MUHAMMAD B. AL-HASAN, a Persian historian, of whom we only know what little he tells us in the beginning of his chronic of his native land of Tabaristan, returned in 606 (1210) from Baghdad to 'Iraq 'Adami after hearing of the murder of his patron Rustam b. Ardashir, governor of Tabaristan. In deep grief he spent two months in Rayy collecting material for his work and studying in the libraries. He then spent five years in the town of Khwarizm, where he found by accident in a bookseller's shop certain new documents, including the letter of Tamsar, Ardashir Bahākans minister, to Djasma, king of Tabaristan (Journ. Asiat. 9th Ser., Vol. iii., 1804, p. 185 and 502). His chronicle begins with this letter, then follows after a brief description of his native land and its remarkable features, the history of Tabaristan under the dynasties of Washmgir and Buwaiith [B. Buyin], under the sway of the Ghaznavids and Saljuqids and under the second native Bawendi dynasty, with which the work closes. An abridged English translation by E. Browne appeared in 1905 in the Gibb Memorial Series, Vol. ii.


CL. HUAET.

IBN ISHĀK, 'Abbās MUHAMMAD b. Kais, an Arab author and authority on Tradition, was the grandson of Vardir, who was captured in the year 12 = 653 in the church at 'Ain al-Tamr in the 'Irak and brought to Medina, where he became a client of the tribe of 'Abbās Allah b. Kais. Muhammad also grew up there; he devoted his attention to the collection of stories and legends of the life of the Prophet and thus soon
came into conflict with the representatives of religious and legal tradition which dominated public opinion in the town, notably with Mālik b. Anas who decried him as being a Shi'i and as being the inventor of many legends and poems transmitted by him. He therefore left his native land and went first of all to Egypt and then to the ʿIrāq. The Caliph al-Muʿāsir instructed him to come to Baghdaḏ, where he died in 150 = 757, or 151 or even 152. He seems to have gathered the materials for the Prophet's biography in two volumes, the Kitāb al-Muḥbadah (Fiḥrist, p. 92) or Muḥaddaṯ al-ʿĀkab ( Ibn ʿAdi in Ibn Hisbaṯ (ed. Wustenfeld), II, p. VIII, l. 23) or Kitāb al-Muḥbadah wa-Kiṣṣa al-Aḥbār (al-Ḥalabi, al-Ṣirā, ii. 235), the History of the Prophet to the Hijra, and the Kitāb al-Maghāzī, His Kitāb al- Ḥanifa seems early to have been a second place before this, his chief work. Karabacek believed he had found a leaf of the original text of the biography of the Prophet in a papyrus of the Rainer collection (see Führer durch die Sammlung, no. 665); on the other hand, the alleged Kitāb al-Maghaḍī of Ibn Isḥāq in the library of the Koprul ī Madrasa in Šimbaṭ (Defer, No. 1140) has been shown to be a copy of Ibn Ḥiṣām's recension (see Horovitz, in Mitt. des Sen. für Oriental. Sprachen, x. Westas. Stud., p. 14). Al-Mawardi, however, seems still to have had access to the original. He quotes from the Ḥiṣāmī in his al-Āṣkāri al-Sultānīya (ed. Enger), p. 65; l. 445, 65, 67, 68, 68, stories which are given in an abridged form in Ibn Ḥiṣām, p. 77, 561, 445, 614. His work is preserved in comprehensive extracts in Tabari, but independently only in the version of Ibn Ḥiṣām [q. v.], who knew through a book of Ibn Isḥāq, the Kūfī al-ʿAdlā al- Ḫakātā. He combined the two independent parts with occasional considerable abridgments into the Kitāb al-Ṣirāt Risāla al-ʿĀlā. The book received its present form in the fourth century A. D. ii. from al-Wazir al-Maghribī [q. v.]. A commentary was written on it by al-Ṣuhailī (died 508 = 1114) and another, very superficial, by the Moroccans Abū Ḫarrār Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Masāʿid (died 604 = 1207 in Fāṣ).


IBN IYĀS (in the popular dialect pronounced “Yeṣa’,” Muhāmmad b. ʿAlīm, is the most important Arab chronicle of the period of the decline of the Mamluks. Born in 852 (1448) he seems to have been nearly 80 when he died, for his history comes down to the year 928. His family was of Turkish origin. His paternal grandfather, Isāb al-Fāḥiṣ, a Turkish slave, called min Ḫanīdī after his owner, was sold to Sultan Zahir Barquq [q. v.], enrolled among his Mamluks and reached the rank of second Dāwārā. His great grandfather (his father's maternal grandfather) had risen further in the official scale. Edeṃir al-Khaṣaṣṣa, son of Sultan Hasan and Sultan Asḥaf ʿAbd Allāh, served him as a slave, ultimately filled the very highest offices in Cairo under Sultan Hasan and Sultan Asḥaf ʿAbd Allāh and governed successively Tripolis, Aleppo and Damascus. Ibn ʿIyās’ father belonged in Cairo to the Awlād al-ʿĀs, a kind of military reserve, who were bound to give military service to the Sultan’s command. In return they received a fief or a sum of 1000 dinars or a yearly allowance (1000 dirhams under the Kāt Bey) [see Ibn ʿIyās, ed. Bulāk, i. 195 et passim]. Ahmad Ibn Isḥāq was a prominent man, related both by birth and marriage to many emirs and high officials. Of his 25 children only 4 boys and 3 girls survived him: one of them is our author; another was master of ordinance (ṣerdeḵāḵ).

Ibn ʿIyās’ chief work, the only one which can claim lasting importance is a detailed chronicle of Egypt entitled Badāʿ al-Zuhār fī Waqāʾ al-Dhakūr. He treats briefly of the early history of Egypt to the end of the Aiṭyebid period, and even the account of the Mamluk period down to Kāt Bey is rather cursory. It is only from the accession of this ruler that he relates events in detail, along with biographies of the high officials and monthly lists of obituaries. A closer study of this work reveals a problem. The chronicle seems to exist in two versions. The shorter is clearly the author’s diary; for the events of the year 921 for example were, according to the text, already completely noted on the 1st Muḥarram 922. Further evidence is that this shorter version is written in the vernacular, while the fuller text of the longer version in the London Ms. appears finished and polished (cf. Volland’s comprehensive article in the Revue d’Egypte, iii. 551). The description of the years 922–928 is moreover much fuller than the preceding parts and might, if Ibn ʿIyās is really the author, belong to the larger recension. It is remarkable that the reign of Sultan Ḥanūr, the years 906–912 (Paris Ms.) and 913–921 (Petrograd Ms.), is not found in other copies (hence not printed in the Cairo edition). This circumstance brought Volland in his article above mentioned to conclude that this portion of the chronicle is not by Ibn ʿIyās. But it is just this part that is certainly from his pen; this is proved by the fact that he writes as an eye-witness. For example, he mentions that he was present at
a procession himself, or that he was personally affected by events (e.g. robbery by Manlūk). Further evidence is the accurate account of his family affairs on his father’s death as well as the occasional mention of his brother. Ibn Iyās’s chronicle is an account of the doings of the rulers of the time, at the same time mentioning other events. He cannot be denied a certain critical ability, although his verdict is often too severe. Yet he was conscious that the utterly corrupt financial administration and the neglect, so often censured by him, of artillery brought about the decline of the empire, although he unjustly gives the whole blame for the wretched financial situation to Sulṭān Ghūrī. The great value of this chronicle consists also in the fact that in part it is the only Arabic source for the beginning of the xiiith century.

Of less importance are his other works: 1. Nieżāb al-Aṣbāb fi ʿAṣānīb al-Aṣbāb, a cosmography with special reference to Egypt much used and often quoted by European scholars of the xiiith century. 2. Mardūj al-Zahārī fī Wafāʾ al-Dihārī, a popular history, dealing with the patriarchs and prophets, of little value, and perhaps not by our author. 3. Nieżāb al-Muḥājir fī ʿAṣānīb wa ʿl-Miḥārī, also a work on history, little known, only extant in one Ms. in Constantinople.

Breivik: See Brockelmann, Geschichte d. arab. Lit., ii, 295, and Vullers’ articles. Ibn Iyās’s chronicle was printed in Cairo (1301–1306) and in the state press of Cairo-Rūbk. 1311–1312.

(M. S. OBEYEHIM.)

IBN AL-KĀDI, Abīʿ l-ʿAbrābī Abī Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīzmān b. ʿAbī & ʿAbī al-ʿĀfiya al-Miṅnāsī, known as Abū al-ʿĀfiya, a descendant of Mūsā b. Abī ʿAbī al-ʿĀfiya al-Miṅnāsī, belonging to the great tribe of Zānātā of Morocco, born in 960 (1552–1553). Jurisconsult, man of letters, historian, poet and above all mathematician, he studied with his father, Abū ʿAbī-Abbās al-Mandājīr, al-Ḫaṣṣā, Abū Zakariya Yahiyyah al-Sarrāǧī, Abū Muʿāźjar al-Maṣṣār, Abū ʿAbī al-ʿĀfiya al-Miṅnāsī, Abū ʿAbī al-ʿĀfiya al-Miṅnāsī, and with Nāṣr b. Mūsā. He was intimate with various offices, as Muṣāfāt, chief Kādi, etc. and devoted particular attention to the Chronique of the Ḫābahāli [q.v.], which he continued and of which he prepared a synopsis. Another work of his is the Ṭabābīt al-Ṣiḥḥīyya.

His son Abū ʿAbī-Abbās, Muḥammad, died 874 (1469), wrote not only a biography of his father but also several other less important works which are detailed by Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., ii, 30.

Breivik: See Brockelmann, loc. cit., ii, 51.

IBN KĀDI SIMĀWNÁ, Badr al-Dīn Mahmed b. Iskāf, a Turkish jurist and mystic, born at Simaw, a town in the Sanjāk of Kutahya, where his father was Kādi. According to an uncorroborated statement, he was a descendant of the Sādīq IX. We have more authority for the statement that he studied in Cairo, was the teacher of Faraj afterwards Mamlūk Sulṭān, and later went to Armenia, where he entered a Sūfī order, whose shaikh was Ḥusайн Aḥkātī. He is said to have disputed about this time in Tīfīs before Timur, with other jurists, and came in Timūr’s train to his native land again. During the wars of succession after the death of Bāyāzīd he attached himself to Mūsā, who had proclaimed himself Sulṭān in European Turkey, and the war which made him Kādi of Nīḥār. Mūsā however lost his life in 816 (1413) in battle with his brother Muḥammad I; Ibn Kādi Simawna was pardoned but had to settle in Ṣīrāq. A short time afterwards, a religious movement began in Asia Minor, the leader of which was a certain Dārākhūdī Mustaṭaf, whom his followers used to call Dede Sulṭān. A detailed account of him is given by Dūkas, ed. Bonn, p. 111 sqq. The accounts of the movement are not quite sure but it seems that all the abrogation of Muslim law and the introduction of a limited communism, so that Jews and Christians also took part in it. One of the leaders is said to have been a Jew, although his name, transmitted in
different forms, Turlak Kamāl (Turlak Hitt or Hīt) does not sound at all Jewish. Boraklüşi Muṣṭafā was, according to some, Ibn Ḫūdī Simāwī’s kethkoda when he was Ḫūdī’s askar; in any case, he seems to have been one of his pupils. When the movement started, however, Ibn Ḫūdī Simāwī was no longer in Asia Minor, but in European Turkey, either because he had connections there and was seeking a career in it, or because he feared to be drawn into the movement on account of the relations between him and Muṣṭafā and therefore retired to Europe. The statement in Ǧūṭ al-Dīn Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka, Wüstenfeld, iii, 255, that he had himself claimed the sultanate is improbable. In any case, Sultan Muṣṭafā sent troops against Muṣṭafā and Turlak, who were both taken prisoner and executed. Ibn Ḫūdī Simāwī was thereupon also arrested and executed under a fatwā of Ḥūdār Harawi at Seres in 818 (1415).


Ibn Kāṣim al-Ruṣayyāt, a notable poet of the Umayyad period, by descent he was a Ǧurāšī although he did not belong to one of the most distinguished families of this tribe. His life is bound up with the wars waged about the caliphate between Ibn al-Zubair in Mecca and the Umayyads in Damascus. The poet who had lost several relatives in the battle of the Ḥarra [q. v.] was a passionate champion of the Zubairids; but he seems to have had sufficient political insight to regret profoundly the struggle in which he found himself involved. That the Ǧurāšī were predestined to rule the Arabs with a firm hand was clear to him; and he made no secret of the fact that such political convulsions were bound to undermine the power of the Ǧurāšī. Our poet was particularly attached to Muṣʿab, the Zubairid governor of the Ḥayk. When the latter was defeated and fell at Maskin, the fate of his brother ʿAbd al-Malik, the Meccan antileph, was also decided. Ibn Kāṣim al-Ruṣayyāt now remained in concealment for a considerable time; the story of his disappearance and his reappearance among the Umayyads in Syria has been romantically adorned. Just as previously Ibn Kāṣim had been more attached to Muṣʿab than to his brother in Mecca, so now he seems to have found less favour and kindly welcome with ʿAbd al-Malik, the ruler in Damascus, than with ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, the governor who ruled Egypt in his brother’s name. The Umayyad Caliph had, it is true, little reason to love the poet, in however moving a way the latter might now beg for grace.

Of his poems a selection made by al-Sukkari in the third century a. h. has come down to us. From this we receive a direct impression of the events which convulsed the world of Islam at this time as revealed in the descriptions and impressions of one concerned in them. The political poems of the Dinār can be considered as political pam-
IBN KATHIR AL-DJAWIZIYA — IBN KATHIR.

1317; Miftāḥ Dār al-Sa`āda wa-Muṣṭafā Li`ad-dīn wa-l-Ilāha, Cairo 1333; Zād al-Maḏād fī Ḥādīṯi Ǧaḥiẓ al-Ḥadīṯ, Cairo 1324; Ḥādīṯ l-Arwaḥ fati li-Bīdūl al-Arwaḥ, ibid. 1326; Ighāṣat al-Laṣfān fī Ḥukūm Tāḏāl fī Ḥaḏaḏān al-Maḏām, ibid. 1318; Āṣām al-Ǧurān, Mecca 1321; al-Dīwān al-Ḡafūr li-ma`ṣāl al-Ǧurān, Cairo 1322; Muṭaṣaṣlī al-Ṣūrāw wa-Muṣāl al-Ṣūrā, 3 vol. Cairo 1333. In the Firūs Maktabat al-Muṭār, 1332, are further mentioned: Ḥiḍāyat al-Ḥaḍīṯ al-Mi`ānī fī l-Ǧaḥiẓ fī l-Ǧaḥiẓ (cf. Golzheier in Feschacher, Zeitschr f. d. Wiss. d. Judenth., ix. (1873), 18 sqq.); al-Ǧaḥiẓ fī al-Ǧaḥiẓ; Ḥuǧrā al-Sabīb; Muṣāl al-Tauhīl al-Mi`ānī al-Ǧaḥiẓ; Muṣāl al-Mi`ānī al-Mi`ānī al-Ǧaḥiẓ. These works were written in the style of the manuscript and the text was printed in the 19th century. The text was also translated into Persian and published in the Persian language, and Translated to the English language, translated by G. M. de Slane, Paris 1843; 28 sqq.; Ibn al-Nadījī, biography of Asad Ibn al-Furāt in Moḥammad al-Ma Ḟārī (Tunis 1320, ii. 2–17) ed. and transl. by O. Houdas and R. Basset, Mission de Tunisie, 2nd part, p. 104–143; M. B. Vincent, Études sur la foi musulmane (Rite de Malek), Paris 1842, p. 36 sqq.; C. Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Literatur, i. 176 sq.


IBN AL-KALĪB. [See al-Kalīb.]

IBN KAMĀL. [See Kamarahzādē, Ibn K.]

IBN ḤAṢI, Ahmad, shākī of the Sūfīs, set up in Spain about 1140 as a Mahdī and took possession of Mertola and other places (1144). He was later followed up by his followers to the Almohads and pardoned by `Abd al-Mu`min. He lived for a time at the court of these rulers till one of his former followers murdered him. He was also an author and wrote a book called Ḥaṣī al-Nālīn fī l-Taqāwawī. Cf. Ḥiḍīṯ al-Kalīfī, iii. 171; C. W. F. Weigl, i. 401. See also: C. W. F. Weigl, iii. 247.


IBN KĀSIM, Abu `Abd Allāh `Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Kāsim b. al-Uṣūf, was the Imam in Malik's most prominent pupil. He studied under him for 20 years and after Malik's death was regarded as the greatest Malikī teacher. Through him Malikī teaching was disseminated in the Maghreb, where it is still predominant. He died in Cairo in 806 (1211).

One of the chief works of the Malikīs, the so-called Mudawwana, is usually ascribed to Ibn al-Kāsim. It was originally put together by Abu al-Furāt and contains a great many of the answers of Ibn al-Kāsim to Asad al-Sa`dīn al-Tanūkhī on Malik's doctrines on the question of Malik b. Ansār in Sa`dīn's recension. The work was printed in 20 vol. at Cairo in 1323 (1905). Various Malikī scholars have written commentaries on the Mudawwana.


(TH. W. JÜNNER.)

IBN AL-KĀSIM AL-GHAZZI, Shams al-Dīn Abu `Abd Allāh Muḥammad, a šāhīfī scholar, who wrote glosses on the celebrated Asābīd of al-Nasaff (Ḫādījī al-Kalīfī, iv. 226), which are not longer extant. His edition of the text is very incomplete in comparison to the ms. Paris Bibl. Nat., No. 1319.

Biography: Ibn Khalīlīkān, Wafayāt (ed. Wustenfeld), No. 772; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arabischen, i. 261.

IBN AL-KALBI. [See al-Kalīb.]

IBN KAMĀL. [See Kamarahzādē, Ibn K.]
Sprachen, vol. xi., Westas. St., p. 267) and Houtsma, Cat. d'unc Coll. etc., N°. 50, 51, 2^ed. 1889, N°. 175: 2 vols., years 96—242, 278—406 (defective in Vienna). He also wrote a commentary on the Kurân and some works on Tradition.

**Bibliography:** Ibn WindowText. Al-Aṣṣālān, al-Durar al-kimāna (Cod. Vienna, N°. 1172), i. 127; al-Nu'mānī, al-Rawḍat al-Sā'iṣ (Cod. Berlin, N°. 687); f. 6o; al-Dhahabi (al-Suyūṭī), Liber clausum sivorum, etc., Ed. Wustenfeld, xxii. N°. 35; Weyer, Orientalia, ii. 433; Wustenfeld, Geschichtsrecher, p. 434.

(C. Brockelmann)

**IBN KHĀRĀN,** the name of three viziers:

1. **ABU ʾL-ḤASAN ʿUBĀDI ALLĀH B. YĀḤĪ Y B. KHĀRĀN.** Appointed secretary of state in 236 (850—851), ʿUbād Allāh was raised to the vizierate by al-Mutawakkil and held this office till the latter's assassination in 247 (861). Towards the end of the year 245 (860) he brought about the fall of Naḍāl b. Salama, the minister of finance; the latter was tortured to death and his property confiscated. Along with al-Fāhū b. Khārān [q. v.] ʿUbād Allāh was the declared favourite of al-Mutawakkil and they used their influence to favour his son ʿAbd-ul-Muṭāz at the expense of his brother al-Munṣūr b. al-Mutawakkil. After the accession of al-Muʿtamid in the year 256 (870) ʿUbād Allāh, in spite of vigorous protests was again appointed vizier and remained in this office till his death in Dhu ʾl-Qaʿa 253 (July 577).


2. **ABU ʾALI MUḤAMMAD B. ʿUBĀD ALLĀH B. YĀḤĪ Y.** Son of the preceding. After the fall of Ibn al-Furat in 299 (912) Muhammad, who had filled several offices since the death of his father, was appointed vizier through the influence of a harem lady but proved so incapable that the caliph al-Muṭāṣab wished to replace him in the following year by Ibn Abī ʾl-Baqī, governor of Fars. He succeeded in saving himself by harem intrigues and Ibn Abī ʾl-Baqī', who had already arrived in the capital to take over the office, returned to his governorship. Towards the end of the year, however, the Caliph had to look round for a more suitable vizier and summoned ʿAlī b. ʾIsā b. al-Djarrāh [q. v.] to Baghdaḍ. After the latter had entered into office in the beginning of 301 (913), Muhammad was arrested with his two sons, ʿAbd Allāh and ʿAbd al-Wahīd. In Djumland II 301 (Jan. 914) he received his freedom again. He died in 312 (924—925).


3. **ABU ʾUL-QĀSIM ʿUBĀDIM ʿUBĀD ALLĀH (ʿUBĀD ALLĀH) B. MUḤAMMAD B. ʿUBĀD ALLĀH B. YĀḤĪ Y, son of the preceding. In 312 (924) ʿAbd Allāh succeeded Ibn al-Furat when the latter was finally dismissed. When he was intriguing against the high chamberlain Naṣr al-Kuḥṣūrī, the latter got wind of it and soon brought about ʿAbd Allāh's fall. Besides he was an invalid and had to trust the business of his offices to others for a period. At the same time a famine broke out in the capital and as usual the discontent of the people found vent against the vizier. Naṣr finally succeeded in overthrowing him and after Abū Allāh had held the vizierate for about a year and a half, he was dismissed and imprisoned in Ramadān 313 (Nov. 925). His property was confiscated; after some time al-Muṣṭafir released him and he died in 314 (926—927).


(K. V. Zettersten)

**IBN KHĀLAWAHI (KHĀLAWAY), ABU ʾABD AL-LĀH AL-ḤUSAIN B. ĀḤMAD B. ḤAṬIMAN AL-ḤAMĀDIHAY, a notable Arab grammarians and lexicographer. The year of his birth is not mentioned; he was a native of Hamadhān and came in 314 to Baghdaḍ, where he studied the Kurān with Ibn Muṭāṣab, ʿAbd Allāh (d. 247) and ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣārīr (d. 368), grammar and adab with Ibn Durādī [q. v.], Nīfawānī (d. 323), Ibn al-Anbarī [q. v.], Abū Ṭumar al-Zāhidī (d. 345), and ʾAḥmad al-Kātibī (d. 370) with Muhammad b. Maṣḥūth b. ʾĀṭār (d. 331) and others. He afterwards went to Syria and settled in Ḥalab; according to al-Dhahabi he also lived in Māyāfīrān and ʾIṣfahān. He took up an eclectic standpoint in relation to the grammatical schools of Kifla and Ṣaḍra. He won a high reputation as a teacher. He was in high favour with the Hamadhānī Saif al-Dawla, whose sons he taught; as a poet he was also appreciated; and he often disputed vigorously with al-Munnadī [q. v.]. The grammatical Ibn Durastawī (d. 347) argued against him in his Kitāb al-adab ilā Ibn ‛Uk̇hawa fi ‛l-Kull wa ‛l-Dawād (Fikrist p. 65, 12). Ibn Khālawayh died in 370 (980) in Ḥalab.

Of his works (detailed in Flugel, b. c.) there are preserved: a) Kitāb Loza, the first half of which was published by H. der Dernburg in Hibrāi̇c, x. 88—105, Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang. and Lit., iv. (1898), 81—93, xv. (1898—9), 32—41, 215—223, xvii. (1901), 36—51; also, hardly completed, printed at Cairo in 1327 (ed. ʿAbd Allāh al-Aṯīn al-Shimīk); b) Kitāb Rūḥ al-Dhābīn Sūrat al-Muṣafād (Ms. in Brockelmann); c) Sharīʿa Muṣafār Ibn Durādī, Ms. Paris Bibli. Nat., N°. 4.331, iv. and in Brockelmann, p. c., i. 111; d) his recension of the Diwan of ʿAbū ʾĪṯār [q. v.], with an introduction; e) Refutation of some grammatical explanations of Ṣulṭān in Suṣūṭī, al-Ḥaṣāb wa Ṣuṣūṭī (Haidarābād 1317), iv. 137—140. — The Kitāb al-Ḥaṣāb ascribed to him is, as S. Nagelberg shows in the preface to his edition (Kitāb al-Safar, Diss. Zürich, Kirchhain 1909), the work of ʿAbū Zaid [q. v.] on which his lectures were based. This is probably also the case with the Kitāb al-ʾAḥqāfī mentioned among his works which is probably his edition of the work of his teacher Abū ʿOmar al-Zāhidī (Berlin, Verz., N°. 7014).

**Bibliography:** Fikrist, p. 83 and 35 sq.; Ibn Khallikān, ed. Wustenfeld, n°. 193, and n°. 49, p. 65 supra (ed. de Slane, l. 456 sqq. and 105); al-Dhahabi, (Cod. Warner 654, iii. (Cat. ii. 120 sq.)), p. 23 infra sq.; al-Suyūṭī, Bāṣgūṭat al-Wāʾīr (Cairo 1326) p. 231 sq.; Flugel, Die gramm. Schriften d. Araber, Aḥmad, d. Dētch.
IBN KHALAWAH — IBN KHALDUN.

Morg. Get., ii. 230 sqq.; Broekelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., i. 125; and the literature given there.

(C. VAN ASELKONDE.)

IBN KHALDUN, 'Abd al-Ra'jamn and Yahya.

Two Arab historians, descendants of a Seville family, who migrated to Tunis about the middle of the viii[th] (xii[th]) century and belonged to the Arab tribe of Kinda. Their ancestor Khalid, known as Khalid (whence the name Ibn Khalid for all members of the family) migrated from the Yemen to Spain in the iii[rd] (xth) century.

There his descendants filled various important administrative offices, some in Carmona and some in Seville. The fall of the Spanish Almohad kingdom and continued conquests of the Christians caused the Khalid family to migrate to Ceuta and the great grandfather of the two brothers, 'Abd al-Ra'jamn and Yahya, of the Hasun family, finally settled in Bona on the invitation of the Hafsid Abu Zakariya. The Hafsid Emirs and Ra'is's showed favours on al-Hasan and his son Abu Bakr Muhammad. The latter, who bore the title 'Amid al-Haghardi 'chief accountant,' was strangled in prison. His son Muhammad attained various important offices at the Hafsid court. The latter's son, also called Muhammad, declined all offices of state, although he remained in Tunis, in order to devote himself entirely to study and piety, he died of the plague in 759 (1359) and left 3 sons of whom the eldest, Muhammad, played no part either in literature or politics, while the two younger brothers, 'Abd al-Ra'jamn and Yahya, obtained renown as politicians and historians.

1. 'Abd al-Ra'jamn (Ab'd Zain) surnamed Wali al-Din, born in Tunis on the 1st Ramadam 732 (27th May 1332), died at Cairo on the 25th Ramadam 808 (19th March 1406), after learning the Qur'an by heart, enjoyed the instruction of his father and the most prominent teachers of Tunis and devoted himself ardently to grammar, language, law and tradition and also to poetry. When the Marinid Abu l-Hasan took Tunis in 748 (1347) 'Abd al-Ra'jamn heard the lectures of the Maghribi scholars in the retinue of this prince and perfected his knowledge of logic, philosophy, dogmatic theology, canon law and other branches of Arab learning. The connections he made at this time with the scholars and high officials of the Marinid court, later helped him to high offices at the court of Fas. When barely 21 he was appointed writer of the al-'amara of the king of Tunis, but left the office soon afterwards, when trouble broke out in the city, and fled to Biskra to Ibn Munzi, lord of Zab. After the Maridin Abu 'Inan had seized Tiemcen, and the whole country east as far as Bougie, 'Abd al-Ra'jamn entered his service and took part in a campaign under a Marinid general. Invited by the sultan at the request of scholars to Fas (755-1354) he went there, became secretary to Abu 'Inan and continued his studies under the best teachers of his time. In 757 (1356) he fell into disgrace and was twice imprisoned, the second time till the death of Abu 'Inan in 759 (1358). The new sultan Abu Salim, appointed him secretary again (760 = 1359) and later chief kadi. After Abu Salim's violent death he was again disgraced under the notorious vizier Omar b. 'Abd Allah, but received permission to go to Granada (763-764 = 1361-1362), where he stayed at the court of the Banu l-Ahmar and formed a friendship with the famous vizier Ibn al-Khatib. Two years later, when this friendship had cooled down, he went to Bougie on the invitation of the ruler there, the Hafsid Abu 'Abd Allah, who appointed him chamberlain (qadijih); at the same time he held the office of khatib and a teaching post (760 = 1364). When in the following year Bougie fell to the ruler of Constantine 'Abd al-Ra'jamn retired to Biskra. Soon afterwards he entered into communication with Abu 'Ishak, king of Tunis, and his son and successor Khalid. He then went himself to Tiemcen, but soon afterwards left the unfortunate Abug Hammu II in the lurch, when he was driven from his capital by the Marinid sultan 'Abd al-Aziz and offered his services to the latter. From his safe refuge in Biskra he continued to support 'Abd al-Aziz against Abu 'Hammu while the Maghrib was tormented with wars and rebellions. He did not go to Fas till 774 (1372) and from there in 776 (1374) to Granada, but the sultan of Granada, at the instigation of the Marinids, soon had him taken to Huinain, the harbour of Tiemcen. In Tiemcen he again found a friendly reception from Abu 'Hammu. He now resolved to shun the friendship of princes and retired to the Kafr Ibn Salama (Taughzah) where he began his history and lived till 780 (1378). He then went to Tunis to consult several books which he required for his work. In 784 (1382) he set out on the pilgrimage to Mecca, but broke his journey in Alexandria and in Cairo where he lectured in the al-Imami al-Azhar, and later in the Samara and in 786 (1384) was appointed Maliki chief kadi by sultan al-Zahir Barakih. Soon afterwards he lost his whole family and all his property by shipwreck and then devoted himself to pious works and completed his pilgrimage in 789 (1387). From 801 (1399) he was again chief kadi in Cairo with a short interruption and in 805 (1401) he accompanied the sultan al-Nasir to Damascus with the other kadis on his campaign against Timur. Returning to Cairo he again filled his office of kadi and held it till his death with several interruptions.

From those biographical notes we see that 'Abd al-Ra'jamn perhaps showed a great and statesmanlike ability in the administration of important offices but that he never hesitated to leave one of his masters in the lurch and to enter the service of another, often the enemy of the former. We have further seen that he played a great part in the politics of North Africa and Spain and had very special opportunities of giving a considered judgment on what happened. His Kitaab al-Ibar (Cairo 1284, in 7 vols.), in spite of the unequal value of the separate parts, is an important work for the history of his time. Although certain parts of this comprehensive history leave much to be desired in the presentation of facts and documentary value, others contain, in spite of some stylistic defects, very important documents for the study of history. His History of the Berbers will always remain a valuable guide for everything that refers to the life of the Arab and Berber tribes of the Maghrib and the mediaeval history of this country; it is the fruit of 50 years' (2nd half of the xiv[th] century) direct observation and industrious study of books and chronicles as well as diplomatic and of-
ficial documents of his time. His Mukadidina which deals with all branch of Arab sciences and culture, remains, as regards the depth of thought, cleanness of exposition and correctness of judgment undoubtedly the most important work of the age, which seems to be surpassed by no other work of a Muslim author”.


Yahyā, Abū Zakariyyā, born in Tunis about 734 (1333), died at Tlemcen in Ramādān 780 (Nov.-Dec. 1378), like his brother and probably with him, devoted industriously to study in his native town and was intimate with all the important scholars of his time in the Ḥafṣīd capital. To judge from his book, on which see below, he seems to have had a special preference for poetry and belles lettres. We know very little of his personality; the references are scattered in various sources, e.g. ‘Abd al-Rahmān’s autobiography and that of the Kūdāb al-lgābī which deals with the history of the Berbers. This last book gives a detailed account of the murder of Yahyā in Tlemcen; Yahyā himself also gives a few details of his career in his Bughayat al-Kawwād.

Yahyā’s political life did not begin till 757 (1356), when he was with his brother (who was soon afterwards imprisoned) at the court of Abū Sālim, sūlān of Fās, and the latter sent two Ḥafṣīd emirs, his prisoners, from Tlemcen back to Bougie. He accompanied these two princes in place of his brother and acted as chamberlain to one of them, the emir Abū ‘Abd Allāh. As the latter, in spite of a long siege could not regain Bougie, he sent Yahyā to Abū Ḥammād II, king of Tlemcen, to ask for his assistance (764 = 1362). Yahyā found a kindly reception in Tlemcen and his request was granted. After the Mawlid festival, which he attended there and commemorated in a poem, he went back to his master to bring him to the ‘Abdalwalidī court on the 8th Djamādā II (26th March 1363). Both returned to Bougie with a column of troops sent by Abū Ḥammād.

In 767 (1365—1366) the Ḥafṣīd emir of Constantine, after taking Bougie, imprisoned Yahyā in Bona and confiscated his property; he escaped soon afterwards and went to Biskra to Ibn Maznī and his brother. It was probably at this time that he made the pilgrimage to the tomb of Ṭāhir which he describes in his Bughayat al-Kawwād. From Biskra he returned to Tlemcen at Abū Ḥammā’s request, arrived there in Radjab 769 (Feb. 1368) and was appointed Kūdāb al-lgābī. When he learned that Tlemcen was threatened by the Marinids, he forgot the kindnesses shown him by Abū Ḥammād and left him (772 = 1371) to enter the service of the Marinid sultan ‘Abd al-Azīz and afterwards of his successor Muhammad al-Sa’īd. It was only after the capture of Fās by Abū al-Dādīd by Sultan Abū ʿAbdAllāh in 775 (1373) that Yahyā returned to Tlemcen, where Abū Ḥammād again welcomed him and gave him his former secretarial office. He soon won the king’s confidence again but thereby aroused the jealousy of the other court officials, notably Abū Ḥammād’s eldest son and probable successor Abū Tadjīm II.

The latter with a few licel arabes fell upon Yahyā, as he was leaving the house one night in Ramādān 780 (1378), and murdered him. When Abū Ḥammād learned that his son had been the instigator of the crime, he had not the courage to take steps against the murderers.

Although Yahyā’s political career was shorter and less brilliant than that of his brother yet it gave him the opportunity to write a historical work of great learning, the Bughayat al-Kawwād (see Dīrās; al-Maktab min Banī ‘Abd al-Wād. It was much used by Brosselard and Bargès in their history of Tlemcen and I have published the Arabic text with translation under the title Histoire des Banī ‘Abd al-Wād, reis de Tlemcen (2 vols., Algier, 1904—1913). His history of the kingdom of Tlemcen is particularly important for a knowledge of the long and in a way brilliant reign of Abū Ḥammād II, whose secretary and trusted adviser the writer was. In this capacity he was no doubt able to consult political documents and even quotes some in full in his book. Although the book neither covers so wide a field as his brother ‘Abd al-Rahmān’s work nor shows such a lofty point of view or critical spirit, it is far superior in literary value. Yahyā reveals in it not only literary but also poetical skill, his elegant style is often lyrical and his narrative is adorned with quotations from the best old Arab writers. He has contributed to a sketch of the historical policy of the central Maghribi kingdom, he has also preserved for us in his work poems by contemporary court poets and gives information about scholars of his time and about the poetical meetings at the court of Tlemcen, all information hardly to be found elsewhere and affording a rather accurate glimpse into the intellectual life of the ‘Abdalwalidī capital in the xivth century.

(Alfred Bel)
two persons, 'Abd al-'Aziz and Abū Sa'id). He was condemned as a heretic in Granada and his extradition demanded, but 'Abd al-'Aziz and his son and successor Muhammad III al-Sa'id (1372-1374) declined to deliver him up, while the pretender Abu 'l-Albās al-Mustanṣir set about it. While the case was being conducted in Fās by his pupil and successor as vizier of Granada, Abū 'Abd Allāh (Brockmann, ii. 259, 'Ubayd Allāh) Muḥammad b. Ẓumrak (al-Maḳkari iv. 274-322), Ibn al-Khaṭīb was strangled in the night by assassins hired by Sulaymān b. Dā'ūd, the deputy of the vizier Muhammad IV. 'Umayr. He was to avenge for a private feud, who broke into his prison an outrage at which the people were very indignant in the morning.

Of the 60 or so writings of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, chiefly historical, geographical, poetical, belles-lettres, mystical, philosophical or medicinal in subject, about a third have survived on which see Pons Boigues, Ensayo-bio-bibliográfico, No. 294 p. 334-347; Brockmann, Gesch. der arab. Litt., ii. 260-263, and their sources. The most important work for us is the extensive *History of Granada*, al-Hudūl il-ṣaḥīḥ al-Madīqāt Gharbātā, which however consists mainly of biographies of scholars, a critical edition of which from the scattered manuscripts and extracts with a translation is a desideratum. The edition of an abbreviation, Cairo 1319, 2 vols. (the 3rd not yet published) is quite insufficient and very deficient as regards the Spanish names; on manuscripts cf. also Cat. Cod. Arab, Bibl. Acad. Ling., But., ii. 2 (1907), No. 1001 sq. (p. 103 sq.). The historical works al-Hudūl al-marākūmā and al-Limā' al-khāridiya fi l-Duwal al-Nasʿiyā, of which Casiri has given extracts in Bibliothèque, ii. 177-240 and 245-319, also deserve a critical edition and translation (the printed edition Tunis 1315, given by Brockmann, ii. 710, is unknown to the writer: there is perhaps some confusion with the following). Rehān al-Hudūl fi Naṣīr al-Duwal was printed at Tunis in 1316. Khāṭarat al-Tauḥīf fi Rīḥāl al-Shībā wa-l-Sa'īf was said by Derenbourg (and Casiri, i. 136*) and Brockmann, p. 262, to be a description of a journey to Africa, while the edition by M. J. Müller, Beiträge, i. 44-41, shows that it is a "journey by the prince Abu 'l-Hāḍījādi into the eastern provinces of Granada". (al-Maḳkālā Muḥammad b. Ẓumrak al-Maḳkālā wa-al-Maraq al-Khūli, on the plague (fāṣīn), the Black Death of 749 = 1348-49, has been edited and translated in 1863 in the Sitzungsber. der Bayr. Akad. d. Wissenschaften (in Casiri, Pons Boigues, and Brockmann, called Manṣūr al-Sa'il). The *Miljar al-ʿIṣṭirāf fi Dhikr al-Maṣḥid wa-l-Dīyār, already completely published by M. J. Müller in Beiträge, i. 45-100, was again published in Fes 1325. Of the great collection of diplomatic documents in the ornate style, Ruhānāt al-Kutṭāb wa-Nuṣūr al-Munābiṭ, Mariano Gaspar Remiro in his periodical Rev. del Centro de Estudios Hist. de Granada y su Rein has given numerous texts and translations since 1912. Muḥammad b. Mufaḳṣalāt Maḥṣūya wa-Sāli was edited by M. J. Müller, Beiträge, i. 1-13. Ḥabib al-Zayyāt's Catalogue of Damaskus mentions on p. 53 a Ṭuṣqūṣ al-Ṭawīf bi l-Ḥubb al-Sharīf li-Liān al-Din al-Khaṭīb. Munich, No. 421, contains a Kāfida by him. Munich, No. 991 sqq., contain several copies by M. J. Müller. The mediocre edition of al-Hudūl al-maṣāḥiṣsīya fi Dhikr al-ʿIṣṭirāf al-Maṣḥid wa-l-Dīyār.
râkhiya, printed at Tunis in 1329, is wrongly ascribed to our author, cf. my remarks Rev. del Centro, iv. 137 sq.; 14 very inaccurate pages on the biography of Ibn al-Khaft, according to al-Makrī and Ibn Khalidūn, are prefixed.

(C. F. Seybold.)

IBN KHORDĀDHBHEH, Abu 'l-Ḳasim 'Usāib Allah b. ʿAbdu Allah, an important geographer of Persian descent who was apparently born in the early years of the third century A. H. (c. 820). His grandfather had been a convert to Islam; his father had filled the high office of governor of Ta'baristān. Little too is known of his own career; he held the important office of controller of the post and intelligence service (Ṣāḥib al-Barid wa l-Khabār) in al-Djibal (Media); when and how he got this office cannot be ascertained. The Caliph al-Mu'tamid made an intimate friend of him; al-Maṣūdī gives a discourse pronounced by him at court on musical instruments, song, rhythm, and dance. He owed his musical knowledge to Istāḥr al-Mawṣili [i.e., a great friend of his father]. Of his works, some of which were of a learned character (e.g. on the genealogies of the Persians), some belonged to the domain of Adab (on game, music, wine, culinaria, boons companions), there has only survived the Kitāb al-Muṣūb wa 'l-Muṭābīk, composed at the request of an 'Abāsīd prince, for which he was able to collect materials in the archives. It forms an important source for historical topography and was often used by later geographical writers (Ibn al-Faṭḥ Ibn Ḥawkal, al-Mukaddasī, al-Djīhān). This work first edited and translated by Sir Archibald de Meynard (Journ. Asiat., 1865) and again by de Goeje (Bibl. Geogr. Arab., vi.) who used further material, is, as the latter shows, not extant in a complete version. The investigations of de Goeje led to the conclusion that Ibn Khordādhbeh wrote his book about 232 (846-7) and then gradually increased it by additions so that a second edition appeared, which was not however completed before 272 (885-6).

According to Ḥajīdī Khalīfa, Ibn Khordādhbeh died towards 300 (912-3).


(C. van Arendonk.)

IBN AL-KIṬṬĪ, Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Ali b. Yūsuf al-Kīṭṭī, called Djamal al-Dīn, was born in 568 (1172) in Kīft [q. v.] in Upper Egypt, came early to Cairo where he was instructed in the most varied branches of Arab-Muslim learning; and continued his studies in Jerusalem, to which his father was summoned to an important office in 583 (1187). After spending about 15 years there he went to Aleppo, where he devoted himself entirely for ten years to his literary studies, until in 610 (1213) he was entrusted with the administration of finance, an office which he held till 628 (1230) except for a break in 613-616. After spending five years in private literary activity, he was appointed vizier by al-Maḳṣūr al-'Azīz in 633 (1236) and held this high office till his death in 646 (1248). His official position gave him an opportunity of helping other scholars, in addition to his own literary activity. For example, he gave great assistance to Yāḳūt [q. v.] when he fled before the Mongols, for which the latter repeatedly shows his gratitude.

Of his numerous works, among which historical writings predominate, (a history of Cairo; a history of Yemen; a history of the Maghrib; a history of the Sa'idūs etc.) only one has come down to us and that only in extracts. The original was probably called Kitāb 'Abd Allāh ba-Ṭāhir al-Ḥakamī, while al-Farazī's synopsis is called al-Manṭukhābīs al-Mantiqātīs wa l-Taqīfīs al-Ḥakamī, usually quoted briefly as the Ta'ībī al-Ḥakamī. The work which was edited by J. Lippert (see Bibliography; also printed at Cairo in 1326), contains 414 biographies of physicians, astronomers, and philosophers from the earliest times to the days of the author and is of great value because it forms an inexhaustible mine of information regarding the knowledge possessed by the Arabs of Greek literature and even gives information about Greek antiquity, which is no longer preserved in classical sources.


IBN KILLIS, Fāṭimīd vizier. Abu 'l-FA-RABĪYYA YĀḳŪB b. Yūsuf, called Ibn Killis, was a Baghdad Jew, an excellent business man, whose ability raised him to the highest offices in the Fāṭimīd empire. Born in 318 (930-1), he came early in life with his father to Syria and in 331 (942-3) to Egypt, where he began to play a part at Kūfīr's [q. v.] court and by his financial ability won an influential position in politics. He remained a Jew till 356 (967), when he adopted Islam, as he saw a chance of becoming vizier. Thanks to his intellectual ability and power of hard work, he soon became an authority on Muslim sciences. His increasing influence aroused the jealousy of the vizier Ibn al-Furāṭ, whose intrigues caused him to flee to the Maghrib. He returned to Egypt with Dījāhwar or Mi'yīz. The Fāṭimīd government could find no more capable and expert administrator of the country's economic policy and thus it happens that the great prosperity of the Nile valley under the Fāṭimīds is associated with his name. The results of his budgets show, according to the sources, figures quite unknown before. But at the same time the country showed a thank the gratitude shown him, notably by Āzīz, was well deserved. In Ramadān 368 (April 979) he was given the honorific title, al-Wazīr al-Adjam. Many pleasing features of Ibn Killis's character are described, although he is also said to have worked against his enemies with poison and other means. He was able to please the taste of the time in poetry and literature, in benevolence and in the splendour of his menage, in external piety and learning; he wrote amongst other works a 9544 book on the Fāṭimī rite (Khiṭat, ii. 6). In any case, he was a financial genius and organiser of the first order. The internal administration of the Fāṭimīd empire is said to have been created by him. In 373 (983-4) he fell for a time into disgrace, but was soon restored to his old office and died at the end of 380 (991), deeply regretted by the Caliph Āzīz and all Egypt.

Bibliography: Isolated data in all the sources for the history of Kūfīr and the early Egyptian Fāṭimīds [q. v.]. Longer notices, based on al-Musabbih and al-Sairafi, in al-Maḳṣūr.
the biographies of the poet in Ibn Bassam, Ibn al-Abbār and Ibn al-Khājib must also be edited from the scattered manuscripts.

**Bibliography:** See above; cf. also Bus- tānī’s *Encyklopaedie arabe* (Dā‘īrat al-Ma‘ārif), i. (1876), 648, which follows Ibn Khākjīn except for the closing remark: date of birth and death are not mentioned, cf. also Samy-Bey in *Kāmil al-Alām*, p. 657; Codina, *Decadencia y desaparición de los Almoravides en España*, p. 154.

(C. F. Seybold)

**IBN KUṬAIBA, ABBU 'AHD AL-ḤĀM MUBARAK B. MUNIR** (often also called *al-Kuṭaihī or al-Kuṭaihī*). *Al-Kif* (from his birthplace) Al-Dinawarī, an A r ā b a u t h or, born in 215 = 828 at Kāfa, was for a time kāfī of Dinawar in the province of Ḫalab, then lived as a teacher in Baghdād and died there in Ḥadāb 276 = Nov. 889 (according to others 270 or 271). In literary tradition he is regarded as the representative of the so-called mixed or eclectic Baghdād grammatical school. As a matter of fact however his activities, like those of his contemporaries, A bū Ḥanīfā al-Dinawarī and al-Dājīrī, covered the whole learning of his period. He sought to make available the lexical and poetical material which had been collected especially by A l-Muḥājīrīn grammarians, as well as historical information, for the requirements of the man of the world, particularly the kuttāb, who were then beginning to gain influence in the administration. But he also took part in the theological disputes of his time, and defended the Kūrān and Traditions against the attacks of philosophic scepticism; but he himself fell under the suspicion of heresy and had to write a book against the Mūshabbāhīn to defend himself against the reproach of belonging to them. His two most important philological works are *Kitāb Adab al-Kūtbī*, ed. M. Grünert, Leiden 1900, Cairo 1909, and the *K. al-Mu‘āmā‘i‘ l-Sahrā‘ in* 12 books, probably the same as Abyā‘ al-Mu‘āmā‘, Aya Sofya, No. 4050. In Adab, p. 71, 5, he quotes his Gharib al-Hadīth, Vol. i. and iii., Damascus, Hābīb al-Zayyāt, Kha‘īn al-Kuttab, etc., p. 62, No. 34–55, the counterpart Gharib al-Kūrān, ed., p. 62, No. 33 (to the end of Sūrā 26). His chief work is the *Kitāb ‘Uyūn al-Abbār*, a model of the scholastic adab in 10 books, often imitated later, 1–4 ed. by C. Brockelmann, Berlin 1900, Strassburg 1903–1208. According to ‘Uyūn, p. 12, 3, the following are supplementary to it: 1. *Kitāb al-Sharā‘at*, ed. A. Guy in al-Muṣṭa‘bal, ii. (Damascus 1325 = 1907), p. 534–248, 387–392, 529– 535; 2. Kitāb al-Maṣā‘īl, *Handbuch der Geschicte*, ed. F. Wüstenfel, Göttingen 1850, Cairo 1909; Kitāb al-Sahrā‘, Liber Poetici et Pastoralem, ed. M. J. de Goeje, Lugd. Bat. 1904; 4. Kitāb Ta‘wīl al-Kūṭāb, lost. Of his smaller philological works the Kitāb al-Ra‘ī al-Muṣṭafī still exists, ed. by Cheikh in Dīn ancients Traités de l’histoire arabe, Beyrouth 1908, p. 121–140. His two chief theological works are the Kitāb Ta‘wīl Muḥājīfīl al- Ḥadīth, Cairo 1260 (cf. Goldzihier, Msb. Stud., ii. 136; Houtman, De Suyd etc., p. 13), and Kitāb Muṣḥīl al-Kūrān, Hs. in Leiden, s. Catalogus cod. Ms. Atr. No. 1650, in Stambul, Koprulu Defteri, No. 211. Theological also is his Kitāb al-Muṣā‘īl, Qāni‘al-Muṣā‘īl, Hs. in Gottha, s. Pertsch, Verz. der ar. Hs. der keri, Bībl., No. 636. The pseudohistorical Kitāb al-Imām wa‘l-Siyāsah, Cairo 1322 and 1327, is

(C. BROCKELMANN)

**IBN AL-KUTIYA.** ABū BAKR MUHAMMAD B. OMAR B. 'ABBĀD 'AL-AZIZ B. IBRĀHĪM B. ISA B. MUZHAHM, usually known as Ibn al-Kūṭiyah "the son of the Gothic woman" because his ancestor Isā, a freedman of 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, had married a Spanish princess named Sāra, a daughter of the Gothic king Oppas (Olemundo, according to Ibn Kūṭiyah) and grand daughter of Witta. The latter had gone to Damascus to make a complaint to the Caliph Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik against her uncle Ardakān. Isā was sent with his wife to Spain and his descendants lived in Seville. Ibn Kūṭiyah himself was born in Cordova and studied in Seville, the home of his family, under Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Kūtā, Hasan b. 'Abd Allāh al-Zubairī, Sa'd b. Dhiibīr etc. He then went to his native town and completed his studies under 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. Mughīth, Muhammad b. 'Omar b. Lu-bābā, Kāsim b. Aṣbāgh, Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Aīman etc. Among his pupils were the Kādi Abu 'l-'Azm Khalaf b. 'Isā al-Waghkī and the historian Ibn al-Farādi. He was introduced to the Caliph al-Hakam II by Abu 'Ali al-Kalī, the author of the *Amālī, as the greatest scholar of the land and put over the *Shura of Cordova after holding for a time the office of kādi. He was a philologist, a grammarian, a historian and even a poet, but was reputed not to know much about hadith and law. Nevertheless people came to him for his advice on passages in hadith and legal points which offered special philological difficulties. He died at a great age in Cordova on Wednesday 23rd Rabī' I 167 = Nov. 6th 927.

He is the author of the following works: 1. *Tārīkh Fath* (var. *Iṣṭifāh*) al-Andalus, a history of Spain from the Muslim conquest to the reign of the Caliph 'Abd al-Rahmān III, published by the Academy of Madrid in 1868; by Ioudas in *Recueil de textes* etc., t. i., Paris 1858, p. 190–280, from the Ms. in Paris, de Slane, Cat. no. 1, 1867 (from the same ms.: Cherbonneau, *Histoire du règne d'Elchaham fils de Hadīm*, Journal As., 1853, i. 458 sqq.); 2. *Kitāb al-'Aṣr*, a catalogue of verbs of three and four radicals, ed. by Guidi, Leiden 1894: *Il libro dei verbi*.


**IBN MAIMUN.** ABū 'IMRĀN MUṢA B. MAIMUN b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kūtari (al-Ammoni; al-Iṣkālī is the Arabic name of Maimonides famed alike in Jewish theology and philosophy. His Hebrew name was Rabbi Moseh ben Maimon and from the initial letters of his name he is shortly known as RaMbh. In Arabic he had the honorary title al-Ra'sī (al-Ummara or al-Milla, chief of the (Jewish) nation” the equivalent of the Hebrew Nāgūd. He is also called Moseh ha-Zamān, the “Moses of his time”.

He was born at Cordova on March 30, 1135, where his father was a dayārā judge in the ecclesiastical court. From him the boy received his first education in Rabbinical studies and he was also taught Arab sciences by Muslim scholars. When he was 13, Cordova fell into the hands of the Almohades [q. v.] and Christians and Jews were not tolerated in the town; they were given the choice of migrating or adopting Islam. Maimonides left the town with his father (on his alleged conversion to Islam see below); the family led a nomadic life for a long time, even in Fez where they settled, their stay was not permanent. They sailed for Palestine, reached Akkā, thence went to Jerusalem and finally settled down in Fustat. Soon afterwards the father of Maimonides died, and he met with many other misfortunes. As he was unwilling to make a livelihood by a Rabbinical career, he decided to practise medicine. He soon made such a name that he won the particular confidence of Sulaymān al-Din’s vizier, al-Kādi al-Fādil al-Baṣānī, who gave him his protection for the rest of his life. Sulaymān al-Din and later his son made him court physician. He was so much sought after everywhere as a doctor that it is difficult to see where he found the time for his manysided literary activity.

Ibn Maimon died on Dec. 13th 1204. In accordance with his desire, his body was taken to Tiberias in Palestine. His tomb is still shown and visited there. All his works except one were written in Arabic and in so far as they were concerned with philosophy and medicine they were read and studied not only by his co-religionists but also by Muslim scholars and through the medium of Latin translations exercised a profound influence on the scholasticism of the Christian west (Albertus Magnus, Duns Scotos). His chief work on philosophy is
the Dalālat al-Hāʾirin “Guidance for those who are confused” (Hebr. Mörch NĪḥāʾīkhim, Latin: Doctor Perplexorum), by which those who have been confused between Reason and Revelation are to be brought back to a comforting harmony. No contradiction between the revealed scriptures and the principles of metaphysics as laid down by Aristotle and following him al-Fārābī [q. v.] and Ibn Sīnā [q. v.] can or may exist. All the anthropomorphism of the Bible is interpreted in this light. We may here call attention to the concise synopsis of the teachings of Muslim theology and philosophy in this book.

The Dalāla soon found enthusiastic admirers but also bitter opponents, to whom it seemed too freethinking, and they used to call it Dalāla, temptation, by a slight variation in the name. It has been edited and translated by Salomon Munk as the Guide de l'Égaré (3 vol., Paris 1856—1866). Among his other philosophical works we shall only mention the Makāla fi Sīnāt al-Mañīṯ (Hebr. Milōṭ ha-Haggyyōn). His medical works in which he chiefly quotes Rāzi, Ibn Sīnā [q. v.], Ibn Wāfīd, and Ibn Zuhru [q. v.], deal with haemorrhoids (a ḥ-fawārīq), asthma (a ḥ- ḥrab), etc. His medical aphorisms, known as Puṣṭūl Mūṣā, are modelled on the Aphorisms of Hippocrates on which he wrote a commentary. He also wrote a treatise on the computation of the Jewish calendar.

Here we can only touch upon his thorough and fruitful work in the field of Jewish literature; we may mention three works, his commentary (Sharḥ) on the Mishnā on which later known as Sirāḏī “lamp”), his Kitāb al-Sharḥ (Hebr. Sepher ham-Mizwāṭiḥ) in which he discussed all the orders and prohibitions of Jewish canon law, and particularly his Misnāh Tharīḥ (also called Yad ha-Ka-resā) a masterpiece of systematisation, in which he arranged for the first time all the vast material of Talmudic tradition — similar to the corresponding Muslim works — according to subject matter, and discusses it.

Ibn al-Kīfīt and Ibn Abī Usābi‘a say that Maimonides adopted Islam in Spain to avoid persecution and professed Islam in public but in secret practised Judaism. At a later date a certain Abu l-Arab b. Ma‘īṣa is said to have accused him in Egypt of having recanted from Islam and gone back to Judaism. His powerful patron al-Ḥaḍī al-Raḍī however declared that a forced conversion to Islam was not a conversion at all and so saved his life. Ibn al-Kīfīt’s and Ibn Abī Usābi‘a’s accounts — the latter however, as his wa-kīla shows, gives it under reserve — have no claim to historical accuracy. Quite apart from the fact that the biographical notices of Ibn Maimon contain much else that is inaccurate, although according to Muslim law a recantation of Islam to save one’s life is judged less severely than a voluntary one, on the other hand a compulsory convert to Islam is a full Muslim and his later secession would meet with the death sentence. The most convincing argument is the following. In the bitter struggle which arose round Ibn Maimon’s Dalālat al-Hāʾirin in which his enemies did not spare their insults and reproaches, not even his most bitter antagonist made this accusation against him. This would certainly have been the case if his conversion to Islam — which could not have remained concealed — had been a fact.


**IBN MAHKHALD, the name of two viziers:**

1. Al-ḤASAN B. MAHKHALD B. AL-DJARKHĪ (of Dair Kunnà, administrator of the domains from 245 (575-8) onwards. After the death of ‘Ubayd Allah b. Yahya in Dhu l-Ka‘da 263 (July 877) [see IBN KHAŽĀN, 1.] al-Ḥasan was appointed vizier by al-Mu’tamid. At the same time he was secretary to the latter’s brother al-Muwallaṣ but after about a month he fled to Baghdād on the arrival of Mūṣa b. Boghā in Sāmarrā, the capital of that time. Sulaimān b. Wāhī then took over the vizierate and his son ‘Ubayd Allah the secretaryship. In Dhu l-Ka‘da of the following year (July 578) Sulaimān was dismissed and his house plundered, whereupon Hasan was made vizier a second time on the 27th of the same month (31st July). In Dhu l-Hijja (August 878) Sulaimān regained his freedom; Hasan fled and his property was confiscated.

2. Abū l-KĀSIM SULAIMĀN B. AL-ḤASAN, son of the preceding, secretary of state from 301—311 (913—923). After the dismissal of Ibn Muḥān [q. v.] in Dju‘māda I 318 (June 930) Sulaimān was made vizier by the Caliph al-Muktaﬁd. The experienced Al b. ‘Isā [q. v. IBN AL-DJARKHĪ, 2.] supported him by word and deed; Sulaimān was not fit for his difficult position and as there was a want of money and his attitude did not make him popular, he was dismissed on the 24th Rājdab 319 (12th August 931). In 324 (935-6) al-Raḍi dismissed the vizier Abū Dja‘far Muhammad al-Karkhī and appointed Sulaimān his successor; but as the disorder increased the Caliph had to turn to Ibn Ra‘īk [q. v.] and Sulaimān was dismissed for a second time. At the end of 326 (Oct. 940) he regained his office and after the death of al-Raḍi in Rabī‘ I 329 (Dec. 940) he was recognised as vizier by his successor al-Muttaqi. He administered his office in name only however, and was only able to hold it for four months after the accession of al-Muttaqī.


(K. V. ZETTERKÆSTEN)
IBN MĀKULĀ, Abū l- Kháṣīm Ḥibrāt Allāh b. 'Alī b. Ḍāʿūr al-Īḍālī, called Ibn Mākulā, vizier to the Būyād Dājāl al-Dawlā, born in 365 (975-6). Dājāl al-Dawlā appointed him vizier in 423 (1032) but soon afterwards dismissed him. His successor Abū Saʿd Muḥammad b. al-Husayn b. Abū al- Rasūl only held the office a few days; as he was attacked and ill-treated by the Turkish mercenaries in the capital, he had to go into hiding. Ibn Mākulā received the office again. In 424 (1033) Dājāl al-Dawlā had to flee to al-Karkh; the vizier followed him and was soon afterwards again replaced by Abū Saʿd. Next year Dājāl al-Dawlā dismissed the latter, and Ibn Mākulā resumed the office although only for a few days. In 426 (1034-1035) the same thing occurred again. Abū Saʿd who was again made vizier, set out against Fāris b. Muḥammad [q.v.] and Ibn Mākulā again became vizier. On this occasion he held the office for two months and eight days. He was then driven out by the troops and Abū Saʿd became vizier. After a year or two Ibn Mākulā was handed over to the ʿUkāilīs, Karwān al-Maṣṣūla, b. Muḥammad al-Muqalla, who imprisoned him in Hīth. Here he died in 430 (1038-1039) after being in prison for two years and five months.

(K. V. Zetterstèrn.)

IBN MĀLIK, Dīmāl al-Dīn Abī ʾAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʾAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʾAbd Allāh b. Mālik, better known as Ibn Mālik, was born, contrary to the assertion of Brockelmann and those who follow him, in Spain, at Jaen in 602—1205-4; some say that he was born a year or two later. He studied in his native town with Abu ʿl-Muṣṭafar and Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Thābit b. Khiyār, surnamed Ibn al-Tašālān, Abū Raḥmān b. Thābit b. Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. Khiyār b. ʿAlī b. Muqalla of Niebla, Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās Ahmad b. Nuwārār, Abū ʿAlā ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Mālik al-Marshān, etc. He then went to the east and studied under the grammarians Ibn al-Ḥadīqib, Ibn Yaʿṣib, Abū ʿAlī al-Shafiʿīn. At Damascus he studied bādīth under Mukrim, Abu ʿl-Ḥasan b. al-Shakhtāwī, etc. Under these pupils we may mention his son Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad who commented on several of his father's grammatical works, the chief kādir Badr al-Dīn Ibn Dīmāl, the poets Bahāʾ al-Dīn b. al-Nawāsī al-Halabī, the jurist Abu Zakariyyā al-Nawawī, the Shāfiʿī Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Yūnīnī, etc. After completing his studies he began to teach grammar in Aleppo, became Imam of the al-ʿAdīya at Aleppo, later taught at Hamsa and finally at Damascus where he died on the 12th Shaʿbān 672 = 21 Febr. 1274. He was a Mālik but on going to the east became a Shafiʿī. Ibn Mālik was considered a great philologist, his reputation almost overshadowed that of Sibawāhi. On examining his works and the appreciations of them by his friends and criticisms by his enemies, one can say that he rendered a real service to the study of grammar by coordinating and simplifying the rules, although he may very occasionally be reproached with a want of that clearness and simplicity, which is necessary in didactic works.

He wrote the following works: 1. Kit. Ṭashkīl al-Fawāʾid wa-Tahkīl al-Maṣāḥīd, a manual of grammar the conciseness of which verges on obscurity, pub. at Fās in 1323; 2. al-Khiyār al-
Mubārak wa l-Maʿṣūla, poem in 162 ṭafāṣ verses rhyming in ī, containing almost all the words ending a short ālif or āṣif followed by hamza and of different meaning accompanied by a short commentary by the author, pr. at Cairo in 1897, 1329; 7. Kitāb al-
Muḥkīlat al-Dīmāl al-Sāhib, grammat. commentary on 99 passages from the Sāḥib of al-Bukhārī, Escurial, Derenburg, ib., No. 141; 13. Kit. al-Ṣāḥib al-mukhtalīf, treatise on synonyms, Berlin, No. 7041; 14. al-Ṣāḥib fi l-Farq bain al-ṣāḥib wa l-Dād, a poem of 62 ṭafāṣ verses rhyming in ī, accompanied by a short commentary on words of the same form, either with āḏār and ǧār or with ǧār and ǧār, Berlin, No. 7023, Gotha, Pertsch, Die arab. Hts., No. 414; 15. 49 kūnāl verses containing the trilliteral verbs of which the 3rd radical is written indifferent with īwār or yāwār (reprod. by al-Suyūṭī, al-Musāhir, Bābāl 1282, i. 145—147); 16. Several short treatises each dealing with philological, grammatical etc. anomalies, some of which are given in the Majmūʿa.

Bibliography: Ibn Shakir, Fawāṣ al-Wafayāt, Bābāl 1299, ii. 227; al-Makkiṭ, Naṣf al-Tib, Cairo 1302, i. 427; al-Sakhātī, Tahāzīl al-Shaḥīya, Cairo 1324, v. 28; al-Suyūṭī, Bughyat al-Wuṣūr, Cairo 1326, p. 53; Muḥ. b. Muḥ. b. Ḥamīd b. al-Bannāʾi, Commentary on the Kāhib of the Alhisya (2 ms. in my possession); Commentary on the Alhisya of al-ʿUṣmānī, of Dāḥān, of Ibn ʿAḵl, of al-Maḵkūdī with their annotators; al-Dalālī, al-Fawās al-Maṣfūkān, Cairo 1322, p. 64; Hurrat, Litt. Ar., p. 170; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. ar. Litt., i. 298 sqq. cf. 525; ii. 697; Moh. Ben Cencheb, Étude sur les pers. ment., dans l'Alhisya du chikh Abū al-
Kādir al-Farsī, No. 197. (MOH. BEN CENCHEB.)


IBN MARDANĪŚ, Abū 'Abd Allāh Mūḥammad b. Ahmad (the latter usually omitted; correct in Ibn Khalūdīn, iv. 166; the nephew of 'Abd Allāh b. Mūḥammad b. Sa'd, who fell in the battle of Albacete in 540 = 1146, cf. Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., xiii. 1909. p. 352) b. Sa'd b. Mūḥammad b. Ahmad b. Mardanīš al-Dīṇdāṇī (according to others, al-Todjībī) was born 518 = 1124-5 at Banāḡaḵāla = Benjshkala = Peninsula between Tortosa and Castellón de la Plana, died on 29th Rādjab 567 = 27th March 1172. In spite of the name, he was apparently of Spanish descent as his great-great-great grandfather after whom he is usually called for short, was called Martinus or Martín "the son of Martín", so that Mardanīš seems to be a corruption of Mardanīš, (for Arabic dataTable cf. Emerita = Márda, Mérida) in spite of Codera's doubt about Dozy's derivation; it is much more difficult to agree with his suggestion of the Byzantine Mardounios. The popular etymology from mard, Arabic ʿadhirūn, "excrement" in Ibn Khalūdīn, Biography of the Dāmmār, iv. 473, is of course a mere play on words. On the collapse of Almoravid rule the unusually capable tyrant Ibn Mardanīš made himself master of Valencia and Murcia in 540 = 1146 and by further conquests (Guadix, Jaen a vast principality of his father-in-law Ibn Hemoqāq = Hemochico, Ubeda, Baena, Almeria etc.) he became king of the whole of South-eastern Spain. As Rey Lobo or Lope, often in coalition with the Christian rulers of Castile, Aragon, and Barcelona, he was able to resist the advance of the Almohad 'Abd al-Muʿallim (died 1163) and his son Yusuf (died 1176). He is accused of treachery of his father-in-law in the last years of his life. He died in 1172 during the siege of his capital Murcia; his sons then surrendered and secured lucrative positions for themselves, while the whole of Muslim southern Spain became Almohad.


IBN MĀṢAWĪ, or Māṣawī (MEṢWA in Latin translations of the middle ages), Abū Zakariyya Yūḥannå (YAHYA), a Christian physician, whose father was a druggist at Dūndjāshāpūr. In the reign of Hūrūn al-Rashīd he was engaged in translation work and studied medicine under Gabriel b. Baktihūr [q. v. i. 602a supra], the Caliph's court physician. In the reign of al-Muʿammān he was appointed to this office and held it till his death in 243 (857). Among his pupils was HunAIN b. Ḳāḏī [q. v.] for whom he wrote his al-Nawādir al-tibbiyya. A Latin translation, attributed to John of Damascus, appeared at Basle in 1579, as a supplement to the Aphorismi Maimonidei, p. 528-542. He also wrote a number of treatises, the titles of which Leclerc gives from Ibn Abī Usāfībī. In the Library at Bankipore, there is a copy of his Kitāb al-Muḥāṣṣāfīūr. Bibliography: Fihrist, p. 295; Ibn Abī Usāfībī, i. 175 sqq.; Ibn al-Ḳiftī, Tārīkht al-Ḥumān, ed. Lippert, p. 380 sqq.; Brockelman, Geschichte der arab. Litt., i. 232; Steinschneider, Die arab. Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischetc., in Verzeichn. Archiv, vol. 124; Catal. Bankipore, iv. no. 1.

IBN MĀṢAWĪ, 'Abd Allāh, ghaffīl b. Ḥaṣīr b. Shāmī b. Fār b. Makhūm b. Ṣāhīla, Kāhil b. al-Ḥāṣīrī b. Tamīm b. Sa'd b. Ḥuṣainī, a Companion of the Prophet. Like many of Muhammad's first adherents he belonged to the lowest stratum of Meccan society. As a young man he herded cattle for ʿOkba b. Abī Muʿāṭ; Sa'd b. Abī Waḳkās at a later date in a polemic calls him a Ḥuṣainī slave (Ṭabarî, i. 251). He is usually described as a client (kāfīf) of the Banū Zubā; his father is also so described. Nothing more is known of the latter; 'Abd Allāh's brother ʿOqba and his mother Umm 'Abd bint 'Abd Wadd b. Sawā belong to the older Ṣaḥāba so that he is called by al-Nawawī (ed. Wustenfeld, p. 370) Ṣaḥābī b. Šaḥābīya. His conversion is given as a miracle. When Muhammad and Abī Bakr were fleeing before the heathens (on what occasion is not stated), they met 'Abd Allāh who was herding sheep. Their request for some milk was refused out of conscientiousness. Muhammad then took a ewe lamb and stroked its udder which yielded an abundant flow of milk; he then made it resume its former size. 'Abd Allāh is regarded rightly as one of the first converts; he was fond of calling himself the "sixth of six" (Muslims); according to other traditions, he was converted before Muhammad entered the house of Arkam, or even before 'Umar. He is said to have been the first to recite the Kur'ān openly in Mecca, although his friends found him unfit for the task, as he did not have his clan with him for protection; he was therefore badly received. Of course he went to Abyssinia, according to some traditions. A Latin translation, attributed to Ibn Māṣawī, he used to be so often entering Muhammad's house with his mother that strangers thought they were members of the family. But 'Abd Allāh was only the faithful servant of the slippers, the cushion, and the dung hill". He imitated his master in externals; but was often mocked for his thin legs. He wore his red hair, which he did not dye, very long; this peculiarity as well as his white garments and his constant use of scent are probably to be attributed to religious views. He laid great value on the past and fasted relatively little to preserve his strength for the divine service. He took part in all the muṣḥāḥid; at Badr he cut off the head of the severely wounded Abū Dājīl and carried it in triumph to his master. He
was also one of those to whom Paradise was promised by the Prophet. When Abū Bakr during the Ridda thought it necessary to make Medina capable of defence, ‘Abd Allāh was one of the men chosen to guard the weak points of the town. He was also present at the battle of the Yarmūk. He was naturally as little fitted to rule as any other representative of the pious of Medina. ‘Omar sent him to Kufa as administrator of the public treasury and as a teacher of religion. He was much consulted on account of his knowledge of the Kurān and Sunna; he is said to be the authority for 848 traditions; it was a peculiar feature of his that in giving information about the Prophet, he trembled, the sweat even broke out on his forehead and he used to express himself with great caution, less he should say anything incorrect. His authority is relied upon for a mild interpretation of the interdiction of wine (Goldzahier, Fortschriften, p. 63, and ‘Uyūn al-‘Abbār, ed. Brockelmann, p. 373 13). The accounts of his end are contradictory. It is said of him that he was dismissed of his office in Kufa. When the news came, the people wished however to keep him. He then said: “Leave me; if there must be offences (fiyān), I will not be the instigator of them” (cf. Matthew, xviii. 7). He is said to have returned to Medina and to have died there in 32 or 33 A.H. over 60 and to have been buried by night on the Bākī al-Gharqad.

When ‘Uthmān visited him on his deathbed and solicitously asked how he was and what were his desires he is said to have given answers which are typical of ancient piety. He appointed al-Zubair his executor and expressed a desire to be buried with al-Abbas and property with al-‘Abbās. According to others, however, he died in Kufa and was not dismissed from office in 26 along with Sa‘d b. Abī Waqāṣa by ‘Uthmān.

‘Abd Allāh is best known as a traditionist and authority on the Kurān. His traditions are collected in Masnad Ahmad, i. 374—446.

**Bibliography:** Sachau in the introduction to the third volume of Ibn Sa‘d, p. xv sq.; Taiji, Annalen, s. Indices s. v.; Ibn Ḥishām, ed. Wustenfeld, Index s. v.; Ibn al-‘Abbās, Cat al-Qabāba, s. v.; Ibn Ḥadīr, Ṣīh, s. v.; Nawawī, ed. Wustenfeld, s. v.; Ibn Sa‘d, ed. Sachau, iii. 105 sqq.; Caetani, Annali, Indices s. v. (A. J. Wiensink.)

**IBN MISKAWAIH** (properly MUSHKIRGAY, ABD ‘ALI AHMAD B. MUḤAMMAD B. YĀKŪR, PHILOSOPHER AND HISTORIAN; Yākū simply calls him Miskawaih, without ibn, and says that he was a Magian converted to Islam, which can hardly be correct in view of the name of his father and grandfather and his mistake is probably due to his wrongly giving the name Miskawaih to the philosopher instead of his grandfather. The latter may really have been a converted Magian. Little is known of his career. We know that he was secretary and librarian to the vizier al-Muhallabi [q. v.] and afterwards enjoyed the favours of the vizier Ibn al-‘Amid [q. v.], and his son Abu l-Fahīm in the reigns of the Bayyids ‘Adud al-Dawla and Ṣamsam al-Dawla, and held an influential position in al-Ra’i. At first he seems to have been much occupied with philosophy, medicine, and alchemy; his history called Tadżīri al-Camān (a complete edition in a photographic reproduction is appearing in the Gibb Memorial Series, vii., under the editorship of L. Caetani; de Goeje edited a portion in 1871, Fragmenta Historiorum Arabicum, ii.), comes down to 369 (979-980), although Ibn Miskawaih lived till 421 (1030). He carried on a literary correspondence with Abū ‘Īyān [q. v.] and al-Ḥanḍāfī [q. v.]. Ibn al-Kifīf [q. v.] gives the titles of his writings on medicine. But he was mainly concerned with ethics and wrote several works on this subject, of which we may here mention the Taḥābīh at-Talāik wa-Tā‘īlī al-Myrak, ed. Constantinople 1299, 1299, Cairo, 1307, and a collection of ethical aphorisms by Persian, Indian, Arab and Greek sages, the first part of which is based on the Persian Ṭabrā’īn al-Khīd ("eternal reason"). A Persian lithographed edition was produced in 1246 by Sīra ‘Umarī. A Spanish translation of Lorenzo 1593. On the Persian Ṭabrā’īn al-Khīd cf. Fath al-Mahṣūr, ii. 17 sqq., and Instr. Instr. Instructs in Zapalova, Vost. Ost. Imp. Arch. Ob. Vol. xvii. 180 sqq., and in Sasaniskie Stili, p. 22 sqq. A general appreciation of Ibn Miskawaih’s philosophical works, in de Boer, History of Philosophy in Islam, p. 128 sqq.


**IBN AL-MUṢAKKAṽ** (properly MUSHKIRGAY, ABD ‘ALI (afterwards MUḤAMMAD), the “son of the cripple”, an Arab author of Persian origin, whose real name was Bāshib son of Dā‘ūn; his father, a native of Dijr (Fārāb), so correct Fihrist, i. 118) in Fārs, who was entrusted with the collection of taxes in ‘Atrak and Fārs under the governorship of al-Hādīḍijāb b. Yūsuf, was accused of extortion in the exercise of his duty; he was put to the torture and his hand remained maimed, whence his surname. His son, entering the service of ‘Īsā b. ‘Ali, paternal uncle of the Caliphs Abu l-‘Abbās al-Saffāh and al-Mansūr, adjured Māzdeism, and became a convert to Islam. He was entrusted with the drawing up of the act of amnesty accorded by the second of these Caliphs to his uncle Abū Allāh, but was accused of having cleverly turned the language in a way not entirely pleasing to his sovereign; the latter vowed vengeance and sent secret orders to Sufyān b. Mu‘awiyah al-Muhallabi, governor of Bāṣra, to put the culprit to death; his limbs were cut off one by one and thrown into a blazing furnace. Ibn al-Muṣakkaṽ’s orthodoxy was suspected and the suspicion that he continued to practise Māzdeism in secret contributed to his fall. This event took place about 139 = 757.

Ibn al-Muṣakkaṽ translated from Pehlevi into Arabic the book of Kadāla wa-Dimma, brought from India by the physician Burūzī in the reign of Khusraw I Anoshak-Rāwān (cf. the article KAL), and the Khind-Gāzān (Book of Lords), a collection of biographies of Persian kings, under the title Siyār Muḥāk al-Aghtam, which was one of the sources of the Shāhānāma of Firdawsi (many fragments in Ibn Khutayba, ‘Uyūn al-Aḥkām.

IBN AL-MUKAFFA’ — IBN AL-MUNDIRH.

al-muqaffa (transl. by O. Rescher, Stuttgart 1915) on morals, and other short treatises published at the same time as the Durra; al-Adab al-kabir was published by Aḥmad Zakī-Paša (Cairo 1330 = 1912).

Bibliography: Fihrist, i. 118; Ibn Khalikān, N. 180, transl. de Sclane, i. 431; Alżiżat al-Qur’ān, iii. 50; Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān bin Na'im, ‘Abd al-Rahmān, 24th ed. (Cairo, 1331 = 1913), p. 6 sq.; de Sacy, Callis et Donna (1816), p. 10 sqq.; Brockelmann, Geschichte der arab., Litteratur, i. 151; Th. Noldeke, Bursā’s Einleitung (Strassburg 1912); Cl. Huart, Litérature arab., p. 211, and Journal Asiatique, xth ser., t. xiv. (1911), p. 554. (Cl. Huart.)

IBN AL-MUKAFFA’, ABU ‘L-BĀGHAR, the Arab name of Severus, Monophysite bishop of Uṣumānain, a contemporary of the Coptic patriarch Philotheos (979–1003). Nothing is known of his life except that he was authorised by the Fatimid Caliph al-Mu’izz to dispute with the kādhāl on religious questions (Huart, Hist. des Arabes, i. 344). He wrote a history of the dignitaries who had occupied the patriarchal see of Alexandria, which forms the basis of Abbé Rénéoud’s Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinarum (Paris 1713). The municipal library of Hamburg possesses the most ancient Ms. (1266) which only contains however, although in a more complete form than the usual text, the first part from St. Mark to Michael I (61–767), published in the original text by Chr. F. Seybold (vol. ii. of the Voröffentlichungen der Hamburg. histor, 1912); Brockelmann, Katal. d. orient. Hist. der Stadt, zu Hamburg, vol. i. p. xxiii. and 160 sqq.; A. v. Gutschmid, Kleine Schriften, ii. 511). Seybold had already published an edition of the text in the Corpus Script. Christian. Orientalium (Script. arabici, iii. Series, Vol. i. fasc. i et 2, Paris and Leipzig, 1904–1910), as had Evetts in the Patrologia Orientalis (Vol. i., fasc. 2, 4, History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria). The Ms. Paris Bibl. Nat., Cat., N. 503, gives the order of the patriarchs from the 4th; Mark II (790–816) to Soterios (1004–1046). His History of the first four Councils has been published in Arabic, Ethiopic, and French by L. Leroy and S. Grébaut in Vol. vi. of the Patrologia Orientalis of R. Grafin in F. Nau. It is an apology for the Monophysite doctrine. There are other works by him in Ms. in Paris and the Vatican.


IBN MUQAL, ABU ‘ALI MUHAMMAD B. ‘ALI B. AL-HASAN B. MUQAL, an ‘Abbasid vizier, born in Baghdad in 272 (886). He was first of all collector of taxes in a district of Fās, but in the middle of Rabî’ I 316 (May 928) he was appointed vizier by al-Muqtadir. After two years of beneficial activity, he was dismissed on Djumād I 318 (June 930) because he was on intimate terms with Mu‘nis, the chief of the Praetorians, whom the Caliph hated, and his enemy the chief of police, Muḥammad b. Yākūt, had him arrested and burned his house. After a considerable sum had been extorted from him, he was banished to Fās. In

Dhu ‘l-Ḥijdja 320 (Dec. 932) the Caliph al-Kāhir restored him to office. But Ibn Muqala soon began to intrigue against Ibn Yākūt and when he also planned the deposition of the Caliph, the plot was betrayed. Ibn Muqala had to save himself by flight and the vizierate was given to his secretary Muḥammad b. al-Kāsim. After his fall he conducted a vigorous campaign for the deposition of al-Kāhir and wandered about the country in disguise, stirring up hatred of the Caliph. When al-Ra‘ūf ascended the throne in Dijmād I 322 (April 934), Ibn Muqala was appointed by him vizier; the real ruler however was the commander-in-chief of the army, Muḥammad b. Yākūt. Although Ibn Muqala did succeed by his intrigues in overthrowing the powerful favourite of the Caliph in the following year, as a result of an unfortunate campaign against Moṣal, where the Hamdānid ʿAbn b. Aḥī ‘L-Ḥajjā‘ ʿAbd Allāh had set himself up as a usurper, he was at the same time preparing his own fall. In the middle of Dijmād I 324 (April 936) he was attacked and taken prisoner by al-Muẓaffar b. Yākūt, Muhammad’s brother. The Caliph was forced to approve and the vizier was dismissed, but received his freedom on payment of 1,000,000 dinārs. After a few years, he was appointed vizier, in name at least, for the fourth time [see Ibn al-Furat, 3].

But when he began to intrigue against the powerful ‘Amir ‘Imārā Muhammad b. Ratki, the latter learned of it and had him seized in Shawwāl 326 (Aug. 936) and frightfully mutilated. According to the usual statement, Ibn Muqala died in prison on Shawwāl 10th 328 (15th July 940). He was also known as a scholar and as one of the founders of Arab calligraphy.


(K. V. Zetterstéen.)

IBN AL-MUNDIRH, ABU BAKR, chief of the stables and chief veterinary surgeon to Sultan al-Nāṣir b. Kalāmīn, died 741 (1340) author of the Kitāb al-Sitt’mat al-Ba’thara wa-l-Zarqā‘a (or Kāshf al-Wāli fī Ma‘rīfat Amrād al-Khaṭīb), which is called al-Nāṣirī in honour of the Sultan and is usually quoted by this name. M. Perron has translated it with a full introduction in a volume entitled: Le Nāṣirī: la perfection des arts ou traité complet d’hygiène et de bipétitation arabes, trad. de l’arabe d’Abū Bekr Ibn Bīrār. The first volume appeared in 1852, it is introductory and contains a wealth of information about the Arab horse, al-Nāṣir’s particular services to horse breeding in Egypt, and a collection of passages from the poems; the second volume (1859) is the translation of the hippology, and the third (1860) of the hippiatry. J. v. Hammer-Purgstall in his treatise Das Pferd bei den Arabern criticises the introduction in a very high-handed fashion, but did not live to deal with the others; but it may well be doubted if this critic possessed the scientific, particularly veterinary, knowledge to enable him to surpass Perron’s meritorious work. The book
is a valuable corpus of information and the first collection of widely scattered references to the horse and must form the starting point of any further work on the subject.


IBN AL-MUSLIMA, the kunya of AHMAD b. ḌOMAR (died in 415 = 1024) which was transmitted to his descendants. Another name for the family is AL al-Ḳaṭīf. This family, the members of which held the office of Raʾis was held in great honour in Baghdād. The grandson of the above mentioned Ahmad, Abuʾl-Kaṣīm Ali b. al-Ḥasan, is better known in history as Raʾis al-Ruʾāsāʾ. He acted for a time (437—450 = 1045—1058) as vizier of the Caliph al-Ḳaṭīm bi-ʾAmr Alāʾ and it was he who induced the latter to make an alliance with Toghrulbeg in order to counteract the machinations of the Fāṭimid Caliphate. This policy saved the ‘Abbasid caliphate but was fatal for its originator, for when Toghrulbeg, who came to Baghdād in 447 (1055), had to undertake a campaign against Mūṣhir in 450 = 1058, al-Basbīrī [q. v. i. 669 sqq.] seized the opportunity to have the khāṣaḥ pronounced in Baghdād in name of the Fāṭimid Caliph. Ibn al-Muslima had the misfortune to fall into his hands and was executed in the cruellest fashion in 450 = 1058, as al-Bāṣasīrī particularly hated him. His son Abuʾl-Faṭḥ al-Muṣaffar was vizier for a short time in 476 = 1083. The latter’s great-grandson, Ḍuḥṣal-Dīn Mūsā b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḍaḥsh Allāh b. al-Muṣaffar, held the same office under Mūṣhir for 566 to 573 (1171—8). The Caliph was at last forced to dismiss him by the Turk Kaimāz, on which occasion the Turks plundered his dwelling thoroughly; it was not till Kaimāz had to leave Baghdād (570 = 1174) that Ḍuḥṣal-Dīn was restored to office. He fell a few years later at the hands of a Bāṭini when about to undertake the pilgrimage to Mecca. Like other members of the family (ʾImād al-Dīn devotes a special chapter to him in his Ḍarūra) he was a man of great erudition and is celebrated in several of Sīūbī al-Taʾwīlī’s panegyrics.


IBN AL-MUTAZZ ʿABD ALLĀH, ABDUʾL-ʾABBĀS, poet and prince, son of the Khalīfa al-Muṭazz, was born of a slave mother in the year 247 (861). From his youth he devoted himself to literary pursuits, studying the Arabic language and literature under al-Mubarrad, Thaʿlab, and other eminent masters, with great zeal and success, and composing works in prose and (especially) poetry which attracted ever wider attention. At the court of his cousin, the Khalīfa al-Muṭʿadīd (279—289 = 892—902), he stood in high esteem, and was closely associated with the principal scholars, poets, and literary leaders of Baghdād. He had himself remote from the intrigues of the ‘Abbasid court, which during his lifetime had been passing through the worst period of its history; but when, on the death of al-Muktafi, the dissatisfaction with al-Muṭʿadīd, whom he had named as his successor, culminated in the uprising, Ibn al-Muṭazz was drawn into the conspiracy, and on the 20th of Rabīʿ I 296 (17th Dec. 906) was proclaimed Khalīfa under the name al-Muṭʿadīd. His party remained in power for only one day, however; and he, having concealed himself in a private house, was discovered after a few days and put to death (2 Rabīʿ II = 29 Dec.).

Ibn al-Muṭʿazz was one of the most important poets of the ‘Abbāṣid period. To his native talent, which included originality of a high order, he added sound learning and good taste. He did not imitate the ancient Arab poets, but could bear comparison with them in elegance of manner and purity of diction. His style, moreover, is remarkably simple and direct. His poems covered the whole range of subjects then generally recognized as belonging to the province of poetry (Diwan, Cairo, 1891, 2 vols.). They are not a small number of life high, however, reflecting all its luxury and some of its affection. A field which he cultivated especially was that of songs praising wine and celebrating drinking customs (Kitāb fuṣūl al-muḥājīf fi tabāhīr al-suwar), an anthology in which his own verses held the principal place; see Goldziher, Abhandl. zur arab. Philol., i. 166 sqq.; also Kitāb al-ṣarḥāb). His Ṭabākāt al-ḥālārū al-muḥāfiṣīn, classifying and estimating the “modern” poets, is preserved only in part. A pioneer work of considerable importance was his Kitāb al-badāʾ, a treatise on poetry. For his other works, see Ibn Khalīfa; Fikrist, p. 116; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., i. 80 sqq.; and Orient. Stud. ..., Th. Nöldeke . . . gewidmet, i. 168.


IBN MUṬ’TĪ, ZAIN AL-DĪN ABŪ ʾL-HUSAIN YAHYĀ B. [ʿABD AL-MUṬ’TĪ B. ʿABD AL-NŪR AL-ZAWĀVI AL-MAGHİRĪ, known as Ibn Muṭṭī, was born in 564 (1168—9), he studied grammar and law in Algiers with Abū Mūṣā al-Dajalī and then went to the east. He spent a very long time in Damascus, where he studied under the traditionalist Ibn ʿAsākir and then taught grammar there. To earn a livelihood he also acted as a ḍāḥīd. When the Ayyūbīd al-Malik al-Kāmil visited the Syrian capital, he invited him to follow him to Egypt and appointed him professor of literature at the ʿAmr mosque in Cairo. Here he died on Monday the 30th Dhuʾl-Ḥidād 628 = 14th Sept. 1231. Ibn Muṭṭī was a Maliki in the Maghīrī, a Shāfiʿī in Damascus, and a Ḥanāfī in Cairo. He seems to have been the first to compose a poem of 1000 verses (Afṣiya) as a grammatical textbook.

His works only the following are preserved:

1. al-Durr al-Afṣiya fi ʿilm al-ʿArabīya or simply Afṣiya Ibn Muṭṭī, a grammar in 1021 verses (rādān and sarʿ musawwīd), completed in 955 (1118—1119) in Damascus, according to Hāfīẓ Khalīfa, according to others, in Cairo, ed. with notes by Zetterstén, Die Afṣiya des Ibn Muṭṭī, Leipzig 1900. 2. Kitāb al-Fuṣūl al-ḥalārū, a short grammar in prose, Berlin, Vers. No. 6556; Bodleiana, Cat., ii. 247, iii. 3. al-Badīʿ fi Sināʿat al-ʿSiḥr, poetical verses in verses, Fleischer, Die Refaiey, No. 246.

Bibliography: al-Suyūṭī, Bughyat al-Waliʿ,
IBN MU'TI — IBN RASHID.

Cairo 1326, p. 416; Ibn Khalikin, Wafayat, Cairo 1310, ii. 235; Abu 'I-Fida', Tariikh, Constantinople 1286, iii. 159; Ibn Hamduin, comment. on the kunta of the Alifya of Ibn Malik (2 ms.): Sahnun-Oshinmi, comment. on the Alifya of Ibn Malik, Cairo 1305, i. 20; Ibn al-Haqqi, Haddiya, on the comment. of al-Malkudi on the Alifya of Ibn Malik, Cairo 1315, i. 19; al-Dalaji, al-Fatihika wa'l-Ma'rifikan, Cairo 1222, p. 93; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. ar. Litt., i. 302 sq. (Molt, Ben Chener).

IBN NUBATA, the name of two Arabic authors.

1. 'Abd al-Rahman bin Muhammad bin Ismail al-Hujjat al-Farisi, born in 335 = 946 in Mayyafarihin, lived at the court of Saif al-Dawla in Halab as a preacher and died in 574 = 984 in his native town. His sermons (hujab), mainly short, in rhymed prose and elegant in style, deal with questions of religion and ethics in a threefold arrangement, often with reference to contemporaries, other. They are concerned with some of his son Abu Tahir Malik (390 = 999) and his grandson Abu 'I-Faraj Tahir (abt. 420 = 1029) about 629 = 1223 and printed in Cairo, 1286, 1292, 1302, 1304, 1309, Bairut 1311.

2. His descendant Muhammad bin Muhammad bin al-Hasan, 'Abd al-Din, Abu Bakr al-Kuraishi al-Munawi, born in Rabbi 686 = April 1287 at Mayyafarihin, lived in Damascus after 716 = 1316, from there often visited the learned Ayyubid prince Abu 'I-Fida' in Hamah, migrated in Rabbi 716 = Jan.-Feb. 1360 as secretary to Sultan al-Nasir Hasan to Cairo and died there in Safar 786 = October 1366. As a poet he cultivated besides the panegyrical kashf of short poems, which Ibn al-Djuzayi in Ibn Batutta (ed. Paris), i. 41, 17, thought very highly of. His Divan of which there are several recensions (cf. Rue, Suppl. to the Cat. of the Arab Mus. in the Brit. Mus., Nv. 1056) was printed at Alexandria n.d., Cairo, 1323 = 1905. His panegyric and rhetorical works are given in Brockelmann, Geschichte etc., ii. 11, where No. 13 should be deleted and Zahr al-Manu'llar added, on letter writing, Brit. Mus. Or. 5656, see Descriptive List, etc., p. 64.

Bibliography: al-Subki, Tabaqat al-Shafi'iyya, vi. 31; al-Suyuti, Himm al-Muhaddara, i. 329; Orientalia, ii. 419; Wundenfeld, Geschichts- schreiber, p. 430; M. Hartmann, Minhwa'da, p. 42. (C. Brockelmann)

IBN NUDJAIM, Zain al-'Abidin bin Ibrahim bin Nadjaim al-Misri, was one of the distinguished scholars of the Hanafi school in the 9th (xviiith) century, whose writings on Islamic law are well known and popular in the east. He died in 970 (1562). Of his works we may mention the principal ones: 1. Al-Aqahab wa 'I-Nasirir al-fikha 'ala Madhab al-Hanafiya, printed at Calcutta in 1826; 2. al-Badr al-ru'yi, a commentary on al-Nashafi's well known book Kans al-Da'hat, printed at Cairo in 1311 (1893) 8 vols.; 3. Al-Fatwaiy al-Fikha 'I-Pisht al-Hanafiya, a collection of fatwas published after his death by his son Ahmad (cf. W. Pertz, Die Arabischen Histor. zu Gotha, ii. p. 351 sqq.). See also C. Brockelmann, Geschichte der arab. Litteratur, i. 310 sqq. (Th. W. Junboll).

IBN RA'IK, Abu Bakr Muhammad, Amir al-Umar. In 317 (929-930) Ibn Ra'ik was appointed prefect of police in Baghdad along with his brother

urahim. Both were dismissed in the following year but Muhammad b. Ra'ik received his office back in 319 (931-2), while Ibrahim b. Ra'ik was appointed at the same time high chamberlain. After the murder of al-Mu'tadid in 320 (932) the two brothers fled with others to al-Madina and thence to Wasiit, and after al-Ra'isi became Caliph in 322 (934) he appointed Muhammad b. Ra'ik governor of Wasiit and Bayda. Towards the end of 319 (Nov. 936) the latter was summoned to Baghdad and given the highest military and civil authority with the title Amir al-Umar. In order to overthrow the powerful general Belqiskin (q.v.) in Wasiit (7th c.) in 320, he entered into negotiations with 'Abd Allah al-Baridi [v. AL-BARDI] and promised him the governorship of Wasiit after the fall of Belqiskin. But al-Baridi was defeated; Belqiskin entered Baghdad in Dhu'l-Qa'da 326 (Sept. 938) and was appointed Amir al-Umar, while Ibn Ra'ik had to go into hiding and al-Baridi was given the governorship of Wasiit. After Belqiskin accompanied by the Caliph had set out for the Hamdansid, Ibn Ra'ik appeared in the capital, but promised to withdraw if he received the governorship of Harran, al-Rahia, and Khinnis along with the districts on the upper Euphrates and the frontier fortresses, which was granted him. As he invaded Syria the Ikshid Muhammad b. 'Uthaimin sent an army against him in 328 (939). The details are variously given; in any case, after some time peace was made according to which the Ikshid retained Egypt and Ibn Ra'ik had to content with Syria as far as al-Ramlia. Quarrels soon broke out between the Turks and the army of Baghdad; the latter won the upper hand and the caliphate's captain Kirthegin was appointed Amir al-Umar. To get rid of him, al-Muttaqi appealed to Ibn Ra'ik. In Ramadhan 329 (June 941) the latter set out from Damascus. He met Kirthegin at 'Utkar and after several days fighting entered Baghdad. When Kirthegin appeared with his troops in Baghdad he was defeated and captured whereas the Caliph again gave Ibn Ra'ik the rank of Amir al-Umar. In the meanwhile al-Baridi had seized Wasiit. In Muhraran of the next year Omar b. Hassan set out against him but a peaceful arrangement was come to and al-Baridi promised to pay an annual tribute for Wasiit. Soon afterwards the Turks deserted Ibn Ra'ik and when trouble broke out in Baghdad on account of famine and scarcity, al-Baridi sent his brother Abu 'I-Husain with an army against the capital. The Caliph and the Amir al-Umar had to take refuge with the Hamhansids of Mosul and in Rajab 330 (March--April 942) Ibn Ra'ik was slain.


IBN RASHID, the name of the Wahnabi rulers (Sayyid al-Ma'ali) of Idayal Shammar in Najd. The founder of the dynasty was:

1. 'Abd Allah b. Ali al-Rashid of the Djafar clan of the Shammar tribe of al-'Abda, 1250—1263 (1835—1847). In 1835 he seized the town of Harr and deposed Shaikh Suhayl of the Idayal family, which had previously ruled the Djabal Shammar
under the suzerainty of the Wahhābī princes of Dar-ṣiya [q.v.] and Riayd. He was recognised by Faisāl, Amir of Riayd, who, according to tradition owed his throne to him, and with the help of his brother, Obād, succeeded in maintaining and extending his rule. In 1838 at the same time as Faisāl, Amir of Riayd, was expelled and replaced by Khālid [cf. Ibn Saʾūd under viii and ix] the Djabal Shammar was also occupied by Khūrshīd Pasha and ʿAbd Allāh banished. After the departure of the Egyptians in 1841, ʿAbd Allāh regained his kingdom. On his death he was succeeded by his son.

II. Ṭalāl b. ʿAbd Allāh, 1263–1283 (1847–1867); he subdued the oases of al-Djūf (Dawmat), Khāibār, Taimā and a portion of al-Kaṣīm and was able to keep the predatory Bedouins in check. By these and other clever measures he brought peace and prosperity into the land ruled by him. His dependence on Riayd, which had become loose even in ʿAbd Allāh’s reign, became limited to occasional military service; payment of tribute was replaced by more or less regular presents of horses. Talāl was also on good terms with Egypt, the Porte and Persia; Palgrave (1862–1863) and Gurnani (1864) were able to travel in his county in his reign; he committed suicide according to Huber in Safār 1283 (June–July 1866), according to Euting on the 17 Dhu ‘l-Kaʿda 1284 = 11th March 1868.

III. Mitʿab, 1283–1285 (1867–1869), Talāl’s brother, who succeeded him, was treacherously murdered before he had occupied two full years on the 2nd Rabīʿ II 1285 = 4th January 1869 (Huber; according to Euting, 2nd Rabīʿ II 1285 = 23rd July 1868) by his nephews Bandār and Badr, Talāl’s sons.

IV. Bandār, the usurper, 1286–1289 (1869–1872) was in his turn disposed of along with his brothers and nephews by his uncle Muḥammad.

V. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Rashīd, 1289–1315 (1872–1897), next to his brother, Talāl, the most vigorous ruler of the Shammar dynasty, continuing the wise policy of his great predecessor strengthened the rising kingdom at home and abroad. Favoured by the Porte, he not only made himself independent of the Amirs of Riayd but in 1891 he occupied Riayd and combined the two rival kingdoms under his own sway. During his reign European travellers repeatedly visited the Djabal Shammar (Doughty, Mr. and Lady Anne Blunt, Huber, Euting, and v. Nolde); he died in the middle of December 1897 without issue and left the kingdom to his nephew.

VI. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Mitʿab 1315–1324 (1897–1906). The latter came into conflict with the powerful Shīkh Mubārak of Kuwait, the protector of the princes of Riayd dispossessed by Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh and a fierce battle took place at al-Ṭurīfya in 1318 (1901), in which ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Faisāl and the Muntashī Shīkh Saʿīdīn fought on the side of Mubārak. In February 1902 ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān of the dynasty of Ibn Saʿūd took the town of Riayd and maintained himself there against the attacks of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz of Djabal Shammar. The latter was finally forced to call in the help of the Turks (1322); he fell in a night battle with his enemy on the 18th Safār 1324 (13th April 1906). His son and successor.

VII. Mitʿab b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was murdered in Dhu ‘l-Kaʿda 1324 (Dec. 1906–Jan. 1907) according to another account in Shābān 12th by VIII. Sulṭān b. Ḥamūd, a grandson of Obād, young brother of ʿAbd Allāh (I above); after reigning a few months, Sulṭān was disposed of in the beginning of 1326 (Feb. 1908) by his brother IX. Saʿūd b. Ḥamūd who was in his turn speedily made away with by Ḥamūd Ibn Subḥān, who placed the sole surviving son of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (VI), X. Saʿūd, on the throne on the 17th Shābān 1326 (14th Sept. 1908); and since then Saʿūd has been reigning with full recognition in the Djabal Shammar.

Bibliography: the travellers mentioned in the article Ibn Saʿūd (particularly, Wallin, Palgrave (Vol. i.), Gurnani, Doughty, Lady Anne Blunt, Huber, Euting, v. Nolde); articles in the Turkish, Arabic and Anglo-Indian Press; notes supplied by Miss Gertrude Bell and J. A. Madīk.

(J. H. Mordtmann.)

Genealogy of the Ibn Rashīd.

A. Elder Line.

1. ʿAli al-Rashīd

2. ʿAbd Allāh (1835–1847)

3. Obād (s. B.)

4. Ṭalāl (1847–1867)

5. Mitʿab (1867–1872)

6. Muḥammad (1872–1897; childless)

7. Bandār

8. Badr

9. Sulṭān

10. Naḥār

11. ʿAbd Allāh

12. Zaid

13. Naʿīf

14. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (1897–1906)

15. Mitʿab

16. Ṭalāl

17. Mishʿal

18. Muḥammad (since 1906)

19. ʿAbd Allāh

20. Saʿūd

21. ʿAbd Allāh

22. Muḥammad

23. ʿAbd Allāh

24. Mishʿal

25. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz
Notes:

B. Younger Line.

1. ʻAlī al-Rashīd (= A 1)
2. ʻObaid (= A 3)
3. Šīmān
4. Fahd (Fahūd)
5. Ḥamdūd
6. Aūt
7. Fāṣīd
8. Šīmān
9. ʻAbd Allāh
17. Ḍārī
10. Mādīd
11. Šālīm
12. Šūṭṭīn
13. ʻObaid
14. Saʿūd
15. Muḥammad
16. Fāṣīl
(1907)

Notes:

**IBN RASHĪK**, ʻAbd ʻAl-Ḥasan b. Rashīk al-ʻAzdī, whose father was perhaps of Greek origin but a client of the Aṣzū, born at al-Muḥammadīya (al-Masila) in Algiers about 385 (995) or 390 (1000). He studied first in his native town where he learned his father’s trade of a jeweller, but went to Ḳairawān in 406 (1015-16) and was appointed court-poet by the Ḳālid Caliph al-Muʻizz. This appointment earned him the enmity of his contemporary ʻAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʻAbd Sa‘īd b. Ahmad, known as Ibn Ṣharaf al-Ḳairawānī, who was also a poet and man of letters. This quarrel which resulted in the publication of several of their works finally induced Ibn Ṣharaf to migrate to Sicily. When Ḳairawān was plundered in 449 (1057) of the Arabs, al-Muʻizz fled, accompanied by his favourite poet, to al-Maḥdiya, where he died in 453 (1061). Ibn Rashīk went in the same year to Mazara in Sicily, where he died in the night of Friday/Saturday 1st Dhu ’l-‘Aṣır 456 (15/16 Oct. 1064), according to others in 453 (1060-1061).

(Moh. Ben Cherif.)

IBN AL-RĀWANDĪ. [See Al-Rawandi.]

IBN ROSTA, Abū ʿAli Ahmad b. ʿOmar, an Arab-Persian scholar of the second half of the 9th (ixth-xith) century. Almost nothing is known of his life. He lived in ʿIsāfūn, where several persons were known as scholars under the name Ibn Rosta. In 930 (903) he visited Medina on the occasion of the pilgrimage. About the same time he wrote his Kitāb al-Aḥāf al-Nafṣīma: of this only the seventh part (ed. by de Goeje, Bibl. Geogr. Arab., v. 1, Leiden 1892) has survived; in it after an introduction on the celestial sphere and the terrestrial globe he proceeds to describe lands and cities. He took his material for the most part from older or contemporary works. Various extracts had previously been published by Chwlonski with Russian translation.

Bibliography: de Goeje, Præfatio to his edition; Brockelmann, Gesch. des arabischen Litter., I, 227.

(C. van Arendonk.)

IBN RŪḤ, Abū ʿl-ʾKāsim al-Ḥusayn b. Rūḥ b. Bahīr al-Bāji al-Nawawardī, third son of the expected Imām (ḡābi) al-Amr of the ʿShīa sect of the Ẓahhārīya (q. v.) during the short absence (al-ghiba al-ʿĀbī) of 264—334 (889-945). In his capacity of nāʾīb (synonymy, ʿābī, wukūf, sīsī, an-nāʾīya al-mukaddasa) he had to issue bulls (tarawīḥ) in the name of the “absent” Imām, who had legal authority among the ʿShīs. He resided in Baghdad, in the Dār al-Nāʾb. He seems to have been appointed by the previous nāʾīb, Abū Dāʾīf al-ʿUmari, before 505 (917). He won so many adherents at the Caliph’s court that the vizier Ḥamdī had him imprisoned. Released in 517 (928) he became implicated in the Karmānī schemes and laid a curse upon al-Ṣaḥmāhghāshī. He died in 526 (937) or 529 (940) after designating Abū ʿl-ʾKāsim al-Ṣāmarrī as nāʾīb. The parents of the great ʿShī theologian Ibn Bāḥyā (q. v.) claimed that they owed his birth to the prayers of Ibn Rūḥ.


IBN AL-RŪMĪ, Abū ʿAli al-ʾAbrās b. Dūrdūdī (Georgios), an Arab poet, born at Baghdad in 221 (836), as the name Ibn al-Rūmī suggests and the name of his grandfather proves, belonged to the land of the Byzantines. He was distinguished for his poetic gifts, but made many enemies by his lampoons, including the vizier of al-Maʿṭahīd, al-Kāsim b. Ḥalāl, grandson of Sulaymān b. Wahb (q. v.), who is said to have got rid of him by poisoning him in 283 (896). The date is not quite certain, for the years 284 and 276 are also given. He left a fairly extensive Divān, which was collected and arranged by al-Ṣāfī. Bibliography: Ibn Khaliḳīn, Wafīṣīṣ, ed. Wustenfeld, N°. 474; Brockelmann, Gesch. der arabischen Litter., I, 79-84.

IBN RUSHD, Abū ʿl-Walīd Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Rushd, celebrated in mediaeval Europe as Averroes, the greatest Arab philosopher of Spain, was born at Cordova in 520 = 1126. His grandfather had been kāfī of Cordova and had left important works, while his father also held the office of kāfī. He studied law and medicine in his native town; one of his teachers was Abū Dāʾīf Ḥāfīz of Truxillo. He lived in 548 = 1153 in Marrākush, whether Ibn Tufail (q. v.) had probably induced him to go. The latter introduced him to the Almohad Abū Yaḥyā Yūsuf who became his patron. An account of this interview is preserved (see Hicr. de los Almohades de Marrakesh, transl. by Fagnán). The Caliph asked Ibn Rushd what was the view of the philosophers on heaven (the universe), whether it was an eternal substance or had a beginning. "It was so overcome with terror" says Ibn Rushd "that I could not answer". The Caliph put him at his ease and began to discuss the question himself by exploding the views of various scholars with an intimacy and learning rare among princes. The Caliph then dismissed him with rich presents.

It was Ibn Tufail who advised Ibn Rushd to comment on Aristotle and told him that the commander of the faithful often lamented the obscure language of the Greek philosophers or rather of the available translations and that he (Ibn Rushd) ought to undertake to explain them.

In 565 = 1169 he became kāfī of Seville and two years later kāfī of Cordova. In spite of the burden of work of this office he composed his most important works in this period. In 578 = 1182, Ibn Yūṣūf summoned him to Marrakush as his physician to replace the aged Ibn Ṭufail, but soon afterwards sent him back to Cordova with the rank of chief kāfī.

At the beginning of the reign of Yaḥūb al-Manṣūr, Yūṣūf’s successor, Ibn Rushd was still in favour with the Caliph, but he fell into disgrace as the result of the opposition of the theologians to his writings and after being accused of various heresies and tried, he was banished to Lucena near Cordova. At the same time, the Caliph ordered the books of the philosophers to be burnt except those on medicine, arithmetic and elementary astronomy (about 1195). Duncan Macdonald observes that these orders of the Almohad ruler who had hitherto encouraged philosophic studies, were probably a concession to the Spanish Muslims, who were much more orthodox than the Berbers. At the time the Caliph was actually waging a religious war against the Christians in Spain. On returning to Marrakush he raised the ban and recalled Ibn Rushd to his court (D. Macdonald, Development of Muslim Theology, New York 1903, p. 255).

Ibn Rushd did not long enjoy the restoration of his fortunes for he died soon after his return to Marrakush (10th Safar 595 = 10th Dec. 1198) and was buried near the town outside the gate of Tagaṭṭāt.

A great part of the Arabic original of Averroes’
works is lost. There have survived in Arabic his Tahāfut al-Tahāfut, the "Collapse of the Collapse", an answer to Ghazâlî's celebrated Tahāfut al-Fālāṣīfā, "Collapse", or perhaps "Collapse of the philosophers" (cf. Miguel Asin y Palacios, Sur le Sens du mot "Tahāfut" dans les œuvres d'al-Ghazâlî et d'avreroes in Revue Africaine, 1906, No. 261, 262, particularly p. 202), also the medium commentaries on the Poetics and Rhetoric of Aristotle (ed. and transl. by Lasinio); the exposition of fragments of Alexander of Aphrodisias on the Metaphysics (s. J. Freudenthal and S. Fraenkel, op. cit.); the large commentary on the Metaphysics in Leiden (Cat. Cod. orient., No. MMXXXCI); small commentaries at Madrid Kitāb al-Qazwīnī (Guillaume Robles, Catálogo... Bibli. Nacion., No. 37; cf. H. Derenbourg, Notes sur les mus. aráb. de Madrid, No. 37, in Homenaje á D. Franc. Codera, p. 577 sq.) referring to Aristotle's treatises De Physica, De Coelo et Mundo, De Generatione et Corruptione, De Meteorologia, De Anima, and certain mathematical propositions; cf. also Derenbourg, Le commentaire aráb. d'avreroes sur quelques petits écrits physiques d'Aristote in Arch. für Gesch. der Philos., xviii. (1905), p. 250, and lastly two interesting treatises on the relations between religion and philosophy (discussed by Léon Gauthier and by Miguel Asin). One of these writings is entitled Kitāb Faṣl al-Maḥbūl and vigorously champions the agreement between religion and philosophy, the other is called Kitāb Ḳahl al-Manahīj, etc. Both works were edited and translated into German by M. J. Müller (see Bibl.) and printed at Cairo under the joint title Kitāb Falsafat Ibn Rushd (1313, 1328). There also exists in Arabic in Hebrew character an abstract of the Logica, the medium commentaries on De Generatione et Corruptione, De Meteoris, De Anima, a paraphrase of the Parva Naturalia (Paris, Bibl. Nat., No. 303, 317), the commentaries on De Coelo, De Generatione and De Meteoris (Bodleiana, Cat., codd. kbr., p. 86) (Renan, Averroës, 3rd ed., p. 83).

The celebrated commentaries of Averroës on Aristotle are of three kinds or rather one in three editions, a large, medium and small edition. This threefold arrangement corresponds to the three stages of instruction in the Muslim universities, the small commentaries, are for the first, the medium for the second and the large for the third year. The exposition of the 'aḵāḍa is similarly arranged.

We possess in Hebrew and Latin translation the three commentaries of Averroës on the Second Analytics, the Physics and on the treatises of the Universe, the Soul and the Metaphysics; the large commentaries on the other works of Aristotle are lacking and no commentary on the Zoology has survived.

Ibn Rushd also wrote a commentary on Plato's Republic, and criticisms on al-Fārābī's logic and his interpretation of Aristotle as well as discussions on certain theories of Avicenna and glosses on the 'Aḵāda of the Mādhī Ibn Tūmar. He also wrote several legal (Kitāb Idāyat al-Muqāṭāt wa-Nīḥāyat al-Muqāṭād, Cairo 1329), and astronomical and medical works. His work on the 'whole art of medicine', al-Kulliyāt (codd. Granada, s. Dossi, Zeitshr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., xxxii, 1882, p. 343; Petersburg, Dorn, Cat., No. 132, and probably Madrid, Robles, Cat., No. 132; cf. H. Derenbourg, Notes etc. No. 132, Homenaje, p. 587 sq.), corrupted in the Latin translations to Colleget, enjoyed a certain renown in the middle ages, but cannot be compared with the Canon of Avicenna.

The philosophy of Averroës cannot be considered original (cf. Renan, Averroës, p. 58). It is rather the philosophy of the Hellenising school of the Fālāṣīfā (cf. Fālāṣīfā, ii. 397) which had already been taught in the east by al-Kindī, al-Fārābī, and Avicenna and in the west by Ibn Bāḏjījī. On some points, however, he controverts the views of his great predecessors but these points are only subsidiary and on the whole his philosophy runs on the same lines.

He owes his fame mainly to his acute analysis and his gift of annotation, qualities which we can hardly appreciate accurately at the present day on account of the differences in our mode of thought, our methods and scientific resources, but they were all the more appreciated by the scholars of the middle ages, notably in Jewish and Christian circles. His commentaries aroused great admiration, even among theologians who saw in his system a danger to faith.

The school of philosophers had already been vigorously attacked by the theologians in the Muslim east. The Tahāfut of al-Ghazâlî directed mainly against al-Fārābī and Avicenna is the most important memorial of this struggle in the east. In the west the school was first attacked by the Muslim theologians of Spain, and later by the Christian theologians also after the commentaries of Averroës had been made known to them in translations. In the 13th century Ibn Rushd was condemned by the bishops of Paris, Oxford and Canterbury for reasons similar to these that had earned his condemnation by the orthodox Muslims of Spain.

The main doctrines of Ibn Rushd's system, that brought the charge of heresy upon him, concern the question of the eternity of the world, the nature of God's apprehension, and His foreknowledge, the universality of the soul and of the intellect, and the resurrection. Averroës may easily appear heretical on these doctrines; he does not deny dogmatism but proclaims it in such a way as to bring it into conformity with philosophy.

Thus in the doctrine of the eternity of the world he does not deny the creation but only gives a rather different explanation from the theological one. For him there is no creation ex nihilo once and for all, but rather a creation renewed from moment to moment whereby the world is maintained and changes. In other words: a creative power is perpetually at work on the world, maintaining and moving it. The constellations in particular exist only through motion, and the motion is not due to any motive force which is acting on them from all eternity. The world is eternal but in consequence of a creative and moving cause: God is eternal and without cause.

In the chapter on the apprehension of God Ibn Rushd repeats the principle of the philosophers that "the first principle only apprehends his own being". According to that school this presupposition is necessary in order that the first principle may retain its unity, for if he recognised multiplicity of being, he would himself become multiple. Interpreted strictly according to this principle, praevalent must live entirely within himself and have knowledge of his own existence only
and foreknowledge would then be impossible. The theologians endeavoured to force the philosophers to this conclusion.

But Ibn Rushd's system has more elasticity. He grants that God in His own essence knows all the things of the world. But His knowledge is neither to be called particular or universal and is therefore not like man's knowledge, but rather of a higher kind of which we can form no conception. [Cf. Falsafa, ii. 50.]. God's knowledge cannot be the same as that of man's, for God would then have 'sharers' in his knowledge and He would no longer be the one God. Moreover God's knowledge is not like man's knowledge derived from things, nor is it produced by them. On the contrary, it is the cause of all things. Therefore the assertion of the theologians that the system of Averroes denies fore-knowledge is incorrect.

Concerning his teaching regarding the soul, Ibn Rushd has been reproached with teaching that the individual souls after death pass into the universal soul, and thereby denying the personal immortality of the soul of man. But this is not at all correct. The soul must be distinguished from the intellect in Averroes' system as well as in the systems of other philosophers. The intellect is quite abstract and immaterial and only exists in reality when it is associated with the universal or active intellect. What we call intellect in the individual is strictly a faculty for grasping the ideas that come from the active intellect, a faculty to which the name 'passive' intellect is given and which is not permanent by itself. It must realise itself and become the 'acquired' intellect (intellctus adepitus). Then it is bound up with the active intellect, in which the eternal ideas rest, and merged into it this faculty becomes itself eternal.

It is not the same with the soul. This with the philosophers is the driving force which effects the life and growth of organic bodies. It is a kind of energy which gives life to matter not free from the qualities of matter like the intellect, but on the contrary closely associated with it. It perhaps may even consist of a kind of half or very fine matter. These souls are the form of bodies and are therefore independent of the body, but continue to exist after the death of the body and can remain individual.

The latter according to Averroes is a bare possibility. He does not believe that a convincing proof of the immortality of the soul so conceived can be established by purely philosophical means. The task of solving the question is left to revelation. (See Zahafat al-Thalifif, p. 137.)

The theologians have further charged Averroes with denying the resurrection of the body. Here also his teaching is rather an exposition than a denial of the dogma. The body which we shall have in the next world is according to him not the same as our earthly body, for what has passed away is not re-born in its identity. It can at best appear again as something similar. Averroes moreover remarks that the future life will be of a higher kind than earthly life; bodies there will therefore be more perfect than in this world. For the rest, he disapproves of the myths and representations which are made of the life in the next world.

As this philosopher was more attacked by orthodoxy than his predecessors, he made more definite pronouncement than they on the relations between philosophical research and religion. He expounds his views on this subject in the above mentioned works Faṣl al-Maḫālī and Kūṣf al-Manāhiḍī. His first principle is that philosophy must agree with religion. This is an axiom of the whole of Arab scholasticism. There are in a way two truths or so to speak two revelations, the philosophic truth and the religious truth, both of which must agree. The philosophers are prophets of their class, prophets who appeal by preference to scholars. Their teaching may not contradict the teaching of the prophets in the proper sense, who appeal particularly to the people; it must rather give the same truth in a higher, less material form.

In religion a distinction must be made between the literal sense and its exposition. If for example a passage is found in the Qur'an which appears to contradict the results of philosophy, we must believe that this passage really has another than the apparent sense and seek the true meaning. It is the duty of the multitude to keep to the literal meaning; to seek the correct interpretation is the task of the learned. Myths and allegories must be understood by the people as revelation presents them; the philosopher, however, has the right to seek out the deeper and purer meaning concealed in them. Finally the learned should make it a practice not to communicate their results to the masses.

Averroes has expounded how religion must be taught according to the intellectual standard of the hearer. He distinguished three classes of men according to their mental endowments: the first and most numerous comprises those who believe as a result of preaching the divine word and are susceptible almost only to oratorical effect. The second class includes those whose beliefs are based on reasoning but only on such as proceeds from a priori premises assumed quite uncritically. The third and smallest class finally consists of those whose beliefs are based on proofs which rest on a chain of established premises. This method of coordinating religious instruction to the mental endowment of the hearer is evidence of a keen psychological insight but it may run the risk of not appearing sincere and it was natural that it should arouse the distrust of professional theologians.

Finally we do not think that Averroes was an infidel, who was trying to protect himself from the attacks of the orthodox with more or less skilful interpretations; we are inclined to think that in general agreement with the attitude of many scholars in the east he was a syncretist, who honestly believed that one and the same truth could be presented under very different aspects and who was able by his great philosophical ingenuity to reconcile doctrines which must have appeared directly contradictory to less elastic minds.

The commentaries of Averroes were translated in the xiii and xiv centuries into Hebrew by Jacob ben Abba Mari Anatoli of Naples (1232), Judah b. Salomon Cohen of Toledo (1247), by Moses b. Tibbon of Lunei (1260), Samuel b. Tibbon, Shem Tob b. Joseph b. Falaquera and Kalonymus b. Kalonymus (1314). Levi b. Gerson of Bagnois (Gersonides) wrote a commentary on Averroes just as the latter had commented on Aristotle.

In the Christian west, Michael Scott and Hermann, both connected with the House of Hohenstaufen,
began in 1230 and 1240 a Latin translation of the Arabic text of Averroes.

Towards the end of the xvth century Niphon and Zimara made some improvements in the old translations. New translations based on the Hebrew were later made by Jacob Manito of Tortosa, Abraham de Balmes and Giovanni Francesco Borelli of Verona. The two best Latin editions of Averroes are those of Niphon (1495—1497) and of the Juntas (1553).


(CARRA DE VAUX.)

IBN AL-SA'ĀṬI (the son of the clockmaker), FAKHR AL-DIN RUSHD (or RUSHDN) B. MUHAMMAD B. 'ALI B. RUSTAM AL-KHORĀSĀNAWI was born in Damascus whither his father had migrated from Khorāsān. The latter was a skilful clockmaker who made the clocks at the time of the great mosque of Damascus, at the request of the Zangid al-Malik al-造船 Nur al-Din Mahmūd (d. in Shawwal 569 = 1174); he was also learned in astronomy. Ibn al-Sa'āṭi was a physician but had also an extensive knowledge of literature, logic and other branches of philosophy, as well as in clockmaking. He was first of all vizier to al-Malik al-Fā'iz b. al-Malik al-造船 Muḥammad b. Ayūb (a nephew of Saladin) and afterwards vizier and physician to his brother al-Malik al-Muṣṭafā b. al-Malik al-造船 (d. 624 = 1227). He died in Damascus c. 1230. There still exists a manuscript of a work by him in Gotha on the construction of clocks (the Arabic title is lacking) written in Mūṣṭafārian of the year 600 (1203), in which he is mainly concerned with his father's clock which he repaired and perfected.

His brother BAKHIR AL-DIN ABU I-ḤASAN ʿALI likewise called IFFN AS-SĀTĪ was a well-known poet who died as early as 604 (1207) at Cairo; on him cf. Ibn Khalikān, ed. Wiistenfeld, p. 489.

Ẓāhir al-Jārī al-Muṣṭafā al-DIN AḤMAD B. ʿALI AL-RAGHĪBĪ, died in 604 (1205), is known by the same name; he was the author of a much used compendium of fikhr, which bears the title Majmaʿ al-Bahrain wa-Muṣṭafā l-Naṣīrīn, because it is a compilation from the Muḥṣafār of al-Kudrī (q. v.) and the Muṣāma of al-Nasāfī. On him cf. Ibn Ḫūṭūlūghaʾs Ṭabḥat al-Hanafiyya, ed. Fīgel, p. 4, and Brockelmann, e. c., i. 382 sq.


(H. SUTER.)

IBN SABĪN, ABū MUḤAMMAD ʿABBĀD AL-ḤAḲĪ, is a rabbi philosopher and founder of a Synagogue, a native of Murcia, is best known in Europe by his reply to some philosophical questions put by Frederick II to the scholars of Ceuta, where Ibn Sabīn had then lived. Cf. A. F. Mehr, Correspondence du philosophe sabbatique Ibn Sabîn avec le chevalier Frédéric II de Hohenstaufen in Journ. Asiat., Ser. vii. Vol. 14, p. 341 sqq., cf. ibid., Ser. v. Vol. i. p. 240 sqq. Ibn Sabīn died at Mecca in 668 (1269).


IBN SAD, ABū ʿABD ALLĀH, MUḤAMMAD B. SĀD B. MANṣ, is a rabbi phiλosopher and a client of the Banū Ḥāšim known as Kūčh al-Wāqīdī (several times vizier to al-造船). He studied tradition under Ḥusayn, Sulaymān b. ʿIrāq, Ibn ʿIbāy, al-Walid b. Muslīm, and notably with Muhammad b. Ṣād al-Wāqīdī (q. v.). Abū Bakr b. Abī l-Dunyā and other traditionists derived tradition from him. His great work, the Kūčh al-Tafaḥāṭ, i.e., the book of the classes, is famous and gives the history of the Prophet, the Companions and Successors down to his own time. Besides the large, Ibn Khalikān and Hādīḏ al-Khalīfā mention his smaller book of classes. When the author of the Fikhrī speaks of a Kūčh ʿAbd al-Nabī of Ibn Sād, this is probably not a separate work but the first part of the latter's book of classes, which deals with the Sirr of the Prophet. The whole work is being published under the title: Ibn Sād, Biographien Muḥammad's, seiner Gelehrten und der späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230 der Flucht, in Vereine mit C. Brockelmann, J. Horovitz, J. Lippert, B. Meissner, E. Mitt.


IBN ŠÂDÅKA, the name of three viziers:

1. Djalal al-Dîn 'Amid al-Dawla Abu 'Ali al-Hasân b. 'Ali, al-Mustashir's vizier. In 513 (1119-20), he was appointed vizier, but in Djamâd 1 516 (July-August 1122) the Caliph dismissed him. His house was plundered and his nephew Abu l-Ridâ fled to Mosul. The office was then given to 'Ali b. Tâirî al-Zainabî and in Shawwâl (October) of the same year, to Ahmad b. Nizâm al-Mulk. When the latter demanded that Ibn Šâdåka should leave the capital, he went to Hitâdhit 'Aina to the Amir Sulaimân b. Mu'nahîrî, but in the following year he was restored to the office of vizier. When the Sâlîq al-Tâhir b. Mu'hammâd was persuaded by Dubâb b. Ṣâdâka [q. v.], to march on Baghdad to subdue the whole of 'Iraq, the Caliph set out to meet him in Sa'dâl 519 (March 1125). Toğhrul and Dubâb encamped at Djalâlîl, the Caliph and the vizier at al-Daskara, N. E. of Baghdad, Toğhrul and Dubâb, then resolved to reach Baghdad by a circular route. The latter was sent ahead with 200 horsemen and occupied the ford of the Dijâla near al-Nahrâwân; but as Toğhrul was delayed partly by an attack of fever and partly by inauditions which made him advance difficult, the Caliph succeeded in ambush him and took Dubâb by surprise. When the latter wished to come to terms with al-Mustashir, the Caliph was willing to make peace but was dissuaded by the vizier, and Toğhrul and Dubâb continued their journey on Khorsânîs to seek help from the Sâlîq al-Sulûk Sandjarî. Djalal al-Dîn Ibn Šâdåka died on Radjab 1 522 (July 1 1128).


2. Djalal al-Dîn Abu l-Ridâ Mu'hammâd, nephew of the preceding, al-Râšíd's vizier. Ibn Šâdåka was appointed vizier by the accession of al-Râshîd in 529 (1135). In the following year, when the Caliph had several high officials arrested, he sought protection with the governor of Mosul, Zânki b. Aş Şonqorî, and was able to hold his office till the deposition of al-Râshîd in Dhu l-Ka'dâ 530 (August 1136). He afterwards filled several high offices. He died in 556 (1160-1).


3. Mu'tamân al-Dawla Abu l-Kâsim 'Ali, al-Mu'âthasî's vizier. He is said to have been a very pious but uneducated man, who knew little of the duties of a vizier, although he belonged to a famous family.


IBN ŠA'ID, Abu l-Hasân 'Ali b. Musâ al-Maghribî, an Arab philologist, was born in 610 = 1214 (according to others, 605 = 1208) at Kašfî Yâshub (Alcalá la Real) near Granada and studied at Seville. With his father he made the pilgrimage to Mecca but when they arrived in Alexandria in 630 (1241-2) his father died there in 640 (1243). He himself remained in Alexandria but travelled in 648 (1250) to Baghdad and from there with Kamâl al-Dîn [q. v.] to Halâb, thence to Damascus, Mosul, Baghdad, Basra, and Mecca. He then went to Tunis and entered the service of Abu 'Abd Allâh al-Mustasîrî. In 666 (1267) he went again to the East and reached Armenia via Alexandria and Halâb, then returned to Tunis and died on returning to Damascus in 673 (1274). According to another statement, he did not die till 685 (1286) in Tunis. He wrote a history of the Magribi entitled al-Magribî fi Hulâ 'Maghrîbî, cf. K. Vollers, Fragmenta aus dem Mscricô des Ibn Sa'id. Semitistik. Studien, Heft 1; Ibn Sa'id, Kitâb al-Maghrib, e. Buch IV, Gesch. der Islîden, Textz. etc. by K. L. Tallquist, Leiden, 1899. He wrote various other works, the titles of which are detailed by Brockelmann and Pons Boëges.

Bibliographie: Brockelmann, Geschichte, etc. i. 336 sqq.; Pons Boëges, Einbau bio-bibliografico, p. 306 sqq. Cf. also the bibliographical references here and in Brockelmann.

IBN SAIYD AL-NÅS, Fath al-Dîn Abu l-Fath Mu'hammâd b. Abû Bakr Mu'hammâd al-Yâmârî al-andalûsî, an Arab biographer, born in Cairo in 661 = 1263 (according to others, in 671 = 1273), studied there and in Damascus and became a teacher of Hâdîth in the Zâhirîa at Cairo. He composed a full biography of the Prophet entitled 'Usîân al-Athâr fi ‘Ummân al-Ma'âthîs, al-Samkil wa l-Sîyar (somewhat differently given in Brockelmann, see below). He also wrote a number of chapters in praise of the Prophet, entitled Bâshîr l-Lubbî fi Dhikra l-Halâb. One of these is published by Kosegarten (Stralsund 1815) and Basset (Louvain 1886). Ibn Saiyd al-Nâs died in 732 (1334).

Bibliographie: cf. the references in Brockelmann, Geschichte etc. ii. 71 sqq. and Pons Boëges, Einbau bio-bibliografico, p. 320 sq.

IBN SARAYA [See al-Hillî]


(C. Brockelmann)

IBN SA'UD, the name of the Wahhâbî dynasty of Dar'îya [q. v.] and Riyâd, Mu'hammâd b. Sa'îd, the founder of this dynasty was a member of the Mu'âdrân clan of the tribe of Masâlîk of the Wald 'Ali, who are considered to belong to the great 'Anaza group of Arabs. His father Sa'îd ruled over Dar'îya and died in the fourth decade of the 13th century A. H., i.e. between 1277 and 1377; according to the genealogy of the Ibn Sa'îd, he left 3 sons besides Mu'hammâd: Thunayyân, Mu'âdrân and Fârîn. The suzerain of the Wahhâbîs of Dar'îya and later of Riyâd has remained in the line of Mu'hammâd b. Sa'îd to this day; the collateral lines
of Ibn Thunayyan and Ibn Mūshāri produced two usurpers (see viii. and x. below) but attained little prominence in the history of the dynasty; Fārāh and his descendants only figure in the genealogical lists. The history of the Wāhhabī kingdom of Dārīyya–Riyadh may be divided into three periods: the first runs from the foundation to the conquest of the land by the Egyptians in 1820 (Dārīyya as capital). The second covers the period from the restoration by Turki and Faisāl to the conquest by Ibn Rashīd of Iṣīlī, 1820–1886 (Kiyyād as capital); the third began with the reconquest of Riyyād in 1902.

I. Muḥammad b. Saʿūd, 1735 (37)–1766. About 1740 Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, the founder of the Wāhhabī doctrine, was driven from Ayyān where he had been active and found shelter with Muḥammad b. Saʿūd, a friend of his. The two combined to spread the new doctrine with preaching and the sword. The fighting with the surrounding towns and tribal districts began in 1159 (begins 24th Jan., 1746) and soon led to the intervention of some powerful neighbours, like the Bani Ḥahlīl of Lāḥiṣa and the Makrami of Nadjān, who were however unable to check the progress of the Wāhhabīs. The Wāhhabī pilgrims were regarded as sectarian by the Sharifs of Mecca and excluded from visiting the holy places. The reports of the Sharifs on this matter in 1162 (begins 25th Dec., 1749) brought the first news of the new sect to Constantinople. Muḥammad b. Saʿūd died in 1179 (1765–6) after reigning about 30 years.

II. 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Muḥammad b. Saʿūd, 1179–1218 (1766–1803). The first decades of his reign were passed in constant fighting with the neighbouring towns and tribes, the Bani Ḥahlīl, the Makrami, and the Muntafīs. In 1795 the Wāhhabīs stormed Lāḥiṣa and Kāfīr and thus established themselves on the coast of the Persian Gulf; the repeated attempts of the Turkish governors of Basra and Baghdad and their allies the Muntafīs to oust them from there (1797 the Muntafīs' Shaikh Thuwaini's campaign; 1798 Kīyyā ʿAli Pasha's campaign) ended unsuccessfully and led in 1799 to a six years' truce between ʿAbd al-'Azīz and the Pasha of Baghdad. The Sharif Surūr of Mecca had in 1186 (1772-3) granted the Wāhhabīs the right of entry to the holy places on payment of a tax; his successor Ghālib (from 1202) withdrew this concession and undertook unsuccessful campaigns in 1790, 1795, and 1798 to check the advance of the Wāhhabīs into the Hijāz; he had to make peace with them in 1798 and allow them to make the pilgrimage, and they in return pledged themselves not to make further raids into the Sharifs' sphere of influence. The peaceful relations with Baghdad and the Sharifs were of short duration. To revenge an attack by the Shīʿī Khazaʿlī on a Wāhhabī caravan, Saʿūd, son of ʿAbd al-'Azīz, fell upon Karbalā on the 18th Dhu 'l-Hijjād 1216 (21st April 1802), plundered and laid waste the Shīʿī sanctuaries there, and massacred most of the inhabitants. In 1214 and 1215 April 18, Ibn Saʿūd and Saʿūd b. Saʿūd made the pilgrimage; about the same time the tribes of Ṭasīr and Tiḥāma as well as the Bani Ḥarb, who had hitherto been subject to the Sharif Ghālib, joined the Wāhhabīs, which led to open hostilities. On the 25th Shawwal 1217 (18th Feb., 1803) the Wāhhabīs stormed Ṭasīr and on the 8th Muḥarram 1218 (30th April 1803) Saʿūd made his triumphal entry into Mecca. After Saʿūd's return the Sharif Ghālib drove out the Wāhhabī garrison in Mecca (22nd Rabiʿa 1218 = 11th July 1803) but was forced to make further concessions to the Wāhhabīs.

About 1800 the Wāhhabīs began to extend their power along the coast of the Persian Gulf where in the course of the next few years they subjected Bahrayn and the coast tribes, namely the Dhawasimī tribes of Ra's al-Khirāma.

On the 18th Rājdah 1218 (4th Nov., 1803) ʿAbd al-'Azīz was stabbed by a Shīʿī from Amādiya in the mosque of Dārīyya.

III. Saʿūd b. ʿAbd al-'Azīz, 1218–1229 (1803–1814). After several smaller enterprises against Baghdad and 'Oman, Saʿūd resolved to put an end to the rule of the Sharif Ghālib and occupied Medina in 1220 (1805) and Mecca in Dhu l-Ka'da of the same year (January 1806). To save the remnants of his power Ghālib submitted absolutely to the Wāhhabīs, who now introduced their teaching into the Hijāz. The pilgrim caravans equipped by the Turkish government were forbidden admission to the sacred territory, the khawba in the name of the Sulṭān abolished, and Saʿūd demanded in a formal letter that not only the governor of Damascus, but the Sulṭān himself should adopt the Wāhhabī creed. To the emphatic refusal of the Pasha of Damascus, Saʿūd replied by plundering Jawzān in July 1810. Saʿūd organised the piracy of the coast tribes on the Persian Gulf on a great scale so that the Indian Government was forced in 1809 to equip an expedition which stormed Ra's al-Khirāma on Nov. 13 of this year and destroyed the pirate fleet.

The Porte unable to defend its own territory from the attacks of the Wāhhabīs finally commissioned Muḥammad 'Ali, Pasha of Egypt, to reconquer the Hijāz.

The first campaign of the Egyptian forces under Tūsūn Pasha began with the reconquest of Yanbū al-Bahr and Yanbū al-Barr at the end of Oct., beginning of Nov. 1811; on his advance on Medina Tūsūn Pasha however was defeated on the 7th Dhu l-Ka'da 1226 = 23rd Nov., 1811 in the narrow pass of Djeidele by 'Abd Allāh and Faisāl, Saʿūd's sons, and had to retire to Yanbū. It was not till the late autumn of 1812 that he resumed operations, this time with more success; Medina capitulated in November, Mecca at the end of January 1813 and Tūsūn was stormed a few days later; on the other hand the Wāhhabīs succeeded in checking the further advance of the Egyptians at Tarāba (summer 1813). At the end of August Muḥammad 'Ali himself landed in Djjddah and Saʿūd sought in vain to negotiate peace with him. A second attempt of Tūsūn Pasha against Tarāba (at the end of 1813) was as unsuccessful as the first and the operation of the Egyptians came to an end till the beginning of 1815. In the meanwhile Saʿūd died on the 8th Djamāda 1 1229 = 27th April 1814 in Dārīyya, at the age of 66.

IV. ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿūd, 1229–1233 (1814–1818). In the beginning of 1815 Muḥammad 'Ali resumed his march against Tarāba, defeated the Wāhhabīs at Tarāba on the 15th January and took the town; he next advanced against 'Asīr and returned via Kūnfūda to Mecca. Tūsūn Pasha entered Nadjād via Ḥanākīya in March
and seized the fortified town of al-Rass where ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿūd met him. A longish truce followed and peace negotiations which lasted till 1816. In Sept. 1816 Ibrāhīm Pasha, son of Muḥammad ʿAlī, took over the supreme command in Arabia and lead his army amid great privations and fierce fighting for eighteen months up to the gates of Darʿīya (defeat of ʿAbd Allāh at Māwyā on 2nd May 1817, capture of al-Rass in the 21st Oct. 1817 after a three months' siege, storming of Dūmmā in March 1818). The siege of the capital defended by ʿAbd Allāh and his relatives lasted from the beginning of April to the beginning of Sept. 1818; after the town had fallen on the 6th Sept. ʿAbd Allāh held out a few days longer in the Kaşar Darʿīya and surrendered on the 9th Sept. to the victor who sent him to Cairo with his family and the descendants of Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb. Muhammad ʿAlī sent ʿAbd Allāh with his secretary and some Kazāri, where they were all beheaded on the 17th Dec. 1818.

V. After Ibrāhīm Pasha had left Najdī in the first half of 1819, Mūshārī b. Saʿūd, a brother of the executed ʿAbd Allāh, succeeded in establishing himself in Darʿīya; after a short time he was captured by Husain Bey whom Muḥammad ʿAlī sent against him and deported to Egypt but died on the way; the Chronicle of Rāšīd al-Ḥanbālī allots the years 1233–5 (1818–20) to his reign.

VI. Turki b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Saʿūd, 1235–1249 (1820–1834). He had fled to Sūdārī after the Egyptian invasion and endeavoured to establish himself in Riyād after the death of Mūshārī b. Saʿūd (V), but was driven out by the Egyptians. In 1822, however, he succeeded in surprising the weak Egyptian garrison of Riyād, and after fighting with varying success against the governors of the Ḥijāz, he finally agreed to pay tribute to Muḥammad ʿAlī. In 1830 he seized the district of Lāḥash which had been occupied by the Turks in 1813 and subdued Bahrāin. Riyād became capital of the new Wāḥhābī kingdom in place of the destroyed Darʿīya. He was murdered in 1240 (1834) by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Mūshārī b. Ḥāsān b. Mūshārī b. Saʿūd, but the latter was attacked in Ḥufūd 40 days later and slain by Faisal, the son of VI.

VII. Faisal b. Turki, first reign 1240–1255 (1834–8). In 1837 Khālid, a son of Saʿūd (III), rose against him with Egyptian help, took Darʿīya, and defeated Faisal at Riyād. Khurshīd Pasha, the commander of the Egyptian troops, defeated Faisal a second time on the 25th Ramadān 1254 (10th Dec. 1838) at al-Delem, took him prisoner, and deported him to Egypt.

IX. Khālid b. Saʿūd, 1255–7 (1839–41). After the withdrawal of the Egyptian troops in 1840, he was driven out of Riyād by ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭuḥnāyān and retired to Dūmmā, where he died in 1861.

X. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭuḥnāyān b. Ibrāhīm b. Ṭuḥnāyān b. Saʿūd, 1275–9 (beginning of 1842 to beg. 1843). After reigning barely a year he was besieged at Riyād by Faisal (VIII) who had regained his liberty in 1841, and taken prisoner. He died in confinement.

XI. Faisal b. Turki, second reign 1250–1282 (beg. 1843—beg. Dec. 1865). By a wise and peaceful policy he was able to establish the rule of his dynasty in Najdī; in his time began the rise of the Ibn Rashīd [q. v.] of Djjābil Shammar, who were his allies. He was on good terms with Egypt and the Sultan. In his reign Falgrāve visited the country in 1862–3, and Pelly in 1865. He died of cholera on 13th Radjab 1282 (2rd Dec. 1865).


XIII. Saʿūd b. Faisal b. Turki, 1287–1291 (1871–4); at the beginning of his reign the Turks, summoned by the banished ʿAbd Allāh, occupied Lāḥash as well as Kaşāf and held them in spite of Saʿūd's repeated attempts to regain them.

XIV. ʿAbd Allāh b. Faisal b. Turki, second reign, 1291–1301 (1874–1884). After Saʿūd's death he regained his throne and held it against his brother Muḥammad and Saʿūd's sons, who disputed it with him. In 1883 he was involved in war with Muḥammad b. Rashīd of Ḥaḍar and was banished by his nephews, the sons of Saʿūd, in the beginning of 1884. As a result, in 1884 Muḥammad b. Saʿūd came to the throne; his rule was of short duration: he was succeeded by his uncle.

XVI. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Faisal, 1302–1312 (1885–95): he was dethroned by Muḥammad b. Rashīd, who placed on the throne.

XVII. ʿAbd Allāh b. Faisal (for the third time, 1887–1888). The latter died probably in 1888 and Rašīd then became a dependency of Ḥaḍar in spite of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān's repeated attempts to regain the vacant throne. In 1881 Muḥammad b. Rashīd conquered Rašīd and in 1892 appointed Muḥammad, the third son of Faisal, Amir of Rašīd. After the death of Muḥammad (date unknown) Rašīd seems to have been governed by Ibn Rashīd's officials.

XIX. ʿAbd al-Azīz b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Faisal, since the beginning of 1902. With the help of Shaikh Mūbārak of Kuwait, with whom his father had found a refuge, he regained Rašīd in March 1902 by a coup d'état and successfully held it against the Ibn Rashīd of Ḥaḍar, who finally called in the Turks to help them. Nevertheless, he succeeded owing to the anarchy prevailing in Ḥaḍar and with the help of the people, who were attached to the house of Saʿūd, in restoring the supremacy of the kingdom of Rašīd.

Bibliography: Rāšīd b. ʿAlī al-Ḥanbālī Muḥārī al-Waqīd fi Merṣīyāt Ansāb Muḥād Najdī (Genealogies of the Ibn Saʿūd and a sketch of their history to 1291 H.; Ms. in the author's possession); ʿUmmān b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Bishr, ʿUrwa al-Maqid fi Torāb Najdī, Baghdād, 1328; Āḥmad b. Zāīnā Dāḥān, al-Fuṭūḥāt al-ʿIlmīyya (Mecca, 1302), ii. 202–209; Ed. Scott Waring, A tour to Shereza (London 1807), ch. xxxi.; J. L. Rousseau, Description du Paysâh des Bejaâd, Paris 1809; do., Notice sur la secte des Wahabîs dans les Tuaregs des Orsent, i. 191–8; Coraneco, Histoire des Wahabîs depuis leur origine jusqu'à la fin de 1809, Paris 1810; [Rousseau], Mémoire sur les tristes fâmeuses sectes du musulmanisme, Paris 1818; Sadlier, Diary of a Journey across Arabia during the Year 1819, Bombay 1866; John Lewis Burk-
Genealogy of the Ibn Saʿūd.

A. (Older Line).

1. Saʿūd b. Muḥammad b. Muḥran (d. about 1735)

2. Muḥammad (1735–1766)

3. Farḥān

4. Thuneyyān

5. Mūṣārī

6. ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīz (1766–1803)

7. ʿAbd Allāh (see below B.)

8. Saʿūd (1803–1814)

9. ʿAbd Allāh

10. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān

11. ʿOmar

12. ʿAbd Allāh (reg.1814–8)

13. Faṣāṣal

14. Nāṣir

15. Ḥaḍḥūl

16. Saʿūd

17. Khālid (1839–1841)

18. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān

19. ʿOmar

20. Ibrāhīm

21. Mūṣārī

22. Turkī

23. Faḥd (Fuḥād?)

24. Ḥāsān

25. Saʿūd

26. Naṣr


Notes:

6. (ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīz) was 82 at his death in 1803 (Mengin, ii. 467) cf. Scott-Waring, p. 177 of the French transl.

8. (Saʿūd) 68 at his death (Mengin, ii. 20), Rousseau and Birkhardt say 45–50.

9. (ʿAbd Allāh) in 1815 brought about the truce of al-Kass (Mengin, ii. 41 sgg); his son Saʿūd was killed in 1818 after the capture of Darʿīya (ib. p. 131; Šanṭāzāḏe, ii. 383).

10. (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān) deposed to Egypt in 1818.

11. (ʿOmar) deposed to Cairo with his sons in 1818 or 1820.

12. Mengin gives a portrait of ʿAbd Allāh.

13. (Faṣāṣal) fell at the siege of Darʿīya in 1818 (Mengin, ii. 129).

14. (Nāṣir) fell on a raid against Muscat (Birkhardt, ii. 122).

16. (Saʿūd), 17. Khālid, 23. (Faḥd), 24. (Ḥāsān) deposed to Cairo in 1818.

22. (Turkī) led a raid in to ʿIrāk and Syria (Birkhardt, ii. 122).

25. (Saʿūd) deposed a fort of Darʿīya in 1818 and was deposed to Cairo with his brothers Naṣr and Muḥammad in 1818 (Mengin, ii. 130, 133, 158).

28. (Khālid) is only mentioned by Ayīḥab Šābtī, p. 266, probably a confusion with 17.

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, II.
B. (Younger Line).

1. Muḥammad b. Saʿūd (= A 2)
2. Ābī Ṭālib (= A 7)
3. Ğurk (1820–1834)

4. Pāšāl (1834–8 and 1843–1865)
5. Ābī Ṭālib
6. Djalawī

7. Ābī Allāh (1865–1871; 1874–1884; 1886–1888)
8. Saʿūd (1871–4)
9. Muḥammad (al-Muqawwāt) (1891–; childless)
10. Ābī al-Raḥmān (1865; 1888–1891)

Turkī

11. Ābī Allāh
12. Saʿūd
13. Ābī al-Āzīz
14. Muḥammad (1884–)
15. Ābī al-Raḥmān

16. Ābī al-Āzīz
17. Saʿūd (1902–)

Notes:
2. (Ābī Allāh) mentioned in Mengin, ii. 482 (a. 1778) and Coranecz, p. 46 (a. 1803).
3. (Turkī), according to Blunt, ii. 269, had two other brothers, Ibrāhīm and Muḥammad.
5. (Ābī Allāh) cf. Blunt, ii. 266.
6. (Djalawī) still living in 1897; s. Doughty, ii. 428; he had five sons: Fāḥd, Muḥammad, Saʿūd, Mūṣīd, Ābī al-Muḥsin.
9. (Muḥammad), according to Nolde, p. 89, not 40 till 1892; doubtful if correct, cf. Palgrave, i. 169 sq. Doughty, ii. 430, and Huber, Journal, p. 162.
10. (Ābī al-Raḥmān), according to Palgrave (ii. 75), in 1863 aged 10–12; Blunt, ii. 267.

IBN SHADDĀD, BAHĀʾ AL-DĪN ABU ʿL-MAHĀ-SIN YΟΥCEF b. RĀFIʿ, an Arab biographer, born at Mūṣāl in 539 (1145), studied there and in Baghādād and became a professor in his native town in 569 (1173). In 583 (1188) he made the pilgrimage and on his return journey went to Damascus, where he entered the service of Shāh al-Dīn who made him Kābi ʿl-Aṣkār of Jerusalem. After Shāh al-Dīn’s death he went to Hālab in 591 (1195) and was made a kābi. He had a very influential and lucrative position at Hālab under al-Zāhir and al-Āzīz and he used it to found and amply endow madrasas. He spent the last years of his life as a private individual till his death in 632 (1234). His chief work is the biography of Saladin ed. by A. Schultens 1732–1755; oriental ed. Cairo 1317. English version by Conder, The life of Saladin by Bekh ad-din compared with the original Arabic and annotated, London 1897. Cf. also Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Hist. Orient., vol. iii.


IBN SHADDĀD, BIZ AL-DĪN ABU ʿĀBĪ AllāH MUḤAMMAD b. ʿĀLI b. ḤIYĀHĪ, an Arab historian, often confused with the preceding, d. 684 (1285). He is the author of an important work on Syria and al-Ḥassira entitled al-ʿĀʿal al-ḥṣira


Bibliography: Brockelmann, Geschichte, i. 482; Cat. Leid. i, II, 5 sq.

IBN SHĀKIṢR. [See AL-KUTUB.]

IBN ŚIDĀ, ABI ʿL-Ḥasan ʿĀLI b. ISMĀʿIL (or ʿAMAẓD or MUḤAMMAD) b. ŚIDĀ, philologist, man of letters, and logician, born at Murcia in Spain and died in Denia aged about 60 on Sunday, 4 days before the end of Rabīʿ II 458 = 25th March 1666.

Ibn Śidā was blind and studied with his father, also blind, who was a not unimportant philologist, Abu ʿl-ʿĀlāʾ Ṣūṭīd al-Baghdādī, Abu ʿOmar ʿAḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Ṭalamanki, Śālīḥ b. al-Ḥasan al-Baghdādi and others. He attached himself to the court of the Emir Abu ʿl-Djālsī Dschajīd b. ʿĀbī Allāh al-ʿĀmīrī and on his death to his successor, the Emir al-Muważṣā. As he had previously avoided the latter on account of a certain disdain he now sent him a long poem of apology.

We possess only three works by him 1. Kīlāb al-Mukrāṣa, a large dictionary, in which the words are arranged in groups according to definite classes, printed in 17 vols. 8 1316–1321.

2. Kit. al-Muḥṣam waʾl-Muḥṣif al-ʿAzām, like-
wise a large and excellent dictionary in which the words are alphabetically arrayed in the order of the first radical, but in this order: 'āin, ḥā, kā, ḥāl, ghain, kāf, kāf, qām, shān, šād, sinn, sin, sā, ṣay, fā, dāl, tā, ṣād, ṣād, rā, ṣād, nūn, fā, bā, mīn, hamza, yā, waw, Brit. Mus., Suppl. N° 854; Khed. Libr., Fihār., IV, 184 (incomplete copy).


(Moh. Ben Chenen.)

IBN SINĀ, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ibn ʿAbd Allāh (Lat. Avicennæ auctore Helb. Aven Sinā), was for centuries and still is in parts of the Musulm.-east considered the prince of all learning al-Shābī, al-Raʾisī. His biography, given by Ibn Abī Qāsīb (ed. A. Müller, ii. 292) was compiled by his pupil Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṭūsī and from his own notes. According to it he was born in 370 = 980 at Afschān near Buhārā. His father had moved from Bālghī to Buhārā, was appointed governor of the capital of Khurāsān, and married in Afschān. After his birth of two years the resumed his residence in Bukhārā, where the latter received their education. Up to his tenth year Ibn Sinā had a tutor in Kūrān and Adāb. He was introduced to secular learning by Ismāʿīlī propagandists who had been received in his father’s house, but their speculations on the soul and the intelligence made no great impression on him at first. After studying fiqh he was taught logic, geometry, and astronomy by Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Nīrī. The student who developed early both physically and mentally soon overtook his teacher and studied by himself physics, metaphysics and medicine. His practice of medicine soon enabled him to understand better but metaphysics, which he became clear to him after studying one of Farābī’s works. This decided his philosophical development, al-Farābī’s metaphysical and logical speculations which originated in the Neo-Platonic commentaries and paraphrases of Aristotelian works, determined the direction of his thought. He was then 15 or 17 years of age.

At the same time the marvellous boy had the good fortune to cure the sultan of Buhārā, Nūḥ b. Maṣūr, and as a result received admission to his library. Endowed with a marvellous memory and rapid power of assimilating knowledge, in a short time he gained here all the knowledge that he required in order to systematise all the learning of his time. He began to write at the age of 21; his style as a rule is clear and comprehensive.

After the death of his father — he was now 22 — Ibn Sinā lead an unsettled life, full of work and enjoyment but also of disappointments. When at rest at the courts of Djiūrjīn, Raqīj, Hamadānī and Ṣafāshāh, he wrote his great works, of which we may especially mention the philosophical encyclopaedia, Kitāb al-Ṣāfā (Teheran, 1313), and his chief book on medicine, al-Kūhān fī l-Ṭibb (Teherān 1284, Būlāk 1294); on his travels he wrote synopses of his larger works and treatises of various kinds. Sometimes his activities were scientific, sometimes political, the latter with slight success. He is important as the universal encyclopaedist, who fixed the system of learning for centuries following.

Our philosopher spent the last years of his life under the protection of Ala’ al-Dawla in Isfāhān. On the latter’s campaign against Hamadān in 428 = 1037, Ibn Sinā fell ill on the way and died in Hamadān where his grave is still shown. His works were much read, annotated and translated into western languages. He lives in the popular tradition of the east as a magician, a kind of ‘Fried Piper’.

Ibn Sinā’s doctrines which still possess great authority in theological, philosophical, and medical circles of the east in spite of their partial reftation by al-Ghazālī, cannot be fully expounded here but only briefly indicated and characterized.

(Moh. Ben Chenen.)
In logic and epistemology he closely follows al-Farabi. This is true also of the question of universalia which is in a way of metaphysical importance. The universal is said to exist in the mind of God and the angels (spirits of the spheres) independent of the existence of the many particulars. It emanates from the divine spirit communicated by multiple intermediation on the one side to the particular things and on the other to human intelligence in which plurality is raised to a concept of unity and universality. More Neo-Platonic than Aristotelian is the view that the concept is primarily a gift of the super-human spirit rather than a product of the abstractive faculty of the human reason.

Although he expounds it fully, Ibn Sinâ only considers logic an introductory science. Philosophy proper is either theoretical or practical: the former is divided into physics, mathematics, and metaphysics, with their applications, the latter into ethics, economics and politics. Ibn Sinâ paid little attention to the practical parts of philosophical science. The series, physics, mathematics, metaphysics, marks a gradual advance from the material to the abstract. It is true that metaphysics is generally defined as the science of all being, so that immaterial being is the problem and not the direct object of this science, but this problematic becomes the main point in philosophical expositions.

Ibn Sinâ's physics on the whole is based on Aristotelian tradition, although there are also Neo-Platonic influences here: particularly for example in the doctrine that earthly happenings are influenced by the stars, not through their warmth but through the intermediary of light. Neo-Platonic also are the speculations on the intelligence, in which results his otherwise finely developed psychology.

Ibn Sinâ had most influence through his medicine, in the west down to the XVIIth century, in the east still now. He is the Arab Galen. How far he incorporated observations of his own into this science, has still to be investigated. In theory at least he gives experience a large place and discusses the conditions, under which the healing effect of a medicine shows itself.

Ibn Sinâ's paraphrase of Aristotelian metaphysics (leaving aside his little known mathematics) besides neo-Platonic elements contains an attempt at reconciliation with Muslim theology. The dualism in mind and matter (actuality and potentiality), God and world, is more marked in him than in al-Farabi, and the doctrine of the immortality of the individual souls is more clearly laid down. Matter is defined by him as possible being or merely passive possibility and creation is said to consist in granting actual existence to this possible being. Only in the Deity are being and existence one, but in all that is not the Deity, existence is an attribute of being. In theological terminology, the granting of real existence is called creation, but it is an eternal creation. God, the absolutely necessary and uniform being, is also a necessary cause, which by on its own, produces the effect, the world, is therefore eternal. In itself this is possible (contingent), from the point of view of its divine cause it is necessary. Ibn Sinâ distinguishes the contingency of this at once possible and necessary being from the contingency of all earthly happenings, that exist for a time, the sublunar world is the world of the merely possible. The metaphysical doctrine of the soul in particular induced our philosopher to mystic reflections, some in poetical form. Great danger forced him once to escape his enemies in Shi'a guise. It may therefore have been in hours of depression, that there was a necessity for him to use the language of mysticism. It is therefore an occasional mysticism which crowns the building of his system but does not carry or support it.


(T. J. De Boer.)

IBN SIRÎN, MUHAMMAD, was a contemporary of Hasan al-Bâšî [q. v.]. His father is said to have been a tinker of Djarjarjâyâ, who was carried off as a slave by Khâlid b. al-Walid from 'Āin al-Tamr. His mother 'Âṣîya was a client of Abû Bakr. Muhammad belonged to the second generation of transmitters of tradition; his authorities were Abu 'l-Mu'âzam and Abû 'l-Mu'âzam [q. v.], Anas b. Malik [q. v.], etc. He settled in Bâšâ, was noted for his ascetic piety like his sister Hâfûz (cf. Ibn Sa'd, Tabbâšt, viii. 355 sqq.), and was considered an authority on the interpretation of dreams. Treatises on the latter subject were therefore frequently written by later authors under his name, for example the Muntakhab al-Qâlâm fi Tafsîr al-'Ahlâm, Cairo 1868, and on the margin of

IBN SURAIDJ, Abu l-ʿAbbas ʿAbd al-Muʾmin B. ʿUmar B. Suraidj, was, according to the Arabic biographers, one of the greatest Shāfiʿi teachers of the third century. Many celebrated Shāfiʿis were his pupils, and he attained such repute that he was considered by many to be superior to all other Shāfiʿi students, even al-Muzani. He was kāfi in Shīrāz and wrote treatises refuting the Zāhirīs, etc. The number of his works is placed at 400, but none of them now exists. Only a few of the titles of his works are known. He died at the age of 57 in Baghdad in 306 = 918.


(TH. W. JYNBOLL.)

IBN SURAIDJ, ʿUbayd Allah Abu Yaḥyā, a Meccan singer and composer of the older Umayyad period, was the son of a Turkish slave in Mecca and a client of the Banu Nawfal b. ʿAbd Manaf, or of the Banu Ṭāhār b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib. He began his career as a musician in the caliphate of Othman. He is said to have been the first to introduce the Persian lute into Mecca and to have learned its use from the Persian workmen imported by Ibn al-Zubair to rebuild the Kaʿba. When at the height of his fame he was on intimate terms with ʿOmar b. Abī Rabīʿa [q. v.] whose love poems he set to music; but he also enjoyed a great reputation as a composer of elegies. But as his art could only be transmitted orally, it was soon forgotten after his death; in the time of the singer Djiḥaṣ his tunes were only known to a few old people. He died in the reign of Hisān (105-125 = 724-743).

Bibliography: Abu l-Farajī al-Iṣbāḥání, Kitāb al-Aghānī, i. 97-129.

(C. BROCKELMANN.)

IBN AL-TĀʾĀWIDHĪ. [See IBN AL-TĀʾĀWIDHĪ.]

IBN TAGHIRIBERDĪ. [See ABU L-MAḤĀSIN.]

IBN TAMĪYA, Tākī al-Dīn Abu l-ʿAbbas ʿAbd al-ʿAlī B. ʿAbd al-Ṣalām B. ʿAbd Allāh B. Muḥammad b. Tāmīya al-Ḥarānī al-Ḥanбалī, Arab theologian and jurist, was born on Monday 10th Rabīʿ I 661 = 22 January 1263 at Ḥarrān, near Damascus. Fleeting from the exactions of the Mongols, his father had taken refuge at Damascus with all his family, in the middle of the year 667 = 1268. In the capital of Syria, the young Almohad devoted himself to the study of Muslim sciences and followed his father's lectures and those of Zain al-

In Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-Dārim al-Mukaddasī, Nādir al-Dīn b. ʿAskīr, Zainab bint Maḳkī, etc.

He was not yet 20 when he completed his studies, and at the death of his father in 681 = 1282, he succeeded him as professor of Ḥanbalī law. Each Friday he expounded the ʿUṣūl in a cathedral. Well versed in the ʿUṣūlī sciences, Ḥadīth law, theology etc., he defended the sound tradition of the earlier Muslims by arguments which, although taken from the ʿUṣūlī and Ḥadīth, had hitherto been unknown, but the freedom of his polemics made him many enemies among the scholars of the other orthodox schools. In 691 = 1292 he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. In Rabīʿ I 699 (1299) or 698 at Cairo he gave to a question sent from Ḥamā on the attributes of God, a "response" which displeased the Shāfiʿī doctors, aroused public opinion against him, and cost him his post of professor. Nevertheless he was appointed the same year to preach the Holy War against the Mongols and for this purpose went next year to Cairo. He was present in this capacity at the victory of Shākhsū, near Damascus, won over the Mongols. After having in 704 = 1304 fought against the people of Dijbāl between Ṣyrūk and Ismāʿīlīs, Ṣuṣānīs, Ḥikāmīs, who believed in the infallibility of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib and considered the Companions unbelievers, neither prayed nor fasted, ate pork etc. (Marī, Kawkabī, p. 165). He went in 705 = 1306-7 to Cairo along with the Shāfiʿī kāfi, where, after five sessions of the council of judges and notables in the Shūlān's audience-hall who had accused him of anthropomorphism he was condemned to be interred with his two brothers in the dungeon (gūbā) of the mountain citadel; he remained there a year and a half. In Shawwal 707 (1308), he was examined regarding a work which he had written against the Ḥathālīyin [v. Ḥathālīyin] but the evidence he gave disarmed his enemies at once. Sent with the post back to Damascus, he was forced to return after one stage of the journey and for political reasons was imprisoned in the kāfi's prison for a year and a half, which he spent in teaching the principles of Islam to those under confinement. But after a few days of liberty he was shut up in the fortress (būḍ) of Alexandria for eight months. He then returned to Cairo where, although he refused Shūlān al-Naṣir a fattuṣ allowing him to revenge himself on his enemies, he obtained the post of professor in the school founded by this prince.

In Dhu l-ʿAqīdah 712 = Febr. 1312, he was authorised to accompany the army departing for Syria, and after going through Jerusalem, he recovered Damascus after an absence of seven years and seven weeks. He then resumed his duties as professor, but in Djamāda II 718 = August 1318, he was forbidden by royal edict to give fattuṣ on the oath of repudiation (to swear to repudiate a wife for example if something is done or not done), a question on which he had allowed himself several concessions not admitted by the jurists of the other three orthodox schools (Ibn al-Wardi, Taʿīdīr, ii. 267) who hold that he who takes such an oath, although he is bound to fulfill his contract, is liable to an arbitrary punishment.

Refusing to obey this order he was condemned to imprisonment in the citadel of Damascus. In Rabīʿ I 720 = August 1320, after 5 months and 18 days he was set at liberty by order of the Shūlān. He resumed his old habits till his enemies learned of his
fatwa regarding the visitation of tombs of saints and prophets, which he had issued in 710 = 1310, and in Sha‘bān 726 = July 1326 he was by the Sultan’s order interned in the citadel of Damascus. He was allotted a room, in which attended by his brother he devoted himself to writing a commentary on the Kur’an, pamphlets against his detractors and entire volumes on the questions which had resulted in his imprisonment. But when these works came to the knowledge of his enemies, he was deprived of his books, paper and ink. This was a terrible blow to him, and although he sought relief in prayer and the recitation of the Kur’an, he fell ill and died in twenty days in the night of Sunday—Monday 20th Dhū l-Ka‘dā 726 = 26-27 Sept. 1328. The people of Damascus who held him in great honour, gave him a splendid funeral and it was estimated that 200,000 men and 15,000 women attended his obsequies at the Sūfi cemetery. Ibn al-Wardī composed his funeral elegy.

Although belonging to the Ḥanbalī school, Ibn Taimīya did not follow all its opinions blindly but considered himself a muḍżliḥ fi ‘l-muḍzliḥ [s. MUḌṬAḤĪD]. His biographer Marī in Kawsālī (p. 184 sqq.) gives a certain number of points on which Ibn Taimiya rejected the ḥadīth [q. v.] and even the igmā‘ (consensus) [q. v.]. In the majority of his works he claims to follow the letter of the Kur’an and the Ḥadīth but he does not think it wrong to employ ḥiyā‘, reasoning by analogy (notably Maḏḏab al-Rasūl ‘l-kubrā, i. 207) in his polemics; indeed he devoted a whole rīa‘ā (op. cit., ii. 217) to this method of reasoning.

A bitter enemy of innovations (būda‘), he attacked the cult of saints and pilgrimages to tombs: did not the Prophet say: “One should only journey to three mosques: the sacred mosque of Mecca, that of Jerusalem, and mine” (op. cit., ii. 93). Even a journey solely undertaken to visit the tomb of the Prophet is an act of disobedience (maʿrū‘a) (Ibn Ḥadjar al-Albāni, Fā‘rā‘i, p. 87).

On the other hand he considered a visit paid to the tomb of a Muslim, an illicit act, following the opinion of al-Sha‘bī and Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī, only if it necessitated a journey and if it had to take place on a fixed day. With these restrictions he considered it a traditional duty (Ṣāfi al-Đīn al-Ḥanafī, al-Kawsāl ‘l-jātī, p. 119 sqq.).

An inveterate anthropomorphist Ibn Taimiya interpreted literally all the passages in the Kur’an and tradition referring to the Deity. He was so imbued with this belief that, according to Ibn Baṭṭūta, he said one day from the pulpit in the mosque of Damascus: “God comes down from heaven to earth, just as I am coming down now”, and he came down one of the steps of the pulpit staircase. (cf. especially Maḏḏab al-Karā‘al-kubrā, i. 387 sqq.).

Both by word and pen he combatted all the Muslim sects, Khāridjī, Murjī‘, Ra‘fī‘, Kādirī, Mu‘azzālī, Ḥaḥāmī, Karrāmī, Aṣḥā‘ī, etc. (Kis. al-Ḥurān, passim, in the Maḏḏabī quoted, i. p. 2). al-Aswā‘ī’s dogmatism, he is said, is only a fusion of the opinions of the Ḥaḥāmis, Naḍju‘ā‘, Ibrārīs, etc. He particularly objected to the explanation given of predestination (ṣadaq), the divine attributes (ārā‘) and judgments (‘aḥkām), execution of the judgment (fīqāḥ ‘al-‘a‘dā‘), etc. (op. cit., i. 77, 445 sqq.).

In many cases he disagreed with the opinion of the principal jurists. For example: 1. He rejected the practice of taḥlīl by which a woman definitively divorced by triple repudiation (talā‘ī) could be married again by her husband after having contracted an intermediate marriage with a man who had agreed to repudiate her immediately afterwards (muḥāllīlī, he who makes permissible). 2. Repudiation pronounced during a menstrual period is void. 3. The taxes which are not prescribed by divine order are admissible and if one pays them he is freed from zakā‘. 4. To hold an opinion contrary to igmā‘ is neither infidelity nor imperity.

He also attacked the reputation of men whose authority is recognised in Islam: ‘ Omar b. al-Ṯalī‘ī made many mistakes, he said in the pulpit of the mosque of al-Djābal in al-Sāliḥīya. ‘Ali b. Abī Tālīb made three hundred mistakes, was another of his statements. He also violently attacked al-Ghazzālī, Maḥfī ‘l-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī, ‘Omar b. al-Fārīd and the Sūfis in general. As to the first, he attacked the philosophical views laid down in his Muḥkām min al-Djāfīl and even in his Āyā‘, which contains a large number of apocryphal hadīths. “The Sufis and the Mutakallimūn are from the same valley” (mi‘a wādi‘ wa wādi‘). He declared, Greek philosophy and its Muslim representatives, notably Ibn Sīnā and Ibn Sā‘īn, were attacked in the great vogue by Ibn Taimīya. *Does not philosophy lead to unbelief? Is it not for a great part the cause of the different schisms which have been produced in the bosom of Islam.*

Islam being sent to replace Judaism and Christianity it naturally incited Ibn Taimiya to attack these both religions. After accusing the Jews and Christians of changing the meaning of a certain number of words in their sacred books (see his works, Nrs 35, 40, 43 and 45 below), he wrote pamphlets against the maintenance or building of synagogues and particularly of churches (cf. N°. 46).

Muslim scholars are not agreed on the orthodoxy of Ibn Taimiya. Among those who consider him at the very least an heretic we may mention: Ibn Baṭṭūta, Ibn Ḥadjar al-Albāni, Taḵī al-Đīn al-Subkī and his son ‘Abd al-Wahḥāb, ‘Izz al-Đīn Ibn Djamā‘ī, Abī Ja‘īyīn al-Ẓāhīrī al-Andalūsī, etc. However, those who praise are perhaps more numerous than his detractors: his disciple Ibn Kā‘īm al-Djāzī‘yī, al-Dhahābī, Ibn Kūdāmā, al-Ṣaṣṣārī al-Ṣūlī, Ibn al-Wardī, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, Ali al-Ḡārī al-Harawī, Maḥmūd al-Ālīsī, etc. This divergence of opinion on Ibn Taimiya exists to this day: Yūsuf al-Nabhānī does not spare him in his Shāfa‘ī al-Djāfīl fi ‘l-Tashbīh bi-Sayyid al-Ḍalā‘īl (Cairo 1224), which was refuted by Abu ʿl-Ma‘ālī al-Ṣaḥīfī al-Salānī in his Ṣayyāt al-Amānī fi ‘l-Radd ‘alā ‘l-Nabhānī (Cairo 1225?).

We know that the founder of the Wahhābīs was connected with the Ḥanbalī scholars of Damascus and it is natural he made use of their works and particularly of Ibn Taimiya’s teaching and that of his pupil Ibn Kā‘īm al-Djāzi‘yī [q. v.]. The principles of the new doctrine are those for which the great Ḥanbalī theologian struggled all his life. [Cf. WAḤHAĪBĪS.]

Of the 500 works said to have been written by Ibn Taimiya only the following survive: 1. Risālāt al-Fārīd bīna, al-Ḥalīl al-Ma‘ārīdī al-Ḍalā‘īl, a refutation of the philosophers and of the Karmātians, who say that the Prophets in certain circumstances may lie, etc.; 2. al-Taḥyīn fi
a sovereign is followed by an account of his ministers. This second part is generally taken literally from Ibn al-Ashtir’s Kamil al-Tawarikh but also contains fragments of lost works such as the medium history and the Annals of al-Maṣūdī; the history of the ministers comes from al-Ṣāliḥ and from Ḥilāl al-Ṣāḥī. Although clearly Shi‘ī in tendency, this book is not biased (E. Amar). The first edition of the text from the MS. of the Bibl. Nat. Paris, n°. 2441, then the only one known, has been published by W. Ahlwardt (Gotha 1860); some fragments of it had been given by Jourdain, Fundgruben des Orient, v. 28—40; de Saçy, Chrestomathie, i. 1—54; 1—92; Hennius, Fragmenta arabica, Petropol, 1828, p. 1—104, and Freytag, Chrestomathie arabica, Bonn 1834, p. 84—96 (the dates given p. iv. are incorrect) and with a French translation by Cheronneau, Journ. As., 1846, i. 297—359, ii. 316—333; 1847, i. 134—147; the second edition which makes use of a second copy discovered in the same collection (n°. 2442) is due to Hartwig Derenbourg (Bibliothèque des Hautes-Études, sciences philosophiques et historiques, 1895). This work has been translated into French by M. Émile Amir (Archives Maro- caines, t. xvi., 1910). The word ṭalāṣa seems to be onomatopoeic (tītacak) applied to fluent and verbose speech (Ṭaḥī al-Arīs, vi. 424, quoted by H. Derenbourg, p. 4). (CL. Huart.)

IBN ῬUFAİL, a celebrated philosopher of the Maghrib, whose full name was ABD BAKR MUHAMMAD B. ʿABD AL-MAḤIR B. MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD B. ῬUFAİL ṬUFAİL. He belonged to the prominent Arab tribe of Kais; he was also called al-Andalusi (the Spanian), al-Kurṣaṭī (the Cordovan or al-Iṣḥābī (the Sevillian). The Christian scholars call him Abubaker, a corruption of Abu Bakr.

Ibn Ῥufaʿil was probably born in the first decade of the 12th century A. D. in Wāḥīd Ṭiḥi, the modern Guzż, 40 miles N. W. of Granada. We know nothing of his family or his education. That he was a pupil of Ibn Bādiḏa[g] (q. v.) as is frequently stated, is incorrect; for in the introduction to his romance he says that he was not acquainted with this philosopher. He first of all practised as a physician in Granada and then became secretary to the governor of the province. In 549 (1154) he became secretary to the governor of Ceuta and Tangier, a son of ʿAbd al-Muʿāmin, the founder of the Almohad dynasty. Finally he received the appointment of court physician to the Almohad Sultan ʿAbū Yaḥṣuṣr Yūsuf (558—558 = 1163—1164). It has also been thought that he was the latter’s vizier; but it is doubtful if he really held this title, as only one text gives him it, as L. Gauthier notes out Al-Bīṭrūḏī (q. v.), who was his pupil, simply calls him ʿaḏr (L. Gauthier, Ibn Ῥufaʿil, p. 6). In any case Ibn Ῥufaʿil always had great influence with this prince, which he used to attract scholars to the court. For example he introduced the young Averroes to the Sultan. The historian ʿAbd al-Wahīd al-Marrakūṣi (al-Mīrāḏi, ed. Dozy, p. 174 sqq.; transl. by Fagnan, p. 201—210) gives a description of this meeting from Averroes’ own account. On this occasion the commander of the faithful showed a remarkable intimacy in philosophical matters. It was also Ibn Ῥufaʿil who, at the instigation of the prince, advised Averroes to annotate the works of Aristotle. This is stated by Abū Bakr Bundūd, a pupil of Ibn Ῥufaʿil, who says further: “The commander of the faithful was exceedingly attached to him (Ibn Ῥufaʿil). I am told that he remained whole days and nights in the palace with him without coming out”.

In 578 our philosopher on account of his advanced age was succeeded by Ibn Rusḥḏ as court physician to the Caliph. But he continued to retain ʿAbū Yaḥṣuṣr’s favour and, after the latter’s death in 580, retained the friendship of his son, Abū Yaḥṣuṣr. He died in 581 (1185—6) the Caliph himself attending his obsequies.

Ibn Ῥufaʿil is the author of the celebrated philosophical novel Ḥayī b. Yaḥṣuṣra, one of the most remarkable books of the middle ages, of which we shall have more to say below. Little else from his pen is known. He also wrote two treatises on medicine and corresponded with Averroes about the latter’s medical work al-Kullīyat. According to the astronomer al-Bīṭrūḏī and Ibn Rusḥḏ in his medium commentary on Aristotle’s Metaphysics (Bk. xii), he is said to have had original astronomical ideas. Al-Bīṭrūḏī attempted to refute Ptolemy’s theory of epicycles and eccentric circles and says in his preface that he is following the ideas of Ibn Ῥufaʿil.

The philosophical romance Ḥayī b. Yaḥṣuṣra, which was published by Pococke under the title Philosophus autodidactus, has also the sub-title Arrār al-iḫrāma al-iʿrāḥiyya “the secrets of illuminative philosophy”. This philosophy is really that of the Neo-Platonic scholasticism in its most mystic form. Ibn Ῥufaʿil expounds it in a progressive fashion with great skill by taking the case of a well endowed man with an inclination for speculation who is placed alone on an island from childhood and here discovers philosophy from his sheer force of reason and step by step constructs the whole Muslim Neo-Platonic system for himself. This man as the symbol of reason bears the name Ḥayī “the living”, Ibn Yaḥṣuṣr “son of the wakeful one” i. e. God; at the end of the story Salāmān and ʿAsāl appear who also have symbolic meaning.

The names Ḥayī, Salāmān and ʿAsāl were not new in philosophic literature. Avicenna had already written a mystic allegory entitled Ḥayī b. Yaḥṣuṣra and this work, which was well-known in the middle ages, was also imitated by Ibn Ezza; al-Djūrjadī, who has given us a list of Avicenna’s writings, also ascribes to him a little work on the story of Salāmān and ʿAsāl. We possess a version of this story by Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī, and the celebrated Persian poet Djīmān took it as the subject of one of his best known works. In these Salāmān and ʿAsāl play different roles but they are always symbolical and represent the human reason struggling with the world of objects. In Djīmān’s poem, Salāmān is a young prince and ʿAsāl his nurse who becomes his lover. In Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī’s form of the myth ʿAsāl is again a woman, and in another version Salāmān and ʿAsāl are brothers. In Ibn Ῥufaʿil’s work they are a king and his vizier. One of the versions is said to have been translated from the Greek by Hunain b. Ṣağh (q. v.) and it is in fact very probable that this whole cycle of stories has an Alexandrine origin.

The following is a synopsis of Ibn Ῥufaʿil’s romance. The book begins with an introduction which gives an interesting survey of the history of
Muslim philosophy. In it Ibn Tufail praises his predecessors, notably Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), Ibn Bādijja, and al-Ghazālī and gives as the purpose of philosophy, according to the interpretation of the mystic scholastics, the acquisition of union with God, i.e., reaching a state of happiness and clear vision where truth is no longer obtained by a process of deduction, but is recognised intuitively. Now follows the story of the novel: a boy is born without a father on a lonely island or put on the sea by a princess in a neighbouring island and carried by the current to it. The possibility of spontaneous generation by the fertilization of the earth with moderate heat is fully discussed. A gazelle feeds the boy and becomes his first teacher. When the latter grows up a little he notices that he is naked and unarmed unlike the animals he meets. He covers himself with leaves and arms himself with a stick and thus recognises the importance of his hands. He now becomes a hunter and his arts make further progress; for example he replaces the scanty covering of leaves by an eagle's skin. In the meanwhile the gazelle which had brought him up becomes old and ill; this troubles him and he seeks the cause of the evil. For this purpose he studies himself and thus becomes conscious of his senses. Thinking that the evil is in the breast, he has the idea of making an opening in the side of the animal with a sharp stone. By this experiment he becomes acquainted with the heart and lungs; but also he gets his first notion of an invisible thing that has escaped and constitutes individuality more than body. When the body of the gazelle begins to decay, Haiy learns from the ravens how to bury it. By chance he discovers fire by dead trees catching fire through the rubbing of the branches: he brings the fire to his dwelling and keeps it going. This discovery induces him to reflect on this visible fire and the animal warmth which he has noticed in living creatures; as a result he dissects other animals. His skill makes further progress; he clothes himself in skins, learns to spin wool and flax and make needles; swallows show him how to build a house, and he teaches birds of prey to hunt for him and learns to use eggs of birds and the horns of cattle etc. This part of the novel forms a very interesting and ingeniously arranged encyclopaedia.

His knowledge develops more and more and becomes philosophy. After Haiy has studied all plants and minerals and their properties and the use of limbs in animals he classifies them into kinds and species. He divides the bodies into light and heavy. He comes back again to the spirit of life, the seat of which he has traced in the heart; he conceives the idea of an immortal vegetative soul. Bodies seem to him to be forms out of which come qualities. He now seeks for the elementary substances and recognises the four elements. While examining earth he grasps the idea of matter and conceives of bodies as matter of different extent. Observing that water becomes steam, he discovers the transition of one form from another and recognises that every new creation must have a cause which produces it. He thus gets the idea of a producer of forms in general. This he sees first in nature but as all elements are subject to change and destruction, he directs his attention to the heavenly bodies.

Haiy has now reached the age of 28, that is the end of the fourth septenary. Henceforth he begins to reflect on heaven: he asks if it is infinite, which he thinks absurd; he imagines it as spherical, observes the necessity of special spheres for the moon and the planets and imagines the celestial world as a kind of vast animal. He understands the necessity for the producer of everything not being a body, the motive power of the world not being included in it, if it is eternal: continuing to develop the conception of God, he deduces his qualities from the consideration of the beings of nature. God seems to him to have free will, to be wise, knowing, perfect, etc. Coming then to his own soul he decides that it is incorruptible, from which he concludes that his soul is immortal and his happiness in the contemplation of the perfect being. This happiness will be attained by imitating the celestial qualities, that is to say by practising ascetic morals. Haiy then devotes himself to a life of contemplation, which he leads till the end of his seventh septenary.

Then Asāl a devout follower of the revealed religion arrives from a neighbouring island; after the two men have begun to understand one another revealed religion proves to be at bottom the same as the philosophical belief attained by Haiy. Asāl recognises in the doctrine which the hermit teaches him a transcendent interpretation of the religion and of revealed religions in general. He persuades Haiy to follow him to a neighbouring island, where a king named Sallamān reigns whose friend and vizier Asāl is, in order to expound to him his philosophy. But it is not understood and, after several vain efforts, Asāl and Haiy return together to the desert island to devote themselves to pure contemplation while people continue to live by images and symbols.

This curious myth thus lays down very clearly the position of mystical philosophy with regard to religion (cf. also the article Ibn Rūqād on this question). The novel of Ibn Tufail was much enjoyed by Muslims and translated into various languages. In 1466 the Jew Moses of Narbonne translated it into Hebrew with a commentary. Leibniz praised it knowing it in Pococke's edition.


(B. Carré de Vaux.)

*IBN TŪMART,* a celebrated Muslim reformer in Morocco, known as the Ṣad of the Almohads. His real name was, according to Ibn Khallīl, Amghār which in Berber means “chief”. Ibn Tūmart in this language means “son of ‘Omar the little”. This was his father’s name who was also called ‘Abd Allāh. The names
of his ancestors also are Berber. The date of his birth is unknown but it must have been between 470 (1077-78) and 480 (1087-88). He was born at Idbi-ten-Warghan, a village of Suf. His land belonged to the Hergha, a branch of the Harka, one of the most important tribes of the Atlas. Ibn Khaldun tells us that it was distinguished for piety and that Ibn Tamiya was very fond of learning and industriously visited mosques where he studied so many catechisms that he was called al-Latif (the instructed). What can have driven him to the East? Probably only the desire for knowledge, for it can hardly be assumed that he had already received the training which he afterwards carried out, which rather owes its origin to the doctrines he learned there.

The Almoravid dynasty which ruled in the Maghrib and part of Spain had then begun to decline. Moral decay had followed in the footsteps of conquest and the shallowness of intellectual life is shown by the studies which were prosecuted. The doctrine of Malik b. Anas, one of the narrowest in Islam, was the prevailing one. Siyyid was confined to the Hanafi school of jurisprudence which had taken the place of the Kairan and Hadath.

In the east al-Ghazali had taken up a vigorous attitude against this in his first book Kitab al-I'tilaf (of his Ilm al-Film). This book therefore attracted the hatred of such fugitives as the Kadi Ja'far [q.v.] and even of the Ash'arites like al-Tajashi who tolerated no independent minds in their school. Al-Ghazali's work was therefore burned by order of the Almoravid Emirs. The coarsest anthropomorphism (tas'lid) was also in vogue; the allegorical expressions of the Koran were taken literally and God was given a corporeal form.

Ibn Tamiya began his travels in Spain and it was there that his views began to be affected by the writings of Ibn Hazm [q.v.]. He then went to the east but the chronology of his travels is not certain. If, contrary to al-Marrakushi's statement, he attended on his first visit to Alexandria the lectures of Abü Bakr al-Tajashi, who in spite of his Ash'ari tenets was an opponent of al-Ghazali, they must have made a lasting impression on him. He then made the pilgrimage to Mecca and studied in Baghdad and perhaps in Damascus also. He there absorbed al-Ghazali's ideas and later writers represent this influence symbolically as if Ibn Tamiya had resolved at al-Ghazali's instigation to reform the beliefs of his country. In reality the two never met.

These years of study and travel had utterly transformed the Maghribi ta'lab. He had formed his plan, if not in detail at least in its main outlines. On the ship on which he returned he preached to the sailors and passengers, who began to recite the Koran at his admonition and to offer prayers; it was afterwards related that a miracle related by al-Marrakushi confirmed this report. He continued his preaching in which he championed Ash'ari doctrines in Tripolis and al-Mahdia, where the reigning Sulaiman b. Agha b. Tamim, showed him great honour when he had heard him defend his case, and then in Monastir and finally in Bougie. He there set up as an inexorable critic of morals, literally following the ancient commandment: "He of yea who sees anything blameworthy shall alter it with the hand (i.e. by force); if he cannot do this, he shall do it with the tongue (i.e. by preach-
IBN WAHSIYA ALI BAKR AHMAD (or "MAMMA") AL-AL-QUDSI AL-MURATTAS "U-MARRATH" was a notable writer on alchemy and other sciences. He was born in the second half of the 12th century AD and died in the first decade of the 13th century. His works on alchemy and other sciences are detailed in the "Ibādīs". His influence is felt even in the 20th century, as his writings are cited in scientific and philosophical literature. He was a significant figure in the Islamic Golden Age, and his teachings and writings had a profound impact on later scholars and thinkers. He is remembered for his contributions to the field of alchemy and his influence on later generations. His works continue to be studied and revered by scholars and scientists to this day.
IBN YA'ISH, whose full name was MUVAFîK AL-DIN ABU 'L-BA`ÂJÀ YÂ'ÎSH B. ALI B. YA'ISH AL-ÂLÀHIB, also known as IBN AL-ÂNÀSH, an Arab grammarian, born at al-Âlùb on the 3rd Ramadân 553 (28 Sept. 1158). After studying grammar and Ijdâli, in his native town and in Damascus, he intended to go to Baghdad to study under the grammarian Abu 'l-Dara`Âb Ibn al-A`bâh (see AL-ÂNÀSH, no. 1). When in al-Mawâlî he heard of the death of this scholar, he remained some time there to study Ijdâli. He then returned to al-Âlùb where he devoted himself to teaching. According to Ibn Khallîka [q.v.], who heard him in 626-7, he was considered an authority in the field of Adab. Besides a Hâdiyya on Ibn Dîjinî’s commentary on the Tûrif of al-Âmazing he wrote a very full commentary on al-Âzamkhâshâri’s al-Mufa`âl to whom he often opposed his own views; the latter work was edited by G. Jahn (Leipzig 1882—1888).

Ibn Ya’ish died on 25th Dîjâmî 1 643 (18th Oct. 1245) at al-Âlùb and was buried there in the Mâkâm Ibrahim.


IBN YÂMîN, AMîR FASÎR AL-DÎN MAHÔMÔD b. ÂMIR YÂMÎN AL-DÎN MUHAMMAD, a Persian poet, was born in Fâryûmâd, Khurâsân. His father, an eminent scholar of his time, came to Khurâsân during the reign of Sultan Muhammad Khudâ Banda (703—716 = 1304—1316) and was fortunate enough to secure the high opinion of the famous wazîr Khwâdati ‘Allâ al-Dîn Muhammad. Ibn Yâmîn was a disciple of Shaikh Hâsan. He spent his life as a panegyrist to the Sarhâdars of Khurâsân (737—783 = 1337—1381) and died in 745 (1344).

Among his compositions his Kifâât are well-known. They have been printed in Calcutta and also translated into German by Schlöch-Wessrâl under the title of “Ibn Jemîn’s brukstücker” Vienna, 1852 Stuttgart 1879.


IBN YÂNûS, whose full name was ABU ’L-ÂHÂN ALI B. ÂBÅ AL-ÂRAÎMÂN b. ALMAD B. YÂNûS AL-ÂDÅFÎ AL-ÂMÎR, was according to al-Battûnî and Abu ‘l-Wa`âfî, probably the greatest Arab astronomer. His father, Abå Sa’îd abu al-Âraîman b. Âmad also called Ibn Yânûs, was a notable historian and traditionist, and died in Cairo in 347 (958-9). The year of our astronomer’s birth is not known but he died in Cairo on the 3rd Shawjal 399 (May 31, 1099); he is said to have been skilled in other branches of learning than astronomy and astrology and to have also been a good poet. Ibn Khallîka quotes several stories from contemporary authors of his peculiarities which were chiefly manifested in his dress. His principal work is the Hâkimî Tablîs (al-Zîdî al-kabî al-Hâkimî) begun about 380 (990) by order of the Fatimî al-A`zîz and completed under his son al-Hâkim shortly before the authors’


II. IBN AL-WÂDÎ, SIRÅDÅ AL-DÎN ABU HAFS `ÖMAR, Shâhîfî savant died in Dhu ’l-Ka`da 861 (sept-oct. 1457). He was author of Khwarîd al-`Adîfî wa-Fardat al-`A`râbîi, a kind of geographical and natural history of no scientific value. It seems that, in spite of the authorities quoted in the preface (al-Mas`ûdî, al-Tâ`tî, Ibn al-A`thir, al-Marrakûshî), the Khwarîd is only a plagiarism from Dâ`ûl al-Funûn wa-Sulawat al-Mu`âfîn of Nadjîn al-Dîn A`hzad b. Hâmîd b. Shâbîb al-Harrânî al-`Hânîbî who lived in Egypt about 732 (1322). Several orientalists have translated fragments or given extracts with translation: De Guignes, Hylander, Tornberg, Mehran, etc. The Khwarîd was publ. at Cairo in 1276, 1280, 1289, 1295, 1300, 1302, 1303, 1309.

Bibliography: Ibn Iyâs, Bâdî`i al-Zahîr fi Wasâ`î al-Duhar, Bîlât 1311, ii. 60; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., iii. 131 sq. (Moh. Ben Chenel.)

IBN WÂSIL, DÇMÁLÅL-DÎN ABU `ABÂL-ÂLÀH MUHAMMAD B. SêLÎM, an A r a b h i s t o r i a n , born in 604 (1207), was at first a teacher at Hamat, was summoned to Cairo in 659 (1261) and sent to Sicily by Bâihars on a mission to King Manfred. He spent a considerable time there and composed outlines of logic called al-Empirîawya which is however known in the east as Nû`ihat al-Fikar fi `l-`Manîfî. On his return he became chief kâfi and professor at Hamat where he died in 697 (1298). He is the author of a history of Arâyûns called Mufarrîdî al-Kurâr fi `Âkhrî Dân Anîyûb and a history of the world entitled al-Tarîk (Vol. i, from the creation to the death of Hasân, in the British Mus., see a Descr. List of Arabic MS. acquired since 1894, p. 33, Or. 6657).

Bibliography: Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., i. 322 sq.; and the works given there; Schack, Poesie und Kunst der Araber in Spanien und Sizilien, ii. 154.
death. They are unfortunately no longer completely preserved. There are portions in Leiden, Oxford, Paris, the Escorial, Berlin and Cairo. Cassinis has published and translated a few chapters from these tables in the *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*, Vol. vi. p. 16–240, which contain observations of eclipses and conjunctions of planets by older astronomers and by Ibn Yunus himself. The latter’s principal object was to test and improve the observations of his predecessors and their statements on astronomical constants, in which the excellently equipped observatory on the Muḥattam rendered him valuable service. In spherical trigonometry he was the first to propound the prosthaphaeresis formula

\[
\cos \phi \cos \delta = \{ \cos (\phi + \delta) + \cos (\phi - \delta) \}
\]

which before the invention of logarithms was of great value to astronomers as it transformed the complicated multiplication of trigonometrical functions expressed in sexagesimal fractions into an addition. He also showed great skill in the solution of several difficult exercises in spherical astronomy with the help of orthogonal projection of the celestial sphere on the horizon and the plane of the meridian.


**IBN ŽAFAR**, İDNEŞI AL-DİN ABU ’ARBAḤ AL-LAḤĪ MUHAMMAD b. ABū MUHAMMAD AL-SAĞALI, A N A R A B S C H O L A R, born in Sicily but brought up in Mecca (according to Suyūṭī also born there), later returned to Sicily and died in 565 (1169) at Hāmāt. On the model of Kalila wa-Dimna he composed the collection of tales called Sultān al-Maṣfṣa jī *Udāna al-Abār* and dedicated to the ruler of Sicily, Abū ’Arbaḥ Allāh Muhammad b. Abī l-Kāsim (pr. Cairo 1278, Tunis 1279, Beirut 1300); Turk. transl. by Kara Khalilzade in Berlin (Pertsch, n°. 445) and Vienna (Flügel, n°. 382), pr. Constantinople 1285; Italian by Amari, Florence 1851, 1852; English from the Italian, London 1852. The author prepared two versions of the book, most ms., editions and translations contain the second of the year 554 (1159). Another less known work İnā ibn Qudāhā’s *Abūna* deals with celebrated children (pr. Cairo 1322) and also exists in a second abridged edition.

For his further literary activity, see the authorities mentioned below.


**IBN ZAIDŪN**, ABU ’L-WALID AHMAD b. ’ABD ALLĀH b. AHMAD b. CHAYBĪ b. ZAIDĪN, ONE OF THE MOST CELEBRATED POETS OF MUSLIM SPAIN and minister to the Arab Emir of Seville. He belonged to a famous family of the Arab tribe of Makhzūm and was born at Cordova in 394 = 1003. Left early an orphan, he was given the best teachers by his guardians and soon distinguished himself among his fellow pupils. At the age of twenty he already composed poems which made him famous.

Our poet became involved in the politics of his country through the civil wars of the Omayyad pretenders and the attempts of the Cordovans to expel from their city its Berber rulers. His origin, the position of his family, and particularly his ambition induced him to take a part. After the retreat of the Berbers he was therefore to be found in the retinue of Abū l-Ḥāzm Ibn Dījar, the chief of the Cordovan oligarchy. A violent love for the poetess Wallāda, of a princely family, brought him into conflict with a powerful rival, Ibn ʿAbdās, the minister of Abū l-Ḥāzm Ibn Dījar. Ibn Zaidūn wrote threatening poems against his rival and held him up to ridicule in a letter that has become famous. The latter denounced him as having secretly worked for a restoration of the Omayyads and he was thrown into prison. From here he wrote tender poems to Wallāda and pressing appeals, in which he defended himself, to his friends. One of the latter, Abū l-Walīd, the son of Abū l-Ḥāzm, succeeded in getting him out of prison. But Wallāda had finally abandoned him for Ibn ʿAbdās.

After an involuntary exile in which he unceasingly poured reproaches upon his lady friend, Ibn Zaidūn returned to Cordova on the death of Abū l-Ḥāzm Ibn Dījar and threw in his lot with the latter’s son and successor Abū l-Walīd. He served him as ambassador at several Muslim courts in the neighbourhood of Cordova. But his ambition was his downfall. For some unknown reason he was disgraced a second time, had to flee from Cordova, and lived in Denia, Badajoz, and Seville successively.

His fame as a poet, his literary abilities, and his knowledge of Muslim conditions in Spain, which he had acquired during his work as an ambassador, gained him a reception at the court of the Emir of Seville, al-Mu’taḍīd. At first he was only secretary to this ruler but later became his first minister. After the death of al-Mu’taḍīd, his son and successor, al-Mu’tamid, retained the poet in the same office and made use of him for the conquest of Cordova which now became the capital.

But Ibn Zaidūn’s popularity aroused the envy of several people at the court, particularly the poet Ibn ʿAmmār [q. v.], al-Mu’tamid’s favourite. A riot directed against the Jews in Seville gave theplotters an opportunity of getting Ibn Zaidūn sent there, to restore order. The poet set off to the great disappointment of the Cordovans who were very proud of their fellow-citizen: his family followed him soon after. But the aged Ibn Zaidūn was seized by a fever and quickly carried off. He died on Radjab 15 463 (April 17–18 1071) and was interred in Seville. The news of his death caused great grief in Cordova and the whole town went into mourning.

Ibn Zaidūn was not only an excellent poet, but he was also a distinguished letter-writer and it is as such that he is particularly famous in the history of Arabic literature. His letters are not all published. The best known are:

1. The letter to Ibn ʿAbdās. It is valuable for
Arabic philology in as much as it contains many allusions to facts, which are only known through it and through the commentary, which Ibn Nubātā (d. 768 = 1364) wrote on it under the title Surk al-'Uyūn fi Sharḥ Risālat Ibn Zaidūn (Būāk 1278, Alexandria 1290, Cairo 1305). This letter was published by Reiske with a Latin translation (Leipzig 1755). 2. The about equally important letter to Ibn Dāhwar was published also with a Latin translation by Beshora (Copenhagen 1889).

Extracts from Ibn Zaidūn's poems were given by Weijers (Leiden 1831), de Sacy (Journal Asiatique, XII, 508 sqq.), al-Maḳkārī, Analcīcīt; manuscript extracts and the biography of Ibn Zaidūn by Ibn Bāṣāmī (Ms. Bibl. Nat. Paris, no. 3322) and Ṣīdād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī (ibid. v. p. 3330).

On the bibliography cf. Brockelmann, Geschichte d. arabischen Literatur, i. 274 sqq. (A. Courr.).

IBN ZUHR, the genealogical family of Muslim scholars who flourished in Spain from the beginning of the 10th to the beginning of the 12th century A.D. They had migrated from Arabia and traced their descent from 'Adnān [g. v.]. Their descendants gradually became scattered over the whole of the Iberian peninsula from Xativa (Ẓāfīn Shātbū) in southeastern Spain where they first settled.

1. The ancestor of the Spanish line was called Zuhr. His biographer, Ibn al-Abbār, gives him the name al-Ṭayyābī, because he traced his descent from Iyādī, son of Ma'add, son of Ṣīrānī, who was regarded as one of the founders of the Arab race. According to Ibn Khāliqān, Zuhr al-Ṭayyābī had a son named Marwān, the father of Abū Bakr Muḥammad, who was the first to take a prominent place among his contemporaries. He was a jurist, celebrated for his learning and piety, eloquence and liberality, and died at the age of 86 at Taḥavara (Ṭalhīn) in 1030-1031.

2. ABŪ MARWĀN 'ABD AL-MALIK B. MUḤAMMAD B. MARWĀN B. ZUHR, son of the preceding, was a celebrated physician, who practised in Kairūn and later for a long time in Cairo. Returning to Spain he settled in Denia (Daniya) where the ruler Mudjāhid heaped honours upon him and took him to his court. From there his reputation spread through all Spain and he is said not only to have been a clever physician but also a learned jurist. Ibn Abī 'Uṣayfī reports that he moved from Denia to Seville, where he died leaving a considerable fortune. On the other hand Ibn Khāliqān assures us of reliable authority, that he died in Denia which he had never left.

3. ABU 'L-'ALĀ ZUHR B. ABU MARWĀN 'ABD AL-MALIK B. MUḤAMMAD B. MARWĀN, son of the preceding, is usually called Abu 'l-'Alā', which since the middle ages has been corrupted into the variants Aḥwāl, Aḥbāl and Ebilāh, and in combination with Zuhr the formus Aḥbālizīr and Aḥbilizīr. Abu 'l-'Alā' adopted a medical career and received an excellent technical training from his father and Abu 'l-'Aināk al-Miṣrī. The accuracy of his diagnosis was marvellous. Among his pupils we may note the poet Abū 'Amīr b. Yannān. The study of belles lettres and Traditus took him to Cordova where he enjoyed the instruction of the most celebrated teachers and soon won a considerable reputation, which attracted for him the attention of al-Mu'tamid, the last 'Abdādīd ruler of Seville. The latter took him to his court, over-

whelmed him with honours, and restored to him his grandfather's estate which had been confiscated. After al-Mu'tamid had been dethroned by the Almoravids Yusuf b. Tāshfīn in 484 = 1091 Abu 'l-'Alā' found an opportunity to show his gratitude to his former patron. But he soon went over to Yusuf b. Tāshfīn, who gave him the rank of vizier, so that in Latin translations of the middle ages his name is often prefixed by the Spanish form Algusar. According to Ibn al-Abbār, Abu 'l-'Alā' died in Cordova. His body was taken to Seville and interred there in 525 = 1130-1131. Wästenfeld maintains, on the authority of Ibn Abī 'Uṣubīsī, that he died in Seville.

4. ABŪ MARWĀN 'ABD AL-MALIK B. ABU 'L-'ALĀ ZUHR, son of the preceding, usually called Abu Marwān b. Zuhr, corrupted by mediaeval copyists to Abu Hormon or simply Avenzoar, was born in Seville. The date of his birth is not given by the biographers, but a few equations place it approximately between 484 = 1091 and 487 = 1094. After receiving an excellent education in literature, law and theology, his father taught him medicine. He soon became equal in knowledge to his teacher and distinguished himself by his original experiments in therapeutics. Like his father he was at first in the service of the Almoravids and later of the Almohads. Averroes [v. Ibn Rushd] was on intimate terms with him and considered him the greatest physician since Galen, but was not his pupil as many insist. On a journey through North Africa Avenzoar suffered many indignities from 'Alī b. Yusuf, the governor of Marrakush, for some unknown reason. The latter even had the doctor imprisoned and he makes some bitter allusions to the event in his later works. On the death of 'Alī b. Yusuf b. Tāshfīn and the overthrow of the Almoravids by the Almohads, Avenzoar went over to 'Abd al-Mu'min and had no cause to repent of his action. He was given rich presents and like his father before him received the rank of vizier. Among his works may be mentioned the Kitāb al-istiṣāḍ fī l-istah al-Anfūs wa l-'Adhādīd, which he composed by order of and on lines laid down by the Emir Ibrahim b. Yusuf, and especially his chief work, the Kitāb al-Tasāir fī l-Mudāhirīn wa l-'Adhādīd, which he wrote at the instigation of Averroes. Avenzoar exercised a considerable influence on European medicine, which lasted till the end of the xvith century, owing to the translations of his books into Hebrew and Latin. From the theoretical point of view, like Galen, he championed the theory of humours, but in practice considered experience the most reliable guide. In him we find not only original views on established facts, but new contributions to knowledge also such as the description of the mediastinal tumours and the abscess on the pericardium, diseases which had not been previously mentioned. He was the first Arab physician to recommend tracheotomy. Artificial feeding either through the gullet or through the rectum was not unknown to him and he explains its working with much skill. The erroneous view taken by several writers that Avenzoar was a Jew has been challenged by Steinschneider (Arch. für pathol. Anatomie [Berlin, 1873, p. 115] and Wüstenfeld Gesch. der arab. Astralte etc., p. 89) and finally clearly refuted by G. Colin (Avenzoar, en vie et ses œuvres, p. 34 sqq.). After a meritorious career devoted to work and good deeds, Avenzoar died, like his father, of a malignant tumour at Seville in
557 = 1161-2. He left a son and a daughter and was buried outside the Victory Gate.

5. ABDU BAKR MUHAMMAD B. ABD AL-MALIK B. ZUHR, son of the preceding; known as al-Hajjaf, the "grandson", born in 944 = 1101-2, died in 950 = 1107-8. He was likewise a distinguished physician but more of a practical man than a writer of medical works, although a treatise on writers of the eye is attributed to him. Almost unknown in Christian Europe, he had a very high reputation among the Muslims of Spain and Africa, although this was due less to his activity as a doctor than to his deep learning in all branches of Arab literature and to his poems of great delicacy of sentiment. The Almohad Caliph Ya'qub b. Yusuf al-Manṣūr summoned him to Africa to court, appointed him his physician, gave him rich gifts and showed him great honour but thus aroused the jealousy of the vizier Abū Zayd Abū Abd al-Rahmān b. Vajīgān. The latter had the physician and his niece who was very skilled in gynaecology and midwifery treacherously poisoned during their stay in Morocco. The Caliph preached his funeral sermon and he was buried in the garden of the Emirs. He left a son and a daughter.

6. ABDU MUHAMMAD ʿABD ALLĀH B. AL-HĀFIẒ, son of the preceding, born in 577 = 1181-2 at Seville, was an excellent physician, trained in the school of his father. The Almohad caliphs al-Manṣūr and al-Nāṣir successively took him to their court and heaped honours upon him. Like his father he was also murdered by poisoning and died in 602 = 1205-6, being only 25, on a journey to Seville (Abū ʿAbū Rabīḥ al-Fath [ibn Abī ʿAbī Rabīḥ]). His body which was buried there was later exhumed, taken to Seville and buried there outside the Victory Gate along with the remains of his ancestors. He left two sons Abū Marwān Abū ʿAbd al-Malik and Abū ʿl-Alāʾ Muhammad, both of whom lived in Seville; the younger was also a physician and had a sound knowledge of the works of Galen.

Bibliography:


IBRĀḤĪM. Ibn al-Ṭabarī, a Biblical Abraham, was, according to the Ḥadīth (Sīta vi. 74), the third son of Azar, whose name is apparently to be derived from Elazar, the name of his servant (cf. S. Frenkel in Zeitscr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellsh., i. 72). The Biblical names of Abraham's ancestors: Ṭārīkh b. Nāḥūr b. Sārūgh b. Arghū b. ʿAbīr b. Shālikh b. Kainān b. Arfakhshād b. Šām b. Šāh are found in al-Ṭabarī, p. 44, and Ibn al-ʿAbdhār, i. 67, and this genealogy agrees perfectly with Genesis vi. 10-21 and Chronicles, i. 12-27. Kai-nān alone seems to have been inserted from Genesis v. 12. Born in 1263 after the Deluge or 3337 after the creation (al-Ṭabarī, l.c.) — a combination of the dates given in the Bible and Genesis xii. 10-25 however gives the birth of Abraham 291 years after Noah or 1918 after the creation—he at once undertook his mission of preaching a holy war against King Namrud. His mother ʿUṣrā had to take refuge in a cave at Kāthā where he first saw the light of the world (al-Ṭabarī, l. c.; Tabār, i. 256; Zakhamshārī, i. 172; Baʿdawī, i. 133; Ibn al-ʿAbdhār, i. 96; Yūkāt, s. v. Kūthā; al-Bakrī, p. 485; al-Makaddasī, p. 86; Baḥbā bāṭrī, 91; Maimonides, Dīdālāt al-Ḥūrin, chap. 29).

For bad dreams had induced Namrud to have pregnant women watched and their newborn sons killed. The slaves visited Ibrahim's mother to examine her before the pains of childbirth came upon her. They examined her body on the right and the child hid on the left; they sought it on the left and it fled to the right so that they had to depart after doing nothing (al-Kisāʾ, p. 115-120). The story in the Sefer Ḥayyūḥār (section Noah) that Terach was ordered to hand over Abraham to be executed and in his place delivered up the son of a handmaid has its origin in Muslim tradition. While still quite a child (Talmud Nedarim, 32) an experience gave him the knowledge of Allān which is mentioned in the Kurān vi. 75-79. When he had left the cave and was coming to his father's house, night fell upon him and he saw a star. He said: "That is my Lord!" But when it set, he said: "I do not love those that set!" He saw the moon rise and said: "That is my Lord!" As it also disappeared, he said: "Verily, if my Lord does not guide me, I shall become one of those that go astray!" When he saw the sun rise, he said: "That is my Lord, he is the greatest!" When it also set, he said: "O my people, I am free from your idolatry, See, I turn my face to the creator of Heaven and Earth!" etc. We also find these stories in the Hebrew book, Shebet Mīṣarat (Smyrna 1729), p. 109-111, and Sefer Ḥayyūḥār (Noah). Of the various legends (in al-Ṭabarī, p. 45-47; and Kurān, p. 125-143), which describe Abraham's wars with Namrud and which also found a way into later Rabbinical literature (Jellinek, Bith Hannisārā, i. 25-34; Sefer Ḥayyūḥār [Noah]; Sefer Eliyāḥā sāḥ, ch. 25, and Pirāḥ b. R. El, ch. 32) the following may find a place here, which are based on Kurān xxi. 50-67, as well as on Genesis Kabbā, section 38. One day his fellow tribesmen left the town to offer sacrifices to their Gods. Ibrāhim pretended to be unwilling and remained in the town. Armed with an axe he went to the temple of the gods where tables were laid with food. He said: "Why do ye not eat?" and struck off the hand of the one, the foot of another and the head of a third. He put them into the biggest of the vases and placed various dishes before him. When the people of the town saw this on their return, they accused Ibrāhim of the deed. He answered: "Verily, the biggest of them has done this; ask them, if they can speak." They said: "You surely know that they cannot speak." He said: "Do you, disregarding Allāh, worship what can neither help nor harm you? Fie upon you and your worship of idols!" Thrown into a limekiln as a punishment he left it unharmed after being three or
seven days in it (al-Thalabi and al-Kisà'i, l.c.). Namrûd was completely defeated and Ibrahim with his followers set out for Palestine being now called Khalil Allah, "the friend of God" (al-Kisà'i and al-Thalabi following Jâmi', xii. 8, Shabbi'ah 137, Minaúsah 53). In Egypt his beautiful wife Sâra was taken before Fir'awn (Genesis, xii. 10–20, al-Thalabi, p. 44; Tabari, i. 225; Ibn al-Athîr, i. 72). She said he was her brother so that he might not be slain on her account. She was not telling a lie, as he was her brother in the faith. When Fir'awn tried to touch her, his hand was paralyzed, and restored again when he had sent her back. In Sâlah in Palestine he dug a well of fresh clear water. Being molested by the inhabitants he had to go away whereupon the water dried up (Genesis, xii. 25–30, al-Thalabi and Ibn al-Athîr, l.c.). The people hurried after him to beg him to return. But he refused and gave them seven goats (Genesis xvi. 30) with instruction to place them at the well; the water would flow then again. When a menstruating woman had drunk from the well, the water entirely disappeared. In his 120th year he circumcised himself (al-Thalabi, p. 59). He died at the age of 175 and was buried in a tomb at Khirbat (cf. the article Al-Kisà'i). On the day of his death the moon will take his place at the left hand of Allah and guide the pious into Paradise (al-Thalabi, p. 60; cf. Genesis R., Par. 48).

**Bibliography:** al-Thalabi, Kisà'i al-Ashab, Cairo 1312, p. 43–47, 59 sq.; al-Kisà'i, Kisà'i al-Ashab, p. 128–145, 153; Tabari, Annals, i. 220–225; Ibn al-Athîr, i. 67–98; Grünbaum, Beiträge, p. 122–130; Eisenberg, Abraham in der aram. Legende, 1912; Weiss, Leben Abraham's, Berlin 1913 [contains a fragment from al-Kisà'i, which seems to be of very late origin and differs in many respects from the original.] (J. Eisenberg.)

Sprenger (Leben und Lehre des Mohammed, ii. 276 sqq.) was the first to point out that the figure of Ibrahim in the Kûrâns has a history before he finally develops into the founder of the Ka'bah. This thesis was further expounded by Snouck Hurgronje as follows (Het Mahdhaanse Feste, p. 20 sqq.). In the older revelations (Sûra li. 24 sqq.; xv. 5 sqq., xxxvii. 81 sqq., vi. 74 sqq., xix. 42 sqq., xxi. 52 sqq., xxix. 15 sqq.) he is an apostle of God, who has to admonish his people, like other prophets. Ismâ'il is not yet connected with him. At the same time it is emphasised that Allah had not yet sent an admonisher to the Arabs (xxxi. 2; xxxiii. 43; xxxvi. 53). Ibrahim never appears as the founder of the Ka'bah and the first Muslim. In the Medina Suras on the other hand, Ibrahim is called Hansîf [q.v.] Muslim, the founder of the "religion of Ibrahim", whose palace, the Ka'bah, he founded along with Ismâ'il (iii. 118 sqq., iii. 60, 84 etc.). This alteration is explained as follows. Muhammad had appealed to the Jews in Mecca; in Medina it was soon shown that they seceded from him. Muhammad was therefore forced to find other support; he therefore ingeniously created the new role of the patriarch; he could now be independent of contemporary Judaism by appealing to the Judaism of Ibrahim, which was also the precursor of Islam. When Mecca again became prominent in his ideas, Ibrahim at the same time became the founder of the sanctuary there.

(A. J. Wensinck.)

IBRÂHÎM B. AMD ALLAH, son of the great-grandson of 'Ali, 'Abd Allah b. al-Hasan [1.] was brought up with his brother Muhammad [1.] in the expectation of one day becoming Caliph. They therefore considered the 'Abbasids as usurpers and with all the more justice as before the fall of the Omayyads, 'Abd Djasîr is said to have paid homage to Muhammad as Caliph. The brothers were therefore no little danger to him and as Caliph he sent officers to search for them, so that they were forced to wander from place to place with many dangerous adventures in order to remain concealed. Muhammad finally went to Medina and Ibrahim to Basra to advertise their cause. Although the project was by no means ripe, Muhammad found himself forced to appear openly as a rebel in Ramadân 145 (Nov. 762), which, in spite of his misgivings forced his brother to do the same in Basra. His situation was at first not unfavourable. Sentiment in the 'Irak was strongly 'Alid and 'Abî Djasîr, who was staying in the unruly town of Kufa, had sent the most of his troops to Medina or elsewhere. Ibrahim seized the state treasury and equipped armies, which captured al-Ahvâz, Fâris and Wâṣîf for him. But soon there arrived the depressing news that his brother in Medina had fallen on Ramadân 145, i.e. Dec. 762, which resulted in the Caliph now being able to send his general Isâ b. Musâ from Medina to the 'Irak. Ibrahim, who had left Basra to attack Kufa, met Isâ at Bakhmârâ south of Kufa on the 15th Dhu-l-Ḥa'â (14 Feb. 763). Ibrahim's troops were at first victorious, but then the battle turned and he himself fell, struck by an arrow. His head was cut off and sent to the Caliph. Ibrahim, who was 48 years old, was better fitted for the dangers of an adventurous wandering life than for the task of conducting a revolution. Like many of his family he was personally brave, but his character was weak, he had a dreamy and somewhat sensual nature and above all he had inherited the fatal faculty of the 'Alids for rejecting good advice and following an unreflecting and ruinous course.

**Bibliography:** Tabari, ed. de Goeje, iii. 143 sqq. passim, 282–319, 416, 533; Fargún, hist. arabič., ed. de Goeje, p. 230–256; Mas'udî, Les prairies d'or, ed. Barbier de Meynard, vi. 190–202; Ibn al-Athîr, Chronicon, ed. Tornberg, v. 390, 398, 408, 420, 428–437; Nöldeke, Sketches from Eastern History, p. 120 sqq. (F. Buhl.)

IBRÂHÎM B. ADHAM B. MANŞûR B. YAZID B. DÎYâRî (Abû Isâhâq) al-Tâmîmi al-Allîlî, the famous ascetic, was a native of Balkh. The dates given for his death, which is said to have occurred while he was taking part in a naval expedition against the Greeks (Hlyat al-Alyâsing), Leiden MS., i. 188), range between 160 and 169 (776–783). Some verses composed on this occasion by the poet Muhammâd b. Kunâsâ of Kufa (died 207 = 822), whose mother was the sister of Ibrahim b. Adham, praise his asceticism, the nobility of his character, and his personal courage and refer to "the Western tomb," al-gharbi, in which he was buried (Abîhâni, xii. 113, 7 sqq.). According to one account, he was buried at Sûkîn, a fortress in Rûm (Yâkût, edited by Wüstenfeld, ii. 196, i.). The fact that after his conversion to Shi'ism he migrated to Syria, where he worked and lived by his labour until his death, is established by many anecdotes related in the
He is reputed to have said to 'Abd Allâh b. Mubarak, who asked him why he had left Khurasân: "I find no joy in life except in Syria, where I flee with my religion from peak to peak and from hill to hill, and those who see me think I am a madman or a camel-driver".

The Siûfî legend of 'Ibâhim b. Adham is evidently modelled upon the story of 'Abdulla (see Goldscheider, A Budükkûnu hadâ'a az İslâmârma, summarised by T. Duka in Joum. Roy. Asiat. Soc., 1904, p. 132 sqq.). Here 'Ibâhim appears as a prince of Balâqê who, while hunting, was wounded by an unseen voice that he was not created for the purpose of chasing hares or foxes: whereupon he dismounted, clad himself in the woollen garment of one of his father's shepherds, to whom he gave his horse and all that he had with him, and "abandoned the path of worldly pomp for the path of asceticism and piety" (for other accounts of his conversion, see Goldscheider, loc. cit., and Fawwî al-Wafâyât, Balâqê, 1283 A.H., 1, 3, 10 sqq.). The anecdotcs and sayings of 'Ibâhim, as recorded by his earliest biographers, show that he was essentially an ascetic and quietist of a practical type; we look in vain for any traces of the speculative mysticism which developed in the following century. Like many of the ancient Siûfîs, he took every precaution that his food should be lawful in the religious sense of the word. He did not carry the doctrine of tarz-al-kabûl to the point of refusing to earn his livelihood; on the contrary, he supported himself by gardening, reaping, grinding wheat, etc. While he approved of begging, if that it invites men to give alms and thereby increases their chance of salvation, he condemned it as a means of livelihood. He said: "There are two kinds of begging. A man may beg at people's doors, or he may say, 'I frequent the mosque and pray and fast and worship God and accept whatever is given to me'. This is the worse of the two kinds. Such a person is an important beggar". A trait far more characteristic of Indian and Syrian than of Moslem asceticism appears in the story that one of the three occasions on which 'Ibâhim felt joy was when he looked at the fart garment that he was wearing, and could not distinguish the fart from the one, because there were so many of the latter (al-Kushairî, Risâla, Cairo, 1318 A.H., p. 83, 1, 25 sqq.). As examples of his mystical sayings the following may be quoted: "Poverty is a treasure which God keeps in heaven and does not bestow except on those whom He loves"; "this is the sign of him that knows God, that his chief care is goodness and devotion, and his words are mostly words of praise and glorification". In answer to 'Abû Yazîd al-Dûhâmî, who declared that Paradise is the utmost that devotees hope to obtain from God hereafter, 'Ibâhim said: "By God, I deem that the greatest matter, as they consider it, is that God should not withdraw them from their Gracious_countenance". Although such ideas mark the transition from asceticism to mysticism, we cannot regard 'Ibâhim b. Adham as one who crossed the border-line. The keynotes of his religion are renunciation of the world and self-mortification, and in these he finds the fullest peace and joy, not in the ecstasy of contemplation or the enthusiasm of self-abandonment. (Nichtolson.)

[An Arabic romance of 'Ibâhim b. Adham, translated from the Turkish of 'Abd-Allâh 'Abd-Allâhim 'Abd-al-Rûmî and abridged by Ahmad b. Vü'ûsîn Sinân al-Karâmînî al-Dûhâmî (d. 1019 = 1611) is preserved in Berlin (cf. Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litter., ii, 501; survey of contents in Alwardt's Verz.), and a manuscript having the title Si'mat al-Sultân 'Ibâhim b. Adham ta'lis al-Dûhâmî 'Abd-Allâhim al-Rûmî, is mentioned by 'Abû Yazîd al-Zayyât, 'Abd-Allâhim al-Kutubî fi Dimashq wa-Damasc, p. 39, Nî. 130, 2. A versified Kisâ Wâli Allâh 'Abd-Allâhim is contained in Ms. Gotha, Pers.-cit. Die arab. His., n. 2752. A romance of 'Ibâhim has been versified in Hindûstan by Abû 'Ahlî-Hasan (Husayn) Muhammad, under the title Gulzâr-i 'Ibâhim (Mirat 1865, lith. Lucknow 1869, Caswagger 1871), ed. J. F. Blumhardt, Cat. of Hindûstani Printed Books Brit. Mus., p. 250; Muhammad Tassiy, Hist. de la Litt. hindoustane et hindostanî, i. 101). There exists also a Malay romance of which the following summary is given by Dr. J. J. de Hollander, Handelingen by de Besteeving der Maleisîche Taal- en Letterkunde, 6th ed. Breda, 1893, p. 348: "After a prosperous reign of some years, Sultan 'Ibâhim, prince of Irân, decides to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca and charges the most trustworthy of his viziers with the government in his absence. Having arrived in Kûfâ, 'Ibâhim becomes acquainted with Sitti Sha'îha, the daughter of Sharîf 'Hasan. He marries her, but soon leaves her in order to continue his journey to Mecca. Twenty years later, his son, Muhammad Tabîr, who was born from this marriage, betakes himself to Mecca to visit his father, who had been uninterruptedly engaged in devotion in the holy mosque. Sultan 'Ibâhim, being determined to renounce the world for ever, gives his son his seal-ring, by which he may vindicate his right to the throne of 'Irân, and bids him go to that country. The son obeys and is acknowledged by the vizier as the legitimate ruler. He does not desire, however, to take the reins of government and abdicates in favour of the vizier, on whom he bestows all the treasures left by his father." The Malay romance exists in two recensions, a shorter (ed. with Dutch transl. by P. P. Roorda van Eysinga, Levenskûn van Sultan Ibrahim, batak, Batavia, 1822; ed. of text with notes by D. Lenting, Geschiedenis van Sultan Ibrahim, zoon van Adham, voorst van Irakh, Breda, 1846; new ed. by A. Regensburg, Batavia, 1890, in Latin transcr., ibid. 1901) and a longer one; the latter is said to have been translated from the Arabic of a certain Hadrami shaikh, named Abû Bakr (cf. Ph. S. van Ronkel, Catalogus der Malische Handschriften von der Bataviisch Geenschap von Kunst en Wetenschappen, vol. 57). Stories of 'Ibâhim b. Adham, in part agreeing with the published text, are also found in the Purâna al-Sultânî (composed in A.H. 1650 ~ 1650), Book iv. Ch. i. (ed. H. N. van der Taak in Bydragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Ned.-Indie, Ser. iii., i. 424 sqq., Nî. 17; do., Malisch Leesboek, The Hague, 1868, p. 40~8, van Ronkel, o. e. Nî. 55) and in the Javanese works Lasmâs (?) Salatin (Br. Mus., cf. G. Tiemann, Inleiding tot de kennis van den Islam, p. 479) and Nawaerî, cf. J. H. G. Gunning, Diss. Leiden 1881, xxii. sqq.; A. C. Vreelee, Catal. de javaanse . . . Handschr. der Leidsech Univ.-Bibl., p. 303, Nî. 221. Poetic adaptations in Javanese have been made by P. P. Roorda van Eysinga (Am-
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IBRAHĪM B. AL-AGHLAB (183-106 = 892-913). Founder of the semi-independent dynasty of the Aghlabids, was the son of al-Aghlab b. Sālim b. ‘Iṣāl b. Tamattā, a native of Marw al-Rūḍānī, who had governed Ifrīqiya after the departure of Ibn al-Aswāth in 148 A. H. and had been killed two years later in the revolt of al-Ḥasan b. Ḥarīb. In 179 (795) Ibrāhīm received the governorship of the Zāb. When the mistakes of the governor Ibn Muḥātīd had roused the people against him, who finally (183 = 799) expelled him, Ibrāhīm came to his assistance, and after the restoration of order, cleverly made himself so indispensable to Ibn al-Aswāth that the Caliph on Hartbama’s advice, left him in possession of Ifrīqiya on payment of a tribute of 40,000 dinars while Egypt was freed from the subvention of 100,000 dinars which she paid annually to Ifrīqiya. This change took place on the 12th Dhu’l-Qa‘da 1184 (July 9, 800). Following Spain and the Maghrib, Ifrīqiya in turn separated from the ‘Abbāsid empire. Egypt was soon to follow. The new king began by building a new capital to replace Kairawān: this was al-‘Abbāsīyya [q. v.]. A year later he received ambassadors from Charlemagne (802), who brought from Africa a number of relics: this was presumably not the only object of their journey and it may be supposed that Charlemagne was seeking an ally against the Omayyads in Spain. In 185 (802) Ibrāhīm suppressed a rising of Ḥamdis al-Kaisī in Tā‘ān; in 189 (805) another broke out in Tripoli, the inhabitants of which drove out the Aghlabi governor Sufyān b. al-Maŷāʾ. Hardly had this been terminated by an amnesty 194 (809) when a more serious rising took place in the very centre of Ifrīqiya. ‘Imrān b. Muḥājīd al-Rablī (Dhahabī has Makhbīd instead of Mudjājīd, v. Fagānī. Ibn al-‘Alīfī, Annāls, p. 158, note i. p. 173) and Kurāshī b. al-‘Umārī were at its head. Ibrāhīm was besieged for a whole year in al-‘Abbāsīyya. Money sent by the Caliph bought off the rebels and Ibrāhīm retired to the Zāb, where he lived till the death of Ibrāhīm without being disturbed. Tripoli was again the scene of a revolt in 196 (811) in the course of which it was pillaged by the Khâlidīyya Huwārī. The ruler sent his son ‘Abd Allāh at the head of an army and after an initial success the latter was forced to fight against the Khâlidīyya from Taḥert (Tugdement) led by their Rustamī āmm ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān [q. v.]. The town was besieged by them, and the assault had begun when the news came that Ibrāhīm had died on the 21st Shawwal 196 (5th July 812) at al-Kairawān. ‘Abd Allāh, eager to seize his heritage, made peace with ‘Abd al-Wahhāb by abandoning to him the whole of Tripolitania, except Tripoli, as well as the districts of Kastilīya and Djerba.


IBRAHĪM B. IBRĀHĪM B. AL-‘Abbāsī ĪRIJĀNĪ, the last ruler of the Aghlabid dynasty. Although he had solemnly sworn to his dying brother Muḥammad Abu l-Gharānīk to recognise his nephew Abī ‘Iṣālī, he seized the throne on the death of his brother on the 6th Dhu’l-Qa‘da 1261 (= 16th February 875) with the acquiescence of the people of al-Kairawān. He was famous for two very different reasons: his taste for building and his ferocious cruelty. He built the Kaṣr al-Ḥarīr at al-Raḳkādī and placed along the coast a number of towers (maŷāris) to signal nocturnal attacks, which has led other buildings to be wrongly attributed to him. He waged wars notably against al-‘Abbāsī, who rebelling against his successor the first Taḥrīrī of Egypt, marched against Ifrīqiya in 266 = 879-880. After defeating the Aghlabid troops under Muḥammad b. Kūrbū at the Wādī Wardāsī, he was held up at first by the siege of Labda and later by that of Tripoli. The Abāḍīs [q. v.] of the Djebele Nefīṣa, led by their chief ‘Iyās b. Mansūr came to the help of the town and destroyed the army of al-‘Abbāsī who fled to Egypt (267 = 880-1). A rising of the Berbers of Ifrīqiya cost the life of Mu-
Ibrahîm b. Kâbir (Dhu ‘l-Hijja 268 = June-July 882) and was only suppressed by Ibrahîm’s son Abu ‘l-Abbâs. The latter having completely defeated the Neîsâ was sent to Bursa where Syracuse had been taken in 839. Ibrahîm followed later and in Radjab 289 = July-August 932 by order of the Abassid Caliph, seized Taormina, then crossing the strait began to besiege Cosenza. He died of dysentery during the siege on the 19th Dhu ’l-Ka‘da 289 = 26th October 902. His body was taken to Kairawân where he was buried on the 1st Muharram 290 = 5th December 902. All the historians unanimously accuse him of cruelty and quote numerous examples e.g. the massacre of the mawlas, the inhabitants of al-Râkîdâda and of Tunis, the murder of his physicians, ministers, pages, his son Abu l-Aghab, and his eight brothers, on account of imaginary fears. He created a bodyguard of negroes whom alone he trusted and who were the instruments of his cruelties.


**IBRAHÎM b. AHMAD**, the youngest son of Ahmad I, was born on the 12th Shawwâl 1024 (4th November 1615) and succeeded his brother Murâd IV (died 16th Shawwâl 1049 = 8th Feb. 1640) on the throne as 19th Ottoman sulțân. His brothers, Osman II and Murad IV reigning before him, had kept him in strict seclusion, and he grew up in awe of their machinations and in continual fear of a violent death, being on the whole of a delicate constitution; all this contrived to render him absolutely incapable of governing a great empire. During the first years of his reign he therefore left the government in the hands of the able vizier Kara Muşafâ. By the treaty of Szon (15th March 1642) the latter renewed the peace with Austria; he reconquered the fortress of Asow, and among some minor disturbances he suppressed the dangerous insurrection of Nasuh-paşâzâde (1642). At the same time he kept a watchful eye on the financial system of the country, and he greatly improved it by reforming the currency, by limitation of the expenses of the State, and by a strict collection of the taxes. After four years he fell a victim to court intrigue and was beheaded on 21st Dhu ’l-Ka‘da 1053 (31st January 1644). The Sulţan, who indulged in the delights of hareem-life as none of his predecessors or successors ever did, was now absolutely under the sway of his odalisks and favourites, particularly the notorious Djinîgî Kâğîa Husîn, an ignorant sofa from Zarafranorlu, who cared Ibrahîm from his fits of faintness by his magic charms and thereby won unlimited control over him. The State revenues were dissipated to humour the foolish whims of Ibrahîm and his court; offices and ranks were given by favour and for gifts i.e. in proportion to the bribes given. The result was an uninterrupted series of changes of grand viziers and ministers.

Such was the wretched state of affairs when on the 28th Sept. 1644 Multrese corsairs seized a convoy of pilgrims near Karpathos; among them was the Sultan’s Kışlar Âghâîi Sumbul with his riches and his retinue, bound for Cairo whither he had been banished. The Sulţan resolved to be revenged, and-as his favourite, the sâhibûr Yâsunî, had already been inciting him against Venice, the Sulţan undertook an expedition against the Republic.

Without a declaration of war a strong Turkish army was landed in Crete in June 1645 and took Canea. In the following year Rhethymonas fell, while the siege of the strong fortress of Candia continued to drag on. In the meanwhile the Turks were repeatedly defeated in Dalmatia. All this roused the Sulţan’s wrath to such an extent that he resolved to massacre all Christians, at least all Franks residing in his empire. This plan failed on account of the opposition of the Shaikh al-Islâm. This war, which was to last for 25 years, weakened the country to utter exhaustion, nevertheless it did not allow the Sulţan to interfere with his disolute conduct. The immense sums spent for the foolish luxury of the Serai rose disproportionately; in order to provide the necessary money, new heavy taxes were imposed on the people. At last the public rage broke forth openly; at the head of the insurrection were the Janissaries assisted by the ‘alâmî and the Shaikh al-Islâm. The Grand Vizier Hezîrî Shaikh Ahmed Pasha fell the first victim of the infuriated mob. Next came the Sulţan Ibrahîm who was dethroned on the 18th Radjab 1055 (8th August 1648) and confined in the Çemlik kâsh, where he was strangled on the 18th days later by the executioner. When Ibrahîm ascended the throne, he was the only living male offspring of the house of Ósman; on his death he left four sons and thus became the founder of the dynasty again, the only thing historical place to his credit.

**Biography:** I‘tîdîjî Khalîfa, Faqîhîka, ii. 220–330; 339 sq.; Na‘îmî Ta‘rîkh, i, 697, ii, 171; Rawçar al-Evrîr, p. 610 sqq.; Mun’.l-qûmîn, iii, 679–693; Solakçâde, p. 766–773; Emlâya, Siyâxât-nâmê, i, 267–277, 355; the same, Travels etc., i, 146–151; Rycawnd, Knolles, History etc., p. 49–79; v. Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, v, 295–454; Zinkeisen, iv, 530–802; Rank, Die Osmanen und die Spanische Monarchie im xvi. u. xvii. Jahrh., iv, 64–71. (J. H. MORDMAN).

**IBRAHÎM b. ALI.** [See Al-Shirazi.]

**IBRAHÎM b. HÎSHÂ.** [See Al-Šâhî.]

**IBRAHÎM b. KHÂLID.** [See Al-Ḥawk.]

**IBRAHÎM b. AL-MÂHî.** Al-Bâsîd, born at the end of 162 = July 1677. His father was the Caliph Muhammad al-Mahdi, his mother a negro named Shikla. When the Caliph al-Mamûn, who was then in Marw, appointed the ‘Alî al-Rîdâ successor on the end of Kamân = 24th March 817, disturbances broke out among the
followers of the ʿAbbāsids. At the end of Dhu l-Ḥijjah 7 they proclaimed al-Māmūn’s uncle, Ibrahim, Caliph under the name of al-Muṣārak (“the blessed”) and on the 5th Muharram 202 = 24th July 817 he publicly appeared in the mosque as ruler. His reign did not last long however. The troops soon rebelled because he could not pay them. After order had been restored in the army, Ḥira and Kūfā fell into his hands, but on the 26th Rāgab = 7th February 818 his generals Šīrāz b. Sājdār and ʿĪsā b. Muhammad were defeated at Walīy by the governor Ḥasan b. Sahl and had to retire to Baghdad. ʿĪsā soon went over openly to the enemy and the other generals began secretly to work for al-Maʾmūn. When the latter came back from Khorāsān, Ibrahim could no longer hold out, but had to abandon his claims in the middle of Dhu l-Ḥijjah 203 = June 819 and on the 15th Safar 204 = 11th August 819 al-Maʾmūn entered Baghdad. Ibrahim henceforth lived in retirement. He was arrested in 210 = 825–826 but pardoned in a few days. He died in Ramadān 224 = July 839 at Surr-maʾna. He had not the gifts of a ruler; but he held a refined taste which was especially interested in music and singing.


(K. V. Zettersten.)

Ibrahim ibn ʿAbbās, the second and twelfth Ghaznavid.

[See Ghaznavids, p. 156 sqq.]

Ibrahim ibn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbbās, brother of the two first ʿAbbāsid Sulṭāns, al-Safawād b. Ṣafawād, born in 82 = 701–702. His father Ṣafawād, according to the usual statement, died in Dhu l-Kaʿda 125 = August 743, was the founder of the secret ʿAbbāsid propaganda and shortly before his death made over to his son Ibrahim his right to the ʿAbbāsid imāmāte. In the following year the latter sent Bukār b. Māḥān [q. v.] to Marw where he informed the Khorāsānians of Muḥammad’s death and proclaimed Ibrahim his successor. After Bukār’s death in 127 = 744–745 Abū Ṣalāma al-Khālīl [q. v.] was appointed plenipotentiary of the ʿAbbāsids. Like his father, Ibrahim himself lived in al-Hamayma, a place south of the Dead Sea, while Kūfā was the centre from which the invisible threads of the energetic propaganda ran. Khorāsān was a particularly fertile soil for the activities of the ʿAbbāsid emissaries, and in 128 = 745–746 Abī Muslim was appointed leader of the secret agitation there. In the following summer the long prepared rebellion broke out and on the 1st Shawwāl 129 = 15th June 747 the first ʿAbbāsid service was held in Ṣīkāḍhān. In the same year the Caliph Marwān II had Ibrahim captured and brought to Ḥarrān, his then residence, and the latter soon afterwards died there. According to some, Ibrahim was put to death by order of Marwān.


(K. V. Zettersten.)

Ibrahim, one of the most prominent of the last Mamluks amirs of Egypt. He was brought to Egypt as a Circassian slave and passed into the possession of Muḥammad Ahmad Abu l-Dhahab, the favourite Mamluk of ʿAlī Bey [q. v.]. He manumitted him and married him to his sister (cf. al-Djabarī’s statement under the 4th Rabīʿ II 1216). In 1182 (1760–61) he was appointed one of the 24 Beys, in 1186 as Amir al-Ḥajjād he led the Egyptian pilgrim caravan to Mecca. On his return the dispute between Muḥammad Ahmad Abu l-Dhahab and ʿAlī Bey had already been decided in favour of the latter. During the few years of his brother-in-law’s rule his prestige must have increased considerably. In 1187 he was Deftedar, in 1189 he remained in Cairo as Shaikh al-Bīlād while Muḥammad undertook his expedition to Syria and when the latter died at Akka, Ibrahim as his nearest relative inherited his great wealth and influence. With Murād Bey, another Amir of Muḥammad’s house, whom the troops had chosen as their leader, he shared the rule over Egypt so that he took over the civil rule as Shaikh al-Bālād i.e. Lord Mayor of Cairo, while Murād took control of the army. The predominating position of these two is clear from the number of their Mamluks. According to Volney, who was in Egypt in 1783, Ibrahim Bey had 600 Mamluks, Murād Bey 400, the other Beys between 50 and 200. That this division of power lasted was mainly due to Ibrahim Bey’s complaisance and love of peace. He probably dealt warily with the impulsive Murād Bey so that serious differences only arose between them in 1198–9. Their joint rule lasted till the French expedition to Egypt in 1213 (1798), although it was twice interrupted when Ismāʿil Bey, the most influential amir of the house of ʿAlī Bey, came to power. In 1191 he was only able to hold out for six months; in 1201 (1786) he was again made Shaikh al-Bīlād by the Turkish Kapudan (Kaptan) Paşa (Admiral) Ḥasan. The object of the latter’s expedition to Egypt was to strengthen the power of the Porte, the influence of which had sunk to a minimum since the days of Ibrahim Kâthkûda and particularly under ʿAlī Bey. Although Ibrahim and Murād in whom Ḥasan Paşa saw the chief culprits, had to leave Cairo they did not dare openly to challenge the authority of the Porte’s envoy, the latter however had to leave the rule of Egypt in the hands of the Mamluks. Even after the departure of Ḥasan Bey, which was hastened by political complications with Russia, Ismāʿil was able to retain his post of Shaikh al-Bīlād. Not till a pestilence had carried him and other amirs off in 1206, could Ibrahim and Murād return to Cairo. They received an amnesty from the Porte and henceforth again shared the government of the country.

During the French advance to 1213 (1798) Ibrahim awaited the result of the fighting at the Pyramid on the east bank of the Nile at Shabra and Būlāk. He ordered the ships at Būlāk to be burned to make it difficult for the French to cross the Nile. After the battles of Khânkâ and Sallimā
he succeeded in escaping with his train to Syria. He stayed at Ghaza and retired to the north-east when Bonaparte sent an expedition to Palestine.

Ibrahim returned to Egypt with the army of the Grand Vizier Yusuf Pasha. When during the battle of Helopolis Nasiri Pasha, whom the Porte had designated governor of Egypt, entered Cairo in Feb. 1800, Ibrahim Bey was with him. He left the town with the Turkish troops when the French were able to hold it. He declined any rapprochement with the French, while Murad Bey made peace with them and received the government of Upper Egypt. He died soon afterwards of the plague in April 1801.

After the final evacuation of the town by the French in June 1801, Ibrahim Bey was again appointed Shaikh al-bilad by the Grand Vizier but soon afterwards on the 20th Oct. 1801 he was thrown into prison with the rest of the Mameluk amirs by order of the Porte, who thought it a favourable opportunity to dispose of the Mameluks. The English forced the imprisoned Mameluks to be handed over to them. Ibrahim Bey thus succeeded in reaching Upper Egypt. From there in the next few years he repeatedly negotiated with the Turkish governor of Egypt, Khosrow Pasha. When the latter was driven from Egypt and the Albanian chief Tahir, who had been appointed kâîmmâkân, was murdered, Muhammad Ali summoned Ibrahim Bey to Cairo in April 1801 and gave him the office of Shaikh al-bilad to prevent Ahmad Pasha, the governor designate of Dijida, who was passing through Egypt at the time, establishing himself there. The influence of the aged Ibrahim Bey was certainly not very great and he must have seen that he was only a tool in the hands of Muhammad Ali. In any case, he developed a great distrust of Muhammad Ali; he probably saw through the latter's policy of making use of the Mameluks when suited himself, while he took care not to allow them to become too powerful and continually sowed seeds among them. The coup de main which Muhammad Ali attempted on 13th March 1804 against Ibrahim and Qothmân al-Bardîf, Murad's successor, failed in as much as both escaped imprisonment by flight. Ibrahim never again returned to Cairo. During the massacre of the Mameluks on the 18th August 1805 he was at Turâ with his son Marzûq and inflicted heavy losses on Muhammad Ali's troops there. His attempt to unite the Mameluks in a common struggle with Muhammad Ali failed owing to the dissensions among them and Muhammad Ali's skill in always winning to his side several of the most influential Mameluks by threats and gifts in honorary offices. Ibrahim declined an attempt at reconciliation made by Muhammad Ali in 1809, saying that too much blood had flowed between them. Owing to Ibrahim's efforts the Mameluks in 1810 were a power against which Muhammad Ali did not dare to take open action. But by stratagem he succeeded in bringing most of the Mameluks to Cairo. Here honours were heaped upon them and thus they were secured. They thus fell into the trap prepared by Muhammad Ali and were massacred in the citadel on March 1st 1811. Ibrahim Bey with a few others had not trusted Muhammad Ali's assurances. He remained on the southern frontier of Egypt and thus was saved. He spent the last years of his life at Dongola with the remnants of the Mameluks in the land of slaves where they sowed millet and lived on it and clothed themselves in robes such as slave dealers wore there, till finally in Rabî' I 1231 the news of his death reached 'cairo' (Djibarî). His widow who in 1811 had been allowed to seek and bury her son Marzûq's body, received permission from Muhammad Ali to bring Ibrahim's body to Cairo. It arrived there in Ramaḍân 1232.


P. KAHLE.

IBRAHIM HAKKI PASHA is the grandson of a Georgian who adopted Islam and the name of Mehmed Remzi, who at the time of his death was president of the Constantinople city council (Sehir Emnneti Meliksi). Ibrahim Hakki Pasha was born on the 22nd Shawwal 1279 = 12th April 1863 in the Beşiktaş-Tagh quarter of Constantinople. From 1877 to 1882 he attended the school of administration (Milhîye Mektebi) in Constantinople and took particular advantage of the lectures of Mehmed Murad Bey (History), Pertuğul Miş'îl Efendi (Finance) and Oğhânu Efeni (Economics). Passing out of the school with brilliant success he became a translator in the Vildiz palace of Sultan Abd al-Hasid from 1883 to 1894. Through his literary and scholarly activities he obtained the professorship of history at the age of 23 in the Constantinople school of Law (Hukuk Mektebi) to which soon afterwards in 1888 the chair of constitutional law (Hukuk-i siyâsîye) was added. Ibrahim Hakki's professorship of history lapsed in 1891. In place of it he was given in 1892 the chair of administrative law in addition to that of constitutional law, and in 1893 that of international law in the school of Law also. Being a brilliant orator and a comparatively bold critic he was able to attach students to himself — and what was more important — also to interest even non-Turks and non-Muslims in the welfare of the Ottoman empire. On 12th Sept. 1894, Ibrahim Hakki was appointed legal adviser (Hukuk Müsbat-i kudüsî) to the Sublime Porte. The Grand Vizier Mehmed Sa'id Pasha in 1901 or 1902 wished to appoint him undersecretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but the Sultan did not approve. Hakki Bey distinguished himself in the office of legal adviser which he held till 1908, and acted as member or president of over 30 commissions which discussed the conclusion of treaties or disputed questions of law. Being a linguist he was twice sent on mission to Europe by Abd al-Hasid and twice to America. When the Turkish constitution was re-established in 1908 Ibrahim Hakki at once plunged into the political arena, championed extremely modern views, and
took the bold step, during the short time he held the portfolio of Minister of Education in 1918, of confirming in office only a hundred of the five hundred officials in the central offices. Soon afterwards he held the Ministry of the Interior for a short time. His great zeal horrified the backward officials, and he had to retire from these offices. He still continued to hold his legal chairs till in 1909 he was appointed ambassador to Rome. Having already for a long time been the candidate of the Committee of Union and Progress on Jan. 12 (Schulthees, Jan. 10) 1910 he was given the rank of vizier and promoted Grand Vizier. İbrahim Haşki proved himself in the field of politics a distinguished orator, a man of striking, well-marked convictions which, however, lacked the elasticity usual and perhaps necessary in the east. In alliance with the Young Turks he held the office of Grand Vizier for 21 months and was a vigorous opponent of the Albanian and other separatist claims. As a result of Italy’s declaration of war against the Porte, İbrahim Haşki’s cabinet resigned on Sept. 29 1911.

The greatest political success of his vizierate was the successful operations of the Ottoman Chief of Staff, Ahmed İzzet Paşa, against the rebels in the Yemen and in the conclusion of a peace with the leader of the Yemeni Zaidis, İmám Yahya, which was based on religious, legal, and in part financial independence. This treaty was also Ahmed İzzet Paşa’s work.

İbrahim Haşki Paşa’s literary works deal mainly with jurisprudence and to a secondary degree with history. His first book was an ‘Introduction to International Law’ (Melikhaşı Haşki Haşki Diewel) and was soon followed by an “History of International Law” (Taşıkeri Haşki beim Judäwal, Istanbul, 1393 = 1885-6). Both are concise, unexceptionable and reliable compendiums for university teaching. In conjunction with Melhem ‘Azmī he published about the same time a “Brief History of Islam” (Müşküdar İslam Tarihik) which was intended for the lower classes of intermediate schools (Müşküdar); (6th edition Istanbul 1321 = 1903-4). Likewise with Melhem ‘Azmī he prepared a “Brief Ottoman History” and then from his own pen a “Small Ottoman History” for elementary schools (Istanbul 1301 = 1890). Soon afterwards he published his most important historical work a “General History” in three volumes from the earliest times to the xviiith century (Taşıkeri Tarihik, Istanbul 1305 and 1306 = 1887-8 and 1888-9). There is nothing original in any of these works.

İbrahim Haşki’s most valuable work is his Administrative Law (Haşki-i İdäre, 1st ed. Istanbul 1308 = 1890-91; 2nd ed. 1312 = 1894-95) in two volumes octavo. The work deals for the first time with a many branched and complex subject in a masterly fashion. It is far surpasses all similar compilations. He has also prepared a number of unpublished works, which his activities devoted for twenty years to education and politics have not yet allowed him to publish.

**Bibliography:** Schulthees’ ‘Europäischer Geschichtkalender’, N. S., 26th year, 1910 (München 1911), 27th year 1911 (München 1912); Ahmed İlyan, ‘Newali Tercüeti-i Fatihaa, Istanbul 1311 = 1893-94), p. 47-50, 60; İsmail Şuhbî ve-Mehmed Fuâd, Sânâmhe-i Tercüeti Fatihaa, Istanbul 1327 = 1911-12 and 1328 = 1912-13; İsa’l Paşa, Khârî to, ii. 2 (Dervi Seâdet 1328 = 1911), p. 23 sq.; much personal information from İbrahim Haşki Paşa.

**İbrahim Khan** the ancestor of the İbrahim Khanîzâde family, was the son of the Prince İmâm Khanî, a daughter of Sultan II, by his first marriage with the famous Grand Vizier Mehmedmed Şokollî Paşa who was murdered on the 19 Shahrîbîn 827 (11th Oct. 1579). Tradition relates that he was concealed by his father at his birth, so that he was the first who broke the laws of the house of Osman, according to which all sons of the Princes, were to be put to death at birth (Hüdîyet al-Darâmî, ii. 38; ep. article Dârâmî), likewise contrary to the rule Ahmad I appointed him to the post of governor general in different provinces, as a reward, it is said, for the fact that he had presented the Sultan with the property on which the palace of his father Mehmedmed Şokollî Paşa stood, for the building of the great Mosque on the Atmeidan (Barozi-li-reichet, Reisnames of Pasha, p. 173). İbrahim died some time after 1313 (1621-22) and his descendants, the İbrahim Khanîzâde, formed like the Evrenosîade and the Türkîzâde, one of the historic families of the Empire, although they never filled important positions in the state ‘Ali Beg, a grandson of İbrahim Khan, is one of the few mentioned repeatedly by the chronicists (Khâhid, Ta‘rîhî, ii. 220 vs.; Knolles-Rycaut, The Turkish History, p. 263; v. Hammer, Geschichte d. Osman. Reiches, ix. 563; No. 2696; de la Motraye, Voyages, i. 326). About the decline of the 17th century, the legend arose that the İbrahim Khanîzâde would succeed to the throne, in case the Osman dynasty should die out, and that for this reason the Sultan was bound to re-establish the religion of all members of this family (de la Motraye, o. c., i. 261 sq.; von den Driesch, Historische Nachricht, etc., p. 137; Kasten, Ottoman History, p. 107; Ludeke, Beschreibung des Turk. Reiches, i. 292, ii. 63). They had their residence in the suburb of Eyyûb on the Golden Horn, and are still the muftis (administrators) of the Evlâf of their ancestor Mehmed Şokollî Paşa (Drewet, Ta‘rîhî, vi. 198).

**Bibliography:** besides the works quoted in the text see Sîghîdî ‘Osmâni, i. 99; White, Three Years in Constantinople, ii. 307.

**İbrahim Lodi.** The last king of India of the house of Lodi [s. Syamdar Lodi], came to the throne in 1510, and reigned at Agra for about 16 years when he was overthrown and slain by Babur at Panipat in April 1526. He was violent and tyrannical, and alienated his nobles who called in Babur to help them. He fell, however, fighting bravely, along with thousands of his Afghans. Like Harold, he had trouble with his own family, before being called upon to encounter a foreign foe. His father’s brother, ‘Alâ al-Din, attempted to dismisses him, first from Gudjat, and afterwards from Kâbul where he got help from Bâbur. But İbrahim defeated his uncle who gained nothing by joining the Moghals.

**Bibliography:** ‘Na‘ım al-Din. Ta‘bâhi-i Akvat; Bâbur’s Memoirs, trans. Erskine and Pavet de Courteille; Elphinston’s History, Ta‘rîh Dâ‘ûdî by ‘Abdullah of which there is an account, with extracts, in Elliot, Hist., Vol. iv. 434; Nîmat Allah, Hist. of the Afghans, Dorn’s translation, p. 70.

(H. Beveridge)
IBRAHIM AL-MAWSILÎ, IBRAHÎM B. MAHÂMÎ B. BAHMÂN, also known as Al-Nadim al-Mawṣili, one of the most celebrated musicans of Arab history, a man of Persian origin, was born at Kūfâ in 125 (742) and died at Bagdad in 138 (854). He studied music under Persian masters, and attained an extraordinary degree of skill both in singing and in the use of the lute. He stood in high favour at the 'Abdâdîd court, under al-Mahdî, al-Hâridî, and (especially) al-Rashîd. His son Isḥāq, a very learned and accomplished man, followed in his footsteps, being a musician and composer of fully equal ability, and a prominent figure in Bagdad under al-Rashîd, al-Ma'mûn, and al-Muta'âsmin. Marvelous tales were told of Ibrahim's proficiency, e.g. Aghâni, V., 41, 1—15. Two anecdotes concerning him which became very widely popular are the story of the singing-girls whose house he entered in a basket (Aghâni, v. 41 sq.; al-Ghazâlî, Muqaddimah al-budûr, i., 243 sq.; Ibn Badîn, ed. Dozy, p. 272 sq.; and the 1001 Nights [in the two latter cases, told of Is̄hâq]), and the story of his visit from the Devil, who taught him a wonderful melody (Aghâni, v. 36 sq.; al-Ghazâlî, i., 241 sq.; and the 1001 Nights [told of Is̄hâq]).


IBRAHIM MUTEFERRIKA (i.e. court-steward), the first Turkish printer, was born about 1674 in Kolozsvár (Hungary) of Calvinistic parents and, at the age of 18, was taken prisoner by Turkish troops, making a raid into Hungary. He was brought to Constantinople and sold as a slave. He then turned Muslim and occupied himself with theological studies. In 1711

Muhammed, in 1721 on his embassy to the court of Louis XV, Ibrahim established the first printing office in Constantinople, after having received the authorisation for this by an imperial warrant in the middle of Dhu 'l-Qa'da 1139 (beginning of July 1727). The maiden work of this printing office was the dictionary of Wânkîl published in two folio volumes on the 1st Redhe 1141 (31st January 1729). In October 1734 the work in the office was closed, but resumed after an interval of six years, and then stopped altogether in 1155 (1742), the office having in all printed 17 books, the incunabula of Islamic typography, (see exact list in v. Hammer, cf. cit., viii, 583 sqq.).

Bibliography: J. de Karacson in the Revue Historique publique par l'Institut d'Histoire Ottomane, No. 3, 173—185, with the additions given by B. A. Mystakides, ibid., No. 5 and 7; Sidjeli 'Osmanî, i., 127; the fioman of the year 1139, in the preface of the first print of Wânkîl, the epitaph of Ibrahim, with the chronogram of the year of his death, has been published in the newspaper Sabâh No. 8505 of the 14th Dûmu'dâ II 1331. (J. H. Mordtmann.)

IBRAHİM PASHA, the eldest son of Muhammed ʿAli, a great general and viceroy of Egypt. He is often described as Muhammad ʿAli's adopted son. Amina, a relative of his fosterfather, the governor (torbağî) of Kavalla in Macedonia, was certainly a divorced woman when Muhammed ʿAli married her in 1787 and it cannot be denied that Muhammed ʿAli had a certain preference for his son ʿÎsâ, who died on the 28th September 1816. There was certainly also a rivalry between Ibrahim and ʿÎsâ (cf. Mengin, ii., 81 sqq). The year of his birth is decisive, however, and this is usually given as 1789, but occasionally also as 1786. In the older authorities like Djabarî and Mengin we find no hint that he was not Muhammed ʿAli's real son. Djabarî (1228 [1813]) describes him as a young man of not yet twenty, which cer-
title of Pasha by the Porte in recognition of the services of his brother (Mengin, ii. 48).

In 1816 his father sent him to Alexandria to make a final reckoning with the Wahhâbi, against whom his brother Tüsün had been fighting successfully from 1811 to 1813, and from 1813 to 1815. Muhammad 'Ali himself also. After three years of heavy fighting the goal was achieved, the capital of the Wahhâbis, was destroyed and 'Abd Allâh b. al-Sa'îd with his relatives were taken as prisoners to Egypt (cf. above p. 416). In December 1819 Ibrahim made his triumphal entry into Cairo. Soon afterwards the Sultan appointed him governor of Djidda. In the meanwhile, Muhammad 'Ali had entrusted his third son Ismâ'il with the conquest of the Sudan. The discovery of the ancient goldfields and the capture of slaves, who were to form the basis of Muhammad 'Ali's new army, were the two objects of this expedition. Ibrahim Pasha was sent thither with reinforcements to support his brother. He seems to have gone there with very adventurous plans (Vauhabelle, ii. 231), but a severe attack of dysentery forced him to return hurriedly to Cairo in the beginning of May.

In the years following Ibrahim Pasha took part in training the new troops (nizâm djiddî), who were entrusted to the French Colonel Sèves. Ibrahim was an industrious pupil of the European instructor and the latter under the name of Sulaimân Pasha became his main support in his later campaigns.

When Muhammad 'Ali was appointed to conquer the Morea by a firmân of the Sultan, dated 16th January 1824, he sent his son Ibrahim Pasha there with an excellent army trained on the European model and ample supplies of war material at the end of July 1824. The capture of Navarino and his entry into Tripolitsa practically brought the Peninsula under his sway. February to April 1826 were devoted to the siege and capture of Missolonghi. After the intervention of the Great Powers had been declined by the Porte and Muhammad 'Ali, the naval battle of Navarino took place in October 1827, in which the greater part of the Egyptian-Turkish fleet was destroyed by the allied fleets of England, France, and Russia and finally Muhammad 'Ali was forced by the English Admiral Codrington, who appeared before Alexandria, to recall his son and the Egyptian troops. He arrived in Alexandria on the 10th October 1826.

In 1831 Ibrahim Pasha was entrusted by this father with the conduct of the Syrian campaign. On Nov. 1 he arrived with his troops in Palestine. After a six months' siege he obtained the surrender of 'Akka on the 27th May 1832, after previously gaining victories over the Pasha of Tripolis and Aleppo on the plain of Zer'a south of Homs, Ibrahim's march, that followed, through Syria and Asia Minor was made possible by his victories over the advance guard of the Turkish army under Muhammad Pasha of Aleppo at Homs on the 8th July, over the main Turkish army under Hussein Pasha in the pass of Bellân at Alexandria (29th July), and over the Turkish army under Râshid Pasha at Konia (21st December). These victories showed the superiority of the Egyptian army. Ibrahim's policy as a leader, and the success of his policy of uniting the various groups in Syria under one banner by the cry of "liberation from the Turkish yoke" and in winning to his side the influential Amir Bishâr of the Libanon, Ibrahim Pasha advanced as far as Kutahlîa. There on May 1833, without the pressure from the European powers, a treaty was signed between the Porte and Muhammad 'Ali by which Syria and Adana were ceded to the latter. Ibrahim escaped from the Sultan the title of "sâlih" of Adana. His father appointed him to administer the new territory: a difficult task in view of the varied nature of the population of the country. Although the latter were agreed in their discreditation for Turkish rule, the strict régime introduced by Ibrahim did not suit them either. Risings everywhere were the result and Ibrahim was partially successful in suppressing them by the general confiscation of arms. The recruiting of the population for military service resulted in the emigration of great numbers to Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, and the commandeering of beasts of burden for military purposes resulted in the decline of agriculture and trade. Although there was quiet generally, the discontent was very great. When the war was begun again, Turkey in 1839, Ibrahim on the 24th June won a decisive victory over the Turkish army under Hâyâ Fehmi at Nizîb west of Birejik and the Turkish fleet under Fевzi Pasha went over to Muhammad 'Ali. The intervention of the powers, who negociations led to the Treaty of London on the 15th July 1840 (the so-called Quadripartite Alliance), altered the situation of things. Hoping for support from the French, Muhammad 'Ali declined the demand that he should evacuate Syria as far as 'Akka and confine himself to the hereditary pashalik of Egypt. No support was given him and the coast of Syria and Egypt were blockaded by the allied fleets. Ibrahim was in a difficult position between their landing army and the hostile people of the I bânoûn who were stirred up against him. After the capture of 'Akka by the English Admiral Napier and the latter's negotiations with Muhammad 'Ali in Alexandria, the latter was forced to agree to the evacuation of Syria on 22nd Nov. 1840. On the 29th Dec. Ibrahim left Damascus with his troops and returned to Egypt via Ghazza, sending a portion of the army home via 'Aţaba under Sulaimân Pasha.

In the years that followed Ibrahim Pasha was mainly concerned with the administration of Egypt. His interest in and knowledge of agriculture is praised. He was several times in Europe, sometimes visiting watering places to improve his health. He was well received in Europe. At the beginning of 1848 he was in Malta when his father's condition made it necessary for him to return. In June 1848 he became practically ruler of the country. In September he was formally granted the pashalik of the country by the Sultan in Constantinople and on the 19th Nov. 1848 he died in his sixtieth year. He was buried in the family mausoleum near the 53.'Amin al-Shâfi'i. Of his sons he was succeeded by Ahmad (born 1825). Isma'il (afterwards Khedive born 1827), and Mustafa (born 1832).

A portrait of Ibrahim Pasha is given in Cadalen and Barrault, Histoire, etc.; descriptions of his personality in Clot Bey, l. p. xxxii 997.; Paton, ii. 55.

Bibliography: Djalarti, 'Alîj'd al-Abhâr fi Tarikhîm al-Abhâr, Bulâk 1290 and often repr.; translated: Merveilles Biographiques et
Ibrahim Pasha, the celebrated Grand Vizier and favourite of Soliman the Magnificent, was born towards the end of the xvth century of Christian parents in Parga in Epirus. Kidnapped in his early youth and brought as a slave to the Imperial Serai during Selim I's reign, he was afterwards attached to the retinue of the heir apparent Soliman as long as this latter resided as Governor General of Sarkakhan in Magnesia. His social and musical abilities soon won him the young Crown Prince's special favour, and on his accession to the throne in 1520 Soliman made him his kahrib oda bashi (master of the inner chamber) and le hâdkîngilar a gâhasi (high court falconer). On the 13th Shab'ân 929 (27th June 1523) the Sultan made him Grand Vizier, at the same time granting him the governorship of Roumelia. During the thirteen years that Ibrahim filled these high offices he enjoyed more than any other ever did before or after him the Sultan's entire confidence. The Sultan actually shared his monarchical powers with him and gave him the insignia of the sultanate. He granted him the tâbil-kâné (military music) and the half of the Imperial bodyguard, as well as the title zeraneh sulân (Sultan commander-in-chief). Ibrahim's wedding (18th Radjab 930 = 23rd May 1524), which the Sultan himself attended, was celebrated with such pomp and splendour that it has become famous in the annals of Ottoman history. Shortly afterwards, owing to the troubles caused by the insurrection of Khâ'în Ahmad Pasha, Ibrahim went to Egypt (October 1524—September 1525) to re-establish order and to re-organise the administration of the country. In 1526 he conducted Soliman's first campaign against the Magyars, (Battle of Mohacs 28th August, capitulation of Öden-Pest 10th Sept. 1526). Three years later, he undertook a second expedition against Hungary together with the Sultan. Ibrahim captured Öden which had been recaptured by king Ferdinand, and led his army up to Vienna. (Siege of Vienna 27th Sept. till 15th October 1526). In 1532, Ibrahim invaded Hungary for the third time, but he did not advance further than Gunz, and had to content with pillaging the country. The armistice concluded with Ferdinand in the spring of the following year was chiefly due to Ibrahim's influence. The decision of the dispute between the king and Zappolya regarding the Hungarian possessions was placed in the hands of the Sultan, who again entrusted the Venetian Luigi Gritti, Ibrahim's favourite, with the delimitation of the frontiers. In his Persian expedition 1533-1534 Ibrahim was not less successful. After occupying the most important places he returned to Tabriz on the 13th July 1534 and took Baghdad on the 31st December of the same year. He returned to Constantinople in January 1536 and there contracted in February the first French capitulation with the ambassador of Francis I. Ibrahim had now reached the zenith of his power and splendour when he was suddenly executed, without apparent reason, by the Sultan's orders in the Imperial Serai, where he was spending the evening (22nd Rama'dân 942 = 15th March 1536). His body was disposed off with equal secrecy and buried in the vicinity of the Gâhîmeân near the Arsenal, where it was later days shown in the Derwîsh monastery Djâf. It was said that Ibrahim in his ambition coveted the throne for himself and that decisive proofs were in the hands of the Sultan; the fact is that the Sultan had done everything to nourish and encourage such thoughts in his confidant; and it seems that Ibrahim's attitude fully justified current rumours. A series of legends and sayings soon gathered around the figure of the mühîdî wa hadâfî Ibrahim Pasha, some of which are still current among the common people. A number of mosques, tâmilâr [q.v.], bridges, and aqueducts in the capital and in the provinces, chiefly in Roumelia, likewise perpetuate his name and preserve his fame to the present day. His splendid Serai near the Atmeidan was later occupied by the Imperial pages, and his gardens along the Golden Horn remained for centuries famous among the sights of the town.

Bibliography: The accounts of the contemporary Venetian Balli in Alberi's Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti, Ser. iii., Vol. 1. and iii.; the Diarii of Marino Sanuto; the reports of the Imperial ambassador Cornelius de Schepenes in von Gévaux's Werkund ans Herzogtâich etc., Part vi.; and in the Mission diplomatique de Cornelle Dupuis de Schepenes, dit Schepners in Mémoires de l'Acad. roy. des sciences... de Bel...
IBRAHIM PASHA.

IBRAHIM PASHA (DAMAD), the favourite of Murad III and three times Grand Vizier under his successor Muhammad III. He was of Samovac origin, born in the neighbourhood of Ragusa; brought up in the Serai he was appointed ışıl-bâr (armour-bearer of the Sultan) in 952 (1547-1575); from Dhu l-Ka‘da 947-952 (End of Dec. 1579-July 1587) he was Aghâ of the Janissaries and then Beylerbey of Roumelia; he was sent to Egypt in 990, where he remained for a year and a half as Governor General. In the beginning of 985 he conducted the campaign against the Druzes of the Lebanon, and thence he returned to Constantinople in September of the same year. His wedding with the Princess ʿAghâ, daughter of Murad III, was celebrated there in Dümâdâ II 990 (end of May 986). At the end of Radjâb 995 (end of June 1587) he was made Kapudân Pasha, and held this office for about a year. Shortly after the accession of Muhammad III he was appointed ʿâlim-i hakk (deputy) of the Grand Vizier on the 17th Shaban 1003 (16th April 1595) and a year later on the 5th Shaban 1004 (4th April 1596) Grand Vizier. He accompanied the Sultan on his march against Eger (Erlau, Turk. Eğri), was dismissed on the day after the battle of Keresztes, on the 27th October, but restored to office for a second time after six weeks, at the end of Rabî‘ II 1005 (middle of Dec. 1596). The whins of the Sultan prevented him completing a year in office; he was dismissed on the 23rd Rabî‘ I 1007 (3rd Nov. 1597), but recalled to his functions for a third time on the 9th Dümâdâ II 1007 (7th Jan. 1599) and entrusted with the continuation of the war against Hungary. In two expeditions 1008-1009 (1599-1600) he succeeded in stopping the advance of the Austrian army. In Rabî‘ II 1009 (end of October 1600) he captured the stronghold of Nagy Kaniza, and as a reward the Sultan granted him the grand vizierate for life. Ibrahim then returned to Belgrade, where he died on the 9th Maharrâm 1010 (10th July 1601).

IBRAHIM PASHA (KARA), Grand Vizier under Muhammad IV, born in 1030 (1620-21) at Khandawer near Bâlburd, began his career as a lawer, then became ʿâfiya (page) of the outlawed Fâtimâ Muṣṭafâ Pasja (v. Hammer, usb. Gesch., vi. 26), and afterwards served several Pashas, including Kâta Muṣṭafâ, as kâtir (ward or agent), till on the 2 Rabbi‘ II 1011 (8 August 1651) he received the office of kâmîr muṣâfâ and (ten weeks later) that of mukatâr muṣâfâ (mace, and chief marshal). From the 17th Ramazân 1018 till the 12th Rabbi‘ I 1020 (13 Nov. 1667-23 April 1679) he was kapudân pâšâ, and at the same time administered for a period the grand vizierate as ʿâli-yi hakk and again after Dümâdâ II 1094 (June 1683) during Kara Muṣṭafâ’s campaign against Vienna. After the execution of the latter on the 6th Maharrâm 1095 (25 Dec. 1683) he was appointed Genel Vizier, and in the 22nd Maharrâm 1097 (19 Dec. 1685) banished to Rhodes on the 18th March 1686, and was stranded there a few months later in Shabân 1097 (June-July 1686).


( J. H. Moritmann.)
IBRAHIM PASHA — IÇ-İL.
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Libraries, e.g. the Serai library and the library of Ibrahim Pasha, were founded. The art of painting was also introduced in this way by Ibrahim Mutafçi. In his foreign policy, the Grand Vizir's object was to maintain friendly relations with the European Powers. After entering upon office he put an end to the conflicts with Austria by the treaty of Passarowitz (1718). A treaty with Peter the Great (1724) regulated the question of the frontier provinces of Persia by virtue of this the Turkish forces occupied in the following years all the most important cities: Hamadan, Gorgan, Erivan, Tbilisi, etc. definitive possession of which was assured to Turkey by the treaty of Humaydjan (30 Oct. 1727). In 1729 however Ahmadshah Khan invaded the newly acquired province, which resulted in a declaration of war by the Porte, though the Sultan agreed to this much against his will. This was the cause of a serious insurrection (September 1750), the people were discontented with Ibrahim Pasha's government, and rebelled in the fall of both Sultan Ahmad and his favourite vizir. Ahmad would not deliver Ibrahim alive into the hands of the infuriated mob and had him strangled in the Serai on the 30th Sept. 1750; on the following day he himself was forced to abdicate.


AL-ISHâHÎ (AL-ISHâHÎ or perhaps AL-AB-SHIHÂH) HÂKHâ, AL-DIN ÂBDU'L-FATH MUSAHMÂD b. AHMAD (SHIHÂB AL-DIN ÂBDU'L-ÂBÂMâ) b. MANŞûR b. AHMAD b. 'ÂD AL-MÂDÂSHE AL-SHªSHEFî, an Arabic scholar of Egypt, born in 790 (1358) in the province of Al-Bahriya in the place Al-Shªîha. Al-Shªîha cfr. Yâsun, Mâdgrâm, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 92; de Sacy, Relation de l'Egypte par Abd-Allâtâfî, p. 631, No. 7; Ibn Du'âmâs, al-'Intiâr, Cairo 1310, v. 82 infra). Here, after learning the Qur'an by heart by his tenth year, he also received instruction in Fikh and Grammar. In 814/1412 he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. He often came to Cairo and heard the lectures of Djâlî al-Din al-Balkûnî. He became khatîf of his native place in succession to his father. For the rest he devoted himself to literary activity, showing a particular preference for adab. According to al-Sakhîwî, his grammatical knowledge was not thorough nor his language free from errors. He is the author of the Adab work al-Mustatraf fi kull Fann mustatraf (pr. Bulât 1272, Cairo 1275 [lith.], 1279, 1304, 1305, 1306, 1308), which G. Rat translated into French (Al-Mostafraf, Recueil de morceaux choisis . . . . . par le Sâkî Shªshad-dîn Ahmad al-Âshîhî etc., Paris—Toulon, 1899—1902). According to al-Sakhîwî, he was also composed of a panegyric work in two volumes, Alââb al-Aswâr liîad-Sînâr al-Âshîhî, and began a book on epistolography (fi 'ânâw' al-fatârân wa 'l-ta'âsu). He may be also the author of the Târîkh al-Âbd al-Mu'tahhîr al-Murshid, ibn Hâmadân. Hadîth al-Sayât, Khazîn âl-Mi'marî fi Domâqjî, etc. p. 80. No. 24.

Ibn 'Ahdî al-Bâlîfîmet al-ÎshâHî in 853 in al-Maâhâla and heard his lectures. He died after 850 (1440).


Bibliography: al-Sakhîwî, al-Dâmâ' al-Hâdî, Hs. Warn. 3694, p. 589; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., ii. 56. (C. von ARENDONK.)

IBTIDÂ (inf. viii form of BD "to begin"); "beginning", "inchoative". Technical term of Arabic grammar denoting the use of a word as subject (muhtâdâ) of a nominal sentence. "The muhtâdan is any noun (or its equivalent) with which a beginning is made in order that a statement may be built upon it: the muhtâdâ and what is built upon it are both in the nominative case: and there can be no ibtida unless something built upon it follows" (Sibawayh, i. 239—43). Thus e.g. in Muhammâd b. Âsînî 'Ellîh, a beginning is made with Muhammâd that, which is nominative by "ibtida", and must be "built upon it" to complete the sense. The distinctive feature of the nominal sentence is that the relation of its subject and predicate is one of logical necessity, and is expressed by any finite verb. In general the subject precedes the predicate, and hence any sentence in which the subject comes first is regarded as nominal: cf. Zâid b. Mâhîa, where Zâidyâ is muhtâdâ, while in the sentence nàsta Zâidyâ Zâidyâ is subject or agent (see esp. Wright, o. c., ii. 251 A. B.). The precedence of the subject is however not universal, and cases are quoted in which inversion (tâbakd) occurs, usually for emphasis or other special reason.

In Prosody, ibtida is a name for the first foot of the second hemistich of a line. [Cf. MUBTADA, MISYAD.]


IÇ-IL (r.) "interior" the name of a province in Asia Minor, which at present forms an independent sanjak of the vilâyêt of Adana [q. v.] with Selsele as its chief town; 17 villages belong directly to it and also the nahiya of Ayash with 13 villages and Bâlûjdû with 6 villages. This sanjak comprises four kaft, viz. Ermenek [q. v.]; Müt, Gûlnîr (Kullünîr, Celendîris) and Anamûr [q. v., capital Corak]. The population consists of
45,000 Turks, 15,500 Kurds, 14,000 Greeks, 12,000 gypsies, and 8,780 of various origins. The hills are covered with woods (221,815 hectares). The products are wood for building purposes and cereals. The Kurdish nomads in the hills prepare butter and cheese, which they sell in the villages. Industry is carpet weaving. The district is covered with Roman remains. It is the ancient Trachæotis (Cilicia Petrea). The principal rivers are the Lamas-su (Lamus) and the Gök-su [q. v.]. The source of the Taṭi-su near the sea is probably indentical with the Nôr of the Greeks.

The origin of the name İç-il may be traced to the Turks considering from their capital Konia this district really seems to be in the interior of the mountains. It has also been suggested that the name is a corruption of Cilicia.

**Bibliography:** 'Ali Dâvûd, Dîngkârîfî Lûgâtî, p. 133; Sâliûmî, ed. 1325, p. 816; Hâdjiî-Khalîfî, Lûhînnumû, p. 611; V. Cunet, Turquie d'Asie, ii. 63 sqq.; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphat, p. 148. (Cl. Huart.)

İÇ-OĞHLAN (r.), "servant of the interior" (i.e. of the palace) was the name given in Turkey to the pages in the Sultan's service. They were Christian children who had either been taken as war or given as tribute in Europe; Asia was free from this levy. The most beautiful and best developed were chosen and those who seemed to be best endowed and to possess the best character. Their names, ages, and country of origin were noted and then they were converted to Islam and circumcised. They received a strict training for fourteen years under the supervision of eunuchs. They were divided into four chambers. The first comprised 400 pages, who received a daily pay of four to five aspers, learned to read and write and were instructed in religion and good behaviour. After six years they entered the second chamber, where the same education was continued and they also received a military training, which included riding and fencing. The third chamber contained 200 pages, who learned to sew, embroider, and make arrows, also to play musical instruments, and perform the duties of a chamberlain. The fourth chamber consisted of only forty picked pupils who received a daily pay of nine to ten aspers; they were dressed in satin, brocade, and cloth of gold and acted as chamberlains, as keepers of the wardrobe, major-domos, first barber, first manicurist, secretaries, and inspectors. The highest offices in the empire were open to the latter class and their occupants were chosen from them. From the end of the xviii century therefore the tribute of boys was abolished, as the Turks were ready to pay to get their own children into the corps, so that they might attain the highest offices in the state. The Galata Serai (cf. i. 875), in which the Lycian Imperial now is, was formerly the training house of the R-Oğlan; there was another in the Imperial Palace at Adrianople but it was abolished by Sultan Ibrâhîm (1049–1058 = 1639–1649).

**Bibliography:** Tournefort, Relation d'un voyage en Levant (1717), ii. 10 sqq.; Ricaut, Études préalables à l'Empire ottoman (trad. Briot), p. 83 sqq.; A. Unkâni, Lettres sur la Turquie, i. 502; M. D'Ohsson, Tableau de l'Empire ottoman, viii. 47 sqq. (Cl. Huart.)

ID, festival. The word is derived by the Arab lexicographers from the root V'w'd and explained as "the (periodically) returning." But it is really one of the Arabic loanwords, which are particularly numerous in the domain of religion: cf. for example the Syrian 'idâ "festival, holiday."

The Muslim year has two canonical festivals, the 'id al-adhâ [q. v.] or "sacrificial festival" on the 10th Dhu 'l-Hijja and the 'id al-ţā'īf "festival of breaking the fast" on the 1st Shawâwal. The special legal regulations for these are dealt with in the following articles. Common to both festivals is the qalât al-'id (au) festival of public prayer of the whole community, which is celebrated sumna. In many ways it has preserved older forms of the qalât than the daily or even the Friday qalât (although in other respects it resembles the latter) and in its general style much resembles the qalât for drought and eclipses. It consists only of two rak'â [q. v.] and contains several takîb [q. v.] more than the ordinary qalât. After it a kmâ'd [q. v.] in two parts is held. It has no 'adhâ [q. v.] and no 'imám [q. v.]; as in the oldest times the only summons to it is the words al-qalât al-qimar. It should be celebrated in the open air on the musjid [q. v.], which is still often done, though mosques are frequently now preferred. The time for its performance is between sunset and the moment when the sun has reached its zenith. At both festivals, which last three or four days in practice, the Muslim puts on new or at least his best clothes; people visit, congratulate, and bestow presents on one another. The cemeteries are visited, and people stay in them for hours, sometimes the whole night in tents. These more popular practices are more usual at the 'id al-ţā'īf than at the 'id al-adhâ; the festival of breaking the fast is much more joyfully celebrated because the hardships of Ramadan are over, so that at the present day the "minor festival" has in practice become of much greater importance than the "major festival."


"ID AL-ADHÂ (also called 'id al-kurban or 'id al-nahr) "sacrificial feast" or 'id al-ţakrîr, the "major festival."") in India ɪbāb 'id (labba 'id) in Turkey bayâk-baiyam or kurban-baiyam (cf. Bairam). It is celebrated on the 10th Dhu 'l-Hijja, the day on which the pilgrims sacrifice in the valley of Minâ (cf. Heracliou), the ayyām al-tashrîq. The old Arab custom of sacrificing on this day in Minâ was adopted by Islam not only for pilgrims but also for all Muslims as sumna. (It is
only a necessary duty [wāṣifah] by reason of a vow [naḍrī].

This sinna (mu'akkada 'ala 'l-baṣaya) is obligatory on every free Muslim who can afford to buy a sacrificial victim. Sheep (one for each person) or camels or cattle (one for one to ten persons) are sacrificed. The animals must be of a fixed age and be free from certain physical defects (one eye, lameness etc.). The period of the sacrifice begins with the '-latul 'iṣra' and ends with sunset on the 3rd of the three 'umrah al-Waṣifah. The following practices are recommended to the sacrificers: 1. the tasmiya, i.e. the saying of the Basmah. [q.v.]; 2. the şálīf 'ala 'l-baṣah, the blessing on the Prophet; 3. the turning towards the kibbah; 4. the three-fold takbeer before and after the tasmiya; 5. a request for the kindly acceptance of the sacrifice. If the latter is offered on account of a vow, the sacrificer must eat none of it but must give it all for pious purposes. If the sacrifice, as is usually the case, is made voluntarily, the sacrificer enjoys a portion (a third) of the animal and gives the rest to charity.

On the public prayer and the wages at the festival on this holiday see 'ID. Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned at the art. 'ID in the Fiqh books in the chapter on Uṣūlīya. (E. Mittwoch.)

'İD AL-FİTİR, ‘festival of the breaking the fast’ or al-'id al-'aṣghīr the minor festival’. Turkish khănk-baýram or quṭîr-baýram [cf. baýram], is the festival celebrated on the 1st Shawwal and the following days. If the Muslim has not paid the zakāt al-fitr [cf. zakāt] before the end of the period of fasting, he is legally bound to do so on the 1st Shawwal at latest and is recommended to do it before the public prayer 'Īsfīt which is celebrated on this day (cf. 'ID). As this festival marks the end of the difficulties of the period of fasting, although called the ‘minor’, it is celebrated with much more festivity and rejoicing than the ‘major festival’; cf. 'ID. Bibliography: The Fiqh books in the section Zakāt al-Fitr and the bibliography to the article 'ID. (E. Mittwoch.)

AL-'IDĀDA (A.) is the line of vision (diopter) marked on the reverse of the astrolabe, turning round the axis or pivot, with the aid of which various observations can be made, particularly the taking of the altitude of a star (see above i. p. 501). (H. Suter.)

IDĀFA (A.) (inf. iv. ivth form of daf “to draw near”); the adjoining of one thing to another; annexion. Technical term of Arabic grammar commonly named the “genitive relation”, or the “construct state”; the relation of two words of which the former is determined or particularised by the latter. The former (al-mudāf; “the annexed”) is said to be in the construct state, and the latter (al-mudāf ilāhi, “that to which the annexation is made”) is in the genitive case. Their relation expresses the genitive of possession, quality, material, cause or effect, part, object, or agent, and its distinctive features are: 1) that its two members together form one idea, and cannot be separated in writing; hence any adjective or its equivalent qualifying the mudāf must follow the mudāf ilāhi, as 'inna 'l-malaki al-hasanin ‘alā 'l-qubūr, “the beautiful daughter of the king”; 2) that both the mudāf and the mudāf ilāhi are definite in sense, or both are indefinite; in either case the former is regarded as sufficiently defined by the latter, and is regularly written without the article and without tanwin (cf. with above example 'inna 'l-malaki, “a king’s daughter”). An exception to this is seen when the mudāf is an adjective which qualifies a definite noun, and which must therefore have the article: this is iversa gharra al-baṣaya or “improper annexion”. In the strict Arabic interpretation the fact that the mudāf ilāhi is in the genitive is due to the government of a preposition expressed or implied e.g. bān 'alā (‘alā ilāha ‘alā) iversa ‘alā (‘alā ilāha bān); “the house which belongs to Zaid”.


(Robert Steevenson.)

IDDA (A.) is the prescribed period of waiting, during which widows and divorced women cannot contract a new marriage after the dissolution of the previous one. The idda prescribed for widows is legally 4 months and 10 days (cf. Kur'ān ii. 234). Among the ancient Arabs a longer period of mourning was prescribed. Then it was the custom for a widow after the death of her husband to withdraw to a small tent, where she spent a whole year during which she was not allowed to cleanse herself. See J. Wellhausen, Die Ehe bei den Arabern (Nachrichten von der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen 1893, p. 454 sqq.). 'Idāda after divorce was unknown to the ancient Arabs. Whoever married a divorced woman who was pregnant, was considered the father of the child born after the marriage even though the previous husband was really the father. In Islam, however, the actual father was considered the father of the child and no woman was allowed to remarry within a definite period ('idda) after the dissolution of the first marriage. If she bore a child during this period only the previous husband could be considered its father. This 'idda after divorce lasts, according to Muslim law, for three menstrual periods (kurūf) or for non-menstruating women three months; if a divorced woman is pregnant she must not contract a new marriage in any circumstance for 40 days after the birth of the child (cf. Kur'ān ii. 238; lxv, 4). An 'idda is also prescribed for slave women, but in place of an 'idda of four months and 10 days, it only lasts two months and 5 days, and in place of an 'idda of three kurūf, one of two kurūf and in place of an 'idda of three months, one of one and a half months. (Th. W. Juvnbiil.)

IDGHIHĀM (according to the Baṣra school of grammarians) or IDGHAM (according to the Kufa school), technical term used in Arabic grammar to denote the close association in pronunciation of two consecutive homogeneous consounds. This may take place without complete assimilation, but in most cases the one consonant “enters into” and is assimilated to the other, which is then written and spoken as if doubled. The following is a summary of the rules as given by al-Zamakhshari.

1. In general 'idghām may occur when both
letters are vocalised (as *radda from *radda), or when the first is silent and the second vocalised (as *akhilaka for *akhil laka), but not when the first is vocalised and the second silent (as *fasiriti, *taliiti, etc.). This applies equally to pairs of identical letters, as exemplified above, and to letters which are phonetically related. Thus in the guttural group changes may take place from *h to *h (as *idhalkkakhi for *idhalk *halakhi; from *k to *k (as *lamma *ro*ulakku *lamma *ro*ulaka *kala), from *r to *r (as *marqalun for *marqai *huttun); and from *gh to *gh, *gh, and parallel changes are seen among the dentals, sibilants, and labials (as *sidqkkon from *sid *qkkon, *samhar from *samhar, etc.).

There also occur cases of interchange between dentals and sibilants (as *ga*ab*abshirkun for *ga*ab *qir*abun). The usual tendency is for the weaker letter to coalesce in the stronger, though exceptions are to be found (as *halakkkutta for *halak *kutta).

The letter *lif is not subject to *lid*k*lam, and *Hamsa only in the nominal form *s*al*un (e.g. g. *s*al*un, rd*aun). Generally, r, *dh, *f, and *y are not assimilated to any letter but themselves.

The verbal forms V and VI are frequently influenced. With verbs initial dental the prosthetic often assimilates *lifqariyya (with additional prosthetic *lif) for *t*ur*awa. In the forms, VII the inserted *t becomes *t after fr, f, r, t, or d. (e.g. *itfara for *itfakku; *itfara and *itfari *ara for *itfara and *ara before d, *dl, or r; *izzana for *izzanu. Mention may also be made of verbs initial or medial dental such as *itlak*ara and *itl*ara for *itlakara and *itlara for *itlak*ara, and more rarely, *bit*ala (with loss of *lif) for *bitala.

3. The L of the definite article is always assimilated to the first letter of nominal forms beginning with any of the so-called "solar letters" *l, *dh, *f, *r, *z, *th, *s, *l, *n, *d, and *n (as *arab for *arabash, etc.).

**Bibliography:**
- al-Zamakhshari, al-Mufassal, pp. 188–197; Ibn Ya'qub (ed. Jahn), pp. 1450–1496; Shibawihi (ed. Denenbourg), pp. 152, 199; Muhammad Al'la, Dictionary of Technical Terms (ed. Sprunger), i. 50; Wright, Arabic Grammar, i. 130, 156, 649, 669, 672; passim; Vollers, Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien, pp. 23–35; Schadde, Shibawihish Lautlehre (Leiden, 1911), pp. 23, 49–53. (ROBERT STEVENSON.)

**IDHADJ.** [See MALK AMIR.]**

IDHN (A.) i.e. permission. Special regulations on idhn are given in the Muslim law books on the law on the chapter of the law of slaves. According to law, slaves as a rule are not considered capable of making valid transactions. If however a master wishes to use the services of an Arab slave in the management of a business, he can empower him to perform the necessary legal transactions. A slave who possesses such authority is called madid*al*ahu lahu in the law books i.e. one who has been given an idhn. Contracts made by the slave so empowered are valid and binding as long as he does not overstep the limits of the powers granted him and he guarantees his pledges to the creditors with the goods his master has entrusted to him to carry on the business with.

**IDJAB (A.)** i.e. offer (in contracts), really the solemn declaration that the offer is irrevocable (cf. the Arabic expression *had na*qaba* al-basir i.e. the contract of sale is binding and irrevocable). In all legal transactions the observation of the pre-enibed legal form is most necessary and the mutual declarations, known in the *fiq* looks as id*gab and *kabul (i.e. offer and acceptance) are as a rule indispensable. Nevertheless in detailed books on law the question is discussed how far contracts are legal without such an id*gab or *kabul. For example, in cases where it is the local custom for parties to exchange goods at their value without further formalities, can a valid transfer of the property take place without id*gab and *kabul? Many scholars reply in the affirmative, but others hold such an exchange without the legally prescribed declarations to be only valid in cases of things of very little value.

**IDJAZA (A.)** Permission, a technical term in the science of Tradition, the permission granted to any one by a competent "carrier" of a text or even a whole book — whether it is the latter's own or an older text which he is able to trace back by a reliable chain of transmitters to the original transmitter or to the author — to transmit further the work, and to quote the transmitter as an authority. The *idjaza does not require immediate contact between the person receiving the permission and him who grants it. And there is a difference of opinion as to what formula has to accompany a text which has been acquired by means of *idjaza. Even the 'Abbadsid Caliphs al-`Nasir and al-Musta'sim gave a number of *idjazat for `hidij's which they had themselves received; the former gave authority to individuals to exercise this function in his name (Suyuti, *Tur* az al-Khulafa', Cairo 1305, p. 181, 186). In time the acquisition of the *idjaza from important persons became a favourite hobby. Fathers collected *idjazat for their sons from all possible shaykhs. (Abu 1-Malaii, ii. 2, ed. Popper, p. 194, 4). The celebrated Nadim al-Din al-Ghazzii (died 1061 = 1651) while going round the Ka'bah (from) at Mecca on his pilgrimage, was besieged for *idjaza by 'Abd al-Hamid 1 and his grand vizier Raghib Pasha sought and obtained the *idjaza for Tradion from the author of the author of the *Tiz al-`Aras (cf. x. 970 of this work). People take advantage of the presence of travelling scholars to obtain from them the *idjaza for their works: this is recognised as an honour to the scholars themselves (Abd Allai al-Makki [1250 = 1834] Rihlat Sallar, p. 70, 76, 90). On the other hand, as early as the 11th century A. H. the *idjaza system had developed to such unrestricted limits that a man before dying would declare that he gave all Muslims living at that time the *idjaza for the traditions he knew (Dhahabi, Ta’dibl al-Hafa`if, iii. 363; Ibn al-`Abbar, Tabula, p. 614, 15). Cf. such general grants of *idjaza in the viii. century in Suyuti, Bugha`ur al-Wu`at, p. 14). Out of modest beginnings (a specimen in Kern, Zeitsschrift d. Deutsch. Morgen. Gesellsch., iv. 74) there soon developed a high sounding rhetorical *idjaza style with extravagant epithets (*idjaza tannina, Suyuti, op. cit.)
other battle they fought with the Lahizim, all under the leadership of an ʿIdjī, against the Ta-
min (cf. Ḥanṣāla b. Malik, p. 262). At al-Kharrāb the ʿIdjī were attacked by their relatives, the Dhuhl, be-
cause they had given shelter to Ḥarīrī b. Zalīm, who slew Ḥarīrī b. Dīfār; Ḥarīrī b. Zalīm also did not wish to be the cause of hostilities left the ʿIdjī and went to the Taghlij. Together with the Dhuhl (under Ḥarīrī b. Waṭīja) they fought under the leadership of Mukashahir b. Ḥanṣāla against Kās b. Masʿūd, chief of the Shabiʿān, by whom there were been insulted on a visit. Of other battles of the ʿIdjī may we mention that of Musallīja (Musallīja) against the Kās b. Ṭasīm and Tami, who together made a raid on the ʿIdjī, that of Ṭirāb and one with the Mīnkar. At the battle of Dhū Kār, the ʿIdjī under Ḥanṣāla b. Thaʿlābā took a prominent part (see BAKK B. WIKIL, i. 605); they formed the advanced guard of the Bakr and bravely resisted the Persian attacks. Ḥanṣāla slew the Persian leader Djalāhzin, and another of their group the leader of a Persian body of cavalry named Hāmar. In the battle of Ḫalīṣ (12 = 634) between Ḥarīrī b. Ṭalāib and the Persians, along with other Christian Arabs on the side of the latter there were also ʿIdjī under Abu l-ʿAswad al-ʿIdjī. When in 22 = 644 Ḫaʿat Numair near Nahāwān was taken by the Muslims, in addition to Ḥanṣāla, there were many ʿIdjī among the latter. In Mesopotamia we still find ʿIdjī in the third century 250, e.g. during the rising of the ʿAlīd Yālāy b. ʿOmar at Kufa, in whose following were ʿIdjī cavalry under the leadership of Ḥālābā al-ʿIdjī.

[Text continued]

AL-IDJI, ʿAṣūd AL-DIN ṬABB AL-RAHMĀN B. AḤMAD, THEOLOGIAN AND PHILOSOPHER, HADIRI, AND MUSLIM, was one of the many authors of important works. He wrote a philosophical and theological treatise which has become known in Europe also; Th. Soerenes has published the last two chapters of it and the appendix with al-Djurjani's commentary under the title Statio 1a et 1b et Appendix libri Mehrāj autore ʿAḥlād-al-ʿIdjī cum Comm. Gougaux, Leipzig 1848: complete edition Constantinople 1839. He also wrote a brief catechism known as al-ʿAṣīl al-ʿAṣīl, which has several times been annotated and has been printed at Constantinople 1827, St. Petersburg 1313. Other works are given by Brockelman, Geschichte etc., ii. 208 sqq. Very little is known of al-ʾIdjī's life. We only know that he was a native of ʾIdjī, a fortress in Fars, held the office of ḡāda and muḥādīn at Shirāz (see Ḥarīrī, Dīfār, ed. Rosenschweig, ii. 242) and died in the year 756 = 1355.


AL-IDJI, ʿABU MANŞUR, CALLED AL-KISF (the piece) and AL-KHANNAK (the stranger) lived at the beginning of the ii = viiith century and was executed by Yusuf b. ʿOmar, governor of al-ʾIrāb in 120 = 735 = 744. His nickname al-Kisf owes its origin to the fact that he applied to himself the words of Kūrān, iii. 44 "if they (the unbelievers) saw a piece fall down from heaven, they would say it was a thick cloud", because he alleged he had been in heaven, God had touched him with his hand and let him down to earth with a divine mission. According to some statements he is said to have first of all recited the 'ʿAlīd ʿAbū Dīfār al-Bakrī, Muhammad b. ʿAlt as-

HISTORICAL. In the battles between the Bakr b. Wāṭil and the Tamīm at Nībādī and Taintal the ʿIdjī with other tribes of the Lāḥāzīm group were on the side of the Bakr. In an-
were called Manṣūriya after him, used to strangle their victims. Friedländer has aptly compared them to the Indian Thugs. On these and similar aberrations in Islam see Djähiz, Kirāb al-Ḥayy-arwān, ed. Cairo, ii. 96 sqq., and the discussion of this passage in Van Vloten, Worgers in Iraq in the Festschrift für Veth, p. 57 sqq.

A Bibliography: The main references to Abū Manṣūr are given in Friedländer, The Heterodoxy of the Shiites etc. in the Journ. of the Amer. Or. Soc., xxix. 89; al-Baghḍādi, ed. Muḥ. Badr, p. 234 sqq.

Idjmā (literally “agreeing upon”) is one of the four usūl from which the Muslim faith is derived and is defined as the agreement of the muṣṭafāhīd’s of the people (i.e. those who have a right, in virtue of knowledge, to form a judgment of their own): see iṣlāḥāt, after the death of Muḥammad, in any age, on any matter of the faith. As this agreement is not fixed by council or synod but is reached instinctively and automatically, its existence on any point is perceived only on looking back and seeing that such an agreement has actually been attained; it is then consciously accepted and called an idjmā. Thus the agreement gradually fixed points which had been in dispute; at a certain point, when thus fixed, became an essential part of the faith, and disbelieved in it an act of unbelief (kafr); cf. however, Goldziher, Über ijmā in Nachr. K. Ges. d. Wiss. Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1916, p. 81 sqq. Each agreement, that is, became a ḫahif for its own and all succeeding periods. It could be expressed in speech (idjmā al-ḵawāl) or in action (idjmū al-fī) or by silence regarded as assent (idjmā al-sukūt or al-ṭaḏfir); cf. the similar classification as to the sunna of the Prophet. It is especially excluded that it means the agreement of the masses (al-awāmm), and in al-Shāfiʿi’s earlier view, before he went to Egypt, a statement by a single Companion was binding on the following generations. But later he gave up this opinion and it has now been generally abandoned.

A general principle of agreement was held in different forms from an early period. The legal system of Malik b. Anas was built largely on the agreement of al-Medina, the city of the Prophet; this agreement was local. The agreement of the two camp-cities (amṣār) of Kufa and al-Baṣra, with their masses of veterans of the early wars, had great weight. For later generations the agreement of the Companions was naturally decisive. But it was al-Shāfiʿi who developed this general principle into a definite asl, and ranged it with the other three. Further, from deciding points left uncertain by the other usūl it has come to be regarded as stamping with assurance points decided by another asl. This is in virtue of a divine protection against error (ijmā) which inheres in the Muslim people. In Shāfiʿite books of ḥadāt the statement is normal:—“such and such to a passage (Kūrān or Sunna), before the Agreement (ṣaḥīḥ al-idjmā), is the basis for such and such a rule.” At present the Wāhhabis (following the vanished Žāhidites) reject the universality of this principle and limit agreement to that of the Companions. And such specific sects as the Shāʿa and the Bāḥrīs are, of course, quite outside of the idjmā of the Sunnites.

The statement of the principle, which is given formally by the canonists, is as above. But the real working has been even wider. The basic tradition from Muḥammad runs: “My people will never agree in an error”;—and there are also Kur’ānic texts, iv. 115, denouncing those who follow other than the way of the believers (ṣaḥīḥa l-baṣṭan niʿtin). In consequence there is in the thought of the people as a whole a power to create doctrine and law, and not simply to stamp with approval that which has otherwise been reached. By means of idjmā what was at first an innovation (baʿda, the opposite of sunna), and as such heretical, has been accepted and has overridden the earlier sunna. Thus the cult of saints has become practically part of the sunna of Islam and, strangest of all, in the doctrine of the infallibility and sinlessness (ṣaḥīha) of Muḥammad the idjmā has overcome clear statements of the Kurʾān. In this, idjmā has not simply fixed unsettled points, but has changed settled doctrines, of the greatest importance. It is thus regarded by many, at present, both within and without Islam, as a powerful instrument of reform; the Muslim people, they assert, can make Islam whatever they, as a whole, please. Yet as to this there is grave divergence of opinion. Goldziher, Veröf. v. v. 56, viewing the matter historically, sees great possibilities in the future; Snouck Hurgronje, Le Droit Musulman in Rev. d.l’Histoire des Religions, xxxv. p. 15 sqq., 174 sqq.; Juvell, Handb. des Islam., Gesetz., p. 46 sqq. (B. MacDonal).

Idjtihād means the exertion of one’s self to the utmost degree to attain an object and is used technically for so exercising one’s self to form an opinion (ṣaḥīḥa) in a case (ṣaḥīḥa) or as to a rule (ṣaḥīḥa of law (Dict. of tech. terms, p. 198; List, iv. 109, 108 sqq.). This is done by applying analogy (kayfa) to the Kurʾān and the sunna. Thus in the earliest usage idjtihād was formally equated with kayfa, as by al-Shāfiʿi in his Risāla (ed. Cairo, 1312, p. 127 sqq., Bab al-idjmā). In his section on idjtihād he quotes first as a proof, Kur. ii. 145, and demonstrates that it involves that each must follow his own judgment, not to the direction of the kibla. It was therefore for Shāfiʿi practically the same as raʿya, “opinion” and the muṣṭafāhīd was one who by his own exertions formed his own opinion; being thus exactly opposed to the muḥaddith, “imitator,” who, as Subki in his Djama al-idjmā, says, “takes the saying of another without knowledge of its basis (dailī).” For this applying himself he would, according to a tradition from the Prophet, receive a reward even though his decision were wrong; while, if it was right, he received a double reward (Goldziher in Zeitscr. d. deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., lii. 649). The duty and right of idjtihād thus did not involve inaccuracy. Its result was always ṣaḥīḥa, fallible opinion. Only the com-
bined idjthād of the whole Muslim people led to
idjma', Agreement, and was inerrant. On the con-
troversy as to the whole peoples of error in muqjthāhid see Taftāzānī on the 'Akkaid of Nasafi, ed. Cairo, 1321, p. 145 sqq. But this broad idjthād soon passed into the special idjthād of those who had a peculiar right to form judgments and pass judgments should be followed by others. At this point and from the nature of the case, a difference entered between theology (kalām) and law (fikīh). Even to the present day many theologians assert that fikīh does not furnish a saving faith; see, for example, the Kifāyat al-'awāmill of Fadālī, passim, and the translation in D. B. Macdonald's Development of Muslim Theology, pp. 315—351. But all canon lawyers for centuries have admittedly been muqjthāhid of one degree or another.

When later Jāliim looked back to the founding of the four legal schools (muqjthāhid), it assigned to the founders and to some of their contemporaries an idjthād of the first rank. These had possessed a right to all questions from the very foundation, using Kurān, sunna, fiqhā, istiṣlah, istiṣθul, istiθqāb etc., and were muqjthāhid absolutely (muqjthāhid). Later came those who relied upon one or another portion of the Qurān (al-muqjthāhid), determining the fikīh as the masters had settled the broad principles (muqjthāhid of fikīh) and had laid down fundamental texts (muqjthāhid). If the view so stated was found implicitly in a nāṣ of the founder of the muqjthāhid, it was called a wajīh. Still later and inferior were those who had a right only by their knowledge of previous decisions to answer specific questions submitted to them, these were called muqjthāhid. The fikīh was by local opinion of the muqjthāhid's been had in a sense muqjthāhid, givers of fatwa's; but these were muqjthāhid only. Such was the formal and generally accepted position. But from time to time individuals appeared who, moved either by ambition or by objection to fixed positions, returned to the earliest meaning of idjthād and claimed for themselves the right to form their own opinion from first principles. One of these was Ibn Taimiyyā (d. 703/1308), and the list extends to the time of al-Shāfi'i (d. 820/1417). Another was Suyūtī (d. 911), in whom the claim to idjthād unites with one to be the muqjthāhid, or renewer of religion, in his century. At every time there must exist at least one muqjthāhid, was his contention (Goldziher, Characteristic i. ur-Suyūtī's, p. 19 sqq.), just as in every century there must come a muqjthāhid. Another, but a very heretical one, was the Emperor Akbar (Goldziher, Vorlesungen, p. 311). In Śīra Jāliim there are still absolute muqjthāhid. This is because they are regarded as the spokesmen of the Hidden Īslām. Their position is thus quite different from that of the 'alām' among Sunnites.

They freely criticize and even control the actions of the Śīrā, who is merely a locum tenens and a resolver of order during the absence of the Hidden Īslām, the rules of ira divine. But the Sūra 'alām are regarded universally as the subordinate creatures of the Hidden Īslām (Goldziher, Vorlesungen, p. 215—218, 231 sqq.).

Bibliography: Karafi, Sharh Taqāsh al-
Faqīh fī l-'Uṣul, ed. Cairo, 1306, p. 18 sqq., on its margin, Sharh of Ahmad b. Kāsim
Sharh of Maḥālī on Waraṣāt of Djiwanī, 134 sqq.; Snouck Hurgronje, Der dritte muqj-
thāhid in Rev. de l'Histoire des Religions, xxviii.

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, Il.

passim; review of Schürer's 'Ammānīsches
livi. 139 sqq.; Juyboll, Handb. d. Islam., Ges.,
p. 32 sqq. (D. B. Macdonald.)

IDJMA' [See IṣṭIṣRĀL.]

IDJMR, infinitive of the 1st form of the root
djmr; to conceal; technical term of Arabic
grammar denoting the honorific of a damir [cf. the
art. DāMR]. Iṣṭírār (ellipsis or suppression) of a
verb or phrase is not uncommon; cf. the frequent
omission of the verb of 'Saying' before
quotations of speech (e.g. Kurān II, 119, 121, 127 etc.),
and such expressions as sākūna warā'ayn, meaning
in full sākūa 'Išān sākūna warā'ayn 'Išān ra'ayn,
"God give you abundant water and pasture!"

In Frosody Iṣmr means the quiescence of the
second syllable of a foot; it applies to the Kāmil
meter, in which the foot muqjthāhid may be
shortened to muqjthāhān.

Bibliography: Siwawalī (ed. Dernogen-
bourg), i. 107 r, 240 6, 188, r, 129 sqq. et
passim; al-Zamakhshari, al-Maṣāṣṣel, as quoted
under DāMR, and cf. 16—25, 26, 29, 33—34,
134; al-Dijżarī, al-Tadrīṣ (ed. Flügel), p. 29;
Wright, Arabic Grammar, i. 53 1 sqq., 100 sqq.,
et passim; Freytag, Damir der arab. Vorh. 
Kunst, pp. 81, 355—6. (Robert Stevenson.)

IDRIS, the name of a man, who is twice mentioned
in the Kurān, Sūra xix. 57 sq.: "Mention
Idris in the book. Verily he was an upright man,
and we raised him to a high place". And
Sūra xxi. 85, mentions him along with Ismā'īl
and Dhu 'l-Kifī as one of the patient (gabarun)
ones. These passages are not calculated to give
any explanation of this character. Even the name
Idris was for long a puzzle to Orientalists till Noldke
pointed out that it probably concealed the name
Andres (Zeitschr. für Assy., xvii. 84 sq. sqq.). That
this Andrus who was raised to a high place, is
Alexander's cook who obtained immortality has
been suggested probably rightly by R. Hartmann
(ibid. xxiv. 314). The post-Kurānic Muslim writers
unanimously insist that Idris is the Biblical Enoch
who also obtained immortality or, as Jewish
literature says, was taken to heaven.

The information given by those Arab writers
regarding Idris is mainly derived from Apocryphal
and later Jewish sources. The Biblical Enoch has
three striking features which are repeated in the
Muslim legends from Jewish models (Genesis v.
23 sqq.): 1. he is a pious man; 2. he lives 365 years
on earth which suggests a solar hero; 3. God
takes him to himself. The name Enoch, the
consonants of which suggest the meaning "initiated"
has probably also affected the formation of this
legend.

As to the last point, Idris appears also in
Muslim literature as 'initiated' in sciences and
arts. He was the first to use pens (kalām), to use
embroidery and sew garments and wear them; previously people had
content with skins. He is therefore the
patron saint of tailors, one of the seven patrons
in the jāmī system. He was also the first
astrologer and was skilled in medicine
(fikīh).

As a pious man he was the first to mount
horse to fight "on the way of God" against the
wicked descendants of Cain. As a prophet
received revelations through Gabriel. Thirty books
(gaṣīfa) were revealed to him in this way in
his activity as a prophet and king see particu-
larly Ibn al-Kifî (ed. Lippert), p. 1 sqq. He received the name Idrîs because he was thoroughly versed in former revelations as the result of industrious study. Baidâwi's philological conscience, however, does not allow of such an etymology from the Arabic; it might perhaps be possible in the cognate languages. His ascetic piety aroused the admiration of the angels. The angel of death asked Allâh for permission to visit him. He came to him in mortal form and invited him to sup with him. But Idrîs declined; the same thing happened on the following two nights. On the third day Idrîs asked him who he was. When he heard his answer, Idrîs asked him to receive his spirit. He therefore remained an hour without his riḥâ; he then received it back. He next asked to be allowed to take him up into heaven to see it and Paradise. When he reached Paradise he would not come out again. He held fast to a tree and appealed to two texts of the Kur'ân: "Every soul shall taste death", for he had already tasted death; and "no one shall drive them out". He therefore would not leave. God then allowed him to remain. He is to return from thence. He and Jesus live in heaven; al-Khaḍîr and Efîas are immortal on earth.

In this version the character of Idrîs as solar hero is seen from the fact that his soul is taken from him at sunset. In another version there are also several traits which point to a solar myth. When one day on a journey he found the heat of the sun unpleasant, he asked God to alleviate it in favour of "him who has every day to travel five hundred years in this heat" (i.e. the sun angel). He begged the latter to postpone his death. He took him with him to the place where the sun rises and transmitted Idrîs' request to the angel of death. The latter could not grant his request. The angel of the sun however was allowed to tell him the day of his death. The angel of death opened his diwân but could not find the date in it. He explained this to mean that Idrîs must die at sunrise. The angel of the sun actually found him dead then.

Nevertheless Idrîs is immortal; expressed in the language of myth this means: the sun dies every day and is revived every day, and is thus immortal. Another recollection of the solar character of Idrîs is preserved in the explanation of the high place of Sûra xxix. 57 as the heart of the spheres i.e. the sphere of the sun.

Idrîs is also identified with Ilyâs and al-Khaḍîr. The Greeks are said to know him under the name Hurmuz, or as Bar Hebraeus says (Hist. Dynast., ed. Pococke, p. 9) Hermes Trismegistus. For further information see Ibn al-Kifî, l.c. In agreement with passages of the apocryphal Enoch Muslim legends also tell that he went through Hell.

On the relation of the Ḥârânsî to Idrîs-Hermes see Chwolsohn, Die Säuber und der Stäbismus, Index, s.v.


Idrîs I. i. ʿAbd Allâh, son of ʿAbd Allâh b. al-Ḥasan [q.v.], an Allîd., founder of the Idrîsî dynasty in the Maghrib, took part in the ʿAlid rising against the ʿAbbasîs (c. 763) and after defeat and death of his nephew al-Ḥasan b. Ṭāhir b. al-ʿAbîr b. al-Ḥasan at Fâ ḳîkh [q.v.] near Mecca on the 20th of Dhu-l-Hijjâh 169 = 11 June 786, when he had himself fought, remained some time concealed, but succeeded in reaching Egypt accompanied by a faithful freedman al-Râṣîd, and with the assistance of the postmaster there, al-Wâdhî, in secret a Shîʿah escaped to the Maghrib, where he was received by Iṣâk b. Muhammad, chief of the Berber tribe of the Awraba. At the instigation of this chief, Idrîs was on the 4th Ramâdân 172 recognised as suzerain by the Awraba and later by the Zenêta, Zuwâgâha, Lâmêya, Luwâta, Ghoumara, and Sadaddîtta, who inhabited the north of the modern Marocco, but this recognition of a ʿAlid by the Berbers, who only shortly before had been Khaṭârdîs was based more on political than religious motives. Idrîs, who only took the title of imâm, is even said by al-Sâghîr to have received the Muṣâli teachings of Iṣâk b. Muhammad.

In the district of Tèmesâ he attacked Jewish, Christian, and heathen tribes, whom he seems to have defeated rather easily, and in a campaign eastwards (about 173 or 174 = 789-790) also brought under his sway the town of Tiemcen (Agadir) and its practically independent prince, Muhammad b. Khâyber b. Sûlàt, who recognised Idrîs as the rightful imâm. In Tiemcen where he spent some time, he founded a mosque (Safar 174), the pulpit of which, with his name inscribed on it, still existed in Ibn Khâlidân's time. Soon after his return to the capital Uli (the ancient Volubilis) he was poisoned at the instigation of the Caliph Harûn al-Râṣîd, apparently by a certain Sulaimân al-Shâmmî (1st Rabîʿ II. 177 = 16 July 793). The details given by some historians of this murder and the means used (watermelon, a grape a toothpick, or tooth-powder) as well as the prosecution of the murderer by al-Râṣîd are only romantic additions.

Leo Africanus, Dell' Africa (Ramusio, Primo volume delle navigazioni, Venice 1903), Pl. 31, D; Fournel, Les Berberes, i. 295–400, 447–449; A. Müller, Der Islam etc., i. 488, 492, 550.

(Rene Bassett)

**IDRIS II, son and successor of Idris I** [q.v.]. The latter at his death left no children but one of his concubines named Kanza was pregnant by him. His freedman al-Rashid persuaded the Berbers to wait till the child was born and in case it should be a son, to proclaim him imam and successor to his father. This expectation was fulfilled. Kanza gave birth to a son on the 1st Djamâa II 177 (793), who was recognised as Idris I's successor and entrusted to al-Rashid's care. The attachment of this man to the family of Idris brought upon him the persecution of Ibrâhim b. al-Aghlab, the almost independent governor of Ifriqiya. He was murdered in the same way as his master, but replaced by a Berber named Bahilû. When the latter was overthrown by Ibrâhim he had to entrust the regency to Abû Khâlid Yazid b. Iyâs. To prevent further intrigues the Berbers summoned the eleven year old Idris to the throne and took the oath of fealty to him in the mosque of Ullî. But Ibrâhim continued his intrigues while Idris alienated the Berbers by his too openly displayed preference for Arabs and by choosing an Arab vizier. When fifteen years of age he had Isâk b. Muhammâd put to death in spite of the great services he had rendered his father, under the pretext that he was negotiating with Ibrâhim b. al-Aghlab, and by this stern, not to say unjust, measure thwarted any attempt at a rising. About the same time 192 (808) he built his new capital Fâs [q.v., p. 76 sq.] and at the age of eighteen again had the oath of fealty sworn to him, while Ibrâhim b. al-Aghlab, being busy putting down risings, was unable to interfere with him. At the same time Idris changed his policy and became more friendly to the Berbers. After a campaign against the Masmûda, whose towns he captured, he marched against Tlemcen (Agadîr) which had made itself independent, and put the government of the town in the hands of his cousin, Muhammâd b. Sulamîn b. 'Abd Allâh. After several engagements with the Khâridjî Berbers, the details of which are not known, he died at Fâs in Rabî‘ I 213 (May 20–June 18, 828) at the age of 36, according to Ibn Khaldûn of poisoning; according to al-Bakrî, he was choked by a grape seed. He owes his fame mainly to the foundation of Fâs, which has kept his memory so green to the present day in Marocco that the beggars there still seek alms in his name. However little we may know of the details of the careers of him and his father, it is clear that he was the less important of the two.


**AL-IDRISI** (formerly usually written Edrisî) Abu 'Abd Allâh Muhammâd b. Muhammâd b. 'Abd Allâh b. Idris al-Hamûdî (see above Hâmûdîs) al-Hâsâni, usually al-Shârîf al-Idrîsî (as a descendant of the Prophet), was born at Ceuta in 493 (1100), died in 560 (1166) (cf. especially Khid., Fihrist al-Kutub el-Arâbîya, v. 166), studied in Cordova, thence called al-Kurûbî (Biblioteca Arabo-Sicula, p. 610 and the Italian version, ii. 487), while the kunya and nida, Ibn al-Thâ’yîrî given by Ibn Bahşûn in the Khâridjî of Imâm al-Dîn is still unexplained, after various travels spent a long time at the court of Roger II, the Norman king of Sicily i.e. Palermo (and it seems also at Sahâlî, the “Sicilian”), where shortly before Roger's death (548 = 1154) he completed the description of the great silver plate map of the world, the celebrated “book of Roger”, the Kitâb Rûdjûr or al-Kitâb al-Rudjûrî, or Nûshât al-Muâshûtî fî 'ibrîkîr al-Anfûs, the text of which (and that 71 maps) is only partly published, but the whole was translated (very incorrectly) into French by Amédée Jaubert (1836–40). For William I (1154–66) he wrote a still larger geographical work, Rawd al-Uns wa-Nâsît al-Nafis or Kitâb al-Mamâlik (walls-Ma‘allûk), which however is only available in the extract preserved in the Hakim Oghli ‘Ali Paşa Library in Stamboul (NM 685) that noticed a decade ago by J. Horovitz in searching the Stamboul libraries for historical manuscripts), while the superficial synopsis of the Book of Roger, entitled Nûshât al-Muâshûtî fî Dhikr al-Anfûs wa-Alfâr wa-Buldân wa-Lajsrur wa-Muâs’dîn wa-Alfûs was printed in Rome as early as 1592 and translated by the Maronites Gabriel Sionita and Joannes Hersonita inaccurately into Latin in 1619 as Geographia Nubium (from the false reading in Clime 8, part 4, at the beginning, dealing with the sources of the Nile: arfâna “our land” for arfâna “their land”). An edition and annotated translation of this is the most important geographical work of the Middle Ages with the important maps from the manuscripts at present known. Paris (2), Oxford (3), Stamboul (only Aya Sofya, as the other all too summary statements of catalogues only refer to the Roman edition of 1592 or to Jaubert!), Petrograd, and Cairo is one of the most urgent tasks for Arabic scholarship. I am already meditating an edition of the smaller unique in Stamboul, as I have photographs of it.

**Bibliography:** Reinard, Geographie d'occident, Introduction générale, p. cxii–cxiii., cxxx–cxxxvii.; Amari, Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, iii. 452–460, 662–668; Aqari, Biblioteca Arabo-Sicula, Versione, i. 267–288., ii. 487–9; Doyé et de Goeje, Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, Leiden 1866, Saavedra, L'Islande, 1885; L'Italia descritta nel "Libro dei re taggero" compilate da Edrisî, testo arabo pubblicato con versione e note da Amari e Schiaparelli, Roma (Lincei) 1878–1883; Blochet, Contribution à l'étude de la Cartographie chez les Musulmans, Bône 1898 (Bulletin de l'Académie d'Hippone), with 2 coloured maps by al-Idrisî of

C. F. SEYBOLD.

**IDRISIDS.** We have dealt above with the reigns of Idris I and Idris II. The decadence of the dynasty began with the death of the latter. He left eleven sons of whom the eldest, Muḥammad, succeeded him. But at the instigation of his grandmother Kania, he divided his kingdom into five, which he allotted to eight of his brothers, some of whom must have been still children. He doubtless reserved a kind of suzerainty for himself but this did not prevent the rivalries and quarrels which broke up the empire. The statements of the historians on this division do not agree perfectly. This is the most probable table: al-Ḳāsim obtained Tangier, Ceuta, Ḥadjar al-Naṣr, Tetuan; ʿOmar: Tiḡaṣa and Tarhqa; Diʿūd; the land of the Husayna, Tasaṣ, and Ṭabān and the land of the Ḥaḡyāba; ʿAbd al-Baṣr, Ṭaḡa and al-Awrīsh (Larrache); ʿAbd Allāh: Aḥmad and the land of the Nafs and ʿIṣa; ʿIsa: ʿAḌa (Cinha), Saʿla (Sala), Azemūr and the land of the Tameṣn; Aḥmad: Muḥiṣa (Mequines) and Tadda; Ḥamza: Ulilit and its dependencies. At the same time, Tlemcen (Agadir) remained in the hands of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, cousin of Idris II. Civil wars began at once, the possessions of ʿUṣayn and al-Ḳāsim, who had revolted against their brother Muḥammad, passed to ʿOmar. The imām of Fāṣ died in Rabīʾ II 221 (836); he was succeeded by his son ʿAlī, who was replaced in Ḥadjar b. 244 (848) by his brother Yaḥyā. The latter founded the celebrated mosque of al-Karawīyyn in 245 (856) [cf. Fāṣ, p. 73–7]. His son Yaḥyā b. ʿAlī succeeded him, but his great debauchery cost him his power and his life. His father-in-law and cousin, ʿAlī b. ʿOmar, took advantage of the disturbances that broke out on the death of Yaḥyā to seize Fāṣ and reconstitute in part the empire of Idris II. But he was overthrown in a rebellion of Berber Ṣufris and the power passed to one of his cousins, Yaḥyā b. ʿAlī b. al-Ḳāsim, called al-Miṣrīn. A revolution replaced him by Yaḥyā b. Idris b. ʿOmar in 292 (905). Civil war was complicated by dangers abroad. In ʿIlīyriya and the central Maghrib the impotent Aḥgalid dynasty had been driven out by the Fātimids. Spain, flourishing under the Omayyads, threatened the Maghrib, and in the country itself, the chief of the Muḥiṣa, Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥ-Ṣayyaa, a mortal enemy of the Idrisids, established his independence in the valley of the Mollīya. The power of the latter at Fāṣ was destroyed by the Ḥaḍirān general Maʿṣūm, cf. *Ḫāmīdīs, p. 88*, cousin of Maʿṣūm b. Abī Ḥ-Ṣayyaa in 307 (919). The princes of this family had to seek refuge in the Rif and among the Ghomāra [q. v.]. Their fortunes seemed to revive under al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḳāsim, called al-Ḥadjdījam, the “bloodletter” from the wounds he caused. He recaptured Fāṣ, defeated Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥ-Ṣayyaa in 314 (926) and regained a part of the territories of his ancestor. But the Omayyads gained a footing in the Maghrib by the occupation of Melila. Al-Ḥasan was treacherously handed over to Muḥammad by the governor of the Kairawān quarter in Fāṣ, then died while attempting to escape. The last Idrisids only held two small states comprising a part of the Rif and the land of the Ghomāra, from Tangier to Ceuta [q. v.], where they were pursued by the hatred of Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥ-Ṣayyaa. In establishing themselves at Ceuta the Spanish Omayyads dealt a terrible blow at the greatly reduced dominion of the Idrisids in 310 (911). The latter reappeared a little later, but it was as governors for the Caliph of Cordova. A semblance of power was left them around Ḥaḍjar al-Naṣr [q. v.]. But the final ruin of the Idrisids, tossed between the Fātimids and Omayyads, was consummated in 363 (974). On Muḥarram 1, 364 (Sept. 21, 974) [cf. al-Ḫakam II], the Omayyad general, Gālib, made a triumphal entry into Cordova, bringing in his train the last Idrisids. Their rule had lasted two centuries. At a later date a branch of this family succeeded in forming a state at Malagrica which lasted a little over twenty years [cf. Ḥammūdīs]. In Morocco itself, a certain number of families of Shawris claim descent from the Idrisids. It is not impossible that some of them are, but as a rule these claims are dubious.


(René Basset.)

**IFLĀK,** the Turkish name for Wallachia. In 1391, the Voivod Mircea became tributary to the Turks, but the land remained independent.
The Boyars retained the right to choose their ruler, who was thereupon confirmed by the Porte. This state of affairs remained practically unchanged till the treaty of Adrianople in 1829, although alterations were made more than once in the terms of a voivod refused tribute or Austria or Russia interfered in the affairs of the principalities. For example, as early as the xvth century, the notorious Wlad Drakul, whom the Turks always call Kayzuku (the impaler) Vovoida, rebelled against the Turks, had the Turkish ambassador, Hamza Pasha, impaled according to his custom, and ravaged Bulgaria. This provoked a campaign by Suljo Manshub Mhambad II, through which Drakul was forced to flee to Hungary and Radul was installed as voivod (1462). After his death in 1477 the cruel tyrant returned, but he was very soon murdered in 1479. Towards the end of the xviith century the Vovoid Michael succeeded for a brief period — he was murdered in 1601 — in bringing Transylvania and Moldavia under his sway. In the period following, the custom came into operation whereby the Vovoids, who took and utterly destroyed in 393 (954-955). In 338 (949-950) he had built himself a capital, Ifgan (Fekkan) in the southeast of Macedonia and peopled it with natives of the surrounding country. But Ya’l’s power was of short duration. He fell in 347 (958) in a battle with Fathimid troops, whose general Jjawhar [q. v.] sacked Ifgan.

The confederation of the Iren was then broken up. Some sections went to Spain where one of their chiefs, Abu Nur, succeeded in 405 (1014-1015) in seizing the town of Ronda. The others after first taking refuge on the edge of the Sahara, tried to reinstate themselves in the central Maghrib by combining with the Maghraba against the Sanhadja. Defeated and scattered once again by Bulukkita b. Ziri in 970, they then tried their fortune in the extreme Maghrib. Yaddu b. Ya’l after first of all showing a vigorous attachment to the Omayyad cause tried to form a principality for himself at their expense. He twice took Fas from Ziri b. Atya the governor of the Maghrib, but could not hold it. One of his relatives, Hammama, revived the fortunes of the Iren. He conquered the land of Taida and maintained himself there in spite of the attacks of the Maghraowa of Fas. His brother and successor, Abu’l-Kamal Tamim, led the Iren in a holy war against the Berghhydrate. He destroyed the power of these heretics and installed himself in Shala. He also took Fas from the Maghraowa but was driven out again in 429 (1037-1038). He died at Shala in 466 (1054-1055). The kingdom, which he had founded, did not long survive him. It was destroyed by the Almoravids who massacred the Iren in all the conquered localities. The remnants of the tribe having sought refuge in Tlemcen were exterminated after the capture of the town by Yusuf b. Tashfin.


Ifrikiya (according to Fleischer, Kleine Schriften, i. 239, more exact than the spelling Ifrikiya used hitherto), the name given by the Arabs to the eastern part of Barbary, the name Maghrib being reserved for the western part. Ifrikiya is simply a corruption of the Latin Africa, which name the Romans gave first of all to the province organised by them after the destruction of Carthage and which was then extended to Bar-
bary and finally to the whole continent of Africa. Nevertheless the name has been given various fanciful etymologies. "Some", writes al-Bakri, "say that the name means the "queen of heaven"; others derive it from Ifriq b. Abraha al-Ra'ish, who led an army into the Berber country and built the town of Ifriqiyah (cf. al-Mas'udi, ed. Paris, iii. 224). According to others, the country took the name from Afriq, son of Idris and his wife, the second wife of the patriarch, or from Farq b. Migrim. According to Ibn Khaldun, Ifriqiyah is derived from Ifriq b. Kais b. Saifi, one of the kings of Yemen. According to al-Makrizi (in Ibn Abi Dinâr) Afriksh b. Abraha b. Dhi 'l-Karnain, having conquered the west built a town there which he called Afrika. Ibn al-Shabbât (quoted by Ibn Abi Dinâr) connects Ifriqiya with barîq "clear" because "in Africa there are no clouds in the sky". Leo Africanus and Ibn Abi Dinâr derive Ifriqiya from faraqa "to divide" because it is separated from Europe by the Mediterranean and from Asia by the Nile, or also because it lies between east and west. The boundaries of Ifriqiya, according to al-Bakri, were Barqa on the east and Tangier on the west. From north to south it extended from the shores of the Mediterranean to the "sands which mark the beginning of the country of the negroes". Ifriqiya would thus have comprised, in addition to the Africa proper of the Romans, Tripolitania, Numidia and even Mauretania. Earlier and later geographers give narrower limits. Al-I斯塔khri, for example (ivth century A.D.) places Ifriqiya between Barqa and Tripoli (Bibl. Geogr. Arab., ed. de Goeje, i. 26 and 34). For Abu'l-Fida', Ifriqiya begins at the eastern extremity of the land of Bougie [q. v.] which, according to him, forms part of al-Maghrib al-Awsat and terminates at Barqa. In a general way, however, one may regard the western border of Ifriqiya as corresponding to the meridian of Bougie. In the south, al-Idrisi and later, Leo Africanus, clearly distinguish al-Ifriqiya from Bilad al-Jarid (the Numidia of Leo). In the Sahara, according to Ibn Khaldun, the Ma'rib separates the desert of al-Ifriqiya from that of the Maghrib. It appears moreover that besides this general sense, the term Ifriqiya was often used in a narrower sense. Ibn Khaldun often applies it to the central and northern part of Tunisia and opposes Ifriqiya to Tripolitania, al-Jarid and the province of Constantinene. (cf. especially the passages in this author referring to the Hilâl invasion). Abu'l-Fida' places Bougie, Bône and Gafsa outside al-Ifriqiya. The limits of the country would thus be those assigned by Marmol to the province of Tunis "which is called Africa", that is to say, on the west the province of Constantinene, on the east that of Tripoli; on the south the mountains of the Atlas with the province of the Zab and the province of Numidia and of eastern Libya, on the north the Mediterranean from the mouth of the Niger (Medjerda) towards Bizerta to Capes (Gabes). Finally, in the xvith century, Ibn Abi Dinâr tells us that "scholars understand by al-Ifriqiya the land of al-Kairawân".

At the beginning of the Hidjra, al-Ifriqiya was still in the power of the Byzantines (Rûm). It was peopled by Berber tribes (Huwâra, Luwâta, Awrigha, Neftîsa, Ifren, Nefawâ, etc.) and descendants, of foreign immigrants into Africa, who were called Afrik by the Arab writers. It included a large number of towns and villages and was covered with flourishing fields. The weakness of the Byzantine authorities and the richness of the country attracted the attention of the Arabs, whose incursions began immediately after the conquest of Egypt. The first Muslim expeditions, of which however we only possess incomplete and contradictory accounts, were simply raids. The invaders evacuated the country after having pillaged it and did not attempt to capture the strongholds held by the Byzantines. The conquest proper did not begin till after the foundation of al-Kairawân by 'Oqba b. Nâfi' in 50 (667). Arab domination in the country however remained very precarious to the end of the viith century. The Greeks held the most important towns; on the other hand, the revolts of the Berbers forced Zu'air b. Kais, the successor to 'Oqba, to evacuate al-Ifriqiya on two different occasions. It was only under the government of Hasan b. al-Mu'inn that the Berbers were forced to submit and the Byzantines lost Carthage and the principal towns in the country.

Placed at first under the governor of Egypt, al-Ifriqiya next made an independent government under Musa b. Nasir, who was directly under the Caliph in Damascus in 86 (705). The conquests of this general extended the boundaries of the province to the Straits of Gibraltar. But from the middle of the viith century the Khôrûd revolt considerably diminished the Arab territory. Al-Ifriqiya properly so called was ravaged by the Abadâ Berbers of the east (Huwâra, Wafardjuma) and by Zenata of the central Maghrib. It even was lost by the 'Abassid caliph for a time. Al-Mansûr however succeeded in establishing 'Abassid rule in Ifriqiya again from 144 (761) onwards, while independent Berber principalities were set up in the Maghrib. However, the Aghlabids [q. v.] dynasty (ixth century A.D.) only nominally recognised the suzerainty of the Caliph. The overthrow of the Aghlabids by the Fâtimids caused al-Ifriqiya to pass into the power of the Shi'a, who gave it a new capital, al-Mahdiya, and when they established themselves in Egypt made it a vice-royalty under the Zirids. The foundation of the Êmmâddid kingdom was however not long in depriving the Zirids of the western part of al-Ifriqiya. On the other hand the Hilâl invasion, a result of the repudiation of Fâtimid authority by the Zirid al-Mu'taz in 440 (1048-9) [cf. Fâtimides, p. 90], exposed the country to the most terrible disasters: Al-Ifriqiya, previously very flourishing and covered with vineyards and farms, was ravaged by nomads and almost entirely ruined. Some Arab tribes, notably the Bîyâl and the Djassah, instaled themselves in the country and perpetuated there their habits of disorder and brigandage. Finally, at the beginning of next century, the Normans of Sicily occupied the principal points on the coast. As a result of the Almohad conquest, al-Ifriqiya became one of the provinces in the vast empire founded by 'Abd al-Mu'inn [q. v.], but she soon recovered her independence under the Hafidh [q. v.] dynasty. The rule of these princes was at first extended over Tunisia, Tripolitania, the province of Constantinene, Bougie and the Zab, but from the end of the xvth century it was reduced to Tunisia in the strict sense of the word. Henceforth the history of al-Ifriqiya is merged in that of this country.

Bibliography: al-Bakri, Deux. de l'Afri-

'Ífrîkit, according to the usual explanations, is one who overcomes his antagonist and rolls him in the dust ('áfar); who successfully carries maters through (mutālīgh); who is, therefore, powerful in a hostile sense, evil, crafty (Zamakhshāri and Baidāwī on Kur. xxvii. 39; Līsin, vi. 263, l. 1 sqq.; l. 14 sqq.; De Sacy, Haríria, p. 355). The classical and only Kur'ānic occurrence is in Kurūn xxvii. 39, "an 'ífrīt of the djinn." Hence it has come to be used peculiarly of the djīnn; but in the first instance it was plainly a general epithet, and thus the Kur'ānic passage might be translated, "a powerful djīnni." So, too, "an 'ífrīt of the djīnn" occurs in two traditions from Muhammad in Damīrī's Hayawān (ed. Cairo, 1313, l. 179, l. 15 sqq., l. 104, l. 22 sqq., under djīnn and 'ífrīt). But soon the word became identified with the djīnn and especially with the more satanic and malignant element among them. So Rāghib, in his Muẓafrait (p. 393) speaks of its application to human beings as metaphorical, and even Tābarī, Tafṣīr, xix. 93, seems to limit the word to the djīnn. But it was not understood as meaning a special class of these as e.g. ǧūl (q. v.); contrast the classification (asāfīf) in Aḥmad al-Mardījūn, p. 17 sqq.; and in the Fīrīsīt (p. 309, l. 21) 'áfīrū is used as a general name for both djīnn and šāfi'ān. Even the distinctive meaning of hostility seems often to have been lost. In The 1001 Nights (Galland MS. of xivth cent. A. D.; Story of Second Skaitik, Night vii.) it is said of a benevolent Muslima, ẓurāt 'ífrīta ǧāniyā, "she turned into an 'ífrīta, a djīniyā." In Egypt the word has come to mean also the ghost of a murdered man, or of one who has died a violent death. (Lane, Modern Egyptian, chap. x. 359; Millmore, Spoken Arabic of Egypt, p. 371 sqq.; "Niya Salina," Harem el Musulmanes d'Égypte, chap. xiv.; St. John, Two years residence in a Levantine family, chap. xx.) It also survives in the original sense of a strong man of violence, e.g. the šūrūt al-ífrīt in Cairo which is explained as the one-time abode of a hārām. But the most normal modern usage is of a powerful, evil, clever djīnni.

Bibliography: has been given above. Add: Dossy, Suppl., ii. 143, and Fleischer, Kleinere Schr., ii. 640. (D. B. Macdonald.)

IGHARGHAR, the valley of a river of the Quaternian epoch in the Sahara, which has now disappeared and is reduced to a subterranean sheet of water. The Igharghar, according to Duveyrier, rises near Asakān-a-Akūr, in the massif of the Haggar at a height of about 6000 feet. It ends near the oasis of Gūg, in the south of Tuggūrt, after a course of about 800 miles (900, if one includes the Wād Gībir, which is its continuation). Its basin extends from the crests of Tadat in the west to the oasis of Chāṭ in the east and from the Haggar to the Shott Melghīr, i.e. from the 23rd to the 34th degree of North Latitude.

The Igharghar flows at first from S. to N., passing near Idales, sometimes in a fairly narrow valley, where springs burst up in the middle of its bed, sometimes also broadening out into a plain with banks indefinitely marked 5 to 8 miles broad. After running along the massif of the Maydir to the west and the Tassili plateau in the east, it describes a curve to the east and reaches the foot of the Hamdāda of Tinghert. In this part of its course it receives a certain number of wādīs, the valleys of which present the same characteristics. The principal are those of the Igharghar, the Wādi Assad-Kifāf which drains all the southern part of the Tassili of the Aṣżjer, the Wādi Issawān, of which the confluence however is still to be found, and lastly the Wādi Ahanāt, which comes from the sands of Edeyen.

The Igharghar then traverses the plateau of Tinghert where it cuts for itself "a well marked channel" (Fourcaur) and receives lower down a large number of streams from the eastern side of this plateau, which rejoin it after having disappeared in the sands of the Erg. In the region of sandhills the bed of the Igharghar becomes quite invisible. It probably passes in the vicinity of the Kāsi Twīl (see 'AREG) without however mixing with it. Fourcaur's observations permit us to suppose that it formerly ran much farther east. On leaving the Erg, it can hardly be more easily recognised, except at certain points, for example at the ravine of Shegga near Tuggūrt. However the continuity of the subterranean sheet of water is attested in this region by the existence of a number of wells.


IHRĀM (A.), infinitive ihrām from the root ḥ-r-m, which has the meaning of "warding off" (man); as the Līsin, xv. 9 says: "to declare a thing haram" or "to make haram." (The opposite is ihṭāl "to declare permitted"). The word ihtām has however become a technical term for "sacred state"; one who is in this state is called muhrīm. For example, a person fasting may be called muhrīm. The word ihtām, however, is only used for two states: the sacred state in which one per-
forms the 'umra and ḍaḥḍījī, and the state of consecration during the ṣalāt. Thirdly the word can be used of the dress in which the ḍaḥḍījī and 'umra are made.

I. The iḥrām in the major or minor pilgrimage. The law declares it meritorious for the pilgrim to assume the iḥrām at the very beginning of his journey to Mecca. But as this is very inconvenient, it is usually only done when the pilgrim approaches the sacred territory (haram, q.v.). Pilgrims who make the journey by steamer often however assume the iḥrām as soon as they arrive in Djjūdā. The law has prescribed several stations (muwāžahāt, plur. of muwāžahah) where this is usually done namely: Dhu 'l-'Hulāsāh for the pilgrims from al-Medina; al-Djāhīa for those from Syria and Egypt; Kār al-Manāzīl for those from Nādīj, Yālamāl for those from Yemen; Dḥāt ʿIrāq for those from ʿIrāq. Any one who assumes the iḥrām too late has to sacrifice an animal in atonement. These muwāžahāt are also called maḥālī i.e. the place where the ʿikār begins. The latter means "loud calling" i.e. the calling of labbaika [q. v.]. ʿIkār is thus used in the same sense as iḥrām and one says for example, ʿahāli ṣ-ḥaḥījī in the sense of aḥrām bi ṣ-ḥaḥījī i.e. to assume the iḥrām for the ṣaḥījī. The law further ordains that people who live within the area bounded by these villages shall assume the iḥrām in their dwellings (Taḥtīl, ed. A. W. T. Jayaboll, p. 72), when it is a question of performing the ḍaḥḍījī. For an 'umra they must go to one of the boundary places of the ʿilq [q. v.]; usually Tanīm is chosen for this purpose, and is thus erroneously also called al-ʿumra by modern travellers.

As one can only enter a state of consecration after casting off all that is ritually impure, one must first of all perform the ceremonies necessary for this. The ghūnī is usually performed; the pilgrim dyes his nails and perfumes himself, all of them ceremonies which were connected with exorcism. Frequently also the pilgrim has himself shaved, his beard trimmed and his nails cut (Burton, A Pilgrimage (London 1857), ii. 133, 377; al-Bītānī, al-Ḥikāt al-Ḥijāzīya, p. 172).

On the significance of shaving, see below.

A particular dress has to be worn in which no seams are allowed. This dress consists of two pieces: a sheet that reaches from the navel to the knees (ṭīrā) and another thrown round the body, which partly covers the left shoulder, back, and breast and is knotted on the right side. This latter is called ṭīrāq and from the manner in which it is knotted ʿaṣīlāh. Both garments are ordained by law to be white, but red stripes are also found (see the illustration in Burton, ii. facing p. 58). On this dress we may remark that it is probably the old Semitic sacred dress. The upper garment of the High Priest in the Old Testament was according to Josephus (Antiq., iii. 74.4) also made without a seam. The Jewish priests wear the ephod around the hips and the ʿeṭāl around the shoulders. In Islam itself there are analogies at the ṣalāt and the burial service. The old Arabs also, when consulting an oracle, as well as the later ascetics wore two garments (Goldziher in Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, xvi. 138, 328; Wellhausen, Relige, p. 122). White is also the sacred colour in many religions: at first the mourning colour (cf. Wilken, Veränderte Geschichten, ed. van Oppenbruggen, i. 416-422) it was next adopted as a sign of a consecrated state: the ephod of the priests as well as the robes of ascetics are white.

The iḥrām dress is thus very old and does not owe its origin to Islam. The wearing of shoes is also forbidden. The most that may be allowed is sandals. This custom is also an old Semitic one. Among the Jews mourners as well as the officiating priests went barefooted. In the consecrated state it is forbidden to cover the head; perhaps this is also an old mourning custom (cf. Ezekiel, xxiv. 17).

Women need not wear any particular dress. But they usually wrap themselves in a long robe which reaches from the head to the feet, while the face, which really ought to be uncovered, is concealed by a kind of mask (cf. the picture in Burton, o.c., ii. 58).

A ṣalāt of two rakʿa's is offered and the niyya [q. v.] is pronounced. The latter can be done in three ways. The iḥrām can be assumed:

a. either for the ḍaḥḍījī or for the 'umra. This method is called ṣaḥījī (separation).

b. for the 'umra, although the ḍaḥḍījī is to be made at the same time. This is called tamattuʿ (bi ṣ-ʾumra ʿal-ḥaḍḍījī), i.e. the utilisation of the 'umra for the ḍaḥḍījī. This is called iḥrām i.e. combination. On the origin and estimation of these three kinds of niyya a good deal has been written in Muslim literature. The four schools of law (maḏhābī, q. v.) have different views on the order of importance of the various niyya's, as regards the merit acquired by them. The kind called tamattuʿ owes its name to an expression in the Kur'ān (Sūra ii. 192), which later became a technical term. According to Snouck Hurgronje's suggestion (Het Mekkaansche Pooet, p. 86 sq.), the restrictions which were imposed by the iḥrām became too severe for Muhammad, so that during his stay in Mecca before the ḍaḥḍījī he conducted himself in a secular fashion. As the followers looked astakhe at him for this, the revelation in Sūra ii. 192 is said to have been given: "Any one who avails himself of the 'umra until the ḍaḥḍījī (shall offer) as many animals as is convenient for him; any one who is not in a position to do this shall fast for three days during the ḍaḥḍījī and seven days after his return". What therefore appeared to the Prophet and his contemporaries as an omission which could be toned for by a punishment, was considered by later generations as a thing permitted. Pilgrims who arrive in Mecca long before the ḍaḥḍījī secure themselves by the tamattuʿ from a painful abstention. As soon as they have performed the 'umra, they put off the iḥrām and only assume it again when the time of the ḍaḥḍījī approaches. But the tamattuʿ is forbidden to those who have sacrificed animals with them (Sūra ii. 192). Originally the 'umra took place in the month of ṣaḥījī and, according to some traditions, an 'umra during the ḍaḥḍījī period was an unheard of thing in pre-Islamic times.

When one has formulated the niyya, the labbaika calling begins, which is to be repeated as often as possible and only ceases after the shaving on the 10th Dhu 'l-Ḥijāja.

The state of consecration imposes certain pledges of abstention: sexual intercourse, care for one's
toilet, the shedding of blood, hunting and the uprooting of plants are forbidden. With regard to this the following remark may be made. In other cases in some Semitic religions a state of consecration excludes sexual intercourse, at least in the menstrual period. The neglect of the body is a well known feature of a sanctified condition among the Semitic peoples. The old Arab mourning women who were in a sanctified state of mourning are described as being dirty and having dishevelled hair (ṣaḥāḥ, al-Khānāṣ, Dīwān, ed. Cheikho, Beirut 1896, p. 28, v. 4).

During mourning the Jews are forbidden to bathe or clip their nails. It is reported of the pre-Islamic pilgrims and of Muhammad that when in the state of Ḯrām they smeared something on their hair to make its filthy condition more endurable (Bukhārī, Sahih, Kit. al-Hadīṣ, Bāb 126; Muslim, with Nawawī’s comm., Cairo 1283, iii. 205; cf. Liṭrām, iv. 391). In a tradition given by Ibn Mūja (Bāb mā rūḍīṣ al-Hadīṣ) Muhammad in answer to the question: “What is the Ḯdīṣ (pilgrim)” said: “He whose hair is dishevelled and whose mouth smells (al-āk̄ath al-tāfī).” The idea underlying all these customs, including the shaving at the beginning of the period of consecration is perhaps that everything that grows on the body during the period of consecration is devoted to the object of the sanctified condition. At the end of the period in most cases an offering of hair may have been made. The endeavour to make oneself unrecognisable may also have played a part.

The muḥrhim is not ordered to fast. But there are numerous traditions which answer this question, some in the negative and some in the affirmative. It may be that in ancient times this ascetic custom was associated with others.

When one arrives in Mecca from his miḥārī, he performs the ṭawfīṣ and saʿy (q. v.), sometimes also drinks water from Zemzem and has his hair cut, if the Ḯrām was only assumed for an ʿumra. But if it was assumed for a Ḥadīṣ, the shaving and hair cutting is not performed till the 9th Dhu ʾl-Hijja in Minā, after the ceremonies of the Ḥadīṣ proper are over. The pilgrim can now assume his ordinary dress again. But it is usual to put on new clothes (Burkhardt, Travels, London 1829, ii. 60). The law however prescribes another ṭawfīṣ in Mecca and many pilgrims only put on their ordinary dress after this ceremony. Finally on leaving the holy city a farewell ʿumra has to be performed. For this purpose the pilgrim goes to Ṭanʿūr, performs a ṣalāt of two rakāʾs, returns to Mecca to perform the ṭawfīṣ and saʿy there. He then definitely puts off the Ḯrām.

2. The consecrated state during the ṣalāt. This state also can only be entered when one is ritually pure and dressed in a prescribed fashion and has taken one’s stand behind a ṣurah (q. v.). This state is announced by the ṭakhrī (q. v.) which is also called takhrī al-Ḥrām. The ceremonies of the ṣalāt proper begin then and can only take place during this consecrated state. One has to avoid everything which might destroy the latter, that is: every superfluous act and every superfluous word. The jurists specially mention greeting, sneezing, coughing, laughing, all that is connected with sexual life or the process of digestion. These are all actions which were originally ascribed to demoniac or animistic influences. We frequently find the idea that angels are present during the Ḯrām (cf. the commentaries on Sūra xvii. 80).

The consecrated state is ended by the two ṭaslima’s, that is the formulas of greeting pronounced while turning the head first to right and then to left. According to some jurists, the object of the first is to leave the consecrated state as well as to greet those present; the latter is only a greeting for those present. Who those are is a question which is answered in various ways: according to some, it is the angels who are summoned by the ṭakhrī al-Ḥrām and are now dismissed by the ṭaslima al-ḥeṣul (the formula by which one returns to the secular state).

The transition from the sanctified to the secular state is dreaded for demonical influences. These are averted by the so-called kūnāt (cf. Goldziher in Orient. Studien Theol. Noldeke gewidmet, i. 323 sqq.).


A. J. WENSINCK.

IHYYA (;&) “bringing waste land into cultivation”. The Muslim Fiḥk̄-books in the section on legal transactions have a chapter on ihyya al-naḥw, literally, making the dead (soil) alive. Land which is not being used is called mawāt. Every Muslim who cultivates neglected land for himself becomes the proprietor if it does not belong to another Muslim. According to most ṣabīḥ’s express permission from the authorities is not necessary. The imām Abū Ḥanifa however considers it illegal to cultivate a mawāt without permission from the authorities.


(TH. W. JUVNBOLL)

ΙΚΑΒ (;&), punishment, retaliation; especially the punishment from God which will fall upon the sinner after-death (often used in the Kurān in this sense). Cf. Ἄθιακ and: Spranger, A Dictionary of the Technical Terms, p. 947.

(TH. W. JUVNBOLL)

ΙΚΑΜΑ (;&) is the second call to the ṣalāt which is pronounced by the muʿaddānim in the mosque before each of the five prescribed daily ṣalāt’s as well as before the ṣalāt at the Friday service. This second call gives the direction in which the ṣalāt begins. The formulae of the Ḯrām are the same as those of the adhan (q. v.). According
to the Hanafīs, they are repeated as often as in the adhām; according to the other Fīḥk schools, they are pronounced only once with the exception of the words "God is great!", which are repeated twice at the beginning as well as at the end of the iḥāma. Moreover after the formula "come unto blessedness", twice in succession there are repeated the words "kāmat al-salāt" (now begins the salāt). In the lawbooks the calling of the iḥāma is recommended as sunna also to every believer who is performing the salāt alone.

According to E. Mittwoch (Zur Entstehungs geschichte des islamischen Gottes und Kultus, Abl. d. Akg. d. Wissenschaft, 1913, philhist, K., N. 2, p. 24) the calling of the iḥāma was borrowed by the Muslims originally from the benedictions in Jewish prayer. According to C. H. Becker (Zur Geschichte des islamischen Kultus, Der Islam, iii. 389) on the other hand, this Muslim custom developed out of the original adhām in the mosque, which was modelled on the Christian mass (see however al-Makrīzī, Kāfet, ii. 271, l. 14–15).

Iḥāma denotes the action of the mu'adžhdhim (the calling of the prescribed formulae) by which he salāt is to begin. On this linguistic usage see C. Brockelmann, Līmāmat al-Salāt (Festschr. E. Sachau, 1915, p. 314–320) and J. Weiss in Der Islam, viii. (1916), 131–135; cf. the expressions: aqāma 'l-salāt and bihamat al-salāt (Gloss. to Shirāzī, Tanbīh, ed. A. W. T. Juyonboll, s. v.; Buḫārī, ṣalāh, Adhān, No. 23–24). In the Fīḥk books however iḥāma is also explained as the call which is intended to summon the believers to rise for the salāt. See Badārī (Būlāk 1307), i. 167, l. 12.

Bibliography: In addition to the collections on tradition and the Fīḥk-books see also: Dimīqāh, Raḥmat al-Ummma fi ikhlaṣ al-A'imma (Būlāk 1300), p. 14, sqq.

(Th. W. Juyonboll.)

IKHĪṢĀD (A.), to keep (or make) clear and pull cid, to keep free from admixture. In connection with the Kurānic use of the expression ikhlaṣ al-dīn il-tāḥ (cf. iv. 145, vii. 28, x. 23, xxix. 14, 16, etc.), i. e. to honour and serve Allah exclusively, ikhlaṣ by itself received the meaning (cf. Kurān, ii. 133) of "absolute devotion to Allah" and became used in opposition to ʿirrāk, ʿirrīk, "associating divine beings with Allah". Sūra cxii, which emphasises the unity and uniqueness of God and denies that he has any associates was called Sūrat al-ikhlaṣ (also Sūrat al-Tawḥīd); this Sūra is frequently recited in the salāt.

With the development of the conception of ʿirrīk, which covers "every kind of worship of God which is not an aim in itself," and also the cherishing of interested motives in religious practice (cf. Goldziher, Vorlesungen, p. 46), the development of ikhlaṣ is somewhat parallel. According to al-Ğhaṣṣālī, ikhlaṣ, apart from the above technical sense, properly means only that one's action should be dictated by a single motive, so that for example it can be ascribed to one who gives alms only with the intention of being seen to do so. In the language of religious ethics as developed especially by the Shiʿa, ikhlaṣ particularly refers to the effort to come nearer to God and means the keeping free of this ideal from all subsidiary thoughts. In this sense it is often opposed to riya', the wish to be seen. Ikhlāṣ demands unselfishness with regard to one's own religious practice and the abolition of the selfish element which mars devotion to God. At the highest stage of ikhlaṣ even the consciousness of ikhlaṣ itself must disappear and all thought of divine reward in this world or the next be put aside. Cf. al-Ġuθfīsī, al-Risāla fi Ḣum al-Tawāwuf, Cairo 1318, p. 111–14; al-Ḥawālī, Manāṣīl al-Ṣārin, Cairo 1326, p. 16 sq.; al-Ğhaṣṣālī, Iyyā, Cairo 1324, iv. 323–332; ed. with comm. of al-Muṭāf, Cairo 1311, x. 42 sqq.; transl. by H. Bauer, Islamische Ethik, I. Über Intention, seine Abhängigkeit u. Wahrhaftigkeit etc., Halle a. S. 1916, p. 45 sqq.; R. Hartmann, al-Khuṣūsī's Darvīshmān al-Šātīn (Türk. Bld., Vol. xviii.), p. 15 sqq. 59, 60. (C. van Arendonk.)

IKHĪSĪDĪS, an Egyptian dynasty. On the general place in history of the dynasty see above ii. p. 190. The name of the dynasty is derived from the old Persian princely title Ikhsīšdī which the Caliph al-Rādī was induced to grant to the founder Muḥammad b. Ṭūhghī in 326 = 937. It was the title of the old rulers of Farghāna (see ii. p. 62) from which the dynasty claimed descent. Ikhsīšdī is said to mean "king of kings," although others interpret it as "servant." (Cf. Ibn Saʿīd, ed. Tallqvist, transl. text, p. 23 sqq.; transl. p. 41), presumably in the same sense as: 'Abd Allāh was used as an honorific of the Caliphs. Al-Ikhsīšdī's father and grandfather were already in the service of the Caliph; he himself worked his way slowly upwards and seems to have had a supporter in the vizier al-Ŷaḍī b. Ḥānīf of the celebrated family of the Banu 'l-Furūṭ [s. ibn al-Furūṭ, 3]. After he had arranged the disorganised affairs of Egypt (323 = 935), he had to defend his new position against the powerful Amir Muḥammad b. Rākī [s. ibn ğaṭr] who penetrated up to the gates of Egypt but then granted the Ikhsīšdī the country as far as Kānīa on payment of tribute. Five years later new difficulties arose, and the undecided battle of al-Ladjiqīn was fought, after which the contesting Amirs may be said to have begun. The Ikhsīšdī paid a yearly tribute of 140,000 dinars. After the death of Ibn Rākī a new enemy to the Ikhsīšdī arose in the Ḥamādānis, and being now at the height of his power he took part in the contest for the position of Amir al-Umarāk. In Muḥarram 333 (Sept. 944) he met the Caliph al-Muttaṣī al-Raḳkāja, but on this side of the Euphrates, and thought for a time of sharing the fortune of the Caliph in the struggle against the Turk Ṭūzūn, who was ruling in Baghdaḏ. But he ultimately returned to Egypt and began the struggle with the Ḥamādānī Saʿīf al-Dawwālīs, which ended in a treaty by the terms of which Damascus remained in possession of the Ikhsīšdī on payment of tribute. He died at the end of 334 (July 946). Two sons nominally succeeded him but they were only réit faintimīn. The real power lay in the hands of an Assyrian eunuch named Kāfūr, who on the death of the second son was formally granted the government of Egypt and successfully defended Egypt and Syria henceforth from the attacks of the Ḥamādānis. On Kāfūr's death a grandson of the Ikhsīšdī was appointed governor, but the dynasty had completely lost its hold on the country and Egypt with Syria fell into the hands of the Fātimids who were advancing from North Africa.

The following table gives the names and order of the Ikhsīšdīs:
The name Unûdîr is transmitted in various forms. The Ikhsâdî and Kâfûr were certainly important personalities. The Ikhsâdî is described as strong physically, but as cowardly and particularly avaricious and greedy. No man’s property was secure in his reign. More pleasing human traits are also credited to him however. Kâfûr was probably the more important. In spite of his repulsive features, by his intellectual endowments he carved a career for himself, unique even in those days, from black slave to wielder of the dynastic power. At the height of his power he never forgot his humble origin. More features of his character that are pleasing than those that are displeasing have been handed down to us. Both princes cultivated the literary taste of their times. Al-Mutanabî sung both their praises, but afterwards lampooned them. Under the Ikhsâdî began the struggle between the two dynasties of Caliphs (‘Abbâsids and Fâtimîds) for the nominal suzerainty over the various governors who had set up dynasties. These soldiers of fortune played them off one against the other. The Ikhsâdî seems to have seriously considered recognising the Fâtimîds, but he remained faithful to the ‘Abbâsids as their prestige was still too great.


Ikhtilâf (A.), trembling of the limbs: whence ‘ilm al-Ikhtilaf, the alleged science of prophecising from the involuntary twitchings of the limbs, also called palomage. The oldest work on the subject is probably Mâdâmûd’s egesyûmatûm per pâlûmûn manîkît pàs Potholómôn bâsûkî (J. S. F. Franzius, Sceptrum philológmôn evertm, Altenburgi 1780, p. 451 sqq.). The Arabs however usually ascribe the origin of this science to the Indian Tômûm. Who he was has not yet been explained. A suggestion is given by Hauber, Tômûm (Tûmûm) = ádûsûm = Dûnûmûsûm, in Zeitscr. der Deutsch. Morgen. Gesells., liiiii. 457 sqq.


Ikhtilâf (A.), difference of opinion; in contrast to Idjma ̃ [q.v.], the difference of views among the authorities on Muslim law and dogmatics on details of legal practice and doctrine which do not affect great principles, particularly among the former, as it appears in the diversities between the Madhâhidî [q.v.] and also in those within each one of them. In opposition to contrary views urging unity of practice, and in face of the reality of the existence of this difference of opinions, the conviction has arisen in Muslim orthodoxy that they are of equal value and this view finds expression in an authoritative form in the saying attributed originally to various Caliphs and latterly to the Prophet himself: difference of opinion in the Muslim community is a sign of (divine) favour. The registering of these differences has produced a great literature in Islam since the foundation of the study of Fikh and this has been most comprehensively recorded by Fr. Kern.


Al-Khwârîzmi (A.), 52 (in number: the Bombay edition as stated in the table of contents at the beginning and the concluding note in the first Risâla consists of 52 treatises, but in the last treatises in part iv. only 51 are mentioned) is usually given as the middle of the iv. (xiii) century and among the collaborators are mentioned Abû Sulâmân Muhammâd b. Mûshîr al-Bustî, called al-Muqqaddûsî, Abu ’l-Hasan ’Ali b. Hârûn al-Zandjâni, Muhammâd b. Nahrâdûrî, al-‘Awfî and Zaid b. Rîfî’s. Further details cannot be ascertained, mainly because the Pure loved to express themselves in very confusing language. Quotations in the Risâla, as far as they have been identified, are mainly taken from the literature of the vi. and ix. centuries A.D. The philosophical position is that of the older eclectic translators and collectors of Greek, Persian, and Indian wisdom. Hermes and Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato are often quoted and thought more highly of than Aristotle. The latter appears as the “logician” and also as the author of the Plotian “Theology” and the “Book of the Apple”. Of the knowledge of a relatively purer and more complete Aristotelianism, which begins with al-Kindî, the treatises of the “pure ones” show no trace. It is characteristic of their mental attitude that al-Kindî is not quoted, at least not by name, although his renegade pupil, the fantastic astrologer Abî Ma’shâr (died 272 = 885), is. It is not impossible, however, that they had literary connections with al-Kindî and his school. According to the medieval Latin translation of the 13th Risâla, this treatise was composed by a “Mahomet discipulis Al-quindî”. Cf. T. J. de Doer, Zu Kindi und
IKLIM, the Greek word klima, inclination. Eratosthenes (d. 215 B. C.) divided the orbis vebiterius notus into seven longitudinal zones, of which the limits were arbitrarily fixed. Hipparchus (c. 150 B. C.) made the zones equal in latitude. The division into seven climates of equal width was taken over by the Arabs, though sometimes the countries to the S. of the Equator were reckoned an eighth, and those in the extreme N., a ninth. Al-Idrisi [q. v.] has arranged his book on geography according to climates. The determining factor in defining the limits of the climate is the length of the longest day within it. In Abu l-Fidā's inhabited world lies practically between 10° and 50° N. Latitude, and the length of the longest day increases by half an-hour in each climate from the S. to the N. The following table shows the S. and N. limits of the climates, the length in hours of the longest day at the S. limit of each and the breadth and length of each in degrees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIMATE</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Limit</td>
<td>12° 40'</td>
<td>20° 27'</td>
<td>27° 30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Limit</td>
<td>20° 27'</td>
<td>27° 30'</td>
<td>33° 37°1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longest Day</td>
<td>12°1/2</td>
<td>13°1/4</td>
<td>13°1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth</td>
<td>7° 47'</td>
<td>7° 3'</td>
<td>6° 7°1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>172° 27'</td>
<td>164° 20'</td>
<td>154° 50'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The length of the longest day at the N. limit of the seventh climate, that is, at 50° 20' N., is 16½ hours. Inhabited lands, however, lie both to the N. and S. of these climates. The climates also diminish in length as they ascend northwards. Thus, according to al-Birūnī [q. v.], the length of the first climate from E. to W. is 172° 27', or, taking 1° = 18°1/2, parasangs nearly, about 3252 parasangs. On the older basis of 22¾ parasangs to a degree it would be 3832 parasangs. The length of the seventh zone is 119° 23' or about 2255 parasangs (on the older computation 2651 parasangs). These measurements are adopted by Abu l-Fidā.

The term climate (khtagawr) was also used by the Persians to denote one of the seven parts or
kingships into which they divided the world, and which had no dependence on latitude. Persia was placed in the centre and Arabia, Africa, the Romans, the Turks, China and India grouped round it. A similar seven fold partition of the earth is found in al-Masʿūdī (chapter viii). Climate then came to be used locally for “country”, e.g. “Syria, Ṭrāṭ, etc. Abu Ḥ-Fīdā calls this the popular climate as contrasted with the “real” or astronomical climate, which depends on the latitude.


(T. H. WEIR.)

Ikrār (A.), Confession. If the accused in the case before the kāfī confesses that the prosecutor is right, no further proof is needed according to Muslim law. The judge can at once give his verdict. An ikrār however can only be considered valid when it is made by a person of age in full possession of his faculties and without any pressure before the kāfī. Measures to extort a confession are absolutely forbidden. Even an ikrār made by some one perhaps from fear of a flogging is invalid. If the case concerns the law of property, the one who acknowledges the demand must be capable of independent action (ražīd). If the justice of an accusation is once recognised in a case, a later repudiation of the ikrār is invalid, except when the accused has confessed a crime which is liable to be punished as a ḥāʾak Allah (see ʾAdhār, i. p. 132).

Recognition of children who are not born in wedlock is of no value according to Muslim law. If, however, the paternity of a legitimate child is uncertain and the husband expressly acknowledges his paternity, then no further proof is required. The paternity of the child is then established by the ikrār. The declaration however must not be neither contrary to the actual circumstances nor the ʾādab. If it is a case of a cultivated land in private possession, it can only be given to one some if it is in an enemy country but has already been promised as ikrār, before it is conquered. The muqtad receives by ikrār a preferential claim, after the conquest of it, if it is granted at all, if for example the owners migrate. Conquered land that is not private property, for example the private domains of the former ruler or lands belonging to inhabitants who have left the country, is in part reserved for the bāt al-maṣl (treasury) and can only be leased for rent (khārāq al-uṣīr) but never become private property. The unreserved parts become khārāq lands (i.e. liable to land tax); they either belong to the faṭ’ (booty) [q.v.] and are immobilised, in which case they cannot only be rented and not become the private property of the muqtad or they remain in the private ownership of (an unknown owner); then it is not possible to grant them and the khārāq due from them takes the place of the poll tax (disya [q. v. i. 1051 sq.]). Lands which fall to the state, because the owner has no heirs are administered like foundations. Many legal authorities hold the opinion that the government is free to dispose of them: in this case they may

act of bestowing land which is not private property in return for taxes or tithes; 2. the act of giving the produce of land in place of or as a guarantee of payment on the part of the state treasurer. Ikrār may consist of: 1. the granting of a whole province as a fief to a governor (e.g. the granting of Egypt to Ibn Ṭūlūn by the Caliph on payment of tribute), as well as the granting of a few fields in return for the ḫirṣ or taxes (khārāq) or rent (khārāq al-uṣīr) or a poll tax afterwards converted into khārāq (khārāq al-disya); 2. the allotment of the revenue from a piece of ground as salary or pension. The conception of ikrār was then extended in the sense of a permanent furnishing of taxes and customs duties and tolls on rivers and canals. Ikrār later came to be used to designate especially a military fief. Al-Māʿwarī has given a theoretical account of the prescriptions of the ikrār in Ch. xvii. of his “Constitutional Law” (al-ʾĀṣkām al-muṣlīmiyya, ed. Enger, Bonn 1853, p. 330–343). He distinguishes at the outset between the granting of the property and the yield from it and investigates under what conditions land may be capable of ikrār.

I. There are three kinds of land.

A. Maʿṣūr (uncultivated land). a. Waste land without trace of cultivation or an owner. The muqtad (the person to whom the land is granted under certain conditions) promises to cultivate it (cf. the Roman amphyteuria) and for three years he pays nothing. (He then pays a rent which is fixed by public auction [tanāyūd]; but lands were probably often allotted at a definite rent which was not considered capable of being increased, cf. Becker, Die Entstehung von ‘Uṣr und Ḥarāq-Land, s. Bibliography). If he does not cultivate it, it may be taken from him at the close of three years unless he can give satisfactory reasons for his neglect. Otherwise he is granted the land on a long lease with the right to dispose of it, so that it is in a way his property, in return for a pledge to pay a certain sum. b. If the land was previously cultivated, the same regulations hold, if it was cultivated in the Ḥāhiliyya (i.e. the period before Muḥammad). If it was cultivated within the Muslim period, the practice varies. If it is a case of uncultivated land in private possession, it can only be given to one some if it is in an enemy country but has already been promised as ikrār, before it is conquered. The muqtad receives by ikrār a preferential claim, after the conquest of it, if it is granted at all, if for example the owners migrate. Conquered land that is not private property, for example the private domains of the former ruler or lands belonging to inhabitants who have left the country, is in part reserved for the bāt al-maṣl (treasury) and can only be leased for rent (khārāq al-uṣīr) but never become private property. The unreserved parts become khārāq lands (i.e. liable to land tax); they either belong to the faṭ’ (booty) [q.v.] and are immobilised, in which case they cannot only be rented and not become the private property of the muqtad or they remain in the private ownership of (an unknown owner); then it is not possible to grant them and the khārāq due from them takes the place of the poll tax (disya [q. v. i. 1051 sq.]). Lands which fall to the state, because the owner has no heirs are administered like foundations. Many legal authorities hold the opinion that the government is free to dispose of them: in this case they may
be assigned, according to some, only on rent, according to others, as private property.

II. *Iṣṭāʿ* of the produce only takes place as a substitute and guarantee for the payments which the treasury has to make to subjects; the sum which the government has to pay to the persons concerned must therefore be fixed if instead of money a grant of produce is to be made. There is a distinction between:

a. *Iṣṭāʿ* of the tithe (*uṣhr*). The revenues from tithes (*uṣhr*) are intended for the zakāt (alms for the poor). They therefore cannot be bestowed because the claims on the zakāt in the individual cases are only defined when payment is made and the *uṣhr* is only paid at the end of the year so that the two dates do not coincide.

b. *Iṣṭāʿ* of the kharāj. The yield of the kharāj for the reasons just mentioned cannot be granted to any one in substitution for the claim to zakāt. For the same reason, officials holding special offices but receiving no fixed salary or appointed for an indefinite period cannot receive the yield of the kharāj as *iṣṭāʿ*. On the other hand the *iṣṭāʿ* of the kharāj is readily given to members of the army in place of their definite pay because the settlement is easy in this case.

*On the kinds of kharāj* (kharāj dījya and kharāj udjra) see the articles dījya and kharāj. The kharāj udjra can be granted for a number of years in compensation for a definite payment.

If the *mukāla* remains in active service till the end of the period he naturally retains the revenue; if he dies it goes back to the state. His heirs receive a pension from other funds; if he breaks down in health his usufruct of the revenue is settled by local practice, according as his pay is continued or a pension is given from other sources on account of ill health. There is no *iṣṭāʿ* with rights for life and the right of transmitting to heirs, as the financial sovereignty of the state would thus be injured by losing the right of disposal. An *iṣṭāʿ* for life without the right of bequest is only possible when, according to local practice, in cases of retiring on account of ill health, it continues to be paid undiminished. These are in the main al-Māwardi’s theories. On the special regulations for the granting of mines etc., see al-Māwardi at the end of the chapter quoted. He does not discuss the *iṣṭāʿ* of land to Muslims as *uṣhr* land. We know that this kind of *iṣṭāʿ* was usual in Muslim countries. Becker in particular has explained the practice, (Steuerpacht, etc., p. 81 sqq., see Bibliography; in this book the eastern and western systems of granting fiefs are compared).

Al-Māwardi points out that *iṣṭāʿ* of kharāj was especially suitable for members of the army; and in reality the military fiefs did develop out of it. Soldiers and amirs were given the rents either as a guarantee of their pay or as part of it. When the rent came in with increasing irregularity; they were gradually given the estates themselves.

This state of affairs lasted about 130 years from the time of the Būyids [q. v.] to the reign of Sultan Malik Shah (465–485 = 1072–1092) under the administration of his vizier Nizam al-Mulk (see Becker, Steuerpacht, p. 89). The latter distributed the estates as fiefs to the troops and allotted them as revenue and income. The Saldjūks introduced an innovation inasmuch as they made the fiefs hereditary in return for military service.

This is best explained by the fact that as an invading tribe of nomads it was their interest at first to have as many of their own people as possible in their army. They thought that in this way they could secure for themselves a particularly true and devoted army (al-Maḍīrī, Kāfī, ii. 216 quotes a statement on this point by a dījya (mercenary) of the army of the Saldjūk Albag, the almost independent of the Sultān of Aleppo 541–569 = 1146–1173): “The fief belongs to us, it is our property, we pass it on to our children from father to son and in return for it we are willing to run the risk or death.”

The system of hereditary fiefs in return for military service is also found among the Mongols. It was different in the Mamlūk period (see Becker, art. EGYPT, ii. p. 14b sqq.; the whole country under his rule, apart from private property, endowments, fallow or desert land, is the feudal property of the Sultān. It was divided into 24 parts from the time of Sultan Qālā’un (565–580 = 1170–1186) (Kūf). Four parts were for the Sultān, out of which he granted fiefs to his guards, officers and soldiers; 10 parts were for the amirs; 10 for the mercenaries (dījya) and the amirs also held a part of the fiefs for the mercenaries.

The land was redistributed from time to time after a survey (at least once in 30 years) but frequently more often, if abuses prevailed, so that for example the highest amirs got hold of very large estates and introduced a latifundia system or the smaller amirs did not pass on the fiefs to the mercenaries. New surveys were also ordered by Sultan Sultān I (595–603 = 1196–1198) for example took 14 ḫirāt of the land for fiefs reserved for his guards. In the survey of Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad of the year 715 (1315) 10 ḫirāt were for the Sultan, 14 for the amirs and their mercenaries. Another abuse first appeared in the first Mamlūk dynasty in the reign of the extravagant Sultan al-Kāmil Shābān: the mercenaries exchanged or sold their estates to private individuals and in return paid considerable sums to the treasury. This practice was even sanctioned by the institution of a special office (Dīwān al-Badā). (See for further details, Sobernehl, Matériaux pour un Corpus Insct. Arab., ii. n°. 44). This abuse was however of short duration only; it is described by the chroniclers as a wicked, illegal, and arbitrary act. When Sultan Sultān I in 922 (1516) conquered Syria and Egypt, he had these lands resurveyed and divided as crown estates and fiefs according to the Ottoman principles. As elsewhere throughout the Ottoman empire the principle of inheritance was gradually introduced. Muhammad ʿAlī was the first gradually to deprive the Mamlūks and the small vassals of their fiefs and to introduce a system of direct payment into the army. The Turkish Sultāns (see the article TURKEY) claimed a part of the conquered territory as their property and granted the yield of the taxes of whole districts (liwaʿ) to their grandees for life (MOLKAN-I MIRĪYE, q. v.).

The governor who was granted a fief in this way, received the ground tax and other dues, while he in return placed a certain number of soldiers at the Sultan’s disposal according to the size of his estate; later he only paid a definite tribute to the Porte. It thus came about that the great pashas were often almost independent of the Sublime Porte. There arose for example small dynasties
in Syria at Ḫims, Baalbek, in Lebanon and Naḥlāt. The smaller fīs were called, according to their size, ẓālim (from ẓālīm, the leader of an army) and ḥimār; the number of soldiers to be provided varied with the size of their booty. They were hereditary and were divided according to certain principles among the sons or heirs of the holder of the fīf in return for military service. It may be said that almost the whole empire consisted of military fīs. This circumstance which in course of time by its decentralising tendency brought about a weakening of the empire was gradually abolished by the reforms (taṣammūḥ) of Sultan ʿAbd al-Majīd, which Sultan Muḥammad II had gathered the way for (1223-1255 i. 1808-1839). The situation was definitely settled by the land legislation of 1856. General military service for Muslims had already been introduced in 1839. Certain hereditary fīs granted to grandees of the empire, which every new Sultan has to confirm, still exist.


**Iṣṭibās** means to take a kabas, a live bird or a light, from another's fire (Kur. xx. 10; xxviii. 7; lvi. 13); hence to seek knowledge ('ilm) and, as a technical term in rhetoric, to quote specific words from the Korān or the traditions but without indicating these as quoted. If the source is indicated and the quotation is put into verse the figure is called 'aḳd, "binding"; and if it is verse, not Kurānic or tradition, that is quoted, and in verse, the figure is taṣnim, "inserting". In Ḥujjāba the original application of the words may be preserved or may be changed. As to the lawfulness of this there has been much dispute. The Māliki- tes generally pronounced it unlawful; but they allowed it under conditions, e.g. in preaching and prayer and praise (following the usage of Muḥammad), but not in verse, where it was disliked (makrūḥ). Yet others permitted such quotation, even in verse, if done in a right spirit. But it is altogether abominable to twist words referring to Allah so as to make them refer to a creature; or to use any Kurānic words in light jesting. But, as a matter of fact, such quoting and alluding has been quite common, even in the most unseemly contexts as in kutub al-bāk, just as the doubt whether the bāzama should be prefixed to poetry (Ibn Rashīd, Umāda, ed. Cairo, 1325, ii. 250) has had no practical consequences. The Poet (p. 104, 11) notes Kifā al-Muḥaktabay by Mādīnī (d. A. H. 1715 or 252) and another by Marzubānī (p. 133, 52) but it is uncertain whether their iṣṭibās was this technically. In the Asīs al-iṣṭibās of Ikhtiyār al-Din (d. A. H. 928; Broc- kelmann, ii. 103) it is extended to cover proverbs, verses and even short hikāyiyy. - Bibliography: Dict. of tech. terms, p. 1187; Mehren, Rhetorik der Araber, p. 1., lvi. 136, 140, 201; Garcin de Tassy, Rho- tique et Prosodie, p. 202; Lieb, viii. 48. (D. B. MCCDONALD)

**AL-IKWA** (A), a technical term in metre, meaning an error in prosody, which consists in the vowel of the vocalised, rhyme-forming, terminal consonant (raw) being a dhammer in one verse of a poem and a kasra in another, irrespective of whether the majority of the verses of the poem end in one or other of these vowels or not. According to al-Khālīl b. Ahmad, al-ikwā means the presence of an unusual vowel with the rhyme-forming consonant, so that the verses end partly in i and partly in a or u. Other prosodists on the other hand call the insertion of verses with the terminal vowels b or i in a poem rhyming in a, isra' or isra'af.

**Bibliography:** Freitag, Darstellung, p. 162,
ILĀH is undoubtedly the same as ḥādād and has the same problem of ultimate derivation (Encyclopaedia Biblica, iii. coll. 3323 sqq.; Brown-Driver-Briggs, Hebrew Lexicon, p. 42 sqq.; Flescher, Kleine Schr., i. 154 sqq.). Here only the Arabic side is considered. The pre-Muslim Meccans regarded Allāh as a proper name (lim ‘alam) and this view is practically universal in Islam; for the arguments of the few who held that it was a descriptive name (ṣifā) see Rāzī, Moṣʿabād, ed. Cairo, 1297, i. 83, sqq. But, according to Rāzī (loc. cit.), al-Khalīfī, Sibawaihi and the most of the formulators of the Muslim fundamentals (al-ṣūḥāyīn) held also that it had no derivation, was murājidī. This Rāzī supports with various a priori arguments. Others, according to Rāzī, held that Allāh was of Syriac or Hebrew origin; others, of the school of al-Kūfā, that it was from al-ṭālāh; and others, of the school of al-Baṣrā, that it was from al-ṭālāh, the infinitive of līm, “to be high”, or “to be veiled”. Of course, as to al-ṭālāh, “the Deity”, Rāzī has shown that it has neither derivation, nor usage, that has come to be practically as a proper name and equal to Allāh. Later Islam has decided that, while Allāh is a proper name, it is also derived (muḥtaṣab, manfūl) and most probably from ab-ṭālāh, in some one or other of its meanings. Al-ṭālāh, then, would mean i. “the god already mentioned”; the article being illāh, ii. “the Deity”; iii. it was softened to Allāh by frequency of usage and in that form came to be a proper name. But ʿalāh, “a god”, still survived in the construct and undefined, as also allāh, “god”, in the plural. Apparently al-ṭālāh does not occur in the Kurʾān as a form, but there are cases where Allāh has the same meaning. So in Kur. vi. 3, wa-ha-wa l-ṭālāh fī ʾs-sāma-wātī, “and he is the deity in the heavens” (cf. Zamakhshari, ʿAskāfī, ed. Lees, p. 394), and in Kur. xxvii. 70, ḥa-wa-ṭālāh lā ṭālāh lā ṭālāh lā ṭālāh ḥa-wa, “he is the deity than whom there is no deity (cf. ʿAskāfī, p. 1064). Then later al-ṭālāh came back in the two senses noted above and was used and is still used by theological writers much as is our “the Deity”. Eight derivations have been suggested for ṣifā (Rāzī, i. 84—86; Baiḍāwī, ed. Flescher, i. 4) but they practically reduce to the following: 1. ṣifā, “worship”, but, as Zamakhshari points out (ʿAskāfī, p. 8), this with the ṡ- and x-stems are derived from the noun. 2. ṣifā, “be perplexed, confounded” — for the mind is confounded in the experience of knowing Allāh; watika has the same meaning. 3. ʿalāh ṣifā, “turn to for protection, or seek peace, or in longing”, again watika has the same meaning. For Allāh the school of al-Baṣrā preferred the derivation from ṣifā in either of its two meanings, “to be veiled” or “to be lofty”. Zamakhshari mentions only 1 and 2, the latter being his choice; in 2 and 3 watika may easily be more original: for the interchange cf. Muṣṣafāl, ed. Broch. p. 172, l. 20.

Bibliography: Add to above Tābāri, Taʃ-sir, i. 42; on margin, p. 53, 63, Gharīb of Naisabūrī (d. circ. 710); follows Rāzī closely but corrects him); on margin of Rāzī, p. 18, 19, Taʃśūʾ of Abu ʿl-Saʿūd (d. 982); Lisi, xvii. 358; article Allāh, i. 302 above, and in Hastings, Dict. of Religion and Ethics, both by present writer. (D. E. Macdonald.)

ILĀT, Arabic plural of the Turkish word il “people” (cf. Thomsen, Inscriptions d’Orkhen, p. 15 and 135, N. 2) is the name given in the Persian administration to the tribes that have remained nomadic in the empire (syn. nāṭa); they are for the most part of Turchoman origin; liable to military service in case of war, they form the only cavalry in Iran (Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān, Matha al-Shams, p. 29 sqq.), except for the regiment of Cossacks. They are also called ḵ arra-tadar (black tents) from the colour of their tents. Their hereditary chief is called ilānī of the people; he enjoys absolute authority and rules his clan in a way absolutely independent of the royal authority. They have teachers of the Kurʾān and of Persian poetry; this is all the education the nomads receive. When the course of the seasons requires the movement of the tribe, they strike their tents, their chief holds a review (ṣān); while the men on foot stand with a large stick in their hands and surrounded by their hunting dogs, the women and children sit on asses, mules, and horses, their domestic chattels being loaded on camels. The nomads pay various revenues to the state; a tax for pasture (ḵaḥḵā-terāb), a certain number of camels and asses to be sent annually to the court; in addition to the usual presents; each tribe furnishes a regiment of infantry (fawṣūd) and a reserve squadron of irregular cavalry (swaūr-ad rādī).

The reforms at present planned by the Persian government aim at increasing gradually the number of tribes who have adopted a settled life, and forcing those who remain nomadic to make their migrations without damaging the interests of the settled tribes on their route. For Fârs, a council of the tribes is to be created on which the ilānīs will be present in person or represented by delegates, in addition to representations of the great families and prominent personages of the region. This organisation will be later extended to the whole of Persia.


ILCĪ (r.) properly elle, from the Uigur ēl, peace, alliance, and the suffix of nouns indication possession, -ēi = peace-maker, ambassador, plenipotentiary. The word ēl “peace”, which is found in Mongol and Manchu, also occurs in Rubghātī, 5, 10 and Kainādār Bīg, 154, 10 (Radloff, Wörterbuch, i. 826). In Turkey a distinction was formerly made between ēyuk iči, ambassador, iči muruqābhār, minister plenipotentiary and ʾurra iči, resident minister. At the present day the diplomatic titles, the employment of which was fixed at the treaty of Vienna, are officially the following: for the first, safir-i hakī; for the second safir-i; the Ottoman Empire has no resident ministers. It maintains embassies at Paris, London, Petrograd, Berlin, Rome, Vienna, and Teheran. The title
ILCI — ILDEGÎZîS.

büyük ilî was nevertheless retained for ambassadors accredited to the Sublime Porte and that of ortal ilî for ministers plenipotentiary (Sâhatnex, 1315, 1072, 1078). The reception of these agents by the Sultan was formerly the occasion of extraordinary ceremony. Now they are content to follow the ordinary European usages. When Ferdinand of Austria sent Nicolas Jurischitz and Joseph von Lamberg (in 1530) on a mission, fifty čavuşlar came to meet them half a league from Constantinople and conducted them to the ambassadors' caravanserais (i'llî-chân), the ruins of which still exist in Stambul. They shut them in there by the Sultan's orders, but took care that they lacked nothing. Three weeks after their arrival they were ceremonially received in audience. The solak, the court valets wearing golden headresses, and 300 Janissaries stood before the chamber of the divân, where the Grand Vizier, two other viziers, the Beylerbey of Rumelia, the two kâdiçâser�, the three defterdar, and the secretary of State (ra'sî efendi) awaited them; then the Chief Marshall and the High Chancellor introduced them to Sultan. The first envoy from the Porte to Vienna was a čavuş, messenger of state or courier (1533), and the practice was continued of appointing ambassadors to foreign countries from this lower category of officials. In 1616 the judge of Galata, who was a negro, forced the ambassadors to pay capitation (il carovgor, the word karâfî being then primarily used as a synonym of Ġiçya, cf. Meninski, Lexicon, s. v.); it was necessary to produce the text of the capitulations to have this judgment of the kâdî annulled by the Grand Vizier. In 1676 (1665) the first account of a mission was inserted in the annals of the empire, on the occasion of an embassy sent by Sultan Mahomed IV, which included Ewliya Efendi and Meninski. Von Hammer at the end of his Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, xvii. 134 sqq., has given a list of embassies sent by the Porte or received by it down to the peace of Kainardjia.

Persia only has an ambassador in Constantinople (safîr-i kâhir). It was represented elsewhere by ministers plenipotentiary, envoy's extraordinary (wa'ar-i mumtaz, wa'ar-i mahlîk) one for England, Germany, and Holland, one for Russia, and one for France and Austria.


ILDEGÎZÎS, SHAHS AL-DIN, A TABBEG of A Darbâidjan, was originally a slave of the Sâlijuq vizier al-Sumârîmî, murdered in 515 or 516 (1121 or 1122) and afterward of Sultan Ma'âtîd. The latter appointed him governor of Arran, whereby he became one of the first amirs in the kingdom. In this remote province he soon took up a more or less independent position and troubled himself little about his Sâlijuq overlords. His marriage with the widow of Sultan Toghurl I gave him a favourable opportunity to champion the cause of his stepson Arslânîshâh and raise him to the Sâlijuq throne in 556 (1161) while he himself came forward as his Atabeg. Some amirs, namely İnâdîn in in Rayy and Zangi in Fars attempted to put up Ma'âmâd, a brother of Arslânîshâh, against him; but their troops were not a match for those of Ildegiz and the plan soon failed miserably. Ildegiz finally got rid of his troublesome rival İnâdîn by assassinating him with the help of the vizier Sa'd al-Din Asâd al-Ashâlî, who as a reward was made vizier to Pahlavân, son of Ildegiz. Ildegiz, who had several times to wage difficult wars with the Georgians (cf. the additions to Ibn al-Kalânî, ed. Ameshra, p. 261 sq.), thus became the virtual ruler of the Sâlijuq empire, and firmly established the rule of his family in A Darbâidjan. According to Ibn al-Ashâlî, he died in 568 (1172) at Hamadânî in the same month as his wife, Toghrul's widow. If the tomb at Nakhâjûwân described by M. Hartmann (Deutsche Bauzeitung, 1899, off-print, p. 21) is that of this princess, her name was Mu'mîna Khâtûn, but the writer's view that Ildegiz had the tomb erected is contradicted by the date 582. The lækâb Shams al-Dîn's proves nothing, because Ildegiz's son Pahlavân (q. v.) also bore it. Cf. Avîfî, Lüübâb al-Âlbîb, ed. Browne, I, 356 sqq. Dawlatshâh, ed. Browne, p. 117, however, says that both Ildegiz and his wife were interred in Hamadânî.

ILKE-KHANS, a Turkish dynasty in Central Asia, iv. 381—389 (xii. 381—389). From this house which ruled the lands north and south of the Thian-Shan came the first Turkish conquerors of Mä warâ' al-Nahr, in the Muslim period; the first monument of Muslim literature in Turkish, the Kudatshu-Bilik or Kutadgu Bilik, was written about 492—1095-1070 for a prince of this dynasty. In Persian histories the dynasty is usually called "family (aš) of Arfasiyâb (q. v., i. 385) sometimes also "Khâns of Turkistan", the name "İleki princes" or "IleKhâns" was introduced by European numismatists (Tornberg and especially Dorn) from a title peculiar to this dynasty, which, however, is not by any means borne by all its rulers, and which it seems cannot be traced in Muslim literature at an earlier or later period. In the pre-Islamic period the word appears as a princely title among the Eastern Turks; cf. the expression "ilg khan gil Cumhelâb" (K. W. F. K. Müller (Ugurica, Berlin, 1908, p. 6). The pronunciation and etymology of the title is uncertain; the historians and the coins have ilk, sometimes also ilk and ilk, the Ugur ms. of the Kutadgu-Bilik, "ilk or ilk, the Arabic (both the Cairo ms. and the newly discovered ms. of Namangan in Fargoûna) ilk; cf. W. Radloff, Wörterbuch, i. 816, "if this word were pronounced ilk, it could be connected with ilk, the first". Naşr b. 'Ali (d. 503 = 1012-1013), the conqueror of Mä warâ' al-Nahr was the "ilk" or "ilk-khan" xar' bogîr, the title was used later also mainly by the kings of Mä warâ' al-Nahr (cf. Bâhâî, ed. Morley, p. 631 infra) but only so long as there were nominally at least the relations of vassal and overlord between them and the Khâns of Kâshgâr. The expression "the khân (or the khâns) and the ilk" is frequently used (e.g. Baïhaqî, p. 841 sqq.); the "ilk" is thus not the "khân", but a prince subordinate to him, just as the ilk introduced in the Kutadgu-Bilik as the personification of justice is not called "khân" but "beg". After the rulers of Sâmârkhân had definitely assumed the title of Khân and founded an independent kingdom, the title ilk disappears from their coins. The word ilk is mentioned for
the last time about 1130 A. D. as the name or title of the ruler of Balasaghn (q. v., i. 615 ff.). The historical references to the "family of Afsiyah" are very scanty; the limits of the kingdom as well as of the individual principalities, of which it consisted, are difficult to determine; the dates also are mostly uncertain; even the coins leave much to be settled here. The kingdom was never actually ruled by one man; feuds between individual members of the dynasty were usually settled by force of arms, frequently with foreign assistance. This state of affairs was first taken advantage of by the Ghaznavids (q. v., ii. 154 sqq.) and later by the Saljuq sultans for their own purposes; of the latter, Malik Shah and his son Sanjar exercised a kind of suzerainty over the princes of Samarkand as well as over those of Kishan; after the battle in the year 536 (1141) this suzerainty passed to the heathen Karal Khitaii (q. v.). The downfall of the dynasty in Ma wara al-Nahr (c. 609 = 1212-1213) as well as in Kishan (about the same time) was brought about by the rebellion of the Muslim population against the Karal Khitaii and the resultant fighting.

**Bibliography:** B. Dorn, Über die Münzen der iranischen oder ehemaligen Chane von Turkestan (Mélanges Asiatiques, viii. 703 sq.; ix. 55 sq.; with bibliography up to 1880); Radloff, Das Kudakhs Bīd-i Transkription herausgegeben, St. Petersburg, Einleitung, P. G. Varnich, La légende de Satok Boghrā Khan et l'histoire (Journ. Asiat., 9e sér., xx. 5 sq.); W. Barthold, Turkestan v epokhe mongolskago nasledstva, ii. 266 sq. (W. Barthold.)

**ILGHÂZI** (i. e. champion of the people) is the name of two Saljuq semi-independent rulers of the Ortoqid dynasty who attained power in northern Mesopotamia.

1. **Najm al-Din Ilghâzî B. Ortoq.** He was first of all a supporter of his brother-in-law Tutush in his struggle for the throne of the Saljuq empire of Fars. After Tutush's defeat and death (488 = 1095) he withdrew to Jerusalem which he had received as a fief from Tutush jointly with his brother Sulman. The two brothers had however after a 40 days' siege to surrender Jerusalem to the Egyptians (Sha'bân 489 = July-August 1096). At a later date (from 493 = 1100) Ilghâzî joined the new pretender Sultan Muhammad, who appointed him governor of Baghda in 494 (1100-1101). He held this important office for four years, ultimately in the service of Sultan Barkyaruk and his son Sultan Malikshah.

When Sultan Muhammad dismissed him from the governorship of Baghdad in 498 (1105), he fell out with the Saljuqs. Between 501 (1105) and 507 (1107-1108) Ilghâzî captured the hitherto impregnable fortress of Mardin, one of the most important in the whole of the nearer east, and in 501 we find him also lord of Nasibin. In 504, 505, 506-7 and 508 (1101, 1102, 1113 and 1115) he refused to perform military service in the war, which the Muslim amirs of the west were conducting against the Crusaders in Mesopotamia and Syria by Sultan Muhammad's orders. During the last of these campaigns he with two of his nephews even attacked the commander-in-chief of the Muslim armies Ashkâner al-Bursuqi (q. v., l. 220 b-24) and defeated him (May 1115), but then fled to Syria and together with Taghtegin concluded a truce injurious to the Muslim cause and even agreed to join arms with the Franks. Taghtegin and Ilghâzî brought 10,000 Muslims to the 2,000 Franks. The Frank-Muslim allies encamped together till August at Apamea and Shaizar in face of the new commander-in-chief, Bursuq b. Bursuq, sent by Sultan Muhammad to fight the Crusaders, without however it coming to a battle between Bursuq and the allies. Shortly after (August or September 1115) Ilghâzî, while on his way back to Mesopotamia, was captured at al-Rastan (between Emesa and Hami; Yakut', ii. 778) by Khîrân, one of Sultan Muhammad's generals, but released after some time for fear of Taghtegin. Ilghâzî managed to get on very well with the Saljuq government after the death of Sultan Muhammad and the accession of his son, Mahmud. 

Lu'tu, the governor of Aleppo, was murdered towards the end of 510 (1117). Owing to internal disputes the town and district of Aleppo were exposed to the inroads and depredations of the Franks. After Ilghâzî had temporarily occupied Aleppo in 511 (1117), he was appealed to in the following year by its inhabitants as their last hope and recognised as prince of Aleppo (Ibn al-Adim Kamal al-Din). Ilghâzî in the second half of 512 (1118) succeeded in definitively gaining possession of Aleppo and thus became a neighbour of the Franks, against whom he at once made energetic preparations. The numerically weaker Franks were outflanked on June 25 1119 by his army of 20,000 men in the valley of Tell Afram, taken by surprise and for the most part cut to pieces or taken prisoner. Among those who fell was Roger, Prince of Antioch. It was one of the greatest battles which the Muslims had so far won against the Crusaders (the village of Balat, after which the battle is often called, appears in Ibn al-Adim as Roger's camp on the night of June 20 1119, eight days before the decisive battle). Antioch now lay defenceless at Ilghâzî's feet; but he neglected to take the city.

The reputation of Ilghâzî's military ability now penetrated far and wide and he received the chief command over the Muslims in the war whilst Sultan Mahmuud was waging war in person against the Christian Georgians. Ilghâzî suffered a very severe reverse (Kamal al-Din, Tarikh Halab, 512 = 1121; Ibn al-Athir al-Kamil, 514 = 1120) which resulted in the loss of Tiflis to the Georgians. In 516 (1122) he was granted Maiyafarikin by the Sultan in addition to his other lands. Soon afterwards on Ramadân 516 = November 3 1122 Ibn al-Kalâni in: Ramadân 6, al-Fârîki: Ramadân 17) Ilghâzî died at the age probably of barely 60 at Maiyafarikin (Ibn al-Athir and Abu l-Faraj); 'Adjulâni on the road from Mardin to Maiyafarikin, according to Ibn al-Adim, Recueil des Historiens des Crusades, iii. 634; al-Fuhâl, according to Ibn al-Kalâni; on the way from Aleppo to Maiyafarikin, according to Michael the Syrian). At his death he was in possession of Maiyafarikin, Mardin, Aleppo and apparently also of Nasibin. He was buried at Maiyafarikin (for further details see the historian of this town, quoted in Amedroz's foot-notes to al-Kalâni). Ilghâzî possessed an influence unequalled at that time over the Turkomans of Mesopotamia. He was a bold and ambitious personality, who claimed a leading position wherever he appeared. He was not a general of great genius; it is said that his drinking habits affected his military decisions. He
struck no coins so far as is known (I. Ghišl Edhem, *Catalogue des Monnaies turcomanes*, Constantinople, 1894, p. 82). He married a daughter of Tugh†egir, Il-Kâhitun, and later during his rule over Aleppo also Parkhândû Kâhitun, a daughter of the former Saldjûk ruler there, Rûdwan. We know the names of several of his children: the daughter Gîhar, (al-Fârîki: Kumâr) Kâhitun, who married the Armenian chief Dubay b. Sadaqa in 513 = 1119-1260; Umâna Kâhitun, the wife of the Inâlid Il-Aldî, lord of Amid, who died in 536 = 1141-2; Ayâz, died 508 = 1141-1155, Sulaimân, Timûr-tâsh, and Shîhâb al-Dîn MaḤmûd (?); another daughter Ighâzî whose name is not known married in 495 = 1101-1102 an unnamed son of Tekish, a brother of the great Sultan Malikshâh. Ighâzî was one of those Muhammadan amirs who were the first to check the advance of Crusaders to the east and before the time of Zangi and Saladin. Ighâzî I was the founder of the Ortokíd dynasty of Mardin which survived till 811 = 1408.


Kûthû al-Dîn Ighâzî I, the son of Nâdim al-Dîn Alpî (probably another form of Alpîn) and a sister of the Turkish ruler of Armenia, Sûkîmûn II, succeeded his father in 572 = 1176-1177; Michael the Syrian: *July 20 1176* in the rule over Mardin, Mayâqaftîn, and Ra’s al-Aîn (in Ibn al-Athir, xi. 268, however, he appears as early as 569 in possession of Ra’s al-Aîn). We have only scanty information about his reign. He first of all oppressed his two paternal (according to another tradition, maternal) uncles, the rulers of Hânî (also written Hana, the modern Hene, north of Amid) and Durû, till they recognised his superiority as they had done that of his father: the two uncles appeared at Mardin and paid homage to Ighâzî II. Soon afterwards the latter fell ill. On his recovery he subdued the Arabs who had become turbulent and is said — according to a statement which is probably exaggerated — to have killed several thousands of them and to have taken 12 000 camels from them. He proceeded to extend his sway towards the Euphrates in the district of Bira (the modern Biredjiki). His uncle Sûkîmûn II seems to have had great influence over him. Ighâzî for example joined the alliance which was concluded towards the end of 578 (beginning of spring 1183) by Sûkîmûn II and ‘IZZ al-Dîn Mas’ûd I of al-Masqîl (a cousin of Kûthû al-Dîn Ighâzî) with the object of checking Saladin’s advance into Mesopotamia. The allies, however, found themselves helpless in face of Saladin’s successes and, after the death of Sûkîmûn II, we find Ighâzî’s troops in the army of Saladin in Syria (Šafar 580 = May-June 1184). Ighâzî II died soon after at the beginning of Dju’dâd II 580 = Sept. 9 1184. His principality in addition to the areas mentioned also included Dunaisir. His name is mentioned in an inscription on the minaret of a mosque at Mardin dated in the year of his accession, but the credit of building it however is given to his father Alpi. On the coins struck by Ighâzî (bronze only, which are called dirhams, are known) he calls himself “King of the Amirs” (Malik al-Umara) and, like other Ortokíd rulers of Mardin before and after him, Shah Diyar Bakr, although he did not rule in Amid, the metropolis of this district. Ighâzî II left two sons Hûsam al-Dîn Yoluq Arslân, and al-Malik al-Mansîr Nasîr al-Dîn Ortoq Arslân, who succeeded their father in turn. Nišân al-Dîn Alpûksh, one of Ighâzî’s slaves, married his widow, while one of his daughters was married to Saladin’s son, al-Malik al-Mu’izz, about the end of Dju’dâd I 578 (Sept.—Oct. 1182) or a little later.


Ighâzî II means literally “to cause to swallow or gulp down” (Littim, xvi. 29, especially two lines). In the Kur‘an it occurs only in the I. 8 — a celebrated but difficult passage — *fe(h) ba’ama ḥuwa ba‘awâda, “then he (Allah) made her (a nafs) swallow down her sins and her godly fear*. The oldest exegetical tradition (Tabari, *Tabîr*, xxx. 115 sq.) gives two explanations: i. Allah explained these to the nafs; ii. Allah created these in the nafs. The Mu’tazilites chose the first (Zamâkhshâri, *Kajîshâf*, ed. Lees, p. 1612) but orthodox Islam generally chose the second, the almost certainly correct view. Thuc Râzi (Mafâthî, ed. Cairo, 1308, viii. 438) and Naisabûrî (margin of Tabari, p. 100) But Baijsâwi (ed. Fleischer, ii. 405) follows Zamâkh-
Central Asia, the tributaries are of greater importance for irrigation than the main stream. As soon as the river leaves the mountains and flows into the broad plain and no longer receives tributaries, it practically loses all importance for agricultural culture. The number of canals fed from the Ili on Russian territory is extremely small, but there is one called Ak-Cughan as far down as the lower course of the river, about 15 miles from its mouth; agriculture is there pursued by the Kirgiz.

The Ili is first mentioned in the history of the Chinese T'ang dynasty (vii.—ix. century A. D.). One of the main roads from China to Turkestan led even in those days through the Ili valley (E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tchouïs (Tures Occidentaux), St. Petersburg, 1903, p. 11 sq.). The oldest Muhammadan source to mention the river is the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam (572 = 982-3); in it and in most later works the name is written Ila. How and when Islam reached here is not known. In the vii.—viii. (xiii.—xiv.) century the Ili valley is described as the boundary of the Muslim world. The lands to the east of it were only won for Islam in the Mongol period. On the Muhammadan principality which then existed there, the civilisation of the upper Ili valley in the vii.—viii. (xiii.—xiv.) centuries, on the decline of this civilisation and its restoration more recently under the rule of the Calkums and Chinese, on the last Muhammadan movement and its consequences, and the partition of the country between Russia and China see the article KULDZA.

Still more scanty are the historical notices of the other parts of the river valley. The name Kunges first appears in the history of Timur's campaigns (Ẓafar-Nāma, Ind. ed., i. 481, where it is written Kangez); the Tekes is mentioned about the same time under the name Teke (in mss. also Yaka). The valleys of the two rivers have always been highly esteemed by nomads as pasture ground. The post route which now crosses the Ili at the village of Ilijsik visloko (the only bridge over the river is here) seems roughly to correspond to the road described by Rubruck in 1253. North of the Ili and south of the mountains (obviously south of the pass of Altin-Imel) there was, according to Rubruck, a town inhabited by Persian speaking Saracens, which he calls Euphrasie (Reis des Voyages, etc., iv. 280 sq. F. Schmidt, Über Rubucks Reise, Berlin, 1885, p. 42). From its situation it is the same town which is called at the same time by the Armenian king Hethum Hnabalek and is called by the Chinese I-la-ba-li or I-li-ba-li i.e. Ili-Balki "town on the Ili" (E. Bretschneider, Medieval Researches, etc., i. 169). The same name is used by the Chinese in the xvi. century as that of a district, and it is expressly stated that there are no towns there and that the population consists entirely of nomads (ibid., ii. 242). Below the high road the river breaks through a chain of phorphy rocks where there are Buddhist inscriptions and sculptures of the Calmuck period (xvii.—xix. centuries); the rocks are therefore called Tamgali-Tas (inscribed stones) by the Kirgiz (N. Pantusow and A. Posdnejew in Zapiski Vost. Otd., Arch. Obozr, xi., 273 sq. with two plates). About a hundred miles below Ilijsik visloko a dried river bed, the Bakanas, runs off from the modern river and reaches the Balkhash in three arms. There are said to be traces here of old canals and ruins of
ancient buildings (L. Berg, in *Istoriya Imp. Kurskogo Geogr. Otdel*, xl. 590). To what period and people these remains are to be attributed is doubtful, as the literary sources are absolutely silent as far as is known (we may however here add to the article BALKHASH, i. 624?), that the lake is mentioned in the *Zafar-Nâma*, Ind. ed., i. 496, under the name Attrak Köl). So far no inscriptions have been found there either.

The Ili like all Central Asian rivers is little suited for navigation and has so far not attained any importance in this respect, although several attempts have been made, e.g. for example, the voyage of L. Berg up the river from Ilijskij viselok to Lake Balkhash in 1903 (ap. cit., p. 588 sq.) (W. Barthold).

**ILLIYAN** [see AL-KUDS.]  
**IL-KHANS**, Mongol dynasty in Persia, vii,ib-viii,th (xiii,ib-xiv,th) century. On the foundation of the kingdom and the meaning of the title of its rulers see the article HULAKU (ii. 332 sq.), on the later rulers see the articles ARBAKA (i. 4), ARGÜN (i. 433), GAIKHUTU (i. 128), BAIKUDU (i. 591), GHAZAN (ii. 149 sq.) and ARU SAATD (i. 103 sq.). With the death of the latter on Rabî‘ II 736 (Nov. 30 1335), the main branch became extinct in the male line till 736 = 1335-1554, several princes, mainly from branch lines and even a princess, Sahl Beg, sister of Abu Sa‘id 739-740 ascended the throne, but were not generally recognised. Some historians also include the Djalâr (i. 1003) among the Ilkâns; in reality these were only connected with their predecessors in the female line (Hasan the founder of the dynasty was through his mother a grandson of Arghun).

The kingdom of the Ilkhan at the time of its foundation included all the lands from the Oxus to the Indian Ocean and from the Indus to the Euphrates, with the addition of a great part of Asia Minor and the Caucasus countries. Later some lands in the east were lost to the Çaghatalı (i. 843 sq.); on the other hand, the local dynasties, which were at first maintained in South Persia and Asia Minor, were gradually swept away and replaced by governors appointed by the Ilkâns. The attempts to take Syria from the Egyptians, Sulṭân met with no success. In Persia itself, in spite of the inevitable consequences of the Mongol conquest and misgovernment of most rulers, this period was in many ways one of progress. After the conquerors under Ghâzân Ilkhan had definitely adopted Islâm new cities arose under their rule such as the extended Tabriz and the new foundation Sulṭâniya, and splendid edifices like the mausoleum of Khân Uljâitü in Sulṭâniya were built. The Mongol rulers naturally had little interest in Muslim theology or Persian belles-lettres; on the other hand, under their patronage the writing of history in Persia developed to an extent unknown before, so that we are much better acquainted with this period than with the events of preceding centuries. Among scientific subjects medicine, and mathematics were specially favoured.


(W. Barthold.)

**ILLIYAN** is mentioned in the Kur. 83: 18, 19, where it may be a place or a book. It is generally supposed to be a name of the seventh heaven, or of the register of the good deeds of the pious. For the various explanations see Lane’s *Lexicon*, p. 2125 and 3147, and the commentaries on the passage. The word is regarded as a regular plural, or as a plural without a singular; but it is no doubt the Hebrew word *šelom* (Gen. xiv. 18, etc.).

**Bibliography: The Commentaries on the Kurân.**  
(T. H. Weir.)

**ILM** is the broadest word in Arabic for “knowledge”. In the lexicons it is often equated with *ma‘rifah* and *šu‘ur* (Lane, p. 2138), but there are marked distinctions in usage. The verb governs one or two accusatives as it indicates knowledge of a thing or of a proposition (German *kenne* and *wissen*). But *ma‘rifah* is “coming to know by experience or reflection”, and implies preceding ignorance. It thus cannot, unmodified, be used of Allah’s knowledge. Yet some contested this on the basis of actual occurrences of the word used of Allah (*Kiswät al-Awilmin*, ed. Cairo 1315, p. 11). *Šu‘ur* is “perception” especially of details, the *šu‘ir* is the “perceiver”, “feeler”, and thence “poet”. Another early distinction has already been pointed out by Goldziher in his article on *Fiqh* (vol. ii. 101 above). *Ilm*, in its early usage, was knowledge of definite things (Kurân, *taṣfîr, ʾahkâm*) but *fık* was the independent exercise of the intelligence. So *faḥk* (*faḥkà*), was one who was thus intelligent, but that word has come now to indicate a minor canon lawyer or casuist, while *ʾilim* (*łaμà*) following a broadening of the meaning of *Ilm* to “science” and of *al-ʾilâm* to “the sciences”, has come to mean a scholar in a wide sense and especially one using intellectual processes. Against this change of meaning there is a vigorous protest by Ghażalî, in his *Ihya*, Book i., Báb 3, who denounces especially that the praises which have come down of the *ʾilâm* as to Allâh, should be applied to these dialecticians and canon lawyers. Further, this brought the *ʾilâm* into sharp distinction on another side from the *ʾarif*, who is the mystical knower by immediate experience and vision, almost, but not quite the same as gnostic. For this distinction of *ʾilâm* and *ma‘rifah* in Şifî theology see Khusrawî’s *Risâla*, ed. Cairo, 1290, with comm. of Zakariyâ, iv. 60 sq. But when *ʾilm* became philosophical it had to submit itself to the system of the scholastic theologians (*muthallâhimūn*). They gave it a place in the scheme of Aristotelian predicaments (*al-ma‘lûmat*). There it is an *arad* (“accident”, in the sense of the older logicians), one of those characterized by life (*muḥtáṣs bil-hayâ*), coming (along with will, power etc.) in the class of the modalities (*kaysîyât*) of the *naf* (the lower or appetitive soul (*Mawûkîf* of *Ibî* with comm. of Djûrdî, ed. Bulâk, 1266, pp. 272 sqq.; *Dict. of Techn. Terms*, p. 1061, cf. pp. 1055—
It is divided into eternal (baṣīṭ) and originated (kādīūl, muḥbatīl), according as it exists in God or a creature, and there is no resemblance (kaḥāb) between these two. Originated knowledge is of three kinds: intuitive (baṣīṭī); necessary (daʿīrūl), by the evidence of the senses and by unanimous assertion (khabar nuṭawātīrī), deductive (iṣīdālī). See the ʿAṣāʾīl of Nasafi with the commentary of Taftāzānī and others, ed. Cairo, 1321, pp. 18 sqq., and for a number of short definitions of ʿilm see the Tuṣūfī of Dījrānī, sub voce. Those scholastic theologians who distinguished between ʿilm and maʿrīfa used ʿilm of compounds and universals and maʿrīfa of simple things (baṣīṭī; see baṣīṭ in Dījrānī’s Tuṣūfī) and particulars (Taftāzānī on Naṣafi, p. 40). Another distinction enters in the relation of ʿilm to ʿamāl, “works” in the theological sense. There is ʿilm naṣārī, such as knowledge of things; when you know them you have done every thing. But opposed to it is ʿilm ʿamālī, knowledge of religious duties (aʿlāṣdālī); your knowledge is not complete until you have acted upon it (Rāghib, Muṣfrādat, p. 345). This is put rather differently in the Taṣkīr of Ṭārīfī (ed. Cairo, 1306, p. 192). It is the duty of every Muslim to seek knowledge; therefore he who knows and acts on his knowledge has two acts of obedience to his credit; if he neither knows nor acts, he has disobeyed twice: it he knows not act, he has obeyed once and disobeyed once. This in the end joins the question as to what is saving faith (iḥām). For a descriptive classification of all the arts and sciences which have been reduced to writing (al-ʿulūm al-nuḍawwūma) see Dict. of Techn. Terms, pp. 2–53. Ibn Ḥādūn in his Muḥaddīna (Fusul vi) deals with these more historically and philosophically in their development and their relation to the essential facts of life (De Slae’s translation, ii. 319 sqq.; Quatremère’s text, ii. 272 sqq.). But with regard to all sciences there is a fundamental distinction. They are divided into those praiseworthy and those blame-worthy (al-maḥmūda wa l-muḍāmīma), and among the blame-worthy are reckoned those which are not useful for this world or for that to come. The basis is the frequently quoted tradition. “It is the beauty of a man’s ʿIlm that he leaves alone what does not concern him” (mā lā yaʿniḥī). The religious Muslim should therefore avoid such sciences as are not demonstrably useful for this life or for his eternal salvation. (Ghazvī, ʿIlāya, Book I, Bāb 2; Ibn Ḥādūn, Muḥaddīna, ed. Quatremère, iii. 136; Goldziher, Muh. Studien, ii. 157, and review in Zeit. d. Deutsch. Morgen. Ges., lxv. 532; Hujwīrī, Kashf al-Mahdāj, transl. Nicholson, p. 11). Bibliography is given above. (D. B. MacDonald). ILTUTMISH, SHAMS AL-DIN, the slave and afterwards son-in-law of Ḳūṭ al-Dīn Aḥbāb [q. v.], who made him governor of Badāk [q. v.]. After the death of Ḳūṭ al-Dīn Aḥbāb in 657 (1210), his adopted son ʿArām Shāh succeeded to the throne, but some of the nobles conspired against him and invited Ilutmish to come to Dīhilī; ʿArām Shāh marched from Lāḥor to meet him, but was defeated and apparently put to death. Ilutmish had to contend with rival chiefs before he succeeded in firmly establishing his authority; in 618 he resisted the attempt of the infortunate Ḏjalāl al-Dīn Mangaberīl [q. v.] to set up a kingdom in India; later on by a series of successful campaigns he extended his dominions so as to include Lakhnawtī (in 622), Sīndh (in 625), and Gwālorī (in 630), and his expeditions into Mīlāwa (in 631–2) brought all India north of the Vindyāya Mts. under his sway. He was the first of the Muḥammadan princes of India to receive recognition from the Caliph of Baghdād (al-Mustansīr Li-Thālib), and on his coins and in his inscriptions after 626, he styles himself Nāṣīr Āmīr al-Muʿminīn. He continued the building of the great ʿAbū Minār [q. v.], which his predecessor had begun. Bibliography: The best account of Ilutmish is given by his contemporary, Minhājī-Ṣarāḥī, Taḥjīb-ī-ṣāliḥī, trans. H. G. Raverty, (Index s. v. Iyaltimish); Elliott-Dowson, History of India, (Index s. v. ʿShams-ud-din Alumṣāh); E. Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 41 sqq.; S. Lane-Poole, Medieval India, p. 70 sqq.; J. Horovitz, The inscriptions of Ilutmish (Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1911–2). ILÝĀS, the Biblical prophet Elias, is twice mentioned in the Qurān. In Sūra vi. 83 he is mentioned with Zakariyāʾ, Yahyā, and Iṣā as one of the sāliḥīn without further details. In Sūra xxxix. 125—130 his history is related in the fashion which is stereotyped for all stories of prophets in the Qurān. That Muhammad however knew something more of him is clear from the mention of the Baʿl, which is differently interpreted by the commentators, sometimes as lord, sometimes as an idol who has given his name to the town of Baalbek, sometimes as a woman whom the Israélites served.Verse 130 calls him Ilyās which has given rise to much conjecture; it is however clear from the context that this name was only formed by Muhammad with his usual freedom to get a rhyme in -īn. The commentators on Sūra xxxvii. 123 sqq., as well as the universal historians and the collectors of legends of the prophets give the following about Ilyās. He lived in the reign of king Aḥāb (Lāḏāb in al-Thaʾlabī) and his wife Ṭūbāl (variously written). Aḥāb used to follow Ilyās, but the Israélites were worshippers of the Baʿl. One day, however, Aḥāb had put him off saying that the kings who served gods had as much success as he had. Astonished at this Ilyās prayed God to give him power over the rain. Thereupon a drought arose which lasted three years; Ilyās concealed himself during this period but was provided with food. He cured Alisaʾ, son of a widow, who became his disciple. At the end of the three dry years God reproached him with causing the deaths of many innocent persons by his severity. Thereupon Ilyās proposed to the Israélites that they should appeal to their gods for help and, if they did not hear, they should return to God. The gods could not hear their worshippers and at Ilyās’ prayer the desired rain fell. The Israélites however were not converted. Enraged at this obstinacy, Ilyās begged God to take him up. When he contemplated with his disciple Alisaʾ the holy horse appeared. Then Ilyās ascended amid the cries of Alisaʾ. God transformed him: he became a feathered being of light exalted above all human passions, half angel and half man, of earth and heaven at the same time. This is the version of al-Tabātābāī. Al-Thaʾlabī is much more detailed. According to him, Queen Ārbīl (Jezebel), the representa-
tive of Lādjab, is the incarnation of all wickedness. Her chancellor however is a pious man, who conceals his faith. As in the Bible, here also, the story of Naboth (Naboth is called Mazdaki, obviously an echo of Mordechai) is the cause of Ilyās’ exhortation and the king’s wrath. Ilyās conceals himself for seven years in ravines. Thereupon Lādjab’s most beloved son falls ill. Four high priests of Baal set out to slay Ilyās, the alleged cause of his illness. The latter, however, instils them with such respect that they return full of awe. Lādjab then sends 50 soldiers who call out to Ilyās that they have been converted. The latter prays God to consume them with fire, if they are lying. This happens and a second body of soldiers meets the same fate. Finally, Lādjab sends the believing chancellor to the queen with a free conduct and with a treacherous troop. At God’s advice Ilyās goes with him to save the chancellor. On the arrival in the palace the child dies, so that the king forgets Ilyās and the latter is able to depart unnoticed. As he wearsies of his stay the mountains he enters the house of the mother of the prophet, Ilyās, who being that child, was raised from the dead by Ilyās. He then goes back to the mountains and begs God to give him power over the rain for seven years. He is only granted it for three years during which he himself is fed by the birds. The whole of Israel has now to suffer famine, only one widow is supplied in a miraculous fashion by Ilyās with meal and oil. The rest of the story of Ilyās, the healing of Alīsā, etc. is practically the same as that of al-Ṭabarī. Here also Ilyās is described as half mortal and half heavenly, appearing to men on earth. Al-Ṭabarī tells of a man who met Ilyās in Palestine; after talking to him he went away on his camel.

There is another Elias story in the Kur‘ān, although the name is not mentioned and the person who here takes the place of Elias is not identified by tradition with him, but with al-Khaḍīr. In Sūra xviii. 64 sqq. it is related how Mūsā and his servant while fishing met a servant of God whom Mūsā wished to follow. The unknown one however replied that Mūsā had not the necessary self-control. While travelling together the servant of God performed several apparently ungrateful and cruel deeds. Mūsā reproached him every time, so that the guide finally separated from him after showing him that each of his supposed wicked deeds was justified. Jewish legend relates a journey of Elias with Joshua ben Levi on which Elias did similar things to those of the unnamed servant of God in the Kur‘ān. Here also Joshua ben Levi apparently rightly indignant at them is shown by Elias to be wrong in his premature judgment. The similarity between the two stories is so great that it cannot be doubted that the Kur‘ānic one goes back to the Jewish. The unnamed servant of God in the Kur‘ān is usually identified with al-Khaḍīr. It should be noted, however, that al-Baidawi for example says on Sūra xviii. 64: “it is also said that he is Alīsā or that he is Ilyās”. This confusion of Ilyās and al-Khaḍīr is significant and further cases may be mentioned. The reason is that in view of the Biblical story of Elias’s being taken up to heaven, the latter name of al-Khaḍīr is numbered among the immortals. Perhaps al-Khaḍīr’s name shows this. Al-Khaḍīr “the green” is only an epithet of the man who was called B-l-y-ā or, according to another reading, V-l-y-ā, i.e. Ilyās. But elsewhere they are twins, not genealogically, but in their work and common activity. They go together to the fountain of life and drink from it, a trait which was originally only in the Alexander legend, but which again guarantees Ilyās’s immortality, as his name shows which is interpreted as al-Ås, “the myrtle”, the symbol of immortality, Ilyās and al-Khaḍīr having survived to the first revelation to Muhammad are said to have wished to die. But Muhammad is said to have replied to them: “O Khaḍīr, it is your duty to aid my community in the desert and you, O Ilyās, must aid them at sea”. Usually however al-Khaḍīr-Glaukos is the sea demon, while Ilyās is the patron on land. The two spend Ramaḍān each year in Jerusalem, observing the fast. They then make the pilgrimage to Mecca, without any one recognising them, unless God grants this favour. Their food is pond-weed (karafa) and truffles (kam‘a). After the pilgrimage they clip one another’s hair and separate with eulogies. Any one who repeats these formulas three times at morning and evening is immune against theft, fire, and drowning (a-rāh, bārāh, qabāh), as well as against higher powers, Satan, sorcery, and sorceries. Al-Khaḍīr and Ilyās meet every night at Alexander’s Dam where they fly in the air. In the Jewish legend he also flies about giving help everywhere. (See also the article AL-KHAḌĪR).

Besides al-Khaḍīr Muslim legend also knows the immortal Enoch-Idrīs [q. v.]. Ilyās is therefore sometimes also identified with the latter. In various genealogies of Ilyās he is said to be really Idrīs. Usually however his genealogy is traced to Aaron: Aaron-Eleazar-Pinchus. The latter is described as his grandfather. The name of his father has become, perhaps from Tishb, N-a-b-y, Y-s-y, and finally Yāsīn.

It may further be noted that Ilyās, like al-Khaḍīr, is often identified with St. George (see DIBDIB) probably because the latter is also a patron saint.


(1. J. WENCESINCK.)

1MĀD AL-DĀWLA, ABBU ‘I-HĀSAN ‘ALI B. BUWAICH, FIRST RULER OF THE BAYIDI DYNASTY. With the help of his two brothers 1Mād al-Dawla in 322 (934) conquered Shīrāz and thus became ruler of Fārs where he reigned till his death. He died in Shirāz on Djamādī I 16, 338 (Nov. 11, 949) aged 57. According to another statement (Ibn Khallikān, ed. Wüstenfeld, No. 491), he did not die till 339 [cf. the article BUVIDS.

(1. K. V. ZETTERSTEEN.)

2MĀD AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD AL-KĀṬĪB AL-ISFĀHĀNI, A CELEBRATED ARAB STYLIST AND HISTORIAN, born at Isfahān in 519 (1125) of a prominent family, to which the celebrated Kāṭīb al-ʿAzīz, whose biography is given in Ibn Khallikān, Wafayyāt, ed. Wüstenfeld, No. 77, also be-
IMĀD AL-DĪN — IMĀLA.

longed. On him cf. Recueil des textes relatifs à l'hist. des Seljoucs, ii., Préface xix. sqq. He spent his youth in his native city and in Kāshān, but also studied in Baghdad particularly fiqh and made a journey to Mōsul and other places. When the Sulṭān Muḥammad II besieged Bagh-
dād in vain in 551 (1156), he was there and con-
gratulated the Caliph on its deliverance in a kašida, which gained him the favour of the vizier Ibrāhīm Hubārī [q. v.]. The latter appointed him nāʾib in Wāsit; after the vizier’s death in 560 (1165) however he lost this office and lived through the difficult years. Finally he applied to the Ayyūbidis in Syria, which were acquainted with his family, particularly with the above mentioned al-‘Azīz, who was an uncle of ‘Imād al-Dīn. He found a friendly welcome there and was appointed kāthib by Sulṭān Nūr al-Dīn and later mudarris at a madrasa built in honour of him. He was also sent on a diplomatic mission to the Caliph and finally appointed muṣrīf of the Diwān. On Nūr al-Dīn’s death in 569 (1173), however, his en-
emies were able to supplant him so that he had to leave his offices and go to Mōsul. There he fell ill, but recovered and returned to Syria on hearing that Ṣālah al-Dīn was preparing to con-
quer that country. He congratulated him at his capture of Hums in a poem, won great influence with him and accompanied him on all his campaigns. On Saḥādīn’s death in 589 (1193) he retired into private life and devoted himself to literary work till his death in 597 (1201). His chief work is undoubtedly the comprehensive anthology of the Arabic poets of the 9th century entitled Khwārid at-Tajwīr wa-Dhararīt Aḥl al-‘Āyr (still un-
published). His history of the conquest of Syria is better known: al-Fath al-‘uṣūs fī l-Fath al-
Kutbīs; Conquête de la Syrie et de la Palestine par Ṣalāḥ ed-Dīn, ed. Landberg, Leiden 1888. He also prepared a history of the Saljūqīs in al-Īrāq on a basis of the records compiled by the vizier Anuṣṭurwān and called it Nūṣar al-Fatḥa wa-
Uṣrat al-Fītḥa; a synopsis by al-Bondārī [q. v.] has been published by Houtsma. Of his memoirs, al-Barg al-Shāmi, only one volume and a few excerpts have come down to us. ‘Imād al-Dīn’s prose writings are characterised by an exceedingly ornate and bombastic style.

Biography: Ibn Khallikān, Wafâyāt, ed. Wüstenfeld, N. 715; further references in Brockelmann, Gesch. der arab. Lit., i. 314 sq. IMĀD SHĀH DYNASTY, of Herāt [q. v.], was founded by Fath Allāh ‘Imād al-Mulk, by birth a Brahman of Vidjayanagar, who had been captured as a youth in an expedition of Aḥmad Shāh Bahmani I to Vidjayanagar and educated as a Muslim. He served under ‘Abd al-Kādir Khāndāhān, governor of Berār, and in the reign of Mu-
ḥammad III Bahmani succeeded his master. In 1490 Fath Allāh followed the example of Aḥmad Nīgān al-Mulk of Ahmadnagar and Yusuf ‘Ādí Khān of Bīdājrūr and declared himself independent, not from dissatisfaction towards Māḥmūd Shāh Bah-
mānī, but from disillusionment to serve the minister, Kāsim Barīd, the real ruler of the kingdom, who kept the king in confinement and from whose control Fath Allāh subsequently made a fruitless attempt to release him. Though a native Dakhani, he was an intimate friend of the foreigner Yusuf ‘Ādí Khān, and his great influence was ever exercised in the interest of peace between the quarrelsome

sultāns of the Dakhan. Before he declared his in-
de dependence, Berār had been divided into the two provinces of Gāwīl and Māḥtūr, of which he re-
tained the former, but before his death he had added Māḥtūr to his dominions. He died in 1504 and was succeeded by his son ‘Alī al-Dīn, who was far inferior to him in ability and permitted himself to be drawn into quarrels, in which he had no genuine concern, and from which his kingdom suffered severely, with Māḥmūd Shāh Bahmānī I, Makhārār of Gūjārāt and Sulṭān Kūl Kūt Shāh of Golkonda. He was also engaged in disastrous warfare with Aḥmād-nagar regarding the possession of Fāṭūr, on the Godāwāri. He died in 1529 and was succeeded by his son Dāryā, a feeble ruler, during whose long reign the influence of Berār in the politics of the Dakhan was on the wane. He played a subordinate part in most of the quarrels between the other Mūhammadan sultāns and, having joined the unnatural alliance between the sultān of Bīdājrūr and the rādī of Vidjayan-
agar against Hūsain Nīgān Shāh I of Aḥmād-nagar, placed a part more credulous to his orthodox and his political acumen than to his honesty but secretly helping Hūsain Nīgān Shāh and thus preventing the establishment of an Hindū predom-
nance in southern India. For some time before his death Dāryā ‘Imād Shāh was completely in the hands of his minister, Tufāl Khān, and when he died in 1560, Tufāl Khān placed his young son, Burhān ‘Imād Shāh, on the throne but kept him a prisoner and governed Berār with hardly a pretence of subordination. Tufāl Khān was attacked by the sultāns of Bīdājrūr and Aḥmād-nagar for having declined to join the confederacy which finally crushed Vidjayanagar at the battle of Bālikota in 1565, but, though defeated and reduced to great straits, succeeded in playing off one of his enemies against the other and in bribing the sultān of Bīdājrūr to retreat. In 1572 Muḥtār Nīgān Shāh of Aḥmād-nagar again invaded Berār, on the pretext, on this occasion, of liberating Bur-
hān ‘Imād Shāh from his humiliating position. Muḥtār captured Nārānā and annexed Berār; and carried off Tufāl Khān and his son, and Burhān ‘Imād Shāh and all his family to a for-
tress in the kingdom of Aḥmād-nagar, where they all died in one night. The manner of their death is uncertain, but it was not fortuitous.

Biography: Firuṣṭa, Burhān-i Mōs-
thir; Munashfāt al-Indāb, vol. iii; Tabaḵkā-
hā, ‘Abbār; Historic Landmarks of the Deccan by Major T. W. Haig. (T. W. HAIG.)

IMĀLA (=? deflection, Inf. iv. of māla, to bend) is a phonetic phenomenon, which, according to al-Zamakhshārī, consists in the alf inclination to karr, so that the tone becomes homogeneous (liyatādjaša ‘t-sawt),… the case is that a karr or yā occurs near the alf; or that it is changed from a letter moved from karr or from a yā; or that in a certain position it becomes a yā′. It is a question of the transition from long a to or â (the imāla may be satīdī “strong” or mutawasīfî “of medium strength”) under the influence of an adjoining i sound, a kind of Umlaut, which was noticed even by the old Arab grammarians and interpreters of the Kur’ān. The inclination of the short a towards yā mentioned occasionally. As is clear from al-Zamakh-
shārī’s definition the i sound which causes the imāla needs not actually appear, it may merely exist in
IMĀM (from the Arabic amat, "to precede, to lead") originally "leader", particularly "caravan leader, any one who guides a column of camels," a synonym of ḥādī; whence also a person or thing who serves as a guide or pattern, e. g. to the pupil in the school (Lišān, xiv. 291). In the Kūrān, the word is found in the meaning of example, leader, pattern, model, or prototype (ii. 118; xv. 79; xxv. 74; xxxi. 11). Since the foundation of the Muslim community, the term has been applied to the person who indicates the ritual movements of each rakʿa to the believers assembled in rows for the canonical service (ṣalāt), which those who stand behind the imām copy. Originally the imām was the Prophet himself or in his absence some one authorised by him; after him his successors (khulafa) or their delegates filled the office. The conduct of public worship became thus one of the chief attributes of the ruler and the transference of power to the governors of the provinces was seen in a form visible to all when the Caliph's deputy placed himself at the head of the community assembled for prayer. The jurists of Islam therefore give the name imām to the chief of the Muslim community, the spiritual and secular head of the nation with success to show that the kind of imām which is due to the presence of an ī sound is common among the eastern Arabs and is relatively modern, while the other variety belongs to the Hijāz and represents an original Semitic ē sound. In answering the question as to how far the imāla spread in ancient times the Arabic names and words preserved in transcription in foreign sources are naturally of great importance.

The modern dialects also show a kind of imāla. This must, however, be interpreted differently from the literary imāla. In the Syrian dialect of Beirut, for example, it depends mainly on the surrounding consonants and only exceptionally (for example with r) does an ī sound exercise its influence. This is therefore a spontaneous transition from an a to an ā. The sounds which prevent imāla are in this case not only the emphatic and velar but also the laryngal.

There has been considerable discussion as to whether the imāla was marked in Arabic script by a final ū, a question which cannot be considered to be definitely settled, in spite of Brockelmann's answer in the affirmative in his Grammatik und Grundrisse. In Ms. there is no special sign for imāla. In edited texts however it is usual to indicate it by the figure — under the consonant.

IMĀM — İMÂN.

The Zaidis assert that the texts quoted in support of the assignment of the imām to ‘Ali do not refer to him, directly and personally but only according to his distinguishing marks as imām. They therefore say that a mistake could be made in regard to the description of the individual and that the community could legally choose two shaikhs (Abū Bakr and ‘Omar) but that ‘Ali had a greater right to the imām. The former were preferred, although the latter had the greater right. The imām has not the right to appoint his successor; among the Imāms however the imām must be known by his predecessor and be regularly designated by him. The Ghufrāt (extreme school) teach the divinity of the imām (Ibn Khaldūn, al-Muqaddimah, ed. Qustemèra, i. 355 sqq., trans. de Slane, i. 400 sqq.; see ZADĪYA).

Every masjid (q. v.) has an imām, a principal mosque (ǧīmān) may have several. The imām is sometimes an official of the town as he has also to supervise the morals and order of the people in the quarter in which his mosque is. In the Turkish empire he has also the office of making out the certificates (ṭīm u ḵabar) required for the conveyance of property, the determining of civil status etc.

To avoid any confusion in the two meanings of the word imām, the Persian call the active leader of the worship of the Prophet, “leader of prayer”, a literal translation from the Arabic āl-ṣalāhām. The founders of the four great orthodox schools of law are also called imāms and Abū Ḥanifa was even known among his scholars as al-imām al-ṣalāhām “the greatest imām”. This name has also been given to a market place near Baghdad, originally called Rusafa, where Abū Ḥanifa is buried (CL. Huart, Hist. de Bagdad, p. xiv). Finally, imām has become an honorary title of all scholars who have founded schools.


IMĀM AʾZAM, title of the Khallīf. (See KHALIFA.)

IMĀM-BĀRĀʾ A. H. (“enclosure of the Imāms”), a building in which the Muḥarram festival in India is celebrated, and the taṣ‘īyār (q. v.) are kept when they are not being carried in procession; it sometimes serves also as the mausoleum of the founder and his family; the best-known examples are those in Lucknow and Murshidabad.


IMĀM AL-MADRASM. (See AL-MUDAWAINI.)

IMĀM ŚAḤ is a saint of the Ismāʾīlī Shiʿa sect, whose tomb is venerated at Pārāna, about 10 m. S. E. of Ahmādābād [q. v.; he is said to have come from Persia and to have settled here in the middle of the 15th century, and the Mūmāns (formerly Muʾmīn) trace their conversion to him; but the majority of his followers are Hindus, who do not differ from other Hindus, except for their special devotion to Imām Śaḥ and their practice of burying the bones of their dead, after cremation, near the tomb of the saint at Pārāna. He wrote a book of religious precepts, entitled Sīhah Pāṭī, which is read by all his followers; some of the Muslim Imāmāshāhs read it in preference to the Kūrān. Some Hindus worship him as a god and in their prayers repeat the words “Imām Kēvūlah” (the Imām is the One God), but most of his followers do not consider Imām Śaḥ to have been more than a religious teacher or a saint.


IMĀM-ZADE, a Persian title for descendants of the Imāms and an abbreviated designation also for their graves. This name was also given to the Persian scholar, preacher, and poet, Abū l-Mahāsin al-Wābir, born in Surkh near Bihkārā (Schefan, Chronom. Pers., i. p. 24 of the notes).

Bibliography: Mīn. J. Dieulafy, La Perse, p. 717; A. Surī, p. 357; Flandin et Coste, Voyage en Perse, Vol. vi., Perse moderne, Pl. ix. (20 sepia); (Karwin. xix. (Sulaimānīye), xxvii. Kāshan), Ilī (Kūmishah). (CL. Huart.)

IMĀMA. (See IMĀM.)

IMĀMĪ. (See IMĀM and ʿIMĀN ASḤĀRĪYA.)

IMĀN. The basic idea in the root ‘mn is rest of mind and security from fear (Rāghib, Muṣfādāt, p. 24; Līlān, xvi, 159, 1b sqq.). In consequence the fourth stem can mean both “to render secure” and “to put one’s trust in” something or some one. Hence in theology al-imān means 1) the putting of one’s trust, the having faith, in Allāh and his prophet and his message, and 2) the content of that message. A consideration of the first of these uses divides roughly into three; cf. the discussion in al-Ghazālī’s Iḥyāʾ, Book ii. Ṭaqāʿ, iv.

I. The Kūrān sometimes distinguishes and sometimes confuses imān and ʿislām and is ambiguous as to their relationship to good works. Theological controversy followed, which is mirrored in the traditions, and the technical use of imān in fāḥ and ʿalām is, in consequence, very contradictory. A tradition, assertedly from Muḥammad, says that whoever has in his heart the weight of a grain of faith (imān) will come forth from the Fire. But what here is imān? Some say that it is simply a holding fast in the mind (ʿiqāl bil-ṣalāhāl), others added a testifying with the tongue (ṣahāda bil-lisām); others added a third element, works according to the fundamentals of the faith (ʿamāl bil-aqāʾīl). The first has been the position of most Asḥārites and Māturiddites; the second of the Ḥanāfīs and the third of the Kātīrjīdites. The Kātīrjīites held that faith was simply acceptance with the tongue (ṣāḏīk bil-ṣalāhāl), i. e. confession (īkār), the narrower sense of ʿislām; others, such as the ʿAṣhrūs, a sect of the ʿAṣhrūs, which was only knowledge (maṣīra) of Allāh gained by reason (ʾikār) and of the messages of the prophets gained by revelation. Orthodox ʿIslām has come to the conclusion, which it, as usually, states as having been the position
of the Fathers (al-salaf), that faith consists of acceptance in the mind of and firm adherence to a belief (taṣdiq, ṭīṣadād, q. v.), statement with the tongue of this acceptance (ikhrār, ḥavel) and good works. The second is Islām in the narrower sense. He who has all three will enter the Garden. But in the case of one who possesses taṣdiq and Islām and dies with a single mortal sin (kabīra) unrepented of, the Muʿātžiṭes held that he was neither a believer (muʿāmin) nor an unbeliever (kaṣif), but a ēreprobate, and that he would remain eternally in the Fire. In the last point the Ḥārāḍiṭes agreed; but they held also that all sins were mortal. Orthodox Islām applies the same name to such an one but holds that eventually he will enter the Garden; for sinful believers the Fire is Purgatory and not Hell, and good works are not of the essence of belief but are additions. At the opposite extreme were the Mūḍjīṭes, the “postponers”. Historically they arose in early Islām from the difficulty which the pious found in treating as Muslims those who professed to be Muslims but were yet notoriously evil-doers. The Ḥārāḍiṭes said roundly that such were unbelievers; the Mūḍjīṭes preferred to “postpone” decision until Allāh revealed all secrets. In the meantime, they argued, a person may claim to be a Muslim, in one form or another and to one degree or another Islām has accepted this position. All who worship towards the Kibla are to be accepted as Muslims, with no questions asked. But the later Mūḍjīṭes developed this into antinomian heresy. It is faith that saves, they taught, and evil works do not hinder the effectiveness of faith, even as obedience in good works cannot save one who is an unbeliever (Van Vloten, Irāq, in Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgen. Gesell., xlv. 161 sqq., Goldziher, Vorlesungen, index sub Murāḍašīrā). Lastly, there is the case of one who professes Islām and acts as a Muslim, that is, goes through the ritual and external observance of Islām, but has no internal faith. He is a hypocrite (mūṣafad) and an unbeliever. In this connection it is to be remembered that the formula (fa'a) and “good works” (ṣamāl fa'il) in Islām primarily and ordinarily mean obedience to the ritual law (al-ṣīḥār).

II. Does faith increase and decrease? In the Kūrān increase of faith is frequently mentioned and the Fathers (al-salaf) held that it increased with acts of obedience and decreased with acts of disobedience. By this, so later Islām taught, they meant that the mental acceptance (taṣdiq) remained and that the good works were not to be regarded as parts of it or essentially affecting it but as additions to it by which it was increased in amount. Conversely with acts of disobedience its amount diminished but itself essentially remained. So the Prophet could speak of faith to the amount of a grain, showing that its amount could vary, and al-Ghazālī shows with great psychological truth and beauty how good deeds go to nourish faith. But the question remained as a subject for verbal dialectic. Those who held that faith (imān) meant acceptance (taṣdiq) and good works (ṣamāl) taught that it increased and diminished, and those who held that faith was simply taṣdiq taught that there could be no question of quantity in it.

III. There appears to have been an early disqualification to say, “I am a believer” (una muʿāmin) without the qualification, in šā Allāh, “if it be the will of Allāh,” and still more with the addition ḥakṣen, “in verity”, or “really, or ṣinda ḥaṭā”, in the sight of Allāh. Examples are quoted in al-Ghazālī’s Iḥyāʾ, Book ii, Fasā’i iv., Muṣāla i.; cf. the commentary of the Saiyid al-Murtaḍa. Hence the Ash’ārites with the mass of Shāfiʿites, Ṣallikites and Ḥanbalites insisted on adding in šā Allāh, while the Māturidites and Ḥanafites prohibited it and permitted the addition of ḥakṣen. They urged that to say “if it be the will of Allāh” implied doubt (ḥakṣ) and doubt in such a connection meant disbelief (kufr). In reply the Ash’ārites argued that the formula was used not to imply doubt of the reality of the absolute acceptance in the mind, but a) to guard against a making of one’s self out to be pure (taṣkīyāt al-naṣīf; cf. Kur. iv., 52, lii. 33); b) out of courtesy (ta‘addub) and to gain a blessing (tabarruk) by submitting all things to the will of Allāh; c) to express a doubt as to the perfectness of the faith in question though not as to its reality or, if works are reckoned a part of faith, a doubt as to whether there will be works; and d) to express a doubt as to whether Allāh will permit the believer in question to die in the faith, for all things must be judged by their ends (khawāsīn). For the Ash’ārite side see al-Ghazālī, reference above, and for the Māturidites, al-Bāṭinī’s commentary on the ʿAḥā’id of al-Nasafi, ed. Cairo 1321, p. 127 sqq.


(D. B. MacKOLD.)

IMĀRET (A.), “building”, “edifice”, the name given in Turkey to eating-houses or hostels where schoolchildren and theological students receive their meals, which consist of bread and one or two hot dishes of mutton and vegetables. Similarly, such food along with a small present in money of 3—5 aspers a day per person, sometimes even as much as 10 aspers, is given to the poor. These institutions are maintained by pious foundations. The first of the kind was erected by Sultān Orkhan in 1336 in Nicaea (İznik) and devoted to the good of mankind; at the opening he presided in person, distributed food to the poor and was the first to light the lamps and candles. Murād II did the same thing after a feast which he had given to the “ulama” of his court in the imāret. At the end of the xviii. century the imārets of Constanti- nople fed over 30,000 people every day. There is an imāret beside each of the great imperial mosques Aya Sofya (kitchen founded in 1155 = 1742 by Maḥmūd I), Bāya zd, Fāṭih, Selimiye, Sulaimānīye, Ḥmedīye, Nūr-i ʿOlāmīne, etc. In Persia, where the word is ‘māret, it means “palace”, e. g. ʿOlām-i imāret, the “Sun-Palace” at Teherān.

Bibliography: M. d’Ohsson, Tableau de l’empire ottoman, ii. 460; Nešrī quoted in Hammer, Gesch. des Osm. Reiches, ii. 106; Ḥāfiz Husain Īransāʾi, Hadīkat al-Diwaswāni, p. 5, 14, 16, 18, 22 (= Hammer, op. cit., xviii. 1 sqq.;) Joãoann and Van Gaver, Tur- quit, p. 90, 154. (Cl. HuArt.)

IMERETIA. [See Kaukasus.]

IMOSHA. [See Tavrég.]

‘IMRĀN, the Biblical ‘Amrām, was the son of
Yishar b. Kāthīh b. Lāwī, and married Yukhābid, who bore him Mūṣā in his seventeenth year. He lived 137 years (Ibn al-Ābir, i. 119, al-Thālābī, p. 99; al-Kisā'ī, p. 201, and Ṭabarî, i. 443). This account differs from the Biblical in so far as, according to Exodus, 6, 90, Amram was son of Kehat and brother of Yishar, and reached the age of 137. 'Imrān was appointed grand vizier of Egypt and had to keep watch every night by Fir'awn's bed (al-Kisā'ī, p. 201). One night he saw a bird in Fir'awn's apartment carrying his wife upon its wings. He was at once enslaved with love for her and had intercourse with her. The bird then took her back home, without the thousand watchers outside the royal palace noticing. Next morning the astrologers announced to the king that the conception of his future enemy had just taken place and also that his star was in the ascendant and brilliant. Fir'awn ordered the midwives of Egypt to seek out and register the pregnant women from house to house. They did not however dare to examine Fir'awn's wife, as they knew that 'Imrān did not leave Fir'awn's side. Mūṣā thus escaped certain death (al-Kisā'ī, ibid.). The Talmud likewise describes Amram as the most prominent man in Egypt (Sūrā 12; Bāba B. 120; Exodus R. 1. 13). The 'Immān mentioned in the Kur'ān (Sūrā iii. 31), whose wife dedicated the fruit of her womb to Allāh, is not identical with the Biblical Amram or 'Imrān. Thālābī (p. 220) expressly mentions this, with the note that there was an interval of 1800 years between the two bearers of this name. The Kur'ān also speaks of 'Imrān b. Māhān or b. Sāḥim, whose wife Ḥanna, daughter of Fākūth, was the mother of Maryam and the grandmother of Jesus. Our 'Immān b. Māhān would thus be identical with the Jakob b. Matan of Matthew xv. (cf. MIRKAM).

Bibliography: The commentaries on the Kur'ān by Zamakhshāri, Bajdāwī, etc.; Thālābī, Kitāb al-Amliyyā; Cairo 1312, p. 91-92 and 220; al-Kisā'ī, Kitāb al-Amliyyā; p. 193-195; Ṭabarî, Annals, i. 443-444; Ibn al-Ābir, ii. 119-120; Weil, Bibl. Legenden, p. 131; Eisenberg, Moses in der aram. Legende, Cracow, 1910, p. 16. (J. EISENBERG.)

'IMRĀN b. ḤĪṬĪN AL-SADĪṢI, an Arab poet born in Baṣra, a pious man learned in the Kur'ān and Tradition, who is numbered among the second class of the Baṣra Tābi‘ūn and transmitted traditions on the authority of Ḥaḍīth and of some Companions of the Prophet, but in his old age is said to have been won over by his wife to the Khāridjīs. As he was already too infirm to serve them with the sword, he is reckoned among the ḫāda‘a (see BRÜNNOW, Die Charidchiten, p. 29). He worked for the cause of his party as a preacher, particularly as a poet, for example he celebrated 'Abd al-Ra‘mān b. Mu‘ādjam, the murderer of 'Ali, in a poem. When al-Hādījādī became governor in the ṭūr and began to persecute the Khāridjīs, he had to flee to Syria and found a hospitable welcome with Rawḥ b. Zibīb. When his stay here became known to 'Abd al-Malik, he escaped to the Džāzira to Zufar b. al-Hārīth in Kirkişiyā. There he was also soon betrayed and now went to 'Omnā, where admirers of Abū Bīlāl Mīrād b. U‘ayyār received him. When al-Hādījādī again discovered his whereabouts, he found a final refuge in Rādī Ma‘āsīn not far from Kūfā, where he died.


'IMRĀN b. ShĀHIN played a great role in the swamps (Batritī, q. v.) of the Lower Euphrates at the beginning of the Būyid rule. A native of al-Dāнима, a village between Ṣūṣīt and Baṣra, he had to go into hiding on account of a crime he had committed and henceforth led the life of a robber, for which the neighbourhood offered excellent opportunities. He then entered into an alliance with Abu 'I-Kāsim al-Bārdī (see al-Bukhārī), who found in him to most suitable man to defend the swamps against his enemies. As his robberies however made the road to Baṣra unsafe, the Būyid Mu‘izz al-Dawla was more than once forced to send troops against him, but they could do nothing in view of the nature of the country and were usually enticed to some place from which it was impossible for them to return. From sheer necessity Mu‘izz al-Dawla appointed him governor of the district, which did not however prevent 'Imrān and his robbers from occasionally renewing their activity again. Repeated attempts by Mu‘izz al-Dawla and his successor Bākhīṯyār to put an end to this state of affairs by force met with no better success. Till his death in 369 = 979 'Imrān remained master of the swamps and transmitted his power to his son Ḥusain. 'Aṣūd al-Dawla had the same experiences with him as his predecessors with his father. Ḥusain however was slain in 372 = 982–3 by his brother Abu 'I-Faradj, and the latter met the same fate in the following year at the hands of the Ḥādījī b. Muṣaffār b. 'Abbās, who had been leader of the army during his father's rule and now appointed a minor son of Ḥusain named Abu I-Ma‘ālī as ruler, but soon afterwards put himself in his place by means of a forged appointment from the Būyid Ṣāḥūn al-Dawla. Once again, in 412 = 1022, a son of 'Immān, Abu 'I-Hādījī Muḥammad, attempted to gain power but met with no success.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Ābir, ed. TOMBARG, ix.

AL-IMRĀN, MU‘IN AL-DIN AL-HINDI, born in Dihīl, studied with the 'ulama' of his native land and became a renowned scholar. He spent a large part of his life in teaching students at Dihīl. At first Mu‘īn al-Dīn much disliked the saints of the Cihāt order and especially Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad, known as Cirāg-i-Dīlī, "light of Dīlī" (d. 757 = 1356), who was his contemporary, but the latter's spiritual power and piety induced him to sit at his feet and at last to become his disciple. He was a great favourite of Muḥammad II b. Taghālāk (725-752 = 1324-1351) who sent him to Shīrāz to induce al-Kaṣī, 'Aṣūd al-Dīn al-Hātī (d. 756 = 1355) to come to Dihīl and adorn his court. Our author reported there instead of persuading the īṣī, he was himself persuaded to pass the remainder of his life there.

He is the author of the following works: 1. a commentary on 'Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad al-Naṣāfī's compendium of Muḥammadan law according to the Hanafi school Kanz al-Daḥāʾīb; 2. a commentary on Sīrāǧ al-Dīn Yūsuf b. Aḥī Bakr b. Muḥammad b. 'Abī al-Sakakā’s (d. 626 = 1229) Mīṣrāf al-
"Ulama; 3. a commentary on Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Akhšikati's (d. 644 = 1246) al-Muntakhab fi Iṣāl il-Din, on the principles of Muhammadan law according to the Hanafi school.

Bibliography: Abd al-Haqq al-Dihlawi, Aḥbar al-Abbār, p. 142; Aṣāid Bilgirmānī, Subḥat al-Mašrūfān, p. 34; Siddīq Ḥasan, Abjad al-ʿUlim, p. 892; Fakhr Muhammad, Ḥasan al-ʿAṣim, p. 304. (M. Ḥidayat Hosann, IMRūʾ al-
KAIS, an Arab poet of the vi
d century A.D., whose real name was Ḥundudj b. Ḥujjīr, belonged to the tribe of Kinā which had migrated from the Yamn. His ancestor, Ḥujjīr Aqīl al-Murūr, had founded (about 480) a principality in Najdī which declined under his successors. On account of his inclination to love affairs, particularly on account of a poem which he dedicated to his beloved Fāṭima bint al-Ubaid of the tribe of the Banū Ḫdir, IMRūʾ al-
KAIS was banished by his father Ḥujjīr. The latter is even said to have ordered his freedman Rabīʿa to murder his son but Rabīʿa instead slew a young anteelope (gawḍar) and brought its eyes to Ḥujjīr (Ibn Ḥaṣib, KIt. al-
Sha'ir, p. 48, lines 7–11). After Ḥujjīr had fallen in battle with the rebels of Banū Ḫdir, his son departs on
his kingdom began to lead a wandering life (whence his nickname al-malik al-dīlīlī, "the wandering king"). Pursued by his enemies, he fled to Samawāl, the ruler of Taimāt, who lived in the citadel of al-
Abkāt, and practised a Jewish Christian religion.

About 530 the Emperor Justinian summoned him to Constantinople with the intention of using his services against the Persians on the advice of the Ghasānīd al-
Hārith V "the Lame", the phil-
arch of the Syrian Limes. After a longish stay in the capital he was appointed governor of Pal-
estine and of the border tribes there, with the title of philarch, and on his way to take up his office he died at Angora (between 530 and 540; cf. Nöldeke, art. Mu'Allaḳaṭ in the Encycl. Brit.). According to Arab legend, he was poisoned by order of Justinian whom he had insulted by seduc-
ing his daughter, by means of a robe of honour which covered his body with sores (whence the name Dhu l-
Kurnāb, which tradition gives him), although there never was a princess corresponding to this description at the court of Justinian or of his successor Justin II.

He is said to have been the first to submit Arabic verse to fixed rules, and laid down definite laws for the rhythms. He also introduced that kind of ḩaštīda, in which the poem asks two friends to stop and weep, and thus gave new life to the ancient stock of Arabic poetry, which had so far been limited to the ṣağas. This is the form in which his verses have come down to us is not original, although Sir Charles Lyall has pointed out that the use of a rare form of the bāṣīf metre as well as the agreement between the methods followed by Imrūʾ al-
KAIS and Abd b. al-
Abrās guarantee the absolute genuineness of the poem. He was a freethinker: when he saw that fate prevented him from avenging the death of his father, he threw the three arrows with which divinations were made, at the head of the idol Dhu l-Khalasa in the town of Tabālta. His name means "the man of Kaif", although it is not certain, whether Kaif is a masculine pare-
dros of the goddess Manat, or the name of her sanctuary (Euting, Nabatātisch Inschriften aus Arabien, No. 2; Ph. Berger, Histoire de l'Écriture, p. 274 sq.; Corpus inscr. semit., ii. 198; Dussaud, Hist. des Arabes avant l'islam, p. 125; Wellhau-
sen, Rester arab. Heidentums, 2, p. 67).

One of his ḩaštīda's in preserved in the collection entitled Mu'alākātats (Lat. trans. by L. War-
er [ed. by Lette]; Engl. by Sir W. Jones, London 1782; Swedish by B. M. Bolme, Lund 1824; French by de Sacy in Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscri., Vol. i. 417; German by Nöldeke and by Gandz, see Bibliography). In the editions of the text of this collection the Mu'alākāts of Imrūʾ al-
KAIS is usually accompanied by the commentary of al-
Zawānī (first publ. by Hengstenberg, Bonn 1823; the commentary of al-
Nahšāhī has been published in extracts by Lette (Leiden 1748) and completely by E. Frenkell (Halle 1786), the commentary of al-
Tabrizī by Ch. Lyall in A Commentary on ten ancient Arabic Poems (Calkcuta 1894). The Diwān of Imrūʾ al-
KAIS was published by de Sane (Le Diwan d'Amrozkas, Paris 1837), by Ahward (The Di-
Wans of the Six Ancient Arabic Poets, London 1870, p. 115 sqq., cf. 196 sqq.), in Bombay 1913, and with the commentary of Aṣīm b. Aṣīt al-
Bātalī in Cairo 1823. A translation was given by Rücker (Amrilhās, der Dichter und König, Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1843).

Bibliography: Aghāil, viii. 62 sqq.; Ibn Ḥaṣib, Kit. al-
Sha'ir, ed. de Goeje, p. 37 sqq.; Cheikh, Poètes arabes chrétiens, p. 6–69; Ibn Abi l-
Khāṭṭīb, Dīyamara p. 29–47; Frag-
ments in the Hūmāsî of al-
Baṭṭur, photogr. ed. Leiden 1909, and ed. by Cheikh 1910, s. ind.; F. A. Müller, Imru'ul-Kasās Mu'allaqā, Halle 1869; Nöldeke in Sitzungsb., der K. Akad. in Wien, phil.-hist. Cl., Vol. 140 (1899); S. Gandz, Die Mu'allaqās des Imru’ul-Kasās, in Rev. di Studi orient., i. 595 sqq.; R. Geiger, Imru’ul-
Kasās Munsūrī-Qazīdah auf ihn, in Zeitschr. d. dtsch. morgen. Ges., lxviii. 547 sqq.; 720; Iskandar Agha, Tāzātī Nihāyat al-
que de l'École des Hautes Études, Sect. des sc. rel.; Ch. Lyall, Translations of ancient Arabian Poetry, p. 103–106; Diwans of Abd ibn al-

INĀL, AL-MALIK AL-ĂSHERAF SAIF AL-DIN AL-
AL-'ĀLṬ (so called from his first owner) AL-
LUH (after Sultan al-Malik al-
Zahrīr, Barūqī, q. v.) AL-
ADRIJ (the beardless), Sulτān of Egypt and Syria, reigned from 857–865 = 1453–1460. Purchased as a slave by Sulṭān Barūqī he entered his Mamulik corps. His son Sulṭān al-
Nāṣir Farād [q. v.] set him free and enrolled him in the corps of the Djamār [q. v.]. Under Sulṭān al-
Munṣīyad Shāhiḳ he became kāṣīṣī (a member of the body guard) and on the latter's death, amir of 10 Mam-
luk. He rose to higher offices under Sulṭān Barūqī. He first of all became aldīlahān (officer accom-
panied by a band), then second ra's nāba (deputy
chief of the watch); in 831 he was appointed governor of Gharaz. Two years later he accompanied Sultan Barsbay in the campaign against Amid (Djak Bakr) which met with little success. When the Sultan wished to place this frontier area under reliable administration, he appointed Inal governor of the almost entirely destroyed town of al-Ruhā (Edessa). Inal as well as others after him declined to accept this office, but finally the Sultan induced him to do so by granting him the fief of an amir of a 1000 (ta’kdim, q. v.) together with the salary of a governor. After two years he was summoned to Cairo, amir of a 1000 (without office, at the disposal of the Sultan) and in 840 sent as governor to Sa’d. When Sultan Casmak ascended the throne, he summoned him to Cairo in 843 and appointed him amir of a 1000 without office and in 846 Great Dawūdar. In 848 he became Atabek (commander of the army) and as such was chosen Sultan in place of Casmak’s son Ədb-ham, who was unable to hold his position after his fathers death, in a rising of the Mamluks. Although he was now 73, he was able to maintain himself on the throne by meeting the wishes of the Mamluks as far as possible and often proving a too indulgent master for them. Sultan Inal’s reign was on the whole beneficial. Although he could not curb the arrogance of the Mamluks, he succeeded in healing another wound in his kingdom. Amid great difficulties he carried through a reform of the currency. The debased silver money which his predecessors had struck was gradually withdrawn from circulation and new and improved coins issued. In foreign politics also he was fortunate. He was on the best terms with the Prince of the White Sheep, with the prince of Albitan (q. v. in southern Asia Minor), and particularly with the great conqueror of Constantinople, the Ottoman Sultan Mahmand, to whom he sent a special embassy to offer congratulations on the conquest of Constantinople. Wherever necessary he was not afraid to fight. He drove out the prince of Karaman who had taken several fortified places in Cilicia from him and forced him to make peace. He was involved in European politics by the relations which had connected Cyprus with Egypt since the reign of Barsbay. In order to deprive the corsairs who ravaged Syrian ports of a base, Barsbay had taken Cyprus in 830 and forced King Janus to recognise his suzerainty and reinstated him on the payment of a tribute. A small Egyptian garrison remained on the island. When one of his successors, John II, died in 862 = 1456, his daughter Charlotte was made queen. His natural son, James, Archbishop of Nicocia, who feared for his safety, fled to Egypt and set up there as a pretender. Both parties endeavoured to gain Inal’s recognition and after wavering a long time (the ambassador of the Grand Master of the Knights of St. John of Rhodes intervening) he decided in favour of Charlotte. But the Mamluks inclined to James and forced the Sultan to send him to Cyprus with a fleet. With its help James occupied the capital Nicocia without opposition. But when the siege of Cyprus dragged on, the Egyptian fleet returned to Egypt; its Admiral apparently having been bribed by the queen, and only left a small garrison in Cyprus with whose help James held out but was unable to deprive Charlotte of her territory (for further developments see KHORESHADAM). Inal was a mild and kindly ruler, and as far as lay in his power, his subjects were ruled justly and lightly. He died in 865 = 1460. His son Ahmad, whom he had acknowledged on his death-bed, was a far-seeing ruler who aimed at the good of the community, but he was not able to control the indiscriminate Mamluks, so that he was only able to hold the throne for four months.


INAT, a town in Ḥāḍramūt, south east of Tarim, on the wadi of the same name. The family of Shaikh Abū Bakr, the only Sa’iyid family in Ḥāḍramūt to bear arms, lives here. It has two munīs (of whom one is chief of the Banu Thanna [see ḤADRAMAWT]. In the eighties of last century there lived in ‘Inat the greatest saint of Ḥāḍramūt, Sa’iyyi Muḥsin b. Sālim, of the family of Shaikh Abū Bakr, to whom people made pilgrimages from the whole country and from more distant lands, such as the Indian Archipelago, on account of the miracles performed by him. ‘Inat is the most important Ḥawta (q. v.) in South Arabia. According to a statement in an Arabic newspaper (al-Davūsīb of Raḥīm al-awal 1299 = Feb. 8 1882), the town had 5000 inhabitants, according to van den Berg, however, only 1000. In the thirteenth century Inan, Anan, Anad in Ritter and, more recently, A’inat in Hirsch for ‘Inat are due to a false transcription.


Schlieffer.

INAYAT ALLAH KANBU, author of the Baba-i Dānīsh (q. v.) and of a universal history up to the reign of Shahjahan, entitled Turiḥā Dīlawī; he held office in Lahor under the Mughal government, but in later life retired from the world and devoted himself to prayer and the study of theology; he died in 1080 (1669), or, according to others, in 1082, at the age of 65, and his brother, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ (q. v.), who died five years after him, was buried by his side. During his life-time, he had erected an imposing octagonal building, with a dome supported by four lofty arches, for his place of burial; the tombs of the two brothers were of red sand-stone, but were destroyed by the Sikhs, who turned the building into a powder magazine; after the conquest of the Pandjak by the English, it was used first as a private residence, but is now a church.


INDIA (British). i. Ethnology. According to the census of 1911 the total population of British India was 315,156,396, of which 66,647,299 persons were returned as Musalmans. To this total the province of Bengal contributed nearly
24 million, the Pándjab nearly 11 million, the United Provinces over 6½ million, the Province of Bombay 4 million (more than 2½ million of whom were in Sínd), Madras 2½ million (953,381 of whom were found in the single district of Málabar), Káshmír nearly 2½ million, and the North-West Frontier Province over 2 million. The Muslim population is unequally distributed among the adherents of other religions in various parts of the country; the largest proportion is found in the North-West Frontier Province where there are 2,039,994 Musulmáns, or 93 per cent, out of a total population of 2,196,923; in the opposite corner of India, in Bengál, 23,980,719, or 53 per cent, are Musulmáns out of a total of 45,483,078, the proportion ranging from 13 per cent in West, to 59 per cent in North, and 68 per cent in East, Bengál; in Káshmír there are 2,398,320 Musulmáns out of a population of 3,158,126, i.e., about 76 per cent of the inhabitants of this state; in the Pándjab they form more than half the total population. In the United Provinces, one of the chief historic centres of the Mughal empire, there are only 6,658,737 Musulmáns out of a total population of 47,181,044, i.e., about 14 per cent, and in other provinces the proportion is still lower; e.g., in the Mysore state, in spite of the proselytising zeal of Hídáir ʿAlí [q.v.] and Típú Suláán [q.v.], there are only 314,494 Musulmáns, or 5 per cent, out of a population of 5,806,193. In the Haidárábád state, embracing territory that has been under Muhammadan rule since the 14th century, there are only 1,380,990 Musulmáns, or 10 per cent, out of a total of 13,374,676, chiefly Hindus; while, on the other hand, it is noticeable that the Muhammadans are relatively more numerous in North Bihár, which has been from ancient times the home of Hinduism and Brahman domination, than in South Bihár, where there are old Muhammadan centres such as Patná and Monghyr. The proportion sinks so low as 2.7 per cent in Oরíssá, though this province was under the rule of Afghán for several centuries.

Within this Muhammadan population of over 66 million there is a great ethnological diversity. One broad distinction may be drawn between the descendants of foreign Muslim immigrants on the one hand and of the indigenous converts on the other. Among the latter, the physical types that are most numerously represented are (1) the Indo-Aryan type, occupying the Pándjab, Rádpútána and Káshmír, to which belong the Rádpút and Dágí Musulmáns, (2) the Arýo-Dravidian type, found in the United Provinces and Bihár, and the Mongolo-Dravidian type, represented by the majority of the Muhammadans of Eastern Bengál. (See Census of India, 1901, Vol. I, Ethnographic Appendices, p. 50 sqq.).

Though by far the larger proportion of the indigenous Muhammadan population owes its origin to the lower Hindu castes or to outcasts, still there are few of the higher castes that have not at one time or another contributed converts to Islam. Brahmanes were forcibly converted amid the savageries of conquest, or in periods of intolerance under some settled Muhammadan government; other Brahmanes embraced Islam through the persuasion of Muslim missionaries, or to gain some social or financial advantage.

From the warrior castes Islam has received large accessions from the earliest days of its entrance into India. Rádpút Musulmáns are found in large numbers in the Pándjab and to a less extent in the United Provinces and Rádpútána; in some cases tradition ascribes the conversion of their ancestors to the influence of Muslim saints, e.g., the Rádpúts of the city of Rádpút prétend that their ancestor was converted by a saint named Ābbá ʿAli Kálandar who died there in 1324 A.D.; in other cases, the change of faith was determined by political or social motives, e.g., in northern India there are several Rádpút families, the ancestor of one branch of which is said to have become a Muhammadan, in order to save the family property from confiscation.

From the lower castes among the Hindus there has been a constant stream of accessions during the whole Muhammadan period (for details, see the publications of the Ethnographic Survey of India), as well as from the aborigines of the country who stood outside the pale of Hinduism. Definite historical evidences of these conversions form a most part wanting. In the case of the various Mongoloid or Mongolo-Dravidian tribes of Eastern Bengál, there was probably a mass-movement towards Islam on their part; adherence to the new faith raised them out of the despised condition to which the higher Hindu castes consigned them.

The Musulmáns of foreign origin are numerically fewer than the descendants of native converts, but their influence in the history of Muhammadan civilisation in India has been vastly more important; the various conquerors, Arabs, Turks, Patháns and Mugháls, brought into the country large bodies of foreign troops, whose services they rewarded by grants of land; when their power was established, their courts attracted into India military adventurers, poets, scholars and theologians, most of whom remained and settled in the country; this movement of immigration went on during the whole period of Muhammadan ascendancy and has not even ceased under British rule. One example may be taken from the 13th century, when the devastations of the Mongols had spread terror through the Muslim kingdoms of Central and Western Asia; refugees made their way into India from ʿIrāq, Khúrásán, Dálam, Turkístán, etc., and in the reign of Sultáán Balbán [q.v.] as many as 15 wards of the city of Dihlí are said to have taken their names from such refugees.

Of these foreign immigrants, the first to enter India were the Arabs who invaded Sínd under Muhammád b. Káshír in 712; the trade in spices, gems, etc., early attracted Arab merchants to the west coast of Southern India, and the Mápillas [q.v.] are descended from the Hindu women they married. Thus from the earliest period of the Muhammadan occupation to modern times there has been an immigration of Arabs into India; their numbers have been small, but their influence has been profound and wide-spread. There was a Sajjíd dynasty in Dihlí from 1413 to 1451, and one in Bengál from 1493 to 1537; a dynasty of Arab origin ruled over the kingdom of Khándésh from the 14th to the 16th century; in the second deca-de of the 18th century two Sajjíds of Bárhá for 7 years enjoyed the position of king-makers and set whomsoever they chose on the throne of Dihlí. As administrators, generals, poets, letter-writers, teachers and saints, the Sajjíds in India have played an important part in the history of Mu-
of the Mughal fleet, and a dynasty of Ḥabashi kings ruled over Bengal from 1486 to 1490; the chiefs of Ḍiaṇḍūra [q. v.] and Sačīn [q. v.] are also of Ḥabashi origin.

The largest group of foreign stock is that of the Afghāns or Paṭhāns, who are found in greatest number in the north-west, but also as far east as Bengal and as far south as the Dakhan. The terms Afghān and Paṭhān are used indifferently by the natives of India to designate this large group of the Mughal Muslim population, but it is a matter of dispute as to whether the original Afghān and Paṭhān stocks were the same, or whether a purely Indian origin must not be assigned to the Paṭhāns [cf. ĀFGANISTĀN, i. 149b]. There has been a constant stream of immigration from Afghanistān into India, from the end of the 12th century up to modern times. Most of the Mughal emperors or conquerors of India have entered the country through Afghanistān and have brought in their armies large numbers of Afghān soldiers, who received grants of land as military fiefs and settled in the country. Of the Afghān tribes found in India, the most widely distributed are the Yāzduṭs, of whom a body of 1200 accompanied Bābur in his final invasion of India, and settled in the plains of Hindustān and the Pāndjāb. Migrations on a large scale into the fertile plains of India have also taken place at various times, e. g. during the period of the Lōḍī (1451—1526) and Sūr (1540—1555) Sulṭāns of Dīhlī, the Prāṅgā and Sūr tribes from which these dynasties sprang, and their neighbours, the Nīyās, appear to have migrated almost bodily from Afghanistān into India. The great bulk of the Balāţc has similarly migrated across the border into India; there are about ten times as many of them in the whole of Balōcistān [q. v., i. 636 sq.].

2. POLITICAL HISTORY: A. Under Mughal Rule.

The introduction of ʿIṣlām into India dates from the invasion of Sind [q. v.] in 712 by Muhammad b. al-Ḵāṣm [q. v.]. This led to a permanent occupation of the valley of the Indus as far north as Multān, but the rest of India was unaffected, and it was not until the close of the 10th century that a fresh invasion began with the raids of Maḥmūd of Ghaznī [q. v.], which extended as far east as Kālindjār in Eastern Bundelkhand and as far south as Sūmāth; but the province of Lāḥār was the only part of the country permanently occupied by his troops. The conquest of the rest of India dates from the campaigns of Muhammad Ghūrī [cf. Ghūrī, p. 162-3] and his generals (1175—1203); on his return to Ghaznī he committed the charge of the military operations to Kūṯb al-Dīn Aĭb [q. v.], who became the first of the Sulţāns of Dīhlī; the conquests of his general, Muhammad b. Bakhtīyār [q. v.], extended his authority over the greater part of Bengal. When Muhammad Ghūrī died in 1206, the greater part of India north of the Vindhyā had been subjugated by his Turki officers, some of whom now became practically independent sovereigns. But the Sulţāns of Dīhlī claimed a suzerainty, which they were sometimes able to enforce, over the other Muslim states. Thirty-four sovereigns reigned in Dīhlī from 1206 to 1526; they fell into five dynasties, 1. the Slave kings, 1206—1290; 2. the Khāliṣīs, 1290—1320; 3. the Taghīās, 1320—1413; 4. the Suyīdīs, 1414—
1451, and the Lōdis, 1451—1526. During this period the Muhammadan conquests were extended further to the east and the south, in spite of frequent internal conflicts and revolutions, and the disasters caused by the invasions of Mongol hordes, at intervals from 1223 to 1305, and by the invasion of Timūr [q. v.] in 1398-1399. Outlying provinces took advantage of the weakness of the suzerain power, and a number of independent kingdoms arose which were ultimately absorbed in the Mughal empire; for an account of these see the separate articles BENGAL, DJAWANTURA, GUJĀRĀT, MĀLWA, KHANDSH, BĀHMANI DYNASTY (the five dynasties that arose on the ruins of the Bāhmanī kingdom), BARĪD SHĀH, ADIL SHĀH, NIZĀM SHĀH, KUTB SHĀH, AND IMĀD SHĀH). The invasion of Bābur [v. BABER] and his defeat of Ibrāhīm Lōdī in the battle of Panipat [q. v.] in 1526 laid the foundations of the Mughal empire, but his son, Humāyūn [q. v.], was driven from his throne for 15 years, and the Afghān Shēr Shāh [q. v.] established the Sūr dynasty, which ruled in Dīhilī from 1540 to 1555. Humāyūn regained his kingdom in 1555 but died the following year. His successor, Akbar [q. v.], was engaged in warfare during the greater part of his long reign (1556-1605) and was succeeded by his son, Jahāngīr. The most important of the Muhammadan kingdoms of Gudārāt, Bengal, Kashmir, and part of the Dīhilī [q. v.], and after breaking down the opposition of the Rājputs reconciled them to his rule by the wise policy he followed of conciliating his Hindu subjects. His son, Dja- hāngīr [q. v.] (1605—1627), and his grandson, Shāḥdājahān [q. v.] (1627—1658), kept intact the Indian dominions of Akbar, and Awrangzēb [q. v.] (1658—1707) brought the Mughal empire to its greatest extent by the conquest of the last of the independent kingdoms of the Dīhilī, Būispur [q. v.] and subjected the whole of India as far south as Tānjore to his rule; but his intolerant policy towards the Hindus alienated the Rājputs, and the last twenty years of his life were spent in a vain attempt to crush the rising power of the Mārāthās. Under his successors, the Mughal empire rapidly declined; the Mārāthās encroached upon one district after another, and during the reign of Muhammad Shāh (1710—1748) a general revolt of the provinces began, which resulted in the independence of the Dīhilī from 1723 under the Nizām of Haidarābād [q. v.], of Awadh (Oudh) under Šāfādāt Khān [q. v.] about the same period, of Bengal under Alāwārdi Khān [q. v.] in 1740, and of Kohilkhand under the Kohillass [q. v.] Further, the invasion of Nādir Shāh [q. v.] struck a blow to the centre of the empire, from which it never recovered; his successor was the throne of Persia, Ahmad Shāh Durrānī [q. v.], invaded the Pandjāb and occupied Dīhilī in 1756—1757, and though he joined with other Muhammadan forces to overthrow the Mārāthās in the third battle of Panipat [q. v.] in 1761, the ruin of the Mughal empire was complete. Shāh ʿAlam [q. v.] (1759—1806), in an endeavour to assert his authority in Bengal came in conflict with the English (1760—1761), and having fallen under the power of Shujāʿ al-Dawla, Nawwāb Ważir of Oudh [q. v.], shared his defeat in the battle of Bāskār (1764). In the following year he granted to the East India Company the Diwānī or financial administration of Bengal, Bāhilār and Orissa in consideration of an annual subsidy of 2,600,000 rupees, and under the protection of the British kept his court in Allāhābād until 1774, when he was persuaded to return to Dīhilī; after a brief period of prosperity he was blinded by one of his officers in 1788 and became a puppet in the hands of the Mārāthās, until General Lake's victory over them in 1803 set him free and left him with a nominal sovereignty over the city of Dīhilī and the surrounding district, and a monthly pension of 90,000 rupees. (For an account of the short-lived Muhammadan kingdom of Maśūr, 1761—1799, which was brought to an end by the capture of Seringapatam and the death of Tipāl Sultān [q. v.], and of the kingdom of Oudh, which was annexed by the British in 1856, see these articles.) Shāh ʿAlam's son, Muhammad Akbar (1806—1837), and his grandson, Bahādur Shāh (1837—1857), retained the empty titles of their ancestors, as pensioners of the East India Company; but Bahādur Shāh's complicity in the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 led to his banishment to Rangōon, where he died in 1862.

None of the self-governing Native States under Muhammadan rulers joined in the attempt to drive the English out of India, while the more important of these States, e.g., Haidarābād, Būispur and Rāmpūr, rendered substantial and valuable assistance, without which the condition of the English would have been still more precarious than it was. After the government was assumed by the Crown in 1858, the territories of these States were enlarged by grants of land, and other rewards for their loyalty were given to them.

Bibliography: It is not possible to give here a detailed list of the numerous works on the history of the Muhammadans in India; a bibliography of the original sources may be found in H. M. Elliot, The History of India as told by its own historians. The Muhammadan Period. Edited and continued by J. Donson. (London, 1867—1877); H. M. Elliot, Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammadan India (Calcutta, 1849); H. E. Mitre, Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office (Oxford, 1903); C. Rice, Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum (London, 1879—1895). The works of several of these historians have been published in the Bibliotheca Indica. A full bibliography is given in vol. iv. of N. Manucci, Storia di Mogor, or Mogul India, 1653—1708, translated by William Irvine (London, 1907—1908). For the bibliography of the works of Europeans who visited India during the Muhammadan period, see E. F. Osten, European Travellers in India during the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries (London, 1909). For separate dynasties and individuals, see the bibliography under the articles concerned. Among general histories, reference may be made to E. Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathān Kings of Delhi (London, 1871); A. Müller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland (Berlin, 1885—1887); Muhammad Dhaka Allah, Tūrīkh-i Hindustān (Dīhilī, 1897—1898); M. Elphinstone, History of India, 9th ed. (London, 1905); H. G. Keene, History of India (Edinburgh, 1906); S. Lane- Poole, Muhammadan Rule in India under Muhammadan Rule (London, 1903); S. J. Owen, The Fall of the Mogul Empire (London, 1913). Two volumes of the forthcoming Cambridge History of India will be devoted to

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, II.
the history of the Muhammadans. A bibliog-
raphy of works on Namismatics is given in O.
Codrington, Manual of Musliman Namismatics.
(London, 1904) and in Imperial Gazetteer of In-
dia, vol. ii. (Chap. iv.).

Under the British Crown.

(i.) Native States. Nearly two-fifths of the
total area of British India is administered by native
chiefs. Of these Native States (693 in number) a
certain number are governed by Muhammadans,
under the suzerainty and protection of the British
Crown; their rulers and their subjects are free
from the control of the laws of British India; the
rights of the chiefs as rulers within their own
territories are guaranteed by the suzerain power,
but they are not permitted to enter into political
relations with foreign nations or other States. As
a separate article is devoted to each of these
States, all that is needed here is to give an enu-
meration of them, with bare details as to the an-
nual revenue and the population in 1911. The
largest of these Muhammadan States is Haidarabâd,
area 82,698 sq.m., pop. 13,374,676, of whom about
one-tenth are Musulmân; the annual revenue is
about £1,760,000; this is the only Muhammadan
State that is in direct political relations with the
Government of India; the others communicate
either with an Agent to the Governor-General or
with one of the Provincial Governments. In the
Baloutan Agency, Kalât (area 73,278 sq.m.) has
a population of 359,086, of whom all but 13,180
are Musulmân, rev. about £51,000, and Las-
Bela (area 7,132 sq.m.), a population of 61,205,
of whom all but 1819 are Musulmân, rev. about
£15,000. In the Bombay Presidency, Khairpûr
(6,950 sq.m.), pop. 223,788, of whom 182,827 are
Musulmân, rev. about £168,000; Djinagar (3,284
sq.m.), pop. 434,222, of whom 88,130 are
Musulmân, rev. about £175,000; Palanpur (1,766
sq.m.), pop. 226,250, of whom 25,158 are Musul-
mân, rev. about £48,700; Cambay (350 sq.m.),
pop. 72,656, of whom 9,715 are Musulmân, rev.
about £37,000; Dijnjira (324 sq.m.), pop. 88,747,
of whom 14,769 are Musulmân, rev. about £40,000;
Râddhanpur (1,150 sq.m.), pop. 65,567, of whom
8,320 are Musulmân, rev. about £26,000; Bal-
sinor (189 sq.m.), pop. 40,563, of whom 4,578 are
Musulmân, rev. about £8,333; Saôin (42 sq.m.),
pop. 18,903, of whom 2,278 are Musulmân, rev.
about £20,000; Savanur (70 sq.m.), pop. 17,909, of
whom 5,448 are Musulmân, rev. £6,666; three small
States pay tribute to the Maharâjâd Gaikwar of Baroda.
- Dabha (12 sq.m., rev. £266), Panadra (11 sq.m.,
rev. £1,000), and Ramas (6 sq.m., rev.
£200); these three chiefs are descended from a Râdd-
pûr, named Harinsinhdi who was in the service of
Mahmîd Bègâra, Sultan of Gujdarât, and became a
Musulmân in 1483. In the Central India Agency,
Bhopal (6,902 sq.m.), pop. 730,383, of whom only
81,996 are Musulmân, rev. about £200,000;
Djora (568 sq.m.), pop. 75,951, of whom 13,686
are Musulmân, rev. £60,000; Bani (122 sq.m.,
pop. 20,121, of whom 2,349 are Musulmân, rev.
£6,666: among the 153 minor states connected
with this Agency there are a few whose rulers
are Muhammadans, e. g. Korwai (111 sq.m.), pop.
18,456, of whom 2,309 are Musulmân, rev. about
£2,500; Basoda (40 sq.m.), which is nominally
subordinate to the Maharâjâd of Gwalior, but pays
him no tribute, pop. 4,650, of whom 737 are
Musulmân, rev. £1,266; Muhammadgâr (29 sq.m.,
pop. 2,863, of whom 422 are Musulmân, rev.
£266; Pathari (22 sq.m.), pop. 3,866, of whom
390 are Musulmân, rev. £600, and a few still
smaller ones. In the Madras Presidency, Bangana-
palle (255 sq.m.) is the only Native State with a
Muhammadan ruler, pop. 39,355, of whom only
8,054 are Musulmân, rev. £6,400. In the Pandjab,
Bahâwalpûr (15,918 sq.m.), pop. 780,641, of whom
654,447 are Musulmân, rev. £182,000; Mâier-
kot (167 sq.m.), pop. 71,448, of whom 53,942
are Musulmân, rev. £24,000; Lohâru (222 sq.m.,
pop. 18,597), of whom 2,401 are Musulmân, rev.
£4,400; Patawdi (52 sq.m.), pop. 19,543, of whom
3,338 are Musulmân, rev. £5,100. In the Râjdûtan
Agency, Tûnk (2,600 sq.m.), pop. 303,181, of whom
40,432 are Musulmân, rev. £8,900, is the only State with a Muhammadan
ruler. In the United Provinces, the only Muham-
madan State is Râmpûr (892 sq.m.), pop. 531,217,
of whom 244,604 are Musulmân, rev. about
£240,000.

(ii.) British India. After the suppression of the Sepoy Mutiny, the Musulmân (especially in Northern India) found themselves exposed to grave suspicions on the part of the British government. Though large numbers of Hindus had taken part in this insurrection, the ostensible aim of it had been the restoration of the Mughal Empire and had consequently enlisted the sympathies of many Muhammadans. The estates of those who were convicted of complicity with mutineers were confiscated, and thus a number of families of the old Muhammadan aristocracy were ruined. The members of these aristocratic families for the most part held aloof from the service of the British government and sullenly watched the Hindus crowd into those numerous administrative and judicial posts which the Muhammadan aristocracy were by tradition and training peculiarly fitted to fill. Saidit Ahmad Khan [q. v.], himself of the Dihi family, whose maternal grandfather had been wazir to the Mughal emperor, Akbar Shah II, laid upon himself the task of reconciling his co-religionists to British rule. He first combatted the opinion held by some British officials that the Muhammadans had taken a predominant part in the Mutiny, in his treatise, "Kisâlah-î-khaire-kiwâlî Musul-
mânân (An Account of the loyal Mahomedans of
India)" (Urdû and English, Meerut, 1860), in which he enumerated the various instances of distinguished devotion to the English on the part of Muhammadan soldiers, officials, and others. At the same time he sought to reconcile his co-religionists to the rule of a Christian power, by refuting the intolerant opinions of those fanaticos who condemned all social intercourse and friendship with non-Muslims; in this connection he published a pamphlet entitled Akhâm-i-fâsîm-i-
akh-i-kiwâlî (Bânâras, 1868), the purpose of which
was to prove by means of quotations from the
Kurânh, the Hadîth, and the works of theologians
and jurists, that it was lawful for Muhammadans to
eat with Christians and to mix in familiar
social intercourse with them. Muhammadan opinion
at this period was much exercised as to the
question whether India under British rule was
to be regarded as Dâr al-ârâr or as Dâr al-Isâlm
and whether a jihâd against the Christian rulers
was obligatory on the Musulmân. A considerable
literature was published on this subject and even the 'Ulama' of Mecca were asked to deliver a Fatwa. (v. W. W. Hunter, *The Indian Muslims* (London, 1871); Syed Ahmed Khan, *Review on Dr. Hunter's Indian Muslims* (Benares, 1872)). The opinion began to prevail that inasmuch as the British Government left the Muhammadans free to practise the observances of the faith and made no attempt to restrict their religious freedom, they might live under its rule as loyal subjects. But their power and wealth had been steadily declining under British rule, largely through their failure to adjust themselves to the changed conditions of administration. Up to the early part of the nineteenth century they had enjoyed the greater part of state patronage, as collectors of revenue, military and police officers, and judges, but as the old order changed, these posts came to be filled by English and Hindu officials; when in 1837 Persian ceased to be the official language, and English or the provincial vernaculars took its place, a considerable number of subordinate offices passed out of the hands of the Muhammadans, and the abolition of the posts of Kadi and Kadi al-Kifaiya closed to a large number of learned men what had previously been an honourable means of livelihood. (Act xii. of 1856 gave power to the Provincial Governments to appoint a Kadi in any particular locality if the Muhammadans of the place so desired). Though the more far-sighted members of the community recognised that the altered conditions of the country called for a change in the methods of Muhammadan education and urged their co-religionists to study western sciences and learn English, their efforts for some time remained fruitless and met with much opposition.

In 1877 Saiyid Amir 'Ali founded in Calcutta the National Muhammadan Association, which was afterwards, when branches had been started in other cities of India, styled the Central National Muhammadan Association; in 1882 this Association endeavoured to establish a national conference of Muhammadans, but the project fell through on account of the strong opposition of Saiyid Ahmad Khan. In 1885 the first meeting of the Indian National Congress was held in Bombay; this is a deliberative assembly, composed of delegates from all parts of India, which meets once a year to discuss questions of politics and administration. While the third meeting was being held in Madras, Saiyid Ahmad Khan delivered in Lucknow on the 28th December, 1887, the first of a series of political lectures with the object of inducing the Muhammadans to hold aloof from the National Congress and similar political movements. He also endeavoured to organise the Muhammadan opposition by the formation of a society entitled "The United Indian Patriotic Association", to which more than fifty Andjumans in various parts of the country became affiliated; but its activity was short-lived, mainly through lack of funds to continue its propaganda. (Pamphlets issued by the United Indian Patriotic Association, No. 2. *Showing the Seditions Character of the Indian National Congress and the opinions held by eminent natives of India who are opposed to the movement* (Allahabad, 1885)). But though its efforts were successful in persuading the main body of its co-religionists to refuse their support to the National Congress, each yearly gathering continued to be attended by a small number of Muhammadans, especially from the cities of Bombay, Calcutta and Lucknow, and on two occasions the deliberations of the Congress were presided over by a Muhammadan, — the third (Madras, 1887) by the Hon. Mr. Badruddin Tajfylldji, (afterwards Judge of the High Court), belonging to a cultivated family of Bohar in Bombay, and the twelfth (Calcutta, 1896) by Rahmat Allah Muhammad Sayarafi; the latter in his presidential address enumerated and discussed the objections of the Muhammadans to joining the Indian National Congress; they were mainly that the success of the aims of the Congress would imply that a preponderating share in the administration of the country would pass into the hands of Hindus and that the Muhammadans would be reduced to an inferior position; that the movement was disloyal to the British Government; that western methods of government, and especially of selecting officers for administrative appointments on the basis of educational qualifications, etc., were not suited to India and would be detrimental to the Muhammadans, as owing to their backwardness in education they could not readily adapt themselves to such methods. (Report of the Twelfth Indian National Congress, p. 16 seqq. (Calcutta, 1897); Sir Saiyid Ahmad Khan: *The Presid., State of Indian Polity* (Allahabad, 1888)). The main body of the Muhammadans continued to hold aloof from the Indian National Congress, and from 1886 held on the same dates a separate gathering of their own, entitled the Muhammadan Educational Conference (v. § 3). But after the powerful personality of Sir Saiyid Ahmad Khan was withdrawn, some of the younger generation came to the conclusion that Muhammadan interests suffered in consequence of their abstention from political life and they founded an organisation entitled the All-India Muslim League, the first meeting of which was held at Dacca in December 1906. In October of the same year a deputation of influential Muhammadans had presented a memorial to the then Viceroy, Lord Minto, and urged that special consideration should be given to the Muhammadans in the proposed enlargement of the Legislative Councils and in the bestowal of posts in the higher branches of the Public Services. This deputation gave the impulse to the formation of the All-India Muslim League, which rapidly extended its organisation by the establishment of Provincial Leagues affiliated to the central body, and holds a general meeting every year in some city with a large Muhammadan population.

In 1907 Nuwab Imam al-Mulk Saiyid Husain Bilgrami (formerly Director of Public Instruction in the Haidarabad State) was made a member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, and was the first Indian to become a member of that body. In 1909 Saiyid Amir 'Ali (formerly a judge of the High Court, Calcutta) was appointed by the King a Privy Councillor, and as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council sits in the final court of appeal for Indian cases. In 1910 Saiyid Ali Imam was made Legal Member of the Council of the Governor-General of India, being the second Indian to hold such high office. These appointments were made in pursuance of a policy of associating Indians more closely with the direction of affairs of state, a policy which led to the passing of the Indian Councils Act in 1909. This Act and the regula-
tions and rules under it increased the size of the legislative councils, and arranged for the inclusion of elected members instead of all the members being nominated as before, and gave to these councils greater liberty of discussion and initiation than they had before enjoyed. While in the Governor-General's legislative councils an official majority is maintained, in all the other (i.e. the provincial) legislative councils, there must be a non-official majority. The Muhammadans claimed to be represented as a separate community, and special regulations were framed for securing the election of Muhammadan members, in accordance with the relative importance and numerical strength of the Muhammadans in different provinces. Much dissatisfaction however was expressed in regard to the regulations for the Muhammadan electors, and the Muhammadans felt that due consideration had not been paid to their claim. The declining fortunes of such independent Muhammadan States as Morocco, Persia and Turkey excited much sympathy in India, and this excitement of feeling was intensified by the successive disasters of the Turks in their wars with Italy and the Balkan States. It was believed that the Christian powers of Europe had banded themselves together to destroy Islam, and the British Government was blamed for not intervening to save Turkey from its enemies. This bitterness of feeling was intensified by the refusal of the Government of India in 1910 to confirm the charter of affiliation to the proposed Muslim University in Aligarh (q. v.), and by the re-adjustment of the boundaries of the province of Bengal, whereby the large Muhammadan population of Eastern Bengal became again a minority in respect to the Hindus of Bengal, and lost that opportunity of self-development which had been opened to them in 1905 by the formation of the separate province of Eastern Bengal and Assam. The most recent tendency in the political life of the Indian Muhammadans is the abandonment by some of the younger generation of the separatist policy of the older school, and co-operation with the Hindus in political activities; and a Muhammadan, Nawab Sayid Muhammad, was elected as President of the National Congress in 1913. The outbreak of war between Great Britain and Turkey in 1914 evoked a fervid expression of loyalty towards the British Government, in which the Musulmān princes, the Andjumans and other organised bodies, and the leaders of Muhammadan public opinion, all joined.

Bibliography: Materials for the history of this period are chiefly to be found in periodical literature, but many general works on India make special reference to the Muhammadans, e.g. Alīf Husain Hāli, Hāyāt-i Dīghād (Kānpū, 1901); W. G. Hunter, The Indian Musalmans (London, 1871); Ameer Ali, A Cbrief from the Indian Mahomedans in The Nineteenth Century, xii. 193 sqq. (London, 1882); Sir Richard Temple, India in 1880 (London, 1881); Sir Alfred C. Lyall, Asiatic Studies, First Series, chap. ix. (London, 1907); W. S. Blunt, India under Rīpōn (London, 1909); Sir John Strachey, India, chap. xvii., xxii. (3rd ed. London, 1903); E. Pirou, L'Inde contemporaine et le mouvement national, chap. v. (Paris, 1905); Valentine Chirol, Indian Unrest, chap. ix. (London, 1910); Sir Banifylde Fuller, Studies of Indian Life and Sentiment, chap. vii. (London, 1910); J. Chall-


3. Social organisation.

The official method adopted under Muhammadan rule for establishing a scale of social precedence was the granting of a mansāb (rank, post), which varied according to the number of men the manṣabādī was supposed to be placed in command of. Though primarily used of the military service, mansāb was not a term confined to this reference; all persons in the employment of the government above the position of a common soldier or messenger, whatever the nature of his duties, civil or military, obtained a mansāb. Some of the manṣabādās were paid in cash, but the commonest method of payment was by the assignment of the land revenue of a certain number of villages or a tract of country. In the case of persons, who were not in the active service of the state, a subsistence allowance was made either in the form of a cash payment (waspāl) or a grant of land (mulk or madad-i maʻāṣ); such grants were made to students, men distinguished for learning or piety, etc. By theory these appointments and grants were personal or for life only (for Ḍinā Il-Din Khālid's arbitrary resumption of all such grants, see Barani, Ta'rīḫ-i Firāz-Shāhī, p. 283), but there was a tendency for them to become hereditary, and thus the original scheme of a graded scale of payment and official rank, dependent entirely on the good-will of the sovereign, broke down, partly on account of the unworkable character of the institution and partly in consequence of a lack of continuity in the administration. (See Aḥnā Akbarī (Bluchmann, i. 236 sq., 268 sq.); Paul Horn, Das Heer- und Kriegswesen der Grossmoguls (Leiden, 1894), p. 11 sq.; W. Irvin, The Army of the Indian Moghuls (London, 1903), p. 3 sq.). A more popular classification of the various sections of Muhammadan society would appear to have owed its origin to the influence of the social system of the Hindus. Just as Hindu tradition gives the number of the higher castes as four, so the Aṣhafrā (or, noble) sections of Muslim society fall into four classes, (1) Sayid, (2) Shahīk, (3) Mughal, (4) Pathān. (1) The Sayīds claim descent from Ḍinā, either through Fīṭimī (the Fīṭimī Sayīds) or through some other of his wives (the Ulwi Sayīds). The Fīṭimī Sayīds have various designations according to the names of the twelve Imāms, e. g. Ḍanā, Ḍusinā, Dja-fa, Mūsāwi, Razawī, etc.; or according to the birth-place of the ancestor who first came into India, e. g. Bakhshī, Gīlānī, Kirmānī, Gordova, etc. The Sayīds in India tend to arrogate to themselves the position of an aristocracy in the Muhammadan community, but economic conditions compel them to follow all kinds of calling and many of them are employed in humble occupations or gain a scanty livelihood as agriculturists. The well-to-do and educated Sayīds carefully preserve their genealogical trees and as a rule intermarry only with Sayīds or even with Sayīds of their own group. But many persons arrogate to themselves the appellation Sayīd, who have no rightful claim
to this honourable title. Akbar is said to have allowed some converted Brahmanas to call themselves Saiyids. A well-known proverb, current throughout northern India, represents a successful man as saying, "Last year I was a vaevar; this year I am a Shaiikh; next year, if prices rise, I shall be a Saiyid." According to popular superstition, fire cannot harm a true Saiyid, and Saiyid Mahmmud of Bahrna (one of Akbar's generals) is said to have successfully submitted to this test by standing for an hour unharmed in the midst of a fire (Blochmann, A'm-i Akbari, p. 390). (For a modern example of this test being applied, see J. C. Oman, The Brahmanas, Tholits and Musalmans of India (London, 1907), p. 323 sq.) (2) Shaiikh is an honorific which is considered properly to belong to persons who can trace their descent from some member of the tribe of the Kuraish. The Shaiikhs are further designated Shaid Uzbek, if claiming descent from Abu Bakr, Fara'id, if from Umar, 'Abd-b, if from 'Abdゥ b. Abd-al-Mutta'id, etc. But Shaiikh is an honorific commonly assumed by Hindu converts, especially from among the lower classes, and as many as 28½ millions (i.e. nearly half the total Muhammad population of India) returned themselves in the Census of 1901 as being Shaiikhs. It is of course quite impossible that more than a very small minority of these persons could have had any rightful claim to be of Arab origin. (3) The so-called Maghals in India claim descent from some ancestor who came into the country with the invading army of Bâbur or was attracted thither during the reign of one of his descendants, but in cases where this claim can be made out, the family is generally found to be of Turk origin. (N. Elias, The Tarikh-i-Rashidi, Introduction, pp. 88—90, 128). These persons add Beg after their names, as an honorific. As the number of persons, who style themselves Maghal, is small compared with either Shaiikhs or Pathans, the number of Muhammadans descended from Hindu converts who lay claim to Maghal descent is not very large, but there is a tendency (especially in the Pandjab) for men of low social standing to assume Maghal as a caste designation. In the Hazara District the working of the Pandjab Land Alienation Act (which was introduced in 1904 in the interests of petty landowners and agriculturists, to arrest the transfer of land to money-lenders) has given a great stimulus to this tendency, as increased prosperity prompts the wish to attain to a more dignified status. (H. D. Watson, Gazetteer of the Hazara District, p. 34. (London, 1908)). (4) Similarly, tribes of undoubted Hindu origin, and even Saiyids and Maghals, will assume the name of Pathan. Tribes dwelling on the border of Afghanistan and exposed to the raids of their turbulent neighbours are said to have invented histories of their Afghan origin, as a protection against ill-treatment; or in cases where this motive was absent but the Pathans were the dominant race, it is common to find men of quite different stock, adopting Pathan as a caste-name; this is especially noticeable in the case of Hindu converts of Râdhpuri origin, who call themselves Pathan and even assume the title of Khan; thus we find a large and influential clan bearing the mongrel name of Lâli Khân Pathân, which claims descent from Lâli Singh, a favourite of the Emperor Akbar, who was given the title of Lâli Khân; his son was the first member of the family to embrace Islam. In Orissa, Pathân is used as a generic name for all Muhammadans, just as Turk is the synonym for Musulmân in some of the eastern districts of the Pandjab.

Such Muhammadans as cannot lay claim to belong to the Agh ráf are styled Aqijid and include the converts of low social status, especially those whose occupation causes them to be formed into functional groups, e.g. the weavers (Djulâbâ, a widespread Muhammad caste), cotton-carders, barbers, tailors, butchers, etc. These castes being descended from converts from Hindustan retain many customs with regard to marriage corresponding to those of the Hindu castes to which they formerly belonged; they also preserve the system of caste government, known as the pandjâyat, which deals with breaches of the social custom of the caste in respect of trade, religion or morality, and imposes fines and other punishments. (Fuzli Rubbee, The Origin of the Musalmans of Bengal, (Calcutta, 1895), chap. iv. v; Census of India, 1901, vol. vi. 439 et seq.; vol. xvi. 244 et seq.).

The spread of western education led to the formation of societies, which introduced into India a form of social organisation previously unknown to the Indian Musalmans. These societies or Anjuman give to energetic and enterprising men an opportunity of coming forward as leaders of the community, irrespective of their position in the old order of society, and each Anjuman tends to become a centre of social activity, and thus to introduce into the community a new principle of social organisation. The aims of these Anjumans are various, educational, social, political, religious. One of the earliest of them was probably the Muhammadan Literary Society founded in Calcutta by Nawâw 'Abd-ul-Latif in 1863. Later in the same year Saiyid 'Ahad Khân founded the Scientific Society of Ghâzîpur (transferred in the following year to 'Aligarh), with the object of translating scientific and historical works from English into Urdu; a press was established in 'Aligarh and a series of translations printed there, but the activities of this Society ceased when the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College was founded in 1875. In order to impress upon the Muhammadans the importance of higher education, Saiyid 'Ahad Khân in 1886 originated the Muhammadan Educational Congress (after the second meeting, styled Conference, and finally, the All-India Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Educational Conference), a yearly gathering held in various cities, chiefly in Northern India; provincial educational conferences were organised later as well as educational associations in several towns. This Conference made its appeal chiefly to such Muhammadans as were interested in the promotion and spread of western learning among their co-religionists, but the Nadwat al-Usâm, established in 1895, was founded with the object of conserving the older learning, in Arabic and Persian, with such modifications and additions as were demanded by modern conditions; it conducts a school in Lucknow, the aim of which is primarily to train religious teachers. The Moslem Institute of Calcutta, started in 1903, is a literary society of the same type as those found in other cities, e.g. the Madras Muhammadan Literary Society etc. Some Anjumans combine educational work with other activities, e.g. the Anjuman Hímâyât-î Isám of Lâhôr has among its objects the refutation of objections brought
against Islam by its opponents, the spread of religious education, the care of orphans, the suste-
nation of preachers etc.; it accordingly has founded a number of schools and a college affiliated to
the University of the Pandjâb, established orphan-
gages, and by preaching and other means promotes
the defence and the propagation of Islam. In most of
the capital cities of India, there is a central body
formed to promote Muhammadan interests
generally throughout the province,—in Bombay,
Lâhore, Nâgpur and Patna called Andjuman-i Is-
lâmiya, in Madras Andjumani-i Islam, in Calcutta
the Central National Muhammadan Association,
in Dacca the Islam Association of Eastern Bengal.
In addition to these societies having an extensive
sphere of operations, there is hardly a town in
India, with any considerable Muhammadan popu-
lation, that has not got its own local Andjumani,
but these Andjumans are too numerous for a list
to be given here; many of them are short-lived and
depend for their continuance in existence to
the zeal of some one individual, and perish with
him. In recent years, especially in Northern India,
in consequence of the attacks made upon Islam by
the Arya Samâdis, societies have been formed of
an apologetic and propagandist character, e.g.
Andjuman Hâmî Islâm (Âdîmî), Andjuman Ta-
bligh-i Islam (Haiderâbâd), Madrasa Ilâhîyat (Cawnpore),
Andjuman Hidayat al-Islâm (Dihîl) etc. The
latest type of Muhammadan society to make its
appearance is the political, in the form of the
All-India Muslim League (v. § 2).

4. LAW AND ADMINISTRATION.

The system of law most widely accepted among
the Sunnis of India was that of the Hâfiz school,
but that of the Shâfi'i school also found adherents
and is accepted by a small number of Muhammadans
in the provinces of Bombay and Madras and the Pandjâb to the present day. The Shâfa'is,
wherever possible, have put into force the precepts
of their own law-books and the decision of their Muqta'ahids. But even under Muhammadan rule,
the extent to which Muslim law was followed,
varied from time to time in different parts of the
country. In towns and cities where the learned
could make their influence felt and could uphold
a standard of orthodoxy, the prescriptions of the
sharî'ah could be more completely enforced; in
country districts, however, among the converts
from Hinduism earlier institutions survived, in
spite of their being in direct contradiction to the
ordinances of the written law. Justice was admin-
istered by Kâdis, with the assistance of Muftis
as exponents of the laws of Islam, which by
theory were independent of the state; but the
real power remained in the hands of the sovereign
and his officials, who did not hesitate to intervene
when, and to whatever extent, they thought fit.
Barani [q. v.] gives an account of an interview
(about 1500 A. D.) between Alâ al-Dîn Khâljî and
Kâdî Muqtabî al-Dîn in which the latter
points out the many ways in which his sovereign's
methods of administration ran counter to the laws
of Islam, but the Sultan states that his policy is
to consult for the good of the kingdom and the
requirements of the situation, without considering
whether the orders he gives are in accordance
with the sharî'ah or not. (Tur'îkh-i Fîrûchosâhi, p. 296
init.; Elliot-Dowson, iii. 188). Even the orthodox
Awrangzâb could interfere with the legal decision
of a Kâdi, when it did not fall in with his wishes
(Ashâm-i 'Alâmgarî: v. Jadunath Sarkar, Anecdotes of
Awrangzâb, pp. 141-2). The Kâdi dealt with all cases
of dispute between Hindus and Muhammadans,
and the penal ordinances of the Muslim law were
applied to all criminal cases and offences against
the state. But the Hindus were left to settle their
internal disputes in accordance with their own
laws or customs. When in 1765 the grant of the
diwâni of Bengal, Bihâr and Orissa was made to
the East India Company, Muhammadan law con-
tinued to be administered, as before, by Muhammadan judges, but in 1772 English judges
were appointed to administer it together with
the help of Muftis acting as expert advisers to
the courts; similarly Pandits sat as assessors to
advise in cases tried according to Hindu law. But
from time to time the Muhammadan criminal
law was modified by the Company's Regulations
and the milder provisions of English law substi-
tuted, but the Muhammadan element did not en-
tirely disappear until 1862, when the Penal Code
and the first Code of Criminal Procedure came
into force; in course of time also the laws relating
to revenue, land tenures, procedure and evidence
have been replaced by the enactments of the
English legislature. But questions relating to family
relations and status (e.g. marriage, divorce, main-
tenance and guardianship of minors, succession
and inheritance), religious usages and institutions,
and dispositions of property by gift, will and
waff [q. v.], are still governed by the Muhammadan
law, provided that the Muhammadans them-
selves wish it to be applied; for in certain parts
of India, it has been superseded in many respects
or considerably modified by customs adopted from
earlier Hindu times, and sanctioned by the legis-
lature and the courts; thus custom takes precedence
of Muhammadan law in the Pandjâb, Oudh, the
Central Provinces, the Bombay Presidency, and
among the Marâthas. In the Pandjâb, for example, in
some districts a widow is not entitled to a share in the property of a deceased
husband, but merely to maintenance; following the Hindu practice of adoption, a sonless
proponent may appoint a kinsman whom he regards as heir to contrast with the
Muhammadan law of gifts (hiba), ancestral immovable property is ordinarily inalienable, except with the consent of
caste of males, or, in the case of a sonless
proponent, of his male collaterals. The Memans
[q. v.] of Kaik, who are descended from Hindu
converts chiefly of the Lohâna caste, are still
governed by Hindu law in questions of inherit-
ance, though a large section of the community wish in future to follow the Sunni
law of the Hâfiz school to which they belong. Similarly, the Sunni Bôhôras [q. v.]
of northern Gujarat follow Hindu law in matters of inheritance
and succession. The Khodjas [q. v.] in the Bombay
Presidency follow Hindu custom in refusing to
females any share in their father's estate, and
generally appeal to Hindu law or custom in regard
to all questions of inheritance and succession;
the right of divorce is limited by the necessity of
obtaining the consent of the djamat (or assembly
of the community) according to the custom of the
sect. The Mappilas [q. v.] in North Malabar
follow the Marumakkattâyam (i.e. descent through
sister's children) system of inheritance, according
to which property descends through the female
line and sons have no claim to a share of their father's property or to maintenance therefrom; they ordinarily follow the custom of holding family property undivided, as the joint property of all the descendants of a common ancestress, in the female line only, each member of the joint family being entitled to maintenance from the property so held; but some Mappillas, while following the Marumakkattāyam system in reference to the joint family property, are governed by Muhammadan law in regard to the self-acquisition of individual members of the family.


**Administration.**

The early Muhammadan conquest of India was more of the nature of a military occupation than an actual appropriation of the whole of the country. The invaders were comparatively few in number, and were constantly engaged in fighting in order to make their position secure; they were content to receive tribute from the Hindu princes who submitted to the new rule, without interfering in the internal government of their dominions; in the parts of the country under the more immediate rule of the conquerors, the native revenue officers were not displaced and collected the revenue much as before. But as Muhammadan power became consolidated and more Muhammadans settled in the country, the internal management of the provinces came to be taken under the direct control of the imperial power, and the Hindu Rājputs became the revenue officials, and both the Rājputs and their former nobles sank to the position of landlords paying revenue to the government. At the same time there was a tendency for the government to enhance the amount of its demand; according to Hindu law the proper share of the king was one-sixth of the produce of the soil, but under Muhammadan rule attempts were made to exact more, and 'Aila al-Dīn (1296–1316) at one time claimed as much as a half. The chief source of revenue was this share in the produce of the soil, supplemented by the dījya [q.v.], which in India was a poll-tax paid by the Hindus; but the latter tax was irrevocably levied, and was abolished by Akbar, while Aurangzeb's attempt to re-impose it brought about a rebellion; a number of petty cessees were also imposed, often of a very oppressive character (Elliott-Dowson, iii. 182, 377). According to the Muhammadan system all land assessed for revenue was divided into the kālīya lands paying revenue direct to the royal treasury, and the dījgir lands, the revenue of which was assigned to individuals, e.g. ministers, courtiers, and especially military commanders, who took the revenues for their own support or that of a military force which they were bound to maintain. The dījgir was originally only a life-grant and reverted to the State on the death of the grantee, and the dījgirdār was not allowed to take more than the sum assigned to him, according to the terms of his sanad, and if more came into his hands, he had to account for the surplus to the State treasury. But such dījgirdārs tended to become hereditary, especially when the central government was weak, and the granting of a new sanad to the incoming heir became a matter of form, or no fresh sanad was granted at all and the dījgirdār came to be looked upon as a proprietor of the land and could do much as he pleased. Attempts were made at times to reduce the system of land tenure and assessment to order, the most successful being that connected with the name of Akbar [q.v.], who entrusted his finance minister, Tūdar Mall, with the task of re-organising the revenue system; the object of the new system was to substitute a money-revenue at a fixed rate for a revenue in kind varying with the crop. A fixed standard of mensuration, the bigha [q.v.], was adopted, the land was surveyed, and the average yield was computed by ascertaining the actual produce for a number of years; the share of the government was fixed as one-third of the average produce, payable in money (unless the cultivator choose to continue to pay in kind). Tūdar Mall commenced the survey in 1571, but the new assessment was never successfully extended to all parts of the empire, and considerable changes were introduced by later rulers; but Akbar's land-revenue system is the basis of that found in India at the present day. Akbar further organised the administration by dividing his empire into 15 sāhās or provinces, subdivided into sarkārs and these again into parganahs; this arrangement secured a centralisation of government and with some slight changes lasted throughout the period of Muhammadan rule.


### 5. Religion.

**a. Sects.** The majority of the Indian Muslims are Sunnis [q.v.], and owing to the high level of theological learning maintained by the 'ulamā' for centuries and the close relations kept up with centres of religious life and thought in other parts of the Muslim world, there has always been a large body of orthodox opinion and practice among the Indian Sunnis, and these have not differed materially from similar manifestations in other Muslim lands. The Shi'ahs [q.v.] have always been in a numerical minority in India; under the rule of the Shi'ah sultāns of Bidjāpur [q.v.] and Golconda [q.v.], and later under that of the Kings of Oudh [q.v.], the Nawabs of Murshidabad
Mu'in al-Din Cīṣṭī, who was born in Sīstan but came to India and settled in Ajmīr, where he died in 1236 [s. Āṣīrī]; his tomb attracts to Ajmīr thousands of pilgrims every year and is venerated by Hindus and Muslims alike (Journal of Indian Art, vol. iii. p. 8). He counts among his successors some of the most famous saints in India: Khwāja Kūṭb al-Dīn Bahākhīyār Kākī, who was born in Farghāna, but after a wandering life spent in visiting various eminent saints, passed his last years in intimate friendship with Mu'in al-Din Cīṣṭī and died in the same year as his spiritual teacher and friend; he is buried near the Kūṭb Minar at Dīlī; — Shāhīk Farīd al-Dīn Shākargāndī (ob. 1265), whose tomb is at Pākpattān, where an enormous fair is held every year, and the object of every pilgrim, whether Hindu or Muhammadan, is to get through the narrow gate of the shrine on the afternoon or night of the 5th Muhārram (M. A. Macauliffe, The Sikh Religion, vi. 359 sqq.); — he had two illustrious disciples, one Kūṭb-ī Abdāl Shāhīk ʿAlī b. Aḥmad Sābir (ob. 1291), whose tomb is near Surkhi (his followers are known as Śāhir Čīṣṭīs), and the other, more famous, Nīzām al-Dīn Awlīyāʾ (his real name was Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Dānīyāl al-Būkhrānī), (born at Bādāʾ in 1238), who was nominated by Farīd al-Dīn as his īlṣāfī, or successor, when he was only 20 years old, and died in 1295; some of the most distinguished of his contemporaries were numbered among his spiritual pupils, including the poets, Āmir Khurān and Āmir Ḥasan Dihlawī, the historian, Dīwān al-Dīn Bānārī, and a number of others. (For a list of these, see the biography of the saint, entitled Muṭṭāb al-Talīkīn by Muḥammad Būlākī.)

His tomb in the outskirts of Dīlī is surrounded by the graves of his followers and admirers and is much frequented by pilgrims. His khalīfa was Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad (or Muḥammadūd) Čīṣṭī (s. Čīṣṭī Dīlī), who became his pupil at the age of 40 and died in 1356; his tomb at Dīlī is still a place of pilgrimage. The renown of these saints led to a wide extension of the Čīṣṭī order, but it is not possible to mention more than two of the latter saints, e.g. Shāhīk Salīm Čīṣṭī (ob. 1572), in whose house the emperor Dāhāngīr [q.v.] was born; and Khwāja Nūr Muḥammad (ob. 1791), known as Ḳiblā-i Ālam, who brought about a revival of the Čīṣṭī order in the Pandībā and Sindh. (For further details see the histories of the Čīṣṭī order, e.g. Savaṭī al-ʿAnwār by Muḥammad Akram al-Bārisawī, and the works quoted therein, and Siyar al-ʿĀrīfīn by Ḥamīd b. Faṣlī Ālam Dīmīlī.) The Suhrawardī order, which takes its name from Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī (ob. 1234), was introduced into India by Bāhāʾ al-Dīn Zakariyāʾ, who was born at Mūltān but travelled to Baghdād, where he became the spiritual pupil of Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī; he died at Mūltān in 1266 and his tomb, said to have been built by the saint himself, is one of the few examples of the architecture of this period in India. One of his disciples was Saiyīd Dājāl al-Dīn Surkh-pūsh, the first of this order to come to India from Baghdād, where he was born in 1199; after many wanderings he settled in Uth, where he died in 1291; he is the ancestor of generations of saints, some of whom were active and successful propagandists of Islam. His khalīfa was his grandson, Saiyīd
Djālī b. Ahmad Kabūr, commonly known as Makhdūm-i Djabāniyān (ob. 1354), who is said to have made the pilgrimage to Mecca 36 times and to have performed innumerable miracles. One of Makhdūm-i Djabāniyān’s grandsons, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh, known as Burhān al-Dīn Kuṭb-i ʿAlam (ob. 1453) [q.v.], went to Gujārat, where his tomb is still a place of pilgrimage at Bātuwā (Archaeological Survey of Western India, vol. vii. p. 60 sqq.); his son, Sayyid Muḥammad Shāh ʿAlam (ob. 1475) became still more famous and played an important part in the political and religious life of his time; his tomb at Rasalāhābād, near Ahmadābād, is a beautiful example of the style of architecture characteristic of this district (id., vol. viii. p. 15 sqq.). The Kādīrī order derives its name from ʿAbd al-Kādīr al-Djīlī [q.v.], who is reverenced throughout India as Pir Dastgir, Pirānī Pir, etc., his festival being widely celebrated on the 11th of Rabīʿ al-Ṣāhīr. This order was introduced into India by one of his descendants, Sayyid Muḥammad, known as Bandīgār Muḥammad Gwāthī, who settled in Cūh in 1482 and died there in 1517; he was the progenitor of a number of saints and miracle-workers, and his descendants have remained in Cūh to the present day (Gazetteer of the Bikaner District, vol. ii. p. 391 [Lahore 1908]). The Kādīrī saints are too numerous to enumerate here, but mention must be made of Shaikh Mir Muḥammad, known as Miyānī Mir, the spiritual preceptor of Dārā Shikōh [q.v.], who wrote a life of the saint, entitled Sābilat al-Akhyār, he died in Lahōr in 1635 and his tomb is still venerated there. The Shāṭīrī order gave several great saints to India, e.g. Muḥammad Gwāthī, who numbered among his spiritual pupils the emperor Humāyūn; he died in 1562 and was buried at Gwālīyār in a magnificent tomb erected by the emperor Akbar (Sayyid Faḍl Allāh, Manṣūḥ Gwāthīya). His disciple, Wajīh al-Dīn Gujāratī (ob. 1596), a man of great learning, is buried at Ahmadābād (Archaeological Survey of Western India, vol. iii. p. 53), and another saint of the same order, known as Shāh Pir (ob. 1632) at Miraṭh in a tomb built by Nūr Dijāhn, wife of the emperor Dijāhngīr. The introduction of the Naḥāb bāndi order into India is usually attributed to Shaikh Ahmad al-Fārūqī al-Sirhindī (ob. 1625), (for his letters, see Ethē, Cat. Pers. MSS. India Office, no. 1891); this order has not enjoyed the same degree of popularity as those above mentioned, but there has recently been a revival of it in the Panjāb and Kashmir (v. Maḥābād al-Naḍārīt, Ethē, no. 652). To the wide-spread influence of these orders it is largely due that Sūfism has generally been regarded in India as compatible with orthodoxy. Muḥammad b. Faḍl Allāh, of Burhānpūr (ob. 1620), wrote a commentary on al-Tafkhī al-mursala ilā ‘l-Nabī, to prove that the doctrines of the Sūfīs were in accord with the teaching of the Khalīfah and the Sunna. In addition to the above so-called bāṣhārī orders, the members of which observe the customary ordinances of Islam as to prayer, fasting, etc., there are certain irregular (or bāṣhārī) orders, peculiar to India, which are looked upon with disfavour by the orthodox; their adherents are almost entirely confined to uncultivated persons of the lower classes. Among these are the玛드ārīs, who are followers of Zinda Shāh Mádār, a legendary personage said by some to have been a converted Jew (born at Aleppo in the 11th cent.), who settled in India and expelled a demon, named Makan Dēs, from the spot (Makanpur) where his own shrine is now venerated; according to other accounts, he was a disciple of Shaikh Muḥammad Taṣfīr Shāhī and died in 1436. The fakirs of this sect claim to be immune against fire and the bites of snakes and scorpions. The devotion to Shāh Mádār is widespread, and pilgrims resort to his shrine from great distances. The رāṣūl Shāhīs are followers of a certain Rāṣūl Shāhī, of the Alwar State, who in the 18th cent. is said to have received miraculous powers from a saint in Egypt. They rub ashes on their bodies and faces, and shave the head, moustaches and eyebrows; they look upon the drinking of spirits as a virtue, and the sect is consequently considered to be a disreputable one by orthodox Muslims. In Gujārat they wander about begging, without wives or settled homes; but in the Pandjāb they are not celibate, being as a rule well-to-do citizens who are never seen begging, and some are said to be men of literary taste and are popularly credited with a knowledge of alchemy.

3. Saints. The Muslim saints of India may be counted by hundreds. Several of the more important have already been referred to in the account of the religious orders; these are historical personages of whom some record remains, and there are many more like them. But others are historical personages whose identity has become overlaid with a mass of legend, in which the record of history is almost entirely obscured. e.g. Ghāzi Miyan [q.v.], Sakhī Sawar [q.v.], etc. Others are purely legendary, as Khwādja Khīrī [q.v.]. Baba Ratan (v. Horovitz, Journal of the Punjab Historical Society, ii. no. 2), Shaikh Sadu, etc. The process of canonisation still goes on, and new saints are from time to time added to the calendar, e.g. at Mūṭhiār (in Bengal) a Muḥammadan Pir, named Patakh Sīm (ob. between 1860 and 1870), is credited with miraculous powers and his aid is invoked especially by litigants. Besides the many miracles ascribed to these saints in their life-time, they are still believed to be able to work wonders for those who invoke their aid; miraculous cures especially are said to be wrought at their tombs, and childless women pray to them for offspring, and litigants for success in the law-courts; the beneficent activity of others has a more restricted reference, e.g. Khwādja Khīrī, Mālumīyar and Pir Bādṛ are the patron saints of boatmen and sailors, Shāh Shāh (of Multān) of persecuted lovers, Shāh Dāwla takes microphonic children under his protection, etc. Many of these saints are known as Piras, a title of honour applied not only to the famous historical saints above-mentioned but also to living spiritual preceptors, who guide their disciples (murādī) in the practices of the devout life, — not only to the saints whose shrines are visited by thousands of pilgrims from distant parts, but also to those obscure individuals whose tombs are to be found by hundreds in the by-ways of a town or the outskirts of a village and enjoy only a local reputation. For the religious movement condemnatory of the worship of saints, see the art. KĀRĀMĀT ‘ALĪ and WAḤHRĪ.

Bibliography: Besides the works already mentioned, see ‘Abd al-Ḥaḳḳ b. Saif al-Dīn al-Dīhlwī, Aḥḥār al-Ashār; Dārā Shikōh, Sāfī-
fore Akbar’s desire to learn the Hindu doctrines caused him to have the Muhâbârata, the Kamâya and the other Hindu scriptures translated into Persian, and his friend, Faiz, compiled for his instruction a treatise on the Vedanta philosophy. Akbar allowed his Hindu wives to have the ceremonies of their religion performed in the royal palace, and under their influence and that of the Brahmins whose society he cultivated, he adopted several Hindu practices, e.g. he abstained from the eating of beef, and on certain festivals he wore the Brahmanical cord and had his forehead marked like a Hindu sectary. Djahângir had none of the religious earnestness of his father, but he kept up the Hindu customs that Akbar had adopted and observed such Hindu festivals as the Diwâli, or feast of lights, and on Siva-râtri, (or Siva’s night), would invite Hindu yogis to the palace and eat and drink with them. A more earnest and sympathetic student of Hindu thought was Djahângir’s grandson, Dârâ Shikoh [q. v.], who diligently cultivated the society of Hindu yogis, and as a result of this intercourse (he tells us) came to the conclusion that the divergence between the doctrines of the Hindu pantheists and those of the Muslim Sûfs was merely verbal; with the object of reconciling the two systems, he wrote his Madâmaâl-âl-Bahrain; he also translated, or had translated for him, into Persian, several works of Hindu metaphysics, including the Upanishads (under the title Sîr-i Akbar). The large number of such translations from Sanskrit and Hindi into Persian, that were made from time to time (see, Ethê, Cat. Pers., MSS. I. O., no. 1928 sq.; Grundr. der i ran. Philologie, ii. 352–7), bears evidence to the interest which many Muhammadans took in the beliefs of their Hindu fellow-subjects, and in mysticism especially they found a common basis for religious thought. Muslim saints numbered many Hindus among their disciples, and thousands of Hindus still worship at their tombs on the other hand, though less rarely, numbered some Muhammadans among their spiritual pupils. Instances are not unknown of friendship between saints of the rival creeds, e.g. at Gîrût (in the Pandjâb) the tombs of two ascetics, Djamâli Sulân and Dîlâ Bhâvan, who lived in close amity during the early part of the 19th cent., stand close to one another and are reverenced by Hindus and Muhammadans alike. (Bhâvanâ Dîs, Dîvan Carita Sûrîhagat Dîl Bhâvanâî (Lâhûr, 1900)). Bâvâ Fattu (for. 1700), a Muslim saint whose tomb is at Rântâl (in the Kangra District), received the gift of prophecy by the blessing of a Hindu saint, Sûdî Guru Gulâb Singh. On the other hand Bâhâ Shâhâna, a Hindu saint whose cult is observed in the Djangh District, is said to have been the âlta or spiritual disciple of a Muslim fakir who changed the original name, Mihrâ, of his Hindu follower into Mihr Shâh. With a still more remarkable liberality, some Muslim theologians have admitted into their system the gods of the Hindu pantheon, on the ground that the Kurân (xiii. 8; xvi. 38) teaches that God has sent a prophet to every nation, to guide it into the truth; thus (to give one instance only, from modern literature,) one of the present guardians of the shrine of Nîgâm al-Din Auliya’s, — himself a descendant of this saint, — maintains that the life and teachings of Râmâ, Krishna and Buddha clearly show that they are the prophets.
referred to in the Kur'an, though no express mention is made there of India; for it cannot be supposed that God would have made so vast a country an exception to the operation of His general rule. (Hasan Naqshmagli, Hindustân ke dâl-paîgâmbar Râm o Krishan, salâm Allahi 'alâikumâ, p. 3 (Lahore, 1325 H.)). The Muhammadian poets of Bengal went still further in their recognition of Hindu theology, e. g. 'Aliol (for. 17th cent.) sang the praises of Siva, and Mirzâ Husnâ 'All composed hymns in honour of the goddess Kâlî. (Unmesh Chandra Sen, History of Bengali Language and Literature, pp. 626, 793 (Calcutta, 1911)).

Owing to the fact that the Muslims in India have lived for centuries in close contact with Hindus and are themselves to a large extent descended from Hindu converts, it is not surprising that Islam in India presents certain characteristics peculiar to this country. The process of conversion was often incomplete, and the converts, instructed in their new faith, carried with them many of their old beliefs and practices. The sacred sites of the earlier faith continued under a changed name to be frequented by pious persons; this has happened in the case of Buddhist shrines in the Ganges country, and to an enormous extent in Kashmir, where a Muhammadan ziyârat frequently marks the site of a Hindu templa; it is then often stated to be the tomb of a saint, e. g. the tomb of Râmânî Sâhî, a popular place of pilgrimage for Muhammadans in Kashmir, has been identified with an ancient Hindu temple built by Bhûma Sâhî, the last Hindu king of Kûbul (ob. 1026); the saint is now said to have been a Hindu ascetic, and to have borne the name of Bhûma Sâdî, before his conversion to Islam. (Kalhana's Rajatarangini, translated by M. A. Stein, i. 249 (Westminster, 1900); A. Foucher, Notes sur la géographie ancienne du Gauhârâra. Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, i. 333 sq. (Hanoi, 1901)). Such survivals from Hinduism are more marked in villages and country districts, remote from the influence of the 'ulama'; here the Muslims still continue to worship the tutelary godlings of the village, join in Hindu festivals and employ Brahmins at their marriage ceremonies. (For details see Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions, i. 314 sqq.). This close association with Hindus has also led to the formation of some mixed sects, which attempt to bring about a reconciliation between Hindus and Muhammadians; among these are the Pirzâdâs, a sect founded by Muhammad Shâh Dullâ (about the middle of the 17th cent.), whose tomb is at Bâhâdûrprî (in the Central Provinces); he compiled a book containing a selection of passages from both the Hindu and Muslim scriptures and adopted as a supreme deity the tenth incarnation of Vishnu, which is to come and is known in the sect as Nishkâlanî, "the sinless one". The Hûsâinî Brahmins call themselves followers of the Athara Veda, but ask for alms in the name of Hûsain; they adopt such of the doctrines of Islam as are not contrary to Hindu teachings, and observe Muslim customs, even keeping the fast of Ramaâdan, and have a special devotion to the saint, Mu'âm al-Dîn Cîshît of Adîmir; the men dress like Muslims, the women like Hindus. The Kâctâbâhiyâs, the members of a sect (founded in Bengal in the 18th cent.), who call their creed the Satya Dharma (true faith), include both Hindus and Musulmans, and in this sect a Muhammadian may even become the spiritual guide of a Brahman. The Sandjûgs, the Sûlyardhûs, and the Lâlîbûs are similar sects on the borderland between Hinduism and Islam. A like syncretism shows itself in the teaching of Nânâk, the founder of the Sikh religion (see T. P. Hughes, Dictionary of Islam, art. Sikhism), and would seem to have originated the worship of the Pânt Pîr[a.v.]. Such an approximation is sometimes indicative of the incompleteness of the process of conversion, as in the case of the Mallânâs in Agra and the adjoining districts, who are converts to Islam but are reluctant to describe themselves as Musulmans; their names are Hindu and they use the salutation Râm Râm; they mostly worship in Hindu temples, but sometimes frequent a mosque, practise circumcision and bury their dead. Such imperfect conversion has rendered possible the recent return to Hinduism of the descendants of such converts. In 1880, about 160 families of Mâttâ Kûnâbis, whose ancestors were converted in the 15th cent. by Imam Shâhî [q. v.] of Pirûna, formed themselves into a separate caste, calling themselves Vaihshaya Mûlâs, gave up all Muhammadian customs, employed Brahman priests and refused to eat with their Muhammadian brethren, the Pirûn Mâttâs. The Arya Samâdî has been very active in the work of re-conversion, and one of the societies affiliated to it, called the Râjpût Suddhâ Sâbâ, having for its chief object the re-conversion of Muhammadians Râjpûts to Hinduism, claims to have converted to the beliefs of the Arya Samâdî as many as 1052 of such Râjpûts in the three years, 1907 to 1910. This change has been facilitated by the fact that intermarriage with Hindus has been common (esp. among the Cawkhâns in the Eastern Pundâb) and the tribal bond with Hindu sections of the tribe has always been stronger than any difference of religion. (6. Literature). Muslim India has always preserved a learned tradition and the study of Arabic has been diligently pursued by the 'ulama', but their literary activity in this language has been largely confined to commentaries,—on the Kur'an, and Hadîth, on the works of fikh, grammar, rhetoric, etc., commonly read by students. Among the commentaries on the Kur'an, mention may be made of Fâî'î's [q. v.] tour de force entitled Sa'âsît al-Ilâmîn, in which all letters with diacritical points were avoided. 'Abd al-Hâkim al-Sîyâl-kîî was an industrious commentator, who enjoyed the patronage of the emperor Shâhidshâhân. Mühîb 'Allâh al-Bihârî (ob. 1797) [q. v.] compiled a treatise on jurisprudence, al-Musâlâm, and another on logic, Sûllâm al-Unaâm, which became favourite textbooks, and generations of commentators wrote glosses upon them. Another industrious commentator was Bâhîr al-Unaâm (ob. 1810), [q. v.]. An important contribution to legal literature was al-Fâlîwâ al-âlamîrî, a collection of legal opinions by Hanfî jurists, compiled by Shâikh Nizâmî and others in the reign of the emperor Awrangzêb. The greater part of the historical and mystical literature of Muslim India was written in Persian, but among Arabic writings mention may be made of Tâhjât al-Mu'jâhîdîn, an account of the Muhammadians of Malzûb, by Shâikh Zain al-Dîn, (ed. D. Lopes, Lisbon, 1898), and al-Dîwân-Shir al-khamisiyâh by Muhammâd 'Abwâth [q. v.]. (Bi-
and other educational establishments, and scholarships granted to Muhammadan students. The total number of Muhammadan pupils under instruction in all classes of educational institutions in 1912 was 1,562,000. Of the various religious communities in India, the Muhammadan on the whole exhibits a greater degree of illiteracy than any other, with the exception of the Animistic tribes: only 40 men, and 4 women, per thousand are able to read and write. This backward condition of the Muhammadans generally is largely due to the low level of education in the parts of the country (e.g. the North-West of India and Eastern Bengal), where they are chiefly to be found. In the ancient centres of Muslim civilisation, their level of education is as high or even higher than that of the Hindus, and the number of Muhammadans attending the Universities is yearly on the increase.

Bibliography: N. N. Law, The Promotion of Learning during Muhammadan Rule (London, 1916); G. W. Leitner, History of Indigenous Education in the Punjab (Calcutta, 1883); Abdul Karim, Muhammadan Education in Bengal (Calcutta, 1906); Syed Mahmood, A History of English Education in India (Aligarh, 1895); Quinquennial Reviews of the Progress of Education in India (since 1886).

8. Art. Space does not admit of any account being given here of the vast artistic activity of the Muhammadans in India, and reference must therefore be made to the literature on the subject. — Architecture: The architectural monuments of Muhammadan India are chiefly mosques and tombs (in large numbers), and some palaces in the chief cities. The early conquerors made use of materials taken from the Hindu and Jain temples etc. which they had destroyed, and employed Hindu workmen to erect buildings suited to the requirements of Muslim worship. In the great mosques at Adhiraj and Old Dilihi, built at the beginning of the 13th cent., Hindu pillars were re-erected without any alteration, and dissimilar fragments were sometimes put together; while on the great gateways of the enclosures was lavished a wealth of ornamentation and of stately Arabic inscriptions, which mark out these buildings as among the most richly decorated examples of Muhammadan architecture in India. After this superb beginning followed a rapid development of architectural forms, varying considerably in the several independent kingdoms that arose in the different parts of India occupied by the Muhammadan conquerors. Of these local styles as many as thirteen have been enumerated. They vary from the stern and massive tombs of the early kings at Bidihi and the grand simplicity of the towering mosques of Djanwpur, to the studied elegance and exquisite detail of ornamentation in the buildings of Bhadadabhad and the degenerate tawdriness of Lakhaw. For some account of the architectural monuments in these various localities the reader is referred to the articles under the name of each, e.g. Bidjapuri, Dilihi, Djanwpur etc.; but space has been found for a separate article on Mughal Architecture, which was not limited to a single locality. — Bibliography: Reports and other publications of the Archaeological Survey of India; Gustave Le Bon, Les Monuments de l'Inde (Paris, 1893); J. Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, ed. J. Burgess (London,
1910); E. B. Havell, *Indian Architecture* (London, 1913); *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. ii. chap. V (with bibliography). — Painting: Few examples of Muhammadan painting in India before the 16th cent. are known, but under the patronage of Akbar and his successors Indian artists produced a vast quantity of pictures, sometimes as separate works of art, but most often as illustrations of manuscripts; the *mattamāwants* of Nīfāmī, and romances both in poetry and prose, were frequently illustrated; but the Mughal school of painting excelled particularly in portraiture, and a large number of vivid and realistic portraits of the monarchs and courtiers of this dynasty has been preserved. The influences under which these artists worked were partly connected with the school of painters that enjoyed the patronage of the Timūrid princes, — and painters who preserved the tradition of this school were undoubtedly attracted into India, — but to a larger measure with indigenous Hindu art. European paintings and engravings were also sedulously copied and their influence can be traced in many pieces of the Mughal school. The majority of these pictures are unsigned, but some bear the signatures of the artists, e.g. Mir Saiyid Ali, Abd al-Samad and other Muslīms who painted for Akbar, — Mansūr and Muḥammad Nādir, among the artists patronised by Dājāngīr, etc. — Bibliography: E. B. Havell, *Indian Sculpture and Painting*, Part ii. (London, 1908); Vincent A. Smith, *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, chap. xiv. (Oxford, 1911); F. R. Martin, *The Miniature Painting and Painters of Persia, India and Turkey*, chap. ix. (London, 1912); A. K. Coomaraswamy, *The Arts and Crafts of India and Ceylon* (with bibliography), (London, 1913). — Calligraphy: The art of the calligrapher was held in high honour in India, as in other parts of the Muhammadan world, and many mosques and tombs are decorated with inscriptions that reveal a superb mastery of the Arabic script. The same skill was shown in the copying of manuscripts, both Arabic and Persian, and monarchs and nobles vied with one another in their patronage of expert calligraphists. Some of these were attracted to India from other countries, e.g. Abd al-Samad, known as Shīrīn Kālam, from Shīrāz, who was patronized by Humāyūn and Akbar; Mir Khaṭīl Allāh, who went from Tārak to the court of Tābārīhīm Aḍīl Shāh II of Bidjāpūr (987–1035 A. H.); Saiyid Ali Khaṭān, of Tabrīz, known as Dājārūrī Khān, whom Awrangzīb appointed to teach his sons the art of penmanship. Under the influence of these and other masters in the art, a long series of native calligraphists was trained, who only slowly gave way before the introduction of the printing press. — Bibliography: *Épigraphe Indiennes*, (with bibliography) (Calcutta, 1908 sqq.). — Chisnū Mūhammad Dihāvī, *Tādhbhir al-Khawānīvāz*, ed. M. Hīdāyāt Hūsain (Bibl. Ind.) (Calcutta, 1910); C. Huart, *Les Calligraphes et les Miniaturistes de l'Orient Musulman* (Paris, 1908). — Metal-work, Textiles etc.: *The Journal of Indian Art and Industry* (London, 1886 sqq.); Sir George C. M. Birdwood, *The Industrial Arts of India* (London, 1880); T. N. Mukharjī, *Art-Manufactures of India* (Calcutta, 1888); Maurice Maundron, *L'Art Indien* (Paris, 1895); Sir George Watt, *Indian Art at Delhi* (Calcutta, 1903); H. Saladin et M. Migeon, *Manus. d'Art Musulman*, ii. (Paris, 1907); A. K. Coomaraswamy, *The Arts and Crafts of India and Ceylon*, chap. xii. (London, 1913); and the Monographs on Arts and Industries published by the Provincial Governments in India. — Garden design: C. M. Villiers Stuart, *Gardens of the Great Mughals* (London, 1913). — Bibliography: Besides the works referred above, the following deserve particular mention: J. H. Garon de Tassy, *Mémoires sur les Particularités de la Religion musulmane dans l'Inde* (Paris, 1831, 1874); Mrs. Meer Hassan Ali, *Observations on the Musulmans of India*, descriptive of their Manners, Customs, Habits and Religious Opinions (London, 1832; reprinted, 1817); Dījārī Shīrā, Qawwāl-ī-Islām, or the Customs of the Musulmans of India, comprising a full and exact account of their various Rites and Ceremonies, from the moment of birth till the hour of death, by Jaffar Shurreef, translated by G. A. Herklots (London, 1832; 2nd ed. Madras, 1865; reprinted, 1895); I. Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islam*, p. 305 sqq. (Heidelberg, 1910). More detailed bibliographies are given under the separate articles devoted to the Indian provinces, towns, kingdoms, distinguished personages, etc. A vast amount of information is to be found in the official publications of the Government of India (e. Frank Campbell, *Index-Catalogue of Indian Official Publications in the Library, British Museum*), especially the publications of the Ethnographic Survey (e. H. H. Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, (Calcutta, 1891–1892); W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh* (Calcutta, 1896); E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India* (Madras, 1909); H. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjāb and North-West Frontier Province* (Lahore, 1911), and Census Reports and Gazettes. The following periodicals and magazines contain numerous articles dealing with the Muhammadans of India, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (Calcutta, 1832 sqq.); *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (Bombay, 1844 sqq.); *Calcutta Review* (Calcutta, 1844 sqq.); *Journal of the National Indian Association* (London, 1876 sqq.); *Punjab Notes and Queries* (Allahabad, 1883–1888); *North Indian Notes and Queries* (Allahabad, 1891–1896); *Journal of the Modern Institute* (Calcutta, 1905 sqq.); *Revue du Monde Musulman* (Paris, 1906 sqq.); *The Muslim Review* (Allahabad, 1910 sqq.). For newspapers see the art DIJĀRĪA, IV. — INDIES (DUTCHEAST) comprise the Malay Archipelago and the western half of New Guinea as far as Long. 141°, except for the north coast of Borneo, which is English, the Philippines, which belong to the United States, and Portuguese East Timor. These Dutch colonies thus include thousands of islands which run from the largest in the world such as New Guinea and Borneo to archipelagoes of the smallest coral islands. From the geographical point of view they are divided into the Great Sundā Islands (Borneo, Sumatra, Celebes, and Java) with the archipelagoes belonging to them); Little Sundā Islands (Bali, Lombok, Sumbawa, Flores, Sumba, Savu, Rotti, and Timor with the surrounding islands), the Moluccas (Hal-
madeira with Ternate, Tidore, Makian, and Batjians, Sula Islands, Buru, Seran, Ambon, and Banda) and New-Guinea with the adjoining groups of islands such as Misol, Waigeu, Batanta, and Salawati in the west, and Kei, Timor-Laut, and Aru in the south-west. The area is about 350,81 geogr. sq. miles. The whole area of the Dutch East Indies is as large as that of Europe without Central and Northern Russia.

The climate of life in this island world are very much influenced by its position under the equator, between Asia and Australia, and between the Indian and Pacific Oceans, surrounded by warm seas everywhere. The formation and origin of the land is also of special importance. The form and situation of the larger islands is a result of the fold mountains which are on the edge of the area of depression in the Indian and Pacific Oceans. One such range on the west and south edge of the Archipelago supports the islands of Sumatra, Java, and the Little Sunda Islands; the chain of mountains which crosses Borneo from west to east runs parallel to it. Celebes and the eastern islands as far as New Guinea show similar systems of folding which cross one another, being dependent on these two areas. The relative wealth of the larger islands in precious metals and other ores, which, like gold and silver, attracted foreign nations in quite early times, and like tin, which is now an important source of revenue to the government and to great mining companies, is due to the predominance of these chains of mountains formed of sedimentary and granitic rocks. Other valuable minerals, such as petroleum and anthracite, which are exploited on Sumatra, Java, and Borneo, come from the tertiary strata, which are common in the East Indies.

Of still greater importance is the volcanic nature of this chain of mountains, which is most marked on the series of islands from Sumatra to Celebes and on its weathered eruptive products causes the unusually great fertility of these islands. Besides the very numerous volcanoes, the volcanic plateau in Sumatra and the alluvial plains of volcanic origin (Sumatra and Java) are among the most highly cultivated and thickly populated regions of the East Indies. The island of Celebes and the Moluccas are also very volcanic.

Next to folding of strata and volcanic effects, coral has the greatest share in the formation of mountains in the Archipelago. From the very earliest period of the earth, countless coral reefs have been formed in these tropical seas in the shallows, where there is sufficient oxygen, light and temperature (about 22° cent.) and the process is still going on. The growth of coral reefs is caused not only by the coral polypi but also by molluscs, chalk algae, diatomene, and many other organisms. The Indian calciferous ranges formed by these reefs thus very rarely yield pure marble. In the course of time this part of the earth's surface has been subjected to great upheavals and depressions so that the old coral reefs have either been transformed into vast calciferous mountains of varying age or, although they could only be formed in the upper regions of the water, are now found at a great depth. On all the Great Sunda Islands one now finds those limestone mountains which are marked by infertility as are often also the neighbouring plains. The small islands formed of coral rock are also very numerous, which have recently become very important through the cultivation of the cocoa-nut palm. The caves washed out of the calciferous rocks supply the edible swallows' (of the Salanga kind) nests eaten by the Chinese.

Living coral reefs are found on almost all the rocky coasts of the Archipelago and in shallows in the high seas.

The climate of the Indies is a moist tropical one and besides being fertile produces a very exuberant vegetation. It renders possible the cultivation of the most valuable tropical plants such as sugar cane, tobacco, spices, indigo, etc. The most important factor for agriculture in the tropics is the rainfall. Only at isolated places is this less than 75 inches in the year, the minimum for the growth of tropical forests. The usual fall is 160—180 inches. In the north of Central Java as much as 360 inches a year has been recorded.

The situation between Asia and Australia causes a climate affected by the monsoons, the result of which is that, during our summer, dry winds from the east and southeast prevail and, during our winter, winds from the west and northwest with a rainy season predominate, in our spring and autumn, winds form a transition.

The dry monsoon is strongest in the southeast, Timor and the adjoining islands have six or more months of drought each year, for which the winds from Australia are responsible. In the north and west this dryness of the wind is more or less alleviated by the greater breadth of the sea crossed and the vapours which the heat raises from it. The Moluccas, Celebes, Borneo, Java, and Sumatra thus feel this drought less and are more suitable for intensive agriculture throughout the year. Central and Northern Sumatra lie outside the monsoon area. The characteristic tropical temperature of about 27° C. with only slight variations in a day or year of ±5° prevails only in the plains. In western Java at a height of 1800 feet it is much lower (23°) and shows greater variations and thus we have a subtropical climate. The cultivation of tea, coffee, Chinese and European vegetables is possible here. In other countries the transition varies more rapidly, for example on Borneo. These climatic conditions have favoured the growth of tropical forests, which must originally have covered the Greater Sunda Islands entirely, till man destroyed them, almost entirely on Java, in part on Sumatra, and only to a small extent in Borneo. Even at the beginning of our era mention is made of the products of the Sumatra bush, such as camphor and benzoic. In the last 60 years the great demand in Europe for products like rubber, gutta-percha, rotan etc., has resulted in an economic revolution through the increased prosperity of the native population on Sumatra and Borneo.

The flora of the southeast on the other hand is of a prairie and savannah nature. Sandalwood has from ancient times been an important article of export here. The flora and fauna of these islands are predominantly determined by the proximity of Asia in the west and Australia and New Guinea in the east. The connections by land between Asia and the Great Sunda Islands existed for a long time, and Asiatic animals and plants were thus able to spread over them. There were also connections by land with Australia and New Guinea in the east, so that their plants and animals are
now found farther west on the Moluccas, etc. These alone have thus become the home of species like nutmegs and cloves. Of Asiatic animals the tiger is found on Borneo, Java, and Bali, the elephant on Sumatra, the tapir on Sumatra and Java, monkeys on Sumatra, Borneo, and Java, only one kind on Celebes, and none farther east. Wild cattle are found in the woods of Sumatra, Java, and Borneo and Bali. On the other hand, the Moluccas possess no genuine mammals, but only the Australian marsupials, of which two kinds are found as far westwards as Celebes. One also finds the birds of the east even on this island, such as parrots and cockatoos, only the cassowaries and birds of paradise are not found till farther east. Thus these two opposite worlds have penetrated the archipelago somewhat disproportionately.

Population: The population of the Dutch Indies, numbering at present 44 millions belongs, with the exception of the Papians of New Guinea and the surrounding region and isolated remnants of an earlier Vedda people, like the Toala in Celebes, to the Malay-Polynesian race which spread from Madagascar to Easter Island and from South Japan to Java. The archipelages between Celebes and New Guinea with the eastern Little Sunda Islands are inhabited by a cross between Malays and Papuans which is known as the Alfurs. The Malay type is only found in the interior of Sumatra, Borneo, and Celebes, still comparatively pure. South eastern Asia has been indicated as the home of the Malays. Linguistically they seem still to have left traces in the south of British India. If one remembers that the Polynesians must also have been present in their present distribution the Malay Archipelago and that even Pitoeomy mentions the man-eating Batak of North Sumatra, it is clear that present conditions must be the results of thousands of years of migrations. In addition to the powerful influence of foreign peoples who arrived in later times and the influence of surrounding peoples, this affords an explanation of the complicated conditions in the varied population of these islands. Two groups are distinguished among the Malays of the Archipelago in older times. The archipelagoes between Celebes and Borneo is the type of the attack, the Fijians, the Balinese, and the coast peoples of the Moluccas. The Makassars and the Buginese are supposed to be Torajans greatly mixed with Bornean Java. The present Minahassas are Torajans who have been educated by Christianity during the last 70 years. The Alfurs include the inland tribes of Halmahera and the neighbourhood, of Buru and Ceram and the adjoining small islands, of Timor, Flores, Sumba, and Sumbawa. The Buginese, who have been seafarers for centuries, have contributed a great deal to the admixture of the coast peoples of the whole Archipelago.

All these peoples are for the most part settled agriculturists; on the great rivers and on the seashore however the Malays prefer to fish and trade (previously they were also pirates). The people of the Archipelago as a rule only work when necessity drives them. They often appear lazy to us on account of their slight wants and the conditions of tropical life. The original Malays, like the Batakas, Dayaks, and Torajans, as well as the Alfurs and Papuans show a state of society broken up into very many small tribes. Each tribe forms a separate social unit, which as a result of war, feuds, or mistrust is only rarely on constant terms of intercourse with its neighbours and thus develops independently. The result is a great variety of languages, manners, and customs.

The patriarchal constitution of these tribes frequently includes a ruling family, freemen, and slaves. In the east among the Papuans and related tribes there appear to be no chiefs. Among the Malays they are chosen from the ruling family, most frequently the eldest son; if necessity arises, a daughter may be chosen. They manage the affairs of the tribe with the elders. The slaves (slavery is now abolished) usually come from prisoners of war or are slaves through debt. They are frequently considered the property of the tribe and then are allotted to the chiefs. They are well treated and often enter the ranks of the freedmen through marriage. They were rarely sold. For human sacrifices prisoners of war were used or men infirm through old age, who were purchased from the coast Malays. Slavery is now the exception even among the most remote tribes.

The density of this older stratum, including the Alfurs and Papuans, is very slight, from 3 to 4 per square mile. As the birth rate is not small, the main causes of the sparseness of population are the terrible devastations wrought by such illnesses as malaria, cholera, dysentery, by crossing the Malay Archipelago and that even Pitoeomy mentions the man-eating Batak of North Sumatra, it is clear that present conditions must be the results of thousands of years of migrations. In addition to the powerful influence of foreign peoples who arrived in later times and the influence of surrounding peoples, this affords an explanation of the complicated conditions in the varied population of these islands. Two groups are distinguished among the Malays of the Archipelago in older times. The archipelagoes between Celebes and Borneo is the type of the attack, the Fijians, the Balinese, and the coast peoples of the Moluccas. The Makassars and the Buginese are supposed to be Torajans greatly mixed with Bornean Java. The present Minahassas are Torajans who have been educated by Christianity during the last 70 years. The Alfurs include the inland tribes of Halmahera and the neighbourhood, of Buru and Ceram and the adjoining small islands, of Timor, Flores, Sumba, and Sumbawa. The Buginese, who have been seafarers for centuries, have contributed a great deal to the admixture of the coast peoples of the whole Archipelago.

All these peoples are for the most part settled agriculturists; on the great rivers and on the seashore however the Malays prefer to fish and trade (previously they were also pirates). The people of the Archipelago as a rule only work when necessity drives them. They often appear lazy to us on account of their slight wants and the conditions of tropical life. The original Malays, like the Batakas, Dayaks, and Torajans, as well as the Alfurs and Papuans show a state of society broken up into very many small tribes. Each tribe forms a separate social unit, which as a result of war, feuds, or mistrust is only rarely on constant terms of intercourse with its neighbours and thus develops independently. The result is a great variety of languages, manners, and customs.
their development can hardly be overestimated.

Among these heathen peoples are still parts of the Bataks, Dayaks, and Toradjas, and almost all the Alfurs and Papuans.

The above rather detailed sketch of this old Malay population is important, just because we are probably not wrong in thinking that the whole population of the Archipelago at the beginning of our era was so constituted. But then began the overwhelming influence of Hinduism.

During the reign of the Emperor Augustus, pepper, cloves, and nutmegs were sent to Rome via the Red Sea, as Pliny mentions. The trade routes between southern Asia and the archipelago were thus known. Ptolemy in his Geography gives a whole series of names which refer to this Archipelago. He knows the name of the harbour of Pamsur at Baros, from which the Sumatra camphor was exported and he also knows of the mangat Batak of North Sumatra.

We can thus conclude that even then the influence of the Hindu trading peoples must have made itself felt in the Archipelago. We also here find an explanation of the stories of the Buddhist monk Fa-hien, who landed in Java in 412 A.D. on his return voyage from Ceylon to China, remained five months there, and clearly found a Brahman society there but no Chinese and very few Buddhists. Several kingdoms of Sumatra, Java, and Borneo are mentioned at later dates in the Chinese annals. According to an inscription in the modern Kedu, in Central Java, Civaism prevailed there in the Čaka year 654 = 732 A.D. Soon afterwards we find the Malayana there and, as numerous temples and inscriptions prove, both religions continued peacefully beside one another on the island for several centuries till about the end of the Hindu period in the Archipelago, about 1500 A.D. These ruins have been found on Sumatra, Java, the coast of Borneo, Southern Celebes and the Lesser Sundas Islands, although they are by far the most numerous on Java. Besides these proofs of the earlier influence of Hinduism the modern languages, by their scripts and vocabularies give evidence of its spread at an earlier period. The alphabets used by the modern Javanese, Batak, South Sumatrans, Balinese, Makassars, and Buginese are derived from Hindu alphabets and there are many Indian words in the languages of these peoples. There are many remnants of Hindu culture in manners and customs also.

Java [q.v.] was certainly the centre of Hindu rule and from this island Hindu influence for the longest period made itself felt in the Archipelago. If one remembers how much higher the civilization of the Hindu was than that above described of the Malay peoples, one can understand that, during the period of over a thousand years when Hinduism prevailed, a great change must have taken place in the conditions of life in the Archipelago. This was very marked in the political field also; despotic kingdoms arose out of the disconnected patriarchal tribes, such as the Europeans found in Sumatra, Java, the coasts of Borneo, southern Celebes, and in Bali and Lombok, and among the Malys further east also. At that period also arose the division into castes which is still found on Bali and Lombok and the effects of which can still be traced in Java.

In the economic field, agriculture, shipping, commerce, and industry developed. The introduction of writing must have given a great incentive to progress. What a permanent advance was made by these alterations in the Archipelago is shown by the height of development of these peoples, whose density of population is also much greater (up to 120 per sq. mile).

The influence of Hinduism on religion assumed a very peculiar form. We have discussed above the characteristic features that animism possesses in the Archipelago and what a crippling influence it has had upon the conditions of life of the Malay, Alfur, and Papuan populations. If one remembers how much higher are the ideas and philosophies underlying the Indian religions, one expects that these would have considerably altered the views of the Malays of the Archipelago. But the actual facts are quite different. As already mentioned, their mental attitude is, generally speaking, determined by their animistic ideas and even the most educated peoples, like the Javanese, are still much influenced by the belief in pêmati and omens. The peculiar social institutions of the Hindus are probably the main cause of this. What we admire as the highest in the religions of India was and is only the property of the highest castes. The masses of the present Hindu peoples have by no means lost their animistic beliefs. It was presumably not the most educated classes in the Brahman and Buddhist kingdoms that undertook as merchants the dangerous journeys to the Indian Archipelago and settled there. It would hardly be possible for these colonists radically to transform the popular beliefs. In the powerful Hindu kingdoms of Java and the other islands of a later date the great religious problems were no doubt studied as in the mother country, but probably only among the priests, and the masses were little affected therein.

The people of British India also had too little insight into the relations of the phenomena of nature to be able to destroy animistic beliefs to any considerable extent. They were as little able to do so after the introduction of Islám.

Although the religious beliefs were little influenced, the ceremonial and vocabulary of religion were transformed during the Hindu period. Among the above-mentioned peoples who were most subjected to this influence the animistic gods and spirits are given Hindu names, as will be shown below in reference to Java. The manner of worship of this world of spirits also exhibits many Indian forms. What form spiritual conditions in the Hindu kingdoms of the Archipelago took can best be seen in the islands of Bali [q.v.] and Lombok, which are still Hindu.

Islám. When the natives of British India in part became converts to Islam, it's influence also spread in the Archipelago through the merchants who visited these islands and settled on them, at least during a monsoon or longer, and often married a native wife, who had first of all to adopt Islám, and thus a considerable influence over her family and tribe was gained. Among the simple peasants of the country the far travelled, experienced strangers enjoyed a certain prestige, which even now contributes a great deal to the spread of Islám in pagan countries. To become one of these men has a great attraction for the heathen and this makes it easy for him to adopt Islám. This was true in a less degree of the Hindu Malays and they therefore were not so affected by Muhammadan influences as the pagan Malays.
We know little that is certain of the beginning of this movement. Unfortunately the Malay and Javanese historians are little trustworthy and thus the accounts by Marco Polo (end of the xiiith century) and of Ibn Batûtah [q. v.] (middle of the xivth century) of the Muslim kingdom of Pasei on the north coast of Sumatra form the first reliable material to go upon. Islam spread rapidly along the east coast of Sumatra, for in the second half of the xivth century Indragiri and Djambi are said to have been vassal states of Malacca. In 1377 Palembang was regained by the Hindu Javanese. The interior remained for long pagan and in parts is so still. It was probably due to the power of the Hindu Menangkabau kingdom on the west coast that Islam here met with more continued resistance, which was first broken from Atjeh. Not till the xvith century did the conversion of the south coast of Sumatra begin and that of the interior only in the xvith century. The people in the mountains of Palembang are still little affected by Islam.

Native traditions give us no exact data for the spread of Islam in the island of Java. But we know from European sources that the great trading centres of the north coast like Djapara, Tuban, Grêsik, and Surabaya at first formed principalities half or entirely independent of the Hindu kingdom of Majapahit, and that in the first half of the xvith century, in alliance with the prince of Dèmes, they took the capital Majapahit. It was not till then that the considerable kingdom of Dèmes was founded and later that of Pajau and finally that of Mataram. By the conquest of these kingdoms the conversion of the whole island to Islam made rapid progress.

Beside these secular states the princes of Giri at Grêsik long held power which was based on religious prestige.

Soon after the fall of Majapahit a powerful movement in favour of Islam began on western Java of which we have fairly reliable accounts from the Portugese de Barros, Pinto, and Couto. In the then Hindu kingdom of Padjadjaran Muslims must have been long settled. The first foundation of a Muslim kingdom there was however the result of the efforts of a scholar from Pasei, who is now called Sunan Gunung Djati from his tomb at Tjirebon. He left his native town of Pasei in 1521 to study for three years in Mecca. He afterwards arrived in Djapara in Central Java and preached here with such success that he was allowed to marry a sister of the king of Dèmes. He then went to Bantên in West Java, converted the governor here and with the help of Demak gained the political power here also and in 1527 took Sunda Kalapa, the modern Batavia, from the king of Padjadjaran. This kingdom of Padjadjaran still existed in the interior, when he migrated to Tjirebon about 1546 and he must have died there about 1570. His grave on Gunung Djati is still highly venerated. He is also one of the eight or nine walis who, according to native tradition, spread Islam over Java. His son Hasanuddin (Hasan al-Din) was the ancestor of the princes of Bantên [q. v.] and lived till about 1570. His son Yusup (Yusuf) succeeded about 1570 in capturing Pekuan, the capital of Padjadjaran.

At the present day the native population of Java, numbering 33,000,000, is Muslim. The only exception is formed by Christians (about 10,000) and the two little hill peoples of the Badui in the west and the Tengèrese in the east who have remained faithful to the pre-Muhammadan tradition. The latter however frequently become converts to Islam.

On the island of Borneo [q. v.] the population of the west coast seems to have been converted from Palembang; on the south coast, on the Barito, probably from Java. The whole Malay population on the coasts and the great rivers is now Muslim and makes many converts among the still pagan Dayak tribes of the interior.

On the island of Celebes [q. v.] there are in the south the Muslim Makassars and the Buginese who were not converted till later. At the beginning of the xvith century their conversion began in Tello and Goa. They are all enthusiastic Muslims and have done much to spread their religion among the distant coast peoples of the east by their trading journeys and colonies. The Lesser Sunda Islands, Sumbawa and West Flores, which were formerly dependent on Goa, have certainly abandoned paganism through its influence.

The Moluccas in the north east of the Archipelago along with the sultanates of Ternate and Timor adopted Islam very early, as a result of the spread of Islam by Muhammedan traders. This was the centre of the spice trade which attracted foreign traders so much. Under their influence Zainalabdin (Zain al-Abidin), prince of Ternate, who ascended the throne in 1486, was converted, and also Prince Tjiliani of Timor who reigned from 1495. They are called the first sulţans of their kingdoms, the second under the name of Djimaluddin.

The Altur tribes in the interior of the larger islands like Halmahera, Buru, Ceram, the Kei and Aru Archipelagoes, and Timor have remained heathen. Islam has only made little progress among the coast population of New Guinea.

The number of Muslims in the Archipelago is about 35 millions (in 1905, 35,034,025 of whom 29,603,653 were in Java), but they observe the precepts of their religions in very different ways. As is clear from the dates above given, Islam was introduced here when its system was already fully developed. Its characteristic features among these peoples took shape according to the country, British India, from which merchants or adventurers had contributed most to its spread. In British India Islam had already adapted itself to Hinduism and was thus all the more easily adaptable to the altered Hinduism of Java and Sumatra. The popular legends of the times of the Prophet and his first successors are modelled on those of India. In these tales as in individual customs of the Indonesian Muslims one can observe traces of the influence of the Shâafs just as on the coasts of Malabar and Coromandel, where, as in the Indian Archipelago, in other respects the Sunni, orthodox rite is followed, and in legal interpretation the Shâafî school. Here as there, there is also a great love of mysticism, which among the more highly developed assumes a pantheistic form and among the lower classes is mixed with the strongest superstition.

The by no means slight influence of the Arabs was the result, not the cause of the conversion of the Malays in the Archipelago. Intercourse with the sacred cities Mecca and Medina increased steadily from the xvith century and a continually increasing number of young men remained there to

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, II.

32
study. These and the Arabs who migrate to India from the poor district of Ḥadramawt [q. v.] often protest against the customs and ideas introduced from India.

As in other countries, İslâm has here also adapted itself in a high degree to the views of the converts and therefore possesses several curious features. The mosque and its personnel forms even more than in other lands the centre of influence of this religion on the whole life of the people. There are Friday mosques in the more important places in Java, in Atjeh, and Central Sumatra: in the Malay districts of Borneo only in the chief towns, and among the Makassars and Buginese only in the capitals of the many principalities. In the east of the Archipelago they are rare. Smaller mosques in Java, Central Sumatra, and in Atjeh are fairly common. Only a small minority perform the şalâ there; on the other hand, a considerable assembly takes place during the two official festivals of İslâm (see ʿĪḍ al-ʿAḍḥā and ʿĪḍ al-Fīṭr). The structure of the East Indian mosques is characterised by a broken roof which consists of two or four small roofs one above the other, crowned by a separate pinnacle. Only few of the largest mosques have minarets. The muʿādhdhin (outside Java frequently called biṭāl) sings his call to divine worship from this broken roof, but previously it is vigorously announced by the beating of a long wooden drum (ḥodug or ṭabuh).

The personnel of a mosque consists of at least four men: an imām, a khatīb (Jav. kētīp), a biṭāl, and a servant. There may however be as many as forty or even more. In the Dutch Indies these officials are not clergy any more than in other countries. In Java however they often carry out the duties of a kāḍī (Jav. kālī) and perform wedding ceremonies, as they alone have the necessary qualifications. The outer gallery of the mosque (surauhini) therefore becomes a court house for the settlement of all quarrels that are decided in these countries by religious law. In Java these include questions of marriage, family law and inheritance; the pengkutu or chief of the mosque for this purpose sits with some qualified members of his staff, often on Thursdays. In 1882 the Dutch government regulated by law the pengkutu courts and made them courts of justice (Priister-raden) with three to eight members.

These courts have in most cases to deal with complaints by women of insufficient attention or bad treatment from their husbands or to give official sanction to a request of a woman for divorce as a result of a previously pronounced conditional ʿaḍb (taʿlīk) [q. v.]. The Muslims of Indonesia have adopted the principle of a conditional ʿaḍb as a corrective against the too great dependence of women according to Muslim law. In Java, Madura, and other islands it is a regular custom for the husband immediately after the marriage ceremony to secure for his wife the dissolution of the marriage by taʿlīk in case he should not fulfill the obligations of a good husband. Only in the matriarchal people of Menagakabau and among the Achnsh is this conditional ʿaḍb not the custom, as the women there do not leave their family after marriage and remain more independent.

All that is acquired during marriage is in Java considered the joint property of the couple. On divorce therefore disputes as to its division thus frequently come before the Priisterraden. In cases of inheritance law the judges frequently demand 10% of the estate. Wasiyy property is administered by these judges and quarrels about it settled by them. They appoint guardians for minors. They also appear as waali's at the weddings of women who have not a waali available among their blood-relations.

The zakāt (Jav. Mal. djakat) to the Muḥam-madans of the Indies means principally the handing over of the tithe of the harvest of rice and similar fruits of the fields. Only in the Sunda countries (West-Java), Atjeh, Palembang, and some other districts of Sumatra do we find a kind of official collector. These however exercise no rights of compulsion regarding the collection. In other countries this religious duty is either entirely neglected or its fulfilment depends entirely on the degree of piety in the individual. Under various pretexts the staff of the mosque is able to get a considerable portion of the yield for themselves. Where the zakāt is delivered without an official collection, it is given by the pious to honoured scholars etc. At the time of the Atjeh war a considerable portion of the zakāt was expended on the "holy war".

The payment of zakāt al-firād, the small poll tax ordered by law to be paid at the conclusion of the fast, is fairly general. It has practically assumed the character of a free-will offering.

The observance of the five daily şalâs varies considerably with place and time. In West-Java and South-east Borneo for example there are districts where almost every one of these services is regularly held. In Central Java and Atjeh they are neglected by the majority and those who observe them faithfully and at the same time refrain from the popular amusements banned by İslâm, such as gamlān, wayang, dancing, sadaṭ performances etc.) are given special names (wong putih, lebe, ontri) and distinguished from the great mass of the people (wong abangan, bangsat).

The fast of Ramadān (puasa) is more widely observed. The festivals at the end of it are celebrated as the most important of the year and regarded by Europeans as the Muḥam-madan New Year. The ḥajji is very eagerly performed by the people of the Archipelago; in the last years (about 1913) the number of pilgrims was 20—30,000. These usually leave officially appointed harbours by European steamers for Djidda and return the same way. Of these multitudes, several young men always settle in Mecca for some years to devote themselves to religious studies. They form the Djawa colony there (about 7000 souls in 1914) and at their return home form the link which binds international Muḥam-madan culture with that of their native land.

The main characteristics in their religion or their conversion are considered by the Muslim natives to be circumcision and abstention from pork or alcohol. Of all religious duties these are the ones most punctiliously observed.

Elementary religious instruction (recitation of the Qurān and possibly practice in the ʿaḍb) is given by the village "priests" or by other teachers. In many districts only a small number of boys and a still smaller number of girls receive this instruction.

In the larger centres of population there are scholars, who introduce pupils to a knowledge of Muslim learning in the mosque, in their own houses, or in a special building. The great reputation
of such a guru induces many young people from far and near to settle for a considerable time in his neighbourhood. Characteristic however are the institutes on their own ground, which so to speak form separate villages, where students from various districts live together to devote themselves to study under the direction of one or more gurus'. In Java these institutions are called pésantren (i.e. abodes of santri). They consist of the houses of the gurus' with their families, and of pondok's or buildings, which are divided into two parts by a passage down the centre. Each of these consists of a row of cells, which serve as sleeping rooms and also as studies for two or more boys. The whole institute with its buildings and estates is often a foundation (wafiat) by pious people; in Central Java there are frequently villages which were freed by former rulers from taxation, etc., and emancipated from all authority of the usual chiefs and dedicated as perdikan-lewa's exclusively to places of religious study.

In Atjeh such institutions are called rangkang, in Central Java surau. Their organisation shows some differences from that of the pésantren. In all these schools the young native Muslims are more or less initiated into the well known medieaval cycle of Muslim learning: law, religion, and mysticism. The manuals used are the authoritatively accepted texts, which are translated from Arabic into a native language or read in the original itself. Advanced pupils also apply themselves to Kur'ánic exegesis, the sacred traditions, and their explanation, the theory of jurisprudence, etc. The period of study lasts from two to ten or more years, according to the goal aimed at by the santri. Those who study for a long time go from one pésantren to another to hear various distinguished scholars. In the country itself the more talented among them can make great progress in learning, but the greatest fortune that can befall the seeker after knowledge is to study in Mecca.

The Muslims of the Dutch Indies reverence the international saints of Islam known to them. The main objects of their pilgrimages and vows however are their wafiat's, to whom is ascribed the introduction of their religion in their region. In Java they are the eight or nine wafiat's of the old trading-towns of the north coast, where the foreign Muslim merchants settled who first converted the native population in their neighbourhood. They also believe in patron saints of certain places and of certain spheres of daily life and, in opposition to the convictions of the educated believers, in trees, stones etc. being tenanted by spirits. There are also individuals who are worshipped as karuma, wonder-workers. Saiyids and ghā rigorous reap advantages from these beliefs of the credulous multitude. No East Indian Muslim can conduct his affairs without the help of saints. The curing of a dear relative who is ill, the winning of the love of a woman, the blessing of getting children, protection of the harvest against insects, success of a son in a school examination, promotion of a native official to a higher post, appointment of a prince as heir apparent, all these and similar fortunate events are hoped for through the favour of saints and their intervention with Allah, who is Himself enthroned too high to be directly approached with such requests. These often take the form of a conditional vow (nadar, kaul, niyāt, etc.). When a wish is fulfilled, the tomb of the saint is visited and recitations of the Kur'ān held, or a sacrificial animal is killed there, or a feast given or something else done which is known to be specially pleasing to the saints or some particular saint. The simple villager often promises something which he himself estoons very highly but which must be repulsive to the Muslim saint, such as the performance of a wazyān. How much saints' graves were venerated in olden times in Java is seen from the fact that former rulers have freed certain villages from other burdens in return for the maintenance of these aśān's (āshān) villages.

From the earliest times the East Indian Muslims thought more of mysticism than the law, more of religious contemplation than of the fulfilment of ritual duties. The influence of Hinduism as well as the fact that it was Indians who sowed the first seeds of Islam favoured this tendency. In the tradition, frequently expressed in poetical language, of the eight or nine wafiat's of Java, pantheistic mystical sayings are attributed to some of them, and in the Malay poems of Hamaa of Baros, whose doctrines won many adherents in the xvith century in North Sumatra and formed the subject of lively discussions at the court of Atjeh, the relation of man to God is described in erotic metaphors. In later times the influence of Mecca and Haḍramawt there was an increasing reaction on the part of orthodoxy against these heretical doctrines but this could not prevent works like the "Book of the Perfect Man" by 'Abd al-Ḳāsim al-Diji (see Al-Insān al-Kāmil) continuing to be zealously read by a wide circle. Religiously inclined Javanese usually enter all kinds of quotations in private notebooks (primbon's in Java) which they consider suitable for the guidance of their daily life. Among these, pantheistic or even nihilistically coloured sayings are particularly common. Such wisdom is particularly in vogue under such names as limu kaḥīrat (doctrine of the highest reality), "doctrine of the seven degrees of being", limu saḥī, "doctrine of the sand from the path to reality. Half educated people content themselves with learning some formulae by heart with a kind of mystic catechism. Illiterates carry as amulets mystic figures with such sentences on them (daerāh's, from the Arabic daʾira, circle).

Of the mystical orders (farījāh's) the Shāṭariya gained the most adherents in Indonesia in the xvith.-xvith centuries. It had then prominent representatives in Medina. It has since almost disappeared in the rest of the world of Islam, but still has many followers in the East Indies. Here it has adopted many heretical elements from popular beliefs. In later times the Kādiriya, Nāṣhini-bandiya, Shāhidiya, etc. through Meccan influence attained considerable prestige. The Shāṭariya with their noisy dīkh exercises spread among the lower classes and resulted in the rise of popular amusements like the Atjeh sādāt performance, which look like a caricature of the dīkh.

Ethical mysticism of the type best represented by al-Ghazzali [q.v.] is also zealously studied in the Indies among such circles as lay particular stress on strict observance of religious law and on dogmatic orthodoxy.

The Chinese, Arabs, and Europeans also later found their way to this archipelago with its varied products. The Chinese probably traded with the Archipelago from the ivith century. If one may judge
from present conditions, in addition to the traders, the poorest young men from South China emigrated to the Indies to make a living by their work and trade and often married native women. From them is descended the mixed Chinese population of the Archipelago, often prosperous and economically very important on account of their industry and thrift. As these half-caste Chinese people retain the manners and customs of their fathers they do not become merged in the Malays. With the more recent immigrants, some 600,000 in number, they are now settled far into the interior of the greater islands, and in the important places on the coast, following their industry and commerce. Of the present immigrant Chinese see Sumatra. The Arabs also, mainly from Hadramaut, go to the Dutch Indies to earn money. Clever and enterprising they rely, with much success in their relations with the Malay Muslims, on their religion and nationality, especially if they can call themselves Sherif or Saayid. Although, like the Chinese, they often become well to do and return home, they leave behind them their families from native wives, which however show a greater inclination in the end to merge in the native population. Prominent Arab scholars from Mecca and Medina also visit the islands occasionally, and so the courts, sometimes remaining a long time, and certainly contribute to strengthen Arab influence, but on account of their slight numbers cannot be considered an important element in the population. The Arabs in the Archipelago are estimated at about 31,000.

Europeans. Of the foreigners the ruling Dutch are economically the most important. With isolated other Europeans they control the wholesale trade, the working of the plantations, and industry. Shortly before conquering Malacca in 1511 the Portuguese had reached this Archipelago and went in the following years to the Spice islands, where they made conquests, carried on trade, and endeavoured to spread their religion. Their enemies, the Spaniards, who had reached the Moluccas from the east, soon retired to the Northern Philippines again.

Towards the end of the xvith century several European nations succeeded in reaching these islands. In 1594 the English, in 1596 the Dutch, and later the French, Danes, and Swedes with their armed ships came to the ports of North and East Sumatra, the north coast of Java, and the Moluccas to obtain spices, precious metals, and other products, which had previously been the monopoly of the Portuguese, Chinese, and Southern Asians.

The very many small Dutch societies for trading with the Indies united in 1602 into the "Geen-troyeerde Oost-Indische Compagnie" with a capital of 6,000,000 guilders. During the xvith century this trading company extended its political power and influence, besides its trade from Africa to Japan, over the Southern Asiatic coasts and the East Indian Archipelago and maintained its position till the end of the xvith century. The competition of the other European nations, the feuds and quarrels in and between the various native states, and its rigid monopoly system soon forced the company continually to conquer more territory, and the resultant costs of administration and war contributed largely to the fact that they were forced in 1800 to hand over their possessions and their burdens of debt to the Dutch government. Their rule then extended to the coast regions of the larger and entirely over many smaller islands. Their relations to the native population consisted almost entirely simply of contracts and trading agreements with the native chiefs for the monopoly of exports and imports. The European influence on the masses of the people was thus very small. During the Napoleonic wars, when the Dutch lost their independence, the English conquered their Indian possessions, but these were returned at the Congress of Vienna as far as they were situated in the East Indian Archipelago. In the sixteenth century and at the beginning of the xvith all the greater islands were considered right to the Dutch and the influence of the Europeans on the natives thus increased. This is best seen on the island of Java which has always been the centre of Dutch authority.

The Queen of the Netherlands possesses executive power with regard to the Dutch Indies and partly independently and partly in combination with the "Staten-Generaal" in the Hague, the legislative authority. The Indian budget of expenditure (366 million guilders in 1916) is fixed by the Queen in combination with the "Staten-Generaal". The Dutch minister of the Colonies takes upon himself the responsibility of the Queen. A Governor-General represents the Queen in the Indies. He also has legislative power in certain circumstances. In the exercise of his great power he is more or less dependent on the cooperation of the "Raad van Indië", a council of five officials of high rank. Under these authorities appointed by the Queen, seven directors, a commander of the army and a chief of the navy with their nine departments carry on the ordinary business of administration. The "Algemeene Rekenkamer", which controls finance, has, like the others, its seat in Batavia. The Dutch Indies are divided into 34 residencies and 3 governments which are under residents and governors. There are 17 of the former in Java. Under these higher civilian officials are assistant residents, controllers, and deputy controllers, all Europeans. The Indian volunteer army consists of about 12,000 Europeans and about 23,000 natives under 1350 Europeans and a few native officers. The Dutch Indies has a navy of its own of small ships and the battle ships of the motherland are detached there.

Besides the area directly governed there are about 300 native principalities which enjoy a certain amount of independence but are otherwise entirely subject to the Dutch government.

This firm government conducted on European lines secures the natives important advantages in contrast to their previous conditions. There are no longer civil or foreign wars, and the exploitation of the masses by the native princes and nobles is very much limited. Among the primitive tribes there is now security of life and property. Trade and commerce have increased everywhere as a result of this security, and necessities of life such as fabrics, crude metals, salt, tobacco, etc., are imported into the interior of the islands much cheaper than formerly. While formerly nothing was done against the terrible tropical diseases, they are now combatted in many ways, although still to an insufficient extent. The Dutch government is as a rule neutral in matters of religion. The often enormous increase in population, for example in Java excluding immigration, from 4 to 5 mil-
lions in 1812 to 30 millions in 1905, is to be ascribed to these circumstances as well as to native customs such as early and general marriage.

The economic development which these colonies have undergone in the last 50 years through the cultivation of products for the world market is of great importance also for the native population. In 1914 the exports of sugar amounted to 185 million guilders, of tobacco 6 million, copra 48 million, coffee 22 million, tea 27 million, rubber 28 million, pepper 11 million. Certain mining districts also yield important products like petroleum (exports 53 million guilders), tin (30 million), anthracite, gold etc.

*Bibliography*:
The literature on the Dutch East Indies in general and its various parts forms a great library. Only the following works may be mentioned here.


**INDJIL** or *Anjil* is corrupted from *λογγίλον*, gospel. From the Kur'an as well as from numerous authors we see that the Muslims had a certain knowledge of the Gospels. It is easy to show with the help of a few quotations the extent of this knowledge. On the other hand, it is often difficult to define positively and not merely by way of induction how this knowledge was obtained. Some of it was certainly obtained orally in controversies or friendly conversations between Christians and Muslims. But this method of transmission for the most part lacks historical record. There were also reminiscences of Christianity which were brought in by Christians converted to Islam. A similar Christian influence made itself felt on the rise of Sufism, in the teachings of which traces of Christianity can be clearly seen (cf. the writer's, *Gaulil, Paris 1902*). Finally, one may certainly assume that there were Muslim seekers after knowledge among the Arabs who read Arabic translations of the Gospels made by Christians. We therefore here give a brief survey of what can be known about these translations, followed by some instances of recollections of the New Testament in the Kur'an or the writings of various writers.

The Christian Arabs translated the Gospels from the Greek, Syrian, or Coptic. The translation from the Greek took place very early, as is shown by the great antiquity of the manuscripts (Vatican,
Arab. 13, and Museo Borgiano-Propaganda), which date back to the viii\textsuperscript{th} century a. d. According to Barhebraeus, there was a still older translation made between 631 and 640 by the Monophysite patriarch Johannes by order of an Arab prince, 'Amr b. Sa'd.

George, Bishop of the Arab tribes of Mesopotamia, a friend and contemporary of James of Edessa, wrote scholia on the Holy Scriptures; Sprenger (Das Leben des Mohammed, i. 131 sq.) even thought he could recognise in a passage in Muḥammad b. Ishāq (ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 149 sq.) a fragment of a pre-Islamic translation. This fragment contains the verses 23–27 of John XV. The word al-m-n-b-minā, by which μανήματος is translated, is neither Arabic nor Syriac but Palestinian and rather old. But even if so great an age cannot be given them, in any case the first translations from the Greek are hardly later than the Muslim conquest and the spread of the Arabic language, which followed it.

A likewise very old translation from the Syriac exists in a Leipzig ms.; according to Gildemeister's investigations (De Evangelis, p. 35), it must have been made between 750 and 850 a. d. The Muslims were thus able to become acquainted with the principal books of the New Testament at quite an early date through direct reading of Arabic translations.

Besides the canonical gospels we possess Arabic recensions of the following New Testament apocrypha: the gospel of the Childhood, Protoevangelium of James, Apocalypse of Paul, a sermon by Peter, and one by Simon, a Martyrdom of James, and of Simon, as well as a small number of others, which do not appear to have been known in Muhammadan circles. R. Duval, La Littérature Syrienne, Paris 1899, p. 96, mentions an Apocalypse of Peter which, according to him, is an Arabic compilation of the xii\textsuperscript{th} century.

Muḥammad was less acquainted with the canonical gospels than with the apocryphal. He did not obtain his knowledge from purely Christian sources, but must have obtained it orally from Christian Jews. This is shown by the kind of legend preserved in the Kurān. They must have taken them from those whom Muḥammad calls hāniṣ's (see HANIS) who traced their religion to Abraham. This question however is only a particular case of the more general question of the origin and sources of Islām.

Poetry is also one of the ways by which Christian ideas found their way among Muslims. At the time of the rise of Islām poets were fond of visiting Hīra [q. v.], where they were on friendly terms with Christian Arabs. They then related in Arabia the legends which they had heard in the wine booths in Hīra. Among these poets are mentioned Zaid b. 'Amr b. Nufail and Umaiya b. Abi 'I-Salt, of whom the latter was particularly well versed in Jewish legends also. Poetry thus formed for a fairly long time a link between Muslims and Christians. We know with what favour the Christian poet al-Akhbāl [q. v.] was received at the court of the Omayyads. Medicine and administration also led to much intercourse between the two religions.

We need only recall the names of Sergius Manṣūr, secretary to four caliphs and father of John of Damascus, and the numerous Christian clerks who were employed by the Muslim government, as is evidenced by the order made by 'Abd al-Malik forbidding them to keep their books in Greek. But let us come back to the Kurān.

Jesus, Mary, and the Greek are frequently mentioned in the Kurān, and Muḥammad knows the essential difference between the Gospel and the Kurān regarding morals, namely compassion and mercy (liv. 27), how he knew to some extent the parable of the sower (xlvi. 29) and the promise of another messenger of God (xvi. 156, cf. xvi. 17). He is also aware that the Gospel is put forward as a confirmation of the Pentateuch (v. 50). Of the miracles of Jesus he mentions the healing of the blind and of the leper as well as the raising from the dead.

The most popular tradition in those circles from which the Prophet obtained his knowledge, seems to have been that of the Annunciation. "He has chosen thee among women" the angel says to Mary in Kurān, li. 37 (cf. Luke i. 28). He likewise adopts the virgin birth of Jesus (xxi. 91). When the crucifixion is denied in Kurān (iv. 156 and iii. 47), he is following the view of the Christian sect of the Docetists. The brief mention of ascension brings the life of Jesus to a conclusion at the moment when, according to the Gospels, the Passion should begin (cf. al-Zamakhshari, ed. Lees, i. 169, where a tradition of Ibn 'Abīs is quoted). The calling of the apostles is distinctly mentioned (iii. 45–46). The institution of monoamiction is connected with this as in the work of the Ikhwān al-Saḥāfa [q. v.]. A miracle in the Acts of the Apostles finds mention in the Kurān: Jesus lets down from heaven a covered table for the apostles (v. 112–115; cf. Acts, x. 9 sqq.). The story that Jesus miraculously gave life to a clay bird (iii. 43; v. 110) is taken from the Gospel of the Childhood. The name "second Adam" given to Christ is approximately found in Sūra iii. 52. The expression "strengthened by the Holy Ghost", which Muḥammad uses in ii. 81, was not understood by him. He confuses the Holy Ghost with the Archangel Gabriel.

The commentators still further develop the legends in the Kurān connected with the New Testament, particularly those of the childhood of Mary. On the whole the figure of the Virgin Mary is a very attractive one in the Kurān and not very remote from Christian sentiment. On the other hand, the figure of Jesus is much more uncertain and, in comparison with the Gospels, a much lower one (cf. ibid.). Jesus is rather only a pious prophet. Muḥammad leaves him the name Messiah (iv. 169 sq.), but this name does not seem to have any definite theological meaning with him. Of other New Testament personages, Muḥammad only mentions John the Baptist and Zachariah.

The New Testament had an important influence on Tradition (Hadīth, q. v.). Various miracles, sayings, and ideas which are attributed to Muḥammad or his followers have their origin in the Gospel. The stories that Muḥammad increased supplies of food or water go back to the miracle of the loaves and fishes in the Gospel rather than to that of the wedding at Cana, as Goldziher thinks. Numerous traditions regarding the high position of the poor and the difficulty of the rich in entering heaven, again reflect the doctrine of the Gospel and are in contrast to the views of the heathen Arabs. As Goldziher has shown, an Arab traditionist, Abī Da'ūd [q. v.], even puts a version
of the Lord's prayer into the mouth of Muhammad. H. Lammens also points out to me that the tradition, according to which Abū Bakr is moved to tears on hearing the Prophet preach, is of Christian origin. The "gift of tears", which is known to Christian mysticism, was little fitting to the temperament of the Arab conquerors.

On the legends of the Mahdi and on Muslim eschatology Christian apocalyptic literature had a considerable influence.

In several Muslim historians we find a rather extensive knowledge of the Gospels. Al-Ya'qūbī, one of the fathers of Arab history, gives a synopsis of them. Such an inquiring spirit as al-Mā'sūdī does not conceal his relations with the Christians.

In Nazareth, as he tells us, he visited a church highly venerated by Christians and received a large number of Gospel stories from them. He knows of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, his childhood in Nazareth, the saying of God in Matthew III, 17: "This is My beloved Son", which he gives with slight alterations. He has also heard the story of the Magi who visited the infant Messiah, according to the Gospel and other sources. He gives the story of the summoning of the Apostles accurately. He also names the Four Evangelists and speaks of the "book of the Gospel", of which he gives a summary, as if he had seen it. On the other hand, he shows a certain distrust of this book, in contrast to the great reverence with which the Kurān speaks of it. Al-Mā'sūdī is comparatively well informed about the lives of the Apostles. He twice speaks of the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul, ascribes to the latter the same kind of martyrdom as, according to tradition, was the fate of Peter only. He knows Thomas as the apostle of India. On the whole, Thomas seems to be the apostle best known to the Muslims next to Peter, and even Paul is less known than Peter.

Al-Bīrūnī is still better informed than al-Mā'sūdī. In order to write his Chronology, he had to consult Nestorian Christians. He knows various parts of the Gospels and also of the commentary of Dādshād (Jesudad, cf. Duval, Litt. Syriacq, 2nd ed., p. 64) and discusses it with a certain spirit of criticism. The four Evangelists to him are four recensions, which he compares with the four copies of the Bible, the Jewish, Christian, and Samaritan. He notices, however, that these recensions differ considerably from one another. Al-Bīrūnī gives the genealogies of Joseph in full from Matthew and Luke, and tells in a very interesting passage how the Christians explain this difference. He speaks of other gospels which the Marcionites, Bardesanesites, and Manichaens possessed, the two first of which differed, according to him, "in some parts" from the Christian Gospels, while the others were contradictory. In view of all these different recensions he concludes that one cannot rely very much on the prophetic value of the Gospels.

The Persian version of Tabarī's Chronicon (French ed. by Zotenberg) contains New Testament legends, which are more detailed than in the Arabic original and correspond with those found in the stories of the Prophets (Kīmas al-Abīyā). Certain details from the Passion for example are given, such as the repudiation by "Simeon", the betrayal by one of the Apostles, who is not mentioned by name, and the story of Mary under the Cross. For the rest the author holds the Muslim view that another person, whom he calls Josua, was substituted for Jesus. As to the history of the Apostles he gives the tradition which makes John come to Edessa.

In the mystic literature, one finds numerous allusions to the Gospel, there are even traces of some knowledge of the exposition of some passages in scripture by the Fathers of the Church. What is given by the Muslim mystics as sayings of Jesus, however, is very far from always agreeing with the Gospel. For example, the sayings ascribed by al-Qāzīzī to Christ are almost all incorrect. On the other hand we find in al-Sahrawardī an accurate and complete version of the parable of the sower. The Rasā'il lṣḥāqīn al-safi' contain remarkable passages about the crucifixion of Jesus, the actuality of which they assume, about the Resurrection, the assembling of the Apostles at the last supper and their scattering over the face of the earth. The Acts of the Apostles (Af'al al-Hawā'iriya) is expressly quoted there (Dieterici, p. 605).

The philosophic literature also shows a large number of controversies between Christians and Muslims. Among the celebrated polemics we need only mention here Abu 'Ali ʿIsā b. Zavrā, who in 387 composed a reply to Abu l-Kāsim ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿĀlīm al-Balikhī, and Yahyā b. ʿAdī, a Christian scholar and pupil of al-Fārābī. The latter produced an apology for Christianity, which he dedicated to Shāhīk Abu ʿĪsā Muhammad b. al-Warāqī. He also replied to strictures by al-Kindī on the Trinity. [See also the articles ʿIṣā and al-Mahdī].

The Muslims in general respect the Gospels and revere Jesus and Mary. The Turks call it Indjil sherīf. Various writers who have lived in Turkey say that many Turks in secret recognize the superiority of the Gospels to the Kurān. In particular they mention the case of ʿAbbās [q. v.], who in the reign of Solmān I openly preferred his preference for the Gospels and was therefore executed (D'Ohsson, Tabululer general de l'Empire Ottomain, i. 153).

INDIJL — INDO-CHINA.


INDIJL. This name, which is properly a name for the royal estates under the Mongols, is usually given to the dynasty which reigned from about 703—758 = 1303—1357 in Fars (Shiraz), as its founder, Sharaf al-Din Mahmûdhshâh, had been first of all sent there by Uldjaitû to administer the royal estates. According to a statement in the *Ta‘rikh-i Čüsäd*, he was a descendant of ‘Abd Allah Anşût [q. v.] under Uldjaitû’s successor Abû Sa‘îd he not only retained his office, but was able continually to extend his power so that by about 725 (1325) he was practically independent ruler of Shiraz and almost the whole of Fars. After the death of Abû Sa‘îd he was put to death by order of his successor Arpa Khân in 736 (1335-6). According to the *Shirâznâmâ*, he had four sons: Dâ’îl al-Din Mahmûdhshâh, Şâyâhâ al-Din Kâjkhusraw, Shams al-Din Muhammad and Abû Islâk Djamâl al-Din. The first name was already named in Shiraz in the lifetime of his father down to about 735, when during his absence his brother Kâjkhusraw took his place. On his return however the latter refused to restore him his authority and a war broke out between the brothers, which ended in 739 (1338-9) with the death of Kâjkhusraw. Mas‘ûd had imprisoned the third brother Muhammad in Ka‘lat Safîd, but he was able to escape and found support from the Čupânid Pir Husain. The latter collected a Mongol army and advanced on Shiraz with Muhammad, so that Mas‘ûd had to take to flight and Pir Husain entered Shiraz.

But his rule did not last long, for, when shortly afterwards in 740 (1340) he put Muhammad to death, the population took up such a threatening attitude that he found it advisable to retire, only however to return next year with new forces. But on this occasion also he had no good fortune, as he quarrelled with the Čupânid Asfâr and, when the two sides were drawn up in line of battle, he was left in the lurch by his own men, so that he had to seek refuge with Shaikh Hasan, who had him put to death. In the meanwhile, Mas‘ûd Şâh had retired to Lûrûstân and made an alliance there with Yaghûbûst, a brother of Asfâr, while Asfâr himself took the side of his brother Abû Islâk. Mas‘ûd, however, succeeded in reaching Shiraz with the help of Yaghûbûst, but there met the same fate as his brother: he was treacherously murdered by Yaghûbûst in 743 (1343). The latter THEREupon quarrelled with Asfâr but made peace again and they jointly attempted to subjugate Fars, but their troops dispersed when the news of the murder of their brother Hasan Kûcûk [q. v.] reached them.

Abû Islâk, a younger son of Mahmûdhshâh, who had previously received the town of Isphân from Pir Husain, now became lord of Shiraz and of the whole of Fars. As he endeavoured to extend his rule over Yazd and Kirmân, he came into conflict with the rising power of the Mu‘azzârîs [q. v.] with varying success. The result was that Abû Islâk was not only driven from Kirmân and Yazd, but was ultimately besieged in Shiraz. The town had to be surrendered to the Mu‘azzârîs in 754 (1353). Abû Islâk had in the meanwhile fled to Ka‘fat Safîd, received some support from the Ilkhan Shaikh Hasan from Baghât and went to Isphân. There also he was besieged and finally captured, handed over to the relatives of a shaikh who had been put to death by his order, and was killed by them 758 (1357). The Persian poet ‘Ubâd Zakâm commemorated his Maecenas in an elegy.


INDO-CHINA. Further India. — ISLĀM in French Indo-China. French Indo-China comprises the whole eastern zone, by far the greater part of the double peninsula which lies between British India and China. The western zone belongs to England and the rather small part in the centre to Siam, which serves as a buffer state between the two. French Further India comprises in the south Cochin China (Annamese Nam ky) which is a direct possession, in the centre the kingdom of Cambodia (in its dialect Srok Khmêr, Nokor Kampûcâ [Sanskrit, Kambuja]), in the north the kingdom of Laos (Laotic: Mông Lao); in the east the empire of Annam (Annamese: Nû‘ô Annam); in the north east the province of Tonking (Annamese Bắc ky), all of which are protectorates.

This country, one and half times the size of France, is only inhabited by about 12,000,000 Annamese, 1,500,000 Cambodians, 1,200,000 Laotes, and about 200,000 Tjams1) and Malays, 275,000 Chinese, 1000 Hindus, mainly Tamils, and about 500,000 savages2) or half civilized men.

1) In French Indo China cham (chams) is written and pronounced tiam. It should be noted that: 𦐃 = ⚖, ListGroup Image 1 = ♂, c, է = թ, j = dj, nh = _ns in the above quoted Indo Chinese words.

2) The natives call themselves Mei, Phong or Kha, which in Annamese, Cambodian and Baoese means "savage".
As regards religion, the Annamese like the Chinese are Buddhists or Confucianists, only a very small number being Christians; the Cambodians and Laotese are Buddhists, the semi-civilised are almost all animists, with a very few Christians; the Tjams, Malays, and a few Tamils are Muslims, except 20 to 25 thousand of the Binh-Thuyhn who have remained faithful to a very ancient Brahmanism. Some Tamils and Bengalese are Hindus.

The Tjams (urang tjam) live partly in Binh Thuyn, in modern Annam, the last refuge of their nationality, partly in Cambodin, along the bank of the Meckong, and on the edge of the great lake (Tonle Sap) partly around the towns of Chau Doc and Tay-ninh in Cochín China, and finally in a few villages in Siam.

The Malays who are almost equal in numbers live entirely near them in Cambodia as well as in Cochín China and are in constant relations with them. They are not found in Annam.

Islam at present plays only a slight part in Further India. It was at one time more important but never predominant, as long as the kingdom of the Tjams dominated the peninsula.

The Tjams, whose physical features and language are obviously connected with those of the Polynesian Malays, at one time founded a powerful kingdom in Further India, which seems to have comprised Cochín China, the modern Annam, with the exception of Tonking, and a part of Cambodin. A memorial of its greatness is the stele of Nhatrang, of the second or third century. In the thirteenth century the kingdom, although already declining, still aroused the astonishment of Marco Polo. In the fourteenth, however, it was broken up when the Cambodians and Annamese attacked it together and in 1471 there were only a few tribes in the valleys of the Binh Thuyn who were much oppressed by Annam. At that time many of them fled to Cambodia, where their descendants still live.

The oppressed Tjams greeted the French rule with joy, but the French are not succeeding in elevating them. Physically they are not degenerate. They are taller and better proportioned than the Annamese, the skin is soft and of a light brown colour, the hair soft and often wavy, the face rather broad, the eye well formed, and with an open look, the mouth of medium size. They belong to those Asiatics whose type is nearest to ours, but their fertility is only very moderate. In spite of a certain childishly liveliness and a great softness of character they are intellectually extremely apathetic. They practise neither commerce nor industry, live in very miserable villages (in Annam they are built on the ground and in Cambodin on piles), weave a few stuffs, and only do as much agriculture and cattle rearing as is necessary to maintain life without worrying whether they can improve their lot.

When was Islam introduced among the Tjams? This question has not yet been solved. One thing however is certain. It was preceded by Hinduism, the most accepted form of which was Civism, which is still practised with the most remarkable variations by some thousands of Tjams who have remained true to this old faith and therefore call themselves Tjan-Diat (Sanskrit jātu), pure-bred Tjams. But by their Muslim fellow countrymen they are called Akhphir or Kaphir (Ar. kāfīr) "infidels", without the one side or the other seeing an insult in the appellations.

Two hypotheses may explain the introduction of Islam into Further India. It was either brought in the 18th or 19th century by Arab merchants, Indians or Persians, in the great movement of the general spread of Islam, or it came later as a result of a Malay immigration.

It is certain that the Arabs were acquainted with Further India at a very early period. As early as the 8th century there were regular relations between Arabia, China, India, and the Archipelago. By 458 the Arabs and Persians were so numerous in Canton that they laid the city waste with fire and sword. In the 6th century they raised a rebellion in Khan-fu, in which 120,000 of them perished by the sword. In these circumstances they must have been acquainted with Indo-China and if they knew it, they must also have endeavoured to win it for their religion with the well known missionary enthusiasm of the Muslims.

A passage in the Annals of the Sung dynasty, Chap. 486, which was ingeniously explained by Ed. Huber (Bulletin de l’Ecole francaise d’Extreme Orient, III, 55, N° 1), shows that Islam was first brought to them by the Arabs or Persians. In the Annals it is stated: “There are (among the Tjams) also buffaloes which live in the mountains. They are not used for agriculture but only as sacrificial animals. When one is sacrificed, the men utter this prayer “A-lo-ho-ki-ka” which means “may it soon rise again”. According to Huber, this A-lo-ho-ki-ka corresponds to Allâhu akbar and warrants the conclusion that there were already Tjams converted to Islam in the time of the Sung. In the same account of the Tjams it is said: “the customs and dress of the Tjams are similar to those of the population of the kingdom of Ta-che (Tâïjik i.e. Arabs)”. The historical statements of the Tjams are not to be taken too seriously. But it must be remarked that their legendary chronicles place at the head of the list of kings who had Sri-Thanoy as their capital, the Po or lord Ovâh (Allâh) who reigned from 1000 to 1036. In the year of the Rat a man of the nature of Ovâh lived a perfect life in the Tjam kingdom, but the land was not contented. This man recommended his soul and body to the lord of heaven and settled for 37 years in Mokkâh (Mecca), then came back to the Tjam kingdom . . .” Did the Muslim Tjams wish to number Allâh among their national rulers out of religious pride or merely give a place among their kings to the Persian or Arab pilgrim who brought them Islam? Both hypotheses are possible.

Another text which comes from the Tjams of Cambodin (see Delaporte, Voyage au Cambodge, Paris 1880, p. 417 sq.), reports that Nao Savan (Nâghîrwan), the divine inoa (youth), the first king of the Tjams, was the inventor of the alphabet, which is still used in profane books. The inhabitants who were previously worshippers of Buddha, were later converted to Islam by Patenta Ali (cf. the Malay Baginda ‘Ali), the father-in-law of Muhammad. At the latter’s birth Nao Savan had gone to Mecca to worship him as all the kings of the earth did, and was installed by him in his residence Bairch Balî (‘îr Bándy, the modern Qui-nho’n, Annam), the capital of Peripanong (the
modern Phan-rê and Phan-rang, Annam), to the east of Cambodia, and the Tjams still say that this is their place of origin.

In short, it is quite possible that Islam had already been introduced in the sixth century by Arab, Persian, or Indian merchants. But it made only slight progress and for the Malay immigration in the xivth and xvth centuries which kept it up and spread it, it would have probably disappeared again. It is moreover due to this immigration that Islam has retained its purity through the relation which the Malays keep up with the Tjams of Cambodia and Cochinchina.

But it is also possible that the law of Muḥam-mad reached them through the Malays of the Archipelago or Malacca. The latter, as Prof. Kern has convincingly proved, themselves come from Indo-China and are related to the Tjams and, as inscriptions and legends show, were from the viith century onwards in uninterrupted close relations with the kingdoms of Champa and Cambodia, partly through intermarriages of the ruling families and partly through invasions. These turbulent Malays, whose Islamism was not of an intolerant type, thanks to the community of religion, kept in such close touch with the Tjams after their political decline that the two are usually confused in the history of Cambodia and Annam. Their common rebellions and intrigues in the xivth and xvth centuries disturbed the peace of the two kingdoms, particularly that of Cambodia. The chroniclers and especially the Spanish theologians, who at the beginning of the xvth century had hoped to see Indo-China brought under the sway of Philip III, bitterly acknowledge at this period (1603) the influence of the "Moros" i.e. the Muslims whom the tolerance of the kings of Cambodia and of the Tjams allow to build mosques everywhere, who endeavour to proselytise and who hate the Christians to the extent of wishing to drink their blood (cf. Brève et vériquie relation des événements Cambodgi de Gabriel Quiroga de S. Antonio ... New Edition of the Spanish text (of 1604) with a translation and notes by Antoine Cabaton, Paris 1904, p. 106, 124, and passim). Matters went so far that about 1624 a prince of Cambodia, Phrā Rām, seized the throne supported by them, married a Malay woman, and adopted Islam to the great scandal of the true Cambodians who were faithful followers of Buddha.

The Muslim Malays and Tjams down to the xivth century took an active part in all the internal strife which disturbed the peace of Cambodia in its decline. For a time they played such an important part that one of them, Tuan Sait Aḥmid (= Shaikh Ahmad) — according to the chroniclers, a Malay of royal descent, but perhaps simply a Tjam with some Malay blood —, in 1820 became regent and right hand man of Ang-Čan, the ruler of Cambodia. He aroused the jealousy of the Cambodians and the distrust of the Annamese, who would have liked the lands of Ang-Čan for themselves, to such an extent that his political enemies succeeded in having him condemned and beheaded without his fellow-Muslims, who would certainly have rescued and saved him, learning anything of it until too late. His sons and followers raised a rebellion in the province of Thbong-Khmun where the Tjams and Malays of Cambodia joined together and united with the Tjams of Chau-dóc and laid the country waste until Norodom ascended the throne in 1859 and French rule finally put an end in 1863 to the political importance of the Muslim element in Indo-China.

From the religious point of view, these Malay immigrants into Indo-China, who are mainly found in Saigon, Chôlô-w, Chau-dóc, Tây-ninh (towns in Cochinchina), Phnom Penh, Kampong-Laong, Kampong Tjam, Lovek, Pursat and in other centres of Cambodia, show no original features. They entirely resemble their brethren in the Peninsula of Malacca, are in constant relations with them, and often receive from there missionaries whose duty it is to maintain the purity of their creed. They are intelligent, active, clever and prudent, but are considered to be treacherous, cruel, cunning and inhospitable. They keep quite apart from the Cambodians among whom they live and only maintain closer relations with their co-religionists among the Tjams. They are mainly traders, farmers, fishermen, boatmen, drivers, growers of vegetables, and are respected if not loved in Cambodia for their intelligence and industry. Although they were well treated by their rulers, their wealth seems to have been often rightly doubted and for their interests do not seem to go beyond that of their community. They are Shi'is and in general are acquainted with the precepts of Islam and they read the Kurân and its commentaries. Among them we find for example the "Aṣida of al-Samā'i, the Si Barung Pingai, Fikh and ʿAṣid books, the Şīrī ʿemustahjīm, various poetical works or legends such as Male Min, Mi Ḡusīn Muḥammad Ḥan-fiyīyīh etc.

These religious ideas and, to a less degree their religious development, the Malays of Cambodia have in common with the Tjams of Cambodia and Indo-China. Both observe the five daily prayers, the ablutions and circumcision, which is performed at the age of 15. They do not eat the flesh of pigs, dogs, crocodiles, tortoises, elephants, peacocks, vultures, eagles, and ravens, and they refrain from intoxicating drinks. If any one worships a strange idol, he is expelled from the community. Some make the pilgrimage to Mecca or pay a certain sum, for which a representative is sent on their behalf. In Cambodia the mosques are almost always built of wood and are placed on slight elevations. The finest are large bare rooms with a platform at the back. The mats which are used as prayer carpets are hung up in a sack from the rafters. On the left at the entrance there is usually a large drum painted red (Tjam garnōng = Malay gendang, Javanese kendang). Outside is a little basin of masonry for ablutions.

Within these precincts the imāms give the children instruction in reading Arabic and in reciting the Kurān. The assembly or ʿijmālah cannot take place without a quorum of 40 believers. Ramaḍān is strictly observed by all, pious families are quite abstemious in this period. On Mondays they refrain from sexual intercourse.

The Tjams of Cambodia also observe the bulan ʿah haji (lasting month of the pilgrims) also called bulan Onlah (month of Allah) three months after Ramaḍān. They also observe the molot or molut (Arab. molat?), when a lock of hair is cut from the children of 3 to 13 and they are given a religious name, which for boys is always Ḥabīb Allah or Muḥammad, for girls Ḥabībīya (Pajims). The imāms, at least four in number, are invited to pray
in the house in which the ceremony is being performed. This custom of hair cutting seems to be borrowed from the Cambodians.

The tanat (Arab tawmā) is a ceremony nearly always confined to the family circle, at which a boy, who has learned the Kurān entirely by heart, which however happens very rarely, is led round the village on horseback amid the acclamations of men and women. He is dressed in his best clothes and is greeted with the greatest reverence by men and women.

The surūḥ (pursuit), which is celebrated in the first Tjām month, is accompanied by two days' fasting and commemorates the migration of the Prophet (Hijīra).

By the tāpāt, which we also find among the Tjams of Annam, who call it sukāh = Ar. tovla, old persons are purified from their sins by means of numerous prayers and sprinkling with holy water.

Malays and Tjams have common religious officials in Cambodia who are given the following names according to their office.

Malay          Tjam          Function.
1. mufsi          mepkati          jurist
2. tuan kadli      tūk kalik          judge
3. raya kadli      rajas kalik
4. tuan pakih      tuan pakē          jurist
5. hakim           hakem          doctor
6. kētēp           kētp          preacher
7. bilal           bilal          mu'ādh jużin
8. lēbāi          lēbēi          officiant.

All are exempt from taxation. The four first have the following Cambodian names: 1. okē in rādā koley, 2. okē in raya koley, 3. okē in tok koley, 4. okē in pakē. They are appointed by the King, belong to his council and are the official superiors of the Muslims. They are regarded by the faithful as representing the four caliphs of the Prophet and enjoy a great spiritual authority.

The religious dignitaries are usually chosen from the most prominent families whose sons can become imāms at the age of 15 and whose daughters are educated with special care to make them worthy wives. The Muslims of Cambodia respect the graves of saints which they call tā-lak: they believe in witches, the werewolf, evil spirits, and in magic and have retained certain agricultural customs which are also found among the neighbouring peoples such as the Cambodians and Annamese. They are relics of an old animism.

The family bonds among the Muslims of Cambodia are very strong; the father has great authority. The wife is well treated but kept strictly within the house as well as the daughters, who are very early initiated into household duties and, being under strict control, are only allowed to marry Muslims.

The Muslim Tjams have adopted from the Cambodians the custom of filing and lacquering their daughters' teeth at the age of 15, an operation which is accompanied by prayers from the imāms and sprinkling with holy water.

The marriage customs are in general Muslim. The boys do not as a rule marry before 18 or the girls before 15. The wedding feast is accompanied with great expenditure. Divorce is possible but rare. If it is demanded by the woman, she loses her dowry (Tjam sakawin, Malay mas kawin) which the husband settled on her at the betrothal.

The burial ceremony is very simple. The corpse is washed twice with a decoction of jujube leaves or benzoin water, then in clear water, wrapped in a piece of linen and placed in a grave about ten and a half feet deep, with the head to the north. A mound of earth is then erected over the grave, which is covered with thorny branches to protect it from wild animals. On the third, seventh, thirtieth, fortieth, and hundredth day the imāms are invited to pray and eat with the family at the grave. The exhumation practised by the Tjams of Annam is not found here.

The husband mourns in white forty days for his wife, the latter three months and ten days for the husband and she cannot marry again before a hundred days.

The Islam of the Tjams in Annam has quite a different stamp. It appears to have a Shi'ī character, as Aṣām (Iṣāsun), Aṣā (Husayn) and A'll are particularly revered and invoked there: they also play the main part in the few manuscripts or legends still preserved in Annam. It is however considerably penetrated by animistic and Hindu ideas and customs which preceded it and still survive alongside of it. The Muslim Tjams of Annam are Muslims mainly through the naive conviction that they are Muslims. They call their Hindu country men kafir without the slightest derogatory intention and themselves banis = banī, the sons of religion, or Tjams Asalām (= Islām), Tjams of Islām. They say that they worship Ovolā (Allāh), but also Pō Devata Thwor (Çevar) (Sanskrit Devatā Swarga), God, Lord of Heaven, and they offer presents in certain agrarian rites, e.g. two eggs, a nyp of rice brandy, and three leaves of betel, to Pō Ovolā, Tak Ala, the mysterious king of the underworld; in reality it is the Muslim expression Allāh tā'tā, out of which they have made a god. They also worship the Brahman goddess Pō Inō Nōgar = "Mother of the Land" (Umā, Bhagavati), and her husband Pō Yang Amō, "the Lord God, the Father [of the land]" (Śiva), whom they identify with Pō Havāḥ (= Hawād), i.e. Eva and Pō Adam, the ancestors of mankind.

The Tjam Kaphir of Annam with as broad a tolerance have taken into their Pantheon Pō Ovolā (= Allāh), an undefined bodiless god, the creator of Pō Raqulik (= Rasić Allāh) and of Pō Latil (= Lā Ilākā), who lives in Mūkāh (Mecca) and who was created by Pō Ovolābuk (= Allāhān) the father of nobi Mahamat (= Nākā Mahāmat), who are par-
asalām (=
kitāb al-Islām), the book of īslām, ki-
tāb al-mu'āma = kitāb al-īlam, the book of
praise, ṭamāh ṭāhārāy, the talisman book. They
never use his real name. The Qurān moreover is
hardly to be found among them at all. The few
copies which exist are incorrect, and written on
chinese paper with the brush and not with the
reed pen. The Bani seem to esteem equally highly
a mystical compendium which much resembles the
Javanese prīmboh and is called nūrlīyān by them.
The "priests" copy it only during rānīvānt (= Ra-
maḍān) and they receive the princely remunera-
tion of a buffalo for each copy.

The Tjams of Annam pray only on Fridays and
during Ramaḍān the five rāh or vākūt (= waḥf)
ṣaḥīf, the names of which they corrupt as follows:
ṣaḥīf, ṣaḥālik (=
ṣaḥīf) "morning prayer", rāh
ṣaṭāk (=
ṣaḥār), "noonday prayer", asārî (=
ṣa'īr) "afternoon prayer", muṣafār (=
ṣa'īr) "evening prayer". They
are in the main content with reciting a few sūrās,
especially the fātihā, without understanding them,
and the Arabic form is so corrupted in their
pronunciation that it is almost unintelligible, e. g.

1. aḥū similla kyor rāh mūnōr rāh hīnāt =
Ar.: bi 'sūnī 'lāhī 'r'raḥāmūnī 'r'raḥīmī;

2. asūnūk akkbār; lā 'lāhā illāwūlāwāh wūwāhāk akkbār =
ar.: allāhū akkbār; lā 'lāhā illā 'lāhī,

They hardly observe any ablutions but are con-
tent with making signs as if they were taking
water out of a hole in the ground. Circumcision
(katān, katāt = Ar. bītān) which is performed on
boys at the age of 15 and must always precede
marriage, is however only symbolical and consists
in the imām with a wooden knife marking the
circumcision. The boy receives a new name (awwāl =
awwāl), usually "Ali or Muḥammad. The Tjām
Bani do not make the pilgrimage to Mecca and,
while they do not eat pork, the priests as well as
the faithful enjoy brandy made from rice, as well as
other intoxicating liquors; the religious dignitaries
do not however drink in the mosque. If the num-
ber of 400 is present on Friday in the mos-
que, those missing are replaced by ceremonial cakes
and the usual service, followed by a meal, takes
place.

The people only observe Ramaḍān for 3 days.
The imāms however must observe it till the end
of the week of the whole community. During this
time they shut themselves up in the mosque with
their prayer books, their rosary, their tea pot,
their sleeping mats, their copper spitoon and their
betel set, which they require to prepare the chewing
material indispensable to all Eastern Asians. For
a whole month they never cross the threshold
except to perform complete ablutions in the river.
The others are taken in the great cisterns under
the penthouse roof of the mosque.

These mosques are also and in such mosques (āmīgik, sāmīgik; cf. Adj.: māqīg) which are turned towards Mecca
are usually rather poor straw huts with walls of
bamboo latticework.

Even the names of the religious dignitaries in
Annam suggest the strange alteration which Islām
has suffered there. At their head is the po gru or ong
guru (Skr. guru), then come the imān (imām),
from whom he is chosen and who are the men
who really perform the ceremonies, then the kāṣīp
(bāthīb), who have to give the religious readings
in the mosque; next come the mūdīn e. e. mu'ādh-
dīn, the ābār (Skr. dāyārya = "religious teacher"),
a kind of religious instructors who belong to the
mosque. In general, the word aṭīr in Annam is
applied to all Muslim "clergy" in contrast to baṣātīk,
which is the name of the Hindu priests.

All the religious dignitaries in Annam shave their
heads and faces. In addition to the simple white fez
worn in Cambodia, they also wear a voluminous
turban with gold, red or brown fringes. The various
ranks are distinguished by the length of the fringes.
Like their Hindu brethren they carry a long
Spanish reed, the lower part of which is woven
into the form of a basket only in that of the ong gru.
A white sarong, a long white tunic which is but-
toned and cut open at the neck is their sole
costume. On high feast days the mibar and the
interior of the mosque are covered with white
cloth; on these occasions they exchange the tur-
ban for a kind of disc, which is bored through
the middle and fastened to the fez by a piece of
linen. The whole looks like the biretta of a judge.

These "priests" are almost as ignorant as their simple
followers; they can hardly read Arabic, hardly
study it at all, and only roughly understand their
sūrās which they repeat only "because their fathers
also did so". They are free from taxation and
forced labour and are held in fairly high esteem
by the people; they are the more educated class,
however slight the education may be. As they are
quite indifferent and tolerant, they do not think
ill of the faithful when the latter make offerings
to the Pū Yang or various Hindu deities, endeavour
to propitiate evil spirits and perform certain agraria-
rian rites or magic ceremonies which have nothing
Muslim in them. They live in perfect harmony
with the Hindu baṣātīk, invite them to their reli-
gious and domestic festivities and are invited in
turn, — only the food for the inmūn must be pre-
pared by a Muslim woman — and give each other
places of honour. From mutual tolerance both
communities refrain from eating pork or beef.

Only from the Hindu cremations do the Muslim
priests carefully absent themselves and this reli-
gious horror of corpses was previously, it is said,
the reason why they alone could enter the royal
palace to pray with women in child-bed and to
watch his wives and children during the absence
of the king.

Either as a result of ancient customs or of the
Malay-Polynesian matriarchal system or through
contact with the Hindus of Annam who have
priestesses called pāḍiṣh, the Muslims of Annam
have priestesses for a domestic cult; they are
called rōjja or rījja. If a sick member of the
family has to be healed, for example, or a journey
or business enterprise to be undertaken auspicio-
ously, the inmūn first of all recites various prayers,
then this rājja — often the housewife herself —
accompanied by the mūdīn who sings and beats
the drum, perform certain ritual dances or falls
into a state of great excitement in order to in-
fluence the 'deities' or 'spirits of the dead', to
whom sacrifices are at the same time made. This
ceremony is always followed by a great feast.
The rōjja's, who must not eat the flesh of the pig or
of the sand cat, even play the principal part at
the great annual festivals, which are celebrated
in December—January and are probably of Malay
or Indonesian origin — the same Java is re-
peatedly mentioned in them — and are regarded by
the Muslim Tjams as the "New Year's festi-
val of the ancestors".
Birth customs in Annam among the Bani are similar to those among the Kaphir except that the Bani do not sacrifice to the gods on such occasions. The seduction of girls is also severely punished. They do not marry till they are 17 or 18. In Panrang, evidently the result of the old Malay matriarchal system—which has left other traces also, like the right of inheritance of women and the tracing of descent through them and their practising the cult of ancestors—the custom prevails that the girls seek the young men in marriage, but everywhere else in Indo-China the reverse is the custom. The wedding (Tjâm, likhaî = Arab. nikâh), which is the occasion of dancing and country festivities, is usually replaced by public cohabitation, which causes no scandal; the pair are free to celebrate it later when they can afford it, and they may already have two or three children to take part in it. It is far more elaborate among the Bani than among the Kaphir. The imûn’s repeat prayers; the ong grû, who represents the “lord Muḥammad”, asks the bride, who is considered to be Fāṭima, whether she accepts the presents of the bridgroom, the lord ‘Ali. Rich feasts take place at the weddings. The dowry given to the woman remains her property in case of a divorce. Divorce is fairly easy and leaves nearly two thirds of the joint property in the hands of the woman. Mixed marriages are rare and in them the children follow the religion of the mother. It sometimes happens that a Muslim woman marries a Hindu, very rarely the contrary.

The burial service is as simple among the Bani as it is elaborate among the Kaphir. The corpse is wrapped in white cotton sheets and placed in a small hut, where the ong grû and the imûn’s repeat prayers. As soon as night falls the dead man is buried, with four imûn’s present, almost secretly, without a coffin and with the face turned to the north. The relatives beseech his spirit not to come and afflict them. On the 3rd, 7th, 10th, 30th, 40th and 100th day as well as on the anniversary of his death a访谈 i.e. a service at the tomb with prayers, a meal and presents for the imûn’s is observed. This festival takes place under the presidency of the ong grû and of two imûn’s for a considerable number of girls on each occasion and lasts two days. It is opened with prayers to Allah, Muhammad, the Hindu deities and the shades of their ancestors as well as with a feast at which the priests eat apart. Two booths are erected, the one for the ceremony itself, and the other as a dressing room for the girls, who sleep there under the supervision of four matrons. The imûn spend the night praying; at 7 a.m. the girls appear wearing their finest clothes and ornaments, their hair loosened and covered with a triangular mitre. Before them goes an old woman and a man clothed in white, who carries a year-old child dressed exactly like the girls except for the mitre. They throw themselves down before the ong grû and the imûn’s. The ong grû places a grain of salt in the month of the child, cuts off a lock of its hair and gives it some water to drink. The same is done with the girls, who then return in procession to their booth. If a girl has been seduced the lock is cut off at her neck as a mark of shame. A second feast, at which the priests eat before the faithful, concludes the ceremony.

The festival lasts two days and three nights. A great booth is built in an enclosure, if possible of quite new material, and the interior is hung with white cotton cloth. The altar is a simple large tray, with dishes on which are betel, food and fruits. Wax lights are stuck on the edge of the dishes and they also are bound round with cotton threads of different colours. A swing hung to two pillars is intended for the radja; she is assisted by three imûn’s and the mödin, who with his tom-tom conducts an orchestra consisting of a clarionet, a violin, cymbals and an oblong drum (ganông). The festival which is interrupted by numerous meals is opened with the bismillâh, then follows the invocation of the mountain and forest spirits and of the shades of the “spirits beyond the sea,” which may not be mentioned by name”; and finally the invocation of 38 deities or spirits by name; at each of them the three imûn recite prayers.

The most characteristic part of the festival takes place on the second day at the rise of the morning star. After the mödin has invoked the deities and the radja has performed a special dance in their honour, they take a small rowing boat made out of a single piece of wood, which is said to come from Java or China to collect tribute. The master of the house in which the festival is held, pretends not to understand Javanese and the mödin acts as interpreter. Amid joking all round, eggs, cakes and the figure of an ape with jointed limbs are put in the boat, the participants then break up the walls and roof of the booth and fight for the cakes. On the third day the radja goes, accompanied by the officiants and the orchestra, to the river and solemnly places the boat with the ape on the water. This ends the festival.

While circumcision is only symbolic with the Tjâm Bani of Annam, the tubah for the old men is practised as in Cambodia and the karob (literally, “enclosing”) marks the declaration of a girl’s fitness for marriage. Not till then dare they cut their hair and marry; until then they are tabunâ i.e. unapproachable, and the seducer would be severely punished. This festival takes place under the presidency of the ong grû and of two imûn’s for a considerable number of girls on each occasion and lasts two days. It is opened with prayers to Allah, Muhammad, the Hindu deities and the shades of their ancestors as well as with a feast at which the priests eat apart. Two booths are erected, the one for the ceremony itself, and the other as a dressing room for the girls, who sleep there under the supervision of four matrons. The imûn spend the night praying; at 7 a.m. the girls appear wearing their finest clothes and ornaments, their hair loosened and covered with a triangular mitre. Before them goes an old woman and a man clothed in white, who carries a year-old child dressed exactly like the girls except for the mitre. They throw themselves down before the ong grû and the imûn’s. The ong grû places a grain of salt in the mouth of the child, cuts off a lock of its hair and gives it some water to drink. The same is done with the girls, who then return in procession to their booth. If a girl has been seduced the lock is cut off at her neck as a mark of shame. A second feast, at which the priests eat before the faithful, concludes the ceremony.
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**Al-Insān al-Kāmil**. This expression, which means literally "The Perfect Man", is used by Muhammadan mystics to denote the highest type of humanity, i.e., the theosophist who has realised his essential oneness with God. Abū Ya‘ūq al-Biṣūmī (ab. 261 = 874), quoted in the Kitāb al-Kushāri (Cairo, 1318, p. 140, l. 12 sqq.; cf. R. Hartmann, Al-Kushāri’s Darstellung des Šī‘ī-Tums, Türkische Bibliothek, vol. xviii., p. 168 infra sq.), speaks of the mystic who after having been invested with certain divine names, passes away (fārāya) from them and becomes "the perfect and complete" (al-kāmil al-tāmim). We may identify the person so described with al-Insān al-Kāmil, a phrase which occurs, perhaps for the first time, in the writings of Ibn al-Arabī (cf. Fustūq al-Ḥikam, Ch. 1) and forms the title of a well-known work, al-Insān al-Kāmil fi Ma‘rifat al-Awāzīr wa l-Awāzīr, by ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Djlī, who died about 820 (1417). These authors base their theory of the Perfect Man on a pantheistic monism which regards the Creator (al-Ḥakīk) and the creature (al-Khaṣṣ) as complementary aspects of Absolute Being. A similar but by no means identical doctrine had already been set forth by al-Hallādī (see Kitiš al-Tawāwīr, ed. by Massinon, p. 129 sqq.) "Man", says Ibn al-Arabī, "unites in himself both the form of God and the form of the universe. He alone manifests the divine Essence together with all its names and attributes. He is the mirror by which God is revealed to Himself, and therefore the final cause of creation. We ourselves are the attributes by which we describe God; our existence is merely an objectification of His existence. While God is necessary to us in order that we may exist, we are necessary to Him in order that He may be manifested to Himself."

Al-Djlī, who differs from Ibn al-Arabī in certain details, gives a full and systematic exposition of the theory. His argument runs somewhat as follows:

Essence (dīār) is that to which names and attributes are attached, although in reality there is no distinction between the Essence and its attributes. It may be either existent or non-existent. The existent is either Pure Being (God) or Being joined to non-being (created things). Absolute or Pure Being is the simple Essence, without manifestation of names, attributes, and relations. The process of manifestation involves a descent from simplicity, which has three stages (1) aḥādīyā (2) aḥwāyā (3) anīya. At this point appear the names and attributes whereby the Essence is made known. They are communicated by means of mystical illumination (taḏjāll). The Perfect Man, who typifies the emanation of Absolute Being from itself and its return into itself, moves upward through a series of illuminations until he ultimately becomes merged in the Essence. In the first degree, called the illumination of the Names, he is destroyed under the radiance of the name by which God reveals Himself, so that if you invoke God by that name, the man answers you, because the name has taken possession of him". The second degree is called the Illumination of the Attributes. These are received by the mystic in proportion to his capacity, the abundance of his knowledge, and the strength of his resolution. To some men God reveals Himself by the attribute of life, to others by the attribute of knowledge, to others by the attribute of power, and so on. Moreover, the same attribute is manifested in different ways. For example, some hear the divine speech (kalām) with their whole being, some hear it from human lips but recognise it as the voice of God, some are informed by it concerning future events. The final degree, which is the Illumination of the Essence, sets the seal of deification upon the Perfect Man. He now becomes the Pole (kālid) of the universe and the medium through which it is preserved; he is omnipotent, nothing is hidden from him; it is right that mankind should bow down in adoration before him, since he is the vicegerent (każīf) of God in the world (cf. Kur‘ān 2, 23). Thus, being divine as well as human, he forms a connecting link between God and created things. His universal nature (ḏal‘iyā) gives him a unique and supreme position in the order of existence. Al-Djlī divides the attributes of God into four classes: attributes of the Essence (Oneness, Eternity, Creativeness, and the like), attributes of beauty (ḏanāli), attributes of majesty (ḏaḏāti), and attributes of perfection (kaḏāti). While the attributes of beauty, majesty, and perfection are manifested both in this world and the next — Paradise and Hell, for instance, being respectively absolute manifestations of beauty and majesty — the Perfect Man alone displays the whole sum of divine attributes and possesses the divine in all its fullness. This microcosmic function, according to the Sufistic interpretation of Kur‘ān 33, 75, is freely bestowed as a trust from the hands of His Maker. He contains the types of every spiritual and material thing. His heart corresponds to the Throne of God (kursī), his reason to the Pen (qalam), his soul to the Tablet (al-lahu al-maḥfūz), his nature to the elements (anwāṣir). He is the copy of God (mashhād al-Ḥakīk); cf. the tradition that God created Adam in His own image.

This theory shows the influence upon Sufism of Gnostic ideas (cf. Bouisset, Haupptide der Gnosis, p. 160 sqq.). The Insān al-Kāmil is the Insān al-Kudin of the Manichaens, the Adam Kadmon of the Kabbāšt. It was inevitable that on Islamic ground the Representative Superman should be the Prophet Muhammad, the dogma of whose pre-existence established itself even in orthodox circles, at an early date (see Goldschmidt, Neuplatonische und gnostische Elemente im Ḥadīth in Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, xxii. 324 sqq.). Many Sufis, adopting the Plotinian doctrine of emanation, identify Muhammad, the Perfect Man, with Universal Reason or the Logos. Al-Djlī takes care to state that Muhammad is the Most Perfect Man.
Al-Insan al-Kamil — Frāb.

Ahmed Rūsim, ʿĪāwēlī Khasīna-i Mekātīb (Stambul 1331); Mehmed Fuʿād, Rehber-Kitāb-i ʿOrnānîye yahhīd Mukkemel Munsīhāt (Stambul 1328);
Said Enn. Guidé compit de correspondance turco-français (Constantinople 1331), etc.

The professional letterwriters (kāthī, q. v.) in the chancelleries (divān al-imāk) are called munsīhī, but in India every educated native, especially a native teacher of languages is called munsīhī. Cf. Hobson-Jobson, s. v. Munshree. Cf. also the articles DAWĀTAKĀR and KĀTHĪ, where further references are given.

In Shā Allāh, "If Allah wills." The duty of frequently using this phrase, even when no doubt can really enter, is based upon Kurān xviii. 23 and xlvi. 27. In these passages Allāh, addressing the Prophet, uses it; and in the second passage the event so conditioned was certain to happen and is even qualified by Alī himself with a ḍulāyēt, "in verity.

This Allāh is said to have done to admonish (ilītaḍī) the Prophet to the use of the phrase. A tradition is also quoted in which Muhammad, addressing the dead buried in the cemetery of al-Madina, saluted them with the Peace, and added, "and we, if it be the will of Allāh, shall join you" — a thing of which there could be no doubt. It is therefore used a) in cases where a doubt can really enter; b) to show modesty in replying to a question or remark of a flattering nature, but never when what is answered was unflattering; c) to show good manners (taḍādūd) towards Allāh in submitting verbally and formally to his will, and thereby to gain a blessing (tabarruk). This formal submitting of all things to the will of Allāh makes the phrase in usage equivalent to the expression of a desire or hope. If some one tells you that the death of a friend is imminent, you must not say in shā Allāh, but you should if you are told that he is getting better. The Saiyīd al-Murtadā (see reference below) says that a sect, al-Marzūqī, existent in his time in Egypt, followers of a certain ʿUmmān b. Marzūq, pushed the use of the phrase so far as to fall into heresy (bidā)

Bibliography: Ḥayy al-Ghazālī with commentary of the Saiyīd al-Murtadā, ii. 262 sqq.

D. B. Macdonald.

Inshā Allāh Khan, Indian poet, born in Mursibhābād; about 1200 he settled in Lucknow, where he secured the patronage of Prince Salimān Shikāb; he died about the year 1250. In addition to a Persian and an Urdu divān, he wrote a Persian mathnawī entitled Shīr u Birinjī; by order of the Nawāb of Oudh, Saʿdād ʿAllā Khan (1212-1223), he wrote a grammar of the Urdu language, entitled Daryā-yī Lajfāt, and published a collection of the witty sayings of the same prince, under the title Ḥalāf al-Seʿdād.


Frat (A.) Technical term in Arabic grammar, frequently translated by "inflexion," has however a much narrower meaning. For in the nouns it only applies to the formation of cases but not to numbers and in the verb it refers exclusively to the distinction of the moods of the imperfect and therefore is not applied, as Flügel, Die gramm. Schuilen der Araber, p. 15, erroneously assumes, to the formation of the genders of the
verb and its tenses and even to that of the personal forms, which are regarded as nominal elements added to the verb proper.

According to the view of the Arab grammarians in practice every occurrence of ʻrāb presupposes as effective cause a governing word, ʻamīl [q. v.]. In contrast to ʻrāb is binda [q. v.] which is applied to all words which retain their form irrespective of syntactical influences. According as it is capable of ʻrāb or not, a word is called muʿrab or maḥmī. The two conceptions ʻamīl and ūrāb have thus to be regarded as the central points round which the theory of syntax of the Arab grammarians turns. Where a distinction is made between the singular (muṣafīd) and the plural (muṣāfīf) in the narrower sense), the theory of the ūrāb as Ḍal-al-Dauti, Kātib ʻal-Tūrīfī, ed. Flügel, p. 61, rightly says, is, in contrast to our view, excluded from the former. On the other hand, ʻilm al-nāṣrī is sometimes actually called ʻilm al-ūrāb (Flügel, Gramm. Schulen, p. 15, note 1).

The Arabs differ from our grammatical notions in having no comprehensive terms for "case" and "mood"; but use the same terms without distinction for the various cases and moods if they agree in phonetic character. These terms are taken from the terminations of the cases of the third declension in the singular (muṣafīd) and the strong nouns and from that of the affixless forms of the moods of the imperfect of the strong verb. This results in the following division: 1. ūrāb (u) = nominative (e.g. rādījūla) and indicative (yāṣīlalā); 2. djār (i) = genitive (rādījīlā); 3. nāṣ (a) = accusative (rādījīlā) and subjunctive (yāṣīlalā); 4. dūs (lack of vocalisation) = jussive mood (yāṣīlalā). The three first named are originally simply names of the vowels concerned; they are still used as such not infrequently by older grammarians, without reference to the ūrāb and even for vowels in the interior of a word, and this use is even found in Sibawaih, in spite of the fact that (i, 2, 3) he expressly reserves them for ʻrāb. The usual usage in Sibawaih however proves that even then they were felt to be genuine terms for the corresponding cases and moods. They are in fact used by him in cases where the declension is formed in quite a different way from that of the above scheme. Thus e.g. the nominative of the sound masc. plural (muṣim-ul-u) is called rāb, the oblique case (muṣimi-lu) sometimes djār or nāṣ, although here, according to the view of the strict Arab grammarians the declension is made through the consonants w and y. It is similar with the dual.

In the noun two kinds of declension are distinguished for the singular (in the widest sense, i.e. including the bare plural). The noun (tim) is either munṣūrī or  ḍīrī and has nunation (taṣīr); or it is ghayr munṣūrī, i.e. it has as its declension vowel only a for the genitive and accusative, that is, it has actually only two cases (diptote) and has no nunation. In this connexion it should be noted that those nominal forms of roots with weak third radical, which, like ʿasā, really show no case changes at all, and according to our view are indeclinable, are traced to corresponding strong forms through the application of definite phonetic laws and like the latter — although according to the terminology of the finished system only taṣīr (virtually) — are considered munṣūrī and further as munṣūrī or  ḍīrī munṣūrī. Moreover a noun has not ʻrāb as an unalterable character; although rādījūla is in general considered maḥmī, this does not prevent that in the vocative: ārādījūl-un and in combination with the lā of the general negation: lā rādījūl-a ḍānī, the Arabic grammarians do not regard the rādījūl or rādījū-l as raf or nāṣ but as maḥmī sui generis. The Arab grammarian always revetted his attention on the individual form and not on its place in a system of declension or conjugation, for which he has not even a name. It is therefore quite natural that he should in the imperfect also interpret the 2 and 3 pl. fem. (yāṣīl-al-ul, taṣīr-al-ul) as maḥmī, because here the verb remains unaltered before the na, which is considered the representative of the pronoun, also in the strong roots in all three moods. In the other forms of the imperfect, which have the affixes i-na, āni, ā-ṣa, ā and ū or, according to the Arab view, the consonants y, olīf, w represent the pronoun subject, while the retention of the n with its auxiliary vowel is considered a mark of raf and its omission as a sign of ḍūs and then of nāṣ. The Arab grammarians do not recognise at all an energetic "mood" with a name of its own; to them there is simply a strengthening n (nūn muʿabbida) added to the imperfect forms, which become maḥmī before it. As their n is not a formative element merged in the verb but is regarded as a separate particle, the energetic mood is discussed in Arabic grammars under the particles, which seems strange to us.

On the reason why the linguistic phenomenon here discussed has been given the name ʻrāb, later native scholars puzzled their heads and gave various unsatisfactory suggestions; cf. Ibn al-Anbārī ʻAṣrār al-ʻArabiyā, p. 9, 15 ff. According to Wetzstein (Ztschr. f. Volkerpsychologie, vii. 461), ʻrāb means Beduineing, transferring into the language of the Beduins. V. v. Rosen similarly interprets it (Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., xxvii. 170): "to speak as a genuine desert Arab". Vollers (Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im Alten Arabischen, p. 141) entirely agrees with Wetzstein; on the other hand, Woldeke (Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, p. 5) says that the application of the term to the Beduins is only that men speaking pure Arabic at the time is "indeed possible but is uncertain". The obvious thing may be here too the most probable. ʻAṣrāb, the verbal noun of which is ʻrāb, means primarily, to arabicise, to give a word an Arabic form, to pronounce it in the genuine Arab way; the word is commonly enough applied, particularly also by Sibawaih, to foreign words adopted into the Arabic vocabulary in which case there is of course no possibility of a reference to the Beduins, as the contrast between ʻAṣrām and ʻArab, non-Arabs and A rāb s, is obvious. If we reflect that the cradle of Arab learning was in the ʻrāb with its population, predominantly Aramaic and Persian, whose language completely failed to distinguish cases and moods, that the latter must have been the most striking characteristic of Arabic in contrast to the foreign languages with which they were acquainted, especially as according to good and abundant evidence it was particularly difficult for the non-Arab proselytes, who contributed a strong contingent to the linguistic scholastic, so that they frequently found it a stumbling block, one will find it quite natural that ʻrāb "arabicising", by narrowing of meaning should come to have the above limited technical meaning; ʻrāb
is therefore at bottom only arabisation کارلِ 'Iraq. How much 'Iraq was considered the exclusive advantage of the Arabic language is clear from the passionate polemic of Ibn Fāris [q. v.], against the assertion that the Greeks also had an 'Irāk (Goldziher, Muh. Studien, i. 214).

Bibliography: A very useful survey is given in the first sections of the Adhurunmya of Şanfadji in Brünnow [Fischer's Christenmth.] chapters 2, 7, 40, and 41 of the Asrār al-Arabiyā of Ibn al-Anbārī are more detailed and very suitable as an introduction to the controversies of the Arab grammarians. For the rest the student must be referred to the older grammars in Arabic.

Al-'Irāk, also called al-'Irāk al-'arabi in contrast to al-'Irāk al-'adjami. In the older period al-'Irākān, the two 'Irāks', meant the two oldest Muslim towns in the country, Kūfa and Bāṣra (Yakūt, ii. 628, 11 sq.). Later this name was applied to al-'Irāk and al-Dībājī [q. v.] together; Yakūt iii. 15, 18 knows al-'Irāk alone as the name usual among the Persians for al-Dībājī and explains this by saying that the Sādījūk ruler who held the 'Irāk also conquered al-Dībājī. As he lived in Hamadhān, the people referred his title as 'Lord of the two 'Irāks' to the province of which this was the capital; it is however rather to be assumed that the Sādījūk, called himself 'Lord of the two 'Irāks' (with a well-known muhālah gaḥda) and that the people began to call the eastern part of the kingdom 'Irāk also, at the same time differentiating al-'Irāk al-'adjami and al-'Irāk al-'arabi.

The meaning of the name is uncertain. The Arab hypotheses are not satisfactory: a ṭārār = lying ground, according to Ibn al-Arbīt in Yakūt, ii. 629, 13 sq.; a 'coastland', according to al-Kindī in Yakūt, iii. 628, 21 sq. At the same time the 'Irāk is called al-Sawād, i.e. the country of a dark colour, owing to the cultivated land, in contrast to the bright white-yellow steppes, the contrast between the two being expressed in the names by the Beduins, who are very susceptible to colour effects. But the two names are not synonymous: sawād is a movable term, 'Irāk is fixed; one talks of the sawād of Kūfa, but not of the 'Irāk of Kūfa. Balkhi's statement (Iṣlākhār, p. 85; 3 Ibn Hawkal, p. 166, 1 sq.) is typical: 'Between Baghdād and Kūfa lies a sawād with a network of cultivated fields' which shows no gap'; this is a statement based on a correct general conception. It consists only of one long strip, very broad, strip of valuable fertile country running from N. to S. in the 'Irāk and, if one wishes to describe the canal system, this continuous fruit garden must be taken as a basis. In Ibn Khurdiši in which there is still a memory of the name which 'Irāk had under the Persian kings: dint Erāshahr, which he translates 'the heart of the 'Irāk' (5, 18 sq.: cf. Ibn Rosta, p. 104, 4); this agrees with the fact that al-Khwārizmī understands by Erāshahr Persia including the 'Irāk, and that, according to Yazd al-Fārisī, the whole of 'Iraq was compared to a body of which the head is the 'Irāk, similarly also Aṣmāyī (acc. to Yakūt, p. 417). The first Persian name of the 'Irāk was Sarāin (Baladurī, p. 276, 5; Ibn Rosta, p. 103, 22 sq.; Maṣṣūdi p. 177, 1; Taṣbar, i. 89, 4; cf. Noldeke, p. 15, Note 3). The following details of the Geography and History of the country may be given here:
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it lay Wasi't; unfortunately however the exact site of this town is not known; the latest travellers to visit the ruins (Koldewey and Moriitz) did not describe them (Sarre and Herrfeld, Archäolog. Reise, i. 247). The Shaft al-Iday, on which Lynch in 1838 was able to travel in a steamer and on which it is still said to be possible for a part of the year to reach Sufk al-Shiyukh, entered the swamps (al-Batäth [q. v.]) at al-Kair, through which it reached, under the name Nahr Abi l-Asad, the Dijlja al-Awra'; the "one-eyed" Tigris, identical with the pre-Muslim and modern Tigris. The Euphrates divided somewhat below al-Musaiyib into the two arms, the western, called the "Hilla" by the ancient Arab, the eastern; since the main stream was turned forcibly into the Hilla arm, the bed of the Hilla arm has been in danger of drying up; it was not till the Hillya Dam was finished at the end of 1913 that the waters were fairly distributed. According to Kudama, the western arm, which makes a slight curve to the west, is called al-Alami (p. 233, 16 sq.; so also Masuli'd, Tonikht, p. 52, 5); and the eastern arm is called Surat; the former runs towards al-Kufa and is lost in the swamps; the Surat arm, more accurately Nahr Surat al-A'la (Ibn Serapion, p. 28), passes the important town of Kafr Ibn Alhabara (ruins a little north of Babel, Tell Irman 'Ali); 6 farsakh below Kafr Ibn Alhabara the upper Surat passes into the lower Surat canal; its direct continuation eastwards is called Surat al-Kabira, and after passing the town of al-Nil it is called Nahr al-Nil and reaches the village of al-Hawl (4 miles from al-Nu'man'ya on the Tigris), where one can tranship cargo and sail direct to the Tigris or turn to the south, reaching the Tigris at Nahj Sabeq (opposite Madhara', which lies on the east bank) (on the subsidiary name Zab, S. zahri, see Marquart, p. 164). The lower Surat (Surat al-Asfal) passes several places, among which the locality called al-Dajami'an by Ibn Serapion is the al-Hilla of the later geographers (found about 495 = 1102 by the Masaddyi Saif al-Dawla); this arm is the modern Hilla arm; at al-Hilla a canal branched off to the S. E., the Nahh Nars, said to be called after the Sasanid Nurses (292) who ordered it to be made. The Surat and the Nars finally pour their waters into the Budæt canal (budat, Yâkib, i. 770), which crosses the northern edge of the Batäth and is taken from the western arm of the Euphrates, a day's journey north of Kufa near al-Kaniqur, which is apparently identical with the Aramaean Pumbedita (= Jam al-Budat); the celebrated centre of Jewish scholarship (mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela in the xith century); after it takes the waters of the Surat and Nars, the Budat (Euphrates arm) after a course of about 40 miles enters the great swamp.

The two main rivers were joined higher up by canals, in addition to the above waterways. The important canal, Nahh Djudjil, which branched off from the Euphrates near al-Rabb (9 miles from Anbar, 16 from Hilt) and reached the Tigris between Ukhba and Baghdad, does not belong to the Irak but to al-Djazra which adjoins it on the north; it sent off numerous branch canals into the districts belonging to the Irak (Maskin, Ka'trabbul); this canal, it appears, was silted up in 340 (951), and its name was transferred to an arm which branched off from the Tigris not far from Samaaret. From al-Anbar onwards four canals leave the Euphrates: 1. Nahr Isä; its course is not certain but it may in general be identified with the modern Nahr Shaklawiya; it is called after Isä b. 'Ali (Ibn Serapion: Mosis): 2. Abdallah b. al-'Abbâs, whose kair lay only a little above the junction of the canal and the Tigris, within the zone of the city of the Caliph; according to Ibn Serapion (p. 14, and Yâkib, iv. 542), it left the Euphrates at Kantarat Dimimma (Abu l-Fida', p. 52, 14, has Dukannâ, which is probably simply a mistake for Dimimma); Abu l-Fida', i.e., also says (on the authority of Sulaimân b. Muhammad) that the canal comes from a place below al-Anbar (on the English map it is entered as "Sifera" on the north bank of the Shaklawiya, 6 miles from its beginning) near al-Faluddja; it irrigated the tashlidj Fersakshir; at al-Mawal, a number of canals branched off towards Baghdad; it entered the Tigris below the Kafr Ibn Alhabara; on the English map the Shaklawiya canal runs through the lake of Akkar Kuft. i.e., 3. Abra'aj of the geographers (e.g., Yâkib, iii. 697) which is assumed to be at the south end; Le Strange wishes to locate the Muhjawal of Ibn Serapion there; on R. Kiepert's map in Oppenheim's book, the Khair of the Shaklawiya is called in the southern part Khair of the Asadjet; not far from the beginning of the canal, west of the Euphrates, on the English map is marked the Habbania (Hibbehiana) lock, which is one of the main works in Willcock's irrigation scheme; on Mutha's plan for draining the Shaklawiya swamp, see Oppenheim, ii. 281; a different account is given by Balkhi (Istakhri, p. 84 sq.); Ibn Hawkal, p. 165); according to him, small streams run off from the Nahr Isä which again join together to form a stream, the Nahh al-Sarrat, which enters the Tigris, while the main stream, Nahr Isä, itself reaches the Tigris in the middle of Baghad: ships can sail on it to its end, while navigation is not possible on the Nahr al-Sarrat on account of the weirs; 2. Nahr Sarrar branches from the Euphrates 3 farsakh (about 12 miles) below Dimimma, flows through a part of the district of Baduryat (spelled -raya in Yâkib, i. 460, this is not correct; it can only be -raïya or -raya) and reaches the Tigris 3 farsakh (16 miles) above al-Madain; so Ibn Serapion, p. 15; according to Balkhi (Istakhri, p. 85; Ibn Hawkal p. 166), the network of canals which intersects the continuous Sawad between Baghad and Kufa (cf. above p. 513) begins with the Nahh Sarrar, on which lies the little town of Sarrar, 3 farsakh from Baghad according to Yâkib, iii. 381, who says that the Nahr Isä is sometimes called Nahh Sarrar; there is obviously confusion with the Nahh al-Sarrat, on the connections of which with the Nahr Isä, see just above; 3. Nahr al-Malik, branches from the Euphrates 5 farsakh below the Nahh Sarrar and reaches the Tigris 3 farsak below al-Madain; it is also the name of a tashlidj in the Sawad; (so Ibn Serapion, p. 16); Le Strange's statement (p. 68), that the Nahr al-Malik began at al-Faladja is incorrect; this is impossible, for this distance is only about 12 miles from the head of the Nahr Isä, while the head of the Nahr al-Malik is at least 30 miles from that of the Nahr Isä and should be sought on the maps somewhere about Khan Makdam; Nahr al-Malik was also the name of one of the four tashlidjs of Bihkubidh al-Awsat, while the two Faluddja were tashlidjs of Bihkub-
A small text reference about the geography and history of Iraq is presented, discussing the Tigris River, the Euphrates, and their tributaries. The text mentions the importance of these rivers as sources of irrigation and transportation. It also refers to historical events and political changes affecting the region.
tertius gaudens. The only clear revelation on foreign politics which survives (others have been lost) hopes for the victory of the defeated Byzantines (Sütra xxx. 1): a weakened Persia was the interest of the Arabian policy of conquest, the guiding spirit in which from the first was 'Omar. The war on two fronts was taken up with a boldness which cannot be sufficiently admired. The conquest of Syria and of the 'Irāk was completed so thoroughly that 25 years after the death of the Prophet the crisis of the first civil war could be passed without serious consequences. The conquerors fell upon the 'Irāk in full strength and here they won their first great victories. In strong, sudden blows the Persian outposts on the Euphrates were taken and the advance relentlessly continued until in the battle of Nahāwand (21 = 642) the Sāsānid power was overthrown. With great skill the Arab generals created a strong base of operations about 400 miles long with the camps of Baṣra and Kūfah as its eastern and western termini (the whole of the materials on the founding of these two cities is given by Caetani, years 16, p. 238 sqq.; 17, p. 13 sqq.). The rich capital of the country, Ktesiphon, which consisted of a group of towns, was ruthlessly plundered and destroyed and the foundations of a new fortified town were not laid upon it, but on the ruins the unimportant al-Maḍā’in (see Noldeke, p. 16, note 1; Streck, p. 246—279) dragged on a miserable existence till it was absorbed by Baghdaḍ. Great care was devoted to the administration of this part of the young empire by the far-seeing 'Omar. Kūfah and Baṣra received separate governors, and that of Kūfah was at first Sa‘d b. Abī Waqāṣah, who was left with the charge of the two important churches. It was taken at the wish of the constantly grumbling Kūfah by A‘mmār b. Ya‘ṣir [q. v.] who was not fit for the office; he was succeeded by Mughira b. Shu‘ba, who had been dismissed from Baṣra on account of a scandal, until Sa‘d was restored to office (25 = 646); then followed al-Walid b. ‘Ukbah (25—30 = 646—650) and Sa‘d b. al-Aṣi (30— 35 = 651—654). Baṣra was more stable; there Abū Mūsā al-Aṣgharī [q. v.] ruled from 17—29 (= 658—660); he played an active part in settling the quarrel between ‘Ali and Mu‘āwiyah before the battle of Siffin. He was succeeded by ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amir [q. v.] who hurried to the help of ‘Othmān but arrived too late. In 35 (655) ‘Ali sent to Baṣra ‘Othmān b. Ḥunayfah, and A‘mmār b. Shu‘ba to Kūfah. Ziyād Ibn Abīthībī (cf. Lammens’ monograph) sent by Mu‘āwiyah as governor to Baṣra in 40 (655) became ruler of the whole of the ‘Irāk in 50 (670) and by a salutary firmness restored order in the turbulent country. He died in Kūfah in 53 (673), before his “brother” Mu‘āwiyah; his son ‘Abd Allāh became governor of Baṣra and Kūfah in 55 (675); under him Ḥusain b. ‘Abī [q. v.] met his death and he persecuted the Shi‘a. An important change in the fortunes of Baṣra took place when in the period of confusion after Yazid’s death (680), the Tamīm, the northern Arabs of Baṣra, fell to ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair [q. v.], as did the people of Kūfah. The ‘Irāk seemed to be lost to the Omayyads for a time. The efficient ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair, who was firmly established in Mecca, appointed his governors in the ‘Irāk; the bold and cunning guerilla leader Mūkhāṭir in 66 (686) was able to expel the governor of Baṣra, but in the next year he fell in the battle of Ḥarūrāt near Kūfah. The death of Mu‘āṣir b. al-Zubair essentially altered the situation; his best officer, al-Muhallab, joined ‘Abd al-Malik [q. v.] and the governor of the Damascus government submitted to him (72—694). The Khāḍijah were a source of continual uneasiness; they were spread over the ‘Irāk and adjoinging Khāḍijah; they never permanently held a dominating position and were opposed by all the other parties. The governorship of Kūfah was sometimes combined with that of Baṣra, but in that case the governor-general had deputy governors under him. We know of the following governors of Kūfah: 53—55 (673—675) ‘Abd Allāh b. Khālid, 55— 58 (675—678) al-Dalḥākh b. Ka‘īs, 58—59 (678— 679) Ibn Umm al-Hakam, 59—60 (679—680) al-Nūmān b. Bāshir; 64 (684) we find ‘Amīr b. Ḥurairah (Ibn al-Aṭhar, iv. 109) as deputy (ghālīf) of ‘Ubaid Allāh (cf. under Baṣra) in Kūfah; in the same year Muḥarrīn appeared in Kūfah, where ‘Abd Allāh b. Zubair had a governor. In Kūfah in 75 (694), the activity of al-Hādīdji b. Yūsuf [q. v.] began; he had been appointed governor of the whole of the ‘Irāk by ‘Abd al-Malik and his able and energetic administration suppressed all rebellion. The revolt of the Baṣra, who had joined the pretender ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. al-Asbath [q. v.], was finished by the battles of Dair al-Djamīm [q. v.] and Maskin (83 = 702). Al-Hādīdji took efficient measures to put an end to the seditious activities of the towns of Kūfah and Baṣra; he created a centre of economic and intellectual life for the ‘Irāk in Wāṣif on the Tigris (Ṣaḥṭ al-Hayī), from which Kūfah and Baṣra, which were not too far distant (Kūfah 120 miles and Baṣra 180), could be ruled. ‘Abd al-Malik’s administrative institutions were also of great benefit to the ‘Irāk; their fundamental principle was that of unity, which was indispensable for a healthy development; the most important was the reform of the currency, which began in the year 75 (694) and replaced the Byzantine and Persian coins current in the empire by coins with Arabic legends (the older emblems were retained on some of the copper coinages; on the silver in some parts of the empire the bust of Khusraw and the fire altar were retained and only the confession of faith was placed on the margin). ‘Abd al-Malik acquired further merit by organising the postal service although it was only used for carrying persons and messages in the interest of the government. Finally Arabic was ordered to be the official language; previously official documents had been in the language of the country or in it and in Arabic. Under al-Walid also (766—775 = 705—715) al-Hādīdji retained his peculiar position. The figure of this man, in spite of the contradictory, on the whole unfavourable, accounts of the Arab annalists is still quite distinct to us. We know that there was a whole school which systematically depicted in black colours all that the Omayyads did, especially all the actions of their great statesmen; this is the ‘Irāk school, the chief representative of which is Sa‘īf b. ‘Omar (clearly elucidated by Wellhausen, cf. Caetani, year 21, p. 305). Unbiased historical research will do justice to the merits of al-Hādīdji; but it must confess that one element in his administration had a pernicious influence on the development of the whole empire: that was the way in which he favoured his northern Arab countrymen, the Kaisiun. Therefore all the Yamanis in the army and the government and all elements in the population who sided with the
Yamanis were against him, as were also the 'Alids, whose pretensions he ruthlessly combated. He took energetic measures against all men who fought for their particular interest, al-Muhallab, who used every party, then it seemed to be for his advantage. The tension produced by al-Hajjajib's ruthless procedure did not find full vent in explosion, as al-Walid, a true son of his father, by his cautious and clever policy was able to avoid fatal outbursts of the principal feud, viz., that between the Kaisis and the Yamanis. The storm burst as soon as al-Walid had died, for his brother Sulaimân who followed him (96—99 = 715—717) was under the influence of the enemies of al-Hajjajib, the embittered Yamanis. Al-Hajjajib was spared the pain of the change, for he died six months before al-Walid. The new epoch which began with Sulaimân first showed itself in the appointment of Yazid b. al-Muhallab, one of the most dangerous intriguers and agitators, as governor of the 'Irak (95 = 714). The new lord began a reign of terror: the most prominent men of the North Arab party were persecuted and ill-treated. With Sulaimân's death there began a period of government by factions, which at every change in the throne resulted in intolerable uncertainty and dangers. 'Omar II, son of 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Marwan, checked the activities of Yazid b. al-Muhallab for a time by imprisoning him (in the citadel of Aleppo, Ibn al-Athir, v. 36); scarcely had 'Omar died (101 = 720) when Yazid escaped; the rebellion which he at once stirred up in Basra was suppressed by Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik (102 = 721); as a reward his brother Yazid II (101—105 = 720—724) appointed him governor of Khorasan, Basra, and Kufa, separate deputy governors for them being placed in them by Maslama. The appointment of Khalid b. 'Abd Allâh al-Kasri as governor of the 'Irak by Hishâm (105—125 = 724—742) had a beneficial result. With the death of Hishâm, however, the complete confusion prevailed throughout the empire; passions were vented without restraint, and the factions of North and South Arabs into which all prevailing antipathies almost all other differences were merged, fell on one another. Al-Walid II who followed Hishâm was a Kaisi fanatic who had al-Kasri cruelly executed. In Marwan II (127—132 = 744—750) a Marwânid once more took energetic steps against the rebellions. In the 'Irak, he also put down Khârijid risings. But the flame which the cunning 'Abbasids Abu l-Abbas (al-Saffah) and Abu Dja'far (al-Mansûr) kindled in Khorasan was no longer to be extinguished. Their general Abû Muslim in 130 (748) won the decisive battle against Marwan's governor, Nasr b. Sâyâr. The governor of the 'Irak, Ibn Hâbara, could not check the evil. The Yamanis in Kufa rebelled and gave up the city to the enemy and it became for a time the headquarters of the 'Abbasids. Marwan himself was decisively defeated on the Great Zab in 132 (750). The 'Abbasids took the place of the Omayyads.

Going back for a moment we may mention a political principle introduced by Mu'awiyah and maintained by his successors as a regular rule, but for which the Omayyads could only have disappeared more quickly. Mu'awiyah succeeded in consolidating his rule in the 'Irak and in Arabia and Islamising the country in a relatively short time by his policy of wise moderation, which was seen especially in the consideration he paid to the inclinations of the people and in the introduction into the army of the principle of territorial military service. While at first the troops of the 'Irak were of foreign origin, stationing them in a few depots, the numerous conversions of the Isma'ilis soon supplied sufficient men for the local forces.

The fact that these troops were not used outside the country or only in campaigns against the east had the disadvantage that the enemies of the Omayyads were able to find a strong support in them. Abû Muslim fought with 'Irakis and Persians against the Omayyads, who only had the Syrian troops on their side. In the civil administration also Mu'awiyah and his successors showed themselves far-seeing statesmen: although they did not allow the 'Irakis to choose their own governor, but imposed rulers upon them, yet they wisely gave way to appeals and changed the individuals, an unimportant concession which in no way meant an alteration of the system. In yet another way the Omayyad rule was beneficial to the 'Irak. These rulers recognised that the 'Irak with its agriculture, dependent on special methods of cultivation, required to be administered with particular care; neither arbitrary interference nor complete laissez faire were here suitable. In not a few cases the representatives of the central government saw to improvements proposed by the natives, like Maslama, the Caliph's brother, who built a canal. The economic results of the Omayyad rule in the 'Irak are to be all the more highly appreciated as they had to reckon with the hostility of the population (Kufa was in the hands of the Shia, Basra in the power of the Khârijis). The difference between Syria and the 'Irak during the Omayyad period is that in Syria there was union and coherence and in the 'Irak continual strife. The Shia and Khârijis troubles have already been mentioned as well as the fighting between North and South Arabs, who opposed one another in the 'Irak under the names 'Tamim' and 'Azd'; in spite of these troubles the great Marwânid succeeded in lessening the differences and bringing about a certain degree of coherence in the whole empire. The turn given to the Muslim empire by the victory of the 'Abbasids seemed likely to make the unity permanent. The transference of the Caliph's capital to the new city of Bagdad consolidated the connection of the regions belonging to the central zone. On the other hand, this measure already concealed the germ of decay, since the west could no longer be commanded from Bagdad, while this move did not result in a firmer authority over the eastern territories. Yet the area within the immediate sphere of the Caliph's influence, with Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, the 'Irak, and Persia, was still so important both in territorial extent and in values inherited from the pre-Muhammadan period that the 'Abbasids and their statesmen might have been able to build a permanent structure of indestructible political power and economic prosperity. Under al-Mansûr and his immediate successors to al-Ma'mûn this great empire was a type of a political magnitude such as had hardly ever been attained before and can only be compared with the Roman empire under Hadrian. The Roman empire and the caliphate under the early 'Abbasids are hypertrophied structures, they are colossal with feet of clay. The imminence of collapse is the mark which they bear on their brows. In the causes of their decline they have much in com-
mon, but each of them had besides its own special conditions. The error in the structure of the caliphate, which was bound to prove fatal, lay in basing the sovereignty of the dynasty on aristocracy of birth and religion. Alongside of the clan which championed this was another of the same character which unceasingly endeavoured to make good its claim and to work for the overthrow of the dominant clan. The latter were the descendants of ‘Ali and Fāṭima, whose partisans formed themselves into a politico-religious party and were a great danger, not so much on account of their numbers, for then as now they cannot have numbered more than a tenth of all Muslims, but they formed the most intelligent and most industrious part of the Muslim population. Besides the clan and religious elements in the feud there soon appeared a third, the racial. The predominant majority was Arabic. These Arabs treated the Persians with contempt; the latter had also to attach themselves as clients to an Arab clan. Their ill-treatment led them to join with the other group, the Shī‘a; ‘Ali “the followers of ‘Ali”, who were severely oppressed by the dominant clan and its government. Their common sufferings formed a strong bond of union. A religious and nationalist party grew out of the at first purely Arab Shī‘a. “Persian” and “Shī‘a” gradually became synonymous. The danger was at first averted: a skilful policy bridged over the differences for a space of about 40 years. The Caliph Alīsār, the second ‘Abbasid (136—158 = 754—775), summoned a prominent Persian, named Khālid, of the Barkak family, said to be related to the old royal family, to rule in the Caliph’s stead. His successors, unusually capable and clever men, this family attained an almost autocratic position. This period marks the zenith of the political power and economic prosperity of the caliphate, while at the same time a civilization flourished that was conditioned by a limited external adaptation to the great cultural elements which the conquering Arabs found in Syria and Babylonia; but the foundations for a further prosperous development were not created. Nor could it be otherwise; for the system of government which at the very beginning of the Omayyad period had replaced the originally democratic principle was based upon the idea that the prosperity of the Muslim community was secured by placing at the head of the government the man most worthy of this office. To exercise his control perfectly he had to have unlimited power and very soon this conception of the caliph became accepted to such a degree that he was actually regarded as the “Shadow of God”. In practice this absolute ruler was usually not only not the most worthy but frequently one who had the gravest moral defects and at the same time a plaything in the hands of those who exploited the community in his name. In an administration of this kind two tendencies developed in a most disastrous fashion: the formation of gigantic fortunes and the development of the “priesthood” of one particular theological school. At the same time a number of adventurers arose who troubled little about the superman on the Caliph’s throne. The caliphate broke up into a number of communities which existed almost independently alongside of one another. In each of these communities developments followed the course settled by local conditions. The ‘Irak also followed its own devices. From the beginning of the ‘Abbasid rule to the end of the ‘Abbasid period it was a province of a kingdom whose centre was in Persia ‘Irak, but there was no marked policy of interference by the rulers; provided that the inhabitants bore patiently the oppression of their foreign masters and their heavy demands for money, they were allowed liberty to maintain their national life. The revival of the authority of the caliph under the vigorous Caliph al-Nāṣir brought no essential alteration. This period, besides, was soon ended by the Mongol invasion.

In the long period of the ‘Abbāsid rule the ‘Irak suffered many vicissitudes. When the caliphs were strong, the conflicts between the various elements and the aspirations of ambitious adventurers were speedily crushed; otherwise, the land suffered considerable unrest; for the Kūfa and Bātra people were incurable as regards their main faults. The new capital attracted the worst elements to itself; at the same time the revival of economic prosperity brought masses into the country who when the time came could be stirred up by ambitious individuals, as for example happened with the rebellion of the Zanji imported from East Africa; finally, the religious fervour which was glowing beneath the ashes, again and again burst forth in burning and consuming flames. The extraordinary skill with which the Barmakids and, under their guidance, three caliphs maintained the delicate balance between Arabs and Persians, was lacking when the Barmak family was destroyed. The extermination of the Barmakids which resulted in an essential alteration in the ethnic balance of power in the ‘Irak, meant that the policy of co-operation between the two main elements, the Arabic and Persian, was at an end. The overthrow of the caliphate first showed itself in a series of ‘Alid troubles, which began with the rising of Ibn Ta'bātah (199 = 815). The capital stood by the Sunni caliphate and even went so far as to oppose the Caliph himself when the latter in pursuit of an untenable policy of conciliation made the mistake of planning to give the succession to the ‘Alid Imām al-Riḍā as husband of his daughter and adopting the green colour of the ‘Alids. As soon as he saw his mistake, he undid his measure not without the use of force. The extermination of the Barmakids did not conduce to the strengthening of the political power of the Arabs in the ‘Irak, but to its destruction, for the dislocation of the intimate relations between the provinces led to the introduction of a new element into the court service and thus into political life. Al-Mu'tasim created for himself a Turkish praetorian guard and lived under its protection in Sāmarrā which was founded by him. The Turkish force with which the caliphs surrounded themselves stood alone and the existing Arab bodies of troops fell into the background before it, as the former had much more energy and soldierly spirit. The people thus became unfit to defend themselves and were at the mercy of those who ruled the land with the help of foreign troops, either as the appointed representatives of the Caliph or as usurpers who entered the land by force. These foreign bodies also endeavoured to gain control of the other provinces. We have already seen that Turkish families gained the ruling power in Egypt and therefore in Syria, but this did not mean the
coming of a system of regionalism, although the land
furnished hardly any troops worth mentioning.
In the Irāk under al-Mu'tawakkil Turkish prea-
torians came into power and made any orderly
government impossible. The caliphs with a few
exceptions (al-Mu'ta'did 892—902) and al-Muqtāfi
(902—908) were utterly incapable and occasion-
cially criminally self-seeking. The struggle for power
around the caliph, that is for the office of genera-
lissimo (Amir al-Umāra), came to an end for a
time through the rise of the Būyids (354 = 945),
who ruled the two Irāks, Babylonia and Media
(cf. the beginning of the article). During the
great disturbances which attended the complete
collapse of the decadent Būyid family and the
rise of the strong Turk family of Saljūqūs (447 =
1055) a peculiar combination arose: a Turk ge-
neral of the Būyid army, Arslān al-Basāsīrī [q. v.],
rules for a short time in the Irāk in name of the
Fātimid al-Mustanṣīr (451 = 1059). But as a
result of the great distance between the Irāk
and Egypt and southern Syria (the inhospitable
Syrian steppe makes it necessary to take a devious
route via north Syria) there could be no question
of real Fātimid rule in the Irāk. The interver-
vention of al-Basāsīrī was an episode which very
soon passed. The Saljūqūs, who appeared as the
main champions of the Turks and held the caliph
completely in their power, also considered them-
selves the protectors of the true Muslim doctrine
and persecuted the Shi'a wherever he raised its
head in the Irāk. Although they showed an in-
clination for Persian culture (the great Sāljuqūs
resided not in Baghīdād but in Isfahān), they did
not interfere with the Arab culture of the Irāk.
The temporary redemption of a certain amount
of power by the caliphate under Naṣīr al-Dīn made
only slight alterations in the political and religious
conditions. The Irāk became an easy prey to the
Mongol conqueror Hülagū (656 = 1258), and its
capital Baghīdād sank to be a minor provincial
town on the extinction of the caliphate. The
de-solation of the country, which as a result of
the complete neglect of organised irrigation had begun
as early as the beginning of the xth century, con-
tinued. The Irāk became steppe country with a
few large villages and which cultivated stretches on
which the cultivation of the earth was already a
matter of some importance. The incorporation of
the Irāk in Persia by the powerful Ṣafawī Shāh
Īsmā'īl (915 = 1509) was not permanent. The
country very soon (941 = 1534) fell to the Otto-
man empire, of which it was a province until 1918.
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IRAM, the name of an individual or tribe
which occupies the same position in Muslim gene-
alogy as Aram in Biblical, as may be seen from
a comparison of the Muslim series 'Ūss b. Irām b.
Shem b. Noah. The Muslim line probably, like
many others, entered historiography under Jewish
influence and therefore gives us no new information
regarding the dissemination of Aramaeans in Arabia.
The name is identified with that of the Irām
Dāšt al-'Imād discussed below, the vocalisation
of which was established. Perhaps this explains why
the Muslims say Irām instead of Aram.

Tradition has still further developed the con-
nection with the Aramaeans. The people 'Ād [q. v.]
were called Irām; when the 'Ādis were destroyed,
the name Irām was transferred to Thāmūd whose
descendants were thought to be the Nabateans of
the Sawād. It was also known to Muslim scholars
that Damascus in ancient times was called Irām
i.e. Aram.

Bibliography: see the next article.

IRAM DĀŠT AL-'IMĀD occurs in the Kurān
only in Sūra 89: 6: "(5) Hast thou not seen how
thy Lord dealt with 'Ād, (6) Irām dāšt al-'Imād, the
like whereof hath not been created in the lands".

The connection between 'Ād and Irām in these
verses may be interpreted in various ways, as the
commentaries explain at length. If Irām is taken
in contrast to 'Ād, it is intelligible why Irām
also has been taken as a tribal name; 'Imād
could then be taken in the sense of "tent-pole".

According to others, the poles are a description of
the giant figure of the Irām, which is thus particu-
larly emphasised. If Irām stands in idāfa to 'Ād,
it is more probable that Irām dāšt al-'Imād is a
geographical term: "Irām with the pillars". This
is the prevailing opinion among Muslims. What is
exactly referred to, however, is a point on which
opinions differ widely both in east and west.

According to Yākūt, the view most frequently held
is that which considers dāšt al-'Imād an epithe-
ton of Damascūs [q. v. i. 9035]. Dājrūn b. Sa'd b.
'Ād [see Damascus, i. 904b] is said to have
settled here and have built a town adorned with
marble columns. Loth has used this tradition in
support of his view that only Aramaic traditions
are associated with the name Irām.

Iram, however, is frequently referred by Muslims
to South Arabia to which 'Ād also belonged. 'Ād
had two sons, Shaddād and Shadīd. After the death
of the latter, Shaddād subdued the kings of the
world; when he heard of Paradise he had a town
built on the steepes of Aden which was to be an
imitation of Paradise. Its stones were of gold and
silver and its walls studded with precious stones, etc.,
then Shaddād, after neglecting the warning of Hūd
[q. v.], wished to see the town, he was destroyed
by a tornado with his whole retinue a day's
journey from Irām and the whole town buried
in sand.

In a tradition given by al-Maṣūmī (ii. 421) the
story does not have a tragic ending. After Shad-
IRÂN. [See Persia.]

IRATEN, Berber AIT IRATEN (cf. Ait), Arabic BANû RATEN, a tribe of Great Kabylia, whose territory is bounded on the north by the Sebou, in the west by the Wâdi Aïsi, which separates them from the Banû Yenni, in the south by the district of the Ait Yahyâ and in the east by that of the Ait Frausen, and forms a hilly country from 3000 to 3500 feet in height, yielding olives and figs and some corn. The inhabitants are settled in several villages, of which the most important are ʿAden, Tawrît Amokrân, Usammîr, and Agemun. To-day the Banû Raten form a single dwâr community (cf. Dôrâr at the end) of 9781 souls belonging to the mixed community of Fort National.

We know little about the history of the Ait Irate. Ibn Khalûd (Hist, des Berbîres, transl. de Slane, i. 256) mentions them as inhabitants of “the mountains between Bougie and Tedelys”. They were nominally under allegiance to the governor of Bougie and were on the list of tribes liable to kharrûd, while they were actually independent. At the time when the Mârâbî movement undertook his campaign to Idrîkiya, they were subject to a woman, called Shamsî, of the family of the ʿAbd al-Samad, from whom the chiefs of the Ait Irate were descended.

During the whole Turkish period, the Ait Irate maintained their independence, secure behind their mountains. They formed one of the most powerful federations in Kabylia, which comprised five arch: Ait İrdjen, Akermâ, Usammîr, Auggâsha, and Umâla, and could put in the field a force of 2800 men. They kept their independence until in 1857 the French under Marshal Randon for the first time penetrated into the Kabylı mountains (DJebel Djarjura: cf. Algérie, i. 270). To prevent a hostile invasion of their territory the Ait Irate arranged to give hostages and to pay tribute. Nevertheless, their land remained a hotbed of intrigues against French rule, so that Randon in 1857 decided to subdue them completely. The French troops leaving Tizi-Uzx on May 24 conquered all the Kabyl villages in succession, and on May 29 destroyed the army of the Ait Irate and their allies on the plateau of Sûk al-šârî. On May 26 the Ait Irate offered to submit. To keep them in check Randon at once began to build Fort Napoléon (now Fort National) in the heart of their country and thus placed “a thorn in the eye of Kabylia”. The Banû Raten were then quiet for 14 years, but in 1871 they again had recourse to arms and took part in the siege of Fort National, which however the rebels did not succeed in capturing.

Bibliography: Boulûq (Saïd), Le Kâneoun d’Adni in Réasais de Mémoriais et de Textes publiés en l’honneur du XIVe Congrès international des Orientalistes, Algiers 1905; Catteret, Études sur la Kabylie (Exploration scientifique de l’Algérie, Sciences historiques et géographiques, ii. 287), Paris 1848; E. Carrey, Récits de Kabylie, Campagne de 1857, Algiers 1858; Clerc, Campagne de Kabylie, Paris 1857; Devaux, La Kabylie du Djurdjura, Marseilles 1859; Randon (Maréchal), Opérations militaires en Kabylie, Rapport au ministre de la guerre, Paris 1854; Hanoteau, Poëties populaires de la Kabylie du jururja (Paris 1867), p. 129—147; Hanoteau et Letourneau, La Kabylie et ses coutumes kabyles (Paris 1872), i. 228—241. See also bibliography to KABYLIA. (G. Yver.)

IRIBD or Arôd (corruption of an older Arôa, see the following article), the old town (of which the ruins only now exist) of Arôa, on a hill on the road from Tiberias through the so-called “Dove Ravine”. Among the ruins those of a synagogue are noteworthy (see Kohl and Wat-
zinger, *Synagogenvrouwen in Galilea*, p. 59 sqq.).
The remarkable rock caves in the neighbourhood played an important role in later Jewish history. Tradition places here the tombs of the mother of Moses and of four of the sons of Jacob, Dan, Issachar, Zebulon and Gad.

Another Iribid–Arabid, likewise an ancient Arabela, lies in the district of Balṣa (q. v.), 12 Arab miles from Baṣṣān. There the Caliph Yazīd I died.


**IRIBIL,** the name of various places in Mesoopotamia:

1. a town in the wilayah of Mōsul, about 50 miles E.S.E. of Mōsul, 12 hours N. of Alīyun Köprü (see i. 322 b) in 36°10' N. Lat. and 42°49' E. Long. (Ornamented Iribil in the common language also Arbil) is the Arba-iliu of the Babyloni-an-Assyrian and the Arbira of the Old Persian cuneiform inscriptions. This place, which is mentioned as early as in Assyrian documents of the 6th century B.C., played no special political role in antiquity. Its main importance was rather based in the pre-Achaemenid period on the possession of a highly venerated sanctuary of the goddess Ištart. Arbailu was the Delphi of ancient Assyria; at the same time however it was of great importance as the junction of caravan roads. It is mainly to this favourable position at the junction of roads that Arbailu owes the fact that it has survived as an existence and a name alone out of the famous cities of Assyria.

Iribil, almost equidistant from the two rivers named Zāb, formed from the earliest times the centre of the district cut off on north and south by these two rivers. In ancient times this was called either Arbaili, after the capital, or, from the Zābs, Adiabene (the Ḥedayab of the Syrians). It practically coincided with the "land (ord.) Iribil" of the Arab geographers. As after the decline of Niniveh, Arbela was the only important town of Assyria proper, the name Adiabene was later extended to Assyria (even as early as the time of the Diadochi). Adiabene was then also interpreted in this wider sense. In the second half of the second century B.C. a small kingdom arose there, which was able usually to maintain its independence during the Parthian period. Under the Sāsānids Iribil was the residence of governors, who occasionally enjoyed very great independence. One of these, Kardaghe, who lived in the citadel of Mēlšī near Iribil, suffered a martyr's death in 358 under Sapor II for adopting Christianity.

In the Muslim period Iribil does not appear until far on in the time of the later Ḥabbāsids. In Taḏari's great history it is never mentioned; of the older Arab geographers only Ibn Khordādbih in Ḥudaym (xth) mention it dealing with the division of Arab Ibrāk as the capital of a district (fasl) of the province of Ḥulwūn; cf. *Bibl. geogr. Arab.*, ed. de Goeje, vi. 63, 235, s. Iribil is also considered to belong to the Dijār, particularly to the province of Mōsul. In 563 (1167) Zāin al-Dīn Ālī Khāṣṣ b. Begtegin founded a small state with Iribil as capital. The most famous ruler of this Kurd dynasty of Begteginids (q. v. i. 688 sqq.) was Muṣaffar al-Dīn Kūbkūrī, Saladin's brother-in-law. Under him Iribil reached its greatest prosperity during the middle ages. Kūbkūrī in 586 (1190) considerably extended the kingdom which he had inherited from his brother. He conquered the adjoining minor principalities and also brought the district of Shehrizor (with Kerkiūk) under his rule. Several numbers of foreigners then settled in Iribil, which soon became an important town; at the same time a year Kūbkūrī gave brilliant festivals which brought visitors from far and near. This was especially the case with the feast celebrated with great ceremonies on the birthday of the Prophet, which was combined with a great fair (cf. Ibn Khallīkān, ed. Wūstefen, fasc. vi. 66). The lower town of Iribil at the foot of the citadel hill owes its origin to this prince. He also founded a school which bore his name, the Madrasa al-Muṣaffariyya, at which the father of the celebrated Arab historian Ibn Khallīkān (born in 608–1211 in Iribil) was professor. For the Ṣūfīs Kūbkūrī built a monastery (aṣīf) in Iribil.

When Kūbkūrī died childless in 630 (1132), he left his kingdom to the caliph al-Mustaṣfīr whose much shrunk secular power thus received a not inconsiderable accession. The latter had however first of all to use force to gain possession of his heritage, for the inhabitants of Iribil refused to recognise the ʿAbbāsīd as their suzerain. The general Ḥabīl al-Sharābī, who was sent by al-Mustaṣfīr, succeeded in occupying the refractory town after a siege; cf. Ibn al-Ṭiktaḵa, *al-Faqhīr* (ed. Ahwardi), p. 37, 380, 12; Barhebraeus, *Chron. Syr.*, ed. Beijan, p. 466 sqq. and Weil, *Gesch. d. Chaliften*, iii. 468. Soon afterwards the Mongols knocked at the gates of Iribil. By 652 (1250) they had entered the radius of the town in their raids (cf. Ibn al-Ṭiktaḵa, ed. Tornberg, xii. 328). In 653 (1255) they were plundering in its streets (cf. Barhebraeus *Tuʾrīk Muhktasar*, ed. Beirūt, p. 436, 9). In 654 (1256) they appeared again, set the lower town on fire and besieged the citadel, which was valiantly defended; but after 45 days they retired on payment of a considerable ransom; cf. Barhebraeus *Tuʾrīk Muhktasar*, p. 437, 12 sqq., and Wüstefeld in the *Abh. d. Gött. Gesch. d. Wiss.*, xxvii. (1881) p. 120, and also d'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, iii. 69, 71, 73. When in 655 (1256) Hülagū began his advance on Baghdad, he met in the same time one of his generals to Iribil. The fortress was defended by the Kurds against all attacks for over a year. It was only with the help of Badr al-Dīn Luʾluʾ of Mōsul that the Mongols finally succeeded in taking the hotly contested town. Cf. Rashīd al-Dīn, *Hist. des Mongols de la Perse* (ed. Quatremère), i. (1836), p. 314 sqq.; Barhebraeus, *Chron. syriac.*, p. 506, 3 sqq.; Barhebraeus, *Tuʾrīk Muhktasar*, p. 472, and Weil, *Gesch. der Chaliften*, iv. 9; D'Ohsson, op. cit., iii. 256 sqq. In the period that followed Iribil had again a great deal from the horrors of war and the raids of neighbouring Kurd and Arab tribes. The last days of storm and stress were experienced during the Turkish campaign of Nādirābād in 1743. After a 60 days' siege the victorious Persian king was able to enter the town. Until far into the first half of the sixteenth century Iribil belonged to the great pashalik of Baghdād and as
one of the most important military points in it was garrisoned by a strong force of Janissaries. When the wilayet of Mūsul was separated from that of Baghdad, Irbit went with the former.

The conversion to Christianity of the district of Adiabene and the adjoining regions was mainly conducted from Irbit. A bishop had his seat here at a very early date. The diocese originally comprised only the area between the two Zāb, therefore it was called by the Syrians the diocese of Ḥēdatayb or, from the two seats of office, of Arbel or Ḥūṣaita (a village near A.). At the beginning of the 14th century Irbit was elevated to the rank of an archbishopric, to which the whole of Assyria proper was subordinated. Not till a later date was the bishopric of Nineveh (Mūsul) or Aḥūr separated from it as an independent ecclesiastical province. On the importance of Irbit in pre-Islamic Syrian church history, cf. especially the chronicle probably composed by a clergymen of the diocese of Irbit, which A. Mingana published in SOURCES SYRIQUES, i. (Leipzig 1908) and Sachau discussed in the Abh. der Berl. Akad. d. Wissensch., 1915, N. 6. This chronicle is preserved in the collection of the history of the bishops and martyrs of our bishopric for the period 100—540 (551) A.D. See also Labourt, LE CHRISTIANISME DANS L'EMPIRE PERSE (1904), passim (Index, p. 356).

In 1268 the Nestorian Catholics moved his see from Baghdad to Irbit. But as early as 1271 he removed from here to Uṣūna in Aḥarbadjān, since the Christians as a result of the machinations of the Assassins became suspect among the Muslims and had to suffer many insults, cf. Barhebraeus, Chronic. Escl. (ed. Abelloos and Lamy), ii. 347; cf. also Chron. Syr., p. 557; 10 sqq., 546, 547 sqq.; D'Ohsson, op. cit., iii. 450 sqq. The position of the Christians of Irbit under the successors of Hūlūgā [q. v.] and especially under Gharāz [q. v.] and Ujlaita, was on the whole very miserable. Kurds and Arabs often fell upon them, plundering and murdering, first of all in the years 1274 and 1285; cf. Barhebraeus, Chron. Syr., p. 528—529, 557, 8 sqq. In 1295, as an inscription of the xiv century which still exists in the monastery of Mar Behnam records, the Ilkhan Bādu ṭarraged the region of Irbit, cf. H. Pogson, Inscriptions Smilit. (Paris 1907), ii. 76, p. 135. In the year 1296, as a result of a royal edict all the Christian churches of the town were destroyed (Barhebraeus, op. cit., p. 596, 18 sqq., and Histoire de Mar Jabalaha, ed. Bedjan, 1895, p. 113); in 1297 the Kurds besieged during several months the Christians who had taken refuge in the upper town (cf. Hist. de M. Jabalaha, p. 121—131). In 1310, in the reign of Ujlaita, the Christians, after bravely defending themselves for over three months on the citadel against the besiegers, Arab, Kurd, and Mongol, were overcome and exterminated. We possess an illuminating description of these dark days for Irbit from the pen of the biographer of the then Catholicos Jabalaha iii. (see Hist. de M. Jabalaha, p. 154—201). From this time onward Irbit ceased to be a Christian town. But since then also dates the decline of the town. A few Syrian inscriptions on the walls of a building now used as barracks (Bīгла) recall the earlier Christian population; cf. Cunet, op. cit., p. 857. In Irbit itself there are no longer any Christian families; a few (united Nestorians) socalled Chaldeans, are however to be found in the village of Ainkawa (also written Ainkeba, Ankawa, Ankowa) a short hour's journey from Irbit, certainly the Amkaba of the Hist. de M. Jabalaha, p. 192, and probably the Amkātūd of Barhebraeus, Chronic. Syr., p. 557, 11) as its exclusive inhabitants. Next to the Christians the Kurds form numerically the strongest element in the population of the town. From the xiiith century the Ḥāḍibānī or Ḥākamīya Kurds were settled in and around Irbit; on them cf. Ritter, Erdkunde, ix. 620; Quatremerie des Itineraires et extrait du manuscrit de Sirac, 509—513, extracts form the geographical and historical work of al-Umari, died 749—1348; G. Hoffmann, Syrische Akten persisch. Märtyrer (1881), p. 236, 272. The chiefs of these Kurd tribes, who possessed a considerable number of citadels in the region of Irbit, were frequently fighting with one another for the possession of the town. Accounts of such local feuds in the middle of the xith century are given for example by the histories of Ibn Kaldūn and Badr al-Dīn Aina; see Tiesenhausen in Mem. présentées à l'Acad. Imp. des Sciences de St. Petersbourg, viii. (1859), p. 117, 165. As to the present population of Irbit, it numbers, according to Cunet (1892), 3260 inhabitants of whom 497 are non-Muslims (Jews). The number of houses is said to be 1822 (Belck and Lehmann, in 1899, estimated those of the upper town alone as 800), besides the serai of the Turkish governor, 2 mosques, 10 Muslim chapels and 16 schools. According to the late administrative division of Turkey, Irbit was the capital of a ħaḍēl belonging to the sandjak of Şehrizor and was divided into two districts (pāşıya's) comprising 330 villages and 12000 inhabitants.

Irbit consists of the lower town and an upper town grouped around the citadel. The lower, built by Kūbbār (called Kotrak, according to Cunet), which lies at the west and south bases of the citadel hill, makes a very poor impression and now lies for the most part in ruins. It was earlier much more extensive, as may be deduced from the fact that the ditch which once surrounded it now lies far beyond the present scanty group of houses. The lower town is the centre of commercial life and contains the bazaars and khāns. Of noteworthy buildings the remains of a large mosque with an imposing minaret, about 203 feet high and 48 feet round (cf. the description in Rich, ii. 15 sqq.), are especially striking; according to an inscription on the minaret, it was built by Kūbbār. This mosque is perhaps identical with the Māṣūf al-Kaff mentioned by Kāzwīnī (loc. cit.), in which, according to him, there was a stone with the imprint of a man's hand. Obviously this refers to a sanctuary with a print of 'Alli's hand (Kaff, pandjā), of which others are known in the 'Irāq, Mesopotamia, and Persia; cf. for examples, v. Berchem, in Herrfeld-Sarre, Archaeolog. Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet, i. 24).

The upper town with the citadel rises from a round hill not quite 65 feet with fairly steep sides. It is obviously artificial. In its interior are massive vaulted subterranean passages and chambers. It is crowned by a strong castle which is surrounded by a wall now somewhat ruined, 48 feet high, set with crenellated parapets and bastions. This gigantic tell with the picturesque citadel upon it has always aroused the astonishment of travellers; from several hours' journey distant it can be seen commanding the
plain. To some extent it reminds one of the castle
hills of Hims and Halab— with which it has
been frequently compared,— but it surpasses
both considerably in the grandeur of its mass. The
castle is occupied by the kâ'immânûn and the
other officials of the town. The houses of private
citizens are quite close to the surrounding wall.
Systematic excavations have not yet been under-
taken in Iribil nor is anything known of any
accidental finds of antiquities.

The importance of Iribil at the present day is
mainly based on its position as a commercial depot
and centre of a busy through trade. Important
caravan routes enter it from different directions.
First mention should be given to the very an-
cient road which runs from Baghdaâd via Kerkûk,
Altyñ-Kopřa to Iribil and thence to Mûṣûl; it is
the most direct route between Baghdaâd and Mûṣûl,
as it was formerly between Babylon and Nineveh.
Two roads run from Iribil to east and north and
lead over rough mountain passes to the country
of Aḏサラbâyîn; the one goes in the first place to
Rowândîzû in the north east and the other to
Khoul Sarða.jsk in the east. On the road from
Iribil to the Wadi Turabîn, some especially Rich.
296—297; Jones in the Journ. of the Roy. Asiatic
Soc., 1855, p. 380; and Cuijnet, p. 793 sqq.; the
road from Iribil to Marâqâs is described by Hoff-
mann, op. cit., p. 231 sqq.

The town of Iribil is the centre of a splendid,
very fertile country, which looks to the eye more
a flat than an undulating plateau. With an aver-
age height of 1300 feet (the lower town of
Iribil is 1332 feet above sea level) it forms the
watershed between the two Zâbûs. There is a com-
plete absence of trees, but it affords excellent corn-
growing soil; cotton flourishes here exceedingly and
is manufactured in the town. The Persian geo-
grapher Hamd Allah Mustawî praises the cotton
grown here in his geographical work Naḵîl est-
Kûlûb about 1340. Numerous streams run in winter
through the plain but there is no perennial river
so that irrigation has in part to be conducted by
subterranean aqueducts. In the north the spurs
of the Kurd Alps come fairly near Iribil; west
of the town rises the Demir-Dagh, to a height of
1600 feet. In the north east and east the plain
is bounded by the Deredawân Dagh in the south
(at Altyñkopřa) by the Zergawân-Dagh. In the
Southwest the plateau of Iribil is bounded by the
Shemamlik lowland plain which stretches to the
bank of the Great Zâbû.

The well cultivated plateau is covered by nu-
merous Kurd villages. The Kurd tribes, who camp
in the summer in the hills of Rowândîz, migrate
cither in the winter. Most villages are built quite
near characteristic tumuli; everywhere one finds ex-
tensive mounds of ruins, evidence of better days,
when this land so richly endowed by nature was
on a much higher level of civilization than at present.

Bibliography: For the Assyrian Period
bânînes (1916), iii. 711; for the Graeco-Romain
periods cf. Pauly-Wissowa, Realencykl. der klass.
Altertumswiss., ii. 407—8 (S. Fraenkel) and
Sâpperz., i. 117 (Streck). — For the Muslim
period apart from works already mentioned, the
following are particularly important: Yakût,
Mubâdîm (ed. Wûstenfeld), i. 186—189; Di-
-mîshbûh, Kosmographie (ed. Mehren), p. 190;
162—3; Marâšî al-Ittîlî (ed. Juynboll), i, 42,
iv. 75; Ibn al-Âfîr, Chronicon (ed. Tornberg),
passim in Vol. vii—xii (s. index); Barbareucaes,
Chronicon syriacum (ed. Bedjan, Paris 1890),
passim, esp. p. 424, 432—7, 466, 506, 525—6,
528—9, 557, 596—7; Hâlijîd Khallîfà's Dîdhân-
numûd (versio latina by Norberg, Lund, 1818),
i. 52—55.— A four volume work on the history
of Iribil, which Abu 'l-Barâkât al-Mubârâk al-
Mustawî (d. 637 = 1240), waźîr of Kökkûrûñ,
composed, is lost. Yakût received many notes
for his geographical lexicon from Mustawî with
whom he was personally acquainted; cf. Wûsten-
feld, Aôh. der Göttergesch. des Wiss., xxviii.
(1881), p. 119—120; J. Heer, Die hist. u. geogr.
36. Ibn Khallîkân, who pursued his first studi-
ues under al-Mustawî in Iribil, also made great
use of this chronicle for his biographical work;
for the geographical work; cf. Wûstenfeld, loc. cit.— Of reports by European travellers the following are worth noting: Nie-
buhr (1768), Itinerarium per Úrmond et al-
ndern umliegenden Ländern, ii. (Copenhagen,
1778), p. 342—4; Olivier (1795), Voyage dans
J. S. Buckingham (1816), Travels in Mesopo-
tamia (London, 1827), p. 325—8; Cl. Rich
(1820), Narrative of a Residence in Koordistan
(London, 1836), ii. 14—18, 293—305; H. South-
gate (1838), Narrative of a Tour through Ar-
214 sqq.; V. Place (1851), Lettre à M. Mohl
sur une expédition faite en Arbîl (in the Journ.
Asiat., ser. 4, t. xx. 1852, p. 441 sqq. and
457—60); J. Oppert (1854), Expé. scientif. en
Mesopotamia, i. (1853), p. 281—6; H. Peter-
mann (1855), Reisen im Orient (Leipzig, 1861),
ii. 321; Czernik (1873) in Petermann's Geogr.
Mitt., Erg. Heft. No. 45 (1876), p. 1—2; E.
Sachau (1898), Am Eufrat und Tigris (Leip-
zig, 1900), p. 111—3; L. Belel and C. F. Lehn-
mann (1899), in Verh. der Berl. Anthro-
pol. Gesellsch., 1889, p. 417; S. Geyer (1911)
in Petermann's Geogr. Mitteil., lxxi. (1916),
p. 294. Cf. also [Rousseau], Descrip. du Pa-
chalîk de Bagdad (Paris, 1809), p. 85; C. Ritter,
Erdbund, ix. 691—4, where the accounts of
Niebuhr, Olivier, Rich, Dupré (1808), and
Shiel (1836) are utilised; V. Cuijnet, La Turquie
A good map of the environs of Iribil is given by
Czernik, op. cit. Pl. ii. On coins struck in
Iribil cf. Lane-Poole, Catal. of Oriental Coins
in British Museum (London, 1875 sqq.), iii. vi.
ix. 1 and 2 (s. Indices), and the notes by v.
Berchem in v. Berchem-Strzygowski, Amida (1910),
p. 94, Note 4.

2. A place in Tur-'Abîdîn in (Mesopotamia),
South East of Killît, in 37° 30' lat. N. and
41° 15' long E.

3. and 4. See under Iribil.

5. The statement by Yakût (i. 189, 21) that
the town of Sa'da (Sidon) was called Iribil is
probably an error.

It is not impossible that the places named
Arabela (Iribil, Arbêl) outside of Assyria were
founded by inhabitants of the Assyrian Arabela
and were called by them after their native town.

(M. Streck.)
IRTIKA (A.) = height: in astronomy the height of a constellation, that is its distance from the horizon measured on a circle passing through zenith and nadir (vertical, busīrat al-irtišā); in geometry it is also used for the height of a plane figure (triangle, parallelogram) or of a body (prism, cylinder), but anādī (pillar, plumb line) is much more commonly used. (H. Suter.)

IRTIŠIŠ a large river in Siberia, in the basin of the Ob. Its two sources, the Blue and the White Irish, rise in the Great Altai after their junction the river as far as Lake Zaïsan bears the name "Black Irish"; after leaving the lake it flows for about 180 miles through steppe country and the "White" or "Slow Irish", then for 60 miles with a stronger current as the "Rapid Irish" through a hilly country. At the town of Ustkanenorgorski it enters the Great Siberian plain which sinks away towards the Arctic Sea and besides several smaller tributaries, it receives on the right the Om and Tara, on the left the Ishim and the Tobol and falls into the Ob below the village of Samarowsk. The whole length of the river is 2230 miles of which only 253 are in the Chinese Empire. The bridge at Omsk is 795 yards long; the greatest breadth of the river in its lower course is about 875 yards.

The name is mentioned as early as the Orkhon inscriptions of the viith century A. D. (W. Radloff, Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolen, 2nd Ser. p. 19; written without vowels). Mas'ūdī in Kitāb al-Tanbīḥ (ed. de Goeje, p. 62) speaks of the "Black" and the "White Irish" and makes both fall into the Caspian Sea. The author of the Maqālim al-Adam (f. 180) thinks the Irish a tributary of the Olga; the name is venerated Artush (or Artūšh) in the mos. which is keeping with the story based on a popular etymology (fr. tūsh "Man, come down", given by Gardizi (text in Barthold, Oezet o poézê de S. Srednjego, Asju, p. 82). In spite of the trading route from Fārāb (q.v., ii. 53), mentioned by Gardizi, to the Irish, the country was little affected in the middle ages by Muslim culture. The river is only seldom mentioned, e. g. in the history of Timūr's campaigns, Žofarnāma, Ind. ed., i. 475 and 495 (Irīšh). The Muslim town founded by the Russian conquerors on the lower course of the river, with its main fort near the mouth of the Tobol, was probably founded in the Mongol period by colonists from the Volga region. Whether the stories heard by Radloff (Aus Silieren, i. 146) of the sending of preachers of the Muslim faith from Bukhāra are based on facts, is doubtful. In any case, Islam only began to spread up the Irish from the north under Russian rule (see Baraba, i. 651 sq.). All the towns and villages on the Irish, as well as in its valley, only arose under Russian rule; down to the xvith century there was no town farther south than Tara; Omsk and the towns south of it were only founded by Peter the Great.

The Irish is navigable almost up to the rivers which form it. Between Tobolisk and Ustkanenorgorski there is regular steamship traffic. Sometimes the steamers go up as for Zaïsan and then up the Black Irish to the Chinese frontier and even beyond it. Since the making of the Siberian railway, the Irish is of still greater importance as a traffic route. (W. Barthold.)

ISĀ, the proper name of Jesus in the Kurʾān, and thence in Islam, is explained by some western scholars (Marracci, i. 39; Landauer and Nöeldeke, Zeitscr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesells., xii. 720) as a form imposed upon Muhammad by the Jews and used by him in good faith. They called Jesus Esaū (אִיסָא) in hatred and said that the soul of Esaū had been transferred to him. Others (J. Derenbourg, Rev. des Études juives, xvii. 126; Fränkel, Wiss. Zeitscr., iv. 334; Vollers, Zeitscr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesells., xlv. 352; Nestle, Dict. of Christ and the Gospels, i. 881) hold that the name originated naturally by phonetic change from the Syriac Yēshā (יושע) combined with imitation of Mūsā. For the Muslim explanation of the name see al-Baṣāwī on Kurʾān iii. 40 (ed. Fleischer, i. 156, l. 2). Titles and descriptions applied to Jesus in the Kurʾān and of importance for his position in the theological system of Islam are: "Son of Maryam" (e. g. iii. 40; iv. 169; xix. 35, and often); he was born of Mary, a virgin, by the direct creative act of Allah; — "a Word (kalīma) from Allah" and "his (Allah's) Word" (iii. 40, iv. 169); this is the creative word "Be" (kalīma) which Allah cast (alīf) into Mary; the creation of Jesus is thus compared (iii. 52) to that of Adam; — al-Mashīh (iii. 40, iv. 169 and often), evidently from the Hebrew māsăxīḥ, but how understood by Muhammad is quite uncertain; for Muslim explanations see al-Baṣāwī, i. 156, l. 2, — "a Spirit from Allah" (iv. 169), so the angels are called angels directly from Allah, so, too, Allah formed Adam and breathed into him of his spirit (min rūḥī, xv. 29; xxxviii. 72); later Islam called him al-Mīšāh (Liṣān, iii. 290, l. 15) and even Rūḥ Allah (al-Khaṣkhāšr of al-Zamakhshari, ed. Lees, i. 338); — Ādīb Allāh (xix. 31); "he is nought but an ādīb (xliii. 59); "he will never disdain to be an ādīb of Allah" (iv. 170); ādīb, literally "slave", is best rendered theologically by our "creature"; man, for Islam, is the property of Allah and not simply his servant, cf. ēʾēʾē in the O. T., and ēʾēʾē in the N. T. and especially of Jesus in Philippins, i. 7; "One of those brought near" (to Allah, masīh, al-muṣārabah, xlii. 40); again the angelic association; later Islam sometimes explains this of his state after his ascension (yūdīd, rāqīf), when he was a semi-angel flying round the throne (surrah) of Allah (insī mubalab, Khīṭāt of al-Thalābī, ed. Cairo 1314, p. 227); but Muhammad in his Miṣrājd found him in the second heaven (Saḥāl of al-Bukhārī, v. 53; ed. Cairo, 1315) — Waḏīḏ, "worthy of regard in this world and in that to come", (iii. 40); al-Baṣāwī explains, "as prophet in the one and as interceder in the other"; — Muḥābāt, "blessed wherever I am" (xix. 32); but al-Baṣāwī explains the word here and elsewhere as "possessing much profit for others", apparently possessing a barakah; — Kāwał al-ḥāʾ, "the sure saying" in xiii. 35 is obscure and may not be a title but apply to the statement made — see al-Baṣāwī, i. 580, l. 25. He is a nābi, "prophet" (xiii. 31) and rāḥiḥ, "messenger" (iv. 156, 169; v. 79), and he has a "book" (kitāb, xiii. 31), which is the inqīlāt (v. 50; lvii. 27). The sending of him is a "sign" (ayā) and "mercy" (raḥma, xix. 21); and he and his mother are a "sign" (xxii. 52); he is made an "example", "parable" (mathāl, xliii. 57, 59). He brought "proofs" (bagaim) and "wisdom" (hiṣma, xliii. 63; i. 169), and was aided by Allah with the
rūḥ al-khuds (ii. 81; v. 109), obscure like all mentions of rūḥ in the Qurʾān but explained by later Islam as Dājīrī; so al-Baʿḍī, (in loco) and Liʿānī, iii. 290, l. 15. Allāh taught him (iii. 43; v. 110) and he possessed peculiar miraculous powers of raising the dead, healing the sick and making clay birds, and by the permission of Allāh, breathing life into them (iii. 44 sqq.; v. 110 sqq.).

On the death of Jesus the statements of the Qurʾān are contradictory. It is certain that Muḥammad rejected the Crucifixion and accepted the Ascension, apparently in the birth-body and not in a glorified body; the crucifixion was prevented by a change of resemblance (shāhāhā lāhu, iv. 156), again an obscure phrase explained later by the commentators that his likeness was put upon another and the other crucified in his place. But his death is referred to: "before his death" (iv. 157); "on the day I die and on the day I am raised, alive" (xix. 34), yet this verse may have been a mistaken repetition of verse 15. In iii. 48 Allāh says to him, "I am about to take thee to myself (muʿašṣaflīha) and lift thee up (rūʾMedical) unto me". The first expression is commonly used of a blessed death, but that is not necessarily its meaning here, for it is also used in the Qurʾān (vi. 60) of Allāh's taking to himself the souls of sleepers during sleep, to be returned when they awake; cf. Frankel in Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesells., ivi. 77. For his Second Coming the only Qurʾānic authority is xliii. 61, a very obscure verse, the reading even of which is in doubt. Some read, "And he is verily a knowledge (laḥīf maʾn) of the Hour", i.e. by (the descent of) whom the approach of the Hour is known. But others read, "a sign (laʿālamun) of the Hour" and even, "a reminder (lādīkhīrān)". Others, again, refer the pronoun to the Qurʾān, "it is". His second coming being taken as established, his death is put after it and the references in iv. 157 and xix. 34 are thus explained; as also the descriptive kohlān in iii. 41, because he was taken up by Allāh as a "youth" (rābīb) before he attained kūlā, "middle age" (cf. al-Baʿḍī on these passages). The later doctrine of his return is given soberly by al-Baʿḍī. On xliii. 61: that he will descend in the Holy Land at a place called Afšīr with a spear in his hand; that he will kill with it al-Daḍījāl and come to Jerusalem at the time of the fast of the morning (mubh); that the imām will remain forty years and he will die, and the Muslims will hold funeral service for him and bury him; and Medina, it is universally accepted, beside Muḥammad, in a vacant space between Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. But others interpret, "before he—the believer—dies", even though it is thus a useless belief, he being at the point of death.

So little can be gathered from the Qurʾān. The oldest traditions have but little more, as in the Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī where Ḥāṣim is merely mentioned in connection with Dājīrī in Kitāb al-Fitan, Part ix. 60, ed. Cairo 1315. Muḥammad had been interested in the idea of Anti-Christ as the story of Ibn Sāʾīd shows (Macdonald, Religious Attitude in Islam, p. 34 sqq.), but the early Muslims, for political and theological reasons, developed elaborately in forged traditions the doctrine of the Last Things, and especially of the Mahdī and Jesus. Thus the Muṣbah has much more, see ed. Cairo, 1316, ii. 136 sqq., 140 sqq. (chaps. on Signs of the Hour and on the Descent of Ḥāṣim). See too, al-Thalālī, Kīfā, p. 22 sqq.; the full account of Ḥāṣim, the most complete of all, covers pp. 215—220; Tabarī, ed. Leiden, i. 713 sqq., and Ibn Wādīh, Historiae, ed. Houtsma, i. 74 sqq., give extracts from the Gospels. But in this development the roles assigned to Jesus and to the Mahdī came to be confusing alike, and one party tried to cut the knot with a tradition from Muḥammad. "There is no Mahdī save Ḥāṣim b. Maryām". For this and also for their respective roles when they were distinguished, see al-Shaʿrānī, Muḥshiṣar of the Taḏkīrāt of al-Kurṭubī, p. 118 sqq. (ed. Cairo 1324). Ibn Khālīdīn in his Muḥādāt (ed. Quatremère, ii. 142—176 = De Slane's transl., ii. 158—205) gives a philosophical examination of the whole subject, showing the untrustworthiness of the different traditions and tracing the development of the idea of a restorer of Islam before the end, as it was influenced by Shiʿītes of different degrees, by Fātimītes and by Ẓūfīs. An explanation given by him of the tradition quoted above is: "None has spoken in the cradle (muhād, cf. Kur. xix. 30) save Ḥāṣim" (ed. Quatremère, i. 163); for another see al-Kurṭubī, p. 118. On the whole subject Goldziher in his Vorlesungen, p. 230 sqq. and notes thereon, has a few luminous pages. See the same, p. 313 sqq., for the modern Aḥmadiya sect in India which teaches that Jesus escaped from Jerusalem, wandered to the East, settled at Srīnagar in Kashmir and died there, where his tomb is still shown. Ghulām Aḥmad, the founder of the sect, professed to both Jesus's return and also the Mahdī. Finally, Goldziher has well remarked that for Sunni Islam, as opposed to Shiʿism and other outlying sects, the expectation of a future restorer of faith and life has never become fixed as a dogma but is only the mythological embellishment of an ideal representation of the future. This may well be due to lack of Khurānic basis.

From the above it is evident that Muḥammad had learned a definite story of Jesus from some heretical Christian teacher, in defense of whose position he polemizes vigorously in the Qurʾān. He knows more, of sorts, about him than about any other of the religious figures of the past. But it is evident, too, that he omits something. For the appearance of the earth in this unique figure, a second Adam, a semi-angel, a Logos much like that of Philo but with a difference, we are given no reason. It is not explained how he is a "sign", a "mercy", and an "example" or "parable" (xix. 21; xxii. 52; xliii. 57, 59). At his birth he— as had been the case with his mother— was
guarded from the touch of Satan, who seeks by touching every newly born infant to implant a tendency to sin (iii. 31 and al-Ba‘id, in loco). Some even say that he and his mother, in consequence of this, never committed sin (Kiṣaṣ, p. 210). But it should be noticed that the same is said, even more absolutely, of John the Baptist because he it called ḥāṣṣūr, “chaste” in Qur‘ān iii. 34; cf. al-Ba‘id. and Kiṣaṣ, p. 211 sqq. But all the Qur‘ān has is that Mary’s mother exclaimed (iii. 31), “Verily, I put her and her seed in thy (Allah’s) care from the stoned Shi‘aṭūn. How much or how little of the later view was in the mind of Muḥammad or was a legitimate development of his position it is impossible to say. He left something uncodified and classed Isā with all the other prophets, although so essentially different. The story of the table with food sent down from heaven (v. 112 sqq.) which is to be to them a festival (Iṣā) and a sign to all generations seems a genuine confirmation on the part of Muḥammad himself in regard to the eucharist. It is significant that the commentators (al-Ba‘id, i. 290) sometimes say that the food was a large fish, thus suggesting the Iṣā symbol.

Later Islam has pictured Isā as separated from all human ties except to his mother, as constantly wandering, barefoot and without abiding place, passing the night in worship wherever he might be when the sun set, living from day to day for nothing but devotion and miracles of benevolence (Kiṣaṣ, p. 218). At the judgment he will be the example of absolute poverty (fuḥr, al-Ḫaṣāli, Durra, p. 90 sqq.). At the maw¬ka‘i on that day men will ask him to intercede for them with Allah and he will refuse, not for any sin of his own, as in the case of the other prophets, but because his followers have taken him and his mother as gods along with Allah (Durra, p. 62 sqq.); cf. many other forms of this tradition in the Iṣāya, ed. with comment. of Sayyid Murtaḍa, x. 459 sqq. Margoliouth has gathered a valuable catena of his sayings and doings from the Iṣāya in the Expositori, vol. v., 1893-94; pp. 59, 107, 177, 553, 561.


Isā b. ‘Ali [See also ‘Ali b. Isā.]

Isā b. Muḥamмaḍ, Ǧharaf al-Dīn, an Arab Amīr, who played an important part during the war between the Mamluks and the Mongols in Syria. His genealogy in Abu ‘l-Fīdā’s (Constant. 1256 A. H., iv. 91, is Isā b. Muḥamмaḍ b. Ṭāfṣa b. Ḥadīth b. ‘Arāfa b. Fadd. Sāliμa and Sarim were the seats of his family; he probably belonged to the Rabī’a. His grandfather Māḏāf and other members of the family are several times mentioned in the history of Halab by Kamāl al-Dīn (cf. Blochet, Histoire d’Alep, p. 168, 210, 213). Isā fought on the side of Kuṯūr in the battle of ‘Ain Dālāt [q. v.] in 658 (1260) and in the following period also was usually on the side of the Mamluks, although there were frequent quarrels, as the Mamlūk sūṭāns on the one hand had little trust in the Amīrūn and the latter like true Bedouin chiefs troubled little about the government and, if occasion arose, did not hesitate to join the Mongols. Isā was already on bad terms with Bahbars [q. v.] and the feud became fiercer under Kālātān as Isā had taken the side of Sonḵor al-Asīḵār. In 679 (1280) the two even called in the help of Abāṣqā [q. v.] and his Mongols but this unnatural alliance did not last long; soon afterwards Isā had a reconciliation with al-Malik (‘Abd Allāh) on his side in the battle of Himṣ in 680 (1281) against the Mongols. Isā died soon afterwards and his son Muḥamмaḍ Ǧusam al-Dīn succeeded him. The latter continued his father’s policy; in 692 (1293) treacherously arrested by Sulṭān Khalīl, he was released again and recognised as Amīr of the Arabs. He intervened with Sulṭān al-Nāṣir on behalf of Kārā Sonḵor, which gained him the former’s enmity, so that he joined the Mongol Ilkhān. After the treaty of peace between the Mongols and the Mamluks in 723 (1323) Muḥamмaḍ returned to Syria. Muḥamмaḍ, who made the pilgrimage to Mecca in 697 (see Wüstenfeld, Chron. der Staat Mecca, ii. 275), died in the same year (734-35). Ibn Khayyat, i. 169 sqq. gives a detailed account of him and (iii. 271 sqq.) gives interesting information on the fortunes of a member of the family who was at the court of the Sulṭān of Dīlī, Muḥamмaḍ Ǧāh. Muḥamмaḍ left several sons but they soon fell out with one another. Nevertheless, the amirate of the Arabs remained for over a century in the family of Isā b. Muḥamмaḍ and the dynasty is said to have survived till 879 (1474). The authorities available, however, do not enable one to give in any detail the later vicissitudes of the family.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources quoted in the article, cf. the historians of the Mamluks and Ilkhān, especially Weiß, Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. iv. (Index), and d’Ohsson, Hist. des Mongols, Vol. iv.

Isā b. Muṣraḥ b. Muḥamмaḍ b. ‘Ali b. ‘Abd Allāh b. al-‘Arrāb, nephew of the two first ‘Abbasid Caliphs, al-Saffāḥ and al-Mansūr. In the last year of his reign al-Saffāḥ had homage paid to his brother Abū Dījāfār and after him to his nephew Isā b. Muṣrat as heirs-apparent. Isā, who a few years previously had been appointed governor of Kūfah, retained this office after the accession of Abū Dījāfār al-Mansūr. When the ‘Alīids Muḥamмaḍ b. ‘Abd Allāh rebelled in Medina in 145 (762), Isā was sent with an army against him. On the advance of the Syrians, many of the people of Medina saved themselves by flight and in Ramadān of the same year (Dīn 762) Isā stormed the city. Muḥamмaḍ fell in the battle and his head was sent to the Caliph. In the meanwhile his brother Ibrāhīm had raised the standard of revolt in Baṣra. The Caliph’s troops were defeated and as the revolt was spreading more and more, al-Mansūr feared that the easily influenced people of Kūfah might be involved in the revolution, so he went in person to the city. He succeeded in keeping the city under control while Isā hurried with help from Medina. His advance guard under Ǧumāʾ b. Kaḥṭāb was defeated in Bahkhamā [q. v.]; a part of the main army also at first retired, but Isā mastered the situation, his troops were put to flight and he himself remained. By the victory of Bahkhamā on 25 Dīn 1 Ka‘b 145 (Feb. 14, 763) al-Mansūr’s rule was secured. Nevertheless he treated Isā slightly and wanted
to exclude him from the succession. The Caliph had even said when he sent him against Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh: "I do not care which of the two kills the other", and in 147 (764—765) he had homage paid to his son Muḥammad al-Maḥdī as successor and even deposed Ḥaṣā from his government, because he declined to abandon his rights. In the end Ḥaṣā had to give in and pay homage to al-Maḥdī, on condition however that he was to follow the latter. After al-Maṣūrī's death he wished to renew his claims as his consent had been extorted from him by threats; his attempts met with no success and in the reign of al-Maḥdī he had again to renounce the succession in favour of his son Mūsā b. al-Maḥdī, son of al-Maḥdī. He died in 167 (783—784).


**ISAAC.** [See ISHĀK.]

**ISAĪF**, name of an idol at Mecca, which is almost always mentioned along with *NĪʿila*. Tradition relates that a man and a woman of the Dājrūn were so called and were turned into stone as a punishment for indecent conduct in the temple. They were first of all placed as a warning on al-Ṣaṣā and al-Marwa, but were later idolatrously worshipped by order of 'Amr b. Lais. It is therefore a question of two sacred stones, but the origin of their names is so far unexplained. Attempts are given in Dozy, *De Israëlieten te Mekka*, p. 197.


**ISAGHŪDI** isasoge, from the Greek *íasouo*, is an Arabic adaptation of the Introduction (al-Madīkh) to an Arabic composition by Porphyry of Tyre. According to Ṣaʿīd al-Andalusi (Ṭabarî-ʿat-Umm, Beyrouth 1912, p. 49), the Arabic translation was made directly from the Greek by Ibn al-Muqaffaʾ [q. v.] and, according to the Fihrist (i. 244), it was made from a Syriac version by Auyūb b. al-Kāsim al-Rakī. In any case, it is certain that Arabic versions of Porphyry's work were multiplied quite early, in commentaries, epitomes and adaptations. Of the latter we only possess the two following: 1. that of Abū l-Ḥasan Ibn al-Makna and 'Omar Ibn al-Bikāʾ al-Shāfiʿī (cf. Brockelmann, *Gesch. d. Arab. Lit.*, ii 142—3, 144, with a commentary by al-Sanusi, cf. *op. cit. and Bibli. Nat. d'Algiers*, Cat., N° 1382, N° 1); 2. that of al-Aḥbarī [q. v. and add Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, Cairo 1910, ii. 132], which is the best known and the most annotated. This little treatise on logic discusses very succinctly the following subjects: term, definition, proposition or judgment, opposition, inversion, syllogism, controversy, rhetorical, poetic, sophistry. The Ṣaʿīdī of al-Aḥbarī was put into *radjus* verses by al-Aḥbarī [q. v.]


**ISAWI.** [See NĀRAŠĀN.]

**ISAIWA, ISAWA (Assoua),** a collective name from the singular *Isāb* (cf. Marqāṣ, *Textes Arabes de Tanger*, p. 397 sqq.): a name given to the *kbīr* [q. v.] or members of the Moroccan religious brotherhood founded by Sidi Muḥammad b. Iṣāf and derived from this last name.

In spite of the fame of this brotherhood, the life of Muḥammad b. Iṣāf al-Fihri and his origin are little known. The ethnic al-Fihri suggests a Spanish Arab origin. He travelled a great deal in his youth and was initiated in the east into the ecstatic exercises of the religious orders of the
and the island of Djebha. They are not widely disseminated in Tripolitania and are almost unknown in Egypt. Like all the great Moroccan religious orders they have a sâwîya at Mecca.


(A. Cour.)

Iṣba‘ (A.) “finger”, the inch, an Arab measure of length, as in Europe the twelfth part of the foot (bādīm), 'īsa of the ell (dhīrā). The inch belongs to the earliest of the Arab measures of length and was marked, probably from the earliest period, on the Nilometer of the island of al-Rawḍa built in 66 A.H. [see MIYAS]. Its length there was 2.2925 cm. = 1 inch (the ell is 54.07 cm. = 21.6 inches). Being a derived measure the inch is not an invariable magnitude, for example to-day in Cairo the inch of the dhīrā mukdanda = 3.195 cm. = 1.25 inches, of the dhīrā istanbūl = 2.82 cm. = 1.1 inch, of the dhīrā hindīs = 2.658 cm. = 1.05 inch, and the dhīrā baladi or mārī = 2.404 cm. = 0.95 inch. In Turkey the most usual is the dhīrā baladi of 65.58 cm. which gives an inch of 2.857 cm. = 1.15 inch. It should be noted however that the name ḫūṣ has long become obsolete in everyday life and the ell in the east is very commonly divided into quarters (raḥb) and twenty-fourths (kīra‘), wherever the metric system has not completely driven out the native system.


IṣFĀHĀN, 'Aṣrāzdānā, Ptolemy, vi. 4.; Firdawstī: Sīpāhān; in Arabic Iṣfāhān, an important town in Persia, formerly the capital under the Šafā-
widā, now the chief town of the province of Ḩarīk ‘Adjamī. Its name means "the armies" (Hamza al-
Iṣfaḥānī) and has been referred to by a popular etymology and in derision as aštāb, which in the
local dialect means "dog" (Median στασ, Herod. i. 110). It was formerly composed of two ancient
quarters, Djalal on the site later occupied by the ṣabristān, the "city properly so called", and
Yahādiya, "the Ghetto", a Jewish colony es-
blished there, it is said, by Nebuchadnezzar (Schrei-
ner, Revue des Etudes Juives, xii. 259; Ibn al-
Fakih, p. 261, 29) or under Yazgird I at the
request of his Jewish wife Shōşa-ḵušt (E. Blochet,
Liste des villes, § 54 in Recueil des Travaux,
xvii., 1895; J. Marquart, Erānshāh, p. 29). Anci-
ent legends, which are transmitted by Ibn Rostam,
attribute the building of the citadel to Kay-Kús
[q. v.] and it was later rebuilt by Bahman, son of
Iṣfandiyār. There are two versions of the story
of the capture of Iṣfaḥān by the Muslims. Accord-
ing to one, the historical school of Kifā, the capture took
place in 19 (640); by order of the Calif ʿOmar,
ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥishām marched on Dža'yay, which
was commanded by one of the four pādoshīn of
the Persian empire (= governors, Nüdeke, Gesch.
d. Perser u. Araber, etc., p. 151, no. 2, cf. A.
Christensen, L'empire des Sassanides, p. 87), who,
after several battles, capitulated on condition that
the gīzaya was replaced by an annual tribute.
Ṭabar (ed. Leyden, i. 2637 sqq.) gives the date
as 21 a. h. The Bašra school says that in 23 (644)
Abū Mūsā al-As'ārī [q. v.], after Nehawand, took
Iṣfaḥān or that his lieutenant ʿAbd Allāh b. Budāl
received the capitulation of the town on the usual
conditions of the establishment of khaṭrdīg and gīzaya
(al-Bidāhī, p. 312); on these varying versions
see Caetani, Annali, v. yr. 23, § 4—35. It was
again, after a rebellion, in the Caliphate of
al-Mu'tazz, during Mūsā b. Boghā's campaign against
the 'Alids of Taḥarastān (247 = 861). Its popula-
tion was decimated and its notables deported
(al-Bišālūrī, p. 314). It was henceforth an
important town, the capital of a large province and
a centre of industry and commerce. Ibn Rosta, who
lived there and wrote his book probably about 290
(903), enumerates its four gates and 100 towers;
the geometerian Ibn Lodda measured its diameter
(it was round in plan) and found it to be 6,000
cubits or half a parasang. The Būyid Rukan al-
Dawla increased the town and repaired its walls,
which were still standing in the xth (9th) cen-
tury. There was a building there like a fortress,
which bore the same name as the citadel of Ha-
madīnā, Ṣātār (Sātiye, Fihrist, p. 240, 16, 279
241, 14; Hamza, p. 197; Ibn al-Fakih, p. 219, 241,
244). Silver mines were found in the neighbour-
hood, the exploitation of which had been aban-
donated since the Muslim conquest, and mines of
copper, antimony, tin, etc. The distribution of the
water from the Zindā-rūd for irrigation pur-
purposes and the name zarīn-rūd, river of gold
(cf. Flandin, Voyage, ii. 336), adopted by Ibn Rosta,
were attributed to Ardašīr, son of Būbak. To the
present day the cultivation of the poppy, cotton,
and tobacco constitutes the wealth of the country.
Passing under the same rule of the 'Alids rulers ad
301 (913), it was taken by Mardšīwīdī b. Žīyār in
316 (928) and taken from the Būyids by Maḥmūd
of Ghazni shortly before his death in 421 (1030).
It was the favourite residence of the Saldīḵūn
Malik Šāh. The Ismāʿīlīs made numerous con-
verts there at the beginning of the xith (9th) century.
During the Mongol invasion a battle fought under
its walls by the Sultān of Khwārizm, Djalāl al-
Mangobūrī, although indecisive, saved the town
(625 = 1228); it nevertheless became part of the
Mongol Empire. Muḥammad b. Muṣaffar took it
from Abū Iṣḥāq Indīlū in 757 (1357). When cap-
tured by Timūr, the inhabitants rebelled and were
massacred (massacres of 70,000 heads, 790 = 1388).
It was taken by the Ottoman Sultān Sulaimān
during the rebellion of prince Ilkān-Mīrzā (155-
1548). After the battle of Gūlūnchūb (1134 = 1721)
the Afgān Maḥmūd besieged Iṣfaḥān and it suf-
fured terribly from famine and capitulated, which
resulted in the abdication of Shāh ʿHasīn. Its popu-
lation was massacred for a fortnight after the
victorious rising in Ḩādūn (1136 = 1723); it was
liberated by Tāḥmasp Kūli Kūhān (Nādir Șāh) in
1141 (1729).
Choosing Iṣfaḥān for his capital, Shāh 'Abbas I
[q. v., i. 7b sqq.] made it a large and beautiful
town, with a large population (at least 600,000
in the xvith century), whence the Persian proverb
Iṣfaḥān nisf-i Ḧājan "Iṣfaḥān is half the world".
It lies along the Ūndā-rūd (now called Zāyin-
dūd), which is crossed by three fine bridges, one
in the centre of the town, Pul-i Dżula or Pul-i
Allāhverdi Kūh, because it leads to the suburb
of Djufla [q. v.] and was built by the general of
'Abbas I, now called Pul-i so sīn Čašma (bridge
of the 33 arches), the two others at the two extre-
mities of the town, the lower, the bridge of Bābā
Rukan, which led to the cemetery in which the
mausoleum of this derviš stood, now called Pul-i
Hasānābād; the bridge of Pul-i Mīrām (Jāmān
or Jāne, name of a district) also called the bridge
of Shabristān, higher up the river. A fourth bridge
called Pul-i Čubī ("wooden bridge") connected the
two halves of the palace of Sašdaštūbūd.
The town was surrounded by a wall of earth,
badly kept and encroached on by houses and
gardens. This wall had eight gates, — formerly
twelve, — but four were built up (see their names
in [Dupré] Voyage en Perse, 1819, ii. 158). Iṣfaḥān
was divided into two parts, Dżawbarā and Dardāšt,
which were inhabited by the hostile factions of
Ni'mat Allāh and the Ūdārī. The Mādīnā-Șāh,
"Royal Square", is a long rectangle enclosed by a
canal built of bricks coated with a kind of plaster
called șah-ki sīyāh, "black mortar"; behind it
along its margin are ranged the houses which se-
parate the square from the bazaar which surrounds
it outside, as well as large buildings like the gate-
way of the royal palace, the mosque of the Šadr, the
clockwork pavilion, the royal mosque in the south
and the imperial market on the north. The centre
of the square was marked by a tall pole used for
target shooting and two great columns of marble
used as goals for the game of polo (waghān). The Royal
Mosque (Masjīd-i Șāh), which is still in existence,
completely covered with enamelled bricks, was built
by Shāh 'Abbas I at the end of the xiiiith cen-
tury; it is one of the most beautiful buildings in
the world. Shāh Șaft I covered its gates with sil-
ver. The mosque of the Šadr, also called the mosque
of Fath Allāh, is much smaller. The pavilion of
the clock was built for the amusement of 'Abbas
II; it was a clock which struck with musical
chimes at each hour of the day; a clockwork arran-
gement caused large marionettes fastened to painted
figures to move along the wall, as well as birds and other animals in painted wood. The imperial market (bâşarî) was, like the other buildings in this square, entered by a gateway covered with bricks of facing; the centre was surmounted by a dome. The finest stuffs were sold there. The royal palace also had an entrance on this square through a large gateway (çatî kâbîli, the many coloured gateway), always open, day and night, used as a place of refuge (batac). In the centre of the garden was the pavilion called the Pavilion of the Forty Pillars (ekliî sultan), although there are only eighteen of them; it consists of a hall and two rooms covering the royal throne; its walls were covered with paintings.

The Kârwan-sarai of al-Khurâsân and that of Ma'âşûd A'sâr (the presser of oil), the palace of the Şâdî mânûbûfî, "superintendent of religious endowments", built by Rustam Khaan, the Kârwan-sarai irections by order of Abûbâs II, the tower of Khâlid al-'Ali, usually called Çulhâ, "Inden with flowers", the Tower of the Hows, covered from top to bottom with heads of wild beasts with their horns, a memorial of great hunts, the citadel called Ta-barak (Chardin, Kâl'a-i Tabarruk, "Castle of the Benediction") were the most beautiful monuments adorning the capital. The garden of Hâzûr Djarîb was formed of twelve terraces and fifteen avenues of trees, of which some were watered by a canal; pavilions and fountains completed the decorations.

The misfortunes of Persia during the Afghan conquest and the removal of the capital to Teherân under the Kâdîjûs ruined Isfahân. The Avenue of the Çâhâr Bagh still exists, as well as the Madrasa-i Mâdîr-i Şâhî, the "college of the king's mother", but many of the beautiful plane trees which adorned it were cut down and taken to Teherân for the building of the palace of Zill al-Sultân. The three bridges are in a good state of preservation. One can still see the Madrasa of Sultan Hussein, which dates from a little before the Afghan invasion, the palace of Hasht Bishtî, which belonged to Sârim al-Dawla, Zill al-Sultân's minister, and in the village of Galândân, in the environs of Diîfja, the two Mîrâz-i Diîfânî, "moving minarets" (explanation of the phenomenon in Mme Dieulafoy, La Perse, p. 278). The Mîrâz-i-Dihân has preserved its fairy-like, aspect; in the evening and morning the royal musicians (tambourines and trumpets) still play in the nakhshârâ khaînâ opposite.

The poet Khaîkânî (vi = viiith century) devoted a long ode of 81 verses to the praises of Isfâhân (Kulîyâ, i. 512).

On the Armenian colony New Diîfja see the article DULFA.


AL-ÎSFÂHÂNî, ABU BAKR MUHAMMAD B. Dâ'ûD B. `Àli. Born in 255 (868), this fākh succeeded his father at the age of 16 as head of the Zâhirî school (cf. Dâ'ûD B. KHALîP); he died in Baghîdâd 297 (909). His juridical polemics against Ibn Su-râjî, al-Nââîî al-Akbar, al-`Alîjîlî and al-Tabârî are recorded, but what has made his memory endure is a work of his youth, the Kitâb al-Zâhirî (ms. Cairo, êFûr, iv. 260), containing in 50 chapters 5000 verses selected from the poets on "the aspects of love, its laws and variations" accompanied by personal notes in very elegant prose. He there expands the Platonic conception of amour courtois (hâshî al-warî) with a grace which has never been surpassed. The friendship which linked him till his death to Muhammad b. Dâ'ûD al-Sâlâdî, to whom this book is dedicated, has become famous (cf. Ibn Fadl Allah al-`Umârî, Ma'âlîkh al-A'zîrî, Vol. 1, ch. v., s. v.; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Lit., i. 195 sqq. (L. MAshhîM.)

AL-ÎSFÂRAYÎN, formerly a small fortified town in the N. E. Khârûsân, south of the Atrak, in the province of Nâshîrûf. five relays distant from this town. Its name, which is still given to the plain in which it was situated, is derived by popular etymology from isfârâyîn "shield-like" on account of the custom of the
habitants of carrying shields, but it used to be called Mīhrādān, a name which since the time of Yākūt has been given to a village in the vicinity. The city itself which defended it was called Ḍaʾlā-i Zard "fortress of gold"; in the great mosque, there was a vessel of brass 12 cubits (gaz) in circumference. The district produced excellent grapes; there were many rice fields there. The inhabitants were Shāhi’s and have produced a certain number of jurists. Sacked by the Mongols in 617 (1220) it was destroyed in the Uzbek invasion a little before 1006 (1597). Its site is now represented by the ruins of Shahr-i Bilqis.

Bibliography: Bibl. Geogr. Arab., iii. 318; vii. 171, 278; Aboulféda, Geographic, i. 448; Yākūt, Muğjam (ed. Wustenfeld), i. 246; Ḥasan Khān, Mirzā al-Baladīn, i. 38; Barbière de Meynard, Diction. de la Perse, p. 34; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 393; Sykes, Hist. of Persia, ii. 152, 258. (Cl. HiArt.)

ISFENDIYAR OĞLU, the name of a Turkom district, which founded the independent kingdom of Kastamūnî on the decline of the Seldjuk kingdom of Konya, at the end of the viith (xiiith) century in N.W. Asia Minor, in the ancient Paphlagonia. The name is taken from that of the best known ruler of this dynasty, Isfendiyyar Bey; in the xviith century we find the name Ḥizil Aḥmed, from Ḥizil Aḥmed, the brother of Ḥizil Bey. The Byzantines called the Isfendiyyar Oğlu "the sons of Amurias" or of Omur. The founder of the dynasty appears to have been Šams al-Dîn b. Yāman Dîndar, who held a grant of the district of Aṣfârân; he went to war with Masʿūd II (681—697 A.H.), captured the town of Kastamūn and in 690 A.H. (Mānedjījibâhî) was appointed

GENEALOGY OF THE ISFENDIYAR-OĞLU.

1. Yaman Dîndar (for Yaman b. Dîndar?)
2. Šams al-Dîn (= Şonkor Bey Šamsi Pasha?)
3. Shūḏā al-Dîn Sulaimān Pasha
   4. Emir Yaʿqûb
   5. İbrahim Pasha
      6. ʿAli Bey
      7. Naṣratīs (= Naṣir al-Dîn?)
      8. ʿĀdil Bey (ʿAll)
      9. Bāyâzîd Kūṭūrūm (Vall)
10. Sulaimân Pasha
   11. Mubâriz al-Dîn Isfendiyyar
   12. İskandar
   13. (daughter) (reg. 795—843 A.H.)
      14. daughter, married to Murâd I.
      15. ʿĀrâr Yaḥyâ
16. İbrahim, reg. 843—847 A.H. married (828 A.H.) a sister of Murâd II.
   17. Kiwān al-Dîn Kâsim Bey
   18. ʿĀdîrî Bey
   19. Murâd
   20. Ḥaṭîma, married 825 A.H. Sulṭân Murâd II.
   21. 24. İskandar, called Mirzâ Bey
   25. Ḥasan, killed 855 A.H.
21. Kamal al-Dîn Abu l-Ḥasan Ismâʿîl; reigned 847—864; in 844 A.H. married a daughter of Murâd II.
   22. Kiwâ Kâbir
   23. Ḥaṭîma
   27. Mehmed, called Mirzâ, married a daughter of Bâyâzîd II.
   26. Ḥasan
28. Şemsî Pasha
   29. Muṣṭâfa Pasha

on this cf. the genealogy of Ḥizil Bey in the Hulawiyât-i Sulṭânî in Rieu, Catal. of Turkish MSS. in the British Museum, p. 11, and that of Şemsî Pasha in Pečewi, ii. 19 sqq.; 4 perhaps the brother of Sulaimân Pasha, called al-ェfendi by Ibn Batūṭâ; the sons of Sulaimân Pasha, 5—7, in Ibn Batūṭa, ii. 349, 348, Shihâb al-Dîn, and Pachymeres, ii. 327 sqq., 611; 8 according to Mânedjîjibâhî, son of Sulaimân Pasha; 13 according to Saʿd al-Dîn, i. 192; another sister of Isfendiyyar and her son is mentioned by Clavijo, p. 92, but without giving her name; 14 according to Târîḵ-i Sâf, i. 39 sq.; on 17 see Saʿd al-Dîn, i. 277 sqq., 284 sq., 318 sq., 320 sq.; Ḥâmid Wahbi, p. 1350 sq.; on 18 Saʿd al-Dîn, i. 287; on 19 Saʿd al-Dîn, i. 318 sq.; on 21, the epithet in Feridût, i. 250; on his marriage with a daughter of Murâd II: Dukas, p. 243; Saʿd al-Dîn, i. 342; on 23 cf. Rev. Hist., p. 390 sq.; on 24 Ḥâmid Wahbi, p. 1354; on 26 Saʿd al-Dîn, i. 474, 476.
governor of the districts seized by him by the Ilkhan prince Kaikhosru. He seems to be identical with Sonqor Bey Shemsi Pasha, who conquered Buli according to Ewliya, ii. 173. His son, Shujud al-Din Sulaiman Pasha (700-740 A.H.), at first acknowledged the suzerainty of the Ilkhan, but afterwards made himself independent and conquered Sinope, which was still in possession of a daughter of Mas'ud II. He is mentioned in Ibn Batutla (ii. 343 sqq.), Shihab al-Din (Not. et Extr., xiii. 340 and 361 sqq.) and Abu l-Fida' (Geographie, ed. Reinaud, ii. 1, p. 35; 2, p. 142, 145); Pachymeres, ii. 345 sqq. and 456 sqq., knows him by the name Eulamitakos. His successors were: his son Ibrahim Pasha; Adil Bey, son of the Emir Ya'qub and grandson of Shams al-Din (about 746 A.H.); Djalal al-Din Bayazid, son of Adil Bey, from 787-795 A.H.; Sulaiman Bey, son of Bayazid, from 795-799 A.H., Suljan Bayazid I killed him and seized his land (according to Rev. Hist., p. 289; the Ottoman chronicles give no mention of Bayazid Sulaiman and make Bayazid Koutchur reign till 795 A.H.). Mubarriz al-Din Isfendiyar, son of Bayazid, was restored by Timur in 805 A.H. He died on Rama'dan 22 843 A.H. About 820 A.H. he had to cede the towns of Tosia, Kiangri and Kalfedik and the district of Djank to Mehemmed I and later the rich copper mines to Murad II; Ibrahim, son of Isfendiyar, 843 - beg. 847 A.H.; Isma' il, son of Ibrahim; was deposed by Sultan Mehemmed II at the instigation of his brother Kilis Ahmed in 864 or 865 A.H. and died in Philippopolis, which was allotted to him as a residence by the Sultan. He was the author of a widely circulated book, Huismayyini Sulaymi, on the ritual prescriptions of Islam. His brother Kilis Ahmed fled to Usun Hasan after the confiscation of Kastamun, returned to Constantinople after the death of Mehemmed II, and was honourably received by Bayazid II; his son Mirza Mehemmed married a daughter of the Sultan and his grandson Shemsi Pasha filled high offices under Selim II and Murad III; Shemsi Pasha in particular had great personal influence as the confidant (mustafib) of Murad III. He fabricated a gilded history of the "Kilis Ahmed al-Isfendiyar-Oghlu" which went back to Khazid b. al-Walid, and invented the name Kilis Ahmedlu for the dynasty of Isfendiyar-Oghlu. Descendants of this family still exist and when at the beginning of the xvith century it was feared that the Ottoman ruling house might become extinct, the Kilis Ahmedlu were considered amongst other as possible claimants to the throne on account of their frequent marriages with relatives of the Sultans.

**Bibliography:** Muneefeddinimbashi, Sada'(al-\-Akhbar, ii. 29 sq.; Hamid Wahbi, Meqaddir-i Islam, No. 43 (= p. 1329-1356 of the whole series); Revue Historique publie par l'Institut d'histoire ottomane, p. 382-392 (monograph by Ahmed Tewhid); the Byzantine historians Pachymeres, Ducas, Chalkokondyles, Phrantzas; Clavijo. On the coins of the Isfendiyar-Oghlu Isma'il Ghalib, Tawkim-i Mevkii'i-i Seljukii, p. 120 sq.; Ahmed Tewhid, Mevkii'i-i introdhu-i Islamii, iv. 400 sqq.

**ISFID DIZ.** [See \kalat sef'd].

**ISHAK,** the Biblical Isaac, whose birth, according to the Talmud (Rash ha-shana, p. 11), took place at the feast of Passah and, according to Muslim tradition, in the night of "Asgib" (al-Thalabi, p. 60; and Kisak, p. 150), was promised to his father Ibrahim a year previously by Allah (also in Gen. R. 45). Ibrahim was in the habit of eating only when the poor and hungry shared his meals. On one occasion fifteen (al-Thalabi, p. 48) or three (al-Kisa, p. 149) days happened to pass without a guest appearing. Three strangers then appeared before him but he gave them a roasted calf. They did not touch it (Kur'an, xi. 73). They said "We eat nothing without paying its price". He said "The price is that you should utter a blessing before and after the meal" (al-Thalabi, l. c.; Gen. R. 54). They then foretold to him the birth of a son. Sara laughed at this, as she was 90 and Ibrahim 120 years old. The latter said: "Then he shall be sacrificed as an offering to God!" (These features probably have their origin in the accounts in the Midrash [Gen. R. 15; Tanchuma Gen. 40]). When seven years old, Ishak visited the sacred place. Ibrahim then received in a dream the order to make sacrifices. The next morning he sacrificed a bullock and divided the meat among the strangers. In the night the voice again said to him: "God demands a more valuable offering". He killed a camel. In the following night the voice said: "God demands thy son as an offering". Ibrahim awoke in horror and said: "O my son, I saw in a dream that I must sacrifice thee" (Kur'an, xxxvi. 101). The latter replied: "Father, do what was ordered thee. Thou wilt find me a patient person, if God will" (102). Taking a knife and a rope they went together to the mount. Ishak said: "Father, take my shirt from my body, lest my dear mother find blood upon it and weep for me. Bind me firmly, so that I do not move, and look away while sacrificing me, lest thou lose thy courage" (al-Kisak and al-Thalabi, l. c., according to Gen. R. 56; cf. also Sefer haysid'ar, Wayyera and Pirke de R. El. 31). "May God comfort thee for my loss! Give my mother my shirt that it may comfort her and do not tell her how thou didst sacrifice me. Never look at boys of my age, lest grief overwhelm thee!" Ibrahim directed the knife against the throat of his son but three times it slipped and glanced aside. Then a voice called to him: "Ibrahim, Thou hast satisfied the vision" (Kur'an xxxvii. 105). Then a ram appeared, which said it had been the offering of Habib and had hitherto been in Paradise; it was offered as a sacrifice (Abath V; Pirke de R. El. 32, and al-Kisak). When a rumour arose that Ishak was a foundling adopted by Ibrahim, God gave father and son the same figure so that they were very like one another. But Ibrahim was grey (Baba M. 87; Gen. R. 53; al-Kisak, p. 152).

As the Kur'an verse above quoted does not state, which son was to have been sacrificed, many Muslim theologians refer the intended sacrifice to Isma'il (al-Zamakhshari and al-Baidawi on the passage; al-Tabari, i. 291; Ibn al-Athir, i. 88; al-Thalabi, p. 55-56; al-Kisak, p. 150). But it may be said that the oldest tradition — al-Thalabi expressly emphasises the "Asgib and Tibbun", i.e. the Companions of the Prophet and their successors from Omar b. al-Khattab to Ka'b al-Ahbar did not differ from the Bible in this question.

**Bibliography:** al-Zamakhshari, i. 224; al-Baidawi, i. 233; al-Thalabi, Kisas al-Amiklay (Cairo 1312), p. 48-60; al-Kisak, Kisas al-
Asiyâ, p. 136—140; al-Tabari, ed. Leyden. i. 272—4; Ibn al-Athîr, i. 87—89; Grünbaum, Beiträge, p. 110—120; Eisenberg, Abraham in der arab. Literatur, 1912, p. 30—31; Encyclop. Hebr., New-York, v. 18, s. v. Isâk. (J. Eisenberg.)

Išâk b. Ḥuṣain b. Išâk al-Ḥarîbî, Abu Yâqûn, the son of Ḥuṣain b. Išâk [q. v.], a physician and philosopher, but more important as the translator of Greek, mainly philosophical and mathematical works into Arabic. He was in great favour with the caliphs al-Mu'tamid and al-Mu'taḍîd, and the vizier of the latter, Ḵâṣîm b. 'Ubaïd Allâh. He died in Kâbi II 295 or 299 (Nov. 910 or 911) in Baḥdâd. Of his most important translations we may mention the Elements of Euclid, afterwards improved by Thâbit b. Ḷûra, his Daṭa, the Almagest of Ptolemy, also improved by Thâbit, Archimedes' books On the sphere and cylinder, Menaclus' Sphaerica, Plato's dialogue Sophistes with the commentary of Olympiodorus, the Categories of Aristotle, his Topica, Hærmenaiæta and Rhetorica, de Coelo et Mundo, de Generatione et Corruptione, a part of the Metaphysica. Of these translations the following has been edited: — Aristotelis Categories cum versione arabica Isaacii Honenti et variis lectionibus textus graeci e versione arab. ductis a J. Th. Zenker, Lipsiae 1846. — Into the question, which of these translations were made from the Syriac and which direct from the Greek, we cannot enter here, but refer the reader to the Bibliography. In the case of several of these translations there is still doubt as to whether they are by Išâk or his father Ḥuṣain.


Išân, Persian pronoun 3rd pers. plur. The word is used in Turkestân in the meaning of šâhâk, murqâd, ustâḏâlī, pîr, teacher, guide [see DERKÄŠI i. 950], in contrast to murîd, adherent, pupil. When the first person always has still to be investigated; it certainly existed in the middle ages; the celebrated Kâbi (Bed. 895—941, also called Išâk in Samarkand) is always called Išâk in his biography. The rank of Išâk is frequently transmitted from father to son. The Išâk lives with his followers in a dervish monastery (ḵânaḵâh), in Central Asia pronounced xhanâka), sometimes also at the tomb of a saint. Most Išâk's make journeys from time to time into the steppe, where they have more adherents among the Kirghiz and receive richer presents than from the settled population. Greater attention was attracted to the Išâk's by a rebellion stirred up by an Išâk in Farghânâ in 1898; but the literature on the subject is still extremely scanty. Cf. J. Geijzer, Materiali k islamným blízovým čerí mužstva manskogo nasledenija Turkistanu krajâ, i. Išâk (Šorňák materialov dlia stastâtiky so Dariâxîskîmi oblasticî, Vol. i.): Šorňák materialov a mužstva manskâ, St. Petersburg, 1899; Sattar-Chân, Mužstva'skîe ishâki (Pravoslavnyj Sobórâčnîk, Sept. 1895, and later N. P. Ostroumîov, Sârî, izd. 3e, Taghkiten 1908, p. 206 sq.); Prince V. Maslîskij, Turkestanskiy krai. St. Petersburg. 1913, p. 355 sq.; Fr. v. Schwartz, Turkstan, Freiburg in Breisgau 1909, p. 198. (W. Barthold.)

Išâkî-yûn (scil. al-Ḫusâkî) i.e. the adherents of the Ḥikmat al-Išâkî or maṣâḥib Išâkî (read by many, e. g. Pococke, Munk, Renan, as maṣâḥib Išâkî = eastern). The name is given especially to the disciples of al-Suhrawardî (died 1191) but the name and the matter are older. On the name cf. Ḥikma; it is really a question of the synergetic philosophy of Helenism, which reached the east from Neo-Platonic, Hermetic and allied sources and was there amalgamated with old Persian and other speculations. It is a spiritualistic philosophy with a mystical theory of knowledge. God and the world of spirits are usually interpreted as light and our process of cognition as an illumination from above through the intermediary of the spirits of the spheres. The following are regarded as particular authorities for this doctrine: Herodes, Agathodeemon, Empedocles, Pythagoras, etc., and Plato more than Aristotle (at least the genuine one). These authorities are often described as prophets or inspired sages. From the beginning to the present day, this philosophy of revelation has influenced Muslim philosophy to a great extent. The so-called Peripatetics in Islam are in part under its influence, Ibn Rushd perhaps least of all.


Išâkî, Abu Išâk Muhammad b. Ahmad [or Išâkî] al-Kârâxî, al-Muttaqî's vizier. In 323 (934—935) he is mentioned as secretary to Muhammad b. Yâkît, chief of police in Baḥdîd, and in Shawwâl 320 (June—July 941) the Caliph gave him the office of vizier, but after only six weeks, in Dhu 'l-Ka'da (July—Aug.) of the same year, the Amir al-Imâm 'Kûrîtî dismissed him. Some time after 'Kûrîtî's fall he received again his rank, but could only hold it for 40 days. In Shawwâl 330 (June—July 942) he was again given the same office and after he had held it for 8 months 16 days, the Hâmidîd Nâṣir al-Dawla [q. v.] dismissed him.


Išâkî-yûn, Alexander the Great (the Arab authors usually see the Arabic article in the first two letters of the name). In the Muhammadan accounts of the world-conqueror there are here and there echoes of genuine historical tradition but as a rule we have to deal with legendary tales, which originate in the romance of Alexander (see the article ISKANDAR-NÂMA below) and were considerably extended and embellished by later writers. We confine ourselves here to giving in its broad outlines what the older Arab historians relate on the subject. In the first place it should
be noted that Alexander's genealogy is artificially made up in various ways as may be seen from Friedländer's *Die Chahār-lēgāned und der Alexanderroman*, p. 294 sqq. As a rule, however, the name of his father Philip is correctly given, frequently in the form Fileššu, Filalkšu or otherwise corrupted, as well as that of his mother Olympias (also almost always in a corrupt form); some authorities even give the name of his grandfather Āminta or Āminātā. Even in the earliest historians however we find also the view, which was as its original Persian national pride, that Alexander was not the son of Philip, but of Dārāb (Dāra al-Akbar) so that he was the half-brother of Dārā (Dāra al-Asghar), the last Persian king. It is said that, when Philip was conquered by Dārāb but had to pay a yearly tribute in golden eggs, his daughter, who is given the name of Halai (otherwise in Firdawsi) to get a fantastic etymology for the name Alexander, was married by Dārāb but on account of her repulsive odour was at once repudiated by him and sent back to her father. They endowed a hospital in order to cure her defect by a medicine called *sândar*. In the meantime born of said son, he was called Alexandros after the name of his mother and that of the medicine. The boy was brought up at the court of his grandfather; his tutor was Aristotel, and after Philip's death he succeeded him. Alexander soon omitted to pay the tribute and, when his half-brother, who had in the meantime become king of Persia, demanded it Alexander sent the messenger home with the answer that he had killed and eaten the hen which laid the golden eggs. We omit here the story of the symbolic gifts which Dārā sent to Alexander and Alexander's reply, although it is found as early as al-Tahārī i. 605. Alexander then prepared for war, collected a great army and went first of all to Egypt, where he founded buildings (see *Al-Iskandarīya*). In the meanwhile Dārā also had assembled his troops and Alexander advanced against him, until the two armies met on the Euphrates where a sanguinary battle took place (its site is also placed elsewhere), in which Alexander was victorious. Dārā fled, but was treacherously wounded to death by two of his own people who sought thereby to gain the favour of Alexander. According to some accounts, several encounters took place between Alexander and Dārā but in the end the result was the same and Alexander met his dying foe. The latter recommended his wife to his care and asked him to see to the punishment of the murderers and to other matters; in particular he expressed the wish that Alexander should marry his daughter Rushang (Roxana). Alexander promised to fulfil his requests and ordered Dārā's obsequies to be carried out in regal fashion. As a result of his marriage with Rushang he now acted as the legitimate ruler of Persia, ordered the affairs of the government, and advanced on India to conquer Fūr (Porus), who was allied with Dārā. He had a fierce battle with Porus and only succeeded in disposing of him by rendering his elephants innocuous by stratagem and finally overcoming his opponent in single combat. Another Indian king, named Kaid, submitted to him voluntarily and sent him four valuable gifts (a virgin of wondrous beauty, a vessel which never became empty, a physician and a philosopher who could answer every question). He then took an interest in the Brahmins (gymnosophists) and had a conference with them in which he put various questions which they answered. After thus becoming acquainted with India he began his expeditions throughout the whole world, which are however usually but briefly mentioned by the historians. After India, came China and Tibet (Dinawari mentions the meeting with Candace) and finally he went to the Land of Darkness and met Khīrīr (Khādīr). The historians apparently knew a great deal about all this, but they omit to narrate it, either because they thought that it was not the contemporary of Dārā but an older Dhu 'l-Karnain who was the real hero of these incidents, or for other reasons. We shall deal with this question below: here it is sufficient to say that Alexander finally died on his return to Persia at Šehrūzr or in Bābil, according to al-Dinawari, in Jerusalem, at the age of 36, after reigning 13 or 14 years (many other figures are also given). According to some accounts, he died from poison and having a presentiment of his approaching end, sent a letter of consolation to his mother in Alexandria. The corpse was placed in a golden sarcophagus, over which the philosophers spoke in turn and in brief speeches when opened, the words of earthly greatness. The sarcophagus was taken to Alexandria and buried there in a tomb, which, according to al-Masʿūdī, still existed in 322 (964).

Among Orientals, Alexander is not only the world-conqueror and founder of cities — he is said to have founded 12, all called Iskandariya — but the hero who reached the ends of the earth (cf. i. Macc. i. 3). It was not lust of conquest but the thirst for knowledge that was his motive. Philosophers therefore accompanied him everywhere and the wonders of nature and enigmatical problems attracted his special interest. Mubashshir b. Fāzik and al-Shahruzi, quoted by Mīrkhwān, therefore deal with Alexander in their biographies of Greek philosophers. Cf. Meissner in Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgen. Gesellsch., xli. 583 sqq. At the same time he appears as the champion of the true faith, because his epitaph, Dhu 'l-Karnain, which is variously interpreted [cf. i. 961b sqq.] led to his being identified with the prophet of the same name mentioned in Kurān xviii. 82 sqq. This is however not approved of by all expositors; the majority distinguish an earlier and a later Dhu 'l-Karnain; the later is then identical with Alexander. For further details and the peculiar confusion with Mūsā in Kurān xviii. 59 sqq. see the articles Khīrīr (Khādīr) and Yaʿṣūr (Wa-Maṣūr). The connection indicated by Lādzbarki, Meissner and others of these stories with very ancient Oriental ideas and myths (Gilgamesh epic) will there be dealt with.

**Biography:** All universal histories deal with Alexander so that one need not only mention the older Arab historians: al-Yaḥyā, ed. Houtsma, i. 96, 161 sqq.; al-Dinawari, ed. Girgas, p. 31 sqq.; al-Tahārī, ed. Leiden, i. 693 sqq.; al-Masʿūdī, ed. Paris, ii. 250 sqq.; Eutychius, ed. Pocock, p. 281 sqq.; al-Thaʿlabī, *'Arāf*, ed. Cairo 1314, p. 203 sqq. etc. Cf. also the references given in the article ISKANDARI-NA."
1036.

A little known version in Eastern Turki we owe to the celebrated Mīr ʿAlī Shīr [see NEWT]. The Ottoman Turkish version by Ahmedi [q. v.] is based on the Persian of Firdawsi (see Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, i. 203 sqq.). A similar work by Fīghāni [q. v.] is also mentioned (Gibb, op. cit., iii. 36).


Bibliography: In so far as it is not given in the work itself, given in Friedländer’s book. Cf. also Chauvin, Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes, vii. 79 sqq.

AL-ISKANDARIYA, occasionally AL-ASKANDARIYA, often SIKANDARIYA, ALEXANDRIA, the principal seaport of Egypt, in Ptolemaic times the second city of the world, now among the most important trade centres of the Mediterranean, with a population of nearly 400,000 including a strong foreign element, is situated at the Western angle of the Delta in latitude 30° 11’ N. and longitude 29° 51’ E. It was founded in 332 B.C. by Alexander the Great. When it came into the hands of the Arabs, it was the capital of Egypt and, though its glory had diminished, it is still a great and splendid town. Under Muhammadan rule it declined to the verge of utter ruin. Its revival dates from the beginning of last century. The present Alexandria is almost entirely modern and needs no description here. It covers the site of mediaeval Alexandria, of which nothing is left but the most scanty remains.

Topography. The port of Alexandria is formed by a peninsula, consisting originally of an island, called Pharos, joined to the mainland by a mole or causeway seven stadia long and known for that reason as the Heptastadium. On the north eastern point of the island stood the Pharos, the great lighthouse built by Ptolemy I, a vast building, prototype of all our lighthouses and generally acknowledged to have been one of the wonders of the world, survived the Arab conquest by several centuries. The Arab writers call it the manāra or manār. Their accounts show that it consisted of a large and lofty structure of white stone, square in plan and massive in frame, above which rose a pile of brick and plaster in the form of an octagonal tower, tapering into a round tower towards the top, with a dome at the summit; they differ greatly as to its height. There are records of the Pharos having been damaged by earthquake and having been repaired on various occasions in the Muhammadan period. A
large part of it fell in 724 (1324), but some portion seems to have been standing a century later. Soon afterwards it had collapsed entirely and in 882 (1477) the present Fort Pharos was built by Ḍaiṭ Bāy [q. v.] on its ruins. The harbour to the east of the peninsula was originally the principal harbour of Alexandria, and (contrary to what is sometimes stated) was the one generally used in Muhammadan times. Even up to the middle of the xviith century the western harbour was resorted to only by galleys, but later it came into use for trading ships, though Christian vessels were not admitted to it until 1803. The Heptastadium, broadened as the course of time by the accumulation of silt from being quite narrow into an isthmus, some three-quarters of a mile in width; it was a vessel of buildings in the middle ages. The town lay to the south, covering an oblong area of about 3 km by one km. Its walls remained in existence till 1811. They consisted of an outer wall some 20 feet high, backed in most parts of the circuit by a thicker and higher inner wall distant some 20 to 25 feet from it; both inner and outer walls were flanked by frequent towers. A further defence was afforded by a moat or ditch designed to be filled from the Nile in case of need. The town had four gates: Bāb al-Bahr leading to the Heptastadium, Bāb Rashid, Bāb al-Sidra at the beginning of the road to al-Maghrib and Bāb al-Akhḍar leading to the cemetery. The walls had been repaired in the reign of Baibars [q. v.] and again in 703 (1303) after an earthquake, in which 17 of the towers had been thrown down; al-Ghūrī also repaired the towers during his reign. The whole system was a curious specimen of mediaeval fortification. It is not possible to say for certain when it was built. A solitary remnant was the so called Tour des Romains, which recently stood near Ramla railway station.

Statements by Arab writers of the ixth to xith centuries, when pieced together, give a very general description of the town itself. It was laid out on a regular plan; eight straight streets intersected eight others at right angles, producing a chess board pattern with direct and continuous thoroughfares, a marked contrast to the meandering roads and blind alleys usual in Eastern towns. The streets were colonnaded, columns were used in most of the buildings; many of the columns were marble. Marble was abundant in the buildings and was employed also in paving some of the highways. There was a market street, a league (so it is said) in length, all built of marble, both its walls and floor. The columns and stones were often of prodigious size and enormous blocks were poised at great heights. Much variety and beauty of colour and fine workmanship were displayed. For instance, pillars like emerald and others resembling onyx are mentioned, all of the highest polish and finish. In the inside of the town there were gardens (kurām) and sycamores. A remarkable feature was that the houses were built on vaults supported by columns, rising above one another in as many as three tiers. The object of this subterranean architecture was to provide cisterns for the storage of water, which was derived from the Nile, and also from the rain, for Alexandria has a fairly considerable rainfall in winter. Materials for reconstructing the plan of the town are quite insufficient. The monuments and buildings noticed may be divided into three classes. In the first, those which dated back to ancient times, there come Pompey's pillar or the column of Dio- cetian (Camīd al-sawārī), the important ancient remain still standing in its place; Cleopatra's needles (al-misīlātān), the two well known obelisks removed in recent times, one to London and the other to America; the Caesarian, a most famous edifice, originally a temple and afterwards the patriarchal church or cathedral, which appears to be mentioned once under the name of al-Ḫaisariya and is probably to be identified with Kanisat Asfāl al-ʾArī, alluded to as a wonder; the remaining remains belong to famous Serapeum, consisting of a forest of columns known as Sawārī Sulaimān, many of which were still standing in position in the xviith century; a magnificent dome called Kubbat al-Khādi, spoken of by several writers; a colossal brass statue known to the Arabs as Shārḥīl, which stood on a rock in the sea; its foot was as long as the utmost stretch of a man lying down at full length; this statue was melted down in the time of al-Walid. In the second category come the churches, buildings but rarely alluded to by Muhammadan writers. Beside the patriarchal church referred to above, which was dedicated to St. Michael, there were two churches of St. Mark, a church of St. John, a church of al-Suwar (the Saviour), churches of St. Cosmas and St. Damian, St. Mary Dorothea, St. Faustus, St. Theodore, St. Athanasius, a Greek church of St. Saba. The list might be extended, but as a rule little more is known of the churches than their names, though one or two of them are described as beautiful or highly ornamented. The great church of St. Mark, which contained the tomb of the saint, was situated a short distance within the Eastern gate on the right hand of one entering. The shrine was known in the xviith century. Whether the modern church of St. Mark occupies the same site does not appear, but it seems that none of the existing churches, even if they mark the site of old ones, preserve any features of interest. There are instances of churches having been built at Alexandria in Muhammadan times; on the other hand, some were destroyed in popular commotions or deliberately demolished, and some were converted into mosques. The third class of buildings consists of additions made by the Muhammadans. It may perhaps be placed the citadel (kiṣām), described as strong and swept by the sea from the west, whence it would seem that it was situated at the north west corner of the town. It was in existence as early as the viiiith century. An ancient citadel, presumably pre-Muhammadan, which was in being in the xth century, contained a government house (dār al-laṣrāb), built by one of the early Arab governors. The Mamlūk sultāns had a similar house (dār al-ṣulṭān), which was situated on the sea-shore and contained many columns of variegated marble and had courts paved with marble,—some ancient palace reserved for their use, but rarely, if ever used. One reads of a great hall of al-Muʿāṣarāy. There was an arsenal or armory "sufficient to equip the people of Egypt". The places of worship included an oratory or maṣṣalā, which, as at Fustārā, had fallen into ruin within a couple of centuries of the conquest. There was a mosque attributed to ʿAmr b. al-ʾĀṣi [q. v.], but whether it stood on the same site as the present mosque
of Amr seems doubtful. The second principal mosque, the western mosque or mosque of the Septuagint, also known as the mosque of the 1001 columns, had been a monastery up to the end of the 1st century, and seems to have been converted into a mosque between this time and the middle of the 5th century. A large mosque "built" by Badd al-Maqdèsī (iii, p. 477) (1084) is presumably represented by the existing Dziμi al-Attairīn, which would seem to be identical with the mosque and former church of St. Athanasius. Ibn Ṭūlūn built a mosque on the Pharos. Early shrines were a mosque of Mūsā near the Pharos, mosques of Sulaimān, of al-Khādir, and of Danīlūlī, still in existence — one notes the Jewish association of these names, — of Dūh l-Karaṇīn or Alexander and the mosque of al-Rahma, marking the spot where Amr stopped the slaughter when he entered Alexandria the second time.

In the ivth century, Alexandria is described by a European traveller as "exceeding beauteous and long" and "exceeding clean" and "carefully kept". In 507, according to another, there was "nothing to be seen but a prodigious heap of stones" and it was rare to see a "continuous street"; in 1634, the town was "almost nothing but a white heap of ruins". There is mention of many houses of Jews on the Heptastadium in (about) 1580, built there "in respect of the air", the earliest allusion, it seems, to habitations on the peninsula. The scanty remnant of the population concentrated there not long after, forming a "new city of very mean appearance" and leaving the town within the walls almost entirely deserted. Enough has come under European observation fully to preserve the former splendour of Alexandria. At the present moment the principal remains, apart from the column of Pompey, are a few of the cisterns.

Alexandria was joined to the Nile by means of a long channel. This work had a tendency to silt up and, instead of being kept open by regular clearing, it was allowed from time to time to become more or less thoroughly blocked and then it was re-excavated. Occasionally after re-digging, it was open to traffic all the year round, but as a rule only for a part of the year. In 1800, the navigable period was only about 20 days. Sometimes communication by water was cut off altogether and the people of Alexandria had to depend on their cisterns for their drinking supply. In the earlier part of the Muhammadan period, the canal left the river at Shāhābur. In the ixth century an alternative waterway from the Nile below Fāwa, through the lakes of Idrīs and Abū Kūr to the neighbourhood of Alexandria, came into use. Al-Nāṣir in the ixth century either improved or reconstructed this channel, the original canal from Shāhābur being abandoned. Various lesser alterations took place subsequently. The damage resulting from the neglect of the canal can be easily understood. It is one of the reasons why the surroundings of Alexandria had become, generally speaking, a desolate waste at the beginning of the ixth century. Maryūt was once busy and thriving and the progress of its gradual decline can be traced. Buḥairat al-Iṣkandariya, identical with the now dry lake of Abū Kūr, has alternated between water and dry land more than once in the Muhammadan epoch.

History. When Alexandria was surrendered to the Arabs in 21 (642), a considerable number of Greeks took advantage of the terms of the capitulation and left it, abandoning their homes. The Arabs on taking possession did not molest the inhabitants. The well known story of the burning of the great library by order of the Khalīfa ʿUmar, which belongs to the 1st century, must be considered as true. On their re-entry into Alexandria after the invasion of Muḥammad in 25 (645), the Arabs revenged themselves on the inhabitants by a massacre; churches were burnt and the town walls, it is said, were thrown down. In the first century of the Hijra, Alexandria was of great importance to the Arabs as a naval station. Hence, no doubt, the rapid increase in the number of its garrison, part of which was drawn from Mađina, and the frequency of visits by the Umayyad governors of Egypt. The Arab occupation at first was purely military. An Augustal was in office late in the century, a sign that the civil administration continued unchanged for a long while.

When the last of the Umayyad Khalīfahs fled to Egypt, al-ʿAswād, a grandson of ʿUkba b. ʿNāfi', declared for the ʿAbbāsids at Alexandria. His followers included 30,000 Muslims of Buḥaira and Maryūt. This host, however, was dispersed by a detachment of 500 troops sent to Alexandria by Marwān; the Khalīfa's men entered the city and there was slaughter there again. The ʿAbbāsids rewarded al-ʿAswād with grants of lands at Alexandria, which seem to have been Umayyad possessions previously. In the course of the struggle between al-Amin and al-Maʿāmūn, Alexandria was coveted for by the Arab tribes of Lakhm and Muddajj. A band of Arab adventurers or pirates from Spain, who happened to be in the port, took advantage of the opportunity to seize the town and managed to hold it against all comers for 16 years (106—212 = 811—827). Four or five sieges occurred during their tenure and, although there are not many details, it is clear that it was a period of tyranny, misrule and excesses, and altogether most disastrous to Alexandria. At this time a band of religious revolutionary fanatics styling themselves Šūfis came into view. There are some signs of similar associations at Alexandria more than a century earlier. Al-Mutawakkil (not Ibn Ṭūlūn) built the walls of Alexandria in 244 (858), for fear of attacks by the Greeks. If these walls were the origin of the walls of 1800 — which is not proved — the town had already become reduced to half the size it had been at the conquest. But little appears during the next two centuries. Alexandria was occupied two or three times by the Fātimids [q.v.] before they achieved the conquest of Egypt. A notable event of the Fātimid period was the transfer of the Coptic patriarchate from Alexandria to Cairo. For a while during the slave revolt (about 460 = 1067) Alexandria was in the hands of the blacks. It was the centre of revolts in 479 and in 547 and on each occasion was taken by siege. A descent by Sicilian Normans on Alexandria in 550 (1155) is mentioned. Amaury, King of Jerusalem, in conjunction with Shāwar and forces of Egypt and aided by the Pisan fleet, besieged it in 562 (1166), when it was occupied by a Syrian garrison, which included Saladin himself. A formidable Sicilian attack on Alexandria in 569 (1173) was beaten off. Baibars built up the galleys at Alexandria and restored them to what they were before. In
762 (1365) Alexandria was surprised and plundered by the King of Cyprus. There is evidence that it had declined greatly in importance by this time, inasmuch as its governors were persons of quite minor rank. The Mamlik Sultan very rarely visited it. They made constant use of it as a place of imprisonment for political offenders. Guns were included in its defence in the xviith century, and al-Churii, when he feared an attack by the Turks, sent a large quantity of ordnance to it in 922 (1516). After the Turkish conquest, the taxes of Alexandria were not included in the revenue of Egypt, but were paid direct to Constantinople. In the xvith century it served as the port of Turkish galleys, which were dismantled and hauled up during the winter. The marauds of these vessels extended as far as the Straits of Gibraltar and the prisons of Alexandria held many Christians they had captured. The ruins of the town now began to be used to provide materials for beautifying mosques and other buildings at Constantinople. The French took Alexandria in 1798. It was taken from them by the British and later by the British in 1801, after the events of 1798-1801, it is not likely to have been much more. In 1828 it was stated to be about 13,528 - smaller than that of Rostova. By 1829, it was estimated at 40,000 and in 1862 at 164,400 In 1871, it was 219,602. As a result of disturbances during the rebellion of 'Arabi Pasha [q. v.] in 1882, the forts of Alexandria were bombarded by the British fleet in July; next day part of the town was destroyed by the mob.

Manufactures, trade. Alexandria was noted for its weaving. Its textiles are described as incomparable and are said to have been exported to all quarters (cf. Egypt, II. 179). Some of the linen manufactured at Alexandria was so fine that the flax for the stuff was sold for its weight in silver and that for the embroidery in it for many times its weight. Alexandrian silks occur in Fatimid inventories (9th to xiith centuries) and it is believed that some of the fabrics presented by Popes to churches in Italy in the xiith and xith centuries were executed by Alexandrian workmen. A great number of miscellaneous manufactures, the character of which is not specified, are said to have been carried on. It was as a market for the products of the Indies rather than those of Egypt that Alexandria was of special importance to trade, particularly for the spices, pepper, cloves, nutmegs, cinnamon, ginger and so forth; - though the list of commodities included other articles such as pearls and precious stones. After being landed on the west side of the Red Sea and conveyed to the Nile by caravan, this merchandise was transported to Alexandria by the river and canal. It was in constant demand in Europe and elsewhere, so that Alexandria was resorted to by people from all parts for commerce. This trade can hardly have been maintained during the early part of the Muhammadan epoch and for various reasons is not likely to have become active until the era of the Fatimids. Towards the end of the reign of the Umayyads or the beginning of that of the 'Abbâsîds, Christian ships began to visit the port, and in the removal of the relics of St. Mark to Venice in 828, according to the well-known story, there is evidence that commercial relations with Venice subsisted then. It seems, contrary to what might have been expected, that the trade with the west was stimulated and developed as a result of the Crusades. In the xiiith century it was well established, and people from all Christian kingdoms resorted to Alexandria; a contemporary name 28 Christian towns or states represented by traders there. Among the number were Amalfi and Genoa, which with Venice appear to have been the earliest in the field, Ragusa, Pisa, Provence, and Catalonia. Besides Christians were to be met Muhammadans from Spain and Barbary and from Mesopotamia, Syria, and the countries towards India. It is known that ships belonging to Alexandria went at the same epoch as far as Amheria in Spain. Each of the various states of the xiiith century had its own fondaco (fondACo), a building in which the merchants warehoused their goods and also resided. The Venetians, as the leading commercial power, obtained a second fondaco in the xiiith century, besides other privileges, and they had also a fondaco at Figo. Their colony was presided over by a consul, and the Pisans, Marseilles and Genoans likewise had consuls there in the xiiith century. Florence established a consul in the xivith century. The first English consul was appointed in 1583. There are many details of commercial treaties, the customs, measures taken with regard to the trade by the Sultan, disputes between Christians and the inhabitants and between the Christians themselves, and other similar matters showing the conditions under which the merchants carried on their work and the difficulties they suffered. The discovery of the route by the Cape of Good Hope in 1498 diverted the Indian trade from Alexandria and reduced the commercial importance of the port to small proportions. When the trade in coffee and other commodities began in some measure to flourish in about 1680, a certain revival at Alexandria manifested itself.

Bibliography: The materials for a history of mediaeval Alexandria are widely scattered. Contributions are to be found in almost every one of the principal Arab histories of Egypt; see article Egypt. To be noticed particularly are Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam (ed. Masâ'îd, Cairo 1914, in progress; ed. Torrey, in preparation); al-Masâ'îd, Murâdî al-Dhahab (Cairo 1303; Paris, 1861-77); Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum, i.-viii.; al-Ithârî, ed. Dozy and De Goeje (Leiden 1866); ibn Djbâhir, Gibb series, v.; Yakûtî, Mu'allîm al-Buldân; 'Abd al-Latîf, Kitâb al-Isfâda wa'l-Fîlîhâr etc. (ed. White, Oxford 1800, and Cairo 1832, transl. and annot. by de Sacy, Paris 1810); al-Makrizî, al-Khulafâ wal-Ahâr; ibn Iyâs, Badî' al-Zuhhâr fî Wâdî al-Duhâr. The Christian writers Severus, ed. Everts and ed. Seybold (cf. ibn al-Mukaffa', 2); and al-Makrizî (Elmaciûn), Lugd. Bat. 1625, supply a few facts not to be found elsewhere. Benjamina of Tduela (many editions) has a brief but important notice. European travellers and accounts in Eu-
European languages include Arculfus (680), Bernard the Wise (870), Ludolf von Sachem (1350), all three in *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society's Series*; M. Baumgarten (1597) in *Churchill's Travels*; Leo Africanus (1517). Hakluyt Soc. 92—94 various titles in *Hakluyt's Voyages*, vol. ii., relating to the xviii century; Sandys (1610) *Travels*; Blount (1614) in *Pinkerton's Voyages*, vol. x.; Maillet (1692); Pococke (1777); Volney (1783), and others.


(plaintext)

AL-ISKANDÂRÎYYA = ISKANDARUNA [see ISKANDARUN]. According to *Tadhq al-Arûs*, iii. 276, al-Iskandariyya was the name of 16 distinct places called after Alexander the Great, including the town of Balkh as well as the two towns mentioned above.

(plaintext)

ISKANDARUN (Alexandretta), the Iskandarûna or Iskandariyya of the Arabs (see the variants of the MSS. of al-Ishkhrî and Ibn Hawqal), the port of Aleppo on the Mediterranean, is the ancient 'Aleksandriya kâtâ 'Isâ, which was afterwards also called little Alexandria ('Aleksandria ū 'umkârî Malalas, ed. Bonn, p. 297), which was reproduced by the Arab actors in the form of the Arabic Iskandariyya; it should not be confused with the place of the same name between Sûr and 'Akka, cf. Maqrizi, *Hist. des Mamlûkes*, ed. Quatremère, ii. 2, p. 256 sqq.; Dimishkî, transl. by Mehrer, p. 280. The 'Aleksandrov of Skylitzes, ii. 677, is formed from Iskandariyya and from 'Aleksandrov then there arose the form 'Aleksandros (Michael Attalî, p. 120; Zonaras, iii. 691; Georgi Cyprius and the episcopal list, *Byz. Zicher*, i. 248); the form usual with us (the Roman diminutive formation) is used as early as the Western pilgrims of the middle ages (Wilibrord von Oldenberg, i. ch. xviii.). Under Arab rule Iskandariyya was the i,jwâd of Kinnasrîn-Halab; the castle is said to have been built in the reign of the Caliph al-Walîthik (Abu 'l-Fida', ed. Reinaud, ii. 2, p. 33). In the wars between the Byzantines and the Arabs the town was repeatedly taken by the former (Murult, *Chronogr. Byz.*, year 1068; Ibn Hawqal p. 121). In Abu 'l-Fida's time it was deserted. In the period following it again gained importance as the port of Aleppo, which was beginning to flourish, but the unhealthy climate, a result of the surrounding swamps, and the not very favourable conditions at the port have so far impeded the commercial development of this important place. It is the capital of a kazîh with 10—15,000 inhabitants. It is connected with Aleppo by a road 60 miles long.

(plaintext)


(plaintext)

ISLAM is the name which Muhammadans in every country give to their own faith. The word means "submission", "resignation", (to God), and occurs eight times in the Qur'an, in such verses as iii. 17, "The (true) religion with God is Islam"; v. 5, "This day have I perfected for you your religion and have completed My favour upon you and it is My pleasure that Islam be your religion"; vi. 125, "Whomsoever God wishes to guide, He opens his breast unto Islam". See further art. MSK.

In the present article merely a statistical account will be given of the extent to which the Muslim religion prevails in the various countries of the world at the present day. For an exposition of the religious tenets and ordinances of Islam, the reader is referred to articles such as Allâh, Muhammad etc., and for the biography, history, geography etc., of Muhammadan peoples, to the appropriate articles under each head.

Various estimates of the total number of Muhammadans in the world have been made, differing as widely as from 175 to 270 millions; but there is a large element of uncertainty about the estimate, as in several countries where Muhammadans are to be found in large numbers, no religious census has ever been taken, and accurate statistics are accordingly wanting. This is particularly the case in the land in which Islam had its origin, and any estimate of the total Arab population must be conjectural only. Some reliance may be placed on the figures given for the districts under European control, as 56,000 (Aden and the neighbouring islands, Perim, Sokotra, etc.), and 89,000 (Bahrain Islands), but estimates of the population in the independent parts of Arabia, e.g. Nadîd, Hâdramût, etc. — 2,500,000 (Zwemer), 3,500,000 (Hartmann) — and those (e.g. Hasjâz, Yemen), under Turkish suzerainty, l,050,000 — can be tentative only. The Arabs are not however confined to the limits of the country that bears their name; as early as the third century of the Christian era had commenced those scattered migrations of Arabs to the north which gradually led to the formation of settlements in Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia; as time went on, advantage was taken of the conflicts between the Byzantine and Persian empires, and larger numbers of nomad Arabs settled in the more fertile countries bordering on the arid land of their origin. This migratory movement culminated in the vast expansion of the Arab race, rendered possible by the conquests of the seventh century, when the Arabs despoiled the Byzantine empire of some of its fairest provinces and subjugated the whole of the territories of the Persian king. The fact that the Arab language was gradually adopted throughout the greater part of Syria, Egypt and North Africa.
is some evidence of the interpenetration of Arab blood in the population of these countries, and a steady, though intermittent, stream of migration from Arabia into Africa set in across the Red Sea. Another stream moved eastward across the Indian Ocean and by the middle of the eighteenth century Arab traders had made their way as far as China and were present in large numbers in Canton. Arab trading settlements are found scattered throughout the Malay Archipelago, and at different historical periods small groups have established themselves on the coasts of British India, and individual Arabs have made their way to most parts of the Muhammadan world, especially those accessible by sea. But no attempt has ever been made to estimate the total number of these Arabs living outside the limits of the Arabian Peninsula, as separate groups in the Muslim populations of which they form a part.

For some countries of Asia which are under European rule, we have accurate statistics. In India, where varieties of religious belief are carefully noted, the Muhammadans, according to the Census of 1911, numbered 66,647,299, out of a total population of nearly 331,515 millions. (For details as to the varied composition of the population, see article INDIA, §1). The Muhammadan community shows a tendency to increase in numbers relatively to their Hindu fellow-countrymen; in the decade ending 1901, while the total population of India increased by 2.4%, the Muhammadans increased by 8.9%; in the following ten years, their number rose by 6.7%, as compared with only 5% in the case of Hindus. Proselytism may partly account for this, but the chief reason for the rapid growth appears to be that their social customs are more favourable to a higher birth-rate than those of the Hindus; they have fewer marriage restrictions, and widows frequently re-marry. Conversions to other religions are not frequent, but Christian converts from Islam are numbered by thousands in Northern India, especially in the Paigah (The Mohammedan World of To-day, pp. 170, 294), and a certain number of Muhammadans of Hindu origin have been re-absorbed into Hinduism through the missionary activity of the Arya Samaj (v. art. INDIA, §5c). In Ceylon, in spite of the intimate trade relations with Arabia, Islam has not achieved any great extension among the inhabitants and there were in 1912 only 284,000 Muhammadans, out of a population of over four millions.

For the Malay Peninsula and Archipelago, complete statistics are wanting. One estimate (Zwemer) gives 673,159 as the Muhammadan population of the Federated Malay States and the Straits Settlements, while another (Hartmann) gives nearly double that figure. Introduced into Malacca from India, Islam spread along the great trade route to Java and the other islands of the Archipelago. The Muslim population of the Dutch Indies in 1905 was 35,034,025; including 29,605,653 in Java, and was said to be rapidly increasing as the result of conversions to Islam from among the sections of the population that still remain heathen; on the other hand, Christian missionaries have in recent years been winning converts from Islam in Java, where more than 300 baptisms are said to take place every year, and in 1906 there were living 18,000 Christians who had been converted from Islam (The Mohammedan World of To-day, p. 237); in Sumatra the various missionary societies working in this island claim to have made 6,500 Christian converts, together with 1150 catechumens, formerly Muhammadans, since the year 1860 (ib., pp. 222, 228).

In Siam, Islam has never succeeded in exercising much influence; converts have been won in the north through contact with the neighbouring Malay States, and in the coast towns as the result of intercourse with the Malay Archipelago; but the total number of Muhammadans is probably not more than 10,000.

In other parts of Asia under European rule, there are found in the French possessions in Indo-China 1,146,000 Muhammadans out of a population of 17,800,000; in the Asiatic possessions (including the Caucasus) of the Russian Empire 11,966,700 Muhammadans out of a population of nearly 25 millions; and in the Philippine Islands, under American rule, 277,547 Muhammadans out of 8½ million inhabitants.

But when we pass to countries in which accurate census returns after the European method are entirely wanting, there is still more uncertainty as to the figures. In Persia, an estimate made by Christian missionaries assigns to Islam all but 500,000 out of the five millions of inhabitants. In Afghanistan it is conjectured that there are about four million Muhammadans.

The first serious attempts to ascertain the number of the Chinese Muslims were made by Broomhall and d'Ollone; the former suggests 8,421,000 (Islam in China, p. 215), the latter (Recherches sur les Musulmans Chinois, p. 430), 4,000,000 only. These figures are in striking contrast to the exaggerated estimates made in the 19th century when their number was alleged to be as much as 20 or 30 millions or even 70 millions; but some Christian missionaries consider that the more recent estimates are too low. But whatever proportion the present Muslims bear to the total population of China, it is probable that their numbers were considerably larger before the massacres that accompanied the suppression of the many Muhammadan insurrections of which a list is given by d'Ollone (op. cit., p. 436), in which millions of persons are said to have perished. In Tibet there are believed to be as many as 25,500 Muslims, most of them settlers from China and Kashmir, with a few converts, and descendants of converts. Islam has succeeded in gaining but few adherents in Japan, and these in quite recent years; there are probably not more than 200 Muslims in Japan itself, but about 25,500 in Formosa.

In regard to some of the oldest parts of the Muhammadan world, now included in the Asiatic possessions of the Sultan of Turkey, and excluding the independent parts of Arabia, various estimates of the Muslim population are given e.g. 11,190,000 (Hartmann) and 12,278,800 (Zwemer), but in the absence of accurate census returns these figures can be considered as approximate only. (v. A. de la Jonquières, Histoire de l'empire ottoman, p. 457 sqq., Paris 1914).

Next to Asia, Africa is the continent that contains the largest number of Muslims, but materials for an exact judgment are so scantily available that estimates vary even by the most recent investigators that estimates vary from 42 to 76 millions. The most rigid investigation has been made by Professor D. Westermann, and his figures, with a total of 42,039,349, have been adopted by Zwemer as follows: Abyssinia,
500,000; Egypt, 10,269,445; Liberia, 280,000; the rest of this continent forms part of the empire of one or other of the powers of Europe, but for the greater part of these vast dominions no exact census returns are available; Belgium, 60,000; France, 15,085,000; Germany, 14,500,000; Great Britain, 12,539,904; Italy, 1,365,000; Portugal 330,000; Spain, 130,000. While much of these estimates is necessarily conjectural, some reliance can be placed upon the figures given for those parts of the continent in which the population is almost entirely Muhammadan, e.g. Morocco (in which there are 3,100,000 out of a total of 3,220,000); or in cases where whole sections of the population such as the Hausas or the Fulbe have adopted Islam. This faith is still making progress among the heathen tribes and new converts every year come in to swell the numbers of the faithful.

In Europe, on the contrary, the influence of Islam continues to decline. What the population of Muslim Spain may have been in the days of its widest extent, it is impossible even to conjecture, but in 1492 the Jewish and Muslim community together numbered over two millions, and when Philip III expelled the last remnant of the Moriscos in 1609-1615, the number of those who left the country was probably about 500,000. (H. C. Lea, *The Moriscos of Spain*, p. 359, London 1901.)

At the present time, the Muhammadans in Europe are almost entirely confined to Russia and those countries that formed part of the Turkish dominions at the beginning of the 19th century. In Russia in Europe, the total number of the Muslims is about 3,500,000, but there has been no religious census in the Russian empire since 1897; they are mainly Tatars by race, but proselytism has taken place to a considerable degree among Finnish tribes such as the Cheremiss, the Votians and the Chuvash. Since the promulgation of the edict of religious toleration in 1905, there has been an increasing number of accessions to the faith of Islam. There is a considerable amount of uncertainty about the religious statistics of the Balkan Peninsula, and even the official estimates are open to grave suspicion of being manipulated to suit some political or racial interest.

In Turkey in Europe (in Asia) there are said to be about 3,200,000 Muhammadans; Hartmann, writing in 1909, gives 3,295,000. In Bulgaria, the Muslims number 603,876 out of a total population of nearly 4½ millions. In Rumania there are about 43,700 Muhammadans, living for the most part in the Dobrudja. In Serbia in 1910 there were 14,435, and in Montenegro 14,000. In Albania the total Muslim population is said to be 334,000, of whom 12,000 are Gypsies, 40,000 Serbs and 26,000 Albanians. Greece still contains 24,000 Muhammadans, while in the island of Crete the number has shrunk to 27,852; but so recently as 1909 there were 33,496 Muhammadans on the island, and in 1881 more than 73,000. In Bosnia and Herzegovina the indigenous Serb population includes 61,437 Muhammadans, and in the rest of the Austrian empire there are about 14,500 more.

In the other countries of Europe, chiefly France and Great Britain, there are some small scattered groups of Muhammadans, mostly of African or Asiatic origin, temporarily resident in these countries.

Emigration and commercial activity have added 8,000 Muhammadans to the population of North America, and 166,000 to that of Central and South America (including the West India Islands, where there are 10,499 in Trinidad and 3,000 in Jamaica). In Australia there are 195,000, chiefly at Perth.

**Bibliography:** The first comprehensive attempt to give a statistical survey of the followers of the faith of Islam, was made by Hubert Jansen, *Verbreitung des Islams in den verschiedenen Ländern der Erde* (Berlin 1897), but his figures are often very exaggerated, and later investigations have shown that many smaller estimates are nearer the truth. Martin Hartmann, *Der Islam: Geschichte—Glaube—Recht* (Leipzig 1909), gives detailed statistics, but does not mention his sources of information. S. M. Zweimer in chapter iii. of *Mohammed or Christ* (London 1910), gives a census of the Muslim World, with a bibliography. Separate studies have been made of the statistics of certain parts of the Muhammadan world e.g. by M. Broomhall, *Islam in China* (London 1910); S. Bobrovnikoff, *Moslems in Russia* (The Moslem World, vol. i. London 1911); D. Westermann, *Der Islam in West- und Zentral-Sudan* (Die Welt des Islams, i. 85 sq., Berlin 1913), and G. Campfmeier, *Statistik der Mohamme daner auf der Balkanhälsung und in Österreich* (ib., i. 32—33). For Africa and Asia see *The Mohammedan World of To-day* (New York 1906). Details as to the spread of Islam are given for their respective territories by the British and Dutch governments in their decennial official publications, the Censuses of India and Kolonial Verlag respectively. Religious statistics are given in *The Statesmen's Year Book*, published annually in London. The *Revue du Monde Musulman* contains articles giving statistics of the Muhammadan population of several countries, see *Index général des volumes I à XVI* (Paris 1912).

(T. W. ARNOLD.)

**ISLĀMĀBĀD,** a town of some importance in the south-eastern part of the valley of Kashmir situated at the head of the navigable channel of the River Djełām. Its Hindu name was Anantāgā, but it was named Islāmābād after the Muhammadan conquest, probably by Sulṭān Zayn al-Abīdīn, 820—872 (1417—1467). The town was formerly famed for its shawl manufacture, but this has died out, and at present the only manufacture is that of white felt, embroidered rugs and embroidered tablecloths. In the immediate neighbourhood are the celebrated Hindu Shrine of Mār tand and Dījāngīn's gardens at Aṭībal.


**ISLĀMĀBĀD.** The name Islāmābād was given on more than one occasion by the Emperor Awrangzēb to towns conquered from Hindus. Of these the most important are Cittāgonga (Çitğām) (q. v.), at the head of the Bay of Bengāl, Çāṅkā in the Dōcān, and Mathurā in the Djamān. Islāmābād was the place of mintage of these coins, but Mr. C. J. Rodgers ascribed them to Mathurā. Çāṅkā
however received the name İslāmābād in 1970 (1659) and Čitgām not till 1075 (1664). The name is not now in actual use for any of these three towns.


(M. Longworth Dames.)

ISLĀMBOLO. [See ĨSTAMBUL.]

ISLĀM GİRĀY, the name of three Khāns of the same.

1. İslām Gīrāy I b. Muhammad Gīrāy, brother of Ghaźī Gīrāy I (q.v., ii. 1514), during the troubled period that followed the death of his father, he succeeded, as his brothers had done before him, in occupying the throne for a short time (a few years till 939 = 1532), but he was not recognised by the Sultan. After the appointment of his uncle Şahib Gīrāy, he rebelled against the Sultan and was murdered in 944 (1537).

2. İslām Gīrāy II b. Dewlet Gīrāy, brother and predecessor of Ghaźī Gīrāy II (q.v., ii. 1514), 990—996 = 1584—1588. In contrast to his successor he was not popular in his country and was only able to maintain his position with Turkish help.

3. İslām Gīrāy III b. Selçuk Gīrāy, 1054—1064 = 1644—1654, in contrast to the two other Khāns of this name, was a vigorous, warlike ruler who also took up more independent attitude than his predecessors to the Porte and played a prominent part in the political events of his time, notably in the liberation of Little Russia from Polish rule. In his youth he spent seven years in Polish imprisonment. Several raids into Russia were made by him. About 1650 he even made an attempt but without success to enter into relations with Queen Christina of Sweden and to procure money from her for the campaigns against Russia. İslām Gīrāy died in the beginning of Shabān 1064 (began 17 June 1654) at the age of 50 after reigning 10 years and five months. For the Bibliography see the article ǦANİČE SĀRĀK, i. 562 sq.; see also the documents edited by Vehlāniq Zernof, Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire du Khanat de Crimée, p. 340 sq. The last document composed shortly before the death of İslām Gīrāy is specially important, it is a threatening letter from the Khān to the Czar Alexei Michaelovit (p. 475 sq.).

(ISM.) pl. asmāʾ, properly "name", technical term in Arabic grammar for the first part of speech, the nōm, noun. The term corresponds exactly to the Greek ὄνομα used as early as Aristotle, and to the Sanskrit nāma, which is found as an established term in the Nirukta of Yāska, who lived many generations before Pāṇini, an authority of the fourth century B. C. There is however no interconnexion; the term occurred spontaneously and obviously in every day speech, in which nāma, īsm and bhūva comprise all words — not merely proper names — which signify a thing, especially one perceived by the senses. In fact, such words represent in the first class of words the predominate element for thinking and speaking (cf. Ztsch. d. Dtsch. Morgenl. Ges., last. 350 sq.). It is not therefore a consideration based on grammatical science but the simple and most obvious semasiological point of view which underlies the term among the Indians, Greeks, and Arabs. The same is true of the Arabic term for the second part of speech, fāʿi, which means "action", while the word ḳūs (saying), which goes back to Aristotle, the precursor of our "verb" and the Sanscrit ākhyātaṃ, used already by Yāska, which means "communicated, related", point to the predicative function, i.e. they are chosen from a logical or syntactical point of view.

To the asmāʾ, first of all belong the substantives, for which there is no special term, and the proper name, al-īsm al-ʿalām (see ĀLAM) is distinguished from the ism al-ṭıfīns or class name; the latter again is divided into ism ʿain and ism maʾnā (Masṣṣal, § 3) accordingly as it denotes a concrete or an abstract. As with the Greeks and Romans the adjective (ṣifa [q.v.], also ṣawf or naʾf) belongs to the ism and the numeral (ism al-ʿadad). Differing from them, the Arabic system includes the personal pronoun (jamār, q.v.) under the ism — the reason being partly the meaning of the words concerned as characterising things and partly their conditions of infexion and the demonstrative pronouns (asmaʾ al-ḥaṣār), classed as muḥāmāt [q.v.], the relative (al-ʾism aš-šawāf), and the ininitive (masūd, q.v.) and (as had been done by the Stoics, the participle, active and passive (af-ṣāfīl and ism al-ṣawāf); the same time the Arabs were by no means unaware of the close relations of the participle with the verb as regards etymology, meaning and syntactical application, which led the Greek grammarians to insert a part of speech called significantly ṣawāf between the noun and the verb. Finally there are considered as nouns, even the exclamations and appeals of very different linguistic character, classed in our grammars under the inappropriate name of interjections, and even purely onomatopoeic formations like ḳāḥ of the crows' caw. The Arabs called these words, when they have a verbal (usually imperative) significance, asmāʾ al-ʿafāʾil, otherwise ʿawād i.e. tones, sounds (sing. sawād). That their classification under the noun was really only at the time they could not be placed anywhere else in the three-fold scheme, is rather bluntly confessed by Ibn al-Ḥadīb in the commentary to the Kāfya (Constantinople 1311) p. 75,8 a f.: "wa lâdhi ya-dīlū ṣal aš-šinṣātā ṣal ad-dāhār u l-harīfīyat wa l-fīlīyat fīhā "and what shows their character as nouns is the circumstance, that the character of particle and of verb is impossible with them".

(ISM.)
In order, however, to be just to the Arab grammarians, one must not forget that the division of the parts of speech usual among us, which goes back to the ancient grammarians, is of an arbitrary character, and that the attempt to build up a strictly logical system is quite impossible of execution (H. Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, § 244).

Sibawaihi does not give a definition of *ism* in his survey of the three parts of speech in his first chapter, because the term was intelligible without more ado. He contents himself with three examples: *radīj* (man), *faras* (horse), and *ḥīj* (wall), merely names of species of concrete things. The other - more fundamental - made him the Muham- mad (d. 285 = 589) and the Kūṭa Ta'lab, (d. 292 = 904) and given by Ibn an Anbārī in *Kitāb al-Insāf*, p. 2, have, as Ibn an an Anbārī himself says, more the character of an etymological explanation. The former, who derives *ism* from the root *swm*, the second conjugation of which, *samān* means "to name," says: al-*ismu* mādalla 'ala musawma tažhahū "ism is that which indicates something named that underlies it". Ta'lab, who derives *ism* from the root *wsn*, "to mark with a brand (stigma, note)," says: al-*ismu* simatin tuḍu'allā 'lāli l-ḥairī yu'waru bi hiwa, "ism is a mark (note) put on a thing by which it is recognised." This explanation by its remarkable similarity recalls that of Friscian (ed. Keill), i. 57, 3: vel ut aliī, nomen quasi nō- tāmen, quod hoc nātās unum cujusque substantiae quidem. It is not till a later date that we recognise the Aristotelian definition: *φωνή* ἐνακτική κατὰ συνέχεια ἔννοις χρήσει κτλ, among the Arab grammarians. Thus al-Strażī (d. 368 = 978) says: Kullu ḥa'tîn, dalla 'ala ma'ānī ghairar mukṭarin bi-zamānin mukhāsanān niin muqūfin an gharihī, ḥalawan *swm*, "everything that indicates a conception without being associated with a definite time namely the past etc., is an *ism*" (Jahn, *Siberwitsch's Buch über die Grammatik*, Note 5 zu § 1; Ibn Ya'qūb, p. 25, 19). This is the definition which with slight variations became usual later (see Ibn Ya'qūb, p. 16, 13). Instead of "with a definite time," the Kūṭa says "with one of the three times" (present, past, and future): Ibn al-Hādżib (l.c., p. 7) gives a full explanation of the reason of this extension of the *swm* χρήσεων and of the difficulties resulting from the nature of the Arabic language in regard also to this definition.

The points of view from which the Arab grammarians regard the declensions of nouns are given in their general lines in the article *rās*. It may be further mentioned that Arab terminology has no equivalent for our "number" and "gender." The word *djins* borrowed from the Greek *νόμος* is never used for grammatical gender, as Merx, *Histoia artis grammaticae apud Syros*, p. 145 and 151, erroneously assumes; even with the grammarians the word only means the genus to which the species (namu) is subordinate (Ibn Ya'qūb, p. 22, 7).

For all details of the theory of the noun in the system of the Arab grammarians, the reader must be referred to the original works, to which Fleischer's *Beiträge zur Arab. Sprachkunde* give valuable elucidations.

**ISMA (A),** in dogmatics, immunity from error and sin, such as is ascribed in Sunni Islam to the prophets and in the Sh'ā to the imāms also. As to the extent of their immunity, the orthodox theologians differ in opinion as regards the prophets except Muhammad (on such points as whether it also exists before or only after their prophetic calling or whether it includes immunity from all kinds of sin or only applies to minor slips). It is applied in unlimited fashion to Muhammad only, in opposition to his own judgement. Among Sunni authorities Fākhʾr al-Dīn al-Rāzī in particular extends the *isma* to all prophets in the greatest degree. According to the Sh'ā teaching, *isma* is inherent in the imāms to a higher degree than in the prophets on account of their exalted qualities of substance. Abū Zaid al-Balkhī (d. 322 = 934) wrote a *Kitāb Ishrat al-Anbāy* (Vakīl, *Irshād*, i. 142, 5 a 462), as did Fākhʾr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (Brockelmann, 1, 507, no. 14). Every work on Muslim dogmatics contains a chapter on definitions and the different views in regard to them (e.g. Ibn Ḥazm, *Mīlād*, ed. Cairo 1321, iv. 1—31; Maʿwīj, ed. Soeren, p. 220 sqq.; a mystic definition of *isma* is given by al-Ḥazālī, *Mīlād al-Amal* (Cairo 1328), p. 116 paen.

**ISMAĪL, the son of the patriarch Ibrāhīm, is mentioned several times in the Korān. In Surah ii. 130 (= iii. 78) and iv. 161 it is said of him that he received revelations. In xix. 55 he is called a messenger and prophet, who summoned his people to *ṣulāt* and *ṣalāt*. These references fit in very well with Muhammad's account of the religion of Ibrāhīm. In Surah ii. 127, he is called one of the fathers of Jacob, along with Ibrāhīm and Ištāk; and in ii. 119, he, along with Ibrāhīm, is commanded to purify the Holy House at Mecca.

Tradition knows nothing of Ismaīl as a messenger nor of his revelations nor has it explained his relations to the spread of the religion of Ibrāhīm. It knows that his mother Ḥādżar bore him to Ibrāhīm as his first-born and that a feud arose between Ḥādžar and Ibrāhīm. With the mention of disfiguring Ḥādżar, Sara even pierced her ears; so this then became the fashion with women. Ismaīl and Ištāk are also said to have fought with one another occasionally. In the end, Sara's jealousy induced Ibrāhīm to decide to travel to Arabia with Ḥādżar and Ismaīl. The party was guided by the *Sakina* or, according to others, by Gabriel (on the form of the *Sakina*, cf. *The Novels of the Earth*, Verh. Kon. Akad. v. Wetenschappen, Ald. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeka, xvii. no. 1 p. 60 sqq.).

When Ibrāhīm and Ismaīl had dug the foundations of the Holy House, Ismaīl helped his father in the building of the temple. When this work was completed, Ibrāhīm abandoned the boy with his mother in the barren country, afflicted by thirst. In her need, Ḥādżar stood on the hills al-Ṣafā and al-Marwāa and looked for water and ran hither and thither between them, the origin of the *sāy* [q. v.]. Gabriel then called "Who art thou? To whom did Ibrāhīm entrust thee?" The boy then impatiently thrust his foot (or finger) into the sand and a spring arose; if Ḥādżar had not hurriedly scooped up the moisture in her jug, the Zamzam would have become a bubbling spring. It is also said that Gabriel pushed his heel into the ground and the Zamzam burst forth beneath it. In those days the Djūrūm [q. v.] lived near
the sanctuary; after Hâdjar’s death, Ismâ’il married one of their daughters. In his absence Îbrâhim visited his wife but did not find a very hospitable reception; when the woman after this repeated to her husband some words which Îbrâhim had said, he understood that the latter was suggesting he should divorce his wife. He did this; afterwards he married another woman of the Djurhum. Îbrâhim visited her also and in the same allusive fashion gave his approval to the new choice.

Îbrâhim and Hâdjar, according to Muslim tradition, are buried in the hâjer of the Holy House, a distinction which they share with most of the prophets: the prophet belongs to the home of the prophets.

Muslim tradition also knows the story given in Genesis xxii. But there are several theologians who say, it was not Ishâk but Ismâ’il that was the ḍabīh. For this view, the sayings of ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Omar, Ibn ‘Abbas, al-Sha’bî, Mudjâhid, etc. are quoted. It is related, for example, that ‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-Azîz asked a Jew convert to Islam about this difference of opinion and he answered: “The ḍabīh is Ismâ’il; the Jews know this also, but as they are jealous of you, they say it was Ishâk.”

Îbrâhim is also considered the ancestor of the North African tribes. In the native genealogies, the Arabs are divided into three groups: al-Bâda’i (those who have disappeared), al-Tîrî (the indigenous) and al-mustâriba (the arabised). Ismâ’il is considered the progenitor of the last group, whose ancestor is called ‘Adnân. The chain between Ismâ’il and ‘Adnân is given in very divergent forms, sometimes in partial agreement with the list in Genesis xxv.

Bibliography: The commentaries on the passages quoted from the Qur’an; Tabari, Annals, i. 275 sqq. and Ind. s. v.; Thâlabî, Kitâb al-Ant’âl (Cairo 1290), p. 69 sqq., 88–90; Abu 1-Fikrî, ed. Fleischer, p. 192; Ibn Khotaiba, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 18, 30; Die Chroniken der Stadt Mexka, ed. Wüstenfeld, passim.

(A. J. Wessinck.)

ISMA’IL, formerly a Turkish fortress, now the district town in the Russian government of Bessarabia, on the left bank of the Kilia arm of the Danube, between the lakes of Jalpuch and Katlabuch, with about 40,000 inhabitants (in 1897: 32193). The name Ismâ’il (Moldavian Smeril, Smil, or Smeth, also Simil) is said to be derived from the Slav smiž, a snake or a dragon, the epithet of several Moldavian princes; according to a Turkish folk etymology, from the alleged conqueror, a Capudan Ismâ’il, who took the town under Biszņicz in 1484. The origin of the town is unknown. It is said to have been at one time in the hands of the Genoese. It only attained importance under the Turks as a fortress to curb the Budjak Tatars, who had been settled there in 1569, and particularly as a point d’appui of the Turks against the advance of Russia, owing to its splendid strategic situation as the best gate of sortie from the north into the Dobruja and the intersection of the roads from Galatz, Khotin, Bender and Kilia. After Ismâ’il had been taken by the Russians without a blow in 1770 in the First Russo-Turkish War, the Turks endeavoured with the help of foreign engineers to make the town, which was restored to them by the peace of Küçük Kainardje in 1774, the strongest fortress on the left bank of the Danube, an “army fortress” (ordu kalâ‘î), i.e. the permanent quarters of large bodies of troops of a defensive character. The fortress, thought to be impregnable, was taken as early as Dec. 11 (22), 1790 by the Russians under Suvorov in spite of a most valiant defence by the Ser’asker Aidosli Mehmêd Pasha; in the three days’ massacre over 26,000 Turks, including the whole Muslim population, were killed, 9000 taken prisoners and only one escaped by swimming the Danube bearing the appalling news. This deed of arms, celebrated by Byron and Djerzhavin, aroused a tremendous sensation in Europe; in Constantinople it resulted in a revolution and the execution of the Grand-Vizier.

By the peace of Jassy in 1791 Ismâ’il was restored to the Turks and fortified again by them. (The splendid stones with the tughrâ of Selim III, testifying to the restoration of the fortress in 1794–5, are in the Odessa Museum). But in 1809 Ismâ’il again capitulated to the Russians, to whom it remained by the peace of Cæsarist in 1812, whereupon many colonists settled there, viz. Russian fugitives and sectarians, especially Ras kolniki, Rumanians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Armenians, Jews and Gipsies. In 1810 General Tuchkov founded at a short distance from Ismâ’il the town of Tuchkov, which bears his name and gradually expanded to form one town with Ismâ’il. By the peace of Paris in 1856, Ismâ’il after the demilitisation of its fortifications was added to Moldavia with a portion of Bessarabia and remained Rumanian till its capture by the last Russo-Turkish War on 14 April 1877, by the Russians, to whom it finally passed by the treaty of Berlin.

Only a few ruins of the fortress exist. The town, which in spite of many vicissitudes of war (such as being plundered by the Cossacks) was at one time an important centre for traffic in fish etc., fruit and corn and a populous town (always with a very mixed population, in contrast to the purely Tatar population around), suffered severely through the wars and the forcible expatriation of the former population of Bessarabia. At the present day its commerce is again highly developed in spite of the fact that means favourable shipping conditions.

Bibliography: Ewiti, Celebi, Seyi̇bat nâmêzî, Constantinople 1315, v. 106; Turâhi Dinîwârî, 2nd ed., Constantinople 1340, iv. 326 and v. 94; Zinkeisen, Geschichte der Osmanischen Reiches, v. 941, vi. 800 sqq., vii. 653; A. Zasbîk, Besarabijka Oblast in Matjârija dij a geografi i i statistički Rossiî, St. Petersburg 1862; A Nakko, Istoria Besarabiei s druzhjesîbek vozmînî, Odessa 1873; N. Orlov, Shtrum Ismaila Suvorowym y 1790 godu, St. Petersburg 1890; P. N. Batujshov, Besarabia. Istoriîskojsko opisanîye, St. Petersburg 1892; Statistîcskoje opisanîye Besarabii, ili Budjakja... s 1825 po 1836 g., Izmîjvi Akkermanskogo Zemstva, Akkerman 1859; Mogil’ianski, Matjârija dij a geografi i i statistički Besarabii, Kishinev 1913.

ISMA’IL I, founder of the Safawî dynas ty of Persia, born of a Shi’ite family, settled in Ardabil [q. v., i. 425 sqq.] in Ahdharbajdzan since the time of the shâkh Sai’î al-Dîn, who was said to be descended from the imâm Mîsîs al-Kâzîm. He was the son of the shâkh Haidar [q. v.]; after the death
of his maternal grandfather, Uzun Hasan (about 883 = 1478), in the confusion of the anarchy that followed, supported on the one hand by the followers of his father and on the other by the seven Turkish tribes which had taken his side (Ustadli, Shamli, Tekkelu, Behiri, Dhu 'l-Kadr, Kulafr, and Ashgari). Isma'il collected an army of 7,000 men, who received the name of Kizil-bash (q.v.). In 817 (1410) he was master of Shirwan, Adharbaidjan, and 'Irak 'Adami and now took the title of shah ("king"). In 914 (1504) he extended his kingdom eastwards as far as Herat, westwards to Diyar Bakr and Baghda; but the forcible propagation of the Shi'a tenets which he conducted in the newly won territories brought him the enmity of his nearest neighbours on the north and west, the Khan of Bakhshis and the Ottoman Sultan, both Sunnis.

The former, Muhammad Shahbani Khan, who had made himself master of Turkistan after his victory over Babur [q. v.], was defeated near Merv by Isma'il in a great battle, in which he himself was killed (Shahbani 910 = Dec. 1510). This success brought Isma'il into the possession of the whole of Khurasan, but he could not prevent the Uzbekts from founding an independent kingdom in Khwarizm with Khiva as its capital. He fought with less success against the Ottoman Sultan Selim I. In the plain of Califdaran (east of Lake Uruzia) the Persian cavalry gave way before the infantry of the Janissaries supported by artillery (2 Radjab 920 = 23 Aug. 1514). Tabriz, Isma'il's capital, and Mesopotamia and the west of Persia as far as Mysul were occupied by the Turks (921 = 1515).

Isma'il compensated himself to some extent for this loss by the conquest of Georgia, but he sought to attain the realisation of his plans of revenge against his most dangerous enemy by an alliance with European powers. An offer of this kind was made him by Charles V after Leo X and Maximilian I had previously in 923 (1517) thought of gaining Isma'il as an ally against the Turks, but on account of the great distance which separated the Shah and the Emperor (it took almost six years for a letter to reach Charles V from Isma'il), no definite agreement was reached.

Isma'il died in 930 (1524) at Ardabil where the tombs of the Safawis are. The beautiful and valuable MSS. on the history of the Safi family are now in the Imperial Library at Petrograd. From the library he added to the tomb of Shah Isma'il. Isma'il restored the Persian kingdom and his dynasty ruled till its overthrow by the Afghans over two centuries later.


(See H. Huart.)

ISMA'IIL II, Safawi of Persia, son and successor of Shah Tahmasp I. After the latter's death on 15 Safar 984 (14 May 1576) his son Haidar Mirza with the support of the Turkish tribe of the Ustadli sought to usurp the throne, but on the day after his accession he was seized in the harem on the information of his sister Peri-Khánun and murdered during a rising in which the Ustadli and Ashaz paid the Kizil-bash. Isma'il, to whom his father had refused the rank of wali 'ahid (heir-apparent), as he knew him to be cruel and hard-hearted, had been a prisoner for nineteen and a half years in the fortress of Kâhshâh. But he was released by the Kizil-bash and proclaimed Shah on 27th Djamâda I 984 (22 Aug. 1576). A greedy and covetous man, he filled his treasury with all the gifts offered him without offering anything in compensation. He also neglected to visit his aged mother who had retired to the mosque of Shah 'Abd al-'Azm. He thus made himself hated by all his subjects. The princes of the ruling house were put to death by him in 985 (1577) under the pretext that they had planned a rising with the support of Turkish dervishes. He forbade the Shi'is to curse the persons revered by the Sunnis. He was particularly fond of giving himself the title 'Adil (the noble), which he certainly did not merit. He died, after a reign of a little over two years, in his capital Kazvin, at the end of a long illness after taking an elephant in Ramadan I 986 (6 Oct. 1577).

Bibliography: Rıdži Kuli Khân, Rawdat al-Safawi Nasiri, Vol. viii. (no pagination); P. Horn, in Grundr. der islam. Phil., ii. 513; Malcolm, History of Persia (London 1829), ii. 335 sqq.; P. M. Sykes, Hist. of Persia, ii. 253; A. Muller, Der Islam, ii. 361 sqq.

ISMA'IIL b. 'ABBĀD. [See under 'ABBĀD.]

ISMA'IIL b. AHMAD, ABU IBRĀHĪM, a Sâmnâd prince (amir) of Mā warā' al-Nahr, who laid the foundations of the power of his dynasty, born in Faqihāna in Shavwāl 234 (28 Apr. - 25 May 849), from 260 (874) to 279 (892) governor for his brother Nasr in Būkhāra; he continued to reside in this town even after he became amir of Mā warā' al-Nahr by the death of his brother and in 280 (993) was confirmed in this position by the caliph. In the same year he undertook a campaign as far as Tarāz (the modern Awliyā-Allāq, q.v.), conquered this town and changed its principal church into a mosque. On his struggle in Mā warā' al-Nahr with the Sa'darī 'Amr b. Alaih see the latter article, i. 335. Although Isma'il was declared to be dismissed from his office by the Caliph and his province granted to 'Amr, the Caliph expressed his satisfaction to the victor at the result of the struggle. The heritage of the Sa'darīs in Khorasan was disputed by Muhammad b. 'Ain, prince of Tabaristan. Isma'il's general, Muhammad b. Hārun, not only succeeded in driving the enemy out of Khorasan but even conquered Tabaristan; but he then rebelled against his master, adopted the white colour, the colour of the rebels against the legitimate government (Tabari, ii. 2208) and occupied Rāyi; Isma'il had to take the field in person against the mutinous general; after his defeat, Rāyi and Kazwin were incorporated in the Sammād kingdom and its frontiers thus settled in the west (289 = 902). In 291 (904) an inroad by a numerous Turkish people was repulsed with the help of volunteers from other Muslim countries (Tabari, ii. 2249). The date of Isma'il's death is given as 14 Safar 295 (24 Nov. 907). In Bukhāra, which was made the capital of the Sammād kingdom by him (cf. i. 775), his tomb is still shown, but its authenticity is not vouched for by inscriptions either on the building or on the sarcophagus.
defeated Ghilân in the north of Fâs and had him put to death. But Ahmad b. Mahraz once more raised the lands of the south and the Atlas. To obtain peace Ismā‘îl had to recognise his nephew as Amir of the lands south of the Atlas and his brother al-Hajrâni as Amir of Tûfîlât.

These civil wars, which had lasted five years, had hardly terminated when a descendant of the Marabouts of Dîlîn, Muḥammad al-Hajjîdî al-Dîlînî, also supported by the Turks of Aqîrîs, fomented a terrible rebellion in the country of Tâdâ and the provinces of western Morocco. But his Berber troops could not withstand Ismā‘îl’s disciplined troops, especially his artillery. Mûlîy Ismâ‘îl, being victorious, terrorised the people to keep them quiet; more than ten thousand were beheaded; thousands of prisoners of war along with Christian slaves had to help to build the palace of Mekines, which the Sultan made his military capital. At the same time the plague carried off thousands of victims (1090 = 1679) in the regions of the Gharb and the Rif.

The vigorous repressio of the Berber revolt and the epidemic afforded Mûlîy Ismâ‘îl a certain respite. He took advantage of it to raise a professional army. He enlisted former negro slaves. He gave them wives, allotted estates to them, trained them in the use of arms, and made of them the famous Black Guard of the "Aḥbâd-Bûjârî which was to assure him supremacy over all Morocco.

At the same time, nominally to favour the intransigent religious party, but in reality to watch the dealings of the Turks and Europeans in the seaports, and to counteract the influence of the corsairs, he organised the corps of the Mudţahâdûn or "volunteers of the faith". The latter corps, the cadre of which was formed by several hundred carefully selected "Aḥbâd, waged an unceasing irregular warfare against the European possessions. They took Tarîb al-Mâmûra (al-Mâmûra), the modern al-Mahdiya, by surprise from the Spaniards. Mûlîy Ismâ‘îl collected over 100 pieces of artillery there (1681). They harassed the English at Tangiers and the latter evacuated the town after blowing up the mole and the fortifications (1684) (cf. Davis, The History of the Second Queen’s Royal Regiment, i., London, 1883, p. 118 sqq.). Larache also was forced to succumb to the blows of the "volunteers of the faith" in 1689, Azîlî in 1691. But all attempts against Mîla and Céuta failed. It was in vain that Mûlîy Ismâ‘îl endeavoured to get Louis XIV to aid him against Spain. French commerce had to suffer for some time as a result.

But the Peace of Ryswick in 1697 raised considerably Louis XIV’s prestige above his enemies. Mûlîy Ismâ‘îl then sought his alliance against the Turks of Algiers who were mixed up in all the plots made in the Atlas against the Sharifs of Fâs. An entente between France, the Bey of Tunis and the Sultan of Fâs was then concluded. The latter even tried to cement it by a matrimonial alliance and demanded the hand of the Princess de Conti (cf. Plantet, Moulay Ismaïl et la Princesse de Conti, Paris, 1893). In spite of the failure of the latter plan, the entente secured to France great commercial benefits at Salé, Têwâmân and Safi. Frenchmen superintended the building of the palaces, roads, and forts of the Sultan and sometimes (like Pillet) accompanied his artillery. On his part, the Sultan organised
several expeditions against the Turks with the help of France, whose merchants supplied him with arms and munitions. But the slowness of the Moroccan armies did not enable Isma'il to reap the advantages expected. He even allowed his ally, the Bey of Tunis, to be defeated near Constantine, which enabled the Turks of Algiers to come to fight the Moroccans in the west in full strength in 1701 and to drive them back.

The expeditions of Mulya Isma'il against the Turks, in spite of their relative lack of success, enabled him to pacify his frontiers where he built or renovated the fortifications. He built the fort of Reggâda in the mountain of the Beni Ya'lis commanding the high valley of the Wâd Shibaret and the lands of the Arab tribes of the High Plateaus. He built the fort of 'Ayûn Sidi Mallûk in the plain of Angâd and that of Salbân in the land of the Trifa. He thus closed the exits on his north-east frontier. Forts built in the lands of each tribe kept the country quiet, especially the Marabouts, the natural allies of the Turks, whose privileges were tending to pass into the hands of the Sharifs. The latter gradually took over the direction of the religious elements, which were organised into brotherhoods. Isma'il completed his system of domination by the creation of military zones. Taza, notably, had its walls rebuilt. This town became the headquarters of the eastern march. A garrison of 2500 'Abid secured the passage from western to eastern Morocco by the pass of Taza. It also had to keep in control the Berbers of the Rif in the north of this ravine, and the Berbers of the middle Atlas in the south.

For this organisation and these works, Isma'il raised his revenues from a monopoly of the commerce at his ports and from continual raids on the tribes of doubtful loyalty. The monopoly besides filling his treasury enabled him also to prevent contraband traffic in horses and arms. But hardly had the Salibân, after reigning 50 years succeeded in imposing, either by skill or terror, peace within his territory than the rivalries of his sons brought his hopes to nought. He had centred all his policy on the struggle against the Turks of Algiers. He could not realise his dream. He died on 27 Rajab 1139 (March 30 1727) just when the dissensions which were breaking up the Regency of Algiers might have secured his success. He was succeeded by his son Mulya Ahmad al-Dhahabi.


ISMA'IL ṬHÂ'B. [See CEBELİZADE.] ISMA'İL HAKKÎ, ŞAHÎKH ISMA'İL HAKKÎ AL- BRUSİWI, or İFLAHİ NAMERî, a celebrated Ottoman scholar and poet and one of the most prolific of mystical writers. Born in 1665 (1652—3) in Aidsos in Rumelia, to which his father had retired after the great fire in Constantinople, he had at quite an early age the benefit of instruction by the Dâwelik Şahîk Faţih Ilahi 'Othmânî. In Adrianople he was initiated into the higher branches of knowledge and Dâwelik mysticism. At the age of 20 he began his fruitful activity as an author in Brusa. On account of some of his mystical tracts he was banished at the instigation of the 'ulamâ to Rodosto. The impulse to wander peculiar to many members of Mahammadan orders never allowed him to settle permanently anywhere, especially as he had not unfrequently to suffer from the fanaticism of the 'ulamâ. After a two years' pilgrimage to Mecca and long stays in Uskûb, Damascus and Scutari he finally settled in Brusa, where he built a mosque and monastery in 1135 and died in 1137 (1724—5). The date 1127 also given is in contradiction to the date of composition of several works.

Hakkî composed over a hundred theological works and mystical treatises, which still enjoy considerable esteem and some of which are printed. The best are Küb al-Bayân (Bâlâk 1276 = 1859—60 in four volumes), a celebrated commentary on the Korân: Kûb al-Mutâ'awwâl, a commentary on Djalâl al-Dîn Rûmî, and Fârâb al-Kûtân (Delight of the Soul), a commentary on the Muhammedyâ of Yâzîdîh Oghlu Me'med b. Salîh b. Kâthîb, Bâlâk 1252 and 1258, Constantinople (lipography) 1258. The following are also often mentioned: Şârîk al-arâbîn hadîkh, Constantinople 1253, ed. Mollâ 'Ali al-Hâfi; Kütâb Hâdîqat al-Bâligha and Râzât 'Ain al-Hayât (1291); 'Uthîfî Isma'ilîye (1292); Şârîk al-Kûsîr, 1257 (1841); Şârîk Shî'âb al-Ismân, 1305; finally a commentary on the Pund-nâmâ of Aq.î.

Bibliography: M. Nâjîdî, Esâmî (1308), p. 58—9; Sâmî, 'Umâm al-Âlâm, ii. 950; Hammer- Purgstall, Gesch. der Osmanischen Dictkunst, iv. 135—137; Flügel, Die arab., pers. u. türk. Handwriting, ... zu Wien, iii. 143, 150 sqq. 478—

ISMA'İL HAKKÎ, an modern Turkish man of letters and literary historian, editor of the periodical Mekûb, a moderate follower of the old Asiatic school and a former officer of artillery. Besides a few poems, tales, translations, and articles in periodicals, a series of treatises on literary history have been written by him.

In 1308 (1890—91) appeared his collection of poems Sevdâ-î Khâsan yahudî Têhassar (Autumn Love or, Repentance too Late). Two Millî stories written under French influence: İki Heçîkat (Two Truths) published in no. 7 of the Arakel kitâbî kitabên dîjîb romanîlarî, 1311 (1905—6). In the periodical Mekûb appeared his translation of Octave Feuillet's Roman d'en jeunesse uomo, tarnen under the title Âlîfâ. He translated Lamartine's Ra- phael and Grecia. His literary studies are more important, as is by no means a superfluity of such works in Ottoman literature. In the four volumes of his On dordunyî ârîn Türk Nakar
ISMA'IL HAKKI — ISMA'IL PASHA.

...to develop the Sūlān on the same line as Egypt, and to suppress the slave trade there. In 1805 he had obtained from the Sultan of Turkey a firman assigning to him the administration of Susāwān and Mossawāt, and subsequently (1870—1875) extended his authority over the coast of the Red Sea from Susā to Cape Guardsafui. In 1874 he sent an expedition to Dar

Für [q. v.], defeated the forces of the slave-trader, Zurbair Pasha [q. v.], and annexed this country, but further progress eastwards was checked by the resistance of the Abyssinians. But these various schemes for the aggrandizement of Egypt were costly, and the Khedive had borrowed and squandered money recklessly, both for public purposes and personal ostentation, so that by 1876 the debt of Egypt to foreign financiers had risen to nearly one hundred million pounds, and the country was so impoverished that its ordinary resources were no longer sufficient for the most urgent needs of the administration. Being no longer able to raise loans in the European market, on April 8, 1876, he suspended payment of his Treasury bills. The European powers interfered on behalf of the bondholders and instituted a Commission of the Public Debt, and established the Dual Control, in accordance with which an English official was appointed Controller-General of the revenue and a French official Controller-General of the expenditure of the country. A Commission of Inquiry in 1878 led to the vast landed property of the Khedive being placed under a similar control, and Isma'il accepted a constitutional ministry, including English and French ministers, under the presidency of Nībār Pasha [q. v.]; but in February 1879 Isma'il dismissed him, on the occasion of a military disturbance headed by Sābi Pasha [q. v.], and two months later dismissed his European ministers also, and restored the demand of the Governments of England and France that the British and French ministers should be reinstated. On June 26, 1879, he was deposed, and four days later he left Cairo for Naples, where the King of Italy had placed a residence at his disposal; later, he went to Constantinople, where he died March 2, 1895.

Bibliography: N. Ronchetti, L'Egypte et ses progrès sous Ismaïl Pacha (Marseilles, 1869); V. E. Dor, L'instruction publique en Egypte (Paris, 1872); Edwin de M. Hildyard, The Khedive's Egypt (London, 1877); [P. van Bemmelen], L'Egypte et l'Europe, par un ancien juge mixte (Leiden, 1882); R. Buchta, Der Sudan unter ägyptischer Herrschaft (Leipzig, 1888); D. A. Cameron, Egypt in the Nineteenth Century (London, 1898); J. C. McCooan, Egypt under Isma'il (London, 1899); J. Charles-Roux, L'Égypte et le Canal du Suez (Paris, 1901); L. Bréhier, L'Égypte de 1798 à 1900 (Paris, 1901); E. Dickey, The Story of the Khedivate (London, 1902); C. de Freycinet, La Question d'Egypte (Paris, 1903); Sir A. Colvin, The Making of Modern Egypt (London, 1908); E. Cameron, Modern Egypt (London, 1908); E. E. Farman, Egypt and its betrayal (New York, 1909); Djērdji Zādān, Turādjmān Maškār al-Shark, 2nd ed., (Cairo, 1910), i. 35—48; Hermann Winterer, Ägypten (Berlin, 1915); A. Haseneleve, Gesch. Ägyptens im 19. Jahrhundert 1798—1914 (Halle a. S., 1917), Ch. IV. See also Ibrahim Hilmi, The Literature of Egypt and the Soudan (London 1886—88), i. 325—7 (s. v. Ismail).

ISMA'IL PASHA, called Niẓām-ud-Dīn, Grand Vizier of the Turkish Sultan Selim III, a native of Aydıği in the province of Angors. After first of all filling the office of a šahdār (mandebearer) to the Sultan he was retired with the rank of Beylerbey of Rumili. In 1080 (1678) he entered...
the office of muṣṭafī-writers and on the outbreak of unrest in the reign of Sultan Muhammad IV received the rank of a vizier (1698—1687).

After the assassination of Siyâwush Pasha in the rebellion of the Janissaries, which took place on the accession of Salâhîn II to the throne, he was appointed Grand Vizier, but dismissed after holding the office for 69 days (1 Radjab 1099 = May 2 1688), imprisoned in the citadel of Kâwâli and soon afterwards banished to Rhodes. Prosecuted by the heint of Zain al-Abîdîn Pasha, Beylerbey of Rûmî, who had been unjustly executed by his orders, he was beheaded in accordance with the jus talianis by order of the Grand Vizier Kùrpîrûl Muṣṭafa Pasha at the age of over 70 in Radjab 1101 = April 1690. Although of a mild temperament in his youth he grew tyrannical and cruel in the exercise of power. Instead of taking supreme command of the troops himself, he chose quite incompetent people as generals like the rebels Yegen Othamân Pasha.


İSMÂİL AL-ŞEHÎD, MAVLANA, was born on the 28th Shawwal 1196 (1781) in a renowned Dîlîh family which traces its pedigree to the Caliph 'Umar. He was the only son of Mawlânâ 'Abd al-Granî and nephew of the illustrious Mawlânâ Şâhî 'Abd al-Azd (d. 1329 = 1823). While a mere boy his father and was brought up as an adopted son under the care of his uncle Mawlânâ 'Abd al-Kâdir (d. 1342 = 1826). In childhood he was very inattentive and fond of swimming in the Jamna, but as he had a retentive memory and a sharp intellect, in time he became a learned man. He was shocked at the gross idolatrous tendencies which then prevailed amongst the Muslims of India. He preached the doctrines of Islam against all opposition. It was at this time that he came in contact with al-Saiydi Âmîd al-Mudjdadd. The religious sanctity of the Saiydi won his admiration and he became his disciple and was his constant companion throughout his life. In 1326 (1820) they made a pilgrimage to Mecca, whence they proceeded to Constantinople. There the Hâddîs were received with marked consideration. Six years later they returned to Dîlîh and began to deliver religious lectures with re-doubled energy. Many people were reclaimed from the darkness of ignorance to which they had been reduced owing to the influence of the professional Nullâs. Mawlânî İsmâîl's charm and erudition excited the envy of the Nullâs who afraid of being discredited with the public tried to lower him in their estimation by severe criticism and malicious censures. But truth triumphed and they were all silenced.

In 1323 (1827) Mawlânî İsmâîl, with his religious guide, proceeded to Peshâwar and declared a religious war against the Sikhs. They were joined by large numbers of people and succeeded in establishing their authority at Peshâwar. But owing to some innovations upon the usages of the Afghâns, their authority was overthrown. They had to fly across the Indus but fell in with a Sikh detachment; a skirmish took place in which İsmâîl with his spiritual guide met with his death in 1324 (1827).

He is the author of the following works: 1) Rûdîlât Uğût al-Fikhr, a treatise on the principles of Muhammadan law according to the Hanafî school, printed, Dîlîh A. H. 1311. 2) Muṣâbî-Imâmât, a Persian treatise on the problem of the imâmat. 3) Tâzîyêt al-Imâm, an Urdu treatise on theology, printed 1293, translated into English by Mr. Ŝâhîmat, 4) al-Masâlif al-Masûlif, a treatise in Persian on the Islamic doctrines; on its contents cf. Joum. of the As. Soc. of Bengal, i. (1832) 479 sqq. Bibliography: Siddîk Hasân, İfât al-Nubailâ, p. 416; Sir Saiyid Ahmad, Allah al-Shanid, ii. 97, and Joum. Roy. As. Soc., xiii. 310 sqq. (M. Hidayet Hosain)

İSMÂİLÎYA, a Shi'a sect, so called because it stopped the series of İmâms at İsmâîl, eldest son of Dja'far al-Sâdîq [q. v.], the sixth imâm, so that İsmâîl to them was the seventh; his father had at first nominated him as his successor, but having learned of his eldest son's intemperance, he changed his decision and declared Mûsâ, his second son, as his successor. The İsmâîlîya refused to admit this alteration, claiming that the imâm, being infallible, could not have prejudiced himself by declaring that it was not permitted to God to change His opinion, contrary to what Dja'far had stated. İsmâîl died five years before his father at Médîna in 143 (760/1) and was buried in the cemetery of Bâkî al-Ghârak. In spite of the precautions taken by the father to have the death of his son confirmed by numerous witnesses, his partisans would not admit his decease, claiming that he was still alive five years after his father's death and that he was seen in the market at Bâṣra, where he cured a paralytic by taking his hand. The sons of İsmâîl, involved in the political persecutions of which the 'Alids were victims, left Médîna; Muhammad, the elder, went to hide in the district of Damâward, near Raiy; his descendants concealed themselves in Khurâsân, then in the Ḵandâbâr region and migrated to India, where they still exist at the present day. 'Ali, his brother, set out for Syria and the Maghrib. From their places of retreat, the descendants of İsmâîl sent out missionaries (da'i q. v., plur. da'at) to traverse the Muslim world and there preach the doctrine known as that of the esoterics (Bâṭîniya), whose starting point was the allegorical exposition of the Kurân. One of these missionaries was Maimûn, called al-Kaddâh the "occultist", whose son 'Abd Allâh [q. v. i. 26] became chief of the branch of the Karmâtians [q. v.]. With the assistance of a rich Persian, Muhammad b. 'Îsâ, called Mandâni, read in the sacred 'Alam the Iranians were going to regain the empire (Fikrit, p. 188; O. Lloth, in Morgenländische Forschungen, p. 307; M. Amari, Storia dei Musulmoni di Sicilia, p. 114), he made them adopt his system, at once religious and social. At the end of the third century A. H. Câbad Allâh b. Muhammad al-Mahdi, recognised as imâm by the Berbers of the tribe of Ketâma [q. v.], founded in Tunisia the empire of the Fâtîmids [q. v.] or Câbadîs, soon afterwards extended to Egypt.

İsmâîlîya of Persia, Ḩasan b. Šâbîb [q. v.] was born in Raiy and was there instructed in the doctrine of the Bâṭîniya; to perfect himself in it, he went to Egypt in the caliphate of al-Mustânîr in 471 (1078—1079); after a stay of
a year and a half there, he was expelled and returned to Persia to act as a missionary and surreptitiously introduced himself into the fortress of Alamut [q. v.], where he had already numerous partisans (6 Radjab 483 = Sept. 4 1090). Taking this castle as a base, he made raids in all directions with his disciples, taking the existing fortresses by surprise and building new ones. It is said that he made beautiful gardens in which the fâdâlī’s [q. v.], initiated of the first degree, enjoyed in anticipation the delights of Paradise; but it is more probable that this paradise was purely imaginary and was a result of the hallucinations caused by taking gâshâd [see the article Assassins].

Thinking this a dangerous establishment, the Sâlûtâb Sulţân Malik-Shâh ordered the Amir Arslân-Tâsh to attack Hâsan b. Şâbâb (483 = 1092). He laid siege to Alamut but was completely routed in a nocturnal sortie by the garrison. In the same year another centre of Îsmâ’îli propa-
ganda, the fortress of Derg, was besieged in vain by another lieutenant of the Sulţân, Kišîl Şâ’yârî. The death of Malik-Shâh put an end to these attempts of repression. Forty days previously the assassination of the vizier Nişân al-Mulk by a fâdâlī, named Zâhir Arslân, had been the first of these mysterious executions which were to plunge the Muslim world into terror. Two of the disciples of the master, the râ’s Muṣaffar and Kišîy Buṣurzân Umdî [see BUZURGMÎD], seized respectively the fortress of Gîrd-khî and Lëmsar (Lenbâr, Handollâb Mustawfî, Niṣbat al-Kalîlî, p. 61) (495 = 1102). Sulţân Muḥammad sent against the Îsmâ’îlî Nişân al-Dîn Ahmad, who for seven years ravaged the country round Alamut, and next the Aštâb Nushîtgin Shir-gîr, who was about to take Lëmsar and Alamut at the end of the year 511 (April 1118), when the Sulţân’s death interrupted the campaign. Sandjar, terried by the sight of a dagger which a fâdâlī had plunged in the ground in front of his throne, made peace with the Îs-
ma’îlya.

Hâsan dying on 26 Rabî’î 1 518 (June 12 1124) Kišîy Buṣurzân-Umdî succeeded him and reigned without being disturbed till his death on 26 Dji-
mâd 1 532 (May 11 1138); it was the same with the latter’s son, Muḥammad (died 557 = 1162). Muḥammad’s son Hâsan, called Âlî dîkh-
rîh al-Salâm introduced innovations into the cult. He placed the minbar opposite the khâba, while the rule is that the pulpit should be placed to the left of the mihrâb (559 = 1164) and he claimed to be a descendant of Niṣâr, son of al-Mustanîr, which gave him the quality of Îsmâm; the rescript in which he took this title and revived the Îsmâ’îlî doctrines, is called by his followers the sermon of the resurrection. At the end of four years he was assassinated at the castle of Lëmsar by his brother-
in-law, a descendant of the Bûyids. His son Mu-
ḥammad II avenged his death by the execution of the members of the family of the murderer and reigned undisturbed for 49 years. While the latter had carried on his father’s tradition, his son Dja-
lâl al-Dîn Hâsan III on the contrary announced at his accession his intention of re-establishing the true religion of Islam. He ordered the mos-
quês to be rebuilt and re-established public worship on Fridays. He was therefore given the name Naw-Muslimân (new Muslim). He died of poison like his father. His son ‘Âlî al-Dîn Muḥammad

III was only nine years old; his youth as well as a loss of blood caused by an accident in the fifth year of his reign forced him to withdraw from public affairs. Henceforth he lived confined to his palace and was murdered during a fit of in-
toxication (last day of Dhu ’l-‘Awâl 651 = Jan. 21 1254) at the instigation of his son Rûkîn al-Dîn Kûrî-Shâh. Hûlîgû [q. v.] having received orders from the Mongol emperor to destroy the stronghold of these dangerous fanatics (654 = 1256) laid siege to the fortress of Mîrmûndiz, where Rûkîn al-Dîn was. The grand-master surrendered, was kept a prisoner and taken to the court of Mangû, who refused to receive him; on his way back he was murdered on the banks of the Oxus. The fortress of Alamût capitulated; that of Gîrd-
khî in Dâmghân held out for three years. The last traces of Îsmâ’îlya disappeared from Khi-
ståin in the reign of the Mongol Khân Ahi Sa’îd, who sent a proselytising mission to Kân. Shâb-Râh, son of Timûr, also had the last followers of heresy hunted out in the same province; only the persons that could be suspected were a few soldiers, Sâyi’id and derwîsh.

Îsmâ’îlya of Syria. Their establishment in this country followed soon after their installation in the mountains of Dîlâm. They are found at Aleppo towards the last years of the 12th century of our era in the reign of the Sâlûtâb prince Kišqîm b. Tûrûq, who was converted to their doctrines by a physician-astrologer. Their first victim was the father-in-law of this prince, Dja-
lâh al-Dawla Hûsam, lord of Hûnîn, as he was about to march against the count of St. Gilles to make him raise the siege of Hûnîn al-Katrî [q. v.]. He was assassinated while at prayers by three Persians disguised as Sîfis. The astrologer was not long in dying suddenly (he was perhaps assassi-
nated) and handed on his power to a companion, also of Persian origin, Ahi Tâhir Ibn al-Sa’îdî. The Îsmâ’îlya took Aapamaye a euse in 499 (1106), but the Crusaders took it from them again very soon afterwards. Their excesses provoked a massacre of their partisans at Aleppo (507 = 1113). The missionary Îbrâmî, having escaped, tried to seize Shâzan on the Qontar by taking a Christian festival. In spite of the successful surprise, the inhabitants, led by the Amirs of the family of Mûnﬁzîrî, regained the caravan (kûhûrî) and were hauled up by ropes into the interior by the women who had remained there. Although the Îsmâ’îls had again gained a certain amount of influence in Aleppo the ruler Ishâqî prevented their gaining possession of the Kût’at al-Sharîf [cf. p. 231 infra]. — On Ramdân 23, 515 (Dec. 5, 1121) Îsmâ’îlî fîd’î’s assassinated the Fîtîmî vizier al-Afjal b. Badr al-Djamâlî [q. v.].

A rising of the population of Amdîr (Diyâr-
Bakr) resulted in the massacre of the proselytes they had made in this town (518 = 1121) but the acquisition of the fortress of Bûnîyân [q. v.] re-established their fortunes. Toghteghîn, prince of Damascus, wishing to save his favourite Bahîram from the ill-treatment of the Damascenes, had left it to him. Bahîram fell in battle in 522 (1128) against the rebel natives. Îsmâm the Persian succeeded him; after the massacre of his partisans at Da-
mascus (15 Ramdân 525 = Sept. 1 1129) he handed the citadel of Bûnîyân over to the Crusaders.

To make up for this loss, the Îsmâ’îlya pur-
chased from Sâlî al-Mulk b. ‘Amarîn the castle of
Muhammad is the son of this Agha Khan; from his father he has inherited his taste for sports.

Present Distribution of the Ismā‘iliya. There are still several thousands in Syria, who live in the ancient fortresses of Maṣṣūth, Kadmus, etc. They are inoffensive, and faithful subjects of the Ottoman empire; the plundering of the first of these sites by the Nāvāris in 1809 produced the ms. publ. and transl. by Stanislas Guyard (Fragments relatifs à la doctrine des Ismā‘īli dans Nabilat et Extravétoires, xii. i. 1874). In Persia there are some in the district above mentioned of Maḥjūlāt near Kunān in Central Asia they are found in Badakhshān, Khorāsān, and Kāzān; in Afghanistan, they are known under the name of Muṣṭarad. In Khūrāsān (valleys of Dākhīlātād and Kermar) there are many Muṣā‘īlās, as well as in several valleys of the upper Osāk (Sārījol, Wālūkān and Yāsīn). In India there are 99,476 in the districts of Ađīmar, Bihār, Rājpūtanā, the Punjab and Kāshmir, and 5,265 in those of Bombay, Baroda and Coorg (Census of India, 1901, I, 561 sqq.). They are not all followers of the Agha Khan. Among the Bōhūrā [q. v.] of Gargārāt, the Dā‘ūrī, who form the bulk of this community (130,000), are Ismā‘īlī (Rev. du Mon. 47, 472).

They are numerous in ‘Omnā: there are some in all the towns; their headquarters are at Mātār, near Muscat. They are also found at Zanzibar and in what used to be German East Africa, where they number tens of thousands and are increasing in numbers by conversions.

Doctrine. God is entirely without attributes, incomprehensible and incapable of being cognised. He did not create the universe directly; by an act of will called anw, he made manifest Universal Reason, in which are all the divine attributes and which is God in his implied outward manifestation. As prayer cannot be addressed to an inaccessible being, it is turned toward his exterior manifestation, Reason, which thus becomes the real divinity of the Ismā‘īlīya. As one cannot attain to knowledge of God, but only of Reason, the latter is given the names of the Veil, the Place, the Antecedent, Spirit, the First.

Reason creates the universal Soul, whose essential attribute is life, as that of reason is knowledge; being imperfect in the latter respect, it necessarily strives to reach perfection. Whence arises a movement which is the inverse of emanation. The Soul produced primal matter, which forms the earth and the stars; it is passive and receives the impress of forms, the ideas of which exist in Reason.

There are two necessary and primitive entities, space and time. The combined action of these five entities produces the movements of the spheres and of the elements. The appearance of man is explained by the need which the universal soul feels to attain perfect knowledge in order to rise to the nature of universal Reason. When this end is attained all movement will cease. To gain salvation knowledge must be acquired, which can only come from the earthly incarnation of Reason, the Prophet, with his successors the Imāms. In the case of each of these the second is the interpreter of this word by means of the inner meaning which this word contains (is‘āwīd).
The three last principles became the inam, the hasidja, charged with giving proof of the mission of the aya, and the ala or "missionary". Muhammad was the nafs and 'All the aya.

There were several degrees of initiation (at first seven, then nine). The missionaries began by putting forward absurd questions, the neophytes then knotty points of Muslim theology (the usual process with the Baitiya) and led him quite gradually to admit that these difficulties were easily solved by the allegorical and symbolical interpretation of the Koran. Calculations made from the numerical value of letters played an important part (see Fragment ii. of St. Guyard and the article Hukmi above ii. 338 b). When the proselyte had acknowledged the force of his arguments, the missionary made him take an oath not to reveal any of the mysteries which were going to be entrusted to him and taught him that in order to be saved it was necessary to submit blindly, fermae ac cadaver, to the spiritual and temporal guidance of the Imam. The majority of the adepts did not pass beyond the first or second stages of initiation; the missionaries hardly reached the sixth. Only a few superior individuals could hope to reach the higher degree (cf. the theories of the Sha's and mysteries of the inam kaimil [q. v.]).

Paradise allegorically signified the state of the soul which had reached perfect knowledge; hell was ignorance. No soul was condemned to hell eternally; it returned to earth by metempsychosis until it had recognised the inam of the epoch and had learned theological knowledge from him. Evil did not exist as a principle, and had only one day disappear through the progressive assimilation of all creation to universal reason. In spite of the reputation as assassins, which tarnished the name of the Isma'ilis, it should not be imagined that their crimes were the application of a dogma; one should rather see in this the excesses of the absolute political power which the grandmasters had arrogated to themselves. Rousseau (Annals des Voyages, xiv. 286) has noted that those whom he knew were hospitable and of a gentle temperament. They do not care to travel, are active at home, much attached to their religion, which however offers much from the old creed, and are brave at need and obedient to their chiefs.


ISMA'ILIA, a town situated about the middle of the Suez Canal. It was laid out in 1863 during the construction of the Canal, and named after the Khojide Isma'il. It was a place of much importance whilst the work of excavation went on, but as soon as the canal was completed, it quickly decayed. In recent years it has recovered some of its prosperity through the traffic between Cairo and the mail steamers. It is connected by railway with Port Said, Cairo and Suez, and there are good hotels, baths, etc. The town is surrounded by plantations and gardens, Lake Timsah being on the south side.


ISNAD (A) e. e. the chain of traditions. See Hadith, ii. 190a and 190b sqgs. (Sections ii. and iii.) and cf. on the connection with Jewish tradition, J. Horovitz, Alter und Ursprung des Isnâd, in Der Islam, vii. (1917), 39-47.

ISPAHBAD (Pahlavi i'spah-pat, head of an army, Procopius' 'ispahbân), a general of cavalry. Under the Sasanians, as a proper noun, it meant one of the seven privileged families of Arsakid origin: as a common noun, it was applied to the fifth of the great hereditary offices, the command of the cavalry (Theophylactes, iii. 8); the second of these offices, that of military affairs in general, was that of the Erânspâhân. Under Khusraw I Anôshhrânawân, Persia was divided into four great military commands, the chiefs of which had the title ispahbad (Arab. al-ispahbâq, al-Balâhûrî, p. 336 psen.). Mäsiyr (Mayazdyûr) b. Kârin was appointed by the Caliph al-Ma'mûn governor of this province with the same title (ib. p. 339). The coins struck by these princes give the names of Khwarâshbî b. 93 (711) and 97 (715), Farrukhan (105—110 = 725—728), Dâd Bûdjî Mîhar in 120 (738), Khwarâshbî II (122—148 = 740—765); after 151 (768) the names are those of Muslim governors. When in the viiith (xiiith) century, the family of Bawân reconstructed an independent state in Tâbaristân, these princes, who added Muslim titles to their Iranian proper names, received the title ispahbad ('Ali b. al-Dawla 'Ali b. Shahrârî b. Kârin, Naqar al-Din Rûstam, Tâdji al-Mullâk, Kârin b. Mârdâwîd, Hûsâm al-Dawla Arzâshî b. Hasan).

Bibliography: Arthur Christensen, L'Empire des Sassamides (Danske Vidensk. Selsk. Skrifter, 7. raekke, i. 1, 1907), p. 27, 42; Fr.
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ISPANDĂRMADB (v.), twelfth month of the Persian solar year, also name of the fifth day of each month.

ISPÂRTA (in Ibn Batûtâ: Sabûtâ; Sabûtâ in the modern). The translation of the Acts of the Apostles, xxii. 1, for the Greek Patra, cf. Zscherl, Der deut. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, ix. 731), the ancient Baris Pisdiaeae (Pliny, Nat. Hist., v. § 147; Ptolemy v. 5 § 5), was taken from the Byzantines by the Safïdâls of Konya in the reign of Kildîj Arslam III (600—601) = 1203—1204 (Houtsm, Rec. de Textes relat. à l'Hist. des Seljoucides, iii. 62 = iv. 26). After the downfall of the kingdom of Konya Isparta belonged to the Hamidoglu [q. v.] and was sold by the last ruler of this dynasty in 1283 (1381—2) with the greater part of his lands to Sultan Murad I. (Lencclavius, Hist., p. 238; Sa'd al-Dîn). Under Ormazd (1652—7) it was the residence of the sayfâ-dâlay of Hamid-elm, now it is the headquarters of the nichtezâriff of Hamidâbâd and of the Greek Metropolitan of Pisdia. The population of the prosperous town is estimated at 30,000, of whom 600 are Greeks and 500 Armenians; it has numerous mosques (13 džâms, 63 masjids), the mosque of Firâwnes being a work of Sinân, 9 madrasas and a library of 600 volumes; also 8 Greek churches and one Armenian, the former not without interest. Among the products of industry may be mentioned carpets (600 looms), alâdja and baghâshi (250 workshops), silk, cotton of roses, and alcohol.

Bibliography: Ibn Batûtâ (ed. Paris), ii. 266; Kâtib Çelebi, Djîhânmâne, p. 639 sq.; Paul Lucas, Voy. dans la Grèce, l'Asie Mineure, la Macédoine etc., i. 246 sqq. (Ch. xxxiv.); Arundell, A Visit to the Seven Churches of Asia, London 1828, p. 118—132; Do., Discoveries in Asia Minor, London 1834, i. 346 sqq., ii. 1—22; Hamilton, Researches, i. 453; Sarre, Reisen in Kleinasiens, p. 167 sq.; Cuenet, La Turquie d'Asie, i. 850 sqq. — View in de la Borde, Voyage de l'Asie Mineure, p. 106.

J. H. Mordtmann.

ISRA'. The term isra' was taken from the Kurâ, Sûra xvii. 1: "Glory to Him who caused His servant to journey by night (isra' bi 'abdilî lâîn) from the sacred place of worship to the further place of worship, which We have encircled with blessings, in order that We might show him some of our signs! Verily He (i. e. God) is the Hearer and the Beholder." — Do. do not know whether this verse originally formed part of chap. xvii. or was first promulgated in some other context, nor need we enquire what may have been the real sense of the verse. In any case it is noticeable that the discourse gives but three explanations.

1. The older one, which disappears from the more recent commentaries, was doubtless in this verse an allusion to Muḥammad's Ascension to Heaven. This is the more interesting, as these traditions (Bukhârî, ed. Cairo 1278, ii. 185, Bâb kâna 'I-nabîyu lamâm 'sinu'nu wâlî yânâmu kalbâku, no. 2; Muslim, ed. Bûlûk 1290, i. 59; Tabari, Ta'rif, xv. 3; cf. Der Islam, vi. 12, 14) retain also the original signification of the story of the Ascension which has been shown to be the initiation to the prophetic career (Bevan, Mohammed's Ascension to Heaven, p. 56; Schricke, Der Islam, vi. 1 sqq.; see the art. Mu'âdja). This explanation interprets the expression al-masjid al-âkâf as "the further place of worship" in the sense of "Heaven" and, in fact, in the older tradition isra' is often used as synonymous with mu'tâfia (Der Islam, vi. 14).

2. The second explanation, the only one given in all the more modern commentaries, interprets al-masjid al-âkâf as "Jerusalem" and this for no very apparent reason. It seems to have been an Umâyad device intended to further the glorification of Jerusalem as against that of the holy territory (cf. Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii. 55 sqq.; Der Islam, vi. 13 sqq.), then ruled by 'Abd Allah b. Zubair. Tabari seems to reject it. He does not mention it in his "History" and seems rather to adopt the first explanation (see Der Islam, vi. 2, 5, 6; 12, 14; Tabari, Annales, i. 1157 sqq., a passage which appears to represent the historian's final verdict formed on full consideration of the evidence before him. beyan, op. cit., p. 57).

Explanations 1 and 2 concur in interpreting 'abîd in xvii. i by Muḥammad and this seems to be right (Der Islam, vi. 13, note 6). The idjâma admitted both interpretations and, when the Umayyad version had arisen, harmonised the two by assigning to isra' the special sense of night journey to Jerusalem. The Ascension, having lost its original meaning, was altered in date, being made to fall at a later period (see art. Mu'âdja) and it became possible to combine both stories as appears, in fact, to have been done previously by Ibn Ishaq in the oldest extant biography of Muḥammad (Bevan, op. cit., p. 54).

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

One night as Muḥammad was sleeping in the neighbourhood of the Ka'ba at Mecca (or in the house of Umm Hâni', Der Islam, vi. 11) he was awakened by the angel Gabriel who conducted him to a winged animal, called Burâk (Bevan, op. cit., p. 55, 57, 59; Der Islam, vi. 12 sqq., with the literature quoted there and the art. Burâk, and with Muḥammad mounted on this animal they journeyed together to Jerusalem. On the way thither they encounter several good and several wicked powers (Mîqâk al-Masjîd, ed. Dihlî 1268, p. 521 sqq.; Baghawî, Mîqâk al-Sunnâ, ed. Cairo 1294, ii. 179, with a harmonising interpolation) and visit Hebron and Bethesda (Nâsi'a, Sunan, ed. Cairo 1312, i. 77 sqq.; Nuwâiri, MS. Warner 23, i. 93, i. 7—10). At Jerusalem they met Abraham, Moses, and Jesus, of whom a description is given (e. g. Bukhârî, ed. Cairo 1278, ii. 147). The şâlât is performed, Muḥammad acting as imâm and thereby taking precedence of all the other prophets thereto assembled. This meeting with the Prophets at Jerusalem resembles and may have been modelled on the transfiguration of Jesus on Mount Tabor (Matt. xviii. 1; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 28), cf. Der Islam, vi. 15.

3. The third interpretation of Sûra xvii. 1 is based on xvii. 62, where ruwâ' "vision" is explained as isra'.' This implies that the night journey was not a real journey but a vision.
Standing at the bâdîr Muhammad saw Jerusalem and described it to the unbelieving Kuraishites (Bukhârî, ii. 221, iii. 102; Muslim, i. 62; Tabarî, Tafseer, xv. 5, l. 14 a.f., etc.). The story is woven into a connected whole as follows: Muhammad journeys by night to Jerusalem, returns and at Mecca describes his adventures; the Kuraishites disbelieve him and Muslims apostasize; Muhammad seeks to defend the truth of his story, but he has forgotten the particulars; whereupon Allah causes him to actually behold Jerusalem (see Der Islam, vi. 15 sq.).

In the more modern and longer narratives the story is further amplified (see e. g. A. Müller, Der Islam in Morgen und Heuteland, i. 86 sq.). The prophet is said to have held 70,000 conversations with Allah, although the whole journey proceeded so quickly that, when he returned, his bed was still warm and the watercup which he had overthrown with his foot at his hurried departure, was not yet empty. By Muslim theologians the question has been discussed, whether the isra' happened while Muhammad was asleep or awake and whether it was his spirit or his body which journeyed. The orthodox opinion is that the journey was performed by Muhammad with his body and awake. Tabarî in his commentary (xxv. 13) very succinctly sums up this meaning for the following reasons: 1) If the prophet had not been carried away in a corporeal sense the event would afford no proof of his divine mission and those who disbelieved the story could not be accused of infidelity. 2) It is stated in the Kur'ân that God caused his servant to journey, not that He caused his servant's spirit to journey. 3) If the prophet had been carried away in spirit only, the services of Buraq would not have been required, since animals are used for carrying bodies not for carrying spirits (Bevan, op. cit., p. 60; Schrieke, Der Islam, vi. 13; Tabarî, Baidâwî, and Baghawi, Tafseer, ad xxvii. 7). Mystics and philosophers often favour an allegorical interpretation (Goldrath, Geschichte der Philosophie im Mittelalter in Kultur der Gegenwart, i. v., p. 310).

Bibliography: Bevan, Mohammed's Ascension to Heaven in Bâdîr as Seen by the Arab Historians, Wissenschaft, vol. xxvii, p. 51 sqq.; Schrieke, Die Himmelsreise Mohammed's in Der Islam, vi. 13 sqq., with the literature there quoted.

(R. Schrieke.)

ISRA'IL. [See ISRÀ'IL.]

ISRÀ'IL, the name of an angel, which is probably to be traced to the Hebrew Seraphim as it is indicated by the variants Sarafîl and Sarafîn (Tafseer al-Aris, vii. 375). The change of liquids is not unusual in such endings. His size is astounding; while his feet are under the seventh earth, his head reaches up to the pillars of the divine throne. He has four wings: one in the west, one in the east, one with which he covers his body and one as a protection against the majesty of God. He is covered with hair, months and tongues. He is considered to be the angel who reads out the divine decisions from the well-kept Tablet and transmits them to the Archangel to whose department they belong. Three times by day and three times by night he looks down into Hell and is convulsed with grief and weeps so violently that the earth might be inundated by his tears.

For three years he was the companion of the Prophet, whom he initiated into the work of a prophet. Gabriel then took over this task and began the communication of the Kur'ân.

Alexander is said to have met him before his arrival in the land of darkness; there he stood upon a hill and blew the trumpet, tears in his eyes. He is called Lord of the Trumpet, it is mainly because he continually holds the trumpet to his mouth in order to be able to blow at once as soon as God gives the order for the blast which is to arouse men from their graves. It is however also said that Isrâ'il will be first aroused on the day of the Resurrection. He will then take his stand upon the holy rock in Jerusalem and give the signal which will bring the dead back to life.

In modern Egypt it is said that his music will refresh the inhabitants of Paradise.


(A. J. WENSCIN.)

ISRÀ'IL, the name of the Patriarch of Israel. Only appears once in the Kur'ân, apart from the frequent name, Banû Isrâ'îl, for the people of Israel. In Sâra ii. 87 it is said: "All foods were permitted to the Israelites except that which Israel declared forbidden for himself before the Tora was revealed." According to the commentators, this means that the restrictions on food were only revealed as a result of the wickedness of the Israelites. Their ancestor himself only refrained from eating camel flesh or drinking camel milk; according to some, because he was afflicted with the disease called 'în al-nâsû, which kept him awake by night and left him during the day. He therefore made a vow to abstain from his favourite food, if he should be cured. According to others, he did not eat the 'în al-nâsû (nerev išchâdûtus) by the advice of his physicians; or he abstained from all sinews (yâfî). The word is a translation of the Hebrew gid and al-nâsû is a transcription of the Hebrew נסוח. This points to Genesis xxxi., the well known story of the dislocation of Jacob's thigh by the angel as an explanation of the fact that the Israelites "to this very day do not eat the nerev išchâdûtus."

The question remains how could Jacob's private abstinence be obligatory for the Israelites. According to some, a prophet, as Jacob was, is by nature qualified to decide questions of law (Arabic muqaddâm). According to others, Jacob received God's permission to make this regulation.

The rest that is told of Isrâ'il in the Kur'ân is found under the name Yâkûb. At first Muhammad seems to have regarded Yâkûb as a son of Ibrahim. In the prophecy made to Sarn, he says: "Then we promised her Ishâk and afterwards Ya'âqûb" (xi. 71; cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Het Hebreeuwsche Ferset, p. 32). The commentators hasten to explain that according to the Arabic usage "afterwards" must refer to the grandson.

It is further stated in the Kur'ân that Ya'âqûb on his death bed warned his sons to be steadfast in the faith of Ibrahim (ii. 126 sqq.); like most of the patriarchs he received revelations (i. 130 etc.).

Muslim legend is acquainted with the main points of Jacob's history. Only divergent and non-Biblical
features will be noted here. Ya'kub was actually older than his twin brother Esau. When he was going to be born in front of the latter, Esau was angry and the two brothers quarrelled even in the mother's womb. Esau then said: Walketh, if thou wilt be born first, I will close up my mother's womb and kill her. Ya'kub then yielded and Esau was the first born. — This story is also found in Jewish literature. After winning the first born's blessing by trickery, Yahwéh took him as his uncle. From fear of Esau he concealed himself by day and travelled by night (vusir or yusir f'labi), hence the name Isrā'il. The Muslim legend therefore does not know of the change of name at Pauel. — As to his marriage with two sisters, it is said that Moses was the first to forbid this. But it is also said that Ya'kub did not marry Rahel until after Liyā's death.

Bibliography: The commentaries to the passages quoted from the Qur'ān; Tafhār, An-nalez, i. 355 sq.; Ya'kubī (ed. Houtsma), i. 26 sqg; Thā'labi, Kiṣāṣ al-Abīnya' (Cairo 1290), p. 58 sqg. (A. J. Wensinc.)

Issik-Kul (Turkish "warm lake"), the most important mountain lake in Turkestan and one of the largest in the world, situated in 43° 30' N. Lat. and between 76° 15' and 78° 30' E. Long., 5116 feet above sea level; the length of the lake is about 115 miles, the breadth up to 37 miles, the depth up to 1381 feet, and the area 4200 square miles. From the two chains of the Tian-Shan, the Kungei-Alatau (in the north) and the Terskei-Alatau (in the south) about 80 large and small mountain streams pour into the Issik-Kul, of which the most important, Tup and Djergalan, flow into it from the east; of the others there may be mentioned: on the south bank, the Karaköl, Kijīl-Su, Djuka (or Zauka), Barskoun and Ton, on the north bank, two Aş-Su's and three Koś-Su. On the origin of the depression Kutemalī, which now connects the Ču with the Issik-Kul [cf. Ču, i. 380b sqg.], views differ; it is said that the Końčar, now the upper course of the Ču, previously flowed into the Issik-Kul and the latter had an exit in the Ču; at present the Końčar sends an arm to the Issik-Kul through the Kutemalī only when it is flooded; at other times there are only a few ditches there filled with water, without any definite current. The question is only of importance for geology and physical geography; in the historical period the Issik-Kul has, as all accounts show, always been a salt lake without an exit.

The oldest of these descriptions we owe to the Chinese writer Huan-Cuang (viith cent. A. D.); the Chinese name (yo-ho) (warm sea; the lake never freezes) corresponds exactly to the Turkish name. The latter first appears in the Hudud al-Ālam (372 = 982–3); in Kūdāma (ed. de Goeje, p. 262) the lake is only mentioned, but not named. The ms. of the Hudud al-Ālam has Iskīk (f. 3b) or Iskūl (f. 18b); the form is probably the same in the Mudmjud al-Tawʾarīkh (the ms. has S-kūk, cf. W. Barthold, Turkestan etc., i. 19); Gardziā (in Barthold, Oṭet, etc., p. 80 ult.) writes Iskīh-Kul, Dījahānī quotes Iskūl from al-Kharaqī in Nallīn, al-Battānī, p. 175, but with tādzhīd over the k. In the history of Timur's campaigns, in Sharaf al-Dīn (Gafar-Nāma, Ind. ed., i. 494, ii. 634), as well as in Ibn Ārabīshā (Egypt. ed., p. 156) the form is Īsūl in the Tur̲k̲i-i Rāshādī (cf. the text in Barthold, Oṭet etc., p. 50, note 1), Isīh̲ Kūl.

In the oldest Chinese accounts (from the viith century A. D.) the land appears in the possession of the nomadic people of the Wu-sun. But from the viith century A. D. on, permanent settlements, even towns, are mentioned. One of the trade routes from China to Western Asia at that time led through the Jādul pass to the south bank of the Issik-Kul and from there into the valley of the Ču; the most important market on the Issik-Kul was Barskān, the name of which is probably identical with the modern name of the river Barskoun. Gardizī gives a legend due to a popular etymology about Alexander the Great and Persians left behind by him on the Issik-Kul; this popular etymology makes certain the reading Barskān against the form Nushdzān given by de Goeje according to Ya'kub, iv. 823. According to Gardizī, Barskān could put 6000 men in the field; according to Kūdāma, the principal place on the shore of the lake could itself raise 20,000 men (Barskān, according to Kūdāma, consisted of nine towns, four of some size and five small ones). Three days journey west of Barskān lay Tūnk, the name of which obviously corresponds to the name of the river Tūn; between Barskān or Tūnk there were only to be seen tents of the nomad Dijikil. I2 farsalī west of Tūnk was the town of Yār, which could raise 3000 men. In Hudud al-Ālam there is further mentioned "a prosperous place, visited by merchants", the town of Stūkūr, on the border between the settlements of two nomad peoples, the Dijikil and the Khallūk̲ (Kārāk̲); the town probably bore the name of the lake; a town "Iṣṣīl" on the north shore of the lake of the name is still given in the Carta Catalana of the year 1375 A. D.; there was said to be an Armenian monastery with relics of the Apostle Matthew (Notices et Extraits, siv. Pt. ii., p. 132 sqg.).

Of this civilization, which probably was destroyed about the same time (viiith—xivth century) and under the influence of the same causes as the civilization on the Ču [cf. i. 881], only a few walls and mounds of brick, and some cemeteries have survived, including a Muhammadan cemetery on the Kungei-Aksu with inscriptions of the viith (xiiith) century (Protokol Tur. Khruša Ljub. arkh. xi. 5 sq.) and a Nestorian cemetery discovered in 1907 on the Djuka, with inscriptions in Syriac and Turkish; one of these inscriptions (of 1330 A. D.) was published by P. Kokowioff (Bulletin de l'Académie, etc. 1909, p. 774 sq. 788 sqg.).

The Turkish and Mongol nomads liked to use the shores of the Issik-Kul as a winter resort on account of the favourable weather conditions (the snow here rarely lies to any considerable depth), so that the Issik-Kul is several times mentioned in the military history of Central Asia. A fortress was built by Timur "in the middle of the lake", i.e. on an island, to which, amongst others the Tatars departed from Asia Minor were banished. It is probably the same fortress as is called Koi-su by Haidar Mīrzā (q. v., ii. 219) (Tur̲k̲i-i Rāshādī, transl. Ross., p. 78); a Mongol amir is said to have sent his family there in the ixth (xviith) century, to put them in safety from the inroads of the Kalmucks. At the present day there are no islands in the lake; the disappearance of the island mentioned, with the fortress upon it was probably caused by an earthquake.
Connected with this perhaps is the fact that pieces of bricks and other fragments are frequently washed up on the shores of the Issik-Kul itself. Of the Issik-Kul itself it is said that a great town here was overwhelmed by the waves of the lake and its walls and buildings can be seen in clear weather; but this story has so far not been confirmed and is probably based on folklore about sunken cities (which is to be found in the most diverse countries). The catastrophe, if there was one, can only have happened comparatively recently; Haidar-Mirza, to whom we owe the latest and fullest account of the Issik-Kul in Muhammadi's literature (Târîkh-i Rastâhî, p. 366 sq.), knows neither of the disappearance of an island nor of rubble being washed up, nor of any sunken town. What Haidar-Mirza has to say about the Issik-Kul corresponds in general to the facts, but there are a few peculiar assertions. He says for example that on account of the great proportion of salt in it, the water is unsuitable for washing in; in reality the proportion of salt is very slight.

In the xvith—xviiiith centuries the shores of the lake were under the rule of Buddhist Kal-mucks; Tibetan inscriptions in the country south-east of the lake still recall this period. The Mongol name of the Issik-Kul was Temar-tu-Nor, "iron lake"; many of the mountain streams flowing into the Issik-Kul carry ferriferous sand; small knives, etc. are made from them (by the Kara-Kirgiz); the Turkish peoples about the same time also called the lake Tüz-Köl ("Salt-lake"). Even in the Kalmuck period the Kara-Kirgiz [q. v.] had grazing grounds here; the land remained in their possession after the conquest of the Kalmuck kingdom by the Chinese; Chinese rule was never firmly established here in spite of several attempts; About the middle of the xixeith century the Russians advanced across the III; the Issik-Kul was reached in 1856 by Colonel Klimentowski; a part of the Kara-Kirgiz was forced to submit to Russian rule as early as 1855 and the remainder in 1860. The Russians founded the town of Karakol, called Przewalsk since 1888, so far the only town in the country round the Issik-Kul (according to the census of 1897, 7987 inhabitants, now about 15000) and several villages; all these settlements are in the eastern part of the Issik-Kul valley; the western part is still inhabited only by nomads. The settlements are still, in the middle ages, called after the rivers on which they lie; the official Russian names are rarely used, even by Russians; even the Russian peasant always says "Tüp" for Preobraženskaya and "Kizil-sau" (which is corrupted to "Kozelzii") for Pokrowskaya, Thanks to the fertility of the soil, the villages are in a flourishing condition, in spite of the frequent earthquakes.

(Cf. L. Berg, Osto Issyk-Kul (Ziemledejki), 1904, Nov.) (W. Bartold.)

Išţakhr, a town in Fârs [q. v., ii. 70]. The real name was probably Stâghr as it is written in Pahlavi; the Armenian form Stähr and the abbreviation S T on Sâsànian coins point in the same direction. The form with prosthetic vowel is modern Persian; it is usually pronounced Išţakahr or Išta-šahr, also with inserted vowel Sitakahr, Sitakahr, Sitårk; cf. Pulver, Lex. Pers.-Lat., i. 943, 97a, ii. 223, and Nöldeke in Grundr. der iran. Philol., ii. 192. The Syriac form is Ištar (rarely Išṭahr), in the Talmud probably Išṭāhar (יִשְׁתָּחָר, Miegilla 13a, middle). According to the statements of Per-
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speak sometimes of 40,000, sometimes of 100,000 of the enemy slain. This second capture of Işṭakhr probably took place in 29 (649), but according to some accounts, it was in 28 (648), cf. J. Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbitten, vi. (1890) 111 sq. For other details of the Arab expeditions against Işṭakhr see: Baldhurri (ed. de Goeje), p. 386 sq.; Tabari, Anuarat (ed. Leiden), i. 2546 sq., 2549 sq., 2601 sq., 2830; Ibn al-Athir (ed. Torbergh), ii. 420 sq. iii. 30 sq., 77 sq.; Chronique de Tabari (Pers. vers., by Belami), transl. Zonlight, iii. 452—3; Weil, Gesch. der Chalifen, i. 86—7, 163, and thereon A. D. Mordtmann in Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, vi. 455—6; Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, iv. 151 sq., v. 19—27, vii. 210—20, 248—56.

Işṭakhr, which in the Sasanian period can have yielded little in size to the ancient Persepolis, remained a fairly important place during the early centuries of Islam also. However it gradually sank to be merely the chief town of a province and was the capital of the kūra, bearing its name, the largest of the five districts into which the province of Fars was divided, comprising its northern and north eastern parts. The heaviest blow suffered by the erstwhile Sasanian capital was the foundation in 64 (684) of Shirāz (a day’s journey south of Išṭakhr), which soon became the capital of the province of Fars and attained great prosperity, particularly from the 7th (ixth) century. Henceforth Işṭakhr, declined visibly. From the description of the geographer al-Iṣṭakhrī, a native of the town, it was about the middle of the ivth (xith) century a town of medium size of the area of an Arab (= Roman) mile; the wall around it was in ruins. Al-Muğaddasī, writing about thirty years later (655), praises the splendid bridge over the river in Işṭakhr and the fine park. Concerning the chief mosque, situated in the bazaar, he mentions the remarkable pillars of bulb capitals. This probably refers not to an original Achaemenid building, but to a Sasanian, — al-Muğaddasī mentions that the mosque was thought to have been previously a fire-temple —, in the building of which pieces of carving from Persepolis had been used. Only a few years after the date of al-Muğaddasī’s account, a fatal catastrophe overwhelmed the town, brought upon it by the rebellious attitude of its citizens to their suzerain Šamsām al-Dawla, a son of Aḥmad al-Dawla [q.v.]. The latter sent against it an army under the amr Kutulmysh, who laid it in ruins. This sealed the ruin of Išṭakhr. In a description of the province of Fars dating from the beginning of the viiith (xith) century, in the Persian Fārs-Nāma, it is described as a modest village with barely a hundred inhabitants. Probably the whole area of the former town was quite uninhabited before the end of the middle ages.

As to the mint of Işṭakhr, coins struck here in the Sasanian period bear the abbreviation ST (新西) in Pahlavi characters; this certainly means Işṭakhr. Numerous specimens of these coins exist from the reign of Khusraw II (612—39 A. D.) to the end of the dynasty. In the Muhammadan period also the Pahlavi legend with the above abbreviation was retained for a considerable time. Such coins struck in the name of the Caliph or of governors are known down to the year 70 (680), cf. for example the references in Zeitscr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, viii. 13, 147 sq., xii. 56, xix. 400, xxxi. 148, xxxii. 120, 131. On the other hand, the Pahlavi coins with mint-names Irān (Iran) and Bābā (Babak) — contrary to Mordtmann (ibid., xxxii. 114—5 and Sitz.-Ber. d. Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss., 1874, p. 250—1) — are not to be attributed to Işṭakhr: Noldeke, Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, xxxiii. 691—2. Of Arab coins struck in Işṭakhr specimens are known from 88 (770) and 90 (708) to 167 (783); Stanley Lane-Poole, Cat. of Orient. Coins in the Brit. Mus., x. p. cii.; H. Lavolv, Cat. des monnaies musulmanes de la Bibl. Nat., i. 518; and the notes in Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, ix. 249, 250, xvi. 776, xix. 286, xxxix. 19, 38.

The present system of ruins at Işṭakhr, which still awaits a detailed investigation, is fairly extensive (about 5—6 miles around); the Pulwar and a small irrigation canal led off from it across the ruins and the area includes two almost equal parts. The remains of the town are mainly recognisable in the mounds of earth of varying height. Here and there parts of the surrounding walls still exist. The most remarkable seems to be a place lying towards the village of Hadji-ābād called Harim-i Djamshid — “Djamshid’s Harem” (cf. below) by the travellers J. Morier and Ker Porter, — where a column stands erect in the midst of an area covered with fragments of pillars. Its capital, composed of bodies of bulls, at one shows it to have been removed from Persepolis. We shall not go wrong, if we look here for the mosque mentioned above, described by al-Muğaddasī. The most detailed account of the ruins of Işṭakhr is that of Flandin and Coste, who spent two months in the neighbourhood about the end of 1840; cf. the pictures in the great volume of plates, Voyage en Perse, ii. (Paris 1843 sq.), Pl. 58—62, and the archaeological text accompanying it, p. 69—72, and also Flandin’s Relation du Voyage, ii. (1854), 137.

In the vicinity of Işṭakhr there are several other sites remarkable for their monuments or history. For example about 700 yards north of the village of Hadji-ābād, which lies quite near the north-east corner of the ruined area of the former Sasanian capital, there are natural caves in the valley of Tang Shāh-i Sarwān. One of them, which contains an inscription of historical importance of Sapor I (241—272 A. D.), is usually called Shahk All by the Persians, as a pious ascetic of this name is said to have ended his days in it; at the same time one hears it called Zindān-i Djamshid, “Djamshid’s prison”. Similar popular names like “Zindān, Harīm” (cf. above Djamshid’s Harim) are also found elsewhere in Persia and in the Irāk; cf. Daštājerd, i. 926, and my Seleucia et Keïphlon (Leipzig 1917), p. 55. Prominent buildings and monuments of antiquity are frequently attributed to Djamshid, a mythical ruler of ancient Iran whom the Muslim Persians identified with the Solomum of legend (cf. below, Takhti-i Djamshid).

Another place of historical importance is the Nāgh-e Radjāb, “Sculpture of Radjāb” (a legendary personage), about ¾ mile S. W. of Işṭakhr. This is a ravine-like split in the wall of rock on the south bank of the Pulwar, which is adorned with three Sasanian reliefs. Sarre thinks (Sarre u. Herzfeld, Iranische Reliefskizzen, p. 98) that this decoration may be explained by the special purpose of the place (a sanctuary of the God Ormuzd?) as the consecrated place of coronation of the Sasanian kings.
On account of its considerable remains from the ancient and mediaeval Persian periods, the best known sites are Takht-i-Djamshid and Naqsh-i Rustam, the former a short hour's journey south of Ištakhr on the southern bank of the Pulwar, the latter on the north bank of this stream about 1 1/2 miles from Ištakhr.

Takht-i Djamshid is the most usual name among Orientals for the complex of Achaemenid palaces of Persepolis. Persian popular fancy frequently gives imposing buildings the name of takht, i.e. bench or throne, of a celebrated legendary king of the past. Besides Takht-i Djamshid one also hears the older name Cihil, or abbreviated, Cil Minâr (also Menare), "the 40 pillars," which is found as early as the Persian historians of the xivth century. This name is taken from the most noteworthy parts of the whole site, the colonnade of King Xerxes I with its pillars originally 72, now only 13 in number. 40 is a round number very popular in the east to express a considerable number; a cave called Cihil Sutun (the 40 pillars) is shown, for example, in the valley of Shirwan in Luristan (cf. H. Grote, Wunderungen in Persien, Berlin 1910 p. 62). The number 1000 is also used in quite a similar fashion to 40. This explains another name, common at an earlier period, Hazâr Sutun, "the 1000 pillars," which first appears at the beginning of the xivth (xiii) century in the annals of Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī, as well as several times in later Persian chronicles, where there is still "the seven walls," found as early as about 1100 A. D. The Arab geographers of the middle ages from about the ii2d (ixth) century knew the ruins of the Persepolitan terrace by the name Malab Sulaimān, "Sulaimān's playing-ground," with which we may compare the name Kūrsi Sulaimān, "Solomon's throne (throne)," found in the Persian history Muqarn-i Tawārīkh (beginning of the vii = xith century), which in its turn may have been the model for the present synonymous name Takht-i Djamshid. It may be noted that Takht-i Sulaimān is also found elsewhere on Iranian soil as a geographical name; for example, a part of the ruins called Takht-i Sülâman-Murghāb; q. v., a mound of ruins in the S. E. of Ḍārbandi, a mountain east of Kābul, and finally the town of Žāb (see above, ii. 63b) in Farghāna; cf. Ritter, op. cit., vii. 482, viii. 150, 443, ix. 808; 1040.

The "Bench" or "Throne" of Djamshid (Saloman) is an artificial stone terrace of polygonal, almost rectangular shape, which lies at the foot of a steep, dark grey mountain of rock. The latter, according to the reports of recent travellers, now bears the name Kūh-i Raḥmat, "hill of mercy," but this is not to be found in literature; it apparently dates only from the post-mediaeval period (first mentioned by Sir Thomas Herbert in the beginning of the xvith century). The name still heard by Osuley, Shāh Kūh, "royal hill," might be older; it coincides with the bâxānîn ēsâ of Diodorus (xvii. 71). At the same time, according to the same authority, the inhabitants also use the name Kūh-i Takht, "hill of the throne (of Djamshid)." The section of the Kūh-i Raḥmat which forms the back wall of the platform contains three tombs of Achaemenid kings. The people know these by the names of the "mosque," the "bath" and the "mill of Djamshid," according to Stolze (Verhandl. der Gesellschaft f. Erdkunde in Berlin, x., 1883, p. 273). The terrace, which at the same time bears a markedly fortress-like character, was, as already mentioned, only intended for royal palaces and monumental buildings; the town of Persepolis lay in its immediate vicinity. Ancient remains of it may be still recognised. Older travellers were able to identify even more of these ruins lying outside the Takht-i Djamshid in the area of the town. It may be expressly mentioned that the view held by Stolze and Andreas (o. c., p. 250 sq.), and Persepolis, i. 3, that the citadel and town of Persepolis are to be sought at Naqsh-i Rustam, to be exact, the former at Naqsh-i Rustam and the town on the site of the later Ištakhr, while the buildings in Takht-i Djamshid were intended for solemn ceremonies closely connected with the cultus, does not appear tenable; cf. against it most recently Herzfeld in Sarre-Herzfeld, o. c., p. 100 sq. The Persian historians make a similar mistake when they identify Persepolis with Ištakhr without more ado, and in order to be able to explain all the ancient and mediaeval monuments and ruins in the plain of Mervâdâšt and its more immediate vicinity as the remains of a single town, ascribe to it the fabulous extent of 16 parasangs in length and 16 parasangs breadth.

Iranian tradition varies regarding the founder of the Persepolis-Ištakhr; sometimes it is Kayûmarsh, the mythical ancestor of the Persians, sometimes the builders or extenders are legendary rulers of the past like Kayûmarsh's descendants Hūshang (Cushanjī), Tahmûrath, Djamshid, Kâi Khusraw. Solomon also is named, for whom the spirits (djin) subject him to carry out marvellous works. A legendary princess, Humây, who plays the role of Semiramis as a builder in Iran, is also mentioned. Persian tradition transfers to Persepolis-Ištakhr the residence of the old Iranian kings and makes them be buried there also. According to Firdawsī's Šāhānama, the town was the residence of the reigning dynasty from the time of Kâi Khusraw. Muslim writers connect the origin of Persepolis with Solomon; the name is often taken, for example, as Solomon or Shahin above. According to their legend, this king dwelled alternately here and in Syria and was rapidly carried by the djin from one place to the other. Separate buildings on the terrace of Takht-i Djamshid bear in Arabic writings the names "mosque" and "bath of Solomon" (cf. with these the above mentioned names of two royal tombs of Kûh-i Raḥmat). Solomon — so the story goes — shut the wind up in a room there; Persian sources of the xiii th and xiv th centuries still speak of a "prison of the wind" here (Zindān-i Bâd) (cf. the reports in Osuley, o. c., ii. 381, 387).

Unfortunately the Arab accounts of the monuments of Persepolis are rather defective and moreover in parts distorted into fairy tales; cf. especially the accounts of the geographers al-Iṣfahānī, al-Muṣaddaṣī and al-Kazwīnī (see Schwarz, l. c.); various not uninteresting information is given by Persian historians of the later middle ages, especially Ḥamd Allâh Mustawfī and Iḥāzī Abūl (see Ouseley, ii. 387 sq., 387 sq.) According to these two, the pillars of the ruins there were celebrated as a source of zinc oxide (hiyā) important for medical purposes. The vandal disfigurement of the heads of the figures on the bas-relief of Takht-i Djamshid (and still more so in Naqš-
Rustam) is primarily due to the fanaticism of the Muslims with its object to the representation of human faces.

The caliph al-Manṣūr (754–775) wished to use the ruins of Persepolis, like those of al-Madīn-at-Temsifon, as a quarry, but was persuaded against it by the advice of his vizier Khālid al-Barmaki, who said that Persepolis was used as place of prayer by AI; see Fargūn. Hist. Arab. (ed. de Goeje), p. 256.

Various Muslim rulers have perpetuated their visits to the ruins of Persepolis by having inscriptions incised. Here are to be seen three Arabic inscriptions in Kufic characters by members of the Būyid dynasties (ixth = xi cent.; three inscriptions, two Persian and one Arabic, of Abu ‘l-Faṭṭ Ābār, a grandson of Tīmu’r (ixth = xiv cent.).), also three inscriptions (2 Arabic and 1 Persian) of ‘Alī b. Khālīf, a grandson of Ūrūn Ḥasan (ixth = xiv cent.). These inscriptions were thoroughly discussed by de Sacy in his Mém. sur diverses antiquités de la Perse (Paris 1793), p. 139. The inscriptions thereon were given by Noldeke in Stolze, Persepolis, ii. 6. H. Petermann, Reisen im Orient, i. 188, also mentions an inscription of the Muẓaffarid Muhammad b. al- Muẓaffar b. al-Muẓaffar b. al-Mansūr (d. 765 = 1363). The various verses scratched on the walls show the high respect in which Persepolis has always been held among the Persians; their modern poets often make allusions to the ancient capital of the country.

As to Naḵš-i Rūstān, its primary significance is only the steep south wall of the long, high mass of rock, Ḫusain Kūh, which has in niches four Achaemenid royal tombs and Sasanian reliefs. But the name is often extended to the whole of Ḫusain Kūh. The name Naḵš-i Rūstān is due to the popular idea that the sculptured figures there represent the Iranian national hero Rustam. Before the wall of the tombs there rises a remarkable towerlike building, now called Kaḇā-ḵār, the citadel of Kūh-e Zoroaster. As to its real purpose the opinions of scholars vary; probably it has something to do with a former fire temple. Two other small buildings are perhaps to be similarly regarded, not far from the Kaḇā-ḵār on the summit of a rock called Sang-e Sulaimān, "the stone of Sulaimān," cf. Ussele, a. e., ii. 300. We may also mention that the Sasanian sculptures of Berme Dekel 5 miles E. S. E. of Shirāz are also called Naḵš-ḵi Rustam.

A stone platform in two layers on the south bank of the Pulvar (about 500 yards W. of Naḵš-i Radjab) is called by the inhabitants of the district, Takht-i Rūstān, the throne of Rustam. The latter, in view of its limited dimension, can only have served as the pedestal of a sepulchral monument or of a fire temple. Cf. Flandin et Coste, Voyage en Persie, i. 72–73 (and Pl. 63). Instead of Takht-i Rūstam, the name Takht-i Ṭājūn, "peacock-throne," is also used. The name Takht-i Rustam is found elsewhere in Iran also: cf. Oussele, a. e., ii. 522.

A somewhat greater distance from Isťakhār, about 3–4 hours journey N. W., on rocky peaks stand three forts within 1½ to 2 miles each of other. Three, which lie practically in a straight line, are frequently comprised under the name Kaḷa’ or Kūh-i Isťakhār, the citadel or the mountain of Isťakhār; also Kūh-i Rāmūdjar, from a district of this name on the left bank of the Kur (into which the above mentioned Pulvar flows). Firdawsi in a distich speaks of the Sīh Sīdy Gumbādān-i Isťakhār, "the three fortresses of Isťakhār" (cf. Oussele, a. e., i. 386). At the same time the separate castles have each its own names, which have however changed frequently in course of time according to the reports of the older historians and travellers. The most important of the three, the Kāl-i Isťakhār in the narrower sense, is also called Miyyān, Kalā, "the citadel," from its position between the other two. Flandin and Coste heard it called Kāl-ḵār Sarw, "the cypress castle," from a single cypress tree standing there. For the two other citadels Persian authors, for example, give the names Kāl-ḵār Shīkastān, "the broken (ruined) castle, and Aḵšunwān (Sakunwān and similar names). To judge from the traces of foundations and pieces of walls found between the forts there were always all linked up by fortifications.

In the Muslim history of Fārs, especially in that of Isťakhār, these inaccessible fortresses played an important part. They were guarded as essential military points d'appui for the holding of the surrounding country. The most prominent is the "citadel of Isťakhār" proper, the origin of which Persian legend places in mythical times by assuming it was built by King Djамshīd. The old Iranian ruler Gushihās is said to have deposited the Javosta, written on cowhides with golden ink, in the castle of Isťakhār, after his conversion to the doctrine of Zoroastrianism; the citadel is therefore also called Diz-i Niβāšt (Castle of the writing) or Kūh-i Niβāšt (Hill of the writing); so in Ḥandi Allah Mustawī; cf. Ţabari, i. 676; and Ibn al-Athīr, i. 182, as well as the Persian reports in Oussele, a. e., ii. 344, 364, 370–1, 375, 384. Under the caliphate the governor of the province of Fārs very frequently resided in this stronghold, which was easily defended by its natural situation. Thus the governor Ziyād b. Abīth was able to hold out up here against Mu’awiyah for a considerable time after ‘Alī’s death; cf. Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich, etc. (Berlin 1902), p. 76. The Būyids, who not infrequently stayed in the region of Isťakhār (cf. the inscriptions dating from their time mentioned above, at Takht-i Djamshīd; *imād al-Dawla [q. v.] was buried in Isťakhār), paid particular attention to the citadel of Isťakhār. Aḏūd al-Dawla [q. v.] in the ivth (xth) century built on it a great system of cisterns, taking advantage of a natural pond already there, which could provide water for several thousand persons for a whole year and which aroused the admiration of contemporaries and of later generations. In 467 (1074) the rebel Faḍlūya, who had seized the government of Fārs, was besieged by the troops of Niẓām al-Mulk in the sulṭānate of Malik Shāh in the citadel of Isťakhār. An earthquake which suddenly caused the cisterns to overflow forced the besieged to a premature capitulation. Faḍlūya was then kept a prisoner in the fortress and put to death next year after an unsuccessful attempt to escape. The castle was later much used as a state prison for high officials and princes. About 1590 the citadel was still in good condition and inhabited. Some time afterwards a rebel general of Fārs took refuge in it and it was besieged by Shāh Aḥmad I, stormed and destroyed. Pietro della Valle, who stayed here in 1621, therefore found it in ruins.
The citadel of Iṣṭakhr has so far been only rarely visited by European travellers, e.g. by Morier, Flandin (and Coste), and Vambery. According to the account by Flandin and Coste, to whom we also owe drawings and plans of the citadel, it stands on a plateau 300 yards round, about 1300 feet above the plain. Of the old defences there have survived the powerful ramparts solidly built of stone; the great system of cisterns of the Byzantines, among which a well hewn deep into the rock is specially remarkable, is still to be seen. It is true that some of them are said to date from the Muslim period. Cf. on the castles of Iṣṭakhr the accounts from Persian sources in Ouseley, o. c., ii. 371, 376, 385 sq., 389, 395-7, 399, 404-5, 407, 531; Ritter, viii. 863-5, 868, 877; Flandin et Coste, Voyage en Perse, ii. 71-72; Flandin's Relation du Voyage, ii. (1852), p. 140-2; Vambery, Meine Wanderungen und Erlebnisse in Persien (Vest 1867), p. 250; Cl. Huart in Revue sémitique, i. (1893), p. 259 sq., 337 sq. and in Hist. de Bagdad (Paris 1901), p. 28, 31; G. Le Strange, o. c., p. 276; Herzfeld in Sarre and Herzfeld, o. c., p. 114-5 (Pl. xvi. and Fig. 45).


(M. Strecker.)

AL-ĪṢṬAKХRI, Abū ʿĪṣāʾ b. Mūḥammad b. ʿĀlī-Pārīsī, an Arab geographer, whose biography is nowhere to be found, because in the geographical handbook ascribed to him, which bears the title Maṣūlī kh-Māmīlīkh and is printed in the first volume of de Goeje's Bibliotheca Geogr. Arab., no biographical data are given. De Goeje however has shown that his work is only a new edition of an older one by Abū Zaid al-Balkhī, just as later Ibn Hawkal [q. v.] took al-Īṣṭakīrī's work as a basis for his own after giving up his first intention of only making some corrections to it, as al-Īṣṭakīrī himself, whom he had met in 340 (951-952), had asked him to do. It is thus at least certain that he must have lived in the first half of the 19th (20th) century. The text which was published in facsimile by J. H. Moeller as early as 1839 only contains a synopsis of the book.


ISTAMBOL. [See CONSTANTINOPLE.]

ISTANKÖI, Turkish name for the island of Stano = Cos; cf. Cui net, La Turquie d'Asie, i. 435 sqq.

ISTAR (istārā), a weight in the apothecary's or troy system, taken over from the Greeks and usually estimated according to two different scales. On the one hand we find the equations: 1 istār = 6 dirham and 2 duqqa = 4 mishāb (an apothecary's stater); on the other, we have 1 istār = 63 dirham = 4 mishāl (commercial istār in the East). The first equation will only be correct if the coined dirham and the mishāl maiyāl are taken (2,97 + 2,97 = 18. 18 = 4,72 × 4 = 18,18); the second equation is approximately correct only if we take the coined dirham and the old mishāl (gold dinār) (2,075 × 6,5 = 19,3 = 4,25 × 4,5 = 19,125). In both cases the result is a much larger amount than that of the usual Greek stater. The further ratio that 20 istār go to the raft (pound) is only true of the istār of 63 dirham and the Baghdad raft of 130 dirham.

Bibliography: H. Sauvaire, Matériaux, s. v.; Don Vasquez Queipo, Essai sur les Systèmes mèses in, i. (E. V. ZAMBAUR.)

ISTIBRÁ (A.) means the "inquiry whether the uterus of a slave woman is empty," prescribed by Muslim law. If a Muslim acquires a slave girl by purchase, inheritance or by any other means, the law forbids him to cohabit with her, until it is ascertained that she is not pregnant, in order that there may be no uncertainty about the paternity of the children. The prescribed period of waiting ends after the first menstruation or, in the case of pregnancy, after the birth of the child, and lasts a month for non-menstruating women. Further a slave, after she is manumitted, may only enter into a marriage after the expiry of the legal istibrá period.

Bibliography: Miḥālī Kh-Tālīš (ed. van den Berg), iii. 60 sqq.; Fath al-Kārī (ed. van den Berg), p. 514 sqq.; al-Badārī (Cairo 1307), ii. 182 sqq.; al-Dimashkī, Ṭabāṭabāʾ al-ʿImāma fī ʿĀthār al-Aʾīma (Bu lugares 1300), p. 124.)
al-Shafrani, al-Iman al-kubra (Cairo 1279), ii, 155; C. Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 135.

(TH. W. JUYNBOll)

ISTIFHĀM (from the root fīHM "to understand"; x. "to ask to be made to understand"; a. technical term by Arab historians denoting "interrogation," "interrogative sentence." An interrogative sentence is nominal or verbal, and is subject to the grammatical rules governing the sentence in general. An interrogation may be indicated merely by the tone of the voice, but more often it is introduced by one of the interrogative particles (qarfa 'l-istiftiham) 'a, 'al, 'um, etc., or by an interrogative pronoun or adverb, e.g. man = who?, mā = what?, kāfa = how, etc.


(Robert STEVENSON)

ISTĪḤĀN (A.), i. e., to consider something hāsan (i. e. good). This is the name given to a method of argument used in the Ḥanafi school to settle fiḥā in conformity with the requirements of every day life, equity or social conditions. The object of istiḥān is much the same as that of istiḥāṣ (i.e., to think that something is qālīb, i.e., in the general interest or most appropriate) applied in the Mālikī school. According to both methods, the results of ḥayāt (i.e., analogy) were often simply disregarded, when it was considered necessary or simply desirable to depart from the strict demands of theory. For this arbitrariness istiḥān and istiḥāṣ are objected to by many and have never been generally recognized as reliable fundamentals in the science of law (uṣūl al-fiḥā).


(TH. W. JUYNBOll)

ISTIKBĀL (A.), in astronomy means the proportion of the positions of sun and moon i.e. their relative positions when the difference of their longitudes is 180°, as is the case notably during an eclipse. Muḥābala is also occasionally used but this word is a common term among the astrologers for the opposition of two planets. The opposite of istikbāl is istifsimā = conjunction, i.e. the relative positions of sun and moon when they have equal longitudes, as is the case for example in an eclipse of the sun. In astrology other expressions are commonly used for the conjunction of planets among themselves or with the sun and moon, viz. muḥārara, ištīrān and ḵirān. Besides these positions (opposition and conjunction), astrology further distinguishes the hexagonal (ṣaṣṣād), the tetragonal (ṭarīb), and the trigonal (ištihāṣ) aspect, according as the angle between the two planets is 90°, or 120° or 180°.

Bibliography: al-Bathâni (ed. Nallino), ii. 349; Dictionary of the Technical Terms (ed. Sprenger etc.), s. v. Istikbāl, Istifsimā and Ki-

rān; al-Khwārizmi, Maǧâth al-Ulūm (ed. van Volken), p. 232. (H. Suter)

ISTIKHĀRĀ (AN), the prayer (iḥdā) of a man who has not yet made up his mind, in order to be inspired with a salutary decision regarding an intended enterprise, a journey, etc. This term is connected with the first conjunctive of the verb ʿara', especially in its use in phrases like Allāhumma bārîs li-ʿaḥālka (Tabari, Anwa'l., i. 1832, q); khār lahu (Ibn Sa'd, ii. 11, 73, 75, sq); khārū 'lāhan li (ibid., viii. 92, sq). The proverb istiṭkāhar al-lamā'ī fī 'l-ṣamā'ā ḫakāy laka bi-issīnīkī fī 'l-khāfī (Ibn Sa'd, viii. 171, sq); Kāfī, Anāli, ii. 106 pan.), is even given from the pre-Islamic period, but it is hardly to be believed that such an aphorism could date from that time. In Islam the formula of the religious istiṣḥārā, consists of a form of prayer of some length, traced back to the Prophet in Bukhārī, Tirmīzhī, n. 10, Da'awāt, n. 45 (ed. Krehl—Juynboill, iv. 202, 400); Ibn Mājah, Dībāj 1282, p. 99 infra, — the authenticity of which however is disputed even by Muslim critics, in Ibn Ḥadījār al-Hāsimī, Fātiṣa al-ḥadīthīya, Cairo 1307, p. 210 — whereas Tirmīzhī (Būlāk 1397), ii. 206, gives only the brief formula: Allāhumma bārīl ṣanā'ī fī iḥdā'ī cf. the Dhaihab, Mīzn al-ḥīdāyāt, ed. Lucknow 1884, i. 315, 4, only as a haddāt of doubtful authenticity. It is introduced by two ra'ās (zilā' ra'kata al-istiṣḥārā, Subkhī, Tāb. al-Sharī'a, vi. 175, 6 infra). Directions are also given regarding the verses of the Kurān to be recited within the two ra'ās (Nawawi, A Ḍādir, p. 56). In Āwīj, Lūhh al-ṣībāh (ed. Browne), i. 210, 12, people go to the mosque to perform the namāz-i ʿistiṣḥārā; but this is not obligatory. It is the rule that the ʿistiṣḥārā appeal should be made from case to case before a definite purpose, and not in a summary fashion (e. g. in the morning for all cases which may crop up in the course of the day) (ʿAbdārī, Mādhūl, iii. 240 infra).

In keeping with the above mentioned traditional saying, Muslim practice shows the ʿistiṣḥārā in use from the earliest examples. The oldest example, probably quite independent of that ḥadīth, seems to be Aghānī, xix. 92, 3, sqq. The poet ʿAbd al-Ḥādī (Tānūn, N. 12, 83; Aḏāḏīz al-Arād, p. 120) praises Ḥādījād, because he undertakes nothing without securing God's approval (illā ra'kāhu ʿistiṣḥārā). And when ʿAbd Allāh b. Tāhir enters on his office of prefect of the Irāk, his father impresses upon him repeatedly in a letter of advice he sends him, to observe the ʿistiṣḥārā in all official business (Tāfīr, Kāb Ilkhāzādād, p. 49, p. 52, p. 56, p. 52, 4 infra, 52, 3). In this way literature gives numerous examples of the custom that the Muslim has to consider as well as unimportant resolutions, in private as well as public enterprises, also conquerors before their expeditions, thought to secure the divine approval by ʿistiṣḥārā. This habit indeed is sometimes fictitiously credited to them, as for example when Muḥāḍrān yīn in ʿistiṣḥārā to be made in this regard by ʿAbd Allāh b. Tāhir, T(abīrī, op. cit., p. 34, 6). Cf. the loud ʿistiṣḥārā
prayer of al-Muqtadir on his accession (with four rak'a's). 'Arīn, ed. de Goecel, p. 22, 13). In the 1007 Night in the tale of 'Uthman al-Wujūd and Ward fi l-'Akāmāt the latter's mother performs a "salāt al-istiikhāra of two rak'a's" in order to obtain an effectual indication in regard to her daughter's love affair (373rd Night, ed. Bulāq 1279, ii. 269). The choice of a baby's name seems occasionally to be made after an istiikhāra by the name (Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii, 139, i). There is no lack of examples to show that in deciding thorny theological questions the learned arguments were strengthened by istiikhāra (e. g. Nawawi, Tabâkhī, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 237, infra.). Authors in the introductions to their books very frequently mention istiikhāra as the motive or excuse for the publication (cf. Dhubahi, Tadhkīrat al-Huffāz, ii. 288, 1). A story, of course quite unhistorical, makes 'Omār II only allow the publication of a work of Ḥabbūn a. l-Yūn which he had in his library, after he had exposed it for 40 days with an istiikhāra at his place of prayer (Ibn Abī Uṣāfīa, i. 163 infra.).

The form of the istiikhāra laid down by religious usage (istiikhāra sharī'ya) is usually in actual practice accompanied by all kinds of forms not sanctioned in the Hadith, for example the expectation of receiving the divine inspiration in a dream (tayyara) after a prayer (Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii. 16, note 4; Doutté, Magie et Religion dans l'Afrique du Nord, p. 415) or strengthening the istiikhāra formula by an oracular casting of lots, in which the alternatives are written on cards (Tabarsi, Makārim al-Akhbār, Cairo, 1903, p. 100). Such additions are strongly condemned by fervid Sunnī orthodoxy ('Abdārī, op. cit., iii. 91 sqq.). There is also the istiikhāra by opening the Kurān (al-ďurū ... fā l-maṣṣāf ... wa-takādim istiikhāra), in Ibn Bishkuwāl, p. 243 ult., cf. Faraīj b. Aš-Shāhī, i. 44; an anecdote on the subject is given by Karwini, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 105, and Seebars, al-Musannif, p. 122, 18 (see Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, i. 10, 17), as in the case of the Sūras Virgiliānæ, are employed for the purpose of the Persians, especially the Dīwarān of Ḥāfīz, or the Mathnawi of Ḥājīl al-Dīn Rūmī (cf. Bankfort, Kalamgari, i, 151). This use of the Kurān is likewise rigorously forbidden by most Sunnī authorities (cf. Danīrī s. v. Tārik, ii. 119, 8 sqq., ed. Bulāq 1284; Murtadā, Ḥāfīz al-Sidā al-Muṭahār, Cairo 1311, ii. 285 infra); this custom in connection with the istiikhāra has led among the people to an excessive use of 'alī magic with the Kurān, of which a full account is given in Lammens, Les Custumés, Ch. xi., i. 328. — There is a proverb: "Ha khí man istiikhāra wa-lā nadīma man istaḍhāra (as hadith in Ṭabarānī, Muṣjam Ṣaghīr, ed. Dhibī, p. 304 infra). Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Zubairī in the beginning of the 4th (5th) century wrote a Kitāb al-istiikhāra wa-lā 'istiikhāra (Nawawi, Tabākhī, p. 744, 3). Bibilography: The above mentioned Ḥādīth passages; Ghaḍālī, Ḥāfiz 'Uṯlām al-Dīn (Bulāq 1289), i. 197; Murtadā, Ḥāfīz, iii. 467-409, and the pertinent sections of the Fīkh books. — Ct. journ. Asiat. 1861, i. 201, Note 2; 1866, i. 447; Philott, Bibliomansy, Divination, Superstitions among the Persians in Journ. As. Soc. of Bengal, 1906, ii. 399 sqq.; Bulletin de la Société de Géographie d'Oran (1908), xxviii. Number 1. (L. Goldziher.)

ISTIṆĀF (A.) means in Muslim law: the performance over again from the beginning of a religious act (e. g. a salāt) which has in some way been interrupted. If, on the other hand, only the part still to be performed when the interruption took place is later carried through, this is called bīnā (i.e. the continuation of an interrupted act).

Bibliography: A Dictionary of the Technical Terms (Calcutta 1862), i. 80.

(Th. W. Juynboll.)

ISTINDJĀ (A.) means a purification fully described in the Fīkh books in the chapter on ritual purity. It is a religious duty (according to Abū Ḥanīfa, however, only a recommended action) for every Muslim who has attended to the call of nature. A Muslim is in general allowed to delay this purification until he is about to perform the salāt, or has to be in a state of ritual purity for some other reason.

Bibliography: al-Dimashqī, Raḥmat al-Ummā fā Ḫāfīs al-Aṭīmā (Bulāq 1300), p. 7; A. J. Wensinck in Der Islam, i. 101 sqq.

(Th. W. Juynboll.)

ISTINŠĀK (A.), the inhaling of water through the nose, is considered by most fāṣīhs as a suunnā (i.e. a commendable act, according to Ahmad b. Ḥanbal however, a religious duty) both at the ghūf [s. v.] and the awzāfā (i.e. the major and minor ritual purification).


(Th. W. Juynboll.)

ISTIṢÂHĀB (A.), i.e., the seeking for a link (i.e., to something which is known and certain). This is the name of a process of settling fīkh rules by argument, which was especially used in the Shafi‘i school and with certain limitations among the Ḥanafis also. This seeking for a link means the endeavour to link up a later set of circumstances with an earlier, and is based on the assumption that the fīkh rules applicable to certain conditions remain valid so long as it not certain that these conditions have altered. If for example the length of some one it is doubtful whether he is alive or dead, then by istiṣâhāb all rules must remain in force which would hold if one knew for certain that he was still alive.

The Ḥanafis only recognise istiṣâhāb in so far as it concerns the retention of rights already granted, the Shafi‘i on the other hand even when it is a question of assigning new rights. An absent man for example would not be recognised by the Ḥanafis as legitimate heir to an inheritance falling due while he was away, but he would be according to the Shafi‘is, as the latter assume that even during his absence he can obtain new rights.


ISTIŠKĀ (A.), prayer for rain. The treatises on canon law expound in what circumstances the hadith prescribes the istiṣâhāb prayer as an obligatory act or leaves it to individual descretion. They also give details of the special ritual to be observed in this prayer. This ritual comprises 1. a prayer of two rak'a performed in the morning outside the town; 2. the faithful ought to put on ordinary dress, without elaboration or luxury; 3. the prayer
is followed by two lá'atba, of which the first is accompanied by a turning of the cloak (a sympathetic rite to produce a change in the weather); 4. the déj which follows the prayer is a supplication for rain; 5. the usual takbir is replaced by an invocation intended to implore God's pardon (istišqāf). This prayer ought to be completed by a series of pious works recommended to the faithful (fasting, almsgiving). Prayers for rain by non-Muslims according to their religions (Jewish or Christian) are admitted and even recommended in orthodox Islam.

Rites and ceremonies to obtain rain are as ancient as man himself and vary not only according to different religious beliefs, but even among the different groups of human beings belonging to the same religion, as I have shown in my Quelques rites pour obtenir la pluie en temps de sécheresse chez les musulmans maghrébins dans Recueil de Mémô- res et de Textes publié en l'honneur du XIVe Congrès des Orientalistes, by the professors of the Collège impérial des Lettres et des Médecins, Alger 1905, p. 47-8). The ceremonies and rites, rather various in the Muslim world, even in the orthodox ritual, much impregnated with animism and magic, may however be grouped under several rubrics: adaptation to the cult of saints; physical and moral sufferings which the faithful impose upon themselves; formulas, songs and hymns; rites relating to a kind of divinity of rain, named ghadja or an analogous name in Bar- bary; sacrifices of victims and communal meals; sympathetic and symbolic acts.

In the article referred to, there will be found, in addition to useful bibliographical notes, references to analogous ceremonies in non-Muslim countries. There it will also be seen that for the Maghribi and other religious services have rather the character of agrarian festivals and they take place at a fixed period of the year, but not in every season.


(Alfred Bel).

ISTISLĀH (λ), i.e., to think that something is in the general interest. [See ISTISHĀH.]

ĪTĀ (א), a term in prosody, meaning the presence of the same word with the same sense used as a rhyme at the end of phrases of the same poem.

Bibliography: Ibn Kaisān in Wright, Opuscula Arabica, p. 56, 59 sqq.; Cheikh, ‘Im al-Adāb (Bairut 1897); Coupry, Traité de versif- ication arabe (Leipzig 1875), p. 185—9; La Khas- radjah, trans. with comm. by R. Basset (Alger 1900), p. 149.

(Alfred Ben Cheyeb).

IṬAK. [See ‘ABD, i. 18.]

IṬHĀNA ‘ASHARĪYA (Arabic ʾithnā ‘ashari, twelve, "the Twelvers", a name given in contrast to the Salafīyya [q.v.], the partisans of the seven imāms, to those Shi‘is who allow the series of twelve imāms and say that the imāmate passed from ‘Ali al-Ridā to his son Muḥammad al-Taṣi, to the latter’s son ‘Ali al-Naṣiḥ, then to his son al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskari al-Zaḵī, and finally to Muḥammad al-Mahdi, who disappeared and will come again at the end of time to announce the last judgement and to fill the earth with justice. The series of twelve imāms is made up as follows:


Such has been the succession which has been definitely admitted since the viith (xiith) century; but this sect has not always been in agreement with itself, and at one time numbered no less than eleven parties, without special names but distinguished from one another as follows: 1. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskari is not dead, he is only absent; 2. al- Ḥasan died without children, but he will return and raise from the dead; 3. Muḥammad his brother Djaḥar by will; 4. the latter died without leaving heirs; 5. Muḥammad son of ‘Ali is the imām; 6. al-Ḥasan had a son, two years before his death, who was called Muḥammad; 7. there was indeed a son, but he was born eight months after his father’s death; 8. al-Ḥasan died without children and the world is without an imām on account of the sins of men; 9. al-Ḥasan had a son, but he is not known; 10. an imām is necessary, but it is not known if he is descended from al-Ḥasan or not; 11. a stop is made at ‘Ali al-Ridā and the coming of the last imām is awaited, whereas the name al-Wāṣābiyya given to this party, i.e., those who suspend their judgement regarding the imām’s death. They were at first called Kaʿīya (Kāʿiyya), because, unlike the Wāṣābiyya, they admitted the reality of the imām’s death or, according to others, because they interrupted the line of the imāms at Muṣaḥ al-Ḵāzin, son of Djaḥar, in order to keep it exclusively in the line of his descendants. Others admitted after Muṣaḥ, the imāmate of his son Aḥmad, excluding ‘Ali al-Ridā; it is also said that Muhammad, the latter’s son, being very young at the time of his father’s death, had not been able to receive from him the training for the imāmate; others admitted his quality of imām, but asked which of his sons Muṣaḥ or ‘Ali should succeed him. After ‘Ali the same question arose between Djaḥar and al-Ḥasan. Those who admitted the imāmate of al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskari were called by objectors al-Ḥimārīyya because they describe the chosen imām as an ignoramus. After the death of al-Ḥasan, some adopted Djaḥar, the pretended son of a concubine, al-Ḥasan according to them not having left any children.

The Šafawids, who claimed descent from Muṣaḥ al-Ḵāzin, made the Shī‘a and more particularly the doctrine of the İtıhāna ‘ashariyya the state religion of Persia, as it still is. After his accession Shī‘a Isma‘īl (906 = 1500) gave formal orders to the preachers of Aḏharbāйdžān to preach the sermon in the name of the twelve imāms, and to the muʿāththīnān to add the Shī‘a formula: “I testify that ‘Ali is the saint of God”. The troops were ordered to put to death any objector.

The cult of the twelve imāms has attained an extraordinary importance among the Persians; hypostases of the Divinity, they direct the destinies
of the world, and preserve it and guide it. With them all is salvation; without them all is perdition (Gobineau, *Religions et philosophies*, p. 60). Their ministry, their intercession ( Intiās) are indispensable. Prayers with special formula are reserved for them; Sunday is sacred to Alī and Fāṭima; the second hour of each day is set to al-Ḥasan, the third to al-Ḥusayn, the fourth to Zain al-ʿĀbidin and so on. Pilgrimage to their tombs (ziyāra) procures special rewards.


**Īṭīkād** is only "belief" that a thing is so. It may be only the "belief" of the English "thinking", or the German "Glauben", or it may be a feeling perfectly assured, and so the word is used especially of belief in religious dogmas (Lane, *Doxy, Supplement*). It is then exactly equivalent to taṣdiq, firm acceptance in the mind of a thing as true, and is distinguished from imān, "faith" in that some held imān to cover works (amāl) and confession (ṣiṣṭ). Al-Tūfāzīnī, in his commentary on the *ʿAṣāf* of al-Nasafī (ed. Cairo 1921, p. 7) explains that some of the revealed precepts (ahākim sharıya) connect with manner of action and are called faršiya, "derivative", and amalıya, while others connect with belief (al-Īṭīkād) and are called asliya "essence" and ʿĪṭīkādiya (cf. al-Ḍabūrī, Ḥāshīya ʿalā Sharḥ Ibn Kāsim, Cairo 1321, i. 20; Ḥāshīya ʿalā Muḥ. al-Sanūsīyya, Cairo 1283, p. 11 sqq.; Lucanī, *Les prolégomes théol. de S.OUNASSI*, p. 4 sqq.; *Dict. of Tech. Terms*, s.v. ḫaṭm).

In consequence al-Īṭīkād is used much in the sense of al-ʿaql, the doctrine of the faith. The exact scholastic definition of the word evidently gave difficulty. In the ʿĪṭīkād is used much in the sense of al-ʿaql, the doctrine of the faith. The exact scholastic definition of the word evidently gave difficulty. In the *Dict. of Tech. Terms* (p. 954) two uses are distinguished: one generally known, "firm belief", and a rarer, "conviction, certainty". The first is a mental judgment, absolute (ṣiṣṭ), but susceptible of doubt (ṣiṣṭ, al-taṣākhkāb). The second is a mental judgment, absolute or preponderant (rājīḥ) and includes "ilim, "knowledge", which is a mental judgment incompatible with doubt or belief or opinion (ṣumāl). The second is sometimes called "certain knowledge" (al-āthār al-yaṣīn) and excludes "compound ignorance" (al-īṭāik al-murakkab), the ignorance that does not know that it is ignorance. Others distinguished the first Īṭīkād into two; that which corresponds to fact and that which does not. See IMĀN.

**Bibliography:** has been given in article.

(D. B. Macdonald.)

**Īṭīkād Khān**, title of a Kashmiri named Muḥammad Murād, who gained such an ascendency over the emperor Farrukhsīyar [q. v.] that he became his confidential adviser, received from him the title of Ruh al-Dawla Īṭīkād Khān Farrukhsīyar, and ultimately became his vazir. When Farrukhsīyar was blinded and deposed in 1714, Īṭīkād Khān was thrown into prison and his property confiscated, but he was subsequently released, and died in the reign of Mughal Emperor Shāh [q. v.]


**Īṭīkāf (A.)** is the name of a religious custom of which the main feature is that the believer retires for a time from the world in a mosque. The ʿĪṭīkāf is always considered meritorious (ṣunnā) and is numbered among those good works which are recommended in the law-books to be performed during the last ten days of Ramāḍān, in order to participate in the blessings of the holy Šarād night. According to the Muslim tradition, the Prophet also used to spend the last third of the month fasting in the mosque in Medina. On the *Lāliš al-Šarād* (Night of the Divine Decree) see Kurān, xiv, 2, xvii, 1-5; cf. Kurān, ii. 181. The question of what is to be considered the Šarād night is not settled. According to the view of most Muslim scholars, it must be assumed that one of the last ten nights of the month of fasting (especially one of the five odd nights, i.e. 21, 23, 25, 27 or 29 Ramāḍān) is meant. According to others — this was Abū Hanīfa's view — there are no indications that the Šarād night belonged to this period of the year.


**Īṭīkād al-Dawla**, (Arabic: support of the king), title of the Persian Prime Minister under the Safawīs; also called waṣīr-i ʿām, "great minister", nusewāb ("Naboh"), deputy or ʿām madīrī, "the hinge of Persia". As the chief administrator of the kingdom he possessed far-reaching powers and no document of the king was valid without his seal; his position however was exceedingly precarious as his fate depended entirely on his master's humour. A controller (māṣīr, supervisor) appointed by the king assisted him as secretary. The residence of the Prime Minister was near the royal palace in Iṣfāhān, in the vestibule of which he held his reception. At public audiences he stood on the right of the ruler and when the latter rode out through the city he accompanied him on the right, while his epithet waṣīr-i ʿām, "minister of the right". His dismissal resulted in his banishment to some town where he lived as a simple citizen. His salary consisted of a definite sum called rūsām, "fees", which he drew annually from the khāns or tribal chiefs whose interests he pledged himself to represent at court. In 1650 his income was estimated at 900 to 1000 tomans or £ 14,000 to £ 16,000.


(C. Huart.)
ITTĪḤĀD, 'becoming one'. Muslim scholastics distinguish two kinds of ittiḥād, 1) 'real' (ḥaḇīṣ); 2) 'metaphorical' (muqāṣīs). The former class has two subdivisions, according as the term is applied to two things which become one, e.g., Amr becomes Zaid, or Zaid becomes Amr; 2) to one thing which becomes another thing that was not existent, e.g., earth becomes some inanimate individual who did not previously exist. Ittiḥād in this 'real' sense is necessarily impossible; hence the saying, al-ittiḥād lā yattaḥṣīlūn. The 'metaphorical' class has three subdivisions, according as the term denotes a) one thing's becoming another thing by instantaneous or gradual transformation, e.g., water becomes air (in which case the real nature of water is destroyed by the removal of its specific form from its substance, and to this substance the specific form of air is added), or black becomes white (in which case one attribute of an object disappears and is replaced by another attribute); b) one thing's becoming another thing by division of complexity into a third thing results, e.g., earth becomes clay by the addition of water; c) the appearance of one person in the form of another, e.g., of an angel in the form of a human being. All these three species of 'metaphorical' ittiḥād actually occur. In the technical language of the Sufis, the name ittiḥād is given to the mystical union by which the creature is made one with the Creator, or to the theory that such a union is possible. This conception of the unitive state, like the parallel doctrine of ḥaḍālī, i.e. the doctrine that the Creator becomes incarnate in the creature, is generally regarded by the Sufis as heretical, on the ground that it involves homotheology and is therefore inconsistent with the true notion of divine unity (tawḥīd), which admits no real existence except that of God. Ittiḥād, thus understood, presupposes the existence of beings which are made one, whereas, according to the more orthodox mystics, human individuality is only a phenomenon that passes away in the One Eternal Reality (fānā f il-Ḥaḥīṣ). Sometimes the term ittiḥād is employed like the Sufistic waḥdat or tawḥīd, in reference to the doctrine that all things are non-existent in themselves, but derive their existence from God and, in this respect, are one with God (Abd al-Razāz al-Kashf al-Iṣlāḥ b al-S̱ajīf, ed. by Sprenger, p. 5). According to 'Ali b. Wafā (quoted by Sha'rān in al-Yaḥṣūb wa'l-Djawāhir, Bālāsh, 1277 A.H., p. 80, l. 18 sqq.), the meaning of ittiḥād in the terminology of the Sufis is "the passing away of that which is willed by the creature in that which is willed by God."


TWĀD (أ) means in Muslim law all that must be given or done as a guarantee of the fulfilment of what the other party is pledged to, in a contract or sale or other agreement.

(IYĀD, a great Arab tribe belonging to the Maʿaddī (Ismaʿīlī) group. Their genealogy is Iyād b. Nizār b. Maʿadd b. Adhānā. The Rabīʿa, Annār and Muffar were consanguineous tribes of the Iyād. A section of the Iyād professed Christianity. The poet Abū Dūrādī, famous for his descriptions of the horse, and the celebrated Khāṣ b. Ṣalīma were members of the Iyād.

At first they dwelt in Tihāma up to the borders of Najdījīn [q. v.]. In the first half of the 8th century they emigrated in large bodies to Eastern Ḥira and thence to Mesopotamia. Among their settlements were Anbār (they are said to have the first to introduce the Arabic characters there), Ain Ubāğī (behind Anbār), Sīnād, Takrit, Baṭn Iyād (lying towards Kūfah), Bāḏīja, Ḥalijā, al-Dījāl (in the Iyād, Jōwār Zarafah, al-Ḥafa, Khīlād, Mawīl (Mawīḥāb), al-Mustarād, al-Salawār, Shībāk, al-Shāfikā (in the Iyād), Sāwār 'Aṣḥādī, al-Tha'lābiya (between Mekka and Medina), al-'Uḏmān. Among the waters of the Iyād were Ḥaşāf and al-Ḥīṣāf.

A section of the Iyād, probably before these large emigrations to the Ḥira, joined the Kašfā in the latter part of the 7th century, and another remained in Ṭādir Bāsha [q. v.]. We also find scattered settlements of the Iyād in Syria, e.g. in Antioch, Ḥims (Emessa), ᴨaḥab, and in Greek territory at Ankyra (Angora in Asia Minor), Bâgγas (Pâšhā), etc.

History: Towards the beginning of the 10th century of our era a quarrel arose between the Iyād and Muddar regarding the possession of the Kašā, which also involved dominion over Mecca, after the two tribes in alliance had driven the Tājurhum from Mecca. The Iyād were defeated and emigrated to the Ḥira, where they established themselves mainly in Ain Ubāğī and Anbār. Some settlements south of al-Ḥira during the first period of their sojourn in the Ḥira the Iyād were exposed to the invasions of Djaḥīma b. Malik of the Aṣd, whose rule extended over all the Arabs in the Iyād, Djaḥīma demanded from them the surrender of their relative, 'Adī b. Rabī'a; after long hesitation the Iyād submitted and delivered 'Adī up, who then married Rīš, sister of Djaḥīma.

In the Ḥira the Iyād seem to have acknowledged the suzerainty of the Lakhmīd princes of al-Ḥira. During the wars of Mundūrī b. Māʿ al-Samā against the Kinda chief al-Ḥarīth b. 'Amr b. Ḥujjār we find them in Mundūrī's train. At the beginning of the 8th century, the Iyād made inroads into Persian territory. They crossed the Euphrates. A detachment of Persian cavalry sent against them was completely destroyed by them near Kūfah [see Dair al-Zamālīm]. To defend himself against their inroads and to take vengeance on them, Khusrav (Kisā) Anšīrīnān sent an army against them under Mālik b. Ḥarīzah, which is said to have included a detachment of the Bakr b. Wālī [q. v.]. In spite of the warning given by their fellow tribesman, the poet Lākīt, the Iyād were surprised and put to flight. The Persians followed them and, according to a tradition, inflicted a considerable defeat on them at the village of al-Ḥurrah. In consequence of their defeat, they are said to have retired into Syria. One section of them reached Byzantine territory at Ankyra, where they found others of their tribe already settled. An isolated tradition mentions a punitive expedition by the Persian king Sābir (Sabūrī) Dhu 'l-Akṭāf in the 10th century against the Iyād, but there is probably confu-
sion here between Sabûr and Kisrâ. In the battle of Dhl Kâr [see BAKR b. WILH] they fought alongside the Kûdâ'î tribes of Mesopotamia under Kâlid b. Yaqûd al-Bahraini on the side of the Persians. A section of the Iyâd had made secret arrangements with the Bakr and took to flight during the battle, thereby throwing the Persian lines into disorder. After the battle of Dhl Kâr they, like the other Christian Arab tribes of Mesopotamia, remained a few more years under Persian suzerainty. In the battle of 'Ain Tamr (near Anbar) we find them on the side of the Persians along with the Mesopotamian tribes under Mîrdhân b. Bahrâm Dhubin. In the reign of Abû Bakr, in the year 12 (634), a large number of the Iyâd, like many of the Tabîm and the Christian Arab tribes of Mesopotamia, joined the false prophetess Sâdîjâh [q.v.]. In the same year Kâlid b. al-Walid [q.v.] inflicted a serious defeat on them and the Persians, on whose side they fought, at Fîrâd (on the East bank of the Euphrates). In the caliphate of 'Omar, in the spring of the year 17 (638), the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius made the last effort to regain the province of Syria, which had been lost to the Muslims. For this purpose he sent a large army which included Iyâd along with the tribes on the Euphrates and Tigris to Hibûn, the siege of which was begun. In the meanwhile the Muslims invaded Mesopotamia and conquered Takrit, secretly supported by the Christian Arab soldiers in the city, among whom were Iyâd, who then adopted Islam. When the Moslem tribes besieging Hibûn heard of a raid into Mesopotamia and the approach of an army, they abandoned the Byzantine army in order to defend their threatened homes. The Arabs in Khinnân, Harb, and other Syrian cities, who had previously joined the Byzantine army, negotiated secretly with Kâlid b. al-Walid and attacked the Byzantines, who were beaten and had to take to flight. The remnants of the Byzantine troops including Iyâd retired to Cîlicia, whither they were followed by the Muslims and almost entirely wiped out. When in the following year 18 = 639, Iyâd b. Ghânam succeeded Abû 'Ubayda [q.v.] as governor of Hibûn, Northern Syria and Mesopotamia, all the Moslem tribes submitted and adopted Islam with the exception of the Iyâd, who fled to Cappadocia in Asia Minor. Here, however, they only enjoyed their security for a brief space, for the Caliph 'Omar demanded their extradition from the Emperor Heraclius under a threat of reprisals against the Christians in his provinces, and Heraclius was forced to agree. Four thousand of the Iyâd then went to Syria and Mesopotamia and submitted to the Caliph. In later times we hear almost nothing of them.

Bibliograph: Yakût, Mug'am, see Ind. s.v. and iv. 978; Hamdânî, Dâjîsra, see Ind. s.v.; Ta'hari (ed. de Goede), i. 685, 752–6, 1032, 1034, 1108–11, 1111, 2061, 2062, 2074–5, and Ind.; Ibn Hishâm, Sira (ed. Wüstenfeld), i. 57; Âghânis, iv. 75, xiv. 41, 42, xx. 9, 49, xx. 23–5, Abu 'l-Fâlak, 'Ilustria antichissima (ed. Fichau), p. 194; Bâlûtârî (ed. de Goede), p. 164, 283; Masûdî (ed. Païris), Ind. s.v.; Wüstenfeld, Genol. Tal., 2nd section: Ismâ'îl tribes, Table A. 4, and Register, p. 244; Causin de Perceval, Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'islamisme (Paris 1847–8), s. Ind.; Blau, Arabien in stichtes Jahrhundert in Zeitschr. der Deutschen Morgen., Gewiss., xxiii. 567 sq. (J. Schleifer.)


After studying in his native town he went in 567 (1114) to Cordova where he devoted himself particularly to Hâdîth and attended the lectures of Abû Muhammad 'Abî 'Allâh b. 'Attab and Abu 'l-Walid Ibn Rûmân. His life lasted a hundred. He returned to his native town and held the office of Kâdî where his administration was much appreciated. In 531 (1136–7) he became Kâdî of Cordova but after a time again became Kâdî of Cûta. He was one of the first to welcome the arrival of the Almoravids and went to Salã to pay homage to their chiefs, but when he saw in 543 (1148–9) that the Almoravids dynasty was weakened by discords he fled from his native town and took refuge in Marrâkûsh, where he died and was buried near the Bâb Ailân.


IYAD b. MUSA — IZMIR.
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57; Ibn Farhan, al-Dibâdî, Fas 1316, p. 177.
Ibn al-Khârî, Dja'hdawat al-Insâlî, Fas 1309, p. 277; al-Kattânî, Saluat al-Anfâs, Fas 1316, i. 151; al-Mâkâtî, Akhbar al-Kiyâh fi Akhbar
‘Iyâd, i. (all publ.), Tunis 1222; Wustenfeld, Die Geschichtsreiber d. Araber, Gottingen 1882, p. 89, n. 246; Pons Boigues, Ensayo bio-bibliogra-
ico, Madrid 1893, p. 218, n. 174, and p. 595; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., i. 369 sq., ii. 700; Haart, Litt. arab., p. 212; Moh. Ben
Cheneel, Et. sur les pers. nom. dans l’Idjâzâ du châbî Abd al-Qadir al-Brî, n. 90; T. An-
drae, Die Person Mohammeden, Upsala 1917, p. 60.

112, 118 q. 147 sqq. (Moh. Ben Cheneel).

IYAS b. MU‘AYNA was appointed kâdi of Bašra by ʿOmar b. ʿAbd al-‘Azîz and died at the age of 76 in 121 or 122 (739-740). He has be-
come proverbial in Arabic literature on account of the many examples of ready wit and intuiti-
on (azkanu min ḫiyâṣ, Freytag, Prov. Arab., i. 593) related of him, which were collected by so-
early a writer as al-Madâ‘înî in a work (Zakân ʿiyâṣ). In this way he has become a familiar figure in literature (cf. R. Bassel, Revue des Traditions papouases, vii. 1937).

Bibliography: Ibn Khalilîn, Wafâyât, ed. Cairo 1299, i. 143 sqq.; Ibn Nubâa, Sharh al-Utnî ʿala Risâlat Ibn Zaîdîn, Alexandria 1290, p. 75 sqq. (on the margin of al-Safadi, Sharh Lamiyat al-Asâqim, i. 142 sqq.; al-Sha-
rrî, Com. on al-Ḥarîrî, Majmî‘at (vii.).

IZMID (older forms: IZNÜMÎD; İZNİMD; in Ibn Khordâbwheb and Idrîsî: İKÜMİDAYA; in mo-
ternal times officially written İzmîr), the ancient Ni-
cmeida, capital of the ancient Lias (nûzərîrîpîk) of the same name (cf. Kôdîa-III). The town was taken by the Saljûqis on their invasion of Asia Minor at the end of the 11th century and belonged to the lands of Salâmîn b. Kutlumûsh (470-479 = 1078-1085) who had chosen Nicaea as his capital; shortly after his death it was recaptured by Alexius I Comnenus (Anna Comnena, ed. Reifferscheidt, i. 212, cf. 247, ii. 72) and, apart from the brief period when the Latin Emperors of Constantinople held the town (1204-1207), remained in possession of the Byzantines till it was taken from them by the Ottomans under Ürğânî, according to the Turkish sources, in 727 (1325-26) or 726 (1326-7) or 731 (1320-31), according to Byzantine sources, in 1338, cf. v. Hammer, Gesch. des Osm. Reiches, i. 85 and 580; (for the legends associated with the Turkish conquest see Leucclavis, Hist., p. 186-
90; Sa’d al-Dîn, i. 34-37; Christo Papadopoulos, p. 65 sq.). In 1399 Marshad Boucicaut had to turn back from the strong walls of the city (J. Dela-
ville Le Roux, La France en Orient au XIVe Siècle, p. 371); in 1402 it was sacked by a body of Timur’s troops (Ducas, Bonn ed., p. 72). Under Turkish rule İzmîd acquired special importance as an arsenal for the navy and as a yard for building small merchant vessels from the wood supplied by the rich forests of the neighbourhood. The arsenal, said to have been founded by the Kö-
prîli’s, abandoned since the middle of last century, was to have been restarted again by English engineers. The population of the town may be put at 25,000, of whom the majority are Muslims, and the non-Muslim element is represented by a strong Armenian community (which immi-
gated from Persia at the beginning of the 18th
century), several hundred Greeks, and a small Jewish community. Since 1873 İzmîd has been connected by rail with Constantinople (terminal station Hai-
dar Paşa; distance 70 miles) and since 1892 with Angora. — Only insignificant ruins exist of the ancient and mediaeval buildings; the Byzantine for-
tifications on the hill are better preserved, which Busbecq and Belon still saw in their original form in the xvith century. Of the Turkish buildings we may mention the madrasa founded by Salih al-Or-
în in the upper city (originally a church; restored by ‘Abd al-Maqlîd); the mosques of Per-
tew Paşa, Muhammed Bey and ‘Abd al-Salâm Bey, built by the architect Sinân, the baths of Rustam Paşa and the Khan of Pertew Paşa. The pleasure palace with park (zîrâ‘ baghîsî) built by Murâd IV has disappeared; another was built by Muhammed II and restored by ‘Abd al-
‘Azîz. Among the Greek churches the oldest is that of St. Panteleimon, said to be also the tomb of this patron of the city; destroyed in the reign of Murâd IV; it was rebuilt in 1760 and again restored in 1861. In the Chapal al-Chams (Çick Mevâidî), where Emerich Thököley, prince of Transylvania, spent his last years, till his death on Sept. 13, 1705 in a voluntary exile (De la Motraye, Voyages, i. 309; Paul Lucas, Voy. dans la Grèce, l’Asie Min., etc. Amsterdam 1714, i. 49); his remains buried in the Armenian cemetery were brought to Hungary in 1906 with his tombstone (cf. von Hammer, Ümlblick, p. 192).

Bibliography: Tomeschek, Zur histor. To-
postothie von Kleinasiaten, p. 7; Tavernier, Les six Voyages, i. 5—6; Grelot, Rêv. nouvelle d’un Voyage à Constantinople (Paris 1681), p. 49—
52; Ewaïq, Traveîs, ii. 31 sqq. (ii. 65—65 of the Turkish ed.); Kütîb Çelibi, Lîbiye tâbihat, p. 66; De la Motraye, Voyages, i. 288 sqq. R. Pococke, Descr. of the East, ii. 2, 96 sqq.; v. Hammer, Ümlblick auf einer Reis von Constanti-
opol nach Brussa, Pest 1813, p. 142—147; Texier, Descr. de l’Asie Mineure, i. 17—28; Ausland, 1857, p. 255—256; v. d. Goltz, Anato-
lique Ausflüge, p. 77—81; Cuinet, La Tur-
quie d’Asie, iv. 356 sqq.; Christo Papadopolous, Bravcî (Constantinople 1867), p. 59—77; P. B. Pogodin and O. F. Wulf, Nikomedia in Nach-
richten des Russ. Arch. Inst. in Konstantinopel, ii. (Odessa 1897), p. 77—184 (Russ.).

( J. H. MOROTTMANN.)

IZMIR (SMIRNA), the most important commercial town in Asiatic Turkey and the residence of the Wali of the province of Aidin. The form İzmir (in İbn Baṭṭûta: Yâmîn) corre-
sponds to the form used by Westerners in the middle ages, Smir, Zmirra, etc. (Tomaschek, p. 28; Esmirî in Ram Muṭanîr, c. 202; İsmîrî in Schilbierger). On the incursion of the Saljûqis into Asia Minor at the end of the xith century the Turk Turşus (Tayzâk, only in Anna Com-
nena), the father-in-law of Kılıçdâr Arslân I, who lived in Nicaea, established himself in Smyrna and undertook from there his campaigns of conquest against the islands of the Archipelago and the Hellas: it was only after the Saljûqis were driven from Nicaea (June 1207) that Smyrna was restored to Byzantine rule. John Vatazes Dukas, emperor of Nicaea (1232—1255), laid out the great system of defences on the Pagus hill (Corp. Inscr. Græc. N. 8749), which commands the town. After the dissolution of the Saljûq king-
The town was twice visited by earthquakes and almost destroyed. In the first, which took place on July 10, 1688 (Râmasân d. 12, 1099), the Sandjak Ka‘fesî was overwhelmed by the waves, most of the buildings collapsed, and thousands of people — at the lowest estimate 5,000 — perished among the ruins (Kâshîd, Ta‘rîhî, i. 147; Rycaut, Tur- kish History, p. 301 sq.; Carayon, Relations inédites des Missions de la Compagnie de Jésus, p. 291 sqq.; Pacificus Smit, Vier jaren in Turkije, p. 178 sqq.; 246 sq.; De la Motraye, Voyages, i. 182 sq.; Slars, p. 76, 128). The second took place on July 3 and 5, 1778 and did equal damage, chiefly through the conflagration which broke out among the falling buildings (Bjornstahl, Briève, iv. 131—147; Slars, p. 132 sq.). Almost equally dangerous was the rioting which broke out on March 14, 1797 as a result of a quarrel between Cephalonians and Croats, and spread fire and death through the town (Djewdet, op. cit., vi. 220 sqq.; Zinkeisen, op. cit., vii. 13 sq.). During the war of the Porte with Egypt, on Febr. 19, 1835, emissaries of Ibrahim Pasha, after he had defeated the Turks at Könya (21 Dec. 1832) and advanced to Kütâhya, occupied Smyrna for MuhammadAli but retired again after a few weeks (Rosen, Gesch. der Türkîke, i. 171).

Smyrna is singularly poor in historical monuments. Nothing worth mentioning is left of the remains of antiquity. The amphitheatre and the circus, in which St. Polycarp, the patron saint of Smyrna, suffered martyrdom, were destroyed in the xvith century and the materials used to build the Bezesten and the Wazîrhân (v. infra). The alleged tomb of Polycarp near the circus was changed into the grave (turbe) of a Muslim saint at the beginning of the xvith century. The Byzantine castle on Mt. Pagus has for years been abandoned and left to decay; the old mosque and the great cistern (kârîk direk), both presumably of Byzantine origin, are in ruins, and the historical foundation inscription of John Vatatzes, as well as the ancient colossal head of the so-called Augustus, which was formerly built into the wall over the entrance gate of the castle and formed the badge of the town, have in recent times been ruthlessly destroyed. The Turks considered this head to he that of Kaidafâ, queen of Sabba and therefore called the castle Kaidafâ Ka‘fesî, which in the popular language has been corrupted into Kâfîdî Ka‘fesî (Velvet Castle). Among the numerous mosques (ca. 20 large, dîjmî, and 46 small, mardhî) the following are specially mentioned: Hîşar Dîjmî (said to be the old Frankish cathedral), Shadrewân Dîjmî, Kestânepârâ Dîjmî (traditionally said to have been at one time a Greek church), Kemer-alî Dîjmî, Hâdidî Hzâsîn Dîjmî; the large Wazîrhân and the Bezesten were built in the years 1546 and 1547 by Grand Vizier Ahmad Köprülü. Other old kânîn (warehouses) are the Derwisbegli Khân, Madama Khân, and the Kânî Əlhamn-zâde Khân. A peculiarity of Smyrna are the numerous arcades of the Frankish quarter, the so called Ferîkhânîn (corrupted from Frenkhhânîn). In the year 1108

dom of Könya, Aidin, Amir of Ephesus, seized the town about 1320, and it once more, as in the days of Tzachas, became the base for piratical raids against the islands of the Archipelago and the merchant ships of the Franks. To put an end to such naval powers concerned combined under the aegis of the Pope and stormed Smyrna on Oct. 28th 1344 (Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant, i. 538). The Knights of Rhodes, to whom the defence of the town was entrusted, built at the harbour the fort of St. Peter, near the later customs-house, which survived up till about fifty years ago. The citadel, on the other hand, remained in the hands of the Aidin-oglu; Bayzad I, who dispossessed them, installed a sâhibî (city governor) there. It was not till January 1403 that Timûrânrek stormed the Frankish fort and drove the knights out of Smyrna (Şurar al-Dîn, Zafaranma, ii. 484—477; Dukas, p. 72 sqq.; Chalkokondylas, p. 161, cf. von Hammer, Gesch. d. osman. Reiches, i. 332 sq. and 626 sq. After the withdrawal of Timûrânrek from Asia Minor the adventurer Djiunâd [q.v., i. 1063 sq.] seized the town; on his overthrow, about 1425, the town passed definitely under Ottoman rule.

The further history of the town is of little general interest. On Sept. 13, 1472, Smyrna was attacked by the Venetian fleet under Pietro Mocenigo, plundered and set on fire (Hopf, Chroniques Gréco-Romanes, p. 207; Cippico, Delle Guerre dei Veneziani nell’Asia, p. xxvi sqq.; Zinkeisen, Gesch. d. osman. Reiches, ii. 405). In the later wars of the Turks with the European powers, the latter, in view of the numerous European inhabitants have repeatedly refrained from attacking the town, for example the Venetians in the autumn of 1694, when after the fall of Chios the Turkish fleet had retreated before them into the Gulf of Smyrna (Kantemir, Gesch. des Osman. Reiches, p. 649; Zinkeisen, op. cit., v. 175) and the Russians in 1770 after they had destroyed the Turkish fleet near Çeçme (Ypsilanti, Ta mêrî ta’rîx âlmosîn, p. 466 sq.; cf. v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Osman. Reiches, viii. 358). As a defence against such attacks from the sea, the town after the battle in the Dardanelles (June 26, 1575, iv. 567), in which Venice built defences at the narrowest part of the Gulf on Cape Sandjak Burnu, called Sandjak Ka‘fesî (saluting fort) or Venîkâîfî, which was completely destroyed by the earthquake of July 10, 1688 and then imperfectly rebuilt. In modern times the batteries were remounted and mine barriers laid during the recent wars.

From the land Smyrna has been repeatedly ravaged by the turbulent Djîalî and Ra‘îa, who were a plagia to Anatolia from the beginning of the xvith century, e.g. in 1600 by the hordes of Kalenderoghlu and Kara Sâdî (Sandys, Travailles, 6th ed., London 1658, p. 12; cf. v. Hammer, op. cit., iv. 398), 1625 by Djennet-oglu of Karasi (Roe, Negotiations, p. 410; Zinkeisen, op. cit., iv. 55 sqq.), and in 1767 by Serbey-oglu of Köhînâs (Pococke, ii. 2 p. 38; Isplanti, op. cit., p. 334).

Equally dreaded were the regular visits of the Barbary corsairs, who till the conquest of Algeria by the French had the permission of the Porte to recruit their crews from Smyrna and the neighbouring (Dumont, Voyages, 1699, iv. 106 sqq.; Tournefort, ii. 198; Dijewdet, Ta‘rîhî, iv. 23; vil. 183, x. 233). The Jewish community of Smyrna produced in the xviith century the Messianic he-

retic Sabbatai Șebî, the founder of the Dönme [q.v.] sect (crypto-Jewish Muslims), which is still represented by a small body (cf. the contemporary narrative of Rycaut, the English consul at Smyrna, the continuation of Ktôles, History of the Turks, ii. 174 sqq.).
(1696—7) a mint was instituted in Smyrna to strike ducats (asbrātī) and silver piastres (abrākī); it closed after a few years however (Raaβ, Tuβrīkī, i 2262; cf. Isma'īl Ghālib, Tažvīnī-i Mesūlīkāt-i 'Othūmīnīye, no. 597—600). Its great importance as a place of export for the products of the soil and industries of the interior (guns, figs, cotton, poppy seeds, opium, valonia, licorice, carpets, etc.) was attained by Smyrna in the xvith century. The goods of more distant lands, e.g. Persian silk and the camelots of Angora in those days and down to modern times found their way to the west via Smyrna. Numerous English and Guelf merchants settled there and the English colony had a distinguished part in the development of the country, economic and cultural. Trade with Persia and Angora resulted in a considerable immigration of Armenians. The Jews (Şehārdīm) had the exclusive right to serve as brokers. The Europeans lived in the Frank quarter and conducted themselves there with the same freedom as in their own land. They were later joined by a strong community of trading Greeks, while the Muḥammadan element was gradually driven into the back ground. Gaur Izmir ("ünafīd Smyrna") therefore became a name of the town; the quarter of the town inhabited by the English and already so called by Timūr's time in contrast to the suburb of which remained in the hands of Muslims (Izmîr-i Gâbūr in Şaraf al-Dīn). — The present population is estimated at about 300,000, of whom 90,000 are Muslims, 110,000 Greeks, 30,000 Jews, 15,000 Armenians, 55,000 foreigners, including 30,000 Hellenes.


IZNIK, the ancient and Byzantine Nicaea (Νίκαια in Ibn Khordādhbih and al-İdriṣî), was besieged in vain by the Arabs in their first campaigns against Byzantium in 717 and 725 (Theophanes, ed. de Door, i, 397 and 405 sqq.) and fell at the beginning of 1018 into the hands of the Saldjuk Salujmân, son of Kûtûmlûsh, who made his residence there. The first Crusaders under Walter Habenichts were severely defeated before Nicaea in 1096 by Alp Arslân, son and successor of Salujmân; next year, however, the town could not withstand the onslaught of the Crusaders, led by Godfrey de Bouillon, and surrendered on June 19, 1097 to the Byzantines in alliance with the Crusaders, in whose possession it remained till the Ottoman invasion. Sultan 'Othmân I is said to have attacked Nicaea, but it was not till the time of Orkhan that it was taken after a prolonged siege in 1331; he moved his capital thither for a time (Ašḥăk-paşazade and Leunclavius, Hist., p. 195; cf. Nicephoras Gregorios, ii, 508 sqq.). In 1402 the town was taken and devastated by a raiding body of Timūr's troops (Ducas, p. 72; Şeref al-Dīn, Zağvānumā, ii, 454 sqq.), but it soon recovered from this blow, and it is described as flourishing and prosperous at the time of the rebellion of Prince Muṣṭafâ (Leunclavius, Hist., p. 525, l. 46); Bâyiāzīd II is said to have intended after the death of his father, Muḥammad II, to renounce the throne and retire to Nicaea.

The decline of the town began about the middle of the xvith century; the population then estimated at 10,000 (Gretel) has since sunk to 1500. The once flourishing manufacture of faience tiles (imīr), which Otter (Voyage en Turquie, i, 44) still found working in 1736, has now ceased. Only a slight memory of it, no longer understood, remains in the name İznik (or Cin İznik, "faience İznik"), which the town popularly bears. The present village occupies a small part of the area described by the town walls and forms with its district a community (mâzkâya) of the Kašā of Yenişehr, in the wilâyet of Khudawendi (Brussa), while İznik was formerly the capital of a kašā of the sâlet of Kôşâ-cheli. The general decay has also affected the ancient buildings. The best preserved are the Roman and Byzantine walls consisting of a double rampart (best described by Prokosh and Texier; cf. thereon Körte, Mitt. des Deutsch. Arch. Institutes, Athens, xxiv, 398—409) with their monumental gateways and 238 towers (Texier). The Byzantine part of these defences dates from the time of Leo III the Isaurian, who had them built here after the Arab invasion of 726 (Corp. Insbr. Grec., no. 8864); Michael III in 838, and later Theodore Lascaris (Corp. Insbr. Grec., no. 8745—8747) completed and improved them. Of the foundations of Sultan Orkhan only a madrasa is preserved in the xvith century; the mosque (restored in the xvirh century by Sinân for Salujmân I) has with its imārât been dismantled for centuries; of the buildings of the family of Dândarli Khair al-Dîn Pasha, the Yeshil Dijâmi (built in 780—794 A. H.) and the mosque of Mukûrine Khaṭūn, dedicated to Esrefzâde Rûmi (flourished in the reign of Muḥammad II; cf. Mitt. d. Seminars f. d. Sprachen zu Berlin, v. 2,
are tolerably well preserved; the tomb of Eshrefeide is still a much visited place of pilgrimage. Of the three churches which the Greeks still had at the end of the xvi. century (Crusius, Turcogracia, p. 204), those of St. Theodori and of St. George have disappeared; the third, that of the Καθεδρική Παναγια, restored in 1607, is a Byzantine building of the 16th century with additions of the 18th and of interest on account of its old mosaic decorations.


On the Greek Church: Oskar Wulf, Die Konsistore in Nicaea und ihre Menäken, Strassburg 1903; also: Α’ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως εἰς Νησίαν ὑπὸ τὸν Καβανέρα Μαρκουζά, Constantinople 1909.

Izrail. (In European literature one also finds Astrail), the name of the angel of death, one of the four archangels (next to Djielbrīl, Mīkhāīl, Astrail). The name is perhaps a corruption of a word which is given by Eisenmenger, Eudekräfte Judentum, li. 333, as the name of the prince of Hell. Like Astrail, whose office of trumpet-blower at the last judgment is sometimes given to him, he is of cosmic magnitude; if the water of all the seas and rivers were poured on his head, not a drop would reach the earth. He has a seat (parv) of light in the fourth or seventh heaven, on which one of his feet rests; the other stands on the bridge between paradise and hell. He is however also said to have 70,000 feet.

The description of his appearance agrees almost exactly with that in Jewish literature: he has 4000 wings and his whole body consists of eyes and tongues, the number of which corresponds with that of the living. He however, is also said to have four faces. At first he was an angel like others. When Allah wanted to create man, he ordered Djielbrīl to snatch from the earth for this purpose a handful of its main constituents. The earth, however, stirred up by Iblis, offered resistance, so that neither Djielbrīl, nor Mīkhāīl nor Astrail could carry out the commission. But Izrail managed to do it.

On account of his hard-heartedness (fiṭlat al-rehnuma) Allah then appointed him angel of death.

On account of his strength he is also master of death. When Allah had created Death, he summoned the angels to look at him. When they saw his astonishing strength, they fell down unconscious and remained lying for thousand years. Then they awakened and said: "Death is the most powerful of creatures". But Allah said: "I have appointed Izrail to be lord over him".

Several angels of death are mentioned, as in Jewish literature. One said that Izrael deals with the souls of the prophets while the souls of ordinary men are under his khaṭiṣr. Special stress is laid on the beginning of Sūrah Ixxix, as authority for a number of angels of death: "By those who tear forth and by those who draw forth" etc. The former are said to be those angels who drag the souls of the unbelievers by force from their bodies, while the latter are meant those who have to separate the souls of the believers from their bodies. The explanation of the verse however is not certain. In Sūrah xxviii. 11 mention is made of the angel of death (in the singular).

Izrail keeps a roll of mankind. But he does not know the date of death of the individuals. Whether one belongs to the blessed or the damned, he sees from the fact that the names in the first category are surrounded by a bright and those in the second by a dark circle.

When the day of a man’s death approaches, Allah causes to fall from the tree below his throne the leaf on which the man’s name is written. Izrail reads the name and has to separate the person’s soul from his body after 40 days.

But there are some people who strive against the separation, and object that the angel of death is acting arbitrarily. The latter then goes back to Allah and asks his experience. Allah gives him as a credential an apple from Paradise on which the kasmala [q.v.] is written; when the man sees this, he yields.

Man also has other means of making it difficult for the angel of death to carry out his task. If the latter wants to creep into his throat to fetch out his spirit, the dying man recites a ḏikr [q.v.] and thus closes the entrance. The angel then returns to Allah, who advises him to try it with the dying man’s hand. If the latter however is just making a ṭadak [q.v.] the angel’s entrance is again impossible. Finally however Izrail writes the name of God on the man’s hand. Then the bitter feeling of separation disappears and the angel can enter to fetch the spirit. — On the other hand, it is also said that he pierces men with a poisoned lance. Another account is as follows: When a believer is on his deathbed, the angel of death stands at his head and draws his soul out as gently as water runs out of a skin. He hands it to his assistants who carry it through the seven heavens up to the highest and then place it with the body in the grave (the soul’s journey to heaven; cf. Bousset in Archiv f. d. Religionswissenschaft, iv.),

But if an unbeliever die, the angel of death tears the soul out of his body in the roughest fashion. The gate of heaven closes before the soul, as it is carried up, and it is thrown down to earth again. Characters like İdris, Iyās, İsa and al-Khādir [q.v.], as is well known, were not subject to death. As regards Moses the same thing could not be asserted; but the Bible throws a veil over his death. Muslim tradition accordingly says that Moses defended himself against the angel of death, who came with the fatal message to him, and bruised his eye. Allah said to the angel when he came back:
If he places his hand on a cow, as many years are to be granted him as his hands covers hairs'. "And then?" asked Moses. "Death," said Allah. — It is also related that the angel of death came to Moses with an apple from Paradise; when he had smelled this, he died.

On an experience of Solomon's with the angel of death, see al-Baidawi on Sūra xxxi. 34; on his visit to Idrīs, see that article.

Bibliography: The Commentaries on Sūra ii. 28; xxxii. 11 and Lxxix. 1; M. Wolff, Muḥammaschānā Schachologie, p. 5 sqq.; al-Qazwīnī, al-Durrā al-Fāhṣihā, ed. I. Gauätter, p. 7 sqq.; al-Kisāʾī, Ḥalīfah al-Makāli, Leiden 1925, 536 Warn., f. 26 sq.; al-Tabarī (ed. Leiden), i. 87; al-Ṭabarī, Maqālāt al-Dhahāb (ed. Paris), i. 51; ibn al-Aṯīr (ed. Turnberg), i. 20; al-Diyārīkī, Taʾrīkh al-Damāmi (Cairo 1283), i. 36; al-Thaʾlābī, Ḫaqq al-Anḥīyā (Cairo 1290), p. 23, 216 sqq.; Mudjir al-Dīn al-Ḥamālī, Kitāb al-Uṣūl al-Dījālī (Cairo 1283), i. 16 sqq.; al-Bukhrāʾī, Dīmānā, bāb 69; (Mutahhar b. Tāhir al-Makālī), Kitāb al-Badʾ waʾl-Taʾrīkh, ed. Huard, i. 175, ii. 214; Mīḥāʾīr al-Maṣḥūlī, trans. by A. N. Matthews, i. 365 sqq.; Bodenschatz, Kirchliche Verfassung der heutigen Juden (Erlangen 1748), iii. 93; Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenthum (Königsberg 1711, i. ch. xix., ii. 333. (A. J. WENSINCK)

IZZ AL-DAWLA, honorific name frequently assumed by Muhammadan princes, e.g. Bakhtiyar[i.e.v.].

IZZ AL-DIN, honorific name, for princes often combined with the preceding (Izā al-Dawla wa Dīn). However, not only princes bear this name, but scholars also.

IZZET MOLLÁ, KECİDDİ-ZADE MEHMET, 'Izzet Efendi, an important Ottoman statesman and poet in the reign of Mahmūd II. Born in 1200 (1785-6) in Constantinople, the son of the kâdıl-asker Şəlîh Efendi, he devoted himself to a theological and legal career, following in his father's footsteps. When he had reached the position of Mollá of Galata, he was subsequently involved in the fall of his patron Hayet Efendi, as he had written satirical verses on his behalf. He was therefore banished to Keşhān near Rodosto. Pardoned a year later he regained Sultān Mahmūd's favour, who chose him as a statesman. 'Izzet received the highest religious offices. In 1245 (1829-30) he acted as a representative at the peace negotiation with Russia. His openly displayed bias in favour of peace at any price brought upon him the enmity of the war party, whose intrigues succeeded in getting him banished to Siwās. There he died soon after his arrival in 1245 (1829-30), of poison, it is said. One of his sons is the statesman Fuʾād Pasha.

In addition to numerous chronograms he composed two diwāns, Behār-i Efkar (Springtime of Thoughts), concluded about 1240 (1824-5) and Ḩaḍān-i Aṯār (Autumn of Actions), only put together after his death. Neither transcends mediocrity. 'Izzet however won great renown through his two romantic Mathnawi: Gürben-i Aškaš (Rose-garden of Love), completed 1227 (1812), lithogr. Constantinople 1263, is a short romance on the old Persian model with a strain of Mevlewi mysticism. The subject matter shows a pretty and original imagination. Still more attractive is his thoroughly characteristic Mathnawi composed during his exile in Keşhān with the ambiguous title Miḥṣir-Keşhān ("The Sufferer" or "Suffering in the place of exile at Keşhān"). This is the poetical diary of an exile, in which ghazals, iṣṣāds and chronograms are scattered through the Mathnawi verses, and it gives an interesting insight into the world of ideas of a highly educated dignitary of the time and especially truthfully reflects provincial life in European Turkey at the period of the beginning of Mahmūd's reforms. The work, the language of which is already remarkably national Turkish and is interspersed with Turkish every-day idioms, secures 'Izzet Mollá a distinguished place among the reformers of the language and the modernists. It was lithographed in 1269 at Constantinople. Zīyā Pasha also published it in his Khaṭlabā. Türk Mathnawiyat (1292).


IZZI (WAGHATU SULĀMĀN ʿIZZI EFENDI); Turkish historiographer-royal and poet. He was the son of Khalil Agha, commander of the Balaḏji Guard, and of Khadija, daughter of Ahmad III, and entered the Imperial Diwan as secretary. In 1156 (1745) he was appointed the seventh holder of the office of historiographer-royal (waḵaʾi-niswās) in succession to Šuḥbī. In 1160 he became master of ceremonics (tekhirfāt). He died in Djamād II 1160 (March/April 1755) and was buried beside Şahīkh Murād-zāde, who had initiated him into the Naḵṣbandi order. 'Izz left a Diwan and a chronicle covering the years 1157–1165 (1744–1752). It was printed in 1199 (1784) as a continuation of Šuḥbī's history. 'Izz's prose is more praised than his poetry. But his style is the most exuberant and to us the most unpleasing of all Ottoman historians. His fondness for chronograms is notorious. He enjoyed a considerable reputation as a calligrapher.


J.

JACOB. [See ISRĀIL.]

JAEN, situated at the foot on the north east of the Tabalcauz (= Džabal Kūz), west of the Guadalbullón, is a capitol (1700 feet above sea level; 30,000 inhabitants) of the Spanish pro- vince of the same name (300,000 inhabitants), the area in which the Gandalquir-Baetis takes its rise in Upper Andalusia; Andalusia in
the narrower use of the word (el Andalucía) compr-
ishes the whole basin of the Baetic and its tri-
butaries and from west to east includes the five
modern provinces of Huelva, Cádiz, Sevilla, Có-
doba and Jaén, while Andalusia in the wider sense
includes also the ancient kingdom of Granada, fi-
ally reconquered in 1492 by the Reyes Católicos.
Feuding for the Ferdinand III the Saint, with the
modern provinces of the Mediterranean, Málaga,
Granada and Almería, so that greater Andalusia
 corresponded to the ancient classical (Provincia
Hispania) Baetica.

The name Jaén is derived from the Arabic
Dhīyān (in Spain pronounced Džayyín with
imāla [q.v.]), the origin of which is unknown (old
Spanish usually Gien), as Dozy’s derivation from
U-cien-se (Edrisi, Descr. de l’Afrique et de l’Es-
pagne, transl., p. 248 sq.) seems impossible to us,
especially as the ancient Útica is rather to be sought
on the Baetis itself near Andújar. Jaén is rather
the ancient Auriga or Flavius Aurigiunum, which
still survives in Ávila (Yaşküt, ed. Wüstenfeld,
i. 400, ii. 186), if we read Ávira instead of
Amarsha. Ávira-Jaén is said by Yaşküt to
be the capital of the Kūrāt Dhīyān, also called
simply al-Ḥadīra, the capital. At the Arab con-
quest, the province of Jaén was colonized by im-
migrants from the Persian Dhīdīr [q.v.] of Kinnasrin.
The most celebrated among its numerous scholars
is the grammarian Ibn Mālik [q.v.].

The history of Jaén is naturally closely bound
up with that of the adjacent capital of the western
annate and caliphate of Córdova, after the fall
of which it formed for a time a small kingdom
of slight importance until in 1248 it was con-
quered by the Ferdinand III the Saint, of Castile.
In D. Miguel Lafuente Alcántara’s Historia de
Granada, based quite uncritically on Conde, the
history of Jaén as well as that of Málaga and Al-
mería is superficially discussed.

Bibliography: al-Muḥaddāt (Bibl. Geogr. 
Arab., iii. 2), p. 234; Ibn al-Fakhrī (Bibl. Geogr. 
Arab., v.), p. 87, 16 sq.; Ibn Roste (Bibl. Geogr. 
Arab., vii.), p. 355; Yaşküt (ed. Wüstenfeld),
i. 400, ii. 169 sq., 186; Murayd al-Himī, v.
128; 130; Yaşküt, ed. Dozy c. e., s. Ind.; Ibn al-
Ḥanīf, al-Ḥanīf al-nuẓihrī (ed. Dozy), ii. 33 and 81,
84 infra, 111, 118, 126, 139, 140, 142, 146,
149, 150, 166, 169, 201, 202; Bibl. Arabico-
Hispana, s. Ind.; Madoz, Diccionario, ii. 565 sq.
(C. F. Sjövold.)

JANINA (澂接纳人, Yenova, turkish Yëniva)
town in lower Albania, on the west bank of
the lake of the same name, at the foot of Mount
Mitrikēlís, 1900 feet above the sea-level. It was
formerly the capital of the vilâyet of the same
name. The palace of the Pasha and two of its
mosques are situated on a peninsula which runs
out to the middle of the lake. It was defended
by several forts. It replaced the ancient Do-
dona which had become the see of a bishopric,
and the ruins of which are still to be seen 12 miles away;
after the invasion of the Goths under Totila in
551, it took the name Joannina, derived from
that of St. John (ς Ἰωάννης) who had be-
come the patron saint of the town. In the reign
of Sulṭān Murād II, after the capture of Salonika,
the deputies of the town offered to surrender
Janina to him, if he allowed the inhabitants to
enjoy their privileges and liberties. The Sulṭān
accepted their conditions, received the keys of the
town and handed over to the deputies a khaṭṭ-i
sharif, signed with his own hand (1st Safar 835 =
9 Oct. 1431); it is said that the ceremony took
place at a place near Salonika called Khlīd (key).
Eighteen officers under the charge of Simān Beg
were ordered to take possession of the town and
to build outside the walls, in accordance with the
treaty, the houses they were to build; in spite of
the pledge, the commissioners had the care of
St. Michael in the middle of the town demolished
and the fortifications dismantled; taking advantage
of a festival celebrated in the church of the Pan-
tokrator, they attacked the crowd and carried off
the daughters of the best families. Janina had no
particular history till the time when ‘Ali Pašha
of Tepe-Dilen [see ‘ALİ TEPEDillow], desiring
to escape from the yoke of the Sublime Porte,
made it his capital. He brought prosperity and
life to the town, protecting agriculture and com-
merce. The siege of 1236 (1820) ruined the
town. Of the 16 churches which formerly
existed only six are left. The mosque of Arsān
Ağha was built in 1712 on the site of the an-
cient builtika of St. John; many ancient columns
are still found there. Other noteworthy buildings
are the Bairaḵāy Džāmī (the "mosque of the stan-
ard"), built by Bāyażid II, and that of Muş-
taşa Effendi. Besieged by the Greeks at the end
of 1912 it capitulated on March 6, 1913, and was
definitely ceded to Greece by the Turkish Empire
(Treaty of Athens, Nov. 14, 1913).

Local industries include the manufacture of
blankets called velōnza, fine carpets, a serge called
shahāz, slippers called yaniya torşy, mir-
rors, gold and silver thread, and garments em-
brodered with gold for the use of the Albanians.
The population was given as 16,230 in 1874
by L. Moreau, French vice-consul in Bull. de la
Société des, Geogr., 6th Ser., xii. (1876), 543 sqq.,
cf. Peterm. Mitt., suppl. Vol. xii. 42 sq. and
supra i. 4515.

The former province of Jannina comprised the
sandjaq of Yanniya, of Ergeri (Argyrokastro), of
Preveza and of Berat, and also, before the cession
of Thessaly to Greece, that of Tīrāla (Trilkala).

Bibliography: Ali Ljevdj, Luglā-i Djo
ghrayba, p. 848; Chalcoondyle, Décadence de
l'Empire grec, Bk. v. ch. 5, p. 137 (trans. De
Vigenère); Ponvequeille, Histoire de la régénération
de la Grèce (Paris 1824), ii. 102 sqq.; Suln-nâm
1352, p. 938 sqq.; J. v. Hammer, Gesch. des
Osm. Reiches, i. 442 sq., 647; N. Jorga, Ge-
schichte des osman. Reiches, i. 408.

(C. F. Sjövold.)

JANISSARIES (ﾂ黒人, yeniği, "new
troops"), the name given to the regular in-
fantry created by the Ottoman Turks in the
sixth century, which became their principal
force and rendered possible the vast
conquests made in this and the following centuries.
Their organisation goes back to Sulṭān Orkān
(1266 = 1326), son and successor of Othmān, his
brother and prime minister ‘Alī al-Din, and Kara
Khalīl Cendereli [see CENDERLERL], brother-in-law of
Shāhād Edebbī. Before this time the chief Ottoman
troops were, as in the Persian armies, bodies of
horsemen called ahvānji (light cavalry); they were
supported by infantry called in Persian piyānda and
in Turkish şeye (foot-soldiers) who, although
organised in companies of ten, a hundred, and a
thousand men were in reality mere levies without any
great cohesion. It is Kara-Cendereli's merit that he created regular regiments of infantry at an age when mediaeval Europe was still at the stage of armed bands, before the organisation of the companies of archers in England, and a century before the first standing armies in France under Charles V. It was very profitable to the conquerors with the legions of the Byzantines, although far sunk from their former glory, that gave the Turks the idea of supporting the Turkoman cavalry with well-trained infantry. But recruiting for the latter was carried out on entirely different lines, of which, moreover, the Janissaries are the only example in history.

In the article DEWSHURM [q. v.], it has been explained how the Ottoman government used to levy from Christian peoples conquered by them a tribute of children, who were converted to Islam and educated in special schools and continued to be regarded as slaves of the sovereign (hâl; the children of J. swaris were proscribe to native in the Barbary regencies and their descendants are called hul ogâsh "sons of slaves" [cf. i. 260b, 271a]). An institution of this kind was contrary to Muslim law which does not allow a sovereign to force the dînmî [v. DİMMÂ] to give their children into slavery; the Turks who were in the service of the 'Abbasid Caliphs came from captures made on enemy territory (dâr harb) and not from conquered territory (dâr islâm); it was only possible to form the Janissaries by an act of the ruler ('urf), in disregard of canon law (şarî'at).

From the first the new troops were under the patronage of the dervish Hâdidê Bektâsh and regarded as related to the religious order which he had founded. (cf. Bektâsh and Hûrûfîs); as headgear they were given a bonnet of white felt; to which there was attached behind a piece of cloth in memory of the bizzathia, during which the saint had left his sleeve hanging on the back of his flocks. This bonnet had a wooden spoon as a badge. The names of the officers were taken from various departments of the kitchen: törbası-bashy (chief soup-maker), aşîl-bashy (chief cook), as we shall see later. The most sacred object in the regiment was the great cauldron of bronze (bûzavân) around which they assembled not only at meals but also to take counsel. Upsetting the cauldron was a sign of revolt, which became more frequent in course of time when, from the reign of Sultan Muhammad IV (1051—99 = 1641—57), the ancient practice of dewshirim fell into disuse.

The corps of Janissaries was called onja, "hearth"; it was divided into several tactical units called orta, "regiment", fixed in number and of varying strength (according to the period, 100, 500 and up to 3000 men); these orta were lodged in barracks called ada "rooms" (East Turk. otak). In the field the regiments encamped under huge round tents on which were embroidered their distinctive emblems. Numbering 165 at first, the orta were increased in number to 196, not including 59 orta formed by the Ademî ogân [q. v.], as dîjmeât, "reunion, assembly" comprising 101 orta; 2. bolik, "division", comprising 61 orta; 3. şîghân, "hunters, hound-keepers"; popularly called sîmen, to the number of 34 orta.

This corps was commanded by a general with the title yenî-işeri-âghasy, "agha [q. v.] of the Janissaries", who had a special residence in the capital and offices where the business of the corps was conducted. The Sultan was not obliged to choose him from among the officers of the onja. He was also in control of the police and of the maintenance of order in the capital; he was always followed by âides-de-camp carrying the jûlayg (see Veliêkerê). In war this general was preceded by a white standard surmounted by a horse-tail (gêşê) and followed by footmen (têşît), having the tails of their robes tucked up and fastened in their girdles. — The şîghân-bashy was originally, as his name indicates, the chief of the şîghân; but as, in time, the orta of the şîghân were placed under the direct command of the agha, this post lost some of its importance; however when the agha set out for war at the head of the onja, the şîghân-bashy acted as his deputy in the capital with the title kûmû-nâmûmân. The kûlaya, "superintendent of the slaves", commanding the bolik, was also adjutant to the agha; in war he was chief of staff of the corps; he enjoyed great influence, being the first to the post by the Janissaries themselves and having the right of reporting the matter to the agha, to appoint subalterns of a rank lower than that of the törbası. The other general officers of the corps were in order of precedence, the türbağdî-bashy, "chief of the bloodhound-keepers", commanding the 64th orta; the mûşir-agha, "chief of the uşers", who represented the interests of the corps with the Grand Vizier; the senior and junior hâşêkî, "charged with special duties", who were sent into the provinces to settle questions concerning the orta there; the bâsî-bashy, "chief of the sergeants", commanding the 5th orta, the crier of the council, who carried out its decisions and enrolled the recruits; the kîlaya, "lieutenant of the intendânt", representing the kûlaya with the agha, who transmitted the latter's orders to the provinces; the kiştîh, "secretary", who had to keep the registers called kûlîh, "tree-trunk".

The officers of each orta were 1. the törbası, colonel of the regiment, an expression which has survived in vulgar Turkish with the meaning "notable of a village"; 2. the onja-bashy, "chief of the barric-room", adjutant to the preceding, who kept order on parade and saw that the rules were obeyed; 3. the wâble-bashy, "controller of expenditure", who looked after the rations; 4. the bâraofâr, "standart-bearer"; 5. the bâb-bashy, "chief of the veterans", the oldest soldier in the orta, who enjoyed great consideration on account of this title; as he was in command of the kara-bal, "guards," he was also called bâb-kara-kolûkü; 6. the aşîl-bashy, "chief cook"), the quarter-master of the regiment, having under his command the yames, "assistants", who were also head of the guard-room and of the prison of the regiment; his sign of office was a large knife; 7. the sîghân-bashy, "chief water-carrier".

The offensive and defensive weapons of the Janissaries varied at different epochs; we shall give here a few indications of their nature taken from Djeväd, from a stock-taking made in the depot for old arms (Museum of St. Irene) in Constantinople; sling, bow and arrows (employed alongside of fire-arms until 955 [1548]), according to Şolak-Sâde, Târîf, 200, 474, but kept as a sport down to our own times in the clubs of the archers called kemân-kesh; at the old exercise ground at the Oğ-Meşdan marble pillars mark the
distance of the Sulṭān Mahmūd II's shot; claw-footed and screw-jack and winding arbalests (tārā-śky), javelin (qerid), matchlock, flintlock, blunderbuss (cf. Montecuilli, Mémoires, Bk. II), pistol, bayonet (introduced in 1151 = 1739, then dropped and taken up again in 1168 = 1755), maces (gûzâ, lâshif, şvettek, şwhips, flails, axes, scythes, hammers, bills, straight swords, for one or two hands, sabres (kûlyî, şâla, yataghân), daggers (șama), lances, bucklers, coats-of-mail covered in places with metal plates, helmets of copper or steel (the peak in imitation of the shape of a fez, terminating in a sharp point).

Each orta had an emblem which was placed upon its flags as well as upon the doors of the barracks; the Janissaries also had a habit of tattooing it on their arms and legs. Promotions in rank were always made by seniority. The Janissaries were only punished by their own officers; the punishments were imprisonment, the bastinado and death; in the last case the execution took place secretly in the yard at the back of the barracks. The body was thrown into the Bosphorus with a cannon ball at its feet; a cannon shot however announced the execution of the sentence. Soldiers who became old and infirm or disabled, were retired with a pension; they were called ortaşak.

The admission of foreign elements, outside of the recruits from the ranks of the ʿadżemi-ogluhan [q.v.], gradually caused the corps of Janissaries to lose its value; the origin of these abuses dates back to the Sulṭān Murād III, who in 950 (1582) forced the olğah in spite of the regulations and in spite of the resignation of the agha Ferhid, to receive into their ranks acrobats and wrestlers who had amused the people at the festivities on the circumcision of the prince who was later to become Sulṭān Muḥammad III. Since then individuals of every kind, to gain the privileges of the corps succeeded in gaining admission to it by patronage or purchase. In 1153 (1740) the authority to deal in salaried offices (şahfü) which anyone could buy or sell, completed the ruin of the Janissaries as a military force. Those who were really soldiers no longer drew their pay but lived by exactions; soon hardly a dozen were found in every body of police to keep order in the streets and take their pay from the passers by.

Mutinies were frequent under the pretext of claiming an accession gift (bâkhiṭik) which the Sulṭān used to distribute to the troops on his enthronement, since the abortive attempt, energetically suppressed, which the Janissaries made against Sulṭān Muḥammad II, on the occasion of his second reign (985 = 1451). From the time of the assassination of Sulṭān Oṭhūmān II (1031 = 1622) the Janissaries played a part in politics, terrorised sovereigns, made and unmade grand viziers. They served as the tools of the factious, who remained in the background, escaping responsibility. The only exception was the glorious reign of Murād IV (1032—49 = 1623—49) who restored their discipline. The unfortunate wars against Russia at the end of the xviiith century persuaded the authorities that they ought to replace this obsolete and degenerate institution, incapable of reforming itself and ready to impede all progress, by new military formations. Sulṭān Selim III, acting on the decisions of a grand council, decided to form a regular army on the estate of Lévent-Cıflık, lying on the heights of Orta-koğ and Arnaut-koğ (Bosphorus, on the European side) under the name of nişan-i-ğeladi (new organisation). This attempt at reform, unpopular and opposed by the Janissaries, who did not wish to submit to military drill, led to the rebellion of Kâbaḵiṭ and the imprisonment of Selim III in the Serā, where he was not long in being assassinated. Bairâḏdīr Paşa in vain gave the name şebān to the new militia, he had resolved to form, for it did not survive its creator.

Sulṭān Mahmūd II finding himself pressed by the Russians, Egyptians and revolted Greeks, resolved to take up his brother's plans again; he created a body of regular soldiers who were called eikheneti “active soldiers”, reviving an old designation given to the Janissaries when on active service; but the announcement of the beginning of regular drill provoked a mutiny (9th Dhū l-ʿKaḏa, 1241 = 19th June 1826) on the Et-Maḏān (the men-square) in the centre of the barracks. The Sultan at once went in a caique to the Serā, consulted the ʿulemā, brought out the standard of the Prophet and summoned the Muslim population, victims of the exactions of the Janissaries, to come and fight them. The gunners and marines of the navy, formed one column, the bombardiers and sappers formed a second and marched on the Et-Maḏān. The great gate was barricaded but soon fell before the cannon; the barracks were set on fire and the rebels overwhelmed. A great assembly, whose decision was ratified by an imperial firman, pronounced the complete suppression of the Janissaries. Since then the Ottoman empire has been able to create a regular army modelled on these of Europe.

In this connection I take the opportunity to mention Djowād, Toškīrī, Aškârī, ʿAshmidī, French transl. by G. Macrid, Etat militaire ottoman, t. i. (all issued, with atlas, Constantinople 1882); Esṭad-Elendi, ʿUsīr Zafar, trad. fr. par Caussin de Perceval, Précis de la destruction des Janissaires; J. von Hamm, Des osmanischen Reiches Staatsverwaltung u. Staatsverfassung; A. de Juchereau de St. Denys, Révolutions de Constantinople en 1807—1808, Paris 1819; Riceau, The present state of the Ottoman Empire, London 1668; Cte de Marsigli, L'État militaire de l'Empire Ottoman, Amsterdam and The Hague, 1732; Chacocondy, Décadence de l'Empire ottoman, t. i. v. ch. iii, p. 132 (transl. De Vigenère); Josannin, La Turquie (Paris 1840), p. 25—26; L. de la Jonquieré, Histoire de l'Empire ottoman (Paris 1851), t. i. 120—122; Th. Menzel, Das Körpersystem der Janisscharen in Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Orientes, i. (Jahr-buch der Münch. Oriental. Ges. 1903), 4739—

(Ch. Huart.)

JAPHE. [See YAPÈLE.]

JAVA, the most important island in the Malay Archipelago, 2,390 geographical square miles in area, in 5° south. Lat. is oblong in form, as it lies with Sumatra and the Little Sunda Islands on the southern Sunda fold mountains [see İNDES (DUTCH)]. In contrast to the western (Sumatra) and the eastern (Timor) end, the oldest rocks on the island of Java are entirely covered by tertiary and later volcanic products and coral limestones. The latter shows that the island was at one time for the greater part sunk below the sea-level and was afterwards raised at least 4,000 feet; the former come from the 109 volcanoes of the island of which 13 are still ac-
tive, and cause by their weathering the great fertility of the plains and of the slopes of the volcanoes. The two groups of rock are fairly equally distributed in the mountains of the island. Flat country is found almost only along the northern coast as the swell and the depth of the Indian Ocean prevents its formation in the south. The rivers are very numerous, almost all flow north and are of no great length. They are therefore of no importance for navigation except the largest, such as the Solo or Bengawan and the Brantas in Eastern Java. But they give the water to irrigate the ricefields and are therefore of economic importance.

The oblong shape, the fertility and the excellent climate of the island have all contributed much to its great economic development. As early as the beginning of the sixteenth century a road was made along the north coast for military purposes by Governor-General Daendels. Since then there has developed the system of roads between the chief towns of the interior, which has been supplemented in the last quarter of last century by railways. At the end of 1917, the state railways in the west amounted in length to 1240 kilometres, in the east to 980, and in Central Java there is a privately owned line 262 kilometres long. The tramlines of the whole island measure 2135 km. (1 km. to each 28.4 sq. km. and to 7350 inhabited).

On the north coast there are harbours at Tandjong Priok near Batavia and at Surabaya and in the south at Jatilatap. Other trading centres like Tjirébon and Sémaring in the north and Patihan in the south have only natural roadsteads.

The island of Java enjoys a very favourable tropical climate without excessive heat or drought. The average temperature of the coast towns is 26°—27°C., the daily and annual variation does not exceed 5°C. The monsoon climate of the Dutch Indies [q. v.] prevails here only in a modified form; as it becomes narrower towards the west, Western Java enjoys a more regular rainfall than Eastern Java, where during our summer months little rain falls in the plains. The annual rainfall amounts in low-lying districts like Batavia to at least 80 inches and rises to 178 inches at a height of 975 feet at Buitenzorg, while in isolated estates in the northern mountains of Central Java up to 360 inches is recorded. Its climate and fertility give Java a luxuriant vegetation which in the west displays the character of the tropical rain forests and towards the east with trees like Tectona grandis (teak) and, in the cool zone, with pines like Casuarina, approximates to the monsoon forests. In consequence of the dense population and the European settlements these forests have been almost entirely uprooted except in the southwest and east, and therefore great floods occur in the rainy season. The high slopes of the mountains are well fitted for intensive agriculture, of which the tropical zone (in West Java up to 2100 feet and 27°—23°C. temp.) bears plants like rice, sugar-cane, tobacco, coffee, indigo, rubber, sweet potatoes, palms, screw-pines and mango trees, the subtropical (up to 5000 feet and 23°—18°C.) plants like tea, coffee and cinchona, European potatoes and vegetables, the cool (up to 8200 feet and 18°—13°C.) coffee, oaks and other trees of temperate climates. Above 8200 feet, mosses and lichens are found. The fauna of Java belongs to the Asiatic zone of India [v. INDIA]. Among the larger kinds are apes, tigers, panthers, rhinoceros, wild cattle, deer and wild boar.

The earliest mention of the name Java is found in a passage in the Kambayana which Kern dates about 150. There Yavadvipa appears as the island of gold. About the same time Ptolemy (vii. 2, 29) mentions the island of labaduni as very fertile and yielding much gold. He interprets the name as barley-island, which is literally correct, but as barley does not grow on Java, the equally possible interpretation millet island may be more appropriate. How far these names agree with the modern geographical denotation is not clear. Java and Sumatra or a part of it are apparently regarded as a whole. (Cf. H. Kern, Java en het Goudeland volgens de oudste bronnen, and De naamooorsprong van Java, in Verspreide Geschriften, v. [The Hague 1916], 303—21). In the old Javanese inscriptions of King Er-Laiga of the 1031 the name is Yawa and in the Kavi poem Nagarakretagama (1565) Java alternates with Yawa as the name of the island.

The oldest Arabic source in which we find the name Džawa seems to be Yākūt (d. 676 = 1228) Madīm. But here as in some other sources it is not quite clear, what is to be understood by it, as the mention of an article of export like camphor points to Sumatra. From the time of Ibn Sa'īd (viii—xixth century) Džawa is usual as a name for Sumatra (Rashid al-Din, Abu 'l-Fida, Ibn Battūta), but in 'Ali Ra's (1554) we find Džawa for Java. But so early a writer as Ibn Khordâbîbîh (272 = 885/6) gives Džaba as the name for the island of Java (ed. de Goeje, trans. p. 46) and it is found in several later works (Ibn Wâsif Ṣāhâ, al-lirdsi, al-Kazwini, Ibn al-Wardi, Ibn Khalîdîn). The name Jawa is also chanted in the name Zâbadāh, which most probably arose out of Džawaga (Javaga) and means Javanese (Malay) (see H. Kern Versp. Geschriften, iii. [The Hague 1915], 283 sq., and Jabudies in Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederl. Indië, 7th Ser. iv [1905], 365 sq., cf. thereon C. Snouck Hurgronje, Een miëgende Arabische paleisal, in Tijdschr. voor. Ind. Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, xlviii [1906], 85 sq.). Al-Zâbadâh however refers sometimes to Central and South Sumatra and sometimes to Java and occasionally comprises the whole archipelago. Cf. on the above: Relations de Voyages et Textes géogr. arabes, persans et turcs relatifs à l'Extrême-Orient du VIIIe au XVIIIe siècle, trans. by G. Ferrand, ii., Paris 1913—14; G. P. Koutser, Artikel Techten (Oudste Ontdekkingen) in Encycl. van Nederl.-Indië, 1st ed., iv. 363 sq.). See also the article DžAWA.

The trading journeys made by the Hindus along the coast, in dependence on the monsoon, to the Malay archipelago on the way to the Spice Islands, touched at this island also, which soon came to bear their most important colonies, presumably because of its fertility and the shelter offered by its north coast. The great accessibility of the interior enabled the Hindu peoples to settle here also, and thus their power and culture expanded quite early over this Malay island. A Chinese source mentions the presence of Hindus on the island of Java in the year 132 A.D. (cf. G. Ferrand, Le K'ouen-Louen etc., Journ. Asiatique, 11th Ser., xiii. 155 sq.). At a later period the Chinese Buddhist Monk Fa Hian says that in 414 A.D. he found many Hindus but few Buddhists on
this island, which he calls Ya-va-di. This Hindu period comes down to Portuguese times but offers great difficulty to the historian as literary and oral traditions have been distorted almost to unintelligibility by fantastic additions. The best data are afforded by the numerous ruins of temples, statues, copper plates (often charters of endowment) and bronze objects with inscriptions and dates, which are found principally in central and eastern Java. They are even sufficient to enable us to sketch the changing political conditions in this Hindu period. Only a few engraved stones are older than 760 A.D., and some copper-plates from Central and Eastern Java, of which the oldest are one of the year 732 from Central Java and another of 760 from Eastern Java.

Numerous inscriptions dated later than 760 exist and are evidence of a flourishing state of Hindu civilisation in Central Java which lasted to the year 860. Eastern Java then came into prominence. It has been established that the celebrated kings Sindok, Airlangga and Djïayâ-Bâyâ ruled here in the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries. In 1222 the king of Singasari, Parameswara, was defeated by the ascendency over that of Daha in Kâdiâri. In 1294 arose the kingdom of Mâdjâphahit in Surabaya, which afterwards became a great power in the Archipelago. The latter existed down to the beginning of the 14th century.

The temple ruins by their situation and architecture considerably increase the importance of these facts. They may be divided into two groups, an older in Central Java and a younger in East Java. Both are rich in marvellous buildings, which however are executed in different styles. In Central Java they are built of tuff and are closely related to Hindu architecture in British India; in Eastern Java, on the other hand, they are mainly of bricks, and here a more independent Javanese style has developed, which shows Chinese influence.

Of the latter we only know that the Emperor Khuâbilai of China in 1293 sent a military expedition to East Java, which was only partially successful. We have only a few small antiquities from Western Java.

In Central Java are the ruins of the Buddhist temples of Bârâ Budur, Tjandi Mêndut, Tjandi Kalasan, Tjandi Sari, Tjandi Sêwu and the Siwaike Tjandi Frambanan. In Eastern Java the most important are Tjandi Panataran, Tjandi Singksari and Tjandi Tumpang or Djâgâ. Ruins like those of Bârâ Budur are among the most beautiful Buddhist ones. From the mixed character of their very numerous statues of gods and religious and profane reliefs it is clear that, as still the case on the island of Bali [q.v.], Brahmanism and Buddhism on Java were closely connected and existed side by side. The Buddhism of the Javanese at that time was of the Mahâyâna school.

In addition to these remains in stone, numerous objects in bronze, gold and silver, such as statues of deities, temple bells, plates etc., are found buried in the ground. Only few remains of secular buildings, of royal palaces, have been discovered; probably they were of wood and other perishable material. (Cf. on archaeology and epigraphy, the works of Cohen Stuart, H. Kern, J. Brandes and N. J. Krom).

The above remarks show us how highly developed must have been the civilization and how flourishing the prosperity of the island to enable so many costly works to be erected. In view of the lengthy period of their existence in Java it is not surprising that these Hindu kingdoms exercised a transforming influence on the Javanese culture. We shall probably not be wrong if we assume that the Javanese at the beginning of the Hindu period were probably in about the same stage of culture as the modern Dayaks or Toraja. It seems however certain that even then they knew how to grow rice on irrigated fields, as the technical performances in this connection are not of Sanskrit but of Indonesian origin. But it must have been considerably advanced by the Hindus.

The formation of despotic Hindu kingdoms among Indonesian tribes organized on a patriarchal system was also of economic importance, as on the one hand it abolished the great insecurity and seclusion of these tribes and secondly brought the masses of the people under the rule of their kings and nobles. The latter brought about the development of native arts and crafts whose ornamental motifs are still Hindustic. That architecture and sculpture were greatly stimulated by the use of temples and statues, and their disappearance after the introduction of Islâm, Foreign trade arose through connections with the outer world in the West, and Java became the centre of the wholesale trade in spices, precious stones, timbers, resins, etc.

The Javanese still use an Indian alphabet and the vocabulary of their language contains a large number of Hindu words and expressions. The introduction of writing was of the greatest importance for the advancement of civilization and it is based the literary development of the modern Javanese.

When the Brahman sects finally attained preponderance in the island of Java, they gradually introduced the caste system in the form in which it is still found on the island of Bali. With the introduction of Islâm this distinction of the classes disappeared. The gulf that exists between the common people and the nobility and official classes with the princes at their head and the submissiveness of the former must be regarded as consequences of the caste system. They are foreign to the aboriginal Indonesians.

Islâm spread to Java from Malacca, into which it had been introduced by merchants from India (such as Persians and Gujaratis), and was predominant in the beginning of the 14th century. Besides the Malays, after the rise of Malacca, Malay traders also by their residence in Java created an opening for Islâm. Around the families founded by such merchants at the ports, communities of native believers gradually grew up, which finally developed into small states. Influential traders no doubt succeeded in entering into close relations with princes of the seaports through marriage, whereby Islâm could gain influence in the upper circles. The relations of the Mâdjâphahit kingdom to its vassal states also gave occasions for the advance of Islâm: it is often reported that princes of Mâdjâphahit married Muslim princesses of conquered or allied states. At the same time commerce between Java and the states dependent on the island (Pasei) and an important commercial town like Malacca contributed to no small degree to the spread of Islâm. In the last named place there was about 1500 large settlements of Javanese who were for the most part Muslims, according to Portuguese accounts. The latter no
doubt influenced their mother country in religious matters. Influences like the above were of all the more effect in a period when there was no strong central authority in the kingdom of Majadapahit. Following the trade route Island first gained a footing on the coast of Eastern Java. There, in the xvitl century, Tuban was the most important harbour of Majadapahit and in the following century the most important commercial town next to Gréisk. The oldest relic of the Muslim settlement in Java is the tomb of a certain Fathima bint Maimun, d. 475 or 495 (1082/3 or 1101/2), in Leran. The tomb of Malik Ibrāhim in Gréisk dates from 522 (1419); according to native tradition, he was a merchant. According to a statement of a Chinese Muslim, there were in 1426 not yet any native Muhammadians, but a settlement of Muslims who had come from the West and a group of Chinese, some of whom were converts to Islam. In view of the position of Island in the Moluccas about 1450, it is very probable that about the same time the Muslims "were beginning to assert their influence in Java also in the coast region from Djapara (?) to Surabaya, Tuban and Gréisk particularly". In the course of the next fifty years the communities of native Muslims with the support of immigrant Muhammadians developed into small states on the coast, which soon endeavoured to assume authority over Eastern Java. (On the above cf. B. J. O. Scholte, Het Heiliglandse Suwun, Leiden dissertation, Utrecht 1916, p. 39 and the literature there quoted; H. Kraemer, Een Javaansche Prinsdom uit de Zestiende Eeuw, Leiden diss., 1921.)

Legend ascribes the conversion of Java to Islam to the joint activity of eight or nine walis. The names of these saints who are called by the honorific title suwan (jisuhunum) and are usually named after their place of burial or activity, are as follows: (1) The already mentioned Malik Ibrāhim (also called Māuliāna Maghrabi) who died in 1419. (2) Sunan Ngumpel (Raden Rahmat) who about 1450 married a princess of the family of Tjaparan, Tuban and died about 1470. His tomb is in Ngumpel, among the descendants of Sunan Ngumpel's marriage with the Tuban princess and born probably about 1465. His activity in Tuban, probably as head of the Muslim community there, must fall between 1475 and 1500. He perhaps lived to about 1525. His tomb is shown in two different places (cf. Schrieke, op. cit., p. 39 ff.). (4) Sunan Giri (Raden Paku), who is considered the ancestor of the so-called priest-kings of Giri and whose tomb is on the hill of Giri near Gréisk. (5) Sunan Gunung Djati, who left his native place Pasai in 1521 and after his studies in Mecca came to Djapara and probably about 1528, had great success with his religious teaching and he married a sister of the king of Dêmak. He then went to Bantén, where with the help of his brother-in-law he succeeded in gaining power. In 1527 he took Sunda Kelapa from the king of Padjadjaran, at whose expense he gradually extended his power. He finally settled in Tjirebon where he died about 1570; his tomb is to be seen near by on the hill called Gunung Djati. (See Hoesain Dja'adininger, Critische Beschouwing van de Sadjarah Banten, Leiden Diss. 1913, Haarlem 1913, Index s. v. Goe-noeng Djati). 6. Sunan Kudus, buried in Kudus (Res. Sémârang). 7. Sunan Muria, called after his tomb in the Muria Hills (Djapara). 8. Sunan Drajat, a second son of Sunan Ngumpel; his tomb is in the desa Drajat on the road from Tuban to Sedaya. 9. Sunan Kalî Djaga, whose tomb is in Kadilangu (Sémârang) (on him cf. Hoesain Dja'adininger, op. cit., Index). - These nine, it should be noted, are also given with partly varying names (cf. the article Heilig in Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indie, ii., and the literature quoted there).

About 1520 a coalition of Muslim kings of the coast states under the leadership of the king of Dêmak, Raden Patih, destroyed the Hindu Javanese kingdom of Majadapahit. An attempt made about 1546 to conquer Pasuwan did not succeed. It appears certain also that the kingdom of Dêmak was overthrown by that of Padjang (c. 1568) and the latter again by that of Mataram (c. 1580), out of which the present "Vorstenlanden" of Central Java have arisen.

For the development of political and religious conditions among the Javanese of the xvitl and xviiit centuries Mataram has undoubtedly been the most important sultanate. It was brought to its greatest prosperity by Tjâkrâ Kusumâ (1618-1646), also called Sultan Agung after 1641, and extended its rule over almost the whole of Java. During his reign there existed in the West the independent sultanate (since 1631) of Bantén and the sultanate of Tjirebon dependent on him. The kings of Giri-Gréisk at this time had great religious prestige.

By Agung's conquest of the Northern ports of Lasîm (1616), Tuban (1618), Gréisk (1622), Surabaya (1625), and Madura (1627), and by their destruction, the foreign commerce and the shipping of Java received a severe blow, which was not repaired by the foundation of the state harbour of Djapara.

The European competition of the Dutch, English, Danes etc. was thereby much encouraged. By the foundation of the town of Batavia in 1619 on the site of the former Sunda Kelapa or Djapara the former obtained a commercial and political centre in the vast area of the despots of Mataram, who had as little success in driving them out by a siege in 1628/1629, as had the Bantênes of the West.

The histories of the Javanese kingdoms of Mataram, Tjirebon and Bantén since that date show us classical examples of the destructive influence of the unbridled passions of their rulers and the latter's officials. Agung's kingdom suffered already from his many costly conquests, his successors and their relations only enriched to increase their revenues and gratify their lusts. Domestic conflicts in the royal house itself and several wars with enemies outside incited thereby, weakened the kingdom more and more.

These circumstances had consequences which were of interest to the "Nederlandsche Generale Geocroyeerde Oost-Indische Compagnie", founded for trading purposes only and managed from Holland, and were important for the development of modern Java. These and the endeavour to maintain a monopoly drove it to a policy of conquest, which became one of the main causes of its decline at the end of the xvitl century. As early as Sultan Agung's death in 1646, the Company made a treaty of mutual support with his successor Amangkurat I. The latter in 1677 found himself forced
to call for the Company's help when pressed by the Madurese and Macassarese. He died a fugitive and his son Amangkurat II was only able to ascend the throne with the help of the Dutch Company. The kingdom was next shaken by two wars of succession (1704–1706 and 1746–1755). When the three claimants to the throne were all maintaining their position in the field during the latter of these wars, the Company found itself forced to divide the kingdom of Mataram between two of them in 1755. Thus arose the kingdom of the Suhuhuns of Surakarta and of the Sultans of Djokjakarta. In 1758 the third pretender had to be pacified, by granting him the semi-independent position of a prince Mangku Negara. At that time the Dutch East India Company already possessed the North coast of the Mata-
aram kingdom and the central part of the West down to the South coast. Up to the end of the eighteenth century the influence of this trading company on native culture remained relatively small, as their officials only dealt with the natives as far as was necessary for the compulsory deliveries of agricultural products by the kings and the monopoly of imports of clothes, opium, etc.

In the course of the sixteenth century, when the kingdom of the Netherlands had assumed the suzerainty in the Indian Empire of the East Indian Company, the conditions of life among the Javanese population have altered very much. Having English rule 1811–1830, the sultanates of Bantun and Tjiribon in the West were completely incorporated in the territory of the Indian government and considerable stretches in Central and East Java. The foundation of the independent kingdom of Paku Alam (1813) also broke the resistance of the Sultan of Djojokarta. When, after the rising of 1825–1830, the present residences of Banyumas, Bagelen, Madian and Kediri were incorporated by the Dutch in their territories as a war indemnity, only 7% of the surface of the island remained to native princes. As they have since then been still further restricted in their powers, the situation of the masses of the people has been much improved. Before this can be judged, we must deal with the population. It consists of 33,000,000 natives, 318,700 Chinese, 72,700 Europeans, 29,370 Arabs and 3000 other foreigners; with a population of 254 to the square kilometre it is therefore one of the most thickly populated parts of the earth's surface. If we consider that in the first and second decade of the sixteenth century, the Governor-Generals Daendels and Raffles estimated the native population at four and five millions and that this enormous increase has taken place without immigration, its explanation certainly appears desirable.

The foreign inhabitants of Java, if we except those only temporarily settled there, are for the most part half-breeds, sprung from intermarriages with native women. The Japanese are included with the Europeans. The Chinese, whose families in many cases have been living for centuries in Java, come from the South Chinese province of Kwan-Tung, the Arabs from South Arabia (Hadramawt) and the other foreigners from British India. With a very few exceptions, all came with the object of earning a living by commerce or industry, and they often succeed very well.

The natives with few exceptions (Baduy in the West, the majority of the Tenggerese in the East and the Christian Javaneses) are all Muslims. Their languages, customs and phyletic divide them into three groups: in the West the Sun-
danese, in the Centre the Javanese, in the East the Madurese. The differences are to be ascribed more to the influences of foreigners (Hindus) and surroundings, than to race. They all belong to the Malays of the Archipelago, but those in the West were less exposed to these influences than those in the East and Centre. The Sundanese therefore remained truer to the original type and more accessible to Islam. The Madurese on their relatively less fertile island have devoted themselves less to agriculture than to cattle-rearing and fishing and formerly to piracy, and thus became more energetic, vigorous and ruder than the Hindu-
ized Javanese. In Western Java the latter only spread along the North and East coasts, while the Madurese are found in East Java in the residencies of Besuki, North Pasuruan and East Surabaya also. The native populations of the large towns like Batavia and Surabaya deserve special mention; in these commercial and administrative centres of the Dutch the native population arose out of traders, slaves, soldiers, political internees of the most varied origins in the course of the last three centuries. As the language formed here has become the lingua franca (Malay) of Euro-
peans and natives for the whole archipelago, these conditions are of special importance.

The natives are an intelligent, circumspect, easily contended, agricultural people who cling firmly to their traditions. They are fond of festivals, games and the use of opium, which sometimes are lead to abuses. The long period of despotic rule has divided the people into two classes, the princes with the nobility and officials on one side and the bulk of the people on the other, and has caused a very complicated system of ceremonial to grow up, which has laid a firm hold on all their customs and also finds expression in their language. The subservience of the masses to their superiors is a further result of these political conditions. In keeping with their geographical situation the Ja-
vanese are more submissive than the Madurese and Sundanese. The awakening of Eastern Asia is now being felt even in Java.

The despot was possessor of the soil, granted it to the peasants in return for half the produce in kind and in addition levied taxes in labour and produce on his people regularly and irregularly. His relations and officials were granted lands, and in the Vorstenlanden, where this system still prevails, these have since the beginning of the sixteenth century been let more and more to European planters. Outside these principalities, the possession of land is private among the Madurese and Sundanese and partly communal among the Javanese. The most popular crop is rice, grown on inundated fields; other food-stuffs are sweet potatoes, beans, spices and fruits; for export tobacco, coco-nuts (copra), cotton and kapok are grown. Of all these a number of varieties are known. The rearing of cattle and buffaloes is only subsidiary to agriculture. The horse is used for riding and as a beast of burden but is also eaten like the sheep and the goat. All these domestic animals except cattle were imported from Asia. Hunting as a means of livelihood is of very subordinate importance. The same applies to fishing in the rivers and in the sea. Many fish are reared in artificial ponds of fresh
water or on the seashore. The wholesale traffic of the island is in the hands of Europeans and Chinese, the retail is mainly carried on by Chinese and a few natives, and the huckstering in the markets is mainly in the hands of native women.

Javanese industries consist of handicrafts almost exclusively concerned with supplying local needs. Weaving and iron-smelting have decreased very much owing to the large imports of clothes, raw iron, and articles of iron. A few genuine Javanese arts like the making of krises (daggers), the manufacture of copper musical instruments and ornamental articles of copper, wood carving and baticking of cotton clothes are still practised. Only a few of their products such as brass gongs and batik clothes are exported. They bear witness to the abilities of the Javanese in these fields.

The language of the Javanese has developed out of the Old Javanese (Kawi) of the pre-Majapahit period and the Middle Javanese current down to the new Kingdom of Mataram. At the courts of the Hinduistic princes the vernacular was frequently used for the adaptation of Indian and indigenous legends; when poets and men of letters of the Muslim kingdom of Mataram continued in this way, the contents of those literary products became modified, but the language remained Indonesian under these Hinduistic and Muhammadan influences. Both in vocabulary and subject matter the very rich Javanese literature has adopted much from Hindu and Muhammadans. Javanese literature contains the modern Javanese recensions of the products of three periods. From the first came Kawi poems like the Arjunawiwaha, Nalagarakrigama, Bharatayuddha (an adaptation of the Mahabharata) and Ramaaya in addition to mythological poems like the Manus-Maya on creation and mythology, and Bandung and Adip Saka which contain the mythical history of old Java. The versions of the Mahabharata are prose works from this period. From the second period comes the Pandjic cycle which celebrates the chivalrous, sentimental love of the Javanese prince Parangtritis for the princess Angrani and his adventures. To the third period belong the Menak Hames, a work of Muhammadan Malay origin, which deals with a Muslim hero endowed with supernatural powers who only achieves his wonderful deeds through his belief in Allah. The Javanese chronicles or Babad's are in rhyme but are of no poetical value, and they are only of historical value when their writers are describing their own experiences. Ambiya contains the Javanese recension of the Muslim legends of prophets. The history of Moses is given in a prose work Radja Pirangon. In addition to the epic the Javanese have also developed poetry (Wulang Rei; also the beast fable with the dwarf deer, kanjiil, as the main character). Poetry is principally cultivated at the Javanese courts, but a good deal is composed elsewhere also. The lack of Javanese prose works is striking. (Cf. also under Indies (Dutch), p. 493 sqq. and Malay).

In the West of the island the language is Sunda and in the East Madura, both languages closely connected with Javanese and having a similar literature, which however in keeping with the less refined civilisation of the Madurese and Sundanese shows a simpler character as regards form and matter. On account of its general interest the language of the town of Batavia and the surrounding district deserves special mention.

The Islam of the native population possesses the same characteristics as have already been described under Indies (Dutch) and indicated in its most important features for the island of Java. It is so important in the lives of the natives up to the highest classes of society that the prevailing political and economic conditions can only be understood if full account is taken of it. This Muhammadanism is grafted upon animism which often appears under Hinduistic forms.

From the economic point of view, agriculture, by far the most important industry, shows most significantly how powerfully the animistic mental attitude makes itself felt. As a result of lack of knowledge of the real conditions of growth, it causes and maintains the neglect of good tillage, of careful choice of plants, of care during growth and precautions at harvest time. Agriculture also labours under the burden of the many animistic sacrificial festivals and ceremonies, which are given a Muslim significance for the people, because a religious person prays for Allah's blessing at them. The yield of all native crops is therefore much smaller than it would be under European management. It is the religious significance of agricultural customs to the natives that forms a great obstacle to their improvement under European guidance. The government has seriously attacked the question of the study and advance of it. It is similar with cattle rearing; with the help of the ruling and other native chiefs, very satisfactory results have been obtained in Central Java in improving the breed of cattle and their care.

Politically Islam is only of importance so far as its teaching regarding infidel rulers makes it appear a subsidiary factor in all troubles which arise out of economic or political grounds. Further, the belief in the personal help of the Almighty and his saints, in amulets, in invulnerability etc. leads in local disturbances to the phenomenon so inexplicable to Europeans, that sometimes a very small number of people, often lead by a gurun, vigorously resist the authority.

The rule of the Dutch is to the advantage of the natives of the Archipelago in several respects, as has already been mentioned at the end of the article Indies (Dutch), and on p. 578. As regards the island of Java, in the last fifty years, economic conditions have largely contributed to this result. The very dense population of the island could not possibly support itself on the yield of their fields and other sources. But in addition there have arisen the constantly increasing sources of revenue which the natives owe to the plantations of tropical products of the Europeans. What huge sums are involved may be gathered from the amounts paid out in wages and rent to the natives by the sugar industry, which moreover is the most highly developed one.

If we consider all these facts together with what has already been said under Indies (Dutch), the astounding increase of the population of Java in the last century will be understood. It could only have been attained however by the fact that marriages are general and early among the natives.

As regards administration, the islands of Java and Madura differ from the other islands (Buitenbezit-tingen); the civil officials are accordingly divided into two classes. There are 17 residencies in Java and
Madura and in districts under European residents and assistant-residents who have controllers under them. Alongside these, the native officials with their regents at their head form the link with the people. The often peculiar organisation of the 32,000 native villages has been left untouched as far as possible.

The native princes occupy a special position. The four kingdoms arose out of that of Mataram, as was briefly outlined above. The residency of Solo or Surakarta contains the kingdom of the Susuhunan of Surakarta and in the South that of the Pangeran Adipati Arya Mangku Negara: the residency of Djokjakarta contains the kingdoms of Djokya or Djokakarta and of Pangeran Arya Paku Alam in the South-West.

Justice is administered with slight exceptions, in the native states as well as in Java and Madura, by jurists trained in Holland.

Public instruction in the present century is being continually extended by the government, missions and private persons. In the larger places, Dutch is often the language of instruction (at the end of 1917 in 5 secondary boys' schools and two secondary girls' schools and in 198 elementary schools with European teachers). The education of the natives was conducted in 150 schools in seven year courses with Dutch, and in 991 schools in four year courses. There were 4815 village schools with three year courses, 1853 schools for Chinese and 30 for Arabs.


*Jeremiah, the prophet.* His name is vocalised in Arabic *Irmiya, Armia* or *Ermiya* (see *Tadj al-Arbii*, x. 157) and these forms are occasionally given with *madd* also (*Irmiyā*).

Wahb b. Munabbih gives an account of him which turns upon the main points of the Old Testament story of Jeremiah: his call to be a prophet, his mission to the king of Judah, his mission to the people and his reluctance, the announcement of a foreign tyrant who is to rule over Judah, Jeremiah then rends his garments and curses the day on which he was born; he would rather die than live to see this. God then gives him the promise that Jerusalem shall not be destroyed except at Jeremiah's own request.

Bukht Nasār then attacks the city on account of the increasing sinfulness of the people. God sent an angel in the form of an ordinary Israelite to Jeremiah to find out his opinion on the fall of Jerusalem. He twice sent the angel away to enquire how the people were behaving. The latter returned with the worst reports and communicated them to Jeremiah who was sitting on the wall; the prophet called out: O Lord, if they are on the right path, let them live, but if they are on the path of evil, destroy them! Hardly had he spoken these words than God sent a thunderbolt (sibla) from heaven which laid the altar and part of the city in ruins. In despair Jeremiah rends his garments, but God said: 'You yourself gave the word'. He then realised that his companion was an angel in disguise. He fled into the desert (Tabari, i. 658 sqq.). — The second episode in the Muslim legend of Jeremiah refers to his meeting with Bukht Nasār. The king found the prophet in prison in Jerusalem, where he had been interned on account of his prophesies of ill fortune. Bukht Nasār at once released him and showed him honour. He thereafter remained in Jerusalem with the miserable remnants of the population. When the latter besought Jeremiah to implore God to accept their repentance, God said to the prophet: 'Tell them only that they are rabbani here'. They refused to do this and took Jeremiah with them into Egypt (Tabari, i. 646 sqq.). According to Ya'qūb, Jeremiah had hidden the ark in a cave before Nebuchadnezzar's entry into the city. — The third episode runs as follows. When Jerusalem was destroyed and the army had retired, Jeremiah came back riding on an ass. In his hand he carried a bowl of grape-juice and a basket of figs. When he stopped at the ruins of Iliya (Aelia), he became irresolute and said: 'How can God call all this to life again?' God thereupon deprived him and his family of life. After a hundred years had passed, God awakened him and said: 'How long hast thou slept?' He replied: 'A day'. God then told him what had happened and brought his ass to life again before his eyes; the grape-juice and the figs had remained fresh. God then granted him long life; he appeared to men in the city and in the desert (Tabari, i. 666). Of the first two episodes one can say that they are a development of Biblical statements. The third however is based on an misunderstanding connected with Sīra ii. 261: 'like him who passed by a city which had been laid in ruins; then he said: How could God revive this after its death? Then God caused him to die for a hundred years; He
then wakened him and said: "How long wast thou dead?" He said: "A day or so." He replied, "Nay, a hundred years; look on thy food and thy drink; they are not corrupted; and look on thine ass: we will make thee a sign unto men: And look on the bones, how we will join them together, then clothe them with flesh".

The commentaries on the Qur'an identify this doubling man with various Old Testament figures, including Jeremiah. But we know that the story in Oriental legend was associated with 'Ebed Melek, who appears in the story of Jeremiah (Jeremiah, xxxix. 16 sqq.; cf. The Paralipomena of Jeremiah the Prophet, ed. Rendel Harris). The confusion of Jeremiah with 'Ebed Melek has apparently given rise to another one. 'Ebed Melek, according to the Jewish view, is one of the immortals who never saw death. In Muslim legend al-Khadr is one of the immortals. This is probably why Wabbi b. Munalibih explains al-Khadr, "the green", as an epithet of the prophet Jeremiah. This also explains the emphasis laid on his retirement to the desert where, as in the towns, he sometimes meets men; for this is a statement which elsewhere refers to al-Khadr in contrast to Ilyas [q. v.] who is the patron saint on the sea.

Bibliography. The Qur'an commentaries on Sūrat 2. 261; Mīlīsīrī's Ṭablīsī al-ifiant al-Dajjal (Cairo 1821), i. 138 sqq.; (Mujāhid b. Thāhir al-Makhdīsī), Kitāb al-Baqī' wa l-Tawrīkh (ed. Huart), iii. 107; Thālabī, Kitāb al-Anbiyā‘ (Cairo 1290), p. 292 sqq.; Ya'qūbī (ed. Houtsma), i. 70; I. Friedlander, Die Chaitirlegende und der Alexandervonm., p. 269 sqq. (A. J. Wensinck.)

JERUSALEM. [See AL-QUDS.]
JESUS. [See ISH.]
JETHRO. [See MUSHAR.]
JEWISH. [See YAHUDI.
JOHN THE BAPTIST. [See YAHYA.]
JONAH. [See YUNUS.]
JOSEPH. [See YUSUF.
JOSHUA. [See YUSHA.]

For other words generally written in English with J (e.g. Jāhāngīr), see under J.

K.

KA‘ANĪ, ḤABĪB ALLĀH, a modern Persian poet, son of the versifier Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥabīb-Allāh. Born at Shihrūz, he was court poet to Muḥammad Shāh, successor to Fath Ḥājī Shāh (1250–64 = 1834–48) and to Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh. He was very precocious and attracted attention from the age of eight. His father died when he was eleven (Perīḵān, Bombay, 1277, p. 19) and he had to go to Khurāsān to complete his studies. Prince Shudjā al-Saltāna Ḥasan ‘Alī Mīrzā, governor of Mashhad, took him under his protection. This was the beginning of his good fortune. In addition to the three classical Persian languages, he learned French. He was addicted to opium but was not guilty of debauchery. He died at Teherān in 1270 (1854). He left a collection of anecdotes in prose and verse entitled Kiṭb-i Perīḵān, "Book of Scattered Leaves", a parody of the Guliśtan of Sa‘di (lithographed at the top of an edition of the Divān, Bombay 1277, and separately at Teherān in 1302, and a Divān containing his collected poems (lithographed at Bombay 1277, 1298, 1306 and at Teherān in 1277).

He is incontestably the greatest of the modern poets of Persia, and is perhaps the most witty of all Persian poets. His irony is deep and biting, unfortunately it is often coarse.


(Çl. Huart.)

KA‘ARTA, the region of the French Sudan between the upper waters of the Senegal and the Sahara. The boundaries of Kaarta are

in the north the land of the Dowahī Moors and the Hōdh [q. v.], in the east Bakalima, in the south Beledugu and Fuladugu, and in the west the Senegal from the western branch of the Kula pool to the confluence with the Baulé. It is a vast schistose plateau inclining towards the S. E. so that the majority of its rivers run towards the Senegal. The climate is that of the Sahelian zone: a very short rainy season followed by long periods of drought; the showers are not abundant. Surface water is rare, hence the settlements have clustered round wells which serve to irrigate gardens, planted with millet and vegetables. Although the country is steppelike in character, it is not yet unsuited to agriculture. Stretches of soil on the banks of the rivers and areas uncovered when the streams are low are especially fertile and yield two crops a year. The principal products are rice, maize, millet, earthnuts, cotton and indigo. Cattle and horse-rearing are fairly well developed. The population is not a dense one. Before the conquest of the country by the Tuculor, Faidherbe estimated the population at 300,000 and the area at 20,000 square miles. To-day it does not seem to exceed 5 to 6 inhabitants to the square mile. This very mixed population comprises Khasanské, Peuhl and Moors in addition to the Bambara [s.d.] and Soninke, who form the most important element. Islam is observed by the Moors and Peuhls, while the Bambara refuse to have anything to do with it. The principal subdivisions of Kaarta are:—Fuladugu (Tambaraka) and Diombo (Konkari) on the right bank of the Senegal, the Guediar (Niogomera) to the north of Diufun; Tomera (Diala) in the centre; Baghê and Kaarta-Lini to the north of Fuladugu; Danghiré in the east; Kingui (Nioro) on the Moorish borders. Adjoining the French possessions in Senegal, Kaarta was traversed at the end of the xviiiith century by Houghton and Mungo Park (1795) and visited in the xixth by Duranton (1828), Kaffelen (1849),
Mage and Quintin (1863), and Lenz (1880).

History. Kaarta after being included in the empire of Ghūna [s. d.] and in the Mandingo empire broke up into several small kingdoms on the dissolution of the empire of Malti, which at the end of the xviiith century was won by the Bambara Massassi who came from Segu under a chief named Sunsa. The latter conquered Fula-dugu, Kaarta, and Bam-buk and took up his residence in a place called Suntanian. His successors had to wage continual war against the Bambara of Segu. Conquered at first, they regained the advantage under the direction of Sīé Banman (1709–1760) who collected the remnants of the Massassi and reconstituted their empire with Guemu as capital. He annexed Danghirit, Diara, Diomboko and Bambug. Towards the end of the xviiith century, the Massassi were again overwhelmed by the people of Segu, but their chief Dassé reconstituted his army by means of slaves taken from the merchants. His successor Musa Kurabo recaptured the lost territories and added Konia-kari to them. The rulers who reigned after him, suppressed the rebellions which broke out in various provinces. The last of them, Kandia (1844–54), took Niore as his capital and after seven years of war conquered the Diamara and forced them to migrate to the Sahara. Kaarta was then a powerful state measuring 190 miles from E. to W. and 110 from N. to S. (Raffenberg). Power was exercised by a chief belonging to the family of Kulubari. He bore the title of fanma and his dignity was hereditary in the collateral line. His authority was absolute but in matters of importance he summoned a council formed of the Kulubari, representatives of certain tribes, and the "chiefs of the captives".

The Kaarta kingdom fell before the blows of the Tuculor. Kandia having put to death an envoy from al-Hādi 'Omar, Kaarta was invaded by the bands of this marabout. The "fanma" army which took the field against the enemy was routed and the "fanma" himself obliged to submit. The town of Niore was occupied by the Tuculor and the members of the royal family massacred. Kandia, spared at first, was not long in suffering the same fate. Kaarta henceforth formed a province of the Tuculor kingdom and was administered by a viceregal until 1894. At this date the Sultan of Segu, Aḥmadu, disturbed by the power of his brother Montaga to whom he had confided the government of Kaarta, decided to dispose of him. Montaga besieged in Niore blew himself up rather than capitulate. Aḥmadu then installed himself at Niore and lived there till the French undertook the conquest of the Tuculor empire. In 1890, the troops of Colonel Gallieni entered Kaarta and seized Konia-kari. On Jan. 1, 1891, they took Niore and completed the subjugation of the country. Aḥmadu had to take refuge in Macina. Kaarta was incorporated in the French possessions and divided into the administrative districts of Niore, Kita and Kayes.


KAB AL-AHBAR, RABU 'ISĀK KABB B. MATTI B. HĀDI, the oldest authority for the Jewish-Muslim traditions among the Arabs, a Jew of Yemen who became a convert to Islam in the Caliphate of Abū Bakr or 'Omar and was called KABB AL-AHBAR or KABB AL-HABR, "the rabbi Kabb," on account of his wealth of theological, particularly Biblical, knowledge. Lidzbarski (De propheticis, quae dicitur, legendis arabicis, Berlin diss., Leipzig 1893, p. 34 sq.) supposes that his name was originally Helew, 'Akbūr or Ya'kūb, and was afterwards changed into the Arabic name Kabb, habr or hibr (plur. ahibūr) is taken from the Hebrew habir, a title of scholarship among the Babylonian Jews, lower than that of rabbi. Al-Khwārizmi also describes it as a Jewish title equivalent to the Arabic al-'ālim (Ma'āzīth al-'ulūm, ed. von Vloten, p. 35). We have very little information regarding Kabb's life and work. According to al-Tabarî, he was on intimate terms with the Caliph 'Omar; he was in his retinue when 'Omar entered Jerusalem in 15 (636) (Annales, i. 2408), became a Muslim in 17 (638) (ibid., p. 2514) and is said to have prophesied the death of 'Omar in 23 (644) three days before it happened (ibid., p. 2792). According to al-Nawawī (Ṭahāhib, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 523), he was alive in the time of the Prophet, but never saw him. Then 'Anṣārī Abu 'I-Darḍā (q. v.) said of him that he possessed great knowledge and that there was only one opinion regarding the vastness of his learning and his reliability (al-Nawawī, ibid.). From Yemen he moved to Medina in the reign of 'Omar and then from there to 'Himṣ in Syria. The Omayyad Mu'awīya, then governor of the province of Syria, is said to have taken Kabb as teacher and counsellor to his court. In the conflict between 'Oṯmān and his opponents Kabb vigorously championed the Caliph, which on one occasion brought about his corporal chastisement by the pious Abū Dāhrr (q. v.) (Ṭabarî, i. 3946 sq.). He died under 'Oṯmān in the year 32 or 33 (652 or 654); (Ṭabarî, iii. 2474 sq.) at Himṣ and was buried there or, as others say (Ibn Barā'ī, ed. Defrémery et Sanguinetti, i. 222; Vālīlī, Muqām, ii, 595), in Damascus. His most important pupils were 'Abd Allah b. 'Abīs (q. v.), one of the earliest expositors of the Kurān, and Abu Harsira (q. v.). Kabb's teaching was given orally only; that he ever wrote a book, is, at least, nowhere stated. Many sayings seem to be credited to him; in many, notably those given by al-Ṭabarî, an older origin can be proved from rabbinical or church-patriarchal traditions (for examples see Lidzbarski, op. cit., p. 38 sq.). Reliable historians like Ibn Kataha and al-Nawawī do not quote him at all or, like al-Ṭabarî, only rarely; on the other hand, he is the more frequently quoted as an authority by story-tellers like al-Tahāhib and al-Dāhribi. In almost uninterrupted succession however he appears as narrator in the aljamiatic Leyenda de José (edited in Spanish transcription by F. Guil- len Robles, Leyendas de José hijo de Jacob y de
ALEXANDRO MAGNO, Zaragoza 1888) so that it almost seems as if this leghenda was in its whole substance a translation descending from Ka'bah. The editor translates Ka'b Abūn (in Spanish transcription, Caba Abhár, p. 4 note 2) by Caba el historiador, as he — like formerly von Hammer (cf. Ledzbardski, op. cit., p. 26 note 4) — confuses Abhár with Abūn and calls him el narrador or el cronista. This Moreño legend is however for the most part, especially the first chapter, a literal translation of the Thālābī’s Yūṣuf legend, and also where the Thālābī mentions other traditionists or none at all, refers to Ka’b, who is mentioned as an authority only five times in al-Thālābī’s story, the first time in his introductory description of the creation and beauty of Joseph (Kiyyūs al-Aqibbā), Cairo 1524, p. 61, l. 4 infra). This passage is lacking in the Legeenda, as the first page of the MS is lost. The agreement with al-Thālābī begins in the former at the very beginning, p. 3 l. 4 infra: Y despues fue Allah muer etc., in al-Thālābī, op. cit., p. 62, l. 23: an la Alhā b to’llār anbata etc., where it is related that God made a tree grow up for Jacob in the courtyard of his house and whenever a son was born to him, made a branch sprout from the tree. As the boy grew, so did the branch and when the boy attained manhood, Jacob cut off the branch and gave it to his son. While al-Thālābī here gives a quite general reference to the statements of people “who know the legends of the prophets and the history of past ages”, the Legeenda as early as p. 4 and on almost every other page gives Ka’b as the narrator. This frequent reference to Ka’b is however, as a further comparison with al-Thālābī’s story shows, quite arbitrary in the Legeenda. Al-Kisā’i in his legend of Yusuf (Kiyyūs al-Aqibbā), Cord. Bonn So. 7, p. 315—352) quotes Ka’b once as an authority viz. in the beginning, where it is related that God gave Abraham five precious gifts, which afterwards all passed into Joseph’s possession and that this aroused the envy of his brothers; then follows the story of Joseph and Jacob’s dream (cf. Well, Biblische Legenden der Moslemmänner, p. 101). We find Ka’b as narrator in one passage in Firdawsī’s Yūṣuf u Zalīkhā (ed. Elbè, in Anthologia Orientalis, Aryan Ser., Part vii., Vol. i., Oxford 1908, p. 258, l. 2599) where he says: Ka’b’ al-Thālābī was the first to say this, from Ka’b I have the following text: he follows the description of the ruler of Egypt (here called Khāṭrās or Khāṭrāgh with the kuṣūr Abū l-Ḥasan) and of his vizier Rāyūn b. al-Walid (the Potiphar of the Bible) and his wife Zalīkhā and of the preparation for the sale of Joseph by public auction. The fact that al-Tabarī in his story of Joseph (i. 371—415) does not mention Ka’b at all, and al-Thālābī, al-Kisā’i and Firdawsī, on the other hand, in the same story quote Ka’b as authority in different, never in parallel passages, strengthens the hypothesis that this name is a late invention not only in the Moreño legend but also in the three authors last named.


(Re. SCHMITZ.)

KAB b. ABU-ASRAF, a Medina opponent of Muḥammad, according to one statement a Naṣīrī, according to another, a member of the Tāqīy family of Nahhān but the son of a Naṣīrī woman. In any case, he was an ardent champion of Judaism (cf. the expression ṣayyīd al-ḥabār, Ibn Hisām, p. 659, 12). Aroused by the result of the battle of Badr, he went to Mecca where he used his considerable poetic gifts (in the Kītāb al-Aqhānī he is called faḥī ṣafīq) to incite the Quraysh to fight against the victor. He then returned to Medina, where he is said to have compromised the wives of the Muslims by love-songs. After the prophet had uttered his fateful “Who will rid me of this man?” Muḥammad b. Maslama offered to do so and he with several others including Ka’b’s foster-brother succeeded by a despicable intrigue in enticing him out of the house on a bright moonlit night and killing him in spite of his valiant resistance: cf. the confirmatory allusions in Ka’b b. Malik’s poem, Ibn Hisām, p. 658 sqq., while Ḥassān b. Ṣlīḥīt (ed. Hirszfeld, no. 97) gives an account of this murder and its counterpart, the assassination of Ibn al-Huṣayn, with startling frankness. According to al-Wāqīdī, the murder took place on the night of the 14 RabīI of the year 3 A.H., but this date, which is in contradiction to his own dating of the raid against Dhū Amarr, is probably due to the events being all compressed within the same period in the source he followed (cf. Ibn Hisām), which might make it appear that Ka’b was murdered soon after his return from Mecca. It is however clear from the poem (Ibn Hisām, p. 658, 18, 60 sqq.) as well as from a tradition in al-Halabi according to which the Naṣīrī’s were in deep mourning for Ka’b’s death, when Muḥammad began to attack them, that his murder did not take place till the year 4 as a kind of prelude to the attack on his kinsmen. It is also natural that punishment only overtook him after the battle of ‘Uqab to which he had contributed by his instigations.


(Re. SCHULZ.)

KAB b. MALIK, Abū ‘Abdullāh, a native of Medina of the Khārazī tribe of Salīma. After taking an active part in the sanguinary tribal
battles in Medina, he was won over to Islam even before the Hijra and took part in the momentous second meeting at the Akaba [q. v.]. He was a poet and along with Hassān b. Thābit [q. v.] and ‘Abd Allāh b. Rawthā [q. v.] was employed by Muhammad to glorify his military exploits and answer the polemical poems of the enemies. He did not fight at Badr [q. v.] but was in most of the other battles. At Uhud, wounded himself, he found the wounded Prophet, who was thought to be slain. On the other hand, he was one of the few followers of Muhammad who, in spite of their devotion to him, could not bring themselves to take part in the difficult campaign against Tabuk. But he later regretted it and after severe penance received the forgiveness of the Prophet (cf. Sūra, ix. 103, 107, 118 sq.). It is noteworthy that he who is fond of emphasising the connection of his tribe with the Ghassānids [q. v.], was at that time summoned by a Ghassānī chief to abandon Medina and Muhammad. In the caliphate of ‘Othmān we again hear of him when he with Hassān and Zaid b. Thābit vigorously championed the Caliph, when he was assassinated; after ‘Othmān’s death he wrote an elegy on him and declined to pay homage to Ali. He died blind in 53 (673): according to others, as early as 50 A.H. His poems have a somewhat nobler tone than those of Hassān and show a real enthusiasm for the religion of Muhammad besides a strong local patriotism.


(K. BUH.)

KA’BA. ZUHAIR, son of the celebrated poet and a Ma’alāda, Zuhair b. ‘Abī Salmā, and of Khalīfa bint ‘Amrām. Poetic talent seems to have been one of the privileges of the family, for, not to speak of Ka’b and his father, we have verses by eleven of its members, including the famous Tūmādīr (al-Kāmil). We do not know the date of his birth; he was the eldest of three brothers, the other two being Bu‘dair and Sallim. Traditions, more than suspicious, report that he early gave proof of his poetic talents, in spite of the opposition of his father who ended in being convinced after a decisive test. He was involved in the wars of his tribe against the Tā‘īrī, the Kūrāsh and the Khaṣārāj, as we see from various poems in his Diwān. At the time of Muhammad’s mission, Bu‘dair was converted shortly before the year 7, but Ka’b refused vigorously to imitate him and launched satirical verses against the Prophet. The latter solemnly authorised his assassination. Henceforth “the earth became too narrow for Ka’b” and he resolved to submit. He appeared unexpectedly in the year 9 in a mosque of Medina where Muhammad was and recited to him his famous poem known as Fānat Sū‘ād (Su‘ād has gone). The Prophet was overcome with admiration on hearing this eulogy of himself and the Kūrāsh and threw on his shoulders his own striped Yemen cloak, the burdā, whence the name often given to this Ka‘b. The date of Ka’b’s death is unknown, but he seems to have reached an advanced age. The Fānat Sū‘ād has nothing of a religious poem; it is inspired with the sentiments of pagan poetry and begins with such a commonplace that Ḥāmid al-Rāwīya [q. v.] claimed to know 700 poems with the same opening. It was frequently produced in the form of tā_qīf and tā_ṣur. Its commentators are numerous. The best known are: Tha‘lab, Ibn Durayd, al-Tibritī (published by Krenkow, Zeitschr. d. Deutschen. Morgen. Ges., lv. 241—279), Ibn Hiṣām (of which the best edition is that of Guidi, Leipzig 1871), Ibn Ḥijāj, al-Suyūtī, al-Bāḍūrī. It was first published by Lette (Leiden 1740); of later editions we may mention those of Freytag with a Latin translation (1823), Noldke, Dictats. Veter. Carmina Arabicoth. Berlin 1840, p. 110—114. I have given an edition with a French translation and two unpublished commentaries (Algers 1910): The _Diwān_ is not yet published.


KA‘BA, the palladium of Islam, situated almost in the centre of the great mosque in Mecca.

I. The _Ka‘ba_ and its immediate neighbourhood.

The name, not originally a proper name, is connected with the cube-like appearance of the building. It is however only like a cube at the first impression; in reality the plan is that of an irregular rectangle. The wall facing northeast, in which the door (the front of the Ka‘ba) and the opposite wall (back) are 40 feet long: the two other are about 35 feet long. The height is 50 feet.

The Ka‘ba is built of layers of the grey stone produced by the hills surrounding Mecca. It stands on a marble base 10 inches high, projecting about a foot (ṣāḥärwān). Four lines drawn from the centre through the four corners (rukn pl. arkān) would roughly indicate the four points of the compass. Four perpendiculars from the centres of the four walls would run north-east, north-west, south-east and south-west. The north corner is called al-arkān al-ṭūrāqī, the south corner al-arkān al-ṣawārī, the eastern al-arkān al-ṣawān, and the western al-arkān al-ṣawār (after the Black Stone).

The four walls of the Ka‘ba are covered with a black curtain (kiswā) which reaches to the ground and is fastened there with copper rings, which are fastened in the ṣāḥärwān. Gaps are left in only for the water-spout and the door. The kiswa is prepared in Egypt every year and brought to Mecca by the pilgrim caravan. The old covering is taken down on the 25th (or according to al-Batāni, the 28th) Dhu ‘l-Ḥijād and the Ka‘ba temporarily covered with a white covering which hangs down to within 6 feet of the ground; the Ka‘ba is then said to have put on the ḥātīm [q. v.]. At the end of the Ḥadīj it is covered with the new cloth. The door is covered by a separate covering also of Egyptian manufacture, which in Egypt is called al-bur‘akā (the veil).

The kiswa consists of black brocade, into which the ṣāḥādā is woven (see Snouck Hurgronje, Bilderatlas zu Mecca, no. xvii). At two-thirds of its height a gold embroidered band (ḥiṣām) runs round, which is covered with verses from the Kurān.
in fine calligraphy. Every inch of the garment, which is taken down each year, is of course regarded as a relic and small pieces are sold by the Banū Shaiḥa, the door-keepers of the Ka'bah, as amulets.

In the north-east wall, about 7 feet from the ground, is the door, parts of which have mountings of silver-gilt. In Burchhardt's and Ali Bey's times the threshold was lit up every night by a row of candles. When the Ka'bah is opened, a wooden staircase (darājā, māriyā) running on wheels is pushed up to the door: when not in use, it is kept between the Zamzam building and the Gate of the Banū Shaiḥa (see Snouck Hurgronje, Bilderratlas zu Mecca, n°. ii.). For a picture of the staircase, see Ali Bey, Travels, ii. 80.

In the interior of the Ka'bah are three wooden pillars, which support the roof, to which a ladder leads up. The only furnishing is the numerous golden and silver lamps suspended. On the inner walls there are many building inscriptions. The floor is covered with slabs of marble.

In the eastern corner, about 5 feet above ground, not far from the door, the Black Stone (al-haḍar al-ārba'a) is built into the wall; it now consists of three large pieces and several small fragments stuck together and surrounded by a ring of stone, which in turn is held together by a silver band. The stone is sometimes described as lava and sometimes as basalt; its real nature is difficult to determine, because its visible surface is worn smooth by hand touching and kissing. Ali Bey (ii. 76) gives a profile sketch of it which clearly shows the surface hollowed out in undulations. Its diameter is estimated by al-Batānī (p. 105) at 12 inches. The corner is reddish black with red and yellow particles.

The part of the wall between the Black Stone and the door is called al-mulūsa'am, because the visitors press their breasts against it while praying fervently.

In the east corner too, about five feet above the ground, another stone (al-haḍar al-ḥadid), the "lucky", is built into wall. It is only touched and not kissed during the perambulation.

Outside the building there is still to be mentioned the gilt water-spout (mizāb), which juts out below the north-west wall, and has an appendage which is called the "heard of the mizāb". The spout is called mizāb al-rājina, "spout of mercy" (so it isf. Ben Chérif, Les Fêtes de l'Islam, p. 75); the part between it and the west corner is the exact kihla [q. v.]. The rain water falls through the spout on the pavement below which here is inlaid with designs in mosaic. The ground all round the Ka'bah is covered with marble slabs.

Opposite the north-west wall, but not connected with it, is a semi-circular wall (al-ḥafīma) of white marble. It is three feet high and about five feet thick; its ends are almost six feet from the north and west corners of the Ka'bah. The semi-circular space between the ḥafīma and the Ka'bah enjoys an especial consideration, because for a time it belonged to the Ka'bah [see ii.]; in the perambulation therefore it is not entered; the rawāfī goes as close as possible along the outer side of the ḥafīma. The space bears the name al-haḍar or al-haḍīr. Here are said to be the graves of the patriarch and his mother Hagar. The pavement on which the rawāfī is performed is called ḥafīṣ; a depression in it just opposite the door has still to be mentioned; it is called al-mīghān "the trough"; according to legend, Ibrahim and Ismā'īl [q. v.] here mixed the mortar used in building the Ka'bah.

Around the mizāb, and a little higher than it, runs a paved border, a few paces broad, on which stand 31 or 32 slender pillars. Between every two pillars hang seven lamps which are lit every evening — to make the darkness visible, as Burton says. The row of columns is closed by the Bāb Bani Shaiḥa, an arch which stands opposite the north-west wall of the Ka'bah and affords an entrance to the mizāb. Between this archway and the Ka'bah is a little building, a kind of pagoda, with a small dome, the mizāb al-Ḥānim. In it is kept a stone, on which Ibrahim is said to have stood at the building of the Ka'bah. Admission is granted to visitors on payment. Europeans have however not been able to see the stone. Burton says that the five dollars asked was too high for his finances. According to Oriental travellers and historians, it is a soft stone on which the footprints of Ibrahim can still be seen. During al-Mahdi's caliphate it was provided with a gilt hand holding it together. Beside the Makhām Ibrahim, also opposite the north-east wall of the Ka'bah and within the row of pillars, but farther north of the Makhām, is the pulpit (musābār) of white marble. It consists of the usual staircase, shut at the foot by a door, and above the staircase are four short pillars supporting a spire like that of a Gothic church tower.

The pavement on which the row of pillars stands is somewhat lower than that which runs round them, to which eight paved paths from the colonnades round the mosque give access. On this outer paved part are four small buildings. Beside the Bāb Bani Shaiḥa, on the left of the path of the rawāfī and just opposite the Black Stone, stands the kubbah built over the Zamzam well. In the room on the ground floor is the well, which is walled in; its water is drawn up in buckets, fastened to a pulley. On one part of the flat roof is a small chapel partly open, which has a roof with a small dome.

In d'Ossian's as well as in Ali Bey's plan of the sacred mosque we find two further buildings north-east of the Zamzam building, at the edge of the outer paving, which are called al-Kubah-tam, "the two Kubbas", by him, Burchhardt and Burton. They are not marked in Snouck Hurgronje's pictures because they were demolished in the eighties and removed entirely. One held various objects, such as chamber stools, jars for Zamzam water; the other, books.

The three other small buildings on the outer pavement are the so-called makām's, the standing-places of the imāms of the various ritual schools during the ṣalāt. The Makhām or Musalla 'l-Ḥanabili stands south of the Zamzam building, opposite the south-east wall of the Ka'bah. It consists of a roof tapering to a point and supported by slender marble columns. The Makhām al-Mālikī is of the same form and is opposite the south-west wall of the Ka'bah. The Makhām al-Ḥanafi looks out on the ḥafīma and the north-west wall of the Ka'bah; it has two roofs, one above the other. The Shafi'īs have no makām of their own; during the ṣalāt they stand under the kubbah on the roof of the Zamzam well or at the Makhām Ibrahim.

Finally we may mention receptacles placed here and there beside the pavements, in which various articles are kept (see Snouck Hurgronje Bil- deratlas, n°. i., ii.; Bilder aus Mecca, n°. i., iii.).
II. History.

The Arabs possess no historical or semi-historical records of the origin of the Ka'ba, and we as little. According to Snouck Hurgronje's supposition, the Zam zam spring in a waterless valley may have been the cause of the rise of a sacred place. It is to be noted that Ptolemy (Geography, vi. 7) in place of Mecca mentions Macraub, which is probably to be interpreted, as does Glauser (Skizze der Gesch. u. Geogr. Arabiens, Berlin 1890, ii. 235) as the South Arabian or Ethiopian mihrāb, "temple". From this one may conclude that the Ka'ba already existed in the second century A.D. The accounts of Abrah's campaign, which has been elaborated with legendary features, also suggest the existence and worship of the Ka'ba in the sixth century but tell us nothing of its appearance or equipment. The Tuba'a of 'Abd Allah karib al-Himyarī, who came to Mecca, is said to have for the first time provided the building with a κύρος and with a door with a lock. The information available regarding the distribution of the offices [see below iii.] among the sons of Kuṣayy shows that the worship of the sanctuary had developed into a carefully regulated cult several generations before Muhammad.

As to the history of the building of the Ka'ba the legends referring to the pre-Muhammadan period are dealt with below [iv]. Whether Kuṣayy demolished and restored the building, as the historians say, is a question that cannot be definitely settled. The historical references only begin with Muhammad. When Muhammad had reached man's estate, the fire of a woman incensing the Ka'ba is said to have caught the building and laid it waste. It happened that a Byzantine ship was thrown ashore at Ḥijādī [q.v.] and the Meccans brought its wood hither and used it for the new building. In connection with this the name of a man Bāḵūm (it is given in various forms) is always mentioned, sometimes as the captain of the ship, sometimes as the carpenter whose advice was taken; he is said to have been a Coptic Christian.

The old Ka'ba is said to have only been of the height of a man and to have had no roof. The threshold is said to have been on the level of the ground so that the water had an easy entrance in the frequent floods (sail). The Ka'ba was then built of alternate layers of stone and wood, its height was doubled and a roof covered it. The door was placed above the level of the ground so that whoever wished to enter had to use a ladder. Unwelcome visitors were tumbled down from the high threshold. When the Black Stone was to be put in its place, the Meccans quarrelled among themselves as to who should have the honour. They had just decided that the first comer should be given the task when Muhammad (who had been engaged in helping to carry the stones) came past. With superior wisdom he is said to have placed the precious object in his cloth — or in his cloak — and to have ordered the heads of tribes to each take an end. He himself then took out the stone and placed it in position. Legend and history are probably hopelessly confused in this story. At the conquest of Mecca in 8 A. H. [see iii. below], Muhammad left the Ka'ba as a building unaltered. But according to tradition, he later said that only the very recent conversion of the Mec-
the day of covering, but in Kadžib also and in other months the building has changed its covering. The kiswa consisted sometimes of Yemen and sometimes of Egyptian or other cloth; during 'Omar's time the building threatened to collapse on account of the many coverings hung on it. All sorts of colours are mentioned also. The Wahhâbîs even covered the Ka'bah with a red kiswa.

The mu'âmîrs around the Ka'bah are mentioned as early as the 'Abbasî period; sometimes under the name zula ('a shade'). The present buildings are said to date from 1074 (1663). A dome over the Zamzam well is mentioned at an equally early period, the present one was built in 1072.

The Ka'bah had offerings dedicated to it in the heathen as well as the Muslim period. Al-Arârî devotes a detailed chapter to this subject (p. 155 sqq.). Many a worldly ruler has used these treasuries for political purposes. Tradition reports that 'Omar said: "I will leave neither gold nor silver in the Ka'bah but distribute its treasuries." To this, however, 'Aît is said to have raised vigorous objections so that 'Omar desisted from his plan.

III. The Ka'bah and Islam.

We do not know the personal feelings of the youthful Muhammad towards the Ka'bah and the Meccan cult, but they were presumably of a conventional nature. What the biography of the Prophet tells us about his Meccan period in this respect can lay no claim to historical value. The Meccan revelations tell us nothing about these relations during this important period in the life of the Prophet. In any case he felt no enthusiasm for the Meccan sanctuary.

During the first period after the Hijra Muhammad was busy with very different problems. But when the expected good relations with Judaism and the Jews did not come about, a change set in. Henceforth — a year and a half after the Hijra — the Ka'bah and the Hâfîdji are mentioned in the revelations.

The change of attitude was first shown in the kibla edict: the faithful were no longer to turn towards Jerusalem in the gûlî but to the Ka'bah.

"We see them turning their faces every part of heaven, but we will have thee turn towards a küba that will please thee. Turn then thy face towards the sacred mosque and wherever ye be turn your faces towards that part. They verily to whom the Book hath been given know this to be the truth of their Lord: and God is not disregardful of what ye do" (Sûra ii. 139). From the dogmatic point of view this volte-face was justified by an appeal to the "religion of Abraham", which was specially invented for the occasion (Sûra ii. 129, iii. 89 etc.), as Snouck Hurgonje has shown in his Meccaanse Beest. This religion of Abraham, the prototype of Judaism and Islam, is said to have been obeyed by the Jews and to have been brought to light again by Muhammad. The Meccan cult was now drawn into it. 'Ibrâhîm and Ismâ'il laid the foundations of the Ka'bah (Sûra ii. 121). The Ma'kâm 'Ibrâhîm is described as a place suitable for the gûlî (ii. 119). 'Ibrâhîm prescribed the pilgrimage to mankind at Allah's behest (xxii. 28); and the Ka'bah to be the first sanctuary that was founded on earth (iii. 90); it is now called the Holy House (v. 98); or the Ancient House (xxii. 30, 34).

In this way there was created for the reception of the old heathen cult into Islam a basis in religious history, which was at the same time a political programme; henceforth the eyes of the faithful were turned towards Mecca.

In the year 6 a council of taking part in the Mecca cult was held out to the Muslims by the pæct of al-Judâbiya (q. v.); in connection with it, the 'Unrâl al-Kâthâ took place in the year 7. Muhammad's political endeavours culminated in the conquest of Mecca in the year 8.

All the accumulation of heathenism, which had gathered round the Ka'bah, was now thrust aside. 360 idols are said to have stood around the building. When touched with the Prophet's rod they all fell to the ground. The statue of Hubal which 'Amr b. Lu'ay is said to have erected over the pit inside the Ka'bah was removed as well as the representations of the prophets. When they began to wash the latter with Zamzam water, Muhammad is said to have placed his hands on the pictures of Jesus and Mary and said: "Wash out all except what is below my hands." He then withdrew his hands. A wooden dove also which was in the Ka'bah is said to have been shattered by Muhammad's orders. The two horns of Abraham's ram did not crumble to dust until the rebuilding of the Ka'bah by 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair.

At the capture of Mecca, Muhammad made arrangements regarding the religious and secular offices which had been filled in Mecca from ancient times. The historians say that in the old heathen period Ka'îsaï after a fierce struggle with the tribe of Khuzâ'a became master of the Ka'bah and held all the important offices, religious and secular: the administration of the Dâr al-Nâdâwa and the tending of the standard, the provision of the pilgrims with food (rîfâda) and with drink (sîkîya) as well as the supervision of the Ka'bah (sîdâna and hîsâba). His descendants 'Abd Manâf

| 'Abd al-Dâr
| 'Abd al-Mutâllib

'sîdâna and hîsâba.

His descendants

| 'Abd al-Uzâ

'Abbâs [q. v., i. 98 sqq.] or, according to another tradition, 'Ali was asked for the administration of these offices. But Muhammad said that they must all be crushed beneath his feet except the sîkîya and the guardianship of the Ka'bah. The former remained in the hands of 'Abbâs; the latter he gave to 'Uthmân b. Ta'hâ who allowed his cousin Khâib b. Abî Ta'hâ to act as guardian. The Banî Sha'bâ are the doorkeepers at the Ka'bah to this day. The rîfâda, which was in the hands of Abû Ta'llîb, was taken over by Abû Bakr in the year 9; after his death the Caliphs looked after the feeding of the pilgrims.

Muhammad's control over Mecca and the Meccan cult was first clearly marked at the Hâfîdji of the year 9. As plenipotentiary of the Prophet, who did not participate in the pilgrimage, Abû Bakr announced to the assembled pilgrims the latest arrangements, which were put in the form of a revelation. They are contained in Sûra ix., which
from them is often called the Sūra of Immunity (barā'a) (v. 1—12, 28, 36 sq.).

According to it, idolsators are henceforth forbidden to participate in the Meccan festival as they are impure (mujjar). Moreover, they are declared outlaws. A period of four months is given them during which they can go freely about the country; but after that "kill them wherever ye find them". Excepted are those with whom an alliance has been made in so far as they have punctiliously observed its terms and helped no one against the Muslims.

In the year 10 A.H. Muhammad himself led the pilgrimage, at which therefore according to tradition not a single idolator was present: the Kaba had become an exclusively Muslim sanctuary, and Mecca was and is for Islam what Rome is to the Roman Catholic and Jerusalem to the Jew. At every ṣalāt the Muslims throughout the world turn towards Mecca and at the ceremonies of the pilgrimage the Ka'ba forms the beginning and the end of the holy rites.

Two special ceremonies concerning the Ka'ba may here be mentioned, the opening and the washing of the building. The opening takes place on definite days and men are first admitted, then the women. On this occasion the above mentioned staircase is pushed up to the building. The days in question change at the will of the Meccan authorities — but some usually fall in the month of the pilgrimage and one on the 10th Muharram (Aqīrā day, q.v.). It is considered particularly meritorious to perform the ṣalāt in the Ka'ba.

After the Ḥajj is completed, at the end of the month Dhu'l-Hijjah, the Ka'ba is washed, a ceremony in which the Grand Sharif, the governor and other authorities as well as a number of pilgrims take part (or took part). The first to enter is the Sharif, who after a ṣalāt of two rak'as, himself washes the ground with Zamzam water which flows away through a hole in the threshold.
The walls are washed with a kind of broom made of palm leaves. The Sharif then sprinkles every thing again with rose water and finally the building is fumigated with all manner of perfumes (cf. al-Kibīb, n. 409, p. 1). The Sharif throws the broom away among the crowd of pilgrims who fight among themselves for possession of it Al-Batānī says (p. 109) that the Zamzamis and the Muṣawwifs sell the pilgrims similar brooms for a minimum of half a real.

As is evident from this example, the veneration for the sacred building extends to all that comes in contact with it: to the Black Stone, the water-spout, the mukarram, and above all to the Zamzam water. It is however said — and probably with truth — that 'Omar thus expressed himself on the Black Stone: "I know that thou art a stone, that neither helps nor hurts, and if the messenger of Allāh had not kissed thee, I would not kiss thee". But then he kissed the stone.

And hardly a single pilgrim will think of 'Omar's words during the twâfif. The ṣalāt under the water-pipe is described as particularly efficacious: "Anyone who performs the ṣalāt under the mustaqab becomes as pure as on the day when his mother bore him" (al-Azraqi, p. 224). The Zamzam water, which the pilgrim has poured over him again and again, is useful for every purpose for which it is drunk (mā' Zamzam li-nā sharīka lahī, Kūṭh al-Dīn, p. 34).

There is abundant testimony in Muslim as well as European literature to the intense devotion of the Ka'ba produces in the pilgrims. We may here quote al-Batānī's description of the ṣalāt at the Ka'ba as particularly characteristic (p. 29). "The assembly stood there in the greatest reverence before this highest majesty and most powerful inspirer of awe before which the greatest souls become so little as to be almost nothing. And if we had not been witness of the movements of the body during the ṣalāt and of the raising of the hands during the prayers, and the murmuring of the expressions of humility and if we had not heard the beating of the hearts before this immeasurable grandeur we would have thought ourselves transferred to another life. And truly we were at that hour in another world: we were in the house of God and in God's immediate presence, and with us were only the lowered head and the humble tongue and the voices raised in prayer and weeping eyes and the fearful heart and pure thoughts of intercession" (cf. also Macdonald, The Pilgrimage of handsome, Chicago, 1909, p. 216 sqq.; Ben Chérif, Les Œuvres Saintes de l'Islam, p. ii, sqq., 45 sqq., 68).

Even the Shi'is and the Wahhābis have left the Ka'ba's place in Islam. For the Karmanis alone has an exception to be made, as can be well understood.

Although moderns like al-Batānī (p. 24) put the question: Why is God particularly worshipped in Mecca, when the whole world is His sphere, they themselves give the answer: "But Mecca is His citadel and the place of revelation of His dominion and power. And the Ka'ba is His temple and the place of His grandeur and grace. And there in any of the four quarters of the earth a place not quite seven square miles in extent where half a million people assemble on a pilgrimage, all of whom call to God with one heart and one tongue? And although they differ in race and language, they all turn towards one kiya and at the ṣalāt move with one motion, without any hope other than the grace of the one God, who has not begotten and is not born and is without equal".

As to the mystics, their attitude to the Ka'ba depends on their position regarding the law. For, so to speak, nomistic mystics like al-Ghazālī, the Ka'ba is, it is true, the sacred building which one has to go round in the twâfif. The twâfif and its object however only receive their value for men when they give them an inducement to rise to a higher spiritual level. Ibn al-'Arabī goes a step further when he says that the true Ka'ba is nothing other than our own being (al-Futūḥât al-Makhūṭa, i. 733); the Ka'ba however also plays a part in his mystic experiences. Hadjīwirı however quotes some sayings of mystics, who no longer require the Ka'ba as an inducement to rise, and even despise it. Muhammad b. al-Fadl says: "I wonder at those who seek His temple in this world: why do they not seek contemplation of Him in their hearts? The temple they sometimes attain and sometimes miss, but contemplation they might enjoy always. If they are bound to visit a stone, which is looked at only once a year, surely they are more bound to visit the temple of God, where they may see three hundred and sixty times in a day and night. But the mystic's every step is a symbol of the journey to Mecca, and when he reaches
the sanctuary he wins a robe of honour for every step”. Abū Yazid (al-Bīṣānī) says: “If anyone's recompense for worshipping God is deferred until to-morrow he has not worshipped God aught today”, for the recompense of every moment of worship and mortification is immediate. And Abū Yazid also says: “On my first pilgrimage I saw only the temple: the second time, I saw both the temple and the Lord of the temple; and the third time I saw the Lord alone”. In short, where mortification is, there is no sanctuary; the sanctuary is where contemplation is. Unless the whole universe is a man's trying-place where he comes nigh unto God and a retired chamber where he enjoys intimacy with God, he is still a stranger to Divine love; but when he has vision the whole universe is his sanctuary. “The darkest thing in the world is the Beloved's house without the Beloved”. Accordingly, what is truly valuable is not the Kā'ba, but contemplation and annihilation in the abode of friendship, of which things the sight of the Kā'ba is indirectly a cause. (Hūqūqī, transl. Nicholson, p. 327).

IV. The Kā'ba in Legend and Superstition

The alleged religion of Abraham gave a lasis for the esteem in which the Muslims held the Kā'ba. Legend attached itself to the Qur'ānic statements and spun them out. As Snouck Hurgronje has proved in his Meekkoanse Feest against Dorz's hypotheses (see his Israelieten in Meekko), there can be no question of a local Meccan tradition in this connection. There was, it is true, a local tradition, but it consists of semi-historical reminiscences of the last few centuries before Islam. But all that tradition relates regarding the origin of the Kā'ba and its connections with Biblical personages, belongs to Islamic legend.

The latter first of all attached itself to the statement that Ibrāhīm and Ismā'īl raised (rafa'a) the foundations of the Kā'ba (n. 121). God's command to Ibrāhīm to build the Kā'ba is by some placed before the episode of Hagar and by others after it. The patriarch came to Arabia led by the Sākina, which had the shape of a stormy wind with two heads; it is also described as having a snake's head. When it reached the site of the Kā'ba it wound itself round its foundations (see below) and said "Build on me". According to others, Ibrāhīm built on its shadow. He was helped by Ismā'il in this; the stones were taken from five (or seven) hills: Hīrā', Thābīr, Lebanon, Mount of Olives and the Dījāl al-Ahmār near Mecca (other names are also given). When the building had risen to some height, he stood at his work on the stone, which still shows the impress of his feet, the Mašūm Ibrāhīm. The Black Stone, which was still white in those days and only received its present colour as a result of contact with the impurity and sin of the pagan period, was brought to him by Gabriel after having been kept in Abū Kubais [q. v.] since the Deluge. Within the building (which was not high and had no roof) Ibrāhīm dug the hole, which afterwards served as a treasury. When the work of building was completed, he took his stand on the mašūm, which now rose high above the mountains, and proclaimed the pilgrimage to all men. From all sides they answered: Labbaika, Allāukumma! Labbaika!

On the other hand Muslim legend has developed the passage, Sūra iii. 90: "Truly, the first temple that was founded for men is that in Bakka; a blessed house and a guidance for (all) creatures". The ambiguous expression according to which Ibrāhīm and Ismā'il "raised" the foundations of the Kā'ba left room for the view that the foundations already existed on which he erected the building. Al-Ṭabarî in his commentary on Sūra ii. 121 (t. 408 š.) however recognises that there are two views: according to the one, Adam, according to the other, Ibrāhīm laid the foundations. Legend relates the following regarding the foundation by Adam. When after the fall Adam was hurled out of Paradise on the earth, he came to Mecca. Gabriel with his wing uncovered a foundation, which had been laid in the seventh earth, and the angels threw blocks on it from Lebanon, the Mount of Olives, Dījāl al-Dūlī [see Dūlī] and Hīrā' until the hole was filled level with the earth. God then sent from Paradise a tent of red jacinth in which Adam lived: what was afterwards the black stone, then a white jacinth from Paradise, served as a seat. When God made his covenant with men, the latter acknowledged God's sovereignty; the document on which their acknowledgment was written was given by God to be swallowed by the Black Stone. At the Last Day it will be given a tongue, to bear witness against men: according to others, because it was originally an angel.

There was a particular reason for sending down the prototype of the latter Kā'ba. Originally Adam's stature was so great that he could hear the song of the heavenly hosts around God's throne. As a result of the Fall, however, his stature was shortened; he then lamented to God that the higher spheres were now closed to him. God then sent down the tent around which Adam now performed the tawāf, following the example of the angels. But Mecca was without inhabitants and the sanctuary without worshippers. When he gave vent to his regrets on this point, he was promised by God that in time this place would be the site of a cult; that the sanctuary would enjoy a particular kara'ma; that it would be a kūrah [q. v.] whose kurna would extend above, below and around, and to which men would make pilgrimage with dishevelled hair and covered with dust, breaking out of every cleft with weeping and takbir [q. v.] and tahlīya [q. v.].

After Adam's death his descendants (Shīth) is specially mentioned) built the Kā'ba. But the deluge washed the building away while the sacred stone was concealed by the angels in Abū Kubais. According to others, however, the flood did not touch the Kā'ba and Noah performed the tawāf round the holy house. According to the first tradition, only a red mound was left of the Kā'ba, which Abraham afterwards found.

But the legends also extend to the period after Abraham. The hole in the Kā'ba, which is called al-Akkahaf or al-Akhikaf, is said to have been several times plundered under the Dājurum [q. v.]. Therefore at God's command a snake took up its abode there and guarded the treasures. When the Kuraishis wanted to pull down the Kā'ba, the monster opposed this plan, until God sent a bird which carried it off to one of the surrounding hills. — Every renovation of the Kā'ba is said to have been carried out amid ter-
rible portents, such as lightning-flashes. It is also said that on such occasions the foundation of the Ka'ba was brought to light and it looked like the necks of camels intertwined.

Or, for the legend connected with the origin of the Zamzam, see the article IMÁM. The following may however be added here. Once when 'Abd al-Muttalib was sleeping in the ḫidr, one appeared to him and in mysterious words ordered him to dig out the Zamzam, which was “at the battle-ground of the Kuraísh” at the “Ravenhole”, and at the “Ants nest”. Now when the Kuraísh contested his right to it (or the claim to the well already dug) both parties went to the Ka'bah of the Imm Sa'd b. Hudhail. On the way their water gave out. But the water which sprang from the impression of the hoof of 'Abd al-Muttalib’s mount was an indication from heaven that the latter was right. They therefore turned back to Mecca; and when 'Abd al-Muttalib had begun to dig, he found there two golden gazelles which the Djurhum had concealed there, as well as swords and armour. All this was deposited at the Ka'bah or used to decorate the buildings.

This legendary story of the origin of the Ka'bah was easily brought into conformity with the cosmological views current among Christians and Jews in the East, the central point of which was the sanctuary itself. Muslim tradition at first adopted this cosmology completely, as is evident from the statements which are still wholly under the influence of the predominance of Jerusalem. They were however not content with this and transferred a considerable part of these sayings to Mecca. These traditions are grouped round the navel theory, the main ideas of which are as follows. The earth has a navel, whose functions are parallel to those of the human navel. It forms the part of the earth which was created before the rest of it and around which the rest stretches. It is also the highest point, the place which provides the whole world with its nourishment; and its forms the place of communication with the upper and under world.

This navel was at first Jerusalem and later Mecca. But not all the properties of the navel are attached in equal degree to Mecca. They may be briefly summed up as follows. About 40, according to others, 2000 years before the creation of the world, the sanctuary was an agglomeration (ḏabūk) in the world ocean. The beginning of the creation consisted in the stretching out of the earth around this point as centre, in the following order: after the substance of the earth (which coincides with the navel) heaven was formed and lastly the earth itself. In agreement with this theory is the fact that in the Kūra’-an Mecca is called the mother of cities (Umm al-Kūra’) (vi. 92, xlii. 5) and in popular literature the navel of the earth (Yaḵūṭ Miḏqam, iv. 278; al-Kabīrī, i. 37; al-Ḥalabi, i. 195, etc.).

That the sanctuary is the highest point in the world cannot be scientifically maintained. The popular traditions however like to move in this direction. Thus, in the story of the creation, it is said that the heavenly man is extended below the sanctuary. The semi-scientific cosmography says that the position of the Ka'bah corresponds to the Pole Star: as the latter is the highest point in the heavens, so the Ka'bah is the highest point on earth (al-Kisā’i, ‘Adilb ḥ-Malakūt, Ms. Leiden, f. 186). This view is probably connected with the conception of heaven and earth as domes or tents put one upon the other, which can be shown to exist in Muslim literature.

The view that the sanctuary connects on the one side with heaven and on the other with the lower world, is clearly not regarded to Mecca as to Jerusalem. But it is said that no place on earth is nearer heaven than Mecca; and in the pagan period men are said to have gone up to Aḥū Kubais to offer particularly urgent prayers. Whether the pit in the Ka'bah was really regarded as the entrance to the underworld, like the corresponding arrangements in Jerusalem and Hierapolis is uncertain.

One typical characteristic of the lower world is certainly possessed by Mecca. It is described as a tomb. Not only Ismā‘īl, but a whole series of prophets, numbering hundreds, is said to have been buried round the Ka'bah. Every prophet belongs to Mecca. This is an essential staging point and termination of his career. Muhammad therefore also belongs to Mecca and Mecca is his real grave as theologians say (al-Ḥalabi, i. 197) in opposition to the fact that he is buried in Medina.

Traditions which emphasize Mecca's importance for the nourishment of the world are hardly represented at all.

These theories had to be brought into consonance with the later cosmology of Isfān, which regards the universe as a series of stories of seven heavens and seven earths. The Ka'bah is now not only placed in the centre of the earth (according to the navel theory) but it forms the central point of the whole universe. Its foundations as well as those of Aḥū Kubais lie in the seventh earth and form a kind of axis which runs through all these worlds.

The so-called stories are exactly like one another in plan. Every one has a sanctuary in the centre so that if the top one fell down, it would fall exactly on the lowest in the seventh world.

The highest of the sanctuaries is the throne of God. Of those which lie between the throne and the Ka'bah two are mentioned by name, the Bait nan‘īr, the name of which is taken from the Kūra’-an (lii. 4) and al-Lūṭ, Jewish literature was already acquainted with a heavenly sanctuary in which the angels act as priests. In Islam these priestly functions are usually replaced by the ṭawāf.

V. Comparative History of the Cult.

From the fact that Ptolemy calls Mecca Maco-raha (i.e. Miḵrān, temple) we may conclude that in his time the Ka'bah was regarded as the dwelling of one or more deities. According to a statement of Epiphanius (Haereses, V, following the text in Philologus, 1860, p. 355), Dhu 'l-Šaḥā had his qaṣāyā in Petra, in which word Ka'bah is also probably concealed. It is however not clear from Epiphanius, whether the temple in Petra was meant or the quadrangular black stone, which represented Dhu 'l-Šaḥā, Al-Bakri (Muṣ'jam, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 46) relates that the tribe of Bakr Wā'il [q. v.] as well as the main body of the tribe of ‘Yūd had their centre of worship in Sindād in the region of Kafa and their holy tent (or temple, ba‘t) here was called Dhat al-Kabābī (cf. however al-Ḥamdānī, Sīfa Līmārat al-Arāb, p. 171, 14, 17, 230, 12). According to Wellhausen,
the Ka'ba owed its sanctity to the Black Stone; this may be right, for the religion of the ancient Arabs was essentially stone-worship.

The form of the building may be compared with the apse of the Jerusalem temple, which was twenty ells in each direction.

It is not related that the Black Stone was connected with any special god. In the Ka'ba was the statue of the god Hubal who might be called the god of Mecca and of the Ka'ba. Caesari gives great prominence to the connection between the Ka'ba and Hubal. Besides him, however, Al-Lat, Al-Uzza, and Al-Manit were worshipped and are mentioned in the Qur'an; Hubal is never mentioned there. What position Allâh held beside these is not exactly known. The Islamic tradition has certainly elevated him at the expense of other deities.

It may be considered certain that the Black Stone was not the only idol in or at the Ka'ba. The Makâm Ithâlim was of course a sacred stone from very early times. Its name has not been handed down. Beside it several idols are mentioned, among them the 360 statues.

The Ka'ba possessed in a high degree the usual qualities of a Semitic sanctuary. First of all it made the whole surrounding area into consecrated ground. Around the town lies the sacred zone (haram) marked by stones, which imposes certain restrictions on each one who enters it [see hêram]. Moreover, the sanctity of the area is seen in the following points. In the haram the truce of God reigns. When the Arab tribes made a pilgrimage to the Ka'ba, all feuds were dormant. It was forbidden to carry arms. Next, the haram — and the Ka'ba especially — is a place of refuge. Here the unintentional manslayer was safe just as in the Jewish cities of refuge. On the Ka'ba there was a kind of handle to which the fugitives clung (Al-Azra'î, p. 114), an arrangement which recalls the purport of the horns on the Jewish altar.

Blood was not allowed to flow in the haram. It is therefore reported that those condemned to death were led outside the haram to execution. The idea of peace extended even to the flora and fauna. Animals — except a few injurious or dangerous sorts, are not to be scared away; hence the many tame doves in the mosque. Trees and bushes were not cut down except the idhâ-khir shrub, which was used for building houses and in goldsmiths' work. These regulations were confirmed by Islam and are in force to this day.

As to the rites, it is said that in the heathen period victims were slain at the Ka'ba. Among the ancient Arabs the idol of stone replaced the altar; on it they smeared the blood of the sacrificial animals. In Islam the killing takes place in Minâ.

It is a question, whether and how far the Ka'ba was connected with the hajjijî in the pre-Islamic period. Wellhausen (Reste Arab. Heidentums, 2nd ed., p. 79) defends the view that originally only the 'umra [q. v.] was concerned with the Ka'ba while the scene of the hajjijî was 'Arâfat, Muzdalifa and Minâ. The connecting of pilgrimage and 'umra is regarded by him as a rather clumsy correction made by Islam. It must be conceded that Wellhausen with justice points to the fact that the 'umra far down into Islam was closely connected with the month of Rajab. Moreover, the hajjijî is called simply hajjijî.'Arâfat and, according to the Shāfi'î school, the 'umra in 'Arâfat is the main ceremony of the hajjijî. On the other hand, it should be remarked that in the Qur'an (iii. 91) pilgrimage is connected with the Ka'ba (hajjijî al-ba'tî) and that tradition nowhere gives us the slightest hint of this being an innovation. The facts emphasised by Wellhausen may however be interpreted otherwise. He himself has pointed out that the ancient Arabs were fond of connecting sacred places situated close to one another by ceremonial rites. It is therefore more probable that the rather clumsy alteration had taken place by the pre-Islamic period and is to be regarded as the result of a connection of the cult of 'Arâfat with that of Mecca.

As was said above, the Tabba is regarded as the first who covered the Ka'ba. Whether this tradition is historically correct is beyond our knowledge. It is noteworthy that the coloured cloths are mentioned which were placed over the building, a rite which one has to consider in connection with similar rites used in other cases. The Jewish tabernacle, the high places of Canaan (Exod. xvi. 16), the throne of the gods, the mahmal, and sacred tents in ancient Arabia as well as the Sidrat al-Muntahâ in Paradise are all covered with coloured cloths. It is misleading to give a general explanation of all such things. But the idea of a connection with the sun shining in the heavens seems obvious here; particularly for the Sidra this notion can be traced further. The question might even be asked whether and how far the Ka'ba was regarded as an astral symbol. For the affirmative there is the fact that the Ka'ba is the object of the 'azaf and that 'azaf and Ka'ba are represented by Muslim tradition itself as connected with the host of spirits round the throne of God. The throne of God is, as is well known, a cosmic magnitude, and the Ka'ba and the Black Stone are described as the throne of God's khâliifa on earth, Adam. The dance of the heavenly spirits can easily be interpreted as a dance of the planets. Moreover, golden suns and moons are repeatedly mentioned among the votive gifts (al-Azra'î, p. 155 sqq.). According to al-Mas'udi (Muru'dî, iv. 47), certain people have regarded the Ka'ba as a temple devoted to the sun, the moon and the five planets. The 360 idols placed round the Ka'ba also point in this direction. It can therefore hardly be denied that traces exist of an astral symbolism. At the same time one can safely say that there can be no question of any general conception on these lines. The cult at the Ka'ba was in the heathen period syncretic as is usual in heathenism. How far also North Semitic cults were represented in Mecca cannot be exactly ascertained. It is not excluded that Allah was of Arabian origin. The dove of aloe wood which Muhammad found existing in the Ka'ba may have been devoted to the Semitic Venus.

Bibliography: On the whole article Wüstenfeld, Die Chroniken der Stadt Mecka (Leipzig 1857—1861, 4 vols.).

On i. and ii.: J. L. Burckhardt, Travels in Arabia (London 1829, 2 vols.); All Bey, Travels (London 1816, 2 vols.); R. Burton, Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El-Madinah and Meccah (London 1857, 2 vols.); A. Müller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendlandt (Berlin 1885, 2 vols.); C. Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca (The Hague,
KA'BA — KABIR.


On iii.: C. Snouck Hurgronje, Het Meekoaanske Feest (Leiden 1880); the Eastern and Western Biographies of Muhammad; commentaries on the Qur’ān on the passages mentioned.


KA'BĀKĪZĪ, or Kabākīwī, the gourd-game, the oriental form of the Popinjay. It was a sort of tilting at the ring, but the weapon was an arrow, and the archers were on horseback. A ring was shot through, but the mark was a pigeon or other bird set on a high mast. In Bābur’s time the mark was a duck (v. Bābur, 377; Gibb. Mem. i. and mrs. Beveridge’s transl. i. 34; and P. de Coutellerie, i. 39). The game was much practised in Egypt (v. Quatremer, Hist. des Mamlouks, i. 243, note 118; also Dozy’s Supplement). It was also practised in India and Persia (v. Akbarāna, i., transl. p. 440; Vuller’s Lex., ii. 710). The game is alluded to in the Gulistān, iii. Story 28. (H. Beveridge.)

KABATASH. [See constantinople, i. 8756.]

KA'B (A.) means the legitimate taking possession of a thing, for example by inheritance or as a result of the contract. Ka'b is usually discussed in the Muslim law-books in close connection with dealings in property, as the contract of sale, for example in al-Bāḍjūrī’s Hājībīya on Ibn Kāsim’s Fatḥ al-Karīb, at the beginning of the chapter on Bā'ī (Bālaq edition 1307, 358); cf. E. Sachau, Muḥammad. Recht nach Schafī‘itischer Lehre, p. 283 sq.; Th. W. Juynboll, Handb. des isl. Gesetzes, p. 263. (Th. W. Juynboll.)

KA'B (A.) “contraction, oppression,” in Sūfī terminology means a state (ḥāl) which is the opposite of bāt, “expansion, gladdening.” (In the phrase Allāhu yāsābin wa-yāsābu, quoted by Sufi authors from Kurān ii. 246, however, the words have a more general meaning). Both happen to the ārif (gnostic) only, while in the novice the cor-
responding emotions are fear and hope, but with the distinction that the latter refer to the future, while bāt and bāat express a present feeling of spiritual dullness or joy. In the language of Western mysticism, they might be said to correspond approximately to the expressions consolatio (consolation) and doelastio (spiritual dryness).


KA'B, a term in prosody. It is the suppression of the fifth quiescent letter in the primitive feet ša’ālun and maša’ālun and is therefore found in tāfāl, ḥazādī, muḍārī and maṭuṣārī.

In ša’ālun, kāb is recommended (according to some, it is obligatory) when this foot is the penultimate of the second hemistich of the third ātār of a tāfīl; everywhere else it is optional. In maša’ālun, ka'b is obligatory in the last foot of the first hemistich of a tāfīl. In all other cases it is only permitted if the foot is not liable to ka'b or suppression of the seventh quiescent letter (w); nevertheless, it is very rarely found in tāfīl, ḥazādī and muḍārī.


AL-KABĪD one of the names of God, see the article ALLAH, i. 3036.

KABĪD (Kābi‘) a Turkish Sunni theologian, founder of the sect of Khuwamshījas (popularly called Chapmanesīhs). By order of Sulaiman he was tried before an extraordinary court, sentenced to death on 8th Safar 934 (3 Nov. 1527) and executed the following day as a sandīq (i. 397). He maintained the (moral) superiority of Jesus over Muhammad (al-faḍīyat lā ‘alā Muḥammad). On the occasion of this trial Ibn Kamālpashazade wrote his treatise on Zindīkism.


KABA‘IL, i. e. Cain. [See KABIRIL.]

AL-KABIR, one of the names of Allah, see the article ALLAH, i. 3036.

KABĪR, an Indian mystic, of the 15th century, who was claimed both by the Hindus and Musalmāns as belonging to their faith. A large collection of Hindi verses is attributed to him, but their authenticity is doubtful, and a like uncertainty attaches to his biography, which is obscured by legends. He is said to have been the son, or adopted son, of a Muhammadan weaver, and to have become the disciple of Rāmānanda, the Vaishnav reformer, at whose feet he sat in
Benares, joining in the theological and philosophical arguments that his master held with Brahmins and Súfs. He appears to have earned his living as a weaver, and to have been a married man, the father of a family, and to have been as contemptuous of the professional asceticism of the Yógi as he was disregardful of the doctrines and ordinances of orthodoxy, whether Hindu or Muslim. The boldness with which he sang his mystical doctrine of the divine unity exposed him to persecution, and he is said to have been driven from Banaras in 1495, when he was about 60 years of age, and to have died at Maghar, in the district of Basut, in 1518. Legend says that his Hindu and Muslim disciples disputed as to the disposal of his body, which the former wished to burn and the latter to bury; when they lifted the cloth that covered the body, they found in place of the corpse only a heap of flowers; of these, the Hindus burnt half in Benares, while the Muslims buried the rest at Maghar, where the shrine is still in the charge of Muhammadan Kabir-Panthís. Modern scholars, like Kabir's contemporaries, claim him for one or other of the rival creeds: H. H. Wilson (op. cit., pp. 69, 74) and R. G. Bhandarkar (op. cit., p. 69) maintain that he was a Hindu; G. H. Westcott that he was a Muslim (op. cit., p. 29, note 107); G. A. Grierson's theory (Journ. R. As. Soc. 1907, pp. 385, 492) that he derived his opinions from Christian sources, may be dismissed as a pious fiction. A study of his poems makes it clear that he had no desire to attach himself to any organised religion: "Let me make self-relection my saddle, And put my foot in the stirrup of divine love... Sahír Kabír, they are good riders Who keep themselves aloof from the Vedas and the Kurá'n"; nor did he attempt to formulate any religious or philosophical system of his own, but he popularised the current Vaisñav teaching of his age, without however connecting it with any particular incarnation, and he spoke of God indifferently as Ráma, Hari, 'Alí or Alláh. He rejected the outward signs of Hinduism, e. g. the sacred thread, the distinctions of caste, the ritual observances of temple worship, etc., and his references to Muslim authorities and institutions (e. g. the Kurá'n, circumcision, pilgrimage, the Múllá, the Kájí etc.) are accompanied with a denial of their validity. He represented God as the omnipresent reality, but maintained the separate individuality of the human soul, which could attain union with God through love, not by knowledge or by ceremonial observances. Through his homely illustrations and his close contact with daily life, he presented his doctrines in a form readily acceptable to unlettered persons, who appear to form the majority of his followers.

Bibliography: Dohír-í-Madábhíb, p. 246–248 (Calcutta, 1809), trans. She and Troyer, ii. 186–191 (Paris, 1843); H. H. Wil- son, Essays on the Religion of the Hindus, i. 68 sqq. (London, 1862); Gli scritti de Padre Marco della Tomà, raccolti... da a. de Gub- bernatis, p. 191 sqq., 205 sqq. (Firenze, 1878); E. Trumpp, Bemerkungen über den indischen Re- formator Kabír in Ati del v. Congresso internat. degli Orientalisti, ii. 159 sqq. (Firenze, 1880– 81); Kabír-Charities, ed. by W. L. W. Béchá (Calcutta, 1881); G. H. Westcott, Kabír and the Kabír Panth (Cawnpoore, 1907); M. A. Ma-


(T. W. ARNOLD.)

KABIRPANTHÍS (Hindi puntí, path, sect). Despite the non-sectarian character of Kabír's teaching, his followers now form a distinct sect, the majority of whom are Hindus. The best ac- count of their organisation is given by Westcott, op. cit., chaps v. and vi. According to the Census of 1911, there were 597,199 in the Central Provinces, and 49,605 in the United Provinces; in the other provinces they either are not found at all, or their number is too inconsiderable to call for separate enumeration.


(T. W. ARNOLD.)

AL-KABÍSÍ, whose full name was 'Abd al-'Azíz also 'Abd al-Ráhím b. 'Óthmán b. 'Álí b. 'Ásír, an important astrologer probably of Persian descent. He was known to the Christian world of the middle ages as ALCABÍTUS(also AL-CHARBITUS). He lived for a considerable period at the court of Sultan 'Abd al-Hamíd (d. 356 = 969) and dedicated his principal astro- logical work to him: al-Madáríj ilí Šihad Asbák al-Nudjum (Introduction to the art of Astro- logy) of which copies still exist in Oxford, Gotha and Cairo. It was translated into Latin by Joh. Hispalensis. This translation was printed in Venice in 1481, 1485, 1491 and 1521. The edition of 1485 is entitled Libelli syagochici Abílasi, id est serví gloriosi Dei, qui dictur Alichbitus, ad magisterium judiciorum astrarum. Interpretatúra a Ioanne Hispalensi, Venetìs 1485. The edition of 1521 is called Praecratonis Alchabitis usus ad secundum stellarem mundi astrarum. A commentary on it was compiled by Joh. de Saxonía in 1331 and printed at Bologna in 1473, and again in 1485 and 1521 at Venice at the end of the editions of Alcabitius. Al-Kabíši also wrote several smaller astrological treatises. The dates of his birth and death are unknown.

Bibliography: A special article on this astrologer is given by al-Baihaki (c. 1150) alone among the Arab biographers, in his T arbík Huk- mám al-Islám (Ms. Leiden, 1324, Gol.), cf. E. Wiedemann, Bier. z. Gesch. der Naturwissenschaft., xx. 68; scattered notices are found in Fikrist, p. 265 (Abyd. Ed.); Khallílán (Cairo 2130), i. 365, trans. de Slane, ii. 335; Ibsk, Mu'djam, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 35. Cf. also H.
Suter in Abhandl. z. Gesch. d. mathem. Wis-
enschaft. x. 60, xvi. 165. (H. Suter.)

AL-KABİR. DİBAİL (DİBAİL) AL-KABİR of AL-
KABİR, as al-Tarā," i. 2660, 2664, 41, 2666, 16
and Yāḵūt iv. 314, 23 have it, and as should be
read, in al-Maʿrūf (ed. Paris) for al-
Kabāb, is a name for the Caucausus, common in
Muslim authors. Hubschmann, Armen. Granum.
(Leipzig 1867), i. 45 derives Kabīb from Arme-
nian Kāpēkh, Pehl. Kāfēkō. An older geographical conception regards this
chain as belonging to the Kāf [q. v.] range which
encloses the world (cf. B. Munkeste, Der Kaukasus
n. Ural as "Gürtel der Erde", in Keleti Szemle, i.
236 sqq.). The name Albūz is no doubt con-
nected with this idea, which Mustawfi, and ap-
parently following him Kāṭīb Celebi, give to the
Caucasus, while the name Kabīb (DİBahnumma,
K-7-1-7) is limited to its eastern (transl. p. 182
wrongly "western") side. Here the range appears
to be considered the continuation of the North Per-
sian mountain chain of the same name, with which
also are associated notions of its being the bound-
ary range of the world. (Cf. the article ALBURZ;
F. Justi Beitr. zur allgemeinen Geographie Persiens,
i. 4sqq., ii. 4 sqq.; Melgunow, Das südliche Ufer des
Kaspischen Meeres, p. 27). To similar con-
erations is probably to be ascribed the fact that
the Caucasus is connected with mountains which,
beginning with Dībaal al-ʿArдж between al-Madinah and
Mecca ( Ibn Khordadbeh, p. 172 infra sq.; Ibn
al-Fakih, p. 23, 7 sqq., 295, 5 sqq.) or in Yemen
(al-Hamdanī, Dīwānat al-Arbaʿī, p. 126, 92 sqq.)
run northwards through Arabia and Syria. The
connecting of these mountains with Kāf led to the
localisation in the Caucasus region of the rock,
sea and village (Kūrān xviii. 59 sqq.) known
from the legend of Moses (Alexander) ( Ibn
287, 14 sqq.; al-Mukaddasi, p. 46, 16 sqq.; Yāḵūt,
i. 220, 21 sqq., 454, 5 sqq., iii. 282, 9 sqq.).
The Caucasus has further been regarded as the
range beyond which dwelt Yāḏḏūd and Māḏḏūd
[q. v.]. The al-Saddān of Kūrān xviii. 89,
explained as "the two mountains", between which
Dhu l-Karain caused a barrier to be built to
check the inroads of Yāḏḏūd and Māḏḏūd is iden-
tified with Armenia and Ḍabārbaḏījan (al-Ta-
bari, Tafṣīr, xvi. 121 sqq.; al-Baiḍawi on Kūrān
xviii. 89). But when geographical knowledge was
extended, Yāḏḏūd and Māḏḏūd were placed farther
north.
The Sasanians in particular had closed the
Caucasus passes with fortifications to prevent the
inroads of the northern nomadic peoples. The
most famous of these passes (cf. Ibn Khordadbeh
p. 23, 13 sqq.; Yāḵūt, i. 439, 2 sqq.) are Bāb al-
Abwāb or Bāb Sūr or Derbend [q. v.] and Bāb
Allān, the gate of the Alans, or the Dariāl pass.
The multiplicity of ethnic groups and languages
in the Caucasus is mentioned by most Muslim
geographers. According to an oft recurring state-
ment (70 (72) different languages are found there
(Ibn al-Fakīh, p. 25; al-Muḥallabi, ii. 2) according
to al-Muḥallabi's Kūrān al-ʿAṣīrī (in Abu ʿl-ʿFida'),
as many as 300. Wherefore the mountain ranges
are also called Dībaal al-ʿĀlīn "Mountain of Lan-
guages" (Abu ʿl-ʿFida', Taḵīwīn al-Baldaun, ed.
Rein.
and de Slane, p. 71, 15 sqq., 393, 3 v. Ta-
rāsūlīn, 405, 5 v. Sarīr Allān).
For groups of peoples, states, and towns in the
Caucasus the reader is referred to the separate articles and the literature given below. See the articles ARKHĀZ, ALLĀN, ARMINYA, ARRĀN, BĀKū
BARDAHĪ, BAGHESTAN, DEREBD, GANA."
phers call this river by various names. Al-Bīrūnī speaks of the River Ghurwand which falls into the Indus below Wairand, the capital of al-Kandahār (i.e. Gandhāra). This name is taken from the Ghurwand Pass near which the Pandj-hā River rises. Al-Maʿṣūdi says “the fourth river of the Pandj- hā comes from the country of Kābul and its mountains which form the frontier of al-Sind”. The modern name of the river in Pashto is Sīnd, (also a general term for “river”). Bābur speaks of the Sīnd river as rising in a mountain to the west of Kābul, and no doubt also to the Kābul, that is somewhere where is applied the name Sīnd to the Indus. The name Kāma given by Elphinstone (Appendix on Rivers) appears to be a misnomer, as Kāma is the name of a tributary only.

The town and district of Kābul seem to have taken their name from the river.

2. An important city, now the capital of Afghānistān, situated in 34°30′N. 69°13′E. 5780 ft. above sea-level, in a fertile and well watered plateau. Population about 150,000.

Although the Kābul River under various names [q.v.] is known from the earliest times, there is no mention of any town which can be identified with the capital city of Kābul. Some name of a Kābuli appears by some to be Kāboura, and the people by names Būlīti are conjectured to be properly Kābolītai or people of Kābul, but these guesses rest on no evidence. Kāphēnē is probably the name of the whole valley derived from the river Kāphēn.

This territory was reoccupied by the Bactrian King Demetrios and formed a Greek kingdom until about the commencement of the Christian Era. The Parthian Gondophares seems to have held it for a time and the Kūsāni invaders were in possession of it during the 1st century. A vase bearing an inscription of King Huvishka has been found at Wardak near Kābul Buddhism was the religion at this period. The Kūsāni were supplanted by the Eūthalitai for a period, but some branches of the race seem to have recovered power afterwards, and held it when Hūsen Thang passed through in 657 A.D. Kao-foo is the name given to Kābul by the Chinese at this period. Buddhism was gradually replaced by Brahmanism, and this was the religion of the later Kūsāni kings, known by the title of Shāhī, who, as we learn from al-Berunti, were superseded by their Brahman waizirs, probably about the time of the first Muhammadan invasions. It is probable that after the first invasions the Hindu kingdom of Gandhāra was ruled from its capital, Udabhanda (or Wairand) on the Indus, and extended to the foot of the mountains west of Djalalākād, but did not include Kābul proper, which continued as a separate principality under its own Shāhī, sometimes under Muhammadan influence and sometimes independent, till Ṣabuktīgin’s time. By the earliest Arab chroniclers the country as a whole is termed Kandāhār i.e. Gandhāra, which has often been mistaken for the town of Kandahār. Thus Ţabarti tells us that under Ūmar in the year 23 Ḍāsim b. Amr and “Abd Allah b. Omair passed on through Sistān as far as the Indian frontier and Kandahār. The town of Kābul is not referred to, mentioned, the Kābul Valley and the adjacent Kābul moves up to the Hindu Kush passes being described as the country of the Kābul-Shāh and the capital as an inaccessible mountain fort of an uncertain name (read Djurwas by Le Strange). Yaḵūbī says that it was conquered under Ūthman by Ūbd al-Rahmān b. Samura, but when he wrote it was known only by the export of the Chebulic (or Kābuli) myrrobalsans. Another expedition followed in Muḥāwiya’s time, and again in 176 (793) under Ḥārūn al-Raṣīd an army from Balkh invaded the valley from the north via the Bāmiyān Pass. There was another invasion in the time of al-Ma’mūn, which led to the submission of the Kābul-Shāh and his acceptance of Islam. These expeditions seem to have led to a nominal submission and acceptance of Islam but there seems to have been no actual occupation before that of the Šaffārīn in 257 (871). Pandjābīr with its silver mines was no doubt a powerful attraction and coins were struck there by Yaḵūb b. Laḥī. But it cannot be said that the name of Kābul applied to any particular town until later, and in any case it was not an important centre. It may be noted that the attack made by Yaḵūb b. Laḥī was from the north by way of the Hindu Kush passes, and not by the more obvious route from Sīdjiśān, by way of the Arghanā Valley and Ghāzna. The ruler of Kābul at this period is described as a Turk by race and a Buddhist by religion, and it is probable that he was a representative of the later is an ancestor of the Īrānīs [cf. AFGHANISTĀN, i. 161].

It was never a mint town before the time of the Mughal Emperors. Coins were first struck there by Bābur [see art. BĀBER]. Throughout the rule of the Ghaznavīs [q.v.] and Ghōrīs [q.v.] Ghāzna was the capital. Al-Idrīsī mentions Kābul as a large Indian city on the border of Ṣukhārīstān, and adds that no ruler could take the title of Shāhī till he had been inaugurated at Kābul. His information was probably derived from authorities much earlier than his own period, when the kingdom of the Shāhis had long ceased to exist.

It seems probable that the frequent destruction of Ghāzna led to the rise of Kābul and after Timūr’s time it became the centre of a principality under some members of his family. After the death of Abū Saʿīd [q.v.], his son Ulugh Beg obtained possession of Kābul and held it till his death. His son was expelled by Mūkim, a son of Dhu ‘l-Nūn Beg Arghūn, who in his turn was driven out by Bābur in 910 (1504). This formed the foundation of Bābur’s Indian empire, and even when his son Ḥumāyūn was driven out of India, Kābul was not lost by the family, but was held first by Kārmīn and afterwards by Ḥumāyūn himself till India was recovered. Bābur was fond of Kābul, and gives an enthusiastic description of its climate, its streams, its fruits and flowers. After his death at Agra his body was brought to Kābul and his tomb still exists in a garden laid out by himself near the town. From this time the history of Kābul is bound up with that of the Mughal Empire of India. It became a mint for gold, silver and copper, and coins of most of the emperors are found up till the time of Muḥammad Shāh. In 1738 it fell into the hands of Nādir Shāh, and although a rupee of the emperor ‘Alamgīr II was struck there after Nādir Shāh’s death, it never again belonged to the empire, but was very soon taken by ‘Alamgīr Durrānī [q.v.]. It soon superseded Kandahār as the capital of the Durrānī dominions, and has continued to hold that position under Sadozai and Barakzai till the present day. [For history see under art. AFGHANISTĀN, i. 169 sqq.]. The town grew in prosperity as the capital of an important kingdom, although it suffi-
ered much during the various wars, especially those between 1839–1842 between the Sadorais and Barakais, in which the British army of occupation took part, and in the civil war between Shēr ‘Ali and his brothers. Under ‘Abd al-Rahmān Khān [q.v.] and ʿAbd Allāh the town has been improved and good roads and bazaars constructed. The Bālā Ḩijār or old palace citadel on a rocky hill has been dismantled. On the upper part has become an arsenal. A new fortified palace known as the ‘Ark was built by ‘Abd al-Rahmān outside the town between Shērpūr and ʿAlamgirān.

In addition to the tomb of Bābur mentioned above, the tomb of Tīmūr Shāh Durrānī is also near Kābul. 3. Kābul is also the name of the province in which the capital is situated. It is bounded on the north by Afghan Turkistan, on the west by Herāt, on the south by Kandahār and on the east by Džalalābād. It includes the Paghmān Mts. to the north-west and the Hazārd,ānd in the south-west. Ghāzni is comprised in its limits, and the boundary between Kābul and Džalalābād is at Džalgalak.


(K. Longworth Dames)

KĀBUL (a). Acceptance of the offer (in contracts); see Īdāb. KĀBŪS b. WAshmīrī, Shams al-Maʿālī, Aḥūn al-Hasan, nephew of Mirdwijdī b. Ziyār and fourth ruler of the Ziyārid dynasty (his genealogy is given by his grandson, Kābul ʿAbd al-Maʿālī in his preface to the Kābulīnamah). Called to the throne by a military conspiracy, in 366 (976) he succeeded his brother Zahir al-Dīn Bahāstīn as ruler of Džurdjān and Tābaristān. When the Bāyīd Fakhr al-Dawla [q.v.] had quarrelled with his brother ʿAḏud al-Dawla [q.v.] and the latter deprived him of his whole kingdom in 369 (979/80) Fakhr al-Dawla took refuge with his father-in-law Kābul. As the latter declined to hand him over to the victor, ʿAḏud al-Dawla sent a force against Kābul who after a defeat at Astarābād in 371 (981/2) fled with his protégé to Nishāpūr to ʿHazām al-Dawla, governor of Khorāsān under the Sāmānid Nūḥ b. Maḥsūr. The latter sought to conquer Tābaristān for himself, but ʿHusām was defeated. On the death of the Vizier, Abu ʿl-Husān al-Uṭūa, ʿHusām was summoned to Bukhāra to succeed him and took Fakhr al-Dawla and Kābul with him. Soon after the death of ʿAḏud al-Dawla at Baghābdād (371 = 983) Fakhr al-Dawla gradually reconquered Džurdjān and Tābaristān and wished to restore them to Kābul but was persuaded by his vizier Ibn ʿAbād al-Šāhīb [q.v.] to keep them for himself. After the death of Fakhr al-Dawla however Kābul regained his inheritance about seventeen years' exile in 388 (998) and held it till in 403 (1012) his tyranny and the many executions ordered by him produced a rising of the troops, who deposed him and put on the throne his son Minūṣīr, who was summoned from Tābaristān. Soon afterwards he was put to death by the rebels in the fortress of Džurshākh between Džurdjān and Tābaristān by being deprived of his clothes, while engaged in his religious aubiations, and then allowed to perish of cold. He was learned in several branches of knowledge, particularly astrology, and left several short treatises (rasā’ilī) as well as Persian and Arabic poems. He was also a distinguished calligrapher. The poets Ābā Bakr Muḥammad b. ʿAli of Sārkhāsh and Ziyād b. Muḥammad of Džurdjān sang his praises (Muḥammad ʿAwfī, Lūbāb al-ʿAbdī, ii. 18, 19).


(CL. Huart.)

KABYLIA, a mountainous country in the Algerian Tell. The name Kabylia or land of the Kabyles (Arab. Bilād al-Kabīlī) is of comparatively modern origin; it is not found in the Arab historians or geographers, nor is it usual among the natives. It seems only to have been introduced as a geographical name by European scholars since the sixteenth century. The name Kabylia is taken from the Arabic kabīl, plural of kabīl, tribe; which some Arab writers use as a synonym for Berbers; this is found as early as the author of the Kīrīf, who several times (e.g. p. 217 and 238 of the Arabic text), in detailing the contingents of troops in the Marinid armies, carefully distinguishes the Kabīlī from the Arabs.

The European geographers sometimes give the name Kabylia to the whole mountain system of the Algerian coast from the mouth of the Isser to the Tunisian frontier. These elevations show in fact several common characteristics: predominance of the older strata with a few less extensive chalk zones intervening, an irregular outline, a striking development of forest flora, a population consisting of settled tribes who for the most part have retained their Berber dialects. According to the different mountain ranges, Kabylia is divided into the following fairly well defined areas: Great Kabylia or Kabylia of the Djerdja, Little Kabylia or Kabylia of the Babour mountains between the Soumm in the west and the Wād al-Kabīr in the east, Kabylia of the Collo, Kabylia of the Diebel Edugh and Kabylia of Bōna. The first named of these areas is the most extensive and has the most marked character; it is therefore called Kabylia by preference and we shall deal with it alone in the following.

Great Kabylia is bounded on the north by the Mediterranean from the mouth of the Wād Buḍuṣ to Bougie, i. e. for a length of 100 miles. In the east it is bounded by the eastern shores of the Wād Sāhel (called Soumm in its low course) and by the upper course of the Isser, in the west
by the valley of the Wād Būdān and the Mi-
tidja plain. The area thus included measures about
41 miles from N. to S. between Delys and Bwira
(Bouira) and covers some 2307 square miles. Ac-
cess is rather difficult except from the west. Here
the gateway of Mēnerville (pass of the Beni Aūsha
450 feet high), the valley of the lower Iisser, the
depression of the Wād Shander and the pass of
Haussonvillers (600 feet) afford an easy access to
the Kabyl plain i. e. the heart of Kabylia.

Kabylia falls into three separate areas very
different from each other: the Kabylian mountains
in the narrower sense, the Djerđura chain and
the coast range. The Kabylian mountains "consist
in the centre chiefly of gneiss and micaceous
schists with larger or smaller intrusions of granu-
litic rocks and, on the flanks, of archaic schists
and primary argillaceous schists, the layers of
which form the outer spurs with their gentler
slopes. In the west of these mountains and sepa-
rated from the main group by tertiary deposits
rise several isolated rocky peaks: Bit Āris, the ma-
mountain of the Khâghna (2050 feet), the Djebel
Bellâwa (2200 feet) on the north side of the Tassili
and the central part of the Djerđura and cut
off on the other sides by a continuous de-
pression, in the north by the valley of the Sebou,
as much as 11 miles broad, in the west by the
valley of Draj al-Mirān and in the south by the
depression of Bughni. The whole system, sloping
from west to east (from 2225 to 1950 feet) is
divided by deep and narrow valleys into mountai-
neous blocks (hills of the Maqata, the Flissa
and of the Zwa, etc.).

The Djerđura forms in the south the edge of the
Kabyl massif for about 40 miles from Tizi (Berber = pass) Djeblit (350 feet) to Tizi-n’Shria
(4010 feet). It consists of lies limestone, split
up into a series of sharp combs or steep rocky
walls, and maintains an elevation of a little over
6500 feet. The highest summits, which run in two
rows, are the Haizer (6935 feet) and the Akukur
(7490 feet) in the north and in the south the
Lalla Khadidja (7500 feet). This altitude and the
scarcity of the passes, which are impassable in
the winter (the most important is the Tirurda
Pass (8655 feet), make traffic between the two
slopes very difficult. In the east of the Djerđura
proper, in the Djebel Arbal, there reappear
scattered layers of limestone, running down to
the sea where they end in the Gūraya of Bougie.

At a lower elevation (2500—3000 feet) the
coast range stretches along the sea-coast from the
mouth of the Sebou to the Djebel Aksfadi and
covers the greater part of eastern Kabylia with its
sandstone formations.

From this variation in elevation and geological
structure result marked differences in climatic con-
ditions. In the valleys, notably in the basin of
the Sebou, cut off from the sea by the coast
range, the summer is very hot (mean July tem-
perature in Tizi Uss 33° C.). In the Kabyl moun-
tain country on the other hand there is a long
cold winter, during which the ground is often
continually covered with snow, which lies on the
summits of the Djerđura from December to June.
The rainfall is unevenly distributed — being par-
ticularly heavy in the east of the district where it
averages 40 inches p. a., while the lowlands, nota-
tibly that of the Wād Sāhel-Summam, which is shel-
tered from the moist winds by the wall of the
Djerđura, are relatively dry. Nevertheless Kabylia
is one of the best watered areas in Algeria. Four
river-systems are distinguished: — the Isser, the
Wād Sāhel-Summam, the coast rivers, and the
Sebou. The latter collects the water from the
north slope of the Djerđura, supplied by tribu-
taries, flowing at the bottom of narrow valleys
cut through the Kabylian mountains. None of all
these water-courses is navigable; they are all
mountain torrents and are able to considerable
variations in their amount of water. The winter
rains and the melting of the snow produce a con-
siderable, often devastating, increase in their
volume.

Lying within the so-called Numidian zone which
is marked by luxuriant forests, Kabylia does not
have the treeless appearance of most Algerian
landscapes. The flint and sandstone formations
of the eastern part support great wooded moun-
tains (Yakur, Tizi Ufella, Aksfadi etc.) which
are covered with different kinds of oaks such as
the cork, the sān (chènes sèns, quercus Mirteckii),
the afores (quercus castaneofolia) and bāllūt or
pine-nut oak. Several cedar plantations, which
however are on the verge of extinction, dominate
slopes of the Djerđura up to a height of 3900
feet. Trees are especially cultivated in the Kabyl
mountains where they afford the inhabitants the
greater part of their resources. The leaves of
the ash-trees are used to feed the cattle, while its
wood is used for agricultural and domestic imple-
mants and vines sometimes cluster round their
stems. The fig and olive trees, the first of which
is grown up to 3250 feet and the latter to 1950
feet, play an important part in the life of the Kabyls.
Dried figs and oil form the basis of the food of
the population; the superfluity is sold abroad.
These fruit trees are therefore cultivated with the
greatest care and in increasing numbers, so that
we find fig and olive trees even on almost inacces-
sible slopes, where the soil has to be supported
by mortarless stone walls. Vegetable fields and orchards
surround the houses and villages and their pro-
duce serves to supply the daily wants of the
inhabitants. Wheat is grown only on the low-lying
ground and as a rule only in the districts settled
by Europeans. As the scarcity of meadows hardly
allows cattle to be reared, the native stock con-
sists of a few cattle and sheep and a large num-
ber of goats. The mule is the only suitable beast
of burden for this mountainous region.

Kabylia is the most populous part of Algeria as
it has about 660,000 inhabitants or 250 to the
square mile. The population however is very
unevenly distributed. Scattered in Djerđura, com-
paratively thin in the forest region, it is however
very dense in the Kabylian mountains where the
soil of the nature and abundant springs afford
more favourable conditions for human settle-
mants. The mixed community of Fort National and that
of Djerđura number, the former 61,726 to 145
miles, the latter 66,353 to 125 miles that is about
418 and 530 to the square mile or about the
density of population in Holland. The natives live
in groups in villages, sometimes up to several
thousand in one village. These settlements lie on
the hill-tops or on the mountain ridges which se-
parate the valleys from one another. The choice
of site was settled by consideration for the most
profitable use of the arable part of the slopes
and also for the necessity for securing a defenc
against neighbouring tribes. Surrounded by a belt of gardens protected by cactus hedges and encircling walls of stone without mortar, accessible only by steep paths, these villages were really fortresses, sometimes impregnable to an opponent unless provided with artillery. Since however the French occupation guarantees the peace of the land, the natives show a certain tendency to leave the summits and move their dwellings nearer to the valley. In spite of the picturesque appearance which the closely huddled together white houses with their brown tiles make, these villages are in reality only piles of wretched dirty hovels. Most of the houses consist of one storey only and have neither windows nor chimney. As a rule they are divided into two by a wall breast high, of which one part is for men and the other for cattle. The very scanty furnishing consists chiefly of mats, which take the place of bedding, and stone vessels, which hold the family provisions. The groups of houses are separated from one another by narrow passages, which are just broad enough to allow a loaded mule through, and are enshrouded in the dust of the native road. The only public building is the mosque which, only recognisable by its minaret, is in almost as miserable a condition as the private dwelling houses. As there are no shops in the village where the natives could make their necessary purchases, they have to go to a market (ṣīḥ) which is held weekly at a definite place, usually in the neighbourhood of a river or spring. This market has a great attraction for the Kabyls as they come to it not only to purchase food and other necessaries but also to meet the inhabitants of other villages and learn what is going on. The market usages have therefore been very strictly regulated. The market formed a neutral area, visitors to it enjoyed a special protection called "ṣānṣa of the market".

The Kabyl population is increasing steadily and rapidly, but the soil, which is of only average fertility, in spite of the aptitude of its inhabitants cannot support them all. The once flourishing native industries such as weaving, making carpets, ornaments, and arms (especially among the Flissa and the Banī Yenni) are disappearing more and more before European competition. The natives thus find themselves forced to leave their native land and seek work outside it, as moreover they used to do in earlier times also. Under Turkish rule the dwellers used to come in considerable numbers to Algiers to gain a livelihood as servants, porters or gardeners. Others, notably the Banā Yahyā, the Banī Iliten and the Banī Šāfā, went about among the Arab tribes as peddlars (ṣittarēn) and combined money-lending with commerce, as their descendants still do. The French conquest and the expansion of colonisation have opened new outlets for the industry of the natives. While they work in the coast towns as bricklayers, hodmen, and dock labourers, the Kabyls at the same time supply the farmers of the Tell of Algiers and Constantine with the labour so necessary for the harvest and vintage. They also readily labour on public works as well as in the mines of Algeria and Tunisia and for some years past in those of France also. Others again enlist in the native regiments, especially the tirailleurs. But the Kabyl's emigration is only temporary: — as soon as the pedlar, the agricultural labourer or the miner has saved a little capital, he returns to his village to buy a strip of land or at least a few trees at the earliest opportunity. The impulse to acquire property is very strong in them and the land is thus broken up into very small shares.

The Kabyls form the most important and at the same time the most compact Berber group in all Algeria. Yet they cannot be regarded as aboriginal and are descendants of the old African race which inhabited North Africa before the foreign conquests and the immigrations of the historical period. The very formation of the country made it a place of refuge for the inhabitants of the plateaus and valleys, who were pushed back by the continual inroads of foreign peoples into North Africa. In addition, as Hanoteau points out, Kabylia was at all times an asylum for outlaws and evil doers. The present Kabyl type is therefore the result of numerous crossings and far from being homogeneous. Many individuals can hardly be distinguished from Arabs, others and indeed the greater number, with their large bones, their square heads and their coarse face, are a mixture of Central and North African. As to the colour of their hair, two types can be distinguished, the brown and the much rarer blonde. Yet in spite of these differences, the natives of Kabylia have all the linguistic, social and religious peculiarities common to all the tribes described as Berber. They talk different Berber dialects, of which the Zwāwa spoken in Jdūrīja and in the Kabyl mountains is the commonest. "The Zwāwa, especially the Beni Raten, are those who, owing to their isolation, are considered to have preserved the purest Berber dialect; this gradually changes by almost imperceptible degrees as one goes westward into the dialect of the Ait Khaflīn and eastward into the dialect of the Wādī Šāhël (Wad Sāhil) and that of Bougie."

(R. Basset, Études sur les dialectes Berbères, Paris, 1894, Introd., p. viii.). The linguistic frontier even crosses the geographical boundaries of Great Kabylia and follows the watershed between the basin of the Wād Bī-Sellām and that of the Wād al-Kābir. The persistence of these dialects is all the more remarkable as the French occupation, the extension of Muslim as well as European education and finally the continual development of emigration seemed likely to bring about a rapid decline in the use of Berber. Although many natives have a more or less superficial knowledge of Arabic and French, Kabyl is nevertheless still the language of the home, and the only language used by the women and children in the villages. In many districts a decline in Arabic has been noted. In the quartier de la Grande Mosquée, for example, several Arabic speaking groups comprising some 18,400 persons have become completely berberised in the last few years (E. Dousté and E. F. Gautier, Études sur la dispersion de la langue berbère en Algérie, Algiers 1913).

The Kabyls possess no written literature but have a fairly varied and copious popular literature (songs, often inspired by current events, fairy tales, riddles, etc.). These productions, composed by illiterate people, often women, have been handed down by oral tradition and transmitted from village to village by wandering singers whose profession is often hereditary. Some of these singers (meddāb, fakīh) who sang the praises of the Dey, the faults of the tribes and the heroic deeds of the warriors, were held in high esteem by their
countrymen; others again who sang songs of love or humour to the accompaniment of the tambourine or the oboe were as despised as the butchers, measurers of corn and other individuals, who followed a trade regarded as degrading.

As Muslims, the Kabyls, like the other Berber tribes, adopted the creed without recognising the Kur'ān as law (see HERBERT, i. 702). Their customs are in many points contrary to orthodoxy. Lending money at interest, condemned in the Kur'ān, is generally allowed. "The acceptance of the principle that money is to be considered as goods," writes Hanoteau, "is a characteristic feature of Kabyl society which in order to remain true to its traditions has not shrunk from showing its contempt for the punishment of exclusion from the Muslim community, threatened as a punishment for usury". (Hanoteau and LE-TOURNEUX, La Kabylie et les coutumes kabyles, ii. 497.) The social and material position of women is far behind that assured her by Muslim law. All rights, being continually in tutelage; excluded from participation in the paternal inheritance, she herself is one of the family chattels. Marriage is merely an act of purchase. The man who divorces his wife still remains her owner and he fixes the price which must be paid him before she can marry again. Polygamy is legal but little practised and only a few marabouts are rich enough to afford it. The position of woman thus appears a very miserable one; she is, according to Hanoteau, "a human chattel" (Poeésies populaires de la Kabylie du Fjurdjara, p. 287). In practice, however, it appears that her position is easier than one would expect, as the local customs are not rigid, and an important place in the family and even in the villages, and, according to some authors (Rînî, Masqueray, Bouïfa), she exercises a role that means negligible influence in domestic life and even in public life.

In spite of the liberties they take with orthodoxy, the Kabyls are not, as is sometimes alleged, lukewarm Muslims. They have always been and still are to-day very susceptible to the influence of fanatics. Perhaps they, at one time, like many other Berber groups, embraced Khâridjî doctrines but they were regained for orthodox Islam at the beginning of the modern era and have since then remained steadfast in their faith. Their ignorance, it is true, leaves them defenceless against the incitements of marabouts. The latter held and still hold a special position in Kabyl society. Enjoying numerous privileges (exemption from taxation, entertainment allowances etc.) they were not expected to bear arms except in the holy war and, thus placed outside tribal wars and quarrels of the gelf, they kept for themselves the fruitful roles of intermediaries and peacemakers. The only representatives of education in the midst of an illiterate population, they gave the rudiments of instruction in the village schools and in the schools attached to the sîwâya, a word which among the Kabyls means a village exclusively inhabited by marabouts. Education in these schools (Kabyl thîmmâmr, Arab. madîrâ) is confined to the elements of Arabic language and grammar, theology and law. The marabouts live either scattered among the people or grouped in families or tribes. Some claim for themselves an Arab or even Sha'ri fi origin. These Shîrîf form a privileged caste and only marry among themselves. At all periods the past played by marabouts — male and female — has been considerable. It was they who stirred up the native resistance to the foreigners, Turk or French, who tried to conquer them. They were supported by the religious orders, of which the largest is that of the Rahmania, which originated in Kabylia itself under the marabout Sîlî Muhammâd 'Abî al-Rahmân Bû Khoirân, sprung from the tribe of the Ait Smâîl, who lived from 1126—1208 (1715—1798). Recruited at first from the Guechèula, a confederacy of which the Ait Smâîl were part, the order gradually extended throughout Kabylia. Its chiefs were the fiercest opponents of the French in 1857 and in 1871; although its influence has declined, the brotherhood of the Rahmâniya, of which the parent lodge is at Akiû, is still that which numbers most adepts (9000 members and 43 sîwâys in 1897, according to DEPONT and COPPOLANI, Les Confréries religieuses du Maghreb). History. Practically nothing is known of the history of Kabylia before the 18th century A.D. There are no native chronicles and the notices supplied by Arab, Latin or European writers are few and fragmentary. The characteristic fact of Kabyl history during this long period seems to have been the resistance of the Kabyls to foreign penetration. In ancient times even the Romans did not succeed in establishing themselves in the massif. Their principal settlements Sâldae (Bougie) Rucacuza (Tiziirt), Rusucurru (Dellys) were situated on the coast. Military posts kept a watch on the valley of Wâd Sâhel and of the Iser, but the Bôjirjara (Mons Perunas) remained politically independent under the rule of native chiefs, vasalls of Rome. The inhabitants of the mountainous region formed the confederation of the Five Nations or Quinque Gentes: — the Massisenses (perhaps the Mlisma of the Wâd Sâhel), Tsaflenses (Iliissens?), Jabubeni (Beni Jubaar), Tendenses and Jasabenses. These natives rose in revolt several times, notably in the first century A.D., during the rebellion of Tacfarinas, then again in the time of Dioecletian. From 285—297, they ravaged eastern Mauretania and western Numidia. To subdue them, Maximian had to depopulate them de masse. In the following century they adopted Donatist doctrines and again took up arms under their national leaders, Firmus (372—375 A.D.) and later Gildon. We do not know at what period and under what conditions, Islam was introduced into Kabylia, taking the place of Christianity and paganism. We may, however, conjecture that this land must have for some time escaped the Arab conquest and served as a place of refuge for the last remnants of Roman and Byzantine population as well as for the Berber tribes fleeing before the invaders. In the 6th century however, the conversion to Islam was an accomplished fact, since Ibn Khdalîn (Histoire des Berbères, transl. of Slane, i. 256) mentions the Zwâwa at the same time as the Ketâma among the pariahs of 'Obaid Allah and the founders of the Fatimid empire. Well treated by the Şanhadjî Zirids, the Kabyls then passed under the rule of the Mmâmidîs, who reduced to obedience the mountain peoples of the Bougie region, and then under the sway of the Hafsids. But Ibn Khaldûn himself says that the authority of the sovereigns of Bougie over the Kabyl tribes was quite nominal [cf. IRÂÌÍN, Zwâwa].
At the beginning of the xvith century, the people of Kabylia were divided into three political groupings called by western writers, the kingdom of Kūko, the kingdom of Lābbes, and the principality of the Beni Jubar. The kingdom of Kūko stretched from Djiurdjura to the sea, and through the port of Azzefûn was in touch with European countries. The kingdom of Lābbes comprised several tribes of little Kabylia of which the most important was that of the Beni ʿAbbas in the east of the Wād Sāhīl [cf. the article KALĀT BANĪ ʿABBĀS]. The principality of the Beni Jubar comprised the population of the coast east of Bougie. The Turks who first appeared in Algeria at the same time and there founded a powerful state, relied on these different groups in turn. ʿArādī contracted a close alliance with the Sulṭān of Kūko, Ahmad b. al-Kādī, who gave him auxiliaries and took part in the expeditions against Algiers and Tiemcen [see ʿARDH], but he thereby alienated the Beni ʿAbbas, who took the side of the Spaniards. After the death of ʿArādī, ibn al-Kādī quarrelled with his successor Khaīr al-Dīn [q. v.]; he inflicted a bloody defeat on him on the land of the Flissat Umellī, and remained for several years master of Algeria and of Mīdītā. An alliance with the Beni ʿAbbas enabled the Turks to regain the advantage. Pursued right into their mountains, the Kabylia were forced to submit and to pay tribute. During the period of the Beylerbeys, the inhabitants of great Kabylia lived on good terms with the Turks. Khaīr al-Dīn and his successors recruited from among the Zwāwa soldiers whose fidelity they appreciated and on whom they could rely if necessary against the undisciplined soldiers of the Janissaries. The alliance with the Sulṭān of Kūko enabled Ḥassān b. Khaīr al-Dīn to triumph over the Sulṭān of Lābbes who became in his turn a tributary of the Turks (1550). As to the ʿAbd al-Djaḥābār, they had shown themselves friendly to the Spaniards and after the reoccupation of Bougie by the Turks never ceased to wage war on its garrison.

The rulers of Algiers did not however succeed in definitely imposing their supremacy on the Kabyls. The latter during the closing years of the xvith century and during the whole of the next century, were in a state of almost permanent insurrection against the Turks. The expeditions undertaken by the Pashas to chastise the rebels yielded no permanent result. The conquered tribes agreed to pay tribute but cast off the obligation as soon as the Turkish columns had quitted the country. In the course of these struggles, important changes modified the political organisation of Kabylia. The kingdom of Kūko disappeared and was replaced by the confederation of the Zwāwa. A new confederation that of the Gueḥšāla (Iqūṣshāl) was founded in the middle of the xviith century by a shāikh named Gassem and united together the population of the western part of the Djiurdjura. In the xviiith century, the Turks made some progress. They succeeded in taking the mountainous region between the Wād Buğdurta and the Wād ʿAssī (1745—46) but could not subdue the Bani Rūṭen. Their military ports at Buğhnu, Bwira, Burdi Sebā, were destroyed on several occasions. The first years of the xixth century were still more unfortunate. The Flissat invaded Mīdītā several times; in 1816 the Gueḥšāla seized the burdij of Buğhnu and only spared the garrison at the intervention of the marabouts.

Turkish authority in Kabylia was therefore up to the end very precarious. The tribes which recognised it were distributed over two kaʿids: the kaʿid of Buğhnu, which included the confederations of the Gueḥšāla, the Bani Sāaḍa and a part of the Maʿātika, and the kaʿid of the Sebā, including, besides the town of Delys, the Bani Kahlīna, the Bani Waguennūn, the Flissat al-Bahar, the peoples of the upper Sebā and those of the Wād al-Ḥamāmūl. In the north-east, finally, the Turks occupied Bougie. To maintain order in the country they(prog. number=1, start=152, end=155, label=Fig. 4.2) established at a few land the a few hundred janissaries installed in fortified posts (burdij), and smala, of which several were composed of negroes (ʿabāt). They levied taxes—which were however quite light—on the produce of the plain, collected dues in kind (sheep, grain, figs & oil) for the use of the garisons, claimed the right of investiture of shāikhs and granted for a fee passports to natives, etc. In return the Turks interfered very little in local affairs and only did so when they thought they could make profit out of it. The most efficacious means employed by them to bring recalcitrant tribes to order was the blockade. As the country did not produce enough grain to feed its inhabitants they were not long in submitting. The Turks, moreover, observed local divisions with the greatest care and showed themselves full of consideration for influential marabouts, to whom they gave exceptional privileges. They heaped gifts on their sāwiyas and built kubahs on the tombs of the most venerated saints. Turkish rule therefore has left no feeling of hatred among the Kabyls. "The Turk", says Hanoteau (Poeésies populaires de la Kabylie du Foujura, p. 63—64 note), "is the type of bravery and dignity in the popular songs; when the poet wants to praise one of his compatriots, he compares him to a Turk".

Where nominally subject to the Turks or completely independent, the Kabyl tribes preserved intact their political and administrative institutions. Kabylia, far from forming a state, was simply an aggregation of little municipal republics, grouped in confederations of small size. The political and administrative unity was the village (ḥadārli), whether a single village or a union of several hamlets (ṭaḥk) and subdivided again into divisions called by different names in different districts (adrīm, tharīf, tāqāhriḥ, ḥārāk). Several villages bound together by mutual obligations formed a tribe (ṭaršā). At the time of the French conquest there were 1400 villages divided among 120 tribes. A confederacy of several tribes was called a thāqibāt (Arab. qabīla). The chief of these confederations were those of the Gueḥšāla, the Ait Šeqa, the Zwāwa, the Eastern Zwāwa, the Ait Irida, the Ait ʿAssī, the Maʿātika, the Flissat Umellī and the Flissat al-Bahar (Ḥlis- sen), the Ait Waguennūn, the Ait Djenma, the Ait Chobri, etc.). In certain cases several confederations could unite for some common defensive or aggressive purpose, but such leagues had never more than a temporary character. All tribes however were not grouped into confederacies and some were content merely to contract, when in case of need, temporary alliances with their neighbours.

The village, the fundamental element in the
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Number 25:
P. 491\textsuperscript{b}, l. 10 a f., read "\textit{al-\textasciitilde{A}m\textacute{u}zi\textacute{y}a}" instead of "\textit{al-\textasciitilde{A}m\textacute{u}zi\textacute{v}i}".

Number 26:
P. 560\textsuperscript{b}, l. 30 a f.: The equation is to be read as follows:
\[ 2.97 \times 6 + 2 \times \frac{2.97}{6} = 18.81 \times 4 = 18.88. \]
P. 565\textsuperscript{a}, l. 18 a f., read "\textit{ittih\textacute{a}d}" instead of "\textit{ittih\textacute{a}d}".
P. 566\textsuperscript{b}, l. 8 a f., read "182 sq." instead of "322".

Number 27:
P. 590\textsuperscript{b}, l. 24 a f., read "\textit{ma\textacute{m}r}" instead of "\textit{ma\textacute{m}r}".
P. 592\textsuperscript{a}, l. 17, add: Gaudefray-Denombynes, \textit{Le p\textacute{e}lerinage \`a la Mekke} (Paris 1923).
P. 594\textsuperscript{b}, l. 24 a f., add: E. Chantrce, \textit{Recherches anthropologiques au Caucase} (Lyon 1885 -- 87).
P. 601\textsuperscript{a}, l. 5, read "\textit{am\textacute{u}z\textacute{v}i}" instead of "\textit{an\textacute{r}av}".
P. 602\textsuperscript{a}, l. 3 a f., add. H. Basset, \textit{Essai sur la litt\textacute{e}rature des Berb\textacute{e}res} (Alger 1920).
P. 613\textsuperscript{a}, l. 8 a f., read "162 sq." instead of "1623".
P. 617\textsuperscript{b}, l. 29 a f., read "\textit{\textasciitilde{d}r}" instead of "\textit{\textasciitilde{d}r}".
\quad l. 2 a f., read "\textit{sul\textacute{t}che}\textacute{u}" instead of "\textit{sul\textacute{t}che}".
P. 618\textsuperscript{a}, l. 20 a f., read "\textit{Dr	extasciitilde{r}n\textacute{st}t\textacute{c}i}" instead of "\textit{Dru\textasciitilde{r}m\textacute{st}t\textacute{c}i}".
\quad l. 9 a f., read "Winogradow, \textit{Eodosiya}" instead of "Minogradow, \textit{Fodosiya}".
Kabyl organisation was a kind of municipal republic subject to the authority of the assembly of its citizens (the ūnama, or ūme). This had most extensive powers. It appointed a president (amakru, amar, año), who was charged with carrying out its decisions, and tenmman (plural of ūmen), a kind of assistants, who had to supervise the aman in the exercise of his duties. The qamāla fixed the quota and the assessment of taxes. As declared war, made peace, administered public charity and, lastly, modified, if necessary, local customs. All male inhabitants old enough to observe the fast of Ramadān took part in the assembly and were bound to be present, but in practice decisions were made by a minority of rich and influential persons, so that the government of the village was only democratic in theory. The authority of the qamāla was, besides, limited by the obligation under which it found itself to respect the rights of individuals or families, kindred or collective guarantees sanctified by long custom, market-laws, etc. The tribe, and the council with which it was identified, was the chief legal and political unit. The relations of the tribes and confederations were based on feudal considerations.

The capture of Algiers by the French in 1830 put an end to Turkish rule. On hearing of this event, the garrisons retired to the Titteri, leaving the country to itself. The Kabyls, however, proved themselves no more able to unite than they had in the past. Various chiefs, Ben Sâlem of the Baidīya, Dâd Zamun of the Flissa, St Djâdi of the Zemāna, Bouman or Hammoud es-Skâd, attempted to ascend the throne, but without any success. The French, their forerunners, had been in occupation of Bougie since 1833, while the Kabyls of the east made frequent incursions into the Mitidja. To dispose of such dangerous neighbours the government therefore decided to conquer Kabylia at a time when 'Abd al-Kâdir seemed definitely reduced to impotence. A first expedition conducted by Bugœaud in the valley of the Sebou resulted in the submission of the Flissat al-Bâh and the occupation of Delles (1844). Interrupted by the Franco-Moroccan War, then by the struggle with 'Abd al-Kâdir, who in 1849 again tried to raise the Kabyl tribes, operations were resumed in 1847 and brought the tribes of Wad Sâhel to recognise French authority. But the Kabyl massif and the Djurdjura served as an asylum for all malcontents and continued to be a smouldering fire of rebellion, which was continually blazing out again. In 1849, the Zîwâ, the Gueshtâla, and the Banû Mellîkhâ attacked the tribes who had already submitted; in 1851, the Shérif Bûl Baghî, with several thousands of mountaineers threatened Bougie, then, repulsed by French troops, sought refuge in the Djurdjura. Pelissier in 1851, Bouquet in 1852 had to take the field against him.

To facilitate penetration of the country, roads were built from Algiers to Bougie, from Delles to Aumale and finally from Sétif to Bougie across Little Kabylia, only recently pacified. The natives, however, were not yet subdued; they took advantage of the reduction of the effective troops during the Crimean war to take up arms again. The rising of the tribes of the upper Sebou necessitated the dispatch of a column which crossed the country between Bougie and Delles and pushed as far as the Banû Yahyâ in the very heart of the Kabyl massif (June—July 1854). New disturbances provoked by the Kabmâniya brotherhood in 1855 and 1856 forced the French once more to fight the tribes of the Sebou and the Gueshtâla. The results obtained however would have remained insecure so long as the Banû Râtan, the most turbulent of the tribes of the massif, were not reduced to impotence. A new expedition was therefore organised in 1857 by Marhal Randon, then governor-general, supported by Generals Macmahon, Renault and Yûsuf. While returning to the southern slope of the Djurdjura, three divisions left Tizi Urt and scaled the slopes of the massif. The Banû Râtan were the first to be attacked and defended themselves energetically for two days. The capture of their villages and the defeat inflicted on them on the plateau of Sûk al-Arbâ forced them to sue for peace (25 May). The Ait Mengueltet, their allies, continued the struggle and were crushed at Išeriden (24 June). The Ait Yenni had to submit in their turn in the beginning of July. The defeat of the Ait Iten, who had been stirred up by the female Ansha about Lalla Fâtma, terminated the campaign. The tribes delivered hostages and paid a war indemnity, but retained their municipal autonomy and their kânâm. The building of Fort Napoléon (now Fort National) on the plateau of Sûk al-Arbâ enabled the French troops to control the whole massif. The country was opened up by roads, put under military rule and divided into four administrative districts.

The most complete tranquillity reigned until 1871, when the Kabyls rose again at the instigation of the grand-master of the Kabmâniya, Shaîkh al-Haddâd and especially of his son al-Azîz, who made an alliance with Mokrâni, the rebel bashaghâ of the Meğjâna. A holy war was proclaimed on April 8 at the market of Şedûk and soon the rebels numbered 180,000 fighting men. Bougie, Delles, Tizi Urt, Fort National, and Dres' al-Misân were blockaded by the natives, the village of Palestro was taken and sacked by the rebels in spite of the resistance of the Europeans. The rebels even threatened Mitidjâ but were held up on the Alma by Colonel Fourchault's flying column. Troops sent from Algiers delivered the towns and garrisons besieged by the insurgents, who were routed at Išeriden on June 24. Shaîkh al-Haddâd
surrendered to the French on July 13 and at the end of the same month, the valley of Wād Sāhel was cleared of rebels. Kabylia lost its municipal autonomy and a war indemnity of 36,582,000 francs was levied on it. Besides, 446,000 hectares of land were sequestered and appropriated for European colonisation, for which centres were created in the valley of the Isser and in the valley of Wād Sāhel. Since that date peace has not been disturbed and civil government has been organised in Kabylia as in the rest of the Tell (cf. the article ALGERIA). Primary schools with technical instruction have been established in the principal villages and education is compulsory for the natives. The latter seem to have adapted themselves to the new situation; their resources have increased to such a pitch that in some districts European colonisation has reeded and considerable areas of land have been bought back by the natives. The isolation in which the Kabyls lived so long is tending to disappear and, if it is chimerical to hope even in remote future for an assimilation of the Berber and European elements, perhaps it may be permitted to foresee for them sufficient community of interest to prevent new conflicts.


KĀČI (sometimes written KÂ; al-Baladûrî and al-Yâkûbî; getContext: {'function': 'add', 'prev': 'KĀČI', 'next': 'KĀČI'}, 'ed. Wûstenfeld, iv. 126, l. al-Kâsâ, but i. 505, 294. iv. 94, 10: al-Kass; in Anglicised spelling CUTCt; an Indian State attached to the Pālānąpur Agency of the Bombay Presidency, lying between 22° 47’ and 24° N. and 68° 25’ and 71° 11’ E. Its area is 7016 sq. m. and the population in 1911 was 513, 429 (Musulmans 126, 133). It is separated from the mainland of Sindh and Kathiawâr by the great salt-swamp known as the Rann of Kācî (Great and Little) which makes it a quasiland. The Rann is included in its boundaries, but not in the area given above. The country is hilly in some parts, but is flat for the most part. There are signs of former volcanic action. Earthquakes have frequently occurred; that of 1819 wrought great destruction, including the capital Bûdî.

The Rann was undoubtedly at one time an arm of the sea and may with probability be identified with the great lake described by Arrian as visited by Alexander near the mouths of the Indus. It has been identified by S. Juliari, V. de St. Martin, Watters and V. Smith with the Ki-ch’a of Hwen Tsang, which he describes as under the suzerainty of the Vâllâhâr kings, but this is open to doubt as the province described by Hwen Tsang does not seem to have been near the sea.

Al-Baladûrî mentions a king of Kâsâ called Râsak (Râsik) in the time of the Caliph al-Walîd I (86—96 = 705—715). The town of Surasta (Soroṣhta) situated in the Bay of Kâcî still existed in the ixth century. It was inhabited by the Maid (Mêd), who were reputed as pirates. According to Al-Baladûrî, the people of Kâcî were Muslims in the time of Hîshâm 105—125 (724—743). When the power of the Muslims in the region of the Indus declined in this period, they endeavoured to maintain themselves in Kâsâ (al-Yâkûbî). Al-Berûnî describes the eastern branch of the Mîhrân of Sîndh (the Indus) as flowing into the ocean at a place called Sîndhu-sâgara (the Sea of Sîndh) in Kâcî, and this is clearly the Rann of Kâcî. The Rann was therefore an arm of the sea as lately as 1000 A. D., and a branch of the Indus still flowed into it. Kâcî is described by al-Berûnî also as the home of pirates (bawîrdî). The Simma Râjâbî fîlers of Sîndh conquered the country probably in the xivth century; the majority of them became Musulmans, but the Dihâdjeđa clan, whose power was established by Môda about 1270 to 1298, adopted a modified form of Hinduism. They have continued to rule the country under the suzerainty first of the Kings of Ghûjarât, then of the Mughal Emperors and lastly of the British Government. The Khalîbâs of Sîndh invaded Kâcî in the xviith century (1762—5). The early reputation of Kâcî for piracy was revived in more recent times and led to the British occupation in 1815—1818. The Râo was however soon restored.

The Dihâdjeđa fîlers bear the title of Râo. Their capital is at Bûdî and coins are struck there in the name of the Mâhârâo joined first with those of the later Emperors of Dihli and more recently with those of Queen Victoria and her successors. The port of Mandvi is a considerable town with a large coasting trade. The Kâcî language is peculiar to the province. It belongs to the Western Indian group of languages and is commonly classed as a dialect of Gujjarâtî, although, according to Grierson,
KAČCHI — KAḌĀ.

It may perhaps be more correctly considered a dialect of Sindhi. In accordance with its geographical position it forms a link between the two languages.


KAČČI, or KAČČH GANDĀWA. A province in Bālūcistān extending from 27° 55’ to 29° 35’ N. and from 67° 11’ to 68° 28’ E. with an area of 6,415 sq. m. It forms a level plain enclosed on the N. and E. by the southern Sulaimān Mts. and on the W. by the Kirthār Ranges. To the S. it is open being bounded by the plain of N. Sindh. Politically it forms part of the Khānate of Kaḥūt [q. v.] with the exception of the small area of Sībī in the north which was nominally part of Afghanistan and was transferred to the British Government under the treaty of Gandanak in 1879. This district is part of British Bālūcistān. The tribes in the western half of Kaḍch, the Dōmmī, Umārānī, and Khāirsī are only nominally subject to the Khān. These tribes are the successors of the railway from Jacobabad to Quetta, which traverses the province from south to north. The territory west of this line is also mainly occupied by Balūc tribes with the exception of the area near Dīddhar in the north, where nomadic Brahōs are found. Everywhere there is a large settled population of Dīssī. There are no large towns; Gandāwā, Sūrān, Dīddhar, Sībī and Lāhrī are the principal villages. Cultivation is carried on by irrigation from the small streams and hill-torrents which issue from the mountains; the Nātī and Bālūcī on the north, the Mula and Sūkhjēdi on the west, and the Lāhrī and Chāตร on the east. Without irrigation, cultivation is impossible as the climate is intensely hot and the rainfall very scanty. The valleys of the Mula, Bālūcī and Nātī form passes by which communication with the uplands has been carried on from time immemorial. The two first-named are now traversed by railways which lead to Quetta and Peshāin by the Bālūc and Harnai countries. The strip of territory called Naṣirābād is politically part of the Sībī district. It lies adjacent to the British District of Jacobabad in Sind, and receives its irrigation from the Sind Canal fed by the Indus.

The population is scattered but denser than in most parts of Bālūcistān. Including the Sībī and Naṣirābād tahsils, and the Dōmmī-Khāirsī country, all of which are geographically part of the Kaḍch plain, the total is 175,860 (census of 1911). The history of this tract is dealt with under atta. BāLūCISTĀN and KAḌĀWĀ.

BiBliography: Census of India 1901 and 1911. Balochnia. (See also s. v. BālūCISTĀN.)

M. Longworth Dames.)

KAḌĀ means literally "deciding" (जन्म, फ़ाळ, फ़ाळ, तरिक, cf. Ibn Ḥarm, Mīlāl, iii. 51) but the root is found in many diverging senses already in the Kaḍch, "commanding," "judging," "making so as to be fixed," "informing," "substituting," "discharging (obligation)" etc.; cf. al-Iṣfāhānī, Mafradāt, p. 416, and Lāsūn, xx. 47 sqq. Technically it indicates a) the office and functioning of a judge (कान्त); b) the discharging of a previously neglected religious obligation, e.g. of the daily worship or of fasting in Ramadān; thus opposed to adā, the performance of the duty at the appointed time (Juyuboll, Ḥanāfī, Ḥanāfī. Gezetei, p. 68, note); Lane, Lexicon, p. 380); c) the eternal, universal decision of Allah as to all existent things as they are continuously, very nearly the "eternal decree" of Calvinism. The point in doubt in the last use is the relation of the term to kādar (कादर), "measuring or estimating an amount," "assigning something by measure;" to iṣāna, "providence;" and to the will (कार्य) and knowledge (ज्ञान) whether kādar is one of the "essential qualities" (al-ṣifāt al-ḥāliyya) of Allah or of His "qualities of action" (al-ṣifāt al-fāliyya); is eternal (कादाण) or originated (कादिक). For orthodox Ashārites kāḍa is the will of Allah (al-Baiḍāwī on Kur. ii. 111) and its eternal connection (tāʿalītaḥ), while kādar is His bringing things into existence in accordance with His will. Or it is His eternal knowledge and its connection with the thing known, while kādar is His bringing the thing into existence in accordance with His knowledge. Kāḍā therefore, is eternal as one of the eternal qualities and kādar is originated because it is the "connections" tie to the "qualities" of the original power. But others taught that ḫaḍā is the bringing forth (तोरन) of transitory things (al-kāʾimāt) in accordance with the knowledge of Allah, while kādar is the eternal defying of each thing with what of good and bad, advantage and disadvantage, it is to have when it exists. Ḫaḍa, then, is originated and kādar is eternal. Further, ḫaḍā, if it equals Allah's will or knowledge, is one of the essential qualities, but if it is this "bringing forth" it is only one of the connections of Allah's power, and these, according to the Ashārites, are originated. The Māturidīs called these "active qualities" and held that they were the names for the Māturidī quality takawīn (making to become) which the Ashārites did not admit as a quality (al-Fadālī with comment of Al-Baidāwī, Cairo 1315, pp. 55, 61; al-Nasīfī's Aḵāṭī with comm. of al-Taftīzīn, etc., Cairo, 1321, p. 95). But the overwhelmingly accepted position makes ḫaḍā the universal, general and eternal decree and kādar the individual development or application of that in time. A phrase quoted in the Sīhāb under KDK is significant, Mā yaḥṣādiruḥu ʿuḥad min al-ḵaḍā, "That which Allah measures out of ḫaḍā", Al-Rāzi on Kur. xxiii. 37, 38 ( Mushāfī, Cairo 1320, vi. 52) even applies the distinction to the prohibition of evil and of human responsibility. That which is by kādar comes in incidentally, almost accidentally, and the disadvantages (dārar) of the world are through it, while the good (ḵhaʾir) is by ḫaḍā. Man was created by Allah subject to lust and anger in order that, striving against these under the guidance of reason and religion, he might be rewarded. That leads in some to sin, but Allah did
not produce this consequential sin in them by intention, although it was by His ḫadār. Again, that which is by ḫadār being unlabelled is always perfectly intelligible — we see it happening all the time; but some of weak understanding may ask the reason for a thing which is by ḫadār. Yet it must not be thought that these latter things are necessary consequences following of themselves according to the Muṭalālī doctrine of tawīl of or the philosophical teaching that there is a nature in things (fāb). Everything is by the choice (fāṣīd) of Allāh and He admits only a certain custom (ṣāfa) in things. Among philosophers the tendency is to equate ḥadār with Allâh's knowledge or with His eternal providence (ṣināya) or even to say that it is an expression for the existence of all existent things, taken as a whole, in the world of reason, while ḥadār is their external existence, separated, one after another (Dict. of Tech. Terms, p. 1234 sq.).

Bibliography: has been given in the article.

(D. B. Macdonald.)

KADÂ (A.). In the terminology of Turkish administration kadâ (kuza) denotes a district governed by a kâtib-mahmûd (q. v.).

KADAM SHARIF (Kadam Rasûl Allâh). Along the routes (muṭār) popularly attributed to Muhammad was the fact that when he trod on a rock, his foot sunk into the stone and left its impress there. (This miracle is usually referred to along with others e. g. that he cast no shadow, that if one of his hairs fell in the fire, it was not burnt, that flies did not settle on his clothes etc. (v. al-Ḥalabi, al-Sîr al-Ḥalabiyya, Bûlîk, 1292, III, 407), or that his sandals left no imprint on the sand (v. Ibn Ḥadîj al-Haṭîmî, commentary on al-Bûṭrî’s al-Kaṣīda al-Ḥamîliya, I, 176. (Ind. Off. MS., Loth, n. 826, fol. 94). No early authority refers to such a miracle, nor can any ḥadîth be quoted in corroborative of it, as Ḧâṣîl al-Dîn al-Sûyûtî himself pointed out (v. al-Ḥalabi, op. cit., i. 497). But sufficient evidence of this miracle is considered to be provided by the numerous impressions of one or both of the feet of the Prophet, which are venerated in different parts of the Muslim world. The most famous of these footprints is that in the Masjid al-ʿAṣû, at Jerusalem, on the rock from which Muhammad mounted Burûq for his journey to heaven (ṣams al-Dîn al-Sûyûtî, Ithâf al-ʿAṣûq, Fî Fadâl al-Masjid al-ʿAṣûq, Journ. Res. Al. Soc., xix., NS., 1887, p. 258–9). In a mosque near the southern gate of Damascus, on the road to Ḥawrân, is shown the imprint of the foot of the Prophet, when he half-lighted from his camel, but was warned by the angel Gabriel that God had given him the choice between the Paradise of this world and that of the next; whereupon he relinquished his intention of entering the city (W. G. Palgrave, Journey through Central and Eastern Arabia, London, 1865, ii. 19). In Cairo there are two footprints, one in a mosque called Mihrâr al-nabî (Rev. des Trad. Pâpe., ix. 653), the other at the tomb of Kâbir Bey (q. v.) (Baedeker’s Egypt, 1914, p. 113), who, according to Aḥmad Dâhlûn (q. v.,) purchased it for the sum of 20,000 dinars; in Tâba there are impressions of both the feet of the Prophet, in the shrine of Sâyid Aḥmad al-Badawi (Rev. des Trad. Pâpe., xxii. 410); as also, at Constantinople, in the mosque where Sulṭân Aḥmad al-Ḥamîd I is buried (ibid., ix. 473); cf. also Constantinople, i. 871.

KADAM SHARIF. But it is in India that this veneration for the footprints is always so great as to have attained its fullest extension, and such slabs of stone are found all over the country, — sometimes venerated in buildings specially erected for their reception, as the Kadam Rasul Mosque at Gâwir, or kept with other relics, as in the Djinâ’i Masjid, Dîhî, or left disregarded in a corner of a cemetery, as in that of Shâh Djinâlî, near ‘Aligâr, or preserved in the house of some private person. Usually, there is the imprint of one foot only, but in the Kadam Rasul building at Balasore (in Orissa), the stone bears the marks of both feet, as well as those of ‘Ali. (Abdus Salam, The Qudam Rasul Building at Balasore in Journ. As. Soc. Beng., iv. [1908], 31–2.) One of the most highly venerated of these footprints is that placed over the tomb of Fâth Khân, the son of Firûz Shâh Tughlîk (q. v.); this monarch had associated his son with him in the government as early as 760 H., and the death of Fâth Khân in 776 H. was a cause of great grief to his father, who erected a stately tomb over his grave, with a mosque and a madrasa attached. The footprint is said to have been brought from Madâna by the great saint of the Ḥâlij order, Sâyîd Ḧâṣîl al-Dîn Bûkhârî, known as Makhîmîn-i-Dijânîyân; it is kept immersed in water, which is believed to possess healing power; a religious fair is held here every year, on the 12th of Rabî’ al-awwal, the anniversary of the death of the Prophet (Sâyîd Aḥmad Khân, Description des Monuments de Delhi, Journ. As., 1860, p. 411–2). At Uâh, which has a rich collection of relics of the Prophet, there is a footprint in the shrine of Bandâgî Muhammad Ghâwî (oh. 923 H.), a descendant of ‘Abî al-Ḥâdi Dîlî (Gazetet of the Bahawalpur State, Lahore, 1908, p. 166).

The slab of stone with the footprint of the Prophet, preserved in the Kadam Rasul Mosque at Gâwir (q. v.) is said to have been brought from Madâna by ‘Ali al-Dîn Husain Shâh, king of Bengal 1494–1521; the fine mosque in which it rests was built by his son and successor, Nûrî Shâh, in 1530 (J. H. Raviwhâb. Geog. Gen., London, 1878, p. 20). About fifty years later, Mr Abû Turâb, who had been appointed by Akbar leader of the pilgrims’ caravan, brought back from Mecca, in 1579, a stone bearing the imprint of the right foot of the Prophet; that brought by Makhîmîn-i-Dijânîyân to Sultân Firûz Shâh is said to have represented the left foot. Akbar himself went out several miles from Agra to receive the holy relic, and carried it on his shoulder for about a hundred paces, his example being afterwards followed by his nobles and courtiers, who escorted the stone with great pomp and ceremony to the city. In the following year, when Mr Abû Turâb was returning to his home in Gandhar, he received permission from Akbar to take the footprint with him; he erected a building in Asâwâl, near Aḥmadâbâd, as a shrine for this slab and for some hairs of the Prophet, which he had also brought from Mecca with him; after his death the footprint was placed over his tomb, which is still standing to the south of the city of Aḥmadâbâd, but the footprint is no longer there, having been removed (it is said) to Khamâyî (Mr Abû Turâb Valî, History of Gujarat, Calcutta, 1909, pp. 97–9). The footprint on the
grave of Sayyid Muhammad Maqbul Alam, who is buried in the precincts of the shrine of his ancestor, Sayyid Muhammad Shih Alam, at Batusya, to the south of Aujmahbudd, is said to be a copy made from the stone in the Djami Masjid at Dihli (J. Burgess, *The Muhammadan Architecture of Ahmadnabad*, London, 1905, ii. 20, 50). Similar copies on stone or on paper are sometimes found in the houses of private persons (G. A. Herklotz, *Qanun-e-Islam*, Madras, 1863, p. 153).

Closely connected with the veneration of the footprints of Muhammad, is that paid to representations of his sandals. Copies of these are hung up in the houses of the pious, as a protection against the assaults of the Devil, as a symbol of purity, as the depredations of robbers, etc.; they are also said to have the power to dispel the pangs of childbirth (al-Qasamali, al-Marwakib al-ladaniya, Cairo, 1281 H., i. 357); such representations are common in Algeria, Egypt, India and Syria.


(T. W. Arnold.)

**KADAR.** The contradictory statements of the Kuran on free will and predetermination show that Muhammad was an opportunist preacher and politician and not a systematic theologian. It has been demonstrated (Grimme, *Einleitung in den Koran*, vol. ii.) that his predeterminist position steadily hardened towards the close of his life, and the least conscious Muslim attitude on the subject seems to have been an uncompromising fatalism. KDR was the root used most generally to express it (see, too, KADAR) and appears to mean primarily "to measure, estimate" and then "to assign specifically by measure" as though Allah "measured out" his decrees. On the early opposition to this, which showed itself apparently before A. D. 700 and under Christian influences, see **KADARIYA.** In the course of the conflict two extreme views and two mediating views developed, the mediating views becoming those possible in orthodox Islam. All could appeal to Kuranic texts and to traditions. The traditions are, of course, in great part shadows thrown back from the later controversies. They may be found in al-Bukhari, Kitab al-Kadar and also in part of the Kitab al-Tabib; see, too, al-Ashabi, *Kitab al-Fama*, Haidarabad, p. 84 sqq. (D=P al-Kinajat fi l-Kadar). The Djabiyya [q. v.] were absolute predeterminists; man had no part at all in the actions which apparently proceeded from him. This became an heretical position in Islam. The other extreme, that man produced his own actions, was that of the Kadarites who eventually merged in the Mutazilites. At first they did not venture to use the word "create" (khala')—Allah alone was khaliq—of this producing, but employed supposedly safer terms, such as lqad, 'idhara', but eventually they came to speak of man *creating* his actions. The intermediate parties were the Ash'arites and the Maturidites. Of the Ash'arites had thought out their position most logically, while the Maturidites stated simply the evident facts in the case. The basis of the upholders of free will seems to have been ethical; the justice (qadi) of Allah requires man's freedom. But orthodox Islam in general cared little for that, although some, as al-Taftazani and al-Razi, spend dialectic on the point. It maintained the Pauline parallel of the potter and the vessels; Allah could do what He pleased with His own. The orthodox difficulty was rather man's consciousness of freedom. This the Maturidites met by admitting that man did possess "free choice actions" (al ihkayyatiya) for which he is rewarded or punished (al-Nasafi, *A'zam*, ed. with comment. of al-Taftazani, Cairo 1231, p. 97). Man knows the difference between a voluntary grasping and an involuntary trembling, but the contradiction of this with the absoluteness of Allah's creative power is left unsolved. Al-Ash'ari introduced the idea of ikhtisar [see KAS] "accepting for one's self": man accepts for himself the action of Allah and this accepting is man's consciousness of free will. Apparently al-Ash'ari meant that this consciousness was only another part of Allah's creative action. Man is still an automaton although part of his machinery is that he believes himself free. Between the two wide scope was left even in orthodox Islam for discussion. The ultimate, scholastic, Ash'arite statement, denying that man possesses any action at all—which must not, however, be taken for the only possible one in Islam will be conveniently found in al-Fadlili's, *Kifayat al-Awmm* with al-Baidjrati's commentary, and in Luciani, *Prolegomenes theologiques de Souusi*. This attitude struck so deep that even al-Ghazali, and that even at the end of the wonderful psychological analysis of the book of the Ihya 'on the marvels of the heart', could quote with approval the tradition: "These are such men that they do not, and these to Him and I care not" (ed. with comment. of al-Sayyid al-Murtada, vii. 308); (cf. Macdonald, *Religious Attitude in Islam*, p. 301). For kadar among mystics see art. 'ABD AL-RAZZAK above.


**KADARIYA** is given regularly as a descriptive or surname (lajab) of the Mu'tazila, but it points back to a pre-Mu'tazilite time when the Muslims were beginning to ask theological questions and
when, the first apparently among these questioners, there were doubters of the harsh predestinarism of Muhammad's last period. The later Mu'tazilites asserted the name and held that it applied better to those who maintained Allah's kadr of all things, good and bad, than to themselves who held that man has a certain power (kundr) over his actions. This, the orthodox said, was because they wished to avoid the saying of the Prophet, "The Kada- rites are the Madjīs (Zararitians, Dualists of this People)", which meant that they made man a khalıkh al-asfāl, "creator of actions", thus giving Allah a partner in creating. But this saying was certainly later than the rise of the Kadarites and the name may well have been first invented and applied to themselves by those who claimed a kadr over their own actions. Another saying ascribed to Muhammad in this connection is, "They are the opponents of Allah in kadr", i.e. they profess to have a rival kadr to that of Allah. Al-Tashkānī (on al-Nasafi, p. 96) has presented a story of how a certain Madjīsil silenced (uzama) 'Amr b. Ubaid on both of these points. The name which the Mu'tazilites preferred for themselves in regard to this doctrine was the "People of Justice" (kālüd); Allah's justice required that man must be free if he were to be rewarded or punished.

**Bibliography:** See that of kadr and add al-ldjī, Mas'ūdī, Bālūq 1266, p. 620; al-Shahrastāni, Mīlāt, i. 54 on margin of Mīlāt of Ibn Ḥarīm; Nallino, Sul na'me di Qudratti in Riz. degli Studi orient., vii. 461 sqq.

(Ö. B. Macdonald.)

**Kadhif (a.)** is slander in a special sense. If anyone accuses a respectable person (mahsūn) of incontinence, without being able to bring four witnesses to support him, he is liable by law to a definite punishment (kālüd) of So lashes for kadhif. The regulations on this subject in the law-books are based mainly on Kur'ān xxiv. 4. In a case of kadhif, all male and female persons are considered mahsūn who have never been guilty of incontinence and who, in addition, are believers, freemen, of age, and in possession of their mental faculties. The right to demand the punishment of the guilty one is in the view of most kadhif a private right of the person slandered (i.e. a kadhif adawāt) so that the latter (or his heir) may also voluntarily refrain from exercising it. In the view of the Hanafii school, however, the kadhif punishment for kadhif is a right of God (kadhif Allāh), and neither the person slandered nor his heir can avest this punishment from the guilty one. If a husband has accused his wife of unfaithfulness without being able to prove the charge in the prescribed manner, he can secure exemption from punishment by procuring the lābīf formula [see ifāk]. Punishment, moreover, may not be inflicted on the father, mother or more distant ascendants of the insulted party, nor on minor, and slaves. For a slave the punishment is only 40 lashes.

**Bibliography:** The chapter on Hadd in the collections on Tradition and the Fiqh books; al-Qādiri, Hādhīya alā Sharî' Ibn Qāsim al-Abbasī, ii. 241 sqq. (Bālūq 1307); Sadr al-Shāria al-ḥanāfī, Miṣkāt al-Wāhīya (Kazān 1296), p. 167 sqq.; al-Dināshī, Rahmat al-Annām: 'ṣīlahāf al-Ammā (Bālūq 1300), p. 142 sqq.; E. Sachau, Muhamm. Recht nach Schafī-
disinclination to fill the office of judge. Traditions were put into currency in which the Prophet was made to utter grave warnings against accepting the position of kâdi. Fious faši's e.g. Abu Ha-
ufa [q. v.] declined to fill the office of judge.

For many centuries past no Muslim judge has any longer come up to the original theoretical requirements of the law; therefore any existing kâdi is regarded by Muslim scholars only as kâdi 'l-ja-
râzî, i.e. as an emergency kâdi, to whom one must go, in default of a better.

H. Goetheil, New York 1908 (with an introduction); cf. The Governors and Judges of Egypt of al-Kântî, ed. by R. Guest (Glib Mem. xix.), 1912; and also the important remarks on the office of kâdi in Cordova by Ribera in the introduction to his edition of al-Khushâni, Kitâb al-
Kufî bi-Kurtuba (Hist. de los Jueces de Cordoba por Ajoyani, Madrid 1914; cf. Hâdîdji Khalifa, li. 141, n°. 2279)

The Prophet and the early Caliphs often decided disputes in person as judges, as did their governors and prefects in the various provinces. Justice was always administered in Muslim lands to a great extent by local authorities, notably the police offices. This was sometimes called Nasar ašša al-
Masulim (al-Mâwardî, ed. Enger, p. 128 sqq.; H. F. Amedroz, The Malazin Jurisdiction in the Ahkâm Sultaniyya of Mâwardî, Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 1911, p. 635 sqq.; de Sacy, Chrest. Arab. 2, i. 132 sqq.). Moreover Umar and Uthman and their successors had appointed special officers as judges (kâdî). These kâdî's, who always belonged to the faši class, never obtained an independent position in Islam. They were often dismissed — soon after their appointment — and always remained subject to the caprice of the ruler. Cf. for example Autobiog.
graphie d'Îbî Khâldîn, transl. de Sâne, Paris 1844, p. 103-110 (Journ. Asiat., 4th Ser., iii. 328 sqq.).

The kâdî's had not only to decide cases but they also had to administer pious foundations (wakf's) and the estates of orphans, imbeciles and other persons. They had often to draw up contracts for marriage of women without male relations, etc.

The chief kâdi in the capital was one of the high officials (al-Mâzrî, al-Kâtafî, Bâlûk 1270, i. 403). In eastern countries he was called kâdi l-kufâ', in the western kâdi l-jumâ'â (Dozy, Suppl. aux Dict. Arâb., ii. 364). In later times the kâdi l-asfar was also a high official (cf. al-Kalâshandî, Shâb al-Askâr, iv. 36; Autobiogr. d'Îlbâl Khâldîn, p. 102, Journ. As., 4th Ser., iii. 327; J. v. Hammer, Des Osmanischen Reichs Staatsverfassung, ii. 378 sqq.). Some kâdî's were military leaders.

In the large cities, where numerous adherents of the different fâk schools lived together, a kâdi was appointed, if necessary, for each madhâbah. For example, there were in later times four kâdîs in Cairo. (Quatremère, Hist. d. sultans mamlouks, i. 
98, Note; Autobiogr. d'Îl-Khâldîn, loc. cit.).

Bibliography: In addition to the chapter on the administration of law in the fâk books: al-Khâsaf, Adab al-Kâdi (Cod. 550 Warn., Cat. Cod. Or. Bibl. Lingu.-Dat., iv. 106); D. S. Mar-
neres, i. 94 sqq.; I. Goldziher, Muham. Studien, ii. 39 sqq.: A. von Kremer, Culturgesch. des Orientes (Wien 1875), i. 415-419; H. F. Ame-

(Th. W. Juyboll)

Al-Kâdî al-Fâdîl, Abû 'Ali 'Abîd al-Kahîm B. 'Ali b. Muhammed B. al-Hasan al-Lâkîmî al-Bâshâni al-A'skâlânî, Muhyî (Muqir) al-Dîn, Saladin's celebrated vizier, was born on 15 Djamâd ii. 529 (3 April 1135) at Asklân [q. v.] where his father, a native of Bâasân, called al-Kâdî al-
Ashraf, filled the office of judge. In 543/ 1148—9 his father placed him in the Divân al-
âlîqî in Cairo as a learner. By 588/ 1193 he had entered the service of Îlb Khâldî, kâdi of Alexandria, as secretary. As his elegant reports from there attracted attention to him in Cairo, in 1190 he was summoned thither as superintendent of the Dîwan al-Dîshâ by al-Âdî Ruzzik b. al-Sâlih Tâli'a, the last representative of the vizier-family of the Banû Ruzzik. When the latter soon afterwards was overthrown by Shâwâr, prefect of Tus, al-Kâdî al-Fâdîl became secretary to Shâwâr's son Kamîl and after Shâwâr's murder to Shirkûh, his successor in the office of vizier. In 563 (1167—8) he became deputy for Îlb al-Khalîlî, chief of the Dîwan al-Dîshâ, under whom he had begun his official career and on the latter's death on 23 Djamâd ii. 566 (March 4, 1171) was appointed his successor, Saladin having in the meanwhile taken over the vizierate. When in the next year, on the death of the last Fîtimid, Saladin himself assumed the rule in Egypt, the Al-Kâdî al-Fâdîl be-
came his right hand man in carrying through the reforms necessary in the army and taxation. He then accompanied the Sultan on his campaigns in Syria. He was in Egypt from 585 to 586 (1189—90) to control the financial administration and re-
equip the army and navy. He then returned to Syria and remained with Saladin till the latter's death on 27 Safar 589 (March 1193). When al-
Mālik al-Afḍal, who had taken over the government in Damascus, very soon jeopardised his authority by stupid measures, al-Kādi al-Fiḍlāī went to Egypt to al-Mālik al-‘Aḍzīz. War soon afterwards broke out between the two brothers, but in 591 (1195) peace was made through the mediation of al-Kādi al-Fiḍlāī. He thereupon retired into private life. He died suddenly on 6 or 7 Rabi‘ 596 (26 or 27 Jan. 1200). Of the numerous state documents which al-Kādi al-Fiḍlāī composed during his activity in the Diwān al-Imāmāt, many examples are preserved in MSS. and in Abū Shāma. Helbig gives a complete list (p. 67—75). In addition there is his correspondence with Usāma b. Munkīd concerning the latter’s Kitāb al-‘Aṣīla from the Khārida of ‘Imād al-Dīn in H. Derenburg, Novo. Méll. Orient., p. 147—52; Vie d’Ousama, French transl., p. 383—392. During his official career he also edited an official journal, Muhaddidāt, of which al-Makrīzī gives many specimens in the Khitāb. These are not only notes on official letters and the answers to them but reports also on important happenings in the kingdom or on gifts of honor granted by the Sultan.


KĀDI AL-ḤARAWĪ. [See al-‘Abdāl.]

KĀDI KHĀN FAHR AL-DĪN, AL-ḤASAN B. MANṢŪR AL-.Interval FARGHĀNĪ, was a Haṇafī Muḥtār and scholar who composed a large number of esteemed juristic works and commentaries on Haṇafī works. In particular his collection of legal decisions (Fatawā Kādi Khaṇā, in 4 vols. lith. Calcutta 1835; with the subsidiary title al-Fatawā al-Sa‘īda, lith. Lucknow 1293—5; pir. Cairo 1292) has become widely known on account of its convenience. He died in Ramādān 592 (1196).


KADIM. [See KIDAM.]

KĀDI AL-‘AṣĪRA, the Mighty, one of the most beautiful names of Allāh: cf. ‘Abd al-Husain al-‘Abīṣā, al-‘Aṣīra ‘al-Saīfa, Allāhāhād 1313, S. 15; Redhouse, The Most Comely Names, Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 1889, S. 49.

AL-KĀDI BI LLĀH, ABU L-‘ABBĀS AHMAD B. ISHĀḤ, ‘Abhāṣīd Caliph. After the deposition of al-Fā‘il, his cousin Abu L-‘Abbas Ahmad was proclaimed Caliph in Ramādān 381 (Nov. 991) with the name al-Kādi. The latter was a grandson of al-Nuṣāṭār, his mother was a slave. During his long reign he was entirely under the influence of the amirs ruling in Baghdad and only once did he give evidence of having a mind of his own. This was when the Būyid Bābā al-Dawla [q. v.] wished to replace the Sunni chief kādi by a Shī‘ī but his plan was frustrated by the opposition of al-Kādi, whereupon the Shī‘īs were given a superior of their own under the title nāsib ‘intentant’. For the rest, all heretics, notably the Mu‘tazilīs, were treated with the greatest severity. In this period arose the dynastic claims of the Mardawīdīs and the Ukhullidds and the Mirdāsidds, and the Ghaznavid kingdom attained its greatest prosperity, while the internal disruption under the Būyids increased, and the Hamadanids and Sāmānids, which latter had long been a bulwark against the Turks, collapsed. Al-Kādi died in Dhu ‘l-Hijjah 432 (Nov.—Dec. 1031) at the age of over 80. He is also mentioned as the author of some theological treatises.


KĀDIYIRA, Order (ṣarīb) of dervishes called after ‘Abd al-Kādi al-Ḍalālī [q. v.]

I. ORIGIN. ‘Abd al-Kādi (ob. 561 = 1166) was the principal of a school (madrasa) of Hanbalite law and a rīḥāt in Baghdad. His sermons (collected in al-Fath al-Kabābbī) were delivered sometimes in the one, sometimes in the other; both were notable institutions in the time of Ibn al-ʿArabī, also Nikūṭ (Irshād al-Arīb, v. 274) records a bequest of books made to the former by a man who died in 572 (1176—7). Both appear to have come to an end at the sack of Baghdad in 656 (1258), till when it is probable that their headship remained in the family of ‘Abd al-Kādi, which was numerous and distinguished. In the Bahgādh al-Asrar, where an accurate account of his descendants is given (pp. 113—117), it is stated that ‘Abd al-Kādi was succeeded in the madrasa by his son ‘Abd al-Wāḥih (552—563 = 1157—1165), who was followed by his son ‘Abd al-Salām (ob. 611 = 1214). Another son, ‘Abd al-Razāq (528—603 = 1134—1206?) was a notable ascetic. Several members of the family perished during the sack of Baghdad, when it would appear that both these institutions came to an end.

A rīḥāt was at this time distinguished from a sāwiyā, the former being a coenobium, the latter a place where an ascetic lived in solitude (al-Suhrawardi, Anwarī al-Ma‘arif, margin of the Ḥiyāḥ, Cairo 1306, i. 217). In the time of Ibn Battūta sāwiyā had come to be used in the former sense also, and his description of the religious exercises practised at the sāwiyā (i. 71) would probably suit what went on at ‘Abd al-Kādi’s rīḥāt. The body of rules and doctrines which had his authority was sufficient to constitute a system (mawāhid: Bahgādī, p. 166), and by accepting the kīrka from the sheikh the mawāhid signified that he wished to that of the former (al-Suhrawardi, i. 192). A long list is given in the Bahgādī of men who attained various degrees of distinction who had received the kīrka from ‘Abd al-Kādi, two of them at the age of seven and one at the age of one. These persons were said to ascribe themselves (intasāba or intamān or even ittammā) to
'Abd al-Kadir, and could bestow the ḥikāya on others as from him; in doing so they would stipulate that the murād was to regard 'Abd al-Kadir as his šaykh and director after the Prophet. In a tradition which is likely to be apocryphal (Bāḥdjī, p. 101), dated 592 (1196), 'Abd al-Kadir declared that assumption of his shi'ah was not absolutely necessary for entry into his Order; personal attachment to himself was sufficient. It would appear that during his lifetime several persons carried on propaganda in favour of his system; one 'Ali b. al-Ḥaddād obtained proselytes in Yemen, and one Muḥammad al-Batārī, resident in Basra, did likewise in Syria; one Taḥṭī al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Yūnī, also of Basra, was another propagandist, and one Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Sanād in Egypt “ascribed himself to 'Abd al-Kadir and in treading the Path relied on him after God and His Apostle” (Bahdhī, pp. 109, 110). Since all who ascribed themselves to him were promised Paradise, the Order is likely to have been popular; and even in recent times missionaries in Africa appear to have little difficulty in obtaining fresh adherents to it (O. Lenz, Timbuktu, ii. 32).

That 'Abd al-Kadir's sons had some share in spreading it is likely, though Ibn Taimiyya (ob. 728 = 1328) mentions that he had associated with one of his descendants who was an ordinary Muslim and not a member of it, and so did not agree with those who held fanatical views about him (Bughyat al-Mūṭād, p. 124). The Bahdhī however does not bear out Le Chatelier's assertion (Confréries Musulmanes du Hégaz, p. 35) that in 'Abd al-Kadir's lifetime some of his sons had been preaching his doctrine in Morocco, Egypt, Arabia, Turkestan and India. It says much of 'Abd al-Razzāk, but nothing of the “mo que now in ruins, whose seven glazed domes have often served as the subject of description by Arabic historians,” which this son is supposed to have built. Indeed this mosque appears to be later than Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī (740 = 1339-40), the first author later than the Bahdhī, who mentions 'Abd al-Kadir's tomb (Nushat al-Kalid, transl. Le Strange, p. 42). Nor does it confirm the statement that this 'Abd al-Razzāk introduced the use of music in the ritual, and indeed the employment of this was earlier than 'Abd al-Kadir's time, and is discussed by al-Suhrawardī (116) without allusion to 'Abd al-Razzāk. E. Mercier (Histoire de l' Afrique Septentrionale, iii. 14) asserts that the Order of Kādiriyya existed in Berbery in the xilth century A.D., and was closely connected with the Fātimid khālas (whose rule terminated 567 = 1171), but he gives no authority for these statements.

Al-Suhrawardī holds that the exercises of each murād should be determined by his šaykh in accordance with his individual needs, whence it is unlikely that 'Abd al-Kadir instituted any rigid system of ḍikr, wārid and ḥikāya, and indeed those in use among different Kādiriyya communities differ (Rinn, Marabout et Khousan, p. 183 sqq.).

The initiation ceremonies given on Turkish authority by J. P. Brown (The Derwishes, p. 68) are quite different from those furnished by Rinn on North African authority. In one of these latter there is a tendency to set 'All above Muḥammad and to insist on the importance of Ḥasan and Ḥusain, which cannot well represent the views of the Hanbalī 'Abd al-Kādir. The wārid of 'Abd al-Kādir in al-Fayūsāli al-Rabbāniyya is given on the authority of one 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-‘Adhamī, who lived 135 years (536-731), and may be regarded as mythical.

2. Development. Kādirism seems from an early period to have developed on different lines according as 'Abd al-Kādir was regarded as the founder of a system of religious rites and practices, or as a worker of miracles. In the latter view it meant the deification of 'Abd al-Kādir, the extremists holding that he was Lord of Creation after God, absolutely, whereas the more moderate supposed that he was so only in his own age (Bughyat al-Mūṭād, l. c.). The latter was the view of Ibn 'Arabī, who takes him as an example of a ḥikāya who showed himself and practised sovereignty (ṭasarruf; al-Fuḥūl al-Muhkama, ii. 407); such a ḥikāya in his system is independent of the revelation to Muḥammad (Ṭafsīr al-Hikam, § 16). But there was also a theory that 'Abd al-Kādir practised in his grave all the activities (ṭasarruf) of the living (Ibn al-Wardī, ob. 749), Tāriḥī, ii. 70); and Ibn Taimiyya (al-Jawārī al-Sūqī, ii. 301). The former theory has been accepted by modern scholars as the true one. Among saints who in his time still appeared to people, being in reality impersonated by demons. In the initiation ceremonies recorded by J. P. Brown, l. c., the candidate for admission to the Order sees 'Abd al-Kādir in dreams; in one case so often and so clearly that without having seen 'Abd al-Kādir's portrait he could recognize him among a thousand. The form of Kādirism which means the worship of 'Abd al-Kādir seems to prevail in North Africa, where it is called Djilīlīsī (for Djīlīli) and whole communities are called Djīlīli. Their system has been described as the application of Şūfī mysticism to beliefs that are certainly pre-Islamic, and the materialization of that mysticism under the form of a cult of hidden Mediterranean powers (E. Michaux-Bellaire in Archives Marocaines, xx. 235). Here the word ḥalwa is used for a heap of stones where women attach rags to reeds planted between the stones and where they burn benzoine and stryax in post-heders (ibid., xvii. 60). Such ḥalwa's are to be found in all the Arab villages. Similarly in the province of Oran on all the roads and on the summits of the chief mountains qubbaḥ are to be found in the name of 'Abd al-Kādir Jillīli" (E. de Neveu, Ordres Religieux chez les Musulmans d' Algérie, p. 30). The society of the Genawah or Negroes of Guinea has placed itself entirely under the protection of Mawlay 'Abd al-Kādir with all his army of male and female demons; wherein M. Michaux-Bellaire finds traces of the powers which, according to the Qur'ān (and even earlier authorities) belonged to Solomon. The cult of 'Abd al-Kādir is most ardently practised by the women in the Khlot and Thlī, who come to the ḥalwa for every sort of object, and to satisfy their loves and hates in all the acts of their existence. The men on the other hand chiefly go to the ḥalwa when they are ill (Arch. Maroc., vi. 329).

That this development is inconsistent with Islamic orthodoxy is evident, and it is attacked by such authorities as Ibn Taimiyya and Ḥabīb al-Shāfi‘ī (Ṭafsīr, i. 348 sqq.). The system to which the name Kādiriya is more ordinarily applied differs from other orders mainly in ritual, although through circumstances connected with Islamism, it has not that homogeneity of statute which is to be found in other congregations, which seem to form small exclusive churches outside which
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there is no salvation" (Rinn, p. 156). Though the founder was a Hasbélite, membership is by no means confined to that school, and the Order is theoretically both tolerant and charitable.

3. Geographical Distribution. Since historical and geographical works rarely distinguish between the different łużeh in their accounts of religious buildings, little can be said with certainty of the date at which the first Kâdiri zawiya or łużeh was established in any country save Īrāq. The Order is said to have been introduced into Fez by the posteriority of two of ʿAbd al-Kâdir's sons, ʿAbdullāh (ob. 592 = 1196 in Wâsīt) and ʿAbd al-ʿĀlit (who died in Dijâla, a village of Siṭādjar), they had migrated to Spain and shortly before the fall of Granada (897 = 1492) their descendants fled to Morocco. The full genealogy of the Shuraṭa Dîjâla of Fez is given in Arch. Maroc, iii. 106–114, on the authority of al-Durr al-Sani of Ibn ʿAlgūyy ibn al-Kâdir (1090 = 1679), who claims to have used a series of authentic documents. The Khatwâ of ʿAbd al-Kâdir in Fez in mentioned as early as 1104 = 1693/4 (ibid., xi. 319). The Order was introduced into Asia Minor and Constantinople by Ismāʿīl Rūmī, founder of the Khatwâ known as the Khatwâ al-Tâbâhân at the Tâbâhân, this passage (ob. 1041 = 1631), who is called on Fir ʿAlim, "the Khatwâ of Shâhîd." The name and its meaning, which is green, having been adopted by Ismāʿīl Rūmī. The candidate for admission to the Order after a year brings an ʿaraṣiyya or small felt cap, to which if the candidate be accepted the Shâhîd attaches a rose of 18 sections, with Solomon's Seal in the centre. This cap is called by them ʿāsir. The holism of this is explained by J. P. Brown, The Deriṭk, p. 98 sqq. (copied by Wilberforce Clarke, transl. of ʿĀwrīf al-Muṭarrīf, p. 159; the Urdu translation Kâf ʿAlîr al-Maṣûbîh adds nothing to Brown's information). According to him, they prefer the colour green, though they allow others; in Lane's time the turbans and bannes of the Kâdiris in Egypt were white; most members of the Order were fishermen, and they in religious processions carried upon poles nets of various colours (Modern Egyptians, 1871, i. 306). In India there are festivities in honour of ʿAbd al-Kâdir on 11 Rûbî' II, and pilgrimages are made in many places in Algeria and Morocco to the zawiya's and shrines of the saint (Rinn, p. 177). The Masowim of the Dîjâla at Salâ is described at length by L. Mercier in Arch. Maroc, viii. 137–

159; it commences the seventh day of the Miṣrīd (Maṣūlād), i.e. the Feast of the Prophet's Birthday, and lasts four days 17–20 Kâbî I. Sheep and oxen are presented to the descendants of ʿAbd al-Kâdir. M. Michaux-Bellesque distinguishes in Morocco between the ceremonies of the Kâdiris, which recite the ḫārūn, and the Dîjâla, who recite the dâkhīr to the accompaniment of instruments; and again between the Dîjâla of the country, whose instruments are the bendir (a sort of big tambourine without bells) and ʿānâda, and those of the town, whose instruments are the ṭūlūl, ʿabāl and qaṣība (Arch. Maroc, v. 330 and xx. 60). A description of the ḥārūn al-malāḥīkī, a performance executed with these last instruments, which leads to ecstasy, is given by him in the first passage cited. He further records some special ceremonies connected with the Awwâl Kâhirî in the Chârb (ibid., xx. 287). All the Hîlâl of the Chârb are Dîjâla, and in all the ḥārūn's (services) of the
Djilâla the presence of at least one Khalifi is necessary for the direction of ceremonies, and when no actual Khalifi is present, some one there takes the name in order to perform the priestly duty. The origin of the name Avlîd Khalîfa is obscure (p. 284); it may be noticed that the ḏâkhîla mentions one Khalîfa b. Msâîl al-Nahmâlîki as having played a leading part in the propagation of his al-Kâdir’s system in the ma’lûb al-Ma’dî, the people of the Djilâla of the country contains neither the ḥâîb nor the ḏîkrî institute of the Ṣhâhîk, but a plain ḏîkrî of improvised words in the ceremonial rhythm of the bandîr (plur. of ṣanûr). These improvisations always terminate with the words “Thus spake Mawâlî ‘Abd al-Kâdir” or “O Mawâlî ‘Abd al-Kâdir!” (Michaux-Bellaire, p. 288).

Various collections of rituals supposed to have been recommended by ‘Abd al-Kâdir have been published in Egypt, Turkey and India. In al-Fi’ûl al-Rahbāniya he who is about to enter upon ḥâlîna (retreat) is advised to fast in the day and keep vigil at night. The ḥâlîna lasts forty days. If a mere reveal itself to him saying “I am God”, he should say “May my God”, and if it be for probation, it will vanish; but if it remain, then it will be a genuine revelation (taqâjallî) (Dhilî 1330, p. 60). Reduction of food during the 40 days should be gradual till for the last three fasting is complete. At the end he returns by degrees to his former diet.

Some practices peculiar to the Djilâla of Tangier are recorded by G. Salmon (Arch. Maroc., ii. 108). Those who make vows to ‘Abd al-Kâdir are in the habit of depositing in the ûsîyâ white cocks, which are called muḫjarar (Sûra ii. 31); they do not kill them, but leave them free to rove about the ûsîyâ, where however they do not long survive; the Sharîf who lives hard by takes them for food. The four daughters of a deceased Sharîf continued to live on the revenues of the ûsîyâ and carry away the muḫjarar hens. The muḫkâdam at this ûsîyâ was the Sharîf, who conducted the ceremonies at which the Kurân is repeated without the ḥâîb of ‘Abd al-Kâdir being pronounced, and where dances similar to those of the Īsâwîs [q. v.] are performed. Circumcisions are performed at the ûsîyâ on the first day of the masûlîd. A nightly meeting called liûla is held on the eve of this day, at which the ḥâîb of ‘Abd al-Kâdir is recited. At El-Qsar, where there are also some local practices, all the potters belong to the Djilîla, among whom the richer members of the community are to be found (ibid., ii. 163).

The first time that the Kâdir appear to have played a political part was during the French conquest of Algeria, when the chief of the Kâdiriya Mahîyî l-Dîn, having been offered the leadership in the war against the infidel, permitted his son ‘Abd al-Kâdir to accept it. This person was able to utilize the religious organization of his order in order to establish the sovereignty which the French had accorded him, and when his sovereignty was threatened could fall back on his rank as muḫkâdam of his order to win fresh recruits (H. Garrot, Histoire générale de l’Algérie, Algiers 1910, p. 800, 803 etc.). Since the fall and exile of this personage it would appear that the Kâdir in Africa have lost their support to the French government. “In 1879 when there was a local insurrection in Arras the shâhîk of the Kâdiriya of Menâ, Si Muḥammad b. ‘Abbâs, displayed unimpeachable loyalty [s. art. AWASIS, i. 5230]; and the same order helped the French government to extend their influence in the Sahara at Wargla and El-Wad. Their Nâbî, Si Muḥammad b. Tâyîb, fell on the French side at the battle of Charontin, March 2, 1901.” (Israel Hamet, Les Musulmans du Nord de l’Afrique, Paris 1906, p. 276). — In the Ottoman revolution of 1908 it is said that their sympathies were with the revolutionists, but that for fear of being outdone in religious zeal by the rival Efiwî order they joined in Baghdad in the pogrom against the Jews (L. Massignon in Revue du Monde Musulman, vi. 451).


Kâdiriya, the name of several places in the ‘Irak and in Mesopotamia: 1. A town in the ‘Irak, on the Eastern bank of the Tigris, 8 miles S. E. of Sâmarrâ. With the latter it seems to have been closely connected in its period of prosperity. We do not know what special part al-Kâdiriya played at that time. Perhaps, as Herzfeld, (op. cit., p. 107) suggests, it is really identical with the town of Kâtîl which Hârîn al-Kâshîdî or the Caliph al-Mu’tasîm began to build before the foundation of Sâmarrâ. Yaﬁt and other Arab geographers mention the glassworks of al-Kâdiriya. In the middle ages the important Dağılî canal left the Tigris opposite the town. The ruins of al-Kâdiriya lie in Lat. 34° 51’ N., between the two still existing out of the former three Tigris canals, called al-Kâtîl: they are a short quarter of an hour distant from the bank of the Tigris. The old name has survived and is now popularly pronounced Dijîdsî (occasionally corrupted to Djîdsîyâ and Djîdîsîyâ). We owe full accounts of these ruins particularly to Ross and Jones; E. Herzfeld also has recently investigated the ruins. Jones gives a plan of the ruins of the town, which Herzfeld says is entirely correct.

The enclosing walls which measure about 6000 paces form a regular octagon. They are flanked by towers at the corners and defended by 16 bastions at intervals. They were built of bricks which in technique, plan and preservation resemble the château of Sâmarrâ. According to all criteria, these ruins belong — in Herzfeld’s opinion — to the Abbasid period, not to an older one. Ten minutes from al-Kâdiriya, just on the river bank, are also mounds of ruins, called al-Sanâm. They mark the site of a mediaeval or ancient town, half of which has already been washed by the Tigris. On a remarkable find of statues made here, see Ch. Rich, Narrative of a Residence in Kordistan, 1836, ii. 152. Al-Sanâm perhaps was within the area of al-Kâdiriya and is to be regarded as its port.

writes Kasidisi and Kadisiya. In the neighbourhood of al-Kadisiya there was a village called al-Kudais, “little Kādis”. The poets give the whole district around al-Kadisiya the collective name al-Kawadis.

The Arab geographers of the 7th (7th) century (al-Iṣṭaḥkīr, Ibn Hawkal, al-Muḥaddasī) describe al-Kadisiya as a small town with two gates and a mud fortess, in the midst of cultivated fields and groves of date-palms, watered by a canal fed from the Euphrates, the last running water in the ‘Irāq. In ancient times the inner arm of the Persian Gulf seems to have stretched up to the region of al-Kadisiya. The main arm of the Euphrates once flowed, as al-Mas‘ūdī notes (Muḥīd al-Dhahab, ed. Paris, ii. 215), towards al-Jīra, where its ancient bed was still visible and was called ‘al-ṣā‘iqa ‘the old (rives)’. It took its course between al-Kadisiya in the north-east and al-‘Udhaib in the south-west; at al-Kadisiya there was a bridge across it called Dijār al-‘Atāk or Dijār al-Kadisiya.

In the Sassanian period al-Kadisiya played a prominent part as an important frontier town of the Persian empire. It was not till the Muḥammadan period that the town became very famous on account of the decisive battle fought in its vicinity, with which the Arab opened their second campaign against the lands of the Euphrates and Tigris in the most successful fashion. The Muslim army was placed under the command of Sa‘d b. Abī Waqākās, while the Persian troops were led by the imperial commander-in-chief Rustam. Statements differ very considerably regarding the numbers on each side; the number given for the Arabs varies from 6,000 to 38,000 and that for the Persians 30,000 to 120,000 men. The latter were undoubtedly superior to the Muslims in strength. The estimate of an almost contemporary Armenian historian may be fairly near the truth when it puts the Persians at 80,000 men and the Arabs at 9–10,000, besides the Syrian reinforcements of 6,000 men who arrived in the last stage of the fight.

It was only after the two sides had stood watching each other for weeks that they joined battle. The battle lasted three (or four) days. These days in the specifically ‘Irāq tradition have special names, which are probably to be explained as place-names. In spite of all the heroic courage of the Arabs, the balance would finally have turned in favour of the Persians, if at the critical moment of the decision the troops hurried from Syria had not arrived in time. Their rapid and vigorous intervention decided the victory of the Arab arms. It was, however, not a cheap victory for the Muslims, as about a third of their whole force perished.

About the doubtless very heavy Persian losses the accounts are contradictory. The Persian commander in chief Rustam was captured and killed in the heat of battle. Very considerable booty was taken by the victors. The most important trophy was the Persian imperial standard said to date from the early Iranian period (on it see Sarre in Klio, iii. 358 sq.), dirafsh-i Kāwiyān, which was cut in pieces and distributed. In the fighting with the retreating Persians the Arabs also captured the celebrated treasure of Nakāh-jān (properly Nakha‘-ergān) which consisted of valuable ornaments for women; cf. on it Noldeke in the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., xxvii. 523–4.

The glorious day of al-Kadisiya, which made the Arabs masters of the ‘Irāq west of the Tigris, is
one of the most celebrated events in the great period of the Muslim conquests. It laid the foundations for the supremacy of the religion of Islam in the near east. Of course, tradition has woven many legends around the victory; it is recounted in the Kādariyya and the Ḥamādiyya.

The date of the battle is very uncertain. The statements in the different sources vary from the years 14 to 16 (655–657). One thing is certain that the battle was fought in the spring and that Baysra was founded after it. Wellhausen (op. cit., vi. 72) decides for 15 (656), while Caetani prefers 16 (657) (op. cit., p. 629–633); see also J. Fuhrmann, Grundriss der Iran. Phil., ii. 546.


In addition to the two towns mentioned above, Yākūt knows three other places called Kādīsiyya, namely two villages in the district of al-Maṣfīl, on the Nahr al-Khāzīr between al-Maṣfīl and Irbil, and a third near Dājirā b. ʿOmar in Meso- potamia; see Yākūt, al-Mughtāris, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 337. Ibn al-ʿArabī also mentions an al-Kādīsiyya near Baghdad (op. cit., xxi. 91). We also find the shorter form al-Kādish beside al-Kādīsiyya, e.g. for the battlefield (cf. above), for a village near Herāt (see J. Fuhrmann, Kastamīnische, p. 337; al-Balādhārī, p. 499, 2) and near Miṣrā al-Kuṭa (Yākūt, iv. 7, 7). Probably in all these place-names, as Noideke suggests (Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgen. Ges., xxxiii. 1623), we have to deal with traces of a name of people of unknown nationality, presumably the Kādisheans, who appear in Syrian literature of the 8th and 9th centuries as a wild warrior people in the region of Sindjār. The places called al-Kādisiyya and al-Kādis in Mesopotamia, Babylonia and on Persian territory are perhaps to be explained as settlements of branches of this stock, made by the Sūsānīan kings. Of the celebrated al-Kādisiyya near Kūfā, it is at least definitely stated that its name comes from Kādis near Herāt, from which the garrison of the fort belonging to the military cordon on the frontier is recruited. Cf. Noldeke, op. cit., p. 157 sq., 162; J. Marquart, Erzählungen nach dem Pamir-Missio Nennings (Abhandlungen d. Ges. d. Wiss., 1901), p. 77, 78. (M. Streck.)

KĀDĀJR (kādār, "marching quickly"); cf. Sulaimān Efendi, Lughat-i Čaghatal (Stamboul 1298, p. 214), the name of the present ruling dynasty of Persia. It takes its origin from the Turkoman tribe of the same name settled in the district of Astarābād [q. v.], but which had not always been there. Persian historians assert that it is a branch of the great tribe of Djalār (q. v.) and that it takes its name from Kādār Noyān, son of Sertāk Noyān, who had been the tutor of Ǧāhrān Kūhān [q. v.]; this Sertāk is without doubt the same as he who was put to death by Bāidā (q. v.), because he was a partisan of Gaikhtān (q. v.) in 694 (1295) (Wasâyf, ʾIbbānay, 1269, i. 282; d’Ollson, Hist. des Mongols, iv. 115). This tribe had, it is said, settled on the frontiers of Syria after the reign of Abū Sārīd [q. v.] in 736 (1335); Timūr is said to have brought it back to Persia and into Turkestan, its native country, in 803 (1400). It was one of the seven Turkoman tribes which placed the Safawī dynasty on the throne of Persia. To it belonged Shāh Kūli Kūrī (body-guard), who was twice appointed ambassador to treat for peace with the Turkmen in 1652 (1655) and in 1672 (1675) (Pérez, i. 327–324; v. Hammer, Hist. de l’Empire Ottoman, Fr. transl., vi. 69, 320; Rādj Kūli Kūhān, ix. 2 is wrong in giving the date 696). In 995 (1587), Shāh Abābā i finding them too numerous divided the tribe into three groups: 1. at Merv against the Uzbeks; 2. at Gandja and Erivan; 3. at Astarābād in the fortress of Mubarakabād which he had just built; those who established themselves in the high part were given the name Yeğgarbāth; those who lived in the lower part adopted the name Aṣbāk bāsh. The object of settling them in this region was to protect it from the inroads of the Turkomans from beyond the frontier. A member of the Astarābād branch was ʿAli Kūhān, the son of Shāh Kūli b. Mahdī Kūhān b. Wali Kūhān b. Muḥammad Kūlī. To avenge the death of his two brothers he seized Astarābād. In 1135 (1723) he went to the defence of Isfahan against the Afghāns at the head of 1000 horsemen; but being denounced to Shāh Husain as dangerously ambitious he returned to his province, abandoning the Safawī king to his unfortunate destiny. Called to their help by the people of Ray, he fought without success against the Afghāns at Ibrāhimābād in Waravin, and returned to Māzandarān to offer his services to Shāh Taḥmāsp. During the advance on Muhshid Shāh Taḥmāsp's general Nādir (the later Nādir Shāh) on 14th Safar 1139 (12th 1139 Oct. 1726) (Mahdī Kūhān, Taṛīkh-i Nādiri, Tīrbele 1666, p. 21).

His son Muḥammad Ḥasan Kūnān, pursued by Nādir Shāh, took refuge with the Turkomans, collected supporters there and recaptured Astarābād, which he lost a little later again; it was then that the two obelisks of decapitated heads were built (Kûlummārā) which Hanway saw (illustration in Historical Account of British trade, London 1753,
KADJAR — KAF.

vol. 1, reproduced in Sykes, History of Persia, 2nd ed., ii. 270). Muhammad Hasan went to the tribe of Daz, who expelled him under threats from Nadir. He then lived in the desert, where he heard by chance of the assassination of Nadir Shah. He thereupon retook Astaraabad (1166 = 1747). He was next attacked by Karim Khan Zand, who besieged him for 40 days, then raised the siege and abandoned his camp (1165 = 1753). In 1168 (1755), Ahmad Shah Durrani [q. v.] seized Meshhed and sent Persia Khan at the head of 15,000 horsemen to attack Muhammad Hasan’s possessions, but this army was defeated at Sabzawar. Muhammad Hasan followed up this success by conquering Kazvin and Gilan. He marched on Isfahan. Karim Khan lost the battle of Gulistanabagh, fought four parasangs from this town, and fled to Shiraz. In 1169 (1756) he seized Aharabaidjan, where the Afgan Azad Khan was in command; he annexed this province in 1170 (1757) and appointed as its governor his son Agha Muhammad Shah, then aged 18. Next year he marched on Shiraz but his army melted away owing to scarcity of provisions. He then had to suppress several local revolts. His troops, exhausted by their continual marches, abandoned him; he returned to Astaraabad with a body of Ashrafshah and his own private servants. Defeated in a fight with Shahk Ali Khan in the desert of Karkas, the feet of his horse sank in the mire and in this position he was killed by the Kord Sabz Ali, one of his servants who had gone over to the enemy (1171 = 1758).

Husain Kuli Khan, second son of the preceding, surnamed Dahan-Siz on account of his courage and fearlessness, entered the service of Karim Khan who also attacked to his court Aga Muhammad Khan then aged 30. The latter went to Shiraz; his family settled in Kazvin. Appointed governor of Daghlan, but carried away by his ambition, Husain Kuli attacked Astaraabad and there gave himself up to plunder and massacre. He seized Mazandaran and surprised at Bafarush, the capital of Mazandaran, the governor appointed by Karim Khan, Mahdi Khan. He was shot in his tent by rebel Komi Turkomans at the age of 27. He was the father of Faiz Ali Shah [q. v.].

Kadjar Dynasty.

Faiz Ali Khan, born 1097 (1685) or 1104 (1693); accession 1113 (1721); died 1139 (1726—27); buried at Khydadah Kabir, near Meshhed.

Muhammad Hasan Khan, born 1127 (1715); accession 1164 (1751); died 1172 (1758—59); buried at Shaz Ali-Ab-jam.

Husain Kuli Khan, surnamed Dahan-shah, born 1154 (1751); accession 1184 (1770); died 1191 (1777); reigned at Astaraabad.

1. Aga Muhammad Shah, born 1155 (1752); accession 1193 (1779); died 1211 (1796—97); buried at Nadjar (Meshhed Ali).

2. Faiz Ali Shah, born 1185 (1771); accession at Tehran 1212 (1797—98); died 1250 (1834) at Kumm. — Abbas Mirza, nephew of Ali Shah, born 1203 (1788—89); died in Khurasan before his father’s death (1249 = 1833—34); buried at Meshhed.

3. Muhammad Shah, born 1222 (1807); accession 1250 (1834); died 1264 (1848); buried at Kumm.

4. Nasir al-Din Shah, born 1247 (1831—32); accession 1264 (1849); assassinated in 1856.

5. Muhammad al-Din, born 1260 (1853); accession June 8, 1856; died 14 January 1907.


7. Ahmad Shah, born 1314 (1898); attained his majority in 1914.


(Cf. Huart.)

KADR (a.) another pronunciation of KADAR [q. v.], a Persian poet who commemorated the capture of the island of Kishan and of the town of Hormuz by ‘Abbās I in two short epic poems, Djang-namə Kayhan and Djangnamāma. The former is edited by L. Bonelli in the Kendicenti della R. Acad. dei Lincei, vi, Semester 1, fasc. 8. Cf. Eshī in the Grundriss der iran. Phil., ii. 237.

KAF, the 22nd letter of the usual Arabic alphabet (numerical value 100; cf. the article ABjad). The pronunciation of ʿaf as an unvoiced palatal explosive, found as early as Sibawaihi, has survived in modern academic speech. In the present day popular speech we find some variants (in addition to ʿaf) notably the affricate ḫ (cf. the article ARABIA, ARABIC DIALECTS, i. 396b; and SchaadⅠ, Sibawaïhi’s Lautlehre, Index). (A. Schade.)

KAF, the 21st letter of the usual Arabic alphabet (numerical value 100; cf. the article ABJAD). The form of the character goes back to the Nabataean ʿaf and later in Arabic was assimilated in form to faʾ, so that it had to be distinguished from the latter by pointing (cf. the article ARABIA, ARABIC WRITING, i. 353b and plate I). In Sibawaihi’s time ʿaf was pronounced as a velar g. This pronunciation is still frequently found among Beduins and peasants; in the ordinary popular language, however, ʿaf is usually pronounced as hamza; for other modern popular pronunciations of ʿaf see the article ARABIA, ARABIC DIALECTS, i. 396b. The modern academic pronunciation is ʿ (i.e. velar k). Cf. SchaadⅠ, Sibawaïhi’s Lautlehre, Index. — Kaf is also the title of Sūrā 1. of the Kur‘ān. (A. Schade.)

KAF in the Cosmology of Islam is the name of the Mountain Range surrounding the earth. On the shape of the earth there were different opinions among the later Muslims:
knows the bull and fish as bearers of the earth; cf. H. Petermann, *Reisen im Orient*, ii. (Leipzig 1861), p. 301. Among the inhabitants of the Red Sea coast, the belief prevails, that the earth rests on the backs of colossal bulls, see E. Ruppell, *Reise in Abyssinien*, i. (Frankfurt a. M. 1858), p. 256. Al-Kazwini gives the bull here for the bull of the Biblical monsters, Leviathan and Behemoth, and thus shows definitely that the Muslim idea is connected with the old Biblical views, which again can in the last resort be traced to the Babylonian Chaos-tradition. The basic idea of the bull supporting the earth is, as Reinsch (*op. cit.*), has emphasized, also to be found in India. The rock already mentioned as supporting the earth and as the starting point of the mountain Kāf may well be associated with the stone Setiyas, which Jewish legend regards as the navel-stone of the earth sunk by God in the depths of chaos or primeval ocean, and as the support of the world. For the Jewish legend cf. Feuchtwang in the *Monatsschrift fur Gesch. u. Wissenschaft des Judentums*, liv. (1910), p. 724 sq.; W. H. Roscher, *Neue Olympus-Studien* (*Abhandl. d. sächs. Gesells. d. Wiss.*), xxxi. (1915), p. 73 sq. It may be added that a tradition in al-Kazwini (i. 144, 23) also gives the view that God made the world stand without any band or support.

According to a very popular idea, Kāf is the origin of all the mountains of the world. They are connected with it by subterranean branches and veins: if God wants to destroy any region, he simply orders one of these branches to lie in motion, which causes an earthquake. According to a different popular view, an earthquake is caused because the bull supporting the earth sometimes trembles under its burden.

Kāf, which is inaccessible to man is regarded as the end of the world; its name is therefore used as a 53 mbol for this; cf. e.g. a verse in Djam†'s *Yašuf-i-Zelišgah* (ed. Rosenzwieg), p. 1, 14. This mythical mountain forms the boundary between the visible and the invisible world. No one knows what lies behind; God alone knows the creatures that live there. Many say (cf. Ibn al-Wardi, p. 188) that the area behind Kāf belongs to the next world, is a land white like silver, 40 days' journey long, and is the abode of angels. According to an alleged saying of Muhammad (see Zener in *Lanc, op. cit.*, p. 250), there are still other lands beyond Kāf; one of gold, 70 of silver, 7 of musk, each 10 000 days' journey long and broad and all inhabited by angels. It is also said that Kāf as well as the region behind it is the abode of the Djam. Kāf itself is especially known as the abode of the fabulous bird Simurgh, a kind of vulture, which is essentially the same as the ankuš [q.v.] of the Arabs. Existing since the beginning of the world, this marvellous bird retired in monastic solitude to Kāf and lives there contented and satisfied, a wise councillor consulted by the kings and heroes of the past. Kāf, his residence, is therefore simply called "Mount of Wisdom" in poetry, symbolically also "Mount of Contentment". In his celebrated work, *Maniš al-Tair* ("The Dialogues of the Birds"), the Persian poet Farid al-Din' Ḍāṯar [see Ḍāṯar] describes the wandering of the bird through the seven stages which the soul has to pass through till its complete merging into God, in the allegory of a very difficult, adventurous flight by a bird through...
the seven valleys up to Mount Kaf, the throne of its all wise king Simurgh.

Kaf plays a part also in Arab fairy tales; in the 1001 Nights it is several times mentioned. Oddly enough a number of Kur'an expositors explain the title of Sura I, the letter Kaf, as the name of the mountain Kaf.

In a narrower sense and localised on the earth, Kaf means that part of the Asiatic highlands which bounds the Muslim world in the North, especially the Caucasus and its spurs in Northern Persia. For this reason Demavend, the scene, celebrated in the Shāhnāme, of the wondrous exploits of old Persian rulers and heroes is represented as the home of the Simurgh [see 937].

There can hardly be a doubt that the Muslim idea of the mountain Kaf in the wider (mythic) and narrower sense is borrowed in its main features from the Persians. With them Alburz (Alburd), old-Persian Harā-berezaiti (“the high mountain”), is originally the mythical mountain at the end of the earth which, like the Hellenic Olympus, also contains the palaces of the gods. From the Avestan account one must regard the Harā-berezaiti as the backbone of the mountain system of the earth, for all other mountains of the world have grown out of it by subterranean connections. The Harā-berezaiti was imagined to be a range of mountains enclosing not only the whole earth but also a lake, named Wuruksha, which is likewise at the end of the earth, but according to the Bundehist does not surround it. In the geography of this Pehlewī work moreover the name of Mount Kaf is actually found; cf. Windschmied, Zoroastrierische Studien (Berlin 1863), p. 73, 75 Note 4. Alburz was next located on the earth itself and identified with the mountain-wall which encloses the world of Iranian civilization in the north. The name Albus (Elburs) is thus found in several places to-day as the name of a mountain or range on the borders of the Iranian linguistic area, notably as the name for the chain which culminates in Damavand. (cf. Aleuzi, i. 251).

It should be emphasised that Yakhut (op. cit.) expressly says that Kaf in ancient times was called Albus; see also Mustawfi, Nuzhat al-Khilah (Gibb Memorial Lectures, xxii), p. 191 sq.). Geiger (op. cit., p. 51) thinks that Lake Wuruksha was originally a definite locality (Lake Aral or the Caspian Sea), but as early as the Avestā it often appears removed into the region of myth. On Harāberezaiti-Alburz and Wuruksha (Wuruksha) cf. Ritter, Erdkunde, vii., 42 sq.; Fr. Spiegel in Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, vi., 85, and in Ernste Altertumskunde, i. 191 sq. (Leipzig 1871); W. Geiger, Ostiran, Kultur im Altertum (Erlangen 1883), p. 42 sq.; F. v. Andrian, Der Hohenbultus annatlischer u. europäischer Völker (Vienna 1891), p. 287 sq.


That the Muslim idea of Mount Kaf possesses its prototypes in the analogous Indian and Iranian ideas of the mountains bounding the world, Lokālaka and Harāberezaiti-Alburz, was previously pointed out by Gesenius (op. cit., p. 317) and Rosenzweig (op. cit., p. 185).

Closely connected with the Muslim view is that of the Mandaeans. According to them (cf. H. Petermann, Reisen im Orient, ii. (Leipzig 1861), p. 452), the disk of the earth is surrounded by the ocean except on the north where a great mountain of rock of the purest turquoise cuts off the sea. Immediately adjoining this turquoise mountain, the reflection of which causes the blue of the sky, lies the pure world stretching to the north. Very probably the Mandaeans got their idea from Muslim sources. The contrary view of de Goeje (Tabari, Annales, Intro., p. cxxxvii) that the Arabs got the idea of Kaf from Mandaean mythology, seems less plausible.


Among the Hindus Meru which, according to the usual Buddhist view, is the centre and navel of the earth (cf. W. Foy in Festschrift E. Windisch, Leipzig 1914, p. 215 sq.; E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, Strassburg 1915, p. 253, Index, and Roetsch, Neue Onomastikstudien, Leipzig 1915, p. 72) is sometimes also interpreted as the Himatya mountains bounding India on the north. For the Greeks, the mount of the gods, Olympus in Thessaly, marked the north frontier of their home.

KAF - KAF.


(M. STRECK.)

**KAFA or KAFFA,** also written AL-KAFA, a mediaeval town on the south shore of the Crimean peninsula, called in ancient times and again at the present day Theodosia (originally a Mileian colony). The name Kafa (Kafa, or Kafa, is first found in Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos (*De administr. imperii*, Ch. 53). Saromates V, king of Iosporus, is said to have been killed there in the fourth century in single combat with Pharnaces of Chersonesus. The view has been put forward (F. Koppen, *Krimský Šborník*, St. Petersburg 1837, p. 107) that the name may be identical with the ζάξων mentioned in Strabo, Ch. 312. With these exceptions, Kafa is never mentioned till the xivth century. As a harbour on the south coast of the Crimea, for trade as well as for warships, we always find Suđađak (even as late as the reference in Recueil de Textes rel. à l'Hist. des Slavonoides, ed. Houtsma, iii., iv. see, Index), the modern Sudak.

Kafa only rose to prominence in the second half of the xivth century, when the Genoese established themselves in the Crimea after the republic of Genoa had purchased this place from a Tatar chief. This chief is usually believed to have been the Urân Timur, mentioned by Abu 'l-Gha'zi (ed. Desmasions, p. 173), son of Tüçü Timur, and grandson of Djiçi, to whom the Khan Mongke Timur (1266—1280) had granted Kafa and the (the name is written by Abu 'l-Gha'zi (p. 178), Urân Timur, by Rashid al-Din (ed. Blochet, p. 126), Urâng Timür; but a consul of Kafa is mentioned as early as about 1263. It was not till the xivth century that "Gazaria" or "Gazzaria", the colony founded by the Genoese on the Black Sea with Kafa as its capital, became of considerable importance. It was controlled by the *officium Gazariane* in Genoa and its statutes (1316); the administration remained in the hands of the metropoles with a limited participation by the local population. The statutes of 1290 and 1316 expressly forbid the minting of a local currency but in the xivth century this was, in practice at least, allowed; the coins (with Latin and Tatar inscriptions) bear the badge of Genoa (after 1453, when the administration of the colony was placed in the hands of the Bank of St. George, the representation of this saint) as well as the seal (tambha) of the Golden Horde (afterwards the tavgza of the Girây; cf. ii. 171). After 1318 Kafa appears as the see of a Catholic Archbishop, whose diocese comprised the whole area from Yarna to Sarai on the Volga and from the Black Sea to the Russian dukedoms. Ibn Batъtīa (about 1330) describes Kafa as "one of the famous ports of the world" (ed. Defremery and Sanguinetti, ii. 358; *mun marâṣī l-'Idnyâ l-zâhîrâ*) of his time. In the harbour there were about 200 naval and mercantile ships. The Muhammadans there had their mosque and kâňa. By the treaty of 1530 however, the Tartars could move no ships beyond the city walls; this limitation seems to have again been removed later. In the statutes of 1449 it is only laid down that Tartars living in Kafa are not to be subject to the *Titanius seu vicarina* i.e. the *Tudun of the Khan of the Crimea*. The fortifications still in existence belong in part to the period 1531—48 (successful wars against the Khan of the Golden Horde, Djinbqeg), in part to the period 1583—66 (building of the city walls as a protection, not only for the city proper (*burgus*), but for the suburbs (*anturburgi*) also. About 1470 the population is said to have been 80,000. As early as a letter from the Bank of St. George to the Pope Calixtus VI (1455—58), of Nov. 1, 1455, in which attention is drawn to the danger threatening the Black Sea colonies from the Turks, Kafa is described as non ambitu quidem minimis sed populorum multitudine Constantinopolis facte praferenda.

The Turkish conquest, inevitable after the fall of Constantinople (1453) and Trebizond (1461), could not be long averted by the Christians of the Latin East either with their own forces or the oft summoned help of the Girây (to whom Kafa was in some degree dependent from 1454, when a Genoese navy was defeated by Habûd of Girây). In 1475, when the whole peninsula had to submit to the Turks; the south shore with Kafa was directly incorporated in the Sultan's empire and divided into three kâñflik (Kafa, Manküb and Suđađ) with a Pasha in Kafa. Under Bâyazid II (1481—1512), at the time of the first Russian embassy (1498), this office was filled by a son of the Sultan, Muhammad (this information does not seem to be found in Turkish sources, as it is only given by von Hammer, *Gesch. der Osmanischen Reiches*, 2nd ed., Pest 1834—36, i. 646, from Karamzin, *Ist. Gös. Ross.*, 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, 1818—29, vi. 169 sq. = *Gesch. der Russ. Reiches*, transl. from the 2nd edition, Riga 1824, vi. 215). For a short period the revenues of Kafa were occasionally surrendered to the Girây; Kafa appears as a mint of the Girây under Mengli Girây from 890—906 (1493—1501) and again not till the reign of Şâhin Girây, regnal years 5 and 6 i. e. 1195, 1196 (1781—82).

Under Turkish rule Kafa (Turkish pronunciation Kefe) gradually assumed the appearance of a Muhammadan town, although many Christian churches remained in existence. The most detailed description is by Dortelli d'Ascoli 1654 (Russ. transl. in *Zapiski Odeszkago Obščeh*, etc., xxiv., text. publ. by Daškewič in *Glavna w. ister. ekbği, Kestora llitipoisico*, Book 5), who had spent over ten years in the Crimea at the beginning of the seventeenth century. There were then in Kafa 70 mosques, 2 synagogues (one for Rabbaines and the other for Karaites), 15 Greek, 28 Armenian (according to Beaulieu [1660], 12 Greek and 32 Armenian) churches and only one Catholic. The principal mosque (*hüyûk quişi*), later described by Pallas in 1794 (*Bemerkungen auf einer Reise in die südliche Staatslalellschaften des ruzz. Reiches*, i. d. J. 1793 u. 1794, Leipzig 1801, ii. 262), stood
in the centre of the town; the dome of the main building, over 65 feet in diameter, was surrounded on three sides by eleven smaller cupolas; the two minarets were 115 feet high. A decline in the prosperity of the town under Turkish rule was noticed by Broniowski as early as 1578; as the world's trade had taken other routes, the shores of the Black Sea no longer had their former importance; yet to the end of Turkish rule Kafa remained the most important harbour on the north side of the Black Sea. Chardin (Voyages, Amsterdam 1735, i. 46 sq.) says that in his 40 days' stay there (Aug.—Sept. 1672) he saw nearly 400 ships arriving and departing. In the town there were then about 4,000 houses of which 3,200 were Muslim and 800 Christian; there were no stone buildings with the exception of 8 churches in ruins (apparently dating from the Genoese period). Even in the xviiith century Kafa was still compared with Constantinople by the Russians and called Little Stamboul (Kütük İstambül).

In 1772 Kafa was taken for the first time by the Russians, but not finally incorporated in the empire till 1783. According to the oldest Russian plan of the city, there were then 29 mosques, 13 Greek and 22 Armenian churches, and 813 houses of which 604 were Turkish. In the description of the journey of the Empress Catherine in 1787 we already find the old Greek name (Russ. Feodosia) reappearing; the town is later called Kafa again and only definitely renamed in 1804. In the very early years after the conquest began the forced migration of the Turks and the voluntary of the Tartars; about 1794 (Pallas) Kafa had already *from a celebrated and populous town become almost a mound of stones*. It is said to have had only 200 inhabitants. The Russian harbour of Feodosia, whose prosperity only began in the last decade of the xixe century (railway connections, building of commercial docks, Sebastopol being the naval port), must thus be regarded as a new foundation on the site of the Turkish Kafa. The number of the inhabitants, according to the census of 1899, was 27,238 (in 1894, only 17,000); of whom only 3,200 were Tartars. The Museum (founded in 1811) contains many inscriptions and other antiquities, particularly from the Genoese period.

Bibliography: cf. BAGHES-SARKI [i. 663]; the works, mentioned there, by Broniowski, Pallas, etc., as well as the Zapiski Odeskiego Obschestva Istori i Drevenosti are indispensable for the study of the history of Kafa. In the Zapiski (from Vol. ii. to xxiv) the material from the archives of Geno in published in Italy (Atti della Società Ligure di storia patria) is utilised. On the coins: O. Retowski, Genoecka-tatarska monee goroda Kaffi (Simferopol 1897 and 1898). Cf. also F. Brun, Cernomorye, i. (Odessa 1879), chap. ii (O poseleniyakh iazykanskikh v Cazarii); J. Kulakowsky, Przychody Tawidi, 2nd ed. (Kiew 1914). An attempt at a connected survey is W. K. Minogradow, Feodosiya (Istorischy Ocherk), 2nd ed. (Jekaterinodar 1902). Cf. also M. G. Canale, Della Crimea (Genoa 1855) and Heyd, Hist. du Commerce du Levant (Leipzig 1858/9), Ind. s. v. Caffa. (W. BARTHOLO)

KAFAL (καφάλα), the pledge given by any one (the kafal) to a creditor (the makfat biki) to secure that the debtor (the makfat biki) will be present at a definite place e. g. to pay his debt or fine or, in case of retaliation, to undergo punishment.

If the makfat biki is not there at the time arranged, the guarantor can be kept prisoner till the debtor comes or until it is proved that he cannot come (e. g. because he is dead). As to the question whether the guarantor is bound to pay for the makfat biki or to suffer his punishment, the opinions of the different madhab's vary. According to the Shafi'i school, he is not bound to do so, not even if he has expressly bound himself to do so.


(TH. W. JUVENBOL.)

KAFF (καφ), a technical term in Arabic prosody. It means the dropping of the seventh, vowelless consonant of a foot, which ends with sabab kisif (see the article KISIF, i. 463). The following feet are liable to kaff: 1. mufussil, provided that the 1 remains (> mafâsila; 2. fâšâla and mutaâlâa (the latter in the kisif), provided that the next foot beginning with a sabab kisîf does not suffer khaân (> fâšâla, mutaâlâa. [In the last mentioned case four short syllables would follow in succession! Editor]. Kaff is therefore found in the metres tawîl, madíd, rakâb, kisîf, kadîjî mudârî and mudjîtahât. Bibliography: See the article 'ARûd.

(MOH. BEN CHENEB.)

KAFFÂRA (καφâra), an atonement, expiation, literally, what "covers" the sin. The kaffâra has usually to consist in releasing a Muslim slave or — for those who are not sufficiently well off — in a three days' (and in some cases even two months') fast or as a substitute — for those who are not able to fast — in bestowing food or clothes on a definite number of poor people (from 10 to 60).

In some cases the Kurân has already prescribed a definite kaffâra for the sinner, e. g. Qurân iv. 94, after killing by accident or by design, Qurân v. 91, to avert the evil consequence of breaking an oath, Qurân lvii. 4 sq., if a man by pronounce the old Arab zikân formula has sworn to refrain from all sexual intercourse with his wife. These and many other cases (e. g. the breaking of the fast prescribed in the month of Ramâdân by fornication or marital intercourse during the day) were afterwards more precisely defined by the fâ'î's and fully described in the fik books of the different madhab's.


(TH. W. JUYENBOL.)

KAFIL. [See KAFÂLA.]

KAFIR (καφîr), originally "obliterating, covering," then, "concealing benefits received"  — "ungrateful;" this meaning is found even in the old Arab poetry and in the Kuràn, Sûra xxvi. 18. In the Kuràn the word is used with reference to God: "concealing God's blessings"  — "ungrateful to God," see Sûra xxi. 57 and xxx. 35: "All that they are ungrateful for our gifts;" cf. also Sûra, xvi. 85. The next development — probably under
the influence of the Syiric and Aramaic where the corresponding development took place earlier — is the more general meaning of "inhal" which is first found in Sūra lxxiv. 10 and is henceforth very common; plural kāfirun or kufār, once (Sūra Ixxx. 42) kufāra. The term is first applied to the unbelieving Meccans, who endeavour to refute and revile the Prophets (muhār) and elsewhere. The subject of incredulity is sometimes more nearly defined with added bi-, e.g., Sūra xxxiv. 33: "We do not believe in your mission"; Sūra vi. 89. In the early Meccan period a waiting attitude towards the unbelievers is still recommended (Sūra Ixxvii. 17; Ixxii. 10 sq.; see also Sūra cix. entitled al-Kāfīrūn), but later the Muslims are ordered to keep apart from them (Sūra iii. 114, also 27), to defend themselves from their attacks and even to take the offensive against them (Sūra ii. 180 and elsewhere). In most passages the reference is to unbelievers in general, who are threatened with God's punishment and Hell (cf. the article ḤANNAHMA). In the literature of ḤAJAMA also the believer with minute elaboration in details — deal partly with the fate of the kufār on the day of judgement and his punishment in hell, and partly with the believer's attitude towards him. For the rest they reflect the great controversy in early Islām on the question whether a Muslim should be considered a kāfir for committing a "major sin" (cf. al-Bukhārī, Kit. al-Īṣām, liāb 24). Thus we find ḥadiths such as: "If a Muslim charges a fellow Muslim with kufār, he is himself a kāfir, if the accusation should prove untrue"; or "The reproach of kufār is equivalent to murder" etc. Nevertheless, kufār in theological polemics is a fairly frequent term for the Muslim protagonist of the opposite view.

Eternal damnation for the kufār, has remained an established dogma in Islām. In the dogmatic controversies of the early centuries the reasons were discussed for which a Muslim could be identical with a kufār and have to suffer eternal punishment. The most tolerant is the view of the Muqaddja that all the Ahl al-Kībla, even if they commit a mortal sin (kabīra) are to be considered believers and their ultimate fate is to be left to God. The most striking contrast to this is the strict view of Khārījīs and Ḥādīṣ that every Muslim, who dies with a mortal sin — and this means with them every sin which has not been repented of — on his conscience, is to be considered just a kāhir. Intermediate is the opinion of the Muṭṭaṣilīs, who for this special case assume an intermediate between believer and unbeliever, the so-called "rejected" fāšk (cf. the article IMĀN. — According to Nallino, in the Riv. degli Studi orientali, vii. 436 sqq., the names Muṭṭaṣilīs, Mūrḍjīs, etc. [q. v.] are probably closely connected with their attitude on this point). According to the Liṣān al-ʿArab, vi. 459 sqq., the following kinds of unbelief are distinguished 1) kufār al-ินākār — neither recognising nor acknowledging God; 2) kufār al-ʿjlīḥād — recognising God, but not acknowledging Him with words, that is, a remaining unbeliever in spite of one's better knowledge; 3) kufār al-muʿānāda — recognising God and acknowledging Him with words, but remaining unbelief (can unite out of envy or hatred); 4) kufār al-miṣfāk — outwardly acknowledging, but at heart not recognising God and thus remaining an unbeliever, that is being a hypocrite [cf. MUNĀFĪK].

In the systematic Fiṣḥ books the kufār are discussed in the following passages: 1) in the Kitāb al-Ẓahrā. For the opinion deduced from Sūra ix. 28 that the unbeliever is unclean, we find all views represented, from the strictest to the most tolerant: just as on all questions of the strictest is the Shi'a which reckons the unbeliever among its dhah adhīyāt; but on this point al-Nawawī, for example, was particularly lenient; he considers the believer and unbeliever equal as regards purity. The Ahl al-Kitāb [q. v.] are usually regarded more leniently than other Kufār for their benefit for example the questions of the dhāhīs and of mūnakaḥa with Muslims are discussed. — 2) In the Kitāb al-Dīnākh (soa ʿl-Siyar). The Ḥiyāh [q. v.] against the unbeliever inhabitants of the Dār al-Ḥarb [q. v.] is a fardʿ alaʾa kufāya. The Ahl al-Kitāb again occupy a special position as by paying ḥisya and ḥarām [q. v.] they become ḥimmīs [see DHIMMA] and can receive amān [q. v.]. These categories of unbelievers in the Dār al-Islām called dhimmī and musulmān have a legal claim to protection. Another class also distinguished from the mass of the kufārin are the renegades [see MURTAD] for whom the law prescribes death, with the opportunity first of obeying a demand to return to Islām. The others, the unbelievers proper, who in this sense also are called kufārin al-ṭālīyūn (or munkabīn, in the narrower sense) have only to expect death or slavery [see ʿABĪ] if they fall as prisoners of war into the hands of Muslims; if they are fortunate, they may be exchanged or released. (In many cases, e.g. in the gradual advance of Islam into Africa the distinction between renegades and pagans was difficult to ascertain and there are writings extant which deal specially with this question, cf. Ibn Ḥadjar al-Ḥattāni, al-Īʿlam bi Kawsūṭ al-Islām, lith. 1293). — 3) In several further points the law discriminates between kufār and believers; the very strict interpretation of the law is however in practice only held by a small minority.

To understand the historical development in the attitude of Islām to the unbeliever, it should be observed that it was settled in the early centuries not so much by religious as by political and social conditions. Even down to the time of the Crusades there prevailed in Islām a tolerance towards the unbeliever, especially the Ahl al-Kitāb, such as is impossible to imagine in contemporary Christendom. We find for example Christians in the highest official positions. In this early period there is no question of any religious fanaticism towards unbelievers. It was only aroused and nourished by the repeated wars with unbelievers (Crusades, wars with the Turks). War-psychology, on the other hand, at the time of the wars between Persia and Turkey could even bring it about that the Persians were called kufār in Turkish fetwas etc. (see Pečeti, i. 311, 319), a name which the Turks themselves had applied to them in the proclamations of the Mahdi of the Südān.

Since at the present day the trend of affairs has apparently been quite in the opposite direction, and Muslims have been more and more impoverished in carrying out measures against the kufār by the political decline of Islām and the rise of unbelieving nations (pressure of the Powers, capitulations, etc.), the very feeling of impotence in face
of these facts may have contributed not a little to the strengthening of hatred and to periodical manifestations of it (in massacres etc.). This also explains the grotesque caricature of the käfer, which one sometimes finds in the popular imagination at the present day (see Snouck Hurgronje, Methka, ii. 48 sqq.) and which is connected with the ideas of the Arch-Käfer, Daddjdu [q. v.] who bears k-fr on his forehead (cf. Goldziher, in Der Islam, xi. 178).

It may also be due to the hatred of the Franks (not to dogmatic squabbles) that käfer had developed into a term of abuse, so frequent in the Turkish form čaw (the Persian čawer [q. v.] is said to be the same), although in theory it is (Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, xvii. 562) affirmed that the Muslim commits a punishable offence if he says to the Christian or Jew: "Thou unbeliever". From the Turkish the word käfer has entered into most Slavonic languages. The Spanish cafer and the French cafar or the French kafar also go back to käfer or kaffir. In two cases käfer has actually become a proper name, that of a people, the Kaffirs, and of a country, Kafirstan [q. v.].

Käfer and kafir underwent a special development of meaning in the terminology of mysticism. Compare, for example, the well-known verse of Abū Saʿīd [q. v.]: "So long as belief and unbelief are not perfectly equal, no man can be a true Muslim", with the various explanations given in Muḥammad Aʾīl, Dict. of Technical Terms (ed. Sprenger, etc.), s. v., according to which kafir is just the equivalent of imān-i ḥašš."}

Bibliography: In addition to the sources already quoted above, see for the old Arabic poetry Ziehrer, d. Dicht. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, xilv. 544. — On the development of kfr in Syriac s. Payne Smith, Théaurus Syriacum, ii. 1798 sqq., in Aramaic s. Levy, Ghidasliche Worterbuch über die Targumim, p. 381 and his Neuhebräisches und chaldisches Worterbuch über die Talmud und Midraschim, ii. 383 sqq. — For the literature of Tradition the whole material will be available in the still unfinished Indexes of Prof. A. J. Wensinck, who has kindly called my attention to the hadith quoted above.


KAFIRISTAN. The name of a mountainous tract in the Hindū-Kush situated between 35° and 36° N. and 70° and 71° E. with an area of about 5000 sq. m. Till recently independent, but since 1896 a territory of Afghanistan. The northern boundary is roughly the watershed between the drainage of the Oxus and that of the Indus, the valleys to the north being occupied by Gālāja [q. v.], to the west the spurs of the Hindū-Kush which runs southward from the neighbourhood of the Khāwāk Pass may be considered the boundary separating it from the Panjāshār and Nīdhunāi valleys. To the east and south the range between the Kunār and Bāshgul valleys and those to the north of the Kunār and Kābul valleys define its limits. The country consists of numerous valleys much isolated from each other by lofty ranges, the principal rivers draining which fall either into the Kābul or Kunār rivers, and so belong to the Indus basin. The principal are the Aliṅgar or Kāo with its tributary the Ali-şāh, the Pīk (Kāmah or Prēṣūn) and the Bāshgul. The inhabitants, from their persistent paganism, have long been known as Kāfrs, and from them the name of the country Kafirstān is derived. The term Sīyāh-pōsh or “Black-clad” which properly belongs to one section only, (the others being classed together as Safed-pōsh or “White-clad”) has also been in use from an early period.

This tract was undoubtedly part of the Kūshān kingdom in the early part of the Christian era, and has been identified with the mountain country of Kapiṣa. The name Kātār applied to the country and its ruling tribe by Taimūr (Timūr) is identical with the title of the rulers of the neighbouring country of Cīrāl, and is no doubt the same as Kātir, the name of the principal tribe at the present day. It is most probably derived from the title Kīdāra used by the later Kūshāns. It has been thought by Wood and Yule that the wine-drinking tribes whom Marco Polo met near Casen (i. e. Kīshm in the Kōkān valley) are identical with the Kāfrs, who may have at that time extended into the northern valleys of the Hindū-Kush, but the first definite mention of them is in the Emperor Timūr’s memoirs. On his way to invade India in 800 (1398) he turned aside into their country from the Khāwāk Pass to punish them for their raids on Andarāb. He calls them Kātār and Sīyāh-pōsh. In spite of his claims to victory it is clear that a great part of his forces was destroyed in an ambush and he returned to Khāwāk without any permanent success. Bābur in his autobiography gives a very accurate account of the country and people, many of the rivers and districts being described by names they still bear.
In more recent times Elphinstone from his observations in 1809, Masson (in 1826) and Biddulph (in 1880) collected all the information available without entering the country, and the account given by the first-named is especially valuable. The first European to penetrate Kāfirīstān was Lockhart in 1835; followed by Robertson in 1839 and 1890. The last named in his work on the Kāfirs of the Hindū-Kush has given the best account available of the country and people, their customs, beliefs and organization.

In the treaty of 1803 between the Indian Government and Afghānīstān, Kāfirīstān was definitely left outside the British border, and the Amir 'Abd al-Raḥmān proceeded in 1896 to conquer the whole and to convert its population forcibly to Islām. The Rāmgāli tribe, a branch of the Kātir, was the last to submit. Robertson classifies the population under two heads, viz. the Siyāh-pōsh tribes all closely related to each other (the principal tribe being the Kātir), and the miscellaneous tribes, without any special bond of union, included under the name of ʿAṣāf-pōsh. The chief of these are the Waigalis (with the Ashkun who are related to them), and the Pṛṣungalis or Vērōn. All seem to belong to an ancient branch of the Arvāni stock, and their languages are of the Piśā family, which according to Proust and Grierson, have the characteristics of a tongue spoken after the Indian family had branched off, but before the Iranī had been differentiated. The purest dialects are the Bāshgī, Wāi-ālā and Vērōn, spoken in the central parts of the country. The Gwār-bāt, Kālāshā and Pāshāī form an outer group; the Pāshāī in fact being spoken in the Dījalāūgh valley outside the limits of Kāfirīstān proper. There is also another member of the group Ašghund, as to which nothing is as yet known.

The form of paganism followed till lately was much mixed with animism, but there were certain principal gods generally recognized, the chief of which were Īmrā, the creator, whose principal shrine was at Pṛṣung, and the goddess Dūzānā, the war-god and the goddess Dūzānā. In the borderlands however many districts had already accepted Islām before the Afghān conquest. These converts were known as Shaikhīs. Sacrifices of goats and ceremonial dances were very prevalent.

The social system is entirely tribal, each tribe consisting of several clans. The tribal government is carried on by a council composed mainly of the headmen or ānjāst who represent the various clans. A number of uṭīr or magistrates are elected annually to carry on the actual tribal government. The houses are well built and grouped into strong villages. The Kāfirs generally are acute and clever, but untruthful, intriguing and vain, yet they are hospitable and not generally cruel. They are brave and fond of freedom, and in their own country show a great sense of dignity; very quarrelsome, but always ready to put a stop to fights among others. Theft and assassination are not in any way condemned. Slavery is prevalent, the slaves being partly hereditary and partly obtained by capture in intertribal war or by purchase.


Kāfiya (λ), a term in prosody meaning rhyme generally. The word seems (according to Goldscher, Ahkand, sur Arab. Philologie, i. 83 sqq.) to have originally meant a poetic utterance or a lampoon, then a poem and finally a rhyme. The theory of the kāfiya is considered a special science, (distinct from 'awād (prosody proper). It teaches how verses should end as regards consonants and vowels etc.

In the narrower sense, kāfiya, according to al-Khallīl b. Ahmad [q. v.], is a group of consonants, which begins with the voweled consonant immediately preceding the last two quiescent consonants of a verse. In the Arab view, of course, a verse ends always with a quiescent letter, whether written or not (the latter is the case with wāw and yā' of prolongation when they are written defectively): yəf'-āl, yəf'-āl, yaf'-āl, yaf'-āl. The kāfiya may include up to six consonants:

1. the principal one (in the Arab view), the rawi or rhyme-letter, the letter which the poet always retains at the end of the line, till he has ended his poem and also, which the letter is called: lām in the mutallaka of Imrū al-Kais, dāl in that of Šāfī, etc. It is to be noted that Arabic poems are all mono-rhymed with the exception of the rādīq matassumid, in which the two hemistichs in a line rhyme. According to some prosodists it is the rule to allow the two first hemistichs of a poem to rhyme; 2. as an annex to the rawi, the waṣil or sīlā, i.e. a letter of prolongation or a hā' (voweled or not) coming after the voweled rawi; of the letters of prolongation, alīf is the only one usually written in this capacity; 3. as a possible further complement, the khrūrdī, the letter of prolongation behind a voweled kā' serving as a waṣīl; 4. the weak letter or letter of prolongation immediately before the rawi; wāw and yā' may interchange with each other in one and the same poem; or 5. tā'sīs, an alīf, placed before the rawi and separated from it by a consonant (ddālī) which may be changed at will but must always have the same vowel; 6. the ddālī just mentioned.

The kāfiya may likewise include up to six vowels: 1. madīr or madīra, the vowel of the rawi; 2. naṣīda, the vowel of the hā if it serves as waṣil; 3. tawwālī, the vowel before the quiescent rawi; 4. ḥadīw, the vowel immediately before the rīf; 5. ḥaḏīw, the vowel of the ddālī; 6. raʾs, the vowel immediately before the alīf of the tāʾsīs (always a of course).

In respect of lengths, five kinds of rhyme are distinguished, viz. — 1. mutakāwāls, in which the two last quiescent consonants (which, as explained above, mark the beginning and end of the kāfiya) are separated by four voweled consonants: fawwā [ka budānīk]; 2. muturādāk, in which three voweled consonants stand between the two quiescent: ṭālā [džabālī]; 3. mutadārīk, in which two voweled consonants separate the two unvoweled: kād [fūal]; 4. mutawālīr, in which there is one voweled consonant between the two quiescent: bālīy; 5. muturādāfī, in which the two quiescent consonants come in immediate succession: kāfī.

Finally we have still to note the faults in the
KAFTĀN

Kāfiya: 1. iḥāw, the substitution of a dhamma for a kasra as madafra; 2. iṣāf or ʾiraṣ, the substitution of a fatha serving as madafra for a kasra or dhamma; 3. ʾeṣā, the use of similar sounding consonants as rauw (miin and niin, ḫā and ḫā, ḥāf and ṭām, etc.); 4. iyūsā which consists in using consonants of essentially different sound as rauw (kāf and ṭā, kāf and ḫā, etc.); 5. ṭāfr, the changing of the ṣadhb (the last foot in the second hemistich) in one and the same poem; 6. ʾeṣā, the repetition of one and the same word in the same meaning as a rhyme-word in the same poem; 7. ʾanfā, a mistake which occurs before the rauw, namely a) ʾinsāf ʾal-ḥādkh, changing of the vowel, which precedes the rīsd; b) ʾinsāf ʾal-ʾetba, changing of the vowel between rauw and al-ʾetba; c) ʾinsāf ʾal-ṭamāzh, changing of the vowel immediately before the quiescent rauw; d) ʾinsāf ʾal-rīsd, the use of rīsd in one line but not in the other lines; e) ʾinsāf ʾal-ʾetba, the use of ʾetba in one line but not in the others; 8. ṭadīna or the running of one line into another, in such a way that the end of one line only gives complete sense when we know the beginning of the next verse.

In conclusion it should be noted that it was considered the rule in reciting a poem to lengthen the vowel of the vowelled rauw; but this custom was not generally observed. The Banū Tānim added a quiescent niin to the madafra in place of the wad. Among the Banū Ṭāṣd the madafra was suppressed. Otherwise it was permitted, when a strong quiescent consonant preceded the rauw, to transfer to it the vowel of the rauw which itself then became quiescent: faʾlā > faʾal. Finally, it often happened that, if the rauw was quiescent, it was given a kasra which was followed by a quiescent niin: faʾal > faʾalān.

Bibliography: In addition to the works quoted in the article Kāfiya: Ibn Rashīd, al-ʿUmda (Cairo 1254), ii. 238 sq.

(NEW: BEN CHENE"

KAFTĪZ, an Arab measure of capacity (dry measure) containing from 25—50 litres (5—10 gallons). In the pre-Islamic period the use of measures of capacity with dry and liquid wares was in general use, as is shown by the usually Arabic names for these measures in contrast to the measures of weight and their names borrowed from the Greeks and Romans. It has still long been the custom to measure these wares by their weight and not by their volume. East and west in this respect have undergone opposite developments. This transition from measures to weights was furthered, on the one hand, by the easier supervision of market business done by weight and, on the other, by the experience early obtained that it is not a matter of indifference whether very large or very small measures are used to measure dry wares. As the weight of the upper layers appreciably compresses the lower, the result is that, other things being equal, larger quantities weigh more per unit of capacity than small quantities. The tables of measures of capacity commonly used in the early period is given below. The remarks show that it is not homogeneous. The greatest variations prevail in the theoretical lists of measures; the figures quoted below which presupposing distilled water at normal temperature etc. — mean so many kilogrammes in weight, are based on an original measure of one mudhd of the year 571 (1175/6) in the Cairo Museum, which, according to its inscription, held 337 dirham kāf of pure water. The measures usual in the early centuries of the Hijra seem however to have been smaller ranging down to the half of the figures here given.

Measures of capacity or dry measure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mudhd</td>
<td>1.15 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾaṣ</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mabkāb</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣafī</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two avoidipois weights were tacked on to this system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>warb</td>
<td>275.0 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kurr</td>
<td>1650.0 kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That these measures of capacity are not entirely forgotten is probably due to the fact that they have been retained in the legal literature. They have disappeared from the market-place, at least in the East. In the lands round the Western Mediterranean the ṣafī has however survived down to the present day, e. g. in Tunisia, in Sicily (cafsa and cafnsa, a measure of weight for oil, 11—20 kg.) and in Spain (cafl, plur. cafhs, a measure for grain of about 6.6 hectolitre) etc.

the direction of the ֿניִּדְּיָא ֵבִּגְּי, an official whose duty it was to take charge of and keep in condition the fur-robes of honour. At the present day this garment seems to be very little worn. Hamambe and Marie de Luannay, Les Costumes populaires de la Turquie en 1873 (Constantinople 1873) only mention it (p. 238) when describing a Kurdish woman from Kharpur: A kaftan of fine dark green cloth, open in front and widely cut out in the form of an excuschten on the breast, leaves the upper part of the shirt quite exposed and does not entirely cover the lower half. ... The very long sleevs of the kaftan ending in a quadrangular piece are taken in above the wrists so as not to conceal the silver armlets. The sleeves are edged with galon and notched gold lace.


KAFUR (also KAFÜR and KAFFUR, cf. Lübn al-Årub, s. Kûf and Kfr; s. Kfar in Arabic in Pnakrit-Kâphûra, -kâphû, Malay kapur), camphor, the resin of Laurus camphora and Dryobalanops aromatica, was an object of commerce with India from the days of the ancient Persians; on the capture of al-Madiin, the Arabs found rich stores of this drug, the use of which they did not know; they took it for salt (al-Balâqîhâri, ed. de Goeje, p. 264); Ibn al-Åthîr, ed. Tornberg, ii. 401) Ibn al-Ba’tîr mentions different sorts of camphor, of which fânsûr and riwaytû were considered the best; all these kinds were purified before being used. Marco Polo (ed. Soc. de Géogr. Paris 1865, i. 447; transl. Yule, revised by H. Cordier, London, 1903, ii. 299 and note 3, p. 302—4) says the camphor of Farsûr was the best and most expensive; it was said to be weighed against gold. Fânsûr — most probably an old name for Barûs (cf. Týdshér, van het Kon. Nederl. Aardrijkskundig Genootschap, Series 2, xvi., 1904, p. 18—22, 27—29; Encyl. van Nederl. Indië, i. 172 sqq.) on the west coast of Sumatra (Residency of Tapanulu) from which the kafur Barûs came — is frequently mentioned by Arab writers; from the first half of the third (ninth) century we find the name in different historicographical reports as the place of origin of an exceptional quality of camphor.

The name of this resin is also found in the Kurâ (Ixxvi. 5): "The righteous shall drink there (in Paradise) out of a goblet, the contents of which are mixed with kafur"; according to the Muslim commentators, either to indicate the pleasant flavour of the beverage or perhaps as the name of a spring in Paradise (al-Tâbarî, Tâfsîr, Cairo 1321, xxix. 111 sqq.). The latter explanation is based on the fact that at the beginning of verse 6 the word wain (spring) is found.


KAFFUR, ANU ‘L-MISK AL-IKSHIDID, also AL-LÂBIH OR AL-ÅSTÂH, called al-Lâbi in a poem by al-Mutanabbî after a place in Nubia, ruler of Egypt and Syria in the fourth century of the Hijrî. Kaffur was born in Nubia or Abyssinia between the years 291 (904) and 308 (920) (so greatly do the statements of the chronicles vary). The fact that he led a slave life as he became the chief slave and rose to be ruler of Egypt and Syria and the celebrated patron of scholars and friend of al-Mutanabbî [q. v.], the greatest poet of his time, has aroused a great interest among the Arab historians and given him a greater fame than his importance really deserves. As the Macenas of poets and scholars, he found kindly biographers who have praised him as a model of fidelity for his devotion — not always maintained — to the Ikshîdîd [q. v.]. His biography is adorned with numerous anecdotes about his humble origin and his rise and about his friendship with al-Mutanabbî. He is only of importance today because he resisted the advance of the Fatimids [q. v.] in the west and of the Arab dynasties in North Syria and maintained by his ability for two decades the kingdom founded by the Ikshîdîds in 323 (935). After his death it soon broke up. As a young slave he is said to have expressed the ambitious wish to become one day ruler of Egypt, to a companion who had said his ideal was to become cook in a cookshop so that he might always eat his fill. As a slave he had the good fortune to be sold to the governor Muhammad al-Ikshîhî (323—334 = 935—946); that he was almost immediately given away by him on account of a skin disease and again taken back, may well be an embellishment, to contrast his degradation with his all the more marvellous rise. Another narrator says that he was sent with money by his former master to the governor al-Ikshîhî but the latter sent the money back and retained Kâfûr in his service instead. It is also related that he was the only one to remain by his master when his comrades had negligently left the governor’s room to see a passing elephant. Both these stories only show that the governor had on some occasion had his attention specially attracted to him. He must certainly have early recognised his merit and put trust in him, for he made this ugly, despised slave the tutor of his children and a general. In the latter capacity he distinguished himself in 329 (940) in a battle near Aleppo which he captured for his master. When al-Ikshîhî felt his end was near at the close of 334 (July 946), he appointed him guardian of his younger son Awnuddur (the name is very diversely written) whom the Caliph had previously appointed joint-ruler with his father. The real power remained in Kāfûr’s hands even after Awnuddur became of age, although he provided for the preservation of the Ikshîhîd dynasty by getting Awnuddur’s brother ‘Ali recognised as joint-ruler and successor in 338 (949). Later in 343 (854) Awnuddur, at the instigation of his friends, tried to shake the tutelage of Kaffur, as he felt himself restricted in his freedom of action and expenditure — he only received 400,000 dinârs out of Kâfûr’s rich revenues. He therefore
KAFÜR — KAHIN.

went to Ramla in Palestine in order to be able from there to exert real authority over Syria and then on Egypt. But the plan did not come to fulfillment, as his mother and Kafür, warned in time, were able to apprise him. The relationship remained unchallenged till Awnûjur died in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 349 (Dec. 966). After the death of Awnûjur, Kafür had his brother 'Ali confirmed in office as governor by the Caliph towards the end of the year. Kafür remained his guardian, although 'Ali was 24, and only allowed him an income of 400,000 dinârs. The power of Egypt was again extended over Syria, so that 'Ali was mentioned next to the Caliph in the Princely and northwards as far as Tarus. When 'Ali died six years later in 355 (966), Kafür himself assumed the government and was confirmed in office by the Caliph, as 'Ali's son Ahmad was only 9 years old. He did not enjoy his independence long, for he died in 357 (968). His successor was the Ahmad whom he had superseded.

Kafür was able to maintain order in Syria and Egypt. Shortly after the death of al-Qaṣîd, he recaptured from Saif al-Dawla, ruler of Aleppo, Damascus which the latter had taken. Kafür was able skillfully to maintain his position between the Biyâgh and the Caliph and the Fâjiimilzim of North Africa. His riches were celebrated; his estate consisted of art-treasures of all kinds rather than of gold. He was a man who loved pomp; like Saif al-Dawla, exceedingly liberal to scholars and poets, so that his court was a popular one and his favourite was a poet. When al-Munâbîb came estranged from Saif al-Dawla, he came on Kafür's invitation to Cairo, where he lived for some years. In the first period of his stay there he composed famous panegyric on Kafür; but the intimacy did not last long, as Kafür did not give him a position in the administration which he is alleged to have promised him. He excused himself by saying that he could not trust an office to a man who had posed as a prophet. Kafür also devoted much time to scholarly studies and is said to have written poetry. Many scholars were in his service, of whom the best known is al-Kindi who composed a history of Egypt for him.


(M. Sökerhurm.)

KâGHAD, KâGHID (from the Persian käghød, perhaps of Chinese origin), paper. In the early period of development of Muslim culture the east was only acquainted with papyrus (ẓirâq) as writing-material. It was Chinese prisoners of war brought to Samarkand after the battle of Ayâksh near Tâlás, that first introduced in 134 (751) the industry of paper-making from linen, flax or hemp rags after the method used in China. The various kinds of paper then made are the following: ṣirâzînî (Pharaoh's paper), a kind which was destined to compete with papyrus even in the land of its origin (the oldest paper with Arabic writing on it found in Egypt dates from 180–200 = 796–815); sulamînî, from Sulamân b. Kâghid, the treasurer of Khurâsân under Hârân al-Kâghid; ẓâfîrâî, called after Ẓâfîr al-Barmaki; ẓâfîrî, from Ẓâfîr b. Ẓâfîr al-Muṭahhîb, the second ruler of the Ẓâfîrî dynasty; ẓâfîrîrî, from Ẓâfîr al-Muṭahhîb, the same dynasty; ẓâfîrîrî, in allusion to the Samânîs Nâšî I.

Paper mills were erected elsewhere on the plan of those in Samarkand: al-ʿAṣrî, brother of Ẓâfîr al-Barmaki, who had been governor of Khâhâristân in 178 (794) probably founded the paper-work in the Dâr al-Kazz quarter in Baghdaûd. Soon after- wards others arose in Tiḥâma, Yemen and Egypt, where paper ultimately drove out papyrus, also in Damascus, Tripoli, Hâmâ, Mâniţîd, Tiberias, the Maghrib, Spain (at Nâtîva), Persia and India. Kâghâd-khânân, the "paper-makers", was the name taken by the people of the village of Khânâdji or Khânâdji in Adharbâyjân, two days' journey from Zâdân, on account of the excellent paper made there. The place was destroyed by the Mongols, who however founded a colony, Mughûliya, there. (Barbier de Meynard, Dict. de la Perse, p. 219; Ḥâdîjî Kâhîî, Lykâhâmmê, Constantinople 1145, p. 298; trans. by Norborg, i. 363.) On the preparation of paper and the different methods of colouring it, interesting details are given by J. v. Karabacek, Neue Quellen z. Papiergeschichte in Mitt. aus der Samml. der Papyr. Erbh. Kaiser, iv. 1975 sqq.

According to a statement of al-Maḫrîṣî (al-Khitî, ed. Wiet, ii. 34), Ẓâfîr al-Barmaki had parchment replaced by paper in the government offices.

The paper used in the east is now almost entirely of European manufacture. In Persia we still find a Chinese paper, called Ẓâhân Bâlîq (Turkish name of Pekin), a scarce paper, sought after for its durability. The Cairo printers prefer a strong yellow-coloured paper called ẓâhâtî (Pers. nâbâî, sugar-candy). A paper-mill long ago destroyed (Kâghâd-khâhâ, popularly Kâî ál-Hâne) has given its name to the Imperial Kiaoak and the public promenade of the "Sweet Waters of Europe" in Constantinople.

Bibliography: Fihrist, ed. Flügel, p. 21; Kalkashandi, Dâwû al-Ṣubb, i. 412; do., Ṣubb al-ʿArâd, i. 474, 475; Karabacek, Mitt. aus der Samml. der Papyr. Erbh. Kaiser, ii, iii. 87–178; Chavannes, Doc. sur les Toûkîn orientaux (St. Petersburg 1903), p. 297; Cl. Huart, Les calligraphes et les miniaturistes de l'orient massûman, p. 8–11; J. E. Polak, Persien (Leipzig 1865), i. 268; Jouannin and Van Gaver, Turrquie, p. 457; d'Ohsson, Tableau de l'Empire othoman, i. 155. (Cl. Huart.)

KAHF, Title of Sûra xviii. of the Kurûn. — See also ASHÂN AL-KAHF.

AL-KAHNî, one of the names Allah, cf. Allâh, i. 303.

KâHIN (A., plur. kâhin or kâhân; fem. kâhîn, plur. kâḥînîn, abstract of profession kâhâna) is the name of the sâr or soothe sayer (vâres, vates) among the pagan Arabs. It corresponds to the Hebrew kâhen, Aramaic, kahen, kâhnû (priest); it is not an arabised form of this however, but belongs to the original stock of the old Arabic
KÄHN.

language (otherwise Nolddeke, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, p. 36, note 6), for the Jewish kähn, kähn is entirely different in character from the Arab kähn: the former, although in all probability at one time also a soothsayer, later appears only as a spirit of miracles and particularly as sacrificer and teacher of the Tora, while it cannot be shown that the latter, who is never a priest (which is contradictory to von Kremer — see below in the Bibliography — p. 74 sqq., and also to Wellhausen, p. 134 and elsewhere), ever held these functions, neither was he permanently connected at all with worship and places of worship, but seems to have been quite unrestricted in the exercise of his activities.

The kähns of course have their origin in the shamanism, medicine-men, and fetish-priests, but in the form in which we first meet them in the old Arabic tales, in the Ḫādith and, much more rarely, in the pre-Islamic poetry, they have already passed beyond the ruder forms of shamanism. Their magic knowledge is based on ecstatic inspiration. They have also, it is true, visions by night which reveal to them future and other events and things hidden from the ordinary mortal (al-Maṣūdī, iii. 379, 394 sq.; Sprenger, i. 176 sqq. etc.), but they are not really visionary. Their inspiration is of demoniacal origin: a ḍijinn or šaiṭān “demon” (ṣāwīwaḥ) who is called their rāḥʿ “comrade,” ʿaḥī ḥāmromaḥ, ānadī or wālī, “friend” (“familiar spirit”), not infrequently also their rāʾ or rāʿ (probably “seer”), speaks out of them. This personification of their ecstasy, which at once stamps them as connected with the old-fashioned kāhan (though literally “knower,” er), also endowed by djinn with supernatural, magic knowledge (cf. vētē = poetēs), is conceived as being so substantial that the daumion proxson regularly appears as the ʿ אל his alter ego, the kähn, on the other hand, appears as the “thou” of the prophetic utterance, that the latter clearly notices the approach of the spirit, feels himself struck by his foot, hears his voice from a distance etc. (Sprenger, loc. cit.; Holscher, p. 85), indeed, these familiars even have their own names (like the familiar spirits of the poets, see Ǧīqūṭ, Māḏḏūm, ed. Wüstenfeld, in. 914, 94 sq. and al-Diḏiḥ, vi. 69; vol. viii. 65). The kähns give their utterances in the form of the ʿāṣif, short sentences in rhythmical prose, with single or more rarely alternating rhyme, such as had been usual in Arabia from early times for all utterance in the higher and lower branches of divination and magic, etc. (Only very rarely is regular verse also used, e. g. Ǧāḥāni, i. 161, 13). Besides the ʿāṣif, the samsana is characteristic of the kähns’ utterances, the mysterious “humming” with which it was delivered (Ibn Ḥishām, Sīrā, i. 171, 7 and thereon i. 58). The word ʿāṣif may in this sense have originally meant nothing more than the “purring” or “chirping” or such like of an alleged demon’s voice; the verb ʿāṣif is also used in other connections of “purring” or “chirping” of the djinn, regularly of course, of the “cooing” of pigeons and also of the “groaning” of camels; cf. in the O. T. e. g. Ḫāṣāh, xxix. 4). The kähns, the majority of whom are to be considered frauds, of course often express themselves in very obscure and ambiguous language. They give greater emphasis to their utterance by striking oaths, swearing by the earth and sky, sun, moon and stars, light and darkness, evening and morning, plants and animals of all kinds etc. (For kähns’ utterances, see e. g. Holscher, p. 87 sqq., 95 sqq.; al-Maṣūdī, iii. 387 sqq.; al-Īṣbīḥī, Ch. 60; Ǧāḥāni, vi. 161, 12 sqq.).

Kähns play an extremely important part in public as well as private life. They are interrogated in all important tribal and state occasions, especially before warlike enterprises, razzias, etc., in which they take part themselves as a rule, indeed, they sometimes lead them in person (cf. Deborah in the O. T.). Kings and queens therefore keep their prophet or prophetess (D. H. Muller, Die Bienen und Schläger Sudarobias nach dem Ḫālī des Ḫādith, i. 74, and al-Ṭabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 762, 5), and the tribes have a kähn or kähna as well as a ʿḥār “poet” and ʿḥāṭṭ “orator.” In private the kähns especially act as judges in disputes and points of law of all kinds, so that the conception of kähin is closely connected with that of ḥākam “judge” (al-Ḥatība, N. xvii. 7; al-Īṣbīḥī, Cairo 1321, ii. 73, 1). Their decision is considered as a kind of divine judgment against which there is no appeal. At the same time they interpret dreams, find lost camels, establish adulteries, clear up other crimes and misdemeanours, particularly thefts and murders, etc. In these proceedings they descend to a somewhat lower scale of divination, viz. to that of the arraif or muʿarrīf (see above i. 460 and cf. Ibn al-Āthīr, al-Nihayā, iv. 40, al-Diḏiḥ, vi. 62, 5, infrā, and al-Maṣūdī, iii. 352). For such work they received an honorarium — forbidden in the Ḫādith (ṣūwaṭ; al-Diḏiḥ, ed. Krehl-Juynboll, ii. 43, 55 et passim). Of course, people liked to test their magic abilities before paying them.

The influence of these men and women was naturally great and often stretched far beyond the bounds of their tribes. They were not by any means recruited solely from the lower strata of society, but sometimes belonged to most distinguished families, occasionally even the ʿayyid or chief of a tribe was also its kähin (Lammens, p. 204, 257: al-Diḏiḥ, vi. 62 = van Vloten, viii. 184; also Wellhausen, p. 134 who, however, says wrongly that such aristocratic kähns had inured their office). They were in any case among the leaders or the intellectual aristocracy of their tribe (cf. the chapter Araqū al-kahāḥ fī l-ḥukūm wa l-ḥukmaṯā wa l-ʿilmām min Khaṭṭān “The names of the seers, judges, orators and learned men of Khaṭṭān” in al-Diḏiḥ, al-Bayān, i. 136, infrā, cf. also 113, 15 sqq., ed. Cairo 1333, i. 192, cf. 159).

Among famous soothsayers of both sexes were Satḥ al-Diḏiḥ in Syria and Šīḵ b. Šab of the Badiṭa, (who often appear together but are both quite mythical), the probably equally unhistorical Yemen princess Ṭurafia, a kind of Cassandra, al-Maʿmūr al-Ḥāʾirī of the Millaḥī, Aḥm d B. Djiṣād al-Alkāf, the chief of the Rāba, Sawadāʾ b. Zuḥra among the Kuraish, Zarḵā bint Zuḥar among the Kudā, etc. (Wellhausen, p. 136; al-Maṣūdī, iii. 352, 364 et passim; van Vloten, vii. 172, 174, 180 etc., etc.). The South Arabian soothsayers enjoyed a particularly high reputation (Aḏānī, viii. 51, 4).

Practically synonymous with kähin is the word Ḫazi (plur. Ḫawāṣit, also Ḫaṣṣa and Ḫaṣṣ, fem. Ḫaṣṣiya, plur. Ḫawāṣit), which is not uncommonly found. It corresponds of course to the Hebrew Ḫōzā, but is undoubtedly also a genuine Arabic word. On the other hand, we must sharply distinguish from the
kähin, who, as above explained, owes his supernatural knowledge to internal inspiration, these practitioners of the lower forms of divination and magic, who employ external, technical means that is, who follow a mere routine that may be acquired by any one, namely the 'ārif or sādīr who watches the flight of birds, the ḥāziq, ḥāziqr and ḥazāz, who reads footprints, the 'arrāṣ or mu'arrāṣ (see also above on these terms), the water-diviner, the ʾammāafūq, the astrologer, al-nāṣirī fi ʾarrāṣ al-kāf or hand-reader, the ḥāfiq who tells fortunes from lines on the ground, al-dārāb or al-dārābi bī-ḥāfiq, who works by casting stones, the enchanter, sāḥār or ṣāḥār. These too are sometimes called kāhin, but only by an erroneous use of the word, which probably only came into vogue when Islam had put an end to the higher art of the soothsayer, kāhīna, while external divination and magic survived. I should like here, again to insist (against Wellhausen, p. 134 and elsewhere) that the kāhin was not, like the Jewish kohein, also supplier of oracles. It is especially noteworthy that we never find him in connection with divination by arrows (lojhān).

The prophet Muhammad disclaimed being a kāhin (Ṣūra lii. 29, lxxiv. 42; also passages like lxxvi. 22 sgq.). But his earliest appearance as a prophet reminds us strongly of the manner of these soothsayers. He was an ecstatic and had "true dreams" like them; his dhāmiyān (gādāb) was the (holy) spirit, whose place was later taken by the angel Gabriel. His revelations are, like the utterance of the kāhin, comprised in safa' and sometimes begin with the usual astrusre oath, even in the forms which he was still using for administering justice and settling disputes in Medina during the early years of his stay there correspond in their main features to those of the pagan kāhin and ḥamāk.

It is therefore not surprising that his Meccan countrymen regarded him as a kāhin and that his protestations that he was nothing of the kind, but a "prophet", a "messenger of God" made little impression on them. The anti-prophets also, Musailim, Talaibā, and particularly al-Aswad ad-Ansī, no less than Sadāqā, a lady member of the faculty, played their parts in the guise of kāhins. The life of Islam with its monotheism, its doctrine of the cessation of all revelation with Muhammad and its regulation of all social customs through the fīh wiped out the old soothsayer's, only gradually, it is true, for we still hear in 132 A. H. of a kāhin (al-Ṭabarī, iii. 21, 91) on banana in modern Arabia, see Landberg, La langue arabe et ses dialectes, p. 701; on women seers in Muslim N. W. Africa, see Doutté, p. 32 sgq.). Muhammad himself probably never doubted the supernatural nature of the kāhin's utterance. But when he declared the knowledge possessed by the demons, whom he at the same time degraded to devils, to have been stolen from heaven and to be falsified and confused (Ṣūra lixxiv. 8 sgq., xxxiv. 15, vi. 112; Ibn Ḥīfẓām, Šūr, i. 131 sgq.), he brought their prophecies into great disrepute, and thus those traditions arose, which warned believers against utilizing the services of a kāhin (al-Suṣū, al-Djami al-qādirī, sub man arā kāhīn; al-Bukhārī, ii. 43, 55, et passim; cf. also the remark of Ibn 'Abbas ʿālīkum zmr ʿālīkum etc. in al-Zamakhsharī, Kākhol, on Šūr xxxi. 34).


AL-KĀHĪNA, the prophetess, the seer. Even her name (Dama, Dīhyā) — for Kāhīna is simply an epithet — is doubtful. According to Ibn Khaldūn, she belonged to the Djarra, a Jewish (?) tribe in the region of Awrās [q. v.], which gave chiefs to the Berbers descending from al-Abtar. When Ḥassān b. al-Nūmān [q. v.], had conquered the Byzantines, he advanced against the Awrās where the Kāhīna reigned. The latter inflicted a heavy defeat on him at Miskiyīnā (between 'Ain Bāṣdī and Tezba in the modern department of Constantine) or according to other authorities, in the Gabies territory or at the Oasis of Nini, and drove him back beyond the frontier of Ifrīqiya. The difficulties in which his wars in the east had involved the caliph 'Abd al-Malik, delayed the despatch of reinforcements. During this period the Kāhīna is said to have extended her rule over the whole country, and to have prevented the Arabs from making new inroads. She destroyed the towns, cut down the forests and laid the country waste. At the same time she is said to have adopted as a son a prisoner named Khālid b. Yazīd al-Kaṣīf with whom she claimed foster-kinship, which, however, did not prevent her adopting son from afterwards betraying her. Her devastations estranged the people from her and when five years later Ḥassān b. al-Nūmān returned with reinforcements, the Kāhīna was defeated in a fierce battle at Tabarka (82 or 84 = 707 or 703) and killed in the Awrās at the place called Bar al-Kāhīna. By her advice one of her sons had gone over to the Arabs before the battle and even received commands in the Muslim army, which continued the war against the Berbers. In reality we do not even know for certain whether the Kāhīna was a queen or simply an inspired woman like Lalla Fūtima, who was the soul of the resistance of the Kabyls against the French in 1857. Almost all that is told of her is legendary, the voluntary devastation of North Africa, her defence in the castle of al-Djem (the amphitheatre of Thysdrus) and the circumstances of her death. A
Berber genealogist, Hānī b. Bakūr, even says that she ruled for 65 years and was 137 years old.


Al-Ḳāhir b. ‘Ijārī, Abu Mansūr Muḥammad b. al-Muṭṭadīd, ʿAbbāsīd Caliph. While his brother al-Muṭṭadīd was still reigning he was proclaimed Caliph under the name al-Ḳāhir, but was deposed again in a few days. After the death of al-Muṭṭadīd the Aḥmīr al-Ummārī Muḥnis proposed al-Muṭṭadīd’s son Abū Aḥmad, afterwards the Caliph al-Rādī as successor; instead of him, however, al-Ḳāhir at the age of 35 was proclaimed Commander of the Faithful (end of Shawwāl 320 = Nov. 1, 932). Although he wished to be regarded as devout and just, his treacherous and despotic nature was soon revealed. Through torture the mother of al-Ḳāhir was forced to give up her whole fortune, and al-Ḳāhir also extorted considerable sums from the sons and officials of the late Caliph. On the advice of the vizier Ibn Muqūla [q. v.] Muḥnis had the Caliph carefully watched, which naturally did not please the latter, and when he was intending to dismiss Ibn Muqūla, the latter conspired with several others to overthrow al-Ḳāhir and put Abū Aḥmad, son of al-Muṭṭadīd, in his place. But the plot was betrayed. While Ibn Muqūla escaped by flight, Muḥnis was dismissed and when he went to the Caliph, the latter had him arrested and some time afterwards executed. Abū Aḥmad was built into a wall, alive. Ibn Muqūla, however, did not cease in his efforts to incite the populace against al-Ḳāhir and in Djumāda i. 322 (April 934) an armed crowd broke into the palace. The half-palace Caliph had to surrender; but when he refused to abdicate, he was blinded and thrown into prison. Eleven years later al-Mustakfi restored him to liberty and he lived as a beggar till his death in Djumāda i. 339 (Oct. 950).


Al-Ḳāhirah. [See Cairo.]

Ḳahrāmān-Nāma (or Dāštīn-ī Kahrāmān), a Persian epic in prose, which, like the Dāštīn Nāma, Kirānī Ḥabāṣāt, Ḥūṣang Nāma, Pāghārī Nāma, Tāhmīrārāt Nāma etc. belongs as regards subject matter to the prose epics which form a cycle round Firdawsi’s Shāh Nāma; like the two first named it is ascribed to Aḥū Ṭāhir ʿIrāşıkī [Ṭarsūsī, q. v.].

The epic which takes us back 35 years of the Old Iranian ruler Ḥūṣhang and describes the exploits of the hero Kahrāmān called Kištil, the “alayer,” has attained some importance in the popular literature of the Turks. Among them the very diffuse Persian version occupying eight books is compressed into one volume. The historical background is an effectively developed picture of the struggle between ʿĪsām and the Indian fire-worshippers. The legendary and fictitious however occupies a considerable space. In parts the Turkish version with its mixture of prose and poetry shows the favourite technique of the popular chivalrous romances and ballads. In it we also find many burlesque elements, which remind us very much of the meddāl tales and their humorous situations. In many passages the secondary figure of the cunning, sly and covetous paladin, Gerden-Keğhan entirely overshadows the main hero Kahrāmān. His foolish pugnacity is proverbial; cf. Bākī’s Diwān (lith. Constantinopel 1256), p. 37 (baṣīda 1).

The substance of the epic is briefly as follows. Kahrāmān, son of the Persian king Tāhmāsp, is carried off when three years old by a dīw and educated as one of their own children by other dīwans on the mountain Kaf [q. v.]. His cousin and next successor to the throne, Kahrāmān voluntaerily renounces his claim to the throne of Irān after Tāhmāsp had died prematurely from grief at the loss of his only son, and becomes a paladin in the service of Ḥūṣhang, who is chosen Shāh. Through the whole epic runs the idea, freely proclaimed, that heroism is better than a kingdom, for the king’s throne is supported by the sword of the hero.

When Ḥūṣhang sets out to conquer India, he meets Kahrāmān, who has now grown up into a hero of terrible valour, has escaped from the dīw and, well armed, is going around as a free lance on the search for home and adventure. In his arrogance and boldness he becomes involved in a series of severe duels with Ḥūṣhang’s heroes, in all of which he is victorious, until finally his identity is established by Kahrārān. He thereupon readily pays homage to Ḥūṣhang and goes to India with him as one of his paladins. There they succeed, after much fighting and many vicissitudes, in taking the capital by a cunning coup, in which the king of the Indias is killed. Kahrāmān to whom the principal exploits fall, mounted on a six-footed, four-eyed, unicorn sea-monster that he has tamed, wins by his heroism as a bride the daughter of the Indian ruler, who has taken part in the fighting, unconquered and
invincible (Amazon episodes are found also elsewhere in the epic). But Kaḥramān has to set out soon again to save the mother of Bahram, another of Hūšang's heroes, from the power of a div in the inaccessible crystal mountain. He succeeds in gaining the talisman of king Kāšān, in liberating his bride, who in the meanwhile had been carried off, and in freeing Bahram's mother. Returning to Persia, he marries the Indian princess and remains in the service of Hūšang's successor, Šah Bahramārān.


Kahrūba or Kahrābā is our amber; the Persian word means attractor or robber of straw. Usually, as in al-Kazwīnī, its peculiar quality is attributed to it without further note; Ibn al-Kabīrī, however, observes that it attracts straw quickly and strongly, when it is slightly rubbed. This attraction is used poetically as a metaphor for the attraction of lovers to each other.

Amber was brought partly from the Baltic lands of Bulghār in the region of Kasan and was considered to be the resin of the Greek nut, and partly from Spain. Al-Ghāṣqī, who mentions both kinds, notes that it encloses flies, straw, etc. Ornaments of amber from the earlier period have not survived in the east; al-Washshābī, however, mentions specimens of yellow amber worn as ornaments by women, and the alchimist al-Dījlākī signs engraved in amber as talismans. In modern times beads of rosaries and cigar-holders are made of it. It has always been in frequent use as a medicine. Just as the word electricity from *elektron* so the Orientals do kahrūba īya from kahrābā. Amber is frequently confused with sanda-rūs, which, according to al-Anfākī, attracts rubbed straw. On the other hand, we find the difference between them emphasized.


(E. WIEDEMANN.)

KAṬṬĀBA b. Shahīd al-Tāʾī, an Arab general. We find Kaṭṭāba, whose real name was Ziyād, mentioned as early as the year 1007 (1798) among the twelve chiefs of the 'Abbāsid faction in Khorasan, who are said to have been chosen by the Kūfān emissary Abū `Irīmā al-Surājī to further the 'Abbāsid cause. When the long prepared revolution broke out in the summer of 129 (747), Kaṭṭāba was in Mecca to which he had gone in order during the pilgrimage to meet in person the leader of the 'Abbāsid, Ibrāhīm b. Mūhammad [q. v.]. He did not return to Khorāsān till 130 (748) after Ibrāhīm had appointed him his general. Abū Muslim [q. v.] gave him the supreme command in the war against the Umayyads and he defeated Tamīm b. Naṣr, son of the Umayyad governor of Khorāsān, Naṣr b. Sayyar, at Tūs. Tamīm fell in the battle and Naṣr had to evacuate Nishābūr and flee to Djiḏārān. When the governor of the 'Irāk, Yazīd b. Muḥammad b. Ḫawāṣib, sent an army under the command of Shāh Ḫanža al-Kūšānī to Djiḏārān, Kaṭṭāba took the field against him; on Dhu l-Ḥijādja 1, 130 (Aug. 1, 748) Nubata was defeated and slain, and Naṣr again took to flight with the object of making his way to Hamdānī, but died on the way in Rabīʿ i, 131 (Nov. 748). Kaṭṭāba then turned his attention to the west. While his son Ḥasan was besieging Nīwānd, where the remnants of Naṣr's army from Khorāsān had united with the governor of Hamāthīn's Syrian troops who had fled from there, Kaṭṭāba gave battle on Rabīʿ 23, 131 (March 18, 749) at Djiḏārān near Iṣfahān to `Amir b. Dūbār b. al-Mūrū who was coming with a large Syrian army. The latter fell in the conflict. After Kaṭṭāba had joined his son, the siege of Nīwānd was continued with vigour, and after several months the Syrian garrison capitulated, while their comrades from Khorāsān, who did not know of the capitulation, were all cut to pieces. Thereupon Kaṭṭāba marched against Kūfā via Ḥulwān and Kāshānī, sending his son in advance by the direct route. Ibn Ḫubairā advanced to meet him with a strong army, but Kaṭṭāba succeeded in evading him and in passing the Tigris unscathed, and then camped near Anbār. When Ibn Ḫubairā followed him and pitched his camp at Fām Fūrat Bādakā on the east bank of the Euphrates, Kaṭṭāba crossed the river and marched along the west bank to a place opposite the enemy camp. In the night of Muḥarram 8, 132 (Aug. 27, 749) he crossed the river again with a small body of men and put Ibn Ḫubairā, who had to seek safety in flight. In the confusion of the fighting, Kaṭṭāba disappeared completely; whether he was drowned or killed in the flight must be left undecided.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEEN.)

KAṬṬĀN is regarded by the Arabs of the Muhammadan epoch as the "father of (all) Yemen" (Ibn Ḥiṣām, Sīra, i. 43; al-Masʿūdī, Marājī dīn al-Dīrāb, Paris 1861—77, i. 797; Die auf Südarabien bezüglichen Angaben Nūrānīs im Sams al-Ṭūbīr, ed. by Aḥmadīn Ahmad, p. 83 et passim) i.e. as the ancestor of all South Arabsians, who therefore are usually described comprehensively as "Bānū Kaṭṭān", "Kabīl al-Kaṭṭān" or briefly "Kaṭṭān", when not called simply "Ve-

ments". Kaṭṭān is thus contrasted with "Adnān", the symbol of ethnological unity of all the
North Arabians. In this we find agreement not only among the Arab scholars, genealogists, historians, geographers, etc. (cf. e.g. Wustenfeld, *Gimelag. Tabellen über die K新华ent, and the Riggenbach and Reiske, *Prima historiae regionum arabicorum*, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 132 sqq.) but also in the ideas of the people, as they are still to be found in Arabia (see Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, i. 252) and as found at an earlier period notably in the poetry (see Abī Ḥanīfa al-Dīmawari, al-Mālik ibn Dāiriyūs, p. 348; al-Ṭabarānī, ed. de Goeje, i. 1087, also ii. 1672, 185; al-Mas’ūdī, op. cit., ii. 142; do., al-Tanbīh wa l-Ṭibrīg = *Bibl. Geogr. Arab.,* viii. 109, etc.; in the statements, that reflect popular opinions, we indeed find as the counterpart of Kāḥṭān usually not ‘Adhnā but his fictitious son Ma‘ād, e. g. Abī Ḥanīfa al-Dīmawari, op. cit., p. 28; al-Ṭabarānī, op. cit., ii. 1056, 1064; and al-Mas’ūdī, al-Tanbīh, p. 88, or his imaginary grandson Niʿār, e. g. al-Mas’ūdī, *Muraṣī‘*, v. 223, vi. 42 sq., 46, 143, 150, and Ibn al-Ahlīr, al-Kāmil, ed. Tornberg, iv. 273, or even his imaginary greatgrandsons Muṣajjir and Rabī’ī, e. g. al-Ṭabarānī, op. cit., ii. 1969 infra, 1855 sq. Arabic sources usually give Kāḥṭān the following ancestry Arab (not ‘Arab, see e. g. Kā̄mūs, s. v.) Shālakh (or Shālākh) – Ar’afqahshād (or Ar’aqfahshād) – Sām – Nūh; they also give him a brother, Fālīg. (See the line Kāḥṭān b. Fālīg b. ‘Arab b. Shālākh etc. in al-Ṭabarānī, op. cit., ii. 2400, and al-Dimashkī, *Nuzhat al-Dahr*, ed. Meheren, p. 249, 252 is obviously due merely to a slip). These names are of course simply arabicised forms of the Old Testament names Ebr (Eber) – Shalālah (Shelah) – Arpazhāzā (Arphaxad) – Shēm (Shem) – Noah (Noah) and Peleg (Peleg). Kāḥṭān x. and i. Črani is therefore identical with the O. T. Yahūkān (*Imsara*), son of Eber and brother of Peleg and ancestor of various South Arabian peoples (*Gen. x. 25 sqq.*, and i. *Chron. i. 19 sqq.*); Yoḵanān, probably to be taken as meaning the “smaller,” the “younger,” i. e. as compared with his brother Peleg, might be a mere ethnological invention with the object of connecting the Arabs with the Hebrews). The Arab genealogists, etc. are quite positive on their identity; they constantly assert: “Yoḵānān (more rarely Yoḵānān) is Kāḥṭān” (e. g. al-Mas’ūdī, al-Tanbīh, p. 31; do. Muraṣī‘, iii. 143; Ibn al-Ahlīr, op. cit., i. 57, Toḏj ār-‘Arū, sub kha; see also Doughty, op. cit., i. 239; Yoḵānān, it is true, appears occasionally through confusion as the brother or son of Kāḥṭān, so Ibn Kuṭaba, al-Maṣārîf, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 14; al-Mas’ūdī, Muraṣī‘, i. 79 sq.; Toḏj ār-‘Arūs, loc. cit., and al-Ṭabarānī, op. cit., i. 217). Indeed, several Arab scholars even assert — and on this they agree with von Kremmer, *Altarabische Ge- dichte über die Volksang von Jemen*, p. 7 sq. that Kāḥṭān is only an arabicised form of Yoḵānān (al-Maṣūdī, Muraṣī‘, i. 143 and Toḏj ār-‘Arūs, loc. cit.). But Yoḵānān could not possibly become Kāḥṭān by any phonological laws. The equation Yoḵānān = Kāḥṭān has in all probability rather come to be made because some old Arab — probably a Yemeni — genealogist quite arbitrarily, simply from a certain similarity of the names, identified the Biblical Yoḵānān with an actually existing South Arabian tribe Kāḥṭān, so that by this artifice, the Yemenis might be linked up to the Biblical genealogical system, which reaches back to Adam, in the same way as had been done with the North Arabians under the influence of the Kūtān and the Bible by tracing ‘Adhnā back to Ishmael, the son of Abraham (see e. g. Ibn Ḥīṣmān, op. cit., p. 3 sq.; al-Ṭabarānī, op. cit., i. 1113 sq.; etc., etc.). Such a tribe of Kāḥṭān, which would have surely been of a certain degree of importance, cannot actually be proved with certainty to have existed in pre-Muḥammadan Arabia. But it seems to me to be at least not impossible that the Kāṭahān of Ptolemy (Geogr., vii. 205, 207) are explained as “Kāṭahānites” (as Knobel has already done, *Die Volkertafel der Genesis*, p. 185, and more recently Moritz in Paulys’ *Kost-enzykl., der kais Altertums- wiss.,* new edition, s. v. Katanitai) and not as “Kasūnaites” (as von Kremmer, op. cit., p. 8, Sprenger, *Die Alter Geographie der Araber*, p. 207 and Glaser, *Kleine der Geogr. u. Geographie Araberien*, ii. 283, 472). The fact, that of the two or more tribes of Kāḥṭān in question none could have been important enough to be known outside of Arabia, seems to be against the latter interpretation. The town of Kāḥṭān (between Ḩaḍid and Sawrā) mentioned by al-Muṣafadda, *Iṣṭan al-Taqāṣim*, 2nd ed. = *Bibl. Geogr. Arab.*, iii. 87, 94 seems also to point to an old South Arabian tribe of Kāḥṭān (cf. also the Al Kāḥṭān mentioned there p. 104 and described as the “oldest princes of Yemen”). Finally, it is not at all improbable that the beginnings of the modern clan Kāḥṭān (see below) reach back to the pre-Muḥammadan period.

The great tribal confederation of the Kāḥṭān fell — in the Muḥammadan period at least — into two groups, the smaller of the Ḥimyar and the larger of the Kāḥṭān, whom the official genealogy put together as brothers and traced their descent from Kāḥṭān by the following line: Yarūb — Yəḥyājub — Saba’ — Ḥimyar + Kāḥṭān (Wustenfeld, *Tabellen*, i; al-Maṣūdī, al-Tanbīh, p. 80, 6 sq.; other lists, the first of them in connection with *Genesis*, x. 26 sqq., are given in Ibn ‘Abd Rabbīh, *al-Ṭib al-farrad*, Cairo 1305, ii. 57). In the genealogical table in *Genesis*, Saba’ (Sawrā) appears as a son of Yoḵānān. Why the Arab genealogists have inserted Yarūb and Yəḥyājub between Kāḥṭān and Saba’ (and the two are also found, but in the reverse order, in the genealogy of Adhnā, as grandson and great-grandson and great-grandson of Imaal, see Ibn Ḥīṣmān, op. cit., p. 3 and al-Maṣūdī, al-Tanbīh, p. 80), is a question that can hardly be answered with certainty. The Ḥimyar (q. v.), the epigones of the Mineaean, Sabean and Ḥimyarite kingdom, were presumably for the most part settled, while the Kāḥṭān may have for the most part been nomads or half-nomads; cf. the expressions: “the Ḥimyar and the Arabs among the Yemenis”,” the Ḥimyar and the clans (sabīl) of Yemen” and similar expressions in *Landberg, Arabica*, v. 116 sqq. The numerous South Arabian tribes which we find in Muhammad’s time in most different parts of Northern Arabia and even in Syria and the Ḫrisk belong principally to the Kāḥṭān. The Kāḥṭān and the Ma‘ād were apparently separated even in the pre-Muḥammadan period by a racial hatred, perhaps originally mainly based on the opposition between the desert and the sown. This enmity was intensified by the repeated raids of the Yemenis into the lands of the Ishmaelites [above, i. 373] as well as later by the anta-
gonism between the Asār (Medijnites) and the Kurai̇sh, which came to a head after the death of the Prophet, and involved in the history of the first two centuries of Islam in the most baneful fashion. It was perhaps this feud that first linked the Yemeni tribes on the one side and the Ishmaelites on the other into closer ethnological unities. One of its more innocuous results was the muṣa- khara, the struggle for rank and glory, which continually prevailed between the two antipodes (cf. e. g. al-Masûdi, Murūd, vi. 136, ii. 142 etc.).

The Khāṭān, in view of the splendid of the ancient South Arabian kingdom, had the more right at first to feel the more distinguished. But Islam with the mission of Muḥammad and the primacy of the Kurai̇sh brought the Ma‘add a tremendous superiority. The Yemenis endeavored to counterbalance this in the most different ways. First of all they created an entirely romantic South Arabian saga, which pictured their past greatness in the most splendid colours (see below in the Bibliography). They then made Khāṭān son of the Prophet Hūd [q. v.], known from the Kurān, whom they next partly identified with ‘Abār (Nashwān, al-Ka‘īṣa al-Himyarīya, ed. von Kremer, p. 4; Die auf Südarabien bezüglichen Angaben Nussrein’s, p. 83; al-Yakbāni, Ta‘rikh, ed. Houtsou, i. 220; Ibn ‘Abd Rabbii, op. cit., ii. 57; al-Masûdī, al-Tanbih, p. 81; Doughty, op. cit., ii. 57 et seq.).

They then tried to connect themselves with the ‘Ad—genealogy: perhaps by partly making the ancient Quraysh [q. v.], the brothers-in-law of Ismā‘il, to be direct descendants of Khāṭān (Ibn Hisām, op. cit., p. 4; Abu Haniţa al-Dinawari, op. cit, p. 9; Ibn ‘Abd Rabbii, op. cit., ii. 57; al-Masûdī, al-Tanbih, p. 185; Abu ‘I-Fida’, Makhtūтар Ta‘rikh al-Bshār, partly edited by Fleischer as Historia Antisilamica, p. 130, et seq.), but especially by the fact that some of their genealogists gave Khāṭān a genealogy direct from Ismā‘il, who thus became “father of all the Arabs” (Ibn Hisām, op. cit., p. 5; al-Tabari, op. cit., iii. 2490; al-Masûdī, Murūd, iii. 142; do., al-Tanbih, p. 81; al-Dinawari, op. cit., p. 246, 252; al-Sam‘anî, al-Istakhri, f. 443b, 446b). They may be also responsible for the theory that the Ka‘ban̄an together with the ‘Ad [q. v.], Thamūd, ‘Adim, ‘Imlīk (Amalek, see ‘Amlīk), Djdīs [q. v.], etc., the so-called “lost Arabs” (al-Arab al-hādīya) represent the genuine (primary) Arabs (al-Arab al-‘ariba or al-‘arbā‘a) etc., while the Ma‘add on the other hand are “arabised” (secondary) Arabs (al-Arab al-mu‘āra‘iba; cf. on this theory, as well as on the other, according to which only the Ad, Thamūd, etc., are ‘Arab ‘ariba, the Khāṭān on the contrary Arab mu‘āra‘iba and the Ma‘add ‘Arab mu‘āra‘iba, Lane, Lexicon, sub ‘Arab. Knobel, op. cit., p. 179 sq.; al-Tabari, op. cit., i. 215; al-Masûdī, al-Tanbih, p. 188; above also i. 372 sq.) Finally, we may here mention the eschatological hādīyat of South Arabian origin, which prophesies the rule in time to come of a noble, pious Ka‘bani̇an; see Mutahhar b. Tāhir al-Makhdīṣi, al-Bʿad wa ‘l-Ta‘rikh, ed. Huart, ii. 183 sq. and Snouck Hurgronje, Der Mahdi, p. 12 (= Verschiedene Geschichten, i. 156).

The native lexicons (Li‘ān al-‘Arab, Kumāt, and Tā‘īf al-‘Arab, sub hāf. give two nisba’s from the Khāṭān, both “good Arabie”; Khāṭān and the remarkable form Aḥṣā‘i. A tribe Khāṭān (more accurately Geṭān, sing. Geṭān, plur. Geṭānūn) still exists, as was briefly mentioned above. It is exclusively Bedouin and pitched its tents in the desert of Asir and in the eastern borders of the southern Yemen and of the southern Hijāz (roughly between 18° and 23° N. Lat.); but little bodies of them penetrate in the summer far into the Nijdjī, as far as WaṣΨm, and even to the province of Kāsh. It is very numerous, rich in cattle and powerful, and also very proud as the “noblest blood of the South Arabians”. Its nobility seems, however, to find expression primarily in a fanatical savagery and villainous cruelty, unparalleled elsewhere even among the sons of Arabia’s deserts.

A clan, Kāḥān, has also survived down to the present day (see i. 3739).
Landberg, *Etudes*, i. 1057 and al-\lqādā, 1st ed., vi. 110, 72, viii. 79, 16, xx. 180, y3, this word was transferred towards the end of the viiib (xvith) century in the Yemen to the beverage made from the berry of the coffee tree. The assumption of such a transcendence of meaning is, it is true, not accepted by some who consider \lqahwā — at least in the sense of coffee — as a word of African origin and seek to connect it with the alleged home of the coffee tree, Kaffa, although they also assume contamination with \lqahwā in Arabic (see below, Erdmann, *Die Kaffee-Pflanze*, i. 566; Völlers in der Zeitschr. d. Morgenl. Gesellsch. i. 657; Hoheb-Johou; Landberg, op. cit., ii. 1057—66). On the other hand, it should be noted that the holders of this view do not prove that coffee was exported from Kaffa as early as 1400, and do not quote a similar word in the languages of Abyssinia and adjoining lands, while the usual word for coffee there (\bun for tree, berry and beverage; see Armbruster, *Initia Arabica*, ii. Cambridge 1910, p. 58; Coulbeaux and Schreiber, *Dictionnaire de la langue tigré*, Vienna 1915, p. 408; L. Reinsch, *Die Kaffee-Sprache*, etc., ii. in *Sittengeschichte der Kaffa*, Akad. der Wiss. zu Wien, phil.-hist. Cl. 1886, p. 273; see also Landberg, op. cit., ii. 1057 sq.) has passed in the form \bun (in rhyme also \lqahwā) as a name of the tree and berry into Arabic. But as it is probable that the drinking of coffee spread in the Yemen out of \Sūfī circles and a special significance was given to wine in the poetical language of the mystics, a transference of the poetic name for wine to the new beverage would not be at all impossible.

The coffee tree was not indigenous to South Arabia and was probably introduced from the highlands of Abyssinia, where it is found in profusion growing wild, notably in Kaffa. But there is no trace of authority for the assertion (Dolers and *Handbook of Arabia*) that the coffee tree was already introduced into Yemen in the period of the Abyssinian conquest and of the fall of the Himyar kingdom, about a century before the Hijra. In this case the older literature would hardly have left it unnoticed.

The earliest mention of coffee so far found is in writings of the xth (xvith) century. According to (Ahmad) Ibn \Abd al-\Ghaffār, quoted by \Abd al-\Kadîr al-\Djazrî in his essay (see below, *Bibliography*), the popularity of \lqahwā as a beverage in the Yemen was first known in Cairo in the beginning of the xst (xvith) century. It was there taken especially in \Sūfī circles, as it produced the ascetic state of wakefulness for the nightly devotional exercises. According to this authority, it had been brought to \Aden by the jurist Muhammad b. Sa\līd al-\Dhāhibānī (died 875 = 1470/1) who had become acquainted with it during an involuntary stay on the African coast and on his return devoted himself to mysticism; and it soon became popular.

Another reference in al-Djazrî, however, ascribes the introduction of the beverage to \Almost b. \Omar al-\Shāhīlī. Abu \l-\Hasan \Alī b. \Omar of the family of Da\s\sain died in 821 (1418) according to al-\Shārî. He also might have become acquainted with it in Abyssinia, for after entering the \Shābīlīya order, he lived for a period in the entourage of the king Sa\līd al-Din (i.e. between 788 = 1386 and 805 or 807 = 1401/2 or 1404/5, cf. al-Makrīzī, *al-\Imām bi-\Akhdār* man\-
xvith century the wali Udemir (cf. Ahmed Râshid, Türkei, i. 83 sqq.) transplanted coffee from Africa to Yemen. This fact, that the merit of introducing coffee as a beverage is given to different individuals suggests that we have to deal with various local traditions. The tradition of Mukhâ is the most firmly established and most widely known; therefore 'Ali b. 'Omar al-Šâhidillî — who is frequently confused with the founder of the Šâhidilî order (d'Ohsson, van Hammer, Rinn) — has become the patron saint of coffee-growers, coffee-house keepers and coffee-drinkers (cf. Goldscher, Abhandl. zur arap. Philologie, ii. p. 1xxviii). In Algeria coffee is also known as Šâhidîye after him (Beaussier, Dict. pratique arabe-français, Algiers 1871). He is popularly regarded as the founder of Mukhâ, which is, however, already mentioned by al-Hamçâni (Šifat Qisasat al-Årab, ed. D. H. Müller, p. 74 sq., 87, 5, 119, 18), although it owed its rise to coffee. A well, a gate and the mosque over his grave preserve the memory of all-Šâhidillî in Mukhâ (Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien, i. Kopenhagen 1774, 438—440; cf. also the legend in Ḥâdîjih Khâshih and 'Abd al-Karîm Khâshih, Sûrah Wâlîya, French transl. by Langlès entitled Voyage de l’Inde à la Méksik par Abdul Kûrîm, Paris 1797, p. 202 sqq.)

Al-Šâhidillî and al-Aïdarus (probably not Hai-dar, as de Sacy, Chrest. Arab., i. 461 thinks) have become Christian monks named Scaldi and Aidrus in the legend given by Naironi. The motif of the camels or goats in which the enlivening effects of coffee were first noticed has so far not been found in Oriental sources. — According to a popular legend, the coffee tree shot up from goat’s dung sowed by the saint (Snouck Hurgronje, The Atchâneene, Leiden 1906, i. 260).

The legends are probably correct in saying that the taking of coffee in Arabia first began among Yemenis. They were particularly fond of the beverage because its effects facilitated the performance of their religious ceremonies. They therefore considered this as its original destination (mawût' asli) and found that it invited to good and hastened on the mystical raptures (fath) (Sa‘fawat al-Šâfaw f. 342b). The pious intention, with which it was taken, made the drinking of coffee a good work (ma‘a). It received a ceremonial character, being accompanied by the recitation of a so-called râth. This râth consisted in the repetition 116 times of the invocation yâ ka‘wi. This usage is based — apart from the similarity in sound between ka‘wâ and ka‘wi — on the fact that the numerical value of ka‘wâ, i.e. 116, is the same as that of kwâ, i.e. ka‘wâ, “strong”, one of the most beautiful names of Allâh [cf. above i. 303q]. According to Shaikh b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Aïdarus, the recitation of the rûthqa [q. v.] should precede it. Shaikh b. Isma‘îl b. ‘Alawî of al-Šhibr, however, prescribed the fourfold repetition of the Sûra Yâ-Sîn (Sûra XXXVI) with a hundred-fold tâfîya on the Prophet as rûth (Sa‘fawat al-Šâfaw f. 344b, infra sq. f. 345b, 347q). Thus when taken with the righteous intention and devotion and genuine religious conviction, coffee-drinking leads to the enjoyment of the khawâ ma‘awîya, the “ideal ka‘wâ”, also called ka‘wâ al-šâfâ, which is explained as “the enjoyment which the people of God (Ahl Allâh) feel in beholding the hidden mysteries and attaining the wonderful disclosures (mukhâshofât) and the great revelations (fathiyat) (op. cit., f. 341b, 345a supra, 345b infra sq.)”. — ‘Ali b. ‘Omar al-Šâhidillî is reported to have said that coffee, like the water of Zamzam, serves the purpose for which it is drunk (op. cit., f. 348b, cf. above ii. 588 infra), and the saying has been handed down of Ahmad b. ‘Alawî b. Dîyâdah (d. 973 = 1565/66; cf. al-Nâbâni, op. cit., i. 330) who in his last years is said to have lived on nothing but coffee: — “He who dies with some ka‘wâ in his body enters not into hell-fire” (Sa‘fawat al-Šâfaw, f. 344).

Coffee is probably not known as a beverage in South Arabia much earlier than the turn of the viih—(xvith) century. Whether the tree was introduced long before this is doubtful. Ibn Hadjâr al-Hâfîzî (q. v.) speaks in his Ṭabî commentary on al-Šâhîb, probably by ‘Ali b. ‘Omar al-Saîfî (cf. Brockelmann, op. cit., ii. 403 sqq.) of a beverage which appeared (vizi. in Mecca) shortly before the xth century A. H. (i. e. about the end of the xvith century) and was prepared from the husk of the bean, a tree introduced from the region of Zâila’, and called ka‘wâ (quotation in ‘Alawî b. Sa‘îf, p. 9). Among the jurists who gave an opinion in favour of coffee, the oldest is ‘Abd al-Rahîm b. Muhammad b. Sa‘îd b. ‘Ali b. Muhammad Khâshih al-‘Adînî (died 818 = 1438, cf. Abû Makhrâmà, f. 159 sq.; according to al-Nâbâni, op. cit., i. 155 sq.; 829 = 1425/26).

An urduja of Sharâf al-Dîn al-Amrî gives the year 817 (1415/6) as the date at which coffee became domesticated in Mecca (Pertsch, Die Arab. Handschr. zu Gotha, iv. Nº. 2107). According to the ‘Umdu al-Ša‘faw, however, the drinking of a decoction of coffee husks first appeared towards the end of the xivth century, while previously only the eating of the fruit as a delicacy (ma‘â) was known. The drinking of coffee dropped out of use again for a time, indeed, but it finally established itself and soon people drank coffee even in the sacred mosque and regarded it as a welcome tonic at dîhr and as wihîdî. Coffee-houses (bu‘yû al-ka‘wâ) were soon opened, where men and women met to music or where they played chess or a similar game for a stake. This and the custom of handing round the coffee on the manner of wine naturally aroused the indignation of the “anço guîd” of whom many had from the first set their faces against the beverage as an objectionable innovation. They found a champion in Khâ’îr Bey, who was appointed chief of the police in Mecca in 917 (1511) by Kâsîth [q. v.]. He carried through the proclamation of coffee as forbidden (barâ) in the same year, in an assembly of jurists of the different schools in which the unfavourable judgment of two well-known physicians and the evidence of a number of coffee-drinkers regarding its intoxicating and dangerous effects ultimately decided the issue. The ŭhâds signed the protocol of the assembly. Only the then mufti of Mecca dared to decline his co-operation and became therefore the object of coarse suspicions. By putting the questions in a clever way they were at the same time able to get an opinion condemning coffee from the faqîhs of Cairo. The rescript which Kâsîth issued in reply to the protocol sent to Cairo did not completely fulfil the hopes of the opponents of coffee as it contained no absolute interdiction but only allowed measures to be taken
against any concomitant features contrary to religion. Ibn Ḥaddar al-Hāitami, as late as about 950 (1543), had a vigorous discussion, at a wedding feast (ṣawāmīt ʿūr) where coffee was offered to the guests, on the new beverage with a prominent mufti, who declared it intoxicating and forbidden. Ibn Ḥaddar refers to the assembly above mentioned and cannot find words strong enough to condemn its decision and the manner in which it was reached (SAFwat al-SAfwā, f. 352b—356a, quotation from the Muḥqam Mustāfiḏīḵāhī).

In accordance with this verdict, Ḵāṭir Bey forbade the taking and sale of coffee and had a number of venal punishers and their stocks broken, so that coffee-houses (bāṭir) disappeared from the market. But Ḵānūn’s rescript again gave the coffee-drinkers courage and when in the next year one of the leading opponents of coffee was subjected to disciplinary punishment by a high official from Egypt and Ḵāṭir Bey was replaced by a successor who was not averse to coffee, they were again able to enjoy with impunity the beverage, to which these measures had only attracted the attention of wider circles. Only occasionally do we still read of action being taken against disgraceful proceedings in coffee-houses. An edict forbidding coffee issued by the Sultan of Turkey during the Ḥādji in 950 (1544) was hardly respected at all.

In Cairo coffee was first made known in the first decade of the 16th century by the Azhar quarter by Şūfīs from Yemen, who held their dibkār’s in the mosque with their companions in opinion from Mekka and Madīna while partaking of coffee. After it had been publicly sold and drunk there for a time, the ʿāyī Ḵāmīn b. ʿAbd al-Ḥāfīz al-Ṣabūdī, famous as a preacher, declared it forbidden in 939 (1532/3). Two years later in a meeting for exhortation in the Azhar mosque he so incited his hearers against the beverage that they fell upon the coffee-houses, made short work of their contents and maltreated the occupants.

The difference of opinion thus emphasised caused the Ḵāṭir Muḥammad b. Ihyāʾ al-Ḥanaftī to take the opinions of prominent scholars; as a result of personal observation of the effects of coffee he confirmed the opinion of those who considered the beverage a permitted one. Although in the years following coffee was from time to time for brief periods forbidden in Cairo, the number of its devotees, even among the religious authorities, steadily increased.

Several notable theologians had given fatwās in favour of coffee, for example, Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī (died 926 = 1520), Ḵāmān b. ʿOmar Ṣalīḥ (d. 930 = 1523/4), Abu Ṭ-Ḥasan Muḥammad al-Bakri al-Ṣiddīkī (died between 950 and 960 = 1543—1553), who in verses in praise of the coffee also gives the advice that the opinion of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥāfīz should be set aside and the fatwā of Abu Ṭ-Ḥasan followed (SAFwat al-SAfwā, f. 349b; cf. also al-Ṣiddīkī’s verses in Bahā’ al-Dīn al-ʿAzmī’s al-Kaṣkhāli, Bulaḵ 1288, i. 19b), ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Ziyād al-Zabīdī (d. 975 = 1567/68) and others (SAFwat al-SAfwā, f. 348b) — Gradually the view came to prevail that coffee was in general permitted (mudhār), but that under certain circumstances the other legal categories could be applied to it also.

Intercourse with the holy cities and with Egypt brought coffee to Syria, Persia and Turkey. Ruwwâl in 1573 found the beverage widely known in Syria (Ḥalab). In Constantinople and Rûmî coffee first appeared in the reign of Sulaymān I (926—974 = 1520—1566). In 962 (1554) a man from Ḥalab and another from Damascus opened the first coffee-houses (bāṭis ḵan) in Constantinople. These soon attracted gentlemen of leisure, wits and literary men seeking distraction and amusement, who spent the time over their coffee reading or playing chess or backgammon, while poets submitted their latest poems for the verdict of their acquaintances. This new institution was by way of joke called also morkbi-bi-tirfān (school of knowledge). The coffee-house met with such approval that it soon attracted civil servants, kādis and professors also. Poets like Ḥasan al-Rūmī (cf. Bahā’ al-Dīn al-ʿAzmī, ep. cit., p. 147) and later Belīghi sang the praises of coffee, and the opinion expressed in 928 by Sulaymān’s court physician, Badr al-Dīn al-Kūstānī (Leiden MS. 945, f. 58) was not unfavourable. The coffee-houses increased rapidly in number. Among the servants of the upper classes were bāṭis ḵāns, whose special task was the preparation of coffee, and at the court they were subordinate to a bāṭis ḵān. In religious circles, however, it was found that the coffee-house was prejudicial to the mosque, and the ‘ulamā’ thought the coffee-house even worse than the wine-room. The preachers were specially eager for the prohibition of coffee, and the way it was paved for them by the muftis (according to d’Ohsson: Abu ʿl-Saʿud) with an opinion that (roasted) coffee was to be considered coal and therefore forbidden (the same argument is found in the treatise by Muḥammad (ʿAlī) Dede, Leiden MS. 682, i. 4b). The fact that current politics were discussed in the coffee-houses, the government’s acts criticised and intrigues woven, was the principal cause for the intervention of the authorities. Edicts issued in the reigns of Murād III (982—1003 = 1574—95) and ʿAlī I (1012—16 = 1613—17) were not strictly enforced and still less obeyed. The religious authorities met public opinion by declaring coffee legal, if it had not reached the degree of being licit. The grand viziers also benefited as they levied one or two gold pieces a day on the coffee-houses, and were therefore anxious to increase their number.

Murād IV (1032—49 = 1623—40) issued a strict prohibition of coffee (and tobacco). He had all the coffee-houses torn down and many forfeited their lives for the sake of coffee. Under Meḥmed IV (1058—99 = 1648—87), while the sale of coffee in the streets was allowed, the prohibition of coffee-houses was at first renewed by the grand vizier Köprülü for political reasons. This prohibition could not possibly be kept in force permanently, and later we even read of measures taken by the government to lower the high price of coffee. From Sulaymān’s time a tax was levied on coffee which was at a rate of 8 aspers per oucha for Muslim buyers and 10 for Christians; in 1109 (1697) there was added a super-tax of 5 paras the oucha, which was called bidāri ʿūr, for both.

According to von Hammer, Gschichte etc., v. 713, the question of the correct spelling of kahwa with ḵ or ḵ has been disputed in Turkey. Kahwa is actually found in several manuscripts e. g. in the opinion of al-Kūstānī above mentioned.

The coffee tree flourishes in south-western Ara-
bia and does best on the western side of the Seifat at a height of 3400-6800 feet, where it finds in the depths of the valleys and on the slopes a fertile, moist soil and the uniform warm temperature necessary for it. The plantations on the slopes arranged in terraces (see the picture in Handbook of Arabia, Pl. xiv.), however, need regular watering; in addition, the mist (śimmā, sukkāmāni) that rises in thick clouds out of Tihamah brings them moisture. To protect the trees from the heat of the sun and from locusts they are surrounded by shady trees like date, arab trees, tamarinds, etc. The tree which is raised from saplings (or propagated from layers) reaches a height of 6 to 16 feet with a diameter of 2-2½ inches and yields berries in the fourth year. It is an evergreen and throughout the year bears both blossom and berries in various stages of ripeness so that there is really no fixed harvest-time. The main harvest, however, varying with kind and locality, usually falls in the months from March to June. After the berries have been carefully gathered and allowed to dry they are shelled in a mill. The kernels and the husks are then dried in the sun a second time.

The coffee tree is found as far north as 'Ashir [q.v.], where it is said to flourish exceedingly on mount Sh-dh-y (Shadhd) in the land of the Zahrān (north of the Wādi Dawkā, Doka on Steder's map). (Shāhār 'Abd al-Muḥsin al-Barakātī, al-Riḥla 11149, Cairo 1330, p. 16; cf. J. L. Burckhard, Travels in Arabia, London 1829, ii. 377; for other places in 'Ashir see Handbook of Arabia, p. 136, 137). The most southern areas of coffee cultivation are Bīlād al-Haḍjira, Wādī Wārazān and Wādī Bānā. To the east we find coffee grown in the land of the Yהליכי and in the Djiwā. But it is the Ḥarūz mountains, the valley of al-Farāh belonging to the land of the Bānā Musayr, the Dżābal Raima and the district round 'Udān that are particularly celebrated for their excellent coffee. (For further information see Grohmann's book [b. Bibliography] where, too, the varieties are detailed).

The cultivation of coffee was and still is of great economic importance for Yemen. In the time of Ḥadījī Khālīfa, i.e. about the middle of the xvith century, the annual export was 80,000 bales. 1Bani and Bait al-Phākīh [q.v. were centres of coffee trade. Mūkāh, which the coffee trade brought to great prosperity, declined completely in the xivth century and has now lost all importance. Coffee is now exported through al-Ḥudāyda, where already in Niebuhr's time an important traffic was found, and especially 'Aデン (for details see von Neumann, Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, xii. 397—403. W. Schmidt, and in the Handbook of Arabia). It has always been the custom in Yemen to drink preferably a decoction of the husks, which like the latter is called ḥāṣr, and is to be obtained in numerous coffee-houses (mīkhāyā). To ḥāṣr as well as to the coffee made from beans, flavourings such as cardamom, ginger, cloves, etc., are often added. In the social life of the Arab no ceremony or festival is complete without coffee, and coffee is the first thing offered to a visitor. An invitation to coffee in Mecca means an invitation to a meal. The Arabs drink coffee without sugar; only in South Arabia milk is occasionally taken; sugar has become the vogue among the Turks.

The fresh ripe fruit is pleasing to the taste and nourishing. The eating of the būn — it is not stated whether fresh or dried — is particularly recommended in a ḥāṣaq by Ḥamza b. 'Abd Allāh al-Nāṣirī (Ṣafwat al-Ṣafwa, f. 358 sq.) on account of its various health-giving virtues. We have no information available as to whether the custom usual among the Galla and in Kaffa of eating ground coffee mixed with butter is also usual in South Yemen. In Persia the eating of dry ground coffee is not unusual.


Kaīawa is also the name of the room in which coffee is served and thus comes to mean reception room and "coffee-house. The word is also used in the sense of "tip" and "present. — On coffeehouses in the East, see the works mentioned below by Olearius, Chardin, Russell, von Hammer, Snouck Hurgronje. — On coffee-vees see Lane, Snouck Hurgronje, von Oppenheim, Soeng, Euting, Landberg. Bibliography: For the works mentioned above: 'Abd al-Kiṣār b. Muhammad al-Aṣwāf, Umdat al-Ṣafwa fi ḥilāl al-Ḳawaṭ, partly ed. in De Sacy, CHRISMOGRAPHIE ARABE, 2nd ed. (Paris 1826), i. Text p. 133 sqq., trans. p. 412 sqq.; 'Abd al-Kiṣār b. Shukhī, b. al-Aṣwarū, Ṣafwat al-Ṣafwa fi Bayān Iṣbūm al-Ḳawaṭ, Ms. Berlin, Ahlwardt, Verzeichnung, N. S. 5479 (Brockelmann, op. cit., ii. 410 sqq.); Abu l-Hasan Muhammad al-Bakri al-Ṣiddīki (his authorship is evident from Ms. Leiden 1742, f. I vs.), Ḩiṣb al-Ṣafwa fi-Ṭaṣḥayt al-Ḳawaṭ, Ms. Leiden 1138 (Cat. Cod. Orienti., iv. 161); Dā'ud al-Anṭāki, Tadhkira fil-'A/lāb wa-l-Djāmī il-'A/lāb al-'A/lāb (Cairo 1294), i. 121 sqq. (s. v. būn), cf. p. 369 (s. v. kawaṭ); Ṭuḳwī al-Afrīzī, ix. 145 infra, x. 308 infra; Kitt, al-Ḍakhāqār wa-l-Tahāf, quoted in al-Nasā'ī, Abhandl. s. arab. Philol. (Leiden 1889), ii. XXXVIII; Abu l-'Abbās Ahmad al-Shařāji, Ṭuḳwāt al-Khawāṣ (Cairo 1323), p. 100; al-Awālī b. Ahmad al-Saqāfī (wrote in 1295 = 1785), Rīṣāla fi Kān al-Ḳawaṭ an Tamāwul al-Tunūbī al-Walīl al-Ḳawaṭ, al-Ḳawaṭ, al-Mīrāb, al-Miṣr (Cairo 1302), p. 8—10; Ḥadījī Khalfīa, Diḳhān-nūmā (Constantinople 1145), p. 535—546 (French trans. in De Sacy, CHRIS., i. 480—5: cf. also Hammer-Purgstall, Literaturgesch. der Araber, vii. Vienna 1856, p. 435 sqq.); Pecewī, Ţūrīḥ (Constantinople 1263), i. 365—3; Na'mūn, Ṭūrīḥ (Constantinople 1140), i. 551—4; Rāḥīdī, Ṭūrīḥ (Constantinople 1282), ii. 425 sqq., v. 144 sqq.; Ḥosayn Ḥafid b. Muṣṭafī, al-Dinār (Handschu), al-muṣākhkāt al-muḥṣara fī Ṭūrīḥ al-Ghawāf al-muṣākhkāt al-muḥṣara (Constantinople 1221), p. 367 sqq.; al-Firūzābābī, Ḥanūrī, Turk. trans. by 'Aṣgī Efendi (Constantinople 1230—33), iii. 911; Ahmad Rāshīdī, Ṭūrīḥ-i Ḳafta wa-Ṣan'ā (Constantinople 1219), ii. 312—5 (cf. Barbier de Meynard, Notice sur l'Arabe mordegha, in Phil. de l'Ecole des Langues orient. vie., 2nd Ser., iv. 103—195); L. Rauwolf, Articulatae descriptione de Koas, so er vor dieser zeit gegen Aufgang inn die Mergenänder ... solis volbracht etc. (Leuveningen 1582), p. 102; Prosper
It is probably a case of borrowing from the military language when certain prominent stars, e.g. the last star in the Great Bear, or mountain-tops (lunar marks) are called ქართ ახტან (cf. Lane, Lexicon, s. v.).

KAIDA, (A.) (lit. "sitting"), basis, foundation, later also rule, principle, etc. Cf. the dictionaries.

KAITT. [See Kt'afa.]
KAI-KA'US, a mythical king of Persia of the Kayănid dynasty. Called Kava Ûsâ in the Acesta, he is regarded by Firdawsi as the son of Kai-Êkhâd and by other sources as his grandson. He was, it is related, a warrior king who undertook a campaign into Mázandarân, which was inhabited by demons and protected by the white dwâ (dwo-i safid) who caused it to rain stones upon the invading army during the night; Rustam, son of Zâl, set out to deliver the king from his imprisonment and on his way met with seven adventures which have become celebrated in poetry [see KUSTAM]. The white dwâ was overcome in his sleep and the blood from his heart restored their sight to the king and his army. Another war led the king into Hamvârân, a land lying to the south of Persia, which might be the Yemen (Himyar), for he set sail for it by sea from Makrân. His adventurous spirit took him as far as the mountain of Kaf [q. v.] which was believed to surround the earth. He married Sùdâ, daughter of the king of Hâmavârân (al-Te'Àli-ibii: Sûdâna, ar. Sùdâ, daughter of ibn-i 'Ashî) and in the course of a visit to his father-in-law was treacherously thrown into prison in a cave on the shore of the sea. It was Rustam who came to deliver him.

Being master of the demons, Kâi-Kâ'ûs used their forces to make them build castles in Alburz (al-Thâyâlî, p. 165: the Tower of Babel; do, Hàmza al-Is-fhâhân, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 55; Muddîmat al-Tâ'arrûd, Journ. Asiat., Ser. iii., xi. (1841), p. 325). To revenge themselves for this forced labour one of them suggested to the king the possibility of rising up to heaven. For this purpose the king trained young eunuchs and attaching four to his throne had himself carried off towards the stars. When the eagles felt tired, they came down again and threw the king on the ground in the neighbourhood of Ámul [q. v.], in the middle of the forest, where he was found by the nobles who had set out to look for him. A son of the king, Siýâwâkhsh (Siýâvâsh, Çevâvarhânà), was accused by his step-mother Sûdâba, whose overtures he had resisted, of having attempted her virtue; he cleared himself of the order by fire, by walking unharmed through a narrow space between two blazing piles of wood. The young prince then asked leave to fight the Túrântâns, whom he encountered near Balkh [q. v.]. The death of Siýâwâkhsh, now the son-in-law of Afûsîyâb [q. v.] and victim of the intrigues of Sûdâba, decided Rustam to invade Persia; the hero put the queen to death before the king's eyes and then hurled himself on Túrân to avenge his country.

Kai-Kâ'ûs reigned one hundred and fifty years the latter of which he passed in retirement; he left the throne to his grandson Kai-Khurwâr [q. v.], son of Siýâwâkhsh.


KAÎKÂ'US, the name of two Sâlûjûk rulers in Asia Minor.

KAÎKÂ'US I, al-Súlûn al-Châlî 'izz al-Dûnîya wa-l-Din K. B. KâÎhûâszwâr, Burhân Amârî l-Mû'mînnîn, reigned from 606—616 (1210—1219). He at once made peace with Theodore Lascaris (see below KâÎhûâszwâr I) because he had to defend his rights against his uncle Toghârîshâh of Erzerûm and his brother Kaîkobâd, who were contesting his succession. The Armenians under Lîfûn (Leon), who seized the opportunity to capture Heraclea and Lândra and to plunder KâÎsâriya, were temporarily induced to retire on payment of a considerable sum. Toghârîshâh also soon retired to Erzerûm, but Kaîkobâd, who had seized the fortress of Anguria, held out for a considerable time and was only forced to surrender after several years' siege. He was thereupon provisionally imprisoned in the fortress of Minshar (Marâyê, now Minser, S. E. of Malayta; cf. Defrémery, Hist. des Croisâts, Documents Armaniens, i. 143, note 3). By a lucky coup KâÎkâ'ûs succeeded in capturing the king of Trebizond, Kîr Âleks, who had to purchase his freedom by ceding the important harbour of Sinope and paying a yearly tribute (611 = 1214). The town of Anjâlia, which had been taken by KâÎhûâszwâr shortly before, but had expelled the Turkish garrison with the help of Christian knights, was again reconquered. In 613 (1216) KâÎkâ'ûs made an inroad into the land of the Armenians and besieged the fortress of Gaban (Ibn Bîbi in place of this mentions two citadels, Cînûn and Gànûn). The army sent to raise the siege included the Constable Constantin and several Barons of the Empire; it was completely routed by the Turks and the Constable with many Barons and knights were taken prisoner. KâÎkâ'ûs then returned to KâÎsâriya, without having taken the fortress, after plundering the land and laying it completely waste. There was nothing left for the Armenians but to beg for peace and the release of prisoners. Both appeals were granted but their king had to pledge himself to pay tribute and to cede the important frontier fortresses of Lu'lû'a and Uawzâd, which commanded the Cilician passes. When in 613 (1216) KâÎkâ'ûs's ally, the Aiyûbdî of Hâlab, al-Mâlîk al-Zâhir, died, KâÎkâ'ûs arranged with the Aiyûbdî lord of Sumâsàt, al-Mâlîk al-Afâljî, that the latter should receive Hâlab with the Sûltân as his overlord. This plan seemed at first to be successful; the Turkish troops occupied Marâbûz without difficulty (Kamâl al-Din, transl. Blechot, i. 158, mentions Burdûj al-Râzâq, as does Yûsûf, ed. Weinacht, ii. 604, and adds Tell Kshâld also), Ra'bân, Tell âsîrîh and Ma'bâd, but in place of handing the places over to al-Afâljî, as had been agreed, KâÎkâ'ûs put Turkish commandants over them. Friction thus arose and the Hâlabis gained time to appeal for help to al-Mâlîk al-Afâljî (cf. i. 222) whose troops defeated the
advance-guard of the Turks at Tell Kabban (Yakut, i. 869). Kaikäüs then retired on Abhestan, while al-Ashtar drove the Turkish garrisons out of the fortresses they had taken. Furious at this failure, which he attributed to the treachery of his own emirs, Kaikäüs had several of them hanged and others imprisoned in a building called Rabab Tartish by Yakut, which was then set on fire so that they were all burned to death. Soon afterwards he himself fell ill of consumption and died in 646 (1249). His body was buried in a hospital built by him in Siwás, where the inscription on his tomb, incised in 617, can still be read. Cf. v. Berchem, Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, Part 3, p. 5 sqq.

Bibliography: The chief source is Ibn Bibi, extract from his historical work in Recueil de Textes relatifs à l'Histoire des Selçoukides, iv. (Turk. trans., ibid., iii.); also of importance is the Chronicle Syriacum of Barhebræus; Kamal al-Din, Zubdat al-Halab etc., French transl. by E. Blochet, entitled Histoire d'Alép (Paris 1900); Historiens du Croisés, Documents Arméniens, i. (Paris 1895); the universal histories by Ibn Dhahir, Ibn al-Calandin, Nuh al-Khadandamir, Muhammad Bashî, and other works still in manuscript; the coin catalogues: British Museum Cat. of Oriental Coins, Vol. iii. (1877); Ghitlif Edhem, Numismatique Selçoukide (Constantinople 1892); Ahmed Tewfîd, Cat. des Monnaies du Musée Impérial Ottoman, Part iv. (Constantinople 1903); Huart, Epigraphie arabe d'Asie Mineure in Recuei Scientifique, ii. and iii.; Konig, Inscriptions des Selçoukiades Bactriennes, by J. H. Lowyved, Berlin 1907; Khalil Edhem, Kaissarîye shehrîs Ma'mûn-i İslamîye ve Kıtâbî (Stambol 1334). Cf. also Fallmerayer, Gesch. des Kaisertum von Trabenschon (München 1827); F. Starer, Reise in Kleinasië (Berlin 1896); do., Konia, Selçoukide Bauendenmalers (Berlin 1921). See also the bibliography to the article SELJÜK.

KAIKÄUS II, 'IZZ AL-DÜN YEH NAW L-DIN R. KAIKHSRAW II. When Kaikhsraw II [3. v.] died in 643 (1245), according to the arrangements he had made, his son 'Ala' al-Din Kaikhoïbâd, whose mother was the Persian princess Tamar, was to become Sultan, but he was barely 7 years old and had two older brothers — also still quite young — Izz al-Din and Rukh al-Din Kiliti Arslân. Izz al-Din was the eldest. His mother was the daughter of a Greek priest (Frater Simon in Vincent de Beauvais, Book xxxii., Ch. 26, who has, however, confused Izz al-Din and Rukh al-Din). The all-powerful vizier of the late Sultan, Shams al-Din Isfahâni, declared for him but did not yet dare to set aside the two other brothers, for the decision ultimately lay with the Mongol Khans. The vizier therefore could not prevent Rukh al-Din, accompanied by several Turkish emirs, from travelling to the urdu of the Great Khan and being present at the great jûralât at which Kuyuk was proclaimed Great Khan (1246). But in the meanwhile the Vizier (whom Frater Simon refers to as Losyr) was busy getting all power into his own hands and married Izz al-Din's mother to the great chagrin of the Turkish emirs. To attain his desires, he had several of them put to death, including, according to Vincent, a certain Salefâdin, i.e. Sharaf al-Din Ma'âmmûd, the governor of Arzandjân, a man well-disposed to the Christians, who understood French and German (ibid., chap. 27). The result, however, was that the malcontent emirs laid a complaint against him before Kuyuk, who gave them a yarîk appointing Rukh al-Din Sultan. In addition, the Khân ordered that the vizier should be handed over to the relatives of the slaughtered emirs. He also laid down definitely the conditions of peace; the Seldjûks were to pay a yearly tribute of 1,200,000 hyperpries (bezants), 500 silk robes with gold brocade, 500 horses, 500 camels, and 5,000 head of smaller animals and also presents which doubled the value of the whole. This is Vincent's story (Ch. 28). Cf. thereon Barthold in Zapiski West. Otd. Imp. Arkh. Obšč., xxviii. 0128; d'Ossian, Hist. des Mongols, iii. 83.

When Rukh al-Din then returned to Asia Minor, he was recognized as Sultan, and the vizier, in accordance with the orders of the Great Khan, handed over to his enemies and put to death in 646 (1249); we have therefore coins with the name of Rukh al-Din as early as the year 646 (1249). In the meanwhile, however, news arrived of the death of the Great Khân and it was not till 1251 that his successor Mongke assumed full authority. The Mongol emirs of the Selçoukides declared for Izz al-Din and agreed with another one that Kaikhsraw's three sons should reign jointly. From 647 to 655 all three names appear on the coins, with the single exception that in 652 (1254) Rukh al-Din struck coins with his name in Kaïsaria, because he had been proclaimed sole Sultan there by the pachalik of the town, Şamsâm al-Din. Long negotiations followed between Rukh al-Din and İzz al-Din, which led to nothing, however, till finally the sword brought a decision and Rukh al-Din was taken prisoner and sent to Amasia and later to Burghû. In the meanwhile Mongke had demanded that İzz al-Din should return to him, but the latter had little desire to undertake the dangerous journey and therefore sent his brother 'Ala' al-Din Kaikhoïbâd with rich presents. On the way, however, the prince was murdered and an enquiry instituted by the Great Khân to find out who had had a hand in it led to no result. An encounter between İzz al-Din's troops and those of the Mongol Nogay Baidûj at Akşara in 654 (1256), in which the former were routed, forced İzz al-Din at once to seek refuge with Theodore Lascaris. The imprisoned Rukh al-Din was thereon liberated and recognized as Sultan (coins of 655). But scarcely had Baidûj retired with his Mongols than İzz al-Din returned to Konya, while Rukh al-Din was in Kaïsaria. After long negotiations and occasional skirmishes between the troops of the two brothers, a division of the kingdom was decided upon. Rukh al-Din was to reign eastwards from the Kızıl İrmak and İzz al-Din westwards. Both brothers were then to go to Hülagü, who was then in the neighbourhood of Trabiz to have the agreement confirmed. This was done, but soon afterwards the Mongols learned that İzz al-Din had entered into negotiations with their archenemies, the Mamlûks of Egypt, and put an end to his rule. İzz al-Din was still able to escape to Anfîla and sailed from there with his relatives and a few faithful emirs to Constantinople, which after the fall of the Latin Empire, was again in the hands of the Greeks. There he was sure of a good reception on account of his having a Christian mother. But the presence of these Turks soon became embarrassing to the Emperor. They are
said to have begun a conspiracy to murder him and make Izz al-Din Emperor. When the Sultan's Christian uncles betrayed this plan, the Greeks lost no time in banishing the Sultan to Ainos, while his servants were incorporated as Turecopes in the Imperial armies, or imprisoned and put to death (662 = 1264). Six years later (668 = winter 1268/1269) Izz al-Din was liberated by troops sent to Constantinople by Mengu Timur and brought to the Crimea. There he married a daughter of Bereke Khan and died in 678 (1279/1280). On his son Mas'ud see the separate article.

Bibliography: See that of the preceding article. Specially important here is Vincentius Bellovacensis, Speculum historiale, Books xxx. and xxxi., chap. 26, 27. Cf. also the Mongol and Byzantine historians (Nicephorus Gregorius and Georgius Apollita); W. v. Tiesenhausen, Recueil de matériaux relatifs à l'histoire de la Horde d'or, i. 482.

KAI-KHUSRAW, a mythical king of Persia, of the Kayanid dynasty. Son of Siyyawalsh, who had left his father Kai-Khuss and taken refuge in Tuiran where he had married the daughter of King Afrasiyab [q. v.], he was born after his father's death and brought up in this country among the shepherds of the mountains of Kal (a valley near Bamiyan), in ignorance of his illustrious origin; but this was soon revealed. At seven years old he was making bows and at ten he feared neither lions nor tigers. Then Piran, the vizier of Afrasiyab, took him into his house. In a dream Gadarz, an Iranian noble, descendant of the smith Kawa, learned that the heir to the throne existed in enemy territory and sent his son Gew to look for him; the latter found him quite by chance and recognized that Kai-Khusraw had on his arm the black mark that distinguished Kayansids; he therefore took him, along with his mother Faringis back to Persia.

There he found a rival in his uncle Faribor. To settle the question, Kai-Kau's decided that the throne should belong to the one who captured the fortress of Bahamanzid, near Ardash [q. v.], where Ahirman reigned. It was of course Kai-Khusraw who won, with the aid of celestial forces, and there he built a temple in honour of the sacred fire Adharbaghshap. A journey through his empire showed him the devastations caused by the Tuiranians and he swore to undertake a war of vengeance against them. Aided by all the nobles, he sent out expeditions of which the first were unfortunate; but fortune soon changed and Kai-Khusraw took over the direction of the campaign. Afrasiyab, in spite of the help of the Emperor of China, was finally forced to fly and Kai-Khusraw sought him in vain beyond the seas. He was hidden in a cave in the mountains of Adharbaidjan [q. v.], and his place of concealment could only be discovered by supernatural means. He was finally taken prisoner and beheaded. Thus was accomplished the vengeance due for the murder of Siyyawalsh.

Having succeeded his grandfather Kai-Kau's, for whom he wept for 40 days, Kai-Khusraw reigned peacefully without any incident more remarkable than the killing of a dragon which had taken up its abode on the mountain of Kisshid, between Fars and Isfahan (Hasma al-Isfahan, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 56). At the end of his life, he asked God to receive him into heaven and, after naming Juhass as his successor, he undertook a mountain journey in the course of which he disappeared, after having washed in the water of a spring (the spring of eternal life). Those who had accompanied him perished in a snowstorm. It is clear that the figure of Kai-Khusraw corresponds to that of the Avestan hero Haoravon, who belongs to Indo-Iranian mythology.


KAIKHUSRAW, the name of three Seljuk rulers in Asia Minor.

KAIKHUSRAW, brother of al-Din, b. Kılıç Arslan. When the aged and enfeebled Kılıç Arslan II died in 588 (1192), he was staying with his youngest son Kaikhusraw, who governed Burghul (i.e. Uluburlu) in his father's lifetime. Kaikhusraw concealed his father's death and only made it known when he had arrived with the body in Konya, in order to have homage paid to himself as Sultan there. His brothers, each of whom ruled over a part of the Seljuk kingdom, troubled about him just as little as they had done about their father in his later years. It was some time, however, — according to some not till 592 (1196), according to others 595 — before one of them was strong enough to take Konya from him. Finally Rukan al-Din Sulaiman [q. v.] succeeded in doing this, so that Kaikhusraw had to take to flight and after several unsuccessful attempts to gain his throne with the help of Leon of Armenia and of the neighbouring princes of Malatya, Hacab and Amid, wandered hither and thither (cf. the poem composed by him in Ibn Bubi, p. 29 sqq.), till he at length found a welcome with Alexius III in Constantinople. At this time he married a daughter of a distinguished Greek named Maurozmes, and the death soon afterwards of his brother in 600 (1204) opened up a good prospect of returning to Konya, because several emirs were dissatisfied with the rule of the latter's son Kılıç Arslan III, who was a minor. The main part in the plot was played by several members of the dynasty of the Dênishmandiya [q. v.], which had been deposed by Kılıç Arslan II. He actually succeeded in being proclaimed Sultan in Konya in spite of a fetwa of the kâdi al-Tirmidhî, who declared him unworthy of the throne because of his Christian mother and his intercourse with the unbelievers, a fetwa which cost the issuer's life. According to Ibn al-Athir, al-Kâmil, ed. Tornberg, xii. 160, Kaikhusraw besieged Trebizond in 602 (1204) apparently without much success. In 603 (1207) he took the imperial city of An- tala from Aldobrandini. From this capture date the first relations of the Seljûks with the Venetians, to whom he granted a licence to trade (cf. Heyd, Gesch. des Levantehandelns, i. 334). In 605


KAHHUSRAW II, GHIYATH AL-DIN wa-L-DIN b. KAIKOBAD, ascended the throne after the assassination of his father in 634 (1237), although Kahlı̄bad had not designated him as his successor but the son of Bajı̄, in 607 (1210) he fell in the battle at Kholı̄, apparently because of his involvement in the Armenian and Ayı̄bad mercenaries and to advance against the Mongols with them; but the incapacity and cowardice of the Turkish troops lost the battle at Kozadağh (Muharram 6, 641 = June 26, 1243). Bajı̄ thereupon marched on Siwas, which surrendered and was therefore spared, but Kahlı̄bad was taken by force of arms, plundered and his inhabitants massacred. He then went into winter-quarters and the vizier succeeded in concluding a temporary peace, which, however, had still to be confirmed by the Great Khan. But as Ugedei died just then and the next kürsitewas not held till 1246 (see above, i. 682), the Turks had a few years' peace and the able Shams al-Din used the opportunity to seek the intervention of Batı̄ Khan, on a ceremonious embassy with several other prominent Turks. He was entirely successful so that on his return he received the office of vizier rendered vacant by the death of Muhabdulbih al-Din. The good for nothing Sultan, who after the battle of Kozadağh, had been about to fly to the Great Khan, again gathered some courage and in 1245 began a campaign against the Armenians, against whom he had a grievance because they had handed over to the Mongols his mother, who had taken refuge with their king, with her treasures. The object of the campaign was Tarsus on this occasion, but soon it had to be abandoned, because the rainy season began, after the land had been ravaged in fearful fashion. The Armenians by the treaty of peace bound themselves to pay tribute and to cede Bragana. When the leaders again appeared at the Sultan's court, the latter had died suddenly a week before.

Bibliography: See above under KAIKOBAD; of particular importance are here Vincent de Beauvais and the historians of the Mongols.

KAHHUSRAW III, GHIYATH AL-DIN, B. RUKN AL-DIN KAIKOBAD ARSLAN was proclaimed Sultan, immediately on the murder of his father, by the all powerful Perwāna Mu'in al-Din Sulaimān [q. v.], although he was still a minor. The events in Asia Minor during his reign will better be discussed in the article SULAIMAN. After the execution of the Perwāna (676 = 1277) Kahlı̄bad's reign was soon at an end, as his youth rendered him a mere tool in the hands of the Mongol rulers. His nephew Mas'ud [q. v.], when he returned to Asia Minor after his father's death, was so successful in gaining the favour of the Great Khan Alażı̄ [q. v. v.] that we have coins of his name as early as 681. The unfortunate Kahlı̄bad, who was entirely in the power of the Mongol prince and claimant Kοῡkuruz, became involved in the latter's fall and was put to death in 682 (1285) in Arzandžan by order of the İkhan Ahmad.

KAIKOBAD, a mythical king of Persia, of the Kayānd dynasty. The Avesta knows his name in the form Kav Kavāta, but nothing more of him; tradition only preserves of him the fact that he was grateful to the Yazatas for having made his empire glorious and for having re-established the legitimate line of kings of Iran. The only source to consult is the Shāh-nāma of Firdawsī. To defend Iranian soil against the inva-
sions of the Tūrānīan Afrāsīyāb, the Sace Zāl, father of Rustam, after ripe reflection and consultation with the mābišt’s decided on Kai-Kobād, who was living in the mountains of Alburz (Hare-herezat), and sent his son to look for him. The latter found him in the midst of a banquet surrounded by boon comrades; he greeted him, but already the new king had seen in a dream two white falcons place a golden tiara on his head and was thus informed of the coming of the embassy; the care which he had taken to make himself remote had not prevented destiny from putting the messenger on his track. Becoming commander of the Irānīan army, Rustam completely defeated Afrāsīyāb, who would have been made prisoner if the girdle by which he was being carried off had not broken. As a result of this victory, a peace was concluded which gave Persia its former frontier of the Oxus. Kai-Kobād spent his time in organizing the empire and traversing it, in founding cities and in lavishing riches on the heroes who had rebuilt the empire: Rustam, Kāršīn and others. He died at the end of a reign of a hundred years.

The Nadjam al-Tawwārikh (Journ. Asiat., Ser. iii., xi. (1841), p. 320) which says that Kai-Kobād came from the mountains of Hamadān, Alwand, and not from Alburz, and Ḥamza al-ʾĪsfahānī (ed. Gottwaldt, p. 35) only mention his building cities, notably Kobādīyan on the Oxus, and the expansion of Ṣafīān. The Būdīshthīk only gives fifteen years to the reign of this king instead of a hundred.


KAİ-KOBĀD, the name of three Seldjūq Sulṭāns in Asia Minor.

KAİ-KOBĀD I, "AL'A al-Dunyā wa l-Dīn abī l-Fath K. b. KAİKHUSRAW. How he had been taken prisoner in the reign of his brother has already been told under KAİKĀTS I. The death of this brother in 616 (1220) opened to him not only the gates to the throne of Guloganpur, where he was then interned, but also placed him on the Seldjūq throne. All the Türkish emirs do not seem to have been quite agreed about this, as they declared for another brother, Kaišerdīn, but Kaikobād succeeded in gaining possession of Konya, the capital, and in soon afterwards rendering the malcontent emirs harmless. He probably received valuable help from the Christian auxiliary troops, as Ibn Bīrī relates that the Emir Constaninopolis played an important part in these events. We know from the account in Vincent de Beauvais (Book xxx. ch. 144), which, however, refers to the reign of his successor, that the Greek emperors of Trebizond and Nicaea as well as the prince of Lampron had pledged themselves to place a number of troops—settled in a treaty at the disposal of the Seldjūq. It is certain that this agreement was already in force in the reigns of Kaikhusraw I and Kaikitās I, perhaps with the single limitation that it was not till the reign of the last named that this pledge held good for the Armenians also, and was renewed under Kaikobād. At the beginning of his reign the Armenian king Leo II died (1219) and his daughter Isabella married the son of the Catholic prince of Antioch, which aroused a great dispute among the Armenians, the result of which was that the discontented barons under the leadership of Constantine, prince of Lampron, captured the prince, poisoned him and married his widow to Haithum, the son of Constantine. A war with the prince of Antioch was thereby rendered inevitable; the Templars and Knights of St. John received orders from Rome not to take part in it so that Bohemond could not do much against the Armenians and, according to Ibn al-ʾĀthrī, had even for appeal to help to Kaikobād. In any case, the latter took advantage of the dissensions among the Christians by seizing several Armenian forts on the Mediterranen and elsewhere, including the castle of Galononas (καλώνων) Candarlılar, which he chose for his winter residence, and made a considerable seaport by his buildings there, so that the place became called Alaya ("Alaʾiya") after him. In these circumstances there was nothing left for the prince of Lampron on his side, but to acknowledge the suzerainty of Kaikobād and to support him with auxiliaries in his wars.

An attempt by Masʿūd, the Ortukid of ʿAmīr and ʾIḫšān Kaīfaʿ, who succeeded his father as lord of their towns in 619 (1222), to leave Kaikobād nonsense on the kaikhusraw and to make an alliance with the neighboring Ayūbid princes, all of them the fortresses of Kāhtila and Cemītāhkez. The troops sent to his assistance by al-ʾĀṣfer (see i., 229) were scattered by the besieging army, but Kaikobād hastened to heap tokens of honour on the captured commander and to release him, because much depended on him for the friendship of the Ayūbids. Indeed he even sought the hand of an Ayūbid princess. His request was granted and the marriage took place a little later. In 622 (1225), the prince of Arzandân, Bahramshāh, died after sixty years’ reign, as also did the Seldjūq of Erzerum, Taghrihrāh. Kaikobād thought this a good opportunity to seize where possible the lands of these rulers. Dāʾūdshāh, Bahramshāh’s successor, did his best to avert the danger by entering into alliances with Djalal al-Dīn Khwārizmshāh, with ʿAlaʾ al-Dīn, Grand Master of the Assassins and with al-ʾĀṣfer, but in vain. Kaikobād forced him to cede his territory and he was equally successful with another member of the Menguek family, Muḥaffar al-Dīn Muhammad, who ruled over Cogonisia (Şabīn Karahisār). But before he could take Erzurum too, he had to wage a difficult war with Djalal al-Dīn, who was an ally of the prince of Erzerum. After embassies had gone several times to and fro between the two rulers, Kaikobād made an alliance with al-ʾĀṣfer, who then fought with Djalal al-Dīn for the possession of the town of Khišt. As soon as the Khwārizmshāh heard of this, he endeavoured by a hurried march to anticipate the union of the two forces, but in the battle of Arzandân on the two armies of the city of 128, 627 (Aug. 10, 1230, cf. Actes du 1er Congrès international. des Orientalistes, iii. 19) he suffered a terrible defeat. The fate of the prince of Erze-
The redaction having determined to finish the work within 10 years, a second series of numbers, beginning with S, will be started, parallel to the present series. It is the intention of the redaction to publish 3 numbers of each series yearly.
rück was thus declared as part of the territory annexed by the Great Khan. The Khowar, Georgians in 1222 and the Mongols in 1223, agreed to the marriage of a princess with Kaikobad's son Kaikobad. In the meantime the Mongols had again appeared in the region, pillaging the country. Kaikobad, who had no women and was generally thought to be a heretic, was induced by his subjects to take a woman for his own daughter. Kaikobad then decided to occupy the district of the Khowar which he had not received after the death of Jalal al-Din but had not defended, and to take the ravaging bands of the Khorasanians into his service as mercenaries. This brought about a coalition of all the Ayubid princes under the leadership of the Kamil of Egypt against Kaikobad. Soon their troops were on the Asal Minor frontier but they did not succeed in forcing the passes to enter the land; in addition the Ayubid leaders soon began to quarrel among themselves. In the end they had to be content with defending the town of Khartit against the advancing Turks. But the latter could not be kept back. Al-Mayafar, the Ayubid of Hama, set upon them the conduct of the defense fell, was captured along with the Ortuk ruler in Khartit. The town surrendered to the Seljuk; Kaikobad next besieged and captured Harran, Edessa and Raqqa (652 = 1243) which, however, were soon lost again to the Ayubids. Amol also was unsuccessfully besieged by him and when in 654 (1257) he was about to undertake a new campaign, he was imprisoned in Kars, for his son Kaikhusraw was killed. He is said, because Kaikobad had appointed his successor not him. A younger son, born to him by the Ayubid princess.

During Kaikobad's vigorous reign the Seljuq kingdom attained its greatest extent and highest prosperity, for Kaikobad was not only an indefatigable soldier but also undertook great building operations: the remains of which in Konya, Silvan, Agha and elsewhere keep alive the memory of the great Sultan to this day. He busied himself in opening up his lands to commerce and in improving the natural wealth of the country; with this object he even undertook an expedition to the Crimea, no doubt at the wish of the Italians. As a result his kingdom was at that time considered the richest in the world.


Kaikobad II, 'ala al-Din r. Kaikhusraw, reigned together with his two brothers, Kaikhusraw and Kildji Arslan, as was briefly described in the article KAIKOBAD. II. Here we shall only refer to a coin and place where Jalal al-Din Edhem, Taqizmi, Makrlik-i Seljuklou, No. 113, which bears the date 653 and the name Kaikobad alone, although Kaikobad had died 8 years before.

Kaikobad III, 'ala al-Din K. r. Farhmarz B. Kaikusus was installed as Sultan by Gha'az Khan in 697 (1298). Of his history practically nothing is known with certainty. His name still

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLAM, II

KAIL (A), the most general term for measure. The word next has the special meaning of measure for dry goods such as grain and cereals of all kinds and finally (like kala) means
KAIL — KAIM

KAILADJA, a measure of capacity in local use and varying very much, whose size varies between \( \frac{1}{2} \) and 2 l. (or kg. = \( \frac{1}{2} \) to \( \frac{3}{4} \) pints). The term existed as early as the 3rd century A.D.

Bibliography: (for the preceding article also): Sauvare, Materials, in Journ. As., Series 8, viii. (1886), 126 sq.; S. Lane Poole, Arabic Glass Weights in the British Museum, No. 47, 51; Becker, Papiri Schell-Reinhart's, i. 31 and 72; al-Tabari (ed. de Goeje), Glossarium, p. cxxviii and cxxix; Behrman, Institutions de police chez les Arabes in the Journ. As., Series 5, xvi. (1860), 131; al-Khwārizmī, Majālīth al-'Umm, ed. van Vloten, p. 15. (E. V. ZAMBAK)

KAIM (A.), "standing upright," "perpendicular." Hence kaim-nūmān "standing in place (of another)," "deputy;" kaim al-Zamān [q. v.]; sūwāja kā'ima "right angle." Also: "existing for example in kā'īn bi-najshī (or bi-dhāthī) "self-existent" (said of God). Kā'īm bi- also means "executing anything;" hence al-kā'īm bi-amrītal "he who executes God's command".

KAIM-MĀKH (A.), "deputy;" pronounced and written kaimākh in Turkish, the name of a rank and office in Turkey. In the period before the tanzūr reforms the word meant the officer (rikā'īl hawāζiẓn or ẓitāqā naimāquz) temporarily commissioned to act as deputy at the court or in the capital in the absence of the Grand Visier, the so-called kaimāqam paše. The case is an isolated one in which the Grand Visier appointed an ordu kaimāqam to represent him in the camp (Lütfi, Tāriξh, iv. 19); we also find kaimāqams for the Seraskers and the Kapudan Paša (İzārār Kaimāqam for the eyalet of the Archipelago, which was under the Grand Admiral); for the regular and representative functions of officials the now obsolete term yer (e.g. kā'īma yer) was used, for the judicial officials nāzib. In the reorganization of the army and the provincial administration on the European model under Muhammed II and 'Abd al-Majid kaimāqam became in the army the equivalent of Lieutenant-Colonel and in the civil service the name of the official entrusted with the administration of a district (kâṣb).


KAIM AL-ZAMĀN (A.) i. e. "Lord of the Age," a Shī'ī term. The phrase includes the two theological meanings of "representative of God on earth" and "Deputy" of the Prophet. Among the earlier Shī'īs for example the Imām is called "the kā'īm," "our kā'īm" or "the kā'īm of his age," synonymous with ḫūṣafīya or ḫutafīya. The political application of the word brought in the meaning of "rebellious," current among all the succeeding sects, e.g. also among the Khāridjīs. Through chiasmus the name is given to the Mahāḍī as "resurrected" from (apparent) death who is active in the "age" through the ṇāzīb until as kā'īma al-ṣīyāma he brings about his kingdom and the judgment. Among the Imāmīs the twelfth Imām, and among the Ismā'īlīs the seventh is therefore kā'īma al-ṣāmān. But the more the Imām becomes like God in the subdivisions of the latter, the more he falls into the background and is only occasionally referred to as "the kā'īm" simply, with allusion to Sūra iii. 16, xili. 33 while the rank and powers are transferred to heads of sects, who are mostly not 'Alīs. Gnostic speculation equates the kā'īma al-ṣāmān to the first emanation, e.g. among the Druses to the intelligenza prima, 'ashī, i. e. ḥamza. The term is mystically amplified by the interpretations of the mystical initial letter ḥāf, the symbol of the girdle of the world.

Bibliography: The dogmatic text books of the Shī'ī; the following may be mentioned: al-Kullā, al-Kā'īr fil 'Imāl al-Dīn (the Ültīn min umār al-jalār) are printed Bombay 1802, Teheran 1307), MS., MS. in Linz, 185, fol. 47, 48 a, b, 112a, 132b, 175a sq.; al-Māṣūkī, 'Imāt al-Wujja li-Aīl b. 'Alī Tābī (Teheran 1320), esp. p. 195-200; Ibn Bībiyā, Kamāl al-Dīn wa-Tamām al-Nīma fi Thabāt al-Qabā'wa Kaṣīf al-Haiz (Teheran 1301), pastim; cf. thereon Ernst Möller, Beiträge zur Mahḍilheth des Islāms (Heidelberg 1901); al-Muṣṭahabb al-Hillī, Kaṣīf al-Murīd (on Naṣr al-Dīn al-'Īsī, Tārīkh al-I'tīdh (also al-Aḍāżib; Bombay 1310), p. 233; Muḥammad Bā기r al-Maṣūkī, Bīqā' al-Anwār, esp. vol. ii (Teheran 1350), p. 110, Ali, Kaṣīf al-Hābiqī, p. 87 sqq. in C. Seybold, Die Drueenschrift: Kīrāb Almāẓuq waṭal-Awād (Kirchhain 1902), cf. there also p. 71 sq., 76; De Saèy in Mémoires de
L'Inst. royal de France, ix. (1831), 53 sq., x. (1835), 95; do, Exposé de la religion des Druses (Paris 1838), also Index s. v. Ḥamza and his Théogonie des Druses (Paris 1865); W. A. Ivanow, Ismaïlites in Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vii. (1922), 1–76; S. Guyard, Fragments relatifs à la doctrine des Ismaïlis in Notices et Extraits, xxii. (1874), 194, 201, 283, 290. (R. Strothmann)

Al-Kā'im bi-ʿAmr bil-ʿAṭār ʿAbd-Allāh ʿAbd-Allāh, ʿAbbasīd Caliph. He is said to have been born in Dhu l-Ḥijjah 301 (Nov. 1001); his father was the Caliph ʿAbd-Allāh, who had homage paid to him as his successor shortly before his death; his mother was an Armenian or Greek slave. When he ascended the throne (Dhu l-Ḥijjah 422 = Nov.-Dec. 1031), the Caliphate had almost entirely lost its secular power and anarchy reigned practically supreme in the capital. To make himself obeyed, he ordered in 236 (1044/5) that all judicial offices should temporarily suspend their activities, which was, however, entirely without success. In his reign ended the Buyid dynasty and their place was taken by the Seldjūqs. On Ramadān 22, 447 (Dec. 15, 1055) the Seldjūq chief ʿToğrul Beg was officially prayed for and on the 23rd the latter entered Baghdād in state, nominally as vassal but in reality as master of the Caliph (see Khwāsūr fidur), who soon afterwards in 449 (1058) granted him the Sultanate and the title of honour of “King of the East and of the West.” In Dhu l-Ḥijjah of the following year, 450 (1059), the Turkish general al-Basāṣir [q.v.] took possession of the capital, while the Caliph took refuge with the ʿUṯtūdīl ʿUrāshī b. Badrān [q.v.], and on the 13th (Jan. 1, 1059) prayer was offered in Baghdād for the Fāṭimid al-Mustansīr. Al-Kāʾim, however, was soon again recognized as Caliph (end of 451 = 1059/1060) and although he was only a tool in the hands of the Seldjūqs, he was treated with respect both by ʿToğrul Beg and his successors. He died in Shaban 467 (April 1075).


Kāʾim bi-ʿAmr Allāh, ʿAbd l-ʿAṭār ʿAbd-Allāh, the second ruler of the Fāṭimid [q.v.] dynasty, born in 280 (893), succeeded his father ʿUbād Allāh al-Mahdī in 322 (934) on the throne, assumed the praenomen Muḥammad and at his proclamation took the name of al-Kāʾim bi-ʿAmr Allāh. His father had designated him his successor as early as 298 (911), when after the death of al-Shir [q.v.] he thought his own rule sufficiently secure, and had had his (viz. the prince’s) name mentioned in the Friday prayer; the prince commanded the army and conducted most of the campaigns while ʿUbād Allāh was still on the throne. He never placed himself at the head of his troops nor ever taken a personal part in any of the numerous wars, but used to entrust his emirs with their conduct and after failures, or on particularly difficult expeditions, he used to appoint his eldest son to the supreme command.

Of al-Kāʾim’s campaigns, while heir-apparent, may be mentioned the conquest of Constantine and Tripolis as well as his efforts to conquer Egypt. He gained great successes especially in the second expedition against Egypt in 307–309 = 919–921. He had conquered Alexandria and Ḥīṣā (Giza) and occupied the Fāṭīmids and Uḡmūnids. But disease, deficiencies in the supply of reinforcements and a strengthening of the Abbasids governors’ troops on the other side and the defeat of his fleet at Rosetta forced him finally to withdraw. He had, however, consolidated Fāṭimid sway as far as Bākra. In 316 (928) he developed the town of Mašla as his capital and called it al-Muḥammādiyya.

When in 322 (934) he succeeded his father, he had at once to turn his attention to an imposter, who gave himself out to be the son of al-Mahdi. After defeating him without difficulty, he turned his attention westwards to secure his authority there. He then devoted himself to various expeditions, sent his fleet to the coast of France, where the crews plundered and took prisoners, to Genoa, which was captured for a short time, and to Calabria. In 323 (935) he sent an army of 10,000 to Egypt, which conquered Alexandria, but was soon afterwards defeated by Muḥammad b. Tughāl al-Khāhidī, brother of the Abbasid governor. At home al-Kāʾim had to wage a continual struggle with rebellious tribes, his most redoubtable opponent being the rebel ʿAbī Yazīd [q.v.]. After heavy fighting and many misfortunes, he succeeded in driving his opponent out of al-Mahdiyya but soon afterwards in 334 (946) he was hard pressed at Sūsā with his army and finally surrounded. During the siege, he fell ill and died in a few weeks.

Al-Kāʾim was a fanatical champion of Fāṭimid doctrines. His reign was a period of ceaseless wars, which were fought in the fiercest and most barbarous fashion. Courage, ability and tenacity cannot be denied him. He laid sound foundations for the greatness of his successors. In this period of warmania, it was impossible for him to attend to the works of peace. The Bibliography is found in Wüstenfeld, Gesch. d. Fatimid, Chaliphen (Abb. der Kön. Ges. der Wiss. zü Göttingen, xxvii, xxvii, 1881) and above ii. p. 92*, at the end of the article FĀṬĪMIDES and i. p. 114*, article ʿAbū Yazīd. (SOBERHEIM)

KAIMAK. [See KIMAK]

KĀʾIM (t. originally ; cf. Kāʾim), the name for paper-money in Turkey, an abbreviation for Schim kāʾimete ("revenue bonds"); the word was originally used of drawings and documents which were written on large, long leaves in such a way that the lines ran parallel to the narrower side, as was the case with the first issues of Turkish paper-money; later the term ērāği nak-dıya took its place.

The first kāʾime appeared in 1840 and were manuscript. They bore interest at the rate of 12%, were to be accepted as money at the public banks and were current throughout the kingdom. They were replaced in 1842 by printed notes of a primitive style; the smaller notes bore no interest; the rate of interest for the others was reduced to 6% and at the same time the
circulation of paper-money was limited to the capital and its vicinity. The total of this first issue was not to exceed 60,000,000 piastres; but in a very few years, as a result of the wretched condition of Turkish finances, it was swollen enor-
nously and in 1862 calculated at approximately a milliard piastres. In this year, with the help of a foreign loan, the paper money was redeemed for 40% cash and 60% Turkish Consols (so-called consulidate) and made no longer legal tender.

In 1876 and 1877 the Porte found itself forced by the bankruptcy of the state and the outbreak of war with Russia to take refuge in paper-money for a second time. Kâime were issued for 1,000 million piastres, which, however, depreciated in a very short time and at the beginning of the 80's were called in along with the depreciated copper-money.

A third issue of a paper currency of a total value of 16,702,106,360 piastres dates from the world-war; it is still (1923) in circulation.

L. Heuzey, Lettres sur la Turquie, i. (Paris 1851); Echternach, Die Reformen des Osmanischen Reiches (Berlin 1858), p. 335 sqq.; [A. J. Mordtmann, Stambul und das moderne Turkentum (Leipzig 1878), p. 182 sqq.; Ed. Engelhardt, La Turquie et le Timuridat (Paris 1882), l. 72, ii. 258; Ch. Morawitz, Die Turkei im Spiegel ihrer Finanzen (Berlin 1903), passim; Tashwini Wazayi. [Turk. Gazette], Series i. year 1256 (1840/41), No. 206, 216, 217, 216; The Near East, No. 620 (of March 29, 1923), p. 328. — These books are in many points contradictory. The history of the Kâime has still to be written. (J. H. Mordtmann)

KAIN. [See Hamid]

AL-KAIN (B. Dârâ), usually Banu 'I-Kain or, with epsilon of the syllable â, Balqain, nishâ Kâine, or Arab tribe. The official Arabic genealogy gives its true name as al-No'mân b. Djar (see Wustenfeld, General Tabellen, Tab. 2, vo. 11 Duraid, al-Lâtikâ, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 317; Tâqiq al-Arâz, s. v. Kayren; Ibn Khallikân, Wafayât al-A'jlân, ed. de Sane, Article Wathâma b. Mára, about the middle; etc.) it therefore interpreted as originally a nickname and probably rightly — in Arabic, which means, as a name, "smith", "metal worker", "swordmaker", etc. (cf. Aram. šânu, šânu, "smith") and is in a wider application applied to artisans generally (for the meaning "slave", which the native lexicons also give and which Baethgen, Feügrife zur Semit. Religionstech., p. 152 uses for his deductions, I have no really certain reference). This might be derived from the Banu 'I-Kain having been at one time actually metalworkers, perhaps miners. Thus the Fethân b. Bali, who worked the celebrated Sulaiman or Fethân mine was also called Banu 'I-Kain, "sons of the smiths" or al-Kâime "the smiths"; see Yâkût, Muqaddim (ed. Wustenfeld), iii. 865 sq.; al-Bakri, Muqaddim (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 20 = Wustenfeld, Die Wohnsitze u. Wanderungen der Arab. Stämme, in Abh. d. Gesells. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, xx. 112 (Noldeke wrongly refers this passage, Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellsch., xi. 131, note 6 to our Banu 'I-Kain); Sprenger, Die alte Geographie Arabiens, § 419 and 28, and Wustenfeld, Register zu den General Tabellen, p. 162. Our tribe, however, appears in the old poems and historical references to it to be in every respect a genuine Beduin tribe. The period of industrial activity of the Banu 'I-Kain would therefore have to be looked for in the very remote past (cf. Spenger, op. cit., § 420). Another explanation of the name Banu 'I-Kain seems to me to be not quite impossible. The names Banu and Banu 'I-Kain are used by the Beduin Arabs, who soon every kind of manual labourer, as terms of contempt; cf. the glossary to the Nâbihî Djarir wa l-Faradâshâ, under 'Kain, where Bevan gives about 60 references, all from the Nâbihî and al-Faradâshâ himself appears here 18 times as "Ibn al-Kâine" or "Ibn al-Kuyân", and his family three times as Banu 'I-Kain", cf. also Kain b. al-Kha-

About this time the tribe Banu 'I-Kain, ed. Kowalinski, Nr. 10, fi. Husein b. Thâbit, Dinân (ed. Hirschfeld), No. cxxii, 4; Hamâs al-Bahturi (ed. Cheikho), No. 1333, i. and Thîrinmâh, Dinân (ed. Krenkow, still going through the press), No. 19. s, It is therefore conceivable that in our case also, we have an original term of abuse, which has remained attached to the tribe.

The Banu 'I-Kain formed a branch of the great southern branch of the tribe of the Khazârene, who, in origin probably South Arabian, were settled in the historical period in the upper north, in Syria, in Mesopotamia and in the ïrak and to all appearance had gone over entirely or at least for the most part to Christianity there (see Wustenfeld, Tabellen, loc. cit.; Ibn Duraid, op. cit.; Ibn Kutaibah, Kit. al-Mulâiri, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 51; Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi, al-Kalâf al-Farîd, Cairo 1305, ii. 88, etc.). That the Slâh and following it the Liân al-Árab and the Tûqî al-Arâz, under 'Kain, and the schollion to al-Harî, Maqâmat, 2, p. 90 include them in the Banu 'Asad, is probably due simply to carelessness, to a confusion of Abd, who in the Arab genealogical scheme appears as the great-grandfather of our al-Kain (cf. again Wustenfeld, Tabellen, Tab. 2) with the eponymous hero of the great Mušr tribe of the Banu 'Asad. As foolish as it is to a statement that they had belonged to the Tamîl (Tûqî al-Arâz, loc. cit.). Their tribal area — corresponding roughly to Arabia Petraea — extended from the Sinai Peninsula along the Syrian frontier far into the land east of Jordan (cf. Wustenfeld, Register zu den general Tabellen, p. 371, where all is not quite correct; Sprenger, op. cit., § 420 sq.; Causin de Perceval, Ensay sur l'histoire des Arabes, ii. 324 sqq.; Noldeke, Über die Arab. Kultur u. einige andere Nachkommener der Israelet in Benfey's Orient u. Occident, ii. 635; al-Hamdânî, Qâsurat al-Árab, ed. Muller, p. 131 sq. = Sprenger, op. cit., § 32; 'Urwa b. al-Ward, ed. Noldeke, p. 32 = Hamâs al-Ábî Tâmmân, ed. Freytag, i. 228, Schol.; Agâmî, i. 124, al-Yâkûbi, Kit. al-Bulûd, in Bibl. Geogr. Arab., ed. de Goeje, vii. 326; Yâkût, op. cit., iii. 459, iv. 415; al-Wâkidî, ed. Maghâzî, abrev. transl. by Wellhausen, p. 315; Sprenger, Das Leben u. die Lehre des Propheten Muhammad, iii. 295; Ibn al-

In the poetry and tales of the
“battles of the Arabs” and of other events in olden times the Banu l-Kain appear in typical Beduin times with the tribes of Kalb (Hamásia, loc. cit., p. 77; Yākūt, loc. cit., iii. 241; Ibn al-Athir, loc. cit., i. 370; Ibn Sa‘d, Tabākāt, ed. Sachau, III/i. 27 sq. = Ibn al-Athir, Usl al-Ghamāh, ii. 224 = Ibn Ḥaddār, al-Jāba, ii. 45 = Sprenger, Das Leben u. die Lehre der Propheten Mohammed, i. 401, also Yākūt, op. cit., iv. 49); Bahrawī (al-Bahrawī, Futūḥ al-Balūd, ed. de Goeje, p. 283 = Ibn al-Fakhr, al-Balūd, in Bibl. Geogr. Arab., v. 182 sq.), Ghassān (Hamza al-Iṣbaḥānī, Tārīkh, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 121, where ḥānā‘ l-khayr bn should be read for ḥānā‘ l-khayr bn), Ghātafān (Aḥānī, ii. 194), etc. At Mu‘a‘, on the Yarmūk (Hieromax) and perhaps also at Fihl, they fought in alliance with other Kūfī tribes and the Lakhm and Dhu‘aym under the banner of the Byzantines, whose authority was recognised more or less by all the Arab tribes camped along the frontiers of Syria (Ibn Hisām, Sirā, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 792; al-Mas‘ūdī, op. cit., i. 161, 223; Nau, LXXI, i. 171; al-Jawharī, Futūḥ al-Shām, ed. Lees, i. 97, 114; Cauwius de Perceval, op. cit., iii. 212; Sprenger, Das Leben u. die Lehre, i. 292, note 2; Caetani, op. cit., II/i. 83, III/i. 206 etc.). In al-Ta’barī, op. cit., i. 1872 Sa‘īf b. ‘Omar says that the wave of apostacy which swept over almost all Arabia on the death of the Prophet, also affected the Banu l-Kain (cf. Cauwius de Perceval, op. cit., i. 345, 352 and Caetani, op. cit., II/i. 583, 585). From this statement it may be deduced that our tribe had become subject to the state of Medina while the Prophet was still alive; but it does not appear to me to be quite credible. In the civil war between Marwān I and ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair we naturally find the Banu l-Kain as South Arabsians on the side of the former (al-Ta’barī, op. cit., ii. 478; al-Mas‘ūdī, al-Tanbih wa l-lithrā‘, in Bibl. Geogr. Arab., vii. 308, etc.) and on the occasion of the rising of Bahūl b. Bishr Khaṭārab in 119 = 737 we again find them in the pay of the Umayyads (al-Ta’barī, op. cit., ii. 1623 sq. and Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil fi l-Tārīkh, v. 156). They again play a prominent part in the Damascus troubles of 176 (792) in the reign of Harūn al-Raśīd, in which they and Kaisīs (Nisārīs) fought against the other Yemenis (Ibn al-Athīr, op. cit., vi. 87 sq.). They then disappear from our knowledge.

According to Nawāsīn’s Shams al-‘Ulamā’ Lūkānān was a slave of the Banu-l-Kain, who flourished about 600 a. d. (see Guidi, Tabāl αλφάμ, υπό Kιταβ al-Aspā, p. 417; Ibn Ḥaṭib, Kita’b al-Shārī‘ wa l-Shu‘ārā‘, ed. de Goeje, p. 229 sq.; Ibn Duraq, op. cit., p. 317; Ibn Khallikān, Wafayat al-‘Uyūn, Bulāq 1299, i. 18 and Hamāsā, loc. cit., p. 558; — wrongly in Wustenfeld, Genealog. Tabālām, Tab. 2, 24 and Register, p. 441, who has misunderstood the passage in the Hamāsā).

H. Ewald (Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, i. 337) has with all reserve connected the Old Testament Kayin (Kain) (see Kayin) with the Kainites (Kain, Kp, ‘Hm) with our Kain. Nüccoli has followed him at first only as a possible hypothesis but later, with more confidence (Über die Amalekiter, op. cit., p. 634 sq., Zöllner, d. Deutch. Morgenl. Gelehr. XL, 181 and in Cheyne and Black’s Encycl. Bibl., i. 130. The Kainites were settled in the south of Palestine in the ancient Negeb, the later Idumaea, this would actually be the region where we find the Yathrib. Besides, the Kainites were obviously nomads like the Balkain (Stade, Zittsch., d. Allt. d. alttest. Apost. Wiss., xxv. 287 and Sayce, Early Israel and the Surrou. Nations, p. 91 sqq., and do in Hasting’s Dict. of the Bible, s. v. Kainites recognise in them the name — see above — a tribe of smiths; but they fail to give their readers any postulate that they were such in historical times. Stade’s identification, following Wellhausen, Die Komposition des Hexateuchs, p. 309, of the Kainites with Cain, the brother of Abel, op. cit., p. 285 sqq., which Ed. Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarn, p. 395 sqq., Procksch, Die Völker Altertums, Vol. I, p. 2 of Das Land der Bibel, p. 37 etc. have adopted, I consider, with Noldeke, Encycl. Bibl., loc. cit., very problematic). But the two coincidences mentioned do not yet justify us in identifying the Kainites with the Balkain. The Kainites disappear from literature with the Exile (with the exception of the Rēḥābītes, whose inclusion in the Kayin is, however, not absolutely certain). They may nevertheless have continued to exist. But that so small a clan, which never appears as completely autonomous in the Old Testament should have continued to exist for a millennium after the Exile and at the end of this period still possess considerable strength and prosperity, — even as the result of incorporating other tribes — I consider a very daring assumption. The name Kain besides was obviously not at all a rare one (see Wustenfeld, Register zu den Genz. Tabellen, p. 371, Lizdharski, Handbuch der nordiszeitlichen Epigraphik, p. 362, also Lkk., Zur Entstehung d. thum. Inschriften, p. 45). Cf. thereon Ed. Meyer, op. cit., p. 399.


(K. Fischer)

KAINUKĀ (BANU‘), one of the three Jewish tribes of Yathrib. The name differs from the usual forms of Arabic proper names but at the same time has nothing Hebrew about its type. Nothing certain is known regarding their immigration into Yathrib. They possessed no land there but lived by trading. That their personal names known to us are not of the most part Arabic says as little regarding their origin as the occurrence of Biblical names among them. But there seem to be no valid reasons for doubting their Jewish origin.

In Yathrib they lived in the south-west part of the town, near the Muyallā and close to the bridge over the Wādī Bahrān, where they occupied two of the castles (ṣāfīm), characteristic of Yathrib. They practised the goldsmith’s art among other trades; al-Bukhārī (Fard al-Khum, Bāb I) incidentally mentions a goldsmith of the Kainukā. On their expulsion they left behind them arms and tools, which were divided among the Muslims after Muhammad had received his fifth share. The number of their fully equipped fighting men varies in the references to it between 400 and 750.
After the dominating power in the old Yahrib had passed from the Jews to the Bani Ka'b, the Kainukā were in alliance with the Khazraj [q. v.]. In Muhammad's settlement of the relations of believers and other sections of the community they are not mentioned by the name of their tribe any more than the Nadr [q. v.] and Kuraiz[a] [q. v.]." but are described as "Jews of the Nadrā, Hārūkh, Sā'da and Djiham" [articles 26—29] i.e. allies of different subdivisions of the Khazraj.

After the battle of Badr (Ramadan 2 H. = March 624) Muhammad's relations with the Jews of Medina became troubled. The Jews as a body had adopted an unfriendly attitude to the Prophet. From the religious point of view therefore they became inconvenient; and from the political side, as a powerful foreign body within the just converted town, they were a great danger. When Muhammad felt his position strengthened by the battle of Badr, the idea of expelling his enemies must soon have entered his head. The Kainukā as they lived in the city itself, were those he wished to be rid of first. With this description of the situation, his attack on the Kainukā (in all probability as early as Shawwal 2 H. = April 624) is sufficiently explained. What the Muslim writers give as special reasons for the attack has hardly more than anecdotal value. Sometimes it is said to have been a jest that a Muslim made to a Jewish woman, sometimes the Kainukā are said to have behaved with particular arrogance. Sūra iii. 10 sqq. and viii. 60 sqq. are said to refer to these incidents. Sūra iii. 11 refers to the victory at Badr as an example and warning, and viii. 60 speaks of vengeance as people, from whom treachery is feared.

After a fourteen days' siege, the Kainukā surrendered without striking a blow; the men were bound and seemed to have to fear the worst. The energetic intervention of 'Abd Allah b. Ubayy, chief of the Khazraj and leader of the Munāfi- Kenneth, however, affected an amelioration of their lot. They departed first to the Jewish colonies in the Wādi 'l-Kūrā, north of Medina, and from there they went to Adhrā`īt in Syria.


AL-KAIRĀWĀN (French Kairouan) a town in Tunisia, 112 miles south of Tunis and 40 west of Susa to which it is joined by a railway; it lies in 35° 40' N. Lat. and 10° 2' E. Long. (Greenwich). The population in 1910 was 22,000 including 800 foreigners of whom 500 were French.

Kairawan lies 250 feet above sea-level in the middle of a great plain traversed by the Wādi Zerūd and the Wādi Marguellil, which ultimately disappear in sebkhas or salt lakes. These rivers are subject to sudden floods, which sometimes transform the environs of the town into a lake extending up to the foot of the walls. When the rains have been sufficiently abundant, the soil yields a rich harvest; al-Bakrī mentions that in the western part called "Pahṣ al-Darrāra", the grain sown is sometimes returned a hundredfold. But usually the ground, lacking trees or herbaceous vegetation, and covered with salt efflorescence, gives the country a desert appearance. The temperature shows considerable variations (24.8° in winter and 120.2° in summer). The rainfall is not heavy (14.5 inches per annum) and therefore running waters and springs are scarce, so that the inhabitants have to use cisterns to collect their drinking-water.

Kairwan really consists of two towns, the city proper surrounded by a battlemented wall of brick, flanked with buttresses and round towers as well as a qāṣa, 3350 yards round, and secondly a vast faubourg stretching to N. and N.W., the faubourg of the Zias (Qīlās) so called from the popular name of the tribe occupying the neighbouring country. To the south finally there has grown up a little European quarter. The interior of the town is a network of narrow and tortuous streets. Commerce and industry are fairly busy, although Kairwan has lost much of its economic importance. The principal industries, which, it may be added, are of the nature of home-industries, are the manufacture of carpets, which occupies a thousand looms and that of woolen blankets. The working of leather (saddle-making, shoe-making) for which the artisans of Kairwan were at one time very famous, and that of copper, are still followed by several hundred workers. The importance of Kairwan in the past is particularly shown by the number of religious edifices to be seen in it. The principal is the great mosque of Sidi ʿOṯkā, one of the largest buildings in North Africa, the foundation of which dates back to that of the city itself. Among the others may be mentioned the Mosque of Sidi Sāḥib (vulgo ʿṢahab, Mosque of the Barber) dating from the first century A. H., but rebuilt and extended in the xvith century A. D. the mosque of the Three Gates (Djāmilīa Thiba Bišām), contemporaneous with the preceding, the Madrasa Sidi ʿAbīd al-Gharyānī (xvith century A. D.), the Mosque of the Sabres (Djāmilī Amār Abba), finished in 1871. The oldest mosques, for the building of which were used materials from Hadrumetum (Susa) and even from Carthage, show an interesting mixture of Byzantine and Oriental influences. The latter are clearly seen in the decorative motifs (faience, woodwork) analogous to those of Tirās and Baghdad. The more recent buildings show examples, sometimes remarkable, of wooden ceilings in compartments, arabesques cut in plaster showing Hispano-Moorish inspiration. We may add that the buildings of the xvith and xvinth centuries often reveal the intervention of European architects and workmen, especially Italians.

History: The foundation of Kairawan dates from the Arab conquest. The town was in fact built by ʿOṯkā b. Nāf in 59 (670) to give his troops a base of operations and depot for supplies and also to keep in awe the Berber tribes. "I intend," the historian al-Nuwairī makes him say, "to build a town which can serve as a depot of arms (Kairawān) for Islam to the end of time" (al-Nuwairī in Ibn Khaldūn, Hist. des Berbères, transl.
Kairwan was built on — or very near — the site of a small Roman town called Kāmidāh or Kammūnīa, the materials of which were used by the Arabs. The site of the new town, two days' journey from the shore, had been chosen to put the Muslims out of danger from an attack by the Byzantines, who still held the towns on the coast. 'O większość first of all built a mosque, the palace of the government, then houses for his soldiers as well as a wall 2750 yards long. Legend was not long in embellishing this foundation with marvellous tales. The site of Kairwan was, it was related, covered with imperishable thickets inhabited by deer and reptiles which disappeared at 'Oência's command. A vision revealed to the conqueror the exact position of the ḥabl and of the miḥrāb of the mosque, and the existence of a spring indispensable for the inhabitants, etc. The buildings were hardly completed when 'Oência was disdained and called back to the East (55 = 675). His successor Dinār Abu l-Muhādīj hastened to destroy Kairwan and built a new town called Takroun or Takrīn two miles to the North. Restored to the favour of the Caliph and sent back to Africa, 'Oência rebuilt Kairwan on the original site.

Kairwan was henceforth the capital of Muslim Africa and the residence of the Arab governors, but during the century which followed the death of 'Oência it had to submit to numerous vicissitudes. After the rising of Kusā'il it was occupied by the Berbers and remained for four years in their power (64 = 684 — 688). During the Khārijī rising it was taken and pillaged by the Wafārdjīma (159 = 756 — 757), who committed such excesses there that the population scattered over the surrounding country. At the end of fourteen months, the Abādī Abu l-Khaḍījīq [q. v.], chief of the Hūvarā [q. v.], drove out the Wafārdjīma and entrusted the government of the town to 'Abd al-Ra'yān b. Rūstam [q. v.] (145 = 758/9). In 145 = 762/3 Ibn Aḥbāṣ was victorious over the Khārijīs and re-established the seat of the government at Kairwan. He endeavoured to repair the damage done by the Berbers, and to protect the town from a new attack he surrounded it with a wall of brick, 12 cubits thick. These precautions did not, however, prevent the Abādī tribes under the command of Abū Ḥātim [q. v.] from laying siege to Kairwan (154 = 771) in which the governor 'Omar b. Ḥaṣāf, who had escaped from Ṭobna, was shut up. After the death of 'Omar, who had been killed during the siege, his successor Dīmāl (or Hamīd) b. Šakr capitulated and opened the gates to the enemy. There were, however, no massacres. The inhabitants were allowed to go free, and content to demolish the fortifications. The Khārijī occupation was of short duration. By 155 = 772, 'Abd b. Ḥātim, victorious over the heretics, had taken Kairwan again. He rebuilt the great mosque, had bazaars built for each trade-guild and earned the title of second founder of the city (al-Nu'wair).

Under the Aghlabīds (800-999 A. D.) Kairwan underwent considerable expansion and reached the zenith of its prosperity. The princes of the dynasty vied with each other in enriching the town with rich monuments and multiplied the works of public utility. Ziyādāt Allāh I and Ibrahīm built waterworks and cisterns to secure the town's supply of drinking water, for the reservoirs built for the purpose in the time of the Caliph Hishām had become insufficient. "The largest and most useful of these reservoirs", says al-Bakrī, "is circular in form and of enormous size. In the centre rises an octagonal tower covered by a pavilion with four doors. A long series of arcades of arches resting one upon the other ends on the south side of this reservoir". These waterworks have not completely disappeared and one of the reservoirs restored by French engineers is still called the "reservoir of the Aghlabīds". The great mosque was rebuilt from top to bottom. The primitive edifice built by 'Oência had already been destroyed by Ḥasan b. al-Numān [q. v.] who had rebuilt it and adorned it with pillars of marble which, without doubt, came from the ruins of Carthage. Soon becoming too small, the mosque was again enlarged in 105 = 723/724, then entirely rebuilt with the exception of the miḥrāb in the time of Yazīd b. Ḥātim (155 = 772). Ziyādāt Allāh I in his time had the whole building taken down including the miḥrāb, which was enclosed between two walls so as to be preserved without being seen except through a narrow grill, and replaced it by the present mosque. According to al-Bakrī, 80,000 mithqāls (about £320,000) were expended on this work. Ibrahīm b. Aḥmad completed the work of Ziyādāt Allāh; he lengthened the principal building and built above the nave shutting on the miḥrāb a cupola called Khabat Bīb al-Baww (the cupola of the gate of the pavilion), 220 cubits long, 150 broad, divided into 17 naves by 414 columns, the great mosque could rival the most famous monuments of the East. Other religious buildings restored in the same period also claimed the attention of visitors, like the Mosque of the Three Gates, the Mosque of Sidī Ṣāḥib (Mosque of the Barber), the Mosque of the Anṣār, which according to the legend was built even before the arrival of 'Oência by one of the companions of the Prophet, Ruiwāfī b. Ṭāhibīt, and the Mosque of Ismā'īl b. ʿOibād al-Anṣārī.

Outside the town rose the royal residences, Kāṣr al-Kadīm and al-Raḳīdā. Kāṣr al-Kadīm, also called al-ʿAbbāṣiyā, was built in 184 = 800, 3 miles S. E. of Kairwan by Ibrahīm b. Aḥlabī, who settled there under the protection of his negro guard and made it the seat of government. It is the "Castle of the Moat", where were received the ambassadors of Charlemagne. Around the palace there grew up a town provided with baths, caravanserais and bazaars and surrounded by a wall with five gates. Al-Bakrī mentions in it a mosque flanked by a cylindrical minaret ornamented with seven tiers of columns. Some distance off was another castle called Banū Ṣafā. Al-Raḳīdā, four miles S. W., was a creation of Ibrahīm b. Aḥmad (265 = 876/877). This prince built here in a place celebrated for the purity of its air, a castle around which grew up an important town with bazaars and baths. It measured 24,000 cubits in circumference but enclosed large areas filled with parks and gardens.

A venerated sanctuary and capital of a powerful state, Kairwan was also a great commercial city. The shops of the merchants stood on either side of a covered street about two miles in length. It was also a city of learning. The teaching of Ḍaṭhātī law was particularly honoured. Celebrated professors like Asād b. al-Furāṭ [q. v.], Ibn Rashīd
and Şahîn had numerous pupils there. The teaching of medicine was equally flourishing. The Jew ʿIsḥāq b. Imrān, physician to Ziyādat Allāh II and his pupil ʿIsḥāq b. Sulaymān founded a regular school there.

This prosperity did not end with the Aghlabid dynasty; it continued under the Fātimids and the early Zirids, although the Mahdi ʿUbayd Allāh, after living some time at Raʾil Ḫāda, had moved the seat of government to al-Mahdiya. The town suffered a great deal, however, from the revolt of Abū Yazīd [q.v.], "the man with the ass." The Nakkāris captured it in 333 = 944 and pillaged it in spite of the appeals of the notables and scholars who had come to implore the clemency of the conqueror. But in 334 = 946, the Caliph Ismāʿīl retook Kairwan and after having defended the Khāṭrigūs built some distance away the town of Sabra to which he gave the name of al-Manṣūriyya, in memory of his victory over Abū Yazīd, and in which he established his residence (337 = 949). His successor al-Muʿizz moved to al-Manṣūriyya the headquaters and factories of Kairwan to the great dissatisfaction of the inhabitants.

The new town was surrounded by a wall with five gates of which the principal, Ṭātāf al-Fatūḥ (gate of conquest) was used by the sovereign when he took the field at the head of his army. The town of Raʾil Ḫāda on the other hand abandoned by its inhabitants and half destroyed by the Nakkāris was razed to the ground. The gardens alone were spared. During all this period Kairwan and al-Manṣūriyya still had a very active economic life. The manufacture of carpets, of woollen and cotton goods flourished there. Cultivated land and orchards extended round the town. The wealth of the inhabitants is evidenced by the fact that the agents of the Fātimids were able to exact from them 400,000 dinars on a single occasion. According to al-Bakrī, the taxes levied each day at one of the gates of al-Manṣūriyya amounted to 26,000 dirhems (about £ 600). The people of Kairwan, however, complained of the tyranny of the Fātimids and the bulk of them remained attached to orthodox. Their hostility showed itself in serious bloodshed under the earlier Zirids. In 407 (1017–18) 3,000 Shiʿis were massacred in a rising and the town of al-Manṣūriyya was pillaged by the populace. Al-Muʿizz's break with the Fātimids was therefore received with enthusiasm by the people of Kairwan.

This act of rebellion let loose on Ifriqiya the Hilālī invasion of which Kairwan very soon felt the disastrous results. After the defeat of Haiderān, al-Muʿizz ordered his soldiers to evacuate the town; they sacked it first of all and he withdrew to al-Manṣūriyya. He then rebuilt the walls of Kairwan on a length of 22,000 cubits and joined Kairwan to al-Manṣūriyya by two walls half a mile apart (444 = 1052). In spite of these precautions the attacks of the Hilālīs became more and more serious. Kairwan was abandoned by a part of the population and in 449 = 1057, al-Muʿizz decided to evacuate al-Manṣūriyya and retire to al-Mahdiya. The Arabs then entered the town and wrought the most frightful havoc. "They destroyed all the beauty and all the splendour of the monuments of Kairwan. Nothing that the Şahînīs princes had left in their palaces escaped the greed of the brigands. All that there was in the town was carried off or destroyed," ( Ibn Khaldūn, Hist. des Berbères, transl. de Slane, i. 37). The inhabitants were scattered in all directions, "some went to Egypt, others to Sicily and Spain; a considerable body to Fās." (ʿAbd al-Wāḥīd al-Maʿrūkūshī al-Maʾṣūrī Ṭābilī al-Maṣḥūrī, ed. Dozy, ii. 259).

The capital of Ifriqiya never recovered from this disaster. Pillaged again in 1060 by the Huwārīs, its possession disputed between the Zirids and the governor, the ʿAml Ibn Mānūnī, who tried to set up in it for his own benefit an independent principality with the support of the Ḥamānīs, Kairwan remained under the domination of the Arabs and defenceless against the exactions of the nomads. "The latter levy contributions on everything; the inhabitants are few in number, their trade and industries in a miserable condition" (al-Idrīsī, transl. de Goeje, p. 129). Stayed for a time in the reign of ʿAbd al-Muʿṣīnī, who restored the town in part, its decline continued its rapid course under his successors and under the Ḥafsids as a result of the continued troubles of Ifriqiya was the theatre. At the end of the xvith century A.D. the town was almost deserted; its only inhabitants were the peasants who sought shelter there. It was gradually repopulated, but it was still very wretched at the beginning of the xvith century A.D. "The inhabitants," writes Leo Africanus who visited Kairwan in 922 (1516), "are at present all poor artisans, of whom some are curriers of the skins of sheep and goats, the others furriers whose handiwork is sold in the cities of Numidia, where no European cloth is to be had. But of all these trades there is not one which is able to make a good livelihood and those who follow them live a miserable existence and are in very great poverty." Ill-treated by the rulers of Tunis, the people of Kairwan were in an almost continual state of revolt. They even definitely threw off the authority of the Ḥafsids when the latter had accepted the Spanish protectorate after the capture of Tunis by Charles V in 1535 and recognized as chief the Marabout Sīdī ʿArīf of the tribe of Shāhība. In spite of the Spaniards Mulây Ḥasan could not dispose of this pretender, who was supported by the Arab tribes and the Turks of the corsair Dragut. His successor ʿAlī ʿĀlibī was no more fortunate. Under Turkish rule Kairwan felt the repercussion of all the troubles of the xvith century A.D. In 1701 the Bey Murād, to punish a rising of the inhabitants, destroyed the walls and the houses and only left the mosques and zāwiyas standing. On the other hand Ḥusain b. ʿAlī, founder of the Ḥusainid dynasty made great efforts to raise Kairwan from its ruins. He reconstructed the fortified wall round it and restored over fifty mosques, according to the author of the chronicle al-Maṭrār al-Mālikī (French transl. by V. Serres and Muḥammad Lasram, Tunis 1900). He had a "bardo" there, where he used to stay while his troops were going through the Djerid to collect the taxes. The inhabitants showed their gratitude to the Bey by supporting him vigorously against his nephew ʿAlī ʿĀsha, who could only capture Kairwan, where ʿAlī Ḥasān had taken refuge after a five years' siege (1735–1740). The town was once more razed by the victor, but it was rebuilt and, according to Desfontaines, was in 1784 "the largest town of the kingdom next to Tunis and even better built and less filthy than it".
Trade and industry were quite busy there and the people were exempt from taxes in return for the fidelity of their ancestors to the Bey Husain. Kairwan had also preserved its character as a place of sanctity and the inhabitants were very hostile to Christians. Very few Europeans, among whom were Peyssonnel, Shaw and Desfontaines had been able to visit the town. The fanaticism of the inhabitants persisted down to the end of the sixteenth century. After the signing of the treaty of Bardo (1881) which placed Tunisia under the protectorate of France, Kairwan was one of the centres of native resistance. To put an end to this, three columns under the supreme command of General Saussier set out from Tebessa, Tunis and Susa and united before the walls of the town. It was occupied without fighting on October 29, 1881.


KAIS, a little island in the Persian Gulf, in that part of it which the mediaeval Arab geographers call the "sea of Omáin" in 54° E. Long. (Greenw.) and 26° 50' N. Lat. Kais, which next to Kishm [q. v.] may now very well be considered the most important of the Persian islands of the Gulf, is about 10 miles long and five broad; it is separated from the mainland by a strait about 12 miles wide, which affords a very secure passage. Apart from a few rocky places, the island is quite flat; it is better cultivated than most of the islands of the Persian Gulf. The mediaeval Arab and Persian geographers make special mention of its prosperous condition, noting particularly its wealth in trees (mainly date-palms) and refer to the cultivated fields, gardens and cisterns. Besides agriculture, navigation and trade, the then fairly numerous population of the island was also engaged in the pearl-fishery; for the latter see the remarks in Ibn Khuradhdhibh, Yākūt, al-Dimashqī, Iḥād Allāh Mustawfi and Ibn Baiṭūja [op. cit.]

The name Kais is an Arabicised form of the Persian Kīs (the form Kīs is also found; see al-Dimashqī, *op. cit.*). In the Portuguese and Dutch authors of the xvth and xviith centuries we find forms like QUSI, QUES, CAEZ or QUECHE, QAS, GUES etc.; cf. Vincent and Tomasek, *op. cit.*. Arab authors (on the other hand Schäffli, *op. cit.*, p. 150) can be maintained. Could Kenna, the Khain of Ibn Khuradhdhibh (p. 62, 1), be the earlier name of another island near Kais, perhaps of the island of Farūr (east of Kais)?: See Schwarz, Iran, etc., p. 87. The circumstance that an Arab prince named Kais b. 'Umarra took possession of the island of Kish — it was henceforth occasionally called Dżazirat Kais b. 'Umarra or Bani 'Umarra, see Yākūt, i. 503; ii. 711, 8 — may have affected the arabisation of the old name. The latter itself does not, however, date only from the Arab chief just mentioned, as Ibn al-Balkhi, *op. cit.*, thinks, but goes back into the pre-Muḥāammadan period, for we find Kish already mentioned in the Sassanian period, as one of the seven bishoprics of the Nestorian ecclesiastical province of Perzis; for this reference to Kish about the middle of the sixth century in Syriac literature, see Guidi in the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Gesellsch., xlix. 413; Chabot, *Synodicon orientale* (Paris 1902), p. 680; Sachau, *Zur Ausbreitung des Christentums in der Persien* (= Abh. der Berlin. Akad., 1919, Nr. 1), p. 38. In the Historiae Samaritanae, *op. cit.*, the classical literature the island is only twice mentioned: in Arrian's *Indica* (37, 8) under the form Kardin and in Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, vi. 110) as Aphrodiasia; cf. Vincent, *op. cit.*, Ritter, viii. 774, xii. 458 and Pauly-Wissowa, *Realens. der klass. Altertumswiss.*, i. 2727 (s. v. Aphrodiasia, No. 7) and x. 2462 (Karim). Perhaps we have in a Karin or a Kar the prototype of Kish (Kish).

In the Muḥāammadan period, Kais formed a part of the province of Ardaghir Kharrā in Fars. It was only in the later middle ages that the town attained greater importance, when, as already mentioned, a prince of South Arabian origin captured it, built a fleet there and gradually began to extend his power. After the capture of Shirāft, which then enjoyed great prosperity as the main staple of the Persian-Indian-Chinese trade, the Arab dynasty of Kais rose under the last Būyids in the first half of the xth (xii) century to unlimited control of the whole Persian Gulf. This Shirāft, which was previously often regarded wrongly as a town on the coast near the island of Kais — actually confused with Kais by Ibn Baiṭūja (ii. 244, 3) — lay much further to the north; the ruins of this famous commercial
centre are near the village of Tāḥrift (north of Rās Nīḥbend, in 27° 40' N. Lat. and 52° 30' E. Long. Greenwich; cf. Schwarz, op. cit., p. 59 sq. and the article sīrāf). Sirāf gradually became more and more deserted under the suzerainty of the princes of Kāis, as they diverted the very consider- able trade and shipping from the captured Persian seaport to their own island. They also extended their sway over several other districts of the mainland opposite the island of Kāis. Their predecessors in the occupation of this strip of land had been a South Arabian tribe, the Bānū 'U- mārā; cf. their territory, the so-called Sīf 'Umārah (the 'Umārah-coast), Schwarz, op. cit., p. 77 sq. 76. In the little town of Ḥūzū there, a little dynasty of a family of the Bānū 'Umārā, of whom coins still survive, ruled before the coming of the ruling house of Kāis; cf. v. Bergmann in the Nasim. Zeitchr. (Vienna), viii. 38—39 and Tiesenhausen in the Revue, N. S., Belge, 1857, p. 337; Ḥūzū (probably the modern Gīrū) and Sāwīyā (reading uncertain, probably the modern Tāwūnāh), both almost opposite Kāis (in the N.W. or N.E. of it), were the most important ports of the inland-rulers on the mainland. On Ḥūzū and Sāwīyā see Ibn al-Balkhī, Fārsīnām, p. 141; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, Nuzhat al-Khitūbī, text p. 120, transl. p. 118; G. le Strange, The Land of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 257. A caravan route from Sirāf ended in Ḥūzū, the more important of these two towns; cf. Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, p. 185, 16, 186, 7. The same author (p. 171, 179, 184, 5, 186, 11 sq.) also gives the routes and distances from Kāis to Baṣra, to Sulṭānīya and to the islands of Sarandīb (Ceylon) via Ḥormūz. Most of the smaller islands near Kāis likewise became sub- ject to the rulers of the latter, for example Dījkāsak (probably the modern Lārēk in the strait of Ḥormūz), where, according to Yākūt ii. 9, 7, the “king” of Kāis maintained a garrison celebrated for its sea- mateship; see also Dījkāsak, i. 1025. At its period of greatest power, the dynasty of Kāis also ruled over the opposite coast on the Arabian side (district of Ḫūmān), where they are called by Yākūt and al-Dīmāḡī “the lords of Ḫūmān.” The journey of the Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela falls within the period of Kāis’s prosperity (second half of the twelfth century). He notes with admiration the rich market of the island, whose chief business consisted in the exchange of Indian and Persian manufactures and produce; see the edition of the Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela by Grünhut (transl. Jerusalem 1903), p. 77 sq. The Jewish traveller wrongly gives the island, which he calls Kīsh, much too large an area; but there can be no doubt that he refers not to Kīshm (so Grünhut, op. cit., and Asher in his edition, ii. 175 sq.), but to our Kāis. Benjamin of Tudela says that there were 500 Jewish families settled on the island. There must, of course, have also been a number of Persians living there. The bulk of the inhabitants, however, in the middle ages (as it is still the case to-day) were not Persians but Arabs who were the chief settlers on most of the islands of the Persian side of the Gulf. The Venetian Marco Polo (Travels, Book i. Chap. 7, iii. Chap. 44) of the second half of the xiiith century knows Kāis under the name Kīsh (in Ital. orthography: Chisi) as a place of call for ships sailing from Babylon to India. The decline of Kāis was caused by the com- mercial rise of the little kingdom of Ḥomūz [q. v.], also under an Arab dynasty. Even under the Sālīdāk prince Malīk Dīnār of Kermān (582—591 = 1186—1194) the ruler of Kāis of that time had vainly endeavoured to get Ḥormūz on the mainland from the latter in return for a yearly tribute; see Muḥammad ibn Rūshd, Tawārikh Al Sālīdākī, ed. Houtsma, Leiden 1886, p. 160, 5 sq.; Zeitchr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, xxix. 395. Further information on the relations of Kāis with Ḥormūz is given in the Relazioni (1616) of the Portuguese Teixeira; the book contains from a Persian source a fairly full history of the kingdom of Ḥormūz; see W. F. Sinclair, The Travels of F. Teixeira, (= Hakluyt Society, Ser. 2, vol. ix., London 1902), p. 161 sq., 169 sq., 183 sq., 259 sq. and cf. Schwarz in the Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., lxviii. 531 sq. and Ḥormūz, ii. 325 sq. According to Teixeira (op. cit., lxviii. 534; cf. Ritter, viii. 777) about 750 (1300) the then king of Ḥormūz obtained from Nūṣā’īm of Kāis by purchase the island of Djarānī which lay opposite his capital. A few years later, he moved his residence to this island, which offered more protection; cf. above i. 694 sq., ii. 325 sq.). This New-Ḥormūz, thanks to its favourable position near the narrowest part of the Gulf, soon began to compete vigorously with the rulers of Kāis and attracted more and more of the trade with India to itself. This led to long wars and feuds between the two kingdoms, which filled a great part of their history. For a time Kāis was actually under Ḥormūz. In the end Kāis completely lost its previous dominating position as the chief emporium of the Persian Gulf. Ḥormūz now took its place and from the tenth century to its capture by Shāh ‘Abbās I in 1622 formed a great centre of international commerce. Its place was in turn taken by Bendar ‘Abbāsī [q. v.], which had to give pride of place to Būšīr [q. v.] after the middle of the xviiith century; the latter is now the most important trading port on the Persian Gulf. In the latter middle ages the commercial centre of gravity within the Persian Gulf thus gradually shifted from north to south (Sirāf-Kāis-Hormūz) and returned in modern times to the north, although less adapted by nature. We know little of the later history of Kāis. When the islanders became dissatisfied with their rulers, they finally called in the help of the governor of Sirāf and as a result of his intervention Kāis became permanently incorporated in Persia. According to Schlafli, who spent 14 days on the island in 1862, there are 8 little settlements on it; he estimated the number of the inhabitants (Arabs and 1/10 Susahe negro slaves) at 2500—5000.


As to the connection between al-Kaïs and the frequent personal and not uncommon tribal name Kaïs (see Wüstenfeld, *Register zu den General Tabellen der arabis. Stämme u. Familien*; the indices to Ibn Duraid, *al-ʿIltikāf*; ed. Wüstenfeld, al-Taṭari, *Taṭarik*, ed. de Goeje, Caetani, *Annali dell’ Islam*, ii. ii. and vi., *Nabat. Dżastr wa l-ʿFarasād*, ed. Bevan; Gualdi, *Tabul. alphabet. d. Kitāb al-ʿAsnī*, s. e., etc., and note also the cabalistic personnal name *Nabūt* Lidzbarski, *op. cit.*, p. 363 and Cook, *op. cit.*, p. 104), as well as the personal name ‘Abd Kaïs (Nāḏrī yu’l-lāhī) and *Dżastr wa l-ʿFarasād*, Indices, s. v.; Ibn Duraid, *op. cit.*, p. 138, 275; Wüstenfeld, *Register*, p. 30; Ibn al-ʿAthir, *Usd al-Ǧābīa*, i. 137; Ibn Ḥadjar, *Iṣbā*, i. 987; no definite statement can be made. But at any rate we should not, as has always been done hitherto, overlook the fact that Kaïs always has the article (which the Nabat. *Nabūt* also shows) in the nevertheless in all probability theophoric form Imru’ al-Kaïs as well as in the tribal name ‘Abd al-Kaïs, while in the personal and tribal name Kaïs and in the personal name ‘Abd Kaïs it is as regularly found without the article. (That the poet ‘Abd Kaïs b. Khuṭaf, *Aghānī*, i. 165, *Hamāsa*, loc. cit., p. 352 and *Liṣān al-ʿArab*, ii. 206 appears as ‘Abd al-Kaïs b. Khuṭaf may be due to an error; see Muskhādiyya, *al-Layl*, Nl. xcvii. sq., ed. Cairo, ii. 85 sq. and Aghānī, vii. 148, 152 sq.). I would consider Kaïs, as opposed to the god’s name al-Kaïs, as a simple personal name. Wellhausen sees in it the god’s name before which the concept ‘Abd has disappeared (op. cit., p. 8). But he does not tell us why in this contraction the article of the name of the god should also have been dropped. W. Robertson Smith (Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, p. 239) had practically anticipated Wellhausen.

Halevy (*Essai sur les inscriptions du Soudan, in the Journal asiatique, 1882*, p. 321, Wellhausen (*loc. cit.*, p. 67) and Gotthelf (*On Nāḏrī m. Nūḥ & Nūḥ*, *Journal of Bibl. Literature*, xvii. 200) have identified our deity with the Edomite god Kaïs, Kōs, Kaush or Kōsh (on the latter see especially Schrader,
Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament, 3rd edition, revised by Zimmern and Winckler, p. 472 sq. and W. Robertson Smith, op. cit., p. 31). I consider the identity of the two to be exceedingly improbable. The comparisons of Kais with another Edomite god, the Keš of Josephus, are, of course, utterly untenable (Keš = Arab. Kasaḥ, see Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 67, St. 51 sq. and 75 sq.; Zimmern, d. Deutsch, Morgenl. Gesetzleh., xli. 1714; Lagarde, Symmica, i. 121, note 1; Gotthell, op. cit., p. 201, etc. and cf. Thamud. and Nabat. d. Morgenl. Zeitgesch., zur Entstehung der chamudischen Inschriften, in Mitt. d. Vorderasiat. Gesellsch., 1904, i. 46; Lidzbarski, op. cit., p. 362; Cook, op. cit., p. 104), as well as the identification with the Nabataean χας (on this cf. Lidzbarski, op. cit., p. 364; Cook, op. cit., p. 105), with the Semitic deity (χας) Kānas (on this see Drexler, in W. Roscher’s Ausführliche Lexikon der griech. u. röm. Mythologie, Col. 970 sqq.) and with χας Nahum, i. De Vogüé, Syrie Centrale, Inscriptions sémitégiques, p. 105; H. Derenburg, Le poste antislamique Ilmnough ‘I-Kais et le dieu arabe al-Kais, in Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes Études, Sciences religieuses, Vol. vii.: Études de critique et d’histoire, 2nd Series, p. 122; Gotthell, loc. cit., p. 201 sqq. etc.) On the other hand the name Kais perhaps appears in χας (Seeptug, Kais) i. Sam., ix. 1, 3 etc. and the appellative Kais in χας (Seeptug., Cod. Vat. Koaçu, Cod. Alex. Koaçu) i. Chron, vi. 29 = χας (to be read χας; Seeptug., Cod. Vat. Koaçu, Cod. Alex. and Luc. Koaçu) i. Chron., xv. 17.


Kais’Allān (Kais’Allān, one of the largest and most powerful tribal groups of northern Arabia in ancient times. Name. For Kais’Allān we often find also Kais b. Allān, most frequently Kais alone (in the poetry occasionally also simply ‘Allān, see Nakhlād Dārūr wa ‘l-Farasad, ed. Bevan, iii. Index iii. s.v.; the “Kaisites” are naturally called al-Kaisiyūn, but as an ethnopolitical group more usually al-Kaisiya, see al-Tabarî, Ta’rīkh, ed. de Goeje, i. 66, 150, 777, 1014, 1663, etc.; the nisba to Kais’Allān or Kais b. Allān is, however, ‘Allān, see al-Samʿānī’s Anāba, p. 404b and Ibn Khalīlān, Bulaq 1299, i. 125 sq.). All three forms occur in prose as well as poetry, the middle one, Kais b. Allān, remarkably rarely in poetry (Kais’Allān in poetry: Ḥamāni of Abū Tamīlīn, ed. Fretayg, p. 160, 655; Nakhlād, i. i, 117, 362 sq.; 370, 375, 390; al-Tabarî, op. cit., ii. 486; Taqā ṣAllār, s. v. ‘y., etc.; Kais b. Allān: Zuhair, Dīwān, ed. Ahlwardt, iii. 36, Nakhlād, i. 373; Abu ‘l-Allā b. Maʿārtī, al-Luʿnūmīyat, Cairo 1891, i. 47 and also Taqā ṣAllār, s. v. ‘y.; Kais: Anṭām, Dīwān, ed. Ahlwardt, xxiv. 3, Append. xvi. 51 sq., Nakhlād, Dīwān, ed. Ahlwardt, Append. liixii. 1; Zuhair, op. cit., i. 17; Ḥamāni, ed. cit., 306, 318, 657–660; Nakhlād, i. 374, 376 sq., ii. 902, 1042; Ḥamāni, xvii. 106, etc.). We never find before any of the three forms the word Banū (“sons”) (wrongly in the indices to Ibn al-A ṣūr, al-Kamil jā’l-Tarīkh, ed. Tornberg, to Caetani, Annali dell’Islam, ii. 1422 and vi. 1445, and even to al-Farabī, op. cit., etc.). What we are to understand by ‘Allān, is difficult to conceive. Those who use the form Kais b. ‘Allān—those are primarily the genealogists (see Taqā ṣAllār, s. v. ‘y.)—see in him naturally, at least the great majority of them (see below), the father of Kais and they further explain that he was the son of Muṣṣar and therefore brother of al-Yāṣ (Khādīf) b. Muṣṣar. According to them his real name is al-Nās (which, according to Ibn Duraid, Kit. al-Iṣbārīk, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 162 comes from al-Nās; according to al-Wazir al-Maghribī in the Taqā ṣAllār s. v. ‘y., al-Nās would be the only correct form), so that ‘Allān would be his epithet (Ibn Duraid, op. cit., p. 162; Taqā ṣAllār, s. v. ‘y.; Ibn ‘Abd Rabbih, al-Iṣbārīk, ed. Cairo 1305, i. 51; Abu ‘l-Fida’, Muhimmāt naʿīl l-Samʿānī al-Baghdādī, partly ed. by Fličer as Hebräische antiquisalien, p. 194; Wustenfeld, Genealog. Tabellen der Persischen und Sasanischen Familien, i. 31; Caetani, op. cit., i. Introd., § 49; also al-Samʿānī, op. cit.; al-Kasbahī, Ta’rīkh, ed. Houtsma, i. 260; al-Musawwī, al-Tanbih wa ʿl-Iṣraṣrāf, in Bibliogr. arab., ed. de Goeje, viii. 208; Yaḥyā, Muḥammad, ed. Wustenfeld, iii. 908; Ibn Khallīkān, op. cit., i. 130; Abū al-Kādir b. ‘Omar, Khāṣṣat ad-Ādāb, i. 449; Caussin de佩佩雷, Essai sur l’histoire des Arabes, i. 192, etc.). But this view is contradicted directly by Ibn Khallīkān, al-Tharīk, i. 305 and indirectly by many others—practically by all who say Kais’Allān and these are, as we have said, the majority; according to them ‘Allān disappears as a separate member in the genealogical table; Kais’Allān is identical with al-Nās or al-Nass (Kais’Allān here also is said to be only an epithet, al-Nās(s) on the other hand the proper name) and is son of Muṣṣar and brother of al-Yāṣ. At the same time they explain the genitive ‘Allān in the most different ways: as the name of a famous horse of Kais (by calling him after this horse, an endeavour has been made to distinguish our Kais from Kais b. al-Ghawāl b. Badjīlī, who also possessed a celebrated horse called Kubba and who was similarly called Kubba, Taqā ṣAllār, s. v. ‘y. and ‘y., and Ibn Khallīkān, loc. cit.), or as the name of a dog or of a bow, which were in his possession, or as the name of a slave or of some other man who had brought him up (in an isolated case in the form of the name Kais b. Allān, the word ‘Allān is regarded as the name of such a slave, see Abū al-Kādir b. ‘Omar, op. cit., i. 67, ii. 449; cf. the exactly analogous interpretation of the tribal name Sā’d (b.) Ḥudayhim in Ibn Kutaiba, Kit. al-Maṣārīf, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 51, Ibn Duraid, op. cit., p. 319, Kāmis and Taqā ṣAllār, s. v. Ḥudayhim, etc.), or as the name of a mountain, where he is said to have been born or lastly, and most stupidly as no notice is taken of genitive relationship, as in the form Kais’Allān—as an otherwise quite unknown adjective, interpreted as qualifying Kais with the meaning “needy, dependent” (see also Ibn Duraid, op. cit.; Śīkhā, Līsān al-ʿArab and Kāmis, s. v. ‘y. and ‘y.; al-Samʿānī, op. cit.; Abu ‘l-Fida’, op. cit.; Ibn Khallīkān, op. cit.; Abū al-Kādir b. ‘Omar, op. cit., and
Hamasa, op. cit., i. 124; Reiske, Primae lineae historiae regiorum araborum, ed. Wustenfeld, Tab. v. and viii. on p. 136; Sprenger, Das Leben u. die Lehre des Propheten Mohammad, iii. p. cxxxix, etc.). Only very rarely do we find the statement that 'Alān was an epithet of Muḥāfar (Ṣūhār and Lisan al-ʿArab, s. v. "yil") and most strong (possibly as a counterpart to al-Yās) (op. cit., p. 31 and 38) and hardly reconcilable with his other statements, that Kaṣ 'Alān is identical with Kahma b. al-Yās b. Muḥāfar.

These confused statements seem to one to be nothing but guesses. I should like to think myself that Kaṣ 'Alān is the real name of our confederation of tribes and that it was the genealogists who first made Kaṣ b. 'Alān out of it. As Arab tradition obviously knows absolutely nothing of a tribe or group of tribes called 'Alān, I should further like to assume — of course with all reserve — that the combination Kaṣ 'Alān is not to be interpreted on the model of Tāğhibū Waṭāntīn, "the Taghib of the tribal group of Wāṭil", Taimuʾ ʿr-Ribāḥī, "the Taim of the al-Ribāḥi Confederacy", Aḍīya ʿr-Ribāḥī, "the Aḍī of the al-Ribāḥi Confederacy", Djarma ʿr-Ṣaṣīta, "the Djarm of the Kūṭa Ḍimas confinement of tribes", "Wāṭil Bāḥilāta, the Wāṭil of the Bāḥilāta group of tribes", also Aṣṣ Bani Kaṣ, "the Aṣṣ of the Banu Kaṣ", Aṣṣ Bāḥilāta, "the Aṣṣ of Bāḥilāta", etc., (see e. g. Naṣīḥ, iii. Ind. iii. s. v. v.), but on the model of Kaṣ 'Alān Kūbba, "Kaṣ, the owner of the horse Kūbba" (see above; the name is everywhere so explained), Raḥilat ʿr-Faḥisī, "Raḥil with the horse", Anmāʾr ʿr-Ṣāḥī, "Anmāʾr with the sheep", Raḥibat ʿr-Ṣaṣīta, "the Raḥib of the Djarma", Kūṭa ʾr-Šaṣīta, "horses-Zaid", etc., (see e. g. Naṣīḥ, iii. Ind. iii. s. v. v.), also Tāq al-ʿArūṣ, s. v. v.). What we are to understand, however, in this case by 'Alān, whether, with the native explanations quoted, a horse or a dog or something of the kind is quite uncertain. According to the native dictionaries (I cannot quote an actual reference in literature) 'Alān as a noun means "a male hyena". As a name, it is not found elsewhere, according to the native lexicons and according to 'Abd al-Kādir b. Omar, op. cit., i. 67 (see, however, Tāq al-ʿArūṣ, s. v. v. — The Arab genealogists make simply invented the name al-ʿNāṣ (see above) as a counterpart to the tribes of the confederation: Kaṣ (ʿAlān) and Khindif (according to the genealogical legend, the wife of al-ʿYās) comprise together the whole of Muḥāfar (Ibn Kutaiba, op. cit., p. 31, al-Tabari, op. cit., ii. 1298, 1299, al-Masʿūdi, op. cit., p. 324, al-Bakri, al-Muṣṭamīm, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 56, Yāqūt, op. cit., i. 463, Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., ii. 305, Caussin de Perceval, op. cit., i. 192, etc.). Between the two groups there were very ancient points of dispute (see e. g. al-Bakri, op. cit., p. 56 = Wustenfeld, Die Wohnsitze u. Wanderungen der arabischen Stämme, from vol. iv. of the Abbeh, Geogr. Gesch. d. Dichter, v. 81). To Kaṣ 'Alān were reckoned the following three branches or main Subtribe groups: Gḥṣṭaṣna (q. v.), with "Abs (q. v.), Dhūbyān (q. v.); the two main branches of the Dhūbyān are Fazārā, q. v. and Murrā, q. v.) and Ahšaḏaḥwaṣīn (q. v.), with Thākṣf (q. v.), in whom many saw descendents of Thāmud (q. v.) (see e. g. Aḥgoodi, iv. 76), Amīr b. Ṣaṣaṣa (q. v.), (from them descended the dynasty of Mirāsid of Aleppo, q. v.), Kulaib, Kūshār, Ṣūkail (q. v.); this is the tribe of the Ṣūkailid dynasty of Mosul, Hīlāl (q. v.) and Dżumāsh — Sulaib (q. v.) — Bāḥilā (q. v.) — ʿAḏwān (q. v.), etc., (On the branches of the Kaṣ 'Alān see especially Ibn Duraid, op. cit., p. 162 sqq.; Ibn Kutabī, op. cit., p. 38 sqq.; Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., ii. 305 sqq.; Abu ʿr-Fīzā, op. cit., p. 174 sqq.; Ibn ʿAbd Rabba, op. cit., ii. 51; Wustenfeld, Gen. Tabellen, Tab. D sqq. and Reiske, op. cit., Tab. vi. sq. on p. 136.

Distribution. The Kaṣ 'Alān, according to legend, were originally settled in the low lying parts of the Thāmā (al- Başāk, op. cit., p. 57 = Wustenfeld, Die Wohnsitze u. Wanderungen d. Arab, Stämme, p. 81 = Yāḳūṭ, op. cit., i. 643 sqq.). Somewhere about the time of Muḥāmad they spread out, keeping in large number of their subdivisions over vast areas of central and northern Arabia; we find them (still) in the Thāmā (Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., ii. 305), then again S. E. and N. E. of Mecca (the Thākṣf here owned the valuable town of Tāṣf and the Sulaib, Hibīl and Ṣūkail all sorts of famous mines; see e. g. al-Yaḵūbī, al-Bulūḏān, in the Bibl. Geogr. Arab., vii. 316, 312), in the region of Medina (Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., ii. 305 sqq., 312), in other parts of the Ḥijaz (al-Hamādān, Diqarāt al-ʿArāb, ed. D. H. Müllner, i. 50; al-Bakri, op. cit., p. 60 = Wustenfeld, Die Wohnsitze u. Wanderungen, etc. p. 84), in the Thāmā (Yāḳūṭ, op. cit., iii. 688, 697; Ibn al-ʿArī, op. cit., 53); throughout the highlands of Nadjī (al-Masʿūdī, op. cit., p. 209; al-Yaḵūbī, al-Bulūḏān, p. 312), in the Yamama, where they occupied the important city of Fālādji (al-Bakri, op. cit., p. 60 = Wustenfeld, Die Wohnsitze u. Wanderungen etc., p. 84; Yāḳūṭ, op. cit., ii. 238, iii. 908; Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., iii. 312 sqq.; Wustenfeld, Bahrein u. Ḥumām, from the Abbeh., Geogr. Gesch. d. Dichter, v. 4; Geogr. Gesch. d. Dichter, v. 83 and the map on p. 559, Caussin de Perceval, op. cit., i. 192 and Caetani, op. cit., ii. the map on p. 376.

The great Arab campaigns of conquest which began with the rise of the Caliphate and the tremendous political revolutions produced by them in Western Asia and North Africa brought the Kaṣ 'Alān like most Arab tribes out of their ancient dwelling-places. To all appearance, however, several branches of them had emigrated northwards even before Islam. At any rate we find them later, partly even under the earlier Caliphs, throughout Syria: at Ḥalāb, in the region of Ḥumām, in Damascus and the Ghūṭa, in the Ḥawrān with its capital Baṣra, in Baniyān with its capital Baniyān, in the Ballaṣ and in Palestine (al-Baladhorī, Fūṭār al-Bulūḏān, ed. d. Geеe, p. 451; Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., ii. 312; Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dinawarī, al-Aḥbār al-fūṭār, ed. Guirgass and Kratchkovsky, p. 183; al-Yaḵūbī, op. cit., p. 325 sqq.; Ibn al-ʿArī, op. cit., p. 331; Yāḳūṭ, op. cit., ii. 744 etc.), in N. W. Mesopotamia, in the large
district called after them Dıyār Mudar [q. v.], with the important towns of Kärkişiya (Circesium), al-Raḥba, ʿArābīn, al-Kānānīk, al-Raḳḥa, Bālis (Barbalissus), Harrān (Carrhae), Dīsr Manbijīd, Saruq, Tell Mawzan, Sumaisat (Sumaisat), etc. (Ibn Ḥawkal, al-Madīlik wa ʿl-Māmālik, in the Biblioth. Geogr. arab. i. 155; al-Balḍūdī, op. cit., p. 178 = Yāḥīṣ, op. cit., i. 393; al-Taḥārī, op. cit., i. 32; Ibn al-ʿAṣḥīr, op. cit., iii. 373; al-Taḥārī, op. cit., i. 1891; Ibn Ḥadhdhūn, op. cit., ii. 310; Caecani, Studi di Storia orientale, i. 271 and Causin de Perceval, op. cit., i. 192), in the Irāk, where they also formed an apparently large fraction of the population of al-Kūfa and al-Ḥaṣa (al-Balḍūdī, op. cit., 451; al-Yaḳūbī, op. cit., p. 310; al-Taḥārī, op. cit., i. 2986, 3454, ii. 777; Aḥmadī, i. 52; Ibn al-ʾAbīl, Muḥtheṣār Kitiḥ al-Buldīn, in Biblioth. Geogr. arab., v. 1790; Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dinawārī, op. cit., p. 183; Ibn al-ʿAṣḥīr, op. cit., i. 116, v. 59), in Bavārīn (Ibn al-ʿAbīl, op. cit., vii. 341; Ibn Ḥadhdhūn, op. cit., ii. 313) and even near Ḩababān (al-Taḥārī, op. cit., p. 275).

In the time of Ibn Ḥadhdhūn (sixth cent.) only remnants of the once so powerful group of tribes of the Kais Ālān were still settled in Central Arabia; considerable bodies of them had settled in different parts of North Africa, Aḏwān tribes for example in Irvikya, Sulaimis there also and in the far west, near Fes (according to Ibn al-ʿAṣḥīr, op. cit., x. 401, — whether rightly or not is another question — Abū al-Muʿmin, the founder of the Almohad dynasty traced his descent from the Sulaimis), Fāzīris and Ruʾāḥīs in Barqa, other Dḥubānīs in Barqa in Taḥθīs and Fezzān, ʾAṣṣḥāʾ in the marches of Algeria and Morocco, Hilālis in Irīkya and at Bān and Constantine, Dḥusamis in Morocco etc. (Ibn Ḥadhdhūn, op. cit., ii. 305 sqq.).

History. The history proper of most Arabian Beduin tribes begins for us with their (*battle*-days) (see AYAM AL-ʿARAB). So it is with the Kais Ālān. Their feuds were particularly numerous, which is not remarkable in so large a group with its multitudinous ramifications. Ibn ʿAbī Rabbiḥa discusses them in the first place in his account of the Ayyām al-ʿĀlān in the Iṣḥāq al-ʿĀlān (iii. 47—93). He describes in this place the following either entirely or essentially civil Kais Ālān battles (cf. Reiske, op. cit., 204—252, following al-Nuwaʿīrī, who on this matter is dependent entirely on Ibn ʿAbī Rabbiḥa): the Yawm Manḍaj (Mandaj, also called Yawm al-Radhā, between Ghawwis and ʿAbsis), the Yawm al-Nāfrāw (between ʿAmiris and ʿAbis), the Yawm Bān ʿAkkīl (between Dḥubānīs and ʿAmiris), the Yawm Siṭr Dḥabla (between ʿAmir, ʿAbs, Ghāni, Bāhil and Barda on one side and Tamīm, Dḥubānī, Asad, Lakhm and Kūna on the other), the endless war of Dḥajis and al-Chābīs (between ʿAbs and Dḥubānīs), with the *days* of Dḥu l-Muʿārākīb, Dḥū Ḥusān, al-Yaʿmarīya, (Qafar) al-Haḥīb-, al-Farāk, Kaṭān and Ghdīr ʿAyyād (?), the Yawm al-Raḳjam (or al-Raḳjam, between Ghaṭaṣāfīn and ʿAmir), the Yawm al-Nuṭātīs (al-ʾAbāḥaʾiʾ, between ʿAbs and ʿAmir), the first and second Yawm Ḥawza (between Sulaim and Ghaṭaṣāfīn), the Yawm ʿAdaniya (other Miḥān, between Sulaim and Ghaṭaṣāfīn), the Yawm al-Līwā (between Ghaṭaṣāfīn and Ḥawza) and the Yawm al-Salāʾ (between Ḥawza and Ghaṭaṣāfīn). Also the following encounters between Kais and Non-Kais: the Yawm Raḥṭan (between ʿAmir and Tamīm), the Yawm Dḥat al-ʿAṣʿīl (between Sulaim and Tamīm), the Yawm al-Kadīd (between Sulaim and Kīna), the Yawm Burza (or Buzaʾ), the Yawm al-Kīṣaʾ (do), the Yawm al-Suʿībān (between ʿAmir and Banū ʿAbīl), the Yawm Aṭkhur (between Banū ʿAbīl and Banū Ḥuṣayn and the Yawm Dīrāt Mṣʾail (between al-Yaqqīt and ʿAbīl). Al-Yaqqīt, i. 261 also mentions as Kais the *days* of al-Baʿdaʾ, Faṣīf al-Rīḥ (between Kaṭān and ʿAmir), al-Mīlbaq and al-Uṛrī. Cf. also the section in Ibn al-ʿAṣḥīr on the *days* of the Arabs in the pagan period (op. cit., i. 367—517), pp. 411 sqq., 435 sqq., 420 sqq., 452 sqq., 478 sqq., 473 sqq., in the chapter which al-Māḍīnī in his Maḏjuwa al-Amṯālā has devoted to the *names* of the *days* of the Arabs (Chap. 29), nos. 76, 12, 11, 66, 96, 122, 30, 53, 22, 25 and Naṣība, iii. Ind. iv. under the separate place-names. Within the scope of this article at least, no attempt can be made to give these wars and feuds any more a historical and chronological sequence. Indeed, speaking generally we cannot say that it is a difficult, indeed for the most part an insoluble task, to get at the historical basis of the essentially legendary traditions of the Ayyām al-ʿArab, which we may call the epic of the Arabs. The most important and therefore also the most celebrated in poetry of the above-mentioned *days* is certainly that of Shīb Dḥabala (see Ḥajba, also Ḥubayyān and also Blau, op. cit., p. 583, Muṣafidālhīyāt, ed. Lyall, ii. transl., p. 251 and especially Naṣīnea, iii. Ind. iv., s. v. Dḥabala). Of the encounters in the Dḥisī wa ʿl-Chābīs bar (see Ḥaṭṭān, ʿAbs and Ḥubayyān), the most celebrated is that of al-Hākhī. It need not surprise us to find that the Kais tribe, as we see from the above, were also continually quarrelling with one another. The individual members of the great tribal confederacies never thought of maintaining peace as a principle within the limits of their group. Ibn ʿAbī Rabbiḥa and al-Nuwaʿīrī really ought also to have described the al-Fijjiār battles as Kais, as in them the Ḥawza, who were Kais, with the Ḥakīf at their head formed one of the two contesting parties (see FIDJAR and ḤAWZA, also Ibn al-ʿAṣḥīr, op. cit., i. 439 sqq., Maṣʿūdī, Murūj Dḥabala, iv. 120, 153, al-Maṣʿūdi, al-Tanbih wa ʿl-ʿAẓīr, p. 208 sqq. al-Dīyābākī, Taʿrīḥ al-Kamīz, Cairo 1285, i. 288, 293, Wastedfeld, Gesch. der Stadt Mecca, Vol. iv. der Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, p. 41 sqq., Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre der Moham- med, i. 148, Caecani, Annali, Introd., § 140, Huart, Hist. des Arabes, i. 92, etc. The question at issue in this was really the endeavours of the Ḥawza to deprive the Kināna of Mecca and the Kaʿba (cf. Aḥbāni, xiii. 3 sqq.).

Like the other great central Arabian Beduin tribes the Kais Ālān belonged to the short-lived empire of the Kinda (q. v. and Ḥamza al-Isfahānī, Taʿrīḥ, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 140; Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dinawārī, op. cit., i. 54); Ibn al-ʿAṣḥīr, op. cit., i. 376, 408; Reiske, op. cit., 98; Causin de Perceval, op. cit., ii. 287; al-Muṣafidālhīyāt, op. cit., transl., p. 259). Otherwise the only thing regarding the pre-Muhammadan history of the Kais Ālān handed down to us is the statement that they had worshipped Sirius (?), Pococke, Specimen hist. Arabum, p. 4; Causin de Perceval, op. cit.,
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chief tribe of the Kūdān, who inhabited the strip of territory between the ancient Moab and Palmyra, an antagonism, at the root of which probably lay ethnic differences (but see Wellhausen, Der arab. Reich und sein Sturz, p. 112) — the Kais were Ma'ādis (Niāris and Mu'daris), that is North Arabians, while the Kalb were — or at least were considered — South Arabians [see Kālīb b. Wābara and Kāfīn]. — This antagonism, being augmented through the Bāṣṣa-Khurāṣtān trouble between the Tāmīm and the Azd [q.v.], very early developed into a general vendetta between Mu'ājīr and Yemen. The Umayyad Caliphs relied sometimes on the Kais and sometimes on the Kalb according to their family connections, the result of marriages into these two extremes, which had as a result that, for example between 719 and 745, i.e. within 26 years, the actual control of the government passed five times from one group of tribes to the other. This state of things was, of course, intolerable and, in fact, the fall of the Umayyad dynasty was really due in the end principally to this feud between Mu'ādis and Yemenis.

Mu'āwiya I had relied on the Kalb and Yazīd I, who was born of a Kalbī mother had also depended mainly on them. As a result, the Kais refused their homage to their successors Mu'āwiya II, whose mother was likewise a Kalbī, and Marwān I, and declared themselves for the anti-Caliph 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair [q.v.]. In 684 the Sulaimān, the 'Amir and the Ghāṭafān — that is all Kais — fought under al-Dāhāk b. al-Fihri on the Mārj Rāḥīt in the Ghīūs of Damascus for Ibn al-Jashār b. Talbī, whose army consisted of Kalbīs and other men of Yemen. They suffered an unusually severe reverse, which plays a great part in the songs of the Kalbī and Kaisī poets and by the laws of the Arab vendetta necessarily perpetuated the hatred of the Kais for the Kalb (see al-Dāhāk b. Kāis). In addition to the literature quoted there al-Mas'ūdī, Murūdī al-Dhahab, v. 201; al-Mas'ūdī, al-Zanjī wa 'l-`Irāfīr, p. 308 sqq.; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, op. cit., v. 204; Yākūt, op. cit., ii. 743 sqq.; Ibn Badrūn, Sharh Kāfīd al-Ibn Abīn, ed. Deyy, p. 184 sqq.; Ramāzūn, ed. Freytag, p. 260 sqq., 317 sqq., al-Maḍānī, op. cit., i. 338 sqq.; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, op. cit., i. 664 sqq. — But they remained partisans of Ibn al-Zubair and maintained themselves with great tenacity in Mesopotamia under their important chief and leader Ṣufār b. Ḥārīth b. 'Amīr b. al-Kālībi and his lieutenant 'Umar b. al-Ḥubbāb b. al-Sulami, who did not capitulate till 691 in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik after a siege of considerable length in their strongholds, Karšītīya and Ra'a b. al-A'in (Resaīnā) (Wellhausen, Das arab. Reich u. sein Sturz, 115 sqq., with references to the most important sources, al-Tabarī, op. cit., ii. 643, 777; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, op. cit., iv. 188, 192, 242, 259; Deyy, Gesch. der Mauren in Spanien, Germany, ed., i. 86, 101 sqq., A. Müller,op. cit., i. 373, 385). Umar b. al-Ḥubbāb was the commander of the Kaisī force which fought against the Shī'īs under 'Ibrāhīm b. al-Ashtar in August 686 on the banks of the Kāhir, a tributary of the Great Žāb, in the Umayyad army led by 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād, but to revenge the day of Mardj Rāḥīt, they desisted in the battle (Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dinawarī, op. cit., 301 sqq.; al-Tabarī, op. cit., ii. 708 sqq.; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, op. cit., iv. 215 sqq.; al-

i. 349; Krehl, Über die Religion der vorislam. Araber, p. 24), and that the 'Adwān had owned the jaffa, i.e. the management of the course run between 'Arrafat and al-Muzalība in the Meccan Ḥādīj ceremonies [see Khālj, i. 193] (Ibn Ḥishām, Sīra, ed. Wüstefeld, p. 77 sqq.; al-Tabarī, op. cit., i. 1134; Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., ii. 305, etc.). The battle of ‘Aṣīb and the first (and thus quite intriguing) antagonistic to Muhammad at first. The Ghāṭafān and Sulaimān [q. v.] especially proved very unpleasant neighbours to Medina in the first seven years after the Hīdājra. But a clan of the Ghāṭafān, the Aḍhājī, who dwelled N. E. of Medina, considered it advisable as early as 627, after the "Battle of the Ditch" to conclude with Muhammad a — purely political — treaty of alliance (Sperber, Die Schreibungen Muhammad an die Stämme Arabiens, p. 8 sq.) and the vastly more powerful Sulaimān along with a number of Aḍhājīs took part in 630 in the "conquest" of Mecca on the side of the Prophet, and indeed, shortly after, we find them fighting against the Muhunain, under the Muslim flag against their brother-tribe, the Hāwāzin, although they must have seen that the latter's resistance to the state of Medina was the last possible attempt to break Muhammad's hegemony over Arabia (Ibn Ḥishām, op. cit., p. 810, 828—

864; al-Tabarī, op. cit., i. 1647; al-Wākīdia, al-Mu'āghāzī, abbrev. transl. by Wellhausen, p. 326, 358; Ibn Sa'īd, al-Tāḥāfūs, ed. Sachau, ii. i. 97, 109; Ibn Khaldūn, op. cit., ii. 308; Caetani, Annali, ii. 147, 153, 444 etc. When Muhammad died all the Kais tribes had probably submitted to the law of Islam (Ibn Sa'īd, op. cit., ii. 41 sqq.; Wellhausen, Arabien, pp. 976 sqq.; Sperber, op. cit., 38 sqq. etc.). After the Prophet's death, it is true, the majority of them joined more or less openly in the apostacy which set in over all Arabia. The Ghāṭafān once more were the most active in this. They several times endeavoured to overrun Medina and finally joined ʿUlāja, the prophet of the Asad. But the old days of Arabia were past. ʿUlāja and his followers were defeated at the well of Buṣūkha by Khālid b. al-Walid, the "sword of God" (of 632) and the rebellious central Arabian tribes had again to submit to the yoke of Medina and Islam (al-Tabarī, op. cit., i. 1870, 1885, 1889, 1898 sqq.; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, op. cit., ii. 574; Caetani, op. cit., ii. 604 sqq.; A. Müler, Der Islam im Morgen- u. Abendland, i. 174 sqq. etc.).

Henceforward the Kais 'Allān show themselves good Muslims. Bodies of them took part in the battles against the Persians under Khālid b. al-Walid, under al-Muṭṭāŷra-š-Šaβārānī and under Sa'd b. Aḥī Waqqās (al-Tabarī, op. cit., i. 2219 sqq.; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, op. cit., i. 347; Caetani, op. cit., ii. 954 sqq., iii. 155, 281 sqq.). In the "battle of the Camel" (656) and at Siffin (657) they fought on the side of 'Alī (Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dinawarī, op. cit., p. 155 sqq., 183 sqq.; al-Tabarī, op. cit., ii. 3174, 3240, 3290; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, op. cit., i. 189).

In the period of the great Muslim conquests in which they — in so far as they had not done so earlier (see above) — had moved their settlements northwards, especially to Syria, their power had become such that from the beginning to the end of the Umayyad period they formed one of the deciding political and military factors in the Caliphate. In this capacity they were in constant antagonism to the Kalb, the
Mas'udi, *Al-Tamhid*, p. 312; al-Ma'dini, *op. cit.*, ii. 339; Weil, *op. cit.*, i. 380 sqq.; Dozy, *op. cit.*, i. 100; A. Müller, *op. cit.*, i. 381; Wellhausen, *Die religiöse-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam*, in the *Abhldg. d. Gotting. Ges. d. Wiss.*, Philhist. Kl., F., v. 1898, p. 84; Wellhausen, *Das arabische Schrifttum sein Stil*, p. 116). In spite of this collapse of the Kaisats in their great war against the Umayyads, their smaller struggle against the Kalb continued without interruption, at first mainly under the leadership of Umair b. al-Hubab. It took the form of a series of "days" fought mainly in the Samawa, the desert between the Irak and Syria and forced the north-eastern part of the Kalb to migrate for a time to the Ghawar of Palestine. The most celebrated of these "days" is the battle of Banat Kain between the Fazzara and the Kalb in 692 or 693. When Umair with his Sulaimis settled on the Great Khobar (Choboras) there resulted encounters with the Christian Taghlibis, who dwelled in eastern Mesopotamia; these led to a bitter tribal and blood feud, fought out chiefly on the Khobar, the Balikh (Bilechas), the Tharthar and in the Tigris region. The best known "days" of this conflict, which gradually reduced the weaker Taghlib to great extremity, are those of al-Shahshak, where Umair fell (in 689; the *Nabz id*, p. 373, 400, 508 give for this event the battle of Semadar), and that of Mount al-Bigh (Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-130; *Nabz id*, p. 404, 508, 899, also *qur.*, 263). 1038 and 1041; *Yakht, op. cit.*, i. 632; al-Bakri, *op. cit.*, p. 179; al-Ma'dani, *op. cit.*, ii. 329, 339). We hear of bloodshed as a result of this enmity between the Kais and the Taghlib as late as 814 in the reign of al-Ma'mun (Ibn al-Athir, *op. cit.*, vi. 213).

After the capitulation of the Kais, 'Abd al-Malik showed himself a clever statesman and above party; he summoned Zufar b. al-Harith and later also his sons to his court at Damascus and married a Kaisi lady of the 'Ab, called Wallida, who became the mother of his sons Walid I and Sulaiman besides other children. Walid I was most probably a Kaisi at heart, but he took care not to irritate the Kalb. Sulaiman seems in spite of his kindness for the Yemeni (Azdi) Yazid b. al-Muhallab to have at least had the intention of placing the interest of the empire before that of parties. As might well be expected in his reign the Kaisats were partisans of the great Thakif al-Hajjajah [q. v.], and of the Dhalili Kutaba b. Muslim (q. v. and *Nabz id*, iii. index II., v. *Kuvis al-Ainana*). In the reign of Omar II, who was pronounced advocate of the policy of conciliation, the dissensions between the two great tribal groups did not make themselves felt. On the other hand in the reign of Yazid II, who in his struggle with the Azdi Muhallabids had naturally to rely on the support of the Kais, the result was a purely Kaisi party government. His brother and successor Hisham endeavoured to do away with this by withdrawing the Fazzara 'Omar b. Hunaiba, whom Yazid II had appointed viceroy of the Irak and the East, and replacing him by the Badhir Khalid b. 'Abd Allah al-Kansi, a distinguished statesman, but the Caliph finally found himself forced to allow the latter to be overthrown and replaced by a Kaisi, the Thakif Yusuf al-Mar, a relative of Hajjajah. Under Walid II, who appeared to have fallen entirely under the influence of Vauf b. 'Omar, the wrath of the Yemenis ultimately found vent in a rising stirred up by personal enemies of the Caliph, which led to the murder of Walid II and the entrenchment of Yazid III. The new Caliph sought his support exclusively among the Yemenis, especially the Kail of last Umayyad, Marwan II, relied no less exclusively on the Kais, into whose territory — to Hijaran — he even removed his capital. Marwan II fell before the 'Abbasiads. Even in the decisive battle on the Great Zohb which he fought against them in January 750, the feud between the Kais and the Kauja proved fatal (cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, i. 131 sq., 140 sq., 162 sq., 194 sqq., 199 sqq., 203 sqq., 224 sqq., 229 sq., 235 sq., 341, where the necessary sources are everywhere given; A. Müller, *op. cit.*, i. 408, 435 sqq., 445 sq.; also the pertinent sections in Weil, *op. cit.*, Dozy, *op. cit.*, Haart, *op. cit.*, Muir, *The Caliphs, its Rise Decline and Fall*, etc.). The quarrel between Kais and Kalb had its effect in history not only in Syria, the Irak and Kurashan, but also in the other provinces of the vast Arab empire, notably in North Africa and Spain, where the two parties just as well were at deadly enmity (for North Africa and Spain see especially Dozy, *op. cit.*, i. 158 sqq.).

In the severe fightings of the later Umayyad period, the Kais had suffered losses from which they never again recovered. What we learn of them during the Abbasiad period is not of any great historical interest. The following are the main outlines: In the years 790, 792, 796 and 805, i. e. in the reign of Harun ar-Rashid, they had all sorts of new encounters in and around Damascus with their hereditary Yemeni enemies (al-Tabari, *op. cit.*, iii. 609, 625, 639 sqq., 688; Ibn al-Athir, *op. cit.*, vi. 87 sqq., 129; A. Müller, *op. cit.*, i. 490; see also above Al-KAN b. JABR). They rebelled under Harun in 794 and again under Al-Ma'mun in 828, in combination with the Yemenis, in Egypt (al-Tabari, *op. cit.*, iii. 629, 1099; Ibn al-Athir, *op. cit.*, vi. 97, 288; Weil, *op. cit.*, ii. 146 sq.; A. Müller, *op. cit.*, i. 490). In 811 under al-Amuq they fought the pretender 'Ali b. 'Abd Allah al-Sufyani chiefly because he had Kalbi blood in his veins (Ibn al-Athir, *op. cit.*, vi. 172 sq.; Weil, *op. cit.*, ii. 187); after the death of Mu'tasim in 842 they stirred up a revolt in Damascus but were quickly brought back to obedience by a severe defeat inflicted on them by al-Wathiq's army on the for them illomened Mardj Rihat (see above) (Ibn al-Athir, *op. cit.*, vi. 376). The Kaisats of Bahrain played a certain part in the initial stages of the Karman movement in 894 sqq. (Ibn al-Athir, *op. cit.*, v. 341; cf. Weil, *op. cit.*, ii. 508, note 3). The Kais appear, compared with the Kalb, to have been in general more savage, less civilized, more hardy, more trencherous and more cruel. The reason, no doubt, is that they were in much closer contact with the life and customs of their rivals, who had been in countries already settled in Syria, a home of ancient culture, and had naturally not remained un influenced by the refining influences of the Byzantine empire, whose eastern marches had been their home before the Muslim conquest. Their readiness to face battle or death is occasionally celebrated, not only in poetry (al-Tabari, *op. cit.*, ii. 1030).

Famous Kaisats (with the exception of those already mentioned). The best known poets of the
Kais were: al-Nājiḥah al-Dhubbānī, Antara, Labīd, Amīr b. al-Ta'fīl, Ṭu'ail b. 'Aww, 'Urwā b. al-Ward, al-Shamākhī, al-Khnāzī, Abū Muḥīṭ, al-Ju'fān, Ta'abāsira Sunnaa, Ibn 'U hostility, Al-'Adwānī, Dinarī al-Simma, al-Abābī b. Mirdās, Muzarrād, Kīdābī b. Zuhair, al-Nājiḥah al-Dhubbī, etc. [see the pertinent articles]. The great philologist of Arabic poetry, Abū Sāmān [q. v.] was a Bātīlī. — Other Kais of historical importance are given by Ibn Khalūdīn, op. cit., ii. 305 sqq., Ibn Ku'tāhī, op. cit., ii. 28 sqq., Ibn 'Abd Rabbīhi, op. cit., ii. 51 and Abu 'l-Fā risk, The dialect of the Kais-ālān. The Arabic philologists give us the following — as a fact of they are in the main common to most tribes of the Najd — phonetic and grammatical linguistic peculiarities of our group of tribes: They still pronounced the hādhā as a guttural stop and they had even changed it to 'ādīn when initia (in part only) so that they said 'ādān, 'adān, 'adān, 'adīn for 'ādān, 'adān, 'adān, 'adīn. They had a tendency to imālā and to īmānā; and they said 'ālēmān, tinālēmān, taqādūmān, etc. for 'ālāmān, tanālēmān, taqādūmān, etc. hublā for huṣūlā or hublā, īn and īn for kūn and kīnā (always) and min ladūni for min la-
tun; Līsīn al-Ārāb and Tāḍ al-Ārāb, sub īn; de Saucy, Grammaire arab., ii. 154, note 1; Sa-
rāw, Die allārah, Dialektspaltung, in the Zeitsscr., f. Assyriologie, xxxi. 31 sqq.; Schaad, Sibawaihi's Lautlehre, p. 78 sqq., etc. On words and expressions peculiar to the Kaisis see Freytag, Einl. in das Studium der arab. Sprache, p. 87 sqq., al-Suyūṭī, op. cit., i. 109 (anājīf 'ādīn, see thereon Lān-

(CHRISTIAN FISCHER)

KAIS B. AL-KHAṬĪB b. 'Aḍī, with Ḥassān b. Ṭabīb [q. v.] the most important poet of pre-Mūḥammadan Vathīrī, the latter Medina. He belonged to the Banū Ṣafār, a family of the Nabi of al-Āws [q. v.]. In the desperate fighting between the two tribes of al-Āws and al-Khaṭrāj, he championed the former with tongue and sword. Very little is known of the facts of his life, if we except the later, very doubtful stories. The account of the revenge he took on the murderers of his father and grand father is however quite authentic, and by this he won particular fame with posterity. This event was later embellished with all sorts of fictitious details, some of which are echoes of the Cyrus saga and form a parallel to the legend of the young Parzival (see Singer, Arab. and europ. Poesie im Mittelalter in the Abhandl. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch., 1918, phil.-histor. Kl., No. 13, p. 7 of the reprint). All else that we know of the life of the poet is that he took an active part in the political and military activities of his tribe. His Divān contains references to a whole series of Mīrūn of the Aws. In the decisive battle of Bu'ātīq [q. v.], later often celebrated in song, he did not take part, apparently on account of a wound received previously. Not long after this battle and before the Ḥijrā he was treacherously murdered. Kāis was involved in polemics with almost all the Khazrajī poets of his day, notably with Ḥassān b. Ṭabīb and Abū Ẓabī Ẓabīh b. Kāwābā [q. v.], both of them survived him by a considerable period. Although he was still alive at the beginning of Mūḥammad's prophetic activity, his Divān shows no trace of a knowledge of it. All that the later sources tell of his meeting with the Prophet is a pure invention.

Kāis's Divān is preserved in an old manuscript (dated 419 a. H.) in the Topkapi Saray Library in Constantinople, as an appendix to the Divān of Ḥassān b. Ṭabīb. The second manuscript so far known which is in the Egyptian National (formerly Khedival) Library in Cairo, seems to be a late copy of the above. The poems were collected by Ibn al-Sikkīt, but the final editor seems to have been al-Suḳkārī. What has survived for us in the Divān is certainly only a fragment of the original total.

Kāis reveals in his poems the two sides of his life, the settled and the nomadic, which was so characteristic of the Arabian oasis of the time. His descriptions of war and women are celebrated. The real Bedūn, the description of the riding she-camel, the ride through the desert and hunting are almost entirely lacking in his poems. Kāis is highly esteemed by later generations, perhaps more for his chivalrous character than for his poetic gifts. His poems are a very important source for our knowledge of conditions in Medina immediately before Islam.

Bibliography: Der Divān des Kāis b. al-Ḥṣīn, ed. T. Kowalski (Leipzig 1914). Besides the literature given there, in the historical introduction, al-Samūḥūdi's Wafā' al-Wafā' bi-
Aḥbār Dar al-Muṣafāt (Cairo 1326/27, 2 vols.) is very important for the topography of Medina and therefore also for the understanding of the Divān.

(T. KOWALSKI)

KAISĀN, Abū ʿAmra, a client of the ʿUrain, who belonged to the Bajilā [q. v.], was one of the leaders of the Mawālī [see MAWLĀ] in Kīf in the time of the Mughārāt [q. v.] and was one of the latter's intimates. Al-Mughārāt made him commander of his police force (harasa, sharfa). In this capacity this ardent Śi'a took part in avenging al-Husayn by killing, wherever possible, those who had taken the field against him and destroying their houses. For example, he beheaded, by al-
Mughārāt's command, ʿUmar b. Sa'd b. ʿAbd Wākās who had commanded the troops sent against al-
Husayn. In the battle of Mādār (67 = 868) Kaisān commanded the Mawālī; he was perhaps killed in this fierce battle. According to al-Kaṣhī, Kaisān's method of procedure is said to have originated among the people of Kīf the proverb applied to one who is deprived of his wealth: "Abū ʿAmra has entered his house"; cf. al-Dinawarī, p. 297, 5: "Abū ʿAmra has visited him". A verse in al-Kaṣhī describes him as wickeder than Iblīs. — As Mūḥammad b. al-Ǧanaffaṣī was the Imām of the Kaisānīya, Kaisān is occasionally represented as his client or pupil.
KAISANIYA was first applied to the Kūfa group of ʿStāl, the Mawāli, represented by Kaisān Abū Amr (see above), whose interests were championed by al-Muḥtār. The name was then extended to those who held the views, which had considerable currency among the ʿStīšis led by al-Muḥtār, and continued to be influential even later. When the little known Kaisān came in times of peace to be practically forgotten, his name was often explained as a ḥaṣab of al-Mukhtar. Mukhthātīs thus became another name for the older stratum of the Kaisānīya. The latter name, however, is also derived from a certain Kaisān, a mawla of ʿAll, who fell at Sīr ʾ (al-Tabarî, i. 3929, 10), from whom al-Muḥtār is said to have derived his views. The Kaisānīya were also called Khvāṣhābiya [q. v.] from the wooden club which the Mawāli carried as a weapon.

The contemporary Kaisānīs ascribed special knowledge to al-Muḥtār and to some extent regarded him as a prophet. There must also have been among them an echo of a cult, followers especially by some Yemen clans and described as Sabaʾ, the worship of an alleged chair of ʿAll, which was compared with the Ark of the Covenant and also used as an oracle. Their Imām in succession to al-Husayn was Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīya [q. v.], whom al-Muḥtār put forward as a mere figure-head. As al-Shahrastānī tells us, the Kaisānīs held the view that he was master of all knowledge and had obtained from the two Sāliydīs (i.e. al-Husayn and al-Husayn) all mystical, allegorical and esoteric knowledge as well as knowledge of the celestial spheres and of the souls. In time there came to be Kaisānīs who regarded Ibn al-Hanafīya as the Imām in immediate succession to his father and thus excluded al-Husayn and al-Husayn. In proof of this they pointed to the tradition that ʿAli in the Battle of the Camel had entrusted the standard to Muḥammad b. al-Hanafīya. This view probably arose in opposition to those held by the Imāmīs and Zaīdis.

Ibn al-Hanafīya’s death, probably in 81 = 71, resulted in a split in the Kaisānīya. Apart from those who followed his son Abū Hanafīya, a section of them transferred their allegiance to the Imāmate to his son Abū Ḥāšîm [q. v.], who was regarded as heir to the secret knowledge of his father. They were called Ḥāšîmīyā; but after the death of Abū Ḥāšîm (g = 716/7 or 99 = 717/8) they broke up into various branches on the question of succession. The Abāšīs now spread the idea that Abū Ḥāšîm before his death had transferred his rights to the Imāmate to Muḥammad b. ʿĀli b. Abū ʿAbbās b. ʿAbbās [q. v.].

A group of the Kaisānīs, however, did not believe in the death of Muḥammad b. al-Hanafīya. According to them, he lived in concealment in a ravine in the mountains of Rawḍa [q. v.] out of which he would one day emerge at the head of his followers as Mādī [q. v.] in order to fill the earth with righteousness. Stay is there described with Messianic features by the Kaisānī poets al-Khulayyīr [q. v.] and al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyātī [q. v.]. These views of the concealment (ghabā, q. v.), and return (raʾīd, q. v.) are attributed to a certain Abū Kārib (Kūrinib), whose followers were therefore distinguished as Karibiyā (Karibiyā) [q. v.].

According to al-Shahrastānī, all Kaisānīs held the view that religion consisted in obedience to a man; by means of allegorical interpretation (taʾwīl, q. v.) the prescriptions of law were transferred to such men. Among the Kaisānīs also arose the view that “the intervention of new circumstances can produce the alteration of a divine decision already made” (kadd, q. v.). Besides the doctrine of the return of the hidden Imām, a messianic chosch (tanhâl, q. v.) had also followed on from them. The Kaisānīs could not survive alongside of the Imāmīyas [q. v.] and the Zaidīyas [q. v.]. For Ibn al-Ham the Kaisānīya was an extinct sect. To Kaisānīs influences should probably be ascribed the fact that concealment and return were attributed to Alīs, whom the Zaidīs had championed. A remarkable document, which is said to contain Karmathian doctrines (see Karmathians) may also emanate from Kaisānī circles. In it a certain Abū al-Muḥammad b. al-Hanafīya appears as Mādī and Prophet (al-Tabī, i. 2128 ff.; Ibn al-Akrī, al-Kūmil, vii. 311, 16 sqq.; de Sacy, Exposé de la religion des Druses, Paris 1818, i. Introd. p. clxxvi. sqq. An Ahmad is, however, not known among the sons of Muḥammad b. al-Hanafīya (cf. Ibn Saʿd, al-Tabarī, v. 67; Ahmad b. Abī al-Daʾūd al-Ḥusaynī, Undat al-Tālīfī fi Amāb al-Tālīf, Bombay 1318, p. 310 sqq.).

KAISARIYA — KAISARIYA

[Text continues with natural prose format]

KAISAR (A.), the usual name in Arabic for the Byzantine Emperor. The word, of course, represents the Greek Καίσαρ and came to the Arabs through the intermediary of the Aramaic (cf. Fränkel, Die Aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen, Leiden 1886, p. 278 sqq.). This borrowing must have taken place at quite an early period as the word in Syriac later appears almost always in the form Κεατ (cf. Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, s.v.). The Arab, centuries before Muhammad, had relations with the Byzantines (cf. A. Muller, Der Islam im Morgen- u. Abendland, i. 10 and the article GHAṢAIM). Among the old Arabic poets, Imru’ al-Kais in particular frequently mentions the Kaisar, who, indeed, played a great part in his life (cf. IMR) al-Kais). The word does not occur in the Korān but is quite frequent in the biography of Muhammad and especially in Tradition, and, therefore, may note, without the article like a proper name — is usually mentioned in the first person among contemporary secular rulers; next to him come the king of the Persians and the Negus of Abyssinia (that the Persian Hormuzan in al-Bukhārī, Ṣafīḥ, Dīṣa, Bāb I = ed. Krehl-Juyboll, ii. 292, s from below gives a different opinion is, of course, not to be wondered at). In the narratives mentioned a great part is played by the epistle said to have been sent by Muhammad through Dīlya [q.v.] to the governor of Būṣrā and through him to the Emperor Heracles, who thereupon interrogated Abū Sufyān, who happened to be within reach, regarding the new prophet. Here as well as in the story of the embassy of the Prophet to the Ghasamid al-Ḥārīt b. Abī Shamlir (of doubtful authenticity; cf. Noldeke, Die Ghasamischen Fürsten etc., in the Abhandl. d. Kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, 1887, phil.-hist. Klasse, p. 42 of the reprint), Heracles (in contrast to Kiswa) appears as a man, at heart inclined to Islām, whom only fear of his subjects prevents from openly professing the new religion. — The Traditions further record all sorts of sayings and prophesies of Muhammad regarding Kaisar, which can at once be recognised as later views thrown back into the past. In al-Bukhārī, Tafsīr on Sūra lxi. Bāb 2 (Kr.-J., iii. 360 middle of page) Muḥammad comforts ʿOmar, who is lamenting the neediness of his existence, contrasted with the splendid court of Kiswa and Kaisar, with the words: “Art thou not content that this world belongs to them and the next to us?” In Dīṣād, Bāb 93 (Kr.-J., ii. 229 below) we read: “To the first army of my community that plunders the city of Kaisar (Constantinople) its sins are forgiven”. In Dīṣād, Bāb 3 (Kr.-J., iv. 259, 9) the prophet foretells the final decline of the power of the East Roman Empire as well as that of the Persian kingdom.

In later poets also, Kaisar is still a current conception as a symbol of power and wealth — again alongside of Kiswa. Thus Ibn ʿIbnī (best known as a grammarian) in a verse quoted in Ibn Kahlīkūn, Waṣfīyyā, ed. Wustenfeld, fasc. iv. 229, from below, prides himself on being descended from the "Casaarīya — Kaisariya"

Bibliography (here and in the text mainly from references given by Prof. A. Fischer, Leipziger and Prof. A. Wensinck, Leiden): Arab Ḥ-i-Māʾ, Muḥaṣṣar Ṭurākh al-Bakhr, part ed. and transl. by Fleischer as Abhulsūs Historia antistamica, p. 132 at end; Imru’ al-Kais, Dīṣāh, ed. Alwardi, No. 13, 4, No. 20, 11; al-Bukhārī, al-Ṣafīḥ, ʿUṣūrī; Bāb 15 (ed. by Krehl and Juyboll, ii. 179); ibid. Maghāzī, B. 82 (Kr.-J., iii. 183, 11; Ibn Hīšam, Sūra, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 971, 11; Ibn Sa’d, ed. Scheda, i. 216, 11; al-Bukhārī, ed. Dīṣād, B. 99 (Kr.-J., ii. 232, 3); B. 102 (Kr.-J., ii. 233, 2 sqq.); ibid., Tafsīr on Sūrat ii., B. 4 (Kr.-J., ii. 214 at top, 216 in the middle) et passim; al-Ṣafīḥ (Caio 1327), ii. 79 below — 81; al-Tirmidhī, al-Ṣafīḥ (Caio 1292), ii. 119 below — 120; Wellhausen, Ghesn. u. Vorarb., ii. 98; Caeti, Annals, year 6 a.H., § 50.

KAISARIYA (also KAYSARIYA), plur. kaysīrī, the name of a large system of public buildings laid out in the form of cloisters with shops, workshops and frequently also living-rooms. According to de Sacy, Relation de l’Égypte par Abd Al-Atlaf (Paris 1810), p. 303 sqq., the kaisariya was originally distinguished from the sīr or bāzār-street probably only by its greater extent, and by having several covered galleries around an open court, while the sīr consists only of a single gallery. At the present day in any case the term kaisariya is not infrequently quite or almost identical in meaning with the Persian word kāwaṣarā, which first came into use in the near East in the 15th century, or the likewise modern analogous names, khān, khanā (okella), funduq [q.v.] and bezirīzān [q.v.].

Origin. The word kaisariya is certainly of Greek origin: κασαρεία "imperial", an abbreviation for μακαρεία ἰεράς “the imperial market”. As H. Thiersch has shown, not only is the plan of the mosque — according to R. Kasdorff, however, in his Haus und Hauswesen im alten Arabien, Halle 1914, p. 69, the early Muslim mosque was of ancient Arab origin — to be traced to the old quadrangular court (with or without cells around it) of the agora, but also the kaisariya, which was used on the one hand as a warehouse for goods (whence developed the market-place) and on the other hand, without any doubt, usually also as lodgings. The expression ἱερά χασαρεία recalls the fact that the oldest of these public buildings were imperial i.e. state institutions, while in the Muslim period they were mainly due to private initiative (foundations of rich merchants, members of royal families or high officials). Thiersch thinks (op. cit., p. 233) that the place where the idea of these buildings originated — like many other things in the new Muslim period — seems to have been Alexandria, which was especially rich in covered market-places and halls. Whether we should actually consider the Caesarea, the Caesareum temple in Alexandria, to which the market-place and warehouses were attached (Strabo, xvii. 794), as the original in name and fact of the kaisariya (as does Vollers in the Zeitschr. d. Dtsch. Morgen. Ges., ii. 302) is uncertain. A derivation of the word kaisariya from the name of the Palestine town of Kaisariya (see be-
low, which de Sacy (op. cit.) recommends, can hardly be supported with sound arguments. The word in any case was originally used only in those districts which, like Syria, Palestine and parts of North Africa, had been under (imperial) Byzantine rule. The idea was only transferred later to other lands, especially Spain and the east. In Spanish and Portuguese we find kastārya as a loan-word: Span. alcaicería (asecicería, caicería), Port. alcaicerias; cf. Fr. Caînes, Dict. Español-Latino-Arabe (Madrid 1787), i. 692; Dozy-Engelmann, Glossaire des mots espagnols et portugais de l'arabe, ii (Leiden 1856), p. 73; 79; D. Leopoldo de Equiluz, Glos. etim. de las palabras españolas ... de origen oriental (Granada 1856), p. 126.

The following notes may help to elucidate the occurrence of the word in the Islamic world. In Egypt we have especially good evidence of its use in Cairo. Al-Maqrizi (d. 845 = 1441) in his description of the city gives a large number of kastārya's; cf. al-Kīfātī (Bulaq 1270), ii. 86-91; E. Reitemeyer, Die Städtegründungen der Araber in Islam (1912), p. 117. Later its place was gradually taken by the word wādāli (wâdêli, wâdâli) and in Niebuhr's time (1761) only the marketplace in the suburb of Bulaq was still called Kastari. — In Fes (see Fès, ii. 72 sqq.) in Morocco the same word was used, that is, in the central market situated off by gates and walls from the other parts of the town; see Dozy, op. cit., ii. 432; T. Williams in the Beitr. zur Assyriol., iii. 583; E. Reitemeyer, op. cit., p. 148, and cf. above, ii. 73 sqq. — In Granada in Spain the Alcaicería is that quarter of the town where the raw silk is sold; see Tollhausen, Spanisch-deutsch. Worterb., i. Leipzig 1888, p. 288; F. v. Schack, op. cit., ii. 327. — In Syria we have evidence of the use of the word kastārya as the name of the shops of the wholesale dealers in Beirüt (see Niebuhr, op. cit., ii. 469 and K. Muller, op. cit., p. 7), in Damascus (see Ibn Džubair, Nûda, ed. Wright and de Goeje, p. 289, 31 (year 1184) and Seetzen, Reisen durch Syrien etc. (Leipzig 1854-9), i. 269) and also in Aleppo (see Ibn Džubair, p. 252, 31; Yûṣûf, Muṣŷlīm (ed. Wustenfeld), ii. 307, 23; Ibn Bāṭṭūṭa (ed. Paris), i. 151; A. Russell, The Natural History of Aleppo, London 1794, i. 56; German transl., i. (Göttingen 1797), p. 45). — In al-Ḥasā (Hofhā, q. v., p. ii. 324 sqq.) in Eastern Arabia the quarter of the town thatcontains the shops is called al-Gasāriyya; see Der Islam, v. 32. — Going still further east we find a square called Kaṣāriyya in Mūsul: see Ibn Džubair, op. cit., p. 235, 16; in al-Salmiyya near Mūṣul: Yaḥṣūb, iii. 113, 21; in Irbil: Yaḥṣūb, i. 186, 22; in Baghdad: see Massignon, op. cit., p. 92 (the present bazaar centre); in Kermêş: see Massignon, op. cit.; in Isfahān: see Ritter, op. cit., ix. 49; Vullers, Lex. Pers.-Lat., ii. 753a, and cf. also (Isphahān) Pietro della Valle, Viaggi (Brugge 1843), ii. 8, German transl., (Gent 1874), i. 5; [Dupré] Voyage au Persie (Paris 1819), ii. 125 and V. Forbes, Travels in Various Countries of the East, iii. (1819), 16; in Tibriz: see Ritter, op. cit., ix. 856; in Khwārizm (Urgand): Ibn Bāṭṭūṭa, iii. 4.

We may further note that, according to a reference in Niebuhr (op. cit.), about the middle of the xviiith century large public buildings in the Barby State (N. W. Africa) were called casseria. In Algiers at the present day kāsāriyya means barracks; see Dozy, op. cit. In the ruined cities of Iḫwarān the palaces of the east, while Roman or Byzantine governors are now also called kāsāriyya; see Wetzstein, Reisebeschreibung über Haeran etc. (Berlin 1860), p. 55. In general it appears that in modern times the use of the word kāsāriyya as market-place and suchlike has to a great extent given way to newer words like bālān, zākāla, fiṣadūk and radīsān.


KĀSĀRIYA or KĀSĀRIYA = Kēśāra (Caesarea), a name bestowed in the reign of Augustus and Tiberius on a whole series of towns of the Roman East, and also in North Africa and Spain. 17 places of the name are known; see Pauly-Wissowa, Realenschr. k. klass. Altertumswissensch., i. 1288 sq. The Arab writers only know of two towns named Kāsāriya, viz.: 1. a town in Pa- lestine, on the coast in 35° N. Lat., about 24 miles south of Haifa. Its letters name Kāṣāra, Kāṣāra, Kāṣāstān, Kāṣānst, Kāṣāstān, Kōṣā war, Kasra, and the philistinische Kaste (f. Schar, Guss und die philistinische Kaste), 1852, p. 420 sqq.; Neulauer, op. cit., p. 11-15) is of uncertain etymology. To distinguish it from places of the same name, especially the north Galilean Caesarea (Caesarea Philippi, Pananes, Dānāyûs [q. v.], this town was called more defi- tely Caesarea Statonis, C. Palaestinae or C. mar- ritima). The Arabs distinguish it by the addition of Filisīn (Kāsāriya in Palestine) from the town of the same name in Asia Minor.

The origin and antiquity of Caesarea is veiled in obscurity; but its name is certain to exist in the second century B. C.; cf. 22 B. C. Herod I laid out a fine city, which received the name of Caesarea in honour of Augustus, on the site of the ancient settlement which had fallen into ruins (on the date cf. Otto in Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., Suppl. Heft 2, col. 68, note). Part of the plan of the new foundation was the making of a splendid harbour which gave the town a great economic importance by giving the Jews access to the Mediterranean. Caesarea rapidly developed to be the first town in the country and maintained this position for some four centuries. It was also of great importance for Christianity, which early found a footing there as it was its spiritual metropolis in Palestine down to the time of the Council of Chalcedon (451). As late as the Arab Invasion Caesarea was still a flourishing town. It vigorously resisted the advance of the Muslims and withstood them in a long siege until finally Mu’awiyah took the city by storm. The statements in the Oriental sources regarding the date of its fall and the length of the siege vary; the siege probably began in 18 (639) and ended in 19 (649).
The accounts also differ very considerably as to the number of the defenders. On the Muslim conquest see de Goeje, Méon, sur la Compétitie de la Syrie, p. 166 sq.; Catani, Annali dell'Islam, iv. 31 sq., 156—162.

Kaisariya remained in undisputed possession of the Muslims until the First Crusade. During this it was stormed and taken by Baldwin I on May 31, 1101; see Wilken, Gesch. der Kreuzzüge (Leipzig 1859—1852), ii. 102—104; R. Rohricht, Gesch. der Kreuzzüge im Orients (Innsbruck 1898), p. 577.

Among the rich booty taken by the Christians on this occasion, the most valuable was a six-sided emerald, a vessel of green glass which was believed to have been used as a bowl of the Last Supper (this belief apparently first arose under the influence of the story of the Grail). The Genoese received those sacred relics along with a third part of the city as a reward for the services which they had rendered at its capture. The vessel is still preserved in the Catedral at Genoa and is known as the sacro calice. On it see Wilken, op. cit., ii. 103, 108—111; Mlinar, op. cit., ii. 306, 307; de Goeje, Chrestomathie, vol. vii, 87 (with plan: copperplate V); A. v. Prokesch (1829), Reise ins heil. Land (Vienna 1831), p. 28—34; Wilson (1842), H. Barth (1846) in Ritter, op. cit., xvi. 599, 604—7; G. Hanel (1847) in the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Ges., iv. 339 sqq.; v. d. Velde, Reise durch Syrien und Palästina, i. (Leipzig 1855), p. 253—6; V. Guérin, Deser, geogr. . . . de la Palestine, 2e partie, ii. (Paris 1875), 321—39; Dalman’s Palastinafahrten, v. 15, viii. 128 sqq.; H. Thiersch in the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Palästinavereins, xxxviii. (1914), 62 sq.

The town in Asia Minor, see KASARIYA.

and Syria\(^5\) (Leipzig 1912), p. 237—239 (with plan); E. Dowling, Sketches of Cæsarea (Palestine), London 1912. (M. Strecke)

**KAISARIYA** (in Arabic authors also KAJARIYA and KAJARIYA, a town in Asia Minor (Rûm), in 35\(^o\) E. Long. (Greenwich) and 35\(^o\) 15\(^\prime\) N. Lat. at the northern base of the Ardish-Dagh [q. v.]), 3,500 feet above sea-level on a treeless plateau, watered by the Kara-Sâ, a tributary of the Kizil Yrmak (Halys) — the latter flows about 14 miles North of Kaisariya. At the present day it is the chief town of a sandjak of the vilayet of Angora [q. v.]. The mediaeval and modern town is the successor of the ancient Mazaca, the capital of Cappadocia, to which Tiberius after its conquest gave the name Caesarea. Mazaca was a mile or two S.W. of the modern town, on the spurs of the Ardish-Dagh, while the latter gradually grew up around the buildings which the great church-father Basilias, a native of Caesarea (329—379), erected here. Justinian I fortified this new settlement.

During the middle ages Caesarea in general shared the political history of central and eastern Asia Minor. In the viith century it passed into the hands of the Arabs, but in 108 (726) again passed under Arab rule; cf. Well, Gesch. der Christen, i. 637 and the Syriac chronicle of Dionysius of Tell-Malih (ed. Chabot), p. 26 sq. In the viith century Kaisariya was taken by the Seljukis and played an important part as the second town in their empire. This was its period of greatest prosperity. In the viith century it was the residence of the Turkish dynasty of the Dânshîmendis (cf. BANISHMENDA).

In the viith century Kaisariya had for a considerable time to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Mongol Khans of Persia (the so-called Il-khans), as is shown by the coins they struck here. Ibn Battûta makes special mention of the strong Mongol garrison in the town. About 1300 (1398) Bayezid I [q. v.] took it (cf. Well, op. cit., v. 70) and it remained henceforth in Turkish hands. Kaisariya fell only for a very brief period into the power of the Mamûl Şûluks, in 1277, when Baibars and again in 822 (1419) when Uthûm, son of Sultan al-Ma'âshid advanced into this region of Asia Minor; see Well, op. cit., iv. 82, v. 146.

Kaisariya is now one of the most important towns in the interior of Asia Minor. The population of the Sandjak of Kaisariya was estimated by Cuinet in 1892 at 210,732, of whom 136,000 were Muslims, 45,318 Armenian Orthodox, 25,449 Greek Orthodox, 1,800 Protestant and 1,575 Roman Catholic Armenians. In 1831 Kinner estimated the population at about 25,000 (including 15,000 Armenians, 300 Greeks and 150 Jews), Amstowr in 1839 at 16,522, Cuinet in 1892 at 72,000 (45,000 Muslims, 14,400 Greek Orthodox, 9,000 Armenian Orthodox, 800 Catholic Armenians, 1,200 Protestants). In 1896 R. Oberhumer-Zimmerer put it at about 60,000, of whom 25% were Christians (including 10,000 Armenians), Paedeler in 1914 at 54,000 of whom 33% were Christians. H. Barth in 1858 estimated the number of inhabited houses at 8,000—10,000.

In the last centuries of the ancient period there must have been a strong Jewish community in Kaisariya, for the Sâsânid Sapor (Sâbur) 1(241—

272) is said, according to Jewish sources, to have slain no less than 12,000 Jews here about 260, in his incursion into Roman Asia Minor; cf. Erasch and Gruber, Allgem. Encykld., 2nd Sect., xxvii. 184 (note 87) and Paulus-Wissowa, op. cit., 2nd Series, i. 2330. In the middle ages the town seems to have been a great centre of Halâkha study in Asia Minor; cf. A. Neubauer, op. cit., H. Graetz, Gesch. der Juden, iv. 61, 263. The characteristic national Church of Kaisariya is unfavourably criticised by several authorities (e.g. Chantre and Ramay). During the hot months many of them live in the hills which form the last spurs of the Ardish-Dagh.

The impression made by Kaisariya is imposing and picturesque especially on account of its beautiful situation and considerable extent. Various travellers, like Mollte (Briefe über Zustände u. Begriffe in der Türkei, Berlin 1893, p. 339) and Naumann have therefore considered it the prettiest and finest town in the interior of Asia Minor. Its interior is therefore the more disappointing. Its filthy and dirty, its numerous ruined streets and its walled enclosures and suburbs. The tuff of the neighbourhood yields excellent building material. For fear of earthquakes, the houses of the town are usually left (as Barth observes) unfinished in the upper stories.

The Arab geographers of the middle ages mention particularly among the buildings a mosque, erected in memory of Sâsiyid Batîâl, the Turkish warrior of the faith and national hero (cf. above i. 680). They also report that the town contained the highly venerated sarcophagus of Muhammad b. al-Ramâziya [q. v.]. No remains are preserved of the important churches which existed here in the early Christian period. We find, however, important monuments of the Seljuk epoch, notably the Ulû-Djami\(^6\) of 1206, the Haşr mosque of 1236 with Madrasa, also somewhat outside of the town, the round tomb or Sûrîshây Gimbet and the Köskûl Oun, a khan-like building around an octogonal tank of 1340. The walls of the town also date from the Seljuk period but have been restored at a later date. This is also true of the citadel which, now filled with Turkish houses, affords a splendid panorama.

Kaisariya is an important junction of roads and carries on a considerable trade. Local industry is limited to the manufacture of carpets and leather, the manufacture of various dyes, and (according to Barth) to the peculiar preparation of dried meat, which is sold throughout Asia Minor.

About half an hour South-West of Kaisariya rise in vineyards the ruins of the ancient Mazaca Caesarea, called by the natives Eski-Kaisariya, more usually Eski-Shehir (i.e. Old Town) and Zorbat by the Armenians. A series of not inconsiderable villages surrounds the modern town in the form of an arc from West to South-East, like suburbs. For example the little town of Talas lies 1 1/2 hours to the South-East, the birthplace of St. Sêbas (752) with an ancient castle, powerful walls in the form of a quadrilateral, and the buildings of the American Mission (schools, hospital, etc.). A little further to the South lies Sindijedere, where in the monastery of St. John, surrounded by well conducted schools, the Greek Archbishop lives. Talas and Sindijedere are already on the North-eastern spur of the Ardish-Dagh.

In the West and South of Kaisariya there was

When Šāmīrūdghā ascended the throne in Dhu-ḥiṣād 1, 872 (Dec. 1467), he appointed his friend Kāṭṭbey At-tabk but the Šūlṭān had no real power, as he had very few followers among the Māmlūks at his command. He had not the money to win over new followers; the treasury was empty. After an unsuccessful rising by the Ustādār Khāṣīr the crown was offered in the month of Ṛadjāb of the same year (Feb. 1468) to Kāṭṭbey, who accepted it after some hesitation. Šāmīrūdghā retired into private life to Damīṭta, to which he was not taken as a prisoner but travelled in perfect liberty accompanied by some friends. Unlike other Māmlūk Šūlṭāns, Kāṭṭbey treated deceased Šūlṭāns or descendants of former Šūlṭāns throughout his reign with magnanimity and honour, frequently invited them to give tournaments in Cairo, allowed them to make the pilgrimage to Mecca and even allowed them to visit the capital in his absence without any suspicion or fear of conspiracies.

Kāṭṭbey’s chief political problem was his relations with the Ottomans. The rivalry between them and the Egyptians found expression in the fighting among their vassals in Asia Minor. The ruler of Albāstances [q. v.], Shāh Šūwār (cf. Idh. ʿl-Šāhīr, i. 9602) was at war with Egypt (cf. Ḥoshkhdām) and was secretly supported by the Ottomans, while Kāṭṭbey assisted prince ʿAlī Shāh of Kūramān in his war against the Ottoman Māmlūk. The first two expeditions sent against Shāh Šūwār (872 and 873) ended disastrously through the carelessness of the Egyptian commanders and more especially the lack of discipline among their troops and the rivalry between the Egyptian and Syrian corps. Kāṭṭbey later succeeded in depriving Shāh Šūwār of the help of the Ottoman Šūlṭān by agreeing to drop the assistance he had himself been giving Ḍāhī Shāh of Kūramān. Thus weakened, Shāh Šūwār was decisively defeated in 876 (1471) by the At-tabk Ezbed. Shāh Šūwār fell back to Zamanāt. Besieged there he capitulated on condition that he was to remain in possession of his kingdom as vassal of the Šūlṭān; but he was taken prisoner, brought to Cairo and executed contrary to the laws of war. The prince of the White Sheep, Uznān Ḥasan, the ruler of Dīyār Bakr and a part of Persia, was a dangerous rival to Kāṭṭbey, and advanced from triumph to triumph; in 872 he defeated the Šūlṭān of the Black Sheep and in 873 the Šūlṭān of Sāmanqād, but when in 876 (1471) he declared war on Muḥammad II he was defeated and thus became less dangerous for Kāṭṭbey. He died in 880 (1475) and was succeeded by Yāḥūb Bey. A quarrel arose between Baydār, the latter’s governor in al-Rūḥā (Edirne), and the Šūlṭān’s general Veshbog, because Baydār had given shelter to Saif, the rebel chie of the Reduins of Ḥāmā. Yeḥubb advanced on al-Rūḥā and, although satisfaction was offered in every respect, he insisted on besieging the town, but was defeated during a sortie and killed with several of his staff; other Egyptian notables were taken prisoner. Kāṭṭbey could not
wipe out this defeat and had to make peace, as he was threatened with a struggle with the new Ottoman Sultan Bayazid [q. v., i. 684]. Apart from continual friction regarding the ownership of Albâstân, Bayazid felt himself threatened, because Kâ'îtbey had given a friendly welcome to his brother Ljem [q. v., i. 1034 sq.], the pretender to the throne and had even encouraged him to fight against Bayazid. An embassy sent to Bayazid to endeavour to maintain peace was unsuccessful. The Ottomans invaded the southern part of Asia Minor in 897 (1486) and occupied Tarsus and Adana; other Ottoman troops besieged Malatya. The Egyptian forces operated with success against both armies especially as Kâ'îtbey had won over 'Alî al-Dawla, prince of Albâstân. In 893 (1488) the Ottomans were no more successful. An endeavour to land a considerable body of troops in the bay of Iskanderûn [q. v.] failed. In 895 (1489/90) the Atâbek Ezek inflected a decisive defeat on the Turks at Caesarea in Asia Minor, where several generals were captured. Kâ'îtbey showed a wise moderation in retaining his inclination for peace, recognizing the enormous resources of the Ottomans and peace was concluded in 896 (1491). The rest of the reign of Kâ'îtbey was peaceful but the domestic situation did not improve. It is true that he succeeded by his authority alone in preventing a fight between the hostile Mamlûk factions, but he could not permanently restrain their outbursts and he did not succeed in introducing a sound financial system.

Kâ'îtbey was by far the most important ruler of the Burji dynasty (see i. 796). He once more raised the prestige of the Mamlûk empire to a great height abroad, so that he could with good reason consider himself the first prince of Islam. For his campaigns and his buildings he required considerable means, which he could only raise by extortion, in the total absence of a regulated system of taxation. This is made a severe reproach against him by the chroniclers. In the modern view it is an obvious duty of a country to provide the necessary means for its army. It was just this lack of organised taxation that brought about the ruin of the Mamlûk empire. The Sultan was left to provide funds for himself by force. He either extorted them (if necessary by torture) from the high officials of the treasury, who had enriched themselves by dishonest means or "visited" the great shaikhs of the provinces and received gifts — presumably not always voluntary — from them (on one tour alone he raked in 200,000 dinârs). He also levied contributions (e. g. to the amount of the five-monthly rental) from the real estate belonging to the jîgu foundations or from private individuals and forced the reservists, the Awdâl al-Nâs [see the article Awdâl İyäs], to pay large sums in order not to be sent to the front. When the expedition planned did not take place, he gave back the money to the general amusement. He taxed Jews and Christians correspondingly. He also levied a very burdensome tax on the sale of corn. His expenses were on a corresponding scale. In the years 872—894 A. H. he expended over 7,000,000 dinârs (70 million francs) in paying the army, a large sum for these days. His buildings as well as the renovation of older buildings required large sums. The mosque at his tomb before the gates of Cairo, the Kâ'nâkâh (monastery) in the village of this name near the capital, the building of the castle at Aleppo, work on the mosque in Medina which was destroyed in 881 (1475/6) by a fire caused by lightning are celebrated. Although he was nearly 60 years old when he ascended the throne, he spent the earlier years of his reign in an almost feverish state of activity. Not only did he, contrary to the previous custom, daily leave the citadel for riding and excursions but he travelled round unceasingly and made the pilgrimage to Mecca and great tours of inspection to Aleppo and beyond to the Euphrates. He was able to keep his Mamlûks in control and the always rebellious Beduins in the Delta as well as the Arab tribes in Nûbûl and Hamî. The period of his reign seemed an ideal one to the historians in contrast to those of his successors. He was of unusual, almost sadistic cruelty. He loved to be present at whippings and tortures, sometimes taking part in person; he was exceedingly strict to his son and once, as a punishment, made him live in the Mamlûk barracks and perform the most menial duties. He had only one legal wife; of his slaves the best known is Aslîh b. Aslîh, the mother of his son Nâsim b. Ismâyîl, the famous poet and great宁r al-Nâsîr (cf. her biography in my article in Zeitschr. des Deutsch. Pal. Ver. 1905, p. 191).


Allâh, AÎMD, AL-KAYYÌM, al-Khâjjî, a philosopher of the third century A. D., with Isâmut and gnostic tendencies; al-Shahristâni knew of works by him in Arabic and Persian; the fragments which he gives are to be compared with Rasûl İshâq al-Safî — cf. Shahristâni, Miqât, Cairo 1317, ii. 17—18.

(L. Massignon)

KA'ÎYM (Allâh), (v. 1), originally: "he who stands upright", then (with bi, ala, 6 or the genitive alone): he who takes something upon himself, takes care of something or someone and hence also has authority over them. Thus we find the pre-Islamic poet al-Ku'âmî (Dîwân, ed. Barth, Leiden 1902, No. 26) already speaking of a "ka'îym of water", i.e. apparently the man in charge of it, the supervisor, and the poet Bârî b. Surâîm (Hamâdan of Abu Tamâmâ, ed. Freytag, p. 269, verse 2) speaks of the ka'îym of a woman i.e. he who provides for her, her husband. The first mentioned meaning, (supervisor etc.), is then found in all possible applications, administrator of a pious foundation, of baths, superintendent of a temple, caretaker of a saint's grave, etc.; indeed, in al-Bukhârî, Ṣahîh, Da'awât, Bah 10 (ed. Kreil-Juynboll, iv. 189, 6), in 'Abî Hammad's night-prayer, the expression is even applied to God as the director of heaven and earth, and this application seems also to be present in 'Omar b. Abî Rabî'a, ed. P. Schwarz, No. 91, 11, where the poet swears by the "religion of the Ka'îym". Here, of course, it is most probably a question of an inversion (perhaps caused by the metre) of the Korânic expression al-Dîn il-ka'îym (see below) on the model of Bâtîm il-Mu'âdadhîn. (Cf. Wright, Grammar, ii.
§ 95 sq. and al-Kaššālī on Buḫšrā, Ṣaww, bāb 67 end).

The meaning “provider, husband” of a woman is frequently found in the eschatological traditions, in which it is said that with the approach of the last day the number of women will increase in proportion to men, so much that there will only be one kašâim for every 50 women.

The adjectival meaning “commanding” (a branch of knowledge) perhaps arises out of the same sphere of conceptions as “provider’s, master”; it is found in a biographical notice of a scholar in Yaqqūt, Muḥammad, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 225, 42. On the other hand, kašâim, also an adjectival meaning “correct, right”, repeatedly found in the Korān in the expression al-Dīn “l-kašâim” and similar combinations may have to be semasiologically separated from the former meaning.

Bibliography (here as in the text mainly from references given by Prof. A. Fischer, Leipzig and Prof. A. J. Wensinck, Leiden):

Kašâim = a d m i n i s t r a t o r : al-Buḫšrā, al-Kašâb Wāṣyā, Bāb 32 (ed. Krehli-Juyboll n. 196, 4) and al-Kaššālī s. v.; Yaqqūt, op. cit., iii. 856, 13; al-Maškāri, ii. 547, 20; al-Tabārī, ed. de Goeje, ii. 814, 11; al-Karwīnī, Aḥāf al-ahwāl, ed. Schneid, ii. 122, a. from below;

= husband: al-Buḫšrā, op. cit., Nīkāh, Bāb 110 (ed. Kr.-J. n. 453, 3 from below) and passim;

= Omar b. Abī Rabī‘a, op. cit., poem No. 269, 3; = correct, orthodox: Sūra ix. 36 and passim; xxviii, 4 and thereon al-Kaššālī’s note on the quotation of this passage from the Korān in al-Buḫšrā, op. cit., Iṣām, Bāb 34 (Kr.-J. n. 19, 16).

A. Schaeade

Al-KAŠÂM (A.), one of the *beautiful names* of Allāh (see i. 393), according to some theologians the greatest name of Allāh (see Tādī al-Arūs, ii. 36, 7 from below — ult. The word is of Jewish origin and means like its prototype, the Hebrew כָּשֵׁמ, or the Aramaic کُشيم (cf. Hirschfeld, New Researches into the Composition and Exegesis of the Koran, London 1902, p. 69, 12 and note 89; Brünow-Fischer, Archaische Christosthätik, Berlin 1913, glossary under ḥām “the eternal”. Muḥammad, who uses it three times in the Korān (ii. 256; iii. 1 and xx. 110) may have picked it up from the Jews of Medina (the attribution of the whole of Sūra xx. as “Meccan” would then have to be revised). When late (post-Korānic) texts e.g. al-Buḫšrā, al-Saḥīh, Tawāhid, Bāb 24 (ed. Krehli-Juyboll n. 466, 17; Muḥammad’s night-prayer) have the variant kašāim, the a in the last syllable is probably only to be regarded as another reproduction of the Hebrew kāmēt. The other meanings which Arabic exegesists have given the word may be due to ignorance of its foreign origin (cf. Tādī al-Arūs, i. 62; al-Ṭabarī, Dīnār al-Bayān, Bāḥāk 1234, ii. 5 on Sūra ii. 256).

Bibliography (here and in the text mainly from references given by Prof. A. Fischer, Leipzig): Leyvi, Neuhebr. und chald. Worterb., under קותא and קוסא, Z. D. M. G., xlvii. (1890), p. 168—171; al-Abghīrī, Kirāb al-Mutṭanāf (Cairo 1308), i. 5, 14 (beginning of Chap. i.).

A. Schade

AL-KAŠÂM (Os. ‘Amr b. Mālik al-Tamīmī, an A r a b general. When Ṣaḏāḥ bint al-Ḥārith gave herself out to be a prophetess after the death of Muḥammad, al-Kašâm joined her and is said to have fought on her side. But in the period following he always retained his Muslim views, and as a subordinate of the famous Khaḍīj b. al-Walid [q. v.] he played a very prominent part in the earliest wars of Islām. As early as the year 11 (632) he is reported to have fought faithfully on the side of Khaḍīj in the battle of Buṣārā [q. v.] and after the capture of al-Ḥira [q. v.] in Rabī‘ 1, 12 (May/June 633) there was an encounter between the Muslims under al-Kašâm and the Persians at al-Ḥassād in the vicinity of al-ʿAmār [q. v.] in which the latter were defeated. The exact date cannot be ascertained; according to one statement the fight was in the year 12; by others it is put in Khaḍīj’s campaign in Syria. In Rādāb 14 (Aug.—Sept. 635) al-Kašâm took part in the conquest of Damascus and in the following year he commanded a squadron in the battle of the Yarmūk, which also ended in the victory of the Muslims. Special mention is made of the way in which he distinguished himself in the desperate battle of al-Kaḏāsya [q. v.] in 16 (637) and of the fact that Abu Wāṣā was in command here, but the success is ascribed to the timely intervention of al-Kašâm. He is again mentioned among the valiant heroes who took part in the capture of al-Madā’in in the same year, when countless booty fell into the hands of the Muslims. According to some accounts he commanded the vanguard in the battle of Djālālā [q. v.] at the end of the same year and organised a garrison in Ḥulwān [q. v.]. He also shared in the capture of Nihāwand in 21 (641/642) and before the battle of the Camel (36—659) he was sent by Abu Bāṣrā to negotiate with Talha and al-Zuhair. He afterwards settled in al-Kufa. Al-Kašâm, who is one of the favourite hero figures in Arab legend, was also famed as a poet and celebrated his warlike deeds in several poems.


KAAHOTA, in older spelling KAAHTA, sometimes AL-KAHCTA, the name of a place on the Kaahta-Su, a tributary of the Euphrates, about 40 miles S.E. of Malatya, the residence of a kaimnakam and chief town in a kašt (circle) of the same name, which comprises the three nīfās (communities) of Gerger, Shiro and Merdu, with a population of about 46,000 (according to Chiniest mainly Kurds; with them over 4000 Armenians and belongs to the nīfā (administrative district) of Malatya in the province of Ma’murt al-Aziz (Kharpūt). The modern Kakahta which numbers only a few hundred huts with about 1000 inhabitants, almost exclusively Kurds, was famed in the middle ages for its exceedingly strong castle which, built on a steep eminence, guarded the eastern road from Simeisat to Malatya and was one of the frontier strongholds (Taṭuhr) of the
Muslim lands, and has again achieved fame in modern times through the discovery on the neighbouring Nemrud-Dagh of monuments of Antiochus I of Commagene of the 2nd century B.C. with first mention in the name of the Oriental historians of the Crusades; in Bar-Hebraeus and Michael Syrus it is written Gakhita, the ancient and the Byzantine name are not known; but the bridge built in the reign of Septimius Severus about 200 A.D. over the Isām-Ṣu at Kakhita and the remains of Byzantine buildings on the fortress show that the place was an important frontier station, even in antiquity and at the beginning of the middle ages. The hypothesis of AnRAW_TEXT_END
had no longer the importance as a frontier fort-
ness that it had in the middle ages, when it is
speecially mentioned as such by Abu 'l-Fida' (Tur-
üzüm, ed. Reinaud, p. 262 sq.) and Al-Dimashqî
(ed. Mehran, p. 206). Igalyzhâde (middle of the
15th century) had given it a section to itself in its
description of the Ottoman empire for the district
of Gerger and Kâkhta (von Hammer, Des Osm.
Reiches Staatswes., ii. 449) in Etwiya aho (Şûqät-
nûna, iv. 22) it is occasionally mentioned, but
the great geographical works of the 18th century,
the Mağârî-âl-Âlâmî of Muṣlamâd 'Abî 'i-
Îlî (f. 176r of the Vienna MS.), and the Dîjâdânnâd
of Kâtatîb Celebi (Constantinople 1145, p. 600 sq.)
only know Kâkhta from Abu 'l-Fida', whose state-
ments they translate word for word: among the
Anatolian Kâha's Kâkhta was placed in the out-
pots of the seventh stage (v. Hammer, Gesch. d.
Osm. Reiches, ix. 8, No. 470). In the course of the
last three centuries, these remote and inaccessible
districts have been settled by Kurds; Kâtatîb Celebi,
who describes them as a useless, re-
bellious horde of highway robbers; they obeyed
only their own chiefs (be yegîrî) and during the last
century it required repeated military expedi-
tions to restore the authority of the Porte in the
region inhabited by them. In these fights the
fortress of Kâkhta also played a part, as a Kûr-
dish Bey with his followers had entrenched him-
self in it; it was stormed in 1839 by Turkish
soldiers and from this incident became known in
Europe through reports of Ainsworth and v. Moltke
(cf. C. Ritter, Erdkunde, x. 870, 874, 883 sq.).
An archaeological excavation of the fortress has
yet not taken place; there is nothing to descrip-
tion in Hamdi Bey's work on the Turkish expedition
of 1883; he paid special attention to the Muslim in-
scriptions (still unpubl.-hed); his statements are
supplemented in details by the Sûlâmîn of Khârî-
pît. The great iron gate, which is mentioned as
early as the Sûlûk conquest in 1226, was brought
along with the gate of the fortress of
Gerger in 1882 to Diyar Bâkî.
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A. H.; Cünet, La Turquie d'Asie, ii. 379 sq.;
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dx dans l'Asie Orientale jusqu'en 1874 (Paris-
Nancy 1911), passim. (J. H. Morritt)
2. A town in Transbaikalia, 30° 19' N.
Lat., 106° 40' E. Long., 5500 feet above sea
level. Kâkhta is separated from Maimâtîn (Dai
Oorgî) by a neutral zone of about 50 yards broad
and connected with Troiskiwskî by the only
high road in the district, about 3¼ versts long.
Lying on the Kâkhta brook (Mong. Kaktugore-
khon) and surrounded by mountains (Burgultei =
Eagle mountain) Kâkhta arose out of a Russian
frontier post south of the Kâkhta brook on the
Rora, a stream that forms the frontier, through
the fact that here on Aug. 10, 1727 the treaty
of Kâkhta was signed. The Chinese opened this
point for trade between Russia and China and
found here Maimâtn (trade-frontier) and the
Russians the frontier post of Kâkhta. Henceforth
Kâkhta has been the coridor for the exploration
and penetration of Mongolia and China, for science,
politics, trade (tea-trade) and commerce. Fortified
with paliades, it has formed down to the present
day a little republic of merchants with its own
taxes (tax on tea), customs, its own administration,
council of elders, fire-brigade and church. In ad-
toion to houses of stone there are still old
wooden buildings in Kâkhta and great business-
houses with large yards for caravans, but no shops;
besides the Russian wholesale business there is
the detail trade among the Mongols and Chinese.
Since 1727 the famous December fair has been
held annually in Kâkhta. Kâkhta is the main
depot and clearing house for the so-called caravan
tea. At one time rhubarb was smuggled into
Russia. Now gold is smuggled into China. As a result
of the treaty of Pekin 1860 and the opening of
the great trans-Siberian railway the import of tea, silk
and cotton goods, has considerably decreased;
the export of cloths, furs and leather is rather basic.
There is a steppe post and telegraph to Pekin via Urga.
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p. 123–125; Timkowski, Reise n. China (Leipzig
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Moskau (Altenburg 1902), p. 236–290; Consten,
Weiteplätze d. Mongolei (Berlin 1919–1920);
Perry, With the Russians in Mongolia (London
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1877), p. 1–6, and xxx.; do., Ot Kâkhta na
îstoîkii rîki (St. Petersburg 1888), p. 70–73;
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(Tomsk 1910), p. 115; Moskowskaya Torgovnya
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KAKÖYIDS, a dynasty, which reigned from
208 (1007) to 445 (1051) over the provinces of
Isfâhân and Hamadhân. It descends from
Dinâmandâr Rustam b. al-Marzâbîn, a native of Da-
lam, who held the fie of Shahriyâr and received
the title of ishâkshâh from the Bâyiî Madjî al-
Dawla (cf. Ibn Isfandîryûn, Hist. dî Tabûr après,
trans. Browne, p. 225, 230, 231, 239; 'Alîr al-
Dîn, Tabûrî-dî Tabûrîrîn, ed. Donn, p. 195, 209;
Mirkhosîn, Raqûd al-Safî', iv. 26).
Kâkhta in the dialect of Dailam is the hypo-
coristic diminutive of ḫāḏa “maternal uncle” (cf. J. de Morgan, *Mission scientifique en Perse*, v. 216, No. 363; Rūstā Kāli Khan, *Farkhān-i Nāṣirī*, s. v.). The surname Ibn al-Aṭīrī was given to the founder of the dynasty, because he was the son of the maternal uncle of Maḏjḏ al-Dawla by the mother of the latter, sister of Dūshmanizār (Ibn al-Aṭīrī, ix. 358, better explanation than p. 146), his patron.

In place of Dūshmanizār, the coin has the name Dūshmanārū (cf. F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, p. 88; genealogical table, p. 445). The dynasty consisted of five members:

1. ‘Alī al-Dawla Muḥammad b. Dūshmanizār, surnamed Ibn Kākēnī, who was the first to declare himself independent, soon after 398 (1007); he was cousin of the wife of the Būyīd Fakhr al-Dawla [q. v.], mother of Maḏjḏ al-Dawla, who had him appointed governor of Isfahān; he seized Hamadān (414 = 1023), Rāi (419 = 1028) and Isfahān (421 = 1030); continual wars with the Kurds, with the ʿizāḥābād of Tābriz, and with the Ghuzz prevented him from peacefully enjoying the possession of these places. In 420 (1029) he declared himself a vassal of Sulṭān Muḥammad of Ghur; in 424 (1033) he was confirmed in the government of Isfahān by Sulṭān Masūd, who had succeeded his father; in 425 (1034) he rebelled, was twice defeated, lost Isfahān, tried to reinstate it two years later and ultimately succeeded after some time. The philosopher and physician Ibn Sīnā [q. v.] filled the ministerial office at his court, having been dismissed from the service of the Būyīd Tāj al-Dawla (Ibn Khallīkān, ed. Wüstenfeld, No. 189; transl. de Slane, i. 442); he was still minister at his death in 428 (1037). ‘Alī al-Dawla died in 433 (1041), after having built a wall round his capital in 429 (1037).

2. Zāhir al-Dīn Abū Mansūr Farkhāz, his eldest son, succeeded him at Isfahān; he fought against his brother Abū Ḥarīb, who had appealed for assistance to the Ghuzz Sālḏḵāj, settled in Rāi; the latter was defeated. Having sought refuge with the Būyīd Abū Kālidjār b. Sulṭān al-Dawla [q. v.] he induced the latter to undertake the siege of Isfahān; the quarrel was terminated by a peace between the two brothers, which lasted till 435 (1044). Zāhir then seized the two fortresses of Kirmān belonging to Abū Kālidjār, who in order to get them back, took Aḥarḵūt and defeated the Isfahān army. Besieged in his capital by Toghūr-Beg in 438 (1047) he was left in possession of his sēf after consideration of paying homage till 443 (1051) when the Sālḏḵāj finally obtained Isfahān after a long siege; he made it his capital and had the walls destroyed, saying that only a weak prince has need of walls to protect him. Abū Mansūr received as sēfs the two cantons of Yard and Aḥarḵūt. He accompanied Toghūr-Beg when the latter went to Frāghābī to marry the daughter of the Caliph al-Kāʾim in 455 (1063).

3. Abū Kālidjār Gershāsp, brother of the preceding, was reigning at Hamadān when this town was besieged by the Ghuzz in 420 (1029). He made peace with their chief Gok-Tāḥ and married his daughter; but the Ghuzz began their attacks again after the capture of Rai and forced him to take refuge in the fortress of Kinkawar. These Turks entered Hamadān in 430 (1038); having succeeded in drawing Abū Kālidjār after them, they attacked him but he escaped. It was immediately after this that his father ‘Alī al-Dawla surprised and defeated them. On the latter’s death Gershāsp made Nīḥāwān his residence. Farāmārız having recaptured Hamadān gave it as sēf to his brother on condition that he had the khotā pronounced in his name. In 434 (1042) Toghūr-Beg seized this town and demanded that Gershāsp should hand over Kinkawar, which its defenders refused to do. In 436 (1044) Gershāsp regained Hamadān and declared himself a vassal of the Būyīd Abū Kālidjār; next year Toghur sent his brother Yannāl to recoup the Ghuzz, but it was the prince who fled and taken refuge among the Dīwjakan Kurds. Yannāl in 439 (1047) took Kinkawar, which was commanded by a lieutenant of Gershāsp’s, ʿOḵba b. Fāris, who, to obtain the best conditions of surrender, pretended that he still had considerable supplies. After the loss of his possessions, Gershāsp took refuge with the Būyīd Abū Kālidjār. In 441 (1049) he was in Isfahān and received favourably the overtures of Mawdūd the Ghurānawī who was seeking help against the Sālḏḵājd, but he lost many soldiers in the desert and fell ill, which forced him to return. He died at al-Ahwāz in 442 (1051).

4. ‘Alī, son of Farāmārız, married Arslān Khaṭūn, daughter of the Sālḏḵāj Dīḏān, aunt of Sulṭān Malik-Shāh, in 469 (1076). Having sought refuge in Kirmān he was given the sēf of Yard (*Rec. de Textes rel. à l’histoire des Seljouques*, i. 26). He was killed in 488 (1095) fighting by the side of Tutāsh (Ibn al-Aṭīrī, x. 312).

5. ‘Alī al-Dawla Abū Kālidjār Gershāsp, son of ‘Alī [p. 145], prince of Yard, was in the service of the Sālḏḵāj; he had married the sister of Sulṭān Muḥammad and of Sandjar; dispossessed of his sēf, which was given to the cupbearer Karadža by Sulṭān Muḥammad, he put himself under Sandjar’s protection and was present at the battle in which the latter defeated his nephew (513 = 1119). He had escaped from the fortress of Farāzim, in which Muḥammad had had him interned (*Rec. de Textes rel. à l’histoire des Seljouques*, ii. 133).


**Kāʾa** (pl. Kāʾa, Kelī) in Arabic the name for a fortress or stronghold built on a hill or small elevation. In Turkey it also means the interior of a city in contrast to the outer suburbs (cf. Zunker, *Türk.-arab. Pers. Handwörterbuch*, p. 707). The word which looks good Arabic and is fairly generally regarded as a genuine Arabic word may be a loanword from Persian. Frankel first raised doubts as to its genuineness in *Die Aram.*, *Fremdwörter im Arabischen* (Leiden 1886), p. 237, because it cannot be derived from any Arabic root. Quite recently A. Siddiqi, *Studien über die pers. Fremdwörter im klass. Arabisch*
Kalā — Kalah

(Göttingen 1919), p. 70 sq. has championed the Persian origin of the word. The original is considered to be the Persian kalāt (a fort or village on a hill), (see Vallers, Lex. Pers.-Lat., ii. 859). This kalāt, strictly an appellative, appears at various places on Iranian soil, especially in Afghanistan and Fārs, as a local place-name also (Kalāt, Kilāt); cf. G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate (Cambridge 1905), p. 269 sq., 332, 395.

The form kalāt is of recent origin and has arisen through the addition of an inorganic t to the older kalā; cf. Andreas in the Mitt. d. Vorderasiat. Gesellschaft, dritter Band, (Berlin), ii. (1897), 85 sq. and Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclo. d. klass. Altertumswiss., i. 1176. Kalāt (also kalā) has survived for example in place names in Māzandarān; for references see Melgunow, Das südl. Ufer des Kaspiischen Meeres (Leipzig 1869), p. 303 sq. The old Iranian form of the word must, however, have been *kalāk; this is shown by the Arabic khulāf (town), which is certainly of Iranian origin, not perhaps an Arab. origin (from Khulāf, which cf. de Lagarde, Arment Studien (Göttingen 1877), No. 2357 and Hubbschmann in the Zeitschr. d. Dtsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, xlvii. 252 wished to make it. *Kalāk would regularly become Kalū (Andreas, op. cit.). It is still uncertain why the Arabs added an *ain at the end of the word. The word certainly was borrowed very early; the prototype yielded was perhaps not kalū, but still the oldest form *kalāk, the final k of which of first of all becoming k might be weakened in pronunciation to *ain. (It is also possible that the Arabs took Persian l as a so-called emphatic lām, cf. al-askar from taṣ-ṣārār, Ed.). In the Arabic linguistic area there are a fairly large number of place names, which have kalā as their first member; cf. kalā, kalāt; Yākūt, Maqārī, (ed. Wüstenfeld), p. 357; al-Balādhūri, Futūḥ al-Buldān (ed. de Goeje), p. 533 (Index); Ibn al-Qalībī, al-Kāmil (ed. Tornberg), xiii. 786–9 (Register); Vulgar, op. cit., ii. 735; (M. Streck)

al-Kalā. See ALCALA, KAĻAT ENI ARBĀS etc.

Kalāh (also Kalāh, Kalā, Khā and Killa), according to the medieval geographers the name of an island or peninsula, which played an important part as an intermediary in the trade and navigation between Arabia, India and China. It was particularly noted for its tin-mines; it is at the same time described as a centre of trade in camphor, bamboo, aloes, ivory, etc. Its capital was likewise called Kalāh; cf. e.g. al-Dimashqī, p. 152, 1170, 12; al-Nuwayrī in (A. v. d. Lith, op. cit., see below, Bibli.), p. 281; the sea washing this region, described as difficult to navigate, was called “the sea of Kalāh” after it; see al-Mas’ūdī, i. 370, 10, 349, 11; al-Dimashqī; p. 152, 1170. The identification of the situation of this island is of importance for the history of Indo-Arabic trade. According to the statements given by the merchant Sulaimān (his journal was edited in 237=851) and Yākūt, a location in Further India is alone possible. The islands and peninsula of Further India have been especially famous for centuries as producers of tin; cf. thereon: Ritter, Erkundige, v. 23, 24, 28, 30, 77–80, 439–439. As it is expressly stated of Kalāh (e.g. by Abū Zaid al-Sirāfī; see below, Bibli.) that it at least for a time — was under the rule of the king of Zābēj (= Java; see A. van der Lith, op. cit., p. 231 sq. and JAVA, ii. 574 sqq.), in identifying it, we must look in the first place to the south-western part of Further India, in the region of the Strait of Malacca. We may leave Sumatra out of this limited choice, especially as it only produces tin in small quantities and of inferior quality. The island of Bangka on the S. coast of Sumatra, now famous as a rich tin-producer, is to be left out of the reckoning, as the mines there have only been known since 1710 and were not worked before (cf. A. v. d. Lith, p. 263). This only leaves us the peninsula of Malacca and we would have to follow Wallkenner (in Nouvelles Années des Voyageurs, Paris 1852, p. 19) and identify the modern town of Quedah (Queda, Keidah, Kedah) on the west coast of the peninsula in 6° N Lat. with the Kalāh of the Arab authors. The province of Quedah (on it cf. Ritter, Erdkunde, v. 20 sq.), watered by the river Kalang, which would appear to coincide more or less with the area of the peninsula in the modern town of Kalāh, which once was a centre of Malacca for its busy tin trade. The actual name of the chief town is Kadah (to-day pronounced Keidah). Quedah is to be explained as simply a corruption through the Portuguese. In the Turkish Muḥiṭ of Siddi ‘Ali (see i. 287), written about 1554 the form Kēdā is found; see Bittner and Tomaseck, Die topogr. Kapitel des indischen Steinriesengesichts Muḥiṭ (Vienna 1897), p. 86 and see there the maps reconstructed by Tomaseck from the statements of the Muḥiṭ and from Portuguese sources (plates xxii. and xxiv.). Quedah is at the present day an unimportant place but in earlier centuries it was a flourishing, much visited and populous harbour; see thereon Ritter, op. cit., p. 25 and A. v. d. Lith, p. 261.

The identification put forward by Wallkenner is also accepted by A. v. d. Lith, p. 259, 308, de Goeje (in De Gids, Amsterdam 1893, iii. 297), Tomaseck, op. cit., and G. Le Strange in his translation of Hāmid Allâh Mustawfi’s Nuzhat al-Kulûb, p. 194. Quatremère, op. cit., p. 734 and Yule-Burnell, op. cit., p. 145 consider it probable. The latter both think that Kalāh might be identical with the Kēdah of Ploemey who required for the latter town (cf. the article Kēl in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclo. d. klass. Altertumswiss., xi. 1075) seems to refute this.

The equation Kadah (Queda) = Kalāh seemed to be made quite certain by the fact emphasised by Kern in A. v. d. Lith, p. 308, that Malay d is pronounced very like t; Malay Kadah would therefore have sounded to an Arab ear as Kalāh. But on the other hand it should be remembered that recently G. Ferrand (see Bibli.) contests the plausibility of a phonetic change from Kadah to Kalāh. According to his investigations, Kalāh would not be Kadah at all, but is rather to be equated to Kērah, Kra (on maps) in the northeast part of Malacca (near 10° N. Lat.).

After what has been said above we are only left with the choice between Kērah or Kērah (Kra) on Malacca for the identification of the Kalāh of the Arals. The other attempts to locate the position of Kalāh — on Ceylon (harbour of Galle, Galle, Pointe de Galle; so Reinaud and Dufour), Malabar (so Reinaudot; see Ouseley, op. cit.), Coromandel (so Goldmeister) — should now be definitely rejected as wrong.

Besides Kalāh we find occasionally in the Arab geographers also Kalāh-bār, e.g. in the voyage
of the merchant Sulaiman (Reinaud, Relation, etc., ii. 18, 19) and in al-Masūdī, i. 3-4); Reinaud wished to separate this from Kalāb entirely and connect the name with Coromandel, or rather its older Sanskrit form (which Gildemeister had already compared with Kalāb). But that so far west a location for Kalāh-bār is excluded is shown by Sulaiman’s reference, according to which Kalāh-bār (like Kalāb, see above) was a dependency of the king of Zabedj (Java); Kalāh and Kalāh-bār are probably identical as Quatremerre, op. cit., p. 733 sq. and A. v. d. Liith, p. 258, 253 have said. What-bār means in Kalāh-bār is quite uncertain; the explanations of Sulaiman (as = mānum = kingdom) and of al-Masūdī (= sea) arouse little confidence.

Most probably it is from the district of Kalāb in Malacca discussed above — whether it is Kēdāh or Kērah (Kra) — that tin gets the name kalās = “the Kalāa” in Arabic. Like the Persian kalā (Kalāt; see the art. KALĀ) the Arabs usually reproduced Kalāh by Kalā; hence the nomen ratiwm kalās (kalāt). The somewhat fanciful observation of the traveller Misār b. Mulhalib (in Yāqūt, ii. 162, 163, 166, 167; Scholer, op. cit., p. 18, 19, 44, 45 sq.) that tin is called kalās from the fort (kalā) of Kalāh, on which alone mines of this metal existed may be described simply as an attempt to explain the term kalā (with k). Besides Kēdāh and Kērah, Kēlāng, Klang, a district in Selangor in Malacca might possibly come into consideration; cf. thereon the article KALĀ as well as for the relationship of kalās to the Malay keting = tin.

This same al-Kalā, which was said to be the site of a very fine tin-mines, is usually regarded by the Arab geographers and lexicographers as the place of manufacture of a celebrated kind of Indian sword, called kalās (kalāt) to distinguish it. (Further information in article KALĀ.)


KALĀ-I SEFĪD. See KALĀ-I SULTANIYE. KALĀ-I SULTANIYE. See KALĀ-I SULTANIYE. KALĀM ("speech") is defined by the grammarians as such utterance (lit.), not single words, and which conveys a meaning by convention, not nature (wob), not ṭab, as in exclamations; see nūr (suf.). So the Adurjūnīmiya; the Mufaqṣil (§ 1) says it must be a complete sentence, however simple, and Ibn ‘Aqīl (Sharh al-Alfiya) distinguishes in detail between it and kalām (a compound of three or more words, not necessarily giving a complete sense) and kalīma (a single word with a meaning by convention only) and jawwār which covers them all. The Dict. of the Techn. Terms (pp. 1268—1707) gives a thoroughly scholastic discussion of kalām and its parts, phonetically, grammatically, lexicographically, rhetorically. See also, De Sacy in Anthol. Gramm., Arabic text, pp. 73 and 93 and notes. In lexicography kalām is a generic noun for speech, little or much (al-Djahwarī in al-Shab and Lisan, xv. 428), applying to every kind of talk, ḫūkū ma yuťakalanan bih (Ibn ‘Aqīl), or an expression for successive sounds (qawāt), giving an intelligible meaning (al-Fayyūmī, al-Mījābī). This is the actual usage of the root in the language. Thus bi-kalām, said by Allāh to Mūsā (Kur. vii. 141) is paraphrased by al-Baṣīdī (ed. Fleisch, i. 363 infra) bi-taklima yāka, “by my speaking to thee”, and on Kur. xliii. 15, al-Baṣīdī says that kalām is an im for taklim (ii. 268, 2). In the remaining two occurrences, kalīma Allāh, Kur. ii. 70, is ambiguous and may mean either Allāh’s actual speaking to Mūsā or the law, while in Kur. ix. 6, it seems to mean clearly the content of Islam. The 2d stem of the verb is used fre-
quently in the Kurān in the sense “to speak to” some one with the accus. of the person addressed (al-ʻAš'ār al-kāfīna, ed. Haiderābādī, p. 27, says that taklīm means an-nuṣhāfaha bi-kalām) and the 5th stem occurs four times (xi. 107, xxiv. 15, xxx. 34, lxviii. 38) in the neuter sense “to speak, talk, discuss” with a bi of the subject discussed; in xxiv. 15 appears a shade of contemptuous reference, more “talkings with the mouth” (cf. Duveyrey, ii. 4860). In the later development kalām came to mean the statement of an intellectual position or an argument upholding such a statement, and a mutakallim was a person making use of such kalām’s; so passim in the Fihrist. By al-Ma‘āṣī (Murādī, Paris ed., vii. 161) takallam is used of the “patter” of a public story-teller and mimic by the roadside.

If the first technical use of kalām seems to have been in the phrase kalām Allāh, meaning either the Kurān or Allāh’s quality (taptic) called Speech. For these applications the way was prepared in the Kurān in the passages already quoted. But the order in which they came and the influence which produced them are still, like all the beginnings of Muslim theology, exceedingly obscure, and we are not yet in a position, in spite of Horten’s collection of materials in Die philosophischen Systemen der sechszehn Theologen im Islam (Bonn 1912) even to sketch their development. It seems clear that the Muslim thinkers were affected (i) broadly by the conceptions, classifications and dialectic of Greek philosophy; (ii) much more minutely by personal intercourse and discussion with the theologians of the Oriental Christian Church (especially the Syriac Church), and the last influence has been suggested tentatively by Horten, especially at several points in his Systemen; but he has not supported it by any detailed references or translations from Indian literature; it remains, therefore, a bare, although very possible suggestion; cf. further on it Masson’s review in Der Islam, iii. 408. The idea of representing the problem of the personality of Allāh as a combination of a dhīl or essence with gisfah or “qualities”, seems partly due to the methods of Greek theories of personality, partly to the Kurānītic rhetoric which, following the fashion of the old poetry, describes Allāh both as dhīl, rational and partly to Christian explanations of the relation of the persons in the Trinity. The problem, however, remained of the relation between these qualities and the essence, and was eventually given up by orthodox Islam which took refuge in the statement, “they are not He (i.e. Allāh himself), nor are they other than He”; this was an admission that the relationship was a theological mystery, ungraspable by human thought. These qualities, further, were uncreated and eternal; the personality of Allāh was unthinkable without them. But rationalistic Islam, later the Mu‘azzilites could not admit such a mystery and tended to reject the qualities as unnecessary to the essence. In these discussions the quality “Speech” was evidently prominent, and on it the influence of the Christian theologians was peculiarly felt. It is never represented by an epithet in the Kurān, i.e. Allāh is never a Speaker, mutakallim or kalām, although the later theologians used mutakallim frequently of him, and there is only one certain use of kalām for the actual Speech of Allāh (Kur. vii. 141); but Allāh is represented again and again by means of verbs as “speaking” and al-ʻAš’ār (al-Mā‘āṣī, p. 23 sqq.) quotes over ten passages, using different expressions, as bases for the doctrine that both the Speech of Allāh, as a quality inherent in Him, and the Kurān as a manifestation of that quality are uncreated. These passages, it may be said, give distinctly the impression that the doctrine was historically reached through other means, or arose by other causes, and that these proofs were then sought as a Kurānītic basis. The rationalistic theologians, on the other hand, denied the possibility of a material, yet uncreated, manifestation of the eternal quality of Speech. Thus when Allāh spoke to Mūsā (Kur. iv. 162; vii. 139 sqq.; xx. 8 sqq.; xxviii. 30) from the tree (ḥimaḥra) they held that the sound of the words was created in the tree as a muḥājara, and therefore there was a state (būl) in it (cf. Gohilzāker in Fāḥiṣ al-Dīna al-Rāzī in Der Islam, ii. 245 sqq.). This the later Aḥṣārītes met by explaining that Mūsā did not hear this Speech with his ear, but in his heart, hearing, but spiritually and as coming from every direction and perceived by every one of his organs. It was thus received in his sensorium by the islām al-mu‘āṣab, the Aristotelian “common sense” (al-Ma‘āṣī on Kur. vii. 139, xx. 12; ed. Fleischer, i. 343, 593, 1). Further, it was recognized at least as early as al-ʻAš’ārī (al-Mā‘āṣī, p. 25) that this Speech does not go without ceasing, for the quality is perfect and silence would be an imperfection in it. The Kurān (xviii. 109; xxxi. 26) and traditions (al-Mā‘āṣī, p. 25) speak also in violent metaphors of the kalāmāt, separating them from all eternity Allāh has been speaking. But al-ʻAṣ’ārī protests (ṣaḥīḥ, p. 41) against the application of the term laf, verbal utterance, to the Kurān; that is not seemly even in the case of our recital of it. Similarly the Lisan (xx. 427, 17) says that you must not call the Kurān kalām Allāh. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī does not seem himself to have reached the position of the later Aḥṣārites that the Speech of Allāh is thinking, at least “ideas in the mind”, kalām or hadīth nafsī, and therefore can go on without letters or words. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī’s desire was only to protect the Kurān from any approximation to the transcendent, numberless; from all eternity Allāh has been speaking. But al-ʻAṣ’ārī protests (ṣaḥīḥ, p. 41) against the application of the term laf, verbal utterance, to the Kurān; that is not seemly even in the case of our recital of it. Similarly the Lisan (xx. 427, 17) says that you must not call the Kurān kalām Allāh. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī does not seem himself to have reached the position of the later Aḥṣārites that the Speech of Allāh is thinking, at least “ideas in the mind”, kalām or hadīth nafsī, and therefore can go on without letters or words. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī’s desire was only to protect the Kurān from any approximation to the transcendent, numberless; from all eternity Allāh has been speaking. But al-ʻAṣ’ārī protests (ṣaḥīḥ, p. 41) against the application of the term laf, verbal utterance, to the Kurān; that is not seemly even in the case of our recital of it. Similarly the Lisan (xx. 427, 17) says that you must not call the Kurān kalām Allāh. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī does not seem himself to have reached the position of the later Aḥṣārites that the Speech of Allāh is thinking, at least “ideas in the mind”, kalām or hadīth nafsī, and therefore can go on without letters or words. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī’s desire was only to protect the Kurān from any approximation to the transcendent, numberless; from all eternity Allāh has been speaking. But al-ʻAṣ’ārī protests (ṣaḥīḥ, p. 41) against the application of the term laf, verbal utterance, to the Kurān; that is not seemly even in the case of our recital of it. Similarly the Lisan (xx. 427, 17) says that you must not call the Kurān kalām Allāh. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī does not seem himself to have reached the position of the later Aḥṣārites that the Speech of Allāh is thinking, at least “ideas in the mind”, kalām or hadīth nafsī, and therefore can go on without letters or words. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī’s desire was only to protect the Kurān from any approximation to the transcendent, numberless; from all eternity Allāh has been speaking. But al-ʻAṣ’ārī protests (ṣaḥīḥ, p. 41) against the application of the term laf, verbal utterance, to the Kurān; that is not seemly even in the case of our recital of it. Similarly the Lisan (xx. 427, 17) says that you must not call the Kurān kalām Allāh. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī does not seem himself to have reached the position of the later Aḥṣārites that the Speech of Allāh is thinking, at least “ideas in the mind”, kalām or hadīth nafsī, and therefore can go on without letters or words. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī’s desire was only to protect the Kurān from any approximation to the transcendent, numberless; from all eternity Allāh has been speaking. But al-ʻAṣ’ārī protests (ṣaḥīḥ, p. 41) against the application of the term laf, verbal utterance, to the Kurān; that is not seemly even in the case of our recital of it. Similarly the Lisan (xx. 427, 17) says that you must not call the Kurān kalām Allāh. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī does not seem himself to have reached the position of the later Aḥṣārites that the Speech of Allāh is thinking, at least “ideas in the mind”, kalām or hadīth nafsī, and therefore can go on without letters or words. Al-ʻAṣ’ārī’s desire was only to protect the Kurān from any approximation to the transcendent, numberless; from all eternity Allāh has been speaking. But al-ʻAṣ’ārī protests (ṣaḥīḥ, p. 41) against the application of the term laf, verbal utterance, to the Kurān; that is not seemly even in the
furthilites followed their normal method in dealing with theological mysteries, of putting the two elements flatly side by side and attempting no solution. Al-Nasafi (al-Nasafi, p. 79) says: "The Kur'an, the Speech of Allah, is created and written in our copies, preserved in our hearts, recited by our tongues and heard by our ears. Yet it does not reside (hâlî) in these". Al-Taufazînî, as an Ashârite, suggests as an explanation that the word "fire" written on a piece of paper does not have in it the burning quality of fire and consume the paper.

The later Ashârite view of this relation may be illustrated in the words of al-Fâdîl (d. 1236 = 1829; see al-Fâdîl, ed. 1315 with al-Saidjâ'î's comm., p. 50). "These Glorious Expressions [the ends of the Kur'ân] are not a guide to the eternal quality in the sense that the eternal quality can be understood from them. But what is understood from the expressions equals (muwâlit) what would be understood from the eternal quality if the veil were removed from us and we were to hear it"; apparently the distinction between âsûbûs and ânâsûbûs. Thus the wording of the Kur'ân is created, and al-Fâdîl has even a shade of doubt whether that wording goes back to the Preserved Tablet, that is to Allah, or is due to Òjjibir or even to Muhammad. Similarly, Ibn Hâmîn [q. v.] reports (Milal, ed. Cairo, 1317, p. 211) in this, and especially of al-Dâ'îlînî [q. v.] and that their formula was that the Kur'ân was the kalâm of Allah only in the sense that it was an 'ibâra, an "expression" for the kalâm of Allah. Similarly in al-Fîlîk al-Akbâr, ascribed to Abû Hamîfa (d. 150) with a comm. by al-Mâturidî (d. 1333), the word for this relation is already 'ibâra and also Îhkyâ, "reproduction" (Haillard Bâdî 1321, p. 25). There is a very complete analytical and objective, but not historical, statement of the different positions in the Mawâûsî of al-Fîlî with comm. of al-Durqânî, Bâlîk 1266, p. 495.

In this the influence of Christian theologians seems plain. The parallel between the uncreated but creating Logos, the reason and word of God, with its earthly manifestation in Jesus and this kalâm, as eternal quality, as creative agency and as revelation in time is very close. The position of the Ashârite school that the quality is practically the thinking of Allah, although they carefully guard against confusion with our "thoughts" which originate in time (al-Fâdîl, p. 52) suggests the rational side of the Logos, the Hebrew åvâd, the divine seva, but it is not allowable to ascribe åbîr, seva, to Allah because philosophical and etymological implications; cf. Mawâûsî, ed. Cairo, p. 541, ed. Oûsenen, p. 161, 'Abdî, and al-Bâîqâwî on Qur. ii. 41, ed. Fleischer, i. 57, 65. The Christian theologians naturally translated their Syriac mélîlîn, åbîr, with al-kalâm. On Christian influence in Muslim theology see further in Graf, Die arabischen Schriften des Theodor Abu Kurra and the various articles cited by Horton in his Philos. Systeme, p. 626; especially C. H. Becker, Christliche Polemik u. islamische Dogmen- hilden in Zeitschr. f. Assyri.-, xxvi. 175 sqq.

III. It is not an overhazardous conjecture that similar influence worked in developing the use of kalâm = theology and of mutakallîm = theologian. The Syriac mélîlîn (= takallîmus) and its derivatives were parallel to åbîr and åbîr, on both sides of their meanings, of reason and speech. Thus mélîlîn allâhîyîn means åbîr and mélîlîn, åbîr. Starting, therefore, with kalâm = speech, the development was easy to intellectual argument, especially as applied to theology. How much in the dark Muslims were on the origin of this use is evident from the eight explanations which al-Taufazînî gives (comm. on al-Nasafi, p. 10 sqq.): (i) Theologians begin, "The kalâm (statement, argument) on such and such a doctrine is . . ." (ii) Deals most with doctrine of Speech of Allah. (iii) Gives same weight to Speech in theology as philosophers give to mazâib, logic. (iv) Most essential of sciences taught by speech. (v) Speech between opponents necessary to it rather than consideration or reading. (vi) The most disputations of the sciences taught by speech. (vii) For its weightiness it is the "statement" as opposed to other sciences. (viii) The cutting, impressive science from kalâm = åbîr. Ibn Khaldîn, (see below) gives only two explanations: (i) That the science deals with speech only and not action (ansâb). (ii) The same as (ii) above; cf. further Haedarbrâ's translation of al-Sâhrâstânî's Milal, i. 26, and remarks, ii. 358--393.

But kalâm came only slowly to be the name for theology. At first, åbîr, "intelligence", was used for the whole speculative side of theology and canon law, as opposed to 'ïmam for the traditional side [see åbîr]. Then theology came to be called "the greater åbîr", al-Fîlîk al-Akbâr, as in the book ascribed to Abû Hanîfa and al-Mâturîdî, referred to above. There, p. 6, it is said, "al-åbîr fîl-dîn afdal min al-åbîr fîl-sîm", which would have been expressed later, "kalâm is more excellent than åbîr". Kalâm, in that book, is not used technically except for the Speech of Allah, Òjjibir generally taking its place; in the ìbâna of al-Ashâ'î [q. v.] kalâm occurs, similarly, only in titles to sections. But in the Fihrist (c. 377--400) kalâm is used normally in the sense of "statement" and also technically, with takallîm and mutakallîm, of theology; while åbîr is used, as regularly thereafter, of canon law. But thus followed speedily a further development: ìlim al-Kalâm became to mean not simply theology, but scholastic theology of an Aristotelianizing type; going back most strangely to Democritus and Epicurus, and a mutakallîm became to mean a theologian, first Mu'tazilite and later orthodox, behind whose theology lay the atomistic system which was Is-lâm's most original contribution to philosophy. The importance of this conception of the matter of the universe, as being of a grained structure and not infinitely divisable and continuous can hardly be over-emphasized. In Europe, until the xvith century, it was eclipsed by the authority of Aristotle; but it re-appeared then, first in a qualitative form (Boyle and Newton) and later quantitatively (John Dalton). It would be curious to contrast the experimental researches of these with the a priori speculations of Is-lâm. A mutakallîm, then, was thus distinguished, although calling himself an Ashârite, from the Ḥanbalite conservative traditionalists among whom al-Ashâ'î had reckoned himself, from the mystics who found their basis in religious experience (mârifah; ḥaṭârat and wakawâsîn in Fihrist, p. 183, 18) rather than in 'ilm and dialectic, and from the philosophers (hukumâ'în) who based upon a blend of
Aristotelian and Neoplatonic philosophy; although all these might profess to hold the same doctrines of the Sūfī school, the end of them, of course, the Sūfī system, a structure of Mu'tazīlī rationalism erected on the doctrine of tawāhid, i.e. that the ultimate basis of our knowledge is not reason but authoritative instruction by an iner- rant guide, always in the world, whom man must seek and obey (cf. e.g. al-Ghazālī's Manūṣīh, ed. 1203, pp. 21 sqq. and Goldscheider's Streitverschriften der Gazālī gegen die Kāhinj-i Sāheb, passim) and the pantheistic side of Sūfism which is not really Muslim at all, except in vocabulary and imagery. It is a great misfortune for theologians, and the real centre of the whole of the Fīlīrīst, which deals with Kalām in this sense, is lost, and with it the account of the origin of this science, and that the first fannā, especially, has reached us in so hope- less a condition (Houtsma, in Zeit. f. d. Kunde der Morgenl., iv. 217—235, essentially supplementing Flügel's ed.). Yet it is clear that the author divided the mutakallimun's of his day (end of 11th. cent. of H.) into five: (i) Mu'tazīlīs; (ii) Shi'ītes, both Imāmītes and Zaidītes; (iii) Predestinarians and Anthropomorphists; (iv) Khārājītes; (v) ascetic Sūfis. This arrangement may have been due to the Shi'ism and, therefore, Mu'tazilism of the author; but the Mu'tazīlīs were cer- tainly the first mutakallimun of his school. He places al-Ash'ārī in the third class and has evidently no idea of the importance of his school — he seems to have been a joker (p. 181, 186); yet he died c. 330. Nor is there any mention of al-Māturīdī who died 333. Al-Bākhīlī died 403, four years after the last date in our MSS of the Fīrīrīst (Flügel's preface, p. xii). Certainly the author of the Fīrīrīst grievously misread the future, for in his third class lay orthodox Sūfi mullahs. Of his fourth class only the Iḥāṣītes [q.v.] continued to have any importance. Nor does he show any idea of the speculative possibilities in his fifth class.

We cannot, as yet, write a connected history of the atomic theory of Islam, the essential differ- ence of the system of the mutakallimun, and it may never be possible. We have only references to and short quotations from the earlier disputants upon that system. Even the extant writings of al-Ash'ārī do not give us any help, and we have, so far, none of al-Bākhīlī's writings, which probably would. Fortunately Horten has gathered up and untangled, with great diligence, in his Philosophische Systeme the later references and quotations, and from these it would appear that the Mu'tazīlīs of Abu 'l-Hudhail al-'Allāf (d. 235 or 226); cf. Abu 'l-Hudhail and Horten, pp. 246 sqq.) was the founder of the atomic school and was opposed to it by two other Mu'tazīlīs, Highām b. al-Ḥakam (d. 231 (?); cf. Hīshām and Horten, pp. 170 sqq.) and al-Nāṣrī (d. 230; Horten, pp. 189 sqq.). It thus arose among the Mu'tazīlīs, however it may have reached them; but we cannot be sure to what extent their system was exactly that which lies behind all the rea- sonings of the later mutakallimun. It is unneces- sary to describe the system here, as it has already been given under ALLĀH, i. 307 sqq. It may, however, be worth while to give the following references to Horten where he deals especially with it, pp. 22 sqq., 42 sqq., 178, 191, 246 sqq., 263 sqq., 526, 551. Pp. 195, 235, 236 make it plain that the division of time into atoms, which could not be further divided, i.e., that time is not endlessly divisible, goes back to Zeno's para- dox of Achilles and the tortoise; it was a solu- tion of that paradox and made motion possible; cf. William James, A Pluralistic Universe, p. 225—231. Ibn Ḥazm in his Milā, because of his very hostility, has given us particularly full accounts, e.g. v. 92 sqq. But in the nature of the case it is not probable that the earlier disputants put their discussions into permanent written form, and still less permitted copies to be freely made and spread abroad. We have the classic case of al-Dīnārī (d. 297—909), a very great theologian and the founder of the Sūfī, on whom no shadow of real suspicion of heresy ever fell, but who openly said that the seeker of the divine Reality might expect to be called a heretic (Goldscheider, Vorlesungen, p. 175; see, further, al-Kūshīrī, Rūḥānī, Bilāhīc 1209, pp. 139 sqq. and Dīnārī, above, i. 1063). When he discussed questions of tawāhid, that is the doctrine of the person of Allah, with his students, it was behind closed doors. We can hardly imagine that these discussions were concerned with such questions as al-Ghazālī's al-Rū'a in al-Kūshīrī, al-Kīsād, or even al-Taṣawwūfī on al-Nasafi; they must have have much deeper and have been like those which Ibn Ḥazm has exposed to us with malicious indignation, dragging those Godless mutakallimun from behind their closed doors. In reply the mutakallimun would have protested that he was not playing the game and did not understand their object. The Mu'tazīlīs preceded the orthodox theologians in open publication. We still have the Masūdī of Abu Rashid, a Mu'tazīlī, who wrote about 400 (1009) (Horten, Philosophie der Araberen, ii. 196, Anchor Becher, Al-Ghazālī, Ācimītische Substanzenlehre). Al-Ghazālī, at a somewhat later date, actually did put such discussions into writing in his two al-Mudāmān; but it was on the basis of Neoplatonic philosophy and not of atomism (see below).

In the Muḥaddīmat of Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808 = 1406) we get another view of this development, about four centuries later than the Fīrīrīst (Qua- tremère's ed., iii. 27—43; Bilāhīc, 1374, pp. 223—228; trans. De Slane, i. 40—64). In Quatremère's text (pp. 44—59; trans. De Slane, pp. 64—85) there follows a section on the ascetic and metaphysical passages in the Ḳāfān in which the word is not found in some of the MSS., nor in the Bilāhīc editions. Ibn Khaldūn evi- dently added it later from a perception (i) that his view of these passages was essential to his general position and (ii) that he had not dealt fully enough with some of the theological matters of controversy. He traced, in fact, the origin, in great part, of the science of Kalām, viewed as defensive scholasticism, to these ambiguous and obscure passages; it sprang, thus, more from exegetical than from philosophical pressure. There is certainly truth in this; but it seems also certain that the early Muslim theologians, under the influence of outside ideas which were pressing in upon them, made use of the obscure verses to secure a possible footing in Islam for these outside ideas. In this they were greatly aided by Muhammad's own confused thinking, and also by a certain largeness of conception and width and freedom of ideas which belonged to his greatness; he had not been a metaphysician; but a keen psychologist. But it is especially characteristic of Ibn Khaldūn's position, and in striking contrast to his otherwise
open-mindedness and genuinely scientific spirit, that he rejected all ta'wil, or elucidation, of these passages as absolutely as Ahmad b. Hanbal or al-Asbāḥī themselves. He interpreted Kur. iii. 5 (cf. Avicenna, ed. Fleischer, l. 146.), as meaning that only Allah knew their meaning and that man should abstain from useless speculation. He thus secured a method of practically throwing out all the passages of the Kurān which did not suit his view of the universe, e. g. those speaking of the jinn [q. v.], and also, which was worse, set up a limit to man's investigation of the world.

Kulm having thus arisen from these difficulties, or impossibilities, of exegesis, the different sects developed according as the anthropomorphic Kurānic expressions bearing on the essence (dhīl) of Allah or on his qualities (ṣiṣḥat) were treated literally (taṣḥīḥ, taṣfīḥ) or as having a meaning different in his case from the literal and unknown to us (tansūk) or according as tansūk was applied also to the other descriptives of Allah, the meanings of which were quite plain and possible in the literal sense because they all expressed ideas apart from the concrete. This last was the position of the Mu'tazilites, between whom and the first sect, the anthropomorphists, stood the sect which professed to follow the doctrine of "the Fathers" (al-salāf). So the orthodox party was driven to the use of rational proofs (aqīla taṣḵila) and there arose al-Asbāḥī who combined ʿaṣr and naḥa, denied taṣḥīḥ, establishing "the qualities consisting of ideas" (knowledge, power, will, life), and limited tansūk as the salāf had done. He also established "hearing" and "sight" and "the speech which exists in the mind" (al-ḥaḍīm bi-nafa ). He also discussed (takallama) with the Mu'tazilites their ethical position (ṣiṣḥa, taṣfīḥ, taṣḥīḥ) and eschatology and future rewards and punishments. He discussed with the Imāmīya the principle of government, and demonstrated that it was not a part of the Faith, but a convenience upon which the people had agreed. With all this compare and contrast Goldziher in Verleugungen, pp. 119 sqq. The next great name given is that of al-Bākhīlī (d. 493) [q. v.]. He reduced the whole to a system and established the intellectual basis and arranged the arguments. Thus he established the atom (al-dīwān al-fari'd) and the void (al-ḥadda) — it is to be noticed that dīwān with the Aristotelian Neoplatonists means "substance" in the philosophical sense, and that ḥadda is exactly the Lucretian inane; that an accident (aṣṣāf) cannot subsist in an accident and that it cannot continue through two atoms of time (see also, Ibn Khaldūn, ed. Quatremère, p. 114; De Slane, p. 157). So he made these principles only secondary in importance to the articles of the Faith, because he held that the nullity of an argument meant logically the nullity of the thing which it proved, and the converse. These principles were arguments for the Faith; the Faith was true, therefore these principles must be true. It is evident that formal logic was not the strong point of those who built up this system, however ingenious it might be; and that Ibn Khaldūn reman. And it is further evident that with al-Bākhīlī the historical value of Ibn Khaldūn's outline begins. He makes no mention of Ibn Hazm [q. v.], a theological free lance, who died in 456; but he gives the titles of two of the books of the Imam al-Haramain (al-Djwañain, q. v., d. 478), a teacher of al-Ghazālī, apparently because of his reputation although no distinctive development is attached to his name. This is intelligently explained by the fact that formal logic was taken up by the theologians who had discovered that it was only a tool for thinking and not a part of philosophy. But this led to an examination of their foundations and to the rejection of a great part of them; so that they no longer argued, as al-Bākhīlī had done, from the nullity of the proof to the nullity of the thing proven. Their new proofs were derived, to a considerable extent, from the physics and metaphysics of the philosophers, and thus they entered upon a new method which was called taṣfīḥ al-mutakalla'mīn; yet they also introduced into it a considerable amount of opposition to the philosophical positions because these were said to be the same as their own earlier heresies. Leaders in this new school were al-Ghāzālī (d. 505) and al-Rāzī (d. 606; see on him especially Goldziher in Der Islam, iii. 213—247) and to their books Ibn Khaldūn would still send the student of theology who wished guidance in his criticism of the philosophers, although there was in them some amount of opposition to the older method. It is to be remembered, too, that al-Rāzī was a systematic user of ta'wil (Goldziher, p. 227) of which Ibn Khaldūn disapproved. But such students as wished simply to follow the path of the salāf in theology should take the old method of the mutakallīmīn — only there could true Islam be found — and especially should study the ṭafrīa of the Imam al-Haramain. This apparently means that with al-Ghāzālī there came a sharp abandonment of the method of the atomists and a going to school instead with the Aristotelian Neoplatonists. Such, too, is certainly the evidence of al-Ghāzālī's writings. After al-Ghāzālī and al-Rāzī came still deeper confusion between theology and philosophy, until the subject matter of the two was regarded as one. Yet the mutakallīmīn's had distinguished sharply the physics and metaphysics of the philosophers from their own theocentric position, using an intellectualist system in defense of dogmas which were down by the system of the atomists. He gives as an example of this confusion the Ta'wil of al-Bāḏwā'ī (d. 685 = 1286) and every user of al-Bāḏwā'ī's Kurān commentary will recognize what he means. The learned of Persia (al-'Adām) who followed al-Bāḏwā'ī had used the same method in all their works. Of the kind of Kulm that was left in his own day Ibn Khaldūn had no good opinion; its ambiguities (iḥānāt) and generalities (iṭṭā'āt) were a profanation of the Creator rather than a defense. And no Kulm was longer needed; it had been a defense against the Muhādīna and the Muṭahādīna and they were extinct. But it was rather disgraceful for one who knew the Sūras by heart not to be able to give a reason for the faith that was in him.

Yet Kulm had still a long course to run, and the commentary of al-Bāḏwā'ī on the short treatise of al-Fadlālī, already referred to, gives a good idea of the development of the system of the mutakallīmīn. Text and comment are quite modern — al-Fadlālī died in A.D. 1282 and al-Bāḏwā'ī in A.D. 1344; they are finished scholasticism and the title, Kif yāyat al-Aswām fī 'Ilm al-Kulm, "The Sufficiency of the Commonality in the Science of Kulm," with reiterated statements in the text that only so much is given as is necessary for sal-
vation, shows a purely intellectual view of religion. The commentary is based throughout on atomistic reasonings; the physics and the metaphysics are atomic. The text suggests an intentional counterblast to the treatise of al-Ghazālī with a similar title, Ilkām al-`Avāmin an`lm al-Kalam, “Rein- back the Commonality from the Science of Kalam”, yet the intention is nowhere expressed. In it al-Ghazālī had denounced the corrupting of the simple faith of the multitude with intellectualist arguments and had advocated very subtly what we would now call psychological methods — startlingly, for modern ideas, backed by the secular arm of the state. But al-Ghazālī had opposed the mutakallimūn system and method from the beginning. On the one hand he knew, as a fact of psychology, that being convinced against one’s will left one of the same opinion, and on the other, he did not approve of atomism as philosophy. He appears to make no specific reference to it in his works, and where he does give an abstract of theology, as a formal science (e.g. in al-`Irādah al-Ghazālī), he stops short of absolutely philosophical lotomism. That, for him, was intellectually impossible; but such an outline of concatenated dogmatics, as in the two books mentioned, was justifiable (Arba`in, pp. 25 sqq., ed. 1328). The only real philosophy for him was, apparently, the Aristotelian-Neoplatonic amalgam, and with it he had dealt in his books which have reached us in a sceptical but respectful spirit. Probably following the economy of teaching, which he himself professed, and which he and all Islam practised, he dealt thoroughly and destructively in other books with the atomic system, and this may explain the mysterious allusions which have been called “the secret” of al-Ghazālī (e.g. W. H. T. Gairdner on the Miṣḥāṭ in Der Islam, v. 121-153). For his attitude towards the mutakallimūn’s see further Al-Ghazālī’s, above, ii. 147 sqq., al-Munīfiṣ, pp. 8 sqq., and Miṣḥāṭ al-Anwar, Cairo 1322, 47 sqq.

It is significant that reform movements in Islam at the present time seem to have cut loose from the atomic philosophy, and to have gone back for leadership to Ibn Sīnā [q. v.], Ibn Khūdgh [q. v.] and the Aristotelians generally. Dīwān al-dīn al-Afghānī (see above, i., 1008 sqq.; E. G. Browne, The Persian Revolution of 1905—1906, Cambridge 1910, Chap. i.; Goldzirher, Die Richtungen der islamischen Koranauslegung, Leiden 1920, pp. 322 sqq.) and his friend and pupil Muhammad Abūn were the protagonists of this renaissance and continued the long interrupted method of al-Ghazālī, even on the side of the economy of teaching. The atomic system had crystallized and had become identified with the stiffest orthodoxy. In its origin, also, it had been, even with the Mu’tazilites, a weapon for the defence of accepted views and not an instrument of free investigation. Modern Islam, therefore, could have nothing to do with it, although it is possible that modern western atomic speculation may galvanize it into a semblance of life just as microbes have been used to defend the Kur’ānic doctrine of the djinn (Goldzirher, Koranauslegung, p. 356). Yet it should never be forgotten that this theory is the most original contribution which Muslim thinkers have made to the history of philosophy.


(D. B. Macdonald.)

Kalam (kālam, red) the reed-pen used for writing in the Arabic character. It is a tube of reed cut between two knots, cut obliquely (or concave) at the thicker end, having the point slit, as with us for the quill and later for the steel pen. It has to be very soft so that it does not wear away too quickly; the best kind comes from Wāṣīt and grows in the marshes (kabāl) of the Tārīr. It is allowed to steep like hemp and is kept in the water until its skin has taken on a beautiful dark brown colour. Its fibres should be quite straight so that the slit may also be even. To make the slit the slanted end of the kalam is laid on a long flat piece of ivory or bone, which is specially used for this purpose and is called miṣḥāṭ (Turk. mişṭā); the point is then slit with a sharp backward cut with a special very sharp knife with a long handle (penknife, Turkish balamintıraş). The point of the knife to the left of the incision is called inš (“human”), because turned towards the writer and the right waḥtī “savage”. If the former is slightly sofer than the latter so much the better. It has been made a rule that in the kinds of writing called nasīt, thulūth and riǧād the waḥtī side ought to be twice as broad as the inš side; in the kinds called dinārī and kīrma, it is the other way about. The nasīt is written with a pen slit exactly down the centre.

To protect the kalam from damage it is kept in a holder (miṣḥāna). These are of two kinds: 1) a metal box in the form of a long flat tube closed at one end by a lid with hinges and often adorned with arabesques. Attached to it is an inkwell (dawwat, popularly dawṣya). This kind is peculiar to the Arabs. In Osманlı Turkish it is called divvit (from Ar. dawvat; at an earlier period it was also called wpdbur “strictly plur. of kabr “grave”) by the Ottoman Turks, a word which is found as early as Abū Yusauf, Khudgh al-Khurābī (Cairo 1302, p. 17), with the meaning of “holder” (“case”); 2) a papier-maché box adorned with lacquerwork. In it is a drawer which also holds an inkwell. This kind is used particularly in Persia and is called kalamdar “pen-box”.

Sūra Ixvi. of the Qur’ān (Sūrat Nīn) is sometimes called Sūrat al-Kalam from its opening:

* N. — By the pen and what they write, . . .

According to the traditions quoted by al-Tabarī (Taṣfīr, Būlāk 1523—30, xxix. 107) the kalam was the first thing created by God so that he could write down events to come; two explanations have been given of this kalam: 1) the implement used for writing, a divine gift like the
Kalantar, a Sufi religious order, founded by Kalantar Yasuf (cf. Kalantar), an Arab of Spain, contemporary with Hâdîjî Bekâš (q. v.), brought to Damietta by the Shâhâd Dîâmâl al-Dîn al-Sâwî, a native of the town of Sâwâ in Persia; he is buried in the Zâviyâ which he had founded there. He shaved his beard and eyebrows, since by doing this he had escaped in an amorous adventure; all his pupils followed his example. This sect, however, must have its origin in an earlier period, for it appeared in Damascus towards the year 660 (1213); it attracted attention, by a strange costume adopted from the Persians and Medesians, which orders from the authorities forced it to abandon. The Mâlûm Sâlîm al-Mâlik al-Nâsîr Hûsân, grandson of Kâlâtânî, in 761 (1360) forbade them to shave the beard. According to al-Mânîsî’s account of them, they made it a rule to lay nothing aside and never to amass this world’s goods; but in his time they did not wear coarse garments nor subject themselves to any mortification or any devotional exercises, saying it was sufficient for them that their hearts were at peace with God. They wanted nothing more; they made no effort to attain a degree of virtue more eminent than this state of peace at heart. To show their indifference as regards everything outside their ideal, they took the course of getting away from the restraint of all the laws of politeness usually observed in society. Their morals also were very loose. Bâbâ Tâhir ʿUryân of Hamadân said: “I am the mystical gipsy called kalantar. I have neither fire, home nor monastery. By day I wander about the world, and at night I sleep with a brick under my head” (Quatrains, No. vi., Journ. Asiat., Series viii., Vol. vi., 1885, p. 516). The description of the odd costumes which accompanies the French translation of Chalcedonias by B. de Vigenèere (Paris 1662) and which is taken from the Navigations of Nicolas de Nicolai (Lyons 1568) gives on p. 23 an engraving showing one of these Kalandar...
protagonist of these views. This is certainly true of Vīsur, said to have been a Spanish Arab, who is often represented as the founder of the Kālandarī, as well as of Shāhīl Djamāl al-Dīn of Sāwā in Persia, who, Ibn Baṭṭūta says (i. 617 sq.), settled in Damletta and ended his days there. The expression ḫuĎa in Ibn Baṭṭūta here obviously means nothing more than "pattern, model". The Kālandarī seem to have originated in Central Asia and to have been strongly influenced by Indian ideas. According to al-Makrizī (d. 1442), they came about 400 years before his time into Arab lands. About 610 (1013) the first of them appeared in Damascus (al-Ḳiṣṭā, i. 433). Here there died in 622 (1225); this, not 722 = 1222 is to be read in al-Ḳiṣṭā, i. 433) the Persian Shāhīl Ḥasan of the Djawālīkī sect, who flourished under Sulṭān al-Malik al-ʿĀdīl Kethbogha and founded a monastery of Kālandarī not far from Cairo (Serȳkās = Kyríasos). The Kālandarī may have been most numerous in Persia and the great bulk of them, still in the 14th century at least, seem to have been concentrated in Ar-Rabādī (q.v.), the stronghold of the Sāfawīyā (Safawīyān, q. v.; cf. Adam Olearius, Persische Reiseschreibung, op. cit., 1656, p. 685: the Kālendarī). In Anatolia also and even in Rumelia in the early Ottoman period down to the 18th century, they sometimes played a dangerous part by attacks on the authority of the state and serious risings (cf. F. Babinger in Der Islam, xi. 145; Pečewlı, Yurğ Ch. Stambul 1283, i. 123). Even in the Ṣaldājī period similar risings seem to have been led by Kālandarī. There are also various indications of connections between Kālandarī and the Beirutī in 18th century.

KĀLANDARI has also become the name of a certain tune in Turkish.

Bibliography: cf., besides the works quoted above, also F. Babinger in Der Islam, xi. 94 and the references given here; also d'Herbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale (Paris 1697), p. 244; do. (Mastrecht 1776), p. 224 s. v. Calendar; Adam Olearius, Persischer Rosenthal, Book viii. § 67; Burhan-i Küf, ed. Th. Reebuck (Calcutta 1819), s. v.; J. P. Brown, The Derwishes (London 1868), where the presumably not Persian origin of the word kalender, baredel is also discussed, cf. besides Dozy, Supplément, ii. 340 also Der Islam, xi. 94, note). (FRANZ BABINGER)

KĀLANSUWA, KULISAYA (Ka), the name for a cap which was worn by men either under the turban proper or alone on the head. The word, from which verbal forms are derived as denominative verbs, is apparently of foreign origin; while it was used to be commonly connected with the Latin calunia, for which, however, the form calantica is difficult to quote — and besides it means a head-cloth for women —, Fraægel shares wishes to derive it through the Aramaic 躏ין (cf. Arabic ʿalā, ʿalā, Dozy, Supplément ii., 359) from καλαῖς (καλαῖς). The Arab grammarians and lexicographers have found in the manifest formation of the broken plural and the diminutive a reason for using kalansawa as a paradigm for substantives of more than three radicals with such peculiarities.

Caps of different shapes are called kalansawa; varieties of the kalansawa are ʿurūs, burnus, urūs, etc. While it is related of the companions of the Prophet that they wore tight-fitting kalansuwa's, later a long peaked sugar-cone shape, supported within by pieces of wood became fashionable, for which the name ʿawās is usual. It seems to have come from Persia (cf. the head-dresses in the Dura-Śūlīya first century paintings; J. H. Breasted, Oriental Pictures or Byzantine Painting, Chicago 1924) for it was regarded by the pre-Muhammadan Arabs as a noteworthy feature of Persian dress (Jacob, At-tarāb, Bidāyān-Ilimān, p. 237) and is said to have been first adopted in the reign of the first Umayyad by ʿAbdāb b. Ziyād from the inhabitants of the city of Ḳandār, conquered by him (Yāḥyā, Muḥājam, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 184). High, black kalansuwa are worn by the ʿAbhāsīd Caliphs from al-Manṣūr to al-Mustāʿin and by their viziers and kāḏīs.

The latter adhered longest to the kalansuwa, so that in the course of the third (16th) century — also popularly known as ʿawās, pot-hat, or ʿawās — it became their regular official headgear together with the neck-veil tālānā and at times was strictly forbidden by other classes of the commu- nity (al-Khindī, ed. Gusein, p. 460, § 86). — On the other hand criminals had a kalansuwa put on their heads when they were led through the streets. The kalansuwa was also worn among the Umayyads in Spain, where muḥā拉萨 meant a Muṣṭi wearing the ʿalā, a headdress introduced by Timūr into his army was also known as kalansuwa.

The name kalansuwa appears several times in Ibn Baṭṭūta according to whom (ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii. 378) the Kipcha, for example, called their kalansuwa's by the Persian name kulāh. Of the ʿUtāwā (q. v.) societies in Asia Minor (Siyyar ufriyān, ii. 264) that their members wore several kalansuwa's above one another, a silk one on the head, above it a white woolen one, to the top of which was tied a strip of cloth 2 fingers broad and 3 ell long; at meetings only the woolen kalansuwa was taken off, the silk one remaining on the head. A similar pendant strip of cloth is also part of the dress of the Coptic priests of modern Egypt and is there called kalāṭa or kalansuwa; here the name appears to have been transferred from the cap itself to its most striking and therefore better known part.

At periods when, as in the second (viii-th) century, both Muslims and Christians wore kalansuwa's, the latter had to tie two knots of another colour to it (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, iii. 138); but when the kalansuwa went out of fashion with the Muslims in the third century, it remained the mark of the Christians. The word is therefore frequently found in Arab authors meaning the headdress worn by Christian monks and hermits, Greek priests and even the Pope himself. Through the Crusades the high cap with the veil seems to have found its way to Western Europe as a woman's dress.

The name kalansuwa was also given to other objects of similar shape: ʿalā is the metal cap of the obelisk near Heliopolis (Ain Shams q.v.), ʿulā. There is also a submarine floating vessel. ʿalā is used by surgeons for a particular kind of head-bandage; ʿalā (ʿalā) is the name of a plant, which seemed to represent a human head with a high cap. Kalansuwa was also the name of a fortress near al-Raʿma in Palestine.

Bibliography: In addition to the usual dictionaries: — Dozy, Dict. diction de nom des vêtements chez les Arabes, p. 365—371; do.
KALANSUWA — KALAT BANI ‘ABBĀS

through the intrigues of his followers Mihrab Khān was embroiled with the British force advancing on Kandahār by the Bolān Pass; Kalāt was taken by storm, and the Khān himself killed in the attack. Two years later the fort was taken by distant affected Ibrahim Khan. The British Agents Loverday, and the traveller Masson fell into their hands and the former was murdered. This led to a second British occupation for a time, but the Khāns were re-instated and remained practically independent for the next thirty years. Under the British protectorate, Kalāt remains the capital of the Khān’s dominions. It is a small town situated in the high plateau 6780 ft. above the sea with a population of under 5000. The best descriptions of Kalāt are those of Pottinger, who visited it in 1860, and Masson (1831 and 1839).

2. The Khānate or State which takes its name from the town of Kalāt. This includes the provinces of Sarāwān, Džahāwān, Kačchā and Makrān, and the tributary states of Las Bula and Khārān.

For details see under BALOCHISTĀN.

KALAT (Kalāt, Kīlāt, Khīrān). 1. The town of Kalāt is the capital of the Khānate and is the most important of the name and the most important part of Balochistān, and is the residence of the Khān, its ruler. The word Kalāt or Kīlāt represents the Arabic Ỉfa or the Persian Kalīt [cf. the art. \[text leftover\] in which India is usually pronounced Ǐlā]. In Balochī the Khārān is the common word for a fort. On coins we find both .Statement of Facts and Figures (W. H. Valentine, Copper Coins of India, vol. ii. 1921, p. 223). It has been known in earlier times as Kalāt-i Seva (from a legendary Hindu king) and Khārān-i Ničārā, which connects it with the Brahūti tribe of Ničārā, which is generally accepted as belonging to the oldest branch of the indigenous Brahūti (S. BALOCHISTĀN, i. 627, 630). The town was unknown to the early Arab historians under its present name. It is however possible that it may represent Kīkānān, which Arab geographers mention as the residence of the ruler of Kūsār [al-Iṣāqū, Bidār, Geogr. Arab., i. 176 mit. sq.; Ibn Hāwkal, ib., ii. 232, s sq.]. Its situation is in the modern district of Sarāwān, close to the boundary of Džahāwān [q. v.]. Thus it would have been included in the ancient province or kingdom of Tūrān, of which the capital was Tūrān (now generally written Tūhūzān, in Džahāwān). [In the Shāhānūm Khāt belongs to Tūrān; cf. ed. Vullers ii. 794. — Ed.]

After the Balūt tribes had passed through the Brahūti country on their way to the Indus valley, in the xvth and xvieth centuries, Kalāt remained in the hands of the Brahūti under a chief of the Khānate, claiming from whom the line of Khāns is descended. Their power gradually extended during the Indian expeditions of Nādir Shāh and Ahmad Shāh Durrānī [q. v.], whose suzerainty was admitted by the Khāns. The greatest of these, Naṣir Khān, endeavoured to shake off the Durrānī yoke. He was defied by Ahmad Shāh, but the latter, who besieged Kalāt in 1722 (1768), was unable to take it, and Naṣir Khān made favourable terms for himself. He built a strong fort (known as the Muṭī) and strengthened his position among the surrounding tribes. In 1834 Shāh Shudjā al-Mulk took refuge in Kalāt with Mihrab Khān after his failure to recover Kandahār. In 1838

(M. LONGWORTH DAMES)

KALAT BANI ‘ABBĀS, a town in Algeria (department of Constantine) 24 miles N.E. of Bardj Bit Arraïdji. Kháf occupies at the height of 3,500 feet a natural fortress formed by a plateau surrounded on three sides by rugged and deep ravines, 1800 to 2000 feet high and joining to the adjoining country by a narrow tongue with precipices on either side. The town is divided into four quarters, which formerly were frequently fighting with one another and one of which is now almost in ruins. It is the most important centre of the tribe of Bani ‘Abbās, whose territory lying between the Wâid Sâjel and the Mâjdâna contains about 24,000 souls. The town itself with an exclusively native population numbers 3000 inhabitants. The few patches of tilled land at the bottom of the ravines not suffering to devote themselves to industry. They used to make woolen burzunas in large numbers, which they sold in Algeria and Tunisia. At the present day many of them emigrate and follow the trade of embroidering burzunas in the towns of the Tell.

Khâf was founded in the second half of the fifteenth A.D. by the marabout Shīh Abī al-Rahmān, a descendant, according to some, of the Idrisids, according to others, of the Ḥannāmids. He established a zāwiyya on the rock of Khâf and put himself at the head of the Bani ‘Abbâs, who had risen against the Zāwâwa, to whom they had hitherto been subject. His son Ahmad built a khâfa, proclaimed himself Sultan and extended his authority over the country between the Hodna and
the sea (the "kingdom of Labēs" of Marmol). 'Abd al-'Azīz, his successor, further increased his power with the support of the Turks, whom he assisted against the Kaybys of Kuka and supported in their expeditions against the Moroccans and the people of Tuggūr and Wāfgī. The results of this alliance in battle and the irrelevance of these affairs to the experiments and experiments at Al-Kāf and sometimes at Al-Ka'ār and it was in this town that he died in 419 = 1028-29. Al-Ka'ār rapidly became very prosperous. "The population increased rapidly, students came there in large numbers from the most remote parts of the empire, attracted by the resources which the new capital offered to those who cultivated science, commerce and the arts" (Ibn Khaldūn). The importance of Al-Ka'ār further increased after the sacking of Kairawan by the Hilālīs. Many inhabitants of Hīliya came to seek shelter there. The population was very mixed. It is worth noting that it included a small community of native Christians; well treated by the rulers, they had a church dedicated to the Virgin and administered by an official, perhaps a bishop, whom Paul the Deacon calls by the Oriental name of calīfa. The country around was quiet, thanks to an alliance made by the Hammadīds with certain sections of the Ḍālījīs; the harvests surpassed the needs of local consumption and were stored in granaries. The grain could be kept for several years. Life was easy there, owing to the abundance of fruits and of cattle fattened on the adjoining pasturage; the markets were attended by caravans, which came from all parts of the Magrib and even from Egypt and Syria and the 'Irāq. Magnificent buildings were erected by al-Nāṣir: the Qaṣr al-Mulk (Governmental Palace), the private residence of the emirs, the Qaṣr al-Mansūr (Palace of the Signal), the Qaṣr al-Kawkab (Palace of the Star), the Qaṣr al-Salām (Palace of Bliss).

The situation altered in the second half of the 9th century. Breaking their alliance with the Hammadīds rulers, the Arabs began to plunder the region of Hīduana and thrust their incursions up to the very gates of Al-Ka'ār. The insecurity became such that al-Mansūr, while continuing to make frequent stays at Al-Ka'ār, moved the seat of government in 483 (1093/1) to Bougie, which had been founded by al-Nāṣir in 1023/2 (see Bougie, 1, 766), but the attacks of the Arabs multiplied and made the lot of the inhabitants more and more precarious. In the reign of al-Aziz the nomads invaded the entire territory of Al-Ka'ār and forced the garrison to take refuge in the town out of which they could not go. Thus Yahyā, who succeeded al-'Aziz, decided in 543 (1058) to remove from Al-Ka'ār all objects of value, that were still there. Four years later, the Hammadīd empire succumbed to the attacks of the Almohads. When master of Bougie, 'Abd al-Mu'min sent his son 'Abd Allāh to lay siege to Al-Ka'ār. The place, defended by Djusīmān, Yahyā's brother, was taken by assault, the garrison put to the sword, 5,000 inhabitants slain and many others taken prisoner. The conquerors carried off vast booty (547 = 1152-1153).

Still Al-Ka'ār survived this disaster. Some of the inhabitants repopulated, if not the town itself, at least the Djerāwā quarter, E. of the wall. According to the author of the Kita'at al-Ittāhār, they were still fairly numerous at the end of the 10th century and were engaged in the making
of garments, which were celebrated. But in 1580 = 1829, 'Ali b. 'Abdāniya captured al-Kāf'ah after a three days' siege. It was undoubtedly he who completed the destruction of the town, for it is never mentioned again after this date. Considerable ruins alone recall the existence of the ancient al-Ḥammādī palace. They lie about 20 miles S. of Burj Bī 'Arārūjī, on the southern slope of the Djabal Ma'did, in the N. of Ḥodna, at a height of 3600 feet and occupy the summit of the cliffs which command the right bank of a tributary of the Wāḍī Selmān. The minārēt of a mosque is still standing. Excavations made by P. Blanchet (1868) and again in 1908 by General de Beylié have made it possible to trace the wall and recognize the remains of various buildings: the Dīr al-Bahr, so called, perhaps, from a tank there, the palace of the Sīdī Bīlāb palace of Bilis and the mosque. Fragments of decoration, painted terracottas, stelacettes of faience, faïences of metallic lustre, and capitals have been brought to light. The study, which has been made of them, leads to the conclusion that Berber art before the Hilālī invasion was in great part Oriental in its inspiration and is revealed as a combination of Mesopotamian and Persian-Berber elements with local Byzantine art. Bibliography: al-Bakrī, Deser de l’Afrique, ed. and transl. by de Slane, text (2nd ed., Algiers 1914), p. 49, 82; transl. by L. de Slane, Algiers 1913), p. 105, 107; al-Iṣṭīrī, Deser de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne, ed. Dory and de Goeje, text, p. 86, 91; transl. p. 99, 106; Ibn Khaldūn, Hist. des Berbères, ed. de Slane, l. 221 sqq., 250—1; transl. de Slane, l. 285, ii. 43 sqq., 89—90; Kitāb al-Iṣṭīrār, ed. von Kremser (Vienna 1852), p. 19, 20, 55—56, 58; transl. Pasqua, L’Afrique septentrionale au XVe siècle, Constantine 1900, p. 32, 33, 34, 35; 99—101, 105; L. de Beylié, La Kalaa des Beni Hammada. Une capitale berbère de l’Afrique du Nord au XVe siècle, Paris 1909; P. Blanchet and H. Saladin, Description des monuments de la Kasba des Beni Hammada (Nouvelles Archives des Missions scient., vol. xvii.), Paris 1908; G. Marguéris, Les poteries et les faïences de la Qasba des Beni Hammada, Constantine 1913; Mequesse, La Kalaa des Beni Hammada (Revue Africaine, 1886); Robert, La Kalaa et Tihummamini (Bull. de la Soc. arch. et de Constantine, vol. xxxvii., 1903). (G. Yver)

KA’LAT DJA’BAR. See Djab’ar, I. 985.

KA’LAT HUWARA, a town in Algeria (department of Oran, a mixed commune of Mina) 20 miles N.E. of Mascara, on the Wāḍī Kāf’ah, one of the branches of the Hillil. Population (1911): 2072 inhabitants, of whom 2047 natives. Carpetmaking, at one time a flourishing industry here, still employs 500 workmen, although on the decline. Kāf’ah was founded in the vii/ixth century by Muhāmmad b. Ḩāyshā, chief of the Huwara, living in the region of Mina. He built a citadel and gathered round it his tribesmen as well as the Masrāt, a Berber clan related to the Huwara. Ḩāyshā’s descendants were faithful to the ‘Abd al-Wād of Tlemcen and as a reward received the government of the land of the Tuḥājīn. After the occupation of Tlemcen by the Mardinīs (759 = 1358), the people of Kāf’ah recognised the authority of the conquerors, then passed again under the rule of the Sīdīs of Tlemcen after the restoration of the Ťizīyān dynasty. In the xvith century Arūjī seized the town (1517) and placed a garrison of 400 men there under his brother Ḩāyshā. Retaken in 1518 by the Spaniards, Kāf’ah was restored by them to the Sultān of Tlemcen and passed finally to the Turks towards the middle of the xvith century. It is described by the writers of this period (Leo Africanus, Marmol) as one of the principal places in the land of the Banū Rāšīd (the Beni Rasli of Leo, the Beni Arax of Marmol). According to these authors, Kāf’ah was a very strong place inhabited by merchants and well-to-do artisans. During the Turkish period, Kāf’ah frequently served as a place of refuge for Beys and Turkish officials, as well as for numerous families from Oran and Algiers, so that about 1830, the population was in great part composed of Kalāghīs, i.e. of half-castes born of the marriages of Turks with native women. On various occasions the town has suffered from earthquakes but it was, on the other hand, greatly extended by the Bey of the West, Bīš Sheshgum in 1736. The population was employed in agriculture and industry (manufacture of soap and especially the weaving of carpets). After 1830, Kāf’ah recognised the authority of ‘Abd al-Kādir, who drove out the Kalāghīs, and was in 1845 occupied by the French. Kāf’ah was the birth-place of the celebrated marabout Sidi ‘Alīm b. ‘Uṣāf (ixth cent. A.H.), to whom are attributed satirical sayings very popular in Algeria (Cf. R. Basset, Les dictums populaires attribués à Sidi ‘Alim ben ‘Uṣaf, Paris 1900).

Bibliography: Ibn Khaldūn, Histoire des Berbères, ed. de Slane, i. 181—2, transl. i. 281—2; Leo Africanus, Description de l’Afrique, Bk. iv., ed. Schefer, vol. iii. p. 34; Marmol, Afrique, transl. by Perrot d’Albancourt, ii. 336; G. Graule, Notice historique sur la Kalaa des Beni Karched (Revue du Monde Musulman, 1913); René Leclerc, Monographie géographique et historique de la commune mixte de la Mina (Bull. de la Soc. de Géogr.; d’Oran, 1902); R. Basset, Notes de voyage (Milans africains et Orientaux, Paris 1915), p. 333; G. Yver)

KA’LAT NADJAM, the name of a celebrated citadel in Northern Syria, on the right bank of the Euphrates in 36° 52’ N. Lat. and 38° 18’ E. Long. (Greenwich). Its importance lay in the fact that it commanded the passage of the river here, where it was crossed by a bridge. It was here that a caravan route from Syria to Mesopotamia, much used in the middle ages, crossed the river. The route ran from Ḥalab via al-Bāb [q. v.] to Manbīdij, thence in a fairly straight line to the Euphrates, then across the river in a slightly north-eastern direction to Ḥarrān. The distance from Manbij to Ka’lat Nadjam is given as 23 or 24 farsakh (a short day’s journey), that from the Euphrates to Harrān as 2 days’ journey. As there are two small islands in the river at Ka’lat Nadjam, a passage is very easily effected by a short bridge of boats.

In the middle ages Ka’lat Nadjam was the bridgehead of Manbīdij (the ancient Ram-byke; cf. Manbij), a very busy emporium, which the Caliph Harūn al-Rašīd had raised to be the capital of the ‘Awāṣim province (q. v., 1, 115). So long as Manbij flourished, Ka’lat Nadjam retained its importance; with the decline of Manbij — by the close of the xivth century A. D. Manbij was already for the most part in ruins; see G. le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems (London
1890), p. 501 — the importance of Kalet sank also, for traffic across the Euphrates turned more and more to the northern crossing at al-Bira (Birejik; q. v., i. 723). In ancient and medi-aeval times there were on the central Euphrates, below where it breaks through the Taurus, a series of places where bridges maintained the connection between Syria and Mesopotamia; on these crossings, some of which succeeded others in course of centuries, see the references in the article BIREJIK (i. 723). Whether there was already a bridge in ancient times at Kalet Nadjm and whether the isolated hill commanding the ford was already inhabited or defended, we do not know. But it is very probable that a place so favoured by nature was used long before the coming of the Muslims. What ancient town is to be sought on the site of Kalet Nadjm or the immediate vicinity can hardly be decided with certainty. Most probably we have to locate here the Caecciliana of the Roman itineraries (Kausilis of Ptolemy); cf. the article Caecciliana in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencykl. d. klass. Altertumswiss., ii. 1172 and Streck's addition in Suppl. i. 266; Regling in Klio, i. 472; V. Chapot, La frontière de l'Euphrate (Paris 1907), p. 281; H. and R. Kiepert, Formae orbis antiqui, part v. (1916); L. Bell, op. cit. (see the Bibl. there), p. 23. Ainsworth, op. cit., p. 224 sought Caecciliana in the ruined site of Sarisat (Sisbat on Kiepert's map in Sachau (op. cit.), north of the Nadjm river, whereas the map of Syria and Mesopotamia published on a scale of 1 : 400,000 by the cartographical department of the Prussian Survey, sheet 16. (Halab) seeks to identify the ancient place in question with the modern Khirfan (Djabal al-Hamam, a little N. W. of Kalet Nadjm). Less commendable is the identification of Caecciliana with Kalet Nadjm: the other identifications that have been proposed: namely with Betamami (Bethammaris), as Benzinger suggests in Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., iii. 362 (adopted on the above mentioned map of Mesopotamia and Syria, 1 : 400,000) (see thereon my additional note in Paul's Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. i. 269), also with Calicocum (so d'Anville, L'Euphrate et Tigre, Paris 1779), on which see my article on this name in Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. i. 270. The Thilaticum of the Itinera Antonio and the Tabula Peutingeriana was suggested by Mannert, Geogr. d. Griech. und Romer, vi. 1 (Leipzig 1831), p. 394, 397 and Ainsworth, op. cit., i. 224. Noldeke proposed (op. cit., p. 13) the Gerre (Gerrha, Serre) of Ptolemy and the itineraries (see the article Gerre in Pauly-Wissowa, vii. 1270); on what are perhaps its ruins see Chapian, op. cit., p. 282. Finally it should be mentioned my Cressner in Euphrates and Tigri (London 1856), i. 420 and in Narrative of the Euphrates Expedition (London 1868), p. 234, wrongly would find Djesr Manbidj — which, as will be emphasised immediately, is only an older name for Kalet Nadjm — in the Kera or Bayuk Manbidj, 10 miles to the south of it (which Noldeke, op. cit., p. 14 considers the Ergazira of the classics, Regling in Klio, i. 471 Betamami).

Al-Baladhrî (Putul al-Baladûn, ed. de Goeje) p. 156, 22 sqq. (excerpts by Yakût, i. 478, 8 sqq.) especially mentions that the bridge of Kalet Nadjm was built by the Caliph 'Othman, but expressly adds that, according to some, traces were still to be seen of an older bridge, which would seem to prove the existence of a river-crossing here, dating back to pre-Muhammedan times. Al-Baladhrî, however, does not call the place Kalet Nadjm but Djesr Manbidj, "the bridge of Manbidj". The older Arab geographers and historians know it only by this name. Even if the name Kalet Nadjm perhaps only begins to appear in Arabic literature from the 9th century A. D. (to judge from the references quoted), it is clear from an important passage in the Hâlabî chronicle (not written, however, till the 13th century) of Ibn al-Sîhawa (al-Durr al-Muntakhab fi Taurih Mamlakat Halab, Beirut 1909; cf. this work above II, 236) that its origin must be put back to the tenth century. Here it is stated (p. 239), that Kalet Nadjm was long ago called Djesr Manbidj, and remained a little village in the Muslim period until it was re-founded by a certain Nadjm, a slave (zilzûl) of Hûblâ al-Şawwânt, about 200 A. H. (912 A. D.). From this Kalet Nadjm comes the new name Kalet Nadjm (N.'s citadel), which in time quite supplanted the earlier name Djesr Manbidj. Similar changes of place-names occurred elsewhere in Syria and Mesopotamia in the middle ages; for example the strong castle of Kalet Dawsar, which rose farther down the Euphrates on the left bank between al-Masli and al-Rakkû, received the name Kalet Djasîr [see the art. ] after the Arab chief 'Ubâr b. Mûlik (in the 11th century A. D.) had taken possession of it.

The passage quoted from Ibn al-Sîhawa's history further shows that the form Kalet al-Nadjm and the translation of the name founded on this as "the star-castle", which have become quite familiar in European literature (and therefore also on maps: Kalet en-Nadjm), are wrong. The Arabic sources, moreover, show, so far as we can see, almost always the correct Kalet Nadjm; the Syrians reproduce this by Kalet Nağâm, e. g. Barhebraeus, Chronicon Syriaicum (ed. Bedjan), p. 509, 23. If the reading Kalet al-Nadjm is occasional, it is also found in ourلطنج نديم; tâbâtâr, p. 357, 9; al-Marrûdî, ii. 443, 2) and al-Kazwînî, ii. 160, 23 — it would still have to be investigated whether the manuscripts really support this reading. At the same time we do not deny that later Arabic writers, in ignorance of the origin of the name of the place, occasionally may have written Kalet al-Nadjm and this may have given the etymology "star-castle". For example, Ibn al-Sîhawa (op. cit., p. 229) gives a passage from a riwâta of the kâb al-Fâdîl [q. v.], in which the latter exploits the monumental fortress in poetical fashion as "a star in the clouds", "an eagle in the sky". Similarly Ritter (op. cit., x. 1062, following J. v. Hammer) writes: "The castle is said to have taken its name from its height, reaching up to the stars". Lastly Ainsworth (op. cit., i. 229) takes the name Kalet al-Nadjm back to al-Mâ'mûn, who is said to have built an observatory here. That the Caliph had observations of the heavens made in the region between Palmira and al-Rakkû on the Euphrates is certainly true (cf. above i. 498), but his responsibility for the doubtful place-name is to be denied, after what we have said above. In this connection it may also be pointed out that we have several places called
Kawkab (= star) in Near Asia, for example one in Northern Syria, but an identification of the latter with Kaftāt al-Nadjm, the star-castle", which R. Köhrich, *Gesch. des Konigreiches Jerusalems* (Innsbruck 1898), p. 237, note 3 proposes, is impossible. It is noteworthy that Mādī al-Ālī, Mustawī (Nizābat al-Kūthī, ed. G. L. Strang, vol. 1, Leiden 1915, p. 103, 22) says that the citadel of Ḥarrān was called Kaftāt al-Nadjm. As there is no confirmation of this in Arabic sources, this must be an error of the author's.

The citadel and the bridge of Kaftāt al-Nadjm play an unimportant part in the history of the wars of Islām. Soon after their invasion of Syria the Arabs occupied this region (in 18 = 639), the Euphrates villages, as al-Baldāḥ, (p. 175, 9) calls it. In the accounts of the fighting between ʿAli and Muʿāwiya, which led in 657 A. D. to the battle of Siffin (on the right bank of the Euphrates opposite Kaftāt Djaʿbar already mentioned) the bridge of Kaftāt al-Nadjm is frequently mentioned; cf. e. g. al-Ṭabarī, i. 3259, 15 sq. and Ibn Miskawī, Taḏāriʾ al-Umān (Gībb. Mem. Ser. i, no. 7, p. 571, 7). When ʿU- bait al-Ālī b. Ziyād took the field against Muhājirūn in the 650s (685) in the Ṣiraḳ, he crossed the Euphrates by this bridge, see Wellhausen, *Das Arabische Reich und sein Sturz* (Berlin 1902), p. 115. In 930 (941) after the murder of Ibn Ṭāfi (on whom see above ii. 407) there was fighting here between the latter's troops and those of the Hamāndīs Nāṣir al-Dawla; see *Zeitschrift für Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, x. 470. The citadel of Kaftāt al-Nadjm changed hands several times then as in later centuries; we find as its possessors, in turns, the Hamāndīs, the Mirdāsids, of Ḥalab (cf. above ii. 229 sqq.), the Bann Numair (see Ibn Ḥawqal, p. 159, 9; Ibn al-Sibṭa, ed. iv., 6 sq.), Sulṭān Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Zankī (1146—79) and his successors in Syria, the Ayyūbids. Nāṣir al-Dīn (according to Abu l-Fidāʾ, Taḏawwim al-Buldān, ed. Paris, p. 233) renovated the castle — on which account Ibn Djbair, who passed it two or three decades later, calls it "a new citadel" — and placed a strong garrison in it, which was very troublesome to the neighbouring Syrian towns occupied by the Franks. Kaftāt al-Nadjm was also for a time in the hands of the Begtēginid princes of Ṣirbīl (on them see above ii. 591). After the death of Salāḥ al-Dīn (1193) his sons and grandsons (al-Malik al-Afdāl, al-Malik al-Zahir, al-Malik al-ʿAzīz) and his brother (al-Malik al-ʿÂdīl) several times succeeded one another in the possession of the town (cf. above vol. i, ii, and Yāḥṣīb, iii. 165, 18; Abu l-Faraj al-Barhebraeus, Taḏwīr Muḥdīr al-Dawla, ed. Beirut, p. 393, 15; Abu l-Fidāʾ (ed. Reiske-Adler), iv. 109, 189; Well, *Gesch. der Chalifen*, iii. 435).

When Ḥallūğ in 658 (1060) began his campaign against Syria (cf. above ii. 332), he had to fight for the Euphrates crossings and the forts defending them; see al-Barhebraeus, *Chronicon Syriae* (ed. Bedjan), p. 509, 9. Barhebraeus, who was then bishop of Ḥalab, went to meet the Mongol ruler to beg that the Christians be spared, which was shut up by him in Kaftāt al-Nadjm (see op. cit., p. 510, 17).

On the topography of Kaftāt al-Nadjm and the present condition of the castle there, we have various accounts by European travellers, e. g. by Helfer and Ainsworth (on their visit together in 1836); Sachau (1879), M. v. Oppenheim (1896) and Miss Gertrude L. Bell (1909). According to their descriptions, the rocky cone about 160 feet high stands quite alone, crowned by the picturesque ruins of the citadel, falling steeply towards the river and fairly difficult of ascent on other sides also. All parts of the castle are standing upright and are quite well preserved. Two stories are distinguished with an agglomeration of rooms of various sizes. The only parts damaged are those which were bombarded during the taking of the castle by Turkish troops about 1820. When at this time an Arab tribe refused tribute to the government and took refuge in this stronghold, the soldiers of the Paşa had to besiege and storm it, and a large gap was made in the wall in the process. A peculiar feature of Kaftāt al-Nadjm is its not yet fully investigated caves and subterranean passages, which, according to the Arabs, run through below the Euphrates to the Mesopotamian side (compare the Oriental stories about a similar system of tunnels made by the Queen Zenobia in Fr. Müller, *Studien über Zenobia und Palmyra* (1902), p. 57). Kaftāt al-Nadjm is now quite deserted and forms a refuge only for countless wild pigeons and bats. According to Sachau, there are still three Arabic inscriptions here. One of them is carved out over the main gateway which is flanked by two high towers and gives an account of the restoration work done by the Ayyūbīd al-Malik al-Zahir in 695—696 (1298—1302); beside it, is a second one which gives the name of the architect. A third inscription of the same ruler (of 1215 a. b.) may be read over the door of what was once the little mosque of the castle.

According to the Arab geographers (Ibn Djbair, Yāḥṣīb, al-Kawāzīnī, al-Marāṭīṣī), a little town lay below the castle rock, probably at the river's edge, which served as a market for the numerous travellers as well as for the Beduins of the surrounding desert. The remains still in existence of buildings of an earlier period at the foot of the hill on the south cannot, as Sachau observes, be considered the remains of a town on account of the way in which the ground is cut up; but the Muslim cemetery in the vicinity with the ruins of two buildings (mosques or chapels) may mark the site of the small mediæval village. At the present day there is no bridge here. Whether traces of any earlier ones can be found seems very doubtful. Cheney (*Expedition*, i. 420; *Narratives*, p. 230; see above) has, it is true, thought to discover remains of one and M. v. Oppenheim claimed to find traces of old bridges in no less than three places (see *Berliner Zeit. für Erdkunde*, xxxvi. 80 sq. and *Byzant. Zeitschr.*, xiv. 1905, p. 7); but according to Chapot (op. cit., p. 284, note 7), who likewise examined the area in question, there is nowhere any trace of such remains to be seen.

A little to the south of Kaftāt al-Nadjm, but on the left bank of the stream, there lies close to the Euphrates a mound of ruins, part of which has at one time been swept away by the river, called Tell Masʿūdīya, out of which M. v. Oppenheim dug a large ancient mosaic of the river-god Euphrates; see *Byzant. Zeitschr.*, xiv. (1905), p. 7 and Moritz in the *Beitr. zur Assyriologie*, vii. 11. 1913, p. 158. Also on the east bank opposite Kaftāt al-Nadjm there lies a very winding system.
of hills, called Djjabai Şarrin after the ancient ruined site of Sarrrin, S.E. of the latter (N.E. of Tell Mas'udiyia) rise two great grave-towers, one of which has in the second story a porphyry sarcophagus with the oldest known inscription in pure Syriac (73 A.D. = 385 Selenic era). This monument of an Edessa man named Manu bar Ma'nu, with inscriptions relating to the building and to the deceased, is of great value from the linguistic as well as the palaeographical side. M. v. Oppenheim and H. Pogson found and copied it independently; cf. Pogson's publication and edition of the text in his Inscriptiones Monetales de la Syrie Antique (Paris 1908), p. 15–22 (and in the Ms. of the S. A. L. and see thereon Noldeke in the Zeitschr. f. Assyri., xxi. 151–155). The edition of the text by B. Moritz in the Beiträge zur Assyriologie, vii./ii. 1913, p. 158–165 is based on v. Oppenheim's material. The ancient names of Tell Mas'udiyia and Şarrin are unknown; perhaps it was one of the above mentioned stations in the itineraries (Gerre or Thallicomum).


Qalat al-Rûm. See Rûm Qala'.

Qalat Sherkat, an extensive group of ruins in the wilayet of Mosul, on the right bank of the Tigris in 35° 30' N. Lat. and 45° 15' E. Long. (Greenwich). They rise on the edge of the desert on the sharp spur of the hilly lands, cut up by many valleys, which slope from the ridge of the Khânûka mountains, an eastern spur of the Djjabal Hamrin, down towards the Tigris. The name Qalat Sherkat is not found in the Oriental writers of the middle ages nor, so far as I can see, in those of later centuries either. Whether the spelling ٣٩٨ = Ashshur sîr (b) T (z), which is found in Arabic inscriptions of the Parthian period, is really connected with Sherkat, as Jensen (Mitt. der Deutsch. Orient-Gesellschaft, vii. 1906, p. 46) supposes, is very doubtful. Perhaps the name Sherkat — not Sherkat; cf. Streck, Die Inschriften Amurathbâlei (Leipzig 1916), p. 792 — only dates from the xviith century A.D.; in the literature of European travellers it seems to appear first about the time of Rich (1821). The meaning (? a personal name) is quite unknown. The Turks allow the place the name (often found where Turkish is spoken) of Toprak-Qala=‘Earth-citadel’, which is without significance; cf. Rich, op. cit., ii. 137 sq.

Qalat Sherkat occupies the site of the oldest capital of the Assyrian empire, the city of Ashshur, from which the whole district ruled by it also took the name Ashshur (Assyria), while the city itself apparently derived its name from the national deity of this name (hardly the reverse). The site offers many advantages for an effective defence and was presumably planned by the inhabitants of southern Mesopotamia (Babylonia) as a military bulwark against the inroads of northern barbarians. That Qalat Sherkat was fortified in the archaic period has been shown by the excavations of the Deutsche Orientgesellschaft. These further show that the Semitic settlement was preceded by a non-Semitic (Sumerian) occupation; Sumerian sculptures have been found which are closely connected with those from Tellah in South Babylonia (about 2600 B.C.). In the time of the third Babylonian dynasty of Ur (2296–2176 B.C.), Ashshur was a small state dependent on Babylonia. The beginnings of Ashshur may safely be put back to 3000 B.C. and perhaps even farther; thereon cf., most recently, Weidner in Boschhödi-Studien, Heft 6 (Der Zug Sargons von Akkad, Leipzig 1927), p. 96. Some not inconceivable time before 2000 B.C. an end was made of the Sumerian colonisation of Ashshur by the invasion of the Semites.

The numerous historical inscriptions, which were brought to light by the excavations of the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft in Qalat Sherkat have extended in a most unexpected fashion our knowledge of the history of the city and kingdom of Ashshur, especially with regard to the older periods. Its chronology now begins about 2300 B.C. or even earlier. From Pazur Ashsh (2086–2072) to the fall of Nineveh, with the help of the dynastic lists of Ashshur, we can restore the series of rulers without a gap; cf. E. Weidner, Die Könige von Assyrien, Neue chronol. Dokumente aus Assur, in the Mitt. der Vorderasiat.-Agypt. Gesellschaft, xxvi. (1921), p. 2; with the chronological list of the kings of Ashshur given there (p. 64 sq.) compare the (somewhat later) list given by Schroeder in Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts, Heft 2 (1922), p. 101 sq.

Ashshur retained its place as capital down to the middle of the tenth century B.C. Older rulers built other towns as royal residences, but only temporarily, for example Salmasasar I (1280–1261) chose Kal'khu (Bibl. Hebr. Kâlah) farther to the north at the mouth of the upper
Zab for his capital and his son and successor Tu-
kultu Ninhurta I (1260–1232) built a new capital for
himself Karr (wall, citadel of) Tu-kultu Ninhurta
(now the ruins of Tulul 'Akir). After their death
both these towns again lost their predominance to
Ashur. It was only from the tenth century
onwards that the latter became more and more
overshadowed by Kalakh and Nineveh and the
later Asshur chose these two places only as the
centres of their kingdom. Ashurhur survived the
fall of Nineveh, however; cf. Streck, op. cit.,
CXXVI and note 3 and p. CXXVII, note 1. It is
mentioned in the proclamation of Cyrus to the
Babylonians, which is preserved in cuneiform.
During the greater part of the Graeco-Roman
period, especially in the 400 years of the Par-
thian epoch (which is represented by countless
remains of buildings), it was an inhabited town,
and as such — under other names (Kainat; per-
haps also Labanna and Libba) — it is several
times mentioned by classical authors; thereon cf.
E. Herzfeld in Memnon, i. (1907), p. 98 sq., 237
sq. In the fall of the ruins of Kalaf Sherkat 43
Aramaic inscriptions, partly in memory
monument, were found, which, in so far as they
were dated, cover the period of the Seleucid (Arsakiad)
era (199/200–227/228 a.D.), i.e. they cease just
with the rise of the Sassanians. An interesting
fact is also to be deduced from these documents,
that the cult of Assyrian deities and names of gods
still survived in Ashurhur in the third century A.D.
On these inscriptions cf. Jensen in the Situngs-
berichte der Berliner Akademie, 1919, iii.
1042–
1051, and in the Miti, d. deutsch. Orient-Ge-
ellschaft, 1920, no. 60.

The name Ashurhur appears in the Ara maic
form A'thur as early as the old Persian version
of the Behistun inscription; see Weisbach, Die
Keltinschriften der Achemeniden (Verordn. Bibl., iii.), p. 140. By Athurhur we have here
probably not to understand the whole of Assyria
but only the district of Ashurhur. The classical
authors give the Aramaic equivalent of Ashurhur
in the form 'Aturfa, 'Atufa; see Panny-Wissowa,
Kalash, d. klass. Altertumswiss., ii. 2260;
Hersfeld, op. cit., i. 127. Ashurhur presumably
became more and more deserted under the Sassanians.
The Syrian authors know of A'thor down to
the late middle ages as the name of a parish;
see G. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syrisch. Akten

The Arab geographers of the middle ages
likewise are acquainted with Athur. It is given
by them firstly as an earlier name of Mosul, then
as the name of the province which was later usually
called al-Djazira and finally as the name of a ruin
near al-Salamiya (probably the Biblical Resen, 24
miles N.W. of Nimrud, the ancient Kalakh; cf.
Streck, op. cit., p. CXXVI). Sometimes A'khir is
written instead of A'thur and sometimes the one,
sometimes the other noted as a variant. A'khir
is either to be regarded as a corruption or, perhaps
better, as a parallel dialect form. Cf. for Athur
or A'khir: Ibn Rosteh in the Bibl. Geogr. Arab.,
vii. 104, 6 (and Athur, "land of A." = Mousul);
Yakrit, Mousgum (ed. Wüstenfeld), i. 119, 15,
340, 5, iii. 118, 18. For the Djazirat A'khir see
Yakrit, Mousgum, ii. 72, 13, 231, 9; this coincides
with the Iklim A'khir (A'khir), the kalafa (region
of) A', of which only al-Muṣgum (Bibl. Geogr.
Arab., iii. 20, 1; cf. al-27, 10, 28, 7) speaks
which, according to him, is divided into three
large divisions. On (Jayvat) A'khir as an older
name for Dazira seen above i. and G. Le Strange,
The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate (Cambridge
1905), p. 86.

From the statements of the Arab geographers
this much is evident that in the middle ages a
ruin was still known which covered the site of the
ancient Ashurhur; only the name had been
erroneously connected with a deserted locality near
al-Salamiya. It may here be recalled that, according
to Layard, Nineveh and Babylon (London 1853),
p. 165, the Arabs at the present day call a high
hill in the corner of the ruins of Nimrud (Kalakh)
'Tell Auhr'. The Arab geographers further make
the observation, which is quite correct, that the
earlier name of the province of al-Dazira, which,
indeed, practically coincides in area with the
ancient Assyria, is derived from the deserted town
of A'thor. When A'thor ultimately came to be
erroneously regarded as the ancient name of the
later capital Mousul, we have a false identification
here similar to the case of Baghdir, which western
travellers throughout the middle ages down to
Pietro di Valte (1616–47) equated with Ba-
bylon and always called so.

On the Arabic names A'thor or A'khir cf. also
A. Schultens, Vita et res gestae... Saladin (Lei-
den 1755), Ind. Geogr. s. v. Mosul; Fr. Tuch,
De Nino urbe (Leipzig 1845), p. 16 sq.; Tuch's
Kommärer über die Genesis, 2nd ed. by Merx
(Halle 1871), p. 61 sq.; Layard, Nineveh and its
Remains 3 (London 1849), ii. 245.

The ruined area of Kalaf Sherkat is of con-
siderable extent (nearly 180 acres), very little
smaller than that of the two other royal cities of
Assyria, Kalakh (Nimrud) and Nineveh (Kuyunjik).
It is sharply defined; there is no doubt on any
side as to how far the ancient city reached.
The Tigris flowed along the east front; the north
front was formed by a natural ledge of rock, which
was strengthened by defensive walls and made
inaccessible. On the finest part of Ashurhur, in
the eastern part of the north plateau, the Sham-
shék Kherša Pashá in the second half of the xixth
century founded a settlement which later became
a Turkish outpost, which until the Great
War served as barracks for troops of regular ca-
valry or mounted police. Apart from this tem-
porary use as a military post by the government,
Kalaf Sherkat has been quite uninhabited since
the memory of man.

The extensive ruins early excited the interest
of European travellers. Their importance was first
emphasised by Cl. Rich, who examined them
carefully on a Tigris journey in March 1821, see
his Narrative of a Residence in Koordistan (Lon-
don 1830), ii. 137 sq. In 1836 Ross visited them;
see a communication by him in the Journ. of
The first thorough description of the site we owe
to W. Ainsworth. He visited it along with Layard
and Mitford in 1840 when on an excursion to
al-Hadhr [q. v., ii. 204] (the caravan road to al-
Hadhr branches off at Kalaf Sherkat; see his re-
port in the Journ. of the Royal Geogr. Society,
i. (1842), p. 4–8). Layard again in 1847 spent
two days at Kalaf Sherkat, engaged in examining
the ruins; see Layard, Nineveh and its Remains, 2,
KAŁAṬ SHERKĀT — KAŁĀʻŪN


A systematic examination of the whole system of ruins was first effected between Sept. 1903 and June 1914 by excavations of the Deutsche Orientgesellschaft which extended over practically the whole site of the town. Accurate plans were made of all parts examined. As the excavations proved, the kings Tiglat-pileser III (1115—1103) and Salmanasser III (859—825) in particular played very great activity in building at Ashšur; the latter renovated completely almost all the great works of his predecessors. The most prominent buildings within the town are the great temples — the sanctuary of Ishtar, the oldest of all, showing a Sumerian stratum below it, then the Ashšur temple, also of very great antiquity, called E-Kharsag-kurkurr with a great temple tower (sēkurutē) belonging to it, and lastly the sanctuary of Anu and Adad. Besides there was a series of smaller temples; of special interest is a "New Year Festival House", a work of Sanherib (705—682), discovered before the city gate. Palaces also were uncovered; but we have not yet detailed information regarding them. The powerful fortifications (double wall, Tigris-quay, wall and citadel) with which the Assyrian rulers protected their capital are most impressive. Among the monuments brought to light in great number special mention should be made of two rows of steles with reliefs and inscriptions (one north of kings and one south of officials), which belong to the xivth—viii centuried and are of fundamental importance for our knowledge of Assyrian history. The topographical and archaeological investigation of the site has, at last, also given us a clear picture of the extent and significance of the erstwhile "city of the Parthians" (we have to distinguish two periods of Parthian building).

An exhaustive work on the topography and history of Ashšur based on the German ten years' excavations on a large scale is not yet available. For the present we have only the official reports, almost all by W. Andrae, the leader of the German expedition in Assyria, published in the Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, N°. 20—22, 25—26, 28—29, 31—33, 36, 38, 40, 42—45, 47—49, 51 and 54. On two of the principal temples, on the fortification works and the rows of steles, Andrae has published monographs in the Wissensch. Veröffentlich. der Deutsch. Orient-Gesellschaft, namely: Der Anu-Adad-Tempel in Assur (Leipzig 1909); Wissensch. Veröffentlich., N°. 10; Die Steinreiche von Assur (1913); op. cit., N°. 24; Die Festtagewerke von Assur (1913, 2 vols.; = op. cit., N°. 23); Die archaischen Nār-Tempel in Assur (1922; = op. cit., N°. 39).

The yield in inscriptions from the excavations in Ashšur has been very rich and exceedingly important. They have to a very great extent extended our knowledge of Assyrian chronology, history and religion. The publication of the texts is likewise being done in the Wissensch. Veröffentlich. der Deutsch. Orient-Gesellschaft; so far there have appeared: Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts, 2 parts, Leipzig 1911 and 1922, ed. by Messerschmidt and Schroeder (= Wissensch. Veröffentlich., N°. 16 and 37); Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts, ed. by Ebeling, vol. i. 1915—1916 (= op. cit., N°. 28), vol. ii. (part 1—2), 1920 (= op. cit., N°. 34); Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenem Inhalts, ed. by Schroeder, 1920 (= op. cit., N°. 35); Altertümer und Keramik aus Assur (dating from the latest period of the Assyrian empire), ed. by Lidsbarski 1921, op. cit., N°. 38.

Bibliography: Apart from the references already given we may mention the following: Ritter, Erdbunde, xi. 666 sq., 674—676; Fr. Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? (Leipzig 1881), p. 252—255. Delitzsch also in 1903, before the beginning of the German excavations, drew up a sketch of a history of the town (especially its buildings) based on the inscriptions then known, in the Mitteilungen der Deutsch. Orient-Gesellschaft, N°. 20, p. 30—36; M. v. Oppenheim, Vom Mittelmeer zum persischen Golf (Berlin 1900), ii. 203—210; E. Herzfeld in Monumenta, i. (1907), p. 97—116, 251 sq., 257; M. Streck, Die Inschriften Asshurs (Berlin 1916), ii. 773; B. Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien, i. (Heidelberg 1920), passim (see Index), esp. p. 12 sq., 33 sq., 300 sq. — The best map of the region of Kaššašīrāt is the one of Mesopotamia and Syria published by the cartographical department of the Prussian Survey on the scale of 1:400,000, sheet 4 C (Sāmarā). The latest plan of the ruins of Ashšur is given by Andrae in his Die Festtagewerke von Assur (1913), Plates i. and iii. On the flora of Kaššašīrāt and district E. Herzfeld writes in the Orientalist. Literaturezeit., Suppl. ii., Berlin (1908) on the basis of the collection made by him as a member of the German expedition in Ashšur in 1903—1905 and (somewhat enlarged) in Sarre-Herzfeld, Archaeol. Zeit. im Euphrat und Tigrisgebiet, iv. (Suppl. Berlin 1920), p. 25—26. He gives the plant-names in the dialect of the half nomadic Djebbûr Arabs of the district. (M. Streck)

KAĻĀṬA. See CONSTANTINOPLE. I. 867.
KAĻĀʻŪN, AL-MALIK AL-MANṢUR SAIF AL-DĪN ABU 'L-MĀʻĀL AL-ÅLĪF (the 'Thousander', a name, it is said, given him because he was bought for 1000 pieces of gold) al-SĀLĪM AL-ÅNĀM, the sixth Sulṭān of the Bahri [q.v.]. Mamlûk, born in Kūfāq [q.v.], was brought to Egypt, sold to Sulṭān Sāmhi Ålīyā [q.v.] and manumitted by him in 647 (1247). The beginning of his career is unknown. Under Sulṭān Bahrāy Khan, son of Baibars, sent him again against the Armenians in 677 (1278). When this Sulṭān was deposed a year later, the Emirs chose his seventeen-year-old brother al-Malik al-Ådīl Sulṭānī as Sulṭān and appointed Kaļā‘ūn his guardian and Atabek. In reality Kaļā‘ūn ruled and was mentioned in the Friday prayer and on the coins along with Sulṭānī; after three months Sulṭānī was deposed and Kaļā‘ūn in due form raised to the throne and confirmed by the Caliph. While he was at once recognised in Egypt, he had to fight a rival in Syria, the Emir Şenḳor al-Asfiqar, who was chosen...
Sulṭān in Damascus by the Syrian troops. Şoŋkor found support among the Beduins of Syria, as well as the sons of Balbars, the deposed Baraka Khān, to whom on his deposition Karak [q.v.] had been given as an independent principality, and his brother Khiḍr, who occupied several fortresses in the southern part of Syria. Both sides gathered together their armies; there was a battle in the beginning of autumn (1279) south of Damascus, which was decided in favour of Kalāˈun, as a result of the desertion of Damascus troops. Baraka Khān had died shortly before; his brother Khiḍr was glad to conclude peace with Kalāˈun in the spring of the year 680, by which he was granted Karak as a fief. Şoŋkor had appealed for assistance to the Mongols and they, always ready for loot, had invaded Northern Syria, plundering as they went. When the Mongols were preparing for a second campaign on a larger scale, Şoŋkor, who had become afraid of his too ardent friends, had made peace with Kalāˈun on condition that he was left the North Syrian fortresses of Shirat, Qara, and several other places to rule independently. Freed from these opponents, Kalāˈun was able to devote his attention to the invading Mongols, who were reinforced by Armenians, Franks and Georgians. The armies met at Ḥimṣ. In spite of their superiority at first, the Mongols were defeated and had to withdraw from Syria. While the Sulṭān, as we have seen, was threatened from several sides, the Crusaders, who still occupied the greater part of the Syrian coast, had not decided to collect their full strength for a decisive effort. Only the Knights of St. John in the fortress of Marqab had renewed their war against the Shirat, and an incredible sinner was approaching it, into an ambush and inflicted a severe defeat on him in a surprise attack; after the destruction of the Mongol army, they, like the Count of Tripolis and the Templars a year later, were content to have peace on favourable terms. An agreement was also made with the city of Akka in 682 (1283). Kalāˈun, however, punished the Armenians for the help they had given the Mongols, by invading their country and doing them great damage by plundering and ravaging it.

The Khān of the Mongols, Abākā [q.v.] died in 680 (1281); his successor adopted Islām, taking the name Ahmād. Letters and embassies were exchanged between him and Kalāˈun, and although their relations did not result in an alliance, they were by no means unfriendly. In 683 (1284) Ahmād was murdered. His successor Arghūn [q.v.] remained a pagan and favoured the Jews and Christians in his Empire. His plan was to induce the Pope and the king of France to cooperate with him in a crusade against Kalāˈun. This scheme, however, did not materialise. The Sulṭān for his part entered into diplomatic negotiations with the republic of Genoa, with whom he concluded a commercial treaty; he had a kind of defensive alliance with king Alfonso of Castile and James of Sicily. Embassies were exchanged with the Byzantine Emperor, with the Emperor Rudolf of Hapsburg, the king of Yemen and the prince of Ceylon. The prince Tūdān Mangūl of Kiṣqān, who became a convert to Islām, obtained from Kalāˈun, as the first ruler in Islām, a title and a standard with a coat-of-arms.

It was Kalāˈun's aim to extend his rule over the whole of Syria. To attain this end he did not hesitate to break his treaties with the Crusaders. For example at the beginning of 684 (1285) he fell suddenly upon the fortress of the Knights of St. John at Marqab and occupied the walls so rapidly with his sappers, that the garrison had to surrender and depart. He adopted another plan to capture the stronghold of Marakša, built in the sea near the coast and considered impregnable. It belonged to a vassal of Bohemund VII of Tripolis. Kalāˈun pursued and threatened the latter so long that finally he bought it from his vassal, and let the Sulṭān dismantle it to appease him. Margaret of Tyre had to purchase peace with Kalāˈun on humiliating terms. Having thus consolidated his position, he was able in 686 (1287) to think of depriving his old opponent Şoŋkor al-Ashkar of his possessions in Syria. In the course of several campaigns he compelled him to give up his kingdom and retire to Cairo. He threatened Khiḍr, prince of Karak, so long that the latter finally yielded up his principality to him. In 688 (1289) he decided to capture Tripolis, the largest town still in the possession of the Crusaders. Prince Bohemund had died and his mother and sister were making claims on the vacant throne. The Sulṭān intervened in the quarrel and finally began the siege of the town. Although Tripolis received help from the sea, its position soon became desperate, so that the mother of the late ruler left the town with the Genoese and Venetian colony. With the help of his sappers the Sulṭān succeeded in undermining the walls and took the town by assault. It was for the most part destroyed and not rebuilt till a few years later, several miles from the sea coast and in the bed of the river Kadsha. (From the Christian period date the great mosque, the Taliˈan mosque, both formerly churches, and the foundations of the citadel). The stronghold of Batrān, south of Tripolis, was shortly afterwards taken. This was Kalāˈun's last feat of arms. When about to depart next year to besiege Akka on the pretext that Muslims had been robbed and murdered by Christians there, he died quite near Cairo, just after starting for Syria. Besides his continuous campaigns in Syria he had also to wage war against Nabia. In two battles he was victorious against king Şamāˈmūm but he could only maintain his authority there as long as his armies remained. He gained no permanent success in Nubia, although he succeeded in making king Şamāˈmūm resume payment of the ancient tribute. He had frequently to take the field with full strength against the Beduins of South Palestine and Upper Egypt; it is a sign of his strength that he, unlike other Sulṭāns, was able to subdue the rebels completely. Kalāˈun, on the whole, maintained his authority over the sacred city of Mecca, although the Sharif from time to time endeavoured to make himself independent.

Sulṭān Kalāˈun succeeded in consolidating Mamlik power in Syria and gradually made good the damage done by the incursions and ravages of the Mongols. We find his renovations on a grand scale in the citadels of Aleppo, Baalbek and Damascus. His most famous building is the hospital in Cairo in which there were large wards for the different illnesses, laboratories, kitchens, ample storerooms with provisions and medicaments. It was connected with a mosque and a school (see below). He was the only one of the Mamlik
Sultans to found a dynasty; his descendant in the fifth generation reigned till 783 (1382).


KALAWDHIRA, according to Yāḳūt, Mīḏjam, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 167 a fortress near Mala- tyā, undoubtedly the ancient Claudias, which is mentioned as early as Pliny, Historia Naturalis, iv. 120, Claudopolis, and under the later Roman Empire was one of the castra praetoria, the fortified permanent camps on the eastern frontier between Samosata and Melitene. It was taken from the Arabs and destroyed by Constantine V Copronymos, probably in 755 A.D., together with Malatya (al-Baladhūrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 186 sqq., Abu l-Fīḍa, Taʾrīkh, under the years 133 and 138 of the Hijra; Barhebraeus, Kethābā dh al-Makhtūbānūt Zubānī, ed. Bedām, Paris 1890, p. 122 below), but retaken and rebuilt by the Abbāūdī al-Mansūr in 140 (757/758) (al-Baladhūrī, p. 188 = Ibn al-Asṭūr, ed. Tornour, v. 382; Abu l-Faraj, Taʾrīkh Makhtūdar al-Dawla, ed. Sābūrī (Bāhraw 1800), p. 310, without giving a date, according to Yāḳūt, op. cit., in 141 A.H.) and the Christian population transplanted to Constantinople (Mi- chael Syrus, Kethābā dh al-Makhtūbānūt Zubānī, ed. Chabot, ii. 518, 522). In the first quarter of the tenth century the district of Melitene again passed under Byzantine rule and was not lost again until the Saldjīk invasion; in the tractate περὶ παρασκευῆς πολιμέαν (de secretione belli) of the second half of the tenth century the place is mentioned under the name tē Kālōdha along with Melitene (Leo Diaconus, ed. Bonn 1828, p. 250). Armenian bands entered the district of Kalawdhiya and established themselves there in 1066 (Michael Syrus, op. cit., iii. 1158). The Byzantines were followed in their rule in these regions by the Dānīḫmandoglia and their rivals, the Saldjīks of Konya. In this period Kalawdhiya is repeatedly mentioned by the Syriac chroniclers, for the last time in the year 1273 (Michael Syrus, op. cit., p. 304, year 1152, p. 400, year 1185; Barhebraeus, op. cit., i. 522 = ii. 543, year 1257; id., i. 549 = ii. 574, year 1273); among other things they report that in October 1152 the Euphrates overflowed its banks as the result of a great landslide and made a way out at the foot of the hills of K. (see Michael Syrus, op. cit., p. 306 = Barhebraeus, Melitēn 354, ii. 347, ii. 348). Hamdūlīh Mustawfī, Nāmah al-Kālābī, ed. Le Strange, p. 98 sq., knows K. under the name Erkawdži as a considerable fortified place in a fertile region, which produced corn, cotton, grapes and fruit plentifully; he thinks, like Yāḳūt, that Ptolemaeus, the author of the Almagest came from there, and was therefore called al-Kalawdī.

With this the place disappears from history; for, although Hādījī Khalīfā (xvith cent. a.n.) still mentions Erkawdži in his Djiḥānīmūnā, p. 601, he only knows it from Hamdūlīh Mustawfī and Otter, Voyage en Turquie et en Perse (Paris 1748), ii. 284 (beginning of the xvith century) translates, as usual with him, only the statements of the Turkish geographer. The site has so far not been discovered: Ainsworth, Travels and Researches in Asia Minor (London 1842), i. 263 wishes to identify the ancient Claudias with the modern Kāhkāta (q. v.), which is, however, impossible because the Syriac chroniclers mention Kalawdhiya and Kāhkāta together contemporaneously as different places.


KALB, the dog, is also in Islam one of the "unclean beasts," primarily because its flesh may not be eaten (al-Nawawī, Mīḥānī al-Tālībīn, ed. v. d. Berg, iii. 312); and further because, according to the Hādījī, there are several special regulations regarding it. For example dogs render food which they lick impure and render unavailing water intended for ritual purifications (al-Bukhrā, Wujūd, bāb 33). Vessels, likewise, which have been licked by dogs, require to be cleaned several times, including once with sand. In a certain way they render impure the whole room in which they are; for angels do not enter a house in which there is a dog and Muhammad had first to sprinkle the place on which a young dog had lain concealed with purifying water before Djbibl would appear to him (Muslim, Lības, trad. 31 sqq.). — Dogs "cut off the šaltī," i.e. they make the šaltī worthless when they come into the immediate vicinity of the man at prayer (Ibn Māḏīja, Jāma, bāb 30) and one is all the more inclined to attribute this rule to the impurity of the dog, as it also holds for menstruating women. The Arab commentators, however, explain it by saying that the dog frightens the worshipper and distracts him from his devotions (al-Sindī, commentary on Ibn Māḏīja as cited above). This is especially true of the black dog, for he is Satan". This saying is either to be interpreted literally as meaning that Satan occasionally appears in the form of a black dog (cf. Faust) or it only means that black dogs in general are con- sidered particularly dangerous. Dogs in general are considered noxious and should therefore be exterminated (al-Nasāʿī, Šayb al-Ḍāhīt, bāb 9—14), but as "Allāh does not create anything in which there is not a trace of his wisdom" (al-Sindī, commentary on this passage), this rule is applied only to black dogs.

It is only permitted to keep dogs for hunting, for herding and for watching (al-Nasʿ, op. cit.); whoever keeps a forbidden dog has to forfeit a portion of his possessions daily (cf. Ba-yālōn, Taʾmūd, Shākhāb, fol. 63*; "whoever pos- sesses a dangerous dog keeps good fortune away from his house"). Dealing in dogs on the other hand is strictly forbidden (al-Bukhrā, Ṣuyūt, bāb 25).

But in spite of its impurity and dangerousness
the Arabs are able to appreciate the good qualities and services of the dog. Muhammad himself promises a woman a divine reward for a kindness, which she had done a thirsty dog (al-Bukhārī, Wu‘āṣa, bāb 33), and al-Kazwini (p. 403) characterises the dog as "a particularly intelligent, very useful animal, patient in hunger and on the watch, whose cleverness and fidelity are shown in many ways". Al-Kazwini describes very fully the dog's senses in Book IV, cap. 9; cf. thereon Babylon, Talmud, Yoma, fol. 8r: "there are five symptoms in a mad dog; its mouth is open, its saliva runs, its ears have a foul smell, its tail lies limply on its hips and it wanders aimlessly along the sides of the streets".

The dog of the seven sleepers (Sūra xviii. 17) is a special matter. According to al-Ba‘dawī (ed. Fleischer, p. 557) it was a dog with the gift of speech, in al-Tabarī's view (Tafsīr, xv. 141, n. 131, p. 131), a man in the form of a dog, but perhaps simply an ordinary dog. On the dog-star (Sirius) see al-Kalb and al-Shitīrūs.


Al-Kalb, the Dog-Star in astronomy: Šarāt al-Kalb al-‘abhar (the constellation of the Great Dog) and Šarāt al-Kalb al-a‘qāhar (constellation of the Little Dog) or also Šarāt al-Kalb al-Munahadānūn (constellation of the foremost dog); ādām, the former known as Canis major and the latter as Canis minor, two constellations of the southern heavens, the names and configuration of which the Arabs took out of al-Majūti of Ptolemaios. Like the latter, the Arabs allotted 18 stars to the sūra proper of Canis Major, of which Sirius (al-Shīrā ‘Alā‘ir) is of the first magnitude (actually 1.6), while outside of the constellation lie 11 stars, and to Canis Minor two stars of which Procyon (a Canis Minoris, al-Shīrā ‘Ujānumaiyān) is also of the first magnitude (actually 0.5). As regards the stellar co-ordinates (latitude and longitude), the star-catalogues of Abū al-Rahmān al-Sufī (d. 376 = 886) and Abū Rūnī (d. 440 = 1048) are based entirely on the Ptolemaic Almagest, while the star-catalogue of Ulugh Beg prepared for the period 1437 contains numerous new definitions of star positions.

The name Dog-Star probably goes back to ancient Egypt where the modern Sirius (śēsōs = burning, brilliant) — with the addition of Kław = Dog-Star — was called Sopdet, which undoubtedly became the Greek Septizon. The name of the star had originally nothing to do with dog, but in the Greek terracottas which are frequently found in Egypt, Isis, to whom the star was sacred, is often represented with a dog and (according to L. Borchart) with a particular kind of dog, the so-called Arman (Ermot)-dog. Sirius alone is sometimes represented in terracottas in that way; he also has a star above his head. According to Borchardt, it is not improbable that the star appears in the star-tables from the Kamesí graves, which precede or follows Sopdet, is the modern Procyon.

In Babylonia Sirius was called "Arrow-Star", never Dog-Star. The older Babylonian name (according to F. X. Kugler) was Kākkūd miširē, the latter Babylonian Kal Kākkūši ("weapon of the bow") — "arrow".


Kalb n. Wabarā, the eponymous ancestor of the tribe of Kalb, a confederation of nomadic Syrián Arabs attached to the powerful Kūfīa [q. v.] group. The Banū Udhrā [q. v.] have been the most famous among the clans of the Kalb since the Hidjra, especially in literary history. The pre-Muhammadan annals of Kalb are very obscure and semi-fabulous. Zuhair b. Dianāb [q. v.], an almost legendary personage — reckoned among the mu‘ammarūn or centenarians —, is said to have been one of their principal chiefs. They seem to have developed independently of other tribes in the Peninsula and to have had no relations with them. Their dialect showed curious peculiarieties and we know of no pre-islamic poets using it. About the time of the Hidjra they were the most important Arab group in Syria.

The conquest of this country brought them to the front, not least through the close alliance made by Mu‘āwiyah I with their tribe, a union sealed by his marriage with Maisūn [q. v.], mother of Yazid I. This political alliance brought them into high office, at court and in the army; to the latter they furnished disciplined contingents and captains of great bravery. Towards the middle of the first century A.H. their numbers must have been considerably over 10,000 of them were losing the pension of 2000 dirhems, the sharaf al-‘aţīf, a distinction reserved for the aʿjārāf or nobles. Half-settled, half-nomadic they covered with their huge flocks — for they were great herdsmen — the Šamīa the steppes separating Syria from the Irāk and hence called Samāwā of Kalb and desert of Kalb. They held the springs, the oases at the east and south of Hāwrān, especially Dawmat al-Dajdal, Tabūk and several others dotted about the Wādī ‘l-Karā with their palm-groves, the property of the Banū Udhrā. In Syria they were grouped round Samāwā and Palmyra, towns which belonged to them. A part of the district of Emessa and of the lower valley of the Orentes were united in their territory and in
the Ghūţa [q.v.] of Damascus a number of villages belonged to the Kalb. The possession of commercial centres like Palmyra and Damaṭ al-Djandal leads us to suppose that this ancient Syrian tribe must have profited by the caravan passing by these routes, still very much used in the first century of Islam.

They seem to have inherited the ancient hegemony of the Qassānids. Like the latter and other Syro-Arab tribes at the time of the Ilidja the great majority of them professed the Christian religion and probably were Monophysites. They gradually exchanged it for Islam; one group is even said to have sent a deputation to the Prophet. In the following of the latter several Kalbīs — we may mention Zaid b. Hārūba, his adopted son, and Dāyah b. Khalīfa, his diplomat—rose to fill important positions. Islam spread among the Kalbī, especially from the time when frequent marriages — the first that of Nā‘īla, wife of the Caliph ‘Othmān [q.v.] — with the Omayyads assured them preponderance over the other tribes. Yazīd I, with his mother Maṣūm, passed a part of his youth in the desert of Kalb and contracted a marriage with a Kalbīya. The supremacy of this tribe and of the powerful family of Bālid [q.v.] incited the Kāsī against them. Refusing to recognize Mu‘awiyah II, the latter declared for Ibn al-Zubair [see ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair]. The victory of ‘Abd Allāh [q.v.], due mainly to the bravery of the Kalbīs, completed the rupture between them and the Kāsī. Burning for revenge, they attacked the Kalb everywhere and succeeded in driving them out of Mesopotamia and the adjoining districts of the Samāwā. Besides, with the advent of the Marwānids, their popularity had sunk for the time at the court of Damascus, where their striking triumph at the battle of Marj Rāḥīt gave offence. They were not long in regaining their influence. They continued to figure among the most stalwart supporters of Omayyad rule. On several occasions, their contingents rendered effective assistance in retaking the ‘Irāq from the rebels in the East. They新冠肺炎现代伙伴, the bravest among the Kūfīya. In a word, the name of Kalbī had become synonymous with partisan of the Omayyads. The almost constant policy of this dynasty was to rely on the Kalbī alliance and through it on the support of the other Syrian tribes. A tradition said that the Kalb would be the last adherents of al-Sufyān [q.v.]. This state of affairs inevitably led to a violent reaction under the ‘Abbāsids and precipitated the fall of the Kalbī, decimated by their long struggle with the Kāsī and their active participation in all the wars of conquest. Soon their solidarity was broken up and the designation of ‘Abū Sā‘īd, an object of suspicion to the Baghdad government, of ‘Abū Sa‘īd, quoted by al-Kalbīshandī (in his Niḥyāyat al-Arba‘n, 3 For the other names, see Tab. of the 309-312, 324-326, 418. [H. LANNHESI]

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, II.

MALIK, according to Ibn al-Kūfi in the Fīhrīst, 3. ‘Abd al-‘Alī b. Bishr, whose grandfather with his sons al-Sā‘īd, ‘Ubayd and ‘Abd al-Rahmān had fought by the side of ‘Ali in the battle of the Camel and whose father had fallen by the side of Mus‘āb b. al-Zubair, had taken part in the battle of Dair al-Djamā‘ī [q.v.], in 10 (101) as a follower of ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. al-A‘lā [q.v.]. He then devoted himself to historical and philological studies; he read the Nāṣiḥat of Farazāda [q.v.] with the poet himself. He lectured in Kūfa on Kūfī genealogy and history; at the invitation of Sulaimān b. ‘Ali he expounded the Kūfī for a time in the latter’s house at Bayra. His commentary on the Kūfī was still used by al-Ṭalḥā [f. 157-159; see Cat. Codd. MSS. Or. in Musc. Britannic. pars ii. No. 82]. He died in 146 (765).

His son ‘Abū ‘l-Munṣūhī Haynām mainly continued his father’s historical studies, in which the latter had been his teacher. Both scholars have often been attacked by critics of traditions and even accused of forgery (see Kit. al-A‘gāhāni, ix. 19; xi. 48; xviii. 161; Goldscheider, Mnh. Studien, i. 186); but on the other hand they did not lack warm defenders (e.g. Ya‘qūb, Mu‘tamaw, ed. Wustenfeld, i. 358). Modern research has confirmed many of their statements, which they reached sometimes by regular methods such as the study of inscriptions, against the fanatical criticism of their opponents (see Noldeke, Gesch. der Araber u. Perser, p. xxvii.). Muhammad, who worked for a time also in Baghdād, died in his native town of Kūfa in 204 (819), according to others in 206.

Of the 40 works of Muhammad, listed in the Fīhrīst, pp. 95—98, there have survived: 1. Kit. al-Nasab al-Kalbī or al-Djamā‘ī f. ‘l-Nasab (Djamā‘ī al-Ansāb in Hādżī Khalīfa), on the genealogies of the Arabs in a MS. of the Escorial (see Cat. Codd. MSS. . Mus. Brit. pars ii. No. 915). This manuscript contains a modern proclamation of the descent of ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Habīb, as the basis of the family’s claim to the Abī ‘Abd al-Rahmān family. It is the most important of the three fragments, which are incomplete; the fragments give only of an extract; a fragment of the work is perhaps preserved in a Paris manuscript (Bibl. Nat., de Sian, Cat. No. 2047). Of apparently much condensed version of the work by ‘Abū Sa‘īd ‘Alī b. Mūsā al-Sukkāri (d. 465 = 1075), which is chiefly based on Muhammad b. Habīb’s recension, but also that of Ibn al-A‘rāf and other fundamentally independent sources also, the first volume is preserved in the British Museum (see Cat., No. 1202 and also p. 785). The extract by Ya‘qūt is in Cairo, Khed. Library, see Fīhrīst, v. 156; Volters, Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morg. Gelehr. d. Arab. Ver. al-Nasab Fuḥūr al-Kalbī, ii. 3, 5. Ya‘qūt’s al-Djamā‘ī al-Arab (cf. H. LANNHESI, D. L. W. abd. phil. hist. Kl. vi. 214 No. 50 in Gomma (see Pertsch, Die arab. Hist., ii. 2075) and in the Escorial (see Cat. i. No. 1700, 2). 3. Kit. al-Aṣāmīr or more accurately Kit. Tunkis al-Aṣāmīr, which Ahmad Zeiki Pasha [Ibn al-Kalbī, Le Livre des Idoles (Kitāb al-Aṣāmīr), Cairo 1914] has published. An apparently very full synopsis which enables us to judge of the extent and arrangement of the book is to be found in ‘Abd al-Ghrādil-Baghādil’s Kitāb al-Adab, iii. 242—6. The numerous extracts in Ya‘qūt have been collected by Wels, Reste arabi. Heidentumwes, ii. 10—64 (cf.
also 243 and translated and annotated. 4 An extract from the Kit. al-Kalbī (Fārisī, p. 97, 48) is given by Ibn al-Anbārī in his commentary on the Mubādýlāt; see C. J. Lyyell, Ibn al-Kalbī’s Account of the First Day of al-Kalbī in the Orient, Stud. Th. Noldeke gewidmet (Giessen 1906), i. 127–154.


(Brockelmann)

KALĪ’I SEFĪD, a fortress in Fārs, in 30° 10’ N. Lat. and 51° 30’ E. Long. (Greenwich). It is built on a mountain with a flat top, in the eastern part of the valley of Kohra, which falls steeply down on all sides. On its summit, which can only be reached by clift-paths, lies an extensive well-wooded plateau watered by numerous springs. A strong garrison is necessary for its defence as is noted in the Fārsīnāma. Descriptions of the fortress and the country round it are given, among Oriental writers for example by Ibn al-Kalbī in the Fārsīnāma (the pertinent passage is copied by Mustawfī from the Kitab al-Kalbī, ‘Alī Yāzdi and Mirkhwand (see Bibli.). Of descriptions by European travellers in the sixteenth century, that of Stolze deserves special mention; along with Andreas he explored the mountain and castle thoroughly. The statements of Kinneir who visited Kalī’i Sefīd in 1810 are unreliable, according to Stolze.

The name of the fortress is given in the Persian geographers and historians as Kalī’-i Sefīd (Sefīd, Sepīd), the “white citadel”; Kalī’-i Sefīd-dīz (the “white fortress”) is also found; Kalī’-i Sefīd is the only form in use at the present day. Translated into Arabic the name is given in Ibn al-Athir (ed. Tornberg), xi. 46 as al-Kalī’-a-Balad. The name “white citadel” which is found elsewhere as a name for a castle in areas where Arabic and Persian are spoken (e.g. in al-Hira, al-Maddah, in the oasis of Ruhf east of HAWRān, and in the region of Kairawān, in Afghanistān, etc.; for Biredjī cf. above i. 723) may very probably originate in the dazzling white colour of the building-stone used. The name Kalī’-i Calu Gušāb (citadel of the rose and rose-water), borne by Kalī’-i Sefīd in al-Bundari, Tarārīkī Al-Saljūqī (ed. Noutma, 2, p. 185, 15) is remarkable.

Kalī’-i Sefīd is the most northerly point on the mountain road which leads from Behbāhān to Shirāz and furnishes communication between Khuṣīstān and Fārs. It may be regarded as certain that a commanding place like this was very early fortified. The “Persian passes” through which Alexander the Great tried to enter the ancestral home of the Achaeemids and which were defended by the Satrap of Persis, Ariobarzanes, with his strong forces, have often been sought in the valley of Kalī’-i Sefīd; e.g. by Vincent, Muzel, Droysen, Forbiger. Ritter (Erмkunde, ix. 138) in differing from these, considers Kalī’-i Sefīd to be the stronghold of the Uxians and places the “Persian Gates” farther east. Ritter’s view has been attacked particularly by Mützel in his edition of Curtius (Berlin 1844), p. 414 sq. and by Stolze (op. cit., p. 262 sq.). That the region of Kalī’-i Sefīd does not correspond with the situation of the “Persian Gates” of the historians of Alexander and that the latter should be located elsewhere has been fairly convincingly proved by Stolze, op. cit.

Kalī’-i Sefīd is not mentioned by the Arab geographers of the middle ages. Like the adjoining town of Nawbandān (Nawbandān) it must have been allotted to the Persian province of Sābūr in the Caliphate period. From the tenth century on we find cropping up in the Oriental sources a nomadic people named the Shīl, after whom the whole area, inhabited by them from the west of Shirāz to the frontiers of Fārs and Khuṣīstān was called Shīlāstān. There is definite evidence to show that Kalī’-i Sefīd belonged to Shīlāstān. On the Shīl and the land of Shīllāstīn cf. the references in Quatremer, op. cit., p. 380 sq. and also Mustawfī, Tā’rīkī Gušā (ed. Browne, Gibb Mem. xiv.), p. 538, 658, 660, 696, 726.

Kalī’-i Sefīd is frequently mentioned by Persian poets and chroniclers. It is first found in Firdwāsi’s Šakhnāma (ed. Mohf, ii. 92, 245 sq.); here the conquest of the stronghold is related as one of the noteworthy deeds of the hero Rustam. As the Fārsīnāma (written about 900 = 1106) reports, the fortress of Kalī’-i Sefīd had lain in ruins for many years until it was rebuilt by a certain Abū Nasr from Tir-Murdān (a district of the province of Sābūr) during the turmoil of the last decades of Būyād rule, that is in the first half of the vii (vith) century. The mountain, difficult of access, served not infrequently in wartime as a secure hiding-place. For example in 534 (1139) Buzhā, Governor of Fārs, retired here before Kašrūm Monkār, Attabeg of the Saljūqī Sulṭān Mas‘ūd; cf. the article BUΖHUĐ, i. 809. The Saljūqī Abū Bakr, Attabeg of Fārs from 623 to 658 (1226–60) (on him see above i. 82) transported his treasures to Kalī’-i Sefīd and placed a garrison in the citadel in order to have a place of refuge here in case of a catastrophe. After the death of the Saljūqī dynasty, Sālqīkhānī, met his death at the foot of Mount Kalī’-i Sefīd in battle with one of Hulāgū’s generals in 663 (1264); see J. v. Hammer, Gesch. der Ḥūlagūn (Darmstadt 1842), i. 243 and cf. also Mustawfī, Tā’rīkī Gušā, p. 509.

Although Hulāgū issued an order to destroy all the fortresses in the lands conquered by him, an exception was made of Kalī’-i Sefīd, as is expressly mentioned; cf. the passage in the Tā’rīkī Waṣafī in Quatremer, op. cit., p. 382. The citadel could therefore continue to serve as a place of refuge, and was also on several occasions used as a state-prison for political opponents. Thus for example Mas‘ūd Shāh, the last ruler of the Saljūqī dynasty, who rules as governor of Fārs from 736 (1335) imprisoned his brother Muhammad in Kalī’-i Sefīd (cf. above ii. 504); when later Abū Ishāk, a younger brother of the Mas‘ūd Shāh just mentioned, came into conflict with the Muẓaffarī Mubāriz al-Dīn and had to flee after the capture of his capital Shīrāz in 754 (1353) he went to Kalī’-i Sefīd (see Mirkhwān’s account in Quatremer, op. cit., p. 382; Mustawfī, Tā’rīkī Gušā, p. 658, 15 sq., and cf. above ii. 804). A few years later the sons of Mubāriz al-Dīn, Shaikh Sulṭān and Shaikh Shuja‘ rebelled against their father, blinded him and imprisoned him in Kalī’-i Sefīd.
in 759 (1358); see Mustafwî, Ta‘rîkhî Gucûda, p. 681; Defroisney in the Journ. Asiat. 1804, ii. 112. In 785 (1383) Shah Shâhâr bi sent his son Sultan Shânik to take Kâfe-i Seifid as an alleged rebel (see Mustafâ, op. cit., p. 724; Quatremêre, op. cit., p. 382; Defroisney, op. cit. (1845), i. 437).

Kâfe-i Seifid has attained special fame through its capture by Timûr. The latter on his second campaign in Fârs in 795 (1393) passed by the road from Behbahân to Shirêza, besieged this barrier fortress, considered impregnable, and stormed it on the third day. All the members of the Mughalid dynasty were captured and put to death (cf. Shâraf al-Dîn ‘Alî Yazdî, Zafarnâmâ, Bibl. Ind., New Series, Nî. 616, Calcula 1887, i. 600 sq.; Mustafâ, op. cit., p. 754).

We read of the capture of Kâfe-i Seifid by Hâma-Bey several centuries later, in the reign of Shâh ‘Abbâs I; see Quatremêre, op. cit., p. 384. The Mâmasenî have now settled in a large part of what was once called Shîlûstan; they are a robber Lîr-tribe, who belong to the Bakhîtîyârî [q. v., i. 603]. They centre round Kâfe-i Seifid. On them see Layard in the Journ. of the R. G. S., xv. 28; Ritter, Erdkunde, viii. 390, ix. 137; C. de Bode, Travels in Luristan and Arabistan (London 1845), i. 210, 219 sq., 262 sq. When the Mâmasenî in the latter part of the reign of Fat‘î Shâh (1790-1834) came under a robber chief named Wâl Khân Bâkash, an army of Adhâr-badjûnî troops was sent against them, who besieged Kâfe-i Seifid and forced the stubborn defenders of the citadel to yield (cf. Curzon, op. cit.).

It should further be mentioned that below the fortress on the mountain there was at one time a second smaller castle, the name of which is variously given as Aštâk (Fârs nâmâ, p. 158, 17) or Nîshân (Mustafwî, Nûshät al-Kûlûb, p. 132, 5); further variants of the name are given here in note 1).

The little village of Têll Eospîd should not be confused with this; it lies northwest of Kâfe-i Seifid in the adjacent plain on a hill some 2400 feet high; cf. Wells in the Proc. of the Roy. Geogr. Soc., 1883, v. 161 and Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 85.


KALÉ-I SULTÂNIYE, in popular speech usually Çanaş Kâle-i ("Pot-castle"), the town and fortifications known to Europeans as the Dardanelles, the chief place in the sandjak of Bigha [q. v., i. 716, cf. also Dardanelles, i. 922], situated at the narrowest part of the straits. The modern settlement has taken the place of the very ancient seaport of Abydos; the latter name, indeed, survived down to the xviith century on Italian charts in the form Avido, Aveo, as the name for Kalé-i Sultânîye (the bay: la bocca d’Aveo). While the form Aandin [q. v.] was found in Yâkût, Munjum (ed. Westermarck), i. 374 also is to be read Abydos, the statement of Job. Leunclavius, Historiae Musulmanae, Frankfurt 1591, p. 182, 55, taken from the Codex Hanavaldonis (Neßnî), that Abydos is called Abydos by the Ottoman can be said to be wrong. There is confusion with Aidos in Koca Eli and the whole story of the conquest in Leunclavius refers to this place and not to Abydos. Here from the days of the Roman empire was the chief custom-house of Byzantium, where every vessel entering the straits had to pay a tithe (Agathas, v. 12; cf. the customs regulations of Abydos published by A. D. Mordwinski in the Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, i. 1878, 1), and it was strongly fortified, as the key to the capital. In spring of 717 the town was taken along with the coasts of the Hellespont by the Umayyad general Maslama (Theophanes, ed. Bekker, Bonn 1839, p. 395). In those days there was attached to a tower here the great chain which barred the Muslim ships’ entrance to the straits (Ibn Khordadbeh, ed. de Goeje in the Bibl. Geogr. Arab., vi. 103 sq.; cf. Yâkût, i. 374; al-Idrisî, Nûshät al-Mughâf, Fr. transl. by Jaubert, Géographie d’Edrusi, ii. 135, 301, 303). While the siege and capture by ‘Emîr Orkhan are as uncertain as the crossing of the Dardanelles attributed to him at this place (cf. Job. Drâsêk in the Neuer Jahrbücher für Klass. Altert., xxxi. [1913], 476—504), the statement that in the reign of Murâd about 1554 the straits were crossed in small boats at Abydos, is more worthy of belief (Dukas, ed. Bekker, Bonn 1834, p. 14, 8, 39, 13; Phrantzis, ed. Bekker, Bonn 1838, p. 45, 13). This would, it is true, be in contradiction to the Turkish account which places the crossing at Kemere opposite Hexamilia. The place did not become of any considerable importance in the Muslim period until the time of Muhammed II, who took it in 1451, built a great defensive works here for the protection of Constantinople, which he had recently captured, and founded a town here (Châlkokondyles, ed. Bekker, Bonn 1843, p. 529, 18 sqq.). The fortress was armed with about 30 large and a number of smaller guns. All incoming ships had henceforth to cast anchor there, to show their papers and pay toll (Châlkokondyles, op. cit., p. 530; cf. thereon Kritobulos, ed. C. Muller, Fragn. Hist. Graec., v. 146). The town was now regarded as the main defence of the Dardanelles, although by the middle of the xvith century we find European travellers who sailed through the straits wondering at the insufficiency of the defences; for example, Pierre Belon, to whom the walls and towers, said to be built out of the ruins of Scamandria, seemed not nearly strong enough.
for the "key to Turkey" (Les observations de plusieurs singularités, Paris 1854, p. 77⁷⁹ sqq.; there, also, is a picture of the Dardanelles forts following p. 78). It is certain that European fleets could pass the straits unhindered in the middle of the xviith century, and that the bastions on both European and Asiatic sides were in almost complete ruins. Although about 1550, 32 great guns still barred the entrance to hostile ships (cf. Charrigre, Négociations, Paris 1849, i. 374 and 380, where "les deux chateaux du Hellespont nommez Dardanneaules", the XXXII gros canons dont nu navire ne peut entrer ou sortir malgré eulx" as well as the search of a ship are described), a very short time after, it was no longer possible to think of any serious resistance being made by them. It was the vigorous Sultan Kosem, who reigned for a period for her minor grandson Mehemmed IV, who, with the grand vizier Mehemded Koprulu, devoted special attention to the decaying Dardanelles forts and decided to renovate and remodel them completely. The building of Seddûl 1-Bahr and Kâlî, the two so-called "new castles", was also his idea, and this was his time (cf. J. v. Hammer, Gesch. der osman. Reichets, Pest 1827—35, v. 516). In 1658 the work was begun under the supervision of 'Ankabît Ahmed Pasha, commander of the Dardanelles, and under the direction of the architect Mustafâ Agha, and by Sept. 1659 Sultan Mehemmed IV was able to inspect the new works (cf. Na'mâni, Stambul 1147, ii. 698 sqq., 704; J. v. Hammer, op. cit., vi. 65 sqq.) and dedicate a mosque (Ewlyâvi, v. 307; according to him, the name Kâlî-Sultanîye arose at this time in honor of Kösem follando, but it is probably older). The appearance of the new citadel is accurately known from European descriptions of the time. The fortress proper was surrounded by a strong wall at each of the four corners of which there rose a fortified tower. In the middle was the donjon, which had been increased in height. Nearly 30 guns were placed here in no regular order, so as not to injure the opposite works of Kiliû 1-Bahr when they were fired. Behind the defences lay the town proper, inhabited chiefly by Turks and Jews, numbering some 3000 inhabitants about 1650 (cf. Grelot, Relation Noyez des deux voyages de Constantinople, Paris 1681, p. 24, 28, 29 and a picture of the Dardanelles defences on p. 41); further pictures in Pitton de Tournenfort, Relation d'un voyage du Levant, Paris 1717, i. 453 sqq., Amsterdam 1718, i. 175 sqq.). There were definite rules regulating the passage of ships. Every merchantman had to announce its arrival with 3, 5, 7 shots to which 1—5 were fired in reply. This had to be repeated with 3, 5, 7 shots and not till then could the voyage be continued. All ships coming from Constantinople had to cast anchor here to be examined and pay tolls (cf. M. de Thevenot, Relation d'un voyage fait au Levant, Paris 1665, p. 32 sqq.; Jacob Spon and George Wheler, Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grece et du Levant fait aux annees 1675 et 1676, the Hague 1724, i. 122 sqq.). Not more than five Christian ships could go through at the same time (cf. Grelot, op. cit., p. 30). These regulations survived into the xviiiith century, although there was considerable laxity in their enforcement (cf. R. Chandler, Travels in Asia Minor, Oxford 1775, p. 11). A hundred years later the defences were again in the most wretched state, vividly described by Baron Franz von Tott (Tott) (Monuments du Baron de Tott, Amsterdam 1754, ii. 43 sqq.). In 1770 the Russian fleet was able to sail through the straits without opposition. Von Tott thereupon hurriedly repaired the fortifications (cf. Édgar Fülöcz, Útikort Tott Ferenc, a Dardanalik története, Budapest 1916), without, however, being able to stop their decay. The town seems to have been in quite a flourishing condition at this time, according to R. Pococke, Description of the East (London 1743—1745), i. 102—104; it was 1½ miles around and had 1200 inhabitants (200 Greeks, 100 Armenians and 50 Jews), who carried on a busy trade in silk, sailcloth and earthenware. The annual export was put at 15,000 dollars. A French Consul, as well as a Dutch and English dragoman had their offices in Kâlî-Sultanîye. The potteries, which seem to have begun about 1740, were for a long time famous and gave the place the name Canâğı Kâlî. The inhabitants lived in different quarters separated into nations. Armenians who fled from Shah Tahmasp are said to have been settled here as early as 1526. They came to Constantinople (cf. La Turquie d'Asie, ii. 689 sqq.) but a regular Armenian colony only dates from about 1650. At the same time there is evidence of a sometimes large, Jewish settlement, which played a prominent part in the business world (cf. Grelot, op. cit., p. 24; Baron de Tott, op. cit., iii. 59; J. B. Lechevalier, Voyage de la Prophétie, Paris an VIII (= 1800), i. 14, according to whom the people were almost all Jews, who did a brisk business in provisioning passing ships (cf. thereon Grelot, op. cit., p. 28). There is no documentary evidence of the presence of Greeks before 1690 in Kâlî-Sultanîye. In the xviith century the fortress sank practically to insignificance. The bold passage of the English fleet through the Dardanelles on Feb. 19, 1807 resulted in the defences being again repaired (cf. Zinkei-en, Gesch. des osm. Reichts, vii. 434) but without their afterwards keeping pace with the rapid development of modern artillery. A very full description of the fortifications in 1836 is given by Helmut v. Moltke, Briefe über Zustände und Begebenheiten in der Türkei (Berlin 1841), p. 51 sqq., 8th ed. (1917), p. 55 sqq. and by Abercrombie Grant, Narrative of a Journey to Greece in 1830, p. 433 (with sketches). Kâlî-Sultanîye and its forts only became of considerable strategic importance again during the Great War, when as a result of an indirect bombardment from the Gulf of Saron by the Anglo-French fleets the town, which had been almost deserted by its inhabitants, suffered severe damage in March 1915 and was burned down. It had previously suffered from frequent fires and especially from the great earthquake of Aug. 9, 1912. About 1890 the town had about 11,000 inhabitants, 11 larger and several smaller mosques and 4 churches, but now the number must be much smaller.

Bibliography: In addition to the works quoted cf. also Sami, Kûmîs li-Aliûn, v. 3685 sqq.; Ali Djewâd, Memâlihi, ... Haram (Constantinople 1895/99, s. v.; Albert Riffat, Lâqâli-i tårîkhîye weanîgîh-îye (Stambul 1881), v. 3; Mehemmed Mekhâr, Ôrûmîyû Memlekettîarî (Stambul 1896), s. v.; Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, iii. 689 sqq.

(Franz Baringer)
KALغا — AL-KALI

473—5, 528 sq. and Index s. v. Kilhat; Ritter, Erdkunde, xii. 305, 373; 376, 377, 378; Geogr. d'Édifices (French transl. by A. Jaubert of the Idria, Nasbat al-Muqaddas), i. 151; J. R. Wellsted, Tiwals in Arabia, London 1858, i. (J. Schleiper)

AL-KALI, Abu 'Ali Isma'il b. Al-Kasim b. A.vlaxDIN b. HAKIM b. 'ISA b. MUHAMMAD, a great Arab philologist, born in Djiñmad au, 288 as May-June, 901 (a little town in Arabia which was then a dependent of Diyar Bakr, and died at Cordova on Djiñmad au 17, 336 as April 19-20, 967 (according to others Rabi' II, Djiñmad au 11, 336, and also 366 according to Ibn 'Idhari).

In 303 having gone to Baghdad in company with some people of the town of Kalkata, he was confused with them and in consequence was named al-Kali. However, he is usually called in the East Abü 'Ali al-Ibaghâdi. After studying Islamic Traditions and particularly Arabic language and literature, al-Kalit, at the end of his resources, left Bagdad in 328 (939-40) and went to Spain where he did not arrive until 330 = 942/3, in the reign of the Caliph 'Abd al-Rahman al-Nasir. The son of this prince Abü l-Asl al-Jahân who was fond of learning and of scholars received him very kindly, indeed, it is said that even he had written to the East to get al-Kali to come to the West. Abü 'Ali arrived in Cordova on Sha'bân 26, 330 (May 16, 942), where he began to teach Traditions and especially the Arabic language and literature. As teachers he had 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad al-Baghwâ, 'Abd Allah b. Sulaimân b. al-'Ashâth b. al-Sudjistânî, Ibn Durâid, Ibn al-Sarrâd, al-Zadrâjî, al-Akhwâsh al-Saghîr, Niţawâlî, Abû Bakr Ibn al-Abâbî, Ibn Ku-tâbî, Ibn Durastawahl, etc. Among his pupils we may specially mention the grammarians and lexicographer Abû Bakr Muhammad b. al-Hassan al-Zahîdî.

Among his works we now only possess: 1st. Kit. al-Amâdî wa 'l-Dhail wa 'l-Nawâdir, a kind of anthology containing a large number of notes on verbs, language and poetry, published at Bâlâk in 1324; indexes of poets and rhymes have been published by F. Krenkow and A. Bevan at Leiden in 1913; 2nd. Kit. al-Nawâdir, part i, Cambridge, Univ. Libr., E. G. Browne, A Hand-list of the Muhammadian Manuscripts, No. 926; 3rd. Kit. al-An'ir fi Gharib al-Hadjî, remained unfinished, Paris, Bibl. Nat., No. 4235.

The name of tīn, for a special quality of tin among the Arabs, occasionally also called al-raṣāṣ, al-bah, and al-raṣāṣ al-aḥyāq, i.e. "white lead"; see Liūān al-Arab, x. 167, 16; Dozy, Supplément aux Dict. arab., ii. 397; Vullers, Lex. Pers.-Lat., ii. 735; Quatremère in the Journ. des Savants 1846, p. 731. For other names of tin in Arabic (Kaḍṣīr = Қәдәр, etc.) see e.g. al-Dimashqī, Nisbat al-Dahr (Cosmography, ed. Mehren), p. 544. The word apparently comes from the Far East, from which the Arabs may possibly have got it directly, without the (not impossible) intermediary of modern Persian, which also has rāṣāṣ, al-muwaqar (ed. Sachau), p. 125, 6 demands (the original would be Persian Kālāth). The correction Kālāth for Kālāta there proposed is based on Ibn Saʿīd, quoted in G. Ferrand, Relations de voyages et Textes géographiques..., relatt. à l'extrême-Orient (Paris 1913–1914), p. 343. The word Kālī (in Ghlian: Kālī) found in the modern Persian dialect of Māzandānī—see Melgunow in the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gelehrten, xxiii. 198—must have come through the Arabic; from the latter the word entered Turkish: Kālā (Sīml, Kānāzī-Türkī, p. 1032) and thence into modern Greek: τὸ κάλαμος. As a loanword Kālāth travelled still further, into Portuguese (caíman, caín = Kālāth) tin; see Dozy and Engelmann, Gloss, des mots espagnols et portugais derivés de l'Arabe, (Leiden 1860), p. 245; Vule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, 2 (London 1903), p. 143. The cradle of the word was probably the district of Kālāth in the peninsula of Malaca, which was celebrated for its tin-mines (see Kālāth above). The Arabic geographers and lexicographers usually derive the name Kāfīr from al-Kāfīr in India (Kālāth, q.v.); so, for example, Yaḥyūt, Muṣāūdī (ed. Wustenfeld), iv. 162, 6; al-Firūzbādī, al-Kāmīs (Cairo 1901), ii. 71, 5; cf. also Hamd Allah Mustawfī, Nuzhat al-Kalābat (ed. le Strange, Gilb Mem. xxi.), p. 203, 6. At the same time the word—totally erroneously—is also connected with an (alleged) tin-mining area of al-Kaḥā in Ceylon (Yaḥyūt, i. 21, 13, iv. 162, 15), in Spain (Yaḥyūt, iv. 162, 15 74); Hamd Allah Mustawfī, p. 203, 8; and in Yemen (Yaḥyūt, iv. 162, 17; al-Firūzbādī, op. cit.).

The most usual word for tin in Malay at the present day seems to be timah. At the same time we find with this meaning also kaling, kalong—not kelang, as written by Langles, Quatremère, Dozy-Engelmann, Yule-Burnell and others—which, according to the dictionaries, means primarily tin-plate, or tinned iron-plate (but nevertheless is the meaning tin an older one); cf. Wilkinson, A Malay-English Diction. (Singapore 1901), p. 497; Wilkinson, An abridged Malay-English Diction. (Singapore 1919) and Klinkert, Neuw Maleisisch-Deutscher Wörterbuch (Leiden 1916). It is obvious that the Arabic Kāfīr is to be traced back not to Kāfīr (Kalābat) but to this Malay word. Quatremère, op. cit. definitely puts forward some such derivation of Kālī's, whereas Dozy-Engelmann, op. cit., and Yule-Burnell, op. cit., leave the question undecided. Is the similarity of name simply an accident? It is hardly possible that the Malay Kaling itself is only a corruption of the Arabic Kālī's. The further possibility has also been considered that the name of the district of Kalang—from the Malay Kaling—may mean simply "land of tin", a view expressed as long ago as Langlès in his edition of the voyages of Sindbad the Sailor in Savary's Grammaire de la langue arabe (Paris 1813), p. 499 = reprint (Paris 1914), p. 63. Yule and Burnell quote as an analogy the Arabic that the little state of Selangor (north of the town of Malacca) was formerly known as Nagri Kalang = "land of tin". To this we may add, quoting Wilkinson, Malay-English Dictionary, p. 526, that Kâlang, Kâlang, properly only the name of a district in Selangor and of a little township in this district, is also often extended to include the whole state of Selangor. Perhaps the origin of Kālī is to be sought in this Kâlang.

2. The name of a particular kind of sword, which is often mentioned, especially in the old Arabic poetry. Cf. for example, Ahs b. Hādiyar (ed. Geyer, Sitz.-Ber. d. K. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.hist. Kl., 1892), xii. 33; Ruḥa b. al-ʿAsāqī (ed. Ahlwardt, Sammlungen alter arab. Dichter, iii. 37), 49, 45, stoloiat to ʿArāf, Mualāsā (in Schöder, Sept. 1853. 39, 10), Kālū, Leipzig 1850, p. 61). On Thālibī, Lātīfī, p. 102, 7, 130, 4 (quoted in Dozy, Suppl. aux diction. arab., ii. 396) see Fleischer in the Sitz.-Ber. d. Sachs. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch., 1886, p. 45. Cf. also Ibn Saʿīd, al-Tabakāt, l. i. 50, 11. This kind of sword is usually said to be of Indian origin (cf. for example al-Firūzbādī, al-Kāmīs under ʿīsī) and, indeed, Indian swords were from early times famous among the Arabs and celebrated by the poets; on this cf. Schwarzlose, Die Werfen der alten Araber (Leipzig 1886), p. 127 sq. and A. Siddiqī, Studien über die persischen Fremdwörter im klassischen Arabisch (Göttingen 1910), p. 88 sq. As a more definite place of origin we usually find the Arab geographers and lexicographers giving that al-Kāfīr from which the tin of this name comes. Occasionally also the Syro-Arabian desert (the ʿAlaḍīya) or the district of Ḥulwān in the Irāk is given as the place of origin; cf. Liūān and al-Firūzbādī, al-Kāmīs under ʿīsī. The Yemen, which produced the finest swords next to India, is sometimes also described as the place of origin of the kāfīr's sword, for example in the above quoted gloss to ʿArāf's Mualāsā. Jacob, Altarabisches Bedüinetleben (Berlin 1897), p. 149, would like to decide in favour of Yemen, in particular the "fortress" (kāfīr) of ʿĀden, in support of which could be quoted the fact that in a poem by ʿAlkama (ed. Socin, No. 3, 4 there is mention of "pears from Kāfīr Kālābat"). Nevertheless, the derivation of the Arabic word from an East-Indian place al-Kālābat (Kalābat on Malacca? see Kālamī) seems to me more probable. It is unnecessary to distinguish between two different kinds of sword, kālī and kālū (see Freytag, Lex. Arab.-Lat., s. v. kālā and kālā), in spite of Schwarzlose, op. cit., p. 130.

Kālī Kālā. [See Erzurum].

Kālīla Wa-Dīmna is the title of an Indian mirror for princes, formed by the corruption of the Sanskrit names of the two principal characters, two jackals, Karatāka and Dāmanaka (in the old Syriac translation the forms are still Kālīla and Dānnag); it was translated from Sanskrit into Pahlavi and thence into Arabic.
and became widely known in Muslim as well as Christian literatures.

1. The original work. The Indian original was composed by an unknown Vishnuvarda Bhojana, according to Hertel probably about the year 300 A.D. in Kashmir; the main argument for this, the decensation of denarius by Amūra is, however, not cogent, as the pronunciation of the name its as i is older than Hertel supposes (see also A. Berriedale Keith in the Journ. Roy. As. Soc., 1915, p. 505). It consisted of an introduction and five books each of which bore the name tantra i.e. "case of good sense". The book was intended to instruct princes in the laws of polity by means of animal-fables composed in perfect Sanskrit. The oldest descendant of the original work is the Tantrābhajyā, rediscovered by J. Hertel (see Tantrābhajyā, die alteste Fassung des Pāñcatantra, transl. from the Sanskrit with introd. and notes by J. Hertel, 2 parts, Leipzig and Berlin 1909). A second recension of the original work is called the Pāñcatantra (see J. Hertel, Pāñcatantra, etc. in Harvard Oriental Series, Vols. 11–14); it has become a very popular book in India and is current there in countless versions. J. G. L. Kosegarten published an uncritical text, Bonn 1848; on this Th. Benfey based his translation, Pāñcatantra, fünf Bücher indischer Fabeln, Märchen und Erzählungen, transl. from the Sanskrit with introd. and notes, 2 parts, Leipzig 1859. In the introduction to this work the history of the migration of Indian literary subjects to Europe was first exhaustively investigated.

2. The Pahlavi translation. A rather early recension of the Pāñcatantra was translated from Sanskrit into Pahlavi by order of the Sassanian king Khusraw Anšāwaran (531–579) by his physician Būrزو, whom he had sent to India for this purpose, and expanded by the addition of an appendix of fables from other Indian sources; of these the three first (chap. 11–13 in de Sacy) are taken from the twelfth book of the Mahābhārata, the other five (de Sacy's chap. 14, 15, 17, 18 and the story of the king of the mice, see below) given in de Sacy hardly appear, however, to have been found again in Indian literature, although there is no reason to doubt their Indian origin. Būrزو prefaced his translation with an autobiographical introduction which the vizier Buzurjmuhr, it appears, signed with his own name as an honour to the author (see Būrزو Einleitung zu den Buchen Kalīla wa-Dīnma, transl. and annot. by Th. Noldeke, Schriften der wissensch. Gesellsc. in Strassburg, Heft 12, Strassburg 1912).

3. The old Syriac translation. Būrزو's Pahlavi translation itself is lost; but by about 570 A.D. it had already been translated by the Periodot Bīr into Syriac. This translation only survives in one manuscript, which was formerly preserved in the monastery at Mardin, then in the library of the Patriarch of Mosaıl and afterwards came into the possession of Mgr. Graffin in Paris. From a defective copy of this, which Socin had brought with him, Bickell prepared the first edition (Kalīla und Dīnma, alte syrische Ubersetzung des indischen Furstenspiegels, text and Germ. transl. by G. Bickell, with an introduction by Th. Benfey, Leipzig 1876). F. Schultess was later able to prepare a much more reliable text based on three new copies which each has had preparatory in Mosaıl (Kalīla und Dīnma, Syriac and German, Berlin 1911).

4. The Arabic translation. About three centuries later 'Abd Allāh b. al-Muḳāfī (see Ibn al-Muḳāfī, II, 464) translated Būrزو's Pahlavi version into Arabic. He wrote an original preface to his book, inserted in Buzurjmuhr's introduction probably the section on the uncertainty of religions, added after the first book of the Pāñcatantra a chapter written by himself on Dimma's trial (chap. 6 in de Sacy), which, by punishing the traitor satisfies the feeling of justice, outraged by the immoral teachings of this book, and apparently also added the chapter "monk and guest" (N. 16 in de Sacy). Ibn al-Muḳāfī's edition was originally a stylistic work of art intended for literary connoisseurs; but from the nature of its matter, it soon became very popular and therefore much corrupted in transmission. Even the numerous quotations in Ibn Kasīlīn's Uṣūn al-Aḥbār already no longer reproduce Ibn al-Muḳāfī's text word for word. The fairly numerous manuscripts of the work are all of late date. Sylvestre de Sacy's edition (Calīla et Dimma, ou Fables de Bidpai, Paris 1816) is based on an inferior manuscript and arbitrarily emended from other manuscripts (see Noldeke, in the Göttinger Gelehrte Anz., 1884, p. 676). In de Sacy's text, Ibn al-Muḳāfī's preface is preceded by a new preface by an otherwise unknown Imām b. Abū al-Ḵāl b. al-Shāb al-Fārisī, in which he gives an account of the history of the book in India, as well as a report said to have been written by Buzurjmuhr regarding Būrزو's mission to India with the commission to bring back the book; in several manuscripts this is followed by another story of Būrزو's being sent for a miraculous plant. Some manuscripts (see J. Denbourg, Directoireium vitae humanae, p. 323) add at the end two more fables, of the lion and the duck and of the dove, the fox and the heron from other, as yet unknown sources. This latter story is also inserted in the oldest Oriental reprint of de Sacy's edition, Bābāgī 1449 (according to Chauvin, ed. des Chavains. Library of Cambridge; a copy in my possession also); from this it has passed into the more recent editions printed at Cairo, Mösul and Bāṣrūt, the list of which in Chauvin, p. 13 sqq., according to Cheikhou (see below), p. 6, is not yet complete. Valuable contributions to the criticism of de Sacy's text from Italian manuscripts are given by I. Guidi, Studii sul testo arabo del Libro di Calīla e Dimma, Rome 1873. The story of the king of the mice and his ministers, not given in de Sacy, which is shown by the Syriac text to belong to the Pahlavi work, was published by Noldeke in text and translation in the Abhandl. der Königl. Gesellsc. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, 1879, xxv. No. 4. The complete material from 16 Paris manuscripts for the story of the aetic and the broken jug were given by Zotenberg in the Journ. Asiat., Ser. 8, vii. (1886), p. 117–123.

While the numerous printed editions of the East in the main reproduce de Sacy's text, A. N. Tabbbara (Kalīla et Dimma, trad. arabe copié d'après un ancien manuscrit trouvé à Damas, avec notes, Beyrouth 1322 = 1904) claimed to have discovered a new source for textual criticism, but his manuscript (of 1080 = 1675) is too modern to afford new material and his edition is, besides, bowdlerized. On the other hand L. Cheikhou found
in the Lebanon monastery of Dair al-Shir a valuable manuscript of the year 749 = 1339, and made it accessible in an excellent edition: *La version arabe de Kalilah et Dimnah d'après le plus ancien manuscrit arabe daté*, Beirut 1905. I have not seen the new edition by Khald al-Va'idy (ibid. 1908); that of Salim Ibrahim Saleh and Shahin Aljia (ibid. 1910) is intended for school use. The modern European translations from de Sacy’s text are given by Hertel, op. cit., p. 393; to these may now be added M. Moreno, *La version arabe de Kalilah e Dimnah*, transl. into Italian, San Remo 1910 (see *Riv. d. Studi Orientali*, vi. 201).

5. Arabic versions. The translation by Ibn al-Muqa'alī has been three times put into Arabic verse. The first version was made by his younger contemporary Aban al-Lahij (q. v.; see also A. E. Krymski, *Aban al-Lahij*, the *Zindil* (environ 750–815), versificaturo arabe dei raccueil des apologies d'indoor-erotic. Essay sur le vie et ses écrits, tiré de l'unique manuscrit de Souli, Bibliothèque Nationale, No. 524, and d'autres sources primiées. Appendices: a. Barlam and Josaph, entit littéraire-historique; b. *Texte arabe intact d'al-Arwâr par Souli, ed. en collaboration avec Mirza Abdallah Ghaffaros* (also in Russian with Russian title) Moskva 1913; on the manuscript cf. Horovitz in *Mitteilung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Südostindien*, Berlin, x. 35. This version is lost; with the help of it, but on the basis of the text of Ibn al-Muqa'alī about the year 1100, Ibn al-Habbariya (q. v.) composed in ten days a poetic version in elegant and flowing language entitled: *Nadhidj al-Filma fi Naqim Kalila wa-Dimnha*, lith. Bombay 1817 (see Houtsma in the *Oriental Stud. Th. Noldeke* ... *ed. Noldeke*, i. 91–96) by third versification of the book entitled *Darr al-Hizam fi Anshul al-Humud wa'ld-Adjam* was completed by 'Abd al-Mumin b. al-Hasan b. 'Abd al-Mu'min al-Saghani after 80 days’ work on Djmada 1 i. 20, 640 (Nov. 15, 1242). It exist only in a manuscript in Vienna (see Flügel, *Die arab. pers. und türk. Hefte der . . . Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, i. 469, No. 480).

6. The later Syriac translation. In the tenth or eleventh century a Syriac clerical translated the work from Ibn al-Muqa'alī’s text again into the then already dead language of his church; he endeavoured to give the book a Christian tinge and therefore amplified the verses of the Indian original, already much distorted in the Pahlavi translation, into long and weary moral discourses. He also made a series of mistakes in the translation. But as the text he used was much nearer the original than the most of our manuscripts, this translation is, in spite of its defects, of considerable value for textual criticism; it is edited by W. Wright, *The Book of Kalilah and Dimnah transl. from Arabic into Syriac*, London 1884. In contrast to the naturalism of the original, Keith-Palconer, the English translator of this version (Cambridge 1855) is even more prudish than the latter itself; on text and translation see Noldeke in the *Göttinger Gelehrte Anz.*, 1884, p. 673 sqq., 1895, p. 753 sqq.

7. Persian prose and verse translations. According to Firdawsi in the *Shahnameh* (see de Sacy in *Not. et Extr. X*, i. 140 sqq.), Ibn al-Muqa'alī’s book was translated into Persian under the Salmānī Nasr b. Ahmad (914–943) by order of the vizier Bâlami (q. v.); but it appears that this translation was never completed. By order of the same ruler the poet Râdhi (d. 354 = 966) put the book into Persian verse of which, however, only 16 verses have survived in quotations in *Asâd's English Persian*, ed. HORN, p. 18 sqq.

Ibn al-Muqa'alī’s work was translated into Persian prose probably after the year 599 = 1144 (see Rieu, *Cat. of Pers. MSS. in the Brit. Mus.*, p. 745 sqq.) by Niqān al-Din Abū 'l-Ma'allī Nasr Allāh b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Hamid, who dedicated his work to 'Abd al-Rahūm Shīh of Ghazna (q. v., i. 856). Nasr Allāh in a new preface announces his intention of reproducing the work completely, including the aphorisms which seemed to him particularly valuable, with all the rhetorical adornment of artificial prose; he only gives Burzūz’s introduction in ordinary prose, as an artificial style does not suit its matter. The work was lithographed in Tīrān in 1262 (= 1846); this disproves Chauvin’s doubts, p. 407, 1304 and 1350. Cf. de Sacy in *Not. et Extr. X*, i. 96 sqq.; E. G. Browne, *A History of Persia*, ii. (London 1906), p. 349.


This work was, however, put in the shade completely by the revision of Nasr Allāh’s translation done by Husain Wā’lī Kāshfī (d. 910 = 1504, see KĀSHĪ), the court-preacher of Ḫusain Baṣrārār of Herat (see WĀ’LĪ MIRZA). In honour of Husain’s minister Ahmad Suhaili he called his work *Awâr-i Suhaili*. He professed to be making the rhetorical artificial prose of Nasr Allāh easier to understand by giving it in a new version but in reality he created an even more florid and verbose concoction, “full of absurd exaggerations, recondite words, vain epithets, far fetched comparisons and tasteless bombast and represents to perfection the worst style of those florid writers who flourished under the patronage of the Timurids” (E. G. Browne, *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, ii. 352, op. cit., p. 503 sqq.). But as this style remained predominant in Persia and particularly in India down to the threshold of the modern period, the work had an unparalleled success and was printed in England (first complete edition London 1836), where it was used as a text-book for the examination of English officials in India in Persian and repeatedly printed and lithographed in India and Persia, translated into several Indian dialects, into Pushto, Georgian and all the principal languages of Europe (see Chauvin, p. 26–43). Husain replaced the four prefaces at the vulgate of Ibn al-Muqa'alī by a new introduction from so far unidentified source; de Sacy supposes *Not. et Extr. X*, i. 59 that in it we have the older Ḫādiwān Khārid, a film-Tuṛūshī who was still able to use for his *Strāfī al-Mulūk* (Bālāq 1285), p. 97, 24–24, 185, 25 sqq. The Emperor of China Humāyunfāl is persuaded to give up the idea of abdicating his throne by his vizier, who
tells him how the Indian king Dabghulim was directed by a dream to a cave in which an old man would give him a treasure. Of the latter Dabghulim keeps only the testament of Hög-hang, king of Persia, which contains 14 pieces of advice for rulers, and with these he goes to Ceylon where the Brahman Bidpai or Fripai explains each of these precepts by stories which form the separate chapters of the book.

Dislike of the extravagant and luxurious style of the Anwār-i Suḥaili induced the Emperor Akbar (1556–1605) to commission his vizier Abu 'l-Faḍl to prepare a new edition of the work. This bears the title ʿIWār-i Dānīḵ and was completed in 996 (1582). It retains the arrangement of its model but restores Ibn al-Muṣafra’s preface and Burzoe’s introduction. The work itself is not yet printed but a Hindustāni translation by Hafizuddin, entitled Khirāt Afroz, was published by Th. Roebeck (Calcutta 1815) and by Eastwick (Hertford 1857, London 1867) on account of its elegant diction.


Naṣr Allah’s edition was translated into old Ottoman Turkish (not into Eastern Turki, as Hertel, p. 407 says, relying on a somewhat misleading expression of Ethi’s, op. cit.) by Masrūd for ʿUmbaġ, prince of Aḍida (d. 750 = 1349) (a MS. in the Bodleian, Marsh. 180). This prose text was put into verse by an unknown author who dedicated his work to Sulṭān Murād I (761–792 = 1359–1389); only about half has survived in a Gotha manuscript (see Persich. Verz. der türk. Handschr. d. Herz. Bibl., p. 168, No. 189). A modern Ottoman prose version, which must have been made before 955 (1548), exists in the Bodleian MS. Marsh. 61; cf. H. Ethi, On some hitherto unknown Turkish Versions of Kalīlah and Dimnah in the Actes du 6e Congr. internat. des Orientalistes, 2nd sect., i. 241 sqq.

ʿAli b. Sāliḥ, called ʿAli Wāṣi or ʿAli Celebi, translated the Anwār-i Suḥaili into Ottoman rhymed prose and dedicated his work to Sulṭān Sulaiman I (1512–1520) with the title Humayūn-nāma; it has been several times printed in Buṣra and Stamul (see Chauvin, p. 56). Among the different European translations of the Humayūn-nāma, the best known is the French of Galland, published after his death by Gueulette (Paris 1724) which was translated by Anggrēk into Malay (Batavia 1866) and the latter version inspired a Javanese translation by Kramaprawira, which was put into Javanese verse by an anonymous poet. The luxuriousness of its language, in which the Humayūn-nāma surpassed even its Persian original, induced the Mufti Yahyā Efendi and ʿOthmānāzēde, who died in 1399 (1726) as Kāḏi in Cairo, to prepare extracts from it (see Ethi, op. cit., p. 242).

The Anwār-i Suḥaili was translated, apparently with the assistance of the Humayūn-nāma by Faḍl Allah b. ʿĪsā Tashkendt at the instigation of Muḥammad Mūsā Bai Bāṭānī into modern Eastern Turki prose (to be more accurate into the language of Tashkend and Farghāna as the colophon, or the language of Turkestān and Farghāna as the title states); the latter then had the book lithographed by the calligrapher Mirzā Hāshim Khodžändi, and published at the colophon in 1306 (1888); according to the title, the book was published in 1893.

Ibn al-Muṣafra’s book was translated into the Arabic into Eastern Turki by ʿAbd al-ʿAlīm Fāris Kādān Oglu and printed at Kazan 1889 (University Press, Orient. Bibliographie, iii. 421), in the same year at Wiatshakow (ibid., iv. No. 3935) and in 1892 at Cirkova (ibid., vi. 167, No. 3160). The introduction, however, was, according to a communication from Prof. Hommel, borrowed from the Anwār-i Suḥaili.

9. The Mongol translation. The Mongol translation which Malik ʿIltūgh al-Din Muḥammad b. Aḥī Naṣr, a descendant of Muḥammad Bakri, prepared in Kazan has not survived (see Hāfizullah Mustawfi, Tarikh-i Qishlaq, ed. Browne, Gubb Mem. xiv. p. 844/5; transl. p. 235; Browne, A History of Persian Literature under Tārīkh-Din, p. 92) and correctly stated as early as Hammer-Purgstall in the Forsch. Asiat., 3rd Ser., i. 580. This statement is confused in Hādijī Khālīfa, v. 239, who ascribes a translation into Turkish (İtegat al-Turk) to the ancestor Muḥammad Bakri (see de Sacy, Not. et Extr. X. 1755; Ethi, op. cit., p. 243, who does not take notice of Hammur’s correct statement). As Flugel wrongly translates in lingua Tartarorum, Hertel (p. 414) wrongly identifies this reported Tartar translation with the above mentioned Kazan Turki (so-called Tatar) translation quoted in Chauvin, p. 78, note.

10. The Ethiopic translation. An Ethiopic version, which was certainly based on a text, indigenous to Egypt, of the Arabic of Ibn al-Muṣafra, is also lost; it is mentioned in a work composed in 1582 (see Wright, Cat. of the Ethiop. MSS. in the Brit. Mus., p. 82) (see Noldeke, Gott. Gelehrte A. 1884, p. 676, note 5).

11. The Hebrew and older European translations. At the beginning of the twelfth century a certain Rabbi Ḥaṿaël translated Ibn al-Muṣafra’s work into Hebrew from a valuable manuscript which, however, already contained the false story of Burzoe’s mission and the two not genuine fables at the end of the heron and the duck and of the fox, dove and heron. From the unique manuscript, exceedingly corrupt in the beginning, J. Derenbourg published this translation along with that of Jacob b. Eleazar of the sixteenth century (Deux versions hébraiques du Livre de Kalīlà et Dimnah in the Bibl. de l’École des Hautes Études, fasc. 49, Paris 1881). Jacob’s version while based on a similar text to that of Ḥaṿaël is, however, very free, composed in elegant rhymed prose and full of Biblical locations. The version of the Rabbi Ḥaṿaël was then translated into Latin by the baptised Jew John of Capua for Cardinal Ursinus between 1263 and 1278 with the title Directorium vitae humanæ (cf. Johannes de Capua, Directorium vitae humanæ, publ. and annot. by J. Derenbourg in the Bibl. de l’École des Hautes Études, fasc. 72, Paris 1887; a new edition based on manuscripts which he has recently discovered is to be expected from Hilks). With the exception of an old Spanish version, which reproduces the same text as Rabbi Ḥaṿaël much more faithfully than John of Capua does (see Clifford G. Allen, Lan-
cientia version espagnole de Kalila et Dîguna, texte des mas, de l’Esorvat, précédé d’un avant-propos et suivi d’un glossaire. Thèse, Paris-Macon 1906), all later translations into Western European languages with the exception of quite modern ones are based on the Latin text of John of Capua (see Chauvin, p. 59–72; Hertel, p. 366–400).

12. The Greek translation. Towards the end of the 15th century, Symeon son of Seth translated Ibn al-Muqaffa’s work freely into Greek from a manuscript which was still free from later additions but contained the chapter on the king of the mice and his ministers. He called the book Σφηνιώτης και Βελτιώτης, because he recognised in Kalila the Arabic iblis and in Dimma the Arabic word for “trace”. See Σφηνιώτης και Βελτιώτης. Quattro recensioni della versione greca del Kithàb Kalīlah wa-Dīmna, pubbl. da Vittorio Funtoni, Pubblicazioni della Soc. Asiatic. Ital., ii. (1889). This version was in turn translated into Latin and German as well as into several Slavonic languages.

13. The Persian translation of the Hitopadèsha. The later Sanskrit version of the Pahitāntara, the Hitopadèsha, was translated very freely into Persian, probably in the reign of Akbar, by a certain Mufarrîh al-Kalīlah (see also Sacy, L’électricité des coups, ou traduction persane du livre indien intitulé Hitopadesha par Tadj-Edîn, ms. persan de la Bibl. du Roy, No. 350 in the Nat. et Extr. X, i. 226–264). This work was then translated by the highly esteemed Hindustāni author Ārī Ḥuṣainī in 1217 (1802) into his mother tongue (see also Garey de Tassy, Hist. de la Littér. hindoue ou hindoustante, i. 609 sqq.). A year later the latter was edited by Gilchrist as Ukhiaq Hindse or Indian Ethico, transl. from the Version of the celebrated Hitopades or Satyrials Counsel by Meer Buhodar Uic, under the superintendence of John Gilchrist, Calcutta 1803; see J. Hertel, Die Akhbär-i Hindī und ihre Quellen in the Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Morgen. Gesellschaft, lxxii. 65–86, lxxiv. 95–117, lxxv. 129–200.

14. The older Malay translation. On a mixture of Ibn al-Muqaffa’s work and a Tamil text of the Pahitāntara is based the Malay version Hikayat Kalila dan Dimna, which was first brought to notice by Werndly in his Malthische Sprachkritik, Amsterdam 1756, and was published in 1876 by Gonggrijp at Leiden (2nd ed. 1882); cf. J. J. Brandes in the Forschungen an Professor M. J. de Groot, Leiden 1891, p. 77 sqq.). This work was next translated into Javanese (Batavia 1878) and Madurese (ibid. 1879).

15. Imitations of Kalila wa-Dimna. Setting aside the tales included in the 1001 Nights, Ibn al-Muqaffa’s work has been three times imitated in Islamic literatures. Ibn al-Habbarîya (see above) followed up his versification with the Kitāb al-Sadhîq wa-l-Bâghîm (see above p. 375 sq.; also printed in Cairo 1294). While this was only an imitation of the beast-fable, Muḥammad b. Abī Naṣr al-Sadâr b. Zâdâr al-Sakîl (d. 565/1170 or 568/1172) in his Sulūk al-Malūk (1273) first composed in 545 (1150) and dedicated in 554 (1159) in a new edition to the Kād of Sicily, Abī ‘Abd Allâh Muḥammad al-Kurâshî, intended to produce a mirror for princes, like the Kalila wa-Dimna; in addition to beast-fables the book also contains historical anecdotes. It was lithographed at Cairo 1278, printed Tunis 1279, Bâârût 1300; translated into Turkish by Kaia Khâlihlâde (d. 1168–1754) and printed Stambul 1285; translated into Italian by M. Amari, Sevcan al-mete oissano Conforti politici di Ibn Zafer, arabo siciliano del XII secolo, Florence 1851, 1852 (Engl. transl. London 1852).

Another mirror for princes in which historic imitations are mingled with beast-fables for the edification of the reader, was composed about the end of the fourth century A.D. by the prince of Tabarištân, Abâ Ṣâhâb al-Murzâbî in the Persian dialect of his land. This work itself has not survived, but in the viii (caliph) and viii (caliph) century it was twice translated into classical Persian. This was first done at the court of the Saljûqs of Asa Minor, Sâlimânshâh (583=600 =1192–1204) by his vizier Muḥammad b. Ghâzi of Malâ y; his work, entitled Rawdat al-Ulûb, exists in two manuscripts in Leiden and Paris. The Murzâbâna of Sa’d al-Din-i Wârâwînî, composed between 607 and 622 (1210–1225), enjoyed greater popularity. It has been edited by Mirrâ Muḥammad (Gîbb Mersî, vol. viii.).

Warâwînî’s version was translated by an unknown author into Ottoman Turkish (a copy of Sâg (1444) in Berlin; see Persch, Ver. der Turk. Hûs., No. 444); this Turkish version was again translated anonymously into Arabic (MS. Berlin, see Aḥlwardt, Ver. No. 8472). A second Arabic translation, which, according to the Gotha MS., (see Persch, Die Arab. Hûs., der Herz. Bibl., No. 2692), is also based on the Turkish, was made by Ibn Ṭeṣâhîh (q. v.); there is another MS. in Paris (de Sâle, Catal., No. 3524) and it was lithographed in Cairo 1278.

The same author then rewrote his work in a somewhat prosaic prose in his Fâṣihat al-Kâfûfâ wa-Muṣârafât al-Sâqaṭûfâ, and added several new stories.

The same recension which had been translated into Ottoman Turkish and which is distinguished from Wârâwînî’s vulgate as well as from Rawdat al-Ulûb by the tenth (concluding) chapter dar bayân-i ziyâdât-i unwar wa-dawlat wa-sin-dâgânî kardan bâ dîst adudsâvan, was translated into Kanâ Turki by an unnamed writer for a certain Sulaimân Bek, son of Muḥammad Bek, and printed at Kanâ in 1684 under the title Kitâb Destûri Sâhi fi hityâyat Fâṣihât. Bibliography: V. Chauvin, Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes ou relatifs aux Arabes etc. i, Kalîlà (Liége–Leipzig 1897); J. Hertel, Das Pahitāntara, seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung, Leipzig and Berlin 1914.

(C. Brockelmann)

KALIM, a Persian poet of India of the seventeenth century. His full name was Mîrzâ Ātâ Tâhir KALIM of Hamadhân. He lived first in Kâshân, that is he also is given the name Kashânî as well as Hamadhânî. In the beginning of the reign of Dschâhângir (q. v., 1605–1627) he came to India to his court. A considerable journey took him in the following years to the tãrî, from which he returned in 1626 (1619) to India and lived there thenceforth as court-poet of the Mogul emperors. Under Dschâhângir’s successor Shâh Dschâh (1628–1656), whom he celebrated in an epic—the title of which is given in three forms: Shâhân-shâhânâma, Shâhânâma and Pãdîshâhânâma—he was given the title of honour Mîrzâ al-Shâ’ârâ'.
It is a question whether 'Laša is called a kalima from Allāh (Kur. iii. 34, 40) because he is an expression of the kalima of Allāh, or because he was produced by the single creative word kw, and is thus a primary creation like Adam (al-Baidawai, loc. cit.; Lisān, xv. 430 supra). From the doctrine of Allāh’s kalīm it follows that his kalīm must be innumerable (see KALIM). But all contingent existences (al-maṣūmūn) are produced by kalīmūt of Allāh, i.e., the creative commands kw; therefore the Speech of the Reality (al-ḥaqqa) is the self of the identities of the contingent existences, or the contingent existences themselves (nafa d’ya’ in-nuṣkātīt, Dict. of Tech. Terms, p. 1271, infra). The half page which follows the last reference shows how this is the bridge from the Greek doctrine of Allāh’s quality, Speech, to the Neoplatonic Chain and all its descendants.

**Bibliography:** Has been given above. See further on ‘Abd al-Rażīq (i. 61 sqq.); Ma‘ṣūm al-Kamīl (ii. 510 sqq.).

(D. B. Macdonaldi)

AL-KALKASHANDI, nisba from Kalkashandā, near Kalyūb.

I. SHIHĀB AL-DIN ABBĀS AIHMAD B. ‘ALI B. AIHMAD B. ‘ABBĀS ALLAH (in MSS. often briefly called AIHMAD B. ‘ABBĀS ALLAH) B. AIHMAD GHUDDA, died on Djamād I 10, 821 (July 16, 1418), wrote besides a number of smaller works a guide to the artistic composition of essays and reports, especially for the use of Egyptian government officials; just as Ibn Qutaba [10.] in his ‘Uyūn al-Akhbār and the supplements to that work wished to afford the secretary class an encyclopaedic survey of the most important branches of knowledge of his time, al-Kalāshandi’s work, composed after 1091 (1387), entitled Suḥh al-Akib fī ʿinādat al-Ibnū, presents in a much more comprehensive and systematic form practically the whole knowledge of his time and contains information of the utmost value, especially regarding the history and geography of Egypt and Syria. It has been printed as a publication of the Dār al-Kutub al-Khadwiya (al-Sulānīya) (Cairo 1351–8 [1913–9], 14 vols.). Cf. F. Wustenfeld, *Die Geographie und Verwaltung von Ägypten nach dem Arab. des Abu ’l-Abbās al-Calekashandi in dem Abb. d. Kgl. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, phil.hist. Cl., XXV (1879); W. v. Tiesenhaus, in the *Zapiski Vost. Otd. Imp. Russ. Arkh. Obš., i. 208; do., Gesch. der Goldenen Horde, i. 395; H. Sauvage, *Extraits de l’average de K. intitulé Lumière de l’aurore pour l’écriture des hommes* (Arab. MS. of the Boulleian Library) in the *Mém. de l’Acad. de Marseille, 1886, 1887; H. Lammens, Correspondances diplomatiques entre les sultans mamelouks d’Égypte et les puissances chrétiennes in the *Revue de l’orient chrétien*, ix. (1904). 151–187, 359–392. A selection from it entitled Dawār Suḥh al-Muṣirr wa-şayān al-Dawār al-Muṣāhir was printed in Cairo 1906. His second great work which he composed in 812 (1420) is a genealogy and history of the Arab tribes before Muhammad with an alphabetical list entitled Nihayat al-Arab fī Mu‘ārifat ḍabāl al-Arab, MSS. in Berlin (Ahlwardt, Verzeich., No. 388/2) and London (Cat. Cod. Mss. Or., in Mus. Brit., No. 347/2); according to Lammens in the *Mém. de la Fac. orient. de Beyrouth*, iv. 150 N. 1, it has been printed in Baghdad n. d.; in this
text the author is called Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh; Ālāmān concludes from this that the authors of the ʿSuḥūk and of the ʿNhīyāta were different individuals; but here either the father is confused with the son (see No. 2) or the printed book contains the work of the son. The alphabetical list was compiled by Abū Fawāʾiṣ Muḥammad Aḥmad al-Suwarṣīdī in 1229 (1814) into a genealogical survey and extended to the Caliphs and Sultāns with the title ʿSuḥūk al-Dhāhāb fī Maʿrījat Ḳābīl ʿal-ʿArab, lith. Baghdād 1280, Bombay 1296. After the year 1242 (1821) al-Kalkhashdī wrote a supplement to it entitled ʿSuḥūk al-Djumān fī l-Turqīʾ bi-Kabīl ʿArab al-Zumān, MSS. in Berlin (Alhwart, Verzeichn., No. 9384) and London (Rieu, Suppl. to the Arabic Ms. in the Brit. Mus., No. 595); a synopsis by al-Suyūṭī in Berlin (Alhwart, Verzeichn., No. 9385).

2. His son Naẓīm al-Dīn Muḥammad imitated his two chief works, the ʿSuḥūk under the title ʿSuḥūk al-Djumān fī Muṣḥafūk Mūkātabāt Aḥī al-Zumān (see Rieu, Suppl. to the Arabic Ms., No. 1020) and the ʿNhīyāta under the title ʿNhīyāt al-ʿArab fī Maʿrījat ʿAnṣāb ʿal-ʿArab, dedicated to the Grand Emir of the Arabs of the East and of the West Zain al-Din Abu l-Dīdār Bākī r. Raṣḥīd al-Zayn; the autograph of the year 954 (1548) in the Bibl. Nat. of Paris (see de Slane, Cat., No. 2049), another MS. in Cairo, Ḳhed. Bibl. (Fihār., v. 179; author Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh, see Vollers, Zeitschr. d. öst. Gesellsch., xii. 115; on the Baghdād printed text see above).

3. Abu l-Fath Ibrāhīm b. Ālī b. I Ḍābī Mlā zb-Ṭūrān (Ṭūrān) al-Dīn, d. 922 (1516), Tradītīṣī, whose works are detailed in Brockelmann, Gesch. d. ar. Lit., i. 78.

Bibliography: Wustenfeld, Geschichtsrecherchen, No. 467; Brockelmann, op. cit., ii. 134. (C. Brockelmann)

KALMUCKS, the Turkish name for a Mongol people who call themselves Orbat. In Radloff's Worterbuch (ii. 272), the forms Kalmak (Central Asian dialects), Kalmak (Volga dialects; whence the Russian word) and Kalmuk (Ottoman; whence the Crimean Tatar expression kalmyck i bad-makhkīz) are given. In Central Asia the Turkish-speaking Teutons are called "White Kalmucks" (Aḳ Kalmak) and the Western Mongols proper "Black Kalmucks" (Kara Kalmak). The word is derived (probably only by a popular etymology) from the verb kalmyck "to remain"; it is said to denote the Orbat, who "remained" pagans, in contrast to the Dungans (the Chinese-speaking Muhammadans), who "returned" (verb donmek) (according to the well known Muslim idea) to Islam.

The word Kalmak seems first to occur in the Mebaddina (not included in the printed edition) to the Ẓafar-Nāma of Sharaf al-Din Yazīdī, not, it seems, as an ethnographical term but as a geographical one. It is said that after the expulsion of the Mongol dynasty from China only their "original territory" (yarīʾ āsīḥ), i.e. Karakorum and Kalmak remained in their possession; the "Emirs of the Orbat" later deprived them of this also.

From the time of Wais Khān (1418–28) the Mongols on the Ili [q.v.] had to fight against the "infidel Kalmak"; accounts of these wars are found, notably in the Tūrīkh-i Rağīdī (ed. Ney Elia, see Index). Wais Khān was twice taken prisoner by the Kalmak and had to give his sister in marriage to the chief of the Kalkaš Island Tāshī (properly Esen Tāshī). Tughlōn, father of the latter, was then ruling in Mongolia on the Chinese frontier, where he was succeeded in 1439 by Esen Tāshī. After the death of Esen Tāshī (1455) the great nomad khan of the Oirat broke up; individual princes are mentioned from time to time later, as ruling in the neighbourhood of Muslim lands; in the beginning of 864 (end of 1459) a Kalmak embassy appeared in Herāt. According to Chinese sources, the Oirat in 1552 had to submit to Altan Khān, prince of the Tumet. The name Kalmak seems to have been extended by the Muslims to this kingdom. According to the Ottoman Saifī (wrote 900 = 1572), the prince of the Kalgāt bore the title Āltum Khān (Turk. Atūm = Mongol Altūm); cf. the text in the Leiden MS. No. 917 and the translation by Ch. Schefner in Abdoul Kerim Bouchkary, Histoire de l'Asie Centrale, transl. p. 292 sq. The Muḥammadan sources also report the restoration of the Orbat kingdom under Khara Khula (d. 1634). In Turkestan the Kalmaks, during the 16th century, were regarded as powerful foes to Islam. The prince of the Kazak (Kirgiz), Tawakkul Khān, had to fly before them to Taškent, where he was received by Nawārīz Aḥmad Khān or Barāk Khān (d. 1556); but Nawārīz Aḥmad is said to have replied to his guest's appeal for help that ten such princes as they two could do nothing against the Kalmak. At a later date on the other hand we find Tawakkul described in Russia as "Czar of the Kazak and of the Kalmucks" on the occasion of his embassy to the Czar Feodor (1594), perhaps because a few bodies of Kalmucks had attached themselves to him; according to the Aḥdāt-Ābān (MS. of the Asiatic Museum, No. 169, l. 351) there were also Kalmucks (Kalkaš) in Taškent in the army of Rāhī Khān (a son of Nawārīz Aḥmad) about 1582. In the winter of 1603–4 took place the first raid of the Kalmucks into Khūvārīm (Abū l-Ġhāzī, ed. Desmazois, text p. 275). Soon afterwards, under the Czar WASSILJ Šuiskij (1606–1610), the Kalmucks for the first time entered into relations with the Russian government, although it was not till 1632 that Kalmucks settled on the Volga on a large scale. This branch of the Kalmucks had separated from their kinsmen, under the leadership of Kh Khuluk, as early as 1618. The land of the Volga Kalmucks therefore did not belong to the empire founded by Khara Khula, although the relations between the two branches of the people had not yet been broken. Representatives of the Volga Kalmucks still appeared at the kurultai (parliament) in 1640; Barūr, the son and successor of Khara Khula, gave his daughter in marriage to the grandson of Kh Khuluk. By the same kurultai the predominance of Buddhism was firmly established among all branches of the Kalmucks. The progress made by Islam described in the Tūrīkh-e Rağīdī (p. 91) in connection with the above mentioned marriage contract apparently was not maintained. Most of the Muslim territories of Turkestan were under the suzerainty of the Buddhist Kalmuck prince on the Ili, the founder of the last great nomad empire in Central Asia, until the destruction of this empire by the Chinese in 1758 (subjected to Kāshghāria in 1682, conquest of Taškend in 1723); as late as 1749 the regent (Alaqī) of
Bukharin and his opponent had to submit a dispute to the verdict of an embassy of the Kalmuck prince (Turk-i-Kalmak) (Muhammad Wafad Karminaghi, MS. of the Asiat. Mus., c. 581b, f. 101b sqq.). A great part of the pasture grounds of the Kazaq was at once occupied by the Kalmucks. Islam was then accepted by the chief of the southern part of the modern Semirjejev. From this period date several Buddhist monuments, including Tibetan inscriptions. It was only after the decline of the Kalmuck empire that these areas were again occupied by the Muhammadan Kazaq. The wars of the Volga Kalmucks with the Crimean Tatars and their raids into Khwaziriam had less effect on Islam; from 1724 the Kalmuck chiefs on the lower course of the Volga were simply considered governors (namjastnik) of the Czar of Russia. No connection existed then with the ruler of the Il. The decision of the "governor" Ubashi and a great part of his people to migrate from Russia and settle on Chinese territory proved disastrous for the Kalmucks. During this migration heavy losses were inflicted on the Kalmucks in Central Asia, especially by the Kazaks (1771). Henceforth the Kalmucks were of no political significance either in Russia or in China. During the Muhammadan rising in the Il valley the great Kalmuck temple of Buddha near Kulja was destroyed (Radloff, Ans Sibirien, ii. 403). After the Russian revolution an "autonomous Kalmuck territory" (autonomnaya kalmuckskaia oblast) arose in what was formerly the government of Astrachan, between 45° and 48° N. Lat. and 44°-45° E. Long. A proportion of the Kalmucks in Semirjev (less than 2000 souls) which has adopted Islam and taken to agriculture is called Sart-Kalmak.

Bibliography: Iakinf, Istoriiske obozrenie oiratov sii khozakev, St. Petersburg 1854; Ilovowth, History of the Mongols, i. London 1876; W. Barthold, Oelekistor Semirjejev, p. 78 sq.; N. Pafmov, Oelekistor kalmuckskego naroda za vremya jeho preobrazhania v predelach Rossi, Astrachan 1922; Oiratskeje lenjesija, founded in 1922. (W. Barthold)

Kalpak (r.), A Central Asian headdress, which was introduced by the Turks into Europe and became a favorite throughout the world. The word kalpak is found in the most diverse Turkish dialects in meanings which are detailed by W. Radloff in his Versuch eines Worterbuches der Turk岱alen, ii. 268 sq. (cf. also kalaba, ii. 234). The Eastern Turkish telpas, Djag. East Turk. telpak, Kurg. and Karakirg. telpak, meaning cap, felt cap (cf. also the French kalpak) is certainly related. Cf. thereon Pavet de Courteille, Dict. turk-oriental, p. 408). In its original form the kalpak is a cone-shaped sheepskin cap, flattened on top, covering the head down to the eyes and ears, for the manufacture of which skins of darker colour, in people of rank particularly a black astrachan, were used and then trimmed with softer fur of a brighter colour. Such caps have been worn among almost all Tatar tribes from ancient times to the present day. In earlier times, as G. Rosen suggests, they were a part of the national costume also among the Ottomans. Nevertheless, neither this headdress nor the word kalpak can be proved to have existed before the middle of the xvith century. The kalpak must, very soon after this, under the arabicizing influence of Islam, have been driven out by the turban in its countless forms (cf. 286 styles in Michael Thalman, Flensburs liberarium or, miss. Vienna 1702, vi. 29 sq. on Codex Turc. VII, Bologna). But the kalpak remained as the distinguishing headgear of prominent Christian subjects of the Sublime Porte, with, it is true, considerable alterations in its original appearance. In place of the fur a thick black felt was used and the shape became swollen almost like a melon. Of these headdresses three kinds were especially known, called after professions which particularly wore them, viz. the kalpak of the physicians, of the money-changers and of the interpreters (belum, saraf and terzumun kalpak). As late as the beginning of the xixth century the embassy interpreters, who were not Turkish subjects, had to wear the kalpak, when they went on business to the Porte. In the house the kalpak, which, on account of its weight, was too hot and uncomfortable for indoor wear, was placed on a stand elaborately carved, often painted and adorned with gilding, the kalpaklik, a piece of furniture, which was considered the sign of a distinguished and prosperous Christian household. When, with the coming of the fez, the kalpak threatened to go entirely out of use among the Christian population also, an edict (furmam) of the grand vizier 'Izzet Mehemmed Pasha ordered in 1842 that all non-Turkish subjects should wear the kalpak instead of the fez. But this order was not long enforced. At the present day the kalpak is still made and worn only by Armenians. The fine lambskins stretched over pine-board shapes were at one time imported from Urfa in Russian Tartary, and also from Khiva and Bokhara, and manufactured and sold on the so-called Kalpak-djilas, or Carshusam in Stambou. Among the peoples who adopted the name kalpak for their corresponding headdress, special mention may be made of the Slav tribes of the Balkans (cf. Slav klobuk; Greek kapaški). Down to 1763 the kalpak was also the headdress of the Hungarian Hussars. The high felt cap made of the finest arctic furs and adorned with valuable jewelled clasps, which is still worn as part of the state-dress of Hungarian magnates and Hungarian hussars, is also called kalpak (Magyar kalpak, cf. also kalap = hat). The Hungarians may have adopted the headdress from the Ottomans in the beginning of the xvith century. Cf. also J. Szenredi, A magyar viselt torteneti fejlődése, Budapest 1905, s.v. Among the Hussars of the German army, where the kalpak was worn since the time of Frederick the Great, kalpak means the cloth tab above in the beraskin, the colour of which served to mark the regiment. Under the First Empire in France the kalpak (colback) was introduced into the French army as the headdress of certain arms; under the Second Empire the mounted chasseurs wore a cap called kalpak.

Bibliography (in addition to the works quoted): cf. Ch. White, Waisliches Leben und Sitten der Turen, ii. (Berlin 1845), p. 299 sq.; du Hoison, Tableau de l'Empire Ottoman, ii. (Paris 1900), 137; Magyar Nyelvör, iv. (Budapest 1875), 400 (G. Szarvas); also vi. 365.

Fr. Baranger) 

Kalyub, a fair sized town in Lower Egypt with a railway station, 10 miles north of the central station at Cairo on the Cairo-
Alexandria railway. The town proper lies about a mile west of the station and about 3 miles from the right bank of the Nile, on the Tut'at al-Sarādiyya. Down to the middle of last century Kalub b was the capital of the Muriyya al-Kalubāyya. Under the Khedive Ismā‘īl the Diwan of the Muriyya was removed to Benha. Evidence that date Kalub b has been a marbāt (district-capital). Branch lines run to Zākāriyy and the Barrage du Nil. The majority of the inhabitants are Muslims. According to ‘Alī Pasha Mubārāk, Kalub b possesses a Sharī‘a court (nasīkhama Sharī‘a) and a hospital. Cf. ‘Alī Pasha Mubārāk, al-Khīfet al-dhajadha, xiv. 114 sqq.; Baederker, Egypt? (1914), p. 34; Sāmilbey, Kānīs al-A‘lam, Stambl 1314 (1896), v. 569b, where (line 2–3) we should read ‘alānībīdīn for ‘alānībīdīn.

A Greek Kālōvē — not yet, however, found — is at the base of the name. In the Sātra it is found under the form Kalovēs (Maspero-Wiet, Matières pour servir à la géogr. de l’Egypte, Series i. 151).

Historical: John of Nikias mentions Kalub b in his Chronicles, Chap. 113 (ed. Zöpner, p. 321, 509). ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ (q. v.) had a bridge thrown over the canal at this town to be able to conquer the other towns of the province of Miṣr (circa 20 = 641). In 549 = 1154/5 the Caliph al-Ẓahīr granted Kalub b as a fief to his great favourite Nāṣr b. ‘Abdallāh; the inhabitants so deprecated this present in the eyes of Nāṣr and his father that it became one cause of the murder of the Caliph by Nāṣr and his father ‘Abdallāh (Ibn al-‘Āthir, al-Kāmil, ed. Tornberg, xi. 126; Sūmā b. Munṣīḥ, ed. Dernbourn, i. 245; Ibn Muyassar, ed. Massé, p. 93). In the fighting between Selm b and Tumān-Bey, Kalub b did not escape the raids of the Arabs (Ibn Iyās, Ta‘āikh Mīṣr, under Sāfār 923 = February 10, 1517). For embassies etc., Kalub b was the last stage before Cairo. Thus, for example, in the Rabi‘ I 925 (= March 1519) (‘Alī Pasha Mubārāk wrongly gives I. 25, 923 for R. I. 23, 925), Khaṭ‘ir Bey had the Sūnūn’s envoy received there with the greatest ceremony by the Kālī Barakat b. Mūsā (Ibn Iyās, op. cit., iii. 109). The town had again suffered excessively from the extortions and plundering of the half-savage soldiers and Mamluks in the years 1219 and 1220 (1804 and 1805); cf. al-Djabarti, ‘Abī ‘Abīd al-Aḥṣā‘ī, under the years quoted. Kalub b, as a result of its situation close to the gates of Cairo, may not have escaped on other occasions the effects of the political happenings in the capital. Ibn Ḥukmā (809 = 1400) and al-Ẓahīrī (839 = 1434/5) report, that in their day Kalub b was for the most part lying in ruins.

Economic: Almost all sources praise the wealth of Kalub b in gardens and trees, among which the acacias (antar) are mentioned as particularly valuable. In spite of the restrictive edicts of al-Malik al-Kāmil, the ground was very badly farmed, so that Kalub b’s prosperity suffered considerably (cf. ‘Othman b. Ibrāhim al-Nabulīsī — wrote 537–643 = 1249–1249; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. sta., i. 355 — who devotes a longish section to Kalub b in his Luma‘ al-Kawānīn al-Mu‘tahā fi Daw‘ānīta al-Dījar bi-al-Marjīyya; quoted in ‘Alī Pasha Mubārāk, op. cit. i. 144 sqq.). In 1240 (1824/25) Muhammad ‘Ali built a cotton mill in Kalub b and later barracks and a remount depot were established there. The al-Shawārīb family deserves special mention for its share in the economic development of Kālūb, where they also built a sanā‘ with a mosque.

There are six mosques in Kālūb, in one of which the Friday service is held. Among these the ‘greatest Mosque’, formerly called Qubba al-Shawārīb, built by the Al-Mu‘tahā, had the most important influence on Ibn Ḥujair (578 = 1182/3) in Egypt; cf. Brockelmann, op. cit., i. 478: ‘Alī Pasha Mubārāk, op. cit., p. 114). According to the inscriptions on its minbar and above the door it was renovated in 1148 = 1735/6 by the Shāhīd al-‘Arab of Kālūb, Abīnād al-Shawārīb. Among the tombs of saints the most important is that of Sādir ‘Awaṭī with popular amusements and horse-racing. ‘Alī Pasha Mubārāk gives a very full account of the above mentioned al-Shawārīb family as one of the most prominent in the town. Al-Malik al-Zahir Barqu, gave them charge of the new bridge over the barh Abūl Maqādīja (cf. also al-Kalākshandī, trans. Wustenfeld, p. 28) and granted them large estates as fieles and an annual pension (which lasted till 1275 = 1859/60). Muṣṭafā Pasha granted them the supervision of the whole province of al-Kalūbāyya. Various members of the family also filled important posts in the administration, besides the office of Shāhīd al-‘Arab of Kālūb, which seems to have been hereditary with them. Sulaimān al-Shawārīb’s patriotism cost him his life: in Kālūb 1213 (Dec. 1798) he was beheaded by the French for his part in an attempted rising (cf. al-Djabarti, op. cit., iv. 37 sqq.).

According to Ibn Ujīsīn (cf. ‘Abī al-Latif, al-Jaffā wa l-‘Utarīth etc., French transl. by de Sacy entitled Relation de l’Égypte etc., p. 595) the province of al-Kalūbāyya comprised in its time (777 = 1375/6) 59 townships and yielded a revenue of 419,054 dinars (but on p. 599 a list of 61 townships is given). Ibn Ḥukmā gives 60 with a total revenue of 383,140 dinars. In the time of the French expedition the revenues of the province from the estates (Deser. de l’Égypte, i. 306 sqq.) amounted to 1. for the payment of the mina, 3,390,742 dinars, 2. for the buskhīyya, 1,710,462 dinars, 3. for the fals, 115,199,199 dinars.

The Bahār al-Sarādiyya — according to legend built by Pharaoh and enlarged by his vizier Hāmān (Ibn Dujmāk, al-Kalākshandī) — was, according to the enthusiastic description in Ibn Dujmāk (whom al-Kalākshandī follows), a large canal, apparently with water always in it. This is indicated also by two documents of the years 891 (1486) and 1061 (1650/1) (quoted by ‘Alī Pasha Mubārāk) in the possession of the al-Shawārīb family. Al-Kalākshandī notes that the canal in his time had disappeared and that its place had been taken by the Abu l-Manādijda canal, (cf. Wustenfeld, op. cit., p. 25 sq.) Maspero-Wiet, op. cit., p. 105). According to ‘Alī Pasha Mubārāk, there was only a small canal in his time: the Tut‘at al-Sarādiyya. Ibn Khallīkān, Bātrūs al-Bustānī and ‘Alī Pasha Mubārāk give several scholars, who have the nisba al-Kalubī. The best known of them is Shihāb al-Dīn al-Kalubī (see the following article).

Bibliography: Besides the works quoted above: Ibn Muyassar, Abīrāb Mīṣr, ed. H. Massé (Cairo 1919), p. 23, 60, 93; Abī ‘Abbās,
Kamal al-Din Abu l-Kasim Omar b. Ahmad b. Ali Farah Pasha arab author, pupil of the celebrated Shahb al-fikih Shams al-Din al-Shams al-Razi (d. 1004 = 1596), was regarded in his day as an unchallenged authority and died towards the end of Shawwal 1069 (July 1659). He composed numerous works, of which 21 have survived, in the fields of Shi'a, geography, medicine, secret sciences, etc. He is mentioned by Brockelmann, op. cit., we have to add 1. a Kitab al-Mujadda b al-Rab in the Zafir al-Emam, and 2. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 3. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 4. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 5. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 6. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 7. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 8. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 9. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 10. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 11. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 12. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 13. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 14. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 15. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 16. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 17. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 18. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 19. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 20. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir, and 21. a Kitab al-Mujadda in the Zafir.
Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. Ḥāfiz al-
Nāṣiriyā, d. 843 (1439) entitled al-Durr al-Mun-
takhab fi Ṭurğh Ḥalāb; the work contains a
description of the city of Aleppo followed by
biographies of distinguished natives (since 658); His-
rovite details the MSS. in the Mitt. St. Or. Öst., x.
60 no. 2, by Muḥibb al-Dīn Abu 'l-Fadil Mu-
ḥammad b. al-Shīna al-Ḥalabi, d. 890 (1485),
etitled Nuzhat al-Nawżār fi Rawd al-Manażirs,
MSS. in Berlin (Ahlwardt, Ver., Nö. 9791); vol. i.
in London (Cat. Codd. Or. in Mus. Brit., Nö. 436,
2); vol. ii. in Götha (Pertsch, Ver., Nö. 1772); 
vol. iii. in Paris (de Slane, Cat., Nö. 2139). From
this one of the descendants of Ibn al-Shīna be-
tween 1014 and 1024 composed a synapsis with
occasional notes down to his own time; MSS.
of this synapsis is given by Pertsch, Ver. d. arab.
Hafs. zu Götha, Nö. 1724 and further in Cat.
Codd. Arab. Bibliogr. Datt., ii. 85, Nö. 60, see.
This synapsis was published as al-Durr al-Mun-
takhab fi Ṭurğh Manlakat Ḥalāb by Joseph
Elias Sarkis, Bâirût 1909. Extracts from it were
Akad., phil.-hist. Kl., IV (1850), i. 125 sqq.

Of the history of his family al-Akbār al-
Mustafād u dīkhār Bānī Alī Ḏarūāl, which he
composed for Yāḳūt, the latter gives extracts in
his Īrābd, vi. 18—35. Of his verses an elegy
on the fall of Aleppo, of which Abu 'l-Fīda', op.
cit., gives specimens, is the most famous. In 610
(1213) he handed al-Malik al-Zāhir a congratu-
lar letter on the birthday of his son Malik al-
'Azīz, entitled al-Durārī fi dīkhār al-Dhārārī,
which is printed from the MS. Nūrī 'Othmānīyī,
Nö. 3790 in the Madīnāt, Stambul 1298, as
Nö. 2. Last he wrote under the title al-Wustā ila
'Alībī fi Wast al-Taqībīt wa ltīs a guide to
make all sorts of perfumes; MS. in Berlin (Ahl-
wardt, Ver., Nö. 5463), in the Brit. Mus. (Elli
acquired ... since 1904, London 1912, p. 56, 62,
Or. 6388, and in Bankipore (Cat. of the Arab.
and Pers. Mss. in the Orient. Publ. Lbr., iv. 146,
Nö. 96). Specimens of his handwriting — he was
one of the most famous calligraphers, according
to Yāḳūt — are in St. Petersburg (see Cat.
des Mss. et Xylographes orient. de la Bibl. Imp.,
Nö. 147).

Bibliography: Yāḳūt, Īrābd al-Ārīb ilā
Mārisf al-Ādīb (Gibb Mem. vi.), vi. 18—45;
Ibn Shākir, Fawāriz al-Wafṣāyāt (Bâlāk
1299), ii. 101; Abu 'l-Fīda', Tārīkh, iv. 634; Ibn Kūt-
lūhughā, Tabāṣsūt al-Ḥanāfiyyā (Abh. f. d. Kunde
des Morgen., ii. Leipzig 1862), Nö. 143; Weliers,
Orientalia, ii. 248; Wüstenfeld, Geschichts-
schreiber der Araber, Nö. 345; Brockelmann,
Gesch. d. arab. Ltr., i. 322. (Brockelmann)

KAMĀL AL-DĪN AL-FĀRSĪ. Muḥammad b. a-
Hasan, Abu 'l-Ḥasan died about 1320. He was a
scholar equal in calibre to Ibn al-
Ḥaitham [q. v.] and, indeed, perhaps surpassed
him in originality. Kuẓb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī had
called his attention to the latter's Optics, which
he procured and wrote an excellent commentary
upon. He added a series of brilliant treatises to it.
These deal more particularly with the refractions
and reflections of a sphere, the rainbow, the halo,
camera obscura, etc. As to the latter it should be
noted that the first scholar whom we know to have
used the camera obscura was Ibn al-Ḥaitham. On
the wall opposite the orifice, he showed the image
of the sun during an eclipse of the sun and ex-
plained the phenomenon. That he did not succeed
in obtaining a representation of the crescent moon
is due, not to some error in his assumptions, but
to the fact that its tips are too faint. Kamāl al-
Dīn gave a more perfect theory and tested it by
brilliant experiments. He first made the orifice
very small and placed opposite it a surface half
red and half green. He then showed how one
got the sharper image the smaller the opening
and that the images were independent of the
shape of the orifice. The larger the opening the
less these principles applied. It was to be noted
that the images were reversed. With this appara-
tus Kamāl al-Dīn also observed on the wall the
clouds and their movements as well as a red
flying past. The movements in the image are
in the contrary direction to real life. At a later

The figure, taken from a
manuscript, shows the path of the rays,
which start from b and undergo a
second reflection in the interior of
the sphere. They produce the
secondary rainbow. The primary bow
would be the result of the first
reflection. Goethe and
Boisserée at a
later date observed the
secondary rainbow.

period Levi ben Gerson (Levi de Balneacis, d.
1344) used the camera obscura in eclipses of the
moon also.

Bibliography: H. Suter, Die Mathematiker
& mathem. Wissensch., part 10, Leipzig 1900), Nö. 138; E. Wiedemann, Beitr. z.
Gesch. d. Naturwissensch., xii., xxix (Si-
zungsser. physik-med., Sozietät in Eil-
langen, 1910, 1914), s. 198. Ibn al-Haiṭham: Optics, Arch. f. d. Gesch. der Natur-
wis. u. Technik, iii. (1912); do. in the Jahrb. der Phys.
Photographie, ed. by J. M. Eder, 1910; do. Ver-
handl. der deutsch. physik. Gesell., xii. (1910,
1917); J. Würschmidt, Monatschr. für
den naturw. Unterricht, iv. (1911), 98; M. Curtze,
Himmel und Erde, xiii. (1905), 225.

(K. Wiedemann)

KAMĀL AL-DĪN ISMĀ'IL. [See KAMĀL AL-
DĪN ISMĀ'IL.]

KAMĀL KHODJANDĪ. [See KAMĀL KH-
DJANDĪ.]

KAMĀL PASHAZĀDE. [See KAMĀL PASH-
ZĀDE.]
AL-KAMAR, the moon, the satellite of the earth, considered in quite early times the principal heavenly body next to the sun, whose path lay on the sphere next to the earth (faslak al-kamar). Pythagoras was the first to recognise it as a dark body illuminated by the sun, from whose twelve position with regard to the sun its changes in illumination or phases were seen to result: the recurrence of the sidereal, when the sun and moon have again reached the same positions with regard to the earth, led to the conception of the synodic month (29½ days). The Muhammadans calculate time by lunar years, each of twelve months. These are alternately "full" of 30 days and "empty" of 29 days. This gives a year of 354 days. The Iranian astronomer al-Biruni [q.v.] in his Al-kūnān al-Ma‘ūdī (Makāla iii. Ch. 7) makes the interesting suggestion that the number 360 may have been introduced for the division of the circuit, because it is midway between the solar and lunar years.

The synodic month, to be quite accurate, is 29.5306 days, which means that the month as reckoned by the Muslims is 0.506 and the lunar year 357 days too short, a number which in 30 years amounts to 11.02 days, in the Muhammadan calendar an intercalary period of 30 years is in use. It is called al-majdūmā and the intercalary year itself al-sana al-kabisa. Within an intercalary period there are 11 intercalary years.

The Muhammadan year begins (or rather should begin) with the sunset after which the crescent moon is seen for the first time (first day of Muharram). The beginning of this era was dated on the first Muharram of the year in which the Prophet migrated to Medina from Mecca (July 15, 622 of the Christian era = al-Hijra).

The first appearance of the crescent moon (ru‘yat al-khīlā) (cf. Zīgī of Habash al-Hasib, Berlin MS., Ahlwardt, Verz., No. 5750, f. 151) on the night of Sha‘bān 29 is of special importance as the fast of Ramaḍān begins with this moment. It is necessary to be able to calculate this moment when the weather prevents the observation of the first appearance of the crescent moon. This is one of the most difficult tasks of Arab astronomy. H. Suter has illustrated this from the example: "to find whether on the night of Sha‘bān 29 of the year 540 A.H. the moon is visible" (cf. Die astronomischen Tafeln des Muh. b. Musā al-Khwārizmi, Copenhagen 1914, p. 67 sqq.) and C. A. Nallino gives a formula for ascertaining the smallest phases of the moon (cf. al-Battānī ine Alhazenii Opus Astronomicum, Milan 1903, i. 269).

Even in the earliest lunar theory, as stated by Hipparchus and Ptolemy, the complicated and irregular movement of the moon during a month is apparent: it is in reality due to the double attraction of both the sun and the earth to which the moon is subjected (the three body problem of modern astronomers). The determination of the longitude of the moon in its orbit is the main problem of lunar theory and, in order to solve it in some degree, Ptolemy was forced to substitute for the eccentric circle of the moon's orbit an auxiliary circle, the so-called epicycle, which the moon would traverse regularly in an anomalistic month (27 days, 13 hours, 18 minutes), while at the same time the centre of this epicycle moved uniformly round the earth on a second called the deferent circle in a nodical month (27 days, 5 hours, 5 minutes). In addition the plane of oscillation was, according to Ptolemy, inclined to the plane of the earth's motion (ecliptic) at 5° (to be more accurate 5° 9'), while he made the line of intersection of the paths of the earth and moon (nodalline) execute a retrograde movement and put the centre of the oscillation about 103° nearer the apogee (distance from the earth).

The true longitude of the moon therefore consists of the four so-called great variables, equation of centre, equation, variation and annual equation. The first denotes the transition from circle to ellipse, the second the displacement of the centre of the deferent just mentioned, while the fourth was laid down by the astronomer Kepler. As to the variation, it is given by the following expression:

\[ -2' = \sin (1-\lambda) + 39.5' \sin (1-\lambda) \]

in which 1 and \( \lambda \) are the mean longitudes of sun and moon. From this formula we find that the variation in the syzygies (1-\( \lambda \approx 0^\circ \)) and in the quadratures (1-\( \lambda \approx 90^\circ \)) i.e. 2 (1-\( \lambda \approx 180^\circ \), quite disappears or is very small, but on the other hand is very marked in the octants. Ptolemy, in order to reconcile smaller differences between theory and observation, actually introduced a kind of variation of the line of apseides, the θερμονομος. After Tycho Brahe had long been regarded as the real discoverer of the variation, the orientalist and astronomer L. Am. Sédililot in his article Sur un manuscrit arabe dans lequel la variation de la lune est signalée (Compt. Rend., 1856) asserted that it was evident from the Almagest of the mathematician and astronomer Abu l-Wāfā' al-Buzjānī (325–385 = 940–998) that he was really the discoverer of the variation to which he gave the name θήτης των μηχανών. A long dispute arose on the accuracy of Sédililot's interpretation of the text, which ran through many years of the Comptes Rendus; Sédililot, Mathieu, Chasles etc. formed the one party, Biot, Binet, Bertrand etc. the other, who held the contrary view that Abu l-Wāfā' had discovered nothing new but only substituted his θήτης των μηχανών for Ptolemy's prosneusis. In the end Carra de Vaux has been able to prove definitely the erroneousness of Sédililot's argument by a thorough analysis of the Arabic text in question and the citation of other Arabic and also Persian and Hebrew sources.

The Arab astronomers adopted the lunar theory of Ptolemy and developed it. They also calculated several numerical values on which the study of the θήτης των μηχανών accessible to us, e.g. those of al-Khwārizmi, al-Farghani, al-Battānī and al-Dschahmini gives the information we require.

In determining the parallax of the moon (θήτης μανσαρ αλ-kamar) and ascertaining its distance from the earth, the Arabs did not go beyond Ptolemy. Al-Bīrūnī in chap. 8 of mašūla ii. of his Kūnān al-Ma‘ūdī makes an interesting observation on the shadow thrown by a gnomon (mikyū) in moonlight. As the size of the radius of the moon in relation to the distance of the earth from the moon is not infinitely small (as in the case of the sun), the staff at the same apparent altitude of the moon and of the sun throws longer shadows in the case of the moon. Al-Bīrūnī calculates the difference between the two shadows for an altitude of 45°.

The Arab astronomers devoted special attention to the exact calculation of the frequency of eclipses (kānaf al-kamar), as they made use of it to
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ascertain the difference in longitude in two places on the earth. They worked out tables (based on Ptolemy) which gave the times of the beginning and ends of the eclipse for various parts of the earth as well as the area of the moon's disc covered. But it is impossible to calculate these with great accuracy from observation only. The difficulties (according to al-Birâdî) lie in ascertaining the point where the eclipse begins on the edge of the moon, in the inexactness of the shadow, the lack of agreement between the astronomical instruments of the two observers, etc. The result was that the calculations of longitude from eclipses of the moon were often very inaccurate. It is true that in al-Khwârizmi's astronomical tables (H. Suter, op. cit., p. 55) there is an example in which the period of commencement of the eclipse agrees perfectly with the previous calculation of it, but not every calculation was so accurate. The Pâfimid astronomer Ibn Yânus (d. 399 = 1009 in Cairo), who goes so far as to distinguish five phases in the course of an eclipse, gives in his al-Zâdî al-Kabîr al-Hasîmî the cases where the difference between calculation and observation amounted to as much as 23 minutes (cf. Caussin, Le Livre de la Grande Table Hakemîe observée par..., about-hasan Ali, etc. as a part of the work of the Great Astronomer, ibid., ii. 279, note 1, do., Verspreide Geschriften (Bonn and Leipzig 1929), iii. 27, 32).

Several studies on the moon, none of which are yet preserved, have been preserved to us from the pen of the exceedingly prolific Arab mathematician, physicist and astronomer Ibn al-Hâjîm (d. 430 = 1039). We may mention: 1) the great Mâkhîla fi Qawâlî al-Kamar (India Office Catalogue, No. 734, ix.) and 2) Mâkhîla fi Ikhtilât manfar al-Kamar (ibid., No. 734, x.) dealing only with a special case of parallax ("when the altitude of the moon is less than 30° and is western, its latitude lies south of the ecliptic and the head of the constellation of Cancer is under the western horizon so that it does not reach the meridian from below, the latitude of Melina being taken at 30° or near this figure, the parallax of the moon is in longitude the opposite of the order of the signs of the zodiac..."); 2) fi Mâkhîla al-Kamar al-Mukaddas (Ministerial Libraries of Alexandria ("If one carefully observes and examines these marks on the superficies, one finds them always the same in shape and never changing, either in configuration or in position or magnitude or as regards their dark character").


KAMARÂN, an islet in the Red Sea, on the coast of Tihâma, opposite Zabid. The fortified town of Kamarân has always belonged to whoever possessed Tihâma; it contained prisons of the King of Yemen, in al-Makdisi's times, and a spring of sweet water called al-Akd. Taxes and customs duties were collected there.

The juist Muhammed Ibn 'Abduya, a disciple of Abû Isâki al-Hashī, author of works on al-ajb, lived in Kamarân and is buried there. When there is a storm and ships are in danger, the natives throw dust from his grave into the sea, which is then supposed to subside.

In modern times Kamarân has become one of the quarantine-stations for pilgrims; cf. on this subject Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 299, note 1, do., Verspreide Geschriften (Bonn and Leipzig 1929), iii. 27, 32.

Bibliography: al-Mu'addads (ed. de Goeje), B. G. A., iii. 2 103; Yâkîn, Mu'ajâm (ed. Wüstenfeld), iii. 80. (V. Vacca)

KÂMIL, the fifth metre in the system of Arab prosody, is regularly composed of three mutâṣ'ulân in each hemistich: it has three 'arâf and nine qasîb.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mutâṣ'ulân} & = \text{mutâṣ'ulân} \\
\text{mutâṣ'ulân} & = \text{mutâṣ'ulân} \\
\text{mutâṣ'ulân} & = \text{mutâṣ'ulân} \\
\text{mutâf} & = \text{mutâf} \\
\text{mutâf} & = \text{mutâf} \\
\text{mutâf} & = \text{mutâf} \\
\text{mutâṣ'ulân} & = \text{mutâṣ'ulân} \\
\text{mutâṣ'ulân} & = \text{mutâṣ'ulân} \\
\text{mutâṣ'ulân} & = \text{mutâṣ'ulân} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In all the feet except mutâṣ'ulân and mutâf, one may suppress either the second vowel of the foot (mutâsi'ulân), or the second consonant with its vowel (mutâṣ'ulân), or the second consonant and the prolongation of the third consonant (mutâṣ'ulân) which is exceedingly rare.

As a result of these suppressions the regular foot, mutâṣ'ulân, may become mutâṣ'ulân (= mutâṣ'ulân), mutâṣ'ulân (= mutâṣ'ulân), mutâṣ'ulân (= mutâṣ'ulân); if this is done so that a piece does not contain a single whole foot in mutâṣ'ulân, it then belongs to the rajîqa metre.

(Moh. Ben Chenes)

AL-MALIK AL-KÂMIL. [See AL-MALIK]

KÂMÂRÂN MIRZA, second son of Bâbur, and half-brother of Humâyûn; his mother was Gul-râh Begam, and he was born in Kâbul city about 1550. He was cleverer than Humâyûn and had a poetical turn, but he was cruel and vicious, and a restless schemer. He repeatedly rebelled against Humâyûn, who was at last compelled by his officers to make him innocuous by blinding him in the end of 1553. He went to Mecca in 1554 and died there in October 1557. The most interesting thing about him is the devotion of his wife, Mâh Châck Begam Arghûn, daughter of Shah Hasan of Sindh. She insisted on going on board her vessel
and accompanying him to Mecca, in spite of her father’s remonstrances, saying that he had given her to Kāmrān in the days of his greatness (in 1546) and that she would not abandon him now in the time of his misery. She died at Mecca a few months after her husband.

Kāmrān was put in charge of Kandahār by his father, and in the beginning of Humāyūn’s reign he was governor of the Pandja. During the interregnum, when Humāyūn in India, Kāmrān and his younger brother, Akṣarī, ruled over Afghanistan. He left one son and three daughters. The son, Abu l-Kāsim, who inherited his father’s poetical talents, was confined in Gwalior by Akbar in 1557, and was put to death some years later as a dangerous competitor. All three daughters were given in marriage; one of them, named Gulbāk, was a woman of a masculine spirit; she married Ibrahim Ḥusain Sulṭān, and she and her son were thorns in Akbar’s side. (Firrūsī, lith. ed., p. 221, and Muhammad Ḥusain, Ḍabkār-i-Abkhar.)

Kāmrān Shāh Dūrkān, the last sovereign of the Sadozai family of Afghanistan who succeeded his father, Maḥmūd Shāh, in the limited sovereignty of Herāt in 1245 (1829) and reigned till 1258 (1842). In the civil wars between the sons of Taimūr Shāh, the princes Zamān, Shudjā al-Mulk and Maḥmūd, the prince Kāmrān proved himself a brave warrior and in 1221 (1806) he took Kandahār from Shudjā al-Mulk, but lost it soon afterwards. In 1232 (1816) he took a leading part in the events which led to the disruption of the Durrānī monarchy. In particular, he was insulted by an insubordinate officer offered to his sister by Dost Muhammad he blinded and beheaded Fath Khān, the Barakzai Wazir (Dost Muhammad’s father), to whom Maḥmūd Shāh owed his kingdom. This led to the loss of the whole kingdom except the Herāt province. Kāmrān was deposed and indolent in his later years, but maintained himself at Herāt through the efforts of his able and unscrupulous wazir, Yār Maḥmūd Akīlkozāl. The siege of Herāt by the Kabīr Shāh of Persia in 1837—39 was the principal event of his reign. The rivalry between England and Russia was one of the principal causes of this siege, the Persians being advised by Russian officers, while Lieut. E. Pottinger, a young English officer, was the main spirit in the defence. In 1258 (1842) Kāmrān Shāh was assassinated by Yār Maḥmūd, who was in league with the Persians and remained in possession of Herāt. Coins were struck at Herāt by Kāmrān.


**Kāmrūp,** a district in Assam, situated between 25° 43′ and 26° 53′ N. and 90° 39′ and 92° 11′ E.; the greater part consists of a wide plain, through the lower portion of which the Brahmaputra R. flows from east to west; but south of the river there are ridges of hills, thickly covered with jungle. Under the rule of the Koch dynasty, the first attempt to bring this country under Muhammadan rule was made by Muhammad Bakhtīyar Khalīji [q. v.], but his victorious progress eastward was checked when he attempted to enter Assam, and successive rulers of Bengal after him made similar fruitless attempts. In 1256 Bakhtīyar al-Din Vāzzāk Taghūī Khān invaded Kāmrūp and erected a mosque in commemoration of his victories, but disease broke out among his troops and the Assamese destroyed the general and most of his army. The thick jungles and moist, unhealthy climate of the Brahmaputra Valley proved to be effectual obstacles to the progress of the Muhammadan troops. But it was not until 1638 that they succeeded in gaining a footing in Kāmrūp and Gaṅhatī became the capital of a Muslim governor, but 20 years later they were driven out of the country by the Ahoms, who took advantage of the confusion that resulted from the conflicts between the rival claimants to the throne of Shah Dīvān [q. v.]. In 1662 Mir Dījālā [q. v.] made a vigorous attempt to conquer the Assam valley, but though he was at first successful, the difficulty of military operations during the rainy season and the outbreak of disease among his soldiers compelled him to beat a retrace into Bengal, and Mir Dījālā himself did not survive the failure of his expedition. After intermittent struggles for some years, the last vestige of Muhammadan rule disappeared in 1681 from Kāmrūp, and it formed part of the Ahom kingdom until it was ceded to the British in 1826.


**Kān** [see Kān]?

**Kān Wa-kān,** the name of one of the seven kinds of modern poetry (junūnī), unknown to the classical authors. It was invented by the people of Bagdād and takes its name from the formula used by story-tellers at the beginning of their recitals: "There was once upon a time". Originally the kān wa-kān was a rhymed tale and it was only later that it was applied to other subjects, especially of moral tendency. In the spoken language it was always in vogue in the east only, especially in its place of origin. The kān wa-kān is a poem composed of strophes of two lines the metre of which is given by the prosodists as follows: mustaṭfīlān fa′lātān, mustaṭfīlān fa′lātān.

"But, according to the 32 specimens that I have seen, the last foot of the first verse is mustaṭfīlān and not mustaṭfīlān; and therefore there is a rhyme only in the last hemistich of every verse. The principal variations are the disappearance of s or f in mustaṭfīlān and fa′lātān is often changed to fa′lātān. Al-Iskāhī, Al-Mustaṭraf, Būlāk"
adjective meaning "reed-shaped", then "channel, canal". In modern Persian also kânât is in use but there it has the special meaning of "subterranean channel or aqueduct. The true Persian word for this particular kind of canal is kā'īr, earlier kā'ārī (Vullers, Lexic. Pers.-Lot., ii. 657, 927); in the older language we also find āwghānī; see Vullers, l. c. 58). This latter word has in turn entered Arabic as șahrī (also šahrīgī), but there means "water-holder", "cistern"; cf. Lišān al-'Arab, ii. 336; Lane, Lexicon, p. 1738; cf. also Yaḵūn, Muḥajīn, i. 270, 271. In Western Europe, i. v. 27). Only in Syria (according to Moritz, Zur antiken Topographie der Palmyren, in the Abh. Pr. Akad., 1889, iv. 12) do we find kā'īrī, šahrīgī, vulgar šahrī, in the meaning of "subterranean aqueduct". It may here be pointed out that the other words in Arabic for aqueduct seem also to be borrowed (probably all from the Aramaic); cf. Fränkel, Die aram. Freimaurer im Arab., Leiden 1886, p. 23-25; take, for example, șahrī (Doby, ii. 344; from the Aram. șahrī = castellam; that is "any large building"; cf. the meaning of șantara = bridge, aqueduct, castle).

The plural Kanānād occurs in Syria as a place-name, for example, the name of a town on the western slope of the Ḥawrān, fifty miles south of Damascus, which is so called on account of its wealth of water, and is certainly a very ancient settlement, although hardly identical with the Biblical Kanēn (Numbers, xxxii. 42; I Chron., ii. 23), which Wetstein would rather recognise in K̲h̲neia (diminutive of Kanān), a village near Kerak, four hours' journey east of Derāt in al-Nuqrā; see Wetstein, Das katanische Giebelgebirge, Leipzig 1884 (from Delitzsch's Palästimerkantment, p. 26). Kanawīt's (Kavoza, Canatha) period of greatest prosperity was in the early centuries of the Christian era; splendid ruins still exist dating from the Roman period. Mention is made of the building of a new canal in the reign of Trajan; this must certainly have been simply the restoration of an already existing canal of older date. The upper town still has a well preserved ancient aqueduct. On this Syrian Kanānāt see Burckhardt, Reisen in Syrien und Palästina, Weimar 1823 sqq., p. 157 sqq.; Seetzen, Reisen durch Syrien, Berlin 1854-59, i. 79 sqq., iv. 51-54; J. Porter, Five Years in Damascus, London 1855, ii. 90 sqq.; G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, London 1890, p. 586; M. v. Oppenheim, Vom Mittelmêr zum persischen Golf, i., Berlin 1899, p. 194; F. Thomsen, Loca sancta, 1915, p. 76-77; Georgius Cyprius, ed. Seitz, Leipzig 1890, p. 206-207; Moritz in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencykl. d. kl. Altertums- wiss., x. 1856; Baedeker, Palästina und Syrien?, Leipzig 1913, p. 153-155.

On the Syrian aqueducts, Kanārat Zainab and Kanārat Fir'aww, see șantara.

Subterranean aqueducts such as we get in Peria are only rarely found in Syria, e.g. at Kāratān on the ancient road from Damascus to Palmyra (according to Moritz, Die antike Topographie der Palmyrene, loc. cit.). The town of Damascus is supplied by a channel from the river Bārrādā, the water of which is led into the dwelling-houses by means of leaden pipes. For information on aqueducts in Syria and Arabia in general see also J. Berggren, Guide françois-arabe vulgaire, Upsala 1844, p. 56-57, s. v. aqued.
Among the oldest aqueducts of the Muslim period is the aqueduct of Mecka, which was begun in the time of Mūsā ibn Jumāh. Ibn al-Rawdī, the geographer, states that the water supply of Ḥādat al-Rabī‘ was maintained, in great part, by providing for the water supply of the holy city; in 810 (1407) she had canals made which led the water from the district of Tā‘if, the valley of Misūn and from ‘Arafāt to Mecca. The channels, much neglected in course of time and often only very negligently repaired, were restored by the Turkish Wali ‘Uthmān Pāšā (1882–86). For details see Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, the Hague 1888, i. 6–10, where the Arabic sources are also cited.

In view of the dryness of Arabia, artificial irrigation by means of canals has always been a necessity of existence there (cf. for example, Polybius, x. 23) as river water is in many places not available in sufficient quantity and the rainfall is slight. Open canals continuously lose large quantities of water through evaporation and they are also not infrequently damaged by cloud-bursts and torrential floods. The subterranean kanār or kārīz (kahrīz) system is therefore generally preferred in Persia. By this means water is brought often from great distances to the human-covered plains. Wells are made in the higher lying parts of the valleys, especially at the foot of the hills, and the water accumulates plentifully in them and is led first by subterranean tunnels, later by open canals and furrows (qurāq), to the fields and gardens to be watered. These channels are often 50 or more feet below the surface of the ground, are vaulted and often lined with bricks and so high that a man can crawl through them. Every 30 or 40 paces a perpendicular shaft, often of masonwork, and covered at the top, leads down to the pipe. In the making of these channels the Persians reveal great skill. The searching for springs and the making of channels is a special industry, that of the muḥānā (see especially Bishop, op. cit.; see Bibliography). The making of a kanār costs a great deal in proportion to the water it supplies and the annual cost of maintaining it is also not inconsiderable. It is also very important that the water is distributed, and much care is taken that the villages in turn have the use of it for the proper length of time. This business of water-distributing is perhaps the most important part of the administration of a Persian village. A special official, the Mīr-āb, is entrusted with the duty. He has also to see to the maintenance of the pipes etc., especially to their being kept clean; cf. thereon Gordon, op. cit.; see Bibliography.

At the present day the Persian kanār system is, unfortunately, much neglected; many channels are now quite dry; for example, the great network of channels which once supplied the thickly populated town of Ray near Tihrān is now so much destroyed that it can barely supply the wants of the village of Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīm which is built on the ruins of Ray (Polak, op. cit., ii. 118). Tihrān is, according to Bishop, loc. cit., still supplied by 35 canals.

This method of irrigating the fields by artificial channels is called in Persia the āb̲ system of agriculture, in contrast to the natural method, the deśm or varāmī system; cf. Polak, op. cit., ii. 120; Stolze-Andreas (see Bibli), p. 8.


A great network of canals cuts up Central Asia. The planning of this system is ascribed to Tūnūr; but they are certainly much older and their origin may be dated at least as far back as the early middle ages. To make them, the water from springs in the oases miles apart was collected, great rivers diverted, and water led by tunnels through ranges of hills and by aqueducts over the valleys. A great many of these canals are, however, now decayed, as in Persia. There the canal is called arīk and the canal manager arīk-āzakāl. A thorough account of this Central Asian system of irrigation is given by A. Th. v. Middendorf in his article Einblicke in das Perghana-Thal in Mém. de l'Acad. imp. des Sciences de St. Petersbourg, 1881, Series 7, vol xxix. See also, especially for the country east of Bukhārā, H. Moser, Durch Central-Asien, Leipzig 1853, p. 114–119.

(M. Streck)

KANAWDJ or KANWDJ, Skr. Kanyākūbdjā (known to the Arab authors as Kanaudj or Kanawdj) was the capital of a powerful kingdom before the Muslim invasions. It is now a small town in the Farnākhābād district of the United Provinces on the R. Ganges (27° 2' 30" N. 79° 58' E.). It has been supposed to be identical with Polien's Kanagora or Marcus Crispin's Ptolemy's 134: Beal, Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims, p. 70). V. Smith disputes this on the ground that the existence of Kanawdj at the time of Ptolemy (140 A.D.) is doubtful. The identification is however not improbable. The first undoubted mention is found in the travels of Fa-hsien (405 A.D.), when it was a place of no great importance under the Gupta kings. At the time of Yuan Chwāng's visit (circa 641 A.D.) under the rule of Harshavardhana it had grown into an important capital and a centre of Buddhism. It may be noted that this traveller gives the Chinese transcription (Kano-kū-she) of the Sanskrit-name Kanyākūbdjā, while the earlier travels Fa-hsien gives the Pali transcriptions, corresponding to the Prakrit and modern forms. The country of which it was the capital was known as Panātra. After a period of anarchy and short lived monarchies it became the capital of the Gujārā Pratiharā kings, who founded a dynasty which lasted for two hundred years. The most powerful king of this race was Bhoḍā (A.D. 480–90) under whom Kanawjd became the capital of an extensive empire, which may be stated to have included all the plain of northern India from the Satadvaj to Bihār and southwards to Gudrāt and Saurāstrā. On the west it was bounded by the territories of Siād now under Muslim rule.
Al-Mas'udi writing in A.H. 332 (943–4) says that the king of Kanawjd ruled over the country, bordering on Multan and Sind and southwards on al-Mānik, the country of the Ballāshī (i.e. the Vallabhi kings), and al-Butnā (q. v.), says that Muḥammad b. al-Kāsim b. al-Munabbih, who had entered Sind from Sūtījānā, penetrated India as far as Kanawjd, but that the date of this invasion is not given. Probably this invader is identical with Muḥammad b. al-Kāsim b. Muhammad, the con-
quered or of Sind who, according to the Caṅnāma, made war on the chief of Kanawjd. But, if any such expedition took place, it could not have been di-
rected against Kanawjd itself, but only against its territories bordering on Sind. There is no

ground for supposing that any Muḥammadan in-
der penetrates as far as Kanawjd before Muḥ-
mūd of Ghazni. His conquest overthrew the Pra-
tha-ra rule, which had already been weakened by
the attacks of the Rāshtrakūtas. At the time of Muḥmūd's invasion, after his conquest of Dājajal,
the Shāhi of Gandhāra, Kanawjd was under Rājapāla, who abandoned the city and fell back on
the river Ganges. The capital was not taken, and the city became the center
of the empire. After Muḥmadūn's departure the Cānḍelīs
seized on Kanawjd and Rājapāla was killed. Muḥmūd returned next year and defeated the Cānḍelīs, and the Kanawjd kingdom continued as a small state until it fell into the hands of the Gāhārīwī Rājputs.

In 589 (1193) the final destruction of the Hindu kingdom was brought about by the invasion of Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sāmī, the Gōrtī king of Ghazni, and Kanawjd ceased to be a place of

importance. It probably never really recovered from its destruction by Muḥammad, as al-Bīrīnī,
writing as a contemporary, says that it was mostly in ruins after the transfer of the capital to Biān.
Mu'izz al-Dīn adopted the style of the coins of Kanawjd in some of his issues with Sanskrit legends, and these were probably struck at Kanawjd after the conquest. There are not many important events in its later history.

In 598 (1490) the emperor Humāyūn was defeated here by Shāh Khān, and in the eighteenth century it was included in the territories of the Bangash Nawāibs of Farrukhābād and afterwards in Awadh. During the mutiny of 1857 the Nawāib of Farrukhābād was defeated by the British army here.

Kanawjd was made a mint by Shāh Shāh after his victory over Humāyūn, and on the Sūrti coins it appears as "Kanawjd urf Shāhgīrā". Shāhgīrā was changed to Shāhgīrā in Akbar's reign. Under Muhammad Shāh and his successors, Ahmad Shāh, Ala'gir II, Shāh Dīshān III, and Shāh 'Alam II, the name of the mint was Shāhgīrāa Kāndābī.

From Kanawjd are derived the names of the Kanawjd section of the Brāhman caste and the Kanawjd dialect of Western Hindi. The only important modern industry is cloth-printing.


(M. Longworth Dames)

**KANDĀBĪ** a city in the territory of the Budha (Buddhāya, var. Nudha) which corresponds to the modern Kāchi or Kaś Gandāva in Balūsīn. It is probably the modern town of Gandāva, which is not now important. Kandābīl was taken by the Arab invaders in the time of al-Ḥadhjadi probably before the invasion of Sind by Muḥammad b. al-Kāsim (q. v.) in 897 (707). The Caṅnāma, a legendary history of Sindh and its capture by the Muslims, mentions Kandābīl as having been taken by the legendary King Caṅ, who advanced through Abīl (Las Bīla) and Tūnā (the city of Kandābīl) into the desert and took the fort situated on the river Sīn (which should doubtless be read Sībī, as a branch of the Nārī flowed through Sībī towards Gandāva). In the reign of Yazīd II (101–105 = 720–724) it was chosen by Yazīd b. al-Muḥallab as a place of refuge for his family when he rebelled. Al-Iṣṭakhīr and Ibn Hāwkal mention it as the principal emporium of the Budha. In the time of the Caliph al-Manṣūr (136–158 = 754–775) it is stated by al-Balāqūtī that Hīshām b. ʿAmr al-Taqīḥī attacked a body of Arab rebels at Kandābīl, and ʿImār b. Mūsā in the reign of al-Muṭṭasim (218–227 = 833–842) conquered Muḥammad b. Khālīf there and carried the inhabitants off to Kuṣṭār. The name of Kanawjd or Kandābīl is not met with in more recent times.

Its identification with Gandāva is doubted by Raverty on the ground that the Masālik waʿl-Maṣūmī (cf. Iṣṭakhīr, p. 179 sq.) states that it is but five farsangs distant from Kuṣṭār, but this is not in accordance with its position as shown in al-Iṣṭakhīr's and Ibn Hāwkal's map (see Journ. As. Soc. Beng. 1892. Plate XI) which shows it to the west of the Mīrān and a long distance North of Kuṣṭār. There is in reality no place in the map which can be reasonably be identified. Cf. also J. Marquart, Erânisahr (Abh K. Geist, Wis. Göttingen, Phil.-hist. k. I., new series III, No. 2, Berlin 1901). p. 187 sqq., 190. Gandāva remained an important centre as is shown by the Balīc ballets of the commencement of the xvth century, and it is probable that the Κ of the Arab writers represented a vernacular Κ, as in Kandāhār for Gandhāra and other cases. It is an ancient walled town standing on a mound, and was long the capital of the province of Kuṣṭār, which from it obtained the name of Kuṭ Chi Gandāva. The disappearance of the name Kandābīl from history may be therefore accounted for by the decay of the Arab rule and the revival of indigenous government which naturally gave the chief town its original vernacular name.

KANDAHAR. 1. The name given by the Arab historians to the Indian Kingdom of Gandhāra, situated in the valley of the Kabul river as far as its junction with the Indus. Its capital was Wainhind or Ohind as noted by al-Biruni (Sachau i. 206); and at an earlier period al-Masudi speaks of Gandhāra as the country of the Rādjputs (Rahbūt) and as situated on the river of the Rādjputs which flows into the Indus (Sprenger p. 381). It was from this Kandahār that the name was carried to the settlement of the Gandhārīans on the banks of the Arghānā, which afterwards became famous as the modern Kandahār.

Bibliography: Sachau, Alberuni's India, Trübner's Or. Series, London 1888; Bellew, Races of Afghanistan, Calcutta 1880.

KANDAHAR. 2. A city in Afghanistan (which also gives its name to a province) situated 31° 27' N. and 65° 43' E. at an elevation of 3,462 ft. between the Tarnak and Arghāntāb rivers. It is an important centre of trade and administration, with a population estimated at 31,000. The province, now the principal territory of the great Durrānī tribe of Afghānīs, is identified with the Haranwāt of the Achaemenians, the classical Arachosia, and the mediaeval Zamīn-dāvar and Zābul, and historians have generally assumed that the town was founded by Alexander and named Alexandria Arachosia, but this does not rest on good evidence, and it is very improbable that the name Kandahār can be derived from Alexandria. Its identity with the name Gandhāra, the ancient Indian Kingdom occupying the valley of the Lower Kabul River, on the other hand, appears to be well established. Kandahār was the form used by the Arab chroniclers for Gandhāra; the Kandahār of Mas'ūdī, for instance, has nothing to do with modern Kandahār. There seems some ground for accepting Bellew's theory that the name was brought to Arachosia by emigrants from Gandhāra. The most probable period for such an emigration is the fifth century, when the Ephthalites conquered Gandhāra, as related by the Chinese pilgrim Sung-yun, who visited Gandhāra about A. D. 520. Buddha’s begging-bowl, still preserved in the Shrine of Sūltān Wais outside Kandahār, was probably brought there by refugee Buddhist monks. It was not however till the 12th or 13th century that the new Kandahār began to be famous. It is not mentioned by the Arab historians in their record of the conquest of Arachosia (al-Rukhadr); the capital was then Buz which was taken in 855. Durrānī, and the same place was a mint-town of the Saffārīs. It was not until after the destruction of Buz by ‘Alī al-Dīn Durrānī in 545 (1150) that Kandahār began to rise into importance. Shams al-Dīn II, the Kart ruler of Herāt, is stated by Khwāndamir to have besieged Kandahār, and as his reign began in 576 (1180) it may be held that by that period Kandahār had become the capital, and henceforth it plays a prominent part in history. It was conquered by Ḥulāl and formed part of the province bestowed on his grandson, Pir Muhammad. At the close of the 15th century it formed part of the Kingdom of Husain Bākhtār of Herāt, and the name Kandahār first appears as a mint on his coins. Under Husain, the Ārghūn Chief, Dhu ‘l-Nūn Beg, obtained the government of Zamin-dāvar in addition to other provinces and made Kandahār his capital. After his death in the wars with Shāh Shāh, the empire Bābur drove his son Shāh Beg Arghūn out of Kandahār in 915 (1507), but Shāh Beg soon recovered the town with the aid of Shāhānšāh and held it for several years, but Bābur finally took it in 928 (1522) and it remained part of the territories of the Mughal Empire of India, although always regarded by the Safavid Shāhīs of Persia as properly belonging to Khurasān. Kamān succeeded Bābur in the possession of Kābul and Kandahār, and held them even when his younger brother Humayūn was expelled from India. A Persian attack on Kandahār in 944 (1535) failed. In the disputes between the brothers which followed Humayūn's exile, Humayūn besieged Kandahār with the aid of a Persian army and after its fall made it over to the Persians, but re-took it from them afterwards. In the early part of Akbar's reign Tahmāsp Shāh succeeded in taking Kandahār 965 (1556) and Akbar did not recover it till the latter part of his reign, 1003 (1594). Persians again took it from the Emperor Djiāhāngīr in 1031 (1621), but Shāh Jīhān's army occupied it in 1047 (1637). The last transfer was in 1058 (1648) when Shāh ‘Abbās II took it, and the Mughal Emperors were never again able to conquer this province.

Kandahār remained under the Safawi Monarchy until the rising of the Ghilzai tribe to power under Mīr Waiz (v. Ghilzai). The success of the Ghilzai rebellion in driving the Persians out of Kandahār emboldened them to invade Persia itself, and Mahommed became Shāh of Persia. Kandahār itself came into his brother's power, and the Ghilzais maintained their hold on it until Nadīr Shāh took it after a year's siege in 1151 (1738). During the siege he built a new town outside the old city and named it Nadīrābād. The Ghilzais were driven away from the neighbourhood, and the Abdālis, who had been removed to the Herāt province, were allowed to return. They are still the most important element in the province. Ahmad Shāh, one of their leaders, who had held high command under Nadīr Shāh, obtained possession of Kandahār without difficulty after the latter's death, and made it the capital of the Durrānī Kingdom which he founded (v. Ahmad Shāh, Abdālī, Durrānī, Afghānīs). He built a new town and gave it the name of Ahmad-abād, most shāhī with the epithet of ashraf al-nilātī, "most illustrious of cities", which appears on all coins struck there during the Durrānī rule, but has been replaced under the Barakzais by the old name Kandahār. The vicissitudes of Kandahār were not at an end; it passed rapidly from one pretender to another in the course of the wars between Zāmīn Shāh and his brothers, Mahommed and Shāhān Shāh.
'al-Mulk, and, after Dost Muhammad Bakhzad had obtained the principal power, the inevitable rivalry set in and Kandahar was held long by his brothers, Kishandil and Fatur. In 1839 it was occupied by a British Indian arm, in support of Shah Shuja 'al-Mulk, and held till 1842 when the British left Afghanistan. After Dost Muhammad's death Kandahar again passed from one to another during the civil wars between his sons (see 'Abd al-Rahman Khani). In the war of 1879-80 after the deposition of Yakub Khan, Kandahar was for a time erected into a separate state under the Wali Shih 'Ali, but after Aiyub Khan's invasion and his final defeat by Roberts at Kandahar the British Government decided to put the whole country under 'Abd al-Rahman as Amir, and the separate state of Kandahar came to an end. Since then it has remained peacefully under him and his successors.

The changes in the political relations of Kandahar are reflected in its coinage. It first appears under Husain Bakhart of Herat, then under Humayun. Then for a long season only a few copper coins of Persian origin are known. Rupees were struck by Djahangir and Shah Jahan. These are followed by a long series of anonymous copper coins of Persian origin bearing figures of antelopes, peacocks, the hand of Fatima or the sword, Dhu'l-fikar. Mahmut the Ghalzai struck rupees, and Nadir Shah also, both in the names of Kandahar and Nadirabad. Then follows a full series of all the Durrani Kings, followed by anonymous coins in the name of the 'Sahib-i-Zaman', or 'Amir-i-Kullam'. Last of all come the coins of the Bakhzad dynasty, and even the temporary Wali, Shih 'Ali, is represented.

The site of Kandahar has been several times altered. The town taken by Nadir Shah appears to have been on hilly ground; it was no doubt the Husainabad built under the Ghalzais and named after the Persian King Husain Shah, afterwards dethroned by Mahmut. Nadirabad seems to have been some distance away on the open plain, while Ahmad Shah, the modern Kandahar, was nearer to the old city, according to Elphinstone. Masson about 1830 describes the ruins of the old town dismantled by Nadir Shah as on the slope of a hill about two miles distant from the walled town of his days. The town of Ahmad Shah is in Kandahar.


(M. Longworth Dames)

KANDAHAR. 3. A fort in the Dekhan, 77° E. 19° F. which gives its name to a tala'a in the dominions of the Niam of Kandahar. This place appears to be the mint-town of some rupees of Kandahar struck in the reign of the Mughal Emperor Muhammad Shah from 1157 to 1159 (1744-45). As the city of Kandahar in Afghanistan had been separated from the Mughal Empire since 1058 (1648) and was at this period in Nadir Shah's possession, it is impossible that these rupees should have been struck there.


(M. Longworth Dames)

KANDURI. The Persian word kanduri or kandur means a leather or linen tabeclotth; in Hindustani this word means also a religious feast held in honour of a venerated person like Fatima. In this latter meaning the word has been import, apparently, from India into the Indonesian archipelago. In Aceh the word is unchange, in Java it is slightly altered to kanduri or kenderen; it may be noted that nowadays the more usual term in Java is: tekpek or sidekak, from the Arabic rāka, slmetric, from the Arabic salām, or hāghat, a well known Arabic word, meaning need, want of a man's presence at a feast, and hence the festival itself. In general it is a feast given with a religious purpose, or at least in conformity with religious law, just like the wakima in the books of Pi. The occasions which give rise to it are numerous, for instance: days of commemoration, domestic events, especially circumcision, the completion of teaching the Koran, certain periods, such as pregnancy, sowing and harvest, and sundry reasons like starting out on a journey, occupying a new house and other enterprises, the averting of epidemics and calamities, etc. According to the Law each kanduri should have a religious character; the poor must be invited, forbidden things should be avoided, but the strong local i'dar is always prone to look for means of effecting a compromise. Every complete kanduri, especially those in commemoration of deceased relatives and those given on the anniversary of a saint, is sanctified by means of recitation of the Kuran, de'ke's or prayers; popular superstition, however, regards such kanduri as consisting of actual offerings of food to the deceased. Almost every kanduri is opened by a prayer, the commemorative ones by the du'a. In Aceh some months are called kanduri with a second word indicating the food the sacred meal consists in.


KANEM, a country in the Central Sudân, east and north-east of Lake Tchad. Until recent years Kanem was only known from the accounts of Barth, who visited a part of it in 1851, and Nachtigal, who crossed it in 1871 on his way to Borku. But from 1900 onwards, the work of French scientific missions, as well as the explorations of officers and officials entrusted with the administration of the "territoire militaire du Tchad", have made it possible to rectify and complete the data furnished by these two travellers.

The name Kanem, taken in the widest acceptation, is applied, according to Nachtigal, to a region bounded on the north by the caravan route from Kouraw to Lake Tchad, in the south by the Bahra al-Khazal (q.v.), in the east by the depression of the Eguie, in the west by the Lake, and lies between 14°—16° N. Lat. and 12°—14° E. Long. (Greenwich). The area may be estimated at 27,000 to 30,000 square miles. Kanem, in the stricter sense, only occupies about a quarter of this huge area, between Lake Tchad on the west, Bahri al-Khazal on the south and the mountainous massif of the Manga, which separates it from the Eguie, on the east.

The most characteristic topographical feature of Kanem is the existence of numerous sand dunes
running N. W. by S. E., separated from one another by hollows several hundred yards broad and sometimes four or five miles long. Dunes and depressions are specially marked in the northern part. The hollows, which are given the name of wads, are dry except during the rainy season when ponds are formed in the deepest parts; their bottoms consist of soil impregnated with natron. Below this, to a depth of 2 to 30 feet, lies a vast water-bearing stratum which therefore are dug into the beds of the wads. The existence of this subterranean water supply has suggested that the present Kanem is simply an ancient lagoon formerly fed by the waters of the Bahar al-Ghazali and now dried up. The wads themselves would be the beds of the ancient exits or bahri of the Tchad. The shore itself is in process of transformation. It is bordered by elongated islets lying S. E. by N. N. W. and separated from one another by narrow channels. The islets, which number 300, of which 80 are inhabited, lie from two to six miles from the shore. They are divided into two groups, the Kuri archipelago in the south and the Buddha archipelago in the north. The gradual desiccation of the south-eastern part of Lake Tchad has added a certain number of islands to the mainland. Peninsulas and bays, which cut into the shore, have thus been formed and force sailors to make numerous detours.

The climate of Kanem is that of tropical regions. Two seasons are distinguished, the rainy season from July to September, and the dry season from February to June. The intermediate period, from October to January, corresponds to winter and is marked by a perceptible drop in the temperature; in the bottoms of the wads the thermometer goes sometimes down to zero Centigrade (= 32° Fahrenheit). The rains themselves are unequally distributed and diminish from south to north. The very luxuriant vegetation of the southern part becomes less and less rich as one ascends northwards. It flourishes on the slopes of the wads, the bottoms of which remain barren. The date-palm grows wild in many of these wads. It even forms a regular oasis at Mao, in the centre of Kanem, but disappears in the northern part, which is of prairie character. Cultivation is limited to the area around the villages, built on the slopes of the dunes close to the wooded zone. The commonest crop is the millet, to which may be added beans and cotton in the bahri of the Tchad. The rearing of horses, cattle, sheep and camels is also a very important source of income for the inhabitants. Fishing around the lake and hunting in the interior also contribute to the support of the inhabitants. The fauna is very rich and varied. The elephant is becoming scarce, but the rhinoceros, the hippopotamus, lion, buffalo and panther abound in Kanem proper and the ostrich, antelope, gazelle and giraffe on the northern steppes.

The number of inhabitants is difficult to estimate. It is certainly not above 80,000 to 100,000 or about two to the square mile. The population is settled, with a few nomads. The principal settlements are in the south Ngiri, in the S. E. Mondo, in the centre Mao, "a junction of roads, a centre of gravity and of confluence of races ... the first oasis in the date country, still rich in millet, suited both for the rearing of camels and cattle". (Largeau).

The population is far from being homogeneous. The diverse elements which compose it belong some to the negro group and some to the Arab group, more or less altered. To the first belong the Kanem-bu, the Buduma, the Kuri; to the second the Ulad-Sliman and the Shoa; the Tundjur and Tubu are classed between the two.

The Kanem-bu, descendants of the first settlers in Kanem, constitute the basis of the population, upon whom they have imposed their language. They are dark grey (asrâfi) in colour and tall in stature. Industrious and peace-loving, they have settled and devoted themselves to agriculture. They profess Islam and are fairly strict Muslims. In their midst live groups of individuals called Haddad (in Kanem-bu dge'na) who, although differing from the Kanem-bu neither in language nor in physical type, are considered as belonging to an inferior race and are despised. These natives are distinguished from the others by their weapons and by their mode of life. They use bows and arrows, while the Kanem-bu use spears, and live chiefly by hunting. Very warlike in disposition, they have played an active part in the civil wars which desolated the country in the course of last century.

The Buduma and the Kuri inhabit the islands of Lake Tchad, which they retired when they abandoned the mainland. The Buduma, who occupy the northern archipelago, live by fishing, cattle-rearing and the cultivation of millet. Before the French occupation, they practised piracy to the detriment of their neighbours of Kanem and even at the expense of the natives of Bornu [q. v.]. They have, for the most part, remained fetish-worshippers, although they have adopted some Muslim customs. The Kuri, on the other hand, while leading the same sort of life as the Buduma, are completely Islamised.

The Ulad Sliman and the Shoa represent the Arab element in Kanem. The first, who came from Tripolitania and Fezzan [q. v.] in the middle of the nineteenth century, have preserved the Semitic type quite pure. They have light complexion, speak the Arab dialect of Tripolitania and dress like the Arabs of the north. Nomads and robbers, possessing, thanks to their rifles, an incontestable superiority over the negro tribes, their sole means of existence was the slave trade and brigandage. Since the French occupation, some sections of them have taken service with Europeans, while others have left the country and entered the service of the Sanussi.

Of Arab origin, like the Ulad-Sliman, the Shoa have been long established in the Sudân. But if they have retained the use of the Arab language, which they speak quite purely, their physical type has been markedly altered by mixture with the black population. The Islam which they profess is fairly strict among the tribes of the north, where many of them are affiliated to the Tidjâniya brotherhood; among the tribes of the south, however, their faith has been contaminated by fetishist practices and the orthodox regard them as kirdi, i.e. idolaters. The Shoa live almost entirely by cattle-rearing; nomads in the dry regions near the desert, they become settled in the moister southern regions. They are represented in Kanem by the Ulad Serrat, the Bant Wall and the Dagona of the Bahar al-Ghazali.

The Tubu or Teda, who came originally from Tibesti, are fairly numerous in Kanem. But, as
a result of contact with negroes, they have lost some of their distinctive features, notably the slimmness of the body and elasticity of gait. They are also much less fanatical than their kinsmen who have remained among the mountains. Lastly, while the Tuu, strictly so-called, are nomads and live almost entirely by brigandage, the Tubu of Kanem or Darzaged Konuma are for the most part settled. They follow agricultural pursuits, for which they are not fitted, without great success. The principal bodies of them are the Gadobs, the Warabbas, the Dogorda and the Yoromba, related to the Kaughteria of the Bahir al-Ghazal. Their language is connected with the Kanuri spoken in Bornu.

The Tundjur are the descendants of Hilali Arab tribes, who, after sojourning around Tunis, migrated to Dirr Fur at the end of the fifteenth century. There they passed to Wadai and finally settled themselves in Kanem towards the middle of the seventeenth century. Much mixed with negroes since then, they form a group intermediary between the Arabs, the Kanembus and the Tuu. Arabic is their proper language, but they also speak Tuu and Kanembu. They are found especially in the region of Mondo and acknowledge the authority of a chief called jagb. History. According to the Arabic sources studied by Marquart, who modifies on this point the data of Barth (cf. Bornu), the kingdom of Kanem seems to have been founded by the Zaghawa, whose territory extended in the ninth and tenth centuries A.D. from Dior Fur to Lake Tchad and Karan. Al-Bakri mentions the inhabitants of Kanem as idolators and al-Idrisi seems also to consider them as such. Some time after the tenth, but not later than the twelfth century, Kanem was occupied by the Tubu (Teda) who came from Boruku and Tibesti, conquered the Zaghawa and introduced Islam. This occupation seems to coincide with the accession to the throne of the Yanzis, who claimed to be descendants from Y. b. Dhi Yazaq [q.v.] and became the disseminators of Islam which had been introduced by Al-Hadi Al-Othmani, the predecessor of the Yanzis. The Kitaib al-Istidair (ed. von Kremmer, Vienna 1852, p. 32, transl. Fagnan, p. 61) places the conversion to Islam of Kanem about 500 = 1106. According to a Hausa legend, Abu Zaid al-Farzati (end of the xith and beginning of the xith century) preached Islam in Kanem and Boruku. Another tradition is the introduction of Islam to the beginning of the twelfth century, in the reign of King Oumé. In any case this religion was solidly established in Kanem in the thirteenth century. Some Muslims from Kanem founded a Fédiki school in Cairo between 640 and 650 (1242-1252). The soli-disant descendants of Salf remained in power as long as the kingdom existed. They preserved their complexion "fair like the Arabs" down to Selma's, son of Bikouru, who was the first negro king of the country. This dynasty considerably extended the kingdom of Kanem, the boundaries of which were carried by Dumana I, Selma's and Dumana II up to the frontiers of Egypt. The Suljas of Kanem maintained friendly relations with the Haafsids. A rapid decline followed this period of prosperity. The Bulala, a Kanembu tribe which at the beginning of the xith century A.D. had withdrawn to the S. E. of Lake Tchad, attacked the Suljas of Kanem and after a century of incessant fighting ended by conquering the country. Ndjima, capital of Kanem, was taken by the invaders. Suljan Omar b. Idris (796-800 = 1394-1398) had to retire to the country west of Lake Tchad, where one of his successors founded the kingdom of Bornu [q.v.]. In the sixteenth century the sover- reigns of the new state in their turn took the offensive against the Bulala in order to re-conquer Kanem. This end was achieved by Idris Katta-karmab (1504-1506 A.D.). The conquered Bulala had to pay tribute and Kanem became a province of Bornu. The submission of the Bulala remained, however, somewhat precarious. During the xvith century the Suljas of Bornu found themselves forced to resort to force in order to oblige their neighbours to respect the treaties that had been made. Thus we find Idris Alaoma (1571-1603) sending five expeditions against the Bulala, who were supported by the Tuu. The Suljan of Bornu was victorious over his adversaries but his authority and that of his successors were hardly recognised except by the people around the shores of the Lake; the interior of the country slipped from them. Very soon the weakening of Bornu enabled the Bulala to recover their independence. But towards the middle of the xvith century they were in their turn conquered by the Tundjur from Wadai. They then left Kanem and went to settle in the west of Bahir al-Ghazal, then in Fiti, where their descendants still are to-day. The Tundjur imposed their authority on the various peoples of Kanem but had to endure the attacks of the Bornus who drove them into the region of Mondo and reduced them to the state of tributaries. The Bornus, troops, commanded by a Hausa slave named Dalaisa, settled permanently in Kanem, where their descendants are known as Dalatua. Their chief (alifa) settled at Mao and became the representative of the Suljan of Bornu, to whom he paid an annual tribute. This restoration of the Bornus suzerainty was of short duration. From the beginning of the xith century Kanem was attacked by new enemies, the Wadaians, who claimed the country as a former possession of the Bulala settled in Wadai. The Suljas 'Abd al-Karim Sabunu (1805-1819) and Muhammad Sharif occupied parts of the south almost without striking a blow. Bornu, invaded by the Fulbe, was unable to intervene, and Kanem occupied with the feuds of the Tundjur and Dalatua was in a state of complete anarchy. The Dalatua ended by triumphing over their rivals but recognised the suzerainty of Wadai. Their chief, the alifa of Mao, received the title of aguid al-bahr, and became the representative of the Suljan of Wadai, in the name of whom he gave investiture to the Kanembu and Haddad chiefs. The natives who would not submit to the Wadaians took refuge in the islands of Lake Tchad. The arrival of the Ulad Sliman (1846) provoked new disorders. Driven out of Fezzan by the Turks these nomads reached the country north of Lake Tchad and began to plunder it. Severely defeated by the Tuaregs in 1850 they moved on to Bornu. The Suljan then took into his service the remains of the tribe and entrusted the Ulad Sliman with the defence of the frontier against the Wadaians. The Ulad Sliman took advantage of this to reconstitute themselves and to plunder friends and enemies without distinction. At the period of Nachtigal's visit to Kanem
1871 they were the real masters of the country. The Tundjur of Mondo were tried to resist them but being decisively beaten in 1883, they were reduced to slavery. The Haddad of Ngumo alone succeeded in keeping in check these nomads, who dreaded their poisoned arrows.

The situation was none the less much disturbed. The Kanembù and the Haddad were fighting between themselves for the Wadasi, and frequently, especially after the death of Shaik Abd al-Ljahli, the various factions of the Uad Sliman began to fight with one another.

The French occupation put an end to this anarchy. Kanem was included in the zone of French influence, as determined by the Anglo-French agreement of March 21, 1899. After being visited by the Joalland and Fourcaur-Lamy missions (1900) it was effectively occupied between 1901 and 1905. Accepted without opposition by the Kanemhù, European domination met with an obstacle in the hostility of the Sanusia, who in 1906 established a zawiya at Bir Alali, in the north of Kanem. Muhammad al-Hadj, the chief of the zawiya, put up for the mastery of the broomroad, at the head of bands of Arabs from Tripolitania, Tuaraga and Uad Sliman, endeavored to arrest the advance of the French. The evacuation of the zawiya in 1902 determined a number of the Uad Sliman to abandon the struggle. The malcontents, who had been joined by Tuqui brigands, continued hostilities down to January 1905, when their chief, Shaik Ahmad, finally made his submission.


KANGHRI (also written KANERI, with the subsidiary form Çangri), capital of the liwa (administrative district) of the same name in the wilayet (province) of Kastamuni, on the Adji Su, a tributary of the Kiez Imağ (Haiys), the ancient Gangra, famous even in ancient times as a stronghold, was sometimes used by the Byzantines as a place of banishment and later in the wars with the Arabs and the Dānishmand-Oghlu again became important on account of its almost impregnable citadel. On their campaigns against the Byzantines the Maniys were repeatedly penetrated as far as Kandgera (variant Dandgera) e.g., in the year 93 = 711/12 (al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, ii. 1236 = Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, iii. 457; al-Ya'kubi, ii. 350, who calls the town Hisn al-Hadi), in the year 109 = 727/28 (al-Ya'kubi, ii. 395) and in the year 114 = 731/32 (Bar-Ihebraeus, Kitab al-Makbakan Tobyni, ed. Bruns and Kirsch, ii. 155; cf. al-Tabari, ii. 1561, and Theophanes under the year 6224). When as a result of the defeat at Mangikert in 1071 the eastern frontier provinces were abandoned by the Byzantines, the Saldjiks and the Dānishmand-Oghlu shared the spoil: the former established themselves in Khazaria, while the latter, taking advantage of the nominal head of Asia Minor from Amasia to Kastamuni; among the conquests of the first Dānishmand-Oghlu in 468 (1075/6) we find Kanghri mentioned; cf. Turukhi Ath Dānishgend in Amasial Husaini Husam al-Din, Amasia Turka, Stambul 1322, ii. 286 sqq.; Hezavrann, Tanbqi al-Tawarikh in the Z. D. M. G., xxx. 470. In the year 1101 an army of Crusaders left Constantinople for the land of the Dānishmand-Oghlu, in order to liberate Boemund of Antioch, who had been captured by them at Malatya and imprisoned in Niksar, conquered Angora and reached Kastamuni (approx. modern Gangra); but the attack on the fortress failed and soon afterwards the army was completely wiped out by the allied Saldjiks and Dānishmand-Oghlu at Amasia (Albertus Aquensis, liber viii. cap. 8; Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, x. 203; cf. Z. D. M. G., xxx. 476; Chalandon, Les Comtes, i. 224 sqq.) The emperor John Comnenus captured Kanghri in 1134 with the help of his heavy siege artillery, after having stormed it in vain a year before (Chronicle of Niketas, i. 6 and especially also Joannes Prodomos; see Chalandon, op. cit., ii. 84 sqq.); but very soon after the departure of the emperor the fortress was retaken by the Dānishmand-Oghlu and never again passed into the hands of the Byzantines. In the period following we find Kanghri in possession of the Saldjiks of Konya (see Chalandon, op. cit., passim). After the decline of the Saldjik empire Kanghri belonged to the territory of the Ifsandiyar-Oghlu of Kastamuni, was taken from them in 795 = 1392/3 (so Negeiri) or 797 = 1394/5 (so Ashikpahazade and the anonymous Ottoman chronicles) by Bayazid I with the greater part of their lands, but restored to them by Timur in 814 (1410) and finally in 822 (1419) definitely annexed by Mehmed I (Ashikpahazade, Türk, p. 88 sqq.; Levenelius, Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum, Frankfurt 1591, coll. 475; the statements of von Hammer, Gesch. des Osman. Reiches, i. 70.248 and ii. 176 are due to a misunderstanding). In the period of peace that now followed under Ottoman rule, Kanghri falls completely into the background: it is scarcely mentioned by the historians; we have, however, full descriptions of the town from Eyvili, Siğahetâme, iii. 239 sqq., and Ḥaddâji Khalifa, Diğâhnum, p. 645. Among European
travellers we find it first mentioned in 1553—55 by Dernschwam in his Tagbuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopol und Kleinasiern, ed. Babinger, Munich 1923, p. 196; nearly 300 years later Ainsworth was the first European to describe it from his own observations and in our own time it has been occasionally visited and described by German explorers in Asia Minor. The castle, in its day stormed by Arabs, Dānīānān-Oghlu, Byzantines and Crusaders, lies in ruins; the tomb still survives of Karategin, who captured the town for the first Dānīānān prince and is now revered as a saint. The system of cisterns which dates from pre-historic times, on the castle hill, which Ewliyâ and Ḥaddîjî Khalîfâ fully described, has not yet been closely examined, nor has the "Medjiddî Tash" (Tash Masджjid), i.e. the monastery of the Mewlewi dervishes, with its inscriptions, which, as Ainsworth was told, are said to date from the Arab Caliphah. Of the 27 large and small mosques some are said to date from the Byzantine period (see Cuinet); the principal mosque was built by Sulâmîn I in 966 (1558/9).

The extensive deposits of rock-salt at Maghāra, two hours south-east of Kâñî (Cuinet, iv. 447 and Marcquer are famous; their process was known even to the Byzantines under the name Ταγγαραή ᾽Ασας (Nikolaos Myrepios, end of the xiiiith century, in Du Cange, Glossar. ad scriptores med. et inf. Graec. s. v.). The severe earthquakes, which have repeatedly shaken the town in modern times, are mentioned in the mediaeval ages also; al-Kâzawînî, Ḥâdar al-Bidât, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 268, gives a full account of some of these catastrophes, which destroyed the town in Aug., 1050.

The number of inhabitants may be approximately estimated at 30,000 in 5,000 houses; among them were about 150 Greek and 50 Armenian families, who may now have left it as a result of the Great War.

Bibliography (so far as not already given):
Ritter, Erdkunde, xviii. 353 sqq.; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 158; the Gazetecers (Sâhinâme) of the Wilâyêt Kaštâmûnâ, Year 1280 A. H. etc.; Cuinet, La Turquie d’Aâr, iv. 551 sqq.; W. F. Ainsworth, Travels and Researches in Asia Minor etc., London 1842, i. 109 sqq.; v. Flottwell in Petermann’s Mitteilung, suppl. part 114 (1895), p. 38 sq. and 50 (with plan of the ruins on the hill); G. Marcker in the Zeitschrift der Ges. f. Erdkunde, 1890, xxxiv. 368 sq. and 373; R. Leonard, Topographia, Berlin 1915, p. 66 and 120 (with view).

(J. H. MÖRDTEMANN)

Kâñî, abu Bachr, a notable Ottoman poet and prose stylist of the old school. Born in 1124 (1712) in Toḵad in Asia Minor, while still a young man he attained a great reputation in his native town as a stylist and poet. He belonged to the Mewlewi order and was allotted to the Şajih of the Mewlewi monastery in Toḵad to serve him. An important landmark in his career was the passing of Hâkim Oghlu ‘Ali Paşa through Toḵad (1658 (1754/5); he had been summoned from Trebizond to Constantinople to fill the office of Grand Vizier for the third time. Kâñî presented him with a kâṣida of welcome and a chronogram which made such an impression on the aged statesman that with the permission of the Şajih of his order he at once took him to Constantinople and procured him a position in the imperial Divân. The way to the highest offices of state was thus opened to Kâñî; but ambition was foreign to his nature. The careless and somewhat unrestrained life that he had been leading in his native town — he was only a lukewarm Muslim and only at the end of his long life returned again to the devout life of the order — seemed to him more desirable; so he took advantage of the fall of his patron, which took place after only two months of office, to give up his position in Constantinople. Henceforth his activities lay mainly in the provinces — in Silistra, in Wallachia and in Bucharest. He acted for a considerable time as Divân secretary to the voivod Alexander; there is a picture of them together in the Museum of Sinaya. Finally Yegen Mehmed Paşa, who had previously been a close friend of his, summoned him to Constantinople, when he became Grand Vizier (1196-1782). But this brought nothing but misfortune to Kâñî. Kâñî showed himself indifferent to all ceremony and conducted himself towards the Grand Vizier with as little politeness as in the old days when there was no difference of rank between them. He also chattered about matters that should have been kept secret. Yegen Paşa enraged at this and him committed to death and it was only with difficulty that the punishment was recalled, and Kâñî was sentenced to banishment to Lemnos. All his property was confiscated, so that he had to struggle with poverty. He died in Rabî’ II, 1206 (Jan.-Feb., 1792) and was buried in Ayâb, Surûrî and Sûmbul- Zâde Wehbi composed chronograms on his death.

Kâñî is one of the most remarkable figures in Ottoman literature of the post-classical romantic period during which Persian influence died down and was replaced by a more national spirit. As a poet Kâñî was not specially distinguished; he even lacks one of the principal features of most Ottoman poets: smoothness and polish of language. In his poems there are many repetitions and harsh passages: this is closely connected with his manner of speech and his habit of extemporising verses on any stimulus or on any occasion. Kâñî himself, it should be added, never collected and arranged his poems nor put the finishing touch to his Divân. Only at the instigation of the Reşât ‘l-Kuttaî Mehmed Râşîd Efendi were the poems which could still be found in existence collected by Nâşir and the Divân published. A portion of the poems have been lost. He wrote poems in Arabic and Persian in addition to Turkish.

His poetical works consist of numerous hymns, nazârs and takbîmân, kâṣida’s, chronograms and some hundred ghazals. What distinguishes his poems from those of other poets is his fondness for wit and humour, his humorous phraseology, while otherwise humour is entirely lacking in the old Ottoman poets.

A much higher estimate must be placed on Kâñî as a prose-writer in his Mînsâzâât and we have the very high opinion expressed by Abu ‘l-Ziyyâ Tawfîq that, as regards his style, a nation produces not more than five or six of his rank. In his letters Kâñî gives rein to his humorous mood and produces the most peculiar and unexpected flowers of speech. He might be compared with Rabelais. Many witty sayings and anecdotes of him are recorded. His happy disposition and his humour made him thoroughly
popular and gave his hearers and readers that attraction to him, his letters (of which about 120 exist) and his poems, which is only partly intelligible to our taste and ideas. His works are especially important for the phraseology, as he often uses popular expressions not found in the literary language and says most unusual and unexpected things.


KANîSA (plural kanîsât), synagoge, church, the arabisch form of the Aramaic knîsât. “meeting (place), school, synagogue” (cf. J. Levy, Neukbr. und Chald. Wörterbuch, ii. 355 sq.).

The Syriac form knîsût in the Peshitta on the New Testament is a rendering of swâvyh and sometimes also of kâlîsîya (cf. Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syr., i. col. 1773), whereas the form knîsîh in Christian Western Aramaic represents swâvyh as well as kâlîsîya (cf. Schultess, Lex. Syr. palæ., Berlin 1903, p. 95). The latter term is nearly always rendered by ta'zîy in the Peshitta The Lîsûn al- arab, viii. 83, 2 sq. is nearly right in so far as it derives kanîs from kanîsîh; al-Kha'fi (Sîhib al-Ghali, Cairo 1282, p. 193), however, rejects this view and expresses the opinion that the word denotes an especially Christian institution and goes back to kalîs, an abbreviated form of kâlîsîyah (kâlîsîya). Al-Bastânî also considers the word as being the arabised kâlîsîya (Muhit al-Muhib, Beyrouth 1886, p. 1847).

In Arabic kanîsa denotes the Jewish as well as the Christian place of worship; this appears also from the various statements of the lexica; some refer to churches, others to synagogues exclusively (cf. al-Djavhari, Şâhâb, Bûlûk 1282, i. 473 ult.; al-Zamakhschî, Arâs al-Bâzâgh, Cairo 1299, ii. 212, 20; Lîsûn al- Arab, loc. cit.; Yakût, Muğlam, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 314, 7). According to al-Fîrâzâbâdî, al-Kâmûs, Bûlûk 1272, i. 549; kanîs denotes the place of worship (mustâshâbâd) of the Jews, the Christians or the Kâfrî; cf. also Tadî al-Arâis, iv. 235 infra.

In early literature kanîsa is often found in the meaning of “church” two documents on papacy of the year 88 (707) mention the church of a monastery called (Munyat) Kanîsa Mîrâs in Egypt (Papryki Schott-Reimhard, i. ed. C. H. Becker, Heidelberg 1906, p. 111, g. line 4, p. 112, i. line 4). In a satirical verse Djarîr speaks of the churches of Taghhib (al-Mubarrad, al-Kâmîl, ed. Wright, p. 485, 5). The treaties which 'Umar or his generals are said to have concluded with the inhabitants of several towns usually contain stipulations concerning the kanîsât (al-Balâdîhûrî, Yâkût al-Bulûdân, ed. de Goeje, p. 1735; al-Yâ-kûbî, Târîkh, ed. Houtsma, ii. 167, 18; al-Tabarî, i. 2405, 8 sq., 2588, 7; Eutychius, ed. Cheikho, ii. 17, 7; Ibn 'Asikî, al-Târîkh al-kabîr, Damascus 1329 sqq., i. 178; cf. also Abû Yûsuf, Kit. al-Khârîjî, Bûlûk 1302, p. 80). In the Hadîth it is related how 'Umm Habîba and Umm Salama told the Prophet of a church in Abyssinia adorned with images (al-Buhîrî, Sahîh, bâb 48, 54; Dâma', bâb 70; Manâbî al-Anfûsî, bâb 57).


Maqârîsî denotes synagogues as well as churches by the word kanîs (al-Khâfî, Bûlûk 1270, ii. 464 sqq., 510 sqq.).

In Spain and in the Maghrib the Form Kanîsîya (perhaps influenced by iglesia) was in use; it is still current in Morocco and Tunisia (vgl. Dozy, Supplement, ii. 493).

In the modern language kanîs denotes a church, kantîs a synagogue (al-Bastânî, loc. cit.). For the Egyptian dialect cf. S. Spiro Bey, Arabic-English Dictionary, 2nd ed., Cairo 1923, 95.

Al-Kanîsa or al-Kanîsa al-Sawâdîs was a town with a stronghold in the frontier province of Northern Syria, which Harûn al-Rashid restored from its ruins (Yâkût, iv. 314; cf. i. 927, 20; al-Lisâkhrî, B G A, i. 63, 7; 68, 2; vgl. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 477 sqq.). — Al-Mu'âddâst, B G A, iii. 2, 453, 9 mentions a place K. al-Ma'âdûs at a day's journey from Arradân. — A harbour in Yemen on the Red Sea in the neighbourhood of Zabîd also bore the name of al-Kanîsa (al-Firâzâbâdî, loc. cit.; Tadî al-Arâis, loc. cit.). According to Tadî al-Arâis, loc. cit., Kunnisîya occurs in several names of places in Egypt.

On the rules for churches laid down by the Muslims cf. the art. Nâshir.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the literature mentioned in the art. S. Frankel, Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen, Leiden 1886, p. 275. (C. van Arendonk)

KANO (in Hausa Kanû), a town in the Central Sudân 300 miles west of Kûka and 290 E.S.E. of Sokoto, 1200 feet above sea-level, situated in 12° 27' N. Lat. and 8° 20' E. Long. (Greenw.). Kano lies in the middle of a marshy plain dominated by the isolated rocky hills of Goron Duchî and Dalâ. The town is surrounded by a fortified wall (birnî) 20 to 25 feet high and measuring, according to Barth, nearly 20 miles in circumference. A portion of the area thus mapped out is occupied by tilled fields especially in the West and North-west. The houses are grouped in the South between Dalâ and the wall. The town divided into two by a marshy pond called Dîkàrâ (Robinson: Jakhara) is formed of mud.
houses. Only the houses of great personages or of Arab traders or rich Hausa merchants are provided with an upper story. The number of inhabitants, estimated by Barth at 30,000, would, according to Monteil, amount to 50,000 or 60,000, according to Robinson, to 100,000, according to the reports of the English officials in Nigeria, to 200,000. This population comprises very diverse elements, Hausa, Fulah, Kanuri and Arab; of whom 2/3 (Robinson) or 4/5 (Monteil) are slaves. In addition to the fixed population there is a very large floating one, reaching, according to Monteil, the figure of 200,000 individuals a year.

This accession is explained by the economic role of Kano. The commercial metropolis of the whole of the Sudân and at the same time a much frequented stage on the pilgrim route to Mecca. Representatives of all the negro races from the mouth of the Niger and Senegambia to Bornu and Kordofan meet there with Tuaregs and Arabs from Gbadamós and Tripolitania. Every day a market is held there attended by over 30,000 people. Business is done through the intermediary of brokers, and owing to the scarcity of currency settlements are made most often with cowries; some transactions are carried through by simple barter. The principal articles of commerce are clothes and garments of local manufacture, leather, salt brought from Bilma, saton and above, the kola nut from the Western Sudân, which is perhaps the most important element in the commerce of Kano. To these we must add sugar from Egypt, gunpowder, paper, iron-mongery, cotton goods of European origin, ostrich feathers and ivory to a small extent and finally slaves. The articles sent to or brought from Gbadamós or Tripolitania are carried by Arabs settled in Kano to the number of 400 or 500. But the Sudânese trade, which makes up 4/5 of the total transactions, is entirely in the hands of Hausa merchants.

Kano is not only a great centre of commerce; it is also a centre of native industries. Weaving and dyeing flourish there. The manufacture of cotton goods is so active that the town has been given the name of the “Manchester of the Sudân.” Robes (tobi) dyed black are much esteemed and exported to all the neighbouring lands. Metal work occupies numerous smiths, who make hunting spears and stirrups as well as ornaments in copper and silver. The leather dyed yellow and red called morocco is very much esteemed and exported as far as Morocco and the markets of Tunisian and Tripolitania. The same is the case with the leatheracks indispensable for caravans.

The province of Kano is very fertile. As early as the xvith century we find Leo Africanus remarking the abundance of cattle, the richness of the soil, the extent of the fields of rice, cereals and cotton. The observations of modern travellers coincide with those of this early writer. The province of Kano, says Barth, includes 27 walled towns with 300,000 inhabitants and an equal number of slaves. “All the ground”, says Monteil, “is cultivated for a distance of 60 miles round the town.” Robinson notes the large number of separate farm places surrounded by plantations of tobacco, indigo, cotton and dura (isorhüm vulgaris).

A tradition noted by Robinson attributes the foundation of Kano to a group of refugees from Daura, a place three days’ journey to the North, led by a certain Kano, son of Bawo. The latter, it is said, built a new town at the foot of the rocks of Goron Duchi and Dala, on the top of which had long been planted. According to Barthe, Kono was the son of Biran and brother of Daura. He would thus be one of the seven “legitimate Hausas” (see Hauša, iii. 391b). Another tradition to the effect that Kano had been appointed by his father Sarekëbala, i.e. chief of the other, attests the antiquity of this industry in the town. The date of the foundation is uncertain but it seems that by then Kano was already of some importance. In the second half of the xvith century A. D. education was held in honour in the town. Scholars had settled there on returning from the pilgrimage and were teaching theology and Maliki law. The celebrated “Abd al-Kadir al-Marjâfl taught there. At the beginning of the following century, Leo mentions Kano as a town filled with rich merchants and artisans. These facts seem to invalidate Barth’s statement that at this date Kano could only have been a citadel built on the rock of Dala. The king of Kano had subjected to his authority the kings of Seggeg and Katene, but he was in his turn conquered by the Sultân of Timbuktu, Muhammed Askia, and was reduced to the state of a tributary. Later the kings of Kano had to endure incessant fighting against the Sultân of Bornu, who even annexed Kano to their empire. The Bornuâin governor, however, was driven out by king Korâa and Kano regained its independence. The invasion of the Fulah at the beginning of the nineteenth century increased the commercial importance of Kano, as the merchants of Katene sought refuge there after the capture of the latter town by Oùmmâ Dan Fodio in 1814. Kano was, however, not long in falling in its turn. On the dismemberment of the Fulah empire, the town was included in the kingdom of Sokoto. The country was administered by a governor (sekül), who paid the Sultân of Sokoto an annual tribute (100 horses, 15,000 robés and other garments, 10,000 turbans etc. in the time of Bâdi). The Anglo-French agreements of Aug. 5, 1884, and June 14, 1898 having placed Sokoto within the zone of British influence, British representatives attempted to settle in Kano. These first attempts were unfortunate. Rev. C. H. Robinson (1893) and Wallis, a British official of Nigeria, were able to visit the town where the French traveller Monteill had already spent three months (1891—1892) in his journey from St. Louis to Lake Tchad, but Bishop Tagwell’s mission was badly received and he had to withdraw. The effective occupation of Kano only took place in 1908 after a military expedition led by Sir Frederick Lugard.

Bibliography: Leo Africanus, ed. by R. Brown, London (Hakluyt Society 1896 iii. 829—830, 848—849; Description de l’Afrique, vii., book ed. by Schefer iii. 305; O. Temple, Notes on the Tribes etc. of Northern Nigeria 2, 1922, pp. 463—486; Sir F. D. Lugard, The Dual Mandate in Nigeria 2, 1923; H. Barth, Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa, 1856—58, ii. 97, 107, 121—125, 143, v. 358; Schon, Dictionary of the Hausa Language, London 1876, s. v. Kano, p. 103—104; Nigerian District Gazettes; Schön, Magâna Hausa, London 1885, pp. 263—265; Harris, Hausa Stories, Weston under Mare, not dated, pp. 82—89; P. L. Monteill, De Saint Louis a Tripoli par le Tchad, Paris 1894, Chap. x; C. H. Robinson,
KANSU, a frontier province in the north-west of China proper; it is bounded on the south and east by the provinces of Sze-čuán, Shensi and Shansi, in the west and north by the territory of Kukuon, Chinese Turkestan (formerly included in Kansu, but since 1854 the separate province of Sin-Kiang) and Mongolia. With its present area of 5910 geogr. sq. m. = 125,483 sq. miles, Kansu is the third largest province of China but as regards density of population it is materially inferior to all the other provinces of China with the exception of Kuangsi. The province first formed under the Emperor Kūibīlāi in 1282 A. D. is said to have received its name from two towns in the extreme north-west, Kānčōu and Sūčōu; both towns are mentioned in the Khazīd el-Ālam and in Gardīzī (cf. W. Barthold, Olocti o połweakie v Irăn, p. 92), the former in the form Khamā (in the Mongol period Kamān or Kamči), the second as Shākēr (later Shūkā or Sükē).

Down till the xiiiith century A. D. this territory was for the most part under the rule of foreign peoples of Turki (Cigur) or Tibetan (Tangut) origin; immediately before the Mongol conquest there was a Tangut kingdom here under the rule of the Hia (or Sī-ku) dynasty (1032—1227) with its capital in Ning-hia. Rashīd al-Dīn (ed. Blochet, p. 484 sqq.) in giving a list of the twelve provinces (zhūn, chin. shên) reckons two with capitals Kincānǐ (now Sīan-fu, capital of Shensi) and Kamči (Kančōu) respectively to Tangut (Tangkūt). In reality Kančōu was at this time the capital of Kansu: Kansu and Shensi then as now combined in one governorship, the only difference being that the residence of the governor was in the capital of Shensi and not, as now, in the capital of Kansu. The boundary between Kansu and Shensi was formed by the Hoang-ho, so that the present capital of Kansu, Lančōu-fu, then belonged to Shensi. In connection with Kincānǐ Marco-Polo (ed. Vavon and Cordier, ii. 24) mentions prince Mangalai (d. 1280; called Mingkalai by Rashīd al-Dīn), Kūibīlāi's third son, as ruler of Tangut, while Rashīd al-Dīn (p. 495 sq.) gives his son Ananda; Rashīd al-Dīn says that Ananda was the founder of the dominance of Islam in this region. He was born about 1270 (in the early years of the xiiiith [xivith] century, he was 30 years of age, ibid., p. 603, 6) and was brought up by Muhammadan foster-parents (ibid., p. 599 sqq.); but it was only after the conversion of Sulṭān Ghaźān in Persia (i.e. about 1295; cf. GHAŻĀN, ii. 1149 sq.) that he openly professed Islam (Rashīd al-Dīn, p. 602). The greater part of his army, said to have numbered 150,000 men, was converted to Islam (ibid., p. 600); the people of Tangut, except the peasants, likewise adopted Islam (ibid., p. 599). Taken to task by his cousin, Kūibīlāi's successor Timūr (1294—1307), for his conversion, Ananda remained faithful to Islam and after a period of interruption was restored to his dominion. In 1307 a party wished to raise him to the throne; he was therefore killed after the success of another claimant, Timūr's nephew Khāshān (1307—1311) (d'Ohsson, Histoire des Mongols, i. 525 sqq.). Not till 1323 was Ananda's son Uruklīmī again appointed prince of Tangut (Blochet, in Rashīd al-Dīn, p. 317 note 3; cf. W. Rockhill, The Land of the Lamas, London 1891, p. 40), although no Muhammadan risings are mentioned for this period. The story which reached Timūr's lands about 1398 to the effect that the founder of the Ming dynasty had had about 100,000 Muslims slaughtered and had completely rooted Islam out of his kingdom (Niğān al-Dīn Shāmī and 'Abd al-Razzāk al-Samarkandi in Barthold, Ulugbek, Petrograd 1918, p. 42 sqq., note 6) finds no confirmation in any Chinese source. Under Manchu rule (from 1644) risings of the Muslims of Kansu are mentioned by 1646 and 1648 and have been several times repeated in the xviiith and xixth centuries.

In Kansu those who profess Islam are at the present day certainly more numerous than in the other provinces (the figures are very variously estimated; cf. the article CHINA, i. 847). The most important centre of Muslim life and culture was until quite recently Iločōu (south-west of the capital Lančōu-fu), "the Chinese Mecca". Iločōu was at an earlier date considered a purely Muslim city (about 30,000 inhabitants) in the year 1884 the traveller G. Potanin (Tangutsko-Tibetskaya Ukraina Kitaya, St. Petersburg 1893, i. 169) was told that there were no longer any Muslims at all there; later the Muslims were only allowed to live in a separate suburb there (Mission d'Ollont, p. 235). The Muhammadan area in Kansu is divided into two separate tracts, Iločōu-Sining in the south-west and Ninghia-Kintsip'ü in the north-east; in the intervening area the Chinese have built hill-forts (ibid., p. 253). Kintsip'ü, sometimes called "the Chinese Medina", was first founded by the religious reformer and leader of a rebellion, Ma Hua-lung (cf. CHINA, i. 849).

In the xviiith century there still seem to have been more Muslims in Shensi than in Kansu (Dabry de Thiersant, Le Mahometisme en Chine, i. 41 and 156); their language and dress were also different from those of the Chinese (ibid., p. 155). This suggests that the modern Dangans or Tungans (cf. CHINA, i. 850) did not adopt the Chinese language until a later date.

The rebellions were usually local movements, not general risings under the banner of Islam. During the great rebellion in Kansu, which began in 1871, there was perfect quiet in Shensi (Dabry,
The rebellion which had begun in 1861 or 1862 in Shensi was only spread to Kansu by the expulsion of the rebels from Shensi. The fighting was carried on with even greater bitterness in Kansu than in Shensi and had the most disastrous effects on the Muslim population as well as on the economic prosperity of the province generally. Just as at an earlier period the number of Muslims in Shensi had been considerably reduced by the expulsion of the rebels into Kansu, so now (since 1872) a considerable part of the Muslim population of Kansu has migrated westwards under the leadership of the valiant Boyan-akhün. The birthplace of Boyan-akhün (also written in Chinese Bo yan-hu or Bai Yen-hu; his Muslim name was Muhammad Ayyüb) is variously given; he had lived for a long time in Pekin and only moved to Kansu shortly before the rising. In December, 1877, Boyan-akhün with the remainder of his army crossed the Russian frontier into Semirech'ë; the Chinese authorities demanded (of course without success) that he should be handed over to them. After his death in 1883, he was celebrated in songs as a national hero by the Dungans settled in Semirech'ë; whether his memory is still revered in Kansu also, does not seem to have been ascertained. The last rising (1895/1896) was started by the Salar and is said to have been provoked by the proclamation of their Chinese governor ordering that in future one Chinese should be regarded as equal in value to ten Muslims. There seems to have been no activity in Kansu against the present Republic government.


**KANSU**

Al-Malik Al-Ashraf Saif Al-Din Baïberdî (i.e. Baïberdî's Mamlûk) al-Ǧûrî (originally pronounced in Eastern Persian with ǧ and later there and in Egypt with ǧ), of the "al-Ǧûrî" division of Mamlûks from Afghanistan, which was specially instructed in the Korān and theological subjects. He served for a long time as a khâṣîkî (lieutenant) and Dîjāmâr and only when he was about 40, he became governor of the province of al-Bahiya [see Bahriya], and in 893 (1490) Hâjî [q.v.], al-Husaynî (president of the military court) in Aleppo, where he gave proof of his great energy in the suppression of a rising. In 903 (1497) he became Mahdîyâl-dîn al-Dînî (commander of a thousand Mamlûks) and two years later Râis aṣârâr al-Dînî (commander of the Mamlûk officers) under Sulṭân Dîjâlî [q.v.]. The latter's rival and successor Tûmânbâbi during his brief reign in 906 (1500) appointed him Grand Dâwâdâr [see Dâwâdâr] and, as often happened in the last period of the Mamlûk dynasty, at the same time Grand Ustâdâr (Grand Chamberlain), vizier and Kâşîf al-Kâshâf (chief inspector of domains). The choice of the Mamlûks therefore, as a result of his high position, naturally fell upon him, when after a few months they were discontented with Tûmânbâbî; after considerable hesitation he accepted, as he was now over sixty. By inflicting heavy taxes and levies and issuing a depreciated currency he ruthlessly raised the money to pay the old Mamlûks and to buy new ones in order to create a following. In his financial measures he did not even respect the privileges of the pious foundations and by depreciating the currency in commerce and trade, and extorted money from merchants, women, eunuchs and from his own court-officials down to the very door-keeper. All this is made a very grave reproach against him by his contemporaries; it was even cast up against him in the Friday sermon. The chronicles number him among the "bad Sulṭân". He hurried on the financial ruin of his country by over-heavy taxes on the sales of goods and by oppressive customs duties, even although he made good use of a great part of the money by strengthening fortresses (notably Aleppo), making roads and wells in the Hijâz and in providing water by good aqueducts (e.g. the aqueduct in Cairo). One great source of revenue in these days was the harbour and customs dues on Indian goods, which then had to be brought to Europe via Egypt (Aden, Jeddâ, Suéz, Alexandria) or Syria (Hermûr, Başra, Aleppo). To avoid these oppressive dues, the Portuguese staked everything on finding the sea route to India, which Vasco de Gama finally succeeded in doing. The Portuguese then gradually established themselves on the coasts of India and brought their great quantities of goods directly to Europe by the Cape of Good Hope. In this way the excessively high costs of passing through Egyptian ports as well as the cost of overland transit were avoided and the profits went to the Portuguese. These losses in revenue could not be tolerated by Sulṭân al-Ǧûrî; besides, he felt it his duty as first ruler in Islam, as plenipotentiary of the Caliph and as a servant of the holy places of Mekka and Medina to come to the help of the oppressed Muslims in India. The first encounter with the Portuguese took place in 909 (1503) when the latter robbed an Egyptian ship coming from India of its cargo and sent it to the bottom. Sulṭân al-Ǧûrî tried at first to get redress by peaceful means by sending the Grand Prior of the Sinai monastery to the Pope with a letter of complaint, threatening to destroy the holy places in Jerusalem if King Manuel of Portugal did not cease from oppressing Muslims in India and from conducting hostilities against his merchant-ships. The mission failed in its object as King Manuel knew quite well that the Sultan's interest in the great profits derived from Christian pilgrimages would prevent him from going to extremes. Sulṭân al-Ǧûrî had
therefore to make up his mind to equip a considerable fleet, especially as 17 Arab ships were destroyed in 910 (1504) in the Indian harbour of Panane. The Sulṭān was interrupted even in the building of his fleet by the fact that the Knights of St. John in Khodais captured a consignment of wood intended for Egypt. To secure a base for his naval war against the Portuguese, the Sulṭān dispatched several expeditions to keep the coast of Arabia under his control; his able general Ḥusain fortifled Djiidda with walls and towers and made the harbour a base for the fleet. The first encounter in the Indian harbour of Shāhul between Ḥusain and Lorenzo, son of the Portuguese viceroy, in 914 (1508) ended in favour of the Egyptians, who were supported by the fleet of the Muslim governor of Dji, Lorenzo perished and the Admirals' ship was burned. But the very next year the Admiral avenged his son's death, destroyed a part of the Egyptian fleet (the Indian ships kept aloof) and forced Ḥusain to a hurried retreat into the Red Sea. Hostilities between the Portuguese and Egyptian continued in the following years, a strong Portuguese fleet even attacked Aden but without any lasting success. A new fleet was then sent to India by the Sulṭān. But when it reached Djiidda, the political situation in Egypt had changed. In 922 (1517) the Ottoman Sulṭān Selim I seized Cairo and thereby became protector of the Holy Cities as well as master of the western coast of Arabia. Selim Selim, who cared little about expansion towards India, as his interests lay in the direction of Asia Minor and the Balkan lands, at the request of the Mekkans, recalled Ḥusain, in spite of his successes, along with his subordinates, who held other parts of Arabia, and had him executed on account of his numerous acts of cruelty to the people of Arabia. The Egyptian fleet had to return. The Portuguese on their side were content with the successes they had won, as they had succeeded in diverting commerce from the route through the Red Sea. After the appearance of the Portuguese in the East and the alteration of the trade-route the most important source of revenue for Egypt gradually dried up so that Sulṭān al-Ğûrî, for want of an intelligent system of taxation, had to fall back on extortion and the oppression of his subjects as he could do nothing else in view of the disorganisation of the finances. Thus it was not possible for him to pay his Mamlûks well so that his rule now lacked a firm support. His foreign policy also was unsuccessful. From fear of the powerful Selim, he made an alliance with the latter's most bitter enemy Ismā'îl [q. v.], the ruler of Persia. In 922 (spring of 1516) Sulṭān Selim entered Asia Minor, ostensibly to fight against Shāh Ismā'îl. Sulṭān al-Ğûrî went to Aleppo under the pretext of acting as intermediary between the two rulers. To show his peaceful intentions he had brought with him the Caliph and the chief kāfîs but had in secret promised Ismā'îl his support. Selim learned of this through spies and was not deceived by the friendly reception accorded his envoys by Sulṭān al-Ğûrî. To make it unseizable, he maltreated al-Ğûrî's envoy, had his attendants killed and sent him back ignominiously on a rule, with a declaration of war. Sulṭān al-Ğûrî's cause was hopeless from the first as he was not sure of his generals. He could neither protect his subjects from the extortionists and acts of cruelty of his governors nor could he rely on their fidelity. Although several times warned, he entrusted the command of the left wing to the governor of Aleppo, Khaṭīb; but at the first charge the latter left the battle with his troops and soon after the beginning of the battle the aged Sulṭān fell from his horse, struck with apoplexy. According to his biographer, his body was never found; others say that a Mamlûk cut off the head from the body and took it to Sulṭān Selim. On the rapid occupation of Syria and Egypt and the last desperate battle of the Mamlûks see the articles Sulṭān and Ǧumâkâr. Although Sulṭān al-Ğûrî had tackled his task with energy, he could neither make friends nor bring order into the chaos of the finances. His attention was always directed only to immediate profit and to making ends meet somehow, while he was not sure of his Mamlûks and Amirs. He had no sense of justice nor a proper appreciation of relative strengths. Besides there was his aversion to the new arms, artillery and titles, due to a certain disinclination of using long range weapons, which it did not require personal bravery to carry. The rapid victory of the Turks and the superiority of the Portuguese was certainly to some extent due to the objection of Sulṭān al-Ğûrî and his knights to proper training with firearms, as is especially mentioned by Ibn Ǧiyâs.[2][3] In the Kurân in the Suratānnya Library, Cairo, written for him, his name is spelt Kansaw Chaww; see E. Denison Ross in Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, ii. 334 (London 1922); Red. Bibliography: Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen, v. 334–416; v. Hammer, Gesch. des Osmanischen Reiches, Pest 1827 sqq., ii. 462 sqq. (in both, the principal Oriental manuscript sources as well as the contemporary chronicles and consular reports of the west are given). Ibn Ǧiyâs deals with the reign of Sulṭān al-Ğûrî in the Badâ'ī al-Zujur [see Ibn Ǧiyâs]; but only the end is printed in the Cairo edition, the years 906–922 are contained in the Paris manuscript, Bibl. Nat., de Siane, Cat. No. 1824 (years 906–913) and in the St. Petersburg manuscript, Rosen, Les manuscrits arabes de l'Hist. des Langues orient., No. 469 (the years 913–922). The full biography by Ibn al-Ḥânballi has not previously been utilised; see Ibn al-Ḥânballi's Durr al-Ḥabab fi Tarikh Ayîn Ḥilâb, Ms. Vienna, Flügel, Die arab. Handschr. der Hofbibl., ii. No. 118, (cf. Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Lit., iii. 368), f. 176b sqq.; J. J. Marcel, Hist. de l'Égypte depuis la conquête des Arabes, etc., Paris 1834, p. 407–11; W. Muir, The Mameluke Slave Dynasty, London 1896, p. 187–201. On his building operations or detailed particulars will be given in the coming work on inscriptions in Aleppo in the sections "citadels and city-walls" on his buildings in Damascus see M. Sobernheim, Die Inschriften der Zeit der Zitate von Damaskus, No. 24–26 in Der Islam, xii. (1921); on commerce in his time see B. Moritz, Ein Firmen des Sultans Selm in der Fetscher, Ed. Sachau, gewidmet, Berlin 1915, p. 425–27. On his wars with Portugal see S. Rupe, Gesch. des Zeitalters der Entdeckungen (Samml. Ocken, ii. 9) and H. Schaefer, Gesch. Portugals, iii., Hamburg 1850, p. 200 sqq.; R. S. Whiteway, Rise of Portuguese Power in India, London 1899. For his coins see Or. Coins, in the Cat. Brit. Mus. iv. 214–216. (M. Sobernheim)

**THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLÂM, II.**

721
KANTARA, plur. kānātir, means in Arabic (1) bridge, particularly a bridge of masonry or stone; also (2) aqueduct (especially in the plural), dam, and finally (3) high building, castle (similarly kāsīl = aqueduct from kāsīl = castle- lum; see kānātir); cf. Tilī al-ʿArabī, iii. 509; 192, Supplement, ii. 35; B.G.A. iv. 334; and particularly R. Geyer in the S. R. A. Ak. Wien, 1905, vol. citix, No. 6, p. 114—119. The original meaning of the word, "arch", is found in the earliest Arabic lexicographers; cf. Dozy-de Goeje, Description de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne par Edret, p. 369. Dīlīr, a bridge of wood or boats, is the opposite of kāntāra, which is of stone; in time, however, the two words came to be used as synonyms (see Dozy, op. cit., i. 194).

No satisfactory explanation has yet been given of the origin of the word. The oldest reference is found in a verse of Tārās (iv. 22; see Tāwāsīt of the Six Ancient Arabic Poets, ed. Ahlwardt, 1870, p. 55). On account of this early occurrence of the word, Yāḥyā (Muḥammad, ed. Wüstfenfeld, iv. 187) considers the word to be genuine Arabic. But we may with considerable certainty regard it as a loan-word. Volland and Geyer thought it borrowed from Latin or Greek. The former connected (Z.D.M.G. li. 376; Z.A., viii. 160) kantāra with the mediaeval Latin word cenitrum (French cintre, arch, vault), while Geyer (op. cit., p. 118—119) sought the original either in κατάντης = basket, καταντίρις = wickerwork used in the making of roofs and buildings, or in κάντρων, κάντριον = depository (cf. also κάντριτ = rousing, from which Volland, Z.D.M.G., li. 302, derived Egyptian-Arabic kāntūr). But all these explanations had best be rejected, because there are phonetic objections to them and they partly rely for the meanings of the words cited on obsolete, far-fetched glosses of, on the other hand, Fränkel in the Z.A., ix. 279 sqq. and Noldeke, op. cit., p. 409. Kantāra is most probably derived from the Aramaic and, as Noldeke, op. cit., thinks, in the first place from kāʿīrā = bond, arch (see Payne-Smith, Thesaurus Syriac, col. 3591; note especially kāʿīrā in Bar Bahlūl, Lexicon, col. 1765). The above mentioned word dīlīr also comes from the Aramaic (Fränkel, Die aram. Fremdwörter im Arab., Leiden 1866, p. 285 and D. H. Müller in IV. Z. K. M., i. 31), but can actually be traced back to the Assyrian or Accadian; cf. Meissner in the Z.A., ix. 269, and Zimmerm, Akkadische Fremdwörter, Leipzig 1915, p. 31.

Al-Kantara has survived in Spanish in the diminutives alKańtarrila = little bridge, gutter and alkańtarritolo = arched aqueduct; see Dozy-Engelmann, Grammaire des mots espagnols et portugais dérivés de l’Arabe, Leiden 1869, p. 47; Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana por la Real Academia Española 13, Madrid 1893, s. v.

Al-Kantara and Al-Kanīr are frequently found — sometimes with descriptive additions e.g. Kānantār Firʿawn — as names for places like quarters of a city (notably in Baghdad) in areas where Arabic was, or is, spoken in the mediaeval or modern East. In his geographical dictionary (Mudjam, ed. Wüstfenfeld, iv. 180, 187—192, vi. 179—180) Yāḥyā gives a dozen places named al-Kantara and four called Kānantār; cf. also, for example, the inscriptions of al-Tābari, ed. de Goeje, p. 759—760, and Ibn al-Mārī, al-ʿAṣālī, ed. Tornberg, xiii. 790. For the numerous districts of Baghdad named after particular bridges under the Caliphate see the index to Guy le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbāsid Caliphate, London 1900, p. 368.

Of the places named al-Kantara, the following are worthy of special mention:

1. An oasis on the southern slopes of the Atlas in Algeria; it is a narrow pass through which run the road and railway from Constantine to the desert regions; it is a station on the Constantine-Biskra line, 35 miles north of the latter.

This, the most northern oasis in Africa, consists of three villages with about 3,500 inhabitants and possesses a very dense date grove. From its situation it was an important military station and, as Roman inscriptions found there show, settled in ancient times. It is presumably identical with the station Ad Caetara Hereditis of the Roman itineraries; see Dessau in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclo. der klassischen Altert. Wissenschaft, iii. 1345. The name al-Kantara is derived from the Roman bridge, restored in 1866 by the French, which spans in one huge arch the ravine, the 150 feet wide Fumma al-Ṣahāra = the mouth of the Safārah (so-called by the natives), through which flows the Wād Al-Kantara; cf. for example, Vivien de St. Martin, Diction. de Geographie Universelle, Paris 1879, i. 66 and Kohl, Reisen und wundare Züge aus Algerien und Tunis, 1883, p. 322.

2. Al-Kantara, a little town of great antiquity in the province of Caceres (district of Estremadura) in Spain, near the Portuguese frontier, with 3,200 inhabitants. It receives its name from an imposing granite bridge, built in 150 A. D., which crosses the Tagus in six great arches to the north-west of the town. The place is also famous for the order of knighthood founded there in 1170 to defend the frontier against the Moors, which became called the Alcantara Order after its headquarters were moved to this town in 1215; see Baederker’s Spain and Portugal 1, Leipzig 1913, p. 455.

3. A small town with a mosque in Egypt, on the Asiatic side of the Suez Canal, halfway between Port Saʿīd and Ismāʿīlīya, a station on the railway connecting these two towns. It lies on a low narrow tongue of rising ground, which runs out between the large Menzaleh lake in the north and the little Balāb lake in the south. But it hardly takes its name from this "land bridge", but from a bridge which already existed here probably in the early Middle Ages.

The Arab geographer Ibn Faṣīl Allāh al-Ummārī, who wrote about 741 (1340), mentions the arch of a bridge, called Kantarāt al-Dīlīr, near the old caravan station of al-ʿAṣālī, in which the superfluous waters flowed into the desert at the time of the Nile’s inundation. There was still a bridge here at the beginning of the nineteenth century, built over a canal connecting the two lakes already mentioned. The modern al-Kantara has only arisen on its present site since the making of the Suez Canal. The old settlement was a short half-hour’s journey to the east and is marked by the mound of ruins Tell Aḥā Sēfe (on the maps also called Tell al-ʿAḥmar). This place may be regarded as the key to Egypt, and it has always been used by conquerors as the gateway to the Nile valley. Its strategic importance led to its being occupied in remote antiquity. Tell Aḥā Sēfe (with ruins of a temple of Rameses II and remains of the Ptolemaic and Roman period)
KANTARA — KANUN-I ESASI

marks the site of the ancient Egyptian town of Zaru (Τζαρ), the capital of the fourteenth district of Lower Egypt, which was already a fortress in the time of the Middle Kingdom. In the later classical and Byzantine literature it appears as Sile, Sele (Selle); according to a Latin inscription found here, it had a Roman garrison in 288 and was later also the see of a bishop. In the Middle Ages it was called al-‘Aḵula (on the name al-‘Aḵula = “the bend” see above s.v. Dair al-‘Aḵula), a name which was temporarily supplanted by that of the castle of al-Ḵuṣair during the Mamluk period. In the World War (1914—1918) al-Kantara played an important part in the struggle for the Suez Canal. From November, 1914, to March, 1916, there were frequent encounters there between English and Turkish troops; cf. thereon, for example, Baer, Der Volkerkrieg. Eine Chronik der Ereignisse seit dem 1. Juli 1914, Stuttgart 1914 sq., iv. 220—232, viii. 367, xi. 318, xvii. 47 sq., 128, 130, 132.

In remote antiquity as well as in the late Middle Ages and modern times, al-Kantara was the point of departure for the caravan road from Egypt to Syria. Since the World War the new railway line to Syria has branched off here from the Port Said—Suez line, and runs from al-Kantara via Kaṭya, al-‘Ariṣ and Qahara to Ludd, where it links up with the line from Yafā to Jerusalem.


5. Kaṭarāt Zaynab in the valley of the Nahr Bahrūt in Syria, an ancient Roman aqueduct of which considerable remains exist at the present day; according to Arab legend, it was built by Queen Zenobia (Zaynab); cf. Fr. Müller, Studien über Zenobia und Palmyra, Diss. Königsberg 1902, p. 14 sq.

6. Kaṭāṭir Firāw ("Pharaoh’s aqueduct"), a great aqueduct in the south of Syria, which, beginning at Dillī, at the western foot of the lava plateau of Lēdā (west of Ḥawrān), runs in a south-western direction for some sixty miles as far as Mukās (Gadarra), providing many villages with the necessary drinking-water in the summer months. It is identified by Wetstein — probably rightly — with the Kaṭanār mentioned by Ḥamza al-Isfahānī (Amadā, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 117). But the Ghassāni̊d Dhābala b. al-Ḫārijī, who reigned about 500 A.D., and hardly as Ḥamza says, be the builder of this marvellous piece of work; see Nöldeke, Die ghassāni. Fürsten ... in the Abh. Fr. Akad., 1887, iv. 50; it certainly dates back to ancient times. For further information see Wetstein, Reiserbericht über Hauran und die Trachonîn, Berlin 1860, p. 123—125.

The diminutive ʿKūnaitira (popularly ʿKūntira or ʿKenēṭri) is occasionally used as a place name, e.g. a village in the district of Djiwān (Eastern Jordan); see Baedeker’s Palestine and Syria (1912, p. 268. (M. Streck)

KANUN, the name of a month, which is found as early as in inscriptions from Palmyra (see S. A. Cook, A Glossary of the Arabic Inscriptions, s. v.) and corresponds to Mareššāwān. It later appears among the Syriac names of the months (see Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syr., s. v.) as K. ḥadīm or ḥadīm and K. ḥray or ḥraṣā. Here the two K. are the ninth and tenth months respectively. Al-Birrānī, Kitāb al-ʿAṣar al-kabīr, ed. Sachau, p. 60, transcribes the Syriac forms exactly as K. ḥadīm and K. ḥray. In Arabic terminology they are called K. al-ʿaṣarā‘ and K. al-ʿabbarīn. In the Ḥadīth the former appears in a remarkable connection. In Muslim, Aṣḥaba, Trad. 99, a reason is added for the regulation, often mentioned elsewhere, that vessels should be kept covered: "for there is a night in the year in which the wasa‘ passes no uncovered vessel". In another version of the same tradition it is added: "foreigners (ʿalāḏi̊m) among us used to fear this in ʿKūntir al-ʿaṣarā‘". (A. J. Wensinck)

KANUN, a musical instrument, consisting of a flat thin quadrilateral box string with wire chords, which is laid on the knees and played with a key of metal fixed on the forefinger, like the zither (Lane, Modern Egyptians, ii. 70, 72; Salvador Daniel, Musique Arabe, p. 37).

KANUN (from the Greek κανών), canon, custom, law. The development of the Muslim empire, its vast conquests which brought it into contact with peoples of very different characters, who for the most part had laws already codified, the rise of commerce and industries and the institution of regular troops forced the governors to establish alongside of the sharīʿa or religious law a series of special enactments by the application of the principle of ṣafṣa‘ lā x-. It is these edicts that are called kanūn (plur. kanūnī). The Berbers give this name to their own statutes, their customary law; see Hanoteau and Letourneur, La Kabylie et les coutumes Kabyles, Paris 1873, ii. and iii.; Morand, Les Kanouns du Maâd in the Études de droit musulman algérien, Algiers 1910; Masquary, Formation des cités chez les populations arabes sidentaires, Paris 1886, p. 74 sqq.; Archives berbères, i. and ii.; Le droit Kabyle, 2nd ed., Paris 1917; Henri Basset, Essai sur la littérature des Berbères, Algiers 1919, chapter v.: La littérature juridique des Kanouns.

(Ch. Huart)

KANUN-I ESASI, "fundamental law", the name given to the constitution of the Ottoman empire dated Dhu l-Ḥijja 7, 1293 (Dec. 24, 1876), promulgated by a khatīf-i sharif of the same date addressed to the Grand Vizier Mîhdât Pasha. It maintains the order of succession of the family of Oghlan and explicitly gives the Sultan the title of Khalifa (art. 3), protector of the Muslim religion (art. 4). It confirms his sacred and non-responsible character (art. 5). It enumerates the rights of Ottoman subjects (art. 8—26), the duties and responsibilities of the ministers (art. 27—38) and other officials (art. 29—41); establishes a parliament (medfīs-i ʿumūmî), consisting of two chambers, the Senate (Hüy̲î-tî dāyān) and the
Chamber of Deputies (Haz'a-i mev'ârîhânî); the first is to consist of members nominated directly by the Sultan and its numbers must not exceed a third of the second (art. 60), which is elected by the people on a ratio of one deputy for every 50,000 Turkish subjects (art. 65). It establishes the permanency of the magistracy (art. 81). No tax can be levied if it is not passed by a law, kânîn (art. 86). The administration of the provinces is based on the principles of decentralisation (tevest-i ne'mâhîye-ye) and the separation of powers (tevest-i nevecâfî-ye); it is based on elected municipal councils (art. 108–112). In case of trouble, the state has the right to proclaim an autocratic government, idârî purfî; it is the state of siege which is meant by this name (art. 113); banishment on the Sultan's decision is provided for those who stir up trouble. The principle of compulsory elementary education is laid down (art. 114). In spite of the formal terms in art. 115, according to which no single article of the constitution could be suppressed or not put into operation for any reason or under any pretext, the fundamental law of the empire, although continuing to figure at the head of the Sâlimâmê (official annals), was actually suspended after the fall of Mahat Pasha and only re-established by the military revolution which marked the close of the reign of 'Abd al-Hamid II.

The same name was given to the Persian constitution proclaimed by a firman (royal proclamation) dated Djam II 14, 1324 (Aug. 5, 1906) and promulgated on Dhu-l-K'sda 14, 1324 (Dec. 30, 1906) in the reign of Muaffar al-Din Shah. It deals only with the formation and activities of the national assembly; it was granted in reply to the demand of the refugees in the English legation. A supplementary constitution, promulgated by Muhammad 'Ali, successor to Muaffar al-Din, on Shâban 29, 1325 (Oct. 7, 1907), laid the foundation for constitutional law in Persia. It laid down more especially that Shi'i Islam is the official religion of the State, that Tîhrân is the capital, that the national flag is green, white and red (in three horizontal stripes) with the emblem of the Lion and Sun. It provided for the equality of citizens of Persia before the law, the protection of life and property; arrests could not take place without a written order from the President of the Tribunal of Justice. It recognises the freedom of the press, except for heretical publications or those hurtful to religion, as well as the right of association and assembly. Legislative power is divided between two chambers. The ministers must be Muslims, they are responsible to the two chambers; lastly it provides for the establishment of provincial and departmental councils (andaman).


(Z. C. Harut)

Sultân Sulaimân completed these ordinances by issuing several Kânûn-nâmê's. The one reorganised the administration of the military fiefs (zâmî, timâr) established by Murâd I; the second codified the administration of the farms in Egypt; the third laid down the rights and duties of the râfirî, "subjects" Muslim and non-Muslim in respect of feudalities; the fourth dealt solely with the police regulations and the penal laws.


(Z. C. Harut)

KÂPLAN GÎRÂY, the name of two Khân of the Crimean in the eighteenth century.

1. KÂPLAN GÎRÂY I reigned three times: 1110–1120 (1707–1708), 1125–1128 (1713–1716) and 1143–1149 (1730–1736). He died on the island of Chios in Shabîbân, 1151 (Nov.-Dec., 1738). Immediately after the death of his father Sâmilîî, in Shabîbân, 1147 (Nov.-Dec., 1704), he set up as a claimant to the throne but was not proclaimed Khân till after the death of his brother Ghâzî II. His own three depictions were on each occasion the result of the unfortunate course of military operations; the first (according to Sâmilîî, 9 months before the battle of Poltawa, i.e. Oct., 1708) after an unsuccessful campaign against the (then not yet wholly islamised) Circassians, the second as a result of his arriving too late on the scene of operations on the Danube, the third (when he was now enfeebled by old age and illness) after his campaign to Persia, by which without even reaching the frontiers of Persia he exposed his own country to the invasion of the Russians. He was generally regarded as a skilful politician but an unfortunate general.

2. KÂPLAN GÎRÂY II, grandson of Kâplan Gîrây I and son of Khân Sâmilîî, in Shabîbân, 1158 (Jan.-Mar., 1770). He fought unsuccessfully against the Russians in the Dobrudja, was falsely accused of having had dealings with the enemy and deposed on Shabîbân 4, 1184 (Nov. 23, 1770). He died in Rabî II, 1185 (July-Aug., 1771) of the plague at the age of 32.


KÂPLAN MUSTÂFÄ PASHA, a native of Merzifon, an Ottoman general and statesman of the time of Sultan Mehmed IV (1648–87), one of the ablest and most successful collaborators of the Grand Vizier Köprülü Ahmed Fâşîl Pasha and therefore closely involved in Turkey's struggle under the Köprülü's to regain her old position of power.

He was brought up in the court service, was Şiihâr of the Sultan and in 1650 was appointed Wâzîr and Wâli of Baghdad. He spent a number of years as Wâli of important provinces, in Wân, Konya and Damascus, until the Hungarian campaign gave him an opportunity to distinguish
himself, notably before Neuthald in 1663, at Kaśnica and elsewhere. The Grand Vizier gave him his sister in marriage in order to ally him closely to him. Aḥmad Fāzīl Pasha cleverly managed to transfer the most important affairs to his brothers-in-law. In 1660 Kapuci was appointed Grand Admiral (Kapudani Derya) (*a tiger on land and a crocodile at sea*, as Kapudan Derya describes a proposition of his appointment in allusion to his name (Kapul = panther). He filled this important post for six years, commanded the Ottoman fleet with vigour and caution during the heavy fighting of the time and cooperated with special distinction in the conquest of Crete. He then took part in the campaigns against Poland and conquered Lemberg along with the Khan of the Crimea. He then became Wali of Aleppo in 1672, of Diyarbakir in 1675, of Bagdad for a second time in 1676 and in 1677 of Diyarbakir again. After the death of the Grand Vizier Aḥmad Fāzīl Pasha his frank nature still enabled him to maintain his position against the new Grand Vizier Kāra Muṣṭafā, who was not inclined in his favour. Even the severe defeat which he suffered in 1678 in the Ukraine in the swamp between the fortresses of Tscherchin and Romodanowski, where he lost the whole of his army and equipment, brought him only temporary dismissal and disgrace. Soon afterwards he became Grand Admiral for a second time. He died in November, 1680, in Smyrna, which he happened to have entered with the fleet, and was buried there. In Bagdad he had restored the mosque and türbe of Shaikh Muhammad ʿĀbudīr.R.


**KAPU, gate, the Ottoman Porte, properly the palace of the Sultan or of the Grand Vizier. The name (by synecdoche, cf. "court") may be of Central Asian origin; it recalls names like the Japanese miko, for example, literally "exalted gate", etc. (cf. J. Six in Acta Orientalia, ii. 205 sq.) Among the Ottomans Kapu has been long in use in the above sense and used alternately with the Arabic bāb or the Persian dar. The name may have passed from Turkish into Arabic about the Mamluk period, as, for example, the passage i. 469, 2 from below, in Ibn Khaldūn, His-taire des Berberes, transl. of Slane, Algiers 1847, where bāb = palace, shows. — Kapu Kuli "gate-slaughters" (the meaning of this expression is explained and a list of the troops concerned given in Ahmed Djemda, Rawdat xil., Stambol 1301, p. 214, 7 from below; cf. in the other hand, J. von Hammer-Purgstall, Gesch. der Osm. Nation, i. 566). — The name "lofty gate" for the office of the Grand Vizier (Pasha Kapu, İkbâl Sâli, "Sublime Porte, Fulgida Porta") probably did not come into use before 1654, when the Grand Vizier Derviş Mehmend Pasha was given a building near the Serai for an office by Sultan Mehemd IV.


**KAPUCI, gate keeper, porter (Ar. bawwāb, Pers. darbān), formerly the lowest grade and outermost guard of the Imperial Serai chosen from the Yanikars, who guarded its gates, 50 at each gate. By day they carried a rod of bamboo, by night they were armed with sword and dagger. They were used as messengers to carry to the grandees of the Empire and foreign princes invitations to court festivities or documents of state. Some performed the duties of eunuchs. They wore white helmet-like caps (tukif, scuffia). Their number and pay varied. While they numbered 300 at the beginning of the sixteenth century (cf. T. Spandugino, Commentari dell' origine de' principi Turchi (Florence 1551, p. 330; in Schefer's edition, Paris 1896, p. 116 sqq.) and each Kapucu received up to 7 aspers a day, their pay had risen to 20—50 aspers daily about 1511 (cf. the Ballo Andrea Foscolo report of March 6, 1511, quoting Marino Sanuto, in J. v. Hammer, Gesch. der Osm. Reiches, i. 627; cf. ii. 234 as well as Spandugino, ed. Schefer, p. 155); under Sultan Murad III in 982 (1574) their number was 300; they were under Sultan Mehmed IV (1648—1687), according to Husein Hanferren's (d. 1103 = 1601) Kānûnîne (written in 1080 = 1669; cf. F. Péris de la Croix, État général de l'Empire Ottoman, par un solitaire turc, Paris 1695, and J. von Hammer, Staatsverfassung des Osm. Reiches, ii. 44 sq.), they had risen to 162, who received 5,785,004 aspers a year. The Kapucu were divided into 45 companies, each of which was under its own company-commander (baluk bâghi), who held a field in place of salary. The commander of the gatekeepers was the Kapucu bâghi, a kind of chamberlain. According to the evidences of Menavino, Navgengo and Spandugino, the number of kapucu bâghis in the first half of the xviii century was only four. Above them was the kapucu kâvâr, head-chamberlain. (Franz Babinger)

**KAPUDAN PASHA, formerly the title of the supreme commander of all the Ottoman fleets, who had also unlimited control of the imperial arsenal. The origin of this rank dates back to the beginnings of Ottoman sea power under Sultan Mehemd II. The first naval captain (Ka-pudan-i Derya); the word Kapudan comes from the Greek KAIUOCT (Bata-Ogullu Suleiman Beg, probably of Bulgarian origin, the Pataklo or Pataklo; or Pataklo of the Byzantine chroniclers (Chalcocondylas, p. 390, 519; Kritoboulos, i. 22, 28, 33, 37, 39, 41; Dukas, p. 270, 5; cf. Ali, Khan ul-Abdar, v. 108, 174). Till 1553 the Sandjakbeg of Gallipoli was at the same time Kapudan Pasha (cf. Ramberti, Carte de Turquie, Venice 1543, p. 142; T. Spandugino, Commentari dell' origine de' principi Turchi, Firenze 1551, 146, 164; Nic. de Nicolai, Navigations et péri-griations orientales, Lyon 1567, p. 77; N. Barozzi and G. Berchet, Le relations degli ambasciatori Venez., p. 356; capitanu dell' armata di Gallipoli; cf. Feridun Bey, Mina'dil-Sethina (1, 404: Gelibolu Kapudan). With the increasing sea power of the Ottomans and the foundation of an arsenal of their own, especially under Sultan Selim, the Great when the dreaded Khair al-Din Barbarossa.
for so long commanded the fleet, the headquarters of the High Admiral was removed from Gallipoli to Constantinople. While the office of Kapudan Pasha, who had the 19th wiltayet of the Empire as well as 13 sandiaks under him and disposed of an income of 885,000 aspers (cf. Sir P. Ricaut, The Present State of the Ottoman Empire, London 1687, p. 102 sq.), was already one of prestige, with the increasing size of the Ottoman navy it soon became one of the first in the Empire. As long as the Sandjak-beg of Gallipoli was at the head of naval affairs, his jurisdiction was limited to Nicosia, and in larger naval enterprises a special Pasha was appointed beside him, who acted in supreme command as admiral (Spandrungino, Commentario, Fitenze 1551, p. 165). Later, especially from the time of Barbarossa, the Kapudan Pasha was one of the regular and active members of the Divân and was not only one of the most powerful but also one of the best paid dignitaries in Turkey. In rank he was equal to the Ser Asker, directly below the Grand Vizier and the Vâlâddîn-ı Ilâhî. On account of the revenues attaching to the post it was always an object of ambition in the Turkish official world and was granted by the Sultan as a mark of special favour without regard to practical or theoretical training and fitness. Down to about 1780 the Kapudan Pasha was also given the governorship of the islands subject to the Porte in the Aegean Sea, some of the sea-provinces of Asia Minor and the controllership of the arsenals on the north shore of the Golden Horn in Galata, where he had his residence among the wharves. In the sixth century the title was abolished under Sultan Abd al-Aziz and replaced by that of Bâbîr-ı Âsîrî, Director of the Arsenal. All naval establishments were under him, the Minister of Marine; a naval council (Şârâ-i Bâbîrî) assisted him and advised on technical matters and affairs of administration. In June, 1876, under Murad V, the title was revived but only for a short time; it was again definitely replaced by that of Minister of Marine.

A list of all Kapudânânegi Derya is given in J. v. Hammer-Purgstall's Geschichte d. Osmanischen Reiches (at the end of each volume) and in the work — which first appeared as a facsimile of the newspaper Dârâ-i Hâwâlid — by Râmiz Pasha-Zade Melmed Efendi, Kârâ-i Kapudânânî Derya (of 761—1265 [= Chronogram of the title]; 220 pp. 12°, Stambul 1285 = 1869/90) and in Melmed Râîî, Mirât-i İslamî, Stambul 1314, p. 481—497.


KARA, the Turkish word for black or dark colour in general. It is commonly used with this meaning as the first component of geographical names, for example Kâra Âmîd (an account of the black basilat of which this fortress is built), Kâra Dagh (on account of its dark forest), etc. Beside Kâra we find in place-names the form Karâda. In personal names it refers to the black or dark brown colour of hair or to a dark complexion. It has, however, at the same time also the meaning "strong, powerful" and has to be interpreted in this sense in the name Kâra Osman or in names like Kâra Arslan. In this connection also we have the name Kâra Khân, which was assumed by the Karâkhanîs in Eastern Turkestan.


KARA ARSLAN, the third Amir of the line of the Oktûkîs (q. v.) of Hîsîn Kaîîf and grand-grandson of the first of this dynasty.

Statement differing regarding the year in which he succeeded his father Dâ'ud b. Sulîmân. According to Abu 'l-Farajî Barhebraeus (Chronicon, ed. Bedjan, Paris 1819, p. 305), Dâ'ud died in the Greek year 1455 (1143—44). The Arabic sources do not give the year; in any case Stanley Lane-Poole, who bases his view that Dâ'ud did not die till about 543 (1148) on a mistaken interpretation of Ibn al-Athîr (Kâmî, xi. 733 (as Cînîs the Urtûkîs Turkmans in Namumata Orientalia, Part ii., London 1886, p. 8), puts the date too late. Münnedjîd Dînî (q. v.) gives 548 (1154). Even before his father's death we find Kâra Arslân at war with the Crusaders. When in Ramadân, 532 (May, 1138) the Byzantine Emperor John, in alliance with the Franks against the Atabek Zangi of Mawuíl, besieged the fortress of Shâizar near Antioch, he retired when he heard that Kâra Arslân had crossed the Euphrates with 50,000 men to come to the help of the town (Kamal al-Din al-'Adîn, Ta'rîkî Hîlîhî, in the Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Documents Orientaux, iii. 677). Kâra Arslân does not, however, seem to have had at all a friendly reception from Zangi on his arrival; the Atabek, indeed, ordered him to go back to his father. His relations with Zangi continued to be strained, as is shown in the account in Kamal al-Din (p. 684) that a battle was fought between the two in 536 (1141—42) at Dhamarad, in which Kâra Arslân was defeated. Peace was restored next year again. According to Abu 'l-Farajî's account of his accession (see above), Zangi went south as to attempt to secure the succession of Kâra Arslân's elder brother Poghmân, who had escaped to Mawuíl, in Mîrîl. At this news of Konya, however, gave help to Kâra Arslân and Zangi had to abandon his plan.

However strained may have been Kâra Arslân's relations with Zangi, his alliance with the latter's son Nûr al-Dîn of Aleppo was a most faithful one. In 544 (1149—50) he accompanied the latter on an expedition against the town of Sindjar, which, however, was later again restored to Nûr al-Dîn's brother Qûlib al-Dîn. In 559 (1164) he again assisted him, along with Qâdim al-Dîn of Mardin and other princes, at the capture of the fortress of Hîrâm, where many Frankish knights were taken prisoner (Ibn al-Athîr, xi. 92, 185). For the rest Kâra Arslân does not seem to have been of a particularly warlike disposition. He would have preferred to keep out of the last named expedition, if the fear of his own subjects, whose fanaticism had been aroused by Nûr al-Dîn (and apparently also the fear of Nûr al-Dîn himself), had not compelled him to take part. Very little else is chronicled of his activities; for example, the capture of the Kurdish stronghold of Şûtân (Ibn al-Athîr, xi. 185) in 546 A. H. and the unsuccessful

Karabah of [see Karabahin].

Kara Tagh (Turkish-Persian: “black garden”, because of the black and fertile soil of its high valleys), the present-day name of the mountainous province of Arran [q.v.] forming a province of Transcaucasia bounded by the Kurr, the Aras and the district of Erivan; area about 6,750 sq. miles and 250,000 inhabitants (half Aderlak-djan and half Armenians); capital Shusha; mountains: Kambish (12,480 feet) and Kapudjik (12,360 feet). Its horses are famous for their swiftness, and reptiles, scorpions and tarantulas are found there. It is in this province that Fath ‘Ali Akhondzadeh [q.v.] lays the scene of his comedy: Monseur Jourdan, botaniste perisan.

At the beginning of the reign of Shah ‘Abbas I, in 1611 (1602), the Ottoman general Farhad Pasha, in alliance with the governor of Shirwan, Djan Pasha, invaded Karah-bagh and seized Ganzja (v. Hammer, Hist. de l’Empire Ottoman, vii. 221; Sykes, History of Persia, ii. 257–258). This province was at that time the hereditary fief of the Turkish clan of Djewansh, the family of Sariafu, a descendant of Aghar or Afsar, eldest son of Yuldad, third son of Oguz (Abu l-Ghaur, ed. Desnaisons, St. Petersburg 1871–74, p. 27). This clan emigrated from Turkestan with Hulagu and was brought back from Asia Minor by Timur and scattered over Turkestan, Persia and Afghanistan, especially around Kamb and Kandahar. Its chiefs were called from father to son alternately Panah and Ibrahim Khalil; it was Panah II who built Shemshah in 1613 (1612) and gave it the name of Panah-abad, whence the name Panah-abad given to the coins which he struck there. His son Ibrahim Khalil Khan, having succeeded him, found himself attacked by the Persians; after two fruitless sieges, Agha Muhammad Khan (later Shah) Kadjar captured Shemshah but was assassinated there on the morning of Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 21, 1211 (June 18, 1797), five days after entering the town, by three of his servants who feared his vengeance. Ibrahim, who had fled, came back two months later; he submitted to the Russian general, a Georgian by origin, Prince Sisianoff (Zitznabl), after the capture of Ganzja in 1219 (1804) and agreed to pay a tribute of 6,000 ducats; he received the rank of lieutenant-general and a Russian garrison occupied his capital. His eldest son, Abu l-Fait Khan, was the brother-in-law of Fath ‘Ali Shah and had remained faithful to the Persian alliance; he brought his father back to the Kadjar party and the latter attempted to liberate his capital, but Djan Faru Khalan, son of Muhammad Hassan Khan and grandson of Ibrahim, warned the Russians of the Persian advance. 660 Russian soldiers left the citadel and in the middle of the night of Kabir 23, 1211 (June 10, 1806) attacked the camp of Ibrahim Kulli, who was killed with his family in the fighting. The Russian major commanding the garrison installed another of his sons in place, Mahdi Kull Khan, who reigned till 1238 (1822) when he fled to Persia. The Kadjars had, however, renounced all claim to Karah-bagh by the treaty of Gulistan (Oct. 12, 1813).


(C. Huart)

Al-Karabisi, the cloth-merchant, the nisha of several Arab authors; viz.: 1. the mathematician Ahmad b. ‘Umar, the date of whose death is not known and among whose works, a commentary on the translation of Euclid is specially celebrated; see Fihrist, p. 265, 265; 252, 31; Ibn al-Kifl, Tarikh al-Fukl, Cairo 1326, p. 57–58; 3. Only one of his works has come down to us, viz., his Kitab Misbat al-balsh (Oxford and Cairo; ed. Bibl. Bodl., Cod. Mus. Or., i. No. 193; and Fihrist al-Kutub al-arabiya fi ’l-Kutubkhana al-Medelikaya, v. 204); 4. the traditionist and faqih Abu ‘Ali al-
HUŞAIN B. 'ALİ B. YAZĪD AL-MUḤÂLĪBĪ, who had at first belonged to the Aḥl al-Ra’y, but after the arrival of al-Ŝāfi’ī at Baghdād attached himself to him; at the same time he remained an absolute supporter of the belief in predestination (ištibráh); nothing has survived of his writings on criticism of traditions and ši‘ah. He died in 245 (859), according to others in 248 (862).


3. the Ḥanafi ṣāḥīḥ b. ṬA‘ĀD b. MUḤAMMAD (d. 570 = 1174), whose Kitâb al-Furū’ī fi l-Furū‘, which Ḥājjī Khālid Khâlif, Khālif al-Zunūn, ed. Flügel, iv. 419, N°. 904 confuses with the Taḥfīz al-‘Uqūl al-Mahbūbū (Broekelmann, G.A.I., i. 380, N°. 34), is preserved in Cairo; see Führer al-Kutub al-‘Arabīyya fi l-Kutub al-Muslimīyya, i. 96. 962 (C. Broekelmann).

KÂRA-CELEBI-ZÂDE, epithet of the Ottoman historian, jurist and Šaikh al-İslām. ‘ABB AL-‘AZĪZ EFE NDİ. Born in the year 1500 = 1591/92 at Stambul, the son of the then military judge of Rumelia, Ḥusān al-Dīn Husain b. Muḥam mad b. Ḥusān al-Dīn Efendi (d. in Mu harram, 1007 = Aug., 1598 at Brussa and buried there; cf. al-Sayyid Isma‘īl Behīr Brūsī, Tūrīk-i Brūsī, Brussa 1302, p. 314—315; Ewliya, Siyāhat-nāme, Constantiopolis 1334—1338, ii. 118; he bore the maḥkmat Kâra-Celebi-Zâde which passed to all his descendants and caused frequent confusion), he enjoyed the tuition of his older brother, the chief district judge Muhammed Efendi (cf. M. Thuriyā, Siyīl-i Othmānī, i. 155; Ewliya, ed. cit., i. 407; J. von Hammer, Constantinopolis, ii. 25; M. died Ibn l-Hidjâda, 6. 1042 = June 1633 and is buried at Ayytub in Stambul) and studied also under the Mutul Šan‘ Allah Efendi. He then filled a series of offices: in August, 1612 he became Mu‘āli at the medresê of Khair al-Dīn Pasha, in April, 1615 at the new medresê of ‘Ali Pasha, in April, 1616 at the medresê of Piri Paşa, in April, 1617 at the medresê of Ka lender Kâhîne, in December, 1619 so-called ‘eighth’ (zâhîn-i ğâmin) at the mosque of Muhammed the Conqueror; in Jan., 1621 he was transferred to the Sulaimânîyya at Brussa, but by October of the same year appointed to the Sulaimânîyya in Adrianopole and in May, 1623 summoned to the same institution in Stambul. In June, 1623 he was involved in a mûnâ at the ‘Ulamâ at the mosque of the Conqueror and sent as a punishment to Brussa to the medresê of Molla Khusraw but pardoned on the accession of Murad IV and in Jan., 1624 recalled to Stambul to the Sulaimânîyya. In March of the same year he became judge of Yeni Şehir, was dismissed in December, appointed judge of Mekka in February, 1626 and dismissed once more in December, 1627; returning to Stambul, after a short stay in Adrianopole, he was appointed city-judge of Stambul in Jan., 1634. In this capacity he had to take measures for the security of the city during the preparations for the Polish campaign; cf. J. v. Hammer, Gesch. des Osm. Reiches, v. 178. But when in July of the same year the shortage of grease-provoked discontent among the people of Stambul and brought down the wrath of Murad IV upon the judge responsible for the regulation of the market (cf. Z.D.M.G., xvii. 722) he was dismissed from his office and sentenced to death by drowning. A letter in the Sultan’s hand ordered the Superintendent of the Imperial Gardens (Vasitātim Manṣūrî), Džej Efendi, afterwards governor of Bosnia, to take the disgraced magistrate in a boat and to supervise the execution of the sentence on one of the Prince’s Islands. The boat was just reaching Prinkipo, where the sentence was to be carried out, when fortunately for Kara-Celebi-Zâde, a second letter, procured by his patron, the Grand Vizier Bâirâm Pasha (d. 1628), brother-in-law of the Sultan, arrived which altered the drowning to banishment to Cyprus and at the last moment prevented the execution of the death sentence (cf. Na‘im, Tūrīk Stambul 1147, i. 577). Pardoned by December, 1634, he was appointed military judge of Rumelia. During the rebellion which cost Sultan Ibrahim his throne and life in the summer of 1648 Kara-Celebi-Zâde distinguished himself by such shamelessness that even the frank Na‘im (ii. 166; J. v. Hammer, op. cit., v. 449) has not the courage to repeat his utterances. After Ibrahim had been disposed of, he gained the favour of the youthful Muhammed IV, who again appointed him military judge in Aug., 1648. The real object of his ambition, which he pursued by every means in his power, was the office of Šaikh al-İslām. After he had first been granted the title of a Šaikh al-İslâm (Na‘im, ii. 231), a case unique in Ottoman history, he was removed in October, 1649 from his position as military judge and appointed Šaikh al-İslâm in place of Behâr Muhammed Efendi, dismissed on May 2, 1651 (‘Balīs Mūfīsî; cf. von Hammer, op. cit., v. 534—555). On the fatal Sept. 2, 1651 he once more fell into the imperial disfavour and was banished to Chios. Four years later he was given permission to go to Brussa and in 1655 for the barley-money (arpašt; see i. 460) which he had so far enjoyed he received the revenues of Chios and the office of judge of Mudania, which he exchanged in March, 1657 for that of Gallipoli. On the evening of Jan. 11, 1658, death finally ended Kara-Celebi-Zâde’s eventful career. He was buried at Brussa in the cemetery of Šaikh Muhammed Dewdewi; his tomb may still be seen there.

Kara-Celebi-Zâde is not a very pleasing figure in Ottoman history, as he was a ruthless, selfish and intriguing man. His prestige as a scholar is therefore all the more marked. He was the author of a series of historical works, of which two have so far been printed. With the Mirzâ al-Šefâ his chief production is the Rawāt al-Abrâr, a historical work in four parts dedicated to Sultan Ibrahim I, which covers the period from Adam down to 1056 (1646/47). The book, of which there are several good manuscripts in Europe (cf. G. Flügel, Diet arab., pers. u. türk. Hist. ..., zu Wiesbaden, 1865; Tornberg, Codices ... Bibl. Reg. Un. Upsalenses, p. 193, N°. 277 and p. 197, N°. 304, which appears not to be complete), was printed in Muhamarr, 1248 (1832/33) at Bulâq.
KARA-CELEBI-ZADE — KARAĆI

(large 4°, six parts, 637 pp.; on p. 637 full title). His Sulamán-nâma has also been printed (Bâlak 1248, large 12°, 256 pp.) and it is the epic of the legislator Sulamán in which he describes his glorious reign to his death (1520—1566) in a pleasing flowery style (a MS. in Vienna; cf. Flügel, op. cit., ii. 230). He extended his historical work from 1056 to 1068 (1646—58) by a supplement (Zâbêt) of which there are copies in the Vienna National Library (cf. Flügel, op. cit., ii. 262), in the Johannaeum of Graz and in the possession of Dr. J. H. Mordtmann. Several other smaller historical works from his pen exist in manuscript, e. g. an account of the conquest of Erivan (1635) and Baghdad (1638) entitled Taş-


Bibliography: cf. besides the already mentioned sources the biography in Na’mâni under the year 1668; Hâddîjî Khâlîfa, Fedâhî, ii. 152 (biography); the best sketch of his life with all details is given by Ismâ’il Belîgh Brûisê, Gutkist-i Ziyâd-i Erfin, Brussa 1308, p. 317—329; Siyâh-i Ugdâmî, iii. 329; Mustâmî, D arrived al-Makhidî al-Kirî, Vienna MS., Mst. 153 (Flügel, ii. 409 sq.); Râyîet Efendi, Dârshat al-Madâyyik, Stamboul n.d., p. 58—62; Siyâye Salmânesi, Stamboul 1334, p. 461 sqq. (with reproduction of K.’s signature); J. v. Hammer, Gesch. der Osm. Dichtkunst, iii. 426 sqq.; do., Gesch. des Osm. Reiches, v. 178, 184. — K.’s collection of manuscripts is still preserved in the library of the Şahzâde mosque in Stamboul. A catalogue of the books (16 pp., 4°, Stamboul n.d.) has been printed. — On the family, of which several members achieved fame, cf. especially Hâddîjî Khâlîfa, Taşcim al-Tawârîh, p. 191; also Ismâ’il Belîgh, op. cit., p. 315, where the ancestors of Kara-Celebi-Zâde are dealt with; cf. also Wüstenfeld, Die Gelehrtenfamilie Mullik, p. 48. (FRANZ BAINGER)

KARAĆI (KURRAČIKE). I. An important city and seaport on the coast of Sindh situated 24° 51’ N. 67° 4’. E. Population (1901) 116, 663. The administrative centrest the province of Sindh at the present day, and gives its name to a district.

The name does not appear to be of great antiquity, and is probably due to the settlement of a Dodâî Balû tribe called Kaluçâ, originally Râdîpût (see Glossary of Panjâb Castes, Lahore 1911), from whom the town of Kullcî (in the Dera Ismâ’il Khân District of the N. W. Frontier) also took its name. Following a common practice in the Sindhi language the i has become r. (Cf. Kothi in the Panjâb and Kotî in Sindh).

The harbour of Karaći was naturally a good one, although when first surveyed by English sailors it was impeded, as Pottinger tells us (1808), by a bar, which prevented vessels drawing more than 16 ft. from entering. The population was at that time only 9000, but it had already become the principal port of Sindh. The Imperial Gazetteer of India (Bombay, Vol. II) asserts that Karaći began to be known as a port about 1779, and that its rise was due first to the sitting up of Khârâk and afterwards of Şahûdbandar, a statement which is not easy to understand. Khârâk (an island in the Persian Gulf occupied by the Dutch from 1748 to 1765) could have had no influence on Karaći, and Şahûdbandar is too far to the Eastern side of the Indus Delta to have affected it. The real cause was the gradual deterioration of the two ports of Dëwâl and Sindî (often spoken of jointly as Dîul-Sindî) which were situated on the two sides of the west mouth of the Indus. These were still in use in Thévenot’s time (Travels in India, published 1687) and Manucci visited Sindî on his way to India in 1655. During the 18th century the advance of the land cut off these ports from the sea, but Karaći, lying outside the Delta to the west, was not liable to such rapid silting. It also took the place of Tatta as the principal city of S. W. Sindh. Under the Kâlhorâ rulers of Sindî it was made over to the Khan of Khilât, and under his suzerainty was held for a time by the Dîâm of Laos, but after the fall of the Kâlhorâs the Tâlpur Amîr, Fath ‘Ali Khân, took Karaći in 1795 and erected a fort on Manora point to protect the harbour. Henceforward the trade grew considerably. Pottinger’s account in 1808 has been alluded to above. Burns found the population in 1851 to be 15,000.

Sir Charles Napier made it his landing place in 1841 and after the annexation of Sindh in 1843 he undertook its development with the object of making it the military and civil centre of the administration and also an important port equipped to deal with the trade of the Panjâb as well as of Sindî. Through his judgment and foresight he was able to lay the foundations of the progress made in more recent times. Sir Bartle Frere improved the harbour in 1854 by the construction of the Napier Mole which connects Kiâmârí Island with the mainland. The Manora breakwater was constructed in 1869—73, and the harbour has gradually been restricted in area, and at the same time deepened and otherwise improved. In 1883, a good supply of water from the Malir R. was brought in. General Haig in his work on the Indus Delta identifies the harbour of Karaći with Alexander’s Haven which Neuchâtel reached by sailing westwards from the western mouth of the Indus. As the coast here has not changed so much as in the actual Delta, it is possible to identify some of the places mentioned. The Island of Bibâkta appears to be Manârâ point, and Eiros seems to be the high ground east of the harbour now known as Clifton. In spite of this identification, however, Karaći as a town has no ancient or mediaval history, although the harbour must always have been of use as a haven of refuge. Its enormous development in modern times is due to the opening up of the trade of N. W. India by railways. It is the outlet for the wheat, cotton, oilseeds and hides of the Indus valley.

2. Karaći District. A modern administrative district taking its name from the town of Karaći, lying between 23° 35’ and 26° 21’ N. and 66° 42’ and 68° 48’ E. with an area of 11,970 sq. m., and a population in 1901 of 607,
It only refers to the Black Sea (e.g. Gardin in Maquart, op. cit., p. 161; al-Dinmashki, op. cit., p. 138, 15, 259, 4 sq.) Bohr al-Rim should be emended to Bohr al-Rim. The name Bohr al-
Khasar, which originally meant the Caspian Sea, was, on the other hand, transferred to the Black Sea (Ibn Khordadbeh, B. G. A., vi. passim; Kuđana, B. G. A., vi. passim; al-Mas'udi, Kit. al-Tanbih, B. G. A., viii. passim), as al-Mas'udi (p. 67) thinks, because a connection was errone-
ously thought to exist between the two seas; as at the same time the name Mu'ūtis (Mu'ūtis) was extended to the Black Sea (al-Mas'udī, Kit. al-Tanbih, p. 138, 140; Murodī, i. 272 sq.; al-
Dimashki, op. cit., p. 138, 15, 143, 13, 228, 17), the name Sird and the Khazars may have been at first limited to the Sea of Azov and only by a mistaken use have come to include the Black Sea.
All these names were driven out of use by the name Kāra Deniz, evidence of which is first found in the xiith century and which is no doubt the name given to the Black Sea by the Turco-Tatar inhabitants of its shores in Southern Russia; it was understood by the western authors of the time to mean "Great Sea" (focuss classicus, Rubrūqīs, ed. Bergeron, p. 2: in la mer du Pont que les Bulgares appellent la grande mer; Mare Majus in Haythain, Vincentius Bellovaccensis, Marco Polo, chap. i; Mar Majour in Gillherib de Lannoy, and Bertrand de la Broquière; mer mayor in Clavijo; the Grete Sea in Chaucer, Prologue, l. 59), more rarely as Black Sea (Schiltberger, who, however, also writes "Grosses Meer"; mare nigrum, quoted for the year 1335 in Yule, Cathay etc., new ed. by H. Cordier, iii, London, 1914, p. 81; il mar nero in a document of 175 in Berchet, La Repubblica di Venezia e la Persia, Venezia 1865, p. 11); by the Arabs as "Black Sea", al-Bahr al-
Arad (Abu 'l-Fida', Ṭūkīm al-Bulūg, p. 31, 34; al-Dinmashki, op. cit., p. 139, 143, 145, 229; al-
Bahr al-Aṣam in Ibn Khordadbeh, p. 110 is to be explained otherwise); among the Greeks we find only mali thalassa and this only for the first time in the treaty with Venice concluded 7265 (Pontes Rosses Austr., part II, xiv. 62); in literature from the xvith century (see Lenuvius, Fundes Hist. Turc., Ch. 148). The Italians and French used Mare Maggiore, Mer Majour down to the first half of the xvith century: henceforth we find the name Black Sea throughout geographical literature. The older re-
production of Kāra Deniz by "Great Sea" shows that Kāra in this connection does not refer to the colour but means, as often in proper names, "great, powerful, terrible" (cf. Kāra), in keeping with the dangers of the voyage, particularly in bad weather, upon this sea so liable to storms and of such extent. All other attempts to explain the meaning, especially those which seek to find the name "Black Sea" among the Greeks and Byz-

Kāra Deniz, the Turkish name for the Black Sea, the Pontus Euxinus (abbreviated to Pontus) of ancient and Byzantine geography. The Arab geographers took over the Greek names Pontus and Maeotis (Sea of Azov) in the forms Bnūntus and Māntūt, which early become Nūntuq and Māntūt in Arabic writing and language (Juynholl on Murājī al-Ilīf, iv. 194) and in these corrupt forms have survived down to the latest works of Oriental geography. Other names were also used, for example Sea of Trebizond (Bahr Tarāzānūdī), Sea of the Crimean (Bahr-īrīm), Russian Sea (Bahr-al-Rim; cf. mer de Rosia in Villehardouin, ed. Wailly, i. 226), which are explained by the commerce of the Muslim East with Trebizond and the coast lands of South Russia (Nūntuq, Midjan, ed. Westenfeld, i. 499; al-Dinmashki, Nakhibat al-Dahr, ed. Mehran, passim; Abu 'l-Fida', Ṭūkīm al-Bulūg, ed. Reinaud, passim; al-Mas'udi, Murūq al-Dhahāb, ed. Paris, i. 260 sq.; cf. Maquart, Osteuropäische u. ost-
aviatische Schriften, p. 162, 333); on the other hand, in the passages where Bahr al-Rim — which otherwise means the Mediterranean Sea —
of the Khazars" has survived into modern times in corrupt form Babri Hazes (the result of transposition of the diacritical points) as a name of the Sea of Azov.

After the Black Sea had been treated as a mare clausum during the centuries under Byzantine rulers, in the latter half of the Middle Ages it was opened up under the Komnenoi and Palaiologoi to the Genoese and Venetians and thus to European trade with the Near and Far East; in Kaffa [see Kafa], Tana, Amara and Samsun there arose autonomous Frankish colonies and smaller settlements in Sinope and Trebizond. After the fall of Constantinople Mehmed the Conqueror closed the Black Sea to foreign shipping by barring the Straits; the destruction of Amara (1459), Sinope and Trebizond (1461) and Kaffa (1475) completed the ruin of Frankish commerce and the Black Sea became a Turkish inland sea, a ประตู "Ağça", on which only the Turkish flag was allowed to wave. It was only with the advance of the Russian empire to the north coast of the Black Sea that the latter was opened first to Russian commercial navigation by art. X of the treaty of Kăşik Kaimardja in 1774, and ten years later, in 1784, to Austrian and in 1799 to British commerce; in the eighteenth century the other European powers obtained liberty of access to the Black Sea: France in 1802 and following her the smaller seafaring nations; the last treaties on this matter were concluded in 1837. Down to quite recently foreign warships were not allowed to pass through the Straits and into the Black Sea.

Bibliography: The history of the various apppellations of the Black Sea has not yet been written. The main work on commerce at the close of the Middle Ages is W. Heyd, Geschichte des Osmantischen Reiches, Pest 1829, i. 127, 600; de la Jonquièire, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris 1914, ii. 404; Händel Khâlla, Rumili ve Bosna, Vienna 1812, p. 86; Fauly-Wissowa, Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, iii. col. 304 sqq.

( H. Krämers)

KARAGOZ, principal character in the Turkish shadow-play. The shadow-play has been known to the Muhammadan peoples since about the sixteenth century of our era. Its origin is perhaps to be sought, as Jacob suggests, in Eastern Asia, but, as regards the matter of the plays, there seem to be connections with the Hellenistic mime (Horovitz, Reich). The modern Turkish shadow-players attribute the invention of their art to the patron saint of their gild, Shaikh Kûshârî (i.e. Tustar, the man from Tustar [Şıștir] in Persia), after whom they call their shadow-stage Shaikh Kûshârî Mâdâni "Shaikh Kûshârî place". According to the Turkish biographers a certain Shaikh Mehemmed Kûshârtar migrated from Persia to Asia Minor in the sixteenth century and was buried in Brussa. On the various legendary accounts of the origin of the shadow-play see Kiter, Karagóz, i. 5. The shadow-players talk among themselves a kind of professional language, in which gipsy elements predominate. Another circumstance in favour of a connection with the wandering gipsies is the fact that the principal figure, Karagóz, is represented as a gipsy. The shadow-play is a favourite image of the transitoriness and weightlessness of all that is mortal with poets, especially those who are fond of mysticism. The idea often expressed by the mystics that all things in the world have only a shadow-existence and only owe their being to the light permeating things from the Primeval One, who alone possesses reality and substance, found in the shadow-play a symbolical application. The shadow-players are fond of calling attention to this edifying aspect of their performance in the so-called stage-gazels (perde gazels). The external apparatus of the shadow-play consists of a stand like that of the European marionette theatre, only that in place of the open stage a canvas is stretched across and illuminated by an oil-lamp. Against this canvas (perde) the
shadow-player presses coloured figures about a foot high made of dried skin; this is done by means of guiding rods which are put into the figures through holes provided with links. All the figures that appear are controlled by one player. Two musicians are his only assistants. The performances usually take place in the early hours of the nights of Ramaḍān but are also given as entertainments at domestic festivals, such as circumcisions.

The following is the course of the typical performance of the Turkish shadow-play: an introductory picture (gösterme) is shown on the canvas before the beginning of the performance. This is removed during introductory music on a reed-pipe and one of the two principal characters, ʿAbd al-Jawād, comes on the scene singing a song. At the end of the song Hādjiwād calls out Hābi Ḥabīb, "O God," as the introductory religious formula of the play, recites the stage-ghost, praises God and curses Satan and then proceeds to pay a tribute of homage to the Sultan. After a conventional introduction he begins to express in rhymed prose his longing for his companion Karagöz and to sing to him before the door of his house — where the scene is supposed to be laid — in languishing tones. Karagöz rushes out in anger and a fight ensues between the two at the end of which Hādjiwād usually disappears to return after an interval. The prologue proper then begins, consisting of a dialogue (mukārār) between Hādjiwād and Karagöz, and this is followed after a stereotyped transition-formula by the piece proper, the dramatic part (faṣil). The piece again concludes with unvarying turns: Karagöz gives Hādjiwād a box on the ear and the latter goes to tell the "master of the curtain" that Karagöz has torn the curtain down and destroyed it. Karagöz then asks for indulgence to the defects of the play and goes off after threatening to punch Hādjiwād still harder the next time — here the piece is announced for the next evening.

The principal characters are always Hādjiwād and Karagöz. The former is a cultivated elderly gentleman somewhat given to opium eating who is well-known to all the characters who appear and often acts as their confidant. Karagöz is an uneducated, rough gipsy, the type of simple, natural vivacity contrasted with the decrepit representative of prudence and deliberation. Like his relatives in the European marionette theatre he is the real favourite with the public. He is bald and sometimes still appears with the phallic features which indicate a certain connection with the ancient mine. Both characters wear special caps, peculiar to the shadow-play.

The humour of the dialogue between Hādjiwād and Karagöz depends on the most part on countless puns and plays on words which are always brought about by Karagöz misunderstanding the learned words of his friend and giving them humorous interpretations. The preludes are not limited to any particular piece (faṣil) but are chosen for presentation at will according to the length of the following play. The substance of the dialogue has almost always the same object, to attain humorous effects by the contrast between Hādjiwād's learning and Karagöz's stupidity. ʿAbd al-Jawād, for example, gives Karagöz lessons in spelling, proposes games which he does not understand, goes with him as a singing Ramaḍān-night watchman round the streets, when Karagöz sings all the songs out of tune and misunderstands them, or gives him sentences to he said rapidly, or plays games with him which necessarily end in a fight, etc.

The production of the dramatic part (faṣil) which follows the preludes shows certain peculiarities in scenic technique which are the natural result of the paraphernalia of the shadow-stage. The white surface of the canvas, only rarely relieved by a few figures in the wings, always represents the Küşhərī square in front of Karagöz's house, which latter is, as it were, represented by the frame of the canvas. As Karagöz has continually to accompany the action with comments from the window of his house, there are often several scenes of action in one, one quite remote, the real scene of action, and the square before Karagöz's house. The possibility of mixing up the characters into crowds with the conducting-rod is used to present remarkable scenes of recognition. The players are often fuddled with fire stock of pieces, which is practically the same with all companies and, except for a few modern pieces, is considered to have "been handed down from olden times." The pieces are sometimes dramatic versions of popular books (Ferkād and ʿArīf, ʿArīf and Zuhir, Meşalim and Laila etc.), in which case Hādjiwād appears as trusted adviser and Karagöz as servant of the heroes concerned, or suchlike; sometimes they are pictures of everyday life in Stamboul. In the latter we are given a series of Stamboul types, among which one recognises pathological (the drowsy opium-eater, the pugnacious drunkard, the lame beggar, the dwarf, the crazy man) and racial types (the young Stamboul Efendi, the Persian, the Armenian, the Jew, the rough woodcutter from Kastamunī, the Kaiffır, the Lase, etc.). The effect is very often attained by the formation of a series of incidents. A whole series of characters, differing as much as possible from one another, is brought successively into the same comical embarrasing situation with Karagöz, around whom the action then usually develops, into some such situation so that the tension increases with each successive character until it is finally relieved by a character superior to the situation.

Pieces of this kind are, for example: Yalova Şafezzi, "The pleasure-exursion to Jalow." A young Efendi, usually called Celebi, wishes to take a trip with his sweetheart to the seaside resort of Yalova and buys a bag and a jug in which to put provisions for the journey. While he is away to make the final preparations, Karagöz appears and teases the young woman, who has remained behind with the sack and jug, with stupid stories about a fatal accident that has overtaken her lover, that he has set the sea on fire with a match he had thrown away and has been burnt or that he has been swallowed by an eater of lobana, and so on. Then a series of typical characters appear all of whom wish to go to Yalova with the young woman and are hidden one after the other by the obliging girl in the sack and jug, in which a new fight begins for the little room available with every new-comer. After 5 or 6 people have disappeared in the narrow jug, Celebi returns and pulls out all the stowaways again. — Another piece of the same kind is Kanlı Nigar, "Bloody Nigar." The young Efendi is stopped in the street by two
ladies of his acquaintance, each of whom assert they have a good right to him and try to pull him with her. As neither will abandon him, women-neighbours are called in to decide which is worthy of the pretty young man. But when the neighbours decide in their own favour, the two women (one is called *Bloody Nigar*) drag the young man into their house, undress him, thresh him and throw him out on to the street to punish him for his infidelity. A series of characters then come up who see the young man sitting naked and volunteer in turn to fetch his clothes out of the women's house; first comes Karagöz, then Hâdişêmî, then the drunkard, then a negro and next a dwarf. In the attempt to get the young man's clothes, they all meet in turn with the same fate. They are likewise undressed and thrown naked upon the street so that naked figures keep accumulating round the door of the house. In the end the problem is solved by the robber captain Şafit Efe from Brussa, whom the women respect, and the naked forms receive their clothes again. — Another is Mandra: — Karagöz finds himself violently abandoned by his wife and enters into relations with a lady who meets him on the street and takes her to his house. To his question whether she also has no lover Mandra replies: "Apart from him who comes afterwards, no one else."

Then various lovers of the woman come in turn, ask for Karagöz's new house-mate and send all kinds of love-verses to her through which he last delivers to her in quite a distorted fashion, and ask her to take a trip with them to Mandra. But they are always driven away by Karagöz and to his repeated question whether there is still any one coming the woman only answers with the above phrase. This goes on for a considerable time until finally Karagöz is turned out of his own house by the drunkard and then collects the admirers he has driven away in order to recapture his own house. In the mêlée which follows all take to their heels. — In the "singer's competition" (Karagöz ve Şehîdî) Karagöz, as a swirling singer (çâlî), dispossession of a number of droll singers who have assembled for a competition. In the "writer's play" (yazık yoinu) he appears as a public letter-writer who writes letters which are absolute nonsense for his clients. — In the "Boat-play" (kâşû yoinu) he acts in his particular way as a ferry-man assisted by Hâdişêmî. In the "Swing-play" (talîndijs yoinu) he lets a swing to the most varied customers, lastly to a Jew who apparently dies on it and is buried by his co-religionists in the most ludicrous fashion and is then brought to life again. Another time we find Karagöz as a rich gentleman (Karagözî-âgâdî) and in this capacity he has to deal with a series of people who wish to get positions in his service and with a beggar. The series of incidents is often made up of vain attempts by Karagöz to gain admittance to a house or a garden, for example in the "Garden-play" (Bâghte Yoinu), in the "Bath" (Hamam), the "Surprise" (Bâşlu), or of his unsuccessful attempts to ascertain something about his wife's doings by questioning the neighbours, who in turn misunderstand his questions and give the stupidest answers ("The Well ğêmemê").

Piecies in which we do not have this succession of incidents are, for example, "The Poplar" (Kantî Kanû), in which an amusing act is spun round a brief touching episode: the singer Hasan's son is stolen by the spirit of the poplar but restored on the poetic appeal of his father. Karagöz is first of all bewitched by the spirit of the poplar, then released by Hâdişêmî and, when he wants to cut down the poplar as a punishment, he is seized by two Albanian foresters and punished with the bastinado, which is made more severe in a comical way as the foresters continually go wrong in counting the blows and have to begin all over again. — In the "Circumcision" (sûmet) Karagöz is circumcised when a full grown man and the usual games are played which are used to distract a boy from the pain. A shadow-player appears, for example, so that we have here a play within a play, also an oya-yinu-player, two jugglers, etc. — A kind of competition in magic between two witches, in which the young Efendi and his sweetheart and then Karagöz and Hâdişêmî are turned into animals, is the "Witch-play" (Džinîlasî). — In the "Lunatic asylum" (hünkârâyên) Karagöz is infected by some lunatics escaped from an institution and chained by Hâdişêmî in an asylum and treated by a Frank doctor. — In the "Wrong Bride" (Sûmîgh Gala) Karagöz is brought as bride to the drunkard, in order to cure him of his craving. — Lastly the play the "Hat" (Mûltûnû) shows the doings of a famous sat named Bekri in the air. The pieces so far mentioned substantiate form with several other less important and less well-known pieces (Tâbûxûklîjler, "The broken ones", Kûşîlîlar, "The coffee-crushers", Bâlîk Yoinu, "The fish-play", Džinîlalaşîlar, "The rope-dancers", Edîlîkîhên, "The chemist's shop") the usual repertoire of the shadow-players.

Very few of these plays have so far been published and translated and those usually in an abbreviated form. The texts printed in the est are almost all bad and defective. For further particulars see the Bibliography.


(HE. RITTER)

KARAGÖZLÜ ("Black-eyed") a Turkish people around Hamadan, to which they pay their tribute (Curzon, Persia and the Persian Question, London 1892, ii. 270 and 472). The Karagözli are several times mentioned in the history of the domestic troubles in Persia in the second half of the xviiith century; cf. J. v. Hammer, Geschichte der Osmanischen Reichs, 2. Pest 1836, iv. 475; Türk-i Zindasya, ed. Beer, Leiden 1888, P. 32, 42 and 93. In the first half of the xviith century the Karagözli are said to have numbered some 12,000 souls (C. Ritter, Erdkunde, viii. 404 and ix. 78). Karagözli is also the name of a small Turkish clan in Fars, which belongs to the "İnönü group of the tribal confederation İli-i Khamas (Tumansky, O Karpzyjskiego kraju, polski o bramach i obronach. St. Petersburg 1896, p. 78). A Tatar village in what was formerly the government of Yezdawetpol in the district of Djevanshir is also called Karagözli.

(W. BARTHOLOMI)

KARA HİSAR, "Black Castle", the name of several places in Asia Minor, which, although distinguished by epithets, are often confused with one another; lists of them, none of which is complete, are given in a later addition to Yakut's Mağdat, ed. Wiesbäld, iv. 44, then by Ewliya, Siyahçınname, Constantinople 1314—15, ii. 384 = Narrative of Travels by Ewliya Efendi, O.T.F., London 1850, ii. 205 (cf. J. v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Osman. Reiches, Pest 1837—35, iv. 619), in Ahmad Wafik's Lekhāşı̄-i Ottomanı̄, Constantinople 1203, p. 911, and in Ali Djawād, Tāriḵ-i Djuhaštābād-i Mūhaddis-i Ahwāz, Constantinople 1353, i. 599. They are alike in being situated on heights, sometimes difficult of access and fortified; the majority date probably from the middle ages only and were mainly built as places of refuge for the inhabitants of the surrounding country during inroads which were continually made in the wars of the Byzantines with the Arabs and Saljuks and later in the wars between the small states that arose in Asia Minor; many were later abandoned under the peaceful rule of the Ottomans and disappeared from our maps.

The most important places of this name are:
1. Kara Hisār-ı Şahīb (in Nashri, Z.D.M.G., xiii. 193 = Lenclovius, Hist. Musulm., Frankfort 1591, col. 140). Şahīb-ı Kara Hisārī; Saibcarascar in Caterino Zeno, Commentarii del Viaggio in Persia, Venice 1558, fol. 149), also called Afūn Kara Hisārī ("the opium K. H."). The former name is derived from a notable man of the last period of the Saljuqs of Konya, Şahīb-ı Fakhr al-Din Ali Beg (d. 687 = 1288/9), who had retired there with his treasures before the Karamanids and Mongols and whose successors ruled the town and district until the protection of the Germiyan-Oghlu of Kutahya (Houtsmuller, Recueil de textes relat. à l'histoire des Seldjoukides, iv. 208, 327, 334, where K. Dewe means this K.; ibn Feisıl Allah, Maqālī al-Aghār, transl. by Quatremère in the M.W., xlix. 359, 357; Ahmad Tawḥīd in the Recueil Historique publié par l'Institut d'Histoire Ottomanie, first series, p. 563 sq.). The popular name Afūn Kara Hisār later became generally used in place of K. H. Şahīb, which is still the official name. Afūn K. takes its name from the extensive cultivation of opium in the neighbourhood which is mentioned as early as Belon, Les observations de plusieurs singularitez et choses vulnerables, Paris 1555, fol. 1829; cf. Blau in the Z.D.M.G., xxii. 280. Kara Hisār-ı Şahīb is now identified with the Byzantine fortress Akromais, Akroñois, in the vicinity of which the legendary Saiyid Bâšîl in 739 perished, and with his followers on a campaign against the Byzantines (Theophanes, Chronogr., ed. de Boor, i. 390, 411) and where the Comnenus Alexios I negotiated with the Seljuqs Sulṭān in 796 (Anna Comnena, Alexiad, ed. Reifferscheid, ii. 285); in the course of the xiiith century it must have been taken by the Byzantines by the Germiyan-Oghlu. Khwār Pasha (d. 750 = 1349), son of Sulaimānshāh of Germiyan, and other members of this dynasty are mentioned as presidents (Cebeli) of the Mewlewī settlements in K. (cf. Ghālī Dedde, Tadhkarā-ı Şirvānī-i Mewlewī, MS. No. 1577 of the Vienna Nat. Libr., fol. 54a and 509 = "Ali Enwer, Simā'-hāne-ı Edebi, Stambol 1309, p. 48 sq. and 102.

During the invasion of Asia Minor by Timūr after the battle of Angora (1401) K. also was visited by the victor's raiding parties (Şaraf al-Din 'Ali Yazdi, Zafarnāme, Bild. Ind., Calcutta 1887—88, ii. 446, 457, 484, 492 = Histoire de Timur-Ber etc., Fr. transl. by Prés de la Croix, Delhi (1) 1723, iv. 21, 31, 60, 68; Dukkara, ed. Bonn, p. 77). In 832 (1428/9) the kingdom of the Germiyan-Oghlu passed to the Ottomans and K. with its lands became incorporated in a sandjak of the eyalet of Anadolu (cf. Dijânnuma, 1341), p. 641). As a stronghold near the Karamanian frontier it remained of military importance so long as Karaman was still independent; at the beginning of the war with Uzbek Hasan in 877 (1472/3) prince Mustafa fell back on its defences and made raids from it upon the Karaman-Oghlu who were allied to the Persians (Ashīk Pascha Zade, Tāriḵ-i Isfahān, Stambol 1332, p. 177; Sa'd al-Din, Tāriḵ-i Isfahān, i. 534; Caterino Zeno, op. cit.) and in 895 (1489/90) K. formed the base of the operations of the Hersek-Oghlu against the Egyptians who had invaded Karamanian territory (al-Din, op. cit., ii. 65). But K. became still more important as a junction of the caravan-routes leading from Smyrna to trading centres of the interior, like Angora, Kaisaria, Tokat, etc. In recent years the Smyrna-Cassaba railway there joins the Anatolian railway system which starts in Stambol. On the dissolution of the old eyalet of Anadolu the sandjak of K. was attached to the
province of Brassa; the town of K. is the residence of the munificents; its population was estimated at 25,000 in 5,000 houses (20,000 Muslims, 5,000 Armenians, some 300 Greeks), but later figures are not available.

Of the few relics of classical antiquity the monastery must have been brought here from ruined sites in the neighbourhood, like Schiller (Vrymnesus), Idâ: Karâhisâr (Dociacena) and Cifat Kâşânâ (Synnada); the monuments of the time of the Germiyân-Oghülî, e.g. the Ulu Lîşî of Khiyâga Beg and the tomb of Sultan Dîwanî, and the older buildings of the Ottomans have not yet been thoroughly investigated.

The feature of the town, the steep cone of thrachyte which rises 650 feet above the level of the town which lies around it, with the late Byzantine defences renovated by the Germiyân-Oghülî, still bore in Niebuhr’s time the name Lek Baran Kâfesi, “the fortress which affords shelter to the Beg”-this citadel was probably never really a permanent settlement and is now left to fall to pieces, although it has been from time to time used for the internment of partisan prisoners (“Aşik Pasha Zade, Târîx r. p. 243-4”), the last occasion being in 1802 when French prisoners of war from Egypt were kept there. The “Arabic” foundation inscription at the entrance, which Niebuhr and Oberhammer saw, has not yet been copied.


Some 15 miles or 5 hours north of Kara Hisâr Sâhîb lies:

3. Kara Hisâr-i Shârî, also called Shâlîn (or Shalîn, Shalî) Kara Hisâr, or Karâhisâr-i Shâhînhâmî, from the alum-mines in the neighbourhood which were worked in ancient times and still more in the middle ages and produced a particularly esteemed kind of this mineral.

As was first pointed out by Blau in 1865 on the authority of a Byzantine inscription the town is the ancient and mediæval Colonia and bore this name down into modern times. After the reforms of Justinian it belonged to Armenia Prima, in the Notitiae Episcopatuum it appears as the see of the bishop of Armenia Secunda. In 162 (778) the town was captured by Yezid I., Usâid al-Sulami in a raid on the Pontus (Ghévond, Hist. des Guerres des Arabes en Arminie, p. 106, quoted by Blau; cf. al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, iii. 493; cf. Ibn Khojddâbiheh, B.G.A., vi. 108). On the other hand the Kalâniya which, according to Eutychius, ed. Selden and Pococke, p. 383, was taken by the Sâsînâ Shâpur with Cappadocia and the Kalâniya, which the Hamândân Saîf al-Dawla captured in 335 (947/8) (Z.D.M.G., x. 467; Yahyâ, Mi’âjam, it. 105) are almost undoubtedly identical with Colonia Capпадoicae, which, according to Niketas (p. 72 and 689), is the later Aş-karâşî. This strong fortress must have been lost to the Byzantines after the battle of Manzikert. The Danishmand-Oghülî first established themselves there (Anna Commena, Alciat, ed. Reifferscheid, ii. 164); later we find the Saltûkâda of Erzurûm in possession (Niketas Chron., Anv., ed. Bonn, p. 185, 294) who were disposed in 598 (1201/2) by the Saltûkîs of Konya; they in turn were succeeded by the Mangûddids, vassals of Konya. After the fall of the Saltûkân of Konya, the descendants of Eretân ruled there and various princes of the house of the Aş-Koyunlu and Kara-Koyunlu (cf. Sa’d al-Din, i. 287 = Ali, Kwhâl al-Akhbâr, v. 178 = Leunclavuis, Hist. Musul., coll. 474, 189 sqq.) in 1473 after the battle of Terdjîn the town was taken by Mehemmed the Conqueror and incorporated into the Ottoman empire (Aşîk Pasha Zade, Târîx, p. 378 and 181, we describes the town as the Kara Hisâr of Kamâk and Sa’d al-Din, i. 541 and 542; Leunclavuis, Hist. Musul., coll. 589, 45 sqq.). Kara Hisâr-i Shârî formed a sandjak of the eyâlet Erzurûm (Ewliya, Travels, ii. 205; Häджджî Khâlîfa, Dhîlânâmûnî, p. 422, 424); this district now belongs to the wilayet of Swâs and the seat of government is in the town of the same name.

The old name Colonia was taken over by the Saltûkîs in the Armenian form Kughûnîya, which we find in Ibn Bâbî’s chronicle (Toutoumi, Recueil, iii. 291-295, iv. 151, 152, 319) and on the coins of Erzân (Ahmad Tawhid, Meslêk-i Kânîne-i İslamî, iv. 439). If, as seems almost certain, the Mavro-Kastran mentioned by Michael Astallota, ed. Bonn, p. 125, and Skylites, p. 679, on a high hill difficult of access in Armenia", is the form in which the town is recorded in the viiiith century we again find the form Garasarins, corrupted out of Kara Hisâr, in use as well as Coönia.

The imaginative description of the town in Ewliya’s Celebi and scanty references in the Dhîlânâmûnî, both of the second half of the viiiith century, are correctly copied and supplemented by the descriptions of modern travellers. The town, built on
the slopes of a hill below the ancient fortifications possessed—according to Cuinet, with whom travellers agree—12,13,000 inhabitants (7500 Muslims, 3000 Armenians and over 1500 Greeks) and was the residence of the mutasarrif and of an Armenian Bishop and of the Greek Metropol of Nicopolis; there is no more modern information available. The citadel surrounded by a ring of walls, in which old well-shafts suggest a pre-Hellenic settlement, is no longer inhabited; within this fortress on the summit of the hill lies a small fortified redoubt with an octagonal watch-tower. The dinners date from the 17th centuries and were further developed by the Muslim rulers.

Sichtberger (Reisebuch, ed. Langmantel, p. 57) calls Karasere “ein fruchtarbès lant an Weinwuchs” (a land rich in vine-yards); more famous than the vine-yards which still exist were the rich alum-mines in the adjoining village of Shakh‘ane, in which were obtained the valued “alume de roce de Colonna” (i.e. Colonia) (Pegolotti in Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant, i. 565); these alum-ware was known in Roman times as “ supplying a vast unam argentarium of Vincentius Bel- lowacensis, xxxi. col. 143; they were also mentioned by Rubruquis (ed. Bergeron, p. 147). Mehemmed the Conqueror took possession of them for the state treasury (Sa‘d al-Din, i. 542) and from the rent they yielded when farmed out the garrison of the fortress was later paid (Djihânamûn, p. 424).


4. Kâra Hijâsr Bahrâm shâh (Bairamshâh) is first mentioned by Hamdullah Muftiawfi, Nushâh at-Kulâh, p. 97; Sidi Re’s (xviiith century) visited the place on his journey from Siwas to Bozaq and Kirâshir (Mir‘at al-Manâlik, Stambul 1312, p. 96). In Kâthib Celebi’s time (xvith century) it was a kâzî of the eyalet Siwas (Djihânamûn, p. 622); it is now the residence of the Mudir of the nahiyye of the same name of the kâzî of Maidan in the sanjak Yozgâd in the vilayet of Angora, of day’s journey east of Yozgâd. The place is not marked on our maps.

5. Kâra Hijâsr De mirdîj, a village in the Kârêm Corum of the vilayet of Angora, a few hours north of the famous ruined site of Üyûk, given in the Djihânamûn, p. 625, among the Kâzî’s of the sanjak of Corum. W. Hamilton in 1839 was the first European to visit and describe it (Researches etc., i. 279, 281, 403; following him Ritter, Kleinasien, i. 147, 149 sqq.; next came in 1859 H. Barth (Reise von Travancore nach Scutari, p. 42) and A. D. Moritmann (in Ausland, 1863, p. 785; Sitzungsber. Bayr. Ak., 1861, p. 191 sqq.). The ruined site of Kâzî Saryï which belongs to it is mentioned under this name in the Djihânamûn also. On our maps this Kâra Hijâsr appears without an epithet; it may be identical with the Kâra Hijâsr which the older Ottoman chroniclers mention in connection with the fightings of prince Muhammed with the Yürük chief Goleroglu about 805 A.H. (Leun- clavius, Hist. Musulmar., col. 386; Sa‘d al-Din, i. 200).

6. Kâra Hijâsr Tekke (Djihânamûn, p. 638; Ahmad Wafik, ‘Ali Djäwa, loc. cit.) also called Kâra Hijâsr-Adalia (Elwiyya, Travels etc., ii. 705), is mentioned by Vâküt, Mi‘lijan, iv. 44 as a village a day’s journey from Angâkia (or rather Angâla). In the time of Ibn Fa‘l Allah a certain Zakariyyâ, a former Manilk of the lord of Adalia, had made himself independent there and ruled a small territory which included 3 towns and 12 strongholds (N.E., xili. 372 sqq.). The place is still mentioned in the surveys of Mehemmed the Conqueror (Recue Historique publ. par l’institut d’historie Turque, part ii. 76) and as a kâzî of the sanjak of Adalia in the Djihânamûn, loc. cit. According to Ahmad Wafik, K. is the capital of a nahiyye of the kâzî of Sirik in Adalia, in the vilayet of Angora; the Sânîme of this vilayet, however, only knows the place under the name of Sirik nor is the older name found on our maps. Sirik, a miserable village on a tributary of the Köprü Su (Eurymeldon), is the ancient Selje (Ritter, Kleinasien, ii. 515 sqq., 653; G. Hirschfeld, Reise im südwestlichen Kleinasien in the S.B. Pr. Ak. W., 1875, p. 134). The similarity of names is accidental because Sirik is originally the name of a Yürük clan.

Besides these towns of the name Kâra Hijâsr and Dewe D. dealt with separately (see above, i. 952) the following are also given: Kâra Hijâsr in the land of Osman (Vâküt, op. cit.); this may refer to Karadja Hijâsr, also called Karadja Shehir near İnöba in the ancestral lands of the Ottoman Sultans for which even in the older historians Kâra Hijâsr is often written. Kâra Hijâsr in the land of Ibn Torgihut (Ibn Fa‘l Allah, op. cit., p. 350); no other reference is known, unless it is an older name for Torgihutu Kâşabasi near Mânsa. Kâra Hijâsr, capital of the Kâzî of Na‘îlukhân, vilayet of Angora (Ahmad Wafik, op. cit.), not given in the Sânîme nor marked on our maps.

Hamâm Kâra Hijâsr, village of the nahiyye of Gümüyni, Kâzî of Siwri Hijâsr, vilayet of Angora (Sânîme); also on the maps. Wân Kâra Hijâsr (Elwiyya, op. cit.); no other reference known. (J. H. MORITMANN).

KâRâKALPAK. [See KERAK].

KâRâKALPAK (‘black caps’), a Turkish people in Central Asia. In the Russian annals a people of this name (Cernyi Klobutz) is mentioned as early as the twelfth century; whether these ‘black caps’ are identical with the modern Kârâkâlpak cannot be definitely ascertained. It is not till the end of the xvith century that we find records of the Kârâkâlpak in Central Asia. According to the embassy report of Skibin and Troghin (1694), they then lived on the Sir Darya, 10 days’ journey below the town of Turkstâan. There they are again mentioned in the xvith century as neighbours of the land of the Khans of Khiwa; about 1722 a treaty was concluded by the ambassador Verugini between Peter the Great and the Khan of the Kârâkâlpak, Abu l-Muaffar Sâ’dat ‘Iyâfat Muhammed
Babādur (Pohnype Sobunuiye Zakonew, 1722, Nö. 4101). The eastern part of the lands of the Volga Kalmucks between the Ural mountains and the Volga used to be raided by the Karakalpaq. Even then the Karakalpaq lived not only by their herds and by their raids but also by agriculture with artificial irrigation of their fields and by fishing on Lake Aral. They are said to have migrated to Central Asia from the Volga region. About the middle of the nineteenth century the winter quarters of a body of the Karakalpaq were on the central course of the Sir at Khwāna (north of Ur-Teb); the prince (tuwa) of these Karakalpaq entered into an alliance in 1755 with the Atash of Bukhara, Muhammad Rahim; 3000 families of the Karakalpaq were settled at Samarqand and received from there 400 ass-loads (ʔawwar) of corn; the son of the tur was joined the army of the Atash (Muḥ. Wafā Karminx, MS of the Asiatic Museum, c. 581 b, f. 148d). Radloff (Jus Siberiæ, Leipzig 1893, i. 228) visited in 1868 north-east of Samarqand some settlements of the Karakalpaq, who had immigrated "from the Amū Daryā not long ago". A considerable number (about 20,000) still live in Farghāna at the present day. The Karakalpaq are said to have been driven out of the lower valley of the Sir Daryā by the Kazaks towards the end of the eighteenth century; they are still mentioned in the sixteenth century a little farther south on the (now dried up) Venī Daryā à propos of the campaigns of Muhammad Rahim, Khān of Khiwa, against the land of Kungrat (1807—1811). The Karakalpaq were then subject to the Khán of Kungrat and lived, in part, on the lower course of the Amū Daryā, especially on the arm of the river known as the "Kazak"; there they succeeded in holding their own even at a later date against the Kazaks. After the union of Kungrat with Khiwa (1811) the Karakalpaq also had to submit to the Khán of Khiwa, but made frequent attempts to throw off this yoke; in 1827 the town of Kungrat was even captured by them for a time; after the suppression of this rising a part of the Karakalpaq migrated to Farghāna (History of Khiwa, MS of the Asiatic Museum, 500 b, from 1836—1856). In 1856 the leader of the Karakalpaq, İbrāhīm, appointed the title of Khán (μιδ, f. 516d); the fortress built by him near where the Kaza flows into Lake Aral, the ruins of which still bear his name, did not fall till the following year, and then through treachery, into the hands of the Khiwans. After the Russian conquest of Khiwa in 1873, when the Khán had to cede to Russia all his possessions east of the main arm of the Amū and the most north-western arm of its delta (Tallīk or Tallīk), the land of the Karakalpaq also became Russian. The area, then separated from Khiwa, was first administered as a separate circle (otdely), later as part of the government of Sir Daryā; after the revolution it was constituted a separate territory (oblast). The Karakalpaq form about half the population there, according to the latest census over 110,000 souls. In addition there are about 20,000 Karakalpaq in Khiwa and as many in Farghāna.

The dialect of the Karakalpaq was first investigated in 1903 by S. Byelyayew; some of the texts then written down were later published (1917) in the Protokol Zakaspiyskago Krūska lyubitelii Arkeologii etc., parts 3 and 4. Information on the Karakalpaq is given in all books on Turkestān and its population; e. g. Fr. v. Schwartz, Turkestān, p. 17; Kostenko, Turkestānskiy Kray, St. Petersburg 1880, i. 329 sq.; Mašal’ški, Turkestānskiy Kray, St. Petersburg 1913, p. 390 sq.; Asiatikaса Rossii, St. Petersburg 1914, an official publication, i. 163 sq.; Vanden, Das Turkvenkol in seinen ethnologischen und ethnographischen Beziehungen, Leipzig 1885, p. 373 sq. No special monograph has so far been devoted to the study of the Karakalpaq people. (W. Barthold)

KARA KHĀLĪL. [See ĖNDERELI]

KARA KHĪTĀI (or KARA KHĪTAY), the usual name since the viiith (seventh) century in Muhammadan sources for the Khitai people, mentioned by the Chinese from the eighth century A. D. onwards, who were probably Türk (according to another view Mongol). In the Turkish Orkhon inscriptions the Khitai are several times mentioned as enemies of the Turks in the extreme east of the area visited by the Turks in their campaigns; according to Chinese sources, they lived in the southern part of Manchuria. From the beginning of the tenth century the Khitai carried on a policy of conquest, conquered the northern part of China, and founded a dynasty which at a Chinese ruling house was called Liaoch (916). Even the founder of the Tang dynasty, Apoaksi, was able to subdue Northern Mongolia, which had been conquered by the Kirghiz about 840; Apoaksi himself visited Karakorum in 924 and is said to have received an Arab, i.e. Muhammadan, embassy there (Breitgut, Mediaeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources, London 1910, i. 265), the first record of the appearance of Muslims in this region; it was probably only a trading caravan (Mongolia, of course, lay outside the usual range of Arabic geographical literature, for which the Kirghiz were the extreme north-eastern people). The house of Liao succeeded in holding its ground against the national Sung dynasty which had arisen in South China since 960; not till about 1125 were the Khitai driven from China and Eastern Asia by another Türk people, the Djürden.

Even before settling in China the Khitai had adopted Chinese civilization to a greater extent than other nomadic peoples; in contrast to the cult of the rising sun predominant among the other nomads of the East, they had borrowed from the Chinese the cult of the South; with this fact is no doubt connected the spread of this cult among the Mongols, and throughout, the Mongol Empire in Central Asia generally (see W. Barthold’s essay in the Zapiski vost. otd. akad. obšč., xxx, 55 sq.). As the Djürden did later, the Khitai formed a system of writing of their own based on the Chinese hieroglyphic system (about 920 A. D. with some 1000 characters). A statement in the official "History of the Liao" (Liao-shi) where, according to de Groot’s translation, there is mentioned an alphabet prepared for the Khitai (small characters, few in number and all arranged in rows") by the foreign wise man, Tiet-ts’i (according to F. W. K. Müller, perhaps tarū = Christian), is explained by Marquart to mean that about this time (the statement refers to the reign of Apoaksi) the sounds of the language were reproduced in an alphabet of western origin (perhaps modelled on the Uighur) (Sitzunsgber. d. Preuss. Akad., 1912, p. 500 sq.) documents or inscriptions in the alphabet have so far not been found. On the other hand we have specimens of Khitai writing in the alphabet

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLĀM, II.
of Iml. From there as a base they occupied without opposition the town of Balasagün [q.v.], wither the Muslim ruler of this region of the Ilk Khan dynasty had summoned them against his enemies; it was only from here, i.e. from the North, that they conquered Kaghchar and Köhtan and later Mā-warā-n al Nahr and Khwārizm; the king of this land, Atfūs (1128–1156), had to bind himself to pay a yearly tribute of 30,000 dinars. On the fighting in Mā-warā-n al Nahr and Khwārizm we are particularly well informed by Ibn al-Athir as well as by a few earlier sources like iMād al-Dīn (Houtsma, Recueil de textes relat à l'histoire des Seljoucides, vol. ii.) and Rāwandi (Kāhāt al-Sādir, ed. Muḥ. ʿIlbāl, esp. p. 172 sq.); the material is utilised in Barthold's Turkestān etc. and in Marquart's Osthirdische Dialektstudien. In Mārān, 531 (May–June, 1137) the Khān of Samarkand, Māhmūd, was defeated at Ḵoḏand and on ʿṢafār 5, 536 (Sept. 9, 1141) his powerful overlord, Sulṭān Ṣandjār, in the desert of Ḵaḏwān north of Samarkand. After this the kingdom of the Khān of Khātān stretched from the land of the Kirghiz (on the Yenisei) in the north for a time as far as Balkh in the south, from Khwārizm in the west to the land of the Uyghurs (see Bīṣābālīk) in the east, with its ruler's residence on the Cū [q.v.] at Balasagūn. The ruler bore the title Gūrkhan, which is explained by Dwiwain (ii. 86 below) as Khān of Khātān (Khān-i Khātān); the word Gūr is perhaps reproduced by the Chinese Ye-lu (family name of the Liao emperors). Unlike the other nomad empires no tithes were granted either to the relatives of the Gūrkhan or to other persons of high rank; the first Gūrkhan is said to have allowed no one command of more than 100 men. On the other hand almost everywhere (Balasagūn perhaps formed the only exception) the native dynasties continued to exist as vassals of the Gūrkhan; these vassal states probably formed the greater part of the empire. The level of taxation was, as in China, fixed by the number of houses; a dinar was levied on every house. The language of the government seems to have been Chinese. The son-in-law of the Gūrkhan is called fascā (Chinese "son-in-law") in Dwiwain (thence Usūfāmī in his note on Mālkhōd, Hist. des Sultans du Khurasan, Paris 1863, p. 124; in the edition by Muḥ. Ḵawzānī, ii. 17, 18 and 20, fascā); in the account of the Khātān in ʿAwīl (Lūḥbī al-ʿAlībī, ed. Browne, ii. 385) we appear to find the well-known Chinese word pāiz (so to be read for bā nasrā), later also adopted by the Mongols. Even under the rule of the pagan Khātān the Muslims appear, however, to have retained their leading positions; the wealthy merchant prince, Māhmūd Bāy, is mentioned by Dwiwain (ii. 89) as vizier of the last Gūrkhan. In Kaghchar about this time we find a Christian bishop (Assemani, Bibl. Orient., ill. part ii. 503); to the same period also belong the oldest Christian inscriptions on the Ču (Zápliški vost. ed. archb. obhč, viii. 26; W. Barthold, Zvět (Christentum etc., Tübingen, 1901, p. 58)); but also Islam seems to have made progress during this period. In the story of the conquests of the Khātān, the country of the princes of Balasagūn appears as the frontier land of the Muslim world; in the beginning of the xiiith century two Muslim dominions are mentioned north of the Ilī [q.v.] (one in the northern part of the
modern Semireche and one at Kulja). After the destruction of the kingdom of the Kara Khitai and that of the Naiman prince Külük, which succeeded it although over a much smaller area, the last Kara Khitai, as is apparent from the account of the journey of the Chinese envoy Wu-ku-sun (1220–1221), had to adopt Muslim customs and Muslim garments (Breternicher, Mediaeval Researches etc., i. 29). All this says little in favour of Marquart’s (Osttürkische Dialektstudien, p. 209) idea of the civilization of the Kara Khitai, which, according to him, stood “brilliantly out from its miserable surroundings”. In the first place, the text does not support this idea. In the second, the first Karashan of the text as translated by Ibn Al-Athir, xi. 57, in Raddj, 457 (Jan. 20–Feb. 18, 1142); he was followed by his widow “and his son Muhammed”. Marquart wants to read ibnātu ‘annāni for ibnānu Muhammed (Osttürk. Dialektst., p. 237); but it is nowhere stated that the wife of the Gürkhan was also his cousin; moreover, according to Chinese sources, she was only regent for her son who was still a minor. The latter, of course, cannot have been called Muhammed; but how the text is to be emended must remain unsettled (the reading wa-ibnu Muhammed is also found in the Bulaq edition, xi. 56). In the Muslim sources we find no complete list of the Gürkhan’s princes; Marquart here makes a guess in which only references to these are scanty and contradictory. Djuwaini in his chapter on the Kara Khitai (ii. 85 sq.) only mentions the widow and the brother of the first Gürkhan; in another passage (ii. 17) he also mentions, as do the Chinese annals, the rule of the daughter of the first Gürkhan; the same queen is mentioned by Râwandi (Râhât al-Sûfîr, p. 174), but he makes her reign down to his time, i.e. to the beginning of the thirteenth century, which cannot be correct. A more accurate list of the Gürkhan’s is given by the Chinese annals, but their tradition also is obviously inaccurate, especially in its chronological data. Marquart’s endeavour (loc. cit.) to bring the Muhammadan and Chinese sources into agreement and thus to date the reigns of the different rulers seems in general to be successful. According to him, the widow of the Gürkhan reigned till 1150, his son till 1163, his daughter till 1178 and his grandson till 1211. The latter is mentioned in the Chinese annals and, according to the usual pronunciation of the characters concerned, was called Chi-lu-ku; Marquart (following De Groot) reads Tirgu.

Under this ruler took place the fall of the Kara Khitai kingdom, brought about partly by the activities of the Muslim rulers in the west and partly by the Mongol power, then just breaking out (cf. the accounts thereon in Barthold’s Marquart, and also the articles Bûrân, Bûhârî, Cîngiz Khân and Muhammed B. Takâsh). As happened elsewhere also, it was here not always the conflict of religions that was the deciding factor. The Kara Khitai Muhammad, afterwards leader of the Muhammadan movement, relied in the early years of his reign for assistance against his Muslim enemies on the pagan Kara Khitai, as well as the spiritual rulers (imâr) of Bûhârî. The rising of ‘Uqman, prince of Samarkand, against the Kara Khitai is explained by Djuwaini (ii. 91) as due to the refusal of the Gürkhan to give his daughter in marriage to this prince. Later, under the influence of the estrangement between ‘Uqman and his Muhammadan liberator and father-in-law Muhammad, this matrimonial alliance nevertheless took place (ibid., ii. 124); the rising of the Muhammadan population of Muwarez-al-Nahr against their liberator had to be put down with ruthless vigour and bloodshed (609 = 1212). In contradiction to the view of these happenings given by Djuwaini, the Gürkhan was in reality deprived of his power a year earlier, in 1211, by Külük, prince of the Naiman. The attitude of this originally Christian, later pagan (probably Buddhist) ruler to the Muslim population did not always remain uniform; he appears as an ally of the Muslim enemies of the Gürkhan and as an ally of the prince of Kâhsârî (cf. the text of Djamal al-Kurashî in Barthold’s Turkistan etc., i. 133). He afterwards became a most bitter enemy of Islam. In his reign took place the first and only persecution of Islam in Central Asia; public Muslim worship was suppressed, the Muslims forced either to adopt Christianity or the religion of the pagans or at least to adopt the clothing of the Kara Khitai. Those who resisted were, like the Protestant feudal lords under Louis XIV, punished by having soldiers billeted on them. The only source on this point is Djuwaini (i. 49 sq.). By Cîngiz Khân’s victory over Külük the religious persecution was ended; the free subjects of the Karashan, subjects of the Kara Khitai, who had had as early as 1211 been in negotiation with Cîngiz Khân, received complete freedom of religion under Mongol rule. The Muslim dress was now adopted (cf. above) by the remaining Kara Khitai, which was the very reverse of Külük’s law. Neither inscriptions nor buildings nor any other trace of the rule of the Kara Khitai have survived in Central Asia.

On the rule of a former “Amir” of the Gürkhan and his descendants in Kirmân see Bûrân, Hâdib and Kirmân. (W. Barthold)

KARA KIRGIZ. [See Kirghiz.]

KARA KOL, KARAGHUL. [See Karaul].

KARAKORUM (karaqorom), a chain of mountains in the centre of Asia lying north and almost parallel to the Himalayas. The range extends westwards as far as 75° of Long.; it has not yet been definitely ascertained how far it runs eastwards. At one time the eastern limit was thought to be the pass of the Karakorum, but, according to the views of several famous geographers, the range runs much farther into Tibet and the Tang-la should, they think, be regarded as a part of the Karakorum. This idea was first put forward by Klaproth in 1836 and is now held by Burrard, von Hedin and others who further regard the Trans-Himalaya as belonging to the Karakorum system. If this is accurate, the whole system would be about 1250 miles long.

The highest elevations are found in the part west of the pass of Karakorum. There we find several peaks over 26,500 feet high and countless summits over 23,000 feet. The highest peak — probably the second highest in the world — is Mount Godwin Austen, indicated on the Survey of India maps as K.2, but which seems to have been long known as Chogo-ri among the natives. This giant attains a height of 28,245 feet.

This western part of the Karakorum possesses a wild and imposing natural beauty; it is covered with eternal snows over a considerable extent. The snow line runs from 15,500 feet north of the principal chain to 17,000 in the south.
If we exclude the polar regions the largest glaciers in the world are found in this part of the Karakorum. The Siachen glacier is 45 miles long and covers a surface of about 1,000 square miles. The Baltoro, Hispara and Bimbo glaciers are only a little less than the Siachen. The plateau out of which rises the Karakorum has an average height of 10,000 feet. The whole region is excessively dry because the rain (snow, hail) falls almost exclusively on the high mountains. The vegetation in the valleys is very slight and is confined to the vicinity of torrents and streams. At the terminations of the glaciers we find — very often on a little plain — a very beautiful alpine flora.

The Karakorum is the most important watershed in Central Asia, dividing the rivers which run northwards empty their waters into the deserts of this part of the world, and running southwards into the Indian Ocean.

The principal pass is the col of Karakorum (18,550 feet), through which runs the important trade route between Chinese Turkestan and Kashmir. It is difficult and dangerous. In their long journey countless beasts of burden perish of exhaustion or in the avalanches. The mountaineers take their "black debris," the name is not very appropriate. It is found for the first time in a map by Elphinstone published in 1815. On this map the range in question is indicated by the name Moor Taugh or Karakooroom Mountains.

The first traveller to write on the mountains now called Karakoram was Mirzâ Haidar, a prince of Chinese Turkestan, a propos of his journey from Yarkand to Leh, capital of Ladak, in 1533. The exploration proper of the Karakoram only began in 1808 when Elphinstone visited those regions. The more systematic and detailed exploration of the high mountains proper was only begun in 1892 by Sir Martin Conway's expedition, which has been followed by several others.

**Bibliography:**

(Ph. C. Visser)

**Karakorum, a town in Mongolia on the Orkhon, in the thirteenth century for a short time (about 1230—1260) the capital of the Mongol Emperors, now in ruins. The fullest accounts of the town are given among European travellers by Rubrak (Latin edition in *Itinerari de Viaggio* et *de Viaggio*, 1539, iv. 345 sq.; transl. by W. W. Rockhill, *Hakuyt Society, 2nd series*, especially p. 220 with the translator's notes) and among Muslim historians by Djuwaini [q. v.]. *Tarikhi-i Dzihan Gubzlu*, ed. Mirzâ Muhammad Kazwini, especially i. 169 sq. and 192. The fullest account of the ruins (by the members of the expedition of 1891) is in *Sbornik Trudov Orkhoonskoy Evpedsii*, part i. (1892); in Radloff's *Atlas der Alterthümer der Mongolei* is a plan of the ruins (Pl. xxxvi.) and a squeeze of a large (not completely preserved) Persian inscription (Pl. xliii.); on the other see E. Blochet in *T'oung Pao*, 1897, vii. 309 sq. As Djuwaini freely remarks, a little below Karakorum there were the ruins of the old (8th—9th century) Uighur capital Ordu balfik ("court town") which, from being in ruins, was then called Mo-balfik ("black town") and is now known as Khara-Balgasun ("black town"). The city built by the Mongol Emperor Udegee (1229—1241) was also at first officially known as Ords-balfik; the name Karakorum was a popular one. On linguistic grounds Karakorum cannot, as Rockhill supposes, be a corruption of *Kara Kuren* ("black camp") but means "black debris" (cf. Radloff, *Versuch einer Wörterbuch*, etc., s. v. *Korum*), a name still frequently found in mountainous regions. As Djuwaini expressly remarks, this was the original name of the mountain region round the sources of the Orkhon. The statement ascribed by Rockhill (following d'Ohsson) to Djuwaini that the town was half a farsak long does not seem to be found in the printed text of the *Tarikhi-i Dzihan Gubzlu* nor in manuscripts. Rubrak describes Karakorum as a small town not larger than the faubourg St. Denys in Paris; the monastery of St. Denys far surpassed in size the palace of the Mongol emperor. The ruins of the Mongol Karakorum indeed indicate a town of very moderate size; the Uighur Ordu-balfik was considerably larger. On the other hand there was much building in Karakorum during the city's brief period of splendour; Rubrak as well as Djuwaini give full descriptions of the imperial palaces built in the city and around it, some by Chinese and others by Muhammadan architects, according to Rubrak, Russian and Western European architects also shared in the building operations at a later date. Two farsaks east of Karakorum lay, according to Djuwaini, the palace of Tarshih-balfik ("city of precious stuffs, brought as presents").

After the Mongol Emperors had removed their residence to China, Karakorum was only the seat of the governor of Mongolia; according to Marco Polo (transl. Yule-Cordier, London 1903, i 226), who was not himself in Karakorum, the palace of the governor was in the citadel. After the Mongol dynasty was driven out of China (1368) the Emperors returned to Karakorum; after the dissolution of the dynasty in the xvth century the city lost all importance; at the present day the great Buddhist monastery of Erdeni-Tuu is there.

(W. Barthold)
KARA-KOVUN-LU (Turkish "those of the Black Sheep"), a Turkoman dynasty which reigned in Persia and Mesopotamia from 777 (1375) to 873 (1468). In the reign of the Emir Dji-dash, Sulthan Uwaiss, Bandur Khvadjia, chief of the family of the Behrul, had obtained an important position at the court of the Sulthan through his valor; at the latter’s death he seized al-Mawyi, Sindjar and Ardjasj. When he died in 782 (=1380), his son Kara Muhammed Tarumsh, who was in the service of Sulthan Ahmad, son of Uwaiss, came back to succeed him and fell in a battle in Syria (792 = 1390). The son of this Kara Muhammed, Kara Yusuf, proclaimed himself independent and chose Tabriz as his capital. He made war on Timur, took refuge with Bâyazid Yildirim and took advantage of the conqueror’s campaign in Asia Minor to seize Irak Arabi, but he could not defend Baghadad against Mirza Abû Bakr, sent against him by Timur, and retired to Egypt to the Mamluk Sulthan, who kept him prisoner for some time. On Timur’s death he was released, collected the thousand men who had accompanied him, took Dyâr Bakr after overcoming a thousand difficulties, defeated Mirza Abû Bakr in the vicinity of Nakhkewwan (809 = 1406), recaptured Tabriz and settled himself there. The following year he again defeated this prince, accompanied by his father Mirzan Shâh, who fell on the field of battle. He took as a hostage on the throne his son Pir Budaq, who had been adopted by Sulthan Ahmad. He took Dyâr Bakr from Kara Oghman Bayendi, put Sulthan Ahmad to death after his defeat and capture not far from Tabriz, seized Irak Arabi (813 = 1410) and made peace with Kara Oghman after defeating him. He destroyed the army sent against him by Shaikh Ibrahim, king of Shirwân and Kustendil, king of Georgia. In 822 (1419) he captured al-Sulţaniya, Kazwin and Sâwâ, towns of Irak Adjami, Shaikh Rukh, son and successor of Timur, was leading a vast army against him when he fell ill and died in Dhu ‘l-Hiijjâ of the same year (December) in the town of Dûjân, at the age of 65, after reigning 14 years. His body was despoiled by the Turkomans and lay for two days without burial, then it was buried at Ardjân beside his grandfather Bahar Khvadjia.

His eldest son Amir Iscandar, having reunited the scattered members of his tribe, took the field against Shâh Rukh and was defeated after a battle lasting two days (824 = 1421); but he seized the opportunity of his opponent’s return to Khorasân to regain Ardhabâdjan. He defeated and slew Shams al-Din, Sulthan of Akhlat (828), Sulthan Ahmad, chief of the Kurds, and Izz al-Din Shir (830 = 1426). He recaptured Shirwân and al-Sulţaniya. He fought again with Shâh Rukh in 832 (1429) and, despite the bravery of his brother Dji-dash Shâh, he lost the battle and fled into Asia Minor; then, taking advantage of the fact that the Timurid sovereign had placed on his throne the other brother Abû Sa’d, he returned to the charge, captured his brother and put him to death. On the complaint of the people of Shirwân, who had been ruined by the plundering, Shâh Rukh sent a new army in 838 (1434) with which Dji-dash Shâh and Shâh ‘Ali, his nephew, joined forces. Not being able to make a stand, Iscandar fled and came back again when Dji-dash Shâh had been installed by the Timurid, but he was de-feated and shut himself up in the castle of Alendjâk, where he was murdered by his son Khozâd at the instigation of one of his wives, who had fallen in love with the young man (841 = 1437). He had reigned for sixteen years. Mirza Djâd-dash Shâh, appointed by Shaikh Rukh (839 = 1435), engaged in the reorganisation of Ardhabâdjan and added to it new provinces, Irak Adjami (856 = 1452). Isfâbân, in which the inhabitants were massacred, Fâr, Kirmân and Khorasân (862 = 1458), where he established his capital in the town of Herât. He was obliged to make peace with the Timurid Sulthan Abû Sa’id, who took the field against him, by giving up the latter province to him because his son Hasan had escaped from his prison and had succeeded in taking Ardhabâdjan. After an exceedingly swift march, on which he laid the country passed through waste and many beasts of burden perished, he captured his son and banished him from the country. Another of his sons, Pir Budaq, whom he had deposed of his office as governor of Far because of his evil conduct and relegated to Baghadad, rebelled in 869 (1465) and sustained a siege for a year. He then obtained by a ruse the submission of Pir Budaq, put him to death and replaced him by his other son Muhammed Mirza. He reigned undisputed over the whole of Ardhabâdjan, the two Idrâks and Kirmân as well as over the coast of Oman. Winter prevented him from putting into operation his plans against Dyâr Bakr (871 = 1467). On his return, while out hunting, he was surprised by his enemy Usân Hasan Bayendi and killed while trying to escape, at the age of 70 after a reign of 32 years (on the 12th of Rabî’ II = Nov. 21).

Hasan ‘Ali, his exiled son, whom Usân Hasan had welcomed, and whose brain was affected by his 25 years in prison, gathered together a body of bad characters and marched on Tabriz where his brother Hussân ‘Ali, the dervish, who had been crowned king in spite of himself, had just been murdered as a result of feminine intrigues. He ascended the throne, distributed his wealth to the mob and avenged his brother. Abandoned by the army leaders who went over to the camp of Usân Hasan, he tried to raise the people of Hamshân but was captured and put to death in 873 (1468). This was the end of the main branch of the family.

The branch which reigned at Baghadad consists of the following succession of princes: 1. Shâh Muhammed, son of Kara Yusuf (died 837 = 1433), had been entrusted by his father with the administration of this province, but he was deprived of it after 23 years by 2. his brother Espân, who reigned 12 years and died in 848 (1444). 3. His son Fûlç succeeded him; it was in his reign that Djâhân Shâh took Baghadad and thus put an end to this line.


KAŠAKM (Turkish "black sand"), a desert in Russian Turkestân, between the Amû Darya, the Ust Urt and the ranges of hills on the Caspian, contrasted with Kižl-Kum ("red sand"),
the desert between the Sir Darya and the Amu Darya. The Karakum (area 148,000 sq. miles) is a still more dreary waste and possesses even fewer fertile areas than the Kizil-kum. The sandy stretches north of the Sir as far as Lake Calkar are called "little Karakum"; cf. Franz Mahatschek, Landeskunde von Russisch-Turkestän, Stuttgart 1921, p. 15 sq., 285 and Index. The Karakum mentioned by Djuwaini in the Tarikh-i Dju'fani Khudai is, in the opinion of the editor, probably identical with the little Karakum (the readings of the MSS. are not certain; cf. edition by Mirza Muḥ. Karawini, Gibb Mem. Series, vol. xvi., part ii. 101 sq.).

(W. BARTHOLO)

**KARAKUSH, BAHK-E AL-DIN IBN 'ABD ALLAH (i.e. son of an unknown father) AL-ASADI (maniluk of Asad-e Al-Din Shirkhul) AL-RUMI (born in Asia Minor) AL-MASIRI AL-MAŠIRI, officer of Malik al-Nāṣir Yusuf (i.e. Saladin), a eunuch, received his liberties from Shirkhul and was appointed an Amir. By the time of Shirkhul's death (564 = 1169) he was already playing an influential part; it is said that he was to him and the Kādi 'Isa al-Hajjāri that the Caliph al-Salih appointed Saladin vizier. After the suppression of the rebellion fomented after al-Salih's death by his Chamberlain, the eunuch Mu'taman al-Khiłāfī, Karakush was appointed Chamberlain. In this capacity he had the surveillance of the family of the late Caliph and is said to have administered his office with great strictness. To prevent the family of the Caliph increasing, he separated men and women. Saladin gave him the task of building the citadel of Cairo and extending the city walls to include Cairo and Fustat; later he was asked to fortify and defend 'Akkā. When the town fell in 587 (1191) after eighteen months' fighting he was taken prisoner; Saladin ransomed him a few months later for the high sum of 20,000 dinārs. After the death of Saladin in 589 (1193) he entered the service of his son al-Malik al-'Aziz 'Uthmān and was trusted to represent the Sultan when the latter was out of Egypt. When the Sultan felt his end approaching (595 = 1199) he designated his son al-Malik al-Mansūr his successor and Karakush his regent. In keeping with this wish, the young ruler appointed him Atabeg although Karakush was now very old. He only held his post for a very short time as most of the Amir and the head of the chancellery, Ibn Mammāt, declared him incapable of ruling, presumably on account of his great age. His supporters, who considered him the most worthy, consulted Saladin's adviser, al-Kādi al-Faḍil [q.v.], but the latter, who had retired from political life, would not be drawn into the question. Finally the Amir asked al-Mansūr's uncle, al-Malik al-Afḍal, to take over the regency. After this we find only one mention of Karakush, when Sultan al-Adil, who had seized the throne in 596 (1200), had two of his nephews taken to the house of Karakush as prisoners. He died a year later. Contemporary historians, like Imād al-Din al-Kāmil al-Isfahānī, bestow the highest praise upon him, as do later writers, like al-Maḵrīzī and Ibn Taghribirdi, and describe him as the ablest man of his day. They give him particular credit for his activity as a builder. Besides the buildings already mentioned, his house, his hippodrome and the br dge at Gizeh, which he built out of stones from the Pyramids at Memphis, are mentioned.

In the same period a "Karakush" became notorious as a type of stupidity. A series of aburd verdicts are related in a work entitled Kitāb al-Faḍḥū fi Aḵkām Karakush, "the book of the stupidity in the judgments of Karakush". According to Ḥājjādī Khalīfā, the above mentioned Ibn Mammāt was the author of this book. Casanova (see Bibl.) in his elaborate study on Karakush quotes three manuscripts: 1) a Cairo manuscript which contains a brief selection from the Kitāb al-Faḍḥū; the author is there given as Ibn Mammāt; 2) a Paris manuscript the author of which is given as al-Sūṭī; it is wrongly as in the introduction Ibn Taghribirdi is quoted wrongly and given a wrong praenomen, which one can hardly credit of al-Sūṭī; 3) a Cairo manuscript which is a later version, in which Karakush is called a Sultan and the number of his "verdicts" is increased, by 'Abd al-Salām al-Łakānī of the year 1200 (1786). These "verdicts" have nothing to do with statecraft but are court verdicts; they are typical, well known anecdotes, current among other nations also. A special investigation has not yet been made of the problem. Casanova endeavours to show that the work is a pamphlet against Karakush, whom, he says, Ibn Mammāt had written an exceedingly severe man. It is not known whether Ibn Mammāt collected and published these anecdotes in the life-time of Karakush. Ibn Khallīkān rightly points out that it is impossible that a man such as is described in the anecdotes could have held high offices of state. Nor is anything known of a particular feud between Ibn Mammāt and Karakush except that Ibn Mammāt had protested in 595 (1199) against the appointment of this then very old man; Karakush is described by the Frankish chroniclers as advanced in years even in 585 (1189) at the siege of 'Akkā; he is said even to have known Godfrey de Bouillon. One thing is clear from Ibn Khallīkān's observation: the anecdotes given by Ibn Mammāt were referred to our Karakush.


**KARAKAM (Banu 'L'), a dynasty of 'Aden, from 476—533 (1083—1138) conducted an ismā'īlī condominium — in Branches of the Banū Saḥl's clan of the tribe of Yam in the Ḥamādan group and were closely related to the Banū Saḥlids [q.v.]. They were therefore the principal supporters of...**
the founder of this dynasty, the Ismā'īlī Fāṭimī da'i 'Ali b. Muḥammad and of his son and successor al-Mukarram. When the Banū Ma'n, whom the Dā'ī had allowed to remain as vassals after the conquest of 'Aden in 439 (1047), rebelled, al-Mukarram and his wife, the Sultāna Saiyida Ḥurra, to whom 'Aden belonged as her dowry, transferred the governorship to the two brothers Mas'ūd and 'Abbās, sons of al-Karam, in 476 (1083); the former received the castle of al-Khadrā' and the revenues of the coast-lands while the latter got the revenues of the landward part of the country and the castle of al-Ta'kīr at the gateway to the interior (not to be confused with the stronghold of the same name above Djabla, not far from the road from Djanad to Yārim). Their joint annual tribute amounted to 100,000 dinārs. Mas'ūd and al-Zūrā'ī, son and successor of 'Abbās, fell before the gates of Zabid, performing their feudal duty under the command of the major-domo of the Saiyida, al-Mufaadżal Abī l-Barakāt. The division of the territory into two parts was for the time being maintained. Mas'ūd was followed in succession by his son b. 'Abu l-Ghārāt and the latter's sons Muḥammad and 'Ali; al-Zurā'ī's heir was his son Abu Su'ūd and the latter's son Sa'bā. But the manner of division of the country afforded the latter line an advantage from the first in view of greater facilities for expansion into the interior and the easier defence of the strongholds won by the two families there. It was the mountains in the north of the al-Ma'āris district that were specially concerned. It proved to be of importance that al-Zurā'ī had taken possession of Dumlawa in 480 (1097). a fortress in the Djabal al-Silw above the bend where the road from Djanad has to curve round the mountain and is at its farthest east point. Under their vigorous Sa'bā, if not earlier, not only had their lands there been considerably increased but even Dhubbān about 100 miles W. N.W. of 'Aden on the road to Mokhā and Zabid had been occupied. Sa'bā's father, along with Abu l-Ghārāt, had succeeded in getting the tribute reduced to half and then to a quarter by successfully refusing to pay more to the Saiyida. Sa'bā was able to stop and altogether with the difficulties of the widow increased. The changed conditions attracted attention in Cairo: the eleven Fāṭimid, al-Hā配备了 Abī al-Ma'djad, soon after his accession received Sa'bā into the Ismā'īlī hierarchy as dā'ī in 525 (1131). Dumlawa remained the royal residence. A two years' war in the Wādī Laḥd brought about a decision between the families of the two brothers. 'Ali b. Wādī l-Ghārāt began by purchasing the support of numerous warriors. When he had shot his bolt, Sa'bā gained the upper hand by throwing his great wealth into the conflict and 300,000 borrowed dinārs in addition. He was finally victorious on the same day, it is said, as his ally in 'Aden, Bilāl b. Dja'īrī, stormed the castle of al-Khadrā'. Henceforth 'Abd al-Dżud b. Shāhīd ruled alone. But Sa'bā died six months after his entry into 'Aden in 533 (1138). He is buried there at the foot of al-Ta'kīr. By the next year his son and successor 'Ali al-A'azz had died of consumption. He had designated as his successors his infant sons, who were in Dumlawa under the guardianship of their tutor Anīs and the minister Yahyā b. 'Ali. But Bilāl, whom he had dismissed and menaced, was now in 'Aden and gave the crown to another son of his former patron Sa'bā, namely Muḥammad who had taken refuge from 'Ali al-A'azz on his father's death with Maṣūr, son of the above mentioned major-domo al-Mufaadżal. The reign of this Muḥammad b. Sa'bā from 534 to 548 or 550 (1139 to 1153 or 1155) marks the zenith of Za'rā'īl power. He put to death the last prince of the line of Mas'ūd in 545 (1150/1), 'Ali b. Abī l-Ghārāt, who had still held out after his defeat with some members of his family and a few faithful followers in a few mountain strongholds, for example in the Djabal Munif, north of Lālājī. In 547 (1152/3) he was purchased from his chief protector Maṣūr, the heir of Saiyida, 28 towns and strongholds including al-Ta'kīr with Djabla and Idb in the north-east and Dhubbā in the south-east. He had received the rank of dā'ī immediately after his accession, for the Kādi sent from Cairo to invest 'Ali al-A'azz found Muḥammad already in actual power. It is to this ruler that we are mainly indebted for our knowledge of the history of the Za'rā'īs. For, with some men not so fully interviewed, like Anīs and Bilāl already mentioned, he is the main authority for the section on the dynasty in the Tārikh al-Yaman of Umāra, who visited him personally and on Umāra are based e.g. al-Dja'īrī, al-Khadrā'ī and Ibn Khallān. Umāra praises Muḥammad very highly, notably as a Maceenas. But one cannot help thinking that he — himself an enthusiastic Ismā'īlī — was biased in favour of his royal co-religionists. Whether Muḥammad for the rest interpreted his duties as dā'ī in a religious sense, we do not know nor can we tell whether the request of the founder of the Mahdi dynasty, 'Ali b. al-Mahdi, who had asked Muḥammad in the presence of Umāra in an audience shortly before his death for help against Zabid, was rejected for purely political and military reasons or for religious reasons as well. In his son and successor Imrān the religious interest predominated. The real power passed into the hands of the vizier family of Bilāl. The latter himself, who had already had the share in the government in the reign of Muḥammad, which was due him for his help in securing the throne, had died not long before — or very shortly after — the change in the throne, leaving a vast estate. He was succeeded in office first by his son Mu'dāf and after the latter's early death by his other son Yāsir who ruled quite independently. When Imrān died in 560 (1164/5) and in keeping with his wishes was buried in Mekka, Yāsir had his 3 sons, who were still minors, imprisoned in Dumlawa in charge of the eunuch Abu l-Dja'īrī. The Za'rā'īs were to be spared the fate of being definitely dethroned by their own people. The last blow came from without: in 569 (1173/4) Saladin's brother Tārā'naskh conquered 'Aden along with the rest of Yemen. In the following year Djawhar surrendered him Dumlawa by treaty and a year later Tārā'naskh had Yāsir, whose holding-place was betrayed, beheaded.

**Bibliography:** The authors mentioned in the text in H. C. Kay, *Yaman, its early Mediaeval History*, London 1892; B. L. Playfair, *A History of Arabia Felix or Yemen*, Bombay 1859, p. 35—88; J. W. Redhouse, *The Pearl-strings .... by .... 'el-Khazrejyy*, vol. i. in
the Gibb Memorial Series, iii. 54 (1906), p. 15, 18 sqq.; S. Lane-Poole, The Mohammedan Dynasties, Westminster 1854, p. 97. (R. Strothmann)

KARĀMĀ is strictly the infinitive of karūna (to be karim “generous” in the widest sense); but in usage it is a noun of similar meaning to ḫrāṣm and takrīm, to show one’s self karim to any one (Lisān, xv 456, 3 sqq.). It does not occur in the Kūr’ān although karim is very frequently used of Allāh and his workings (al-Rāghib al-Isfahānī, al-Mufradāt, sub nec). It has come, therefore, in the devotional language of Islam, to mean the efficaciation by Allāh of his generosity, favour, protection, help towards any one, e.g. al-Baydāwī on Kur. x. 63 (ed. Fischnler, i. 419, 411), a locus classicus on the wali; and karāmāt mean individual cases of this generosity. In a special sense, the karāmāt then come to mean the miraculous gifts and graces with which Allāh surrounds, protects and aids his Saints (al-wala‘yīn). A Kur’ānic basis for these was sought in the story (Kur. iii. 32) of the food which came miraculously to Maryam in the locked hirāh; and in the transporting in a moment from Yemen of the throne of Bilkis by a unnamed companion of Solomon (Kur. xxviii. 40). As neither Maryam nor the unnamed companion was a prophet these could not be evidentiary miracles (mu‘ījdāt). See the whole discussion in al-Taftazānī on al-Nasā‘ī’s Aḥādīth, Cairo 1321, pp. 134 sqq. But the real basis lay in the innumerable narratives of karāmāt in the lives of the walis, exaggerated and distorted reflections of indubitable facts in the ecstatic religious life. The fact of these all orthodox Islam admits, even so philosophically an historian as Ibn Khaldūn (ed. Quatremère, i. 169, 199; transl. de Slane, i. 190, 227) and a peripatetic philosopher like Ibn Sīnā (Iqātār, ed. Forget, pp. 209, 219, 221 sqq.). These were evidently driven by the pressure of facts to fall back on the hypothesis of still unsolved mysteries in nature; cf. Goldziher, Die Richtungen der islamischen Karāmāt, Leipzig 1916, p. 130, note 3. Only the Mu‘tazilites, who were certain that nature held no mysteries for them and that they need only apply reason to their theological positions, protested and found, even in the Kur’ān, basis for their protest. See al-Zamakhshāri on Kur. lxxi. 26, 27 (al-Kazakib, ed. Nassau Lee, ii. 1539) and on the whole development Goldziher, op. cit., pp. 144 sqq. The coincidence in sound, in derivation and in meaning between these karāmāt and the ḥizāqa‘at of the early Christian Church (1 Cor. xii.) is most striking and can hardly be accidental. The religious phenomena behind both are the same; but the verbal link is not clear; the Syriac Church called the ḥizāqa‘at simply “gifts”, naukhāhā, in Arabic, naqshib, which indeed occurs in this sense; it is possible that the Greek word taken over into Syriac may have suggested to users of Arabic their own karāmāt. Technically, such a karāmā is one of the ḥuz wa‘l gūn, “the breakers of usage”; for there is no Nature in orthodox Islam, only, and at best, a custom which Allāh has established (Goldziher, Vorlesungen, p. 130). It differs from the mu‘ījdāt or “evidentiary miracle” in that it is not worked by Allāh for a prophet in proof of his mission and is not accompanied by a ḥirā‘a or a taḥnādī, a claim of prophethood or a challenge to the unbeliever. It differs from the ma‘ūna, “help”, in that while the recipient of the mu‘ījdāt is a Muslim he has had very special religious experience; and from the ḫrā‘ā, an amicable miracle worked for a prophet before his call. It differs from the isti‘rādāt and ikhāna as these are wrought at the instance of unbelievers to lead them astray and bring them to shame (Dict. of Techn. Terms, i. 444 sqq.; al-Nasā‘ī, Aḥādīth, loc. cit. with accomp. commentaries). A wali should conceal his wonders, while a prophet must display them; a wali may not know about them, while a prophet cannot help knowing. Yet the karāmāt of a wali may be regarded as a mu‘ījdāt for the prophet whose follower he is. Finally, a wali should disregard them as much as possible and should look on them as tests rather than as privileges.


KARAMAN — KARAMAN is the name — derived from the Turkoman dynasty of the Karaman-Oghlu [q.v.] — 1) of a district in Asia Minor, 2) of a town in Turkey, capital of a kaza of the same name. The boundaries of the district of Karaman (Karaman-III, Caramania) have varied. All the lands which were permanently under the Karamanids are occasionally so called, that is Lycania, the Cilician Taurus and the whole southern Anatolian coast territory as far as Adalia. When the Karamanids were finally overthrown, their lands became one Ottoman province (wilâyet) with Konya as the residence of the Pasha. The sandjak of Ef-ili [q.v.] was afterwards separated from the Pashaik; the northern larger portion was called Khatrā, probably in contrast to Ef-ili (Hadjidjī, al-Qalafa, Džahan-namā, p. 615 sqq.; cf. also Ewīyā Celebi, Siyāsāt-namā, Constantinople 1314—18, iii. 20), and comprised in the xvith century the sandjaks of Aḵsarā, Aẖ-Sehir, Konya, Kır-Sehir, Kaşar, Nigde. After the administrative reforms of 1861, the name of the province was changed to Konya [q.v.]. The population of Caramania is overwhelmingly Turkish (picture of a Muslim of Caramania in d’Ohsson, Tableau de l’Empire Othom. Paris 1786—1820, ii, opposite p. 137); even the Greeks, or at least those inhabitants who belong to the orthodox Greek Church, speak Turkish. They are known as Karamanlis and write Turkish in Greek letters; in Constantinople they have their newspaper Nicos Amatoli printed in this way. During the nationalist fighting in 1919 and 1920, the Karamanlis under the protection of the nationalist government east of the Oeconomian Patriarch and for a time chose a patriarch of their own. They are very probably not Greeks at all by origin but descendants of the ancient Lycianians. In the mountains of Caramania live Yörükis and Turkomans. The name Caramania for the coastslands from Mersina to Adalia seems to have become

2. The town of Karamán is the ancient Lâranda (Τὰ Ἀγάβαι; cf. Pauly-Wissowa, Realent, d. class. Altertumswiss., xii, col. 793). It lies 35 miles S.E. of Konya in the plain at the foot of the Taurus, on one of the great roads which lead from the coast (Seleuke) across the Taurus into the interior of Anatolia. It is not known when it fell into the hands of the Seljûks for the first time; as was the case in the rest of Anatolia, the process of islamisation probably was rapidly completed here. Lâranda also belonged to the Dînârmandâks from whom Kiliç Arslân retook it in 1165 (Michael Syrus in the Rec. des Hist. des Crois., Dec. Arm., i, 360). In 1190 Frederick I Barbarossa entered Lâranda on his way to Cilicia and in 1210 it again fell into the hands of the Christians when Leon II, King of Armenia, conquered it for the Knights-Hospitalier. In 1216 it had, however, again to be surrendered to Sultan 'izz al-Dîn Kaïkûs (Rec. etc., Dec. Arm., 1, 644).

 Shortly afterwards (about 1230) Lâranda was among the towns which were abandoned to the invading Kâhîjîmîs (Ibn Bâli in Houtsma, Recueil de Textes relatifs aux Selçouks, iv, 193). In connexion with this event Bûhâ al-Dîn Walad, father of Dîjlâl al-Dîn al-Rûmî, migrated about this time from Khorasân to Lâranda where Dîjlâl al-Dîn al-Rûmî married in 623 (1226) and where Sultan Walad was born (Les Saintes des Derviches Tourneurs, transl. by Huart, i, Paris, 1918, p. 19, 26, 268).

The town attained great importance through the dynasty of the Karamân-Oghlu [q. v.] who made it their capital in the beginning of the xivth century, when they did not yet feel secure in Konya. Several princes of this dynasty lived there even at a later period. They embellished the town with fine buildings and fortified the citadel. During this period the town was often under Egyptian suzerainty (Ibn Ishaq, ed. Paris, ii, 284; Ibn Faâl Allâh, Maqallât al-Hâkîmîn, in the N. E., xii, 342 sq.). In the wars with the Ottomans, Lâranda was repeatedly occupied by the latter and the Karamânîd ruler was forced to take refuge in the mountains. Finally in 1467 it was captured under Mehmed II and totally incorporated in the Ottoman Empire in 1486 by Bayazid II. Henceforth Lâranda was known as Karamân, although the old name has always been retained in official language.

The modern Karamân is a town of about 5,000 inhabitants (according to Banse, p. 106; Kâmaüs al-Flâm gives 7,500; 'All Djawâd 10,000). It lies on a low hill on the southern edge of the Lycaonian plain about 4,000 feet above sea-level. The highest part of the hill (about 300 feet higher) has on it the citadel now falling to pieces; it consisted of round and square towers linked by walls; the outer wall is built from stones from older buildings with Arabic inscriptions. Among the most important buildings of the Karamânîd period is the Emir Mûsa Medresesi where several princes of the dynasty are buried. The dome has fallen in; pillars of it are still standing which once belonged to Roman buildings. There is also the Kâhîjîmî Medresesi, one of the finest buildings of the Karamânîd period (pictures in van Berchem, op. cit., p. 118 and 126, and Weermann, Gesch. d. Kûst, ii, 446). According to the inscription (Tarih-i 'Ogânî Medresesi Medînî'î, also entitled Recueil historique publ. par l'Institut d'histoire ottomane, 11, 1, 714), it was built in 783 (1381) by the daughter of Murâd I, who married the Karamânî-Oghlu 'Alî al-Dîn (or 'Ali); there now very little left of it.

Mention may also be made of the sâvâjî built by the same 'Alî al-Dîn in 772 (1370), where Dîjlâl al-Dîn al-Rûmî's mother is reputed to be buried (now called Agha Tekke; cf. van Berchem, op. cit., p. 110), and of the 'Urûb where the Karamânîl Ibrahim Beg and two of his sons are buried. The inscriptions in it are now destroyed (Z.O.E.M., 11, 13, p. 831). The 'Urûb is situated near the Karamânî-Oghlu mosque or 'Umarî Dîjmî which was founded by this same Ibrahim Beg in 836 (1432) (picture in van Berchem, op. cit., p. 127) and has a finely ornamented gateway and is richly adorned with tiles in the interior.

The houses of the town are built of clay (tepêkâb); the inhabitants are reputed to be very dirty and the climate with its great variations in temperature here is said to be very unhealthy. There are a number of looms (kelînîs and sulfûjîdanîs) in Karamân and tanneries. The town is on the Anatolian Railway between Konya and Ereğli; it has always been an important station on the trade route to Cilicia.

The Kadjî of the same name, the capital of which is Karamân, belongs to the sandjak of Konya. It has about 30,000 inhabitants (according to Cunet 21, 417) of whom the great majority are Muhammadans. The Taurus in the south is here called Alî Dagh and in the north rises there the Kara Dagh. As the chalk soil is as a rule well watered by the streams from the Taurus there are good crops. Most of the farmers in the plains are Muhâjdîrs (settlers from Rumelia). The mountain valleys are tilled by Turkomans who have settled there. The produce of the soil consists of different cereals, vegetables, fruit (raisins), cotton and opium. Salt is also produced. The wool for the carpet factories is yielded by the many sheep reared there.


(J. H. Kramers)

KARAMÂN MEHMED PASHA, an Ottoman Grand Vizier and historian. He first saw the light, probably in Caramania, as son of a certain 'Arif Celebi and was a descendant of the great mystic Djâlî al-Dîn al-Rûmî [q. v.]. He seems to have come when quite young to Stambul where he made the acquaintance of the celebrated
Grand Vizier Mahmud Pasha-i Welt [q.v., executed 1474] and through his influence was educated in the medrese founded by him (cf. J. v. Hammer, Gesch. des Osman. Reiches, ii. 1431, 1474). He was secretary of state to the signet (nâhîname) with the rank of vizier. But in 862 (1454—5) he soon after the capture of Constantinople he must already have been in high office, as is shown by the epigraphs al-âmîr al-khalîf wa l-wasir al-kâhir in his Arabic grant of foundation (wäfîâya), dated Dhu l-Ka'dâ 4, 862 (= Sept. 13, 1458), in the Pruss. Nat. Library in Berlin (cf. W. Ahlwardt, Katalog der ar. Hs., iv. 227, No. 4765, fol. 74 sqq.).

He attr. in the attention of Mehmed II, the Conqueror, more and more, became his adviser in the organisation of the offices of state and in the making of new laws. The celebrated Kanun-nâme (cf. Mitt. zur orn. Gesch., i. 151 sqq., Vienna 1921) is probably* for the most part his work. When in May, 1475 the Grand Vizier Ahmad Gedik Pasha was dismissed, Mehmed II summoned the unwarlike but intellectually distinguished Mehmed Pasha to be Grand Vizier. As such he achieved fame by composing a dispatch to Uzun Hâsan, prince of the alkûls and hierarch (cf. Ferdinân Bey, Münchenat al-Saltanât, Stambul 1745—50). On Rabî' I 5, 866 = May 4, 1478, on the death of Sinârevâli, he was most cruelly murdered by mutinous janissaries in Stambul in the Tahtâ al-Kâla (Cam Kapan) quarter (cf. M. Guazzo, Storia d'èt secc. del Mosekito, Venice 1545, p. 285; cf. also Andrea Navagero in Muratori, Rerum italic. script., xxvii. 1167, Milan 1733). He is buried in Stambul near the Küm Kapu in the new Nâhîname mosque called after him (cf. Hâfiz Hüsain, Resatât al-İmamîn, Stambul 1821, i. 209; J. v. Hammer, Gesch. des osman. Reiches, i. 90, No. 449; do., Constantiopolis, Pest 1822, i. 430; Sehl's statement, op. cit., p. 23, 10, is incorrect). Mehmed Pasha also dabbled in poetry and published his verses under the masâzâr Nâshâlî. He is more important as a historian. He wrote a treatise (risâla) in two parts (sâfet) on the history of the Ottoman Empire; the first part covers the period from 0thumân to Mehmed II (1451), the second from 1451 to 1480 (885) i.e. shortly after the deaths of Mehmed II and himself. Specimen of the work, which is written in Arabic, were published in English, by Turkish by Mukrimin Khalil in the Recl. Historiques, vol. xiv., Stambul 1924, part 2 and 3, from the MS. in the Aya Sofia, No. 3204 (Defter, p. 192). The historian Rûbûl Edrânewî [q.v.] follows him.

K. M. F. had two wives, through whom he became connected with famous and wealthy families viz. Shâh Khatun, daughter of the celebrated author, Ali al-Din Ali al-Bistani (called Musînîfez, cf. i. 734 sqq.; he was also a politician, cf. Kâtibulbouz, ed. C. Müller, p. 140: 5 imâm hâvâl Collector and chalkokondylas, ed. L. Bekker, p. 526, 17) and Sitti Sulân Khatun, daughter of the well-known chief of Aliyâa, Lutfî Beg, cf. Miklosh-Müller, Acta et Diplomata, iii. 284 sqq. and L. de Mac Latrice, Historien de l'île de Chypre, ii. 64—68, Paris 1861, and 5 Asikpasha Žade, Türlük, Stambul 1332, p. 174 and 192). By his first marriage he had a son, Zin al-Abîidin Ali Celebi, from the second a daughter, Ruşâyîn Khatun. His marriage with the daughter of the Beg Aliyâa (q. v. in-corporated in the Ottoman Empire in 1471) apparently brought him considerable wealth, which he used for splendid endowments in Constantinople and Adrianople. This explains, the hitherto obscure spurious passage in the history of Asikpasha Zhade, Türkîc, p. 192, where all sorts of wicked things are said about the "nâhîname pasha," which must be due to personal quarrels (probably the withdrawal of krafft-states in Iwân Celebi).


Bibliography: Sehl, Téldîkîre, Stambul 1235, p. 23; Lutfî, Téldîkîre, Stambul 1314, p. 334 (Nîshânî); Ewêlyâ i. 335 (Nîshânî); Sâ'd al-Din Tâdî al-Tavarîkh, Stambul 1279, ii. 2; 'Ali, Kûnk al-Abîdâr, under the Viziers of Mehmed II (unprinted part of the work); Hâşîh Khatûn, Tahtân al-Tavarîkh, Stambul 1316, p. 175; Othmanâzade Ahmed Tâbî, Hâfizât al-Wasara, Stambul 1271, p. 14 sq.; Şüqîlî-İ Oğlanî, iv. 105; J. v. Hammer, Gesch. des Osm. Reiches, ii. 246 sq. (the statement there made that Hâşîh Baha [i.e. Ibrahim b. 'Abd al-Karim al-Tâbi, cf. Taşköprüzade, Şahîch al-Nâmûnîa, Stambul 1269, p. 220] was Mehmed P.'s father is due to a mistake; J. v. Hammer, Gesch. des oms. Reiches, i. 281 (Nîshânî), 40 (error regarding Hâşîh Baha repeated).

KâRAMANLI, a family who ruled Triopolitania in almost complete independence from 1711 to 1835. The founder of the dynasty, Ahmad Kâramanî, seems to have been a Kûltûghi. In 1123 (1711) he took advantage of the absence of the Pasha Muhammad Abû Anmis to have himself proclaimed by the people, conquered and killed at Zuwağa Khalîl Pasha who was sent to overthrow him, bribed Muhammad Pasha who commanded a new expedition (1124 = 1712) and purchased from Sultan Ahmad III a firman confirming him in authority with the title of beylerbey. He put down insurrections at Tadjîs and Maslata and that of 'Ali al-Šahbûn, gave the government of Bahirî and of Bengazî to his brother al-Hâşîh Shâbûn Bey, who was killed ten years later in a rebellion suppressed by the Pasha. He also rebuilt the fortifications of Triopol, notably the Burdi al-Mandirik, and built near the gate of Manzîya the mosque which bears his name and the madrasa adjoining it. In his reign a French squadron bombarded Triopol in 1728 (1141—1142) and a treaty was concluded which lasted till 1766 (1180—1181).

He was succeeded in 1158 (1745—46) by his son Muhammad Pasha under whom piracy developed and who concluded a treaty with England. He died in 1167 (1753—1754) leaving the power to his son 'Ali Pasha. In his reign the reins of authority became more and more loose and thefts and murders made life in Triopol miserable; the troops were no longer paid regularly, the people
thought of appealing to the Porte. Matters were made worse by divisions in the family of the Pasha. His third son, Yüsuf, had his eldest brother Hasan assassinated on his authority in the arms of his mother (1790 = 1205—1206), then, supported by the Şahîd Khalifa b. Mahmüd, chief of the Djibal Nafis, he rallied under his flag the Arab and Berber population hostile to the Turks, openly raised the standard of revolt against his father and besieged Tripoli. On these events, an adventurer named 'Ali Pasha Burghûl, a former official of the Oulâ of Algiers, succeeded in obtaining a fermân from the Porte and seized Tripoli. In face of a common enemy, the Karamanli were reconciled and asked help from the Bey of Tunis, Hammûd Pasha, who was also threatened by the return offensive of the Turks against their former Barbary possessions. With a Turkish army they retook Djerba commanded by an ally of the usurper, Kara Muhammad al-Turkî, and Tripoli in which 'Ali Burghûl had made himself detested by both Arab and Jew (Djumâld II 25, 1209 = Jan. 16, 1795). The latter fled to the East and in 1803 he succeeded in getting himself appointed Pasha of Egypt but was assassinated by a Mamlûk as soon as he arrived.

'Ali Pasha's rule was transitory; his son Aḩmad II Bey was next proclaimed. But taking advantage of his absence in Tâdûrâ, his brother Yüsuf Bey had himself proclaimed (1210 = 1795—1796) and received a fermân from Sultan Selim confirming him in his dignity. Aḩmad resided at Derneh with the title of Bey.

Yüsuf was the most important ruler of the Karamanli dynasty. He completed the fortifications of Tripoli, built a navy with which he forced Sweden to pay tribute to him (1213 = 1798—1799) and in secret agreement with Napoleon restored Portugal whose fleet commanded by the English captain Campbell bombarded Tripoli. This expedition was celebrated in a Latin poem (Carmen heroicum de rebus a Lusitanis ad Tripolinam gestis, Lisbon 1800; 2nd edition with French transl., Paris 1864, La guerre de Tripoli). Yüsuf had to sustain a very serious fight with the United States (1217 = 1801—3). An expedition commanded by Commodore Massina arrived in Tripoli, trading his terms, the Djibal Nafis, recognised 'Ali, the rest of the country remained faithful to Muhammad. The Ottoman Porte took advantage of the occasion with the secret support of England; after having sent a fermân to 'Ali, Turkey sent out under the command of Nadjib Pasha a fleet which took Tripoli without striking a blow (Muḥarram, 1215 = May, 1835) and re-established the authority of the Porte in Tripolitania. Yüsuf remained till his death a prisoner in his own house, 'Ali was deported to Constantinople, Muhammad committed suicide and his brother Aḩmad fled to Malta.

**Bibliography:** Besides the works quoted above: Aḩmad Bey al-Anqûn, al-Mahmûd al-aĥdî fi Tâdûrâ, Tâdûr, Turkish text, Constantinople 1217, p. 287—292, 298, 299, 300, 301, 303—316, 317—320, 322—324, 323—345; Pellissier de Reynaud, La Régence de Tripoli, Revue des deux Mondes, 1853, p. 119; Slousch, La Tripolitaine sous la domination des Karamanli, Revue du Monde Musulman, 1908, vi. 58—84, 211—232 (from a Jewish chronicle); Rohlf, Von Tripoli nach Alexandrien, Norden 1885, 2 vols., i. 36—47 (contains many mistakes in dates and names); Von Maltzan, Reise in den Regentenstaat Tunis und Tripoli, Leipzig 1870, 3 vols., iii. 245—259; Miss Tolly, Narrative Ten Years' Residence at Tripoli, London 1816, passim; R. Bassot, Notice sommaire des manuscrits orientaux de deux bibliothèques de Lisbonne, Lisbon 1894, p. 27—30; Roy, Documents sur l'expédition de Tripoli en 1795, Revue tunisienne, 1906, p. 283—291; G. Medina, Les Karamanlis de la Tripolitaine, Revue tunisienne, 1907, p. 21—22; Abd Râs, Description et histoire de l'île de Djerba, ed. and transl. by Exiga-Kaysier, Tunis 1854, p. 21 of the text, 23—25 of the transl.; Rousseau, Annales tunisiennes, Algiers 1864, p. 228—239; Nachtigal, Sahara et Soudan, French transl., Paris 1881, i. 31—32. On the tombs of the members of the Karamanli family see Houda...

**KARAMÂN-OGHULU**, the most important of the various Turkoman dynasties, which arose in Asia Minor after the break up of the Saljuk empire at the end of the viii\(^{th}\) century. They were for a time the most serious rivals of the Ottomans. The name goes back in the first place to the Turkoman chief Karaman, who attained a certain degree of independence during the Mongol troubles in the middle of the viii\(^{th}\) century and was granted by the Sultan Rukan al-Din a territory, from which he himself had come, in Cilicia. His native district was then known as Kamar al-Din-Ili (now Içli-Ili) after the Amir Kamar al-Din, who had been appointed commander of the conquered Armenian fortresses after the war between 'Ali al-Din Kaikobad I and Lesser Armenia (625 = 1223; Ibn Bibi in Houtsma, *Receuil*, iii. 329). Munadjidim Bashî (iii. 24) derives the name Karaman from Kamar al-Din, following Ibn Bibi's statement. This explanation of the name is hardly more than a popular etymology. The derivation from a geographical or ethnic name is nevertheless very probable, as similar derivations are found among other Asia Minor dynasties and elsewhere (cf. Izmir-Oghlu, Germiyân-Oghlu [q. v.]). It is most probable, that the Karâmanids originated in the subdivision of the Turkoman tribe of Siür [q. v.] called Karâman. That the town of Lâranda and the surrounding country later became called Karâman [q. v.] and that even the whole southern coast territory of Anatolia is called Karâmania, is however due to the name of the dynasty itself. Among the older Ottoman chroniclers the general name Karâman-Oghlu is used almost regularly for every reigning Beg of the dynasty and the European authors of the xvth century also speak of the "Grand Karaman". The Byzantine authors have never had a clear idea of the identity of the Karâman-Oghlu. They confuse them with the Germiyân-Oghlu and sometimes call the princes of Konya ʾAleldros ʾAleldros etc. which goes back to the Germiyân-Oghlu ʾAli Shir.

There are two kinds of sources for the earliest history of the Karâmanids. The one is hostile to them; it belongs to the school of Saljuk historians and is represented by Ibn Bibi and the later Ottoman chroniclers; the other group is only represented by Shikârî, whose *Karaman Târîhî* is a Turkoman prose translation of a Persian poem in the style of the *Shâhânama*. Shikârî sings the praises of the Karâmanids, but unfortunately gives no facts (on the *MS.* of Shikârî cf. Khalil Edhem in the *T. O. E. M.*, N°. 11, p. 597; Munadjidim Bashî also used Shikârî). Al-Djânnâbî occupies a position midway between the two traditions. An extremely important addition to our knowledge is formed by the inscriptions of the Karâmanids edited by Khalil Edhem.

The ancestral home and the later regular place of refuge of the Karâman-Oghlu is the almost inaccessible mountainous country in the northwestern Taurus on the frontier between Cilicia and Lycaonia, where the town of Ermenek [q. v.], the ancient Germanicopolis, lies. Karâman, according to Ibn Bibi (Houtsma, *Receuil*, iv. 321), was a Turkoman charcoal-burner, who used to sell his charcoal in Lâranda, but this statement is biased; in Djânnâbî (p. 213) and Shikârî, Karâman's father, is called Nûrû Şûfî (son of Sa'd al-Din in Shikârî), who was a mystic Shârif held in great esteem by the Sultan of Konya. Djânnâbî calls this Nûrû Şûfî an Armenian but this statement is probably suggested by the name Ermenek. Besides it is improbable that Ermenek had anything at all to do with Armenia; it never belonged to Lesser Armenia (*Rev. Hist. des Crois. DC. Arm.*, i. p. xxii), and there is no obstacle to the derivation of the name from Germanicopolis. The name Nûr [nûr] for the father of Karâman is further guaranteed by an inscription given by Khalil Edhem from the "türke of Karâman (Karim al-Din Karâman b. Nûr) in Bâltkân in the sandjak of Ermenek; Nûr Şûfî's türke is said to be at Deýirmenlik in the kağât of Mût [one of the sons of Ibrâhim Beg (see below) was also called Nûrû Şûfî]. The Karâman-Oghlu thus have their beginnings in Şûfî circles, just as now seems to be probable for the Ottomans (Giese, *Zuchtr. f. Semitskï*, 1924, p. 240 sq.) and for the Şafawids (cf. Babinger, *Z. D. M. G.*, 1922, p. 132). Djânnâbî's statement that Nûrû Şûfî was a follower of Bâbâ ʾIlyâs needs only the correction that the latter was not the instigator of the Bâbâ'i rising in Amasia (this was Bâbâ ʾIlyâs) but a Khorânsâh Şûfî who strongly influenced the whole religious development of Asia Minor (cf. Koprunlu Zede Ferhad, *Ib Mûsâsawanfer*, p. 232, 233). It is in any case significant that Ibn Bibi calls the Karâmanids Kâhwarîid, which name was also given to the Bâbâ'is, cf. also Kâhir Allâh, Tûrâkî, Constantinople 1292, ii. 58, where it is said that Nûr al-Din Şûfî (sic) was ʾAlîhâfa of Bâbâ ʾIlyâs for İc-II.

Nûrû Şûfî is said (according to Djânnâbî) to have taken the fortress of Seuleke by treachery and his son Karim al-Din Karâman was granted this fortress as a fief by the Sultan; according to other sources, he received the beglîk of Ermenek (Munadjidîm Bashî) and the Sultan Rukan al-Din al-Djânnâbî therefore to regain the fealty of himself and his brother Ongûz, who had been made Mirâkhor of the Sultan, after they had begun to stir up unrest in this region. After Karâman's death, which is placed in 666 (1261) (by Munadjidîm Bashî; Shikârî makes him be poisoned by the Sultan), his sons and his brother were imprisoned in the fortress of Kawâla (şâkî; Ibn Bibi, *Recueil*, ix. 322; After the death of the Sultan (666 = 1267) they were released by the vizier Mûn al-Din Parwânâ.

Soon afterwards Karâman's son Muḥammad began his activity. He came to an arrangement with the rulers of Syria, who where then at war with the Saljûkûcs, and the vizier Parwânâ found it impossible to bring him to obedience again, among his mountains. Then, when the Saljûkûcs and their overlords, the Mongols, were engaged in Mesopotâmia with the wars against the Milmûks, the Ermenek Turkomans began to covet the plain of Konya. Muḥammad Beg made use of Djamîr, the false claimant to the throne, who gave himself out to be a son of the Saljûk ʾIzr al-Din who escaped to the Crimea. In the name of this false Sultan, Muḥammad seized Konya which was poorly defended and Djamîr entered its citadel as Sultan (Thursday, June 7, 1275 = Dhū l-Ḥijđja...
| 1. Sa'd al-Din |
| 2. Nurâ Şufî |

3. Kârâmân Karîm al-Dîn † 660  
4. Ongûz

5. Muhammed I † 675  
6. Mahmûd Badr al-Dîn (reigned in the beginning of the eighth century)

7. Badr al-Dîn (= İbrâhîm?)  
8. Khalîl (= Yakhsî beg?)  
9. Musa

10. Fâhîr al-Dîn Ahmad † 750  
11. Shams al-Dîn † 753  
12. Kârâmân  
13. Darêkhwând Khâtûn † 813

14. 'Alî al-Dîn 'Alî † 793  
15. Sulâîmân Saîf al-Dîn † 772  
16. Da'dîd  
17. Khîdr  
18. Ishâk

19. Muhammed II † 826 or 827  
20. 'Alî 'Alî al-Dîn  
21. Oghûz  
22. Pir 'Ahmad  
23. Kâsim

24. İbrâhîm Tâdî al-Dîn † 868  
25. 'Alî  
26. Muştafa † 822  
27. Ishâk  
28. Khalîl  
29. Kârâmân † 876

30. Ishâk  
31. Pir 'Ahmad † 879  
32. Kâsim † 888  
33. Kârâmân  
34. Nurâ Şufî  
35. 'Alî al-Dîn  
36. Sulâîmân

37. Hîlmîye Khâtûn † 914

This genealogical list is reconstructed and somewhat different from that of Khalil Edhem Bey (T.O.E.M., No. 14, p. 880). The table in v. Hammer, 1. 682, is obsolete. The names written in capitals are found on coins and inscriptions, those in italics only in Shikârî. — 4. in Ibn Bibi, Recueil, iv. 322, is called Bûnûz. — 7. The Badr al-Dîn of Shikârî and Ibn Batûta is here tentatively identified with the İbrâhîm mentioned in the epigraphs of 10 and 11 as called Bûnûz. — 8. This Khalîl would be the Yakhshî Beg of Munadjudîm Başhî. According to Shikârî, he reigned for 17 years. — 9. Inscription of the year 740 at their father. — 13. Tomb inscription of the year 813 at Ermenek. — 14. is the Abu 'l-Fath 'Alî al-Dîn Khalîl of the inscriptions (see the text), identified with Ermenek. — 15. is buried in the Khâtûniya Medrese at Lâranda; according to the inscription Shikârî's 'Alî al-Dîn Ibn Khalîl and with 'Alî, the husband of Nafise. — 16. is buried in the Khâtûniya Medrese at Lâranda; according to Shikârî, he was appointed by his brother (14) regent of Lâranda and poisoned at the instigation of Artena-Oghlu. — 19. and 21 of 772. — 20. to Shikârî, he was the son of a Sâlûk princess. — 22. is buried in the battle of Kâsariya (822) against the Mamlûk. — 29. Epitaph at Adrianople 876. — 30. coin of 880. — 32. Epitaph at Lâranda of 888 26. who married İbrâhîm. Shikârî in part has other names. — 37. Epitaph of 924 at Lâranda.

(J. H. KRAMERS)
followed on his abdication by Khalil, then came Badr al-Din for a second time, Fakhr al-Din, his son succeeded him after his death; he was killed through the intrigues of Artana, Beg of Kaiafarta, and succeeded by Shams al-Din’s second son, also called Shams al-Din, who was poisoned by his brother Karāmān after reigning 14 months. The above mentioned Mustāb b. Maḥmūd then ascended the throne to be replaced four years later by Khalil’s son ‘Alī al-Din, passing over the brief reign of Badr al-Din’s third son Karāmān. According to Shikārī, this ‘Alī al-Din was one of the greatest of the Karāmānids and is called by him Abu l-Faṭāḥ. In agreement with the statements of Shikārī is Ibn Baṭṭā‘a (ii. 281, 284), who visited a Sulṭān Badr al-Din in Lāranda in 732 (1332), to whose territory Konya also belonged. But his brother Mustāb had, it is said, already reigned in Lāranda before him but had ceded the town to the Marinids from whom it later had been reconquered by the Muslims; this ‘Alī al-Din had very close relations with Egypt, is confirmed by Ibn Fadl Allāh also (Ma‘ālik al-Aḥšā‘, in N.E., xi. 347). We must therefore assume that the brothers reigned in different parts of Karāmān at the same time. Two epitaphs in the Emir Mūsā Medresē in Lāranda prove that Fakhr al-Din Aḥmad b. Ibrahim b. Maḥmūd died in 750 (1349/50) and Shams al-Din b. Ibrahim b. Maḥmūd in 753 (1352). They must certainly be the two sons of Badr al-Din (who, in that case, may perhaps have borne the name Ibrahim) mentioned by Shikārī.

It is more difficult to ascertain the identity of ‘Alī al-Din. An inscription of 772 (1370/1) on the gate of the zāwiya in Lāranda, where Djalil al-Din Rūmī’s mother is said to be buried, records that the zāwiya was built by Sulṭān ‘Uṯmān ‘Alī al-Din Khalil b. Maḥmūd b. Karāmān and that Saff al-Din Sulāmān b. Khalil (who, according to Shikārī, was a brother of ‘Alī al-Din) was buried there. Munadhdjim Bāshī (iii. 26) also knows an ‘Alī al-Din, son of Yakhshi Beg, son of Maḥmūd; as there is no documentary evidence for the existence of this Yakhshi Beg, he may perhaps be identified with Shikārī’s Khalil as Khalil Edhem Bey in the T.O. E.M. has already done; Yakhshi is probably not a proper name at all here; cf. Ibn Baṭṭā‘a, ii. 316). Shikārī makes his ‘Alī al-Din marry the daughter of the Ottoman Sulṭān Murād II, while according to Munadhdjim Bāshī it was ‘Alī al-Din’s son ‘Ali Beg who made this marriage. The contract of marriage between Murād II’s daughter Nefīse and Karāmān-Oghlu ‘Alī Beg is, indeed, still preserved in Ferādīn’s Munjizi “i, i. 105 sq.” (in the printed text, p. 107, the date is 788 = 1386, but Khalil Edhem Bey has shown that 783 = 1382 is more probably correct). There is an inscription of this Ottoman princess in the Khātunīye Medresē at Lāranda of the year 783, in which the reigning prince is called Amir ‘Alī al-Din Khalil b. Maḥmūd, the same name as in the above mentioned inscription of 772, but without the title of Sulṭān. The difficulty now is whether the ‘Alī al-Din Khalil of the inscriptions is identical with Shikārī’s ‘Alī al-Din Ibn Khalil and with ‘Ali, the husband of the princess Nefīse. Very strongly in favour of this identity is a wakfname of ‘Alī al-Din’s grandson Ibrahim of the year 859 = 1454/5 (given by Khalil Edhem Bey in the T.O. E.M., Np. 13, p. 831), where this Ibrahim is called: b. Maḥmūd b. ‘Alī al-Din b. Khalil b. Maḥmūd b. Karāmān
In 824 (1421) he received permission to return and again ascended the throne. He met his death at the siege of the Ottoman fortress of Adalia, which is fully described by the chronicler probably 826 or 827. His son 'Ali went over to the Ottomans, who gave him the sandjak of Soğan, while his son and successor İbrahim returned to his native mountains with his father's body. Of the second Muḥammad various inscriptions exist in Konya. There are also inscriptions of his brother 'Ali in Nigde, where he held sway before and after the Egyptian period. After his brother's death he endeavoured to make himself independent again, but when Murad II deposed his nephew İbrahim he did not succeed. In this period, the power of the Karaman-Oghlu was considerable; Sanudo estimates the size of his army at 30,000 men on a war footing and 60,000 on a peace footing (Murat, _Inschr. Ital.,_ xxii. col. 962).

İbrahim b. Muḥammad Tādji al-Din received from about 827 (1425) to 868 (1463) (coins of the years 827 onwards) and is the last great member of the dynasty, which after the extinction of the Germiyan-Oghlu was now the only dangerous rival of the Ottomans. İbrahim had married the sister of Murad II and was at peace and war alternately with the Ottomans. The fact that he crushed the revolt of the Sultan's brother-in-law Ilyas in 834 (1430) was of great importance, for his brother-in-law had also an alliance with the Emperor Sigismund; the early Ottoman chroniclers bitterly reproach him for his dealings with the unbelievers as well as for his repeatedly breaking faith after solemnly concluded treaties (Aron, ed. Giese, p. 63, 64, 68). Murad II had made up his mind to exterminate the Karamanids and for this purpose he made an alliance with the Turkomans of the Dhu 'l-Kadr dynasty. The latter about 840 (1436/7) took Kajariya and the surrounding country from the Karamanids; İbrahim lost Akshehir and Beyşehir among other possessions to Murad II. An attempt to regain the lost territory after Murad's death (855 = 1451) failed. Mehməd II is said to have accepted a truce as a friend and protector of the Christians (Ducas, p. 233). İbrahim was more successful in the south; in 1443 he took the fortress of Gorgos in Cilicia from the Cypriotes (Rec. Hist. des Crois., Doc. Arm., i. 638). Before his death İbrahim wished to abdicate in favour of his son Ishak. But Ishak was the son of a slave and the other six sons whose mother was Murad's sister besieged İbrahim and Ishak in Konya; both had to take to flight and İbrahim died in the fortress of Kâwala (or Guwâle; 868 = 1453).

His successor was his son Pîr Aḥmad whose side Mehməd II had taken. Ishak fled to Üzun Hasan, prince of the Aḵ-Ḵoyunlu. The confusion that followed in the struggle for the throne finally brought about the end of the dynasty. With the help of the Ottomans Pîr Aḥmad defeated his brother in the battle of Ermenek (869 = 1465) and henceforth regarded himself as the vassal of Mehməd II (inscription of 870 = 1466 at Kajariye). But he soon came into conflict with his overlords because he had come to an arrangement with the Venetians. In 872 (1467) the Ottomans permanently occupied Konya where the Ottoman prince Muṣṭafā became with a part of the Karamanid population transferred to Stamul. Pîr Aḥmad retired to Lâranda and Nigde, where he fought the Ottomans and his brothers alternately. He made
an alliance with his brother Kâsim for a time
(inscription of the two at Nigde of the year 874 = 1469/70). But they could not stand against Gedik Ahmad Pasha and lost Lâranda. After Ermenek and Minan had also been taken by the Ottomans, where Pir Ahmad's family and treasures fell into their hands, the latter threw himself from a cliff but did not kill himself. He was still able to go to Tarsus where he died about 879 (1474), according to the Tâdji al-Tawwârîkh. Ishâkh had withdrawn to Selefshe, where his widow continued to hold out for some time after his death.

Kâsim b. Ibrâhim then maintained himself till his death (Muâram, 887 = Febr.-March, 1482), according to Anonymus, ed. Giese, p. 117: his epitaph at Lâranda is dated 888). He also sought the assistance of Uzun Hasan but could not recapture Lâranda. Then in 887 (1482) he joined the pretender Sultan Djem [q.v.] who had at one time governed Konya in succession to his brother Muşafa and on other occasions also had been served by Kâramânî troops. Kâsim was afterwards pardoned by Bayazid II but with his death the rule of the Kâramânîs ended. His other brothers had already gone over to the Ottomans.

After Kâsim's death his generals placed Torghut-Oghlu Muhammed, who belonged to the Kâramân nobility, on the throne, but he also came into conflict with the Ottomans and had to flee to Aleppo in 892 (1487). It was then to their geographical situation that the Kâramânîs owed the great power they held for a time. Their mountains formed a refuge which it was almost impossible to capture, from which they could make successful descents into the plains of Konya and Cilicia again and again. The possession of the various Cilician passes and other routes over the Taurus brought them a considerable revenue from the tolls which they levied on the Genoese and Cypriote merchants, who carried on a busy trade by these routes with Asia Minor, while their revenue from the customs in the coast towns ruled by them (Scandolari, Manavgat, Anemur, Selefke, Lamos) must have been considerable. Their wealth and influence in a still stronger position: their buildings in Lâranda, Konya and Nigde are evidence of this wealth, especially the ruins of the Khâtuniye Medrese in Lâranda or Kâramân [q.v.]. Kâramânî art is a continuation of Seldjûk art in contrast to Ottoman art which rather follows Byzantine models (Woermann, Gesch. d. Kunst, Leipzig and Vienna 1915, ii. 445). Of importance in the history of civilization is their encouraging the use of Turkish instead of Persian, as has been already mentioned. The contrast between the Kâramânîs and the Ottomans seems, however, to have been very marked (Ducas, p. 195, says: ἵω ὁδὲ ἐὰν ἐβδομάς δαμακεὶν ἀρτι τὸν Καραμάν μετὰ τοῦ Ὑμᾶν).


Kâramât ʿAli, born (date uncertain, early in the 16th century?) at Dâwânmâr [q.v.], of a Seldjûk family, which had held the office of ʿâfhî in Muhammadan rule; his father was varîqeddâr in the Dâwânmâr Collectorate. He studied theology and other Muslim sciences under various celebrated teachers of the time, esp. Shâh ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, muhaddith of Dîlî, who was also the teacher and afterwards follower of Saiyid Ahmad of Baréli. Between 1820 and 1824, Saiyid Ahmad made a tour through Bengal and Northern India, collecting a band of disciples, and Kâramât ʿAli was one of the most devoted of the younger men who followed him, but he does not appear to have taken part in the ġîkâd, which Saiyid Ahmad waged against the Sîhs [q.v.], or to have ever been in the Afghan borderland, where Saiyid Ahmad was slain in battle in 1831. The Sîhs's old master, Shâh ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, now became his khâlîfa, and an active propagandist for the revival of Islam was organised in Bûrâg and Bengal. With this peaceful propagandist Karamât ʿAli was identified, and he may be regarded as its most successful apostle, as he was certainly its most brilliant exponent. During the early decades of the 19th cent., there were several minor reform movements in Eastern Bengal, led by men with more zeal than learning, notably by ʿAbd al-Rashîd Allâh [v. Fârâbî, ii. 57], who in 1252 (= 1836-7) met Karamât ʿAli in Calcutta. By 1855 the two schools had made some progress towards a rapprochement, and in the meeting then held at Barisal, Karamât ʿAli was able to agree on several points with the representative of the other movement, Mawlâwî ʿAbd al-Djâbbâr, though on the question of the laws of Ḥuṣna and Ḥd prayers in British India, he could not overcome the opposition of ʿAbd al-Djâbbâr, and he had to appeal to the humour of ʿAbd al-Djâbbâr's followers by pointing out that their leader mistook grasshoppers (which were unlawful food) for locusts (which were lawful) (Fârâbî-i-kâtîb, p. 29-32).

Kâramât ʿAli's life was a double struggle; first, he combated the Hindu customs and superstitions
which had crept into the practice of Islam in Eastern Bengal, against which he wrote a book, entitled Ra'id al-Firdaws, besides inveighing against them throughout his writings; and secondly, he tried to bring back into the fold of orthodoxy the new heterodox schools against which he waged a successful war; to this subject, also, he devoted a special book, Manzilat al-Hurairi, besides constant references to "the ignorant" in his voluminous writings. He kept in touch with the Musalmans of Bengal, and distributed to the needy all the presents that he received. He was a trained kari' and an expert calligraphist.

Garcin de Tassy (op. cit., ii. 162) says that he competed for the prize offered by Sir Charles Trevelyan for the best Hindustani essay on the influence of the Greeks and Arabs on the Renaissance in Europe, but that his essay was not accepted for want of an English translation, which according to the rules should have accompanied the essay. He was thus interested, unlike the majority of contemporary Indian Mawlavs, in the relation of Islam to the wider questions of the world at large. He died in 1879 (23rd May), and was buried at Kandarpur (Tadjadji-i-Nur, ii. 136), in the province in which he had laboured for the regeneration of Islam all his life. He was succeeded in his work by his son, Mawlawi Hajji Ahmad (ib. 1898), and his nephew, Muhammed Muhsin. His following was so large that there was hardly a Bengal village without his disciples and he still exerts a living influence in certain districts of that province.

He wrote chiefly in Urdu. Rahmán 'Ali (op. cit., p. 174—2) gives a list of 46 of his works, without claiming that it is exhaustive. One of his works, Misfah al-Djinnat, has run through numerous editions and is accepted in India as a correct statement of Islamic principles. His writings may be divided into four classes: 1) general works, like Misfah al-Djinnat; 2) works on the reading and verbal interpretation of the Korâ'n, and formal prayers and ablutions; 3) works on the doctrine of spiritual preceptorship (Firi Murid), the cornerstone of orthodox Islam in India; in accepting this doctrine, Karâmat 'Ali stands in sharp opposition to the Wahhâbî sect and merges insensibly in the Taqawwuf schools, which he brings into relation with the traditional religious orders; 4) polemics against Shari'ât Allâh, Dîdu Miyan, the Wahhâbîs, etc.

The common conception that Karâmat 'Ali was a Wahhâbî is refuted by the detailed exposition of his own views as set forth in his Muhâsâbat-i-Rahmat; he had seen no Wahhâbî books, but had made verbal enquiries and found that they were so fanatical (qiâdí) that they called all who did not agree with them mustâbik (p. 38—9); he and his school carefully distinguished between shirk, which was the negation of Islam, and bid'a, which was only an error in doctrine (p. 39). In his Hudžâbat-i-Kâfî'â he draws a clear distinction between a faâshî (sinner) and a kâfîr (infidel) and inveighs against those who would deny funeral prayers to those who did not pray but repeated the kalima (p. 21); if non-Muslims conquer Muslim lands, the Djinna prayer and the two ûd [q. v.] prayers were not only lawful but obligatory (p. 13 ibid). He laid great stress on authority, successively handed down by living teachers, and based his doctrine on the orthodox Sunni books of the Hanafi school (Mukâkhkha'ât-i-Rahmat, p. 37). He accepted the six orthodox books of tradition (Suûh qita), the commentaries (ta'âsîr), the principles of ceremonial law as interpreted by the masters (qi'îlî firdaws), and the doctrines of taqawwuf and firi muridî (pp. 38, 39), even basing the mission of Saiyid Ahmad on a hadith from Abu Hurairâ (p. 20). In every community a teacher is born to revivify the faith; Saiyid Ahmad was such a teacher for the xiiith cent. and should be followed until another teacher arise for the xivth cent. (p. 34). All this was in direct antithesis to Wahhâbî teaching and the "reform" amounted merely to the abolition of Hindu rites and ceremonies or those introduced through ignorance (p. 36), or to a revival of Islam according to the accepted orthodox schools (p. 59). The political effects of Saiyid Ahmad's life brought his followers into conflict with the authorities, but the writings of the school show that there was no connection, political or doctrinal, with the sect founded by Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Wahhâb in Arabia.

Bibliography: The European accounts of Karâmat 'Ali are unsatisfactory, being based on secondary information and failing to distinguish between this school of reform and Wahhâbism, and in some places there is confusion between the subject of this article and Mawlawi Saiyid Karâmat 'Ali of Dijawnpûr (1796—1876), who represented the British Government at the court of Dost Muhammed Khân at Kâbul, 1832—1835, and was superintendent (muhtawallî) of the Hughli Imâmsâba (1837—1845, 1857—1865, 1865—1875; Nine- teenth Century, May, 1905, p. 780—782; Sir W. W. Hunter, The Indian Musalmans, p. 114; C. E. Buckland, Dictionary of Indian Biography, p. 229; Nûr al-Dîn Zaidî, Tadjadji-i-Nûr, ii. 139); Census of India, 1901, vol. vi. part i. (Bengal, p. 174 (Calcutta, 1902); Journ. As. Soc. of Bengal, vol. xiii., part ii., pp. 54—6 (Calcutta, 1894); Garcin de Tassy, Hist. de la Littérature Hindoue et Hindoustanie, ii. 162 (Paris, 1870). It is doubtful whether the Muqaddisa-i-Rashid-i-Muftâb Dîhli, 1868, mentioned there, was a work by the subject of this article); Saiyid Nûr al-Dîn Zaidî, Tadjadji-i-Nûr (biographies of the famous men of Dijawnpûr), pp. 135—6 (Dijawnpûr, 1900).

A correct appreciation of Karâmat 'Ali's doctrines can only be gained by a study of his own writings, the most important of which are the following: Misfah al-Djinnat (Calcutta, 1843) (frequently reprinted); Kawâbî durri (Calcutta 1853) (translates passages from the Korâ'n for the benefit of those who know only a little Arabic); Ba'âfati Twâbâ (Calcutta, 1854) (defends the legality of repentance at the hands of a ûd, and other practices of the religious orders); Zübt al-Kârî (Calcutta, 1264), (on the correct principles for the reading aloud of the Korâ'n); Faid-e-Smith (Calcutta, 1282), (on speculative theology, expounding the doctrines of Shaikh Ahmad Sarhindî); Hudzâbat-i-Kâfî'â (Calcutta, 1282), (a polemical tract against the school of Shari'ât Allâh and his son ûd Miyan, whose name (common solle Dûdhu Mûsâ) Karâmat 'Ali always writes in this way); Nûr al-Hudâ (Calcutta, 1286), on the doctrines of taqawwuf, of the mudîlîディiya school, apparently the new school of Saiyid Ahmad of

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, II.
KARA MUŞTAFA PASHA, the name of two Ottoman Grand Viziers.

I. Kara Kemâneşî (i.e. archer) Muşafî Paşa, an Arnaut by origin, taken from the Janissaries became first kayıa and was then dismissed; in 1043 (began July 8, 1633) he was appointed Seyhban başlı (general of the Janissaries) and became successively Ağa of the Janissaries in Shawwal, 1044 (began March 9, 1635), Grand Admiral (Kaşpudaan Derya) on İmamâdâ 1 5, 1045 (= Oct. 17, 1635), Grand Vizier in Şaban, 1047 (began Dec. 15, 1637). During his period of office which lasted till his execution by order of Sultan İbrahim I on Muḥarrâm 1, 1053 (= March 22, 1643) (cf. J. v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Osman. Reiches, v. 326 sqq.) he distinguished himself by economy and a talent for administration, which all the historians recognise with admiration. Hüseîn Wâdîji, the author of a history of the Ottoman Empire covering the period between 1048 (1638) and 1070 (1669), was K. K. Mustafâ Paşa’s keeper of seals. A number of buildings owe their origin or restoration to him; he founded mosques, built bridges and planned settlements (for example Ortaktheid near Siwâs). The best verdict on him is that of the contemporary Em. Buttâlî in Duae Historia Byzantina, Paris 1649, p. 263 infra: vir, quemenis ineruditissimus, ut qui nec legere, nec scibere sivebat, in rebus gerendis sagaxissimus, expetidivis recitassimus ac pronuntissimus. Kara Muşafî Paşa is buried in Stambul at Parmak Kapu on the Divân Yolu in the madresa built by him (Na’mî, Ta’rîkh-i, ii. 30 sqq.).


II. Kara Muṣṭafa Paşa, the haseki of Vienna. He belonged to Merzifûn where he was born in 1044 (began July 27, 1634), according to other stories about 1620 (cf. Barozzi–Berchet, Relazioni degli ambasciatar e belli veneti a Constantinopoli, Venice 1879, ii. 207, according to whom he was 53 about 1677), the son of a Sîphî captain named Çulî (according to other sources Haşan Ağa) who fell before Baghdad. His father was a friend of Kaprûlî Mehmed Paşa who had the boy educated. His first rank was Sillîdar, next Taşkîhidî (master of oratory), in Dhu ’l-Hijja, 1068 (began Aug. 30, 1658) Mirâşâh (chief marshall) and in Muḥarrâm, 1070 (began Sept. 18, 1659) he became Beylerbey of Silistria with the rank of vizier (cf. Barozzi–Berchet, ii. 134 sq. and Voyages du Sieur A. de la Motraye, the Hague 1727, i. 439); in Râmayân, 1073 (began May 11, 1660) he was appointed governor of D yawrâb, in Râdayân, 1072 (began April 15, 1662) Grand Admiral (Kaşpudaan Derya) in Râmayân, 1073 (began March 9, 1663) Râkîb Kaşimâcî (deputy for the Grand Vizier a latero) and two years later dismissed from the office of Grand Admiral; in 1672 he was Kaşimâcî at Adrianoûl (d’Arvieux, o. c., Knolles–Rycart, o. e., ii. 263, 277). In 1086 (began March 28, 1675) he was betrothed to the Sultan’s daughter Kuçuk Sultanê. In Şaban, 1087 (began Oct. 9, 1676) he was appointed Grand Vizier. His policy as Grand Vizier was that of his great predecessors and may be summed up in the one word, war: — war, for the sake of domestic peace, war, to please the Sultan, war, for the glory of the Ottoman Empire, and more particularly for his own prestige. Ambition and avarice are said to have been the motives of his actions (cf. Barozzi, op. cit., ii. 207; Rycart, op. cit., i. 89 sqq. and contemporary western chroniclers) generally described by him as inusit, cruel and avaricious (cf. Barozzi, op. cit., ii. 207: venale, crudele ed ingiusto). In his boundless ambition and avarice he allowed himself to be tempted in the late summer and autumn of 1683 to a campaign against Austria and the siege of Vienna, although he had no ability as a general. He had already conducted an unsuccessful war against Russia in the spring of 1677 and had been forced to consent to an armistice (at Radźin on Feb. 11, 1681) disadvantageous to the Porte and the campaign which he began in 1683 against the Emperor Leopold V brought about his ruin. After he had given Tokóy, the chief rebel in Hungary, the Hungarian crown, he advanced into Austria laying the country waste as he went along. On July 14, he began the siege of Vienna with 200,000 men; the city was finally defended by Count Starhemberg with 10,000 men. The city was near its fall when the German–Polish army of relief appeared and on Sept. 12, 1683, completely defeated the arrogant foe. Mustafâ Paşa escaped with the remnants of his force to Hungary. On Dec. 25, 1683, he was executed by the Sultan’s orders. His body was buried in Belgrade in the mosque erected by him before setting out for Vienna and his skull brought to Adrianoûl to Sultan Mehmed IV and buried in the mosque of Saridja Paşa (epitaph in J. v. Hammer, Gesch. des Osm. Reiches, vol. ix., p. xxxiv.). The statement, made by J. v. Hammer, Gesch. vi. 519 and 740 and in Wiens erste ausgehobene türkische Belagerung, Vienna 1829, p. 119 sqq., supported with documents of Cardinal Leopold von Collowich (of Sept. 17, 1666) and adopted by V. v. Renner, Wien im Jahre 1683, Vienna 1883, p. 465, that the Turk’s skull was used in the sale of the Historical Museum of the City of Vienna, the former arsenal, is Kara Muşafî’s is wrong. The question of the talismanic shirt (şâbûzâ) also preserved there and of the skin of silk is more uncertain. Cf. A. Camesina in the Berichte und Mitteilungen des Altertumsvereines zu Wien, viii., Vienna 1865, Appendix, p. xlix. sqq. and also J. v. Karabaček in the Katalog der Historischen Ausstellung der Stadt Wien 1883, Vienna 1883, No. 541. —
Kara Mustafa Pasha was exceedingly rich and left a vast estate. According to Sieur A. de la Motraye (op. cit. p. 349), he possessed over 1500 odalises, the same number of slave-girls, 600–700 black eunuchs and fabulous treasures, all of which passed to the state. He is said to have left 12,000,000 ducats (cf. Franz Wagner, Historia Leopoldi Magni, Augsburg 1719, i. 631). Besides several madrasas (cf. J. v. Hammer, Gesch, ix. 158, 189) he founded a number of mosques, in Stamboul, at Galata, at Adrianople, Belgrade, Djidja and in his native place. His palace (Timâkâni Yalâ at Kuru Çeşme near Constantinople) was sumptuously furnished (cf. J. v. Hammer, Gesch, vii. 362); his splendid tomb in Stamboul was destroyed by the mob (Barozzi, op. cit., p. 334).

His son was Kânîkâ Mustafa Pasha; on his descendants see Sîgîdîlî 'Othmânî, iv. 402, 2 sqg. from below. A sister was married to Kaplan Pasha (d. 1091 = 1680 at Smyrna; Magni, Viaggi per la Turchia, Parmo 1679, p. 348).

Kara Mustafa Pasha has been repeatedly made the hero of dramas and romances; cf., for example, 'Omer Bey, Drama zu the Reise der Konstantinopel, Histoire contenant son eclusage, ses anciens dans le soidal, ses diverses exploits, le vrai sujet qui lui a fait entrerprendre le vojo de Vienne et les particularités de sa dort. Paris 1684, 24, and Pierre Martino, L'Orient dans la littérature française au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècle, Paris 1906.


Kara Osmân Oğlu. [See Derebeyis.]

Karakapak ("Black-caps", so called from their head-dress of black lamb-skin), a Turkish people formerly living on the river Borçala or Debeda in the eastern part of the government of Tiflis, who migrated about 1828 partly to Turkish territory (to the vicinity of Kars) and partly to Persian territory (district of Sulduz, south of Lake Urmia). In the district of Kars they form about 15% of the population; about 1853 they numbered 21,652 of whom 11,721 were Sunnis and 9,931 Shi'is (K. Sadovskij, Kariškâyi zamanetâk hâr Karskàyi oblastiâ in the Sur Mattier, etc. Karakasa, iii. 315–359); about 1893, 28,266 (N. Arslan, Zarafshân: Íro oclâsımka sostaste tyurkîskî plênin etc., St. Petersburg 1897, p. 139 sq. quoting Prav. Viestnik, 1896, No. 74); according to the census of 1897, 29,579. In the "Caucasus Calendar" (Kâr-bâazhî Calendar) for 1910, 99 villages of the territory of Kars are given as inhabited by the Karakapak, of which 63 are in the district of Kars, in that of Arzhan (Russ. Ardagon) and 7 in that of Kafgzan; the number of the Karakapak is given as 39,000 (ibid., p. 546, article by A. Dirr).

A small village of Karakapak, inhabited by Tartars, is also mentioned in the government of Yelesawetpol, in the district of Karsâ (which bounds on the government of Tiflis). On the Karakapak in the district of Sulduz cf. C. Ritter, Erdkunde, i. 939, 1018 and 1032, following Fraser and Rawlinson (up to 1838), and more recently V. Minorsky (member of the Commission for the Rectification of the Turco-Persian frontier, 1911–1914) in Matarîlî pa incinetiynî Vertoba, vi, 2, Petrograd 1915 (see Index).

These Karakapak, who are all Shi'is, were at one time in Russian service and still preserve the certificates given to their ancestors by Russian generals in recognition of their services. After their transfer (it is said there were only 800 families under the leadership of Mahdi Kân affected to Persian service the district of Sulduz was allotted to them as Ĥalî (fief) by Ābbâs Mîrzâ [† v., i. 13] in return for which they were to furnish 400 horsemen. As landowners the chiefs (Kân, Āghâ) of the Karakapak attained considerable prosperity under Persian rule. After the occupation of the district by the Turks (1905) the situation became much less pleasant, because their situation was not given them the opportunity of migrating to the interior of Persia. Sulduz was thereupon adjudicated to Persia (protocol of Nov. 4/17, 1913). The Turkish troops had already been withdrawn during the Balkan war (1912). How the situation has developed since the world-war we do not know.

(K. R. W. BARTHOLOM))

Karsâ, 1) the name of the founder of a Turkoman dynasty in Asia Minor in the 13th century A.D. (thirteenth a.d.), the dynasty which was the first to succumb to the Ottomans; 2) the name of the territory ruled by this dynasty, now a sandjak of Turkey.
1. Karasi is said to be a contraction of Kara ˙Ia or Kara Ese, the name of a Turkoman chief, a vassal of the Saldjuk Sultan Ghiyath al-Din Mas’ud, who conquered the province of Myria for him from the Byzantines in the reign of Andronicus II Palaiologos (Duca, p. 13). The name of the father of Karasi is also given by the Byzantine historians (Nicephorus Gregora, i, 214) as Kalahia, which Mordtmann identifies with the Marqun or Marqun of Pachymeres (ii, 316, 359), which name perhaps conceals Alamshah or Kalamshah (cf. Ibn Battuta, i, 281).

Although Karasi did not conquer the whole of Myria at once (Edremid and Assos remained Greek down to the xiv century) he must have had considerable power not least on account of the fleet which he created and with which he conducted raids on Rumelia. His territory became a refuge for the inhabitants of Eastern Anatolia, fleeing before the Mongols, as well as for the Turks when they were driven back after conquering the Dobrudja under S¸yri S¨uly¨uk Ghazi [q. v.]. How long Karasi reigned is not known. About 1330 we find two other rulers in the land, namely Yakhsı Khan in Bergama and Demir Khan in Balikesi. They are mentioned by Ibn Battuta (ii, 316, 317) and in the Mavsık al-Abdar (Notes et Extraites, xii, 339, 366; the

mentioned on p. 339 is probably a cor-

ruption for Demir Khan), with which authorities the Byzantine writers agree, except that they (Kantaezenos, i, 339) make gazi the father of Tawmukh, while the Mavsık al-Abdar makes the two brothers and sons of Karasi.

The account given by the Ottoman historians, who all follow Aşıkpaşazade (p. 43–45 of the Stambul edition of 1332), is different. They only deal with the dynasty in connection with the annexation of its land by Orkhan. According to them, Ili ˙Adiljan Beg ruled in Karasi and maintained friendly relations with Orkhan; he even sent his youngest son Tursun to be educated at Orkhan’s court. After ˙Adiljan’s death his eldest son (whose name the chronicles do not give) succeeded him. He made himself so hated by his subjects that his vizier Haddjej Ilbeki went to Orkhan to seek help against the tyrant. The younger brother Tursun therupon promised Orkhan the towns of Bergama, Balikesi and Edremid, if he would in return leave him in possession of Kizildja Tuzla and Maharım (Assos). In keeping with this arrangement Orkhan conquered from the Greeks Ulubad (Lopasdon) and several other for-

tresses which still lay as Greek enclaves between the Ottoman lands and Karasi. He then advanced on Balikesi whence ˙Adiljan’s son fled to Bergama. At Orkhan’s instigation, negotiations for peace were opened between the two brothers; Tursun, however, was killed by his brother on the walls of Bergama during the discussion of terms. The latter was then completely overthrown by Orkhan. He had also to leave Bergama and died two years later in Brusa of the plague. Haddjej Ilbeki was given the administration of Karasi Ii and the Timariots were left in their fiefs. These events are put by the Ottoman historians to 735 or 737 (1434 or 1436). If we compare this with the statements first given, we could equate the elder son of ˙Adiljan with Ibn Battuta’s Demir Khan (as Ahsad Tawhıd dies); for the latter traveller gives a very unfavourable account of Demir Khan. Yakhsı Khan would then be the same as ˙Adiljan; Ibn Battuta himself says that Yakhsı Khan only means the “good Khan” (ii, 316) so that his real name might have been ˙Adiljan. It is more important that, as Mordtmann makes probable, the Karasi dynasty existed somewhat longer than the Otto-

mans say. The Byzantines as late as 1343 still mention a Sultanian, a descendant of Karasi (Nik. Gregor, p. 741; Kantaezenos, i, 476, 507), who was married to a daughter of Ventizas. This is in keeping with the fact that in Orkhan’s letter of 714 (June 27, 1340) in which he tells the prince of Djänik of the conquest of Ulubad nothing is said about the land of Karasi (Ferdiun, Mawha`, i, 76). Mordtmann therefore supposes that the country did not finally pass to the Ottomans till a few years later (about 1345) and that the chroniclers have mixed up two events. In any case the Karasi-oglu dynasty did not arise again later under Timur, as was the case with most other Turkoman dynasties.

There are neither imitations nor coins of the Karasi princes; a small mosque at Balikesi is presumably of the pre-Ottoman period.

With the conquest of Karasi Ii a number of able statesmen and soldiers passed into the Ottoman service, such as Ahsad Khalil, who had led the Muhadjirs out of the Dobrudja, Haddjej Ilbeki already mentioned, ˙Adiljan Beg and the celebrated Chasi Ewrens Beg [q. v.].

The lands ruled by the Karasi Ogligi are given in detail by Munezdetjamin Bashj, iii, 36.

Bibliography: J. H. Mordtmann, ¨Uber das t¨urkische Fr¨uhestengeschicht der Karasi in My-

sien in the S. B. Pr. Ak. W., 1911, p. 2–7; a second monograph in the Revue Historique de l’Institut d’histoire Ottoman (T. O. E. M.), No. 9, p. 564 by Ahsad Tawhıd, Balikesi Karasi oghullari. The Byzantine sources are already mentioned in the text (from Mordtmann). Of the Turkish historians besides A˘şıkpa¸szade, Constantinople 1332, p. 43–45, see also Said al-Din, T¨ahi al-Taww¨irkh, Constantinople 1279, i, 47; All, Kunh al-Abdar, Constantinople 1277–1285, v, 43, 45; Haddjej Khalifs, T¨ahnamm, Constantinople 1145, p. 661; Munezdetjamin Bashj, S¨ah¨aci al-Abdar, Constan-

tinople 1285, iii, 36, 228. See further Shirhaj al-Din al-Umari, Mavsık al-Abdar fi Mavsık al-¨Amur in Quemadure’s translation, Notes et Extraites, xii, 339, 365, 366 and Ibn Battuta, loco cit.: Nadijd˘¸Asim we-Me¸nmed ˘Arif, Osmaniye Tacri˘g˘i, Constantinople 1335, p. 497; J. von Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, i, Pest 1827, p. 110 sq.

2. The sandjak of Karasi belongs to the wilayet of Khudawendiyyar; towards the end of last century it formed for a short time a separate wilayet along with the sandjak of Bighat [q. v.].

Karasi coincides with the ancient Mysia. The rivers Simaw and Shigirli divide the land into a western and eastern half. The eastern half is very inaccessible owing to the irregular form of its thickly wooded mountains and it has no towns of any size; the mountainous centre of the west, also thickly wooded, gives place to flat country as it approaches the coast. The most populous and easily accessible parts are in the region along the railway from Banderma to Smyrna; the capital Balikesi [q. v.] is here. In the south-west is
an equilateral triangle is placed below in the centre of the beam, the altitude h of which is marked; from the centre of the beam hangs a pointer (şahîl); if the pointer coincides with the line h, the beam is horizontal. Sometimes, as in our balances, a scissors-shaped fork (şayvârân) is used above the balance and one watches when the tongue (tusân) standard or, in one style of the beam lies between the arms of the fork, or sometimes a pointer is attached to the fork above pointing downwards and one watches when the end of this pointer is exactly opposite the tongue below. Finally the tongue may be placed below and the fork hung downwards, turning on the fulcrum of the balance. If there is not equilibrium the tongue falls outside the fork which is always perpendicular. Of technical expressions we might further mention al-wazn, the weight as measure of heaviness (al-thikîl) and lightness (al-khasîf), the scale (al-kaflâ), the threads to which the scales are attached (al-kârlî), the hook on which the scales or the weights are hung (al-krâfî), the arrangement for suspension (al-šâfâ).

Almost the only weights used in scientific works are the dirham and the mithkâl (1 mithkâl = 10 dirham and one mithkāl = 4—4.5 grammes). The absolute value is usually of no importance in the cases we are concerned with, as it is only a question of relations of the weights. Further, 1 mithkâl = 6 dānak = 24 tâqâf = 96 aţâ. The normal weight, the standard, with which the other weights are to be compared, is called sanjî or sanîjî. Weights etc. have been discussed and studied by H. Sauvage (see the Bibl.).

In the theoretical discussion of the balance the first point to be considered is the definition of heavy and light body, the establishment of the centre of gravity, that of stable and unstable equilibrium, which is given by the relative positions of centre of gravity and centre of balance, the investigation of the question if it matters whether the weights are attached directly to the beam or to rods attached to it which are perpendicular or inclining to it.

By a fortunate chance there has been preserved to us the very important work “The Balance of Wisdom”, Miťa al-Ibâna, by Abû Maṣûr Abû l-Pâth ʿAbd al-Râjmân al-Khâzinî (c. 1100 A.D.). That he was really the author is certain from a passage in al-Bâhaqî (see Reitcr., xx. 73). All the above questions as well as the theory of the definition of specific gravities and some special applications of the balance for measuring time and for levelling are fully discussed by him.

In the general part he carefully considers the achievements of earlier workers in this field, for example the classical writers like Archimedes, Aristotle, Euclid, Menelus and Pappus. He used the pseudographic work of Aristotle — without, however, mentioning his name — the μηνεικτης προβάλλατα (cf. Th. Bel., op. cit., p. 123). M. Stein- schneider’s statement that there is a translation of the work in the British Museum is wrong, as Mr. E. Edwards informs me. The work is, however, mentioned among those of Aristotle by Ibn al-Khâîf, p. 43, 13. Among Muslim writers Thâbit b. Qurra, Ibn al-Haithâm and Abû Saḥîr al-Kâhî were specially used by al-Khâzinî. He also deals with a series of balances which have been made by different students (see below). For specific gravities he relied mainly on al-Bûrîn’s work Maḥâli fi
As the two arms of the beam were of different lengths the superior weight of the longer had to be balanced either by a suitable form of the beam or by a special weight attached to the shorter arm. Thabit b. Qurra’s work on the karastın, which is preserved in Arabic and in Latin translations (cf. Buchner, op. cit.), is devoted to this problem. To increase the steadiness of the lever for weighing, several large running-weights are used (fig. 1); but attachments can also be fixed to the shorter arm of the lever at two distances from the fulcrum, but in this case compensatory weights must be used. If the spaces are in the relation of 1:2, the weights of the articles on it are as 2:1, when the position of the running poise is the same; two divisions are marked on the longer arm. It is the same when different running-weights are used; a corresponding number of these divisions is called bāb.

In order to be able to weigh the dirham and the mithkāl with the same divisions, ‘Omar al-Khayyāmi puts the scale for the dirham (silver) at a greater distance from the fulcrum than for the mithkāl (gold). If the lever is in equilibrium for the dirham, a compensatory weight (mīyār al-fālād) must be added to the shorter arm for the mithkāl.

The beam of the balance may also have divisions marked on the upper and on the lower side and be so arranged that either side may be turned upwards, so that one can weigh with two quite different systems of weights.

In many steelyards, for example those in use in Egypt at the present day, the scale hangs on to the lūbma (the “bit”), a piece of metal shaped like W. The running poise is a cylinder of brass without the interior (kalb) of which is filled with lead. Attached to it is the hook; the pointed part that moves along the divisions is called mīrāy (index). The whole apparatus, about five feet long, rests on a wooden support, chabla; the rod itself is called badalan.

In the work by Eliyā (mentioned below) methods are given for ascertaining and correcting errors. Two errors may arise from the balance and its attachments having false weights, from the poise being wrong, the beam bent or crooked or the divisions being wrongly marked.

Al-Khāzīnī gives two pictures of older standards, one of the generally known mahārkhābān (fig. 2) and another (fig. 1) of the kastūs al-muṣṭafīn of the great mathematician ‘Omar b. Ibrāhīm al-Khayyāmi, author of the celebrated quatrains. The illustration shows the different divisions, the running poises, the different places for the attachments and the marginal notes of the text.

A place in Fez was called al-Kaṣrātīn, probably because a karastın was placed there (see Dozy, op. cit., s.v.).

The following are Arabic works on weights and balances besides those of al-Khāzīnī:

-Treatises of Euclid on the balance (mīzān), ed. Wepcke in J. A., Ser. inap, vol. 58 (1851), p. 27. According to Wepcke, it comes from the Banū Mūsā, according to M. Curtze and L. Heiberg from Euclid (cf. Th. Ibel, p. 35). The work ascribed to Euclid on “Light and Heavy” is preserved in Arabic and often mentioned.

Works with the title “On the karastın” were written by the Banū Mūsā (about 950), Thābit b. Qurra (862–901), Kusṭā b. Lūkā (964–923) and Iba al-Haitham (1065–1036).
Important information on balances, especially the karastün, is also contained in the work on masses and weights by Eliyya bar Shinñây (975 to a year later than 1049); Archbishop of Nisibis, which is perhaps based on a work by Kustâ b. Lükkâ, Kürâsh fi'l-Musulûn wa'l-Mü̇kûl. Part of it was dealt with by H. Sauvain in the J. R. A. S., vol. ix. 291, and 1850, vol. xii. 110; much information is also contained in the work by Hasân b. Ibrahim al-Djâbarî (1698—1774) entitled: al-Ibad al-šamâ'a mina yasta'allâku bi'l-Mawâzin, or as it is also called: al-Durr (al-Ibad) al-šamâ'a fi'l-Mawâzin. According to his son 'Abd al-Râhîm al-Djâbarî, weighing machines in Egypt etc. had fallen into great confusion about 1758, which was completely cleared up by his father, who may therefore be regarded as the reformer of Egypt in this respect. In the composition of this work he was assisted by the Shaftâr al-Khabbân, 'Ali b. Khâlih.

Other authors and their works are:
Abu l-'Abbâs Naǧmî al-Dîn al-Khâzarîjî (1247—1310), al-Iâbâb wa'l-Fawâ'id fi Marifat al-Mü̇kûl wa'l-Musulûn, "science of mass and weights"; Hm Abî 'I-Fathî al-Sûfi al-Misrî (about 1494): Two treatises on the steelyard (Risâlât al-Khabbân). A number of MSS. on the subject in the Viceregal (now Egyptian) library in Cairo is given by H. Suter in his translation of the math-astron. part of the catalogue in the Zeitschr. für Mathematik und Physik, hist.-liter. Abteil., year xxxviii.

---

Above the beam of the balance is written al-‘Amî’d, to the right of it al-karaštûn, marhâsh (mark) for gold, for silver. Below are the hook (al-takrîb). Below the weights is written: the large, middle and small rummâna (running poises) for the hundreds, tens and units, for the fractions. Partly below again is information relating in part to the separate running poises. Above on the left of the scale instructions are given for putting on the running poises. Above this the six parts of the balance are given: 1) the beam with the indicator etc.; 2—4) the three rummâna's etc.; 5) the scale etc.; 6) the compensatory weight. The illustration is taken from "The Balance of Wisdom".


In the following, the works of E. Wiedemann are collected from the Beiträge (B.) zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften in the Sitzungsberichte der med.-phys. Gesellschaft (S.B.) zu Erlangen. When the whole part deals with the subject only its number is given: 1) Wagen bei den Arabern (gefasst): B., iv., S.B., xxvii. 368—392; 2) Über die Lehr von Schnittpunkten: B., vi., S.B., xxvii. 405 and 427; 3) Zur Mechanik bei den Arabern: B., vii., S.B., xxviii. 7—10; 4) Anbange aus der Schrift des Archimedes über die schwimmenden Körper: B., vii., S.B., xxviii. 152—162; Über al-Fârâbî's Aufzählung der Wissenschaften: B., xi., S.B., xxxix.
KARATEGIN, a district on the Wakhsh or Surkhab (Turk. Kizil Sā), one of the rivers which form the Amīr Daryā, called Rāšt by the Arab geographers [cf. l. 339]. The principal place (or "the fortress", al-Kaʿī, al-Ṭarīkhī of Rāšt) considered as regards its situation perfectly with the modern Garm, the only town in Karategin. Rāšt then formed one of the frontier towns of ʿAlam and was defended on the east against the inroads of the Turks by a wall built by Fāḍl b. Barmak [on him cf. i. 665, ii. 37]. In ancient times there ran through this region the road from Western to Eastern Asia described by Ptolemy. Karategin is frequently connected with the "highlands of the Komeds" ʿAjāḥīd (e.g. as recently as Chavannes, Documents sur les Traits Occidentales, p. 164, on the authority of Seyrūn in the Bulī, de la Société Géogr., part iii. 1890, p. 420—431); but in the middle ages the name (Arabic Kutumbed or Kumād, Chinese Kiu-mi-tu) was borne by the country below Rāšt. In the middle ages and later the valley of the Wakhsh seems to have had no great importance for trade; as far as has been so far ascertained, only the embassy sent by Shah Rukh to China (1419—22) used on its return journey the road between Farghāna and Balkh described by Ptolemy.

Like all the highlands on the upper course of the Amū Daryā Karategin also was under its own rulers down to quite modern times; in the pre-Mongol period only one Amīr of Karategin, Diṣ-far b. Shamānūkū (Gurīzī in Barthold, Turkest an etc., i. 9, under date 337 = 948/949) is mentioned. Under ʿTimūr and later the name of the country Kār Tegin (or Tīgın) is found, in the printed edition of the Żafīr-nāma, i. 189, erroneously Tīr Tegin; when and how the present form arose is unknown. In the manuscripts of the Bābur-nāma (ed. Beveridge, f. 33b and f. 63b ʿArūṭīgīn, f. 69b and f. 81 ʿAyīrtīgīn) and of the Tuʿrīkhī Radhī (transl. Ross, especially p. 241) both forms are found. Karategin is popularly explained as a Turkish word for "blackthorn" (cf. Radloff, Württem. Ind. 135, Ottoman Karā Kūn or as the name of the two first Kīrghız tallers of the soil (I. Minayev, Suyuyuva ʾs stranakh ʾp verkhovym Amū Daryā, p. 241, following Arendarenko). As is narrated in the Bahar al-Asrār of Maḥmūd b. Walī (India Office MS., Ethē, Cat., No. 575, f. 277a, in Radjāb, 1045 (Dec., 1635—Jan., 1636) 12,000 families of Kīrghız, then still pagans, went through Karategin to Iṣārār. At the present day the Kīrghız (Kara Kīrghız) form a part of the population of Karategin along with the Tadjīk (and a small number of Özbek).

Karasu. [See al-Furāṭī, KaRASU-BĀZĀR, a small town in the Crimea, east of Simferopol, in 45°10' N. Lat. and 34°36' E. Long. of Greenwich. In 1736 after the destruction of Bāghchē Sarāy [q. v.] by the Russians, Karasū-Bāzār was for a short time the residence of the Kūn; but this town was also taken by the Russians under General Douglas in 1737. The town has preserved its oriental aspect down to the present day: there are many Kūns' there with wash-houses and coffee-houses. The large Tāṡ Kūn, said to have been built as a fortress in the seventeenth century, now serves the same purpose. The town was several times pillaged by the Don Cossacks in the seventeenth century. Cf. Veliamin- nol Zernof, Matırxian für servir à l'historie du Khamat de Crimee, St. Petersburg 1864, Index. (W. Barthold)
(later also called Mużaffar Şah). When in the year 1869 Hisār had to submit to the Amir of Bukhārā, Karategin also was occupied by the troops of the Amir and Mużaffar Khan taken as prisoner to Bukhārā; the conflict thus engendered between Bukhārā and Khoḵand was only settled by the verdict of the Russian governor-general (K. v. Kaufmann) and Mużaffar Khan again restored to his principality; but after his death Karategin was definitely incorporated in Bukhārā. Karategin also became involved in the last fighting in Farghāna before the final subjection of this country by the Russians (1874–1876); the Beg Muhammad Ṭāhir Khan advanced to resist the insurmountable with force, although they had been favoured by his brother Mużaffar Şah (apparently not identical with the prince already mentioned). The frontier between Farghāna and Karategin (on the heights east of the valley of Kīčik Karamuk Ša) was defined by a treaty concluded between Skobelew and another brother of the Beg, Šaḥ Khan on August 28 (Sept. 9), 1876.

It was not till 1878 that Karategin was for the first time visited by a European (W. Oshāni). In the following year the Russian Beg Nur Ṭāhir and his successor Almās Beg had a mountain road, one of the best in Central Asia, built through Karategin on the right bank of the Wakhsh, which made Karategin much more accessible, but in winter Karategin is completely cut off from neighbouring lands. Oshāni and later travellers describe Karategin as a fertile country with numerous villages and orchards, and as one of the most prosperous provinces in the kingdom of the Amir of Bukhārā. It is said (Loqofet, p. 322 sq.) that in Karategin all the inhabitants without exception make a living by agriculture (including gardening), and that there is no landless proletariat there; anyone who neglects his piece of land for three years loses any right to it. On the other hand, Rickmers (p. 340) says that many peasants go from Karategin to Farghāna, work there as day-labourers and servants and bring their savings home, so that Russian money is taken more readily there than Bukharian. The only town is Garm; as regards the number of inhabitants, estimates, as usual in the east, are very contradictory: according to Oshāni 2,300, houses, to Masalskī 4,000 people, to Logofet 15,000. Information regarding administration, taxes, etc. is given especially in particular by A. Semenov (Journal of 1898). The question: “When will the White Czar (pāūdžīhūhī safīd) take us to himself?” was frequently asked Semenov by the people embittered by the arbitrary conduct of the tax-collectors.


Karaul (Karavul, Karahului), an Eastern Turkic word meaning guardian, watcher, guard, sentinel (borrowed by the Russian in the last sense); a hunter who watches game from a distance; the chief of a body of these hunters is called karaul-begi. In Ottoman Turkish karavu means a police-station. The word is connected with the root kar-, karâ-, to observe, watch or guard. — At the present day in Bukhārā, the name of karaul-begi corresponds to that of lieutenant (P. Kounzietsoy, Lute des civilisations et des langues, Paris 1912, p. 83).

In Persia the name karaul-khūna is given to the watch towers erected on the mountain tops, commanding the surrounding country (Chodzko, Specimens of the Popular Poetry of Persia, Or. Transl. Fund, p. 228, note). Bibliography: Radloff, Opys, ii. col. 146 and 165; Pavet de Courteille, Dict. turc-oriental, p. 398; Sulaimān Efendi, Mehāt-i Iqābārān, p. 216; K. Yousouf, Dict. turc-français, s. v.; Barthier de Meynard, Dict. turc-français, s. v.; Mme Carla Serena, Hommes et choses en Perse, Paris 1893, p. 56. (Cl. Huart)

Kara Yazdíjí, leader of a serious rebellion in Asia Minor from 1599 to 1602. His proper name was Abū al-Ḥālim and he was chief of the corporation of Segbāns (Seğbān bâlûk bâzīl). His followers consisted of Kurds, Turkomans and a large body of soldiers who had fled in Hungary, chiefly on account of the Grand Vizier Çīhânda’s harsh and cruel treatment of them. They are therefore called Frārīn, another name is Djalâlîn; their rebellion is known as the Khurđi-djalâlîya. Kara Yazdíjí’s first act was the occupation of Rūhā or Urfa (= Edessa) in 1600 A. H. The former Beglerbeg of Ahvassia, Husein Pasha, who had been sent as an inspector to Anatolia in the previous year and had also rebelled against the Sulṭān, took refuge with Yazdíj on hearing that Sinān Pasha Zāde Mehmed Pasha had arrived at Koɔya in order to bring him to book. They sustained together a siege in Rūhā in which they were finally compelled to cast bullets into silver coins, but in the end Kara Yazdíj made terms with the government troops by handing over Husein Pasha to them. The latter was sent to Constantinople and put cruelly to death. Kara Yazdíj was then appointed governor of Amasia. In this town he again began a reign of terror; as Ewliya Çelebi tells (ed. Constantinople 1314, ii. 184), the inhabitants hid themselves and their possessions in the mountain caves. Mehmed Pasha again succeeded in driving him into the mountains round Siwâs and, after passing the winter in Diyar Bakr, marched a second time against him. But Mehmed Pasha, Beglerbeg of Siwâs, and other nobles went to Constantinople and convinced the authorities that Kara Yazdíj had abandoned his evil ways. Accordingly the latter was given the sandjak of Corum, on condition that he would swear fealty. But, with his brother Deli Hasan (in Na’ima, i. 128 the name is once written Husein) he continued his propaganda, so that Ibrahim Paşa, former governor of Damascusa, and Hasan Paşa, former governor of Bagdadā,
were sent against them; these two Pashas were utterly defeated at Kaşgar by the 11th of Shawwāl, 1008 (April 25, 1600) by 20,000 rebels. After this victory Kara Yazidi regarded himself as an independent sovereign over the regions which he had taken from the Ottoman power. Finally he was defeated on the 12th of Shawwāl, 1010 (April 5, 1602) by the vizier Hasan Sokolli, at Sepentalı. The rebels fled to the mountains of Džnik; here Kara Yazidi died in Ramadān of the same year (according to Şüfî-i-Üzümâ, Constantino-plot 1311, iii. 301 sqq., his death took place already in 1009). He was succeeded by his brother Deli Hasan and three chieftains called Şahverdi, Yulcar Karpaš and Tawil; his body was cut up by them into several pieces which were buried in different spots in order that the 'Othmānīli might not have it in their power to burn the corpse. The new chiefs afterwards waged war successfully against the already mentioned Hasan Pasha, who was killed by them in Tekšt.

The inner history of this rebellion, which continued until its bloody suppression by Murad Pasha in 1605, has not yet been sufficiently studied. It does not seem unreasonable to seek religious pro-Shī'ī motives behind it (cf. Babinger in the Z. D. M. G., lxxvi. 143), as a name like Şahverdi suggests. On the other hand the moment was very favourable for a rebellion, the bulk of the 'Othmānīli power being then occupied in Hungary at the siege of Kutoc. On the name Džšili cf. Babinger, Ist., xi. 14, note 3.

Bibliography: Na'mā, Ta'rīkh, Constantino-plot 1147, i. 85 sgg., 120 sgg., 128, 152, who cites chiefly the chronicle of Hasan Bey Zade; von Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, iv. 271, 303 sqq. (J. H. Kramers)

Kārīm. [See Kārīn, Kārīn.]

Kārib, the name of a modern metre used by the Turks and Persians and called al-munṣarād by the Arabs. Its measure is in each hemistich: maṣfīlun, maṣfīlun, faṭīlun, faṭīlun. The principal variations are: maṣfīlun by ḥabī [q.v.], maṣfīlun be kaff [q.v.], faṭīlun by ḥabī [q.v.], faṭīlun = faṭīlun by kāf [q.v.] and lastly faṭīlun = faṭīlun by ḥabī [q.v.].

In Persian, it should be added, maṣfīlun may become faṭīlun (= maṣfīlun) by khār [q.v.].

Bibliography: See the article 'Arūb.[(Moh. Ben Cherub)

Karbiya. [See Kurabiya.]

Karim, of persons: generous, benevolent, liberal, honourable, noble, high-born; of things: bounteous, plentiful, honourable, noble, splendid. Al-Karim is one of the ninety-nine attributes or "excellent names" (Sūra vii. 179) of God, but in the twenty-seven passages in which the word occurs in the Koran it is only twice applied to Him. It is applied to Muḥammad, to an angel, and, ironi- cally, to unbelievers, but it more frequently qualifies things, e. g. the recompense and provision awaiting the faithful, the Kafran, the letter sent to Bilkis, queen of Saba' [q.v.], the entry of the faithful into paradise, plants, cornfields, dwellings, the mode of addressing parents, etc. In Ḥadīth the term is often applied to Vusuf, who is called al-Karim ibn al-Karim (al-Bukhari, Manākıb, bāb 13; Tāfṣir, Sūra 12, bāb 1). Al-Karimātina denotes the eyes (Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, iii. 283).

Bibliography: The lexica, s. v.
(T. W. Hagi)
KARIN means a companion of any kind (muqaddim in the Sūrah and the Lisan, xvii. 214 sq.; khalid in al-Baiḍawi on Kurān, xlii 24); thus Abū Bakr and Tāliah and Abū Bakr and ʿUmar are called the two Karin. It is plain, too, that for Muḥammad and pre-Muḥammad Arab the word also suggested a spirit-companion. That is the overwhelming usage of the Kurān. In theology, every human being has, as a kārin, a ṣāḥīfān and also an angel appointed to accompany him and, respectively, to tempt him to evil or to incite him to good (Lisan, loc. cit.). The ṣāḥīfān is sometimes called a ginni and will be cast into the Fire at the Judgment along with his human comrade whom he has led astray. These two karin are therefore different from the recording angels which accompany each human being (Kurān, lxxixi, 10-12). The basis of this is both Kurān and Ḥadīth. The word occurs in the Kurān eight times; in Kurān, xxxvii. 40, a human companion is evidently meant (gīfts of ṣuḥūr, al-Baiḍawi); in Kurān, iv. 42 (b), the ṣāḥīfān is a kārin in Kurān, xlii. 24, the plural ṣāḥīfān is used, but the context and special meaning of the term is not, for, on the other hand, shows that tempting spirits are meant; closely paralleled is Kurān, xlii. 35, 37, where a ṣāḥīfān is “ordained” (qayyad) by Allāh as a kārin on Kurān, l. 22 al-Baiḍawi is in doubt whether by kārin a ṣāḥīfān or an angel is meant, but on v. 26 he is certain that it is a ṣāḥīfān. In this he follows the oldest exegetical tradition on the whole subject given in al-Ṭabar’s Tafsīr, xxvi. 93 sq. Even the prophets have such a ṣāḥīfān, but that of Muḥammad was converted by him to Islam; a great many traditions bearing on this are given in the Akān al-nawzān of Muḥammad ʿAbdul-Ḥāfiẓ bin ʿAbd al-Rahmān, p. 26 sq. (ed. 1326). A very suggestive and full ethical-theological treatment of the whole subject is in the Iyā of al-Ghaznī, Kitāb ad-dīn al-bala, ed. with comm. Ilīf al-sādah, vii. 264 sq., where the traditions are given in detail; cf. D. B. Macdonald, Religious Attitude in Islam, p. 274 sq.

At the other extreme is the folkloristic development in popular Islam; for it see S. M. Zwemer, Influence of Animism on Islam, chap. vi. Much of this, too, may easily have been in the mind of Muḥammad and his world.

Another use of kārin in old Arabia was for the ginni who accompanied a poet and brought to him his verses. This use has been transferred into Islam to the angel who consorted with the Prophet and brought him his revelations (Lisan, loc. cit.; Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arab. Philologie, i. 5 sq.; D. B. Macdonald, op. cit., p. 19 sq.).

Bibliography has been given above; add traditions in Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, iii. 385, 397 sq., 401, 460; cf. ii. 323; al-Dārimi, Musnad, Rīḍā, hāb 25; Muslim, Ṣahih, Siṣī al-Munāṣibīn, Trad. 69 (ed. with al-Nawawī’s commentary, Cairo 1253 v. 362; Constantinople 1334, viii. 138).

(D. B. MACDONALD)

KARKARLA, a Cossack village and the capital of a district in the territory of Semipalatinsk, 49° 2′ N. lat., 74° 7′ E. Long. (Greenwich); it has about 3,000 inhabitants of whom two-thirds are Muḥammadans.

(W. BARTHOLOMEW)

al-KARKH, the name of an important quarter of old Baghdad. The word Karak, which comes from the Aramaic (Karka), is found in Greek and Roman writers as Carcha, Charcha and Charase (see Pauli-Wissowa, Realencykel, d. klass. Alterthumsquiz, Suppl. i. 275, 283) and means town; cf. Yākūt, Muṣḥam, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 252, 18; Streck, op. cit. (see Bibli), p. 92, 186; G. Le Strange, Baghdad, p. 63. There was still in the Muslim period a whole series of places or parts of towns called al-Karkh within the area of influence of Aramaic culture, in the Irāk, Kūf, Ḥārān, and al-Dirāz; they were distinguished from one another by the addition of a geographical name (like Maṣṣan, Ṣanāra). Yākūt, iv. 252-257 gives 9 such places; see also al-Ṭabar (ed. de Goeje), Indiciss, p. 762. Our Karak is often more exactly defined as Karkh Baghdād.

As the Aramaic name shows, the al-Karkh quarter was already in existence before the foundation of Baghdād by al-Manṣūr (145 = 762), as a small independent township said to have been founded by the Sāsānian Shāhīn II (309-379 A.D.), which, like the other earlier settlements on the site of the future capital of the Caliphs, was no doubt mainly inhabited by Aramaic Christians (cf. above, i. 564). This pre-Muslim Karak was selected by the Caliph al-Manṣūr to be the mercantile centre of the busiest quarter of Baghdād owing to its commercial character. Al-Karkh was at first quite separate, south-east of the so-called round city of al-Manṣūr and a fair distance from it; but as new roads and squares grew up all around it, it soon became merged in the sea of houses of the great capital.

Al-Karkh was watered by the Nahr ʿĪsā, the most northerly large canal of the Euphrates in the Ḥārāk, as well as by its branches, the Nahr ʿĀrāt and the Nahr Karakḥāyāt. The latter is the “Karakhian Canal” (Karkhāyāt = كركهاي ن) see Freihel, Die aram. Provenz. im Arab., Leipzig 1886, p. xx) which left the Nahr ʿĪsā below the small town of al-Μuḥauwāl near the village of al-Barābā (see above, 655) and supplied the southern part of the western half of Baghdād, i.e. the mercantile quarter and its neighbourhood, with its branch channels, which in places ran underground. Numerous bridges carried the busy traffic over it. On the Nahr Karakḥāyāt and its canal system see Ibn Saʿrān, ed. G. Le Strange in the J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 24, 17-20; 286-8, 292-3; al-Khāṭir, Baghdād, ed. Salomon (see the Bibli, p. 60-68, 154-5; Yākūt, iv. 253; Streck, op. cit., p. 85-90; G. Le Strange, Baghdād, p. 52-56, 63-80; Herzfeld in Serre-Herzfeld (see the Bibli), ii. 110.

In the civic history of Baghdād, especially during the Būyids period (xth-xith century), al-Karkh, which was regarded as a Shīʿa stronghold, is frequently mentioned (cf. above, i. 567). Under the Būyids who had Ṣaffād sympathies the already frequent encounters and frictions between the Sunnis and the Shīʿa of the capital became more and more serious. Sanguinary street fighting between the two hostile sects often accompanied by pillaging and incendiaryism was the order of the day. Al-Karkh was usually in the very centre of this civil strife; its inhabitants were always at daggers drawn with the Sunnis of the adjoining quarters (Bāb al-Baṣra etc.). Sulṭān Djalāl al-Dawla (416-453 = 1024-1044) under whom the situation had become unusually serious was even on one occasion, in 422 (1031), reduced to take refuge with his Shīʿa co-religionists in al-Karkh. In 445 (1053) a considerable part of al-Karkh was laid in ashes as a result of these feuds. A great fire had previously devastated al-Karkh under the Caliph al-
Wählich (227—232 = 542—7); but the destruction was very soon made good.

In course of time numerous mosques and tombs arose in the area of al-Karkh in the wider sense, by which the whole southern half of Baghdaad west of the Tigris was often meant. The most celebrated is the tomb-mosque of the local saint Muhammed b. al-Farazrud al-Karkhi (d. 200 = 816) and the alleged tomb of Zuhayda, the wife of Hārūn al-Rashid, barely 300 yards south of it. Both mausoleums (see also I, 569) still exist and are important starting points for studying the topography of old Baghdaad. In their present form they were renovated by the Caliph al-Nāṣir (575—622 = 1180—1225); but they have been frequently restored since then. On the tomb of al-Karkh, which as early as the 13th century was one of the most popular places of pilgrimage in Baghdaad and which lies in the middle of an impressive cemetery as in the ‘Abbasid period, cf. Streek, op. cit., p. 159; G. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 98—100, 350; Massignon, op. cit. (see the Bibl.), p. 49, 108; Herzfeld, op. cit., ii, 172—3. For the so-called grave of Zuhayda see G. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 100, 161 sq., 350 sq.; Massignon, op. cit., p. 108 sq.; Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 73. On other mosques and tombs in the west side of Baghdaad see Massignon, op. cit., p. 64 sq. or 94 sq.

Al-Karkh was not only the largest but also the most long-lived quarter of the western half of Baghdaad. When the quarters around it had gradually fallen into ruins, it stood quite isolated — as early as Yākūt’s day for example (beginning of the xiiith cent.) — like a separate town, as it had been in the earliest period after the foundation of Baghdaad. It was a mile distant from the then still inhabited quarter of Bāb al-Brār (in the southeast of the old round city of al-Mansūr). In the later middle ages (cf., for example, Ibn Batūta in the xivth century) the name of the Bāb al-Brār quarter was not infrequently extended to all the quarters of western Baghdaad still standing i.e. even to include al-Karkh; cf. G. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 336; Herzfeld, op. cit., ii, 114 sq. We may here point out that the topography of al-Karkh and its vicinity in Yākūt is not quite in agreement with the other sources. It appears that the local knowledge of the author of the Geographical Dictionary at the time of writing was no longer quite reliable. Cf. G. Le Strange, p. 84, 159.

Al-Karkh is also known as a rare mint; there are coins of the reigns of the Caliphs al-Mukhtadīr, al-Kāhir and al-Ridi, dated in the years 308, 315, 318, 321, 325; cf. Numismatische Zeitschrift, Vienna 1893, vol. xiii, 321; Lavoix, Cat. des Monn. Mus. de la Bibl. Nat., i, 285; Numismatic Chronicle, 1902, p. 272; 1910, p. 197. The wine of al-Karkh was highly esteemed in poems of the older ‘Abbasid period (e.g. in Abu Nuwas, Ibn Mu’tazz) it is often mentioned; cf. G. Jacob in Oriental Studien, Th. Neideke’s geniedt, Giessen 1906, p. 1065.

At the present day the part of Baghdaad on the right bank of the Tigris, which barely makes up a third of the area of the city, is called Karshiaka, properly (Turkish) Karshy Yak = the other side (lying opposite the city proper on the east bank), a reproduction of the popular Arabic Ḥālak al-Dīnārī. This name has therefore no connection with al-Karkh (the contrary view is held by Le Strange, op. cit., p. 66). Ḥālak was for long merely an insignificant suburb; but in recent years it has increased somewhat in importance and will certainly continue to do so as the railway station of Baghdaad is there. Since the second half of the xvith century Arabs of the tribe of Čaql (Čogel, ‘Ağel) have settled here, who with other caravan people form at the present day a considerable part of the inhabitants of this western town. Cf. thereon Černik’s expedition in Petermanns Geograph. Mitt., suppl. part 44, Gotha 1875, p. 28, 30; Oppenheim, Vom Mittelmeer zum persischen Golf, Berlin 1900, ii, 224, 238; cf. H. Hurst, Hist. de Bagdad dans les temps modernes, Paris 1901, p. vii, 188 sq.; Massignon, op. cit., p. 99 sq.


KARKHA. [See KARKHĀ].

AL-KARKHĪ, ABŪ BAKR MUḤAMMAD B. AL-ḤASAN (or AL-ḤUSAIN), was one of the most important mathematicians of the Arabs; he also calls himself al-Ḥasib (the arithmetician). He lived in Baghdaad in the time of Abū Ghālib Muhammad b. Khālid al-Fakhr al-Mulk, vizier of the Būyid Bahā’ al-Dawalī (q. v.) and his son Sulṭān al-Dawla Abū Shaddīj. The date of his death is not known but it may lie between 410 and 420 (1021—1029). The two of his mathematical works that still exist are entitled al-Kāfī fī’l-Ḥisāb (the requisite for arithmetic) and al-Fakhrī (i.e. the book dedicated to the vizier Fakhr al-Mulk). The first exists in a unique manuscript in Gotha, the second in Paris, Oxford and Cairo. The Arabic text of neither of these works has yet been published but there is a German translation of the former by A. Hochheim, Kāfī fil Ḥisāb des Abū Bekr Muh. b. Alhussein Alkarkhī, in 3 parts, Halle a/S. 1878—80, and a synopsis of the second in French by F. Woepcke, Extrait du Fakhrī, Paris 1853. The second work is the most important next to the Algebra of al-Khayāmī that has come down to us on this branch of mathematics. In it al-Karkhī closely follows the Greek mathematician Diophantus of Alexandria; for the first time among the Arabs indeterminate equations appear in this work and they are solved after the fashion of the Greek mathematicians;
whether al-Karkhi deliberately took no notice of the Indian methods or was not acquainted with them cannot be decided. In his book on arithmetic, like almost all Eastern Arab mathematicians (except 'Ali b. Ahmad al-Nasawi, about 980—1040), he does not use Indian numerals but writes out all the figures in words.

**Bibliography:** There is not a separate article on al-Karkhi in any of the Arab biographical works so far published; he is only occasionally mentioned in Ibn Khallikân, ed. Cairo 1310, ii. 65; and by de Slane, iii. 279. Cf. also M. Cantor, Vorlesungen über Gesch. d. Mathem., 2. ii. 718—729; H. Suter in *Abhandl. z. Gesch. d. mathem. Wissenschaft*, xx. 84.

(H. Suter)

**KARKIŠIYÂ (also KARKIŠIYÂ), a town in al-Djazîrâ on the left bank of the Euphrates, close to the confines of the Khâbûr, a little above the 35° N. Lat. Karkišiyya is simply an Arabic reproduction of the Graeco-Roman name (rò) Karpéoûs, (trò) Karpéón (Karpis in the *Notit. episc.*), ed. Parthey, p. 67). Cirkesium, Syriac Kirkiusia, Latin = Caerimon Circense, the Castle with the Circus = Cirkis, op. cit. (see Bibl.), p. 3. Hassa al-I斯塔bûrî in Yâkûr, iv. 63 sq., still knew the etymology of the place-name (Karkišiyya, arabicized from Karkišyâ, from kir- = arab. kalas, Hippodrome). The name Circesium for the place at the mouth of the Khâbûr in any case first appeared, when a Roman military station was built there. This perhaps may have been even before Diocletian. It was, however, this Emperor who first made the place of great importance by making it a powerful fortress on the extreme frontier of the Roman Empire in Southern Mesopotamia. From this it seems quite impossible that Circesium could have been a latinisation of the Aramaic Kharka = town (see the article al-Karkhid), as Moritz, op. cit. (see Bibl.), p. 37, supposed; see Streck's arguments in the *Z. A.*, xxvii. 259.

A situation so favoured by nature as the mouth of the Khâbûr must certainly have been already inhabited in remote antiquity. But the names of the settlements there have — as frequently happens in the East — changed several times in the course of centuries.

The old native name of the place was perhaps the Nabagath mentioned by Isidor of Charasse (cf. Hefsel, op. cit., i. 174). Another name is perhaps preserved in Chabara i.e. the town on the Khâbûr; see Streck in Pauly—Wissowa, op. cit. (see the Bibl.). In the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings of the ninth century (Tukulti-Ninurta II., Assurnasirpal) we find mention of a place named Sirku (Sirkî), which, according to the itinerary of Tukulti-Ninurta, was the last western stage along the Euphrates on the road to the mouth of the Khâbûr. Following Maspero (*De Carchemis oppressa sita*, Paris 1872, p. 13), this Sirku has been connected with Circesium and the latter name actually derived from the Assyrian one; see for example Sayce in *Proc. of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, xviii. 174; S. Schiffer, *Die Aramäer*, Leipzig 1911, p. 20 and 22, and Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, i., Heidelberg 1920, p. 344; it is queried by Scheil, *Annales de Tukulti Ninîp*, ii., Paris 1909, p. 48. This identification is untenable; see against it Streck in the *Z. A.*, xxvii. 269 sq. and Horn in the *Z. A.*, xxxiv. 150 sq. The site of Sirku is besides to be sought on the right bank of the Euphrates; on the probable situation cf. Forrer, *Die Provinzialaufteilung des Assyrischen Reiches*, Leipzig 1920, p. 15. According to the above mentioned itinerary of Tukulti-Ninurta, Rummunina (on the reading see Horn, op. cit., p. 151) must probably be located in the region of the junction of the Khâbûr with the Euphrates.

Simply on account of the similarity of names, Circesium used to be identified with Carchemish, the great Hittite city, for example in the older Biblical commentaries, by the Jewish traveler Benjamin of Tudela, also by Ritter, op. cit., x. 15 and by Chesney, op. cit. (see the Bibl.), p. 250. The lack of foundation for this identification was shown notably by Maspero in the above mentioned work and by Noldeke, op. cit., p. 1 sq. Besides, the site of Carchemish has been identified for several decades beyond all doubt in the ruins of Dîrîbûs or Dîjârîbis on the right bank of the middle Euphrates, a few hours' journey below Birekît.

In the fourth century A.D. Cirkesium passed into the hands of the Persians by the shameful treaty made by the Emperor Chosroes (395). The Arabs, next captured it in the conquest of al-Djazîrâ. The occupation by the Muslims, which took place, apparently without fighting, under the commander Habîb b. Maslama who was sent by 'Yâşî b. Ghann, probably happened in the year 19 (640), not 16 (637), as many sources say. Cf. thereon al-Baladhûrî, *Kîlāb al-Futûk* (ed. de Goeje), p. 176 sq. (and cf. p. 111, 175, 178, 179); al-Tabari (ed. de Goeje), i. 2478; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kamil (ed. Tornberg), ii. 409 sq.; Yâkût, Mu'jam 'al-Abbâsî (ed. Wittenfeld), iv. 65 sq.; Weil, *Gesch. des Chaliften.*, i. 82; Czetw, *Annales del' Islam*, vii. 402, iii/I. 734, 755 sq., 799. Karkisîyâ became the capital of the district of Khâbûr in the province of Diyar Bakr. On account of its very characteristic situation, Karkisîyâ is mentioned by all the Arab geographers in their descriptions of the river-courses and roads, but no detailed account of it is given. The place probably did not contain any great size in the Islamic period either. The high percentage of Jews (500 families) found by Benjamin of Tudela in the second half of the 12th century there is remarkable; see the Hebrew text of his travels edited and translated by Grünbôh and Adler (Jerusalem 1903, Frankfurt a/M. 1904), i. 49, 21 sq. and ii. 47.

In the history of the wars of mediaeval Islam we find Karkisîyâ often mentioned. When 'Abd al-Malik was engaged in his campaign against Mu'âsh, governor of the Ífrîk and brother of the anti-Caliph 'Abdallâh b. al-Zahhâb, he had to devote his attention to Karkisîyâ in 71 (690), where the Kâsî Zafar b. al-Hâfîz was ruling independently and had successfully resisted the governor of Ïmîs, who had been sent against him. After a siege of some length, Zafar had to submit to the Caliph's army; cf. the account in Ibn al-Athîr (ed. Tornberg), iv. 275 sq.; Weil, *Gesch. der Chaliften*, i. 431; J. Wellhausen, *Das Arabische Reich und sein Sturz*, Berlin 1902, p. 115—116, 119—120, 126. In the wars fought in the ivth (xth) century on Mesopotamian soil in the Hamdânî epoch, we find Karkisîyâ playing a part along with al-Raŷba, a day's journey down the Euphrates from it; cf. Freytag in the *Z. D. M. G.*, x. 451—2. The rulers of Egypt repeatedly extended their power as far as Karkisîyâ, for example the Tulûnî Ahmad, from
whom, however, the Caliph al-Mu'tamid's vigorous brother al-Muwaffaq was able to retake it in 263 (881); see Wüstenfeld, Die Staatshistorien von Legißen zur Zeit der Chälifen, Abb. G. G. W., (1876), vol. xxii., part iii. 20. Several centuries later the Egyptian Sulaiman Balbars again advanced his frontier up to the Khabur, when he took Karkisiya from the Mongols in 663 (1264); cf. Weil, Gesch. der Chälifen, iv. 96.

At the present day the site of Karkisiya is marked by a miserable village of 30–40 houses and hovels of clay and an extensive ruined site adjoining it. It is now called Busaira (Besira); wrongly written Busayra, by the travellers give the form Abū Serai etc. Busaira is probably a corruption of Abū Serai (as, along with other authors, Moritz, op. cit., p. 37, thinks); it has been with less probability taken as a derivative from Basr, the older name — recorded by Abu l-Fida' for 732 (1331) — of the present Dār ez-Zūr (see Hersfeld, op. cit.). According to Hersfeld, the old name Karkisiya still survives locally in the form Karṣa.

Busaira lies on an irregularly shaped tongue of land formed by the Khabur at its junction with the Euphrates and is about half an hour's journey distant from its mouth. Communication with the hinterland is broken by a ditch so that we have a well-marked peninsula. The plan of the old fortress can still be easily recognised; it forms a rectangle, the longer side of which runs along the Khabur, while the shorter faces the Euphrates from which it is now about 1000 yards distant. Four more or less well preserved towers and a fort-like building (praetorium, serai) can still be seen, from which Moritz (op. cit.) suggests that the modern name Abū Serai (Busaira) may be derived. The fairly extensive town lay to the north-east of the fortress and is still marked by numerous walls of earth. Descriptions of the modern ruins are given by Sachau, Moritz and Hersfeld; plans of them are in Sachau and Hersfeld (see Bibli.).

The important part once played by Karkisiya as a trading centre as a result of the important roads which meet here — from Syria to Babylonia, Māşūl to Syria — has in modern times been to a great extent regained by the town of Dār ez-Zūr on the Euphrates (see above, i. 936) above mentioned, a few hours' journey above the mouth of the Khabur.

concerning the conquest of Central Asia by the Kara Khitai [q.v.], the latter appear as the allies of the Khan of Balasaghun [q.v.] against the Kauluks; the Kara Khitai of Samarqand, on the other hand, are the allies of the Kauluks against Sultan Sandjar (cf. especially al-Rawandi, ed. Muḥ. ʿAbd al-Rasul, Gibb Memorial Series, new series, ii, p. 172). Later the Kara Khitai induced the Kauluks in Samarqand to abandon their warlike life and to take to agriculture. According to Ibn al-Athir, this took place in 559 (1163/4) (Kāmil, ed. Tornberg, xi, 205), but this date seems to be late; cf. W. Barthold, Turkestân, ii, 358. In the second half of the 12th century the Kauluks are mentioned for the last time (by al-Kātib al-Samarqandi; cf. the text as edited by Barthold, Turkestân, i, 71 sq.) as enemies of the Khan of Samarqand; in the history of the 12th century they no longer appear. A Kauluk state N. of the Ili with the capital ʿAwālij is however still mentioned; cf. especially Taʾrīkh-i Diwan Ḵᵛāzla, i, 567 sq.; other reports in Barthold, Turkestân, ii, 433 sq., 477. The son of the Kauluk prince Arslan Khan, who had submitted to the Mongols and taken part in the expedition against the Khwarizmshah Muhammad, was given in fief Uzgand in Farghana by the Great Khan Mangu (1251—1259; cf. Taʾrīkh-i Diwan Ḵᵛāzla, i, 58); there is no later mention of this dynasty. To the same division of the Kauluks perhaps belonged the dynasty of the princes of Almalīgh (cf. the art. KULJA). The name Kauluk seems later to denote an Ozbek family only. (W. BARTHOLO)

KARMAṬIANS (ḴARMAṬI, plur. KARMAṬIJA: Carmathians). In the strict application of the word, the name was given to the rebel federations of Arabs and ʿAbātaeans, which were organized in Lower Mesopotamia after the sargive war of the Zandj [q.v.] from 264 (877) and based on a system of communism into which initiation was necessary; active propaganda extended this secret society among the masses, peasants and artisans; in al-ʿAfsa, where they founded a state independent of the Caliph of ʿAbābād; in Khorsān, in Syria and in Yemen, where they formed lasting hotbeds of discontent.

In the broader sense, the name Karmāţian means the great movement for social reform and justice based on equality, which swept through the Muslim world from the ninth to the twelfth centuries of our era; this movement, captured and controlled by an ambitious family, the Ismaʿilī dynasty (cf. ISMAʿILĪYA, ʿṢABĪYA), who founded the Fatimid anti-caliphate in 297/910, became abortive and finally succumbed with this dynasty by the counterstroke of the Crusades.

The movement is characterized, from the point of view of knowledge, by the adaptation of the Arabic language to certain technical achievements of foreign origin, especially Hellenistic (Neo-Platonic, pseudo-Hermetic and Ṣahaean writings); from the political point of view, by the exploitation of the ʿAlid legitimist tradition on behalf of a conspiracy, carried on in a strict secrecy, in which the name of the supreme leader was never pronounced; from the point of view of worship, by the use of an allegorical and mythical catechism, ʿOrfāne in origin, adapted to all creeds, to all races and all classes. The movement was based on reason, tolerance and equality, with a system of graduated initiation and the ritual of a gild which encouraged the rise of the trade gild movement (see the art. GILD) and universities—seems to have reached the West and to have influenced the formation of European gilds and freemasonry.

I. Etymology and early history.

The etymology of the word ʿKarman (not ʿKarmīt) is disputed. It appears as a descriptive adjective in the name of the first leader of the insurrection, Ḥamdān ʿKarman (cf. ʿAll b. ʿKarman, a heretic quoted by the ʿUsāiri author Maimūn Ṭabarānī). Voilers has connected it with the Greek ʿkhrimēta, but it is more probable that we should see in it a borrowing from the local Aramaic dialect of ʿWaṣat, where ʿKarmanū (this day means undallū (Arabo-Aramaic dialect of the Midīn, ed. Ālādīrī, x, 18, p. 857). From the year 255 (868) we find mentioned in the same region, along with the Ṣarāryīya, a corps of Karmāţiya among the rebellious troops of the Zandj (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1757; cf. iii, 1749: ʿRāghid Karmāţī).

The name ʿKarman in palaeography means a particular kind of naskh; in addition there is a special secret Karmāţian alphabet used in the Yemeni texts recently studied by Grinti.

The Karmāţian insurrection was begun by Ḥamdān in the neighbourhood of ʿWaṣat; in 277/890 he founded a dār al-khā/] (an entrenched place of retreat) east of Kūfa for his partisans, whose various voluntary contributions supported the common chest: these contributions were always at the breaking of the fast (zahūl ʿal-ʿifr), for the right to use the place of refuge, a fifth of all income (ḵūns), right of all participation in the agapes (būchī; cf. the art. ʿUSĀRĪ); community of all objects of general utility (sulfa). These details, which we know from Sunni sources, are perhaps accurate; at the agapes they ate "broad of Paradise"; this detail which we find in the contemporary trial of al-Ḥallādī is perhaps simply a transference of the consecrated bread (pohta) used among the Mandaeans of ʿWaṣat (mawdūsita = nāṣīrāya; cf. al-Ṭabarī, year 278 (981), on the Karmanīya of ʿAbū ʿOṣūmān of Naṣrān; or to be pointed Naṣūrāya).

We find along with Ḥamdān his brother-in-law ʿAbādīn (d. 286/899), a master of a manual of initiation for the seven degrees (balagḥīt sābaʿ). Both seem to have been dependent on leaders whose identity remained a secret, living outside of ʿWaṣat, the ʿṢabīl ʿal-ʿZahrā, who is said to have invested Ḥamdān, and the ʿṢabīl al-Nākān, who had dismissed ʿAbādīn and put in his place Ḥikrauiwāl ʿAbādīn. Ḥikrauiwāl in 288/900 gave the signal in the desert of ʿWaṣat among the Banū ʿUlaś for the general Karmāţian rising — so long prepared (expected in Khurāsān) for the year 290/902 — and proclaimed as leader the ʿṢabīl al-Nākān, under the Ismaʿilī regnal name Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad, who took the dynastic name ʿṢabīl al-Ḥalāl, who as ruler took the name Abū ʿAbdalshāh ʿAbdāzīr, and who was captured and executed at ʿAbābād in 291 (933). The Karmāţian movement in Lower Mesopotamia, drowned in blood, ceased to be an active factor in politics in 294 (906) with the death of Ḥikrauiwāl.

In time the movement regained strength in
al-Āṣār, where the ʿṢāḥib al-Naḥaṣ had sent as his representative Abū Saʿīd Ḥasan b. Buhām al-Djannābī in 281 (894); with the support of the Kaʿbah tribe of the Abī al-Kaṣīr, al-Djannābī seized the whole of al-Āṣar (286 = 899) and made it an independent state, the bulwark of ʿĀṣār power and the terror of the Caliphate of Baghdaḍ. His son and successor Abū Tāhā Sulaimān (301—
323 = 914—943) began to lay waste Lower Mesopotamia, cut the pilgrim routes and finally seized (Mekka on the 8th of Dhu al-Ḥijja, 317 = Jan.
12, 930) from which he carried off the Black Stone six days later to take it to al-Āṣar. Abū Tāhā, like his father, was only the emissary of a secret organisation, its "commissionary for foreign affairs" for al-Āṣar; while waiting the opportunity to enthrone the expected Imām there, he appointed a representative council over it, the Ṣūda (i.e. the elders of the tribe) for the political administration of home affairs. This organisation was still in existence in 422 (1030) after the decline of the military power of the ʿĀṣār; it seems to have maintained local autonomy down to the xviiiith century, when the revival of propaganda took the form of a new Imāmī dynasty (Makramīs).

The name of the ʿĀṣār was also that of a Makramī (new name given to Hadjār; on the site of the present Ḥufūf).

In Yemen, ʿArmanī propaganda, directed from 266 (879) by Maṣūr al-Yaman (title of Ibn Hawshab) with the dār al-ḥidara near ʿAdanā, failed against the resistance of the local Zaidī chiefs and could only find some little principalities, the Ṣuṭ-Sahs, and the Makramīs of Nadjān (texts studied by Grifinī).

In Khurāsān the movement began in 260 (873) at Raʾis with Ḥalāf, then spread to Marw al-Rūḥī and Ṭālāṯān in Dijarjān, where the Amīr became a ʿĀṣārī aṣārī. Dalīm which was to become a bulwark of the Imāmī dynasty (see the art. ALAMĪT, ASSASINS), was next taken for the cause, finally Muḥammad al-Nasafī al-Baradjuʿī (d. 331 = 942) undertook the conversion of the Sāmānid rulers. His execution destroyed the political hopes of the party: the small ʿĀṣārī centres of eastern Khorāsān — if we except the wāqūt of Nāṣir-i Khusraw — only produced a moderate literary activity (texts studied by Iwanow).

In Syria the centre seems to have been Salamīya; but, except for some biased Sunni records, we do not know what happened there after the insurrection of 288 (991), nor the part played in it by the future ʿUbād Allah, the first Fāṭimī Caliph. Syriān ʿĀṣārīanism is still dormant, without showing any signs of activity nor of contact with the Druses, who are its distant brethren.

The small local bodies, among which ʿArmanī manuscripts have survived down to our days (for a list of them see the art. ISMIṢAYA, li. 549 sqq.), have not been the scene of any serious doctrinal activity apart from the writings of the Syrian Rasḥīd al-Din Sinān (xivth cent.), the Ḥudūdān of the Indian Māmūd Fānti (Mohed Shāh) (xviiith cent.) and the Turkish and Persian texts of the Ḥurūfīs (xviiith—xviii cent.).

II. The position of the ʿĀṣārīs relative to the Fāṭimīds.

The general tendency of ʿĀṣārī doctrine was to consider ʿĀṣārī legitimacy as a means rather than an end. The Imām, the supreme authority, is not a hereditary monopoly transmitted in a dynasty; it is an intellectual characteristic, a divine investiture, an imperative mandate (siyās al-amīr) conferred (taliṣīṣ) on the new holder of the title from among the initiates by a sudden illumination of his intellect, which makes him "substituted" or "spiritual son" of his predecessor. Such is the justification, given in the formula of initiation in the Druze books, for these alleged "usurpations" of genealogy, which are the rule in the annals of the ʿĀṣārīs from ʿAbd Allāh b. Maimūn down to Ḥasan al-laḥīḵhī Ḥaṣānī. And this is the meaning of the definitions of the imāmate given by adepts like Ibn Masʿūd, Kuʾīn, Ibn Ḥanī and the Ḥudūdān al-Naṣafī and ʿṢāḥib al-Naḥaṣ in 288 (990), and ʿUbād Allāh in 292 (995) had assumed a Fāṭimī dynastic title, neither one nor the other plainly indicated their genealogical connection with the ʿĀṣārīs (cf. al-Makramī, Ṣarḥ, ed. Buzn., p. 7—11). And if this claim was of importance with respect to the public, in the opinion of their enemies, it seems that it hardly interested those initiated into the true doctrine, who expected above all else a chief, possessing a special divine appointment, of the "intellectual order", whether he was ʿAlī or not.

The official version of the ancestry of the family of ʿUbād Allah compiled by his ʿUzī, the Malikī al-Nu ṣān b. Abī Ḥanīfa al-Tamīni (born 259, d. 363 aged 104), is a laudatory and lying composition specially written in reply to a Buḥraidī attack. The versions of two Sunni anti-ʿArmanī pamphlets by Muḥammad b. Kīrām al-Ṣaʿīd, president of the Muḥāṣīn in Baghdaḍ in 326 A.H., and by Muḥammad b. Ṣaʿīd Muhāmmad al-Naṣafī, an ʿĀṣārī of Damascus, who died about 375 A.H., are hardly of any more value. S. de Sacy, Guyard and de Goeje thought they could rely on them as Ibn al-Nuṣairī, al-Dhuwairī and al-Makramī had done. But a result of a comparison with the statements contained in the biographical collections (taḥākīt) of orthodox Imāmī muḥaddithīn, in which the early ʿĀṣārī propagandists have a prominent place, shows that there are serious errors in the exposé by these two opponents. Maimūn Ṣaḥīḥ (d. about 180 A.H. at latest) was not a "Bardesian"; he was a client of the Makhzūmī clan (Kuraib), a native of Mekka, a well-known theologian, the official interpreter of the fifth and sixth Imāms, Bākīr and ʿṢāḥīḥ. His son ʿAbd Allāh, who was official ʿUṣūrī of ʿṢāḥīḥ (which provoked the irony of the poet Abī ʿAbd Allāh al-Maṣṣīrdī), did not die in 250 A.H. but in 230 at latest, "in prison in Kufa under al-Maṣṣīrī"; Dīnān (and not Zaidān) is the sobriquet of an known Imāmī author, Ḥaḍīd b. al-Husain al-Ahwāzī, who died about 250—270 A.H., etc. In these circumstances the statements made in the two Sunni sources mentioned regarding the assassination of ʿAbdān, the illegitimacy of ʿUbād Allah and the usurpation of the soi-disant "son" of Dhikrwalī in 288—291 A.H. have to be received with caution.

After the proclamation of the Fāṭimī Caliphate in the Maghrib the general attitude of the ʿĀṣārīs in al-Āṣar as in Yemen and in Khurāsān was one of expectancy, which the assassination of ʿṢāḥib al-Baḥri (267 = 909) by ʿUbād Allah amply justified. Let us take al-Āṣarī for example: Abī Saʿīd had sent from the first paid the fifth ʿUṣūrī of al-Naḥaṣ; after various evasions, which the intrigues of the court of Baghdaḍ do not quite explain, Abī Tāhā sent it to ʿAlī, but with so little conviction of his legitimacy, that he welcomed and enthroned in 319 (931) as the
expected Īmām al-madān, Abu l-Faḍl al-Zakari al-Tamāsāni (a kind of Heliozabalus, soon put to death). The Black Stone was restored to the Meccans in 260 (971) by order of the Fatimid Caliph al-Manṣūr; but in 356 (960) the Kaʿbārī chief ʿAbd al-Muʿīz al-Yamanī, who had come to him with the intention of giving him the Bayān al-ʿAmrīy, a document which he condemned. The Korān of king Sabaʿ, the soul of the world (nafs), which, like all other Prophet, was attributed to the Kaʿbārī Caliph. 

On the other hand there are abundant proofs of the adoption of Kaʿbārī doctrine by the Fatimid dynasty. It was at the dār al-ḥikma of the Maḥrūb, ʿAbd al-Muʿīz (O Gaudin) founded by the Kaʿbārī ʿAbd al-Muʿīz, who succeeded to the throne of the dār al-ḥikma, etc., in the present masonic term is nafs, which he founded in Cairo. The Druze religion is simply a Kaʿbārī heresy. The introduction of ʿAbd al-Maʿīz of the Sanāʿī ahl al-Talā in the end of the Ḥāfiẓ (131 of the ) in the J. A. of 1855, p. 542) is to be traced to the part of nafs, translated in the Prophecies by the Kaʿbārīs. 

III. The Kaʿbārī Doctrine. 

It is no longer possible to rely, as used to be done, on the accounts of Kaʿbārī doctrine given by the Sunni anti-Kaʿbārī writers on heresies; al-Maʿṣūmi has judiciously said of the latter that they contradict one another and that the Kaʿbārīs themselves recognise nothing of their doctrines in their accounts. For a few lines that are accurate in the Tanbih of al-Maṣālī (d. 377-387) we have to come down to the ixth century of our era to find a conscientious author, al-Shahristānī, able to give us authentic Kaʿbārī fragments, some quite old (of Maimūn Kaddād and Aḥmad Kajīz), and in the Tanbih of al-Maṣālī (d. 377-387), which he does not mention, but which Faḵr Rāzī of Faḵr al-ʿAṣwī (Mafīl al-ʿAṣwī) has identified with the Faḵr arwaʿ of Ḥasan Ṣabūl (on Saʿbānī: ii. 155-155 of the Cairo edition of 1317) and the Sanāʿī al-Ḥikma of Abū Dāʾer Siṣṭānī b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq (on Hellenism: ii. 155-193, of the Cairo edition of 1317). 

To deal with the problem more minutely one must search the polemical literature of the Imāmīs and particularly the apologetic treatises in which the various extemists sects endeavour to convert one another, starting from their common technical terms. Lastly the encyclopaedic collection of the Ṣabīn al-Shaʿrī, which has not yet been thoroughly studied since Dieterici, is invaluable for the synthetic understanding of Kaʿbārī thought. 

According to them, the world is a sum total of phenomena which repeat themselves in cycles, playing and replaying the same drama to us time after time; in this spectacle, presented to intelligence (invariable in number) so that they may be illuminated, is the gradual disappearance of the material veil, perceptible by our senses, a multiformal and transitory mirage; then the intelligences are born (khalq Īmtān) by gaining consciousness of a pure intellectual evidence of a unique and impersonal thought, which is divinity itself. 

The divine essence, in fact, outside of which nothing exists, is only the evidence of a single idea, an authentication of indifferented intelligibility and devoid of all content; the via rēminēs (Ēmān) of the Kaʿbārīs, still more rigorous than the īfī of the Ṣaḥābiya, denies all divine attributes and postulates an absolute monism of fundamental intellectualism. 

True worship consists in knowing how to recognize as the result of a graduated initiation what have been the stages of the creation the illumination of the universe outside of God; what exactly leads the initiated by a process of inverse gnostic illumination to forget these stages and to become absorbed in God. 

a) Creative evolution:—the divine essence or supreme light (nafs ʿawḥī), alone in the beginning and in the end, gives forth first of all the nafs ʿawḥī, "glistening" and "victorious (ṣāḥib) light" which then engenders the universal intelligence (cafi kūl) and the soul of the world (nafs); the latter under various modes produce human intelligences (those of the prophets, imāms and elect; the others are only phantoms of nothingness). The nafs ʿawḥī in the second degree gives forth the nafs ʿawḥī, "tenebrous light"; that is matter, passive, "vincible" (naḥṣū), destined to disappear; it appears in various modes as stars at the skies (aṣlū), as perishable bodies on earth. 

b) Gnostic invocation:—the intelligences of the prophets, imāms and their adepts are sparks of "sparkling light" suddenly illuminated in the midst of the tenebrous light, blind and unreal matter like reflections in mirrors, following the cyclic intermitances of the initiatory illumination; these sparks shine, on becoming conscious of their divine identity, in a liberating intuition, in which, losing all individuality, they find themselves "delivered from the five tyrants": — the sky, which makes day alternate with night, nature, which gives desires and regrets, law, which commands and forbids, the state, which controls and punishes, necessity, which forces one to daily labour.. 

c) The immaterial succession of initiatory investitures (nūṭaqa, tāfuq). Initiatory illumination makes the separated intelligences cohere, divine sparks individualised for a moment, following two convergent hierarchic series: increasing, of the initiators (nāẓīr, rāʾī, ṣāḥib); and increasing, of the initiated (ṣāḥib, ḫudūd, ʿānām). Historically the list of their titulars was classed in cycles of limited number; the intelligences, in invariable number, "transmigrate" from cycle to cycle (without "fiding" again their personality, since they have only the appearance of individuality). 

d) Planetary denominations of the cycles of transmigration (akāva, atāva, ẓārāvāt). There are just mentioned are named from their material veins, i.e. from the planetary revolutions, periods and conjonctions. This is a very fine point which must be appreciated. The Kaʿbārīs are nominalists; they do not believe that the name determines the thing and they unani- 
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month and every day). When the moment comes for the final cassation of every action (biqar = datifjir of the Hadith, sahir) cycles and periods will cease together.

e) The degrees of individual initiation. Initial illumination is transmitted to the adept by degrees as in the ancient initiations (Greek, Manichaean) and in modern freemasonry.

It emanates from the divine volition following a method of irrefutable and infallible authority (ta'lim, whence the name ta'limiyah given by al-Ghazali to the Karmatians). The adept submits himself for it (the fourth degree) by a declaration — a solemn contract with a clause (pil'ak mu'addal) of triple repudiation of his favourite wife if he should reveal the secrets (sisih' al-sirr), which constitutes Karmatian adultery, ʿzina. Its formula has been studied by Goldziher (cf. the art. SURAHIJJA). We find it first used during the revolt of the Zandij (al-Tabari, iii. 1750) and Usama alludes to it in his Memoirs. The Sunni heresiographers record 3, 5, 7 (al-Ḥanāni) or 9 degrees; but the names which ʿAbd al-Kahir al-Baḥdānī gives them are doubtful: tafarruk, diagnostic of the future adept, described as "fertile" or "sterile" earth, ta'nis (taming), taḏkāḥ (apprenticeship to medico-didactic double), tašīḏ (talking of the oath), ṭabī, tadīs, ṭafī, ʿzina, and tašīd. The programme for the five highest grades (secret) is little known. The "letter of ʿUbayd Allah to Abū ʿUmar" an apocryphal curiosity (recalling certain modern anti-masonic productions), analysed by al-Baḥdānī, puts in various maxims of cynical impiety, among others the mediaeval parable De TribusImpostoribus (the earliest reference to it; cf. R.I.R., 1920) Al-Maqrīzī's reference to the muḥti of Cairo (transl. by de Seyc and Casanova) shows that initiation simply amounted to showing that the exterior rites (taḏkāḥ) of all the revealed cults conceal under equivalent and inadequate allegories the same hidden meaning (kātin, whence the name Bāṭiniyya of the Karmatians), purely negative and without mystery; initiation being reduced to teaching of the use of wholly speculative philosophical reasoning, which propounds without practical differentiation the antithesis, opposite conceptions like "law" and "break of law", "tawḥīd" and "tašīd"; (cf. DRAJZES). But this is only, as we have seen, one aspect of the fundamental intellectual monism of the Karmatians.

IV. Its Islamic technical vocabulary, its criticism of the other extremist Shi'i sects (Ghulat).

Terrified by the wide and rapid spread of Karmatian doctrines in the most cultivated centres of the Muslim world, the Sunni heresiographers strove to discover and denounce an anti-Muslim offensive in it, originating in a foreign religion — Mazdeism, Mazdakism (Khurramiyah), Manichaism, — in racial hatred, setting Iranian against Arab, the tribe of Rabi' against that of Muṣṣar (Ṣafwāniyya). They quoted parallelisms which are not very convincing.

The hypothesis of the Sabaeans origin of the Karmatians, which is also found among them, is more attractive. It seems to have been put forward by the Karmatians themselves with a view to gaining citizenship in the Sunni Muslim state, presenting their syncretism as the heritage of Abraham (khaliyya) from these mysterious "Sabaeans" mentioned by the Qur'ān. Such is probably the leading idea in the Sabean tale developed among others by al-Shamānī in some pages borrowed without acknowledgment from the Karmatian Ḥasan Salīḥ. The documents hardly permit us to connect effectively the Karmatians, with the pseudo-"Sabaeans" of Ḥarrān or Wāṣṭi.

In reality an examination of the Karmatian technical terms shows that this doctrine was formed before the end of the second century A.H. in the Imāmī circle of Kūfa. The Karmatians retained, embedded in their system, various series of Imāmī special terms, which we find again among other extremist sects, Ḥāklī, Ṣafī, Nāṣīrī, Khāṣṣī, Ḥallājīya; e.g.: nāṣīrī, nasfinī, ṣafī, ṣafīnī, ṣafīnī, muḥājirīn, muḥājirīn, ʿazīdīnī, ʿazīdīnī, ṣafīnī, ʿazīdīnī, faṭīḥ, ṣafī, ṣafī, ṣafī, ṣafī, ṣafī, ṣafī; the mystic sense of the 28 letters according to the ṣafī. The last orthodox Imāmī Maḥdīkullāh received into the Karmatian imām's are Mafṣūdāl b. ʿOmar and Muḥammad b. Sinān al-Ẓahīrī (also admitted by the Nūṣairā).

The most outstanding Karmatian author is Abu ʾl-Khaṭṭāb Muḥammad b. Abū Zaynāb al-Asadî al-Kābilî (d. 167 = 783 at Kūfa); he substituted in place of the "personifying" Kūrahī exegesis of the early ʿArifs an abstract allegorical exegesis; in cosmogony he replaced the use of letters (cf. Mughrīr) by their corresponding numerical values (mystic meanings of ṣafī); it was he also who seems to have invented the pledge guaranteeing the secret of initiation: for the Ḥāklīyya, his adepts, are the only Imāmī sect whom al-Shāhī (Kiṭāb al-Ḥaḍādāt) will not allow to take the oath on the ground that they make of the taṣfī (negative practice of secrecy) a positive precept justifying false testimony (to keep a secret).

After him, Abū ʾIlā Bakr Mīrām al-Kaddāl al-Makkīmī (d. towards 160 = 796) gave definite dogmatic form to the Karmatian doctrine of emanation; he substituted the abstract first principles for the five atām (deity-personal personages), demijures of the first Ghulāt. He denies that the divine essence has any attributes and defines the "eternal Qur'ān" as a pure divine illumination in intelligences.

If one compares Karmatian dogma with the preceding Imāmī systems, their naivey "materialising" (taḏīm) and "personifying" (raṣḥākhshīyā) notions and their idolatry of ʿAli and his descendants, we see at once after the connection a transposition: here they are intellectualised, objectified in abstractions. Finally the Karmatians, considering only rank and the external role played, restore to Muḥammad priority over ʿAli. Not that they in turn deify Muḥammad — it is simply his predestined role of pre-eternally foreseen messenger or herald (nāṣīr) that they look at. They are (to the exact term) not Muḥammadīyya but Miṣnīyya (the letter miṣn means in ṣafī the name, iṣm: that is to say the name of onomatopoeic, nāṣīr, devolved on the prophet), in opposition to the Ṣafīyya (the letter iṣn in ṣafī means the original sense, ma'ānī, whence the hidden meaning, the "silent" (iṣāmī) role of "acutely designated" chief, devolved on ʿAli), like Dāsī and Nakhi.
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sili, modifying the doctrine of the ‘Ainiya to suit the exigencies of controversy, maintains ‘Ali (ma ni = imam) above Muhammad (hijab = khalīja) and Salām (insan = sālih). To the ‘Ainiya arguments Muhammad is the ‘veil’ uncovering the divine appearance called ‘Ali, the Druzes reply with good Karmajans logic that a ‘veil’ only covers and that Muhammad has given more perfect evidence of God by his words than ‘Ali by his silence. Internal sanctity is set aside in favour of the gift of prophecy and sinlessness neglected for infallibility. It is the same polemical attitude which dictates to Maiman Kaddār the order in which he associates his two first principles (followed in that by Ka‘yāl, Baradāy, the Druzes and Ḥašān Sabā‘ah): first the intellect (‘alī = nafs nāliha = awāmī = rāḥīk) and secondly the soul (nafs = nafs huwāni = thāli = fiqīk). Then comes the ‘fāt’ (kūn, qidāda), the central sign of divine intervention, before the second pair of principles, simply reduplication of the first among the Druzes (‘alī and nafs) and in Ḥašān Sabā‘ah (fath and khayal). The identification of the five Karmajans first principles with those of the Hellenistic philosophers, like the physician Rāzi (intellect, soul, matter, space and time) does not seem to be primitive and represents a later effort at syncretic conciliation.

In psychology the Karmajans deprive each human individuality of all definitive reality; his body being removed a priori like an unreal veil, there only remains a momentary principle of indetermination to which they refuse any name implying internal finality, like rūh, nūr, ma‘ṣūr (employed by the early Imāmīs); they substitute for it the term ‘alī ‘intelligence’, indicating a simple causation on the part of God, “ab extra”, a role of an observer who takes no actual part in what he sees.

They criticise the gross materialism of the first Qhulat (and of the ‘Ainiya) who believe that souls are fallen stellar bodies, fallen from the higher heaven (of which the sun or the moon is the threshold) and destined to return there by that same predesigned attraction which caused them to adore the divine. They then imperfectly seen in the course of the cycles of bodily transmigration (tanānāk). For the Karmajans there is no corporeal transmigration even for the damned (they have only been phantoms) in the bodies of animals and we cannot even speak of true spiritual “transmigration” for the elect, since the immortality of the intelligence is only impersonal whether it assumes modes as “spark” or not.

Contrary to the ‘Ainiya, who refuse initiation (and immortality) to women, the Karmajans admit them (risāla al-nisā‘ in the Druze canon).

The Karmajans profess an integral nominalism; the letters of the alphabet are only intellectual symbols; the name is the mask of the thing; not its manifestation (‘Ainiya view); each symbol ought to be detached and permitted access (taḥzīl) to the pure Idea. The obligatory duties of religion etc. are only supererogatory counsels leaving free play to all human faculties (iḥāba).

V. Its connections with Hellenistic philosophy.

Karmajans preserved from its place of origin an old stock of primitive Islāmic terms, Kordanic and others, in which it retained the archaic special meanings they had before the third century A. H. (e.g. amr, tāl, ‘ard, kun, sam‘, šahid, balaq, ġāna, ṣabā‘a, kālāma, ṣabā‘at, riqā‘, ta‘līm). From the same period it retained an ignorance of certain problems, which were only put forward later, among the Imāmīs after Ibn al-Hajjāk, and among the Sunnis after Naẓār, such as the perception of sensation, the conceptual process, the modality of a harmony between the movements of the limbs and the intentions of the heart which accompany them. The Karmajans on these three points profess a kind of fatalism, a blind occasionalism, something like that of Da‘īm.

They, however, like the Mu‘tazilis in another field, marked the very first awakening of Muslim philosophic reflection at its contact with Hellenistic science: by the systematic employment of the word ‘alī, intelligence, to designate the principle of individuality which constitutes man. This brought them not only to the abstract allegorical exegesis above in which dialectic gives place to logic, but also to the direct acceptance of scientific bases, of natural constants — viz. consideration of arithmetical properties (numbers 3, 5, 7, 9, etc.) permitting the calculation of the astronomical calendar (new-moon festivals: against the Sunnis), of the four elements and the “humours” (tabā‘a), specific remedies (iḥāba), the foundation of medicine.

Without going further or assimilating the whole corpus of Hellenistic philosophy, as the Ḥanawī al-Ṣafwī attempted to do, Karmajansism prepared many minds to understand it; it presented to them as divine prophets the ancient philosophers of Greece: Pythagoras, Empedocles and Plato, the masters of hermeticism (Agathodæmon, etc.), stimulating in consequence its adepts to read works coming from these foreigners as freely as the Kurān.

The same licence was to a less degree allowed for certain Persian sources (books of Da‘īm, the “amshapand’s”, being regarded as prophets) and much later for Hindu sources also.

VI. The role of Karmajansism in the evolution of the Islām.

The influence of Karmajans authors, especially of the encyclopaedists the “Fait or Frayds” (Rā‘ūl ‘āmm al-Ṣafwī), on diverse Muslim thinkers belonging to the Sunna or to orthodox Imāmism has been considerable.

In philosophy, it inspired the political theory of idealistic imāmism (iṣṭi‘ād il-nubuwasu) of al-Fārābī and Ibn Sinā (Rāzi had polemics on this subject with Ka‘yāl), the emanation theory of the ten ‘uqūl (Ibn Sinā). The famous parable of the self-taught (Ḥayy b. Yaqzān) would also be of Karmajans origin (cf. the art. Druzes).

There were in the same way various infiltrations into dogmatic theology: abstract allegorical exegesis of the Kurān, tanānāk of Ibn Ḥā’it and Ibn Yānāsh, and the nūr Mahdī. This ‘uqūl of Ibn Sinā. The famous parable of the self-taught (Ḥayy b. Yaqzān) would also be of Karmajans origin (cf. the art. Druzes).

In mysticism, it is still clearer from Sahl al-Tustari [q.v.] to Subhwardi of Aleppo (nūr kāhir). The mystics who attack Karmajansism use al-Hallāj, al-Tawhidi, al-Ghazzālī [q.v.]. Ibn Taimiya rightly pointed out the adoption of Karmajans theses in works of the Andalusian school of Sunni mystics, Ibn Barradān, Ibn Ǧasīr, down to their pupil, the great mystic Ibn al-‘Arabī [q.v.]. When he defined the five periods of creative evolution and of gnostic invasion (same number in al-Fargān); three times in ‘Abd al-Karim Dīb) and when he identified the spirit (ra‘ī) with in-
telligence (‘abūl) in his monist description of the fundamental unity of being (mahdāt al-muqaddam) in reference to the Kārmaṇi themes of the covenant (mithāl) and the Nocturnal Ascension (fātūk kawāsīn). Ibn al-‘Arabī only took up Kārmaṇi exegesis again in a more moderate form.


KARMISIN. [See KIRMISIN.]
KARNAK. [See AL-LUGUK.]
KARNAL (1). A town of 23,559 inhabitants (1901); situated a few miles W. of the Djamān R. in 29° 41' N. 76° 59' E. The town is the administrative centre of a district of the Pandjāb, but historically and ethnologically it belongs to Hindustan rather than the Pandjāb. The language commonly used by the inhabitants is a dialect of Western Hindi. It is no doubt a place of great antiquity, and the name is traditionally derived from Karna of the Mahābhārata (Karnāyā = Abode of Karna). But it was not of great importance in early times, and is not mentioned in the accounts of the invasions of India by Mahmūd Ghānawī and Mu‘izz al-Dīn. Its prosperity seems to have been commensurate with the construction of the canal from the Djamān by Ferōz Shah Tughlak (see Shamsi-Sirāz), Tarīq-i Ferōz Shāh, Elliot and Dowson, Hist. of India, iii. 300). The country became productive and rich, and being on the direct road to Dīhlī from the north became an object of attention to invaders and rebels. Thus in 980 (1573), while Akbar was engaged in Gudhārat, Karnāl, Pāñhipat, and Sāopat were plundered by Ibrahim ‘Iṣa’un Mīrāz. Dāhīnghar halted at Karnāl in 1013 during his pursuit of his rebellious son, Khusraw (Elliot and Dowson, o. c., VI, 296, also Beveridge’s trans., Jahangir’s Memoirs, Vol. i). In 1120 (1708) during the reign of Bahādur Shāh, Karnāl was attacked and plundered by the Sikh rebels (Elliot and Dowson, o. c., vii, 410). But the most noteworthy event in its history was the great victory of Nādir Shāh over Muḥammad Shāh of 152 (1753) which fought just outside the walls of the town. The imperial army was before the battle encamped on the banks of the canal, where it was re-enforced by the 30,000 cavalry of Burhān al-Mulk, Nāgin of Awadh (Oudh). But Nādir Shāh’s army was under better discipline and provided with abundant artillery, and the defeat of Muḥammad Shāh’s forces was sudden and complete. After the break-up of the Mughal empire following this invasion (and those of ‘Alāmah Shāh Durrānī and the Mahārrattās) Karnāl and the surrounding district again became a prey to the Sikhs. Gudjpat Singh of Dīhlī took possession of it in 1763 after the battle of Sirhind but Nadīr Khān recovered it in 1775. After this the Sikhs and Mahārrattās contended for its possession with varying results. The intrepid adventurer, George Thomas, drove out the Sikhs in 1798, but only held it for a short time. Gurdit Singh, the Sikh chief of Ladwa, then held it for a space until driven out by a British force under Skinner in 1803, after Lake’s defeat of the Mahārrattās at Dīhlī.

After these events Karnāl became the headquarters of a British district and was for several years the most advanced military post towards the north-west. Partly due to its unhealthiness and partly owing to the advance of the British frontier to the Sattālid it was given up as a military post in 1841, but remained the centre of a civil district. When the mutiny of 1857 broke out, Karnāl was held by the British with the assistance of the Sikh Rājā of Dīhlī and the Muslim Nawāb of Karnāl, and remained an important link in the chain of communications between the Pandjāb and Dīhlī. Its later history is uneventful. The canal originally constructed by Ferōz Shāh and afterwards extended by ‘Alī Mardān (whose name it bore) in the reign of Shāh Dāhān 1, was entirely remodelled by British engineers and now irrigates a very extensive tract. The only building of importance is the tomb of the Saint Bā ‘Alī Kalmār ‘A, locally said to have been built by Ghiyāth al-Dīn (probably Tughlak), but the architecture shows it to be a much more modern building. Bā ‘Alī Kalmār died in 1325 (1833) and Ghiyāth al-Dīn died the following year, so the tradition as to the original foundation of the tomb is probably correct. Both Pāñhipat and Karnāl claim to have this saint’s tomb.

2. A district in the province of the Pandjāb lying between 29° 11' and 30° 15' N. and 76° 11' and 77° 17' E. Area 3153 sq. m. Population (1901) 883,225 of which 241,412 are Muslims. Its eastern boundary is the R. Djamān, the District of Dīhlī lies to the S., that of Ambala to the N., and the territory of Pāltāna and other Sikh States to the W. In addition to the Djamān, the small rivers called Čīang and Saraswati flowing from N. E. to S. W. traverse part of the district. The first named is absorbed in the Western Djamān canal system. The Saraswati joins the Ghaggar and the joint stream is lost in the Rājputana desert although, when the Saraswati held a greater supply of water, it was a famous river, and the stream probably joined the old course of the Sattālid, otherwise called the Hākra. It gave its name to the town of Sarsut or Sirsa. The territory in the N. of the Karnāl district was the Kurukshetra of the Mahābhārata still locally called Kulchhāt. Sthānēswara (now Thenāsār) was the principal town. Towards the end of the 6th cent. it became the centre of a powerful kingdom to which Harṣavardhana succeeded in 606 A. D. He spread his rule over Northern India from the Bay of Bengal to the Sattālid and Gudjpatār and was an enthusiastic supporter of Buddhism. He was visited by Yuan Ch’ang at his camp at Kanawd in 635.
is called al-Sidjastānī, a fairly full biography is given by al-Samānī in the Anbār, 476b, 477a. According to this, he was of the Banū Nizār, was born in a village of Zarandī, was brought up in Sijistan, and afterwards went to Khōrāsān, where he attended the courses of Ahmad b. Ḥab, the Ascetic (d. 254); at Balkh he heard Ibrahim b. Ūṣuf al-Mākīyānī (d. 257), and in Merv (Ṣāḥīb al-Ṭarīq, d. 244); and in Herāt 'Abdallāh b. Mālik b. Sulaymān, and he recited many traditions on the authority of Ahmad b. 'Abdallāh Dāraybārī (d. 247) and Muhammad b. Tamīm Faryānānī: "he had known these two, he would have left them alone", both being notorious fabricators. After spending five years in Mecca he returned to Sijistan, where he sold all his possessions. He proceeded to Nishābūr, where he was imprisoned by the governor Muhammad b. Ṭahir b. 'Abdallāh (according to the Tāj al-ʿArīš on two occasions); after his release in 251 he left Nishābūr and proceeded to Jerusalem, where he ended his days in 255. The sanctuary of his followers there, called Khānikāh, is mentioned by Muḥammad b. Ṭahir (Livre de la Création, ed. Huart, v. 149) a hundred years later, as also by al-Muḥaddīsī.

2. Doctrines. The opinions of this person were set forth in a work called Alḥāb al-Ḡabr “The Torment of the Tomb”, of which some citations are given in the Fark bain al-Pirāk, pp. 202-214, where there is the fullest account of the sect, with some of whose members the author held debates. His chief theological doctrine, which caused the inclusion of his sect among the Ṭashabbiyān, was that the Divine Being is a Sub stance (Dāyvar), for which some of his followers substituted Body (Qisām), though without human members, and in contact (numāsā), for which the euphemism mutlabāt was substituted) with the Throne, which is located in space. This was apparently a deduction from the Kurānic ʿala ʿArzī jāva, and, indeed, the rest of his theology would seem to have been an endeavour to work the Kurānic texts into certain parts of the Aristotelian philosophy, notably the distinction between Substance and Accident, and that between dynamis and energia. Thus his followers could maintain that God was “speaking” before he spoke, and could be worshipped before there were any worshippers. The doctrine of the eternity of the world was reconciled with the Kurānic creation by some subtle expedients; God, he held, was subject to certain Accidents, such as willing, perceiving, speaking, coming in contact, over such accidents He has power, but not over the world and the objects therein, which were created not by His will, but by the word bān. Thus, it would seem, the tense in bān fayakānī could have its proper meaning.

Another doctrine to which allusion is often made in kalām works is that faith (imān) is constituted by a single utterance of the two shahāda’s, and involves neither conviction nor works. This view, through similar to the chief thesis of the Murdja’s, is said to have been held by no one before him (Ibn Taimiyya, Kitāb al-Imān, Cairo 1325, p. 57, which refutes it at length). The rest of his opinions, as recorded in the Fark, seem to have been in the direction of moderate. Thus the infallibility of Prophets was confined within certain limits, and a reason was found (somewhat in the style of Ibn Ṭalaf) why those
whom no prophetic message had reached ought to believe in prophetic missions; he held that there might be two Imāms simultaneously, and that each would have a right to his followers' allegiance even when the two were at variance. His innovations in the Fārābī were such as to render the law more flexible.

3. History of the Sect. It would seem that the Karramī doctrine spread chiefly in Khorāsān, and in 370 the author of the Fārābī debated with a member of the sect in the presence of the Šāmānīd commander Muhammed b. Ibrāhīm b. Sīmādžūr. It was favoured by Sabuktaknī of Ghazna out of respect for the asceticism of Abu Bakr Ištābī b. Mahmūdshāh (d. 383), the chief of the Karramīs in his time, who is said to have converted some 5,000 dīnārs. This person's son Muhammed encouraged Mahmūd b. Sabuktak in a violent persecution of the Bātūnīs; from this there seems to be an echo in the Life of the Šīfī Abū Sa'id (357–440; ed. Jhakhovski, 1899, i. 84–91), where Ištābī b. Mahmūdshāh makes common cause with the Ākū at Sa'id (a Hanafī) against the saint; the numbers of the Karramīs in Nisābūr at the time are given as 20,000. In 403, however, this Ākū, who had made the pilgrimage, and been favoured by the Caliph Kādir, complained of the Karramī heresy before Mahmūd of Ghazna; Muhammed b. Ištābī thereupon repudiated the doctrine, while those who openly adhered to it were penalised. Many, however, continued to hold it at Nisābūr; Ibn al-Athir in 488 records a civil war in that city between the Karramīs and the joint forces of the Hanafis and Shāhīs, the leaders of the first being descendants of the leaders of the sect's early years, Kāfar (s.v. ʿAbdīsī) mentions a Karramī preacher who acquired popularity at Nisābūr in the middle of the sixth century; and ʿAbd al-Kādir Dālūnī (d. 561; Ghunya, Cairo 1288, i. 81) speaks of them as still numerous in Khorāsān. Farābī al-Din Rāzī (d. 606; Aṣār al-Takdīs, Cairo 1328, pp. 96–98) apparently thinks of them as still existing. It is probable, however, that the sect was practically exterminated when the lieutenants of Činīqh Khān massacred the inhabitants of Khorāsān; and when writers of a later time allude to its doctrines (e.g. Ibn Taimiya and the author of the Mawāliği) they probably derive their knowledge from earlier works.

4. Literature of the Sect. In the Fārābī it is stated that the sect was subdivided into three minor sects, which, however, were mutually tolerant; these were called Ḥaḳḳāqīya (I.), ʿĀṣīr-iya (II.), and Ištābīya (III). Shahrastānī mentions twelve minor sects, of which he enumerates six: ʿĀṣīr-iya (as above), ʿĀdībīya, Nūmīya, Zarbīya, Waḥidiya, and Haiṣamiya. On these the first was doubtless named after Ištābī who was mentioned above; whereas the last was named after one Muhammed b. al-Haṣam, who is called their Muṭakallim in the Mīzān. The works therein the founders of these minor sects put forth their views seem to have contained little notoriety; the author of the Bayān al-Maḍīn (485; Schefer, Christostamhie Pteranes, i. 152 text), though living at Ghazna, just knows the name of the main sect; and ʿAbd al-Kādir (loc. cit.) in giving the names of Karramī authorities is in error in each case. The work of the founder ʿAbbāb al-Kābir seems to be known only from the citations in the Fārābī.


(D. S. MARGOLIOUTH)

KARS, a town in Armenia, called Kars in Ibn al-Athīr, Kars in Yakūt and Ḥamd Allāh al-Kawāzīnī, Kār in Shams al-Dīn 'Azīz Yāḥyā and later. According to a doubtful etymology, the name comes from the Georgian kari "gate", karī-kēlakī is said to mean "town at the gate" (from its situation on the frontier between Armenia and Georgia). The town (rāz Kāz) is first mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus (De administ. imperii, ch. 44) as the capital of the chief of the Armenian princes (μαραθάν οῦ καὶ ἀρχηγόν). From 961 Musheg, a brother of the king of Ani, Ashot III (cf. above, i. 355), ruled in Kars, and his successors. A manuscript of the Gospels found in Jerusalem with miniatures of important historical interest for the history of the last of these princes, Gagik (1028–1064). The king, queen, and their daughter are represented seated in Oriental fashion and wearing Oriental costume; Kars, although it did not then belong to the Caliph's empire, was apparently under the influence of its culture. Gagik continued to hold his principality even after Ani had been incorporated in the Byzantine empire (1044). It was only when danger threatened from the Turks that he was induced to renounce his rights voluntarily in favour of the Emperor Constantine X Ducas (1059–1067) and received in return a town in the Cilician Taurus. But even the Byzantines could not avert the danger, for in the same year Ani and Kars were both conquered by the Turks. Kars remained a Muhammadan town till 603 (1206–1207), when it was taken by the Georgians (Ibn al-Athīr ed. Tornberg, xii. 169). It was besieged in vain by the Khārazmshāh Ljulalet al-Dīn (about i. 1004) in 1226 and taken by the Mongols in 1239 and, according to Ḥamd Allāh al-Kawāzīnī (Nuzhat al-Kulāḥ, ed. Le Strange, p. 93), it belonged at a later period with Ani to the province of Georgia (Gurjistān wa-Abhaz) in the kingdom of the Ikhānīs (cf. above, ii. 465 sqq.) and later again apparently to the kingdom of the Ğalār (cf. above, i. 1003). Unlike Ani, Kars was never a Muslim mint. In 1386 Kars was captured by Timūr; it is said to have been levelled to the ground (Zafar-Nāma, i. 400). The town was then in the possession of a prince named Kruz-Bahkht, who does not appear to be mentioned elsewhere. It was not till the year 1579 (according to ʿAbdīdī Khalfī, Ḏīkān-nūmā, p. 407, however, 988 = 1580) that Sulṭān Murād III (1574–1595) had Kars rebuilt as an Ottoman fortress by Lālit Muṣṭafā Pasha; during the operations a marble slab is said to have been found with an inscription recording an earlier section of the time of ʿĪsā al-Dīn probably Kiliḍ Arslān II, 1156–1185). Kars was raised to be the capital of an eyalet of six sanjakıs under Ottoman rule and also became a place of pilgrimage; the tomb of the Šīh Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Karākānī (d. at the beginning of 425 = Nov., 1033) was shown there (cf. Samʿānī, ed. Margoliouth, fol. 194 b), but he can never have been in Kars. The tomb is said to have been revealed by the saint himself in a dream — a story often told of other places. The
first Friday mosque was built by 1ahl Pasha of the tomb of the saint.

Kars was conquered by Şah ʿAbdulla in 1604 and in 1616 rebuilt by the Turks, attacked in vain in 1628 and 1744 by the Persians and captured for the first time by the Russians on June 23 (July 5), 1828. On Nov. 16 (28), 1855, Kars had to surrender to the Russians after a long defence under General Williams (later Sir Fenwick Williams of Kars). In the war of 1877–1878 Kars was stormed in the night of 6/18 Nov., 1877, and ceded to Russia by the peace of 1878; in 1918 it was returned to the Turks by the treaty of Brest-Litovsk; this cession survived even after the treaty of Brest-Litovsk became void.

The number of inhabitants of Kars about 1860 was 12,300 (Ritter's Geogr.-statistisches Lexikon 5, s.v.), in 1878 only 8,672 (according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica). Under Russian rule the number seems to have fallen considerably at first and then to have risen again rapidly (1889 only 3,941, in 1897 20,805, in 1908 18,397, mostly Armenians). The old Armenian church which had become a mosque (probably the Këzil Kilsa monastery mentioned by Ebliyä Celebi; as a mosque called Hassan Katchuda Gëjmi) now became a Greek Orthodox church. Therefore, in addition to two Armenian churches and three mosques (two Sunni and one Shia). No accurate information is available in Russia regarding conditions since the restoration of Turkish rule; this fact is said to have been fatal for the Armenian population.


(W. BARTHOLOD)

KARSHI, an Uighur word for "castle, palace", probably borrowed from a native language of Eastern Turkestan and later adopted by the Mongols. The town of Nakhshab or Nasaf [q.v.] has taken its modern name of Karshi from a palace built for the Khan Khabak (1318–1326; see the art. ÇAGHATAI KHAN), 2 farsakh from the town, all trace of which has long since disappeared. Cf. Sharaf ad-Din Yazdi, Zafar Nâmû, ed. Muḥ. Ḥaḍîd, Calcutta 1887–1888, i. 111; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 270 sg.

(W. BARTHOLOD)

KARSHUNI is the name, the origin of which has not yet been explained, for the Syriac alphabet adapted to suit the Arabic language. Yiṣuf Daryān, Archbishop of Tarsûs, wrote recently on the name in the Muḥāfiz, 1904, vii. 785–790, but his suggested derivation of the name from an unknown Syriac karkûn, diminutive of karkû, which would describe the alphabet as the "small", "round", is quite improbable. Just as the Jews used their alphabet to reproduce the language of the countries that afforded them hospitality, not only for the churches and schools but also as a sign of nationality, so also the Syrians must have written the language of their conquerors in their own alphabet soon after they had adopted Arabic for everyday use. The letters lacking in the Syriac alphabet were supplied by pointing those already in existence, but in doing this this modification was paid to the sound than the shape of the Arabic letters. Aḥā and g̢ain, for example, are usually reproduced by Syriac ʿāf and g̢amal with wālkaḥa, ḍīn by the Jacobites usually by a point inserted in the letter, by the Nestorians by a hook below it. Zā and dād are written by the Nestorians after the Arabic fashion with points over ʿāf and g̢adāl, but among the Jacobites often by a point in the letter, because they had come to be identical in pronunciation. The feminine ending is usually represented by ʿi with two points above it in the Arabic fashion. Vowels are written in the Syriac, and sometimes in the Arabic way, but ā and ī are almost always represented by ḍamma and karrā. Whether there were different rules in different periods and localities can only be ascertained after an accurate examination of manuscripts but nothing of the kind has so far been attempted.

(C. BROCKELMANN)

KART, the name of a dynasty which ruled Herat from 1245 to 1389 A.D. It was founded by Shams ad-Din Muhammad I, Kart, who was descended from the Shamsabani house of Ghur, the family to which the brothers Ghiyâṣ ad-Din Muhammad and Muʿizz ad-Din Muhammad b. Sâm belonged. As Herat recovered from the devastating raids of the armies of Cingiz Khân, Shams ad-Din gradually gained power, and by 1245 had established himself as ruler of the state, and used the title of Malik, borne by his descendants. In 1251 Mang, the great Khân, when reorganizing the administration of his empire, confirmed Shams ad-Din Kart as governor of Herat, Sistan, Balkh and the country lying between those provinces and the Indian frontier. During the latter part of Shams ad-Din's reign his son Rukn ad-Din acted as his coadjutor, but predeceased him, dying in 1283, and when Shams ad-Din himself died, in 1285, he was succeeded by Rukn ad-Din's son, Fakhır ad-Din. As the power of the Mongol Il-Khans of Persia declined, that of the Kart Maliks of Herat increased, and Fakhır ad-Din befriended the powerful Amir Cûbûn, who had been regent of Persia during the minority of Abû Saʿid Bahâdur Khân, the fourteenth Il-Khân. When Abû Saʿid Bahâdur, apprehensive of the growing power of this family, attacked it, Amir Cûbûn sought an asylum with Ghiyâṣ ad-Din, who received him but in 1327 treacherously put both him and his son Djâlaw Khân to death. Ghiyâṣ ad-Din himself died in 1328 and his two elder sons, Shams ad-Din II and Hâfiz, who succeeded him in turn, died in 1329 and 1331. The historian Hand Allâh Mustâfi attributes their deaths, following one another at such short intervals, to the divine displeasure incurred by Ghiyâṣ ad-Din's treachery towards Amir Cûbûn.

Hâfiz was succeeded by a third brother, Muʿizz ad-Din, who sent an army to the assistance of Malik Kûb al-Din of Kirmân, driven from his capital by the Amir Murâbîs al-Din. This army was defeated and a second army was sent to the aid of Kûb al-Din was shut up in Kirmân and compelled, at the end of 1340, to capitulate. Muʿizz ad-Din, who died in 1370, left two sons, Muḥammad, who held the government of Sarakhs, which he retained after his father's death, and Ghiyâṣ ad-Din Pir ʿAlî, who succeeded him in Herât. In 1380 the Amir Timûr sent an envoy to Herât, to claim the
allegiance of its ruler and his presence, with a contingent, at the forthcoming muster of his army, but Ghiyāth al-Dīn Pir 'Alī detained him on various pretexts while he provisioned the city and completed its defences. The envoy was obliged to return to Samarqand and report the failure of his mission, and in the spring of 1351 Timur marched to Herāt and captured the city, its ruler and his eldest son, Pir Muhammad, after a few days' siege. Some of its leading citizens were deported to Shahri-Šabz and its defences were dismantled, but the Malik and his two sons, the younger of whom had been induced to surrender the strong fort of Ishaqla, were pardoned, and Ghiyāth al-Dīn Pir 'Alī was permitted to retain Herāt as a vassal of Timur until 1385, when the dynasty was extinguished.


KĀRTĀS. [See KĪRTĀS.]

KĀRŪN, the largest river in Southern Persia. It rises in the north-eastern part of the district of 'Arabštān (earlier called Khūţistān); a little above 32° N. lat. on the Zardeh-Kūh (Kūh-i Zard) mentioned as early as the 13th century by Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi; see the Bibliography), which belongs to the Bakhtiyārī mountain system, to be more accurate on one of the range named Kūh-i Rang, one of the highest mountains in S. W. Persia (estimated at 13,000 feet). The actual source of the river, according to Sawyri (Bild.: op. cit., p. 486, with a picture), is about 10 miles above the place called Seri-i Čhesmi-i Kurang "main source of the Kurang (Kuran)". The Zāindohe or Zāndeh-Rūd, also called Iŝfāhān-Rūd, likewise rises on the Zardeh-Kūh and flows eastwards towards Iṣfahān where it is joined, according to Ritter, op. cit., ix. 222; G. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 207; cf. also ii. 529 and the article ZENDE-RUD). As the source of the Kārūn is only about 100 miles from Iṣfahān, Shāh 'Abbas I, the Great, thought of leading the Šāh into the Zāndeh-Rūd by a tunnel through the mountains. The work although almost finished at his death, was not continued by his successors, however; the remains of it may still be seen at the present day; cf. Layard, op. cit., p. 59 sq.

The valley of the Kārūn is not yet sufficiently known, particularly in its upper course; among those who have explored it are Kinneir, Rawlinson, Selby, Ainsworth, Layard, Chesney, Loftus, Houtum-Schindler, Mackenzie, Lynch, Bateman, Champain, Wells, Sawyer and Grandtvon Roggen. We may call the upper part of its course down to its exit from the mountains at Štšur, the middle course from Štšur to Ahwāz or Nāšīrye, which breaks through the spurs of the Djabal Hamrān; its lower course runs through the alluvial plain formed by the Kārūn system. As a result of the great windings, which the river takes in its course, it covers about 500 miles from its source to its mouth in the Štshal al-Abāb, while a straight line between the two points is only about 150 miles. In its upper course the Kārūn makes two great loops in about 32° N. Lat. Shuster which is a little above this line and only a little south of the source of the river is in a straight line only a third of the distance the river has covered from the source. The course of the Kārūn is at first a south-easterly one; it then runs from east to west, while the next section runs north-west to Sūsān where the second smaller loop is formed towards the south-west and then the river runs north-west again. This direction is maintained till Chamāni Yorga (20 miles as the crow the N. E. of Shuster) is reached. From there to its mouth the Kārūn runs S. W., although at times it describes very wide curves.

At Shuster, a little above the town, the Kārūn divides into two navigable arms which unite again about thirty miles away at the village of Band-i Kūr (near the medieval 'Askar Mulkara; see above, i. 488) and thus form an island. The western arm is the main stream, the Kārūn proper; it is now called Ab-i Shāhāt (popular for Shāhtāt = little river; cf. i. 970b for the same name for a bed of the Tigris) and further down also Ab-i Buzurg Shuster (= great water of Shuster). The east arm is artificial in origin and is now called Ab-i Gerger; the Arab geographers of the middle ages know it by the name of Maran (Mashrūn, Mursūn) which is explained as a corruption of the Persian Ardashir-Kān (= Ardashīr's trench). The form Wardekhūadministration is noteworthy: it occurs in a Syriac chronicle edited by Guidi in the Actes du 2e Congrès des Orientalistes, Leiden 1891, p. 32, and cf. thereon Noldeke in the Sitz.-Ber. Ak. Wiss., 1893, cxxviii., Abb. ix. 42). The first Sassanid king is said to have been the maker of this water-course. The Persian geographers of the 9th century call the western water-arm, which carries the bulk of the water, Čahar Dānīkah (= 4/6), the eastern Dānīkah (= 2/6); cf. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 236. These names are still known locally, according to Layard (op. cit., p. 27). It may further be noted that in the 9th century, according to Arabic sources, the Masrūn canal did not enter the main stream, the Kārūn proper, at 'Askar Mulkara, but ran parallel to it and reached the Persian Gulf by a course of its own.

The Kārūn delta begins a little above the village of Sālā. Three channels break off from the main arm, which continues its course till its junction with the Štshal al-Abāb at Māhjama, and these run S. E. into the Persian Gulf and finally enter in estuaries (Čahar, Čīr) which are at times swamps. Their names are:

1. The Štshal (or Rūd) al-Kādīm (= the old stream) which leaves the Kārūn about an hour's journey above Sālā and broadens out into the Khūr Mūsā (also called Khūr Mūj Allāh; mūj in 'frāj Arabic = water). In it we have probably the oldest course of the Kārūn.

2. The Štshal al-Amāya (as it is usually written on maps) or al-A'āma (= the blind stream), probably so called because its bed is usually choked with mud. In Ritter (ix. 159, 166, following Renouard) the name is wrongly explained as "šawerer" (the form al-Amara in Ritter, xi. 1028, 1390, is certainly wrong). The same name is given to an arm of the Štshal al-Hāi, below Kūt al-Amārā (see Ritter, ii. 169; Ainsworth, op. cit., ii. 259, and the maps). Cf. also the analogous name Dišāla al-Âwar for the present lower course of the Tigris; see above, i. 970b, as well as
The Shāṭt Bāmishīr (Bamishir, Behesmhīr) which leaves the Kārūn 6 miles below Sābla and expands into the Khor Silīd (Seluge in Kiinuhr, op. cit., p. 292) or the second oldest branch of the Kūrūn. This branch from the Kārūn is considerably wider and holds more water than the other two. According to the Persian Gulf Files, p. 284; see the Bibli.) It is 54 miles long (40 as the crow flies). This may now be regarded as the natural mouth of the Kūrūn. Bammishir is a corruption of Bahman-Ardashir, the name of the first Sasanian king, to whom is ascribed the making of a whole series of canals in southern Iraq. The most southern district of this province, on the coast, was called Bahman-Ardashir after him, as was a town opposite Ubala (east of Basra) on the left bank of the Dījdīl al-Awra (Shat al-Arab); cf. Yāḵūt, Muǧjam, ed. Wustefeld, i. 770, 20, where the arabicised form Bahmanshir is also given. It appears as if in the middle ages Bahmanshir was regarded as the Persian equivalent of Dījdīl al-Awra. Different scholars (like Rawlinson, Ainsworth, Le Strange) have made the further deduction that the Shat Bāmishīr is to be identified as the old mouth of the Emphates or Tigris (before the formation of the modern Shat al-Arab). But it is very easy to suppose that the name Bahmanshir (Bamishir) was at a late date transferred from the Dījdīl al-Awra (Shat al-Arab) to its eastern neighbour, the third branch of the Kūrūn. For Bahman-Ardashir and Dījdīl al-Awra cf. especially Reinaud, op. cit., p. 207 sq.; Tomashchek, op. cit., p. 78; Ainsworth, op. cit., ii. 173, 182; Le Strange in the J.R.A.S., 1895, p. 300 and op. cit., p. 43.

The two western branches of the Kūrūn, the Shat al-Amā and the Bāmishīr, form two long islands with the Shat al-Arab which runs parallel to them the main Kūrūn in the north and the Persian Gulf in the south. The eastern island, bordered by the Shat al-Amā (Kolān) and the Bāmishīr is called Kōbān (Goban, Gobban); the western branch between the Bāmishīr and the Shat al-Arab is now usually called Dāzāra Abbādān, a name it already had in the middle ages, from the town of Abbādān (see above, i. 57) which probably lay at the mouth of the delta originally. The island is also called Dāzāra Khūdrī after the prophet Khūdrī [q.v.] highly revered in Muslim popular belief especially in the Iraq as a patron of water, who had or still has a sanctuary near Abbādān (Chodder Abbadān in Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien etc., ii. Copenhagen 1773, 206) as mentioned as early as the xiii and xiv centuries by al-Dimashḵī (Nābūkkat al-Dahr, ed. Mehren, p. 97, 18) and Ibn Batūta (ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii. 19, 9). With Abbādān the most important place in it in the middle ages seems to have been al-Mūhirīha (Mūhirīa) and the island seems to be occasionally called after it; in Portuguese sources of the xviith century the island is therefore called "ilha Murziq"; cf. Tomashchek, op. cit., p. 76; for Mūhirīa see Yāḵūt, i. 502, 137, 712, 13; iii. 598, 9; iv. 709, 5; al-Dimashḵī, p. 97, 61; al-Kazwīnī, Aḥṣār al-↵Rūbāṭ, ed. Wustefeld, p. 280, 14. The Persians gave this island the name Miyaṭī Rūbāṭ (= between the rivers, Marxhaqfa) see e.g. Yāḵūt, iv. 708, 23, and Le Strange, op. cit., p. 482.

It has already been pointed out that the Kūrūn at an earlier period probably entered the sea through the Shat al-Amā apart from the river-bed represented by the Shat al-Kadīmeh, which is perhaps the oldest bed. According to the Arab geographers of the middle ages, the different branches and tributaries of the Dudjaile (Kūrūn) united at a place called Ḥišn al-Mahdī. Whether the Nahr Ṣiddīr (= Lotus-river) which also enters there must be considered the main arm of the Kūrūn from Ahwaz onwards, is doubtful: cf. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 237; Schwehr, op. cit., p. 306. The reunited Kūrūn called Nahr Ḥišn al-Mahdī (see Schwehr, op. cit.) then enters its estuary (Faid Dudjaile) which ends at Sulaimānān on the coast On Ḥišn al-Mahdī and Sulaimānān cf. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 48, 243, and in the J.R.A.S., 1895, p. 302; Schwehr, op. cit., p. 306, 329-330, 400. Ḥišn al-Mahdī perhaps lay in the neighbourhood of the present Sābla; Sulaimānān is perhaps to be located somewhere in the region of the Khor Silīd; the end of the course of the Kūrūn in the middle ages would thus coincide practically with the modern Shat al-Amā. In the middle ages there must have been several other separate smaller mouths of the Kūrūn. In these topographical investigations it should not be forgotten that southern Iraq and Khazāstān, the delta of the great rivers, has undergone far-reaching changes in its hydrographic structure in the course of thousands of years. In ancient times the Persian Gulf extended much farther into the mainland, so that the Kūrūn, Kerkti, Euphrates and Tigris had all separate mouths; cf. above, i. 675 sq., and Andreas in Pauli-Wissowa, Kademykli, d. klass. Alterturmzeit, i. 1394, 281. During the middle ages and in modern times the coast line had been steadily advancing southwards.

The bed of the Kūrūn from Sābla to Muhāmara seems to have been in human hands. In the tenth century the Bigyid Aḏud al-Dawla (see above, i. 143) had a canal made, which was called Aḏud after him, to secure direct communication between the Tigris and Kūrūn (= Basra and Ahwaz). As in those days apparently the Kūrūn flowed into the Persian Gulf through the Shat al-Amā, the Aḏud in its main lines probably corresponded with the present course of the Kūrūn between Sābla and Muhāmara. It is very doubtful if the work of the Bigyid Sultān was something quite new; it is more likely that he undertook the restoration of an older channel which had fallen into neglect and become silted up. A century earlier we have evidence from the Arab geographers of the existence of a canal called Nahri al-Djādīd (= New Canal) which led from Ḥišn al-Mahdī (near Sābla?) to the Tigris and may well have coincided with the Aḏud From a still earlier period we have the Bayan canal (see above, i. 9703); considering its course it may wholly or in part have coincided with the Aḏud or Nahr al-Djādīd. Whether there was in ancient times about the period of Alexander an artificial channel connecting the Kūrūn and Tigris following the same direction cannot be ascertained with certainty; on this question cf. Andreas in Pauli-Wissowa, op.
In modern times the name Hařar (usually written Haftar in books of travel and in maps) has come into use for the stretch of the Karun between Sable and Muhhammara, which suggests that here we have a work of human hands, not a natural bed dug out by the river itself. At the present day, however, this name is limited to the short stretch, only about an hour's journey long, from the beginning of the Shatt Bilimshir (the mouth proper of the Karun at the present day) to Muhhammara. This lower Hařar is (according to Stolze-Andreas, op. cit., p. 48) about 600 yards broad and 20–25 feet deep, while the Karun above Sable before the beginning of the delta is a mile broad and 25–30 feet deep. It should also be noted that in the second half of the xviiith century Sulaiman, the powerful Shaikh of the tribe of Ka'b (on him see below) destroyed the connection between the Karun and the Shaṭṭ al-Árāb by placing a dam (band) across the Hařar at Sable and led the water into the Shaṭṭ al-Ámā. The district of Kōbān was thereby soon raised to great prosperity. But at Karun Khañ's [q.v.] second invasion the dam in the Hařar was destroyed (cf. Kinneir, op. cit., p. 90). On the communication between the Karun and Tigris by the 'Aqīdī, Nahr al-Dżadd, Bayān and Hařar canals see Kinneir, op. cit., p. 90, 293–294; Layard, op. cit., p. 55–56; Tomasek, op. cit., p. 76–77; Ainsworth, op. cit., i. 174, 184; Persian Gulf Pilot, p. 296; Le Strange, op. cit., p. 48, and in the J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 308–309; Schwarz, op. cit., p. 309, 311, 390.

While still in the mountains the Karun receives a number of abundant tributaries, for example above Sāsān the Ab-i Bāzūf on the right and the Ab-i Bās on the left. A little above Chamani Yorgha the Talak joins it. But the most important tributary is the river of Dīzif [q.v., i. 983 sq.], the Dīzif-Rūd or Ab-i Dīz. This has no name of its own at the present day; it was the same in the middle ages as it figures in the Arab sources simply as the "river of Djiandal-Suhrūr". On Djiandal-Suhrūr, which must have lain to the S. E. of Dīzif, see i. 983 sq. and more recently Schwarz, op. cit. p. 346 sq. The Dīzif-Rūd, which, like the Karun, has a very winding course, rises out of the confluence of two little streams in the district of Būurjerd in Little Lāristān (cf. von Bode, op. cit., ii. 274). It joins the Karun at Band-i Kīr; in earlier times the confluence seems to have been a little further south (cf. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 239); it may have at one time flowed into the Kerkhā (q.v.), as modern tradition still says (see Layard, op. cit., p. 65). As to the Kerkhā, which now loses itself in the marshes below Hawza [q.v., i. 294 sq.], it must be assumed from the statements of the Arab authors and the ancient river-bed, which can still be traced, that the bulk of its waters joined the Karun a few hours' journey below the town of Āhwāz (on this see also Billerbeck, op. cit., p. 30). Another arm of the Kerkhā but hardly the main stream (contrary to Rawlinson; cf. Andreas in Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., i. 1394) may have at one time entered the Shaṭṭ al-Árāb in the region of Kurna.

The Dīzif-Rūd, the upper course of which still requires more thorough geographical exploration, has as its principal tributary the Bāwij-Rūd which enters it about 7 miles S.W. of Dīzif. Another important tributary of the Dīzif-Rūd is the Shāwār (Shībūr, also written Shāu, Shuwer), a narrow but deep water-course which rises a few miles above the ruins of Śīr [q.v.] and falls into the Dīzif-Rūd about 15 miles (as the crow flies) west of Bandi-Kīr. In the middle ages the Shāwār, like the Kerkhā, was called the "river of Śīr" because it flowed past this town — which, it may be noted, is at the point where the Kerkhā, Dīzif-Rūd and Karun are nearest one another. The Shāwār and the Dīzif-Rūd were at one time and in part still are connected with the Kerkhā and the Karun by canals. On the Dīzif-Rūd and Shāwār cf. Hamd Allihn Mustawfi, Nuzhat al-Kulûb, ed. Le Strange, p. 215 sq.; 218, 219; G. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 233, 239, and in the J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 312; Schwarz, op. cit., p. 303–305; Kitter, ii. 193 sq.; Layard, op. cit., p. 56 sq.; v. Bode, op. cit., ii. 193; Loftus, op. cit., p. 329, 342, 346; J. Dieulafoy, op. cit. (see the Bibliography), passim; Sawyer, op. cit., p. 490 sq.

The Kārun is not only connected with the Tigris and Kerkhā in the west but in the east it is linked up with the Dījārsīh or Kūrdistān-Rūd or Ab-i Kūrdistān (the Taib of the Arab geographers; see Le Strange, op. cit., p. 270; Schwarz, op. cit., p. 5 sq.; see also the article Arakṣān, above, i. 460). At Sābā a canal navigable by boats leaves the Shaṭṭ al-Ámā and runs to Dwarkā (Dörak)-Felāhīye (see the art. Dījārsīh) on the Dījārsīh.

The more important towns on the Kārun in mediaeval as in modern times lay on its central course between Shuster and Āhwāz. At the two termini of this stretch stood the two capitals of the mediaeval province of Kūhdizān, Āhwāz and Tustar (Shuster). Ahravāz, formerly the capital proper of this district, has a very important situation. This is at the gateway of the Kārun where the Nile breaking through its last barrier, the Dījārsīh range, enters the plain and henceforth offers no impediment to navigation to the sea. The later place of this name is built near the ruins of the old city; a mile south is the modern town of Naṣīrīye, which is growing rapidly (cf. Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 77). Cf. on Āhwāz above, i. 208, and Schwarz, op. cit., p. 315 sq., and Graedt van Roggen, op. cit., p. 202 sq. (with plans); for Tustar see the article SHUSTER and on the site (particularly the bifurcation which begins there) Graedt van Roggen, op. cit., p. 174 sq.

Places worth mentioning between Shuster and Āhwāz are: the large village of Wāris, where a dead arm of the Kārun runs to the east, and Band-i Kīr (usually pronounced Khīr), a place of considerable importance owing to its situation at the junction of the two arms of the Kārun and the mouth of the Dīzif-Rūd. Band-i Kīr is the successor of the mediaeval Aṣkār Makrum, the ruins of which (called Lāhījar; Lāhījar is the Persian equivalent of the Arabic Aṣkār) lie 3 miles north of it. On Aṣkār Makrum see above, i. 488 sq., and Schwarz, op. cit., p. 377 sq.

The lower course of the Kārun from Āhwāz to Muhhammara has no places of great importance on its banks. Among them are Ismā'īliya and Sābā, remarkable for its situation at the beginning of the bifurcations of the delta; it has the ruins of a castle which was at one time the favourite resort of Sulaimān, the influential Shaikh of the Kā'ba already mentioned (cf. Kinneir, op. cit., p. 87). Muhhammara [q.v.] at the junction of the Kārun and the Shaṭṭ al-Árāb is, however, a place of unusual
importance. It is undoubtedly the best harbour in Persia, easily accessible at any time, and is destined to have a still greater future. The fact is noteworthy that all the places of any importance that we have mentioned on the central and lower Kārūn lie on its east bank.

In the mountainous upper course there are no longer any towns of importance. In late antiquity and in the middle ages the most prominent were Susean (also called Avūd or Aūth and Džabaliḳ; see the sūsan) on the right bank and Ḩidżhad or Mūl Anū [q.v.] opposite on the left bank. Both are famous for the very fine remains dating from the Elamites and Susaans. Along the upper course in parts runs a road protected by many forts, now mostly in ruins. The Kārūn in general is one of the most historically interesting rivers in Persia owing to the numerous ruins from ancient times which are everywhere found on its banks.

The dwellers on the Kārūn in its upper course and on its middle course to beyond Shuster are the Bakhit-iyaṛis [q.v.] i. 603 ff. we have already mentioned as one of the three principal tribes of the Great Lūr. In the lower half of its central course and the whole of the lower stretch the powerful Arab tribe of Ka'b (popularly pronounced Thā'b, Shā'b, Sha'ab) are predominant; their Shaikh lives in Dawrāk-Fellāhaye. On this tribe which has only become important in these regions since the xvi century see Kinneir, op. cit., p. 85–87, 91; Buckingham, Travels in Assyria, Media and Persia, London 1830, ii. 195 sq.; Selby, op. cit., p. 214; Layard, op. cit., p. 36 sq.; v. Bode, op. cit., ii. 110–120; Lotius, op. cit., p. 285 sq.; Ainsworth, op. cit., ii. 527–530; Hertel, op. cit., 153–156, 161, 1398, 1063–1064. From Ahvāz to Mahmārā we find also Bāwi and Idris tribes who are subject to the Ka'b (cf. Selby, op. cit.).

In the military history of the middle ages the Kārūn basin only occasionally occurs as the scene of fighting; cf. thereon Schwarz, op. cit., p. 299–300. During the World War of 1914–1918 the possession of this territory became very important on account of its oil-fields; cf. thereon Schweer, op. cit., p. 140–144, and the section relating to the Trak and southern Persian fronts in books on the war.

As early as the Sasanians powerful dams (shāhhrān's) with the necessary sluices had been erected at various places to enable the water thus dammed back to be led by numerous small canals to fields on a higher level, especially on the central stretch of the Kārūn. During the whole of the middle ages this irrigation system was kept in excellent repair and transformed the land it watered into flourishing gardens. Since then, however, most of these works have fallen more and more into ruins as a result of neglect and great stretches of once fertile country have become desert again.

The most celebrated was the gigantic dam at Shuster, which was regarded in the east as one of the wonders of the world. Its erection is ascribed to the Sasanian king Sapor I (241–272 A.D.). It is very probable that the tradition is correct which says that Roman prisoners of war were forced to build it for him; the modern name Band-i Kaisar = Caesar-dam, also points to its Roman origin. On this great system of dam and sluices here, which after considerable restoration is still partly in use to-day, see Ritter, op. cit., ix. 186 sq.; Noldke, Geschichte der Araber und Perser zur Zeit der Sasaniden, Leiden 1879, p. 331; Justi in the Grundriss der iran. Philologie, ii., Strassburg 1896 sq., p. 318; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 235; Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter etc., p. 296. At Ahvāz, a few hours' journey below Band-i Kūr, the ruins of a great dam may still be seen (cf. Herfeld, op. cit., p. 76). In Ahvāz, at the rapids there, considerable remains of a triple ancient system of dams still exist. Band-i Kūr (= Bitumen-dam) has got its name from the ancient dam coated with bitumen. At the beginning of this century the Persian government thought of restoring the province of 'Arabistān to its former high degree of prosperity by restoring the old system of canals with dams and sluices. It was intended to begin with the island formed by the Abl-i Shaţāṭi-Kārūn and the Abl-i Gerger between Shuster and the Band-i Kūr and the Dutch engineer Graadt van Roggen was appointed to make a survey. He published the valuable results of his investigations in an important treatise illustrated with numerous plans and sketch-maps (Notices sur les anciens travaux humains sur Shuster in the Mem. de la Délegation en Perse, vii., Paris 1905, p. 167–207); he also went fully into the old irrigation systems of Shuster and Ahvāz. Unfortunately political jealousies have prevented the execution of this most useful project of the Persian government.

The Kārūn is the only river of Persia that admits of navigation. Communication is maintained with the Persian Gulf through the Shatt al-Arab and the Shatt Dāmīshār. There is evidence as early as the Umayyad period that there was regular traffic up the river as far as Ahvāz (cf. Schwarz, op. cit., p. 300); for the Kārūn is navigable as far as Shuster. The only obstacle is the rapids caused by the gypsum rocks below Ahvāz (see the very full description by Wells, op. cit., p. 156 sq.) which make unloading and reshipment necessary; in 1891 a little railway was put in use for this purpose. The Abl-i Gerger is also navigable; but in it also reshipment is necessary at Shihili (6 miles below Shuster). One can sail up the Dīfūl-Rūd as far as the vicinity of Dīfūl (cf. Persian Gulf Pilot, p. 298). The first to show that steamers could ascend the Kārūn as far as Shuster was Selby in 1842, accompanied by Layard, although in 1836 Major Estcourt, accompanied by Ainsworth, had previously reached Ahvāz in a steamer of smaller size. In 1888 the Kārūn was opened to international navigation. At the present day there ply on it boats of the firm of Lynch who have long had a concession, the Persian Naşiri company founded in 1889 and a Persian government steamer. If the bed of the river received a certain amount of regulation and the caravan roads from Shuster to Isfāhān were improved, we should have an important route for traffic, which would shorten by about half the journey from the Persian Gulf to Isfāhān, the centre of Persian commerce, which now mainly follows the difficult road from Būšīr via Şhrāz. Steamers of a moderate size can go as far as Ahvāz; from there to Shuster only small boats of shallow draught.

The shipping on the Kārūn has in the last few years become specially important for the transport of the petroleum obtained in Southern Persia. The Kārūn valley possesses a series of oil-wells, e.g. at Ahvāz. The oil-fields of Mādān-i Naftān (east of Shuster) are particularly productive, perhaps the richest in all Persia. The exploitation and
development of the Persian oil-fields is now in the hands of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. The yield of the oil-fields, where the most modern methods are now in use, has grown to such an extent that the transport of oil down the Kūrān in tank-ships is now no longer sufficient and two special pipes have had to be laid in addition. On the oil industry in the Kūrān valley the best authority is Schwehr, op. cit., p. 22 sq., 110 sq., 177 sq.

We conclude by dealing with the names of the Kūrān; in its upper course it is called Abī Kūrān = "water of the Kurān." Kurān (cf. Wells, op. cit., p. 146; Le Strange, op. cit., p. 252) is said to be a corruption of Abī Rang = "variegated hill." The name of the mountain already mentioned in which the river rises. Whether this explanation is correct, need not be discussed here. Kurān, or Kūrān, seems to have become Kūrān in the mouths of the Arabs. Among the Portuguese historians of the xvith century we find the name as Rio Caron; cf. Tomasech, op. cit., p. 83. They presumably only refer to the lower course of the river, which alone is called Kūrān at the present day. This name is quite unknown to the Arab and Persian writers of the middle ages. They give the river various names. It is usually called Dudaúj (is little Tigris) by the Arabs, apparently because it was not the larger river. As the name Dudaúj was also found elsewhere (for example a Tigris canal above Sâmarra; cf. i. 970 sq.; a water-course near Kūf, see Schwartz, op. cit., p. 299, note 6) it was more accurately specified as Dudaúj al-Ahwāz = the Dudaúj of Ahwāz (Khūzestān or its capital; see the art. AHWAZ, i. 208). According to Hāmza al-Ifṣahānī in Yākū (ii. 555 sq.), Dudaúj represents the translation of the Pahlavi Dīda Kūdā. The Kūrān was also called "river of Khūzestān or of Ahwāz" (Abī Ahwāz is still usual for the stretch near the town of Ahwāz; see above, i. 208). It was also called "river of Taxtar" (Shuster) after the second principal town of the medieval Khūzestān; in Ibn Baṭṭūta (ii. 24, r) we find the name Nahī al-Azrāk = "the blue river," from the blue colour of its mountain water which was generally esteemed for its remarkable freshness. We have already discussed above local names for particular parts or arms of the river, for example in the bifurcation between Shuster and Band-Cir and in the delta. Brief reference may be made to the cuneiform names L'ā (also in O. T.), Idīdē, Iđūdūd and to the names found in Greek and Roman literature: Adāma, Etaicēs, Hedyphon, Koprates, Patisgris, which were used not only for the Kūrān itself, but also for its tributaries, like the Dafak-Rud with the Shāwīr. For the cuneiform inscriptions cf. Streck, Assurantipal, Leipzig 1908, p. cccxxxii., 26, 787, 788, 813; for the classical references cf. Pauly-Wissowa, i. 435 sq., 436, 1393, v. 2459, vi. 1661-1663, vii. 2594, xi. 1635.


(M. STRECK)

Kūrān occurs in Kūrān xxvii. 76-82; xxix. 38; xi. 25. In the second and third passages he, with Hāmid, is an unbelieving minister of Pišān in oppressing the Israelites; he behaves proudly towards Mūsā, saying that he is an enchanter and a liar. In Kūr. xxviii., he is the Biblical Korah (Num. xvi.) and he behaves proudly towards the people of Mūsā but it is because of his immense wealth which he believes to have been given to him on account of his knowledge (Cāla īmān āndī). He makes a great public display
of his wealth and is swallowed up by the earth with his palace (dīr). He is thus an example of the wise who prefer the fleeting wealth of this world to gaining by alms and humility and righteousness the abiding riches given by Allāh in the world to come. This is apparently a moralized echo of a story heard and remembered vaguely by Muḥammad. To this the commentators and the compilers of prophetic wasāṣ have added a long and involved legend derived in whole or in part from rabbinic literature. For this, on the rabbinic side, see the Jewish Encyclopedia, vii. 556 sqq. and, on the Muslim side, the notes in Sale’s translation of the Kur’ān and al-Ṭabarānī, Ḳīṣṣ, Cairo 1314, p. 120 sqq. It is plain that Ḥanān has become a minister of Pharaoh because he is bracketed with Korah in rabbinic literature for rapacious wealth. The legend of Ḳūrān has had two special developments. 1. From his wealth and knowledge (above and Kur. xxviii. 78) he has become one of the founders of alchemy. See the preliminary statement of the Fikrist on alchemy (p. 352, l. 1) and al-Ḥaḍā‘ī alludes to this (Muṣīd al-Ḏharī‘, viii. 177). 2. He is associated in Egypt with lakes. Thus what is left of Lake Moeris in the Fayūm bears his name (Baederer, Egypten, p. 184; Jeannes, Egypte, p. 611; Heerodotus, ii. 149). Also, beside the Birket al-Fil to the south of Cairo, near the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn, there was formerly a Birket Kūrān which had evidently associations of supernatural legend. Al-Maḥṣū‘ī describes it (al-Kāhīf, ed. 1325, llii. 261 sqq.) and tells that Kāfūr who build beside it was said to have been driven from his house by djinn. He figures also in the Story of Jŭdār the Fisherman in Zotenberg’s (cf. Not. et Extr., xxviii., i. 167 sqq.) Egyptian Recension of “The 1001 Nights” (Nights 606–624) as a place where spirits take refuge from magicians. Von Hammer suggested in a note to his transl. of this story (Der Tausend und Einen Nacht noch nicht überseitete Märchen, etc., trans. Zinseler, i. 32; trans. Trübmann, i. 291) that Kūrān had here become confused with the Egyptian Charon.


(D. B. Macdonald)

KĀRĀN (older former kar-bān, “he who protects trade”) the original of the word caravan, means in Persian a number of merchants who organise themselves into a body to defend themselves against robbers and brigands (Ar. Ḳīṣīḥ). The beasts of burden are camels, horses and mules. The camels are usually arranged in files of seven animals (ḥāṭar); the camel-driver rides on an ass at the head of the procession. The camel drivers are slow and do not hurry, but their work is hard and trying; a man has often ten or twelve camels to watch and guide: sometimes thirty or forty are managed by three men. The men have to unload their beasts on reaching a stage and feed and tend them: it is only when this has been done that they can think of themselves. In the middle ages the signal for departure was given by beating kettle-drums (kāt).

In desert regions, the caravan camps under the tents that it carries with it; but sovereigns and generous benefactors have had built from stage to stage and at the resting-places, buildings called karawānshāry “caravan-houses”. Their plan is always practically the same; — a square courtyard surrounded by walls with no windows looking outwards, upon which abut a series of rooms each with a door and window or sometimes little huts without a roof, intended to serve as a lodging for the night for the merchant and his goods. The beasts of burden remain hobbled in the courtyard. These caravanserais are as far as possible supplied with running water or at least a well. In Persia the bulk of these buildings still standing date from the Șafawid dynasty and are traditionally attributed to Shīh ʿAbdās the Great. There is nothing here but the four bare walls; the travellers carry everything that is necessary with them, beds, carpets, cooking utensils, etc. In the towns especially, however, there is to be found near the caravanserais a caterer who has always ready the dishes loved by Orientals.

The Shīh considers it a work of piety to be interred near the mausoleum of ʿAlī at Nadjef (Mesḥhed ʿAlī) and of ʿHuṣain at Kerbelā (Mesḥhed ʿHuṣain), both places situated in Ottoman territory. For this purpose corpse-caravans have been organised, which carry from the remotest corners of Persia dead bodies by thousands. The bodies placed in wooden coffins or rolled in mats or carpets are tied in twos, threes or fours to the back of a horse. At every stage the bodies are unloaded as packages. As the journey lasts several weeks, these caravans give out an unbearable stench and never camp at less than three or four miles from the villages they pass through.


(CHR.)

KĀRWĀSH b. AL-MUṢĀ‘ALLAD ABU L-MANIFI, Mu‘TAMID AL-DAWLA, an ʿUqailid. After the murder of al-Muṣā‘allād in 391 (1000/1), Kārwāsh succeeded as Amir by being chosen by ʿUqailids. In 392 (1001/2) the latter sent an army against al-Mādā’in, which then owed allegiance to the Buyids. The ʿUqailids, however, had soon to retreat and when they made an alliance with the Banū Asad under Abu l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Māzyad, Bahā al-Dawla’s [v. s.] deputy, Abu Da‘far al-Ḥadjījādī, at once took the field against them and summoned the Banū Khafījā to help him. In Ramāḍān of the same year (July–August, 1002) the armies met; Abu Da‘far was defeated but gathered his forces together again and soon inflicted a heavy defeat on the ʿUqailids near Kūfa. In the year 397 (1006/7) Kārwāsh undertook an expedition against Kūfa but was defeated. A few years later (1011) he abandoned the ʿAbbasids and had the khutba read for the Fātimid caliph, al-Ḥakim bi-Amri l-lāh, but on the approach of an army under Bahā al-Dawla’s general, Ḥusain b. Ustādī Hormūz, at once returned to his allegiance. In 411 (1020/1) Kārwāsh was attacked and defeated by the Mazyadids and the Caliph’s troops and was only allowed to retain his position by the Caliph’s grace. But peace did not last long. The Banū Khafījā invaded Kārwāsh’s lands and when he took the field against them they made an alliance with Dubais b. ʿAlī b. Mazyad (417 = 1026/7). An army from Baghdad also joined the
allies. The vanguards met near Kuīf; Karwāsh took to flight and the allies for the time being occupied the town of al-Abdār. Internal feuds then broke out. Two 'Ukālidis, Nadīd al-Dawla Kāmil b. Khālid, and Rašīd b. al-Husāin, who were joined by Badrān, a brother of Karwāsh and lord of Nāṣībin, made an alliance, advanced against Karwāsh with a strong army and the two forces soon met. In the midst of a desperate conflict, however, a reconciliation was effected on the battlefield and Badrān was allowed to retain Nāṣībin. In the meanwhile Manī b. Ḥassān, commander of the Banī Khafsādār, plundered the town of al-Djabālān, which belonged to the Māzādīs, whereupon Dubais made peace with Karwāsh. After Manī had twice burned down the town of al-Abdār, he submitted to the Būyād Abū Kālidīdār [q.v.], while Karwāsh assisted the people of al-Abdār to fortify their town. In the struggle between the Turkish prince Barṣotāgnān and the Būyād Djalāl al-Dawla [q.v.], Karwāsh was on the side of the latter. In the year 432 (1040/1) they quarrelled for various reasons, but friendship was soon restored after Djalāl al-Dawla had sent an army against al-Abdār and Karwāsh had to pledge himself to obedience. In the years 432 and 433 Mesopotamia was invaded by the Ghuzz [q.v.], cf. the article MARWĀNIDS; on Ramādān 20, 435 (April 21, 1044), however, they were defeated by Karwāsh in combination with the other 'Ukālidis and Dubais at Ra's al-Ayīl and had to retire to Dīyār Bākr and Aḥbarbadān. Karwāsh had also to wage war on his brother Abū Kāmil Baraka. Their good relations were interrupted by 440 (1048/9); their nephew, Kuraīšī b. Badrān, joined his uncle Karwāsh and put Abū Kāmil to flight. In Muharram, 441 (June, 1049) it came to fighting between the two brothers; but as several of the followers of Karwāsh went over to Abū Kāmil, the latter had little difficulty in taking him prisoner and bringing him to al-Mawṣil. Although Karwāsh continued to be nominally recognised as suzerain, he no longer played an active part in politics, and as Abū Kāmil found him too independent, Karwāsh was deprived of his freedom in 442 (1050/1), although he was still treated with respect. After the death of Abū Kāmil in 443 (1052) his nephew Kuraīšī was recognised as Amir. Karwāsh died on Rajab 1, 444 (Oct. 27, 1052) in the fortress of al-Djar-rābiya near al-Mawṣil. According to one story, Kuraīšī had him assassinated.


Kārya, a village or small town (balad). It is not now used of a large town or city (madīna) unless it is qualified by an epithet denoting greatness, but in the Kurān, where the word is of frequent occurrence, it is applied without a qualifying epithet to cities of whatever size, including Mecca and Jerusalem. It is now used chiefly of such villages and small towns as are in India styled mawādī, that is to say fiscal units which are not the chief town of any district or local area.

Bibliography: The lexxica v. (F. W. Hall)

Al-Kaṣābā, a town in South Arabia in the Wādī Bāihān. The town comprises 12 strong castle-like buildings and 400 houses—there is a Jewish quarter 50 houses—and is surrounded by palm-groves. It has four main streets with shops in which a busy trade is carried on. The goods come mainly from 'Aden and are brought via Bāl-Hāf. Cotton, which is much grown here, is used for the manufacture of excellent cloths which are much sought after in South Arabia. Indigo is also much cultivated and a number of dyeworks produce the well-known blue-coloured material which is in great demand throughout the south. There are also seven sesame-mills in the town. In addition to cotton and indigo, the fertile soil yields wheat, barley, millet, the red variety (Pennisetum glaucum), and summer-millet, dates, grapes and vegetables. The Jews of al-Kaṣābā, the capital of Bāihān, are, like all the jews everywhere in South Arabia, mainly silversmiths and leather workers.


Kaṣaba means primarily the interior part of a country or town and hence a fortified castle, such as is occupied by a commander and his forces, and the town in which such a castle stands, the chief town of a district. It is also applied to a new well. In India, where it is locally pronounced kaṣaba, it is applied to the chief town of a pargana or mahāllī, which is the smallest subdivision of a fiscal district, and is distinct from the mawādī, the village or small town which is a complete fiscal unit, and from the mahārī or hamlet, which is included in the area and in the fiscal accounts of the mawādī of which it is an off-shoot.

Bibliography. Besides the lexica: The Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford (T. W. Hall)

In the Muslim East, the name is especially applied to the citadel in fortified towns in opposition to the rest of the town. It is the centre of defence and also the governor's residence. Sometimes it is a town beside the town. It is not uncommon to find the two parts of the city taking opposite sides and having violent quarrels. The history of Fez, Tara or Rabat give numerous examples of this. The Kaṣaba developed in the Maghrib especially after the Almohad period (twelfth century); the great ornamental gateways (usually single and simply swung, differing from the outer, more complicated of towns), which were built at this time between a town and its kaṣaba (a dialectical form of the word) are among the most magnificent monuments that survive from this brilliant period (e.g. the gate of the Kaṣaba of the Udaya at Rabat, Bāl-Agdīw at Marrākshē).

Under the Sherifi dynasties of Morocco (from the xvith century) and especially under the 'Alawiids (xvith century to the present day) the word was commonly used to designate little forts of very simple plan, built here and there in the country where the sovereign maintained small garrisons to watch the country; the name is also given near the towns to the different cantonments supplied by particular tribes liable for military service (Kaṣba of the Filāla, K. of the Shīrārā at Fez &c.).

Europeans extend the word more or less legi.
Kasha, or Kasam, is a verb in the Arabic language, which, like all verbs, has a definite meaning and function in the sentence. Kasam means "to divide", and it is often used in contexts where a division or separation is taking place. In religious contexts, it can also be used to refer to the division of time or space.

The verb kasam is in the root word kasam. The prefix is kas, and the suffix is ama. The verb kasam is used in different contexts, such as in the context of a wedding ceremony, where it might be used to describe the division of property or the separation of two individuals. It can also be used in the context of a scene of separation, where it might be used to describe the division of roles or responsibilities.

In the context of a religious ceremony, the verb kasam might be used to describe the division of time or space. For example, it might be used to describe the division of a prayer rite or the division of a ritual space. In this context, the verb kasam might be used to describe a moment of separation or a moment of division.

In the context of a wedding ceremony, the verb kasam might be used to describe the division of property or the separation of two individuals. It can also be used in the context of a scene of separation, where it might be used to describe the division of roles or responsibilities.

The verb kasam is in the root word kasam. The prefix is kas, and the suffix is ama. The verb kasam is used in different contexts, such as in the context of a wedding ceremony, where it might be used to describe the division of property or the separation of two individuals. It can also be used in the context of a scene of separation, where it might be used to describe the division of roles or responsibilities.

In the context of a religious ceremony, the verb kasam might be used to describe the division of time or space. For example, it might be used to describe the division of a prayer rite or the division of a ritual space. In this context, the verb kasam might be used to describe a moment of separation or a moment of division.
notably the period after the *yalat al-fayr* (see Goldziher in the *Archiv für Religionswiss.*, iv, 297 sqq.). There is evidence of oaths in connection with *sacrifice* from the pre-Islamic period (Zuhaih, i, 50; Ḥamāsā, p. 243, 10). Swearing by the sacrificial animals is common, still more frequent by the lord of the sacrificial animals (e.g. Ḥamāsā, 715, verse 6). Among the traditional forms of oath is the *kāla*. According to al-Djawhari, *ṣiḥāb*, s. v., it consists in taking the oath by the fire of the tribe into which salt is thrown. This ceremony, referred to by al-Kumait (al-Haǧīmiyāl, ed. Horovitz, no. 4, verse 36), still survives (Landberg, *Arabica*, v, 133 sqq.).

The magic circle is often used at the present day; this, which is sometimes divided by lines at right angles, often has something put in it, such as dung, ashes or a piece of cloth. One solemn oath consists in sticking a sword in the ground in the centre of the circle and placing ants beside it; this is the *yamla waw-nīmile* oath. Sometimes one takes a piece of wood in the hand and swears "by the life of this wood"; this is the *din al-ṣūd*. Popular customs could be mentioned, such as laying a hand on the tent-pole, taking bread and coffee in the hand, turning towards the *kīla* etc. (see the works of Musil, Jaussen, Landberg, Burchhardt and Doughty). Increasing the gravity of the oath by various procedures is acknowledged in official Islam and called *taqlīt al-ayamīn* or *taqīn al-ayamīn*; for example, the Kūrān or al-Bukhārī's *Ṣiḥāb* is placed in the bosom while the oath is being taken (cf. Goldziher, *Die Zāhirīn*, p. 115; Lane, *Manners and Customs*, i, 168, 470). Great oaths are called *Aīmān bīl-ḥākīma* (Ṣūra ixviii. 39; cf. Dīḥād *aimānumīn*, Ṣūra xvi. 58; vi. 109; vi. 40). The oath formulae give the substance of the oath. Apart from special kinds of oaths such as the curse and the vow, the usual formula is for that by which one swears to be introduced by a particle. The most common particles in this connection are bi, ta and wa, which are all used in solemn oaths (wawtalāhā, wa-bī-lāhā wa-tallāhā); the two last mentioned are not so freely used as bi. The particle bi is the common preposition "in combination with"; ta is probably the termination as in anānula or layātā; wa is an intensive particle like ḍa, which is used particularly in the formula la-tawrī, la-anrukan *by my (thy) life* etc.

Other demonstrative particles occur in oaths such as a, ħā, or sometimes the simple accusative is used; abbreviations of *aimānum* like āimin, ima, un, mu etc. are also sometimes used as particles in oaths. There are several linguistic peculiarities associated with oath formulae; for example, a negative can be omitted after the oath; vice versa, we find occasionally in the Kūrān a negative la before the oath, which is apparently intended to give it particular emphasis. A further intensification of the oath is expressed by prefixing la to the following verb (on the grammatical point cf. al-Mufāṣṣal, ed. Broch, p. 163 sqq.: Ibn Ya‘ish, ed. John, p. 259 sqq.).

Just as an oath is taken at a holy place or at a sacrifice, so we find oaths taken by the place or by the sacrifice (or by its lord). The Ka‘ba and all that belongs to it as well as the pilgrimages are used in oaths in continually changing phrases. The old Arabs swore especially by their gods and fathers. The *kāba* is often sworn by natural phenomena (Ibn Ḥishām, ii, 11). It is in keeping with the character of the oath that in Islam swearing by Allāh is alone permitted, but that, on the other hand, swearing by fathers, sants and especially by the Prophet (by the tomb of the Prophet, *Akhān*, vi, 91, l) is found in everyday life. Swearing by one's father was particularly forbidden by the Prophet (al-Bukhārī, iv, 253) but it is sometimes used by `Umar and Abū Bakr (al-Bukhārī, ii, 444, 6) and even by the Prophet himself (Muslim, commentary on *Al-Nawār*, iv, 99). It is a good Muslim oath to swear "by the Lord of my father" (al-Bukhārī, ii, 203, 15) or "by the Lord of the Ka‘ba, of the sacrificial animals," etc.) The Prophet also swears by his honour (Zaid b. Ali, ed. Giuffi, p. 104, 4). The formula may call God to witness, as, for example, "God knows that I am not lying:" "God is witness that I am saying this," etc. God is often referred to by some descriptive phrase; for example, "by Him Who sent Muḥammad with truth," while a Jew says "Mūsâ" for "Muḥammad." The oath can also be adapted to particular words; they may have their favourite oaths; the Prophet, for example: "by Him in Whose hand my soul is," etc. The oath is intensified by repeating the formula three or more times.

One is freed from an oath to fulfill a vow, when he has performed it (ṣuṣra or ḥālal yamin). "Discharge from the oath" (ṭaqlīt al-ḥāsaw) may mean a small quantity or a short period of time, literally: sufficient for release from the vow (cf. al-Bukhārī, i, 316, 11: iv, 265, 12; Sūra xix, 72; Caiyai b. Abī T-Salt, ed. Schultess, xxiii, 14). The man, to whom someone has vowed to do something, may, however, release the latter from his oath. The latter is allowed to disregard his oath if higher considerations demand it. There is evidence from the Muslim as well as the pre-Islamic period that such a solemn promise was accompanied by the taking off or rending of certain articles of clothing (al-Wāqī’ī, tran. by Wellhausen, p. 197; al-Tahārī, iii, 862, 14 sqq.). Release from a vow is obtained among the modern Beduins by a sacrifice. One may bind others with an oath if one conjures them. The formula is often of this kind: "I call (nαygα) God to thee" or "I mention (īdhābā) God to thee." But it is an oath of the speaker and it depends upon the relation between the latter and the person adjured whether the latter will fulfill the vow; in such forms of oath appeal is often made to mutual friendship or relationship (e.g. Līsān, vi, 428, 73; Ḥamāṣa, p. 254 middle). One can also appeal to God. "A servant of God is one whose God redeems when he appeals to him" (al-Bukhārī, ii, 168, 19, 204, 2). God is more pressingly conjured, if the appeal is made through one of His favourites, like the Prophet (Īrvāsāl be‘l-Nābi). Mu‘āwwī al-Kairkhi is said to have advised a disciple to call upon God through him (al-Ḳushairī, Ṭītalā, Cairo 1330, P. 9, 23).

Between the popular use of the oath among the ancient Arabs and in Islam there is no essential difference, as is clear from what we have already said. But there are special rules regarding the oath in Islam. In the Kūrān, especially in the older Sūra’s, the oaths taken by the kāhins by natural phenomena are usual (Sūra lvi, 74; lxxx. 15–18; lxxxi. 1; lxxix. 1–3; cxi. 1–7 etc.) we also have instances of swearing by the Kūrān (xxxvi. 1; xxxviii. 21; lvii. 1; l. 1, 1), by the angels (xxxvii. 1), by the Last Day (lxxxvi. 1) etc. Iblīs swears by
God's majesty (xxxviii, 23) and we have evidence (Zaid b. 'Ali, ed. Griffini, p. 286, 7 sq.) that God swears by His majesty and grandeur (cf. for the oath in the Kur'ān ḥaqq, al-Kaṣāṣṣ, Abūāśmā, al-Kāshās). Two passages in the Kur'ān are of special importance for the use of the oath. In Sūra v. 91 and ii. 224 sq., it is said that inconsidered expressions (lāghū) in oaths can be (broken and) expiated. The context in both passages makes it probable that the references are to vows of abstention, sometimes from food, sometimes from women. Vows of the last mentioned kind, called išār, are limited to four months (ii. 226), in connection with ii. 224 sq., after which time they must be expiated or the man must divorce the wife. A particular vow of this kind (ṣīḥār) in which the husband says "Thou art henceforth as the back of my mother to me (ba-zākhī umum)" is especially condemned in Sūra xxxiii. 4; Ivi. 2, 4 sq. (see Juynboll, Handbuch des islamischen Geistes, Leiden and Leipzig 1910, p. 224 sqq.; Sachau, Muh. Recht, 1897, p. 13, 68 sqq.).

The practice of atonement for such oaths after repenting of having taken them seems to be taken from the Jews (cf. Mishna, Nedarim, and Lev., v. 4 sq.). In Sūra lxvi. 2 we read "God hath prescribed you the dissolution of your oaths" and this prescription is applied to a case in which the Prophet had sworn to his wife Ḥafṣa not to touch the slave-girl Māriya, which he later regretted (cf. al-Ṭabarī, Taṣfīr, xxvii. 90 sqq.).

Among hadiths first place must be given to a saying of the Prophet: "I never take a vow without being prepared to expiate it if I see that another is better and adopting the better". In this and similar sayings, which are collected by al-Bukhārī, Muslim and other traditionsists (see Kishār al-imān wa'l-nahrūr), the expiation of vows is recommended in cases other than vows of abstention. On the other hand it is insisted that one should keep one's oath (Sūra xxvi. 93, 96; cf. iii. 71; Ivi. 15, 17, 19 etc.) and carrying out what one has sworn to do (ṣūdār al-mukāsām) is mentioned by al-Bukhārī, ii. 99, 3 among the seven principal requirements. It is only in Paradise that there are no such pledges, for there vows are fulfilled and oaths are disposed of (Unaiyāb a. Abi ʾl-Salt, ed. Schultess, xii. 23). But an oath must always give place to a higher consideration. It is therefore recommended not to take an oath without adding the stithāna (the formula "if God so will") (al-Bukhārī, iv. 286; Muslim, comment. of al-Nawawi, iv. 106; Zaid b. 'Ali, ed. Griffini, p. 463).

These statements in the Kur'ān and in the Sunna form the foundation of the Fikhl system on the subject. According to this, the person taking the oath must be nukhāli, he must be acting deliberately as a free agent and intend the oath. He must not take an oath to commit a sin; views are divided on the question whether such an oath is valid at all. One can only swear by God, either by His existence or by one of His names or attributes. The oath by the Prophet is recognised by some Hanbalis but in general is not considered a binding oath. The barā'a oath already mentioned is not recognised by the Fikhl. The breaking of a vow (ḥinnā) is considered a duty in certain cases, when one has sworn to commit a sin. The išār already referred to must be broken within four months if the man does not divorce his wife; after the ḍhar the wife must at once be divorced or the vow must be expiated.

Expiation (haṣārī) consists, according to Sūra v. 91, in setting free a slave, feeding ten poor men or clothing the same number; for those who cannot afford this, three days' fasting is equivalent. The things to be done are described in detail in the Fikhl books. In the išār the expiation is the same as in other oaths while in the ẓāhar it consists in releasing a slave who is a believer or fasting for two months or feeding 60 poor people (Sūra Ivi. 4—5). The Muslim law recognises the oath of affirmation as well as the vow to perform. The former only occurs in law-suits. A special case is formed by the kāsāma already mentioned which was taken over from the ancient Arabs. It is limited in Islam to trial for murder and consists of 50 oaths which can be sworn by one or more individuals. The oath is imposed on the accuser but only in connection with certain indications (lawli) which must be regularly ascertained. If the accuser refuses to take the oath, the 50 oaths are applied to the accused; if he refuses they apply again to the accuser. In other cases the principle in Islam is that the onus of proof is on the accuser and the accused has to take the oath. Witnesses as a rule do not take an oath; witnesses to the will of a testator who has died in a foreign country are an exception (Sūra v. 105). If the plaintiff has only one of the two necessary witnesses, the oath of one of the parties may take the place of the second witness (al-Bukhārī, ii. 158 sq.). When the plaintiff has not valid proofs, the oath is put to the defendant; if he declines to take it, it is put to the plaintiff (yanīn al-radd). Perjury on account of some crime is called yanīn al-żamās by Muslim scholars, an expression which originally meant a peculiarly binding oath. Such oaths can be expiated in the above fashion, according to the Shāfiʿi school, if they are false, according to other views they cannot. The latter hold that expiation only applies to vows.

The formalism of the legal system opens the way for all kinds of artifices by which an oath can be broken, yet formally kept. Thereby there arose a whole literature regarding such subterfuges; the best known work is al-Khāṣṣī's Kīṣār al-ḥiyal wa'l-mākhārid (ed. by Joseph Schacht [autogr.], Hannover 1923; printed Cairo 1314).


(Johns Pedersen)

al-kaṣāṣ "the story", title of Sūra xxviii. of the Kur'ān, taken from vs. 25. See further KISĀṣ.

KASB. The root occurs a large number of times in the Kur'ān with the meanings, "seek", "attain", "earn", "work" (good and evil); see C. C. Torrey, The Commercial Theological Terms in the Koran (Leiden 1892), p. 27 sqq. and Nöldeke's note there. Terms i. and visi are used synonymously although al-Baḏawī on Kur'ān ii. 286 (Fleischer's ed., i. 143, 21), following al-

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, II.
al-Nahr the name was everywhere pronounced Käs is very doubtful; for the later period the pronunciation Keš is proved by the frequently recurring expression Keš-i Dubašt. The accounts of the Arab conquest are discussed by Marquart in particular (Etibānahr, see Index). The Käs of the Samanid period is described very fully by the Arab geographers (Bibl. Geogr. Arab., ed. de Goeje, i., al-Iṣṣākhūr, p. 324; ii., Ibn Hawkal, p. 575 sqq.; iii., al-Mu'adhdhah, p. 258). The town was then within the territory of the tribe of Asad (about a mile) in length and breadth; the old city (madina, Persian shahrwān) as well as the citadel (shahābān) were already deserted, only the outer town (rabād) was inhabited; in the vicinity of the earlier Käs a new town was arising. This suggests that the modern town has a site different from that of the Käs which existed before the Muslim conquest. Nothing is known of other transferences of the site. Käs is never mentioned in the history of the Mongol conquest, so that it must have submitted to the Mongols (617 = 1220) without resistance. The name Shah-i Sabz first appears — on coins also — about the middle of the eighth (fourteenth) century. Many buildings were erected by Käs by Timür, who belonged to the district of Käs, and his contemporaries; thereon cf. W. Barthold in Zapiski mos. otd. arkh. obk., xxii. 1 sq. Especially famous is the palace Ağ Saray built at the end of 782 (beginning of 1380) by builders from Khrasān, cf. Shahīf al-Dīn Yazdī, Zafar Nāma, Calcutta 1887—8, i. 301 sqq., and the notices by Nizām al-Dīn Shāhī and 'Abbāl al-Razzāk Sarmandī in W. Barthold, Umgieg i ego wremia, Petrograd 1918, p. 23; N. Sitnikowskij in Protokol Turk. Krēzā LBukh. Abh., v. 114 sq. As late as the tenth (sixteenth) century Käs or Shahīf Sabz is described by Hāfiz-i Tānish (Abī ʿAlā Nāmī, MS. of the Asiatic Museum, 574 age, f. 87v) as an important town usually governed by a prince of the ruling house, while the administration of Nasaf or Karšī (q.v.) could be left to a military official (daraḵwā). At the present day the situation is reversed and Shahīf Sabz is an unimportant town in comparison with Karšī, the result of the political changes in the twelfth (eighteenth) century. The district of Shahīf Sabz is surrounded by hills on north, south and east, so that it can hardly be expected that this region will be soon linked up with the railway system, while Karšī is already connected by railway with Bukhārā and Termīdī; the town of Shahīf Sabz has therefore little prospect of renewing its prosperity.


(K. BARTHOLOMD. 

KASHAN (in Arab authors often Kāshān), a town in Ilrā 'Adāmi (al-Dībāl, Media) one day's journey from İshāhīn and twelve days' from Kumm. It is an ancient town which is said to have been rebuilt by Zabāhsī, wife of 'Abūn al-Rashīd. The heat there is excessive in summer, but the winter is very mild. Water, which is scarce, is brought by an aqueduct from the spring at the castle of Fin outside the town, to which

KASHAN — KASBF.

KASHF. [See KHUSUF.]

KASHF, the modern SHAH-I SABZ ("green town", on account of the fertility of its surroundings) a town in Bukhārā on what was once the great trade route between Sarmandk and Bukhārā. According to Chinese authorities, Kashi (Chinese transcription Kia-ša or Kié-shuang-na, also Kla-ša, as a town Ki'-she) was founded at the beginning of the seventh century A.D.; cf. J. Marquart, Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften, Leipzig 1898, p. 57; Eränjahr etc., Berlin 1901, p. 304; E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tourn. (Turc) occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 146. Yakūt's statement (Muṣājam, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 274) on the authority of Ibn Makulā, who died in 743 (1058/9), that in Mā warī
the inhabitants go on pilgrimage once a year. The melons and figs of this locality are esteemed. Large numbers of big, black and very dangerous scorpions are found there. The natives are all Shi'is and were already noted for their devotion to the twelve Imams at a time when this part of the world was still Sunni. In expectation of the return of the hidden Imam, they used to go out every morning with great ceremony to be ready to meet him; after a long wait they returned home disappointed but not discouraged. Almost the same thing was done at Hilla (Cl. Huart, Histoire des Arabes, ii, 324—5).

The town was destroyed by an earthquake in the reign of the Wāki Khārim Khān Zand, who had it rebuilt. Situated in the centre of a fertile plain, it was surrounded by walls flanked with towers, with a deep ditch running all round; it had six gates. Although not very important (15,000 inhabitants of whom 300 were Jews at the beginning of the nineteenth century), it is one of the prettiest towns in Persia; its streets are clean and paved. According to A. Williams Jackson, Persia Past and Present, New-York 1906, p. 410, it has now about 20,000 inhabitants. Its manufactures are cauldrons, silk embroidered with gold and silver flowers, plain stuffs with stripes of colour and a kind of velvets. Gold, silver and alabaster are worked there. It has become especially famous for the plaques of faience called Kāshī [q.v.], of which there was no longer any trace as early as 1408.


KASHANI. [See 'ARD AL-RAZZĀZ].

KASHANI, HADJĪ MI'RĀJ DĀDĪ, the Bābī historian, was a merchant of Khash who, with two of his three brothers, Ḥadījī Mirzā Ismā'īl Dādī and Ḥadījī Mirzā Ahmad, was among the earliest disciples of Mirzā 'Ali Muḥammad, the Bāb. When the Bāb, in 1847, was being conducted from Isfahān to his prison at Mākū the brothers bribed his escort to allow him to be their guest for two days and two nights at Khash. In the following year Khashānī, with Bābī 'Alī, Šubī-i Azal and other prominent disciples, attempted to join the Bāb insurgents of Shāhīk Tabarsi near Bārūrūsh in Māzandarān but was captured by the royal troops and imprisoned for some time at Amul, until ransomed by two merchants of Khashānī. "We find him always impelled, as it would appear, by religious zeal, now at Bārūrūsh, now at Mashhad, now at Tībrān." The Bāb was put to death on July 9, 1850, and Khashānī occupied the next two years in writing his history of the movement, for which task he was qualified by personal acquaintance not only with the Bāb, but with Šubī-i Azal, Bābī 'Alī, and almost all the early apostles of the Bābī religion, and by detailed and accurate information of every event connected with the movement during the first eight years of its existence. His history (which, for some mystical reason not readily comprehensible he styled Nūḥat al-Kūf "the Point of Kūf"), is accurate, but is disfigured by fulsome and almost idolatrous adulation of his hero and by coarse abuse of his persecutors. When Nāšīr al-Dīn Shāh resolved to cut off at a blow the adherents of the new religion, Khashānī was forcibly removed from the shrine of Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm, about six miles south of Tībrān, where he had taken sanctuary, and thrown into prison, where he shared the cell of Bābī 'Alī. On Sept. 15, 1853, he was put to death at Tībrān in company with twenty-seven of his co-religionists. As an act of policy, in order to divert vengeance from himself and his master, the Shāh handed the heretics over to his local governors and at the adherents of the new religion, Khashānī was delivered to Aḥsam Mahdī, Malik al-Tūdžūrī ('chief of the merchants'). According to one account he suffered death by being flayed alive, and according to another the merchants and shopkeepers of the city inflicted wounds on him until he was Novet.

Of his brothers Ismā'īl died at Tībrān and Ahmad, who, after the death of the Bāb, recognised Šubī-i Azal as his successor, was slain at Baghdad by some Bābī's, followers of Bābī 'Alī. Bibliography: Ḥadījī Mi'rāj Dādī, Nūḥat al-Kūf, ed. E. G. Browne in the Gibb Memorial Series; Browne, A Traveller's Narrative, written to illustrate the Episode of the Bāb, Cambridge 1891; do., The Türkeri-Tabār, or New History of Mirzā 'Ali Muḥammad the Bāb, Cambridge 1893. (T. W. Hato)

KASHF, "uncover", has two technical uses. I. In prosody it is the elision of the seventh voweled letter in the root masā'āl, changing it to masā'ala and farther to masā'ala — a combination of wašaf and kāf. This is often called kāf, "cut", which is more probable; but that root has unlucky associations (Freytag, Darstellung der arabischen Verbenkunst, p. 87; De Sacy, Grammaire arabe, i. — Tratté de la Prosodie, Tab. iii.; Garcia de Tassy, Réhormique et Prosodie, p. 241; al-Durūjīnī, al-Tarifīnī, under kāf). — II. In the emotional or religious sense (tāsawwuf) it is the broadest term for the unveiling of the mystic. When this is analyzed more carefully it is commonly divided into three: (i) mudākara, in which reason (šikā) is the means by proof (bārān); (ii) nūkhāsafā in which taught knowledge (šulūk) is the means by explanation (hayān); (iii) nūkānāhā by means of immediate, personal experience (ma'rīfā). By (i) 'ilm al-yāqīn is reached by the arba'āl al-wāli, this is still in the realm of reason and is not really kashf. By (ii) 'a'n al-yāqīn is reached by the ʿāqīb al-ulūm and by (iii) ḥāf al-yāqīn is reached by the ʿāqīb al-ma'rūfī, the last is the immediate Vision of God and is sometimes called muḥāwīn al-Kashfīr, al-Risāla, ed. with commentaries of Zakariyā al-Arūsī, and al-ʿAzhārī, Būrān 1290, ii, p. 79 sqq.; on this cf. R. Hattmann, Al-Ansāhirīs Dasstellung des Ṣūfītums (Turk. Bibl.,
KASHGAR, a town in Chinese Turkestan, called Su-le in the oldest Chinese sources: the same name is still used in Chinese official documents. The name Kashgar first appears in Chinese transcription (K'iu-ch'a) in the Tang-shu, cf. E. Chavannes, *Documents sur les T'ou-Kin (Turke) occidentaux*, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 121 sq. On the pre-Muhammadan Kashgar and the ruins of Buddhist buildings in the vicinity see A Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, Oxford 1907, i. 52 sq.; do., *Serindia*, Oxford 1921, p. 80 sq. Arab armies did not reach Kashgar; the story of Kuts Abu-Khulthum’s campaign in 96 (715) is, as H. A. R. Gibb (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, ii. 467 sq.) has shown, a mere legend. On the flight of a prince of Farghana to Kashgar in the time of the Caliph al-Mansur (755-775) see the article FARGhana. In the Sāmānid period a Dihān of Kashgar with the name or title Tughān Tegīn is mentioned (Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, viii. 37), with whom the rebel prince Iyās b. Ishāq took refuge; whether this Dihān had already adopted Islam is not mentioned. At a later date Satuq Boghārā Khān is mentioned as the first Muslim Khān of Kashgar; in the oldest reference to him that we have (Djamal Kurshei in Barthold, *Turkestan in its ethnic mongolokh namestviania*, i., St. Petersburg 1898, p. 130 sq.) the date of his death is given as 344 (955). This story already contains features which are certainly legendary; in the story of the building of the first mosque we have the well-known folklore motif of the cutting of an ox-skin into strips. The later legend, reproduced by F. Grenard (*Journ. As.*, Ser. 9, vol. xvi. 1 sq.), has not this feature but contains many other legendary traits and absolutely false dates. The year 344 A.H. is perhaps too early as probably the story of the adoption of Islam by a numerous Turkish people (200,000 tents) in 349 (960) must be referred to the Turks of Kashgar; this story is found not only in Ibn al-Athīr (viii. 396) but also in Ibn Miskawayhi (*The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate*, ed. Margoliouth and Amedroz, Oxford 1921, text ii. 181, translation v. 196); the original source is probably Thabit b. Simān al-Sabī (cf. Ibn al-Athīr, viii. 476 and 491; *The Eclipse etc.*, *Index*). The tomb of Satuq Boghārā Khān is in Artuq (now pronounced Artush) north of Kashgar, where it is still shown.

Under the rule of the Ikék-Khāns [q.v.] Kashgar was politically the most important town in what is now Chinese Turkestan; perhaps it was also the most important from the point of view of culture. In the fifth (eleventh) century there was already in existence a work in Arabic on the history of the town, composed by Abū 'l-Futūh Abū al-Ma‘ṣūr (or Abū al-Ghaffār) b. Husain al-Alma‘sī al-Kashgari (sic!); the author’s father, who survived his son (according to al-Samání by about ten years), died in 486 (1093). On father and son and the works of the latter see al-Samání, *Kitāb al-Ansaḥ*, ed. Margoliouth, Leiden-London 1912, f. 470a and 472b; Djamal Kurshei in Barthold, *Turkestan* etc., i. 123 sq. The rulers were buried in a special mausoleum (Arabic al-dawruth al-ḥāṣāniyya) on the bank of the Tumen; the first prince buried there died in Muharram, 424 (Dec. 7, 1032—Jan. 5, 1033) and the last in Rajab, 601 (Feb. 22—March 23, 1205). During Mongol rule a madrasa was built in Kashgar by Mas‘ūd Beg (cf. the art. BUKHARA); in its library was the copy of the Siḥāt of al-Dhuwayrī used by Djamal Kurshei for his translation (E. Sachau and Eith. *Cat. of the Persian... Manuscripts of the Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*, Oxford 1889, col. 983). Kashgar was later under the rule of the Dughlat Amirs [see the article DUGHLT]; the last of them, Abū Bakr, reigned till 920 (1514), according to the statement of his relative Ḥāfiz ʿAbd ar-Rahman [q.v.]. This forty-eight years (*Tarhib-i-Kashgari*; English translation, London 1895, p. 253 and 326); but this is contradicted by the author himself, who says that Kashgar was not conquered by Abū Bakr till 885 (1480/1). Abū Bakr is the founder of the modern town. He destroyed the old fortress and in the last years of his reign rebuilt it on a new site, on the other side of the Tumen on the tongue of land between this river and the Koll Sū (ibid., p. 286 sq. and 295).

Under the rule of the “Mongol” Khans [cf. the Bibliography to the art. QACHTAKH-KHAN] and later under that of the Kalmicks and Chinese the capital of the district was no longer Kashgar but Yarkand; it is only quite recently, since the reconquest of the country by the Chinese in 1877, that Kashgar has again attained considerable importance as the residence of the Tao-Tai, who is over the western and southern part of Chinese Turkestan as far as the oasis of Čereq, and the residence of the Russian and English consuls. On Kashgar in 1873 see II. W. Bellew in Sir T. D. Forsyth, *Mission to Yarkand in 1873*, London 1875. On modern conditions see especially Kornilow, *Kashgariya*, Tashkent 1901 (review by W. Barthold in *Zapiski vost. otd. arkh. obs.,* xx. 131 sq.) with plan of Kashgar on p. 268, and M. Hartmann, *Chinesisch-Turkestane*, Halle a/S. 1908, especially p. 45 sq., 89 sq., with plan of the town from Kornilow. The most important building in Kashgar and vicinity is Ḥadrat Ḍāpūk, the tomb of the famous saint of the eleventh (seventeenth century) Kashgar is now also of greater importance than Yarkand for its intellectual life; Yarkand, “which, down to the conquest of Kashgaria by the Chinese, was the political capital and also the principal centre of learning and sanctity, has now fallen behind Kashgar. Its day is over!” (M. Hartmann, *op. cit.*, p. 49). The number of its inhabitants is said to be about 50,000.

KASHĪ (in Yaqūt: KASHHĀN, KASHĪ; in Ibn Baṭṭuta: KASHHĀM), the name derived from that of the town of Kāshān [q.v.] in Persia, given to square, sometimes hexagonal, plaques of faience used in the exterior decoration of buildings or of interior walls.

It is one of the most ancient arts of nearer Asia (already known to the Assyrians and then to the Achaemenids) which survived in Persia in the middle ages, and more especially, it appears, in the town of Kāshān. The monuments of modern Persia from the time of the Safawids to our day (those that are older are in ruins) are covered with these plaques of faience decorated with conventional flowers (kashī-kārī), in which the predominant colours are indigo blue, turquoise blue, green, less frequently red and yellow. Those
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with figures in relief are the rarest and the most esteemed.

When this industry was brought to the town of Damiq by Persian artisans — perhaps Christians (some plaque-like inscriptions in Syriac) — the Syrians called these plaques khashā (from the Arabic orthography Kāshān). The art disappeared perhaps over a century ago; the ruins of the factory which made them are still shown outside the Bud Shahrā. These fragments were imitated in Turkey at İzmir and Kütahya. Recently an attempt has been made to revive the factory, but the modern work is far from equaling the beauty of the ancient pieces; it is some place in Persia where the beautiful models of past ages are clumsily imitated at the present day.


AL-KĀSHĪ, DANISHMAND R. MAṢṢĪR B. MAḤMŪD, GHAYTH AL-DIN, a Persian, was the first superintendent of Ulugh-Beg’s observatory in Samarqand and a collaborator with this prince in the preparation of his astronomical tables. Besides his astronomical and mathematical researches he also studied medicine; he must have died about the year 840 (≈1436/7). Of his works there have survived: (1) Zād-i Khaṣṣā (the Khāṣṣā tables), in Persian, a manuscript in Constantinople (Aya Şofa); a supplement to the Il-Khāṣṣā tables (of Naṣrāl-Dīn al-Tūsī); (2) Mīṣāf al-Ḥiṣāb (key to arithmetic), in Berlin, Leiden, British Museum, India Office, etc.; the preface to it was translated by F. Woepcke (see Bibliography); (3) al-Risāla al-Kanā‘īya, also called Sulīm al-Samā‘ (the ladder of heaven), on the magnitudes and distances of the heavenly bodies, in Oxford, Leiden, India Office; (4) Risāla fi isktārād dā’īb darafā’ waḥida, etc. (an essay on the calculation of the sine of a degree), in Cairo; in this al-Kāshī solves an equation of the third degree by an interesting process of approximation (cf. below Hankel’s work).


KĀSHĪF, MUḤAMMAD SHARĪF B. SHAMS AL-DIN, with the taḥkālīt KĀSHĪF-UL KUMĀT, a Persian man of letters of the xth (xvi) century. What is known of his life comes mainly from the Khāṣṣā of his Khaṣṣā u Bakār. The author’s father, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad, also known as Shams al-Dīn Shīrajī, was living at Karbalā’ when his son Muḥammad was born and left it for Isfahān in 1006 (1597/8). He had been imprisoned in the Zanjan factory to escape persecution from the Sunnis. Muḥammad, the son, was then three years old so that he was born in 1003 (1594/5). In 1008 (1599–1600) Shams al-Dīn went to Mashhad and returned seven months later to Isfahān. These dates are given by the Brit. Mus., according to Rieu’s Catalogue; from Rosen’s description of the St. Petersburg MS it seems to make the author five years old in 1006 and to put the journey to Mashhad in 1010 (1601/2). After a stay of 23 years in Isfahān the family moved to Ray where the father died in 1035 (1625/6). Muḥammad Šarīf himself was Kādī of Ray for 15 years.

In the Taḏkira-i Naṣrābādī (synopsis in Sprenger, Catal. of. the . . . . . manuscripts of the Libraries of the King of Ondh, i. 88 sqq.), there is a notice of Kāshīf and his two brothers, Isma‘īl Muḥammad and Muḥammad. The date of his author’s death is unknown but must be after 1063 (1652/3). This date is given by the chronogram at the end of the Khaṣṣā u Bakār in the London MS. as the date of completion of the work; he mentions his other works in the Khāṣṣā as already written so that the Khaṣṣā is the last.

**Works.** Kāshīf, who, as he himself tells us, had a literary training and devoted a considerable period to study, wrote both prose and poetry. He composed three epics, two of which (the Laila Muḥammad and the Haft Fārs), like very many epic poems of the later period, were very popular since Niẓām’s time. The third was called Abāzānūnā, probably a panegyric on the Safavid Abbas II (?). Then there are his shorter poems, ḵaṣṣā’s, rubā’ī’s etc. His prose works are: Sirāf al-Munīr, a work inspired by Sa’dī’s Golestān, composed in an ornate style with verses interspersed. The text is divided into 20 sections (ramā’ī) and deals with the different virtues and moral qualities which are illustrated by anecdotes. The London MS. gives 1050 (1625/6) as the date of completion of this work; but it is probable that this date refers to the time of copying the MS. and the work itself is a few years older. Khaṣṣā u Bakār, his last book, is a collection, also in ornate prose, of tales which his young brother Muḥammad urged him to compile. Most of the stories are taken from the earlier al-Parādīs ba’d al-Shidda of Ḥusain al-Dihistānī, but he details, for example, also an incident that happened to his father Shams al-Dīn. The work consists of a preface (mubāṣṣāma), fourteen sections (aṣāṣa) and a conclusion (khāṣṣā) (lithogr. Tabriz 1294). Two other prose works from his pen are recorded, namely Durr-i Muḥammad and Hawwā’-i Ḥātīn.


KĀSHĪF, ḤUSAIN WAṢĪ, a prolific writer, who flourished in Hirat (during the reign of Sulṭān Ḥusain Mirzā [q. v.]) and died in 910 (≈1503). Among the best known of his writings are (i) a work on ethics, entitled ʿĀlākaḵā-µuhītan, dedicated to Abu ‘I-Muḥsin, a son of Sulṭān Ḥusain Mirzā, and completed in 900 (≈1495); it was printed for the first time in Calcula, 1609, and frequently since; (ii) a modernised version of Nasr Allah b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanāfī’s [q. v.] earlier Persian translation of Kalīla wa-Dimnak [q. v.]; he undertook this task at the suggestion of Niẓām al-Dīn Amir Shahī Aḥmad al-Suhailī (ob. 907 or 908 ≈1501–1503) and entitled it Anawār-i-Suhailī; it is written in a very artificial style, overlaid with rhetorical ornament, and has on this account been much admired in the East;
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MSS. are common, and it has been printed several times, for the first time in Calcutta, 1804. His other works comprise Djawhir al-tafsîr li-tub NATIONALISME, a Persian commentary on the Kur'ân, compiled at the request of Mir Ali Shir in 899, but he only completed one out of the four volumes he had planned, and broke off this work to compile for his patron a shorter commentary, entitled Mawâlikâl-alîya, but usually styled Tafsîr-i-Hasinî; a-Rawdat al-Shukhâda, a history of the martyrdom of ‘Ali and his family (abridgments exist under the titles, Dah Modâjîs and Muntâjabî-r-Rawdat al-Shukhâda); — Badâtî al-A’fkar fi Sena’i al-Aqîhâr, a treatise on figures of speech and poetic artifices, as well as faults in poetic composition; — Mazhûn al-inzâhî (compiled in 907 and dedicated to Husân Mirzâ, and later) Safaî-i-Shâhî, two works containing models of epistolary composition; — Kitâb wa-Aghâri-i-Hâtim Tacîl (or, Risâla-i-Hâtimîyeh), completed in 919, giving the story of the Hâtim Tacîl [p. v.]; — Tuba- nat al-salawât; — Risâla al-âlîya fi l-mukhtalîf al- nabawiyeh; — selections from Djalîl din Râmi’s Mawâlikî, translated by Lubbî-i-Lubbâb. Several of the above works have been translated into Turkish, and are the first two into English.


KASHISH-I-DAGH (in Turkish “mountain of the priests”), a name given by the Ottomans to Olympus in Mysia, at the foot of which is built on the north the town of Brussa [q. v.]. Its slopes are covered with forests now much diminished; its summit is covered with snow which only melts in summer (height 6,200 feet). Its massif is formed of granite, marble and felspar. At the time of the Ottoman conquest, Olympus was covered with convenits and hermitics’ cells whence its Turkish name. The Christian monks were replaced by dervishes. The poet Lami’s has described the two monasteries Geikli Baba and Doghlu Baba. At the foot of the mountain in a quarter of the town of Brussa is the tomb of Shahsh Shams al-Din Muhammad b. ‘Ali of Bukhârâ, better known by the name Shuljan Amir Walt; a mosque is built over the tomb.


(Ch. Huart)

KÂSHKÂL, a Turkish people in Persia. The name is said to be the Turkish kashka “horse with a white spot on its forehead” (W. Raillot, Versuch eines Worterbuches der fûnfs Dialekte, ii, 395). The Kashkâl are said to be descended from the Turkish Khaladj (cf. also B.G.A., i, 158: Khaljî) mentioned by al-Istakhri (B.G.D., vol. i), and later writers in the country between India and Sistan. The Khaladj are said to have migrated first to the Persian ‘Irâk where a district near Sâwa is still called Khaladjistan; there is still said to be a Turkish speaking people there (private information from V. Minorskiy). The Kashkâl are said to have come from the ‘Irâk to Fârs where they lead a nomadic life at the present day. Their winter quarters are in the southern part of this province, especially around Fârâbâbâd, where the chief of their tribe (lîkâmî) is regarded as ex officio as governor; the stronghold of Fârâwa was built there by the Ilkhâns Sâlnâ-i-Dawla (from 1245/6–1296/7). In summer they wander as far as Kûmesâ and Gomandelîn in the southern part of the province of Isfahan. According to Curzon (Persia and the Persian Question, London 1892, ii, 112 sqq.), the Kashkâl were a numerous people down to about 1870 (60,000 families; in case of war about 120,000 horsemen) but they suffered greatly from the famine of 1871 and 1872; at the time of Curzon’s journey (1889) the number of families was said to be 25,000, while he put it at really some 10–12,000. The number 12,000 is also given by Tumanisky (1894) for the tents of the Kashkâl proper, but he says the number of all the nomads for whom the Ilkhâmî of the Kashkâl paid the taxes was double (24,000). Larger figures are given by later travellers: 35,000 (1906) and 55,000 (1914). In 1914 the Kashkâl formed a well armed division of an army of about 20,000 men and took part in the conflict on the Armenian side against England. All the Kashkâl were fanatical and were engaged in horse-breeding (the breed is related to the Arab); the women weave carpets. A few Kashkâl have gone over to a settled life in the south at Dârâb and in the north at Kûmesâ. According to Curzon, the Kashkâl, in spite of their Turkish descent, were considered to belong to the Lûr family; in their customs they also differ little from the Bakkûyânî and Kûtgelî (the Turkish tribe of the Aghâcherî also belongs to this Lûr tribe); but the language of the Kashkâl, as the songs written down in 1914 by A. Romaskevič show, is a Southern Turki dialect closely related to the Turkoman and Aqha’râchidâni.


(W. Barthold)

KASKUL (v.), an oval bowl of metal, wood or coconuát (calabash), worn suspended by a chain from the shoulder, in which the dervishes put the alms they receive and the food which is given them. The etymology of this word is obscure; a popular one is given by the Persians: kash “draw” (impertative) and ðul “shoulder”; “what one draws over the shoulder”; but as we find a form khasrîl attested in the older poets (Anwari, Saif Isfaranji), this explanation can hardly be accepted. The dictionaries give as the first sense “beggar” and then “beggar’s bowl.” We are not able to tell whether they are right.

In literature the word means an album, a collection of different pieces from different sources, and is applied particularly to the Kitâb al-Kasha’ul
KASHMIR

The name Kashmir (in Arabic works also Kashmir) has from early times been employed to denote the valley situated in North-west Himalaya between 33° 30' and 34° 40' N. Lat. and 74° and 75° 30' E. Long. This valley has a length from N. W. to S. E. of about 84 miles and a breadth from N. E. to S. W. of 20 to 25 m. The area is about 1900 sq. miles. It is separated from the outer hills of Djamnâ, Râjdjâwari and Pâmâ by the lofty Pâr Pandjâl Range of which several peaks are more than 15,000 feet in height. On the North-west side ranges which come nearest to the valley rise to greater heights, the principal peaks being Gâwshâ-birî (21,800 ft.), Amarâth (21,341 ft.) and Hâramukh (19,903 ft.). Beyond these is an extensive mountainous district through which the passes connecting the valley with Lâdâk, the Upper Indus valley, and Central Asia are few and difficult. The Zâlji Pass (23,300 ft.) is the principal means of communication with Lâdâk, and the Burzil Pass (13,500 ft.) with Astdor and Skârdû. With the plains of India the most direct pass is via Bhimbar over the Pâr Pandjâl (11,400 ft.), but the easiest and only route open throughout the year is that by Bârâmîla which is the R. Djeblam or Bhalat leaves the valley. This may be approached now most easily by the good road from Râwâl Pâtî via Mârî, which follows the gorge of the Djeblam, but the Aibottabâd route which joins the other at Mûasâfarâbâd (the confluence of the Kishangangâ with the Djeblam) has more natural facilities and was most used in early days. The geography and geology of this isolated valley are largely described by Drew, Lydkeker and Oestreiche, and the historical geography has been elucidated by Cunningham and Stein.

The valley is shown to be a lacustrine basin formed by the Djeblam R. and its tributaries, of which the Sinâ and Lidak are the principal. The drying up of the lake which filled the valley is due to the removal of the rocky barrier which must have closed the exit at Bârâmûlia, and no doubt the general progressive dessication of this part of Asia contributed to the result. The Wular Lake is the principal remaining sheet of water, and the small Mârâsbâl Lake and the Srinagar Dal also deserve mention.

The surface of the valley lies between 5000 and 6000 ft. above sea level, it is nearly level and of great fertility, and seems to have attained prosperity at an early period, although its remoteness and inaccessibility protected it from many of the storms of invasion which have swept over Northern India. The people of Kashmir, although of fine physique, have generally been stigmatized by travellers and rulers alike, from Yuvârâng to Abu l-Faḍî [q. v.] and Gâlûb Singh, as an unsavory, cowardly and cunning race, but, as Lawrence has pointed out, these defects have been exaggerated by persistent oppression. It is evident that a race which maintained its independence for so many centuries could not, even though assisted by the great natural difficulties of approaching the country, have been altogether destitute of a manly character.

Although historical information does not go back to a very early period, yet for the last two thousand years Kashmir is exceptionally well supplied with sources of historical information. The principal of these is Kâlaââ's Râjdârângâ, a metrical chronicle composed in the 16th century, which is almost unique in India, and which as edited, translated, and annotated by Stein is the main source of our knowledge. Other authorities are the Chinese pilgrim, Yuvârâng, who visited Kashmir in the 7th century, the chronicle of al-Birûnî [q. v.], in the 10th century, the Aîmâ Akbarî of Abu l-Faḍî, the diary of the Emperor Dîjâhângîr, and the accounts of many modern travellers, beginning with the French physician Bernier, who accompanied the Emperor Awrangzâb [q. v.] on his visit to the valley. There is also a very complete series of coins illustrating the history of Kashmir from the 6th century till the present day through the period of the Ephthalites, the Sârakhs, the Hârâns, the Musâlim sultans, the Mughal Emperors, the Durrânîs of Afghanistan, the Sikhs and the present rule of the Hindû Dogras of Djamnâ, under British suzerainty.

The most noticeable point in the history is the immunity of the valley from the great historic conquerors. Alexander did not touch it, and it repelled the attack of Mâhîmdû of Ghâzânî, Cînzî Kâhî [q. v.] and Timûr passed it by as did Bâbur [q. v.]. It fell easily into the possession of Akbar after he had consolidated his power over the whole of Northern India, and it was unmolested by Nâdir Shâh even when the Mughal power had crumbled away under his attacks. Yet the disorganised country succumbed at once to the attacks of the mountainbred Afghans of Ahmad Shâh Durrânî, and the later Durrânîs, divided among themselves, were easily defeated by the Sikhs. In these cases the people of the valley, regarded simply as subjects for extortion, had no ground for preferring one set of conquerors to another, and they took no part in these later struggles.

No information about Kashmir can be derived from classical sources before the time of Ptolemy, as the Greek historians of Alexander do not even mention it. Ptolemy (in the middle of the 2nd cent. A. D.) describes it as a very powerful state extending far beyond the limits of the valley, and it is evident that it formed part of the great kingdom of the Kishân which spread over Northern India at that time. He calls it Kaspisparis, and states that it lies below the sources of the Bistaspes, the Sandalph and the Adris, i.e. the Vistâs (Vâhat, Bhalat or Djeblam), the Candrabhâga (Cinâb) and the Airawati (Râvî), a very accurate description.

Before this time however, although there is no contemporary information, there is good ground for believing that Kashmir formed part of the dominions of Asokâ about 250 B. C. The defeat of Seleukos by Candragâpta had enabled the Maurya monarchs to extend their power northward, and the spread of Buddhism made it easy for Asokâ to extend his influence into Kashmir when he adopted that creed. No inscription of his edicts has been found in the valley, but that at Mansehra was situated close to the most obvious route
to Bāramulla through the Paklí plain forming part of Uraš (Harara), and Yuan Cháng tells us that he erected four stūpas in the valley.

This is confirmed by the Kārgētarangī (1.104), which shows the tradition still existing in Kāla-pā's time. It represents Aśāka as a king who built numerous stūpas, and founded the city of Srinagar, the name of which is preserved in the modern capital Srinagar, although its actual site is marked by the temple of Pāndārājan (i.e. Pu-rānādhisthāna “ancient capital”), three miles away.

The chronicler again embodies an actual tradition when it comes to the kings Kālikāsha, Dūṣṭhakā, and Hūṣṭhakā, who correspond very closely to the Kūṣhāna Kālikāsha, Vāsishtha, and Hūvishtha, known from coins and inscriptions. We know from the Chinese and other Buddhist records that Kālikāsha called together the second great Buddhist council in Kashmir, and it seems probable that this took place, if the Buddhist tradition is correct, 400 years after Buddha's death, viz. the last half of the 1st century B.C. Even if the theory identifying Kālikāsha's date with the Sāka era should prove correct, this council cannot be dated later than the first cent. After the decay of the great Kūṣhāna kingdom it is probable that Kashmir remained under the rule of minor chiefs of that race who were overthrown by the Epiphalites or White Huns in the early part of the 5th century.

All through this early period the name Kashmir or some similar form seems to have been in use. Stein shows that 'Ptolemy's Kaspuria corresponds with a Prākrit form Kavstrā, which is preserved in the modern Kashmiri form Kāshmir, while the older Sanskrit form Kasmirā has survived almost unaltered in India and Persia as the appellation of the country. The derivation from a supposed Kasīyapa-pura advocated by Wilson and Lassen is not now generally accepted, and the Kasparystos of Herodotos certainly does not refer to Kashmir but to some place bordering on the Indus. He places it in the province of Paktiukh which must have been the later Pākhtā, the hilly district lying between the Indus and the Dīhlam which gave its name to a sākār of the Mughal empire under Akbar). Hekataios also mentions Kasaparyos as a city of the Gandharvi. In the viii th cent. the Chinese pilgrims adopted the name Kī-pūi for Kashmir, but Yuan Cháng also uses the form Ka-si-mī-lo.

The Epiphalite occupation of Kashmir does not seem to have formed part of the direct invasion of India, which came from the west. Their king Mīhira-gūla seems to have been established at Sākāla (Siwāl-kār) in 520 A.D., when the Chinese pilgrim Sung-yun found him making war on Kāshmir. How far he succeeded is not clear, but after his defeat in Central India in 528 A.D. he appears to have retired into Kāshmir, and seems to have gradually obtained possession of the country, whence he attacked his brother who had usurped his throne in Gāndhāra. Yasūdharman, his Indian conqueror, appears to have followed him into Kāshmir and struck coins there, but probably Mīhira-gūla remained in possession, as coins in the Kāshmir style are found in the names of his successors, Khiṅgila and Tōrāmāna, Yuan Cháng, who visited Kāshmir early in the next century, states that Mīhira-gūla was a tyrant and oppressor of Buddhists. He was favourably received by the king then reigning, whose name he does not give, probably Durlābha the founder of the Kārkotāka dynasty and found 100 Buddhist monasteries still existing. Shortly afterwards king Harsha of Kanawā [q.v.] restored from Kāshmir the tooth relic of Buddha, but did not invade the country. Relations with China were frequent during the viii th cent. An embassy from China arrived in 713 A.D. After 720 A.D. the kings of Kāshmir were recognized by the Chinese emperors. The last recorded embassy from China was in 759 A.D. The Kārkotāka dynasty was then in possession, and the embassy in 713 A.D. seems to have been due to an application by the king Candrapadā for assistance against the Arabs, who now appear for the first time. Muhammad b. Kāsim after the conquest of Sindh had advanced to the foot of the Himalaya, but no further advance was made. The regular coinage of Kāshmir reproducing that of the later Kūṣhāna (with gradual degradation of designs) begins with the Kārkotākas and continues till the supersession of the Hindū by the Muslām kings in the xiv th century. The earlier kings of this race had possessions extending far beyond the limits of Kāshmir including Pākhtā, Pūru, Kāḍājarpuri, Taxila and the Salt Range.

The expression of the Kāshmir style of architecture, which is found almost unaltered in the ancient temples of the Salt Range, may probably be referred to this period. Hinduism and Buddhism flourished side by side in Kāshmir, as we learn from Yuan Cháng, and even as late as the xii th century when Kāla-pā wrote; and the style of architecture used for the Hindū temples was probably identical with that of the Buddhist vihāras. Foucher ('L'Art Greco-Bouddhique, p. 136–145) has proved its derivation from the Gāndhāra architecture of the i st and ii nd centuries. The double pyramidal roof, its distinguishing feature, has been perpetuated in Muslām mosques up to the present day. The mosque of Shāh Hamādān in Srinagar shows this feature.

It is also in his account of this period that references to the Śāhīs of Gāndhāra begin to appear in Kāla-pā's chronicle, and (as was the case with China) the growth of Islam appears to be the cause of the alliance between Gāndhāra and Kāshmir. In addition to the progress made in Sīnd attacks were being made on the Gāndhāra border towards Kābal, Al-faham tells us that as early as A.H. 23 'Āsim b. Amr reached Kan-dāhār (Gāndhāra) and the Indian frontier, and under al-Mansūr, 136–158 (754–775), according to al-Balādhurī, Hishām b. 'Amr al-Tabghībī, governor of Sind "conquered Kāshmir and Mūltān .... then he came in boats to al-Kāndāhār and conquered it", and al-Ya‘qūbī confirms this. The territories of Kāshmir which were conquered were no doubt outlying portions of the dominions between the Indus and Dīhlam, and not the valley. It was no more than a raid without permanent effect on Kāshmir, where the Hindū kings continued to rule undisturbed for some centuries. The most remarkable of these kings was Avanti-varman (A.D. 855–883), founder of Avanti-pur, where the ruins of his temples still exist. He also carried out extensive works to regulate the floods of the Dīhlam. The alliance with the Śāhīs is again met with in his time, and the names closer as time goes on. Copek (902–904) helped Tōrāmāna or Kamalukā, the Kamalūc of al-Biruni, to recover his capital from a rebel,
and Kshëma-gupta (950—958) married Diddå, grand-daughter on her mother’s side of Bhimä, successor of Kamaluka. Diddå exercised great influence in successive reigns, and ultimately became queen herself. She was a member of the ruling family of Lombardia in Pùnë, and through her influence, this dynasty became rulers of Kashmir. In 404 (1013) Måhmåd of Ghazni destroyed the Shãhí kingdom. The last king, Trilócán-pål, assisted by a Kashmir force, was defeated and put to flight, but Måhmåd’s attempt to penetrate into Kashmir itself was brought to a stop at the hill-fort of Låhara, the Lawhår of al-Birùnì which he describes as the strongest place he had ever seen. Even after the destruction of the Shãhí kingdom princes of that family continued to exercise influence in Kashmir. The Låhara dynasty reign throughout the Ghaznawi period. The half mad king Harhå (1089—1101), according to Kalhånpa, was under Målîmans influence, employed Turkish soldiers and destroyed Hindu and Buddhist images. The appointment of “Tarùshka” or Turkish troops is attributed partly to the incapacity of the Kashmiris. It is evident that the country was distracted at this period by frequent plots and rebellions caused by misgovernment, and it is probable that foreign troops were employed quite as much on this account as for the reason alleged. Kalhånpa’s chronicle comes to an end in 1149, and it is evident from the continuation by Dñorådåga that the condition of affairs became worse, and also that a gradual conversion of the people to Islam was in progress. An invasion from the north by Tåtàrs under Dùh ‘l-Kådår Chån (Zulål) took place in 706 (1303), and it is stated that after plundering Kashmir, this army perished in the snows while returning northwards. This perhaps made the way easier for the next Muslîm adventurer, Shãh-Mår Swåtī (probably an Afgån), who seized the crown and brought in Muhammadan rule under the title of Shams al-A’alam in 735 (1334). The change seems to have been accepted by the bulk of the nation, and the Hindu, mainly Brahmins, who retained their religion were treated with toleration, still continuing to hold official posts. In the reign of Sikandar Shãh, 788—813 (1356—1410), a change took place, and this fanatic ruler commenced a violent persecution and reduced the ancient temples to the ruined state in which they still remain. His nickname Butåshân (Iconoclast) commemorates these deeds. Zåin al-Abidin, who reigned 820—872 (1447—1467) reverted to the policy of toleration, and was an excellent ruler in every respect. His reign is looked back upon by Kashmiris of every class as a golden age in which justice was prevailed. He constructed roads, canals, and bridges and in every way promoted the prosperity of the country. Under his successors misrule again prevailed. The Shãhí Çaks who, according to Lawrence, probably came from Dardisånt, obtained great power, and ultimately displaced the later kings of the legitimate line. Ghâzåt Chån Çak was king in all but name, and Husain Shãh, Muhammad ‘Ali, and Yùsuf, as shown by their coins, took the title of Badshåh in rivalry of the Mughal emperors, and not of Bahlùn used by the former kings.

After Bâbur’s conquest of northern India the emperors turned their eyes on Kashmir, which offered great attractions to a race accustomsed to a cool climate, running streams, and gardens. Bâbur himself sent a small expedition into the country which met with no success. In 947 (1540), the year in which Humayûn was driven from power by Shâh’s rising, his cousin, Håidar Shãh Dåghåli, a member of the ruling family at Kasåhír [see Kasåhír], a man of great ability and fame, and a historian [see Håidar Mirzå], persuaded Humayûn to attempt the conquest of Kashmir, and thus to obtain a safe refuge from his opponents. Humayûn, however, found himself unable to carry out the project, but Håidar Mirzå went on with the expedition, and receiving much local support established himself as ruler in Humayûn’s name. He maintained himself till 955 (1551) when he was killed in an outbreak. This was probably organized by the Sûrî kings as a coin of Isâm Shãh struck in Kashmir in 957 is known. The Çaks continued to rule until Akhår invaded the valley. In spite of the determined opposition of Yâkîb Chån, son of Yûsuf Shãh, all resistance was overcome in 995 (1586) when Kashmir became part of the Mughal empire. It became one of the favourite resorts of the emperors.

Akkår’s first personal visit was in 997 (1589) by the Pir Pandål Pass, the next in 1000-1001 (1572) when he was accompanied by Nigåm al-Dån, author of the Tåbahât-i Akhår. On his third visit he had a land-settlement carried out by his financial, Todar Mal, and fortified the hill at Srinagar on which now stands the fort of Hari Parbat. A full description of Kashmir under Akhår is given by Abû l-Fadl in the Pâr-i Akhår. Dñåhångir as a prince accompanied his father to Kashmir, and induced his fondness for the country by the fine all the time after he became emperor. He erected numerous summer palaces and laid out gardens, of which the Nighåt Bågh on the shores of the Dal, Achabal where the springs of one branch of the Dçhelam gush from the rocks, and Vëräng are the best known. To please his consort, Nûr Dçhåån, he is said to have introduced the chimår or plane-tree from Persia, her native country, and the fine groves and avenues of this tree are still one of the beauties of Kashmir.

His successor Shãh Dçhåån also laid out many gardens, and under his reign ‘Ali Mårådån Chån built serais along the Pir Pandål Road. His son, Dàrâ Shîkhå (q. v.), built the Pâr-i-Mahâli or Fairy Palace of which the ruins still stand on the mountain side above the Dal. Here as elsewhere the intolerant policy of Awrangzåb brought in trouble. He only visited the valley once, and some mosques erected by him still exist. The outward splendour of the empire was still undiminished, and the condition of Kashmir is vividly described by Bernier who accompanied the emperor on his visit.

Under the later emperors the administration became very bad. Nådîr Shãh’s invasion, although he did not touch the valley, brought in anarchy. Its rûbahår became practically independent. About 1752 Ahmad Shãh Darråni (q. v.) took possession and in 1756 he appointed Bùlånd Chån Sàdåzå to be rhûbahår of Kasåhír, Coinage however continued in the name of the emperor ‘Alâmgar II till 1774 (1760) and Ahmad Shãh’s first Kashmir coinage is dated 1759. (The coin of 1762 mentioned by Rodgers is shown by Whitehead to belong to the Mughal Emperor Ahmad Shãh and not to Ahmad Shãh Darråni).
The condition of Kashmir under the Durrâns was thoroughly bad. They were barbarous and uncivilized rulers, and their governors looked on Kashmir simply as a field for plunder and extortion. The internal wars between claimants to the throne, especially between Mâhmûd Shâh and Shudûtâ al-Mulk, are faithfully reflected in the coins. From the time 1227 (1814) when Fâtykhân Bârakzâi obtained possession of Kashmir by the help of Randjit Singh, the Sikh ruler of the Panjâb, the nominal rulers were Mâhmûd Shâh and afterwards Aylûb Shâh, but the real power was in the hands of the Bârakzâi chiefs, especially Muhammad A'zâm Shâh, by whom the coins in the name of Muhammad (1227—32) were probably struck. In 1223—1225 the anarchy prevailing is shown by the issue of coins in the name of the popular local saint, Nûr al-Din, instead of any nominal king. This state of affairs was brought to a close by the invasion of Randjit Singh in 1234 (1819), who annexed Kashmir to the Sikh kingdom. The Sikh rule also was harsh and oppressive but firmer and better than that of the Durrâns. Hari Singh was a governor noted for his severity, and Miïân Singh was the most just and efficient. Moorcroft, the traveller, visited Kashmir during this period and gives an unfavourable account of the condition of the people under Singh rule.

Under Randjit Singh a Dôrgr family of Djamûm consisting of three brothers, Dhiyân Singh, Gûláb Singh, and Saçût Singh, had risen into notice. They were not Sikhs but orthodox Hindus. The Dôgras are a Râjpút race of the outer hills, but not of the Kashmir Valley. Dhiyân Singh, became one of the chief officials of the Sikh state, while Gûláb Singh was invested with the Djamûm Râjâ, which had been confiscated by Randjit Singh about 1220. In Randjit Singh's name he annexed one hill-state after another, increasing thereby his own power, and his influence in Kashmir itself.

In this way he added Kishâwar and Ladakh to the Sikh dominions. After Randjit Singh's death in 1239 and the dissections which followed it, Dhiyân Singh's position was for a time a very powerful one, and through his help Gûláb Singh was able to consolidate his power in the mountain country. After the murder of Dhiyân Singh with Mahârájâ Shîr Singh, by the Sîndânâwallâs (1243), Gûláb Singh after a time withdrew to his mountain possessions, but previous to this he had been sent into Kashmir to put down a mutiny in which Miïân Singh, the governor, had been killed (1242). This he did successfully, but the country had again fallen into anarchy, and the rebellious Bombâ tribe defied the Sikh army. In 1245, when the Khâlsâ army plunged into war with the British government, Gûláb Singh took no part in it, and after the war he acted as representative of the young Mahârájâ Dalip Singh in the negotiations which followed. Ultimately, on the advice of Major H. Lawrence (Sir Henry Lawrence), Kashmir and the adjoining territories between the Indus and the Râvi were separated from the Panjâb and formed into a separate state of which Gûláb Singh became Mahârájâ on payment of a subsidy and recognition of British suzerainty. The treaty in which these terms were embodied was signed in 1846. From this date begins the modern state of Djamûm and Kashmir.

Gûláb Singh did not obtain peaceful possession of his new dominions. The governor Imâm al-Din allied himself with the turbulent Bombâs. Gûláb Singh's troops were defeated, and he was able to assert his authority only after a British force had entered Djamûm. The Bombâs continued to resist for several years. Ultimately all the rebellious tribes submitted. These movements had not had any hold on the agricultural population whose only desire is to live quietly and escape excessive taxation from officials. Gûláb Singh's rule was on the whole firm and just, and the condition of the country gradually improved. He died in 1257 and was succeeded by his third son Randjit Singh, a good and well meaning ruler, but lacking the strong character of Gûláb Singh. The famine of 1277—79 caused great misery in the country and the earthquake of 1285 enormous losses. Randjit Singh was succeeded in 1285 by his eldest son, the present Mahârájâ Pârtâb Singh, who is a pious and conservative ruler. In 1293 the famine and earthquake were followed by one of the most disastrous floods in record. In spite of these catastrophes the preservation of peace and an orderly administration has caused an enormous increase in prosperity. One of the principal contributory causes has been the establishment of a regular system of land revenue administration under the settlement made by Mr. Wingate and Mr. W. Lawrence in 1287-92, adhered to and modelled on the settlement in British India. These have been since improved and developed by Mr. W. S. Talbot, settlement commissioner. The development of communications by the construction of a good road through the Djamûla Valley to Bâramulla and more recently the cart road from Bâramulla to the capital has been a great benefit to the country.

Kashmir is divided for administrative purposes into the districts of South Kashmir, North Kashmir and Muåffarábd. The first two comprise the valley with the smaller river valleys and mountain slopes immediately adjoining it. The third consists of the narrow valley of the Djamûla below Bâramulla and that of the Kishân-gângâ which joins it at Muåffarábd. This tract has from time immemorial been treated as part of Kashmir. North Kashmir was formerly known by the name of Kamrájâ, and South Kashmir as Mañjâd. The Kashmiri language extends down the Djamûla some distance below Bâramulla, but not to Muåffarábd or the Kishân-gângâ valley where the dialect spoken is a form of Lahândâ or Western Pandjâb.

The population was 1,295,201 in 1911. It consists of about 94 per cent of Musalmans and 6 per cent of Hindus, including a small number of Sikhs. The Hindus are mainly Brahmans, commonly called Paujîtis, whatever their occupation may be. The aboriginal agricultural population has become Musalmân, there has been little or no admixture of foreign races, and the original castes survive among them, but intermarriage between them is permitted, and family names (kînîm), often nicknames in their origin, have to a considerable extent superseded caste-names.

There is a great deal of artistic talent, and a natural gift for craftsmanship among the Kashmîris. The old-established industry of shawl-weaving for which Kashmir was once famous, has died down to very small dimensions, plain pashmina woven from the pashm or wool of the Tibetan goat has to some extent taken the place of
the shawls of the same material. Other industries have however sprung up; carpets, unbordered felts and tablecloths are made in considerable quantities, while the products of the wood carving, lacquered and painted wood and papier-maché, silverwork, and copperwork all find a good market in Kashmir and among tourists.

A considerable class, the Hāndjīs or boatmen, live entirely on boats on the rivers and lakes, and form a very distinct element in the population.

Kashmir has always had an attraction for visitors, and the improvement of communications has increased the number of visitors. It has become one of the principal summer resorts for European residents in India as well as for tourists from all parts of the world, who travel about the country in camps or house boats on the rivers or settle in the upland valley of Gulmarg, 8000 ft. above sea-level. Game large and small in the mountain valleys formerly attracted many sportsmen, but it is no longer abundant, and seekers after trophies now seldom visit Kashmir.

The language of Kashmir, as Kashmiri or Kāshār is a Prakrit tongue differing much from the dialects of the Panjāb, and showing so much affinity in some respects with the Shīrām language of Dardistan that it is classed by Grierson with the Pāvā group of languages.

The principal travels in Kashmir which may be consulted in addition to the earlier authorities prior to the 17th century which have been mentioned above are those of Francisco Xavier (who accompanied Akbar to Kashmir), François Bernier (who accompanied Awrangzēb in 1664), George Forster in 1783 (during the reign of Timūr Shāh, Durban), William Moorcroft and George Trebeck (through Ladākh and thence into Kashmir in Randjīt Singh's time 1819–25), Victor Jacque- 

ment (1831), Von Hugel (1835), and Vigne (1835).

For more modern times the best general descriptions are those of Drew and Lawrence and for ancient history the works of Stein.

(2). A name frequently given to Srinagar, the capital of the country of Kashmir. It was the name applied to the mint-town under the Muhammadan Sultan, the Mughal emperors, the Durrānī Shāh’s, and even as late as 1835 von Hugel speaks of the City of Kashmir. The ancient name of Srinagar which, according to Kal- 

aha, was given by Asoka, has been revived by the Hindu rulers in modern times and is now in general use.

(3). The extensive dominions of the Mahārājās of Djamātm and Kashmir are now frequently included under the name Kashmir in atlases and official publications such as the Censuses of India. These include vast tracts not only in the outer hills, southwest of the Pir Panjāl Mts., including Djamāt and Rādājwāri, but in the inner Himalayas comprising the conquests made in the name of Randjīt Singh and those made by the Mahārājās of Kashmir in more recent times. This region extends 32° to 37° 30’ N. Lat. and from 73° to 86° E. Long. and has an area of 84,432 sq.miles and a population of 3,158,426 in 1911. Of this population however 2,885,061 is comprised within the narrow limits of Kashmir and Djamāt, while the outer enormous area, the greater part of which consists of mountains, contains only 265,960. The countries of Ladākh, Skādā (Baltsān [q. v.]), Cilās, Gilgit [q. v.], Hunza-Nagar [q. v.], and Yāsin are comprised in this region and will be found described under their own names, the connection with Kashmir being purely modern.
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**Language:** Grierson, Kāṣrī Grammar
KAȘIDA, not infrequently also Kaşid, is the name given to a form of Arabic (also Persian, Turkish etc.) poem of some length. The name is derived from the Arabic root kašada with the meaning "a aim", because in the earlier times it contained the praise of the poet's tribe and attacks upon its adversaries, later the praise of a person or family by a poet who expects and openly asks for presents for his eulogies. From the earliest times the elegance (mađhīya) does not appear to be included under the same designation, but poems of insult (hidījī) are frequently by older poets called a kaşida, though the latter probably had frequently not the characteristics which come into the scheme of a proper kaşida. We can form the best opinion by taking as the basis for investigation the poems of the authors who lived in the first century of the Hijra, instead of beginning with the poems preserved from the time of Paganism, though the latter formed the model of the former. A perfect kaşida should contain three essential parts.

First the nasīl or erotic introduction in which the poet describes his visit to the erstwhile abode of his lady and his yearnings at finding the place forsaken. Secondly follows a description of his ride to the persons whom he intends to praise. This gives him ample scope for describing the terrors of the desert and the comparison of his camel with various animals of the deserts. At last comes the chief portion of the poem containing praise, or abuse of the person or tribe aimed at. Some poets, when so inclined, finish up with some moral reflection.

An Arabic (or Persian etc.) kaşida is a very artificial composition; the same rhyme has to run through the whole of the verses, however long the poem may be. In addition the composition is bound by a metre which the poet has to guard most scrupulously through the whole course of the poem. The result is that we cannot expect very much beautiful poetry; the description of the desert and its animals and terrors may have a certain charm at first, but when the same descriptions recur in endless poems expressed in the same manner, only with different words, the monotony becomes nauseous. The difficulty was keenly realised by the poets themselves and accounts for the fragmentary character of most poems, which required much time in their composition. The poem Dhu 'l-Kummata stated that for a long time he could get no further than the first verse of his now celebrated poem (November 1 of his Divān) and that it was only when he visited Isfahān that the remaining verses (128 in the edition) came to him with ease (Asā'ī al-Balāgha, s. v. r-3). The poet Dījarī, though stung to his soul by the attacks of Djalīl, the son of al-Raŷī, composed at first only about 80 lines of his reply, though rhyme and metre are the easiest possible in the Arabic language, and completed the remainder at a later time (Nasīrī, ed. Bevan, p. 430). We can likewise be sure that al-Tirmīdhī composed only a portion of his renowned poem against the tribe Tānim and al-Farázak that and the additional verses sometimes included in the poem are by the poet himself and not interpolations by others. When a poet had composed a kaşida he would recite it whenever an occasion offered and it is quite natural that he should add or cancel verses himself, especially if he reply to his poem opened fresh avenues of attack. Poets certainly never rose to composition of a poem containing all the essential portions of a kaşida, and it is foolishness to assume in each case that part of a poem has been lost if only a certain part is recorded. Such a poem was sent into the world before the poet had time to complete it and it is equally certain that lampoons in particular did not lend themselves easily to the complete scheme. Very early poets also composed poems which, though called kaşida, did not contain the essential portion, the praise or insult. As such we must take e.g. the poems of 'Umar b. Abī Rabī'a and some poems of al-Tirmīdhī. Some of the latter's compositions were made to display the art of description and were never intended to be kaşid in the proper sense of the word. The Arabic kaşida was naturally imitated by poets who wrote in other languages and the Persian poets Anwārī and Khákānī are celebrated as masters of this style. The form of the kaşida has survived to modern times and I have specimens by poets still living where we find the absurdity of a description of a desert-ride by persons who live in Cairo and travel by railway and steamer. The kaşida by its references to persons and events is also a source of historical information. This, however, must be handled with the utmost care, as false statements, by design or through ignorance, are frequent and the mention of a battle-day does not necessarily imply that the poet was present. As an example I mention only that the Asādi poets 'Abid and Bishir b. Abī Khāzīm, probably a century distant from one another, both boast that their tribe was victorious at al-Nisār and al-Dīfarī.

KASIM, the name given by the Ottoman Turks to St. Demetrius whose festival falls on October 26 of the Julian calendar. It was formerly the beginning of the winter semester, during which the fleet took up its winter-quarters at the Golden Horn.

Bibliography: Meninski, Lexicon, Vienna 1730, ii. 941; Bianchi and Kieffer, Dictionnaire turc-français, 2, 1871, 418; Redhouse, A Turkish and English Lexicon, Constantinople 1890, p. 1415; Barbier de Meynard, Dicționar, turc-français, Paris 1886, ii. 458; Dirâk Kelâkian, Dicționar turc-français, Constantinople 1911, p. 928; Zenker, Dictionnaire turc, 1866, p. 684. (Cf. Huarr)

AL-KASIM b. ḤĀSHIM b. ḤĀSHIM, usually called Abu Dula, a Muslim general. When in 125 (511) the Caliph al-Amīn sent an army under 'Abi b. Ḥāshim b. Ḥāshim against al-Maʾmūn's general Tāhir b. al-Husayn, Abu Dula went with him. When Ibn Māhān had fallen, Abu Dula came back to the neighbourhood of Hamadhān and, although he declined to pay homage to al-Maʾmūn, Tāhir left him in peace in al-Karadaj. In 214 (829/30), when al-Maʾmūn came to Rayy, he sent for him. His friends advised him not to go, but he went and the Caliph rewarded him with the greatest goodwill. In al-Muʿtāsim's reign Abu Dula was appointed by al-Ashāfīn [s. v.] who was jealous of his bravery and eloquence. Al-Ashāfīn accused him of murder
and treason and on the evidence of false witnesses he was condemned to death but reprieved at the last minute by the intervention of the chief kaši Ahmad b. Abi Dūdād (q. v.). As soon as the latter heard of the danger threatening Abū Dūlaf he hurried to al-Ashīn and told the Caliph that he had ordered him to spare Abū Dūlaf. When the latter had been released, Ahmad went to the Caliph and told him that he made up the story to save the life of the innocent accused, whereupon al-Mu'tasim forgave him and pardoned Abū Dūlaf. The latter died in 225 (839/840) or 226 (840/841) in Baghdad. He left several works. He was also famed as an exceedingly ardent devotee of the Caliph 'Ali. On his descendants see the article DULAFIDS.


AL-ḴĀSIM, a district in Central Arabia, on the high plateau of the Arabian desert. It owes its fertility to the Wāḍī Kūmān, which runs to the northeast and whose course is barred by a series of parallel sand-dunes and hills from 1600—2000 feet high, which run from north-west to south-east. The water, richly provided by the spring and summer rains, sinks into the valleys and even in dry periods is preserved for years at a little depth under the red or yellow sandy soil and this supplies the essential requisite for a rich vegetation. The plateau is therefore covered in spring and summer with a rich crop of grass and affords excellent pasture for the great herds of camels and cattle and the numerous smaller animals. The sand-hills are covered with tamarisks (atššī, tānuvari nilotica Ehrbg.) and varieties of acacia indigenous to Arabia (ḫarāṣ, acacia Arabica W., ḥafād, acacia Senegal W.). Millet, maize, wheat, vetches, etc. grow in the fields. Fruit-trees of all kinds yield plentiful crops. So early a writer as Yākūt makes special mention of the figs, peaches, grapes and pomegranates. The most important and most cultivated fruit-tree is, as elsewhere, the date-palm, which is represented in al-Ḵāsim by a particularly fine variety.

Among plants of economic importance may be mentioned the cotton-tree, which supplies local requirements. In the western part of al-Ḵāsim rock-salt is found. This mineral, so important for the cattle-breeders, is sold in the towns, especially in Boreida and 'Aneiza.

Al-Ḵāsim plays an important part in the caravan traffic of Arabia on account of its wealth in camels and its enterprising population. Of the population, estimated by Palgrave at 25—30,000 souls, at least a third devote themselves to caravan traffic either hiring out animals or acting as attendants or as small merchants. The caravan business takes them through the Wāḍī Dawasir and Wāḍī Nadẖrān to the Yemen, from which the best coffee is exported to Kuwait, al-Brāṣa, Baghdad and Djebel Shammar, to Mokka and Syria via Khābar. It is in the nature of things that many natives of al-Ḵāsim settle in the frontier districts or in one of the towns just mentioned and many have attained prosperity and wealth. Al-Ḵāsim also plays an important part in the trade in race-horses. Al-Djarād, also called Djarād al-Ḵāsim, in olden times the chief town of al-Ḵāsim, a day's march from 'Aneiza on the road to al-Baṣra, has been identified by A. Sprenger with the Tābaḵ of Ptolemy. The ancient settlements of this area which al-Hamdānī includes in al-Yamāma are all in ruins; the modern larger towns date from the late middle ages.

The district which lies in the centre of Arabia has had a lively history. One of the battle-days* of the Arabs is called after it. Zuhair, Akhthāl, 'Aws b. Ḥadjar and other poets know and mention al-Ḵāsim. The young faith of Islam found al-Ḵāsim at first on the side of the anti-prophet Musallīma, but in the decisive encounter between the Muslims and the followers of the Prophet of al-Yamāma we find al-Ḵāsim on the side of Khālid, the "Sword of Allāh"; in the struggle for the Caliphate, Nadẖjād and al-Ḳāsim were on the side of 'Ali but the victory of the Umayyads brought the whole of Central Arabia under their sway and there was no change with the 'Abbasids. It was not until the revolutionary movement led by the Karakūmīs that Nadẖjād was lost to the 'Abbasids. In the eleventh century, Dārīm, a native of al-Rass in al-Ḳāsim, was able to conquer a large part of Nadẖjād and Yemen and unite it with al-Ḳāsim. His kingdom was inherited by his sons and successors but the increasing power of the chiefs of al-Yamāma and 'Ārid conquered Dārīm's kingdom bit by bit, till finally it was again reduced to al-Ḳāsim. Al-Ḳāsim was from the first somewhat hostile to the Wahhābī movement; but Abī al-'Azīz b. Sa'ūd of al-Darīya succeeded in gaining possession of Boreida, al-Rass and Tinnūn. The other villages then rose and in 1772 slew all the Wahhābīs they could capture. In 1780 a new rising broke out against Ibn Sa'ūd, which Sa'ūd, who was only able to put down after much fighting with varied fortunes. Ibn Sa'ūd's kingdom soon found itself faced with an extremely dangerous opponent: Meḥmed 'Ali of Egypt had been commissioned by the Sublime Porte to take measures against the Wahhābīs and sent his son Tūṣān to Arabia, where in a rapid succession of victories he conquered the whole of the west coast (1811—1813).

After the death of Ibn Sa'ūd (1814) the Egyptians extended their intrigues against Ibn Sa'ūd's kingdom to the interior of Arabia, and in 1815 Tūṣān marched into Central Arabia and captured the fortress of al-Rass in al-Ḳāsim after gaining over the greater part of the country by bribery. The peace concluded between Tūṣān and Abī Allāh b. Sa'ūd was, however, not confirmed by Meḥmed 'Ali, who ordered Ibrahim to conquer Arabia; in 1817 he took al-Rass, Boreida and 'Aneiza and thus became master of al-Ḳāsim. Abī Allāh b. Sa'ūd had to retire to Darīya, was taken prisoner and in 1818 beheaded in Constantiople. Al-Ḳāsim was now under Egyptian suzerainty and formed a strong base for Meḥmed 'Ali. But by 1822 the Arabs of Central Arabia had begun their war of liberation from the Egyptian occupation which ended in 1841 in the Egyptian-Turkish troops being driven out. Al-Ḳāsim was now for a time under the protection of the Grand Sharīf of Mokka; in 1855 Ṣāmīl Al Šalim, who resided at 'Aneiza, was recognised by Ibn Sa'ūd as independent ruler of al-Ḳāsim, but in 1861 the district was again paying tribute to Ibn Sa'ūd. After six years al-Ḳāsim was again able to attain its independence and in 1879 Ibn Sa'ūd surrendered his claim to suzerainty over al-Ḳāsim in favour of Ibn Rāshīd.
lord of Hā’il. A rising against Muhammad b. Rashīd in 891 ended in disaster and Zāmāl Al Salim lost his life in battle. The Turks then took advantage of the fierce feud between Ibn Sa‘ūd and Ibn Rashīd to gain a firm footing in al-Kašīm again, all the more easily as the people of al-Kašīm were weary of the long struggle and anxious for peace, and even Ibn Rashīd would rather have the Turks in al-Kašīm than the governors of his enemy Ibn Sa‘ūd. Āḥmad Fa‘īl Pāsha therefore invaded Central Arabia in 1905 and occupied al-Kašīm also. Soon the Turks became the masters of the region, uncontenable, especially as Ibn Rashīd now sided against them; the Turkish troops had to evacuate al-Kašīm and Āḥmad Fa‘īl Pāsha’s successor, Sāmī Pāsha, was no more able to restore Turkish authority. In 1906 al-Kašīm belonged to Ibn Sa‘ūd; in 1911/12 there were again attacks on Ibn Sa‘ūd, especially by the Grand Sharīf of Mecca, but since 1913 al-Kašīm has formed a province in the wide kingdom of Ibn Sa‘ūd.


KĀSIM AGHA, called Қaғa (the old), an Ottoman court architect. He was appointed court architect in 1532 (begun Nov. 5, 1622) in succession to the distinguished architect Mehmed Agha, who built the Ahmedi mosque in Stambul (on him cf. the Rāhālī mīrāmūn in MS. of Dījar Agha), received of his duties in 1535 (began March 22, 1624; cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., v. 335) and his office given to Musa‘īd Agha, known as Merammetçi, lit. “mender”. But after a few months only he was restored to the office as the result of a low estimate (cf. Nā‘mā, Ta‘rīikh, ii. 46; J. von Hammer, op. cit., v. 335 sp.). His many intervention on behalf of Kopruđ Mehmed Pasha, afterwards Grand Vizier, cost him his office and dignities very soon after the Sultan’s mother Mah-Feiker (Kosem Valide, q.v.) had appointed him to manage her affairs (Pūya) in October, 1651, on account of his honesty. He was imprisoned in the Seven Towers and soon afterwards banished to Cyprus (Nā‘mā, op. cit., ii. 335 sp.). He was later released and after being unsuccessful several times finally succeeded in the summer of 1655 (Nā‘mā, op. cit., v. 551) in getting for Mehmed Pasha the Grand Vizierate. He died, apparently at a great age, in 1670 (begun Nov. 18, 1660). None of his buildings seem to have been of great importance. His work did not apparently extend to public buildings. It is only known that he was engaged in 1651 in building the Yeni Valide қaғa but hardly as the chief architect. The part which he played as a politician in Ottoman history is more important and the historian of the empire, Na‘mā, in particular, deals very fully with it.

Bibliography: Nā‘mā, Tūrkkī, Stambul 1147, ii. passim; Sūdžūlī Əmīrānā, iv. 49 (following Na‘mā); J. v. Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, v. 335, 338 sqq., 566, 576, 636, 655; F. Babiner, Quellen zur osmanischen Künstlergeschichte im Jahrhundert des Ataturks, Leipsig 1924, p. 37. (F. Babiner)

KĀSIM-I ANWĀR, a Persian poet, man of letters, born in 757 (1356) in Sārāb Tabriz. For Sārāb (in Vākšī Sārāb) Dawlatshāh, Todiqār, p. 346, gives Surkhāb; this name is not found in Yāqūt, but Dawlatshāh has three times the phrase Surkhābī Tabrīz; the name is once found in a play on words (in a rubā‘ of Kamāl-ḵudāndī in Dawlatshāh, op. cit., p. 326). According to the Persian lexicographers, Surkhāb is a hill near Tabrīz (Vullers, Lexicon Pers.-Latinum, s. v., No. 7). Kāsim’s family came from Ardābīl. His religious teachers were ‘Ṣād al-Dīn-i Ardabīlī (an ancestor of the Sa’ㄨawīs) and ‘Ṣād al-Dīn Aḥī Yāmānī, who was a pupil of ‘Abūl-Haq al-Dīn-i Kirmānī. As ‘Qāmī (Nafṣāt al-‘Uṣnā, p. 690) tells us, mention was made of Yāmānī but not of Ardabīl in a work on Kāsim’s Šundū, which came from the circle of his intimates. This circumstance might suggest that Kāsim did not think so highly of Ardabīl’s instruction. The facts given in Browne, Hist. of Pers. Lit. under Tabrīz Dominion, p. 473, contradict this, however. Among Kāsim’s own murāds there must have been several free-thinkers, as ‘Qāmī, op. cit., p. 690, mentions that the teacher himself was, however, free from this imputation. The truth is that he — although it cannot absolutely be proved that he was a Ḥūfī — strongly sympathised with this sect (Browne, op. cit., p. 479). He travelled a great deal; first of all lived in Gīlān; Gīlān expressions are several times found in his poetry. From Gīlān he migrated to Khurāsān where he lived first in Nishābūr and later in Herāt. He was expelled from the latter town when the king, Shāh-Ruḵh, was murdered by a Ḥūfī in 830 (1426/27). It was assumed that Kāsim was connected with the murderer, had harboured him and knew of the attempt beforehand. A singular story is given by Dawlatshāh, op. cit., p. 346 sp., according to which he had already been expelled from Herāt once previous some individuals had complained to the king that the murād was gathering many young pupils around him, which aroused mis-givings among them on moral grounds. Shāh-Ruḵh, according to the story, then intervened and banished Kāsim. The latter then travelled to Balkh and Samarkand but returned later to Herāt. This story is not very probable but it is evidence at any rate of the great popularity of the teacher in Herāt. Whether the liebous reason given for his expulsion is true cannot be proved either, but it must be confessed that at that time there were great rascals among the Sūfis. It seems to be certain that Kāsim found a protector after his banishment in 830 in Ulagh Beg in Samar- kand. As we also find Samarkand mentioned in the story in Dawlatshāh, it may be suggested that the story in Dawlatshāh is an invention duplicating the story of his actual banishment.
Kāsim-I Anwār — Kāsim Pasha

Kāsim later returned to Khurāsān again and settled in Khardjīrīd in the district of Dānim. There through the support of well-do-to friends he was able to lead a life of freedom from care down to his death in 837 (1433/34). Dawlatshāh, op. cit., p. 348, makes him die in 835, deriving from the other authorities, is, however, a matter of what Rieu says (Catalogue, p. 676) on the date of Kāsim's death. See also Rosen, Les Manuscrits persans de l'Institut, p. 121, where a chronogram on his death is quoted from a St. Petersburg MS.

Kāsim was buried in Khardjīrīd; Dawlatshāh says that in his time 'Ali Shīr began to embellish the site of the tomb with buildings. The same authority tells us that Kāsim in his youth practised asceticism to such an extent that he injured his health. But after later years he altered his views — for example he said to someone who could not help expressing surprise at his prosperous appearance that he was no longer āsātī but mairātī; he had once been a beggar but now he was a king.

Works: The author, who, according to Dawlatshāh, op. cit., p. 303, derived the title of admirer of Ḥāfeẓ from the poetry of Ḥāfez, left a Dīnawār behind him containing ghazāls, ḵūšāns, ṭūbīs, elegies on mysteries and mathematics. Some pieces are composed in Gilânī and Turkish. His other works, Anis al-Ārifūn and Anis al-ʿĀšikīn (also called Rasūlī al-Amāmā) are treatises on mysticism in prose and verse. Finally we may mention his extracts from Šāhūn's Bustaŋ entitled Khudā-anī Bustaŋ.

These writings are unpublished; judging from the not very extensive specimens in Browne and the few pieces in Dawlatshāh (Ibnād’s Century where ten of Kāsim’s ghazāls are published I have not seen) we can agree with Browne when he says “the poetry of Qāsim ‘l-Anwar, so far as a foreigner may venture to judge it, is only of average merit”. One cannot deny his ability to write pleasing Persian verse but I ask to write in vain for anything out of the way which would give him a claim to a place among the great names of Persian literature. A just verdict on his literary activity, however, will only be possible when his works have been published.


Kāsim Pasha (or Kāsim Paşa), an Ottoman statesman.

The son of Christian parents (i.e. Ayas Pasha and Kāsim Pasha) sont tous venus de chrétiens, in C. D. Schepper, Tagebuch, in Missions diplomatiques de Corr. Dipl. de Schepper, dit Scottsers, de 1523 à 1555, par le Brn. de St. Genou (and G. A. Yssel de Schepper, in vol. xxx. of the Archives de l’Académie de Belgique, Brussels 1861, p. 169 infra), he was born in the reign of Hayazīd II and brought up in the Imperial Serāí (Evelīyā, i. 169). He attained the rank of a rībāh aghāsī (“stirrup-aghāsī”), accompanied Selim I on his campaign to Egypt, was appointed governor of Ḥamā on its capture in August, 1516 (sandjakbeyi) (cf. L. Forrer, Dit am, Chronik des Rustom Pascha, Leipzig 1923, p. 55; not in Halil Edhem, Tagebuch der agypt. Expedition des Sultans Selim I., aus Ferdinands Sammlung der Staatschriften, Weimar 1910, p. 15), and soon afterwards governor of Adana. A few years afterwards, he became Beylerbeyi of Anatolia and Rumelia, probably as early as the first year of Sultan Sulaymān, appointed second vizier in 1527 (began December 12, 1520) Kāsim Pasha held a command in the expedition against Rhodes (Chronik des Rustom Pascha, p. 62 at the top). When on Kadijāb 12, 929 (May 27, 1523) the Egyptian governor Muṣṭafā Pasha was dismissed, Kāsim succeeded him but lost the office with 34 days (on Sha’bān 16, 929 = June 30, 1523) (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. K., iii. 35). A few months later, when in Rabī‘ II (February, 1525) the traitor (ḵā’in) Āḥmed Pasha, his successor, was slain in a rising, he went to Cairo as governor for a second time but was again dismissed by March, 1525. Down to 935 (beginning September 15, 1528), when he once more became second vizier, he seems to have held a government (”Bażīr“). Occasionally he was called on to attend to some sources, but which could only have been a temporary appointment). In May, 1533, the Fleming C. D. Schepper, envoy of the Hungarian royal widow Maria, saw him in Stambul as vizier along with the Grand Vizier Ibrāhīm Pasha [q.v.] and Ayās Pasha (d. July 13, 1539): Cassim Basa a la face plus grande et rouge et n’est si grand que le dict Ayas (op. cit., p. 169). In 1537 he was governing the Morea and sandjakbeyi at Modon; in the summer of this year he attacked unsuccessfully the two last bulwarks of Venetian rule in the Morea, Nāpoli di România and Malvasia (cf. Zinkeisen, G. O. K., ii. 771, 785). He may have then fallen into disgrace and lived in exile. The date of his death is uncertain. In 939 (began December 29, 1551), however, he seems to have lived in the Morea in non-activity; cf. ‘Atīr, Dhoi on the Shakīk al-ʿAmal-ulūnyā, p. 23. In 944 (began June 10, 1537) he had a madrasa built for the poet Surūrī [q.v.] in the garden of the turbe of Mehmēd Yāziddī Oghlū [q.v.] which is now burnt down (cf. ‘Artī, op. cit., p. 27); he cannot have, therefore, died in 939 (1532). It is certain, however, that he was buried in Gallipoli.

Kāsim Pasha earned lasting fame from a series of pious foundations and by building a mosque, a madrasa and a bath in Stambul. To this day one of the most important quarters in Constantinople, the Byzantine “Suburb of the Spring” (krenides or pegal) is called after him Kāsim Pasha mehālesi (cf. J. v. Hammer, Constantinople and the Bosporus, Pest 1822, p. 55 sqq.; Evelīyā, Siyākatnāme, i. 169, 416 sqq.; The Travels of Evelīyā, transl. by J. v. Hammer, London 1834, i; Hāfīz Husain, Hadiḵat al-Dīwānāmī, ii. 2 sqq.; J. v. Hammer, Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches, ix. 106 sqq.). His daughter Neftise Khutan also endowed a school and is buried in it; cf. Hadiḵat al-Dīwānāmī, i. 48-53.

Bibliography: In addition to the works quoted above: Sīdīlī ʾatīmānī, iv. 46 sqq. (defective and inaccurate); Geoffroy, L'Estat de la Cour du grand Turc, Paris 1542, fol. 10v; Guil. Postel, La tierce Partie des orientales Histoires, Poitiers 1560, p. 61 sqq. (Casino Bassa du temps qu’il estoit Basa, avoit 20 mille ducats, il en peut avoir autant, de Sangrevale de Morea. Maintenant en son lieu est Meushafa Bassa).}

(Franz Babinger)
KASIMOV, in Russian originally gorod tse or gorodok meshechsky, in Tatar Khan Karmän, formerly the capital of the Tatar princes subordinate to the Czar of Moscow and now a district capital in the government of Ryazan. It took its name from Kasim, son of the founder of the kingdom of Kazan, Ulu Muhammad. In the wars between the brothers that followed the assassination of Ulu Muhammad (1446), Kasim was engaged in the service of the Russian Grand Duke. The town, which bears his name, was granted him about 1452 (not later than 1456); there he built a mosque (of which only the minaret still exists) and a palace of stone (no longer standing; it was seen as late as 1768 by Pallas). After his death about 1469, his son Daniyar reigned till about 1486. Kasimov was next under the rule of the prince Nur Dawlat of the Giray dynasty and his sons Satighan and Djanaï. About 1512 Shaïkh Awiylar (grandson of Khan Kučak Muhammad), descended from another branch of the descendants of Djoe, is mentioned as prince of Kasimov. In 1516 his son Shâh 'Ali (he is so called in his epitaph, but is usually known as Shaïkh 'Ali, Russian Shigaley Shigavliyovitch) was reigning (nominally). After a life of vicissitudes (he was repeatedly appointed Khan of Kazan by the Czar and then deprived of all his dignities and condemned to the severest imprisonment, then pardoned and again restored to his principality), Shâh 'Ali died childless, aged sixty-one, on Monday, Shawwal 10, 974 (April 21, 1567). The tâkya built by him in Ramadân, 962 (July-August, 1555), in which are his tomb and the tombs of several of his relatives, has been several times described, first by Pallas in the year 1768, most recently by Welyaminov Zernov in 1863. During his rule in Kazan, his brother Djân 'Ali represented him in Kasimov and later ruled for a short time (1532–35) in Kazan also until he was murdered during a rising there. The "Czar" Shâh 'Ali was succeeded in Kasimov by his distant relative Séyin Bulât, great-grandson of the Khan of the Golden Horde Ahmed. In 1573 he adopted Christianity, received the name of Simeon, moved to Moscow and was there given by Ivan the Terrible the title of "Czar of all the Russians". He died in 1616 as the monk Stephen. It was not till 1585 that a successor to him was appointed in Kasimov, Mustâfa 'Ali, whose father, Abd Allah b. Ak-Kubak, also a great-grandson of Khan Ahmed, died in 1570 and was buried in Kasimov. About 1600 we find mentioned as prince of Kasimov Uzay Muhammad of the family of Khans of the Kizir Kazak, who afterwards took part in the fighting during the civil war in Russia and was killed in 1610. The last rulers of Kasimov were Arslân (grandson of the last Siberian Khan Kučum) and his son Saiyyid Burhân, descended from the house of Siberian rulers; the latter, first mentioned as ruler in 1627, was baptised between 1653 and 1655 (he received the name Wâsîliy) and yet remained prince of Kasimov till his death soon after 1678. To this period belongs the forcible conversion of a part of the Tatars by Mesaiyl, Archbishop of Ryazan (1651–56); in one of these attempts at conversion the Archbishop was killed by the enraged populace. The verse from the Korân (iii. 52), constantly quoted in epitaphs in Kasimov, seems to have been placed there in antagonism to the zeal of the Christian missionaries.

Even under Wâsîliy the administration of Kasimov was in the hands of a Russian woyewoda; the Tatar prince exercised only nominal rule. The mother of Wâsîliy, Fâtma Sultan, was re-elected as ruler in the years following Wâsîliy's death on the first terms; she is last mentioned in 1681. After this there was no "Czar" or "Czarevitch" (sometimes one, sometimes the other title is used) of Kasimov any longer. In the modern district capital of Kasimov the Tatars only form a comparatively small part of the population, according to the census of 1897, 13,545 souls (according to Reclus, as many as 14,100 in 1870), including 1,539 Tatars, in 1909, 17,075, including 2,000 Tatars. The Bullgar industries (tanning and shoemaking; cf. above, i. 7858), introduced to the Russians through Tatar intermediaries, are especially followed in Kasimov.

Bibliography: The most thorough and still indispensable, although several new documents have since been made available, is Wilyamnov Zernov's great work "Istoïa Kasimovskij Zarey zi zarevčity" (4 vols., Trudi Vost. Okt. Imp. A. Arch. Obšč., ixxi–xxi), based as all that has been written about the princes of Kasimov in the west, especially Howorth, History of the Mongols, ii. 429 sqq. Cf. moreover recently N. Lîچelay, Simen Bekbudovitch, Trier 1891, review by D. K.obeiko in the Zap. Vost. Okt., viii. 335 sq.; N. Shishkin, Istorya giroda Kasimova, 1889; review by V. R.osen, ibid., v. 122 sq.

(K. BARTHOLOMEW)

KAŞIYUN, a bare and rocky massif — the summit is over 4,000 feet high — commanding in the north-east the Ghiţa [q. v.] and dominating Şâlihiya, the suburb of Damascus. It lies between the valley of the Barada [q. v.] and that of the Halbûn. The Nahî Yazid which flows out of the Barada runs along the foot of Kaşiyun. There they venerate the birthplace of Abraham on the slope adjoined the village of Barza. This mountain has been famous since remote antiquity as a place of ascension and retreat of prophets ("Ibn Džumâh, Adam is the name of the stars") and Cànik killed Abel there, whose body was buried on this "sacred and most venerated mountain" (Yşakat), which is covered with sanctuaries. The encyclopaedists and the historians of Damascus associate its history with several thousand of myths and prophet and his name received between the Bab al-Farâdis and the slopes of Kaşiyun.


(H. LAMMENES)

KASKAR, the name of a town in the 'Irâk. When al-Hadîjâdîd [q. v.], the governor of the 'Irâk appointed by the Caliph 'Abd al-Malk, had put down the rebellion there, he began in 850–856 (702–705) to build a new town which was called Wâsî ("centre") because it was midway between the two Arab capitals of this province, Kâfâ in the north and Bâsra in the south. For the site of the town he chose the vicinity of the town of Kaskar on the Tigris, which had played a not unimportant part in the Sâsâniân period. The new Muslim town was built on the east bank of the Tigris, while Kaskar lay opposite it on the west side; a bridge of boats linked the two halves of the city. Neither Wâsî nor Kaskar
exist at the present day and until quite recently their exact situation was uncertain. In looking for the site we must not think of the modern course of the Tigris in Central and Southern Babylonia; in the days of the Caliphs this river ran much farther to the west; its course in those days probably corresponded for a good part to that of the Shatt al-Haiy (cf. i. 6779, 9709). Kaskar-Wâsit certainly lay somewhere in the neighborhood of the modern Kut al-Haiy (cf. i. 6779, 9709).

According to the results of an archaeological journey by Count Aymar de Liedekerke-Beaufort (see Babylonica, vii., Paris 1922, p. 115) the now insignificant ruins of Wâsit lie almost 25 miles west of Haiy on the dry Tigris bed of Shatt al-Khâdir. On the other hand the map of Mesopotamia (Sheet Baghûdâ, 5 d) published by the General Staff in Berlin 1917, puts Wâsit about 15 miles N. E., as the capital of the seventh district of Kut al-Haiy. On the modern ruins of Wâsit see also the notes by Mas'ûd signon based on information given by a native of the district in his al-Hailâj, Martyr mystique de l'Islâm, Paris 1922, p. 23. For further information on the site see the article.

As to Kaskar, it probably dates back into the Assyrian period. It may be recalled that we seem to have a Babylonian town Ka-as-ka-ri mentioned in a fragment of an inscription probably of the time of Assur-bani-pal, in the British Museum (i. 1882: 3—23: 128; see Beold, Catalogue, p. 1824); cf. Streck, Assurbanipal, Leipzig 1916, p. Lxxviii.

The place is perhaps also mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud (Yoma, fol. 104, where Baghûdâ has probably been corrected into Kashkar); see Marquart, Erânakhr, Abh. G. W. Göt. d. New Series, iii., No. 2, Berlin 1901, p. 164. In any case Kaskar was known in Syriac and Christian Arabic sources, is one of the oldest Christian towns in Babylonia. It frequently appears in the ecclesiastical history of this region. The episcopal diocese of this name was considered second in importance within the Nestorian church. Its occupant was the right arm of the patriarch of Seleucia — Ktesiphon (see MADDIN) and his representative when the office was vacant.

Among the signatories to the acts of the Syriac councils we find bishops of Kashkar from the period 410—750 (Gilli in Z. D. M. G., xliii. 411 and Chabot in the A. E., xxxvii, Paris 1905, p. 675). According to the Syriac "chronicle of Arbelâ" there was a bishop of Kashkar as early as the first half of the third century A.D. The Christian Arabic "Chronicle of Secert" also mentions an occupant of the episcopal see there of the period before 410 A.D. On the bishopric of Kashkar and a list of its occupants see J. Labouret, Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la Dynastie Sassanide, Paris 1904, passim (s. the Index s. v.); Sachau, Die Chronik von Arbeba (= Abh. Pr. Ak. Wiss., 1915, No. 6), p. 21; Sachau, Zur Ausstellung der Christentums in Asien (= Abh. Pr. Ak. Wiss., 1919, No. 1), p. 30—31.

The town of Kashkar, like the bishopric which bore this name, was the home of many founders of monasteries, as may be seen from the work compiled in the eighth century by Jeshi'dî, entitled K'tâba hâlî makhshî (ed. Chabot in Mélang. d'archê, et d'histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome), xvi., Paris 1896, p. 225 sq.; the Great Abraham (d. 588) was especially famous, s. Jeshî'dî'shî No. 14; Labouret, op. cit., p. 315;
the denominators 3 to 10, i.e. \( \text{thith} \left( \frac{1}{10} \right), \text{rafi} \left( \frac{1}{9} \right), \text{khuwu} \left( \frac{1}{8} \right), \text{sud} \left( \frac{1}{7} \right) \) etc. In other cases, e.g. instead of \( \frac{1}{11} \), one writes "five out of eleven parts". If the denominators can be broken up into factors, the following formula is used: \( \frac{\text{sixth}}{10} = \text{one sixth} \) of one eighth. The fraction \( \frac{1}{4} \) is expressed by \( \text{nis} \) (half).}

**Bibliography:** J. Rusa, *Zur ältesten arabischen Algebrā*, Heidelberg 1917, p. 20 and 54, (C. Schoy)

**KAŠR,** a palace, castle, mansion or pavilion, in which sense it is synonymous with the Turkish kāşk. The word occurs in the Kurān three times, once in the singular and twice in the plural (kāšār), and is applied twice to castles on earth and once to the abodes of the faithful in Paradise. It is the common word for the palace of a king in his capital or of a governor in the chief city of a province, e.g. Kāšr-i Kāshār, the Palace of the Kāšārs, near Tbrān. The word, with the article, has been naturalised in Spanish as alcázars and is applied to old Moorish castles, such as the alcázars of Segovia and the alcázars of Seville.

**Bibliography:** E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, s.v.; Stanley Lane-Poole, *The Moors in Spain*, London 1872, (T. W. Haig)

**KAŠR FĪRA’WN** is the name given by the Moors to the ruins of the Roman city of Volubilis, which lie in a little valley of the Djbal Zarhūn about 20 miles N. of the present Meknès. Volubilis, at the entrance to the fertile plain of the Wādi Rdom in a district where the olive-tree flourishes, was the principal Roman centre of the interior, although it lay almost on the southern edge of the zone effectively occupied by the Romans. It was still a flourishing town in the fourth century A.D. In the fifth the Vandals, without establishing themselves there, put an end to Roman power in Morocco. The Byzantines, when they reconquered the country in the seventh century, had no effective authority outside of the north coast. There is reason to believe, however, that Volubilis left to itself was not depopulated but there grew up there, as in other parts of North Africa, a kind of state, comprising the remnants of the urban populations, romanised Berbers for the most part, and the surrounding tribes under the authority of a native chief. Little by little, in the course of these two centuries this region became the centre of the great Berber confederation of the Brānēs, the dominant tribe of which at that time was the Awağa (Warba) and the chief, at the time of the Muslim conquest, Kosalla (whose capital some authors have tried to locate in the Awağa, which is untenable). When the Berbers, who under the leadership of this chief, had overcome 'Oğba b. Nāfi' and succeeded in driving the Arabs out of the whole of Africa Minor (63 = 683), had to abandon Kašarān again five years later, the Warba contingents having lost their chief and having been severely punished, returned to Walīti (Ullī = Volubilis (68 = 688). These events much diminished the power of the Warba. Henceforth they lived quietly, taking no part in the great Kāšārījī risings which began in 122/740, but recuperating their strength, until the day when, after the battle of Fakkāh, Idrīs b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Hassan b. Allī (of the art. Idrīs I, above, ii. 450) settled in Ullī, where he was received by Išḥāq b. Muḥammad, chief of the Warba (172 = 788/9). He was soon recognised as sovereign by the Waḥba and ultimately by all the surrounding tribes either voluntarily or under compulsion. Ullī became the capital of a state stretching from the Atlantic to the region of Tiemcen, the first Muslim empire in Morocco and the centre of intense missionary activity among the heretical tribes and those which had remained Jews, Christians or pagans. It was there that Idrīs died in 177 (793), poisoned, it is said, at the instigation of Hārūn al-Rashīd. His son Idrīs II (q.v.) continued his policy of conquest and conversion, but in 192 (808) abandoned Ullī for Fāṣ which he had just founded, no doubt in order to escape from the tutelage of the Warba, whose chief Išḥāq b. Muḥammad he had killed. When he himself died in 213 (823) he was buried beside his father in Ullī, according to most of the earlier authorities. But in 841 (1437) his tomb or at least a tomb reputed to be his was discovered, conveniently for political reasons, in the Djamī al-Shurafa in Fāṣ; and this tomb has become the most popular sanctuary in the town founded by him.

After the building of Fāṣ, Ullī lost all political importance. The Zarhūn remained a much visited place of pilgrimage. Around the sanctuary of Idrīs rebuilt two centuries ago by Sultan Isma‘īl, two miles from the ruins of Volubilis in a very picturesque situation of two mounds commanded by higher hills, stands the town of Mūlay Idrīs of the Zarhūn with about 9,000 inhabitants, the majority Idrīsī sharīf's.

The Idrīsī town of Ullīn, of which no remains seem to survive, probably lay on the site of the present town, a remarkable natural fortress. Excavations systematically conducted since 1915 in the Roman town have already yielded interesting results, bringing to light inscriptions very important for the history of the settlements of the Romans in this region and works of art of the first rank.


**al-KAŠR AL-KABİR** (Kašar al-Kabīr), a town in Northern Morocco, about 50 miles south of Tangier on the right bank of the Wādi Lūkkos, which at one time ran through it, but the course of the stream was diverted to prevent inundations. Lying in a vast plain commanded on the east by heights it is divided into two parts, al-Shari‘a in the north and Bāb al-Wādī on the south, between which lies the suq or market-place. The only buildings of any importance are the great mosque which is pre-Almoravid, the mosque of Sidi al-Azmī and the Djamā‘ al-Saida, finished in 1089. Within and around the town are many knubba’s dedicated to local saints. The most venerated marabouts are Abu al-Hasan al-Kurshī (Kursāsh), a native of Spain who came towards the end of his life to teach in al-Kašr, where he died in 508 or 573 (1112-75 or 1177-1235). Sidi Ben Ahmed, Sidi Ali b. Khlef b. Ghalib, usually called Mūlay ‘Ali al-Ǧahāl and regarded as the patron saint of the town, and lastly Sidi Bel-‘Abbās, who is really a Jewish rabbi, Vīda Yabalay.
The population numbers about 9,000 belonging for the most part to the Khbôt, Tîk, and Djbâla. It also includes Risans, a few families originally from Tétwan and Fès as well as Algerians who left Tlemcen and Oran as a result of the French occupation. The Jews number 2,000. Many of them have settled in the town quite recently in such numbers that the Melîb was too small for them and they had to live among the other inhabitants. They speak Arabic and Spanish but Muslims use only the former language. Industry at one time flourishing is now limited to the manufacture of cloths for local needs. Agriculture, on the other hand, is prosperous in the country around as a result of the system of combination between townspeople and tribesmen. Al-Kašr is thus a busy market for corn, barley, beans and flax.

History. The site of al-Kašr perhaps corresponds to that of a Roman town (Oppidum novum?) which had already disappeared by the time of the first Muslim invasions. In the second century A.H., a fortress was built in these regions by the Danhâda, a branch of the Kartâm. According to Zîyânî, it was built in 970 (1070) by al-Mami Abd al-Karîm al-Katami whom the name Kašr 'Abd al-Karîm (al-Idrisî, Description de l'Afrique, ed. Dozy and de Goeje, p. 78; transl. p. 89; Kitâb al-Istîhâr, ed. von Kremer, Vienna 1852, p. 78; transl. Fagnan, Constantine 1900, p. 140; as well as Ibn Khalîlûn, Hist. des Berbères, ed. de Slane, i. 401; transl. ii. 323) or Kašr Kétâmâ which the town kept for several centuries. Al-Bakrî, however, makes a distinction between Süy Kétâmâ "a large and magnificent town situated on the river Lukkos with a djami and a very busy market" and Kašr Danhâda "a castle built on a hill and commanding a large river". Ibn Khalîlûn, on the other hand (op. cit., text i. 188, transl. ii. 291), connects Kašr Ketâmâ with the Danhâda (cf. also Kitâb al-Istîhâr). Süy Kétâmâ was the capital of the state governed by Idrîs b. al-Kâsim b. Ibrahim. Al-Makaddasî (Bibl. Geogr. Arab, iii. 219, 2) mentions Süy Kétâmâ among the towns dependent on Fès. Although eclipsed by the rapid development of Fès, al-Kašr seems to have retained a certain amount of commercial importance. Al-Idrîsî (loc. cit.) mentions its very busy bazaars. But it was only under the Almohads that the town rose out of the semi-obscenity in which it was vegetating. Yaqwub al-Manṣûr surrounded it with a fortified wall and made a hunting-ground and a hospital called Hârat al-Mudjârin. This is perhaps why he was regarded by Leo Africanus and Marmol as the actual founder of al-Kašr. Under the Marinid dynasty, the town was given a madrasa by Abî 'Inân which attracted many students and was still frequented in the xivth century. Al-Kašr recognised the authority of the Marinids from 620 (1223-1224). In 687 (1288-1289) the latter appointed as its governor the Ra's Abî 'l-Hasan b. Ashkilkîla, whose descendants for long remaining lords of the town. The memory of this local dynasty, whose members, in alliance with the Banu 'l-'Amr of Granada, distinguished themselves in the holy war, is still alive today.

The period following the disappearance of the Banu Ashkilkîla was one of calamities. The Portuguese, established on the coast, threatened the town. The inhabitants did not dare to cultivate the soil more than six miles from the walls. In 1503 the governor of Aqila, Don Juan de Menecez, attempted to take it but without success. In the century following, al-Kašr became the most advanced post of the "volunteers of faith" (Mudjâhidîn) who harassed the Christians settled on the coast. During the period of anarchy that preceded the establishment of the Filîlî dynasty, the town became the residence of the Ka'id Ghalûn, who had gained possession of all Gharb. Driven from his capital by Mûlay al-Rashîd in 1798 (1098), Ghalûn was able to return to it on the death of this prince. He held out there till 1804 (1673) when he was defeated and killed by Mûlay Ismâ'il. Al-Kašr fell again, this time finally, into the hands of the Sharîf, who dismantled its walls.


Al-KAŠR AL-SÂGHîR, a town in Morocco, now in ruins. It lay on the south bank of the Strait of Gibraltar, 14 miles W. of Ceuta, 23 miles E. of Tangier, at the head of a bay sheltered by a spur of the Djebel Ghomari at the mouth of a navigable river.

In ancient times this site was perhaps occupied by a Phoenician factory and then by a Roman town (Lissa or Exilissa of Potlemy). A fortress was erected there quite early in the period of Muslim occupation, in 9 (708/9), according to al-Zîyânî, Archives Marocaines, vi. 494, on the territory of the Maison which the name of Ma'sûmâ whence the name of Ma'sûmâ (cf. Ibn Khalîlûn, Hist. des Berbères, ed. de Slane, i. 280, 13; transl. ii. 134) which is given by the author of the Kitâb al-Istîhâr and by al-Idrîsî. Al-Bakrî calls it al-Kašr al-Awwal to distinguish it from al-Kašr al-Kabîr [q. v.]. According to him, it was inhabited by the Banu Tarîf and surrounded by great plantations. Under the Almohads it took the place of Marsâ Mûsâ as the port of embarkation for Spain. Many authors call it therefore Kašr al-Majdî (Geogr. d'Aboul-fida, transl. Reinau, i. 185; Ibn Khalîlûn, loc. cit.), or Kašr al-Djâwâ "Castle of the crossing" (Ibn Abî Zârî, Rawd al-Kirèsât, ed. Tornberg, p. 138, 143, 146). The Almohads erected important buildings in it and established naval dockyards there. But the prosperity of the town declined in proportion as the rulers of the Maghrib lost their hold on Spain. Deprived of the income which the transport of the armies had assured them, the inhabitants turned to piracy. Al-Kašr therefore became one of the first towns that the Portuguese sought to capture. In 1458 King Alfonso V attacked it with a fleet of 80 ships and an army of 17,000 men; after repelling
two assaults, the Muslims, overwhelmed by the Christian artillery, capitulated. They were, however, granted permission to retreat with their arms and baggage. Alfonso V entered the town on Oct. 10, 1458. The great mosque was turned into a church, the fortifications were strengthened and a garrison installed under the command of Don E. de Menezes. Two attempts made by the Sultan of Fass in 1458 and 1459 to recapture the town did not succeed. In 1463 the tribes of Anjara recognized the suzerainty of Portugal and in 1471 Sultan Muley Sa'id signed a treaty by which he ceded al-Kaşr to the king of Portugal. Al-Kaşr remained in Christian hands till 1540 but during this period it was continually being attacked by the Moors. John III therefore decided to evacuate it after previously dismantling it. Some years later (1550) a French prince, Antoine de Bourbon, king of Navarre, obtained al-Kaşr in exchange for the men-at-arms that he was to supply to the Sharif of Fass but the intrigues of the king of Spain, Philip II, prevented the treaty from being carried out. Since that date no attempt has been made to rebuild the town. The inhabitants abandoned it and the harbour became silted up and no longer used except by smugglers. The site is marked by the ruins, still imposing, of the Portuguese fortress, by ditches, the remains of the wall and the ruins of the gate through which the citadel communicated with the town proper.


(G. Y. E.)

**Kaşr-i Shirin**, a town in the south-western part of the district of Ardîlan or Persian Kurdistan (cf. Ardîlân) in 34°30' N. lat. and 45°30' E. Long. (Greenwich) on the right bank of the Huwîn-rusually called, as the Kurds call it, the Alwân or Alwând. This river alters its course, hitherto east to west, at Kaşr-i Shirin to a southerly one and enters the Diyâlî [q. v.] at Zeugmâd. To the west and south-west of Kaşr-i Shirin lies the great range of Agh-Dagh; in the S. E. also on the left bank of the river run imposing mountain chains. Kaşr-i Shirin was an important caravan station from the earliest times. The most important route through it is the very old road from Baghâd to the Iranian highlands — the **Turîf Khorwâân** of the Arabs of the middle ages (cf. above, i. 925a). Kaşr-i Shirin lies about halfway between the two stations of Khânhîn [q. v.] in the south-west and Sari-pul (in mediaeval times Huwîn, S. of Sari-pul; see **Sarful-i Zohûr** in the east. Less important roads also branch off here to north, north-west and south-east.

The modern Kaşr-i Shirin (1600 feet above sea-level) is an insignificant town surrounded by a wall of earth and stone. Outside the walls on the east is a commodious caravanserai; to the west is a fort of modern style which, according to Aubin (op. cit.; see the **Bibl.**), Dowân Mir built at the beginning of the sixth century and plundered passing pilgrims to Kerbelâ and merchants from it until he was captured and killed. The population of the town, which de Morgan estimated at 3,000—6,000, is Kurdish. Shâh Abûâhisîh inscription (1587—1628) transplanted to the region of Kaşr-i Shirin to guard the Turco-Persian frontier 900 families of the Kurdish tribe of Sandjâh (on which see Rawlinson in the **J. R. G. S.**, ix. 33; for a Lur branch of this tribe cf. Rabino, **Les Tribus de Louristan**, Paris 1916, p. 17). A Lur chief acts as Persian governor of Kaşr-i Shirin. Since the beginning of the eighteenth century there has been a small customs house here. Opposite the town on the left bank of the river lies the Bagh-i Shâh = "King’s Gardens", a park laid out with date palms, orange and pomegranate trees by Naşr al-Dîn Shâh on the occasion of his pilgrimage to Kerbelâ.

The most remarkable feature at Kaşr-i Shirin, which makes it one of the most interesting places in Persia to the historian or archaeologist, is the extensive system of ruins dating from the Sassanian period in its vicinity. The name Kaşr-i Shirin, "Shrine Palace", dates from the later period of the Sassanian empire. Shirin, a Christian, was the favourite wife of Khusraw II Parwêz (560—578) who called the great palace built by him as a summer residence after her. Kaşr-i Shirin and the neighbourhood was the scene of the unhappy love-story of Shirin and the royal architect Farhâd, which plays a great part in the romantic poetry of Persia; cf. above, ii. 67, and Justi, **Iranisches Namenbuch**, Marburg 1895, p. 1028. A rock tomb south of Kaşr-i Shirin, for example, is popularly known as Utâk-i Farhâd = "Farhâd’s chamber"; see Sarre and Herzfeld, **Iranische Felsreliefs**, p. 10. The famous late-player, Bûrbûd (on him see Vullers, **Lexic Persico-Lat.**, i. 168, and Justi, op. cit., p. 63) also spent some time at the imperial court at Kaşr-i Shirin; he also plays an important part in the cycle of legends which centre round Khusraw Parwêz. Among the 30 melodies or songs which he composed for the king (see the list of them in Vullers, op. cit., ii. 359) there is one (No. 4 in Vullers) entitled Bagh-i Shirin = "Shirin’s Garden"; another (No. 30 and cf. also Vullers, ii. 129b) is entitled Nâzâkîra = "Hunting Song", probably the Bagh-Nâzâkîra in Yaqîb, iv. 113, 13. Both songs obviously refer to Kaşr-i Shirin, the summer-residence and hunting-palace of the Sassanian ruler.

The period of Kaşr-i Shirin’s glory was only a brief one. Ten years after the death of Khusraw II the Sassanian empire collapsed before the onrush of the Arabs and in the Muslim period the palaces of Kaşr-i Shirin seem to have been no longer inhabited. They fell quickly into ruins, mainly as the result of the poor quality of the building-material used. Al-Yâkûtî (B. C. A., vii. 270) as early as 278 (509) talks of the ruins. Ibn al-A‘lîr (ed. Tornberg, viii. 388) mentions
that as a result of an earthquake in 345 (950) the walls of Kašr-i Shirin were cracked. The Arab and Persian writers including Ibn Kohe, Yākūt, al-Kazwini and Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi, emphasize the great scale of Kašr-i Shirin with its halls, horsenages, treasure houses etc. and the splendid gardens containing very rare animals roaming at large in them, but give no detailed descriptions. Yākūt and al-Kazwini give especially the story of the origin of the palace, which the former (Ma‘lid, iv. 115) actually regarded as one of the wonders of the world.

We owe the most accurate description of the modern ruins to the French expedition of J. de Morgan. The main ruins lie on a broad plateau N. E. of the modern town. Near the latter is the quadrangular citadel of Khusrav flanked by 6 round towers (called Ke‘lā or Kašr-i Khusrav, also Ke‘lā-i Khusrav) surrounded by a ditch. Built as barracks for the ruler’s troops, we have preserved in it one of the rare perfect examples of the military architecture of the Sassanians.

North of the Ka‘lā are further mounds of ruins of the object of which we do not know. About 500 yards to the N. E. we reach the wall of a gigantic park in shape not quite regular oblong, enclosing the summer-residence proper of the king, measuring, according to de Morgan, 300 acres. The wall round it which also served as an aqueduct, the highest part of which reaches 20 feet, is about 6,000 paces in extent. Another aqueduct-wall divides the park into two parts. The requisite water for the irrigation of the gardens was brought from the Hulwān-Rūd and, as already observed, led farther along the top of the miles’ long surrounding wall; the aqueduct can still be traced in the Hulwān-Rūd valley until it is lost in the maze of ruins of Hāwsh Kūnī. In the centre of the whole scheme is the main palace, now called ʿAmārāti Khusrav (= house of Khusrav) or Hādjiqī Kāfe-sey (= pilgrim palace). It is a vast building lying east to west (1080 feet long, 625 feet broad) with vaulted rooms and a long terrace in front which is still mostly imposing with its huge dimensions and colonnades. Before the palace still exists a 600 yards long stretch of the aqueduct flanked by two kiosks. West of the ʿAmārāti Khusrav stands a smaller similar vaulted building with 4 doors and a square principal chamber. It is now called Chār Kāfu or (pure Persian) Čar Dāvari = “Four Doors”, or Ka‘fā-i Chār Kāfu = “Palace of the 4 Gates”. The object of this building (perhaps for audiences) is obscure.

About 3 miles E. of Kašr-i Shirin is another late Sassanian ruined palace, called Hāwsh Kūri = “House of the Horses” (so the name is explained: Kūri = probably Pers. kurrāh, kurāh = colt; Rich gives the name Hāwsh Kerk), because it is popularly believed to contain the stables of the horses belonging to the palace of Kašr-i Shirin. These ruins which consist of a palace 600 feet long with annexes and another mound of ruins are the latest of all the palaces of Parwez so far known.

Kašr-i Shirin is, of course, a town of much greater antiquity than the time of this Sassanian king. A site so favoured by nature must always have invited settlement. So far it has not been ascertained what ancient city — which must have practically occupied the site of the present town — stood here. It was still thought — e.g. by Malcolm, Kinner, Ker Porter — that Dashtārdjīd was here, but this is certainly to be located in the ruins of Eski Bghāṛ (cf. above, i. 926). This erroneous identification was previously attacked by Buckingham, Rich (see Bibl.) and Ritter, i. 84, 590. The ancient Artemisia, a town of Apollonias, has also been supposed — e.g. by Kinner (see Bibl.) — but this is much better located in the region of the later Dashtārdjīd [q. v.]; and Herzfeld in Sarre-Herzfeld, Archael. Reise im Euphrat- u. Tigrisgebiet, ii., Berlin 1919, p. 78. Herzfeld, op. cit., ii. 329, suggests with all reserve an identification of Kašr-i Shirin with the station Danas of the Tabula Peutingeriana; but see against this view my article DANAS in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyk. der klass. Altertumswiss., Suppl., i. 337. Kašr-i Shirin has not the slightest connection with Kiniwar or Kašr al-Luqā, although there was a great palace built by Khusrav Parwāz there also (cf. on this G. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 188; Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, p. 494 sq.); the latter place lay much farther east between Kirkūn, Shāhān and Hamdān. This corrects Caetani, Annot. dell’Ismā‘īl, v. 17, vi. 144 (where Kašr-i Shirin and Kinkiwar are regarded as one and the same).

There is a village 12 miles north of Kašr-i Shirin called Ke‘nd-i Shirin. A short hour’s journey above it are some oil-wells, not, however, very rich, which form part of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company’s concession. On them see de Morgan, op. cit., ii. 81 sq., and Schwer, Das türkisch-persische Erdölwesen, Hamburg 1919, p. 21, 48, 110, 112, 143-144.

Down to the Great War the Turco-Persian frontier, which was not minutely defined, ran about two hours’ journey S. W. of Kašr-i Shirin. On the Persian side the frontier was guarded by the fort of Ka‘li Selzi where a detachment of Sandjābī cavalry was stationed (cf. Aubin, op. cit.). On the place see also Rich, op. cit., ii. 263 (where it is wrongly called Kalai Selzi; Buckingham calls it Khallet el-Suezy). An hour’s journey beyond it is the Turkish frontier-station Ka‘fī Rādīsfy.


**KASRA**, lit. “break”; name of the sign of the vowel i; the vowel itself is called kār.

**AL-KAṬĂLĀNĪ**, Abu ‘l-‘Adbās ˚Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭṭīr Shihāb al-Dīn al-Shāfī’ī, an authority on tradition and theologian, born on Dhu l-Ka‘dā 12, 831 (January 20, 1448) in Cairo where he spent his life as a preacher — and apart from two stays of some duration in Mekka — and died on Friday, Muḥarram 7, 923 (January 31, 1517). He owes his literary fame mainly to his exhaustive commentary on the Šāhīh al-Bukḥārī entitled Iqrāḥ al-Šārī ‘fi Sharḥ al-Bukḥārī, which exists in numerous MSS. and printed copies; of these latter the earliest may be that of Bu‘lāk of 1267 and next the Lucknow edition of 1869 (others in Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, i. 159). The Cairo edition in 1325/6 gives the glosses of Yaḥyā al-Anṣārī and the Cairo edition of 1279 those of Ḥasan al-‘Idwī (d. 1203 = 1887). In the field of Ḥadīṣ he wrote a Muḥaddidma which was printed at Cairo (n.d.) with the commentary of ‘Abd al-Ḥādī al-‘Abayrī (d. 1305 = 1883). Great popularity is enjoyed in the Muslim world by his history of the Prophet entitled al-Muwaḥḥid al-ladunīya fi ‘l-Mīnak al-Muḥaddida, which he completed on Sha‘bān 15, 899 (May 22, 1494) and caused him to be accused of plagiarism by al-Suyūṭī. It exists in numerous MSS. and has also been printed several times, e.g. Cairo 1281, several times commented on, e.g. by al-Zurkānī (d. 1122 = 1710), printed in 8 vols. Bu‘lāk 1278, 1291, and translated by ‘Abd al-‘Abās into Turkish, printed Stambul 1261. Not long ago al-Nabānī, the President of the Court of Justice in Bāḍrīt, prepared a synopsis of it entitled Al-Anwār al-Muḥaddidma min al-Muwaḥḥid al-Ladunīya, Bāḍrīt 1310–1312. Finally in the same field he prepared a commentary on the Ṣuḥāīḥ al-Shāmī‘ī al-Ṭarīḵī (Geschichte der arab. Litt., i. 162). Besides studying the science of tradition he worked also at the readings of the Kurān. His principal work on the subject is entitled Lāṭif al-İzāhā r li-Funūn al-Kirā‘āt. He also wrote a biography of the teacher of Kurān reading, Abu ‘l-‘Aṣim al-Šāhītī, (C. A. L., i. 409), and a commentary on the Muḥaddidma al-‘Idwārī on Tafsīrīd (op. cit., ii. 202). Finally he also wrote on mysticism and personal piety; among his works in this sphere are his Maṣāḥat al-‘Arīfī, Maṣāḥat al-‘Aṣim fi ‘l-Maṣāḥat wa‘l-Nābi al-muṭafī, and his commentary on the Burda al-Busīrī (C. A. L., i. 265).

**Bibliography**: ‘Ali Bāshā Mūbānār, al-Khaṭṭīr al-Iṣfahānī, Bu‘lāk 1306, vi. 11; Wüstenfeld, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber*, No. 509; Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, ii. 73. (C. BROCKELMANN)

**KAṬĂLĂNĪ** (Kesteli), Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṭafī, Ottoman theologian and Hāfiz jurist. Muwalānā Muṣliḥ al-Dīn was a native of Kesteli (from Latif Castellum), a village not far from Brusa, where in after life he built a mosque. From his native place he took the name of Kestelī, or, more impressive, Kaṭălănī. In his youth he attended in Brusa the lectures of the celebrated theologian Khīdīr Pāg in and on the conclusion of his theological and legal studies was appointed teacher in various madressas, for example in Mardin, Demotica (medrese of Urudī Pasha), and finally “guardian”. Next he was for some time kādī of Brusa, Adrianople and in 886 (began March 2, 1481) of Stambul, but in the same year was appointed military judge of Rumelia with the rank of a fourth vizier. He was the first to hold this office separately: it had previously been combined with that of military judge of Anatolia (cf. the art. KĀṬĂLSKY). At the same time Hādīǧī Ḥasanāzāde Mēhmed Efendi was appointed the first independent military judge of Anatolia (cf. J. von Hammer, *G. O. R.*, ii. 246). In 891 (1486) he was deprived of his office. He died in 901 (1495–1496) in Stambul where he was buried in the cemetery of Esref. — The Hanafi Kaṭălănī composed a number of popular works in Arabic including highly esteemed marginal glosses on the commentary of al-Tāfażzīnī on the ‘Aqā’id al-an-Nasīf (cf. Hādīǧī Khalīfa, Ḥāfiẓ al-Zanūnī, iv. 226, as well as Brockelmann, *G. A. L.*, i. 427, which, however, belongs to ii. 196; MSS. in Berlin, No. 1973, and Leiden, No. 1998) as well as an essay on seven doubtful matters (Aṣḥāb) in the Jurdānī’s commentary on al-Iḍī’s Kitāb al-Mawāki‘ī fi ‘l-İzāhā r al-Kalām (Hādīǧī Khalīfa, vi. 240), also a work Tanfīl al-Masʿīlīn (Hādīǧī Khalīfa, ii. 442), an essay on the orientation of the Kitāb (Risāla fi Dīyāt al-Kitāb; cf. Hādīǧī Khalīfa, iii. 387) and lastly a work called Yaḥyā Dhu‘ayf al-Tarīḵ (cf. Hādīǧī Khalīfa, vi. 511).


**KAṬĂMŬNĪ** (in the Arab geographers, Abu ‘l-Fida‘, al-Dimashkī, Ibn Bassātīn, Ibn Biābī and on the coins Kaṭămūnīya with variants; al-Iṣrī‘ī, ed. Jaubert, ii. 321: Kaṭămūnī; ibid., p. 393: Tama‘ūn; the Kaṭămūnī of the Byzantines, in Chalcodýnys, corresponding to the oriental form, Kaṭămūnī; corrupted in various ways by Western writers: Albertus Aquensis: civitas Constantia; Clavijo: Castamoc; Benedetto Dei: Chastarumina, Cattinma; Menavino: Castelmol; with modern Greeks and Europeans: Kastamolos; cf. Leundavias, *Hist. Musulm.*, col. 313, 40, a town in N.W. Asia Minor, capital of the vilâyet of the same name, which corresponds to the ancient Paphlogonia. The town is not mentioned in classical literature although the rock tombs there show that the place was settled in historical times. In the middle ages Kaṭămūnī was famous as the family stronghold of the Gaṭṭaounī, who waged a desperate warfare with the Danishmand-oghlu and the Saldjiqs for its possession until it was finally lost to the Byzantines about the middle of the 14th century A.D. The town then passed, along with the other possessions of the Danishmand-oghlu, under the sway of the Saldjiqs of Könya and formed a beylerbeylik, which was hereditary in the family of Hūsān al-Din Cōbān. On the break-up of the Saldjiq
KAŞŤLIYA, the name given by Arab writers to the district of Tunisia adjoining the Shuṭt's and to Tawzer, the most important area in Tunisia. Its boundaries are rather difficult to determine. The descriptions by Ibn Iḥawṣ and al-Ṭibrī refer only to the town of Kaşṭliya. Al-Bakrī, on the other hand, distinctly distinguishes between the town and the district. "The land of Kaşṭliya," he says, "contains several towns, such as Tawzer, al-Ḥammar and Neṣfa. Tawzer, which is its metropolis, is a large town." In another passage he refers to Tawzer as marking the eastern limit of the land of Kaşṭliya. 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Marrakushi opposes the land of Kaşṭliya, "formed by Tawzer and the cantons attached to it" to the "Zāb, which includes Bišrā and its dependencies." Ibn Khaldūn (Histoire des Berbères, ed. de Slane, i. 646; transl., iii. 156) includes among the dependencies of Tawzer the "cantons" of Kaşṭliya, to the south of the Shuṭt al-Djarid and Neṣfa. The same indications are given by al-Zarkušī. Ibn Khaldu'n (op. cit., i. 122; transl., i. 192), on the other hand, seems to identify the Bilād al-Djarid with the land of Kaşṭliya. After enumerating among the towns of the Bilād al-Djarid, Neṣfa, Tawzer, Gafṣa (Kafṣa) and the places in Neṣfa, he adds: "All this country is called the land of Kaşṭliya." The Shanī al-Tidānī, in his turn, applies to Tawzer the description "capital of al-Djarid." From the fifteenth century onwards, we no longer find the terms Kaşṭliya and land of Kaşṭliya as the name of a district or of a town, but only those of Tawzer and Djarid, still in use at the present day. The enumeration of the towns of Africa given by al-Kairawāni (Kitāb al-Muṣnis, transl. Pellissier and Remusat, p. 28) in which Kaşṭliya is mentioned is probably taken from an earlier writer. In brief, the land of Kaşṭliya seems to correspond very well with the present Djarid, i.e. to the group of oases (Neṣfa, Tawzer, al-Udŷāna and al-Ḥammar) occupying the isthmus which separates the Shuṭt al-Djarid from the Shuṭt al-Ḫarsa and perhaps to al-Neṣfa. The Arab authors are unanimous in praising the wealth of the land of Kaşṭliya. The cultivation of dates and other fruit-trees, watered with great care, was very flourishing there. Flax, indigo and sīnāna were also grown. The fields of sugar-cane, noticed by Ibn Iḥawṣ, were beginning to disappear by the time of al-Bakrī and soon afterwards vanished. Commerce was active and prosperity general. In the time of al-Bakrī the taxes of this area amounted to 200,000 dinārs a year.

The population was composed for the most part of Berbers, many of whom practiced Kharīḍī doctrines or, as at Neṣfa, Shī'a doctrines. Al-Muṣaddasī (Bibliogr. Arab., iii. 243, 244) and al-Bakrī mention that cypnographica was practised among them. According to al-Tidānī, they lived alongside the Berbers of the Rūm, who occupied this region the Berbers the descendants of the Rūm. When this Shanī visited Tawzer the remains of Christian churches were still to be seen. Ibn Khaldu'n (op. cit., i. 646—647; transl., iii. 156) says that there were in al-Neṣfa and the land of Kaşṭliya people of Frankish origin, whose ancestors had come from Sardinia and settled in the country as tributaries of the Muslims to whom they paid poll-tax.

Bibliography: Ibn Ḥawṣal, Bibliogr. Arab., ii. 67, 69, 1—3; transl. de Slane, Journ. As., 1842, third series, vol. xii. 243, 248; al-

empire, the Turkmen-İsândiyār-oghlu of Alańi seized the region of Kaşṭamuni and made the town their capital. It was taken from them by Bayazid I in 1402, but restored to them by Timur after the battle of Angora (804 = 1401/2) and remained in their possession till they were ousted by Mehmed II (864 = 1455/56). Henceforth Kaşṭamuni formed a sandjak of the eyalet of Anadolu, in more recent times a vilâyet, which besides the so-called meğes sandjak included the sandjak's of Boli, Kánglī and Sinūb (Sinope). The Kaştemuni of the earlier Isândiyār-oghlu is described by Ibn Batūta (ed. Paris, ii. 341 sqq.); Chalcocondyles (sixth century) calls it a "flourishing and strongly fortified town." (p. 260, Bonn edition); the description in Hādīdī Ḥakīm's Dīthān-nūmā (p. 648 of the first edition) dates from the beginning of the xvith century. Kaştemuni was first visited by European travellers in the beginning of the xit century, first of all by Kinneir in 1814. The erstwhile family stronghold of the Comnenoi with its Byzantine and Saŀdājk fortifications was abandoned and left to fall into ruins after the Turks had maintained a garrison and artillery in it down to a century ago. There are no antiquities in existence that date from the classical period but numerous buildings survive from the times of the Saŀdājk and Isândiyār-oghlu. The town contains no less than 62 large or small mosques (Ďjtim and masjdī), 16 medresses, 12 dervish monasteries, 4 libraries and 30 tombs of saints. The oldest dated building is the tekke of the Divl (called Yilanlı Tekyeye) of the year 671 = 1271/2; from the same period dates a mosque built in 672. The following are also of special mention: — the Djtim's of Ghażī Atābeg with medrese, of Hādīdī Naṣr (of the year 754 = 1353/54), that of Ḥādīdī Salāh al-Dīn (of the year 806 = 1403/404), and the last Isândiyār-oghlu, İsmā'īl Beg, dated 855 = 1451/52, but these monuments have not yet been scientifically examined. They bear witness to the way in which the former lords of the land fostered Muslim culture; İsmā'īl Beg himself, after his dispossesion, composed a much esteemed theological work, the Ḥulūliyya-ī Sulṭanī (cf. Rue, Cah. Turc. M.S.S., p. 12 sqq.). Lajjī (q. v.), the biographer of poets belonging to Kaştemuni. Hādīdī Ḥakīm calls Kaştemuni the "city citadel" (kāfīda) of the Turkomans and the dialect of Turkish spoken there still survives. The population of the town was estimated at about 30,000 including 1500 Turkish speaking Greeks and 500 Armenians but the latter may have emigrated since the war. Bibliography: C. Ritter, Kleinaustien, i. 414—419; Macdonald Kinneir, Journey through Asia Minor, London 1819, p. 281 sqq.; Ainsworth, Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, London 1843, i. 80—84; A. D. Nordmann, Anatolien, Hanover 1925, p. 228 sqq.; Leonard, Połtgogia, Berlin 1915, p. 72 sqq., 130 sqq. (with pictures), La Turquie d'Asie, iv. 462; Sīnānumā of the vilayet Kaştemuni for the year 1297; Revue hist. Ottom., Series i., Part 5 and 6 (articles by Ahmad Tawhid); Doğhū (Kaştemuni 1340 A.H.), No. 3 and 5 (articles by İsmā'īl Ḥakīm Beg); on the dialect of Kaştemuni see Josef Thury in the Ertüketiket of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1885, vol. xii., part 1. (J. H. Mordtmann)

**Kāṭ, dījīt (A.), Ĕxt (Amharic, Gallu), Ėṭāo (Kaffa)**, is a name of a smooth-stemmed shrub, of the family of Celastraceae (represented in Central Europe by the spindle-tree: *Catha edulis,* Forskål, [or *methysophyllum glauceum,* Eckl. et Zeyher]), reaching a height of 12 feet, which is found in East Africa from Cape Colony to north of Lake Tānā (Sānū) and in the Yemen. The leaves are called *kāṭa* in Arabic. Those and the skins of the young shoots contain an alkaloid, *katin,* which accounts for the stimulating or intoxicating effect of these parts of the plant (or a. decoction made from them) and the widely spread use of *kāṭ* in the Muslim lands of Abyssinia and South-West Arabia.

In Abyssinia, as well as in S.-W. Arabia, the leaves and young shoots of the *kāṭ* are chewed; more rarely a decoction is used, which is either taken as *tea* or added to the Abyssinian honeywine (Amharic *daḏàq*). The most esteemed are the tender shoots and young leaves which have a pleasant, sweetly aromatic flavour and are merely stimulating and anti-soporific and slightly intoxicating only in large doses, while the older tough leaves are unpleasantly astringent and have a much stronger effect. All accounts agree that the use of *kāṭ,* as ordinarily taken, which has become regular in all classes of society in the Yemen, underlines the physical and moral health of the people and also does the greatest damage from the economic point of view.

As a result of the enormous consumption of *kāṭ* leaves (about 30,000 tons are exported annually from Abyssinia and the adjoining countries) the cultivation of the shrub, which is propagated from cuttings, is very important. In the Yemen, Djabal Šābīr, Djabal Raima and Ūdān are mentioned as the centres of its cultivation. The *kāṭ* twigs, which are not plucked till the plant is in its fourth year, are tied in bundles for transport (Arabic *katōt,* pl. *katūt*) and, in order to keep them fresh as long as possible, are bound up in moist, leafy branches and banana leaves.

*Kāṭ* is first mentioned in "The Military Exploits of the Ethiopian King *Amāda Seyōn against the Muslims* of the year 1322/33, which puts the following words into the mouth of *Amāda Seyōn’s opponent, King Šābīr al-Din:* "I shall make . . . . his royal palace Mar’sāde (Arabic *Mar'adād*) my residence and plant *kāṭ* there." Al-Makrīzi († 846 = 1442) mentions the *dījīt* as a plant found in Awīl (Ethiopian Iptf, in Eastern Shoa (Shoua)), the leaves of which are eaten. The Shaikh *Abū al-Kādīr al-Dījiz, who wrote in 995 (1587), says that *Ali b. Umar al-Shahibīl (al-Māzīqa, † 827 = 1424), as is still said in West and South Arabia, introduced coffee into the Yemen, which took the place of *kāṭa,* i.e. the *kāṭ* leaves, previously in use. Ibn Ḥadjar al-Haitami († 1574 = 1657) wrote in the *Institution of people from Ṣan’ā* and Zabīl a treatise in which he, without taking up a definite attitude to the contradictory opinions of reputable scholars regarding the effects of the *kāṭ,* includes the enjoyment among the *gūrābāt,* from which one should refrain. Among European travellers Niebuhr and his botanist collaborator Forskål give the earliest accounts of our plant and its use.


Further references are given in Dillmann and Beitler.

(J. J. Hess)

**Kāṭ (A.),** a cut. The Arabic verb *kāṭ* has, as the dictionaries show, undergone a remarkably varied development of meaning both in its original and metaphorical senses. Here we only deal with cases which are of importance for the history of religion, etc.

The infinitive form *kaf* is not found in the *Kurān* but the verb occurs in the literal meaning (*Sūra v. 42;" cut off the hands of a thief, male or female" — the well-known law adopted in the Fikh, sometimes briefly known as *Kaf al-Līṣ —*) and in a more metaphorical sense (*Sūra ii. 25 and xiii. 25; "cut asunder what God hath ordered to be bound together").

The old reciters of the *Kurān* (*kūrān*) gave the name *kaf* or *wukf* to a pause in reciting whether required by the sense or for another reason. Later reciters distinguished between the brief pause necessary to take breath and other pauses required by the sense: *kaf* was only applied to the first (according to others only to the last).

The grammarians give the name *alāf* to the strong hamza which cannot be elided in contrast to the hamzat *al-waw* (cf. the article *alīf*). *Kaf* is also the deliberate division of a syntactical combination in a sentence for special reasons, e.g. for *al-hamdu li’l-Īkhān hamīdah:* *al-hamdu li’l-Īkhān hamīdah* (= wa-hamna *l-hamīdah*) or *l-hamīdah* (= *dīn l-hamīdah*).
In prosody ḫ<t: means the elision of the end of certain feet, e. g. the abbreviation of fa:š:to to fa:š:: in or of mu:št:l:: to mu:št:: This shortened form is then called mu:št::

The conic section ḫ<t, alt-mūk̄i:di is of importance in mathematics and the varieties are ḫ<t: wād, the hyperbola, ḫ<t: nūs, the ellipse, ḫ<t: mūk̄i:, the parabola and ḫ<t: mūk̄i:d: mu:gamān, the paraboloid.

In astrology ḫ<t: al-awwārak meaning a format of paper, has acquired some importance in the history of administration. According to the Arab accounts, ṭirās (papyrus-paper was probably not used before the third or fourth century; cf. above, i. 385) was used from Mu:š więya's time for documents in the chancellery of the Caliph and at quite an early date we find five different formats used: (ḫ<t: thulūth, al-thani, the chancellery of the Caliph and the chancellery of the court in Cairo and those used in the province of Syria. He distinguishes, giving exact particulars regarding the size and particular uses, of nine formats in use in Cairo: ḫ<t: al-hādū d: a: kāmil, ḫ<t: al-waw a: ri, ḫ<t: al-nūs, ḫ<t: al-thulūth, ḫ<t: al-mūk̄i:di, fi 'l-mu:nsīrī (rubūt), ḫ<t: al-ṣa:qi:gh or ḫ<t: al-ā:la (rubūt), ḫ<t: al-khānī, ḫ<t: al-ṣa:qi:gh (min warā: ak:far); also four Syrian formats: ḫ<t: al-thānī, ḫ<t: nūs, ḫ<t: al-khānī, ḫ<t: al-ā:la (min al-tha:li, ḫ<t: wa:di: al-ṣa:qi:gh. The smallest formats were used for the pigeon post. Al-Kalbānī only gives quite general observations for other countries.

In the history of religion the expression ḫ<t: yā:ninā: meaning "to take an oath", which Pedersen (Der Eid bei den Semiten, p. 46; cf. also p. 12, note 5) compares with the Hebrew ḫr: bērī, is interesting. It is perhaps through the influence of this expression that ḫ<t: comes to mean "to settle, to decide", as do verbs meaning "to cut" in other Semitic languages. In logic we find it meaning "to assert something with confidence, to refute someone completely", etc., or e.g. alina ḫa:ṣ: or ḫa:ṣ: wa:li: "to be absolutely sure of something", ḫa:ṣ: al-ki: "a decisive proof".

A small Shīʿi sect is called ḫ<t:ya because it "eats short" the list of Imāms at the death of Muṣa: ʿl-Kāsim.

s. v. Catabanes and Chatramis, to read Ktisbaia in Theophrastus need not be accepted. Glaser wrongly supposed (Studien der Geschichts und Geographie Arabiens, Berlin 1890, ii. 6) that Ktisbaia (or, as he incorrectly writes, "Kittibaini") lay on the Persian Gulf; later and fuller is the reference to Katabān in the synopsis in Strabo, xvi. 768, of Eratosthenes (end of the third century B.C.), who, in addition to the sources available to Theophrastus, had at his disposal itineraries of seafarers and travellers by caravan in Egypt and Petra. According to this, the Katabānī, who are given after the Minaeans and Sabaean(s in order from north to south of the four principal Arabian peoples and before the Chatramoties (inhabitants of Hadramot), whose lands stretched farthest east, dwelled down to the straits and entrance to the Arabian Gulf (πρὸ τὰ στενὰ καὶ τὴν διαδρασθὲν τοῦ Ἀραβίου κόλπου); their capital was Tā'aus. From Strabo's information it may be assumed that the Katabānīs in the time of Eratosthenes lived in the part of the west coast south of Saba', holding the western parts of the south coast of Arabia, being the eastern neighbours of the Sabaean(s. From Strabo's account of their lands which refers to the straits of Bāb al-Mandab, it is clear that the boundary for the kingdom in Glaser (op. cit., p. 19), who sought to locate the Katabānīs "mainly east of the Djabal Sabir" with the Gebanites west of them and the Hīmys south of the Katabānīs and Gebanites, was not correct. This could have been deduced from the fact that in the time of Eratosthenes the Hīmys did not form an independent kingdom (cf. the art. Saba') but belonged to Katabān, which Glaser, who later modified his views considerably, had to confess in his book Die Absteiner in Arabien und Afrika, Munich 1895, p. 112. The Jaffūn of Strabo (xvi. 768), the Gebanites of Pliny (vi. 153), were presumably at this date still a part of the kingdom of Katabān (see the article GABAOI in Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyk.) and only became independent about Pliny's time and at that time were, it is true, the neighbours of the Katabānīs but not on the west, as Glaser supposed, but on the southeast between Katabān and Saba'. The statements in Pliny, Nat. Hist., v. 65, are also in agreement with Eratosthenes, according to which the Katabānīs lived in the S.W. of Arabia Felix. From the idea we get of the geography of their lands from Eratosthenes, which is nowhere contradicted, we see the impossibility of the mixture of right and wrong in the location of the four principal kingdoms in Glaser, Dem und die südarabischen Reiche, M.V.A.G., 1899, iv. 21, according to which Katabān in the old part was the land south and S.W. of Saba', bounded by N.W. Hadramot and later stretching to the straits of Bāb al-Mandab so that it originally included the land of the Hīmys and would appear as early as Theophrastus as the immediate neighbouring of Hadramot on the west. Glaser at the same time also assumed in the passage in Theophrastus the alteration Σαβα' in the text (said to be = Shehār, Sjeha, "frankincense coast") for Σαβα', which, however, is wrong (cf. the art. Saba'), and further altered his early views on the frontiers of Katabān (cf. below). That Eratosthenes mentions the Katabānīs between Saba' and Hadramot and that the Katabānīs inscriptions found by Glaser, according to his own words (Abessinier, p. 111), "all came from the region between Mārib and Sabr-wat" (M. Hartmann's "Die Arabische Frage in der Islamische Orient," vol. i., Leipzig 1909, p. 169), observation on this statement, that the description of the find-spot of Glaser's inscription No. 1693, "which is of Ru'ānin provenance", is not in keeping with it, can now be more easily estimated at a true value; cf. the topographical data in N. Rhodokanakis, Katabanische Texte zur Bodenwirtsch., Series 2 [S. B. Ak. Wien, 1922, CXXVIIii, p. 57 sqq.] is, as the expression quoted πρὸ τὰ στενὰ ... κόλπου in Strabo shows, not sufficient evidence for the conclusion that the land of the Katabānīs was limited to the territory between Saba' and Hadramot and does not prevent - neither does another circumstance - the assumption that Katabān was not only the land directly on the coast but also stretched into the interior, towards the upper Wāfān. - A. Sprunger's view (Die alte Geographie Arabiens, Bern 1875, p. 64, 254 sq., 264, 273 sq. etc.) that the Katabānīs were the Arabian tribe of Kufta'a was absurd. Obsessed with this view, he recognised the definition of the land of Katabān in Eratosthenes as only correct "in a limited sense". When J. Halévy and J. H. Mordtmann established the identity of the name Katabān in the South Arabian inscriptions with the same name of a land and people mentioned by the Greeks and Romans, any linguistic connection of Katabān with Kufta'a and the localisation of the original nucleus of the Katabān kingdom far to the east (near the Khar) were ruled out (see D. H. M. von der Burg und Schlottke, Südarabien, vol. ii. [S. B. Ak. Wien, 1888, CVIIIi, p. 1025 sq.]). Nevertheless Sprunger again at a later date in his Bemerkungen zu Mordtmanns Ansiehe von Glasers Skizze in the Z.D.M.G., xxiv. 505, maintained a connection between the names Katabān and Kufta'a. Relying on the similarity in sound of the Katabān inscriptions to the name of the plain of Kaţāb in the vicinity of Zafar (near Yarim), the later capital of the Hīmys, D. H. Muller endeavoured to locate the Katabānīs there, assuming that "they exercised their power in the place where traces of their existence have survived in the name of the place and where those who followed them in power had their capital" (op. cit., p. 1020); cf. for this view so early a writer as Ch. Forster, Historical Geography of Arabia, London 1844, vol. i., p. lxxx. and 84; K. Müller in the index to his edition of Strabo, p. 769, and Sprunger, Vorderasien, loc. cit. In support of this form of the name Katabānī against Katabānīs of most MSS. of the passage in Strabo is the form Katabaia of the name of the land, a few lines below in the majority of manuscripts in the passage from Theophrastus quoted above, the form quoted below from Pliny, the varia lectio in Ptolemy with single t, finally also the Arabic original form. The form Katabānī has influenced the error Katabān in the MSS.
an error in copying the equally erroneous Kāfrān (and Kāfrānaw) of the other MSS. In the note immediately following in Strabo on the capital of Chathamotae, the name of which was first restored by (Gräskau) as Kāfrānaw (= Shabat of the invaders) (followed in modern, von der Kämmer, Memel, K. Müller, etc.). On the etymology of the name nothing definite can be asserted. Forster’s [op. cit., vol. i., p. xxvi., 35, 83 sqq., 87, 89, 91 sq., 105, 115; vol. ii. 154] also quoted by K. Müller [op. cit.], connection of the name with the Arabic Kāfrān and his derivation (i. 83) from kāfrān in the sense of scribae or notarii, according to Bochart, is simply one of the curiosities with which his book is filled. Even C. Landberg’s (Arabica, Leiden 1898, vol. vii., p. 62) derivation from kāfrān (jack-saddle) in reference to the wealth of the region of Bahān al-Asfāl in camels, is not exactly probable.

Eratosthenes calls the capital of Katabān Tahma. That the Katabānians had a monarchical constitution like the Mineans, Sabaeans and Chathamotae is known from the South Arabian inscriptions. Sprenger, in his Geymüller’s Katabān (p. 268), notes the association of the name with Θεότως in Polymyrm. vii. 7, 37, and (p. 268, 309) consequently sought it between the Sabean capital Marib and Sabatha, the capital of Hadramot, had, as a result of his preconceived notions regarding the Katabānians, as he himself said (p. 268) “some difficulty in finding the bulk of the kingdom”. Of the earlier writers Glaser came nearest to settling the question of the situation of the capital. While, according to his opinion expressed in the Skizze, ii. 18 sq. (in correction of Skizze, i. 48), Tahma was identical either with Dammam Diba or more probably with Dammam Khadi, not very far E.S.E. of (the highest part of the) Dibah Sabir on the road from the Turkish frontier-custom station of Surra (Kaida) to Ta’izz, he later (Abessinier, p. 112, 115) said that Tahma (Tinma) of the Katabānian inscriptions was Tamme of the Wādī Bahān al-Asfāl and this was not only the Tinma of Eratotheneus but the Thonma and Thomala of Pliny and also the Θεότως of Ptolemy, thus abandoning his idea that the massif of the Dibah Sabir was the frontier of the Katabānian kingdom. Of these attempts at identification Landberg (Arabica, v. 81 sq. on the land of Harib), especially p. 100, said that Glaser, after looking for Tahma here and there almost always found it when in his paper Zwei Inschriften aus dem dammbruch von Mārib (M. P. A. G., 1897, ii. vi. 58) he wrote a propos of the name Tinma mentioned in the Sirwāh inscription (Glasner 1000) “Tinma”, the former capital Tahma or Thonma of the Katabānians, is in the Wādī Bahān. This identification of Glaser’s, who (Abessinier, p. 112) expressly stated the conviction of the correctness of his location of the Tinma of the inscriptions, was corrected by Landberg (p. 107 sq.) when he fixed the position of the present Tinma, the site of the ancient capital of the Katabānians, in the land of Harib in a plain by the Wādī Ablah, a tributary on the left of the Wādī ‘Ain, which is bounded in the S.S.E. by the hills of Rokhama, in the S.E. by the Kawim Al Djeňah, in the midst of which rises the hill of Had Wadj; the Wādī Wadj waters the part of the plain called Tin Tinma. Following this, Hommel (Grundris der Geographie und Geschichte des alten Orientes, Munich 1904, p. 137 [65]) identified Tinma and the town of the inscriptions as Tinma, “in a tributary Wādī of Bahān al-Asfāl S.S.E. of Mārib”. M. Hartmann (op. cit., p. 168) was wrong in objecting to the location S. E. of Mārib “in spite of the view expressed by Hommel with absolute conviction”; he sought Tamma’s east of Yarim, on a hypothesis which is quite without foundation. Rhodolamakis (Die Inschriften der Mutter von Kokhan-Tinma in the S. P. A. Wien, 1924, c. viii. 8), identifies Timma, the capital of Katabān, with Kokhan, by combining mentions in the inscriptions with a study of photographs taken by G. W. I bury, who in 1901 visited Kokhan (Karkhan) on the left bank of the Wādī Bābān and took impressions and photographs of inscriptions there for the South Arabian expedition of the Vienna Academy and also gave an account of the ruins. Sprenger, relying simply on the Telenemiac location for Thonma (between Marib and Sabatha) had come very near to the identification proposed by Landberg. It may safely be concluded that not only the royal seat but also the original home of the Katabānians lay not far from the frontier of Saba’ and the gradual expansion of the tribe of Katabān—now also known from inscriptions—into the kingdom took place towards the S.W. The equation of Tinma with Thonma, which Pliny (vi. 1533 xii. 63) calls a town of the Gebanite, proposed by D. H. Müller (op. cit., p. 1010), Mordtmann (review of Glaser, Skizze, vi. i., in the Z.D.M.G., xiv. 184), Glaser (loc. cit. and Punt, p. 57) and Landberg (op. cit., p. 109 sq.), has a certain probability in spite of the phonetic difference in the initial dentals of the two names, which we also have between Θεότως and Tinma, which had already been equated by K. Müller (op. cit.). But it should be remembered that Ptolemy may have referred to names of similar sound to one place. In favour of the identification of Θεότως and Thonma we can quote—in addition to the form of the name—Pliny’s remark (xii. 65) on the frankincense route. Of the towns of similar sound in Pliny, it may here be remarked that neither can Thonma, the capital of the Gebanite, be identical, as Glaser suggests, with Thomala, which Pliny (vi. 154) expressly calls a town of the Sabaeans, nor can Thomala be altered to Thonma, as Mordtmann (review, p. 186) proposed. The latter (ibid.) and Hommel (Die archaische Oberlieferung, Munich 1827, p. 274) assumed that the name of the Katabānian capital and that of the Edomite tribe of Tinma (Gen., xxxvi. 40) were connected.

Strabo’s further remark that Kartasa (var. Karasa, the same form as in Stephanus Byzantinus, s.v.) produced frankincense, has recently been wrongly taken to mean that, according to his authority, frankincense was not found in other parts of South Arabia (cf. the art. Saba, below, iv. 69). Glaser’s suggestion (Skizze, ii. 26) that there is “obviously some confusion” in Strabo may be met by the statement in Pliny (xii. 69), which is based on authentic information, as well as the corroborative statements of modern travellers, like C. Niebuhr, Beschreibung von Arabien, Copenhagen 1774, p. 283, and Th. Pentz, Southern Arabia, London 1806, p. 77, 91, 254; Glaser himself acknowledges the possibility “that even by the tribes of Eratotheneus individual Katabānians owned lands in the frankincense areas” (similarly in Abessinier, p. 111 sqq.; previously Sprenger, Geographie, p. 264; cf. K. Müller, op. cit.; in Punt, p. 46 (cf. 50 sq., 57) Glaser speaks of Katabānian suzerainty over the frankincense
country. His deductions (Abessinier, p. 112 sq.) that Kataán perhaps also had possessions in the African fringe area and that the whole of Azania belonged to it may be emphatically rejected.

Pliny twice mentions the Kataánians; v. 65: Kataánanes (this is the better reading, not Catta-
banes) Arabs and, in another form, vi. 153: Catapani, a divergence which is probably explained by the use of different sources. According to the first passage (also Solin, ed. Mommsen, Berlin 1895, § 707), they are to be regarded as the possessors of the south-west of Arabia Felix. Glaser (Skizze, ii. 291) wrongly says that by Pliny’s time there was no longer a Kataánanian tribe. He is possibly correct in saying that they and the Hadramówites had inhabited the southern Mineanan territory and could only hold out by continually fighting the Sabaeans. Whether there still was a kingdom of Kataán, as known to Erotróstenes, in Juha’s time is doubtful. Glaser (Abessinier, p. 114) denied that the Kataánanian kingdom was still in existence at the time of Gallus and thought (Punt, p. 56) that it no longer existed by 81 A.D. and that the Kataánians “disappear completely from the scene as an independent people” in the first half of the first century B.C. (ibid., p. 48; cf. Abessinier, p. 77; for the time of Gallus see D. H. Müller, Burgen, ii. 1030). This view must be considerably modified, if only on account of the mention of the Kataánians in Pliny and Ptolemy (see Glaser’s own limitation, Punt, p. 48, i). Against Hommel, who (Grundris, p. 139, 142) placed the end of the kingdom of Kataán in the second century B.C. (on this chronology see Glaser, Abessinier, p. 115), Hartmann (op. cit., p. 164; cf. 168) said that Kataán does not disappear before 80 B.C. That the references in Ptolemy from the time of Juba refer only to the people of the Kataánians and no longer to the now weakened kingdom, cannot be asserted with certainty. It may however have been included in the Himyar kingdom at the beginning of our era (on the supposed beginning of the Himyar epoch see the art. Sab’a, below, iv. 8).

This question is bound up with that of the connection between Kataán and the Gebánianites of Ptolemy (vi. 153, xii. 93, 68 sq., 87 sq., 93), the Gebán of the inscriptions, into the details of which, as they would require a special article, we cannot go here. Sprenger’s view (Geographiae, p. 256, 268, 282) that the Kataánians lived in S. W. Arabia before the Gebánite and were driven out by them in Juha’s time was supported by D. H. Müller (Burgen, ii. 1028 sq.) (also Glaser, Punt, p. 36). 48, 50). In my articles Gabain, and Gebanitae in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencykl., it has been suggested, that the Gebanite, called Ṭabiyyu by Erotróstenes (Strabo, xvi. 768) and therefore known to him alongside of the Kataánians, were settled in Kataán or close to its frontier (for other errors of Sprenger see ibidem). Glaser, Punt, p. 35, 60, regarded the Gebanitae as a subdivision of the Kataánian people. But it is not quite clear even for the time of Juba whether the Gebanitae are not still to be regarded as neighbours of the Kataánians. D. H. Müller’s other considerations are discussed in another connection (see the Bibliography). The Gebanitae, like the Kataánians, also became a part of the Himyar kingdom, probably not before Pliny’s time. Hartmann’s proposal (op. cit., p. 410; cf. 22) to alter Gebanitae in Pliny, xii. 63, to Catabanitae cannot be accepted. This unquestionable reading is amply supported against emendation by vi. 153; and besides, Pliny never uses the form of the name which Hartmann’s conjecture would introduce.

That the Periplous Maris Erythraei (cf. the art. Sark, iv. 9), presumably composed between 40 and 45 A.D., does not mention the Kataánians — a fact on which Glaser (Abessinier, p. 115) laid stress in support of his view that their kingdom came to an end at an early date — like the non-
mention of the Mineanians, means nothing, especially as the much later Ptolemy — and Pliny also — mentions the Kataánians along with the Sabaeans, Mineanians and Chatramotites (vi. 7, 24, Kotraβovoi [var. Kotraβovoi, vulg. Kotraβovoi]), i.e. all the four main peoples of South Arabia known to Erotróstenes. This is at any rate an argument against those who hold that the Kataánian people had entirely disappeared from history by the time of Gallus and was therefore a view at first challenged by Glaser. That the Ptolemaic map placed them between the frankincense region and the modern ‘Oman is explained to mean they had also lands in the former. The Kotraβovoi mentioned in the same passage by Ptolemy were originally considered by Glaser — who wrote their name erroneously “Kutheraner” — (Skizze, ii. 4, 6, 8, 268 sq.) to be the inhabitants of the Kotraβovoi of Theophrastus, said to be situated on the Persian Gulf, and regarded them as well as the Kotraβovoi as different from the Kataánians. This was only intended to serve as a basis for his assertion that even by Pliny’s time there was no longer a Kataánanian tribe (see above). Later (Abessinier, p. 111) he abandoned his view that the Kataánians are not mentioned in Ptolemy and (p. 115) conceded the possibility at least that they are the Kotraβovoi so that he now took up an intermediate position. On the question of the relation of the two peoples with similar names to one another no definite answer can be given. According to Mordmann (review, p. 187), they were identical, and it is in fact not improbable that Ptolemy refers to the Kataánians under two different forms of the name, just as in one passage (vi. 7, 10) he calls the people of Ḥadramawt Ṭaβarμaτa (var. Ṭaβarμaτa) and in another (vi. 7, 25, 26), Xtraβovoi. The capital of the Kataánians can be recognised in his Ṣab’an (Thomna in Pliny). Mordmann was wrong in his view that Ptolemy erroneously — as a result of different estimates of the distance — had given Thomna twice (31 and 37) in his map.

The mentions of Kataán in the later literature of the Greeks are of no value, such as Dionysius Periegetes, ed. K. Müller, vi. 95 sq., nor perhaps from the geographical didactic poem of Alexander Lychnus of Ephesus — in the phrase ἐκ τῆς Ἐφεσίας Καταβανῶν rightly describes the Kata-
banians as neighbours of the Sabaeans mentioned just before. This mutated form is a misreading of Kataβανoι of the original source; it appears also in the Latin paraphrases of Dion. Periegetes and as Cletas in the Geographer of Ravenna, ed. Pinder-Parthey, Berlin 1860, ii. 7.

The references to Kataán in South Arabian inscriptions were down to the last decade of the sixth century very limited, e.g. the Minean inscription Ḥaléyy 504 (= Glaser 1087) in which a Kataánian king is mentioned as a contemporary of Minean kings, and Frenzel 56 (= Glaser 461).
in which there is mention of a peace between Saba' and Katabān. A deeper knowledge of the past of Katabān was first obtained from the rich finds of inscriptions made by Glaser, who, in his fourth journey to South Arabia (1892–1894) before which no Katabān inscription had been known, brought back scribes of about 100 Katabān inscriptions, one particularly remarkable result of his journey of exploration. Hommel's conjectural dating of these inscriptions "from about 1000 B.C. to the end of the Katabān kingdom (3rd century B.C.)" (Grundrisse, p. 139) is too early in both its limits. The beginning is not earlier than that of the Minean kingdom (see the att. Saba'); on the latter see above. Hommel (ibid.) was only able to say further that there were about 18 Katabān kings' names in these as yet unpublished texts, out of which Glaser had, however, already gathered much valuable information, and that it, apart from a few passages in inscriptions which Glaser himself published (e.g. Punt, p. 58 [beginning of Glaser 1592]; Zwei Inschriften über den Daumbruch, p. 105 [contents of Glaser 1690]), other Hommel utilised for his researches in the history of religions (from Glaser 1599, 1600 and 1604), some of these inscriptions were again squeezed by Arabs, one for the Greek Kallisperis (published by Hommel, Z. D. M. G., 1899, liii. 98 sqq., the first Katabān inscription made generally accessible), three others for 'Aden, whence they were sent to Paris (pub. by H. Derenburg, Nouveaux textes yéménites inédits, R. A., 1902, vii/v. 117 sqq. [N. ii., iii., iv.; new edition with emendations in the Répertoire d'Épigr. sem., 1903, i., No. 310 sqq.]) Ditlef Nielsen in the M. V. A. G., 1906, xi/xiv., published in his Neue katābanische Inschriften, a German version of his Studier über sudarabische Indische, Copenhagen, 1906, §, Katabān texts (Glaser 1600, 1492, 1110, 1584 and one fragment) (which he had received from Glaser) with notes (critically reviewed by O. Weber, Studien zur sudarabischen Altertumskunde, in M. V. A. G., 1907, xii/i. 1–22); at the same time Glaser in his Altjemenische Nachrichten, Munich 1906, p. 60 sqq. and 162 sqq., published the first of these inscriptions and Glaser 1606, of which Nielsen No. 5 was a fragment. The article following the above mentioned one by Weber was his Neue sud-arabische Inschriften (p. 23 sqq.) (Landberg 1–5) (No. 1 already published by H. Derenburg in Nouveaux envois du Yemen [despatched in 1903] under No. 3; Landberg 3 is identical with the first third of Glaser 1230 [in Glaser, Altjem. Nachrichten, p. 147 sqq.])

On the basis of the earliest publications from Glaser's papers, research was at once begun on individual problems of Katabānian antiquity. Hommel, for example (Grundrisse, p. 85 sqq., 140 sqq.), first proposed hypotheses regarding the religious system of the Katabānians. Hartmann gave his views on the constitution, from the important inscription Glaser 1606, and on historical questions (from Glaser 1599/60, 1693 etc.; op. cit., p. 430 sqq.; cf. also 164 sqq.). It is a noteworthy fact that the kingdom of Katabān appears also in the inscriptions as existing contemporaneously with some of Ma'in, Saba' and Hadramāt, just as we find it in Eratomethes. As regards language, Katabānian is nearer Minean than Saba'ean; Hommel said the Katabānian dialect was practically Minean. The traces of Saba'ean in it are due to contact with the neighbouring people. Weber had already pointed out (Studien, p. 2, 63 sqq.) in the epigraphy certain peculiarities from the few reproductions available to him. It is unnecessary to go further into the details of this earlier literature, especially in view of the comprehensive edition of Glaser's Katabānian inscriptions which is being undertaken by Rhodokanakis (see the art. Saba'). The latter had already published in his Der Grundzat der Öffentlichkeit in den sudarabischen Urkunden (S. A. B. Ak. Wien, 1915, clxxvii/i. 12 sq.) the Katabānian inscription Glaser 1606, already discussed by Glaser (see above) and Hartmann, (op. cit., p. 431), with very thorough notes; he then published some hitherto unknown inscriptions in Katābanische Texte zur Bedeutungswissenschaft in the S. A. B. Ak. Wien, 1909, cxix, namely Glaser 1601, 1602, 1395 = 1604 = No. 84 of the inscriptions collected by the South Arabian expedition (S. A. E.), Glaser 1412 = 1612 = S. A. E. 81, Glaser 1413 = 1613 = S. A. E. 82; in the already mentioned series of the three inscriptions Glaser 1396 = 1610 = S. A. E. 83, S. A. E. 48, of which the Kallisperis inscription (see above) forms one part, and Glaser 1693; lastly in the already mentioned treatise Die Inschriften an der Ma'in von Kobla Timma the inscription S. A. E. 77 = Glaser 1404 = 1614, S. A. E. 80, 80A = Glaser 1397 sqq. and, in elucidation of the title of Ma'inrib among the Katabānians, S. A. E. 94 = Glaser 1405, S. A. E. 85 + S. A. E. 60, Glaser 1410, and in the appendix S. A. E. 86; a new edition of S. A. E. 78 sq. = Glaser 1605 sq. has appeared in W. E. K. M., xxxii. 22 sqq. These publications mark an extraordinary advance not only for the accurate reproduction of the texts of the inscriptions and the very full commentary but also for the systematic investigation here attempted for the first time of problems of law, constitution and economy (see the art. Saba', iv. 12), as well as, for example a propos of the discussion of inscriptions Glaser 1601 and 1693, of details of the earlier history of Katabān; for example, in Katāban Texte, i. 26 sq., 34 sq. (supplement in Katāban Texte, ii. 98 sq.) a chronological order is proposed for some groups of Katabānian kings (cf. A. Grohmann, Katābanische Herrscherchronik in the Anze. Wien, x., 1916, p. 42 sqq., older attempts in Nielsen, op. cit., p. 42 sqq., and Studien, op. cit., p. 9 sq.; Hartmann, op. cit., p. 165 sqq. 601). Our knowledge of the history of ancient South Arabia is for the first time enlarged on many points by a combination of these newly published inscriptions with those already known. We see that certain smaller countries were dependent on Katabān, with which they for some time formed a great power. In Glaser 1396 there is mention of the dependence of the Ma'in tribe on the leading tribe Katabān. The inscription Haley's 504 (quoted above) shows that Ma'in was dependent on Katabān. On the other hand, from the Minean inscription Glaser 485 Ma'in appears as the donor of Saba'; Katabān was for some time one of the enemies of Saba'. But the period after the Minean inscription Glaser 418/419, in which Katabān is mentioned along with Ma'in among the enemies of Saba', was weakened by Saba'. At the time of the Sirwāt inscription, Glaser 1000, which mentions a campaign of Saba' in which Katabān was on its side, it had lost political control over considerable territory (cf. Glaser 1600 and
1620). A war lasting many years between Kataban and Saba’ (Glaser 481 = Fresnel 56 [see above], Glaser 1693) in the course of which (according to Rhodokanakis’ supposition) there was a rupture of the alliance between the two powers ended in a peace. References to Kataban being included in the kingdom of the Himyars may also be gleaned from inscriptions. None of the inscriptions concerned can be definitely dated in a known era, but it is possible to bring some of them into a chronological series relative to one another. The publication of new material alone will show whether the unsettled problems will be cleared up or remain unsettled.

**Bibliography:** The books and articles of Glaser, Rhodokanakis, Hommel, Deringen, Hartmann, Landberg, Weber, D. H. Muller, J. H. Mordtmann, Sprenger etc. are already cited in the text; reference need only be made here to my article Saba (Realexykleptaii s. v., esp. coll. 1425 sqq., 1448 sqq., 1457 sqq., 1492 sqq.).

(J. Tatsch)

**Kataban** b. Idas, ancestor of the Shariifs of Mecca from the beginning of the 13th century A.D. onwards. In 1201, 1202 or 1203 A.D. he overpowered the then ruling family of the Habisim and established his authority in the Holy City. The last Shariifs of the Banu Hashim had lived in continual family strife and quarrels. Meanwhile Kataban (for his pedigree cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, i., Stammtafel I between p. 24 and 25, and Stammtafel II between p. 74 and 75) had enlarged his estates from Yanbu’ southward in the direction of Mecca, thus preparing his attack on this city. When the Meccans were out of the town in order to assume the hajj [q.v.] for the *uura* on the 27th of Rajab, the commemoration day of Muhammad’s Ascension, he made use of this occasion to establish his power in the town. According to another story, however, his son IJzanah captured the town and prepared his father’s entry.

Kataban, in contradistinction to the Banu Hashim, his predecessors in the Hijaz, was a man of political genius, who pursued the idea of founding the independent principality of the Holy Land of Islam. He repaired the walls of the town which had fallen to ruins, captured Ta’if and brought the Thalibi-tribes under his dominion. He continued the war with the Shariifs of Medina, built a fortress at Yanbu’ and organised his army with peculiar care.

His attitude towards the Ayabids, the caliph and the Zaidites of Yaman is to be viewed in the light of his central political idea. He did not suffer manifest signs of any foreign power in his territory, so that relations often became strained and sometimes even ended in open hostility. Nevertheless the caliph once invited him to visit Baghdad. It is said that Kataban started on his journey to the capital, but returned to his own country when he was met by an embassy of the caliph which had in its train fettered lions. Be this legend or fact, this much is certain, that Kataban embodied his idea of the “splendid isolation of the Hijaz” in verses which are a typical illustration of his negative attitude towards foreign powers. Probably his encouragement of the Zaidite occupation of Yaman is to be viewed in the same light.

In his last days he undertook an expedition against Medina. Illness, however, induced him to return to Mecca, where he was killed in 1221 by his son Hasan, who suspected him of favouring one of his relatives as a candidate for the throne. His descendants were ruling Shariifs at Mecca, until in 1916 Husain converted the shariifate into a kingdom.


(A. J. Vekensink)

**KATAK** (Cuttack), a district in Orissa [q.v.]

**KATANGA, a province in the Belgian Congo.**

**Geography and History.** Katanga is the most southern, richest and least populated of the four provinces of the Belgian Congo. It lies between 5° and 13° 30’ S. Lat. and 21° 30’ and 30° 30’ E. Long. It is bounded on the north by the eastern province and the province of Congo Kasai, on the east by Lake Tanganyika which separates it from the former German East Africa (now under British mandate) and by Northern Rhodesia; in the south by Northern Rhodesia and Portuguese Angola; in the west by Angola and the province of Congo Kasai. The area is 207,000 square miles, about a quarter of that of the Belgian Congo. Its native population is about a million and a half of Southern Bantus (Balubas, Lunda, Basonge, Bangango, Warua, Watumwbe, Babui, Baholoholo, Kanioka and Batschok), while its white population is about 4,500, of whom the great majority are Belgians, about fifty Dutch, a few English, Americans, French, Italians, Portuguese, Greeks and Scandinavians. In 1922 there were forty-nine Hindus, eight Turks and fifteen Arabs and Zanzibaris. These figures have since been considerably increased.

The province of Katanga is divided into four districts — Upper Lupula, Lomami, Luba and Tanganya Moero. A number of towns — Elisabethville, Likasi, Alberville, Kongolo, Kabinda, Sandonge and Kambove — have arisen in it as a result of the economic conditions of which we will give a general account below.

We may add that Katanga enjoys a fairly temperate climate, especially south of the tenth parallel, in which the altitude varies from 3,500 to 5,500 feet and that it is well watered by rivers and streams, such as the majestic Lualaba (upper reaches of the Congo river) which runs through it from south to north and is fed by many tributaries of which the most important are the Lufira, Lupula, Luvua, Lovoi and Lukuga, which flow from Lake Tanganyika. If the soil of Katanga, which is covered with a forest of more or less dense bushwood, is far from having the great fertility of the immense central depression which constitutes the most extensive part of the Belgian
Katanga

Congo, and if it does not offer to the fascinated eye of the traveller the imposing beauty of gigantic forest, its soil, on the other hand, possesses wealth incalculable. It is to the exploitation of this that the economic policy of the Belgian colonisers has been primarily directed.

Deposits of tin are abundantly distributed between Luulaba and Lake Tanganyika; two important coal-mines are worked at Albertville and Lutena; auriferous dykes, pipes of kimberlite and alluvial diamond-bearing deposits have been discovered in various places. Since 1922 the Mining Union has been working an extremely rich deposit of uranium which was found at Shiukolobwe. In 1923, 450 tons were exported which enabled Belgium to produce several grammes of bromure of radium.

But the principal source of the wealth of Katanga is certainly the copper found in profusion in immense deposits worked by the natives before, the Belgians came, which the earlier travellers simply could not help discovering. The richness of the ore, the density of which is 14%, and the intelligent organisation of the industry have enabled 80,000 tons of raw copper to be exported in 1924. This production, like economic development in general, will certainly make new strides ahead when "white coal", the reservoir of hydraulic energy of enormous power abundantly distributed through the province, has been controlled and put at the disposal of industry.

The first methodical exploration of Katanga dates from 1890. Famous explorers — Buton, Speke, David Livingstone, H. M. Stanley in the Cameroons, Böhm and Reichard and certain Belgian expeditions of the Association Internationale Africaine, representatives of which — Pulselin, Ramakers, Storms and Becker — founded the stations of M'Toa, Karem and M'Pala on Lake Tanganyika — had, of course, visited it previously. But it was only at the end of the nineteenth century, just when Cecil Rhodes was pushing his railway and British influence northwards, that the Congo Free State began to take notice of the urgent necessity of recognising and organising the most southern part of its vast territory. King Leopold II, sovereign of the new state, whose colonial plans did not meet with very great approval in Belgium, to realise this scheme had to have recourse to a private society, the Compagnie du Congo pour le Commerce et l'Industrie, with which he founded the Compagnie du Katanga.

This society was essentially a body for exploration and occupation, whose duties and rights were defined by the convention of March, 1894, which imposed on it the following obligations:

1) The placing of a certain number of craft on the Upper Congo — the building of stations — giving assistance in the suppression of the slave-trade and the trade in spirits and prohibited arms — the organisation of a sufficient police service — the eventual exercise by its agents of the functions of the different branches of government service.

In return it received:

1) Full possession of a third of the lands belonging to the domain of the State, in the part of the valley of the Upper Congo lying to the south of the fifth parallel.

2) The right of exploitation of the soil of the ceded lands for a space of ninety-nine years.

But the division of the lands between State and Company raised serious difficulties and the necessity soon appeared of putting the properties of the contracting parties under joint ownership.

There was therefore created in 1900 the special Committee of Katanga to which the State and the Company entrusted the management of their affairs. The resulting agreement provided that "all the advantages or benefits to be gained from the exploitation and all expense, charges and losses would be divided by the Committee in proportion of two-thirds for the State and one-third for the Company; the Committee would further have the most extended powers of administration and alienation without exception or reserve".

A decree of 1910 deprived the special Committee of the delegation of the functions of the executive powers, but made no essential modification in its functions as regards the administration of the patrimonial rights of the State and of the Katanga company.

This is the regime that is still in control; our reason for giving at length the circumstances that brought it into being is that it is at bottom extremely original and that — contrary to what is often thought — the position of the Katanga Committee is totally different from that of great companies like the Chartered Company of Rhodesia, or the British East Africa Company, and of other distant possessions. Nowadays Katanga has made great progress, thanks to the policy of the Belgian government and the activity of private initiative. The railway, which runs from Bukama to Sakania and connects the mining region with Luulaba and with the railways of Rhodesia, has been equipped in a very up-to-date fashion and soon a new line will link it up by the Kassi river with the port of Matadi and the Atlantic Ocean.

Muhammadan penetration, the slave trade and the anti-slavery campaign.

History tells us that even before the Hijira Arab barques were traversing the ocean between the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. But it was only when the great Muslim movement had made its immense advance into North Africa and caused the migration on a huge scale of the disciples of the Prophet, that we find the Arabs devoting themselves to the methodical conquest of the lands round the Indian Ocean and building up important satelites there, of which those of Sofala and Zanzibar have from time to time had bursts of splendour and passed through periods of power and brilliance.

But this power soon began to degenerate and assume a new character. It passed into the hands of traders and exploiters for whom, as Privelle said, "the normal state of society was the choice by them of the most convenient and most remunerative method of exploitation".

It is then that we find chiefs penetrating into the very heart of East Africa where the weak and poorly armed natives offered them no resistance and where they found vast riches, from ivory to human cattle, for whom the American planters and the Asiatic Muslims offered handsome prices.

Setting out from Zanzibar and the coast of Mozambique, the movement reached Lake Tanganyika at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It reached Katanga by the bay of M'Toa and spread through the whole of the eastern province by the road from M'Toa to Kabambare and
Kasongo. A regular Arab power extending from the banks of Tanganika to Stanleyville was established by the chief Tippo-Tip and his nephew Rashid. We know (Stanley and Livingstone have given terrible pictures of it in their works) the horrors which accompanied this invasion and the rapid disintegration of native communities which was produced by the constant wars, flights, endless migrations and continual rupture of the most sacred links of family life. Europe was moved. Cardinal de Lavigerie preached a holy war and on the initiative of Leopold II the civilized nations met in an anti-slavery conference in 1889. War was declared on the chiefs Rashid, Sefu and Kumalaza. While Dhanis was fighting them in the south of the Congo, Commandant Jacques and his lieutenants fought fierce battles with them on the banks of Lake Tanganika, at Kataki, Albertville and McPala, which were to liberate for ever the native population from the scourge which had fallen upon them. What influence did this activity of the Muslim world leave upon the Bantu peoples of Katanga? From the shores of Lake Tanganika to Stanley Falls, we find at the present day negroes who profess Islam. They are called arabised "wangwana". There is no reason to doubt that the Arabs used to make and still make serious efforts at conversion to Islam; but is there any reason to doubt that a religion which, like Islam, preaches hatred of the kaffir and recommends polygamy is specially suited to attract the natives of Africa.

We must say, however, that if we consider this influence serious in the eastern province, where we have important groups of arabised natives at Kasongo, Mbangwe, Kirundu and Stanleyville, and if it is reviled as fairly considerable in the residencies of Ruanda and of Urundi (former German districts, now under Belgian mandate) it is perhaps not quite the same in Katanga. For if there are still a few arabised negroes on the shores of Lake Tanganika and along the old Arab roads, they are really very few in number and their religious education is of the most rudimentary nature. They like to wear a white dress to show their superiority over the other negroes and sometimes perform their qalār turned towards Mecca and fast in Ramadān, but for the rest they are ignorant and still believe, like their pagan kinsmen, in spirits, witchcraft, superstitions and in the power of malevolent magic.

Is any influence of this kind worthy of the attention of colonising nations? We think so, for one thing is certain, that the arabisation of the negro very quickly gives him a contempt for the kaffir and for European authority and the Muslims do not hesitate to encourage these sentiments.

Alongside of the arabisised negroes there remain in Katanga a certain number of Arabs who have been joined by Muslim Indians. They devote themselves to trading with untiring industry and some of them possess substantial shops, doing a big business and have prospered exceedingly. Indeed, we are at the commencement of a powerful economic offensive, the strength and meaning of which we must try to estimate.

Economic penetration from the East. Dār al-Salām (Léopold) and Zanzibar lying at the crossing of the routes from Europe, Africa and Asia, have become by force of circumstance depots for Asiatic merchandise of all kinds which eastern commerce intends for East Africa, into which they penetrate as a result of the activity and business skill of the immigrant Arabs and Hindus. To give an idea of the importance of this trade, it will be sufficient to consider that in 1922 Bombay and Zanzibar sold in Tanganika Territory (under British mandate) goods worth £ 694,000, the total imports being at most £ 1,386,500 and Great Britain herself purchased to the extent of £ 292,000. The goods which reach Katanga by this route are mainly cloths, articles of clothing, blankets and a certain amount of foods, soap and miscellaneous articles.

As regards textiles, the Hindu and Arab merchants import the most varied kinds, but especially the white cottons called "American" and "chader", which sell very well in the markets of Katanga. Not only do the importers attach a great importance to the quality and variety of their goods, but they pay special attention to the measurements of their cloths and call for a certain amount of goods which are not native-produced, as for example the port of Albertville alone, 18,000 kilograms of chader, 27,000 kilograms of American and 8,000 kilograms of cotton printed and dyed, as well as a considerable quantity of blankets and other goods.

Their activity is not confined to imports alone. They also export and it will give an idea of the magnitude of this branch of their trade if we say that a single Arab house in Albertville imported almost millions of francs worth of ivory. Several of these firms extend their activity from Zanzibar or Dār al-Salām to Albertville and from Albertville to the Stanley Falls. They have branches in the more important stations and have agents in their service and petty traders who are of great value to them, sober and active, living almost like natives, carrying on business at insignificant expense and thoroughly acquainted with the soul of the negro with its vices and weaknesses, which they can flatten when necessary even — and particularly — to the detriment of the prestige of the European; they carry into the remotest corners eastern influence with their wares.

In Katanga we can see an attempt at economic penetration which will have great developments and the figures which we have given ought in our opinion only to be regarded as stages in an increasing progression which, if European commerce does not take care, will assume considerable importance.

Is this economic influence susceptible of having a serious repercussion in other spheres? I should be premature to try to answer this question definitely. But we know that the demands raised by Orientals in the Kenya Colony in 1923 created profound uneasiness there and that the commercial strike began at the beginning of the same year by Hindu and Arab merchants in Tanganika Territory seriously disturbed the economic and political atmosphere of this colony. And then — and this is a thing which no colonising nation can afford to neglect — we are at the present watching the evolution of a phenomenon which an American author has styled "the blood tide of colour" and which may perhaps be a subject for grave anxiety to humanity to-morrow.

Bibliography: Travaux du groupe d'études coloniales (Instituts Solvay), Le Katanga; A. de Bauw, Le Katanga, Brussels 1920; O.
The peninsula was of some importance even in ancient times on account of its important situation commanding the Gulf of al-Bahrayn. A. Spranger has sought to identify the Cattaraei of Pliny (Naturalis Historiae, vi. 28, § 147) with the inhabitants of al-Kaṭar. The peninsula used to belong to the Sulṭānate of Ṭūm. From 1872 till 1914 it was under the suzerainty of the Turks, who had a garrison in al-Bedja down to October, 1914, and belonged to the province of al-Ḩaṣa, forming the kada of the same name in the sandjak of Naḍja. Since 1913 Abd Allāh al-Thānī has been lord of the peninsula. But parts of it became independent earlier. For example, in 1862 Dawaḥa made a treaty with England, ratifying her protectorate; in 1862 Dawāḥa, and in 1814 other places followed this example. Al-Ḳaṭar is now under the control of the ruler of Central Arabia, Ibn Saʿūd, who has thus regained the position once held by the Wahhābī kingdom to the peninsula, which the Turks had for a time usurped.


(KARL GROHMAN)

Kaṭarī b. al-Fuḍjāʿa, the last chief of the Azraḳ Khāridjīs (cf. above, i. 542). He belonged to a clan of the Tamīm (the tribe which furnished one of the most noteworthy contingents to these rebels), the Banū Ḋiyāb b. Ḍiyāb b. Māzin (Wüstenfelde, Geneal. Tabellen, i. 14). The name of his father, al-Fuḍjāʿa, is said to have been a surname and his real name was Djaʿwanī. Like other Arab chiefs, al-Ḳaṭarī had a double kunya (cf. Goldziher, Muḥ. Studien, i. 267): Abū Muḥammad in peace and Abū Maʿṣūma in war (Dżahī, Bayān, i. 131, i. 126). Of his youth we only know that he took part under the command of Abū al-Ǧaḥmān b. Samuel, along with several other chiefs among whom was al-Muhallab b. Abī Ṣafra al-ʿAzdi, destined later to become his bitter enemy, at the submission of Siṇā, in 42 A. H. (al-Baladḥurī, Futūḥ, ed. de Goeje, p. 396; Khāliṣa b. Khaṭīb in Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, al-ʾIsrāʾīlī, Haiđerābād 1318, p. 405; Ibn Ḫadjar, Ṭaba, Cairo 1325, iv. 161). He must have reached a fairly mature age when, 27 years later, he was acclaimed ʿCommander of the Azraḳs when the latter, defeated by al-Muhallab and his lieutenants, were forced to surrender to nature. They passed through a very serious crisis. Kaṭarī, endowed with tremendous energy and indifferent to danger, was able to arouse the enthusiasm of his partisans, and after leading back the remnants of the army into the mountains of Kirman, reorganised them; he then went down again into the Ṭirāq, occupied Alważ and threatened Ba-rā. Kept for a long time in check by Muhallab, he nevertheless succeeded in maintaining his position on the left bank of the Ḫudjaṣ and after the Ṭirāq, as a result of the defeat of Moṣjàb b. al-Ẓubair at Māṣrik (71 A. H.), had fallen into the hands of Abīd al-Malik. Finally al-Ḥaḍjijād b.
Yusuf, appointed governor of the 'Irak, decided to reappoint Muhammad to the command against the Arzakis, in which he had been replaced without success by other chiefs. Muhammad then crossed the Djırafa along the line of the Djırafa to the Djudjaila and the offensive, pursued them into the very centre of their power. Kirmın. Kaṭari nevertheless was able to hold out for a long time in his lines (it is to this period that a silver coin with a legend in Pahlavi and Arabic of the year 75 struck in the name of Kaṭari as Amīr al-Mu'minin, refers [Z. D. M. G., 1585, xii. 52, No. 303]). The discontents that broke out within the Arzaki army between Arabs and Mawāl resulted in a split: Kaṭari had to leave the town of Djudjaila which was the Arzaki head-quarters and take refuge along with the Arabs in Tabaristan, while the Mawāl continued to hold Djudjail under the command of their chief, 'Abd Rabb or 'Abd Rabbi, (there are two individuals of this name among the Mawāl distinguished by the epithets al-Kābir and al-Saghir and the sources give the rank of commander sometimes to one and sometimes to the other or even distinguish two groups of the Mawāl which separated successively from al-Kaṭari and were led by 'Abd Rabbi the Great and the Less respectively). This division proved fatal, for Muhallab had no difficulty in routing the Mawāl and killing their chief; al-Hadjdjādī sent the Kābī warrior Sufyān b. al-Abrād against Kaṭari; or rather the latter (according to a tradition recorded by al-Yaqlī) as governor of Kaly received the appeal which the Ḥarāfī (local chief; cf. A. Siddiqi, Studien über die Pers. Fremdwörter im ksl. Arabischen, p. 784) addressed to him on behalf of the people of Tabaristan who were exasperated by the rigid application of the Ḧarāfī tax by Kaṭari. The Arzaki surprised by Sufyān's troops in a defile in the mountains suffered a decisive defeat. Kaṭari who fell under his horse and was abandoned by his followers was discovered and killed by a native. His head was cut off and borne in triumph to Kūnī and then to Damasc as was to be presented to the Caliph. The remnants of the Arzaki under 'Abida b. Hīlāl al-Yashkuri fled to Saghwan, a stronghold near Kūnī (Yaqlū, ii. 62) where they sustained a long siege from Sufyān; having exhausted their supplies, they made a desperate sortie which were wiped out. The chronology of these events is far from certain: the sources say that Kaṭari was in command for 13 or even 20 years are of no value. According to Wellhausen (cf. Bül.), the election of Kaṭari as Caliph probably took place at the end of 69 A.H. and his death in 78 or 79.

Kaṭari b. al-Fudjā'a represents in striking fashion the type of Kāhrīdī insurrectionist and also that of Arab Sayyid, half cavalier and half brigand. Like the other Arzaki, as a result of his fanatical zeal, he preached and practised istiraq (assassin.) of anyone who did not accept the Kāhrīdī creed) and declared the kā'ad (singul. kā'id) infeudals, that is to say those who, while professing the Kāhrīdī doctrine, refrained from taking part in the war against their adversaries. On the other hand, he was proud of his Arab blood and that of Bedouin character; like several other illiterate Kāhrīdīs, he had a real talent as orator and poet. One of his speeches is recorded by Dāhīj, Dayān, i. 196, 197; 'Ubd, ii. 195-196 (cf. also Fīrāṣ, p. 125 ff.); the fragments of his poetry that have survived to us, of which the most celebrated is the fragment Ha'madah, p. 44 (frequently quoted, with numerous variations), are remarkable for the elevated style and a heroic contempt for death and place their author in the first rank of Kāhrīdī poets.

Bibliographie: al-Tabari, ed. De Goeje, ii. 764, 823, 829, 914, 1003, 1017—1023; al-Dinawari, al-Kāhir b. 'Abd al-Thā'īl, ed. Gurgans, pp. 285—289, 311; Mubarrad, Kāmil, ed. Wright, Index, s.v.; al-Yaqlī, ed. Houtsma, ii. 222—230; al-Balādhūrī, Anbīya al-Abrād, Anon. Alh. waw., p. 122 (7) end—125; Ibn Kutaibah, Kitāb al-Ma'mirī, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 210; Ibn Durāid, Kitāb al-Iṣkāh, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 126, 1; Ibn Khallikān, Wafayat al-A'yan, 2nd ed., ii. 184—185 = 3rd ed., i. 430—431 (N. 555 Wustenfeld); Khāzinat al-Dakh, iv. 261; al-Shabānī, al-Ma'mir wa 'inbal, ed. Curoet, p. 59—90; Abd al-Khārīr al-Baghdādī, al-Fārik bi-nu'l-Fīrās al-Garīb, Cairo 1328, pp. 65—66; R. Frimmel, Die Christenfehde unter den ersten Ommeyaden, Leiden 1884, p. 44—46; J. Wellhausen, Die religiöse-politischen Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam (Abb. G. W. Grote), Berlin 1900, vol. vii. 36—41. Kāth, the ancient capital of Khwarzim, is the modern Khiva; according to Yaqlū, Mu'addī, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 222, the name meant a wall (qā'it) in the desert in the language of the Khwarzims, even if there were no buildings within this. The fullest accounts of the old town and citadel of Fil or Fir, which was gradually washed away by the Amū-Daryā (the last traces of it are said to have disappeared in 834 = 994), are given in al-Biruni's Qātīb al-Anbār b. Dāyīya, p. 55; on which E. Schauz based his Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwarizm (Sitzungsber. der phil. hist. Cl. d. K. Akad. der Wiss., Innsbruck, Vienna 1873, esp. p. 459 sq.). On the description of the town by the geographers of the 11th (xth) century cf. G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 446 sq.; W. Barthold, Turkestân w forquha mongolskog nasjonaliteten, i. St. Petersburg 1900, p. 143 sq.; the fullest information is given by al-Mu'addī, ed. De Goeje, 1906, p. 287 sq. The town lost its political importance when the dynasty of the first Khwarzimshah was destroyed by the prince of Gurgāndī, Abu T'Abbas Ma'mūn b. Muhammad, in 385 (995); cf. W. Barthold, Turkestân, etc., ii. 275 sq. Kāth is mentioned by Ibn Batūta (called al-Katb by him; cf. ed. Defrémey and Sagninetti, iii. 20) as the only inhabited place between Khwarzim and Urgench (the ancient Gurgandī). In the 12th (xith) century Kāth along with Khiva before the rise of the native dynasty in Khwarzim, belonged to the kingdom of Ghur. mā (Zafar- Najmā, Calcutta 1887, i. 232), this is shown for example also on the Chinese map of 1331 (in Bretnscheider, Medival Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources, 1888, ii. 63). On the storming of Kāth by Timūr in 1372 cf. Zafarnāma, i. 237 sq.; for the assertion of P. Lorch, Khivas oder Khwarizm, St. Petersburg 1875, p. 21) that the army crossed the Amū-Daryā between Se-Fāyā and Kāth, which would mean that Kāth even then was on the left bank of the river, there is no authority in the text. In the 13th (xvth) century Kāth was on the bank of a dry canal; Anuṣa, Khān of Khiva (1665—1687), therefore built a new Kāth west of the main stream on the bank of the Yarmūk canal which he
himself had dug (W. Barthold, K istorii o rožen'ya Turkestana, St. Petersburg 1914, p. 95, from the MS. of the Asiatic Museum 590 ob, History of Khiva, fol. 335). The ruins of the old Kālīkh east of the Amū-Darya are now called after the alleged tomb of a saint of the earliest period of Islam, ʿAbbās Wallī; they were visited in 1873 and described by A. Kuhn (Materiali diya statističkii Tur. Kraya, iv. 252). Besides the tomb of the saint, the only building adorned with glazed bricks, there are mentioned here a half destroyed minaret and the remains of the city wall, all of baked bricks. The modern village (200 houses, 15 shops with schools) occupies only a small part of the ancient site and the modern fort only a quarter of the old citadel. According to V. Masalskiy (Turkestanskii Kray, St. Petersburg 1913, p. 749), the ruins are 31 verses from Petroalexandrovsk (called Turkul since the revolution) and 7 verses from the present right bank of the Amū-Darya. (W. Barthold)

KATHAI, KETAI [See China].

KATTA [See K'AI].

KATIC, writer or scribe, is probably derived from the word kāṭāb (book) and from both was later formed the verb kataba (he wrote). The word was perhaps imported with the art from the Northern Arabian neighbours of the Arabs. We not only find the word in the earliest poetry preserved, applied to those who wrote the Arabic script but also ancient poets speak of Ḥimāriyā kāṭābs. In the time before Islam the art of writing, though apparently practised in all parts of Arabia, was the accomplishment of the few, and Ibn Saʿd in his Ṭabākāt makes a point of mentioning each time when he states that a certain ʿAṣāḥib could write, that the art of writing was little known at that time. Among the Companions at Medina some ten are stated to have been kāṭābs, and ʿAṣāḥib b. Mālik in a tradition preserved by Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (iii. 459) mentions that he is a kāṭāb as a particular accomplishment. It is further recorded that several prominent men in Mekka also wrote, and we may assume that the kāṭābs of the court of al-Ḥira (like ʿAbd b. Zaid) were employed in drawing up the safe-conducts (mentioned by Tūsail al-Ghanawī or hīfi-contracts referred to in the Naṣaḥāt and in the Muṣallākā of al-Ḥarīrī b. ʿUllī and written in Arabic. Of far greater importance from an Islamic point of view were the men who wrote down the revelations of the Prophet; they are named Kāṭīb al-Walīy. Such men were ʿUbayy b. Kaʿb, Ibn Masʿūd and Zaid b. Ṭabīt. These same men were also employed for writing the various letters sent by the Prophet to prominent men in Arabia inviting them to embrace Islam. The office of kāṭīb was one of great honour and the rank, which was later occupied by the waṣī, was filled during the whole time of the first four Caliphs and the Umayyads by men who had the simple title of kāṭīb, and it was only under Abu ʿl-ʿAbd b. Sālih that the title of waṣī was first employed. By this time, on the model of the Persian chancellery, a complicated system of government offices had developed. The chief secretary had the title of Kāṭīb al-Sirr "Private secretary", others were employed to make the first drafts of official documents; these were called Kāṭi b al-Inṣāq. The control of the army with the payment of the troops was regulated by the Kāṭīb al-Dhakād, which might equate with the "Secretary for War". Other secretaries were employed for the supervision of the landed property of the ruler. The whole system of kāṭībs was the Divān [q.v.]. This class of men became all-powerful and it was from them that the highest officials of state were recruited. They appear to have kept themselves apart from the other men of education, for only rarely find we any of them mentioned among the innumerable traditionists and theologians, though many are found among the men who made a mark as poets or authors in other branches of learning. As they were required to have a general knowledge of all manner of subjects, authors early began to compose books for the benefit of this class and as this office maintained its importance the works for their benefit have come down to us in many copies. The chief works on the education of the kāṭīb are the Abab al-Kāṭīb of Ibn Ḥusayn (q.v.), the Kitāb al-Kutṭāb of Ibn Durustawāhi, the Abad al-Kāṭīb of al-Sūlī and especially the voluminous work of al-Kalāshandī. While the first three works give us an insight into the requirements of a competent kāṭīb in the earlier centuries, the Suhh al-A'īdā of al-Kalāshandī contains practically all that it is necessary to know on the subject. We can trace step by step how the kāṭīb improved the whole of Arabic prose literature; from the simple and clear letters of the earlier periods we come gradually to the bombastic composition of later times in which it is frequently difficult to discover the purpose of a document in the volume of sounding words. The disease was due to the zeal of the kāṭīb to outdo his colleagues or predecessors in the imagined elegance of his diction. We may owe many useful works to their authors' desire to supply the kāṭīb with the material for his compositions, but the whole striving for grandiose language has been the cause for making so much Oriental literature so indigestible to our taste. This is perhaps aggravated by Persian, Turkish and Indian kāṭībs. They were proud too when they could solve the meaning of the tangle of words and we get a glimpse at that mentality when a renowned kāṭīb like the ʿAbd b. ʿAbdāb object to a letter being sent to him, because the words were properly pointed and vocalised, as he considered it an insult to his intellect. Though the kāṭībs rose to high positions, they appear as a class to have been of a cowardly disposition, and could only intrigue; and I believe no one ever rose to become a ruler, which so many bold spirits succeeded in doing during the last twelve centuries. Bibliography: Ibn Ḥusayn, Abad al-Kāṭīb, ed. Grünew and several Oriental editions, especially the Commentary of al-Batalyūsi entitled Abad al-Kāṭīb; Ibn Durustawāhi, Kitāb al-Kutṭāb, ed. Cheikh; al-Sūlī, Abad al-Kāṭīb, ed. Beirūt; al-Kalāshandī, Suhh al-A'īdā, ed. Cairo in 14 volumes and the abridgment of the latter entitled Al-Daw'n. (F. Krenkov)

KATIB CELEBI. [See ḤIJJILA].

KATIB-I RUMI. [See 'Ali b. Husain].

KATIBI SHAMS AL-DIN MUHAMMAD B. ABD ALLAH, a Persian poet, born at Tarak, Wardenesh; a village of Turğiş in Khwarāsān, studied at Nishāpūr, went to Herāt, and in 1082 at Harat to the court of Timūrids, where he did not receive the welcome he expected, and lived for a long time in Shīrāz where the prince Mirzā Shaikh Ibrāhīm (d. 820 = 1417) had taken him under his patronage. He then lived in Adharbudān, where he was not appreciated by Iskandar b. ʿUṣūf, and in Iṣfahān, where
he immersed himself in the study of mysticism, and died of the plague at Astara in 838 and 839 (1434—1435). It was in the last-named town that he undertook to compose a *khawāna* "a group of five poems" in imitation of Nizāmī and Amir Khosrow but he only finished the *Gulshan-i Abru* "Rosebush of Pious Men" and his *Laftāt-i Maḏjūnāt* of which the only known manuscript is in St. Petersburg. In the field of ethical and didactic poetry he wrote a book entitled *Dīh Bāb* "The ten Chapters" or *Tadhāifik al-Funūn*; he also left a *Dīwān* of ten gazelles were published and translated by Bland in his *Century*, p. 18—21, the *Pul-i Qubbat* "Thirty Letters", devoted to mystic love, and among the *Mathnawī* of allegorical and epic matter the *Mathnawī al-Bahrawn* "Confluence of the two Seas", which has a double rhyme, and can be read in two different metres and represents the mystic love of two personages named Nāẓir and Maḥnūr, and the *Dīrūzād* "Ravishing of Hearts", an allegorical history of Khūbd, king of the Yemen, and of his minister, fertile in ruses. His poetical surname of Kātibi probably comes from the fact that he was a calligrapher, having received lessons in Nisāfūr from Mawla Ilqī, who later quarrelled with him. He spent the whole of his life in poverty as a foolish and meagre-voiced person which prevented him in a few days the sums he received from the munificence of his patrons.


(CI. Huart)

**Al-Ḵātīf, a seaport on the coast of the Persian Gulf in the bay of the same name.** The latter, which faces due east, is about four miles broad at the entrance, and enclosed on the north by a narrow promontory, shaped like a mussel-shell, on which lies the fortress of Dārūn. Its point is called Rās Tanūrā. The south side of the bay is confined by a jutting horn of land, called Zahrān, from a hill on it shaped like a sugar-loaf, which forms an excellent landmark for ships entering the bay. On this side of the bay lie the fortifications of Dammān. Towards the mouth of the bay lies the island of Tārūt, four hours' journey in length from north to south, well provided with water and thickly planted with palm groves. This island lies exactly opposite al-Ḵātīf. The best and safest passage to the harbour of al-Ḵātīf is through the deep channel on the north between the island of Tārūt and Rās Tanūrā; the channel south of the island is shallow and difficult to navigate. The waters of the Gulf are shallow almost everywhere in the bay, and only show a level surface of water at high tide: when the ebb sets in, landbanks appear, and little islands, shallows and bushes of sea-plants, among which wind narrow channels filled with mud. The coast is very flat; except at a few places it is almost level with the sea.

It is significant of the change in the coast-line that Abu 'l-Fida (d. 1331) tells us that in his time Tārūt was still part of the continent and was only surrounded by the sea and became an island at high tide. As soon as the sea went back a part of the land between Tārūt and al-Ḵātīf appeared, so that people could pass along it to the mainland. According to him, Tārūt was half a day's journey from al-Ḵātīf and rich in vineyards with excellent grapes. Al-Maṣūdi (d. 956) puts the distance between Tārūt and al-Ḵātīf at a mile. As Tārūt is now an island, the sea has swallowed up part of the coast here. On the land side al-Ḵātīf is surrounded by a broad girdle of gardens and orchards. The flourishing crops in the gardens far surpass those of the best watered places in the interior, e.g. at Huhūfī. The date-palm does exceedingly well here in a soil richly irrigated, partly by salt water, which the flood-tide carries far into the interior, and partly from the fresh water springs of the adjacent hills. Cereals, wheat, barley, rice, and all kinds of vegetables, figs, apricots, mangoes, pomegranates, grapes, citrons and lemons also flourish here. Through an uninterrupted succession of palm-groves, which it takes several hours to traverse in either direction, wind-sieve-like ites, the arches and canals of an old irrigation system, which date from the Karmaṭian period, and formerly supplied al-Ḵātīf with better water than could be had in the immediate neighbourhood of the town. The whole length of the system, now in ruins, must have been about five miles. Al-Ḵātīf has walls and towers. The western gate has a high stone arch of delicate work and is flanked by towers and walls which are now in ruins. Just outside the gate are two cemeteries. The town, which is about a quarter of a mile long, is damp and filthy, and with its suburbs has about 6,000 inhabitants; the whole district, according to Sallier, had nine walled and seven open villages, the population of which including al-Ḵātīf he put at 25,000. The continual fighting, of which the town has been the scene, has much affected its appearance. It now has a dismal, broken-down look. The market-place, on which the products of the country are to be amply had, is large. At the inner end of the small bay already mentioned, stands the powerful citadel said to have been built by the Karmaṭian Abū Saʿīd al-Dānaībī, later used by the Portuguese, the high massive walls of brick and stone of which come down almost to the water's edge, so that only a narrow path along the shore is left, on to which opens the main gate defended by an outwork. Close to the shore there is now also the customs-house. The outer court forms a quadrangle and is surrounded by high walls with towers at the corners, and protected on the land-side by a ditch. At the south-west corner stands the old palace of the Karmatians, of which part has fallen in and been taken away and part has been very clumsily restored. The entrance is through a great archway in the Moorish style, supported by slender pillars, three arches deep and five long with fine cross-vaulting with arabesques in stucco, which have now for the most part fallen down. This archway leads into a long gallery, formerly covered, of which the side walls and pillars and a few arches remain. One then enters the inner court, which is surrounded by a series of chambers still fairly well preserved. A lofty room, long and
The climate of al-Kāṭif is very unhealthy; fever and other diseases have given the coast a bad reputation. The harbour, which was once accessible to heavily laden ships, is now for the most part silted up, and accessible only to small vessels at high tide. The sand-banks which run out on either side make entrance difficult, nay even dangerous. To the west and south the bay is well sheltered by the promontories and the islands of Tārūt and Suwaq. It is also favourably situated for trade with the ports of al-Bahrain, Būhhār and other places. Al-Kāṭif might again attain some importance as a harbour, if it were dredged and kept in order and given better communications with the interior. The inhabitants of al-Kāṭif are mainly engaged in pearl-fishing and in trading. Their type shows the strong Persian stamp, which dates from the pre-Muḥammadan period.

History. A. Sprenger has identified the bay with the Sinus Capensis of Pliney, Nat. Hist., vi., 28, § 147. Before the days of Isām, al-Kāṭif, like the whole of al-Bahrain, was under Persian suzerainty. Šāhpūr II about 320 A.D. conquered the whole Arabian coast beginning at al-Kāṭif. In the early days of the Parthian Empire there were still many Persian colonists (Maqjans), Jews and Christians in al-Kāṭif, as well as in the other towns of al-Bahrain. In al-Kāṭif, however, the ‘Abd al-Ka‘is were predominant in those days. The whole country of al-Bahrain including al-Kāṭif then submitted to the Prophet in al-Medina and came under the administration of al-‘A‘iz b. al-Hādrāmi. But when the general rising broke out among the Muslims under Muḥammad’s death, al-Bahrain was one of the first districts to proclaim its independence from the lord of al-Medina. In 111 A.H. the rebels under al-Ḥādī Ṭabī‘i occupied al-Kāṭif, but the rebellion soon collapsed. In 67 A.H. there was an encounter at al-Kāṭif between the Abī al-Ka‘is and Nadjiya b. ‘Amir al-Hafal, in which the former were decisively beaten. Nadjiya then abandoned the tents of the people of al-Kāṭif, who had risen against him, and took up his headquarters there. Much more momentous for the town than this transitory feud was the invasion by the Kārmat ‘Ajam Abī Sa‘id al-Ḥasan b. Bahram Al-Djinnabi in 286 A.H. Many inhabitants perished. Abū Sa‘id had pitched his camp in the town and then undertook a bold campaign against al-Baṣrah. The governor of the town, Ibn Bānū, gave battle to the Kārmāṭians at al-Kāṭif in 290 A.H.; the latter were defeated and suffered heavy losses, including Abū Sa‘id’s successor designate. The town was taken by Ibn Bānū and Abū Sa‘id had to abandon his campaign against al-Baṣrah and hurriedly return. Al-Kāṭif fell again into the hands of the Kārmāṭians, who were now masters of almost all al-Bahrain with Ḥadjar, al-‘Aḥsa‘, al-Kāṭif and al-Tā‘if. When at the period of decline of Kārmāṭian power in 378 A.H., al-‘Aḥsa‘ with a section of the Banu ‘d-Mun-

\textbf{Kat\text{"u}n}, Kad\text{"u}n (v.), [see K\text{"u}t\text{"u}n].

\textbf{Kat\text{"u}l} (a.), killing, putting to death, used in the two principal meanings of the word — the crime of murder and the punishment of execution.

I. \textit{Kat\text{"u}\text{"u}l} as a crime.

1. In the \textit{Kur\text{"u}n} unlawful slaying is forbidden in a series of verses, which date from the second Mekk\text{"a}n period to nearly the middle of the Medina period. The passages may be arranged chronologically as follows (cf. Th. Noldke-Fr. Schwally, \textit{Geschichte des Kor\text{"a}n}, vol. i. and ii. Grimm, \textit{Mohammed}, vol. ii.); when the exact order in the particular passages cannot be ascertained, the passages are here arranged in the order of the \textit{S\text{"u}ras} and verses): — xvii. 33 35 (second Mekk\text{"a}n period, according to O. Procksch, \textit{"Uber die Blutstotte}, p. 74, note 4, later than vol. 152): "Kill not your children for fear of being brought to want; We will provide for them and for you; verily the killing them is a great sin. Neither slay the soul which God hath forbidden you to slay unless for a just cause; but whosoever shall be slain unjustly, We have given his next of kin (wait) power (to demand satisfaction) but let him not exceed the bounds of moderation in the killing; indeed he is protected"; xxv. 65 sqq. (second Mekk\text{"a}n period): — (and the servants of the Merciful are those) who slay not the soul, which God hath forbidden to be slain unless for a just cause, for he who does this commits sins (or: will bring retribution upon himself); his punishment will be doubled on the day of the Resurrection and he shall remain in it covered with ignominy for ever; except him who repents and believes and performs good works; for them God will change their evil deeds into good" .... (here killing and unbelief are considered together so that the question, what happens to a believer who kills unlawfully, is left quite out of the question): v. 152 (third Mekk\text{"a}n period; similar to xvii. 33 35); iv. 94 sq. (about the years 3 5; according to Procksch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 86, to be dated between the treaty of al-\textit{Hudaiya} and the capture of Mekka): "it is not lawful for a believer to kill a believer unless by mistake (by \textit{qiy\text{"a}d}); but if anyone kill a believer by mistake he shall set free a slave who is a believer and pay a \textit{diya} to the next of kin of the dead man, unless they waive it; .... but if the person slain belong to a people hostile to you, but a believer, a slave who is a believer shall be released; but if he belong to a people with whom ye have a treaty, a \textit{diya} must be paid to his relatives and a slave who is a believer set free; if anyone cannot afford to do this, he must fast for two successive months so that Allah may look upon him again .... but if anyone kill a believer deliberately (with \textit{am\text{"a}d}) his reward is hell in which he shall remain for ever and Allah wrathful against him and curse him and shall prepare a great punishment for him" (the true interpretation is undoubtedly this, that every Muslim who kills another Muslim with \textit{am\text{"a}d} is condemned to eternal hell-fire and that Allah will not accept his repentance, a view which is ascribed to Ibn \textit{Ab\text{"u}b\text{"u}s}, Ibn \textit{M\text{"u}\text{"u}n}, Zaid b. \textit{b\text{"u}b\text{"u}s} and al-\textit{Hudaiya}; the view held by \textit{Ikh\text{"a}ma} and others that the verse refers to the particular case of a \textit{wurt\text{"u}d} who has killed a believer is not to be accepted; this is already a transition to the view that has finally prevailed, which tones down the literal wording of the passage, either by adding with al\textit{M\text{"u}d\text{"u}j\text{"a}d} unless he repents or by holding, as has become usual, that Allah will not leave a Muslim eternally in hell, and can even remit entirely the threatened punishment of hell-fire; but this is only the result of speculation and combination with other passages in the \textit{Kur\text{"u}n} [e.g. xi. 108 110; xxix. 54] and is therefore to be rejected: iv. 33 sq. (from about the same time; similar to iv. 95); ix. 12 (probably dates from soon after the treaty of al-\textit{Hudaiya}; similar to xvii. 33 35).

There are further two passages, in which it is asserted that Allah forbade the Jews to kill: ii. 75 sqq. (from about the first half of the year 2 \textit{A.H.}) and v. 35 (probably of the year 6 or 7; according to Grimm, to be dated before the battle of Badr).

There are also a number of verses in which killing is not exactly forbidden but is more or less strongly deprecated and represented as a mark of the unbeliever, just as committing no murder is a sign of the believer, e.g. lxxxi. 5 sq. (first Mekk\text{"a}n period); ii. 28 (probably third Mekk\text{"a}n period; according to Grimm, Medina); xvi. 24 (probably the battle of Badr); xii. 138, 141; xvi. 61 xvi. 26 (same time); viii. 30 (after the battle of Badr); v. 33 (shortly before the capture of Kh\text{"a}bar). In numerous passages in this connection the unbelievers are reproached with the slaying of prophets, e.g. ii. 58, 81, 85 (from the first half of the year 2); iv. 154 (after the outbreak of open war with the Jews of Medina); iii. 177, 180 (probably soon after the battle of \textit{Ubud}); xx. 108 (shortly before the war with the Banu \textit{b-N\text{"u}d\text{"i}}); v. 74 (later Medina period).

2. \textit{Supplements to the \textit{Kur\text{"u}n} passages from the \textit{S\text{"u}ra}, accounts of the life of Muhammad.}
In the so-called ordinance of the community, which dates from the first Medina period, it is laid down that no believer may kill a believer on account of an unbeliever; in another passage it is said: "If anyone kill a believer and is convicted, then vengeance for bloodshed must be done, unless the soul of the man slain waive it". In all probability Muhammad had in mind in the murder of a non-Muslim member of the community (Frockch, op. cit., p. 71): this agrees with the development given above. In the ba'itha, the initiation into the community, the initiate had to pledge himself, among other things, not to commit an unlawful act of slaying (cf. Kurān, lv. 12). Once Muhammad cursed a murderer (cf. the art. ḫiyāraṯ). In the so-called first temple-speech (of the year 650), the genuineness of which is not absolutely certain, however, on every point and seems doubtful on this particular point, there appears the by no means exactly defined conception of ḫatl shabab 'amad (see below, sub 5); Muhammad is also said to have declared there that all blood-guilt attached to a Muslim dating from the period of paganism was to be cast off, which extends the corresponding passage of the ordinance of the community. Finally it is to be mentioned that the Sira knows of several cases of deliberate and of unpunished slaying; so far as they are liable to be punished, they are dealt with in the article ḫiyāraṯ.

3) Comparison of the views of authoritative circles in the Muslim community in the older period as preserved in Ḥadith (tradition). It is obvious that in the Ḥadith also the slaying of a Muslim is strictly forbidden; by the adoption of Islam (and of monotheism at all) life and property are protected. The life and property of a Muslim are as inviolable (ḫarāṭiḥ) as the day of sacrifice in Dhu'l-Hijja in the sacred territory of Mekka (al-Bukhārī, Diwāšt, bāb 8, etc.). All blood-guilt, which has weighed a man down from an earlier period, is thus wiped out by the adoption of Islam, even if the crime was committed just before conversion to Islam. Only if a Muslim kills another, or, to be more exact, if he commits a crime worthy of death, can it be blamed. Everyone who perfectly agreed that killing with 'amād is one of the deadliest sins (kalābīr); it is usually considered the gravest sin, along with the ṣhirāk (polytheism; e.g. al-Bukhārī, Diwāšt, bāb 1, 2), whether it is asserted of killing with 'amād in general or of the killing of newborn girls usual among the heathens. Therefore many Ḥadith's express disgust at killing; e.g. "the slaying of a Muslim is to Allāh like the cessation of the world", or "the cessation of the world is even less to Allāh than this"; "if someone is killed in the east and another in the west approves of it, he is guilty of the person's blood"; "the work of Allāh; cursed he who destroys Allāh's works". The first murder which introduced killing into the world is the subject of special condemnation: Cain is accessory to every later murder. Murder is punished in the next world as well as on earth; on the Day of Judgment cases of the shedding of innocent blood will be judged first. As to the punishment itself, a whole stratum of ḥadiths reflects the already mentioned view of Ibn 'Abbās and others regarding the eternalness of punishment in hell for slaying with 'amād; e.g. "whoever sheds blood in an unlawful way, for him there exists no way of escape"; "whoever contributes though only by a word to the slaying of a Muslim must despair of the mercy of Allāh". In several passages the deliberate murder of a Muslim is considered equivalent to unbelief (baḍāʾ in which a warning is simply uttered against murder being a sin of the unbeliever are, of course, not dealt with here). It is even said: "if two Muslims attack one another with swords and one kills the other, both go to hell (unless it was a case of legitimate self-defence), the sayer for his deed and the slain because he wished to kill the other" (cf. e.g. al-Bukhārī, Diwāšt, bāb 2); and: "if all the inhabitants of heaven and earth together had killed someone they would all go to hell". In these two passages it is not exactly demonstrable that eternal punishment in hell is meant but it is very probable. In several of the traditions mentioned, Ibn 'Abbās appears as the authority. Such ḥadiths were naturally rendered harmless by "interpretation" by the representatives of the other view, if they were not entirely suppressed, which did happen to not a few. Thus the description of deliberate murder as unbelief is sometimes interpreted to mean that it is a very grievous sin and sometimes taken as a reference to the refusal of the protection of Islamic law, which occurs in both cases, to the life of the slayer or of the unbeliever. This was not found sufficient, however, but traditions were put into currency to prove the contrary, namely that Allāh would accept the repentance of a murderer, even if he had committed several murders as if these traditions is provided with a grotesque story, the object of which is quite apparent, as corroboration. In one tradition the kaffāra, especially the liberation of a slave, is represented as a means to save the murderer from the merited punishment of hell, obviously by someone who demanded it even in case of ḫatl with 'amād (see below sub 6). It is even asserted in public controversy against the views of the other side that after the Day of Judgment no Muslim will go to hell and that, on the contrary, all sins will be forgiven them. — The killing of a muḍāriḥ, i.e. a Muslim under the protection of the Islamic state, is threatened with punishment in the next world (e.g. al-Bukhārī, Diwāšt, bāb 50; al-Dārīmi, Sīyar, bāb 60; the Kurān is silent on the question); but, as might be expected, the view is very rarely expressed that this punishment is eternal. — The prohibition of suicide, which we do not find laid down in the Kurān, is given in the Ḥadith and the suicide is threatened with eternal punishment in the next world.

As an appendix to the above we may briefly mention the connection of several kinds of animals with ḫatl, which is also dealt with in tradition. Muhammad had, as is related, recommended the slaughter of dogs but later withdrew the order, although the dog always remained subject to certain exceptional regulations (cf. the art. KALIN; the sunna further orders the killing of the ṣawāṣn, a kind of lizard, but if possible it should be done with one blow: on the other hand the killing of ants and of cats is forbidden (among the authorities for this last tradition is Abū Hujairah); on the killing of snakes cf. Guillaume, Th. Traditions of Islam, p. 116 sq.

As regards the value of the traditions just quoted, the genuineness of none of them can be proved; while the falsity of those, which seek to save the murderer of a Muslim from hell, is
apparent, it is also probable of those which hold the contrary view.

4) The controversy regarding the punishment of the murderer of a Muslim centres round a passage in the Koran, which in itself could and must form a foundation for it, and is in part at least independent and original. This controversy and the conception of *khat* in general are, however, very closely connected with the disputes aroused by the *khadda*, *kadaria* and *mu*-

The controversy and the conception of *khat* in general are, however, very closely connected with the disputes aroused by the *khadda*, *kadaria* and *mu*tulits; the determinations of these articles; here it is sufficient to recall the following questions: — *is the committing of death a sin* and *killing with *samad* is certainly one of them — *unbelievers*? "Does man create his own actions, including sins, himself, or do they happen through *kadar*?" "Can man by his intervention interfere with Allah's decision, for example by killing another sooner than the period predestined for the latter's life?" We have more than one example of these questions being applied to *khat*, and they have been cited in discussing *khat* (cf. e.g. Goldziher, *Vorlesungen fiber den Islam*, p. 98 sq.; sec. ed., p. 92 sq.). But the Mu'tazilis' view of the eternalness of hell-punishment for him who commits a deadly sin and does not repent, is specially important in this connection; al-Zamakhshari gives an explanation of the verse of the Koran in question from this point of view. Finally the concensus of orthodox opinion agreed that the deliberate killing of a Muslim is certainly a deadly sin, but the slayer, on the other hand, if he repents and voluntarily submits to the punishment prescribed, will not he further punished in the next world and, even if he does not repent, will in no case remain in hell eternally (agreement was reached on this point even before the rise of the Fiqh-schools; therefore there is no *ikhtila* of the madhhab on this question); this view has found its way into all text-books of Fiqh and of doctrine.

5) A statement of the prevailing Ikhwan views on killing. *Khat* in the Fiqh is the act of a man whereby the life of a fellow-man is brought to a close (the death need not immediately follow the act). It may be qualified by any of the five "legal categories": — death without necessity, recommended (naudah), e.g. when the ghaazi kills his unbelieving kinsmen if they insult Allah or his Prophet; permitted (mukhab), e.g. when the Imam kills the unbelieving prisoner of war, in the case when the reasons for killing him exactly balance those for granting his life; killing in self-defence is also allowed i.e. in defending oneself against an illegal attack on one's life, person or property, in defending oneself or some one who comes to help, if the attack cannot otherwise be averted (on further questions there is *ikhtila*, also on the question whether a man who surprises another in adultery with his wife or endeavouring to see into his harem, and kills or mutilates him, is acting legitimately or not; one tradition on the subject is interpreted in different ways); disapproved (makruh), e.g. when the ghaazi kills his unbelieving kinsmen without their having insulted Allah or his Prophet; illegal and therefore forbidden (haram).

Illegal killing as the result of actions in themselves legal may take place in five ways:

a) as *sama*, i.e. someone willfully makes another the direct object of an action in general fatal so that the other dies as a result; according to one view, the intention of killing is necessary for the conception of *khat* which, however, is always presumed in the case of any act generally fatal in its result, which is illegally inflicted on another; so that, for example, any one, who strikes a blow at the hand of another with an instrument adapted in general for killing, but inadvertently hits his neck and kills him, *cesir*as *purush* is unanimously regarded as equally guilty with the man who strikes another in the neck with the same instrument, willfully intending to kill him and slays him: this killing is a sin (ma'dhaw) and in general is punished by *khat*, or else the slayer is bound to pay the heavier *diva* and to lose any possible legacy from the deceased to himself;

b) as *khat* (or *khat*), i.e. there is no intention of committing an act illegally on the other as in the case of a), while the action itself is premeditated: two kinds are distinguished, according as the *khadd* (mistake or misadventure) which shows that the killing is not wilful, is in the intention of the doer (*khat*); or in the carrying out of the action (*khat*); The former is the case when someone treats another as a wild beast or a *harbi*, (an infidel not enjoying the protection of the Islamic state, against whom the *djuhal* is to be waged) the killing of whom is not illegal, and kills him; the latter when someone unluckily hits another, while shooting at a target or at a *harbi*, so that he dies, or strikes at the hand of another person but inadvertently hits the neck of a third person and kills him; this killing is not sin but brings with it (without *khat*) the obligation upon the *ahila* of the killer to pay the smaller *diva* and to lose any claims to any inheritance from the deceased as in a); besides the obligation of the killer to perform the *kafrara*;

c) as *shabah* (or *shibh*) *samad* = similar to *samad*, i.e. someone intentionally makes another the direct object of some action, not always: but sometimes fatal, and death results. Actions which experience has shown not to be fatal are all thus quite open; if someone as a result of such an action as this, it is an unfortunate accident, which is not followed by any penal consequences. This killing is a sin and brings with it (without *khat*) the obligation upon the *ahila* of the slayer to pay the heavier *diva* and to lose any possible inheritance from the deceased as in a), and in addition the slayer is bound to perform the *kafrara*. This category only exists in cases where death actually results; in cases of bodily injury, which, by the way, are similarly classified, the action is regarded as *sama*;

d) as *djiir* madjira *khat* (or madjira *khat* or *khat* *matam* ak-*khat*) "equivalent to *khat*", i.e. the factor of deliberation is lacking in the action (and also the intention of directing the action illegally against another) in the circumstance of b) and c), for example: someone falls upon another in his sleep or falls from a roof upon him and kills him; the legal results are the same as in b);

e) as *khat* bi-*sabh" indirect killing", i.e. someone brings about the death of another without doing anything directly against him; e.g. he digs a well and someone falls into it and dies as the result; sometimes this category is treated as a subdivision
of death; but it is a matter of indifference, whether the act, which indirectly results in the death of another, is deliberate or not, intentional or unintentional, even if the action has been planned in some very cunning way such as setting a savage beast on another person with the intention of causing his death, it does not alter the situation. The legal consequences are in any case limited to the obligation upon the 'zālia of the doer to pay the lighter diya; larger works on Fiqh usually discuss very fully the question what acts are to be considered direct causes of death and which are khat bi-sahab and in which there can be no question of a causing of death so that no legal consequences result.

Two cases are especially dealt with in the Fiqh books: a) The causing of a premature birth or abortion and b) killing through giving false evidence. 

a) If in causing an abortion, or premature birth, the embryo — which must be sufficiently developed to be of human form — is brought into the world dead or dies after the birth or the mother dies, it is not a case for the application of khat; there is in any case no khat bi-sahab in the mother whose killing is dealt with under the above rules and the embryo before completion of birth is legally not in full possession of its powers but is usually regarded as a limb of the mother. [Hence we have the following law: if the head of a child appears out of the mother's womb at birth and the child cries (and is therefore certainly alive) and then someone cuts off its head, it is not a case for khat and only the punishment prescribed for producing an abortion is to be inflicted. Different amounts are to be paid for the embryo according to the different cases and if it comes alive into the world and then dies the person who causes its death is liable to kaffāra; he also loses any inheritance that might have come to him.

b) If anyone is killed on evidence which shows that a crime deserving death has been committed and then the witnesses recall their evidence or in other ways it is proved that their testimony was false, khat cannot be executed on the witness; the diya must be paid, the heavier if the false evidence was deliberately given, the lighter if otherwise.

6) We may add the following — taking only the most important points — to the above exposition of the Hanafi system, with reference to ikhkāāf (difference of opinion among the schools).

a) On 'amād: the difference of opinion within the Hanafi school already mentioned, regarding the part of the intention to kill in 'amād is also found outside the Hanafi school; among the Shāfī's the view which does not demand the existence of the intention to kill has become predominant, and the evidence for the other views is sometimes interpreted as meaning a presumption of intention. Abū Yūsuf and al-Shāhī in agreement with Mālik, al-Shāfī and Abū lbn Ḥanbal, assume 'amād if the action is as a rule fatal; Abū Ḥanifa, on the other hand, limits it to the use of a weapon or of a thing which can be used like a weapon to cut off limbs; among such he includes fire; deliberate killing, for example with a large sharpened stone, or a big stick, which in the ordinary way would kill, or by drowning in water, which would be generally regarded as sufficient depth to do so, is therefore considered by the former as 'amād, but by Abū Ḥanifa as shahab 'amād, relying on a passage in the so-called first temple speech of Muhammad, which the champions of the other view naturally interpret otherwise, and this view was later considered the better by the Ḥanafīs. The qualification of the various actions generally differs sometimes considerably and the Ḥanafīs often make use of istihlāl, exercise of discretion. In the Mālikī and Ḥanafi view no kaffāra is to be performed for 'amād; al-Shāfī, on the other hand, demands it if the khat is not executed and both views are given on the authority of Abū lbn Ḥanbal.

b) On khat: that khat is not a sin is more exactly explained to mean that it is neither permitted nor forbidden but that this killing is rather fit al-shāfi, "action of a thoughtless person", and is to be judged in the same way as the act of a mentally defective person or of an animal. Except in the Ḥanafi madhab, categories d) and e) [sub 5] are not distinguished from khat, which also was the earliest view of al-Shāfī (Z. D. M. G. 38) and khat bi-sahab has generally the same legal consequences as khat; we thus have three kinds of khat: 'amād, shahab 'amād and khat, of which shahab 'amād is considered to be composed of 'amād and khat.

c) On shahab 'amād: this category is also called 'amād khat, khat 'amād or khat shahab 'amād; in contrast to it, 'amād is also called 'amād maḥād and khat also khat maḥād (pure 'amād or khat); the application of khat is said to be permissible by al-Shāfī if the killer, for example, repeats the blow with an instrument not normally adapted for killing so frequently that the person attacked dies; the act is then considered 'amād; one of the two opinions handed down on the authority of Abū Yūsuf and al-Shāhīn is to the same effect while the view that became predominant in the school was to the contrary. Mālik allows khat in shahab 'amād in general.

d) On khat bi-sahab: Mālik, at-Shāfī and Abū lbn Ḥanbal demand kaffāra in addition if the placing of the cause of the death was illegal.

e) Different views also prevail as to the amount to be paid for the killing of an embryo.

f) On causing death through false witness: if the false evidence was deliberately given, according to al-Shāfī and the better known opinion of Mālik, khatās can be executed on the witnesses.

7) Notes on the question of permission, request, compulsion and assistance in illegal killing. a) If someone kills another by his request or with his permission there is neither khat nor obligation to pay diya.

b) No definite punishment is laid down for the case of a request to kill someone; such a request does not mean the expulsion of the slayer; only if the person requested is a minor or a slave claims may be made from the 'āqila of the minor, or from the proprietor of the slave.

c) A forces B to kill C; then, according to Abū Ḥanifa, the khatās is executed on A, according to Mālik and Abū lbn Ḥanbal on B; as to al-Shāfī's view, there is no doubt that A is liable to khatās; as regards B both possible views are transmitted, of which the one that ultimately became predominant in the school makes him also liable to khatās. Mālik further makes A also liable to khatās if the compulsion comes from a person having authority, or from a master to a slave.
II. Katl as punishment.

The punishment of death may be described quite generally as "katl" in the following account cases in which it is applied are given seriatim; in contrast to raqab and jahil (cf. below) "katl" is also used in the narrower sense of execution with the sword.

1) In the cases of illegal killing described in detail above, the nearest relative of the dead man, who in this capacity is called "wali al-dam," is entitled to kill the culprit in retaliation if certain definite conditions are fulfilled. This punishment is called "kiyyu" or "kawad," names which also cover retribution exacted for wounds which are not fatal; for further information see the article "kiyya." 

2) There are special regulations regarding sorcerers ("sajdah"), about whom there are also various traditions. Malik, al-Shafi'i and Ahmad Ibn Hanbal regard sorcery ("sajdah") as an actual force. Abu Hanifa disputes this, but there is a consensus of opinion that it is forbidden to study it; it is even described as unbelief ("kufr") almost as a general rule. Malik and Ahmad Ibn Hanbal say that the sorcerer is to be killed with the sword simply for studying, teaching and practising magic; al-Shafi'i limits this punishment to the case in which someone has been killed by sorcery (i.e., he makes it a case for "kiyya," which in practice is only justified by the confession ("hirar") of the guilty person; while the punishment in Abu Hanifa, Malik and Ahmad b. Hanbal is regarded as "hadd."); two different more lenient views are credited to Abu Hanifa. Opinion differs on particular questions, such as whether the conversion of the sorcerer effects a remission of the punishment, whether a woman is to be punished equally with a man, how sorcerers of the Ahl al-Khiṭab are to be treated, how far soothsaying is to be considered sorcery.

3) The punishment of death by stoning ("rajd") — in certain circumstances also by the sword ("katl") — occurs as "hadd" in certain cases of immorality; on this see the article "aridal." 

4) Highway robbery ("kaft al-qariq") may also in certain circumstances be punished with death. The authority for this is Kurâ, v. 37 sq. (from about the years 6 or 7, before the conquest of Kahtar; Grimes puts the verse before the battle of Badr): "The punishment of those who fight against Allah and His prophet and create ruin upon the earth is that they shall be slain or crucified or have their hands and feet cut off on the opposite sides or be banished from the country. This is their humiliation in this world and in the next world they shall be severely punished — unless they repent before ye have them in your power. . . . ." It can be asserted with certainty that this refers to the unbelievers, very probably to the Jews; ruthless war is ordered to be waged on them and their repentance is the adoption of Islam. There are still traces of this interpretation in the commentaries. But in general this passage is connected with Muhammad's attitude to certain murdark's (which will be dealt with in section 5); this cannot be correct, if only because the procedure there practised does not entirely conform to these rules, so that they were forced to restore harmony in a different fashion. Those murdark's were considered as highway robbers, from the point of view of the later definition strictly and only in this way could a law for the punishment of highway robbers be found in the Kurân. 

The more important laws of the Shafi'a are the following. Only such persons as are adults in full possession of their faculties and who are able to be dangerous to travellers are to be considered highway robbers. According to Abu Hanifa, highway robbery can only take place in the open country, according to Malik, al-Shafi'i and Ahmad Ibn Hanbal in the town also. Malik gives the Imam — and this is certainly the correct interpretation of the passage in the Kurân, which is also found in the commentaries — absolute freedom in the choice of punishment, even in the contingency of a cumulative application, whatever form the robbery may have taken; but if the person concerned has killed someone (in this connection killing implies a murder to which "kiyya" might be applied), he must at least be executed with the sword. The three other Imams grade the punishment to fit the different forms of robbery on the highway; according to Abu Hanifa, the criminal is put to death if he has caused the death of his victim; if he has also robbed him (and in such a way, it must always be understood, that the hadd for theft can be carried out; cf. the art. "kaft") he may be further punished by cutting off his hands and feet on alternate sides and with crucifixion ("jal"") which in that case takes the place of killing with the sword; if he has only committed a robbery, we have only the cutting off of hands and feet on alternate sides; according to al-Shafi'i and Ahmad b. Hanbal, he is killed, if he has killed his victim; if he has also committed a robbery, he is crucified after being put to death; if he has only committed a murder, he is punished by cutting off his hands and feet on alternate sides; if he has only made the neighbourhood unsafe, then, according to Abu Hanifa, al-Shafi'i and Ahmad b. Hanbal, he is put in prison; whether this must be done in another place is a debated point. In Abu Hanifa and Malik (also in some Shafi'is but their view is rejected by the school) crucifixion consists in the criminal being tied alive to a cross or a tree and his body ripped up with a spear so that he dies, and this is certainly the more original form; according to al-Shafi'i and Ahmad b. Hanbal, he is first killed with a sword and then his corpse is ignominiously exposed on a tree or cross. All these punishments are "hadd" and a right of Allah; therefore any re-nunciation by the wali al-dam of the "kiyya" is of no avails even though he is one who has the right to carry out the katl. If the criminal repents before he falls into the hands of the authorities (what exactly is meant by repentance is disputed) these "hadd" punishments are dropped; but clains by indivi-duals to "kiyya" etc. can still be brought against him.

5) The murdark, that is the renegade from Islam, is liable to the death-penalty if his apostasy is proved. If we leave out the passages dealing with the munafik's [q.v.] who are separately dealt with — their execution is, however, described under
certain conditions in Kurān, iv. 91 — there is no such law in the Kurān referring specially to the murattad, although xvi. 128 (third Meckkan period), ii. 244 (of the year 2), iii. 80—84 (Medina; passed by Grimez shortly before or after the battle of Uhud), 102 (soon after the battle of Uhud), iv. 136 (of the same period) threaten the eternal punishment of hell for all those who apostatise from Islam and do not repent, as well as for all unbelievers, and in ii. 95 sq., 142, and ix. 67, a warning against apostasy is uttered. Among the traditions we find in various forms the story that Muhammad, contrary to the rules of the Sharī'a, cruelly mutilated and killed some murattad's, who had killed one or more of his herdsmen and driven away the camels, but the tradition is probably correct just for this reason. This contradiction was felt and an endeavour was made in the ḫadīth to justify the cruelty of the punishment, and even the text was altered. Of 'Ali also a cruel act, of another kind, however, is recorded in a similar case, but Ibn 'Abīa is said to have protested against it. Two murattad's, each of whom had killed a Muslim, were executed by Muhammad's orders after the capture of Mekka; a third man, against whom there was nothing but his apostasy, was also placed on the list of the proscribed; his foster-brother 'Ulmān, however, obtained security (amīn) for him although Muhammad would gladly have seen someone kill him before immunity was granted; he later became a Muslim again. There is also a saying of Muhammad's: "Slay anyone, who changes his religion" or 'He who secedes from you shall die'; and others similar, e.g. that the blood of a Muslim could only be shed for apostasy; and, and khal 'amid; there is also a story that Muṣṭafī b. Djabal killed a murattad because Allah and His Prophet had so ordained; Muhammad is also said to have ordered that conversion should first of all be attempted and a period of three days allowed for this; but all this can hardly be genuine. There are also the traditions regarding the Aḥl al-Ridda (cf. the art. Ridda) who refused the zakāt and were treated as apostates by Aḥbār Bakr. The tradition "He who is a good Muslim will not be punished for his sins from the pagan period but he who is a bad Muslim will have them counted against him" does not refer to the murattad, as it is usually said to do.

The punishment of death laid down by the Sharī'a for the murattad is sometimes described as ḥadd, sometimes not; in the latter view he is simply killed as an unbeliever (kāfir) and the punishment need not be carried out in every individual case. Only an adult in full possession of his faculties and not acting under compulsion can become an apostate from Islam; opinions are divided regarding a man who apostatizes while intoxicated or a minor (on the verge of his majority) capable of discernment (murākh; muna'iṣṣ). There is also difference of opinion regarding the attempt at conversion and the granting of a period, usually fixed at three days, for reflection. If the murattad does not repent, he is to be beheaded with the sword; torture and cruel methods of execution are forbidden. According to al-Shāfi'i, his punishment is left to his owner, if he is a slave; but Abū Hanīfah and his school limit the punishment of death to male apostates and the consensus of opinion excludes the minor; a woman (and also a minor) is imprisoned and beaten every three days till she repents; according to Abū Ḥanīfa (contrary to Abū Yūsuf and al-Shāfi'i) she may also be made a slave and this is recognised as right by the school. Anyone who puts to death a murattad of whatever kind without powers granted by the authority, is generally liable not to kūfī, but only to ta'zīr. The same rules generally hold for repeated apostasy.

Similar to the punishment of the murattad is that of the sīnādī, i.e. anyone who, professing to be a Muslim, is really an unbeliever or any who belongs to no religion (cf. Masṣūn, Al-Halajī, l. 186 sqq.). The conversion of a non-Muslim to another non-Muslim religion is similarly dealt with, although such an one is not called murattad. He can only escape punishment by adopting Islam; on the whole of this cf. Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien, ii. 215 sq.

How exactly one becomes an unbeliever and therefore a murattad is disputed in particulars, especially the question how far this is the case with irreverent utterances regarding Allah or one of His prophets; there are various special enactments regarding the latter, which threaten the death penalty to non-Muslims and in part allow a Muslim no remission of punishment if he recalls the words.

For further information see the article MURTADD.

(6) There is no law in the Kurān for dealing with a man who omits the ṣalāt (ritual prayer) (ṭārīkh al-ṣalāt), where its performance is, on the other hand, often strictly enjoined, and not a single unequivocal ḥadīth on the subject can be found — quite apart from any question of genuineness. The Sharī'a lays down the law as follows: — Anyone who does not perform the ṣalāt, as in duty bound, without denying its obligatoriness (anyone who does this is murattad) and has no — even invalid — excuse for this, according to Malik, al-Shāfi'i and the more popular of the two views credited to Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, if he does not have, i.e. makes good his omission and says he will never commit the fault again, is to be executed with the sword. The punishment is also sometimes described as ḥadd. According to Abū Ḥanīfa, the culprit is imprisoned till he again performs the ṣalāt. In all these views he is considered a Muslim, while the other view attributed to Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal deals with him entirely as an unbeliever, i.e. a murattad; but these regulations are modelled on those for apostasy (cf. the remarks on the Aḥl al-Ridda above).

There are two more cases in which the suppression (fiṣād) of the enemies of orthodox Islam is prescribed; killing, of course, plays the main part and therefore we must discuss this aspect of the process here.

(7) Firstly, the fighting of the bughāt is prescribed. It is said in Kurān, xlix. 9 (late Medina period): "If two parties of the believers contend with one another, make peace between them; but if one oppresses the other (bughāt — from which bughāt is the plural of the participle), fight against the party which oppresses them until they again obey Allah's command; and if they do this, make peace between them with equity and act with justice" (this refers to a quarrel among the emārū). Oppression is often forbidden and disapproved of elsewhere. But Muhammad at any rate did not know the later conception of bughāt, although
its development begins at a point closely connected with this. Some traditions on the bukhāt are in agreement with the legal enactments. The Sharī'ah understands by bukhāt sectarianising Muslims who reject the authority of the Imām, are able-bodied, so that they might offer resistance, and justify their attitude, although erroneously, with their dogmatic conviction (they are to be distinguished from highway robbers, for example — individual bukhāt, who are guilty of breaches of the law are punished like them —, on the one hand, and unbelievers on the other). If they do not attack the orthodox community, they need not be attacked otherwise their suppression is a duty of the Imām (the head of the Islamic community) and a fard al-kifaya for the Muslims (cf. the art. FARD). This punishment is also sometimes called ḥadd. In general the rule is that only participants in the actual battle can be killed during the fighting. Fugitives, wounded, those who surrender and prisoners, as well as women and children, cannot be put to death. According to Abū Hanīfa, the Imām may kill a prisoner if he knows that he would again join the bukhāt if spared; according to him, a captured slave who has been fighting by the side of his master can also be killed.

(8) Regarding the Qiyād see that article; there are also traditions regarding the following regulations. If the unbelievers with whom war is being waged are not among those from whom the qiyāa can be taken — who exactly those are is a matter in dispute — the men are killed, if they do not adopt Islam and the women and children enslaved. If, on the other hand, they refuse Islam and will not pay the qiyā, they are to be fought. All able-bodied men can be killed as long as they are not taken prisoners; men incapable of bearing arms, as well as women and children, cannot in general be so dealt with unless they take part in the fighting or assist in it in some way; they are to be taken prisoners and enslaved. The free, able-bodied prisoners may be (a) executed with the sword if they will not now adopt Islam; (b) made slaves; (c) exchanged for Muslim prisoners; (d) ransom (e) or set free without a ransom being paid (in all these cases by the Imām). Any one who kills a prisoner without authority is only punished with ta'zir.

Every unbeliever who does not pay the qiyā or does not belong to a people which has a treaty with the Muslim community or is not a musta'min (on these cf. the art. KSY) is khalil al-lum (to be killed with impunity) and may at any time be killed by any Muslim without his being liable to qiyā or to pay any diya or perform kafara. This enactment is only the natural consequence of the Qiyād law and Muḥammad himself not infrequently made use of it.

(9) The views of the Sharī'īs on all the points dealt with above agree almost entirely with one of the Sunni views. It would take up too much space to deal with them in a similar fashion.

(10) The infliction and execution of the death penalty was in practice very often a strong contradiction to the regulations laid down in the Sharī'ah (cf. the art. 'ADHAB; Snouck Hurgronje, Verspreide Geschriften, ii. 200, etc.). The historians afford many examples for the actual practice and so do accounts of European travellers; on the conditions in the empire of the caliphs in the tenth century see Mez, Die Renaissance des Islam, p. 347 sqq. also Massignon, Al-İtâbat, i, especially p. 200 sqq., 292 sqq.; on those in Egypt in the first half of the nineteenth century see Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, end of the chapter on Religion and Law; on those in Persia in the same period see Polak, Persien, i. 328 sq.; on those in the Ottoman empire of the eighteenth century see Mouradgea d'Ossb, Tableau Général de l'Empire Ottomane, especially vol. vi. (1834), p. 244 sqq.; for Turkey the Kânûnînms are also useful (cf. Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte, i. 13 sqq.); among the published sources quoted there are of special importance: Digeon, ii. 245, 262; v. Hammer, Staatsverfassung, i. 125, 133; 143—150; T. E. O. M., iii. (1328), Appendix i. 27 sqq., ii. 1—4, 7, 9; M. T. M., i/i. 341 sqq. and from the Kânûnîname itself (edited there; p. 19—21, 32—34.

Bibliography: The Fih'books, the works given in the article 'ADHAB, especially Juyb'il, Handbuch des islamischen Gesetzes, p. 284—209. and the literature there given; the articles MURDER and EXECUTION in T. P. Hughes, A Dictionary of Islam. Besides the articles already referred to, the article 'ADHAB and those dealing with the Arabic expressions not explained above should be consulted.

(J. SCHACHT)

KATRÂN B. MANŞUR, a Persian poet. 'Awfî calls him Katrân al-'Adudi al-Tabrizi; according to Dawlatshâh, he was born in Timurîd. Others say he was born in Djabal-i Daiam; Djâbal is also found as his nick. Dawlatshâh says that he spent some time in Balkh and later lived in the 'Iraq. The period of his literary activity lies about the middle of the eleventh century A.D. Naşîr-i Khusrav mentions in the Sufarîname that he met Katrân in Tâbriz in 1348 (1049); a well-known poem by Katrân commemorates the earthquake in Tâbriz in 1348 (1042/43). According to a ta'khîva quoted in Rieu, Supplement, p. 149, our poet died in 465 (1072). He was the panegyrist of the rulers of Daiam and of 'Abhârîbâdjan; among his patrons are mentioned the Amirs Faqlûn, Wahsûdân, Abû Nasr Mâîlûn b. Wahsûdân, who was appointed over a part of 'Abhârîbâdjan by the Sâlidjûk Sulṭân in 450. and Muḥammad b. Kamûdî (according to Dawlatshâh, governor of Balkh and 4andjar; if this is correct he long survived the poet) and further the Bâyiî 'Adûd al-Dâwla, as is indicated by the epithet 'Adûd given by 'Awfî.

Works. Katrân left a Dîwan (manuscripts of which are found in European collections) and a nâmawîn called Kaws-nâmâ. The poems of Katrân are sometimes wrongly attributed to Rûdagi in manuscripts; the confusion is caused by the similarity of names of their respective patrons (Naşî b. Ahmad the Sâmânî in the case of Rûdagi and Abû Nasr Mâîlûn in the case of Katrân). On this question cf. Rûdagi and Pseudo-Rûdagi by E. Denison Ross in J. A. R., 1924, p. 609 sqq. Criticisms on the poetry of Katrân are given by Naşîr-i Khusrav and Watîwî. The former says, curiously enough, that Katrân did not know Persian well but otherwise was a good poet; Watîwî (in Dawlatshâh) places him very high and allots him a special position with regard to the other poets. 'Awfî's verdict on Katrân means very little for us, as this author regularly introduces each of his biographies of poets (if we may so call his inflated empty prose) with a rhetorical eulogy of the person
in question. But he is at least to the point when he says that Kāṭrān was fond of rhetorical artifices and particularly of the kind called tadjinī (cf. Ibn Ḳais al-Kāṭrānī Ma’dhīq, Bib. Mem. Ser., x. 309 sqq.). The only quotation from Kāṭrān given in Ibn Ḳais’s manual of poetics (p. 312) is quoted to illustrate one of the varieties of tadjinī (tadjinī-nī tāqī). On Kāṭrān’s skill in managing the more difficult poetic forms cf. also Daulatshāh, p. 67, 14 sq.

Although the Divān is not yet published one can form a fair opinion of the skill of the poet from what is in print. A few Ḳaṣīda’s and fragments of Ḳaṣīda’s are given in Schefer, Chrestomathie Persane, ii. 240 sqq.; others in Browne’s edition of ʿAwfī’s Lūṭab al-Alab (ii. 214 sqq.). All that is given in Daulatshāh (ed. Browne, p. 67 sqy.) is also found in ʿAwfī, only Daulatshāh gives much less and has a few unimportant variants. The oft occurring substitution of Arabic terms for the rarer Persian words is also found in him; thus the less well known ṣhāmar (= pond; ʿAwfī ii. 215, 10) becomes in Daulatshāh (p. 68, 1) ṣhāmar and the verse is, of course, nonsense (or it may be that we have simply a copyist’s mistake). It may be assumed that Daulatshāh, as far as the poems are concerned, simply copied ʿAwfī.

In the poems printed in Schefer, rhetorical artifices are not more used than in the other panegyists, for example Mināḥšīr or Azraṣḥ; we find among other figures Tuhī in wa-Tafṣīr, p. 245 pauper., p. 246, 6 sq., m wetazama, p. 245, 1. These poems have something in common with the old panegyics; the three fragments of Ṭaṣfī’s describing spring, autumn and winter contain themes already known from Mināḥšīr, such as the comparison of wine grapes with women, namely negroes and Rūmī’s, while Mināḥšīr compares them with little girls. Kāṭrān gives more prominence to the epic element in his panegyrics than do his predecessors. The first poem in Schefer (i. 240) is noteworthy in this respect; its maḏḥ commemorates a victory of the Amir Waḥsūṭānī and Mamlān, and the oft quoted song (p. 243) to Mamlān, the ṭaḥṣīb of which contains the description of the earthquake which demolished the town of Tabriz in 434 (1045), is equally noteworthy; this description is in this case the main thing. The fragments in ʿAwfī are obviously chosen to illustrate the use of tadjinī by the poet, which is discussed in the prose notice of Kāṭrān by this author. The tadjinī found here is almost exclusively the tadjinī-nu ṣuwadāwī (Ibn Ḳais, p. 313); the tadjinī-nī ṣuṣī (cf. Ibn Ḳais, p. 312) is also found (p. 214, 11: giṣā ṣuṣī) and ṭakīr (cf. Ibn Ḳais, p. 315) in the second part of the distich (ʿAwfī, ii. 214, 21). The rhetorical effect achieved by means of homonyms (tadjinī-tāmī; cf. Ibn Ḳais, p. 309), of course, occurs, e.g. ʿAwfī, ii. 215, 9–11, where the word ṣir is repeated four times each time with a different meaning. In contents these fragments offer nothing new or noteworthy.

The prominence deliberately given to the narrative element in the court-lyric may be an innovation of Kāṭrān’s own. That his lead was followed is shown by Daulatshāh, who not only calls Anwarī a pupil of Kāṭrān’s but also mentions others (Raṣḥīdī, Rūḥī, etc.) and “most poets of Balkh and Transoxiana”.


Al-Kattānī, Muhammad b. Dīnār b. Idrīs, a member of the important family of the Kattānīyn and Sharīf in origin, a contemporary Moro-

<box>coon writer (he was still writing in 1314 A.H.). He is the author of a number of works including a book in honour of his ancestor Idrīs (al-Anṣār al-Aṭiwar al-Anfās bi-dīlār hād Mahāsin Kūth al-Naqībī, Fās 1314 A.H.). The most important is his Ṣawwāt al-Anfās wa-Muḥāvahdat al-Abyās minman nūrān ʿl-Islāmi m ʿl-Yuṣūfī bi-Fās (3 vols., Fās 1356 = 1898–99). The first part of this book is devoted to showing the merit which is acquired by visiting ʿawwās’s and tombs of saints. He then proceeds to give, quarter by quarter, the illustrious men who have lived in Fās or are buried there and this part of the book contains valuable information on the historical topography of the town. He consulted a considerable number of books a list of which he gives at the end of the third volume. We know no details of his life, not even the date of his birth.


Kāwālā (also Cavaalla), a seaport on the Aegean Sea, opposite the island of Thasos on the boundary between Macedonia and Thrace. In ancient times Neapolis lay here, the port of the town of Philippi, just as Kāwālā is now the harbour for the district of Drama. The town is partly built on a promontory which is still surrounded by walls which date from the middle ages; there is a harbour on both sides. An aqueduct has also survived from the middle ages. Kāwālā was captured by the Turks from the Byzantines in the reign of Murād I, who conquered Thrace. Murād had sent the sandjaq-bey Deli Balban to besiege Seres; soon afterwards he sent Lala Şahin to assist him; the latter then captured Kāwālā, Drama and Seres. This event is usually placed in the year 775 (1373/4) (Saʿd al-Dīn, Taḡī al-Tanwīrī, Constantinoople 1279, i. 91), and von Hammer, G.O.R., i. 181, whose statements are inaccurate in other respects); the anonymous chronicler, ed. Giese, p. 260 (on the other hand, gives the date 787 (1385/66). He adds that nomads from Sarāmūn, who were then settled here and in the Vardar plain. Not much more is heard of Kāwālā in Turkish history; Sulaimān I fortified it before beginning his campaign against Rhodes. The population probably always remained predominantly Greek. Muhammad ʿAlī, the Egyptian Khatūbe, was probably born here; at any rate he lived here in his youth (born about 1769; P. Zaidān, Maḥṣūṣī al-Sharīf, Cairo 1910, i. 4). Muhammad ʿAlī later endowed the town with a school (Muḥendis-ḵāneh) and other foundations, for the upkeep of which he set aside the revenues of the island of Thasos.
In the sixteenth century Kawâr attained great importance as an exporting harbour and the main depot for the tobacco grown in the neighbourhood and in the whole hinterland (Drama, Seres and Xanthi). In the years before 1912 this brought the Turkish Tobacco Regie an annual profit of over 10 million francs; the tobacco is for the most part manufactured and every year 5,000–6,000 people from the surrounding country come into the town for this work. This is probably why the figures given for the population differ so much (cf. e.g. Sâmî, Kâmîs al-Âlim, v. 3704). According to an accurate calculation, before the Balkan war there were 17,000 Greeks, 13,000 Turks, 1800 Jews and 800 Bulgarians in Kawâlî (Nicolaides, Grîchenlands Anteil an den Balkankriege, Vienna and Leipzig 1914, p. 222). The town at that time was the capital of a kadî of the same name in the sandjak of Drama in the vilayet of Salonika. The treaty of San Stefano (March 13, 1878) had already given Kawâlî to Bulgaria. In the first Balkan war the town fell into the hands of the Bulgarians (Nov., 1912) but in the second Balkan war it was taken by the Greek fleet (July, 1913) and finally incorporated in Greece by the peace of Bucharest (Aug. 10, 1913) in spite of Bulgaria's protests (Nicolaides, op. cit., p. 367 1997). Since then many Greeks have migrated thither from Xanthi and the number of Turks in the population must have been considerably reduced.

Kâwâr, a group of oases situated in the Sahara (Bilma, the most southern oasis, is in 18° 41' N. Lat. and 13° E. Long.), to the west of the massif of Tibesti on the caravan route from Tripoli to the country round Tchad via Fezzân [q.v.]. On this route Kawâr is nearly halfway between Fezzân and Kanem, separated from the former by a hamâma and from the latter by a region of sand-dunes. It owes its formation to a continuous chain of cliffs running from north to south, which blocking it on the east shelters it from the dreaded winds from the north-east. It is a coiltor of oases, about 50 miles long from north to south and never more than 2 to 3 miles broad. The water is at no depth and fairly abundant but usually brackish. In all the oases together there are about 100,000 palm-trees; the inhabitants, whose number does not exceed 3 or 4,000, are Tubu by race, considerably mixed with Kanuri blood (the common language is Kanuri); they are sedentary and peace-loving, unlike their kinsmen who live in Tibesti. They are scattered up and down in a dozen villages of which the chief are Anâî, Acharma, Dîrîî and Bilma; these villages consist of wretched huts that beside one on a cliff inaccessible except by ladders a place of refuge is prepared, a precaution which until quite recently was far from being unnecessary. The inhabitants live on the produce of their palm-trees, the poor crops which they raise and particularly by trading. The caravan route from Tripoli to Tchad via Fezzân, although hard, is the shortest of those that cross the Sahara; it was at one time very busy and Kawar was the place where it was joined by the roads from Zinder and Agades; its inhabitants were destined to become caravan-men. But their principal revenue came from their salt-pans. Those of Bilma are especially famous. The salt which the waters bring to the surface of the soil is treated by evaporation and pressed into cakes of great purity. Some is sold to the Tuaregs who come to buy it on the spot along with dates; the remainder is exported to all quarters of the Sudân from the Niger to Dârâût. The salt-pans of Kawar are of the same importance for the country as those of Tsodoni for the region of Timbuktu and the western Sahara.

The history of Kawar is very obscure. The caravan route on which it lies was already in use in ancient times although we have no formal evidence of this. In any case this group of oases was already in existence at the time of the conquest of North Africa, if we may rely on the stories of the Arab historians who attribute its conquest to the legendary hero of the conquest, U'bla b. Nāfî'. He is said to have taken the castles of Kawar one after the other. Al-Idrisi, in the twelfth century, several times mentions the importance of the trade through these regions. He mentions the inexhaustible mines of salt there must be some confusion with the salt-deposits. It seems that at this time Kawar was under independent local chiefs. Later when the kings of Kanem extended their authority over Fezzân, they certainly held Kawar; this is the situation described by Ibn Khaldûn following Ibn Sa'di; for the rest, local traditions seem to preserve the memory of migrations from the south. It is certain that a strong power at one or other extremity of the caravan route would try to control the whole route.

In the sixteenth century, Kawâr was visited by several European travellers; first in January, 1823, by the Denham, Clapperton and expedition and then by Vogel, Barth, Rohôf and Nachtigal and lastly by Monteil. In the closing years of last century Kawar was in a somewhat wretched condition. It was under the nominal authority of a chief (ma'l) elected by the notables; in reality each village ruled itself. Kawâr had been seriously affected by the general decline of trade in the Sahara; it was still more affected when the French occupation of the Tchad region put an end to the slave-trade, the principal source of business. The inhabitants paid tribute, apparently to the Tuaregs; they were nevertheless plundered and blackmailed by them and raided by the Tubu and Awlân and afterwards by the Kasar. The Kawar then became the centre of political aspirations. The Sanûsîya had had a zawiyah there for quite a long time; it was a necessary station for them when they were endeavouring to extend their influence in the countries of Central Africa and when the Sanûsî Shaikh dreamed of creating a regular principality bounded by the two sides of the Sahara. The Turks also tried to make their authority recognised in the Kawar as they tried to do at Djannet and in Tibesti. The occupation of the Kawar by French troops from the Tchad region in July, 1906, and the establishment of a permanent post there put an end to these efforts, at the same time giving the inhabitants of this group of oases effective protection from the exactions of their turbulent neighbours.

Bibliography: al-Bakri, Kitâb al-maṣâliḥ wa-l-namâliḥ, ed. de Sâlè, p. 13; transl. de Sâlè, Algiers 1913, p. 34; al-Idrisi, Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, ed. and transl. Doss and De Goeje, Leiden 1866, Index; Denham and Clapperton, Narrative of Travels and Discoveries
in Northern and Central Africa, London 1826; Barth, Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa, London 1851, i. 504, v. 424–

(Henri Basset)

KÄWINTERN (F.), marriage, dowry, see MANH, NIKH.

KAWKAB, star, in Arabic astronomy the general term for a luminous heavenly body. The five planets known to the Arabs (Mercury to Saturn) were called al-kawâbîk al-khumsa (al-mus-tæhayyirâ). The general term for the sun, moon, and the five planets is al-kawâbîk al-jârîyâ or al-
kawâbîk al-sâyîyâ (i.e. the moving stars), in contrast to the fixed stars (al-kawâbîk al-ğasbî). The name kawâbîk al-kalâmî is applied to the star e of the Little Bear, which is nearest the north pole of the heavens. In al-Birrûni it is called tarf al-
idanâb wa-husna jâlî al-kibla (= tip of the tail, i.e. the little goat [for ascertaining the kibla]. This presupposes that from a knowledge of the north pole (direction of north) one can ascertain the diametrically opposite south, which is identical with the direction of the kibla (santo al-kibla). This method of ascertaining the kibla is only correct in regions which lie approximately north of Mekka (cf. Reinard's note in his introduction to Geographie d'Aboufisâ, p. cxvii; Or, la Mequê is au midi de la Syrie ainsi que d'une partie de la Mesopotamie et de l'Egypte (1), le mot Kiblah est devenue pour les musulmans de ces contrées, le synonyme de midi et il a été employé ailleurs avec la même acceptation)]. Finally it may be mentioned that the stars â, ß, and ù of Cepheus were, according to Ulugh Beg, also called kawâbîk al-
ârîk, i.e. stars which inhabit the flock of sheep flock of sheep.

A catalogue of fixed stars, of which the Arab astronomers had several, is called Djâlât al-kawâbîk.

Bibliography: al-Birrûni, al-Kânûn al-

(C. Schoy)

KAWKABÂN, the name of several places in South Arabia.

1) The name of a sanctuary mentioned in the inscription Halevî N°. 686, 3–4, copied from a building in 'Aden by J. Halevî (mihrâbân Kaw-
kabân). Cf. also F. Hommel, Grundzüge der Ge-
ographie und Geschichte des alten Ostens, ii, Leip-
gzig 1925, p. 707.

2) The name of a castle near Żafîr north of Na'âf. It was called Kawkabân, the two stars, i.e. star-castle, because it was adorned with silver stripes outside, the roof was covered with white slabs of stone, the interior panelled with cypress wood and paved with mosaic, different gems, ivory and corundum, which shone like stars at night. This small town was naturally ascribed to the Djinn. This castle is perhaps also mentioned in the inscription Glaser N°. 218, 3 (Bait wa-Kawkabân), which comes from Bait Churî in the vicinity. The castle is said to be still standing.

3) A little village on a great cliff on the right side of the Wâdi Sâfâma, N. E. of Ḥadjâ and called Kawkabân-Ḥadjâ to distinguish it from other places of the same name.

4) Capital of the province of the same name, N.W. of Ṣâfâma. The town of Kawkabân lies at a height of 8,750 feet above sea-level in 15° 31' 42" N.Lat. on the southern part of the ridge which begins about half a mile S.E. of the town of Kaw-
kbân at the left towards Jawâla and runs S.E. to N.W. for several hours' journey. It is part of the great Maṣâma'a plateau and is called Džabâl Dalûs. The south-eastern part of the range, the especially precipitous part, is separated from the main massif by an almost straight ravine, the Wâdi Nabhân, which runs from Shîbâm past the one gate of the town of Kawkabân (Bâb al-Ḥadîd) to the Wâdi Na'âf west of the Džabâl Kawkabân. Two roads run over this mountain, cut off only by the ravine of the Wâdi Nabhân, the one through the town of Shîbâm, following the very deep ravine of Nabhân which is bridged over, an old winding narrow path of steps hewn out of the rock, and the second, an easier one, running in the Kâ'a Dalûs and crossing a bridge over the Wâdi Nabhân just before reaching the Bâb al-
Ḥadîd. The town of Kawkabân stretches from the Bâb al-Ḥadîd to the S.E. and runs quite close to the eastern slope of the cliff, all along that side. This part seems to be the oldest. Not very far from the gate on the great open square in the centre of the town (in the northern part) is a double wall for the most part now in ruins. Between the two walls a great number of skillfully walled pits have been cut out of the ground, which served as granaries for the old inhabitants. Similar granaries, but of more recent date, are to be found in the southern part and outside the town.

The town itself consists of a large number of excellently built houses of red stone the architec-
tural effect of which is often striking: the doors of the houses are often ornamented with fine iron work. The houses of the former Imâms now for the most part decayed or shot together are particularly striking with their splendid façades. Besides the principal mosque with minaret, the only one in the town, there are seven small mosques. The water supply is provided from two huge and finely built reservoirs; the one, called Mużâlî, lies in the south, exceedingly deep and enclosed on the west side by a wall 60 to 80 feet high. The second, to the east of it, begun but not quite finished by Saïyîd 'Abd al-Kârim about 1450, is called Barîk al-'Azîyâ. There are also four smaller cisterns. This water-
supply would suffice for a town three times the size of Kawkabân. The Jewish quarter lies E. S. E. outside the town but consists almost entirely of low stone houses with little windows and doors.
A stone bridge with huge arches led across the Wadi Nabhān to the Bāb al-Hadīd but it was blown up by the Arabs in 1872.

Kawkabān is an ancient city dating from the Himyar period, as inscriptions found there show. Al-Hamdānī mentions a stronghold of Kawkabān on the summit of the Dājil Dhukhār which is certainly identical with the old town of the modern Kawkabān. In troubled times its strength made it a desirable place of refuge — in 1569 the Turks besieged the stronghold in vain — and for centuries Kawkabān has been important as a capital and residence of the Imāms of the principality of the same name. The latter comprised in addition to Kawkabān the towns of Shāhib, Ḥadja, Tawila, the Khāb Batir (between Kawkabān and Harrā), the lands of Miswar, Sārī, Ḥoṣāṣ, Milāḥin, Abddīr, Arūsa, Bani Khayjiyā, al-Shahduyi Lā’a, a part of the Bani Ḥuṣayn, the Bani Naḍhir and of al-Ahmār.

The old dynasty of the country, which traced its descent from the Imām Ḥādi of Ṣa’dah, was able to retain its imāmat even during Turkish rule and to maintain its independence from the imāms of Ṣa’dah after the Turks were driven out in 1630. C. Nāhr (op. cit., p. 260; see Bibliography) has given a general historical survey of the princes of Kawkabān. When the Turks again invaded Yaman in 1872 and subjected the country, Kawkabān after a seven months severe siege also passed to the Turks but only after capitulation. The last ruler of Kawkabān, Sāyiīd Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, who had bravely defended the town against the Turks, afterwards lived in Ṣa’dah on a pension given to him by the Sublime Porte. At Glaser’s visit in 1878 his brother Sāyiīd Yaḥyā still lived in the old ancestral home in Kawkabān, which is remarkable for the splendid stucco-work of the interior and the rich ornamentation of its façade. The windows and doors had all sorts of varied shapes, colours and ornaments.

Kawkabān is now almost depopulated; although the houses, which in spite of much destruction are still imposing, afford accommodation for some 30,000 people, the area is barely 100, now in the town; from the town one gets a splendid view over the fertile fields and valleys of the country around, especially the plain of Shīḥām, a part of the plain of Ṣa’dah and the surrounding hills.

5) Kawkabān al-Shā’a is in Mahīwīd, west of the town of Kawkabān, but belongs to Tawila, a small place of no special importance.
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(Adolf Grohmann)

KAWM (Ar.), plural ʾaḏwām, ʾaḏwāmin, ʾaḏwīmin, people. The word occurs also in Nahalitean, Palmyrene and Şafīti inscriptions in the name of the deity Šaʿīr al-Kawm ‘support of the people’, see Lidzbarski, Ephephiser für semitische Epigraphik, 1, 235, 46, 45, etc. According to some lexicographers the word applies in the first place to men; evidence for this opinion is afforded by passages from literature where K. is used in opposition to niḥā (women). The term does not primarily suggest the meaning of nation. A man’s K. are his ʾaḏhā and his ʾaḏhīrā (Līdā). In this limited sense the word occurs also in the well known tradition: ‘Who clings to a K. without the permission of his master (palṭon), is cursed by Allah, the angels and the prophets’ (Bukhārī, Fāṭiḥat al-Mahīs, bāb 1). — Used without article it has the same meaning as English ‘people’, French ‘gens’ and German ‘Leute’, e. g. ʾaḏrā (people who do not understand); cf. 8, 66; 9, 61 (also with the article ʾaḏrā); the plural has the same meaning. In a tradition it is said: ‘There will be people (ʾaḏwām) in my community, who will proclaim licentiousness regarding women and wine’ (Bukhārī, Ashrība, bāb 6).

In the Kurān the term is chiefly used in connection with the prophets, Muḥammad’s precessors: the people of Ibrahim, Lūlū, Nūh (e. g. 7, 146; 11, 91; 22, 43; 26, 105, 166; 38, 11), i.e. their unbelieving contemporaries. In this sense it
is also used in connection with Muhammad himself: "Thy people declare Him a lie, though He is the Truth" (sūra 6, 66). The same term is to be found in Ḥadīth, e. g. Buhārī, Ahūsānī, Uṣūlanā, Ibn Hanbal, Ibn-Muṣnad, v. 72, where Ṭūfāl, one of Aḥṣa`ī’s brothers, relates a dream which he had. He dreamt that he passed by some Jews and said to them: "Verily, ye would be the people, were it not that ye pretend that 'Umar (Iṣra) is the son of Allāh". They answered: "And ye would be the people, were it not that ye say: 'Ma ʾisū Allāh-wa-ma ʾisā Mūḥammad'"? 

In Aḥṣa`ī (Aṭṭāh) the term has acquired a peculiar form and use: Ḳawwām has here the genealogical meaning of "all those who descend from one man in the male line", see Snouck Hurgronje, The Aḥṣa`īn, Index s. v. Ḳawwām.

For special meanings of the word see Dozy, Supplément, s. v.
(A. J. Wensink)

Al-ḲAWS = the bow; in Arabic geometry the arc of the circle; in astronomy the constellation of Sagittarius, the ninth sign of the Zodiac (Greek Ἀργον, Latin Arcem or Sagittarii). (H. Suter)

ḲAWS KUZAH (أ.), the rainbow. The ancient Arabian deity Kuzah [q.v.] who is described as shajāt (devil) was a thundergod who shot hail-arrows from his bow and then hung the latter on the clouds. He is found in the combination Kaws Kuzah, rainbow. Kuzah is also in popular belief the angel who looks after the clouds. Other names of the rainbow are: Allāh’s bow, the bow of the prophet of God, bow of the heavens, bow of the clouds (ẓhammān, nuwaq), signs of heaven (ʿalāmāt al-nuwaq). It is also called Ḳawwām ʾisā (Christ is the supporting arrow of the sky). Quite different in origin are the names Ḳawwām (dust), Ḳawwām (mold), Ḳawwām (mist). Muslim scholars include the rainbow among the Ṭāhār al-ʿuswāya, the upper phenomena. The rainbow is usually opposite the spectator, while the sun is at his back and there is a dark cloud or wall behind drops of water; the drops may be in a cloud or formed at springs, water-wheels, in turbulent rivers where spray is formed, in the steam of baths or in water which is ejected from the mouth in a spray (see Beitr. V., loc. cit.). Frequent reference is made to a description by Ibn Sinā (E. Wiedemann and M. Hörtin, loc. cit.), among others, who was on the top of a very high hill at the foot of which lay a vast bank of mist. The sun was above the hill and Ibn Sinā saw a rainbow on the mist below him.

Numerous descriptions of rainbows occur in literature e.g. in the Ḥamāsī (F. Tuch, Z. D. M. G., iii. 200 sqq.), also by the Ḥamāsīn and Saḥṣar al-Dawla (333–356 = 944–967) and by the poet Wāʾil († 990 = 999); see F. Dieterici, Mūtanāblī and Saḥṣar al-Dawla aus der Edelprose des Ḥamāsī, Darmstadt, 1847, (227 and 175).

More or less strictly scientific studies of the rainbow are also numerous. Ḥabīb Khalīfa (Kashf al-Zamān, iv., No. 9640) quotes a special Ḳawwām Kuzah (science of the rainbow) he

deals with all questions that can arise. According to him, "it investigates how the rainbow is formed, the reason why it is formed and why it is circular; further the reason for the difference in its colours, why it appears after rain at the end of a day, and why it is often seen by day but only rarely at night by moonlight. It further investigates the astrological significance (al-akhīm) of its appearance". Descriptions on similar lines are found, for example, in the works of al-Qazwīnī (Adīlīb al-Makhlīktah, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 98; Kosmographie, trans. Ethé, p. 201, in the Kitāb al-Ṭūfāl al-Ṣafī, Bombay 1305, ii. 52 sqq. (cf. F. Dieterici, Die Naturanschauung der Araber, Berlin 1861, p. 87); also by Shihāb ad-Dīn Ahmad b. Idrīs al-Karāfī († 1285 = 1285/1286) in his Kitāb al-Ṭūfāl al-Ṣaḥīh, dār al-ṭāhira fī al-ṭawārub al-ʿalākār; and in the Risāla fi Kaws Kuzah of Husain al-Dīn al-Tarakī (about 850 = 1446; see Berlin Catalogue by Ahlwardt, No. 5691); two anonymous works are published by Cheikho (al-Muqrib, 1912, xv. 736–744).

A considerable section in a meteorological work (Ahlwardt, Berlin Catalogue, No. 6054) and no doubt many other passages deal with our phenomenon. The most important and most comprehensive work, however, is from the pen of Ibn Sinā in his Shāfī (see the Bibli.)

The descriptions of the rainbow are in general very similar. Not only the simple rainbow but also the double and even triple are described. The first is said to be produced by the sun’s rays themselves, the second by the rays shining through the rays from the first and the third by the rays from the first two; the bows therefore are successively weaker. It is emphasised that the rainbow is not always composed of the same colours, a phenomenon which has recently been fully investigated by M. Pernter. It is also mentioned that the rainbow is particularly beautiful when the sun is on the horizon.

The older treatment of the theory of the rainbow goes back to Aristotle, with whose meteorological works the Arabs were acquainted. Thabit b. Kuirma is said to have translated a commentary by Athāfirīdīzus = Epaphroditos (?) on Aristotle’s essay on the rainbow (Ibn al-Kifīs, p. 59). Aristotle is followed by Ibn Sinā, Ibn al-Haitham, al-Kararī etc., although in many details they make additions and corrections to his views. It is always assumed that the rainbow is produced by beams of light or visual rays which are regularly reflected on the raindrops on very minute reflecting surfaces. Later Kamāl al-Dīn al-Fārsī (q.v.) gave a brilliant exposition of the correct explanation, as far as was possible in the general state of knowledge in his day, when the dispersion of light was unknown. Like us he says that the light is once or twice reflected in the interior of the gLOBule of water and then radiates out from it; thus we see it in its colours. Why it appears only by day he endeavours to investigate the cause of the colours although, of course, not satisfactorily. By experiments he proves the correctness of his results, which are on a much higher level than those of Theodoricus of Freiberg (about 1300).

From Kaws comes a word takāṣīn (the word is not takāṣīn, as I said in the Archiv für die Geschichte der Naturw. und Technik, 1902, iii. 9). It means “showing the colours of the rainbow” or briefly “the colours of the rainbow”. It is defined by Kamāl al-Dīn as “differentiated

The Encyclopedia of Islam, II. 53
colours in the region between blue, green, yellow, red, smoke-coloured white, that is, as regards sensual perception".

The rainbow is also given an astrological significance according to the zodiacal sign in which it appears. In the ram it means plague and death (Ahlwardt, Berlin Catalogue, No. 5006, al-Kawl 'alā Ṭūl Ka'ūs Ka'ūs). In another MS. (No. 5915, 2) it is said that in September a rainbow indicates great tyranny and oppression.


(E. Wiedemann)

KAWSHA, a small volcanic island in the Mediterranean Sea between Sicily and Tunis (now south of Cape Granitola and 45 miles east of Cape Bon [Ras Addar]; area 40 sq. miles), now called Pantelleria. The name Kawsha (variously written in the MSS. goes back to the classical Cossoya (cf. Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyclo- pide der klass. Altertumswiss., xi. 1503). The island, famous for its antiquities (cf. Orsi, Pantelleria in Monumenti dei Linz, 1899, iv. 450-539), was already important in ancient times for intercourse between Sicily and the African coast and played an important part during the conquest and rule of the Arabs in Sicily, which was always attacked from Africa. The first conquest of Kawsha by the Arabs as well as their expedition to Sicily under Mu'āwiya b. Kha'dad in the time of the Caliph Mu'āwiya (Ibn Khuldan, K. al-pharr, i. 211; Yāqūt, Mu'ājam, iv. 200, according to the Aḥbāb Ibn al-Kaitā; al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 235, does not mention the island) was only transitory; the Byzantines soon recaptured it (al-Bakri, K. al-Musālik, Bibl. Arabo-Sicula, p. 13). According to Ibn Taghibrībīdī (ed. Juy- boll, Leiden 1885, i. 136) 'Ali's murdered, Ibn Muldījam, was banished to Kawsha. 'Abd al-Malik b. Khātān, the general of the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik, recaptured the island from the Rūm (al-Tidjānī, Kāhla, Bibl. Ar. No., p. 375) but Muslim rule was only firmly established under the Aḥbāb Ziyādī, Allah whom representative, Asad b. al-Forat, captured Sicily (210-213 = 825-828) and Kawsha (Ibn Khuldan, loc. cit.). In 220 (835) an expedition against the island was once again necessary (Ibn al-Atīhīr, Ka'mīl, ed. Tornberg, vi. 239). In the two following centuries Kawsha was partly converted to Islam. Its harbour was a naval base for the Arabs. Their ships were often wrecked in its vicinity. When the power of the Muslims began to decline, Kawsha was again exposed to raids by Christian states (e.g. 481 = 1088 by the Pisans and Genoese; Ibn al-Atīhīr, Ka'mīl, 110). When Sicily had entirely passed out of Muslim hands, the island was taken in 516 (1122-23) by George of Antioch, Roger II of Sicily's admiral, on his first campaign against the Zirid al-Iṣāsan b. 'Alī [q.v.] in Mahilya; the island served him as a base for the capture of this town in 543 (1148) (Ibn al-Atīhīr, Ka'mīl, xi. 82).

The Arab geographers tell us very little about Kawsha. The distance from Sicily and the African coast is usually given as a day's journey; the harbour is celebrated (al-Idrīsī). The production of figs, cotton and mastic is often mentioned (Abū 'l-Fidā'). The Muslim inhabitants remained there after the Norman conquest as dhimmīs of the Franks (al-'Umāri, Mālik al-Ashur; al-Anfūsī). Down to the xviii century the Arabic language was spoken on the island of Pantelleria; it has exercised a considerable influence on the local Italian dialect (above, i. 419; Gregorio and Seybold in Studi di glotto- logiai, italiani, in. 1901, 235-238). Amari has published a tomb inscription from Pantelleria (Le epigrafe Arabiche di Sicilia, Palermo 1879, p. 118 sqq.).


KA'WTHAR, a word used in Sūra cviii. 1 after which this Sūra is called Sūrat al-Kawthar. Kawthar is a small form from kathara, of which other examples occur in Arabic (e.g. nawṣāf; further examples in Brockelmann, Grundriss der verglei- chenden Grammatik, i. 344.). The word, which also occurs in the old poetry (e.g. the examples in Iba Hilāmī, ed. Westenfeld, p. 261, and Nuldekeschwalli, Geschichte des Qorans, i. 92), means "abundance" and a whole series of Muslim authorities therefore explain al-Kawthar in Sūra cviii. 1 as al-ḥādir al-kathīr (see Ibn Hilāmī, op. cit. al-Tabarī, Taṣfīr, xxx. 180 sqq.). But this quite correct explanation has not been able to prevail in the Taṣfīr. It has been thrust into the background by traditions according to which the Prophet himself explained Kawthar to be a river in Paradise (see so early as Ibn Hilāmī, p. 261 below, and notably al-Tabarī, Taṣfīr, xxx. 179) or Muhammad says that it was a water-basin intended for him personally and shown to him on his ascent to Paradise (al-Tabarī, Taṣfīr, xxx. 178), which latter view al-Tabarī considers the most authentic. Even the earliest Sūra's (lxviii. 41; lxxxvi. 12 etc.) know of rivers that flow through Paradise, but it is not till the Medina period that they are more minutely described, notably in Sūra lxxvi. 11: there are rivers of water which does not smell foul; rivers of milk the taste whereof does not change;
and rivers of wine, a pleasure for those that drink, and rivers of clarified honey. These rivers correspond to the rivers of oil, milk, wine and honey, which had already been placed in Paradise by Jewish and Christian eschatology; the only difference is that Muḥammad replaced oil by water; in Arabia pure water was not to be taken for granted, and besides it was necessary to mix with the wine of Paradise (see Horovitz, Das koranische Paradies, p. 9). When, after the Prophet’s death, eschatological explanations of the “abundance” of Sūra cviii. 1 began to be made, al-Kawthar was identified as one of the rivers of Paradise and when we find in one of the versions quoted in al-Ṭabarî’s Tafsîr that “its water is whiter than snow and sweeter than honey”, or “and its water is wine”, etc., we have obviously an echo of Sūra xxviii. 11. But they did not stop at simply transferring these Karānî descriptions to the Kawthâr but the imagination of later writers gave the river of Paradise a bed of pearls and rubies and golden banks and all sorts of similar embellishments. According to a later view (see Abûl-Ḳāsim ibn Ḥanâfî, ed. Wolff, p. 107), all the rivers of Paradise flow into the Ḥawaḍ al-Kawthâr which is also called Nahr Muḥammad, because, as we have seen above, it is the Prophet’s own.

Bibliography: given in the article.

(J. Horovitz)

KAWUĞLU, “the man with the kawûg”, a character in the Orta Oyunu.

The Turkish word kawûg means the inner cap-shaped part of a certain kind of headgear, a rather high cap around which the headdress proper, the sârāz, is wound; a cap like this could be of different shapes; it either culminated in a rounded top or in a flat surface; sometimes also it was wider at the top then on the bottom. It was usually made of wadded felt in perpendicular strips narrowing towards the top. These kawûg’s were worn by officers of different ranks in the Janissaries. They varied in form, colour and name according to rank. For further details see Mahmut Şahvet, Osmanlı Tekâbilât ve-Kıyâfet-i ‘atkerî-yesi, Stamina 1325, i. 29 sq. Other professions also had particular kawûg’s; thus there were molla, kâtib and paşalîk kawûghu or, from the shape, one talked of tepeli kawûg, while dal kawûgh acquired the special meaning of parasite. The word kawûg (plur. kawûğîn) has even penetrated into Arabic.

Kawûg, “the man with the kawûg”, has acquired a special significance as one of the two principal characters in the Turkish folkplay of Orta Oyunu. It is not till last century that we are at all minutely acquainted with the Orta-play and the names Orta and Kawûg do not seem to be any older. According to a tradition, the character of the Kawûg was first introduced by a certain otherwise unknown Şükri, in place of a character called Nekre whose main feature is said to have been a fondness for opium. Kawûg is the real comic figure in the Orta-play and plays a part like that of Karagöz (q. v.) in the shadow-play. Peskâh, the other principal character in the Orta Oyunu, is, on the other hand, the real director of the piece, a kind of stage manager, who always appears first on the stage and corresponds roughly to the Hâdiwâd of the shadow-play.

The costume of the Kawûg is sometimes described in the pieces themselves. Its chief feature is a high kawûg on his head. This is usually flattened above, red in colour and made of strips (dîmîl) sewn together, almost like a top-hat without the lower brim. The kawûg is jokingly compared to a tandir, the Turkish stove of similar shape. A shawl called aghâh, made of wool and silk, is wound round the kawûg. The kafan (dîmûr) of the Kawûg and his trousers are also of red cloth while his under-garment (enârî) is of striped woollen cloth or silk (sham sharîris or allî pârûş). An ordinary shawl is used as girdle. The Kawûg wears yellow Turkish saffron leather slippers (celek pârûş) usually with heels, over the leather stockings called meyt. He usually carries an umbrelîya made of different coloured parts. In modern times more and more of the old dress has been lost and even the kawûg has had to give place to a fez with a long tassel.

In the play the Kawûg is usually a shopkeeper, artisan or a servant. Like Karagöz he is responsible for the grotesque and comic element. He misunderstands the remarks of the other players, especially the Peskâh, in substance as well as language, carries out orders in a stupid fashion, coarsens sentiments or twists them into the obscene. He is tactless and stupid, especially when he has to be on good behaviour among high class people, but in his absence he exaggerates respect even from his friend, whom he treats badly, and is very capricious. If he describes his experiences, he exaggerates tremendously but unmercifully disparages any presents that have been given to him etc. If he is caught in a trick he usually succeeds in escaping by some of his thousand shifts. A further favourite source of humour is the imitation of foreign voices and dialects, taṭıld (Ewliyâ, i. 645 sqq., gives the name to Orta-like plays of his time), sometimes with the addition of disguises. It seems that the players were originally foreigners and non-Muslims and in the older period the business was still considered unseemly and it is regretted when a Muslim earns his livelihood in this way.

All his pranks have to be improvised by the player, only a rough outline of the piece being given. The part of the Kawûg makes the greatest demand upon the player and only a few really great actors have succeeded in playing the part to the general satisfaction. The most famous was a certain Hamîd at the end of last century and in most of the texts known to us from that period the Kawûg is often addressed simply as Hamîd.


KAWURD B. DÂÜD ÇÂGHRIPEG, sometimes also called Karî Arslânbey, the founder of the line of Salûqûd of Kirmân. The first year of his reign is usually given as 433 (1041). Perhaps it was he and not Ibrahim Imâl (cf.Ibn al-Âthir, ed. Tornberg, ix. 349) who led the Ghuzz, who came to Kirmân in 434, but he did not succeed in establishing himself there then, for the lord of this province, the Bûyid Abî Kâlidîr (q. v.), was informed of the raid and sent troops who put the Ghuzz to
flight. It was not till some years later (440 = 1048) after the death of Abābū Kūlūdijī, that the capital
of the country, Ba'dir, where Bahram b. Lash-
karsīnān commanded for the Būyids, was taken and
henceforth the land belonged to Kāwūr. By a
stratagem he was able to subjugate the rude tribes of
the Kūf and Kufādijī, who dwelled in the
Garmast (the hot region). He also waged war in
Shēhān and in Fārs, in the latter country with the
chief of the Šahbānār Kaflu—on him cf. Ibn
al-Balkhī, ed. Le Strange and Nicholson, p. 166
and with the assistance of the Amir of Hormoz
even sent troops across the Gulf to the coast of
Arabia who conquered Omān so that his successors
ruled there till 537 (1142—43). He was an energetic
ruler in every respect and maintained order in the
land and acquired merit by making wells and
building towers to serve as landmarks in the desert.
One of these towers still stands between Ourg
and Fardaj (cf. P. M. Sykes, Ten Thousand Miles in
Persia or Eight Years in Irān, p. 418). But in
the end his ambition proved his downfall. Even
during the reign of his brother Alp Arslān, he
could scarcely bring himself to acknowledge his
suzerainty but when the latter came twice to Kirmān
(456 = 1064; and 459 = 1067) he did not dare
throw down the gauntlet but showed himself sub-
missive. But as soon as he heard that his brother
had fallen (1072) and that his son Malik-shāh had
succeeded him he collected his forces and marched
against him. The two armies met near Hamaštān.
Kāwūr's troops were put to flight, he was taken
prisoner and strangled. The best account of this
battle, which was fought on Dju'dān 26, 466 = Jan.
27, 1074 (according to Ibn al-Ainhir, x. 53,
in Shēhān = April), is contained in the Zubdat al-
Tabārīk, B. M. MS., fol. 33. The victor, how-
ever, left the sons of Kāwūr in possession of
Kirmān.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources quoted in the article: Recueil de textes relat. à
l'histoire des Selj., i. 2 sqq.; cf. in addition
Houtsma in the Z. D. M. G., xxxix. 367 sqq.

KAWWĀS, an Arabic word meaning originally
archer, then archaebus, finally, like the French
archer, came to mean military police. The form
kawwās (with šd) is found in the 900t Nights
(Dowy, Suppl.). The word is applied in the Levant
specially to the military police, called in French
cavalerie or sometimes janissaires (because before
the abolition of the latter, they were chosen from
their ranks), detached to act as guards to em-
bassies and consulates. They go in front of the
head of the embassy or consulate when he goes
into the town, whether officially or not, and make
way for him in the crowded streets and bazaars.
In Turkey they are called yasak-li. In terms of
articles 45 and 50 of the renewal in 1740 of the
treaty between France and the Ottoman Empire,
known as the capitulations, the ambassadors and
consuls may employ such janissaries as they please
without their being forced to use any who do not
suit them (T. X. Bianchi, Nouveau Guide de la
Conversation, Paris 1835, p. 275—274). The
regulations of Şafar 23, 1280, fixed the number of
natives that the consulates could employ in account
of their privileges, at 4 yasak-li for consulates
general and consulates in the chief towns of pro-
vinces, 3 for ordinary consulates and 2 for vice-
consulates or consular agencies. Their appointment
is notified to the governor-general of the province
who keeps a register of the names of those employed
(Aristarche-bey, L'escàton en Ottomate, Constanti-
nople 1873—1888, iv. 15 sqq.).

Bibliography: Descr. de l'Egypte, Paris
1822, xxiv. t. 326—327. (Cl. Huart)

KAY. [See KERIHWAK.]

KAYI, the name of one of the 24 tribes
of the Huzz [q.v.] or Oguz from which the
Ottoman ruling house is descended. Cf. the
pertinent text of the Tabrīzīh-Aīt Selīldijī and
the Kayak Dīlī Kaygīsh in the Zem., ins. 977.
Mahmūd Kāshānī, Diwanugah al-Turk (I. 1)
still has the old form Kaygīsh, which refutes the
identification proposed by J. Marquart (Abb. Ge-
W. Gottingen, Nine Folks, xii. fi. 39 sqq.) with
the Kāi mentioned by al-Birūnī and al-Awīf
in the extreme east. The Kay are regarded by Marquart
as turkicized Mongols (op. cit., p. 88) which also
he says, op. cit., p. 191) explains "the rôle which the
blood-stained and fratricidal race of Oman and Ot-
oman people have played in history". That the Kay
were Mongols is very probable. They are cited by
Mahmūd Kāshānī (op. cit., i. 30) with the Tātār
and others among the peoples who speak a language
of their own, although they also knew Turkish;
but the Oguz tribe Kaygīsh or Kayfī had cer-
tainly nothing to do with the Kāi.

(W. Barthold)

KAZ (t.), goose, occurs also in geographical
names such as Kāz Dagh, the Caucasus [see KARE].
KAZA. [See KAD].

KAZAK (t.), robber, disturber of the
peace, adventurer; on these and other mean-
ings see W. Radloff, Versuch eines Wörterbuches
der türk. Dialekte, i. 304. The existence of the
word in Turkish can be first shown in the ninth
(xvb) century. During the civil turmoils under the
Timurids the pretendors, in contrast to the actual
rulers, were called kazak; those who would not
accept the verdict of fortune led but the life of
an adventurer at the head of their men; cf., for
example, the mention of the kazak years (kasakli)
of Sultan İfusin, afterwards ruler of Khorasān, in
the Bāhū-Nūma, ed. Beveridge, p. 173 b, infra.
The name kazak is also applied to whole bodies of
people, who had separated from their princes
and kinsmen; in the Tārīık-i Rashidī (transl.
E. D. Ross, especially p. 82 and 272) the Ózbek,
who had abandoned their K Hasan Abu l-Khair
(cf. the article), are called Özbek-Kazak or simply
Kaza; the latter name has been retained by their
descendants as an ethnic to the present
day (cf. the art. KIRGE). In Russia the word
kazak first appears about the same time as in
Central Asia (in the second half of the xvb century)
and is probably borrowed from Turkish although it
appears in Russian in a larger number of meanings;
thus individuals without kinsmen or possessions
were called kazak even although they did not lead
a wandering or marauding life; the word, therefore,
had not yet the exclusively military meaning which
it had afterwards. The word Cossack, used in
Western Europe, is the result of the Little Russian
and Polish pronunciation. No certain etymological
explanation of the word kazak has yet been given.
The last suggestion by N. Marx (Zurnal Min. u.
Prom. 1915, June, p. 286), according to which the
old Caucausian ethnic kazak mentioned in the
Russian annals under 6473 = 906 is preserved in
Kazak, is a hypothesis which can hardly be accepted
by the historian.

(W. Barthold)
KAŽAN, also written Karazin, in the xvth and xviith centuries the capital of a Tatar principality, in the xvbth century a Russian university town, now capital of the Tatar Soviet Republic. According to legend, the town was built by Vitus. In 1391 Kažan was destroyed by Russian fisher-boomers from Novgorod, and again in 1399 by the Prince Vwryi Dmitrievič. About 1445 a powerful kingdom was founded here by Ulū-Muhammed and his son Maḥmūde (in Russian works Maḥmūtces) who had been banished from the Golden Horde; in the same year (1445), in which Ulū Muhammed captured the Russian Grand Duke Wasiliy, Kažan, where a prince called ʿAli Beg was ruling, was captured by Maḥmūde. In 1460 Ulū Muhammed was killed by Maḥmūde; two other sons of Ulū Muhammed, Kašim and Yaḵūb, had to flee to Russia from their brother, where Kašim founded a local dynasty in Kasimov [g.v.], which is called after him. Like many later pretenders who sought refuge in Russia, Kašim took part on the Russian side in the wars against Kažan. Maḥmūde died about 1464 and was succeeded by his sons, first Khaḷil, then Ibrāhim. In 1468 even Wsibka had to submit to Khaḷil Ibrāhim but in the following year the campaign took a more favourable turn for Russia; Ibrāhim had to make peace and restore their freedom to all the Russian prisoners in Kažan. Ibrāhim’s successor was his son Iḫsan; in 1487 his brother Muḥammad Amin appeared before Kažan with a Russian army; after a siege of three weeks Iḫsan had to surrender and was sent with his wife to Wologda; Muḥammad Amin was installed as Khaḷ in his place. In 1496 the Khaḷ and with him the Russian party was driven out by the conqueror Makhmud, for after the victory of the Russians — at the request of the people of Kažan — it was not Muḥammad Amin but his brother ʿAbd al-Laṭif that was installed as Khaḷ but by 1502 ʿAbd al-Laṭif was brought back to Russia and the throne restored to Kaḥ Muḥammad Amin. In 1505 the Khaḷ rebelled against Russian suzerainty and killed or robbed the Russian merchants who came to the annual fair in Kažan; the Tatars advanced as far as Njini-Novgorod. In 1506 a Russian army was defeated; while a second campaign was being prepared the old relations were restored by a treaty of peace in 1507. Muḥammad Amin died in 1518, ʿAbd al-Laṭif had died the previous year; with them the dynasty founded by Ulū Muhammed became extinct.

The following decades were a period of almost uninterrupted fighting between the pretenders supported by Russia, the brothers Shah ʿAli (on his tomb in Kasimov, not Shahk ʿAli) and Dān ʿAli, who had come from Astrakhan, Russia, and the national party supported by the Crimean Tatars and the Noghai. The latter won their biggest victories in 1524; Shah ʿAli was driven out by prince Şahib Giräi who came from the Crimea; the brothers Muḥammad Giräi from the Crimea and Şahib Giräi from Kažan advanced up to Moscow; the Grand Duke Wasiliy abandoned his capital; a peace was concluded in his name by the Tatar prince Peter, a convert to Christianity, by which the Russian government bound itself to pay tribute to the Khaḷ of the Crimea. The Russian prisoners were sold as slaves by the Crimean Tatars in Kafa and by the people of Kažan in Astrakhan. In 1524 Şahib Giräi went to the Crimea and left his thirteen year old son Şafā Giräi in Kažan. The only original document that survives from the period of the principality of Kažan dates from the brief reign of Şahib Giräi: it is a decree dated Safar 12, 929 (= Jan. 1523), confirming a faculty as "Tāriḵān", that is nobles freed from all taxes. The text is very detailed so that the document is of some importance for the domestic history of the principality.

After vain efforts to come to an agreement with Russia, Şafā Giräi was driven from the throne by the Russian party in 1530; at the wish of the people it was not Şah ʿAli but Dān ʿAli that was elected Khaḷ; he was killed in 1535 in a rising of the national party; Şafā Giräi recalled and supported by his father Şahib Giräi, then Khaḷ of the Crimea. The Russian attempts to restore their suzerainty had therefore for a long time no success; it was only in the year 1546 that Şafā Giräi was driven out and Şah ʿAli put in his place; but Şafā Giräi returned immediately after the departure of the Russians and held the throne till his death in 1549. He was succeeded by his two year old son Otemiş, who was taken to Russia in 1549 and christened by the name of Alexander and lived till 1566. The brief and cruel reign of Şah ʿAli ended with his banishment. Yaṭiyr Muḥammad, a prince born in Astrakhan, was summoned from the land of the Noghai to Kažan as Khaḷ. The Grand Duke Iwan who had already conducted two unsuccessful campaigns (1548 and 1550) against Kažan now appeared before the town with a larger army; after hard fighting Kažan was stormed on Oct. 2, 1554, and all armed men put to death.

The town retained its former appearance and its military importance under Russian rule for a long time. The town had ten gates and a citadel separated from the other quarters of the town by a ditch; the old wooden wall was replaced by one of stone in 1555. The town was then about 600 cubits (= a mile) in length and 500 cubits (1500 yards) in breadth. To injure the commercial importance of the city, the Russian government as early as 1524 had forbidden the annual fair at Njini-Novgorod; at the same time merchants were forbidden to go to the fair at Kažan. Christianity was indistinctly preached. Kažan was the see of an archbishop from 1555 and later of a metropolitan. The immigration from Russia proper assumed considerable importance. Little is left of the old town; a tower in the citadel still bears the name of the princess Şiyûnbigi, wife of Şahib Giräi (she was previously married to Dān ʿAli and later to Şah ʿAli). Under the influence of national Tatar movement the memory of this princess is kept green; in 1914 a biography of her appeared and a periodical for women is published under her name; but it is not definitely known when and how the tower received this name, and what parts date from the Tatar period and what from the Russian. During the xviiith century Kažan had lost all military importance and was easily taken — with the exception of the citadel — by Pugacev in July, 1774; there were then 2,867 houses in it. Even at this date Kažan was of much greater importance than Njini-Novgorod as a centre of government and of culture. The university founded in 1504 became famous especially for its Oriental faculty (strictly the Oriental section of the faculty
of history and philology). In 1855, as a result of the opening of the Oriental faculty in the University of St. Petersburg, instruction in Oriental languages in the university of Kazan was stopped and the library and other accessories for the most part brought to St. Petersburg.

Instruction in Muhammadan languages was resumed in the university of Kazan in 1861. According to the census of 1897, Kazan had 131,568 inhabitants, in 1911 182,477, of whom 30,781 were Tatars.


W. Barthold

KAZBEGI. A Persian copper coin worth one ghori, according to Chardin, the thirtieth part of a ghori. It is now obsolete. Chardin says, iv. 279 (Rouen, 1723), the name means "the King’s money," but see the titles Goszek and Csebacege in Hbbon-Jobon (revised ed.). Another form of the word seems to be Kazbini from Kazin where they were coined.

W. Beveridge

KAZERUN, a town in Persia in the province of Fars, between the sea and Shiraz and 55 miles from the latter at a height of 3,000 feet. It is supplied with water from wells and pipes as the district has no river. Its industries used to be flourishing; it manufactured a kind of cotton called ghatavi (Yakuti, ii. 288); it had a rich trade carried on by merchants for whom ‘Ajdal al-Dawla the Buayd had built a bourse and who had luxurious dwellings and pleasure-houses in the town and vicinity. A kind of date called gilican was gathered there. At the present day it is surrounded by tobacco-fields; there is a horse-market there frequented by the nomad tribes. The principal mosque was built on a hill commanding the hazar. Among the tombs of saints venerated there, mention is made of that of Shikh Abi Ishak Ibrahim b. Shabriyur Kazeruni, patron of the sailors in Indian and Chinese seas, their protector from storms and pirates, a capacity which brought his swaiya abundance of axvoto’s ( Ibn Batuta, ed. Paris, ii. 89). Twenty miles to the north are the ruins of Sabur; Kazeruni began to rise in importance from the time Sabur fell into ruins. The district was called Shul, a name that survives in the modern name Shulustin. In the vicinity there is a very salt lake full of fish which in the fourth century was called Buahair Muz (or Muraq).


(C. HUART

KAZI-ASKER (A.T.), military judge, one of the highest offices in the judicial system of the Ottoman empire; its holders took precedence immediately after the Shâhîd al-İslâm, the chief of the ‘âmmârî; they are entitled sâhir (i.e., iv. 45); they are equal in rank to the vizier and na’shir. They are entitled in written petitions to be addressed as semâeh-hâ “your benevolence.” There are two Kazi-Askers, one of Kûm-lî and the other of Anatolia. Before the reforms, the first was inspector-general of all the dedicated properties (wâfî) except those of the two holy cities, when they become vacant (ma’âlî) by the decease of their administrators (mutawawil); since the timâniât this duty has fallen upon the Minister of the Awlâf.

The title Kazi-Askar was created in 763 (1362) by Sultan Murad I in favour of the Kâdi Kara Khan Djiendere-li; this judge followed the Sultan in the army and excercized his functions in camp. After the capture of Constantinople, Mehemd II ennobled 885 (1481) and by the advice of the Grand Vizier Karamanlı Mehmed Paşa (q.v., ii. 745), jealous of the credit enjoyed by Mûniçeh Çelebi, Mûniçeh al-Dîn Kasîflânî and Hadjiî Hasanîâwere the first holders of these new offices. The Shâhîd al-İslâm or Grand Murdi did not have precedence over them until the reign of Sultan Süülâmân al-Kânumî. They had the right to appoint all the kâdi’s and mudarrî’s (professors of theology) except those of Constantinople, Brusa and Adrianopolis, the three successive capitals of the empire; these nominations were reserved for the Grand Vizier.

The Kazi-Askar of Kûm-lî dealt with the cases of Muslims in questions belonging to the capital while those of non-Muslims were left to the Kazi-Askar of Anatolia. The importance of the first of these posts put the second on the background. His competence extended to cases relating to estates, to debts of the state and interests of the treasury; down to the reign of Mahmüd I the sphere of jurisdiction included the three Barbay regencies; his authority over the kâdi’s of the Crimea was recognized by the treaty of Kainarde (1775) and the convention of Aineli-Kavak (March 21, 1779).

Bibliography: d’Ohsson, Tableau de l’Empire ottoman, iii. 548; iv. 531; J. von Hammer, Hist. de l’Emp. ottoman, iii. 309.

(C. Huart

KAZI KUMUKH. [See KUMUKH.

KAZIMAIN. A town near Bagdad, one of the most celebrated of Shî‘a places of pilgrimage. It is a little over a thousand yards on the right bank of the Tigris, which describes a loop. It is separated from the river by a girdle of gardens. Kazimain itself is prettily situated among palm-groves; there are also gardens almost without interruption in the direction of Bagdad. It is connected by a horse-tramway with the west side of Bagdad (Karhîyak; see the art. AAKHII) about three miles away, which was laid down by the governor Mirhat Paşa, who did a great deal for Bagdad (1869—72; cf. i. 568). Quite recently Kazimain has also become a station on the Bagdad-Samarrâ railway, which runs along the right bank of the Tigris. Down to the World
War Kāzimain was the seat of a ḍār-i-moḥamāt and the capital of a ḍār of the sandjak of Bāgh Ḍād with a population of 25,000 (of whom 5,000 are Shīʿis); see Cuinnet, op. cit. The number of inhabitants of the town itself Cuinnet estimated at 6,000, Aubin (1907) at 7–8,000, of whom two-thirds were Persians. They are very fanatical; access to the sanctuaries is strictly forbidden to Christians. The Arab Beduin tribe of al-Maḍāma' encomaps along the Tigris as far as Kāzimain (see M. v. Oppenheim, op. cit., ii. 71).

The name Kāzimain, a so-called duali a potiori (cf. Wright, Grammar of the Arabic Language, i. 190), means ‘the two Kāzīms’. The reference is to the two ʿAlīs buried here, Mūsā al-Kāzīm (d. 186 = 802) and Muḥammad al-Jawād (d. 219 = 834), the seventh and ninth Imāms of the Shi‘a sect of the ‘Twelvers’; [cf. ʿināʾ ashkariyya, ii. p. 563]. The place is often briefly called Kāzim (also Ghaḍim in books of travel) or Kāzīmiyye (Kāzīmiyye); the name Imām Mūsā is also Alīd, but as the region is the seat of Najaf (in Ibn Khallikān). At the present day Kāzimain is one of the four greatest sanctuaries of the Shi‘a. Its favourable position at the junction of the roads to the three other Shi‘a places of pilgrimage, Sāmarrā in the north and Kerbelā and Najaf in the south, accounts for the fact that many thousands of pilgrims pass through it annually. Frequently 25–30,000 believers assemble here on one day. The throng is greatest during the first ten days of the month of Muḥarram, which are specially dedicated to the memory of Husain and the ʿAlīs generally. One of the most prominent and the principal spiritual leaders of the Shi‘a, lives in Kāzimain.

The sanctuary of Kāzimain is one of those exceedingly splendid and rich temples which the ʿIrāq owes to the Shi‘a and for which Persia and Shi‘a India supplied the necessary millions. With its domes covered with gold, the drums and the spires of its minarets it is visible to the traveller a long way off. Its present form faience covered, is due to the ʿIrāqī Imāl ʿIsmāʿīl (903–940 = 1502–1544), whose family claimed descent from the Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm (cf. above, ii. 544). The inscription published by Massignon, op. cit., p. 90, of the year 926 (1519) refers to this and the complete transformation of the old building by the ʿIrāqī. The restoration not quite completed by ʿIsmāʿīl was finished by the Ottoman Sultan Sulṭān Sulṭān I, who visited Bāgh Ḍād in 941 (1544). The covering of the domes with golden tiles was done — according to the inscription in 1211 (1796) — by command and at the expense of Shāh Aḥmad Muḥammad Kāhn [q. v.], the founder of the ʿIrāqī dynasty. On the occasion of his pilgrimage (1870) Shāh Nāṣr al-Dīn had the gold plating on the principal dome and on the roofs of the minarets renewed; cf. Cuinnet, op. cit. The double cupola flanked by four minarets, which two sides are covered beneath it. Close to this mausoleum stands an isolated pavilion under which are shown the graves of ʿDjafar (formerly supposed to be that of ʿIsmāʿīl) and ʿIrāhīm, sons of the Imām Mūsā. The cupola of this building is modern and a gift of the general of division Salīm Paḫa; cf. Massignon, op. cit., p. 100. It may be noted here that there is also at Ḥadīthā on the Euphrates (between Āna and Hit) a small sanctuary which is said to contain the tomb of Muḥammad, son of Mūsā al-Kāzīm; see Herzfeld in Sarre-Herzfeld, op. cit., ii. 321. On the tomb of a certain ʿHānma b. Mūsā al-Kāzīm in Kārīyat al-Bāṣiyya (in the ʿIrāq) cf. Massignon, op. cit., p. 60. In the vicinity of Astarābād [q. v.] there is also an Imām-zāde (tomb-chapel) where a descendant of the Imām Mūsā called Imām Kāzīm is said to be buried; cf. Melgunof in the Z. d. M. G., xxii. 235, and in Das sudliche Ufer der kurdischen Mecres, Leipzig 1868, p. 119–120.

Like the sepulchral mosques of other great places of pilgrimage that of Kāzimain also is surrounded by a very broad court-yard (ṣābīn) enclosed by a wall. This latter was rebuilt in 1298 (1880), with the permission of the Turkish government, by a wealthy Persian named Fāhrād Mīrzā and adorned with ceramic work and inscriptions containing whole sūras; cf. Massignon, op. cit., p. 110. In the great court, in course of time, extensive buildings for the housing of numerous pilgrims (with treasury) grew up, especially along the enclosing wall. In 1907 Aubin estimated the number of bazaars and caravanserais within the area of the sanctuary at forty-five. There are also a number of petty coffee-houses.

Adjoining the wall of the court-yard is a Sunni mosque with the tomb of the famous ʿHānafī lawyer Abū Yūsuf (q. v., d. 182 = 798); cf. Massignon, op. cit., p. 57, 100. It is a mistake, as Le Strange (Baghdad, p. 161 sq., 350 sq.) does, to locate the grave of Zabūaid, wife of Hārūn al-Raṣīl, in or near this Kāzimain; cf. against this Massignon, op. cit., p. 110 sq., Herzfeld, op. cit., ii. 111, and also the article A.L.KARSH.

In the time of the Caliphs, extensive cemeteries lay on the west side of Baghdad above the Ḥarbiyya quarter. The two ʿAlīd graves were in the cemetery of the Kūraṣīh (Maṭḥāb al-Kūraṣīḥ); the names Shāhīzīya and cemetery of the Bāb al-Tībān are also found for it. When Yashīk wrote (623 = 1226), Maṭḥāb al-Kūraṣīh was a fairly populous suburb surrounded by a wall. Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī about a century later found that this place, formerly reckoned a suburb of Baghdad, was now an independent little town. With the first built the ʿAlīd sanctuary at Kāzimain is unknown. We know that princes of Shī‘a tendencies, like the ʿAybūṣ, frequently bestowed gifts upon it. But in the course of time, especially during the frequent fighting in the capital between Shī‘is and Sunnis, it was repeatedly burned and plundered, notably in the years 43 (1051) and 622 (1225). At the conquest of Baghdad by Hulāgū in 656 (1258) it was again laid in ashes. It may be mentioned that in 1801 on the occasion of the Wahhabi invasion the treasures of the sanctuary were removed from Kerbelā to Kāzimain; see Jacob in A. Nöldeke, op. cit., p. 48, note 1.

Opposite Kāzimain, on the left bank of the Tigris, connected with it by a bridge of boats, is the suburb of al-Muʿazzam (see above, i. 568—569), a stronghold of the Sunnis and a kind of national sanctuary of the Turks. In this place of about two thousand inhabitants is the highly venerated sepulchral mosque of Abū Ḥanīfa, the founder of one of the four orthodox schools of Muḥammadan law (q. v., d. 150 = 767). On this tomb cf. M. v. Oppenheim, op. cit., ii. 241; Streck, op. cit., i. 162; Le Strange; Baghdad,
for their campaigns against the latter. Muhammad b. al-Hajjājī, b. Yūsuf built a mosque here called Māshjd al-Dhawr "mosque of the white." The Caliph Mūsā al-Hādhī built a new town opposite the old one, called Mādina Mūsā. Mubarak al-'Urkī, a freedman of al-Ma'mūn or al-Mu'āsir, built a fortress there called Mubarakya in which he put a garrison. When Harūn al-Rashīd passed through the town on his way to Hamaḏān the inhabitants of Kāzinī asked and obtained a relief from their tithes, alleging that, living on the frontier, they had to fight for the faith. Harūn built a mosque there and began to restore the ramparts which work was continued by the Amir Abī 'Ali al-Dārifārī in 411 and finished by Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Maʿrūš, minister of Sulṭān Arslān, in 572. Ruined by the Mongol invasion at the beginning of the viii (xiii) century Kāzinī revived again under the Sāfawīs. Taḥmāsp I lived there for long and Abū Bakr I adorned it with fine buildings. In 1723 its inhabitants drove back the Afghāns. Kāzinī has retained a certain importance as the roads from Tabriz and from Rešt to Teherān meet there; the latter is fit for carriageway traffic and is used by motors. Kāzinī is a depot for the silks of Gīlān and Shirvān and manufactures carpets.

Kāzinī, the name given by Ṣūfīn Ṣūlṭān of Mysore (1197-1213 = 1785-1799) to the 1½ rupee (1 anna) in silver; it commemorates Mūsā al-Kāzinī, the seventh Imām. (J. ALLAN)

Kāzinī. [See KASIMOW.]

Kāzinī, formerly Kash-win, a town in Persia in the province of 'Irāq; the distance from the sea, by the sea road, is 103 miles from Esfahan at the foot of Mount Alburz, [q. v.], a height of 4,000 feet above sea-level; the population about 25,000.

The etymology of the name is uncertain. Al-Baladhūrī (p. 321; cf. Ibn al-Fakhr and Kudāma) says that Kāzinī means "the boundary which one watches," i.e. "well guarded"; it may also be explained as "the one who watches the corner," but this seems to be a popular etymology. It has been connected with Carpius (Spiegel, Erān. Alterthumskunde, i. 74, note 1). Founded by Ṣāḥibūr I (Ibn al-Fakhr) and called Ṣāḥib Shāhīr by him, it was besieged by al-Barkhārī b. 'Adījī in 464 (444) and surrendered to him. The people adopted Islam to escape the imposition of the dīya (poll-tax). This strong place, which was a barrier against the incursions of the mountainers of Dīlam, was used by the Muslims as the starting point.

The Cosmography consists of two parts the first of which deals with heavenly things and the second with terrestrial. After a very full introduction the heavenly bodies (sun, moon, stars etc.) are described; next the inhabitants of heaven (the angels) are dealt with; the first part concludes with a chapter on chronology. The second section discusses sub-lunar phenomena and the elements in general, especially the sphere of fire, air and water, natural history in the three kingdoms (minerals, vegetable and animal) and lastly man. The Cosmography also contains a great deal that is purely geographical as it describes the more important mountains, islands, seas, rivers and springs; in the Geography to some extent the same things are again dealt with, usually in the same words.

The manuscripts of the Cosmography differ very much from one another. There are longer and shorter versions and further abbreviated editions or more or less modified versions, sometimes published under another title. References to the manuscripts of the Cosmography are given by Pertsch, Die arab. Hess. der Bibl. zu Gotha, iii. 126—127; supplementary information in the Cat. cod. Arab. Bibl. Lugdun. Batavi., ii. 14. The oldest copy of the text is Cod. Monac. 464, which, according to Seybold, was written in 678 (1280) i.e. three years before the death of al-Kazwīnī (cf. BI., iv. 260). Almost identical with it is the Cod. Sarre prepared about 1420 (see Taeschner, Die Psychologie des Kazwīnī, 1912, p. 6; Saxin in Isl., iii. 152).

Wüstenfeld (see his edition of al-Kazwīnī, vol. i., p. iii. sq.) distinguishes three different editions of the Cosmography all of which he believes to have been prepared by al-Kazwīnī himself: the first of the year 661 (1263), the second of 674 (1176), much enlarged and considerably rewritten, and a third which is represented only by a single codex the latter part of which is incomplete (Gotha, Nov. 1508). Taeschner and Wüstenfeld based his edition of the text has two titles, an earlier, Tuhfat al-Kazwīnī, and a later, Mirāt al-Kazwīnī. In it, apart from other minor additions, we have two entirely new sections (on the different races of mankind and the various arts).

This idea of Wüstenfeld's is, however, untenable, as Ruska has shown in his important Kazwīnī-Studien in Islam, 1913, iv. 14—66, 236—256 (a summary of his researches was given in his article Über den falschen und echten Kazwīnī in der Mittell. zur Gesch. der Medizin und Naturwissenschaft, 1914, xii. 182—193). As a result of his analysis of the structure of the text of the anthropological and mineralogical chapters (especially of the section on the rain-stone) of the Cosmography based on a number of Arabic MSS. and Persian translations of the text Ruska comes to the conclusion that we must distinguish not three but four recensions of the Cosmography. Of these I (= Wüstenfeld's II) is so far known only from two Gotha MSS.; II (Wüstenfeld's I) is represented in many — some very old — MSS. and in the text of the Cosmography given on the margin of the printed edition of al-Hamidī. To this second recension also belongs the already mentioned oldest MS. of al-Kazwīnī (Monac. 464) and the Codex Sarre. The Arabic original of Rec. III is lost; it is not certain what its relation was to the two preceding.
Its characteristic feature is the addition of chapters 7 and 8 on the races of men and on the arts. The Arabic original of Rec. III — of which the date and compiler are unknown — must also have been the original of the Persian translations as well as the basis for the version preserved in Rec. IV. The idea of a Persian version without an Arabic basis, i.e. of a retranslation of Rec. IV from the Persian, may be set aside as quite improbable. Rec. V, which is only represented in the already mentioned Cod. Gothanus 1508 defective at the end, represents a version of Rec. III. It is quite different from the text of the Persian translations in contrast to which it has marked interpolations; many chapters are amplified by considerable additions. It alone contains the extracts regarding the Turkish hordes of the tenth century from the journal of Miṣar b. al-Mahalhil [q.v.] and Ibn Faḍlān's [q.v.] notes on the Slavs, Khazars, Russians, etc., as well as the excerpts on jewels from al-Ḳazānī’s book. This Rec. IV (= Wüstefeld’s III) cannot be from the pen of al-Ḳazānī himself. Cod. Goth. 1508, besides, as has already been mentioned, has a different title from the other three recensions and, indeed, expressly describes itself as a commentary (ẓahrā) on al-Ḳazānī. Goth. 1508 is perhaps original; at any rate it was compiled by someone with a thorough knowledge of the old literature.

Wüstefeld’s edition of the text of the Cosmography therefore does not contain the genuine text of al-Ḳazānī but a much later recension of the xviiith century. Almost the whole of Wüstefeld’s volume (p. 73—366) follows the text of the recension o. Cod. Goth. 1508. But portions are omitted from this and replaced by portions from other manuscripts, which have also been used to fill up other gaps. Wüstefeld’s procedure has therefore given us an entirely arbitrary edition of the text. To obtain the true text of al-Ḳazānī’s Cosmography it would be best to choose the older, shorter Rec. II (= Wüstefeld’s I) which also seems to have been the most widely distributed. Among the numerous manuscripts of this recension the oldest Cod. Monac. 464 should be taken as a basis.

Extracts from the Cosmography also exist. One with the title Kitāb al-Durar mutawāfū min ʾAṯār al-Buldān is in the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale; cf. de Sacy, op. cit., iii. 449 sq., and de Slane, Cit. des Ms. arabes de la Biblioth. Nat., N°. 2182. A similar abbreviation ibid., N°. 2419(3).

The anonymous work ʾAṯār al-Maḥḍūrat al-Ṣughrā, i.e. “the little Cosmography” (also in Paris, de Slane, N°. 2182) has much in common with the Cosmography.

On account of its relatively succinct form yet containing all essential information generally popular at the close of the middle ages, al-Ḳazānī’s Cosmography was translated into various foreign languages, notably Persian and Turkish. As to the Persian translations their relation to the Arabic original has already been briefly discussed. But two or more recensions or paraphrases have to be distinguished among the Persian versions, the relation of which to each other and to the Arabic original requires still to be more closely investigated. One of them is called Ṭuhfāt al-Ḳarāʾib (Vienna MS. N°. 1438; see Flügel, ii. 506 sq., and cf. thereon Persich, Vers. der pers. Hs. , . . . zu Berlin, p. 367). On the Persian translations cf. de Sacy, op. cit., iii. 436; Wüstefeld’s edition of al-Ḳazānī, vol. i., p. xii., and Ruska in Jb., N°. 17, 160. There are also abbreviations e.g. London, British Mus. (Rieu, 1853, p. 403, N°. 7). In Cambridge is a manuscript which also contains excerpts from the Geography of al-Ḳazānī; see Browne, Catal. of the Pers. Ms., 1856, p. 208 sq., N°. 126. Ḥامزة ʿAbdūr ʿAṣfār’s al-Dālin (d. 866 = 1461) composed a poetical synthesis of the second part of the Cosmography entitled Ḥusrāʾib al-Dārūy. Of this the Bodleian in Oxford (Catalogue by Sachau-Ethe, col. 401—403) and the India Office in London (Ethé, Cat., 79 and 191) have each 2 MSS. This synopsis forms the second part of a much more comprehensive poetical cosmology in four chapters which ʿAbdūr published under the title Mirāṯ.

There are also various Turkish translations; on them cf. Taeschner in the Z. D. M., G., lxxvii. 35. There is one by Ayīb b. Khalil finished in 977 (1570) in M.S. in Vienna (Flügel, Kataf. der Hofbibl., ii. 508); it is entitled Ṭuhfāt al-ʾAṯār wa-Tardjumāt al-Qaẓānī. Another translation was made by the famous theologian al-Maqūḍī (d. 850 = 1454); there are manuscripts of it in London, British Mus. (Rieu, p. 107—109; Add. 7284 and Add. 24,954).

The anonymous Turkish translation in the Berlin Library N°. 177 (see Persich’s Catalogue, p. 197—

198) is probably different; its author has dealt very freely and arbitrarily with the Arabic original, has omitted many articles and added others in their place. The original work has been much abbreviated throughout and the arrangement of the matter is different. Another Turkish translation made by Ismāʾil ʿAbdūr and dating from the year 1109 (1697) is only known from Ḥāfẓi Khalīfa (ed. Flügel), vii. 154, N°. 14,608.

The Berlin and London translations (Brit. Mus., Rieu, Catal. p. 205—209) also differ from the Arabic original and from almost all the Persian translations in that they include a book of countries, a synopsis of the Geography, as in the Cambridge Persian Codex mentioned above. Ahmad Yādzīdī-atings work, ʾAṯār al-Maḥḍūrat, is probably only a free version of al-Ḳazānī’s Cosmography; cf. Persich, Kataf. der arab. Hs. zu Gottha, iii. 127, and Persich, Verzeichnis der türk. Hs., ... zu Berlin, p. 199.

There is apparently a Çağhatāi version of the Cosmography in the St. Petersburg Library (Chanykov, N°. 108); see Persich, Kataf. der arab. Hs. zu Gottha, iii. 127.

2. The Geography. The Geography exists in two editions with different titles; the older is called ʾAṯār al-Buldān and the latter Ṭuhfāt al-ʾAṯār wa-ʾAṯār al-ṭuḥfāt. The first recension represented by MSS. in Berlin (see Ahlwardt’s Catalogue, p. 370) and Paris (de Slane, p. 392) dates from the year 661 (1263). The second, much enlarged and on some points completely altered edition dates from the year 674 (1275). On the two recensions and their relationship to each other see Wüstefeld in his edition of the Geography, p. viii. sq.; he based his edition on the second recension which exists in numerous manuscripts. On the MSS. see the references in Wüstefeld, op. cit., vol. ii., p. iv. sq., and Persich, Kataf. der arab. Hs. zu Gottha, iii. 152 sq.

In this work al-Ḳazānī gives a description of the earth following the Ptolemaic division into
seven climes or longitudinal zones (see the art. iktifam and also Taeschner in the Z.D.M.G., lxxvii. 51 sq.). Within the seven climes the separate countries, towns, mountains, islands, lakes, rivers etc. are arranged in alphabetical order. Their remarkable features are described and many historical events connected with them are given. Considerable space is taken up by the sections on the life and work of famous men born in the various places. The book is therefore, like Yakût’s Geographical Dictionary, loaded with historical and biographical material. In arrangement it is a geographical lexicon, like Yakût; only, as a result of the division into seven sections, it is less easy to consult. Many articles such as those on various mountains, lakes, rivers etc. are also found in the Cosmography usually with identical text.

There are also Persian translations of the Geography; manuscripts of them exist, for example, in St. Petersburg (Chanykow, N.° 107; see Persch, Katal. d. arab. His. zu Gotha, iii. 153) and in Oxford (Sachau-Etke, Catalogue of Pers. MSS., coll. 401, N.° 401). It has already been mentioned that a synopsis of the Geography of al-Kazwinî in a Persian translation (MS. in Cambridge) and seems to have been inserted in several MSS. of a Turkish version of the Cosmography.

A synopsis of the Geography of al-Kazwinî was made about 806 (1405) by al-Bakûwî ʿAbd al-Rashîd b. Saʿîlî b. Nârî, entitled Taʾlîkh al-Āthâr wa-ʿAḍîr bîl-Malik al-Ṣâhîrî. The unimportant alphabetical arrangement of the names within the seven climes is retained; on al-Bakûwî and his book see Hâdiqî Khalîfa, ed. Flugel, ii. 399, N.° 3529; Reinard, Geographie d’Alphonse, 1., p. clxi.—ii.; Wüstenfeld in Lüdder’s Zeitchr. für vergleich. Erdkunde, i., 1841, p. 59, and in his edition of al-Kazwinî, ii., p. viii.; Aumer, Katal. der arab. His. . . . zu München, p. 402; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i., 481, ii. 213. A translation of this book based on a Paris MS. was given by de Guignes in the N.F., ii. 386—454. On the relationship of al-Bakûwî’s Synopsis to al-Kazwinî’s original see especially Juyvboll, Lexic. Geograph. Marvîzîd al-ʿIttîhâdî, vol. iv., p. lxxvi.—xxii. al-Bakûwî usually adds the latitude and longitude to the places mentioned, which are lacking in al-Kazwinî. He is also of use in correcting wrong readings in al-Kazwinî and coming to a correct opinion on doubtful ones.

We may here say a little about the illustrations found in many MSS. of al-Kazwinî’s works, astronomical figures and tables, etc. Painted pictures are not abundant, only found in MSS. of the Cosmography. We may assume with certainty that the originals of al-Kazwinî were full of such pictorial embellishments and of tables. Indeed, almost all the larger MSS. of the Cosmography are embellished in this way. Manuscripts which show gaps deliberately left for the insertion of pictures must also have been copied from illustrated originals; such are Gotha N.° 1508 (cf. Ruska in ltt., iv. 261) and London, India Office (Catal. by Roth, p. 209 sq., N.° 725). Rude pictures are contained e.g. in Gotha 1507, Munich 463 and Vienna 1436; better Gotha 1506 and Vienna 1437; numerous fine illustrations in Munich 404 and Cod. Sarre (see supra); cf. thereon the Catalogue of Aumer (Munich), p. 192 sq.; Flugel (Vienna), ii. 505 sq., and Persch (Gotha), iii. 128 sq. The Persian versions of the Cosmography also are usually adorned with miniatures e.g. the two Berlin Codd. 345 and 346 (see Catal. by Persch, p. 367 sq.) and London, Brit. Mus., Nº 8 (Catal. by Ricke, col. 464), the latter with illustrations in the Indian style. Although these pictures with their illustrations of plants, animals, marvels of the sea etc. are very often quite fantastic in character and not infrequently pure invention, they ought not to be simply ignored in any future edition of the Cosmography, as Wüstenfeld did, who has only reproduced the astronomical and other figures and tables in his editions of the Cosmography and Geography (cf. thereon Wüstenfeld, Kosmographie, p. iv. sq.). So far only a few facsimiles have been published by Moller in the old Gotha Catalogue, vol. I., from Gotha N.° 1507.

The miniatures in al-Kazwinî’s Cosmography have, however, been used in the discussion of important problems, e.g. by Salz in his investigations into the history of the representation of the planets (in Islam, iii. 151 sq.). There he discusses the seven pictures of planets of Codex Monac. 464, which he also reproduces (Pl. 4, fig. 1—4 and 5, 6—8). Sarre in Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst, i. 18 sq., discusses the somewhat different figures of the Cod. Sarre.

In criticizing al-Kazwinî’s two works, it is also important to know what sources were used for them. A list of the authorities quoted in the Cosmography was compiled by Moller and there are two MS. copies of it in the Gotha Library; see Persch, Katal. d. arab. His. . . . zu Gotha, iii. 131, N.° 1509—1510. Wüstenfeld in the G. A. K., 1848, i. 351—355, briefly discusses the sources known to have been used for the Geography (practically the same as for the Cosmography). According to him, about 50 authors are quoted in the Geography, including the more important geographers and historians. The following are specially cited for the geography of Spain: al-Ǧârâraṯi Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahim (d. 1168; on him see Wüstenfeld in Lüdder, Zeitchr. für vergleich. Erdkunde, i. 43) and al-Uṣâthī Ahmad b. ʿUmar (d. between 476 and 500; on him see Jacob, op. cit., i. 3 sq.). Abâ Hamîd al-Andalusî, d. 565 (1169), the author of a Cosmography entitled Taḥfîz al-ʿAlâb (on it see Jacob, op. cit., iii. 69—94), is often quoted. The already mentioned Persian Cosmography of Ahmad al-Ṭâṣî (on it see Reinard, Geogr. d’Aboufîdâ, vol. i., xlvii., and Persch. Die pers. His. . . . zu Berlin, p. 366) is also found among the sources. Further may be mentioned the works of Avicenna, the so called Petroleo of Aristotle wrongly ascribed to Aristotle (cf. the two works by Ruska; see Rieß) and the Kitaib al-Hayawân of al-Dājrî. Ibn Fadlan and Muḥarrar al-Muhallî have already been mentioned. Many of al-Kazwinî’s sources e.g. the African travels of al-Dâjânî are now lost to us. Al-Kazwinî also utilised oral information from foreigners e.g. al-Multânî Abu ʿI-Rahîb Sulhâmî who had travelled in the interior of Africa. The remarkable information regarding various French and German towns which al-Kazwinî owed to the Spaniard Ibrâhîm al-Tâṣî (fl. 477 = 1055) was also probably communicated orally and not taken from a book; on this cf. Jacob, op. cit., i. (third edition entitled Ein arabischer Reisestersteller aus dem 10. Jahrh. über Fulida etc., Berlin 1896) iv. 137 sq.
As to the printed editions of the two works of al-Kazwini, the first and only complete European edition is that of Wustenfeld. The Geography (published as the second part of al-Kazwini) appeared in Gottingen in 1849 and the Cosmography (= Part i.) in 1848. The value of the latter has already been discussed above. In the east the Cosmography has been repeatedly printed on the margin of al-Damiri's Kitāb al-Fawā'īl al-Ażwā'īn, e.g. in Cairo 1505, 1509 and 1539. An edition of al-Kazwini printed in 1531 in Cairo (only the Cosmography) is mentioned in Harrassowitz, Best. über neue Erwerbungen, No. 2337. On earlier editions and translations of parts of the two works of al-Kazwini cf. the references in de Sacy, op. cit., iii. 431, 435, 450; Wustenfeld in Lüttke's Zeitschr. f. vergl. Erdk., i. 1842, p. 49, and in his edition of the Cosmography, p. iv; Pertsch, Katal. der arab. Hss. zu Gotta, iii. 1881, p. 126. Of earlier editions of parts of the Cosmography we may mention: de Sacy, op. cit., iii. 385–516, with Arabic text, p. 168–207 (sections on minerals, plants, men, with translation and full notes); L. Ideler, Untersuchungen über den Ursprung und die Bedeutung der Sternnamen, Berlin 1809, p. 373–405 (the text of the description of the stars with annotations); Volck, Calendarium Syriacum Arabice Latinumque edidit et notis instructum, Leipzig 1859 (dealing with the chapter on the Syriac months).

Of translations alone we may also note: Ethê's translations of the Cosmography, part i., Leipzig 1896; this only covers about the first half of the Cosmography (Wustenfeld, i. 1–208). Of special value is the very full appendix of notes (with many textual emendations by Fleischer); J. Ruska, Das Steinbuch aus der Kosmogr. des Kazwini, Heidelberg (Progr. der Oberrealschule), 1896 (translation of Wustenfeld, i. 208–245); cf. with this also J. Ruska, Das Steinbuch des Aristotheles, Heidelberg 1912, p. 81 sq.; J. Ansbach, Der Abschnitt über die Geister und wunder baren Geschöpfte, transl. and annot. Erlangen (dissert.), 1905 (transl. of Wustenfeld, i. 368–374, 448–451); Taeuschner, Die Psychologie Kazwini's, Tübingen dissert. Kiel 1912 (transl. of Wustenfeld, i. 301–322). Valuable material for a commentary on al-Kazwini is further given by the works of G. Jacob and E. Wiedemann, who have translated and elucidated various shorter articles from the works of al-Kazwini. Special mention should be made of Jacob's Studien in arabischen Geographien, part 1–4, Berlin 1891–1892 (of which part I appeared in a third enlarged edition in 1896); E. Wiedemann has made many contributions on the subject to the Mitteil. zur Gesch. der Medizin und Naturw., S.B.P.M.S. Erl., and to other periodicals; cf. for example, the references by Ruska in Ist, iv. 336 (No. 303), xii. 270 (No. 76) and 277 (No. 129).

In conclusion, attention should be drawn to the fact that in preparing a new edition of al-Kazwini's works Fleischer's own copy of Wustenfeld's edition of the text, containing numerous emendations, which is preserved in the MSS. Dept. of the Berlin Library, should be utilised.

have it). Mention must also be made of the critical work which al-Kazwini (probably before he began work on the Za‘farānname) did on Firdawsi’s Shāh-nāma. The London MS. of the Za‘farānname has the text of Firdawsi edited by our author to the margin (Rieu, op. cit., p. 172). Work on the Za‘farānname was interrupted by the compilation of a compendium of universal history, the Tārikhi-Guzāda (finished 730 = 1330). This work comprises the history of the Muslim-madan world from the creation to 729 (1329) and is written in a very simple, indeed arid style, except for the preface which contains a dedication to Ghiyāth al-Dīn, son of the vizier Rašīd al-Dīn. The preface is followed by an introduction (fātiha) dealing with the creation of the world and then come six sections (labī) dealing 1) with the prophets, 2) the old Persian kings, 3) Muḥammad and the Caliphs, 4) the dynasties of the Muslim period in Persia and adjoining lands, 5) scholars and poets, and 6) history and topography of Kazwin.

A khāsimat follows containing genealogical data and genealogies, which latter, however, are wanting in most MSS., according to Browne. Some of these manuscripts, like Brit. Mus. Add. 22,693 and that published by Browne in facsimile, have between labī 4 and 5 a synopsis of the history of the Muẓaffarid dynasty which is not by al-Kazwini (Rieu, Catalogue, i. 82; Browne, Gibb Mem. Ser., xiv/ii. 151 sqq.). The compendium must have enjoyed great popularity on account of its wealth of matter, for it has often been copied in the East and is therefore of frequent occurrence in European collections also. Browne, J. R. A. S., 1900, p. 725, gives a list of the most important copies and says that one published in facsimile by him is not included; it was written in 875 (1453) and comes from a private Persian collection (Gibb Mem. Ser., xiv/ii. p. xv). The sources on which the book is based are given by the author (ed. Browne, p. 8). On this cf. Browne in the Gibb Mem. Ser., xiv/ii. 1 sqq., and Hist. of Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion, p. 87 sqq. They include the celebrated historians al-Ṭabari, ibn al-Aṯīr, Ḥamza al-Iṣfahāni etc., also Persian authors of a later period, like Dīwainī, Niẓām al-Mulk’s Siyāsāt-nāma, also the Shāh-nāma and a Tābdhirat al-Asyāḥa, which, according to Browne, is the well-known work of the same name by Farid al-Dīn Aṯār. The main source seems to have been Rašīd al-Dīn’s Dīwān al-Tawārīḵ, with the second part which the author edited by our author in an arrangement (ed. Browne, p. xii. sqq.). Another work now lost, the Salīqāt-nāma of Ẓahrīr of Niẓāmpūr was used by al-Kazwini and by Rāwandī also in his Rāḥat al-Sudūr; on the relation of the Rāḥat to the Guzāda cf. Muḥammad Iḥbāl in his introduction to the first edition mentioned work (Gibb Mem. Ser., New Ser., ii. 30 sqq.). The Guzāda itself is five times quoted in Dwlattāsh’s Taẖkhirat al-Shu’arā, among other things for the well-known story of the Sāmānī vizier Naṣr and Rūḍgār (Dwlattāsh, ed. Browne, p. 51 = Guzāda, ed. Browne, p. 382). Dwlattāsh once (p. 105) expressly quotes as his authority the Taẖkhirat of poets preserved in the Guzāda. On the relation between Dwlattāsh’s Taẖkhirat and the Guzāda see also Browne in the J. R. A. S., 1899, sqq. Lastly it may be mentioned that the Guzāda itself is one of the sources of Mir-khwānd’s Rawdat al-Safā.

Al-Kazwini’s last work, the Nuzhat al-Kulūb, completed in 740 (Rieu, Catalogue, i. 419), is mainly geographical. It is divided into an introduction (fātiha), which deals with cosmography, and three sections (maḵāla), which deal with natural history, anthropology and geography. Then follows a concluding section (al-khawāṣim) on wonderful things and curiosities in Iran and other lands. As in the case of the Tārikhi-Guzāda there is a large number of MSS. of this work (a survey of them is given in Le Strange’s preface to his edition in the Gibb Mem. Series, xxii/ii., p. xiv. and xx.). On the sources of the Nuzhat cf. Rieu, Catalogue, i. 418; Browne, Hist. of Pers. Lit. under Tartar Dominion, p. 99. They include, as might be expected, the famous geographer Yākūt, the older Kazwini, Ibn Khurābdībīh and others not so well known. The statements regarding Fārs are taken from Ibn al-Balḫī’s Fārs-nāma. That he, as Le Strange supposes, made use of official documents, taxation lists, as to be expected from his position as finance officer, is very probable.

Bibliography: On his life see Tārikhi-Guzāda, ed. Browne, p. 3 sqq.; Rieu, Catalogue, i. So sqq.; Supplement, p. 172—174; the prefaces by Browne and Le Strange to their editions of the Guzāda and the Nuzhat; Browne, History of Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion, p. 87 sqq.


Nuzhat-i-Kulūb: editions: Bombay 1311 (1894; I have not seen this, an edition of the whole work); The geographical part of the Nuzhat al-Qulūb ..., ed. by G. Le Strange, Gibb Mem. Ser., xxii/ii. (text), ii. (Engl. transl.) 1915 and 1919. A part of the text had been previously published by Schefer, Siasetnamā, Supplément, 1897, p. 141—235 (not accessible to me).

(V. F. BUCHNER)

AL-KEF (الكاف), a town in Tunisia, 110 miles S.W. of Tunis and about 20 from the Algerian frontier, situated in 36°11' N. lat. and 8°30' E. long. The population in 1911 was 6,312, including 1,200 Europeans and 800 Jews. Many of the latter are descended from the Jews who used to live among the Beduins, whose customs and dress they had adopted.

The word kef means "rock". It is given on account of the situation of the town on a spur of the Djebel Dyr at a height varying from 2,486 feet in the S.W. to 2,853 in the N.E. Before the establishment of the French protectorate, it was surrounded by a wall now in part destroyed. The area circumscribed by the wall contains many
buildings now in ruins and empty spaces; in compensation a European town is in process of formation on the plain near the station on the railway now connecting al-KeF with Tunis. At the foot of the wall rises an abundant spring, the Ain al-KeF, an object of veneration to the inhabitants and regarded by them as "marabout." Commanding the principal roads from Algeria to Tunis and, for long one of the busiest markets of the Regency; in economic importance the town ranked next to Tunis and Sfax. This is no longer the case since the building of the Tunis-Constantine railway to the towns in the valley of the Medjerda. Nevertheless the mineral resources of the adjoining country assure to al-KeF the elements of future prosperity. The town was, and still is, a religious centre. The two most popular brotherhoods in the Regency, the Kadhiriya and the Râhînîya, have each a much frequented zawiya there.

Al-KeF is the ancient Sica Veneria, a Punic town which became a Roman colony under Augustus. Very prosperous during the early centuries of the Christian era, it was in the Byzantine period one of the strongest places in Africa. There still survive many ruins, columns, capitals, fragments of statues, inscriptions, remains of temples, baths and Christian basilicas. The cult of Tainus, identified with Venus, whose name is found in that of the ancient town, may even have left some traces in local superstitions.

Sica survived the Arab invasion of the seventh century A.D. The ancient name of the town continued in existence in the form Sijjka Banâriya. This is the name used by al-Bakri (ed. de Sane, p. 33; transl. p. 82) in the Arâb al-idhâr and even in Ibn Khaldûn (Hist. des Berbères, ed. de Sane, i. 220, 256, ii. 20; transl. ii. 42, 98, iii. 209). We know very little of the history of the town till the seventeenth century. Ibn Khaldûn, however, tells us that it was governed at the beginning of the sixth (twelfth) century by a certain Ilyâd b. Našr Allâh, who succeeded in protecting it against the incursions of the Hilâlis, and whose son submitted to 'Abd al-Mu'min in 554 (1159—1160). In the following century the Sulaim settled in this region and incorporated the Houwâra Berbers, who had been settled there since the beginning of the second century A.D. In the beginning of the sixteenth century A.D., al-KeF and the surrounding country were occupied by the Ulema Sulä, a section of the Banû Shennûf, who attached themselves to the Muhallil, one of the two great families into which the Sulaimi Ku'ub were divided.

Under Turkish domination, the region of al-KeF played an important part in the fighting between Algerians and Tunisians, especially in 1629, 1685, 1694, 1705, 1746 and 1756. The rulers of Tunis during this period tried to make al-KeF strong enough to bar the invader's road to the capital. Muhammad Bey scattered the Banû Shennûf, put in their place a makhzen formed by the Ulema Ya'qûb, and stationed a smâla of spahis near the town. The Bey 'Ali built a kasba in 1675, so strong that the place was able to repulse an Algerian attack four years later. In 1739—1740 'Ali Pasha built a wall round the town and placed forts on the cliffs which commanded the kasba. In spite of these precautions, al-KeF, which had been unsuccessfully attacked by the Algerians in 1746, was taken by the Dey's troops in 1756 after a siege of thirteen days. In the beginning of the nineteenth century a new Kasba was built (1813) by Hamada Pasha, who said that "his body was at Tunis, his head was at al-KeF. The garrison was put under the command of an aga, independent of the kadi and civil governor. The taking of Constantine in 1837 by the French, by holding the key of the dangerous proximity of the town was, however, the military importance of al-KeF, the fortress was now only used to protect the town against Berber raids. During the Tunisian expedition, the French troops entered the town without striking a blow on April 25, 1851.

this place. The descriptions of Ani as a royal residence have some resemblance to those of the other place of the same name (see the art. ANI) situated on the Arpa Cai.

Kemâk was taken by 'Umar b. al-Hulâb al-Sulaimân in the year 590 A.H. It has, however, from that time onwards often changed its master. In 133 (751/52) it was besieged by the Emperor Constantine. The 'Abbâsîd caliph al-Mansûr tried to strengthen his hold on it by a restoration of the citadel; it is said that he intended to use it chiefly as a bulwark against the invasions of the Khazars. In 177 (793/94) it was besieged by the Byzantines. 'Hamd Allah Mustawfi (born 680 = 1281/82) mentions it as a small town. The Ottoman Emperors Bâyazid and Selim took it after a siege, the former, at the hands of his general Timurtaş, in 1396, the latter in 1515. Timûr beleaguered it for seven months, without being able to take it. According to J. Brunt, who visited the town about 1830, its population consisted at that time of 400 Turkish and 30 Armenian families; it was the residence of one of the last Derevelis [q.v.]. Kemâk is the chief place of the Kaţû of the same name, Sandîqâ Ernedjûn, wilayet Erzerum. It is the residence of a kâmil muwafîk. In the vicinity are numerous turba's. At the present day it is still an important centre of commerce and industry.

The population of the Kaţû consists of 14,547 Muhammâdans, 3,503 Greek Armenians, 189 Pro- testant Armenians and 633 orthodox Greeks (Cuinet).


KEMAL AL-DIN ISMA'IL, a Persian poet of Iṣfâhân, son of Djamâl al-Din 'Abâl al-Razâkî, was one of a group which devoted its eulogies to the family of the Sa'îdîs (also called Alî Khudjandî) which kept political and judicial power in its control in Iṣfâhân. Surnamed Khalîl al-Ma'ānî "creator of thoughts", he dedicated his odes mainly to the judge Rukn al-Din Sa'îd b. Ma'âd, but also to the Khwarizmshâh ('Alî al-Din Takaşh), Muhammad, his son, Djalâl al-Din and Zbiyâh al-Din, his grand-sons) who ruled in Iṣfâhân, as well as to the Atâbeks of Fars who ruled at Shîhâr (Sa'îd b. Zang and his son Abâ Bakr). In 1328 he retired from the world and devoted himself to the mystic life under the guidance of Shaikh Shihâb al-Din 'Umar b. Muḥammad al-Suhârâwî. He was tortured and put to death on Djumâdâ i 2, 635 (Dec. 21, 1237), at the capture of Iṣfâhân by the Mongol soldiers of the army of Ogotâi, son of Çingiz Khân, who hoped to find hidden treasure in his house. His Discourse has been printed at Bombay (n.d.); there are partial translations by H. Gray, put into English verse by Ethel Watts Mumford (Hundred Love Songs, New-York 1904) and by Theodosia Garrison (Lippincott's Mag., iv. 783), of the 15 quatrains published by Salemann-Shukovski, Persische Grammatik.


KEMAL KHODJANDI (Kamal al-Dîn Mas'ûd), a Persian lyric poet, born in Khudjand in Transoxania. He followed the mystic path, went on a pilgrimage to Mecca and on his return settled in Tibriz the climate of which had pleased him. On the capture of this town by Togtamish Khan, he was taken to the town of Sarai at the request of this prince's wife. He remained there four years. Having returned to Tibriz the Dja-lîrîd Sulîn Hüsain, son of Sulîn Uwaïs, had a house built for him. He likewise received favours from Miân Shîk, son of Timûr and governor of Alâbarbâdân, who paid his debts. He died there in 792 (1390) according to Dâwlat Shâh, or 803 (1400) according to Khondemîr. He was buried in the Fârâb-âbîshî quarter where his tomb became an object of pious visits. Ten of his ghâzâls have been published by Bland, Century, p. 9-12. There is, in the national library of Vienna, a very beautiful manuscript of his poems illuminated with miniatures (Flagel, Die arab. pers. u. türk. Handschr... zu Wien, i. No. 581).

Bibliography: Dâwlat Shâh, Ta'lihât al-Shârârâ, p. 325; Lu'f All Beg, Atâbekhî, in the section on Tûrân (not paginated); Ridâ Kuli Khân, Ma'dîma ma'ul-faşâh, ii. 29; J. v. Hammer, Schone Redekünstler Persiens, p. 555; Khondemîr, Mas'ûd al-Siyâr, iii. 3, p. 90; Sir Gore Ouseley, Biographical Notices of Persian Poets, p. 192-194; H. Ethé, in the Grundrisse d. iran. Philologie, ii. 304. (CL. HAURIE)

KEMAL MÊHMEĐ NÄMÎK, one of the most important of Turkish poets, novelists and authors, the principal leader of the Turkish moderns, creator of the modern Turkish prose language and the most notable Turkish patriot of modern times. Kemal, born on Dec. 21, 1840 (Shawwâl 26, 1256), in Rhodosto on the Sea of Marmara, belonged to an old aristocratic family which could be traced back through his father, the astronomer Mustafa 'Âşûm Bey, his father Shams al-Din Bey, the first Chamberlain of Sulân Selmî III., the admiral Kapudan Ahmed Râhî, and the great Visier Topal Qâshân Şahşah, the conqueror Nâdir Şah of Persia. His father was Adem Shehi in Anatolia and his mother to Konica in Albania. The Albanian strain in his father was of the highest importance and explains much in his
indomitable character and his strong passionate nature. In appearance he was quite like a European. He was liberal, open-hearted and attractive.

Kemal had a rather irregular, unsystematic education at home; he had only nine months' regular schooling in Constantinople at the Bayazid-Rüştüye and the Valide-Mektebi. He was trained in Arabic, Persian and French by private tuition. In 1852 he was with his grandfather Şams al-Din Bey in Kars and later in Sofia where he began to write poems although only 14 years of age, quite in the style of Sümül-Zade, whose Divân had to serve him as a model for lack of other patterns. Returning to Constantinople in 1857/8 he entered the translation bureau of the Sublime Porte and soon became a member of the then flourishing group of poets of the old school: Nâifî, Maqbul Pasha-Zade Memdûh Faik, Hület, Henselk ʿArif Hikmet, Ġâlibî and Kaşım, who imitated ʿNeşî and ʿFebrî who, Kemal quickly won an honoured place among them. He put together a slim Divân-i Murstebe of not very original poems. In his poems he took the pen-name of Nâmîk. It is remarkable that the last incomplete ghaşal of the divân is the first of his patriotic poems.

He only entered upon the field he was to make his own through ʿShinâsî Efendi, who had studied in Europe and was now in Constantinople endeavouring to attract men of intellect to western culture and ideas, mainly in his capacity as editor of the influential newspaper Taşpur-i Efsâr. Kemal became friendly with him and soon fell completely under his influence, which directed him from the imitation of classical models to the spirit of the west. Kemal grasped with ardour the new ideas, the importance of which he at once realised. He made it his aim in life to bring about a literary, political and scientific renaissance in old fossilised Turkey and to secure her a place among the nations of the West. He began his troubled career by writing for ʿShinâsî's paper. Henceforth he wrote under the name Kemal, which soon gained the greatest popularity.

When ʿShinâsât q.v. fled to Paris in 1864 he left the editorship of his paper entirely in the hands of the young Kemal, who at first found it a very difficult task. For a year he published almost nothing but translations from the French. Then important political questions (the Polish rising and the American Civil War) helped him to raise the standard of the paper which had gone down very much. He now took the field with political articles of his own which aroused the greatest interest on all sides and made the Taşpur-i Efsâr the most influential newspaper. It was in its pages that the expression “Young Turk” first appeared.

Kemal became more and more embarrasing to the government. Although only 23 years of age, he had already been given the müteşarrîfluk of ʿKafe-i Sulṭânîye (Gallipoli) for a short time and next they wished him to become an ambassador to Persia in order to get him away from Constantinople. But he did not accept this post. It was only with difficulty that he escaped being sent to Erzerûm. Kemal had joined the Young Turk Committee founded by Ziyâ among the elements in favour of reform, the main object of which was to raise Turkey from her backward state and obtain a constitution. When the members were threatened with arrest, Ziyâ, Kemal, Nûrî, Rifât and ʿAllî Sulâtî fled from Turkey in 1866 to London where they settled down. At the time of this his first voluntary exile Kemal was expecting the birth of his first child, who afterwards became the poet ʿAllî Ekmek. In London Kemal published the paper Mükâbir (“The Correspondent”) on behalf of the party; it was later transferred to Paris and then replaced by the Hürriyet (“Liberty”). In Paris he studied law and economics and translated important French works into Turkish.

His stay in Europe was of overwhelming influence on his political and literary development. Henceforth he came back again and again to the subject of civilization. When, after the death of the Grand Vizier ʿÂli Pâşâ, it became possible for the Young Turks to return home, Kemal underwrote the constitution in Constantinople of the Young Turkish paper İhârî. He succeeded by his articles, which are of permanent value, in making the paper one of the most important in Turkey. At the same time he contributed to a number of other papers and periodicals and thereby completely influenced and revolutionised public opinion.

When Kemal became inconvenient to the government by his political activity, especially through his patriotic drama&Wafan, which aroused unbounded enthusiasm, he was banished to the fortress of Famagusta in Cyprus. At first he was in the closest solitary confinement, where he planned in his subterranean cell his drama ʿAkrî Bey, which he wrote out and printed as soon as the rigour of his imprisonment was slackened. He was detained in Famagusta for 38 months until the accession of Murâd gave him his liberty and permission to return to Constantinople. But Murâd only reigned 93 days. With the accession of ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd a limit was soon put once more to Kemal's activity. Kemal took part in the preparation of the constitution and shared in the deliberations with Midhat Pâşâ and Ziyâ Pâşâ.

His liberal activities aroused the deep distrust in ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd. He was arrested and spent 5½ months in the common prison in Constantinople where he spent most of his time in historical study in preparation for a history of the Turkish army. In spite of his acquittal after a trial, ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd sent him to detention in Mytilene (Chios). This enforced inactivity was a great trial to him after the disastrous conclusion of the war with Russia and he expressed his feeling in songs like the touching Mubâṣṣir barm ʿAllîh ibn olđur beni.

After two years' detention during which he wrote the Dîvâni and the Ljesni, he was appointed Mûteşarrîf of Chios. There the disease of the lungs, which was to cause his premature death, first broke out. When Chios became the capital of a wilâyet, he was moved to Rhodes, where the more favourable climate restored his health and revived his creative powers which had somewhat abated. With the assistance of a splendid library, for the enlargement of which at great personal expense he had agents in India, Persia, Egypt and Europe, he set about the preparation of a history of the Turkish Empire.

From Rhodes he went to Chios, as müteşarrîf again. He worked at his history with a feverish activity and, in spite of the fact that his health was much affected, displayed considerable literary activity in all other directions. The order forbidding the printing or continuation of
his history which came from Constantinople as the result of a treacherous denunciation of him was therefore a frightful blow and he died during the night after receiving the order, Dec. 2, 1888, in Mytilene.

His body was first of all interred in Mytilene in front of the mosque and then solemnly removed by his son 'Ali Ekrem to Bulair, 8 miles north of Gallipoli and there buried with military honours in the türbe of Sulaiman Pasha, a worthy honour for the great patriot. 'Abd al-Hamid built a splendid türbe for Kemâl. While Sulaiman Pasha's türbe was already a place of pilgrimage, Kemâl's türbe became to a still greater extent the goal of many Ottomans, who saw in him the incarnation of their ideals. The first thing done after the revolution of 1908 by the "Committee of Union and Progress" was to go solemnly from Salonica to his tomb at Bulair as to the grave of the "founder of the building of liberty" and pay homage to his manes. The unexamined moderation with which the victorious party proceeded was also a tribute to the influence of Kemâl.

The supreme and unique position occupied by Kemâl in Ottoman literature can hardly be too highly appraised. His influence on his own and the following generation was tremendous. He was perfectly aware of the difficulty of his task but always believed in a successful result, which was quite in keeping with his singular temperament. His personality — he was a born agitator and thoroughly revolutionary in spite of his aristocratic birth — with his unusual energy and inflexible and undaunted strength of will exercised an overwhelming effect on the masses. He was filled with a deep, most fervent religious, spirit, thoroughly Islamic in its attitude and he believed in his people, his country and their future. Basing himself on the idea of the true Islamic culture with a strong leaning to pan-Islamic ideas which he endeavoured to realise by going back to primitive Islam and rejecting the Islam of the past which did not satisfy him, he evolved the idea of the Ottoman fatherland and was able to impose it on his "lethargic" people. It was Kemâl who first awakened his countrymen to the conception of Watân (fatherland), which was later replaced by the Turkish Yarı, and to the conception of Millet (nation) and Hurriyet (liberty) which the Young Turks took as their watchwords.

Kemâl remained faithful to his task which he regarded as a kind of apostolic office, in spite of the most difficult conditions. His talent as an author was certainly not small but this does not completely explain the almost magical influence which he has exerted down to our own day. The most recent Ottoman literary criticism is rather inclined not to estimate him so highly. But what no critic can deny him, what places him high above all others is his thirst for freedom, his patriotism, and the fearlessness with which he expresses his ideas and above all his masterly command of language. When he began writing, he found the language in a chaotic condition, at his early death he left it a wonderfully modelled instrument. The creation of the modern Turkish prose language is undeniably Kemâl's work.

In his political and literary essays Kemâl is vigorous and convincing when he wants to defend any view. No one has surpassed Kemâl in his essays.

His longer works have a tendency to resemble a series of collected articles rather than a consecutive whole.

The admission in which he was held found expression in his many imitators.

Works. Kemâl was not primarily a poet. Besides his Divân written in the old style, although already showing traces of new features (love of country and people) and adopting modern ideas (theatre, steamer), in the ghalâl he composed a not very large number of powerful poems which passed from mouth to mouth like revelations. He was readily followed simply because he still paid part tribute to old ideas in his poems. Many poems are scattered through his works and many went unprinted from hand to hand. They all show his deep patriotism.

In his Wawaila ("groaning, wall", republished 1326 = 1908) Kemâl laments his fatherland which is wrapped in a windig sheet. His Bârîk-î Zafar ("Flash of Victory", 1872) written in an elaborate style is a panegyric on the conquest of Constantinople. His enthusiastic Watân Müşâmsesi did not appear till 1326 (1908).

Kemâl's main success as an author was won by his dramas of which he wrote six. He might be regarded as the creator of the Turkish drama. In the play by Abu 'l-Ziyà Tewfîk, his most devoted friend and follower, Edlî-î Kafta ("The Threatened Fate", 1288 = 1871/72), the first national Turkish drama, he was a silent collaborator although his name was never mentioned. He then tried his skill independently:

1. Watân yakhid Silüstrâ ("Fatherland or Silistra") a play in 4 acts first printed in 1872 and often since (transl. into Russian by W. D. Smirnow in the Wiesbad Eurogî, 1876, ix. 151; German by L. Pcktotsch, Vienna 1887). The play, which is important from the sociological and psychological points of view, depicts heroic scenes in the defence of Silistra in 1854. The piece aroused tremendous enthusiasm and was the main cause of his banishment to Famagusta.

2. Zawâlî Coğûb ("The Poor Child"), a drama in 3 acts (1873). It describes the consequences of the abuse of parental authority over the child and is an attack on the traditional manner of arranging marriages. Kemâl deals with the new idea of the freedom of women to feel and to love. The influence of "La Dame aux Camelias" is unmistakable.

3. Akîf Bey, a drama in 5 acts (1874). In this the patriotism of the Turkish naval officer is emphasised and contrasted with the faithlessness and inconsistancy of his wife who abuses the absence of her husband.

4. Gûl-nikâh, a drama in 5 acts (1875), probably based on Hamlet, extolling the motive of vengeance, especially woman's vengeance and rebellion against despotism.

5. Dîlâl al-Din Khâirem-zâhâ, a tragedy in 5 acts (1875), with a long literary introduction (muşâddele) on the defects of Ottoman literature and the technique of the drama, first published by Rodosî Şâlıh Djinmêl and then printed in Cairo without the introduction in 1292 (1875); the muşâddele alone is printed in Mevînê-i Âbu 'l-Ziyà, No. 41 (1885), and Kitâb-işân-i Âbu 'l-Ziyà, No. 69.

It is a romantic tragedy from Persian history in the style of Hugo's "Cromwell" and "Hernani".

Dîlâl is thought to mark the zenith of Turkish romanticism. It is a drama intended to be read
only, a passionate protest against the government system of the Ottoman Sultan. On account of its obvious bias the piece was always suppressed by the censor.

6. Kara Bela "Black Misfortune", first published in the Kulübet in 1908, written in Famagusta in 1875, describes the violation of an Indian Emperor's daughter by a negro who has smuggled himself into the harem as a eunuch and takes the place of her lover. The disinterested lady commits suicide by poisoning herself on the eve of her marriage after killing the black monster.

Sarköylu seems to be wrong in ascribing a drama Anadolu Kıyıleri to Kemal, for which the Sultan is said to have granted him a special reward. Kemal's dramas suffer from a lack of naturalness, a want of lucidity in the inner motives, from sentimentality, too much patriotic pathos and from tirades. But he knows how to grip the attention of his audience and carry them with him. A certain psychological depth cannot be denied him. The Turkish theatre was then something quite new. The plays are great achievements for their time and circumstances, in spite of all their dramatic and technical defects, especially as Kemal was mainly concerned with using the drama as a medium to carry his ideas to the masses and to arouse the feelings dormant in the people. For him the theatre is "an amusement useful to influence the people".

He followed similar lines in his two novels, which have the same defects. But in them we have the typical features of Turkish life and thought vividly and realistically portrayed. From the point of view of style they reveal great beauty. The influence of his novels was great; they became the model for a whole school whose most ardent representative was Vedjiief. The two novels are:

1. İhtihâb yâkub Ali Bey'in Seragüzeşti "The Awakening or "Ali Bey's experiences" (1874; the original title is said to have been Son Peşânmâle). It is the description of the adventures of a rich spoiled mother's darling, who finds himself in the clutches of a harlot, deluded by her intrigues heartlessly sacrifices his innocent sweetheart and is completely ruined, until finally he kills his mistress, after the sweetheart whom he has abandoned has saved him at the cost of her own life, and ends in prison.

2. Lüzuni, a historical novel (1927 = 1880, printed 1935 = 1887/1888), the romantic love story of 'Adil Girai of the Crimea and the sister of the Shah of Persia during 'Adil Girai's captivity in Persia in the xvii century. The main facts are taken from history; Lüzuni marks an important technical advance on 'Ali Bey in the compactness of its style and its wealth of colour. Pan-Islamic ideas are very evident in it.

The most noteworthy of Kemal's historical works are: his biographies Evrak-i Perîbân "Scattered Leaves" (1901) in 4 parts in which he gives accounts of the lives of four remarkable Muhammadan men, writing in a learned style in the European manner, in the further development of his Islamic tendencies; the four are: the Aiyubid 'Salih al-Din, the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II, Selim I Yawuz and the Emir Newroz Bey. The collection is considered a classic among the Turks, both in language and learning although it is only a good compilation, mainly taken from European sources. In vividness of description and vigour of style they take almost the first place among his works; 2) Derâ-i İsrâîl "The Period of the Invasion"; 3) Kanîsâ, the story of the capture of the fortress of Kaniza in Hungary, written in 1290 (1873) in Famagusta and printed anonymously the same year.

4) Kemal was a passionate believer in the vitality of Islam. There is, however, in his views a certain lack of coherence between the Muslim ideas and the Romeeanian formulae which he has adopted. He endeavours to prove the equal worth of Islam with the ideals of modern nationalisation which are the end ideals of Islam also; Islam was in no wise backward down to the xvii century, and had only to give way to the superiority of Europe with the rise of experimental science. In reply to Ernest Renan's attempt to prove the hostility of Islam to education, Kemal wrote a defence Renan Müdafa'â-ı-nâmües published in the Kulübet, which is based on much sounder foundations than the other Muhammadan pamphlets combattting Renan's views.

5) Melekâl, the history of ancient Rome and the history of Islam which comes down to 438 (1046), were intended as an introduction and a foundation for his Ottoman history. The latter runs from the beginning of the empire to the death of Sultan Selim I Yawuz in 1526 (1520).

6) Köyû "The Dream", the most vigorous and inspired of his writings, which every Turk must have read at the time of the reaction, dreams of the days when the chains will fall in the fatherland. It has been often reprinted, for example twice in Cairo (I'dîâbê) in 1907 and 1909.

7) Seragüzeşti (1326 = 1908) also describes a dream.

Kemal was above all a publicist. He raised the 'Ifrat to be an ideal newspaper. His articles which appeared in it are still reprinted again and again and put into collections. The separate numbers of the newspaper are still carefully preserved. As a critic he also displayed a comprehensive activity, an appreciation of which has been given by Gibb. He mercilessly scathed the old Parnassus and helped the new school to victory. There is much criticism in his essays and in his Mehadime. When Ziya Pascha, his old comrade in arms, made a rather unfortunate selection in an anthology of Turkish literature in his three volumes Kharâbât, Kemal wrote two vigorous criticisms of the first two volumes, Tâhirî Kharâbât, 1928 = 1931, and 'Abd al-Mâlik Kharâbât, reprinted in 1930, which Gibb considers among the best essays in Turkish.

Kemal's letters are of great importance, as he corresponded with almost all the leading personalities in Turkey, political as well as literary. Unfortunately they are only in part published so far, for example the letters to Midhat Efendi, 'Irîfân Pascha, a part of those to Abu 'l-Ziyâ Tewfîk, 'Abd al-Hasîn Hâmid and others. He wrote naturally and vigorously and was the first to teach his people the epistolary style.

We must not omit his official papers. However conventional and crarked Ottoman official style is, he nevertheless succeeded in giving it lucidity and clearness. The number of official documents which he composed in his different official positions is legion. They are essays on the
creation of the state and its reforms, the rights of the people, its intellectual and ideal requirements, on law, history, political economy, social philosophy, schemes, protocols, semi-official documents, etc.

Finally we may mention his numerous translations: Behri-i Dâvûd ("Spintime of Knowledge"), translated with a literary introduction from the work of the Indian Shâhî, 1 miejszy Atâh. He also translated from the French of Victor Hugo, Lamartine, Montesquieu, J. J. Rousseau, Condorcet, Volney, etc.

A complete edition of his works was begun by his son Ali Ekrem. But his scheme was too ambitious and he broke down in the middle of it. The biography of Kemal promised by Ali Ekrem has, so far as I know, not yet appeared. It is unfortunate that the essay on Kemal's place in literary history by Dr. Riad Tewfik has not yet been published.


(TH. MENZEL)

KEMAL-PASHA-ZADE, the usual name of the Ottoman historian, lawyer and stylist ŞAMS AL-DIN ÂŞMAD B. SÜLÂMÂN B. KEMAL PASHA, often also called Âb Kemal-pasha. Kemal-pasha-zade belonged to a distinguished family of Adrianople where he was born as the son of the wealthy Süleimân Pasha. His grand- father was Kemal-pasha who, like his father, had taken part in repeated campaigns against the infidels and attained great prestige (on him see Süçüli-i 'Othmânî, iv. 78). Kemal-pasha-zade served at first in Bâyazîd's army but was induced to take up a legal career by an experience which is minutely reported by Taşkhoupruze. He was one day in the Grand Vizier's Dwân when Aşmad, the son of Ewenos [q.v.], entered and was received with great respect. Soon afterwards there appeared a man with shabby clothes and no head- dress, to whom the vizier, to Kemal-pasha-zade's surprise, showed even greater respect and even gave him the seat before the son of Ewenos. He was the celebrated jurist Lâfi of Tokat (d. 96a— 1498). The ambitious youth, surprised at the reference shown to a müdderris with 30 aspers over a nobleman of the empire, at once made up his mind to abandon the army and became Lâfi's pupil. The latter lectured at the Dâr al-Hashiy in Adrianople together with other celebrated professors, like Kaştfâltâr [q.v.], Khatib-zade, Muârriiz- zade, on Muslim law subjects. After completing his studies, Kemal-pasha-zade was appointed teacher in the most famed medrese of 'Ali Beg in Adrianople but was soon afterwards summoned to Uskûb as müdderris, finally to return to Adrianople to the Hâlabîya medrese. After a great deal of hostility from the Chief Justice Hâdî, Hasan-zade, who was jealous of all rising talent and put every obstacle in its way, he was appointed by the Sülan, on the advice of the poet Muâ'ayyed-zade (Talkhillus Hattimi, d. 932 = 1506), teacher in the Taşkâli High School (= 'Ali Beg Medrese) at
Adrianople on a salary of 30,000 pesos. The influential patronage of Mu'tiyyed-zade procured him all sorts of liberties, so that he was able to spend some time in Sofia and some time in Dupniza (Bulgaria), to carry out with the greatest leisure the composition of the Ottoman history entrusted to him by the Sultan and at the same time to write the most varied works, sometimes on law, sometimes on history, sometimes on poetry and sometimes on rhetoric. Over 300 treatises etc. are said to have come from his pen in this period.

In the reign of Sultan Selim I, Kemal-pasha-zade in 1516 finally attained the rank of military judge of Anatolia and in this office accompanied the Padishah on his Egyptian campaign. On the march he was commissioned to translate into Turkish, among other things, two works of the Arab historian Abu l'Mahasrin b. Taghibirdi (q.v.) on the lands of the Caliphs. Every morning he handled his master an instalment of the translation, which, according to Hâdîjî Khâlîfa (No. 5,878 and 13,616), was called al-Kawwâb al-Bâhira miin al-Nu'dîn al-Bâhira (on this cf. Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 42), and took the opportunity to enlighten the Sultan regarding the feeling in the army through a soldier-song, made up by him, expressing the desire for a speedy return home. Although Selim saw through the plan, he pardoned the poet and even gave him a present of 500 gold pieces as a mark of honour (cf. J. v. Hammer, Gesch. des osm. Reiches, ii. 153; H. F. v. Diez, Denkmâr-

digkeiten aus Asien, i. 323), and the Defterdar Abu l-'Yâfish supplement (Zekiel, part 4) to Hisht Behtih of his father Ridîlîs, MS. of the Vienna National Library H.O. 16 d., fol. 126). After the return home, Kemal-pasha-zade resumed his old position as teacher in the Dâr al-Hadîth, then at the Bâyazidîya in Adrianople and at the same time resumed his scholarly and poetical activities. On the lines of 'Sdîl's Bustân and Gulsân he wrote in Persian the Niştîrân (i.e. "picture-gallery") (cf. Hâdîjî Khâlîfa, Kaşf al-ğunûs, vi. 351, and Der Islam, vii. 118; extracts in German are given by C. v. Harrach in the Fund. des. Orients, i. 401 sqq., ii. 249 sqq., iii. 47 sqq.). Kemal-pasha-

zade is the author of an Ottoman history which begins in the year 856 (reign of Bâyâd II) and goes down to the first Hungarian campaign of Suleiman the Great in 933. Manuscripts of the complete work seem to be exceedingly rare.

The Saxonische Landesbibliothek in Dresden seems to have most parts of it (cf. J. H. Mordtmann's collation in Der Islam, xii. 153 sq.), while in Vienna, for example, there are only fragments of the whole work which was perhaps written and issued in separate parts dealing with particular periods from time to time (at least as early as the reign of Bâyazid II) (cf. G. Flügel, op. cit., ii. 220; the work cf. H. Khâlîfa, Kaşf al-

zu'nûs, ii. 111, No. 2153). An edition would be very desirable and of considerable value in solving the problems of the old Ottoman chronicles. That Kemal-pasha-zade prepared a translation of the Hisht Behtih of Idris, as is stated in the Umîye Sâlimnâmi, p. 347, is probably a mistake. Kemal-pasha-zade subjected the campaign of Mohæs to a very full review, which was published for the first time with a French translation by Pavot de Courteille (Hist. de la Campagne de Mohæs, Paris 1859). There is a very good manuscript of it in the Dresden Public Library.

His poetic masterpiece is the story of Yâufû and Zulaikha often dealt with before (e. g. by Hamdî, q.v.) and after him, but his treatment of the subject is peculiarly fictitious; his other poems, in which his sharp wit much admired in his life-time and his intellectual nimbleness are revealed, are collected in a separate Divân which appeared in 1313 in Stambul (cf. Ghib, Hist. of Ottoman Poetry, ii. 347—363; where a full appreciation of his literary activity is given). He further wrote a number of philological works of which we may mention here a dictionary to elucidate difficult Persian phrases, called Daşîqâ al-Hâshî'î (cf. G. Flügel, op. cit., i. 130). Of legal works special mention must be made of his Risâla fî Tabâkât al-


He left a vast number of commentaries on the Hûdâya, Tâjîrîd, Mîfâs, Tabâfsî, notes on the Kur'ân, marginal notes on the Kaşfâsh etc. which are represented in most eastern collections of Oriental MSS. (cf. e. g. G. Flügel, op. cit., i. 130, 132, 133, 251, 291, 524, 710, 714, 722, 723; ii. 220, 221, 612; iii. 179, 215 sqq.; list of several treatises in Ahlwardt, Berliner Kât., i. 12, No. 19; collection of 59 treatises in the Fihrist al-Kutub al-

'Arâbiya al-mahfûzah bi n-Kutubkhâna al-khadâ-

wiya al-Mîrâya, vol. vii., Cairo 1309, p. 435—445; also Defter-i Kutubkhâne-i Avâ Sûfîa, Stambul 1304, No. 4794, 4797, 4820; Defter-i Kutubkhâne-i Laâlî Dînîyâ, Stambul 1300, No. 2433, 3645, 3647; collection of 26 treatises appeared in two parts at Stambul in 1316 (Iç-


He even wrote on the subject of bah, as his Kûtub al-

Rudiqâ'at al-Shâbî i-iî Sîbîh fi 'l-Kawwâb 'adâl al-Bâh shows (printed Cairo 1316 and 1335; Turkish version: lithogr., n. d., 90 pp. in 8°).

Kemal-pasha-zade died on Shawwâl 2, 941 (April 6, 1535), at Stambul and was interred outside the Adrianople Gate in the monastery of Mahmûd Çelebi, where one of his pupils, Mahmûd Bey, who died as Çâli of Cairo, erected a stone monument to his memory. Three chronogrammatic verses (tâ'izâh) in Arabic were inscribed on his coffin, his sword and his tombstone, the numerical value of which was each 941 (cf. Hâdîjî Khâlîfa, Djhawûmûz, i. 180, 181, and Ekwîya Çelebi, Sijûllâ-

nâme, i. 345, esp. 359; cf. on the other hand, J. v. Hammer-Purgstall in the Z.D.M.G., vi. 282, and Sitzungskr. der Wiener Ak. der Wiss., 1851, vi. 326—328, according to which the date is 940, which is certainly an error).


Dâchz, ii. 205 sqq.; Brussal Mehmed Tâhir, Osmanlı Matellîsleri, i. 223; Umîye Sâlimnâmi, Stambul 1334, p. 346 sqq.; Mehmed ârî Bey in the Kütûbe Hikâye Ottoman, p. 1411 sqq.; C. Brockelmann, Gesch. der osm. Lit., ii. 449—453 (where most of his works are given under their titles).

(F. v. Baringer)
KEMAL REIS, Turkish corsair and sea-captain during the reign of BAYAZID II. In his youth he had been given as a present to the Sultan by the Kapudan Pascha Smail, on which he was brought up as a page at the court. He began his career as a chief of 'azabi, then took to the Mediterranean and captured and razed to the ground in 1496/1497 a Maltese Prince ('Sidilli-i 'Othmanî, iv. 28). In 1498, by order of Bayazid, he raided the Spanish coast in order to support the last Nasrid of Granada, Mulay Hasan, who, in his critical situation had invoked the Sultan's aid. This expedition is only recorded by Hâdidji Khalifa in his Ta'kvim al-Tavâribî but not in his Story of the Naval Wars (Tâhfat al-Kibâr) and it seems to be unknown to the other historians; in any case it cannot have been of much importance in view of the great difficulties of the Ottoman Empire occasioned at the time by the wars against Egypt and Austria. In 1497-1498 we find Kemal Reis marauding in the Eastern part of the Mediterranean with other corsairs; he took several Christian ships and brought his booty to the key of Alexandria ('Ashik Pascha Zade, p. 250); at this time therefore he probably was not serving the Sultan. But in the war of the Turks against Venice (1498/99) he was one of the admirals of the fleet. The Turkish fleet had three newly equipped unusually large battleships (turkish: kâbi) of which one was commanded by the Kapudan Pascha D'fûd, and the two others by Kemal Reis and Burâk Reis ('Sidilli-i Bashî, writes Budâlî, so also Leenclavius, Budâcicus). In the naval battle of Sapienza (28 July 1499) the Venetians took the latter's ship for that of Kemal Reis, on whom they particularly wanted to take revenge. Burâk Reis was boarded by two big and some smaller Venetian ships; he defended himself with burning naphtha, until he, and his enemies, were blown up together: the island of Sapienza was called after him Burâk Reis Adašli. After this battle the Turkish fleet took Lepanto (Ie-nâbulî). In the next year, after the towns of Koron and Modon had been taken by Turkish sea-power, Kemal Reis was sent with 40 ships to Navarino (Turkish Aleviz), of which town he captured the citadel from the Venetian commander. He died on the是什么呢, according to Sâmi ('Kemâlâ bil-'Alâm, v. 38), in the beginning of the 17th century, perishing by a ship-wreck ('Sidilî-i 'Othmani). 


KEMANKES (i.e. 'Acherger') is Ali Pascha, an Ottoman Grand Vizier. He was born in the Anatolian district of Hamid-eî [q.v.], came early to Stambul, where he was brought up in the imperial palace. In 1600 (1600/1601) he was appointed governor of Diyar-bakr and soon afterwards of Baghdad. Next year he was given the rank of third vizier of the dome (kübbe uwarî). In Dhu 'l-Ka'da, 1032, he was given the imperial seal in place of the dismissed Grand Vizier Mere 'Usain Pasha, mainly through the efforts of the Shaikh i 'Al-Islâm Yahya Efendi, but also as a reward for his readiness in assisting in deposing the incapable and imbecile Sultan Mustafa I. Kemã negociates 'Ali Pasha, weak, timid and common in character, began by getting rid of his enemies and rivals by throwing the viziers GürAli Mehmud Pascha and Khaîr Pascha into prison and dismissing the Mufti Yahya. His greed and avarice prompted him to the most contemptible embezzlements and frauds on the Treasury; he had coins minted with a slight proportion (barely one-fifth) of silver, put the pay of the Janissaries into his own pocket and in other ways let the state go to ruin. Within six months he had made a huge fortune by depreciating the currency and selling offices. Sir Thomas Roe who describes the Grand Vizier at his accession to office in a despatch of August 23, 1623, as "a man quietly honest, but of untried and therefore suspected ability, for so great a charge" (cf. The Negotiations of Sir Th. Roe in his Embassy to the Ottoman Porte, from the year 1621 to 1623, London 1740, p. 173) talks on April 3, 1624, of "his owne sordid covetousness, who in six moneths had heaped up infinite treasure, by portsale of all justice and offices, which hath weighed him to the ground" (op. cit., p. 230) and a Venetian report of August, 1624, puts his wealth at a "somma di 700,000 scudi in contanti, molto opportuna" (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., v. 21).

The terrible state to which the empire was reduced (rebellions in Asia Minor and Egypt, the threat from Persia, the fall of Bagdad on November 28, 1623, concealed from the Sultan, Stambul without food, the currency depreciated, the treasury exhausted, the Janissaries out of hand) aroused to the highest pitch the wrath of the youthful Murad IV against the Grand Vizier responsible. Kemâ negociates 'Ali Pasha was summoned to the palace on Dju'nadât II 14, 1623 (March 24, 1624), and summarily beheaded. His body was buried in the forecourt of the mosque of 'Atik 'Ali Pasha (cf. Hâdidî al-Dowâmî, i. 150; J. von Hammer, G. O. R., ix. 75, Nû. 320). His successor was Cerek Mehmud Pasha, who succeeded 'Ali Pasha, was married to a daughter of the celebrated Kâfi-asker and Shaikh al-Islâm, Bostân-zade Mehmud Efendi.

Bibliography: 'Othmanî-zade Ahmad Tâbi, Hâdidî al-Wuza'ir, Stambul 1271, p. 72; Hâdidî al-Dowâmî, i. 150 sq. (with short sketch of his career); J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., and J. W. Zinkeisen, G. O. R., under Kemâ negociates Ali Pascha; Na'imî, Târîkî, Stambul 1280, ii. 294 sq.; Hâdidî Khalifa, Fedâhîk, ii. 52 (execution); 'Sidilli-i 'Othmani, iii. 510. (Franz Babinger)

KÉNÄ, a town in Upper Egypt, on the east bank of the Nile (23,357 inhabitants in 1917 against 17,485 in 1875, 15,402 in 1884 or 27,500 in 1897). It is the capital of the province (mu/dirîs) of the same name which is divided into seven districts (muvazzâa), namely: 1. Dîshnî, 2. Isnî, 3. Kên, 4. Kûsâr, 5. Kûs, 6. Luzurî, 7. Nadjî Hamadî. In 1897 the population of the province was 711,457 of whom 120,330 are in the province of Kêna. — The region produces cotton and cereals, in the town, cloth and sweet-stuffs are manufactured. But Kêna is especially noted for its porous pottery; the jars (kûlê) which are made there are called
Kenān Pasha, also called Şafi K. Pasha, an Ottoman Grand Admiral. He was a Russian (I Circassian) by birth and came as a slave into the service of Bâkîreddî Ahmed Pasha, Ottoman governor of Egypt. On the latter's execution he was taken by Sultan Murad IV into the Serai and educated there. He was promoted to Agha of the stirrup-holders (Ribâb-â-dâr aghâşis) (Chronicle of Weilhiji, fol. 91b of the Vienna MS.), became a favourite of Sultan Ibrahim after his accession (Feb., 1649) and married his daughter 'Atike Sulâne. He was at the same time appointed third vizier but banished soon after Ibrahim's death (Aug., 1648) to Crete. In Sept., 1652, he returned to Istanbul and was appointed to the charge of the defences of the Dardanelles. On Sept. 9, 1653, he was given the governorship of Ofen, but deprived of it on Sept. 22, 1655, and on Feb. 9, 1656, appointed governor of Silistria. On May 3 of the same year he was appointed Grand Admiral (Kapudân Pasha, q.v.). On June 26, 1656, while in command of the Ottoman fleet sent out against the Venetians, he suffered a severe defeat in the Dardanelles, the greatest naval reverse inflicted on Turkey since the battle of Lepanto (cf. J. v.Hammer, G. O. R., v. 649 sqq.). The whole weight of the Sultan's wrath fell upon Kenān Pasha who was immediately thrown into prison. He was finally released on the intercession of his Russian countrywoman, the Sultan's mother (Kösem Wallide; q.v.) but was dismissed from the office of Grand Admiral almost immediately, on July 18, 1656. Two years later, on June 23, 1658, he was appointed Kâmi-mâşîm [q.v.] but the very next month, on July 16, 1658, dismissed again and sent to Brusa as commander of the garrison (Müfäţez) (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 37; Naţâni, Târîх, first ed., ii. 660). He set out from here by arrangement with the Anatolian rebel 'Abâsa Hasan with whom

Honoured during his life for his reputation for sanctity and asceticism he has become one of the principal saints of Egypt along with Ahmad Badawi, İbrahim Dâsîki and Abu 'l-Hâjîdîlî Aş- surî. At one time a pious formula used to be handed down which if recited beside the tomb hastened the realization of a desire or brought about cures. According to some travellers, the pilgrims who came to Kenâ made circuit (tawâfî) of the tomb of 'Abd al-Rahîm similar to those made by the pilgrims at the Ka'ba (Adfuwî, Tahtî Sâlîh, Nî. 29; Goldziher, Nih. Studien, ii. 315; K. R. K., ii. 284; Gaudeffroy-Demombynes, Le pèlerinage à la Mekke, p. 224). There were descendants of 'Abd al-Rahîm living in Egypt for two centuries; they were particularly jurists and professors (Adfuwî, Nos. 29, 117, 129, 308, 402, 405, 476, 553; al- Maṣṭîrî, Aḥšâfî, ii. 423).


(G. Wiet)
he closely allied himself, only to share his fate, treacherous assassination, on Febr. 17, 1659, in Aleppo (cf. Naṣrūn, Tārizī, ii. 685). His head was brought to the Diwan in Stamfl on March 9, 1659.

If this is the Kenān Pasha mentioned by Ewliyā Čelebi, Sūhāt-nāma, iii. 396 (and he certainly never was governor of Oezakov any more than was Kōdja Kenān Pasha [d. 1652 = 1651/52] who is also often confused with the Grand Admiral e.g. in the Sīǧīfī’s ʻOtbūna, iv. 81), he was also an author and composed a Şahāt-nāma in honour of Şāh Șāhī Pīā (q. v.). His own warlike exploits, especially his military operations in the years 1036–1038 (1626–1628), were celebrated in a rhymed Pāsha-nāma by the poet and judge ʻUtlīn ʻIbrāhīm Efendi (of Kalkandelen) of which there is a copy in the Brit. Mus. (Sloan MS. 3584); cf. Ch. Rieu, Catalogue of the Turk. MSS., p. 191 sqq., with detailed summary of contents. The possibility that it celebrates the above mentioned Kōdja Kenān Pasha who had a very similar career to his name-sake and contemporary (both were, for example, governors of Ofen) has always to be remembered. The biographical data regarding Şāhī Kenān Pasha are much confused, as the article on p. 65 sq. in Rāmūs Pāsha’s-tāde Mahmīd, Adhīrāt-i Kapsūndādām-Dürsî (Sīla 1285) and Sāmī Bey Frasherī, Kāmān-āl-ʻĀlm, p. 3990, who follows it, shows. According to this authority, Kenān Pasha was buried beside the school not far from Kūr Ҫeşme.


(Franz Babinger)

KENEZ. [See knez].

ALKERČ, a fortress east of the Dead Sea in the ancient Moab. The name goes back to the Aramaic karḵāt, “town”, which the Targum gives for yir in the Moabite place-names Kīr MōṬh (Is., xi. 1) and Kīr Nāzīr (Horšt; Is., xvi. 7, 11, Jer., xlviii. 31, 36). It is found as karxwāna in Ptolemy (xv. 1.4) on the mosaic map of Ma’dāba, in Stephanus Byzantinus, etc. Its situation on a steeply sloping spur only connected by an (artificially deepened) saddleback with the main ridge makes al-Kerak an unusually strong fortress. It is remarkable that it is not mentioned in connection with the Muslim conquest of the East Jordan country or in the following centuries; only with the Crusading period, after it had been fortified by King Fulco’s former cupbearer, Payan, does it begin to play a part, and that a prominent one. The Christians of that time, who were not well read in geography, sought the ancient Petra here and called it Petra deserti. As it commanded the pilgrim road from Damascus and all traffic between Syria and Egypt, it caused the Muslims much trouble and was therefore repeatedly but vainly besieged from 656 (1170) onwards by Na’dīn and Sālāḥ al-Dīn until finally it was so starved out (stambûl, 1188) to Sālāḥ al-Dīn’s brother al-Malik ʿAlī (q. v., to whom it was allotted after Sālāḥ al-Dīn’s death. In the years that followed it belonged to various Ayyūbids and even after the rule of most kings of this family was over, al-Mughīth ʿUmar still held out in al-Kerāk until Baibars captured it by treachery and put him to death (661 = 1263).

Behind the strong walls of the fortress the Mam-lūk Sultan ʿAlāʾ found shelter in 708 (1309) when he escaped from Cairo to found a real power. At this time al-Kerāk was capital of one of the mam-lūkāt into which Syria and Palestine were divided; its territory lay chiefly to the south of it. How powerful the fortress, the majority of whose inhabitants were still Christian, then was, is seen from the descriptions by al-Dimāshqī, Yāḥūt, al-ʿUmarī and Kāhil al-Zāhīrī. Under Turkish rule it lost its importance until quite modern times when the Ottoman government put a strong garri-son into it and made al-Kerāk capital of a separate administrative district. The walls date mainly from the middle ages, while the lower strata go back to an older period.


KERBELA’. [See mešẖīd Ḥusain].

KERČ (KERTCH), a town and fortress on the Crimean peninsula; according to the census of 1897, it had 28,582 inhabitants. In ancient times it was the site of the Greek colony of Pantikapion, later called Bosporos as the capital of the Bosporan kingdom, from the end of the seventh century the residence of the Khazar governor (with the title Tudun) of the eastern part of the Crimea (the western with the capital Kheresones still belonged to the Byzantine empire). The name Kerč first appears in Muslim sources and is variously written; to the references to the texts (for the forms Karz and al-Karsh) in J. Marquart, Ost-europäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig 1903, p. 506, may be added Rukn al-Dīn Baibars in W. Tiesenhausen, Sborník Materialů, oto-nyh螅hķ in istorii Zobol Ordī, St. Petersburg 1884, p. 89, 5 (there Kardł). In Marquart, op. cit., the derivation of the name from the Greek Κόπρος or Καρύς, “as a monastery near Kerč is called”, proposed by Russian scholars (Wassilyevski, Bruun, Kunik, Harkavy), is also given. In old Russian sources the town is called Korčèv; for example in the well known inscription of the year 6576 (1068) quoted by Karamzin, Istorija gosudarstva Rossiskago, ii, note 120.

After the final destruction of the Khazar empire by the combined forces of the Byzantines and Russians about 1016 the eastern part of the Crimea with Kerč belonged to the Russian principality of Tmutarakan, the capital of which of the same name lay on the peninsula of Taman opposite
Kerč. About a century later the possession of the steppe territory passed to the Kipčak or Komons and that of the seaports to the Byzantines. As Yu. Kulakowski (Probyłayye Tauridiâ, Kiev 1912, p. 93), on the authority of Miklosich and Müller, Acta et diplom. gr. mediæ aevi, ii, 25, suggests, the town of *Taurida* mentioned in the treaty of 1169 between the Emperor Manuel Komnenos and the republic of Genoa is to be identified with the Russian Kerčev. From the xiii-th century the Crimean peninsula belonged to the Tatar kingdom of the Golden Horde; in the year 698 (Oct., 1298—Sept., 1299) Kerč with some other towns of the Crimea was destroyed by Nobigay and vengeance his grandson who was killed in Kafa (Tischenhausen, op. cit.). In the xv-th century Kerč came into the hands of the Ottoman Turks. After the conquest of Azov, Peter the Great, during his stay in Vienna in 1698, asked that Kerč should be ceded to Russia by the Turks in the peace negotiations then about to begin. But this demand was not granted. After the peace of Carlowicz concluded in the same year, Kerč remained in the hands of the Turks (V. J. von Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, ii, 909; S. Solowjew, Istoriya Rossi, izd. tovar. Obščestvo Poltva, iii, 1171). On account of the danger threatening from the Russians, Sulṭān Muştafa II in 1702 had a new fortress built not far from Kerč (now Veni-Kale) (v. Hammer, op. cit., iv. 47). In 1771 Kerč and Veni-Kale were occupied by the Russians without resistance; Abaza Pagha, who was sent to defend Veni-Kale, did not once dare to expose his troops and returned to Sinope (op. cit., iv. 622; Solowjew, op. cit., vi. 738). The cession of Kerč demanded by the Russians during the peace negotiations in Bukharest (1773) was steadily refused by the Turks (v. Hammer, op. cit., iv. 638) but had, however, to be granted after the treaty of Kucuk Kainardje (1774). Henceforth Kerč was a Russian fortress of the second class; during the Crimean war it was occupied by the Allies in May, 1855.

The town, which is world-renowned for its monuments of the Greek, Roman and early Christian periods, had no longer the same importance in the Muhammedián period and has therefore no Muslim buildings of importance.

(W. Barthold)

Keresun (ancient Kerasos, Cerasus), on the maps Kerassoudie, a town and harbour in Asia Minor, on the Black Sea. It is the chief town of a kaža of the vilayet and the sandjak of Trebizond, 70 miles west of this last town. The population is 8,440 (3,588 Muslims; 3,906 Greek orthodox and 946 Armenians). It is built at the end of a rocky cape. The botanist Tournecourt found still there the forest of cherry-trees which gave their name to the town, for it was from there that Lucullus imported them to Europe. This source of revenue is now replaced by the export of nuts (5,000,000 lbs. produced annually) and of beans (a million okes = 2,825,000 lbs. annually). There are ruins of the ancient walls, of a citadel and of a city-gate. The remains of an amphitheatre may be seen some distance off. The ruins of a mole to the north of the town could be cleared away at small expense and the area made into a harbour which would facilitate the export of the produce of the provinces of the interior. The town contains 11 mosques, 1 tekke, 9 Greek churches, 2 Armenian churches; it has also barracks and an arsenal. — The Keresos of Xenophon lay in the valley of the Keressin-dere: the present town is built on the site of the one founded by Pharmacis I, grandfather of Mythradates VII, King of Pontus, who called it Pharmacis after himself.

The kaža of Keresin includes 138 villages and 4 närìya’s; it has a temperate maritime climate; mountains of volcanic origin, covered with forests, cover about half the area of the district. The inhabitants are fishermen on the coast and miners in the interior (mines yielding argentiferous lead, iron, copper and antimony). The total population is 64,526 (5,704 Muslims and 11,884 Greek Orthodox).


Kerka, a river in Khûzistân whose sources lie to the east and south of Nihâwênd in 'Irâk 'Adjamî. The Çâshî-ê Kêşîm is regarded as the source proper and rises in the Kûh Çîhî Nabilîghan. The map shows a little stream called Sura Kênî here, which receives the Kar Sara from the east, then near Nihâwênd the Abî-i Kûlan from the east which rises in the Kûh-i Ferrtâz and next the Sirwîn Rûd from Dawlatâhâb. In this district the river is known as the Gamasîb, more accurately Gamasîb (corrupted to Garasîb).

The direction of the river, at first N. W., gradually changes to the west. Before it reaches Bisûtûn it is joined by the Shâdja Rûd reinforced by the Kangarshâh. It then turns to the south and is joined by the Kara Şu, the river of Kirmânshâhân and later by the Abî-i Karînd, which itself has a number of important tributaries. While the tributaries so far mentioned are all on the right side, on the left it has the Kasgân Rûd which has as its tributaries the Hadrian Rûd on the right and the Rûd Khorrâmâlûd with the Rûd Kûkîl on the left. Next come, also on the right, the Lalîm Rûd and the Abî-i Zâl. The direction of its course now changes from southern to westerly for a short stretch and then to south-west. On this latter stretch the river is called the Kerka (Kerka), a name which it temporarily exchanges between Lalîm Rûd and Abî-i Zâl for the name Abî-i Şâîmêre. This name preserves the name of the town Şîmârâ [q.v.] which lay west from the river and some distance from it. After the confluence with the Abî-i Zâl the river again turns southwards; as soon as the region of Pû-i pul is reached we have canals linking it with the Abî-i Diz and its tributaries, the Nahr Tabâl Khan and the Nahr Daghdari. The ruins of Susa lie on one of the eastern watercourses which is later called R. Sharw. The Kerka ends its course in the region south of Nahr Hâshîm, where it receives the water of the Shaṭṭ al-Dîjamuz. At an earlier period the river ran north-west from here to Hawizia (Huweza).

Among the roads which follow the course of the river from time to time, we may mention the great highway connecting Hamadîhân and Mesopotamia in the region of Bisûtûn, and also the road from Hülwan to Şaiman.

The ancient geographers called this river the Choaspes. The name Kerka is not found in the Arab geographers; according to Rawlinson, it first appears in a xivth century Persian text. It is, however, probably older. Ibn al-Thir mentions a
Kerkhā under the year 553 (1158). If the reference is to this river the name must go back to the sixth century. Ibn al-Athir, who usually avoids geographical details as much as possible, must have taken the name from an older contemporary source. Kerkhā must be Aramaic and mean "the [river] of Karkhā" i.e. Karkhā de Lēdān.

The river is certainly twice mentioned in the Arab geographers although not by name. According to Ibn al-Fahī, a particularly esteemed kind of black sealing-clay was obtained on its bank near Nihāwend. The "large river" near Būratūn mentioned by Ibn Rosteī must also be the Gamasiāb. The bridge between Šimāra and Tārīn, considered a marvel of architectural skill, may also correspond to the Pul-i Khurāw over the Kerkhā. The Kerkhā is usually called the "river of Sās", e.g. as early as Ibn Ḫordādhbih. The geographers have no reliable information regarding its sources; Ibn Ḫordādhbih says it rises in Dinawar and Ibn Wāḏīh at Hāmadān, which is true, at least for the tributaries of the Gamasībā, if we take these names to refer to provinces. The river, according to the Arab geographers, flows into the Dudjāil of Ahwāz. Mention is made of the fact that at high tide the river is about two mil broad at Sās. According to Ibn Wāḏīh, the river was called Hindwān. Probably the "river of Bassinā" or "Bassina" which drove 7 water-mills and raised a bowl-shot from the town of Bassinā, mentioned by al-Mukaddasi and Yākūt, is identical with the Kerkhā.


(K. G. B.)

Kerkūk. See Kerkūk.

Kerkūk, a heap of stones, especially a sacred heap of stones. The cult of heaps of stones is extremely ancient and distributed all over the world. It seems to come not from an act of litholatry in the strict sense but from a rite of transference or expulsion of evil; the individual, picking up a stone, causes the evil of whatever kind that afflicts him to pass into it — as the case may be, fatigue, physical or moral suffering, sin, the dangerous power that attaches itself to a man in certain sacred neighbourhoods, or all these things together — and gets rid of it by throwing it or depositing it with the stone on a place suitable for absorbing it; the accumulation of these expiatory pebbles forms the sacred piles of stones which rise all along the roads, at difficult passes and at the entrances to sanctuaries. Alongside of these, the throwing or placing of a pebble or the building of a little pyramid of stone often becomes one of the obligatory rites of the pilgrimage and the rite losing its primitive character has been sometimes taken for a true offering-rite (cf. R. Dussaud’s view, La Matérialisation de la prière en Orient, in the Bull. et Mém. de la Soc. d’Anthr. de Paris, 1906, p. 213—220). The kerkūr are often built at the place where a man has been killed and buried; this has been explained from the desire to bury more deeply a dead man whose spirit might be tempted to come out and avenge itself or, less plausibly, as a kind of homage to the dead; but this casting of stones can also be explained rather as a rite for the expulsion of evil (a dangerous place, the infection of death, proximity of disturbing magical forces). It appears therefore that we always find rites of purification in the origin of the kerkūr.

Pre-Islamic Arabia knew the rite of casting stones and sacred heaps of stones. The sites of the Ḫadīḏi have preserved evidence of this. It may be asked if there is not a rite of this kind in the origin of the lappations at Minā (for other explanations see the art. Ḫadīḏ, ii. 201) and in any case, as G. Demombynes (Le Pélérinage à la Mekké, Ch. i.) has recently shown, the raised
stones or raqjam which stand at the mawṣūḥā marking the ūrum of Mecca are exactly comparable to the kerkûr which are found from Central Asia to North Africa along the roads at points where one begins to approach the great sanctuaries; there are also examples of this practice to be found equally in Christian countries.

Islam found the cult of piles of stones in all or almost all the lands that it conquered and although orthodox lares of the gods were sometimes too numerous to accommodate itself, as to so many other popular practices, which owed their origin to paganism in the remote past. The kerkûr are especially numerous in certain regions, Syria for example, but nowhere has their cult been so developed and is so vigorous as in North Africa, especially in the south of Morocco, where it has been especially studied by E. Douillé. There, one may say, there is not a pass, or ravine or cross-roads which has not its little pyramids of stones or its great kerkûr to which every passer-by adds his pebble, not a rustic sanctuary but has its sacred piles of stones.

Sometimes the kerkûr itself, as in other cases a spring, a track or a rock, has given rise to a sanctuary which has become islamised in a marabout fashion. It is also very common to find under the aegis of a saint several of these cults combined, strange sanctuaries which perpetuate the ancient rites of paganism, still vigorous after twelve centuries of Islam.

Bibliography: The bibliography of the subject is very extensive. What is essential from the general point of view is given in Frazer, Golden Bough, third ed., part vi, The Scape-goose, p. 8–36, where also are given a certain number of references to Muslim countries; from the Muslim standpoint in Douillé, Marrakech, Paris 1905, p. 58–103; and, Magie et religion dans l'Afrique du Nord, Algiers 1908, ch. x. Since the publication of this last work, E. Westmarcht, The Moorish Conception of Holiness (Baraka), Helsingors 1916, p. 26 sqq. (on Morocco). (Henri Basset)

KERMÁN. [See Kirmān.]

KERMÁNSHÁH. [Kirmānshāh.]

KERMES. [See Kermei.]

KEMIYAN. [See Kermiyan.]

KERRÍ, a village and district on the right bank of the Nile, fifty miles north of Khartum. In the xvith century the governorship of the surrounding territory was conferred by the Fungi ruler, Úmára Dunkas, on Abd Allâh Djamâka (4. 1554–1562) of the Arab tribe of Raffâa. His descendants, the Abdallâb, maintained their position as a semi-independent dynasty with the title of Mândjî or Mângâluk until the Egyptian conquest, but transferred their seat from Kérrî to Halfayat al-Mulâk after the rise of Shendi in the latter part of the xvith century.


KERIS. [See Kerri.]

KETÂMA (or Kótma), one of the great Berber families; when Islam was introduced into North Africa, they occupied all the northern part of the modern department of Constantine, between the Aurâs [q. v.] and the sea, that is the region containing the towns of Íkádn, Sefti, Bâghâya, Ngaua (Nikâwus), Tiguikt (Tikist), Mila, Constantine, Skikda (Philippeville), al-Koll (Cullo), Djdjelî [q. v.], Bellezma, and the part of Kalyûla in the department of Algiers, i.e. the region between Wed Sahel and the Seban. One legend flattering the national pride makes them descended from the Hîmaryates brought there by Iriqos. Kôtâm, the eponymous ancestor of their race, was said to be the son of Bernes. He had two sons, Ghræsen and Isâlû, from whom are descended all the tribes of the Ketâmâ. They do not seem to have played a part in the civil and religious wars which desolated North Africa from the time of Ûkba to the days of the Aglabîds; we do not find them among the Khâridjîs. When Ûbâyîd Allâh gave himself out to be the Mahdi, his emissaries made some Ketâmî pilgrims in Arabia and converted them to Isámílî doctrines. The principal convert was Mûsâ, chief of the Sâkîn, a branch of the Djmila whose name survives in the town of this name. The missionary (da'î) Abû 'abd Allâh al-Shîrî [q. v.] settled in Íkádn and succeeded in maintaining his position there in spite of the efforts of the Aglabids. From there he was able to extend his influence to the Mahdi who was a prisoner at Sîdjîmâsa. The empire of the Fâtimids was then founded with the help of the Ketâmî. It was they who furnished its main strength and supplied the means of conquering Egypt. But these continual efforts exhausted them. Those who remained in the Magrib after the exodus of al-Mu'izz were forced to submit to local rulers, as Ibn Khâldûn tells us.

In our day the principal representatives of the Ketâmî are the Zawâs of the Djurdjura and the population around Djdjelî and in Little Kabylia. We do not know at what date Ismâîlî doctrines disappeared from among them but long afterwards their attachment to this teaching was regarded as a subject of obloquy and for this reason the powerful tribe of Sedzikish of Ketâmî origin renounced all connection with this family. At the present day all the Berbers of this region are Sunnis.


KETKHÛDA (v. kethû "house", khudû "master, lord"), originally meant the master of the house or head of a family; the name came to be given in Persia in the villages to the headman or bâllîf and in the towns to the "dixenier de quartier" (Ghârîne, Voyages, 1811, iv. 77) or "district tithe-man"; a kind of police officer whose duty it was to inspect his district and who was responsible to the kâltarî [q. v.]. The administrative reforms recently introduced into Persia have led to making the ketkhûda the representative of public authority (mayor) in the karya (village), the smallest territorial division. Unfortunately, these officials, whose duties were formerly confined to the levying of dues, are powerless in face of the great landed proprietors (R.M.M., June 1914, xxvii. 194) whose stewards they are and who appoint them; there are, however, some villages where this agent is appointed by the governor or even elected by the inhabitants.

The word has passed into Ottoman Turkish where it has been corrupted to kekâya, kâya and means the "steward of a house". Ernîf kâya-
is the chief or syndic of a workman's guild. The kliya kadin is the first lady of the palace, the housekeeper who has charge of the domestic arrangements and the servants. The kapu kliya is the representative, the agent of the governors of provinces at the Ottoman Porte. The name develet kliya-i used to be given to an official whose function corresponded to the minister for home affairs in modern constitutions; ől Kliya-i was the inspector of the Janissaries, lieutenant of the Agha and his chief of staff, who could only be dismissed with the consent of the whole odjik; he himself had an agent with the Agha who had to transmit the chief's orders to the commanders of fortresses and was called kliya-yeri, "the inspector's lieutenant".

Bibliography: Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire turc-français, ii. 612; G. Demorgny, Essai sur l'administration de la Perse, Paris 1913, p. 50, 55. (CL. HUART)  

KHA', the seventh letter of the Arabic alphabet, representing the harshest of the gutturals, with the numerical value 600. It belongs to the sounds peculiar to the Arabic alphabet (in which it is distinguished from ţa by a diacritical point), so far as the Hebrew and Aramaic scripts do not distinguish it from ġa. In Ethiopic, on the other hand, Kharm in contra-distinction to ḫawt is denoted by a sign of its own; it is, however, to be observed that in the MSS. the two signs are often interchanged and that in the modern languages of Abyssinia there is little or no difference in the pronunciation of the gutturals. In Minean and Sabean ƙa is denoted by a sign which slightly deviates from ġa. In the Assyrian script the sound corresponding to ġa is usually distinguished from the softer gutturals.

Bibliography: Comparative grammars of Semitic languages (Wright, Zimmer, Brockelman, Cohen etc.); A. Schade, Shibawayhi's Lautlehre, Leide 1901, p. 19 and note 48.  

KHBAR (A.), plural akbhar, akhbar, report, news. The word is not used in any special context in the Kur'an. In the Hadith it occurs among other passages in the tradition which describes how the djinn by eavesdropping obtain information from heaven (khabar min al-somā) and how they are pelted with fiery meteors to prevent them from doing so (al-Bukhari, Adhān, bab 105; Muslim, Sunat, trad. 149); al-Tirmidhi, Tafsir, Sūra lxii., trad. 1).

In his collection al-Bukhari has a chapter entitled Akbār al-Ḍahd, which, as the firdauma indicates, deals with the validity of traditions regarding adhān, saūd, fasting, the law of inheritance, and judicial procedure, which are only given on the authority of one man.

Al-Ghazālī gives the name akhbar to the traditions that go back to Muhammad. He distinguishes the sayings of the Companions by the term ṣāḥib (see his Iyâ', passim). On such and similar technical distinctions see Lane's Lexicon s.v. and Dict. of Techin. Terms, ed. Spranger and Nasau Lees, s.v. Akhbar is further often found in the titles of historical works; see Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., Index ii.

Ṣāḥib al-Khabar was the title of one of a sułtan's officers in provincial capitals whose duty it was to report to his master all new happenings, the arrival of strangers etc. The postmaster was often given this office; see Dozy, Suppl., s.v., and the literature there given. — As a technical term in grammar khabar is predicate.

(A. J. WENSCINK)  

Khabn, a term in prosody, indicating the suppression of the second letter when quiescent of a foot beginning with a sabah khaṣṣ (see the art. 'Arūn). It affects: 1st. ʕāliʿun (≥ ʕāliʿun), 2nd. mutasfiʿun and muntasfiʿun (muntasfiʿun = maʕāliʿun), 3rd. maʕāliʿun (maʕāliʿun = ʕāliʿun), 4th. ʕāliʿun (ʕāliʿun). It is found in the metres mawdūd, haft, raṣīf, ramaṭ, sīr, musambaṭh, khaṣṣ, mukhtād, rubūṭṭ, and musamāṭh and musamāṭh and musamāṭh and musamāṭh and musamāṭh.

Bibliography: cf. the article 'Arūn.  

(MOH. BEN CHENER)  

Khabūr, the name of two rivers. I. The larger Khabūr is one of the chief affluents of the Euphrates, which it joins at Karkisya [q.v.]. In classical literature the name is written in various ways: 'Arba war, Ḥasy anâna, 'Arba war, 'Aṣba war, 'Aṣba war, 'Aṣba war, Bāṣara, Chaboras. Xenophon calls it 'Arbasia.

It takes its origin in the Northern Mesopotamian mountains (the Iza M. and Masius M. of the classical authors), flows through the plain of Mesopotamia, passes between Djabal 'Abd al-'Azîz and the Singâr mountains, where it takes a southern direction which it changes in the last part of its course into a south-western one.

Its springs, as well as those of its numerous affluents, are chiefly connected with three important towns, Ra's al-'A'in (Reshâàna of the Syrians) in the Northwest, Mardin in the North and Nasîbîn in the Northeast. The springs at Ra's al-'A'in are said to be three hundred in number; they were shut off by iron grills, in order to prevent people from being drowned in them.

Downstream from Ra's al-'A'in the Khabūr is joined by the river of Mârîn, which in the Arabic geographers is called Sâvur; on Sachau's map it bears the name of Naher Zarg. Just before passing between Djabal 'Abd al-'Azîz and the Singâr mountains it is joined by the river of Nasîbîn, which in classical literature is called Mygdonius; the Arab geographers apparently mean this river when speaking of the Hirmûs; on Sachau's map it is called Djaâchîja. The course and the nomenclature of this and other affluents are still uncertain.

The Arab geographers mention several more or less important places situated on the Khabūr between Djabal 'Abd al-'Azîz (classical Gauzânis) and Karkisya, such as Şâhî, Taninsir (upper and lower T.), Šâbân (also on Sachau's map), 'Arbân or 'Arbûtân (also on Sachau's map), Zâkair, al Shamsâniyya (probably Sachau's Schenismak), Makisin ("the custom-house"), al-Gudair ("the pool"), and Şwa'îr (Sachau's es-Sawâr). At Makisin there was a bridge of boats. "Much cotton was grown here and by it lay the small lake of deep blue water called al-Munkhârik, said to be unfathomable" (Le Strange).

The whole region through which the Khabūr flows, chiefly in its lower course, was renowned for its fertility. Its trees are mentioned in Arabic poetry, its fruits were exported to the towns of the Irâk. But al-Idris already speaks of the plundering raids of the Beduins which cast a shadow over these natural riches. Sachau calls the tribes residing in the plain near Shiddâdiya Djabûr. When he travelled there (1899), the large fertile
valley was devoid of towns, villages and human beings in general.


II. The Lesser Khabur, one of the affluents of the Tigris which takes its rise on the mountains of Southern Armenia, south of Lake Van and west of Lake Urmia. It passes between the mountain ranges which are now called Djibah Harbāl (North) and Zakhā Dagh (South). The latter mountains derive their name from the town of Zakhā (classical Azochis). The Khabur joins the Tigris between Maghāra and Maza. The Arab geographers often call it Khabur al-Hasaniya, after the town of this name. Here the river was spanned by a magnificent stone bridge which was looked upon as a miraculous piece of masonry. Al-Hasanía probably survives in the hamlet of Ḥasan Agha.


KHADHILAN (Khadhi'a, A.), women actionists from the root ḥ-la-l 'to leave in the lurch', a technical term in Muslimaean theology, applied exclusively to Allah when He withdraws His grace or help from man. The disputes regarding it first appear in connection with the quarrel over ḫadār (q.v.). A starting point is found in Sūra iii. 154: "but if He abandon you to yourselves (yakhibkulam), who will help you after Him? Let the faithful therefore trust in God". On this al-Rāzī observes: "The Companions deduce from this verse that belief is exclusively a result of Allah's help (cf. John, vi. 65), while unbelief is a result of His khadhīlan. This is obvious as the verse points out that the matter is entirely in God's hands".

A more detailed exposition is given by Ibn Hazm: *Right guidance and assistance consist in God's preparing (tairur) the believer for the good for which He has created him; while khadhīlan consists in God preparing the fašíh for the evil for which He has created him. Linguistic usage, the Kurfān, the force of logic, and the attitude of the fašíhs and those in the past who handed down traditions and of the companions and successors as well as of those who came after them and of the whole body of Muslims with the exception of those whom God has led astray as regards their intelligence, namely such as belong to the followers of slanderers and outcasts, like al-Nazā'im, Thumāna, al-'Alīf and al-Dhāhib, are all unanimous*. Then follows this reasoning: Allah has given man two forces, hostile and opposed to one another, tawmiz (power of discrimination) and kawāl (passion, desire). When Allah protects the soul, tawmiz prevails by His help and power. But when He leaves the soul to itself (khadhīlan), He strengthens the kawāl with a strength which amounts to leading astray (ifilāt).

Khadhilān is therefore, according to Ibn Hazm, the opposite of kūdā and tawmīk and the conception approaches that of ifilāt. The Muʿtazilis (as already indicated by Ibn Hazm's words) see it in contradistinction to Allah's justness: according to them, Allah does not urge a man to evil. In their terminology khadhilān therefore means the refusal of divine grace (manṣ al-latīf), while, according to the Ashāris, khadhilān is "the creation of the ability to disobey".


KHADIDJA, Muhammad's first wife, was a daughter of Khwawīd of the Kuraish family of 'Abd al-Uzza. The authorities are unanimous in saying that when she made Muhammad's acquaintance and took him into her service she was a well-to-do merchant's widow who worked on business independently. She had been twice married previously and had children of both marriages. The one husband was a Makhrūmī, the other a Tamlīn, Abū Hāla, whose real name is variously given; but this Abū Hāla is also mentioned by others among the followers of Muhammad, which — if both stories are true — would make Khadidja a divorced woman. When she discovered the brilliant qualities of her young employee — the story of this is adorned with all sorts of legendary features — she proposed marriage to him according to the generally accepted story, her father was dead by this time, according to another, still alive and opposed to the marriage, so that she only obtained his consent after making him intoxicated — a favourite motif in fiction (cf. the art. DIJHIMA). Most authorities make Muhammad twenty-five at this time and Khadidja forty, which, in view of the fact that Arab women age early and that she bore him at least five children (see the art. MUHAMMAD), is not even probable, although in later times extraordinary capabilities in this direction were ascribed to the Kuraish women (cf. al-Dhāhib, Tria Opera, ed. van Vloten, p. 78). Otherwise we do not need to doubt the essential accuracy of the tradition, for the alteration in Muhammad's circumstances has witness borne to it in the Kurʾān (xxiii. 6 sq.) and the fact that in spite of his later so marked sensuality he was content with one wife so long as Khadidja lived is best explained by her superior social position which she perhaps used to insist on this condition. Her wealth must have been a great help to him during his struggle and her death (which is said to have taken place three years before the Hijra) after she had probably suffered
considerable losses through the hostility of the great merchants, contributed to make his position still less endurable. But her personality seems to have been of even greater weight with her husband; in any case tradition draws a very attractive picture of the moral support which she afforded him during the excitement and agitation of the first investigation. That Wâliya b. Nawfal [q. v.] was her cousin must have helped to make her sympathetic to Muhammad's aims.


(Ch. BuHl)

KHADIM (A.), servant; in Turkish often used with the secondary meaning of "eunuch." The word is applied to male and female, freemen or slaves alike; as to the latter see the art. ABD. The collective is Khadimun and the plural Khudidîm. Khâdim al-Haramain al-ghāfîfâin (servant of the two sacred areas i.e. Mecca and Medina) was one of the titles of the Sultan of Turkey (see Barthold, Isl. vi. 1916, p. 379, sqq.).

There have always been free servants alongside of slaves in ʿIslâm. Anas b. Mâlik [q. v.] entered Muhammad's service as a youth (al-Bukhârî, Diwâh, bâb 74 etc.) and he records it to his master's credit that the latter had never said a harsh word to him nor even asked him for an explanation of his doings (al-Bukhârî, Waṣâyâ, bâb 25). Servants were used on journeys especially, and put up the tents, etc. These servants are called farrâq (lit. spreaders of the carpets), a name which is, however, given to servants who look after the beds and the house generally (Lane, The Thousand and One Nights, London 1859, ii. 202, note 16).

In Egypt in Lane's time there was an organisation of servants. They were under special shaikhs to whom anyone who required a servant had to apply: these shaikhs were responsible for any dishonesty or breach of trust by their people (Lane, Manners and Customs, London 1899, p. 139). There were also free female servants who performed the lowest household duties (eb. cit., p. 147, 197) for a very small wage (p. 168). Some of the male servants used to shave their beards (p. 572).

In Turkish houses of the upper classes these people, who are usually addressed by their name followed by Agha, work as cooks, gardeners, janitors, etc., and they have to avoid the women's apartments in the house with which they communicate by the swivel-box (dolâh). If they are married they do not live in their master's house.

The women servants in the konaks live in the women's apartments and have very little personal freedom. They sometimes belong to impoverished Turkish families or are the children of former servants and slaves. They are called kâfîs (from kâfîf) or kâlıî (from kâlıkh) and the men mîšâk, dâfiyâh, hizmekâr (khâidemâkîr). The servant girls (khîmetâfî = khâidemêfî) are usually Greeks or Armenians.

Uniformed officials in the imperial and official services were divided into various corporations (chamberlains, janitors, musicians) and were included under the general name kadâma = khdâma (information supplied by Dr. Kramers). On such corporations see also v. Hammer, Constantinopel und der Bosporus, Pest 1822, i, 395 sqq.

In North Africa, especially in Algeria, conditions have become considerably influenced by European customs. In place of khâdim, ṣâhab, plur. ẓâhîb, is commonly used; this honourable designation is applied to the clients of prominent Moroccan families who are employed in various duties from the lowest to the most confidential missions. They usually receive no regular salary but live on the bounty of their master. They accompany him on the road, look after his mount, and order illumination for trips at night, etc. If their master is a great kâ'id or the head of a brotherhood he appoints one of his ṣâhîb to accompany travellers who are passing through the areas over which his authority extends. This is a sign that they are under his protection.

In the zâwiya servants of this type form a guild to which is entrusted the care of pilgrims and of the buildings; cf. Depont and Coppolani, Les confréries religieuses musulmanes, Algiers 1897; Doutté, l'Islam algérien en l'an 1900 (information supplied by Prof. H. Basset).

The Ḥâdhîth has handed down various sayings of Muḥammad which endeavour to secure good treatment for servants: in this it is not always possible to distinguish whether the reference is to freemen or slaves. The khâdim is responsible for his master's possessions (al-Bukhârî, Waṣâyâ, bâb 9); on the other hand alms which he bestows out of his master's property bring him a heavenly reward (al-Bukhârî, Zakât, bâb 25). One should be ready to forgive one's servant (al-Tirmîdî, Bîrî, bâb 32); he should neither be beaten nor cursed (al-Tirmîdî, bâb 30, 31, 85); and the servant who has prepared a meal has a right to partake of it (al-Bukhârî, Aţîmâ, bâb 55; al-Tirmîdî, Aţîmâ, bâb 44, etc.)

A. J. WENSINCK

AL-KHAḌĪR (al-Khîdîr), the name of a popular figure, who plays a prominent part in legend and story. Al-Khâdir is properly an epithet ("the green man"); this was in time forgotten and this explains the secondary form Khîr (about "the green"), which in many places has displaced the primary form.

Legends and stories regarding al-khâdir are primarily associated with the Kûr'ānic story in Sûra xviii. 59–87, the outline of which is as follows: Mûsâ goes on a journey with his servant (faţâ), the goal of which is the Madjâmâ al-Bahrîn. But when they reach this place, they find that as a result of the influence of Satan they have forgotten the fish which they were taking with them. The fish had found its way into the water and had swum away. While looking for the fish the two travellers meet a servant of God, Mûsâ says that he will follow him if he will teach him the right path (raṣâhid) They come to an arrangement but the servant of God tells Mûsâ at the beginning that he will not understand his doings, that he must not ask for explanations and as a result will not be able to bear with him. They set out on the journey, however,
during which the servant of God does a number of apparently outrageous things, which causes Müsâ to lose patience so that he cannot refrain from asking for an explanation, whereupon the servant of God replies: "Did I not tell you that you would be lacking in patience with me?" He finally leaves Müsâ and on departing gives him the explanation of his actions, which had their good reasons.

This servant of God is called al-Khâdir by the majority of the commentators. Others, however, identify him with Müsâ’s servant (see below). Both interpretations have their roots in Oriental legends. The Qur’anic story may be traced back to three main sources: the Gilgamesh epic, the Alexander romance, and the Jewish legend of Elijah and Rabbi Joshua ben Levi. The first two, of course, again closely related to one another; at the same time it should be noted that the fish episode is lacking in the epic and is only found in the romance (cf. R. Hartmann in the Z. JA., xxiv., 307 sqq.).

The main features which the three sources have in common with the story in the Qur’an are the following:

The Gilgamesh epic. Overcome with melancholy at the death of his friend Enkidu, the hero Gilgamesh sets out on a series of travels to look for his ancestor Unnapishhitim (Khasisatira, Xisouthros) who lives at the mouth of the rivers and who has been given eternal life. Gilgamesh wants to ask him about the plant of life which will save man from the power of death.

The Alexander romance. The fish episode (with which we are here concerned) which shows Alexander on the search for the spring of life is found in greatest detail in Syriac literature, in the Lay of Alexander (cf. C. Hennius, Die syrische Alexanderlied, in the Z.D.M.G., lx. 169 sqq., lixe 188 sqq.). Alexander is accompanied by his cook Andreas (cf. the article Andreas). During the laborious journey through the land of darkness Andreas on one occasion was washing a salted fish in a spring; the contact with the water made the fish live again and it swam away. Andreas jumped in after it and thus gained immortality. When he told Alexander his adventure the latter at once realised that this was the well of life. All attempts to find it again failed: Alexander is denied the immortality which becomes the lot of the unfortunate cook, who does not know what to do with it.

The Jewish legend (printed in Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrasch, v. 133–135) tells how Rabbi Joshua ben Levi goes on a journey with Elijah under conditions laid down by Elijah, like those absent of the servant of God in the Qur’an. Like the latter, Elijah does a number of apparently outrageous things which affects Joshua as it did Müsâ. Zunz, Gesammelte Vorträge, X. 130 (not accessible to me) first pointed out the similarity of this story to the Qur’anic legend. A comparison of the main features of these three sources with Sura xviii. 59 sqq. suggests the following conclusions, questions and hypotheses.

The chief figure in the Qur’anic story is called Müsâ. Some commentators doubt his identity with the great prophet (see below). There is not, however, the slightest hint of another Müsâ anywhere in the Qur’an. On the other hand, we have no legends of Moses which make him, like Gilgamesh and Alexander, go on the great journey. We might suggest the following explanation of the difficulty. The figure of Joshua ben Levi, with which Muhammad first became acquainted through the Jews and which does not again appear in Muslim legend, was identified, as we shall see, with Joshua b. Nün. This identification may have resulted in a confusion of his master Elijah with Joshua b. Nün’s master Moses. Müsâ thus represents Gilgamesh and Alexander in the first part of the Qur’anic story and Elijah in the second.

The figure of the travelling-companion is not connected with the Gilgamesh epic where it is not found, but with the Alexander romance and the Jewish legend. It probably comes in the first place from the romance. This is suggested by the fact that the companion is called faša (here practically “servant”), a term that points to Alexander’s cook rather than to Rabbi Joshua; the fish episode, which also is only found in the Alexander romance, points in the same direction.

The Madjma’ al-Bahrain is given as the goal of the journey. The expression has no direct original either in the epic or the romance, although there are points of contact in both. Unnapishtim lives ina fi maratì, i.e. at the mouth of the rivers. It is not quite certain what this expression means, but it is probable that the place in the extreme west is meant where the sources of all running water are. This, however, still leaves the dala in the Qur’anic expression unexplained. This is still the case, if we attempt to trace it to the Alexander romance where (i.e. in the Syriac Alexander legend; see Budge, op. cit., p. 259) Alexander with his army crosses a strip of land between the eleven bright seas and the ocean. It is also possible that the expression goes back to none of these but to another story unknown to us, which perhaps never found its way into literature, in which there was mention of the meeting-place of two seas. According to western Semitic cosmology, this is the end of the world where the oceans of earth and heaven meet.

We can likewise only guess at the origin of the rock (verse 62). It also belongs to cosmology (see A. J. Wensinck, The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites, in the Verh. Ak. Amst., xix., No. 2, p. 26 sqq.). It is found neither in the epic nor in the romance, again an indication that the Qur’anic story borrowed from other sources also.

The servant of God at the Madjma’ recalls Unnapishtim-Khasisatra. He is called (verse 64) one to whom God’s mercy had been shown, to whom divine wisdom had been granted. This sounds almost like a translation of the name Khasisatra and the granting of divine favour is perhaps an echo of Unnapishtim’s immortality.

The test of patience to which he subjects the newcomer comes from the Jewish legend only; the servant of God in this respect thus represents Elijah.

II

The commentators, Hadith, and historians have collected a mass of statements around the Qur’anic story, additions which, like the story itself, came for the most part from the three sources already mentioned.

The first question discussed is whether the principal character is Müsâ b. Imrân or
Mūsā b. Mīshā (Manasseh) b. Yūsūf b. Ya'qūb, i.e. a descendant of the patriarch Jacob (al-Rāzī, Mafāתיح al-Qāhira, iv. 333 sq.); al-Zamakhshārī, Koshghāfī (on verse 59). Commentators are almost unanimous in favor of the former alternative and base their opinion on the following legend which is transmitted in several forms. When Mūsā, the famous prophet, was one day preaching to the children of Israel he was asked if there was any man wiser than he. When he replied in the negative, Allāh revealed to him that his pious servant al-Khaḍīr, was wiser than he. He thereupon decided to visit this wise man. The story comes from Jewish legend; it is found in a considerable number of Arabic sources (al-Bukhārī, ‘Ilm, báb 16, 19, 44; Anbiyā’, báb 27; Tafsīr, Sūra viii., báb 2–4; Muslim, Fadā’il, trad. 170–174; al-Tirmīzhī, Tafsīr, Sūra viii., báb 1; al-Ṭabarī, ed. de Goeje, l. 417; Tafsīr, xv., 165 sq.; Fakhri al-Dīn al-Rāzī, op. cit., iv. 333). The (salted) fish serves as a guide to the route; the place where it is lost or retrieved by contact with water is the spring of life where al-Khaḍīr lives (al-Ṭabarī, i. 417). A further indication of the spring of life is that it is marked by the rock, for it rises at its foot (al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, xv. 167; al-Bukhārī, Tafsīr, Sūra viii., báb 4). The rock is also located before the river of oil or the river of the wolf (al-Baidāwī and al-Zamakhshārī on Sūra viii. 61; al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, xv. 164). Some connection between a river of oil and the spring of life is in itself not impossible. According to many statements, oil is a feature of Paradise rivers. Then writing which could easily arise. Voellers considers the reverse probable; he thinks that “river of the wolf” is a translation of the name Loubā, which is not uncommon in classical literature as a river-name. If this hypothesis is correct, one might think of the Lukkos in Morocco or the Lyucus on the Syrian coast, two regions with which the idea of extreme west is associated, as we shall see directly.

The Madīma’ al-Baḥrān in explained in various ways. Some regard it as “the place where the Persian Ocean unites with the Roman Sea, to the east” (al-Baidāwī on Sūra viii. 59; al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, xv. 163). This points to the Isthmus of Suez and is an echo of the idea that the coast of Syria was the extreme west (see A. J. Wensinck, Bird and Tree as Cosmological Symbols in Western Asia, in the Verh. Ak. Amsterdam, 1921, p. 17 sqq.). Others say that it is the junction of the Roman Sea with the Ocean (Tafsīr, Tafsīr, al-Irīkīya; al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, xv. 163; al-Zamakhshārī on the passage). This view reflects a later cosmological standpoint which regarded the Straits of Gibraltar as the extreme west. A far-fetched explanation is that the union of the two seas means the meeting of Mūsā and al-Khaḍīr, the two seas of wisdom (e.g. al-Damrī, Hayāt al-Hayawan, i. 318).

When Mūsā first sees Khaḍīr he is wrapped up in his cloak, as the Kur‘ān says, “because he was sleeping”, says al-Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje, i. 418). When he sees a bird drinking out of the sea he says to Mūsā: “Your wisdom is as insignificant compared with that of God as the amount the bird drinks is compared with the sea” (al-Ṭabarī, ed. de Goeje, i. 418; al-Bukhārī, Tafsīr, Sūra viii., báb 3; al-Rāzī, Mafāţiḥ al-Qāhira, iv. 333 sq.). Al-Khaḍīr lives on an island (al-Ṭabarī, ed. de Goeje, i. 422), or on a green carpet (jinṣa‘ī) in the heart of the sea (‘aṭa‘ habīd al-baḥr; al-Bukhārī, Tafsīr, Sūra xviii., báb 3).

The test of patience is embelished by the commentators with a wealth of detail. It would take up too much space to go into them here; cf. the commentaries on Sūra xviii. 59 sqq.; see the works on history and tradition mentioned in the Bibliography.

As may be expected from what we have said above, another branch of tradition lays particular emphasis on the connection between al-Khaḍīr and Alexander’s search for the spring of life. Friedländer, however, goes much too far when he says (Die Chaldäerlegende, p. 108 sq.) “that originally Chadhr had nothing at all to do with the puzzling servant in verse 64 — who belongs to quite a different cycle of stories — but with the servant of Moses (Alexander) who has charge of the fish in verse 59 sqq.”, in other words his search is identical with Alexander’s cook whom we know so well from Pseudokallisthenes and the Syriac homily”. For Khaḍīr is, as we have seen and will see further, connected with Umāpīstīm as well as with Alexander’s companion.

There is no translation of the Alexander romance in the Arabic literature known to us (cf. Weymann, see Bibliography). On the other hand, there are a number of, in part unedited, versions of the Alexander saga, which have been examined by Friedländer. It would take us too far to go into the differences between these versions with regard to our subject. These sources show their independence of the Kur‘ān not only by the fact that the Khaḍīr is the companion of Dhu ‘l-Karnain, but also by the complete absence of any reference to the fāṣ of the Kur‘ān. Al-Khaḍīr usually appears as the commander of Alexander’s vanguard on his march to the spring of life. In al-Sūrī’s version he is called the king’s vizier and has become the principal character, throwing the king himself into the background; in ‘Umāra he is Alexander’s cousin, conceived and born in similar circumstances to him and at the same time. The usual account of the journey to the spring of life makes Alexander and al-Khaḍīr go their ways separately; in some versions, the latter has the fish with him and discovers the miraculous well through the fish’s becoming alive when it touches the water; in other stories, on the other hand, there is no mention of the fish and al-Khaḍīr recognizes the spring by other signs; in others again he dives into it without knowing its virtues (e.g. al-Ṭabarī, i. 414). In one version in Niẓāmī, al-Khaḍīr does not go with Alexander but with Elijah to the spring, out of which both drink and both become immortal.

III

The descriptive character of the name al-Khaḍīr is so obvious from its meaning that tradition could not but give the hero’s real name, as well as his genealogy and dāte. We find him most frequently called Bāyazīb b. Malkān. In al-Mas‘ūdī (Marrāǧ, i. 114) the latter is called a brother of Kaḥṭān and thus given a place in the South Arabian genealogy. This makes it probable that Malkān is identical with Malkam (1 Chronicles, viii. 9), who is also included among the
South Arabian patriarchs. This genealogy is next traced back to Shem through Fālah (Phaleg) and ʿAbīr (Esar) (cf. al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 415; al-Maṣʿūdī, Murajjī, i. 92; al-Nawawi, on Muslim’s Sahih, v. 135). Is this Balyā (بالي) (perhaps not a corruption of Elia (إليا) which is identical with a Syriac form of the name Elijah. On the other hand, Elijah is also given in the Muslim form Ilyas al-Khadir’s proper name and also Elisha, Jeremiah (cf. God’s words in Igaba, p. 887). Khadrīn (al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 415; al-Diyārīkī, Tuʾrīk al-Khamis, i. 106, and Friedländer’s Chadirjergende, p. 333, under Chadirj). Ibn Ḥadjar also gives the following genealogies (Igaba, p. 883 sq.): (1) He is a son of Adam (weak imād); with this is connected the story (Igaba, p. 887 sq.); Abū Ḥātim al-Sulṭisānī, Kībūl al-Muwallamasin, p. 1) that al-Khadir took care of Adam’s body and finally buried it after the flood; (2) He is a son of Kāhl called Khadrīn; (3) He is al-Muʿammār (the Long-legged) b. Mālik b. Ṣubūr b. Nāṣr b. al-Azd; (4) He is Ibn ṣāmīl b. al-Nār b. al-Jābī b. Isḥāq; (5) He is the son of Pharao’s daughter; (6) He is a Persian, or his father was a Persian, his mother a Greek or vice versa; it is also said that he was born in a cave, fed there on the milk of wild beasts and finally entered the service of a king (al-Damiri, i. 318; Ibn Ḥadjar, p. 891 sq.); cf. also his meeting “on the market-place of the Bānū Isrāʾil” with the man who asks him for alms (Igaba, p. 894 sq.).

This does not, however, exhaust the traditions about his names and genealogies. We shall only quote here the following from Maracci, Pseudomonicus Serae xvi. 57: Alchedrus, quem fabulatatur Moslemi emundi fuisse, ac Phineum Eleazarí, filii Aaron; cujus anima per metempsychon emigravit primum in Elam, unde al Elia in S. Gregorium, quem propertes Mahometanis oamse summo honore prosequuntur. — The latter identification is probably due to a confusion with St. George, with whom al-Khadir has certain points of resemblance; cf. thereon Clermont-Ganneau in the Revue archéologique, vol. xxxii. sq., and Friedländer, op. cit., p. 275. Clermont-Ganneau further pointed out the relationship between the consonants ḥḏ-ḏ and the North Semitic group ḥḏ-ḏ. The name has also been taken as a corruption of Khaisāstara (Guyard in the R. H. R., i. 344 sq.) or connected with Ahasuerus, the wandering Jew (Lidzbarski in the Z. A., vii. 116).

Very varying dates are given for al-Khadir’s period. Sometimes he is called a contemporary of Abraham, who left Babel with him (al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 415); sometimes he is put in the period of Afrūdīn; he is a contemporary of Alexander and lived down to the time of Mūʾṣa (Ibn Ḥadjar, Igaba, p. 886); according to others, he was born in the period of Nāṣīḥā b. Amūṣ (i.e. Ismaʾil b. Amos) (al-Tabari, op. cit., p. 415 sq.). The divergence in these statements is partly connected with his immortality (see below).

More important are the explanations of the name given in the Oriental sources. He is said to have become green through divining into the spring of life and thus got his name (Ethiopic Alexander romance); cf. Friedländer, op. cit., p. 235 sq.). As already mentioned, he lives on an island (al-Damiri, op. cit., p. 317); he is also said to worship God on the islands (al-Nawawi, op. cit., p. 135; al-Iḫṣāṣī, p. 107). This may point to al-Khadir’s having originally been a marine being. The following circumstances point in the same direction: he is frequently called the patron of seafaring people (e.g. Tuʾrīk al-Khamis, i. 107); he is said to be appealed to on the Syrian coast by sailors in stormy weather. In India he has become a regular river-god under the name Khwāja Khīḍr [q.v.], who is represented sitting on a fish. Clermont-Ganneau and Friedländer sought the origin of the figure mainly in this direction, the latter on the assumption that the Greek Glaucus legend reached the Muslims through a Syriac intermediary (op. cit., p. 107 sqq.). But apart from the fact that we know nothing of any such intermediary, a connection between al-Khadir and Glaucus would only explain one aspect of the former; nor would it tell us anything about the origin of the figure, indeed one may doubt whether it is right to seek for the origin of a figure so complicated as al-Khadir, who has characteristics in common with Unāpsītham, with Alexander’s cook and other figures.

There are other things to be considered. In a number of Arabic explanations of the name, al-Khadir is conceived not as belonging to the sea but to the vegetable kingdom. “He sat on a white skin and it became green” (e.g. al-Nawawi on Muslim’s Sahih, v. 135; cf. al-Tabari, Tafṣīr, xv. 168). “The skin”, adds al-Nawawi, “is the earth.” Al-Diyārīkī (i. 106) is still more definite. “The skin is the earth when it puts forth shoots and becomes green after having been bare.” According to Umāra, al-Khadir is told at the spring of life: “Thou art Chadirj and where thy feet touch it, the earth will become green” (Friedländer, op. cit., p. 145). Wherever he stands or performs the salāt, it will become green (al-Nawawi, op. cit.; al-Rāzī, Maʿṣūfī al-Khālīq, iv. 336). These are statements (especially the last) which remind us of a Messianic passage in the Old Testament: “Behold the man whose name is the branch and he shall grow up out of his place” (Zachariah, vi. 12). Al-Khadir is really connected with two Messianic figures — with Elijah (cf. the art. Ilyās) and with Jesus; these three form with Idris [q. v.] the quartette of those who have not tasted death (Tuʾrīk al-Khamis, i. 107).

The variations in the character of al-Khadir result in different views regarding his nature. If he is a prophet (see Igaba, p. 882 sqq.) it remains doubtful whether he is to be included among the Apostles (al-Nawawi, op. cit., p. 135). He is, however, a real human, angelic, mundane and celestial (al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 444, 798). Popular piety as well as Sufi circles really regard him as a saint (wālī). According to one Sufi view, every age has its Khadir, in so far as the Nasib al-ašwilīyā for the time being is al-Khadir (Igaba, p. 891). As wālī, if three times appealed to, he protects men against theft, drowning, burning, kings and devils, snakes and scorpions (Tuʾrīk al-Khamis, i. 107; Igaba, p. 903). Sky and sea and all quarters of the earth obey his sway; he is God’s khalīfa on the sea and his wakīl on land; he can make himself invisible at will (Umāra in Friedländer, op. cit., p. 145). He flies through the air, meets Elijah on the dam of Alexander and makes the pilgrimage to Mecca with him every year (cf. Igaba, p. 904 sqq.).
Every Friday he drinks from the Zamzam well, and Solomon's pond and washes in the well of Siloa (Tarikh al-Khamis, i. 107; Friedlander, op. cit., p. 148 sq., 151); he can find water below that is clear and pure, and the languages of all peoples (al-Sar’ in Friedlander, p. 184).

His immortality is particularly emphasised (cf. Rückert's poem "Chidžer"; Umara in Friedlander, op. cit., p. 145; Abū Ḥātim al-Sūdīštānī, Kīṭāb al-Mawā’imur, p. i; Iṣbāḥ, p. 887 sqq., 892, 895). According to the Iṣbāḥ, p. 882, he was given immunity after a conversation with his friend, the angel Rafael, in order to establish the true worship of God on the earth and maintain it. Ibn Ḥaḍjar describes a meeting between al-Khaḍīr and Muḥammad in various versions (Iṣbāḥ, p. 899 sqq.). On meetings with individuals who lived at a later date see Iṣbāḥ, p. 908 sqq.; on the table which was let down to him from heaven see ibid., p. 919; on his presence at the battle of Kādīsiya see Mūrūdī al-Dhahab, iv. 216.

He lives in Jerusalem and performs his pilāt every Friday in the mosques of Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem, Kūbāʾ and on the Mount of Olives; his food is kām’a and water-parsely (Tarikh al-Khamis, i. 107; Iṣbāḥ, p. 889 sqq., 904).

On his matrīages we have as early as classical Ḥadīth (Ibn Ḥadāj, Zuhd, bāb 23) a legend also mentioned by al-Tha’labi, Kītāb, p. 193 sqq., which in its main features must have come from Christian sources. It is the motif of the pious youth who married his parents against his own wish in order to preserve her virginity (cf. the Syriac Acts of Thomas, 2nd Praxis). The story links up with that of Pharaoh's daughter's handmaid.
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Dichtung (Sammlung gemeinverst. wiss. Vorträge, Nr. 280; not accessible to me); Weymann, Die uthiopische und arabische Übersetzung des Preydobalthischen, Kirchheim 1901; R. Faret, Sirat Saif ibn Dīr Ḥasan, Hanover 1924, Index I, s. v.; G. W. J. Drewes, Dr. Juswani Schreer, Leiden Diss. 1925, p. 56 sqq., 105 sqq.

(Al. W. Senninck)

Khwādīja, a Persian word of uncertain etymology, an honorific title applied to personages of a town, not of military rank, bourgeois. It was generally borne by ministers of sovereigns who were chosen from among the learned. It was later used to designate eunuchs. It is found as early as the beginning of the 9th (xiith) century in a verse by the poet Anwārī. The derivative substantive khwādīja in the sense of "merchant", "tradesman" is found in Meninski and the Sicilian documents published by Michele Amari (p. 212, 2).

It passed into Arabic in the forms khwādīja and khwādījī, the modern khāwādīja (eastern dialects) and means "Sir, Mr., Monsieur". It has been borrowed by Ottoman Turkish in the form khoda (q.v.) and here means "scribe, clerk, copyist, literate, private tutor"; it is found again in the western dialects of Arabic which have borrowed it with the same pronunciation and the same meanings. It is found in the roor Nights (cf. Dozy, Suppl.). The title of Khoda, like that of Shahāk, is in Turkish only given to descendants of the Caliphs Abū Bakr and 'Umar and to those of 'Ali through his wives, among whom Fatima (Defrémery, Ministres d’histoire orientale, ii. 407, Nr. 1; Malcolm, Hist. of Persia, Lahore 1888, p. 86).

(C. H. Hart)

Khwādīja (or Khīzir in India), is in many parts of India identified with a river-god or spirit of wells and streams. He is mentioned in the Sīkhand-rāmā as the saint who presides over the well of immortality. The name was naturalized in India, and Hindu as well as Muslims reverence him; it is sometimes converted by Hindus into Rādja Khīzār. On the Indus the saint is often identified with the river, and he is sometimes to be seen as an old man clothed in green. A man who eats a worm becomes endowed Khwādīja Khair (Temple, Legends of the Panjūd, i. 221). In a poem by a Bāligh regarding a fight on the Indus a boat is unloosed "to float on the Khwādīja's waves", and it is asserted "the Khwādīja himself will remember that battle". (Popular Poetry of the Balochis, i. 74), and by one poet his name in substituted for that of Mīkāl as one of the archangels. His principal shrine is on an island of the Indus near Bakhar, which is resorted to by devotees of both creeds (Sind Revisited, ii. 226). Manucci who was present at the siege of Bakhar in 1669 (1658) alludes to this shrine under the name of Cōla Quitan. Burnes also mentions it in his *Bokhara*.

The saint is believed to ride upon a fish, which was adopted as a crest by the Kings of Oudh, and appears on their coins. Possibly in this case there is also a survival of the fish-avātār of Vishnu. Muslims offer prayers to Khwādīja Khīzār at the first shaving of a boy, and a little boat is launched at the same time; also at the close of the rainy season. — See further fāhrīd.

Bibliography: Crooke, Popular Religion and Folklore of N. India, London 1896; Burton, Sind Revisited, London 1877; Temple, Legends

**Khwāf, a town in Khurāsān, more accurately Khwaf, is first mentioned by al-Muqaddasi in the form Khawāf as a district of Nisabūr; he describes it as small, rich in pomegranates and grapes which were made into musctab, and he calls the capital Shūmāk. According to Yākūt, the district was bounded by Būshendj of Herāt and Zūzen of Nisabūr; it included 200 villages and three towns: Sandjān, Sirāwadh, Khardjīr. Al-Ḳazwini says that Khwāf was near Naṣīr. According to him, it was large with many inhabitants, and had many villages, gardens and streams. It is perhaps to the same locality that Saiyid al-Muṭarṣaḏ ṭ refers as Khāf (without w), "a village in the land of the Persians (ṣāʿītān)". The modern Khawaf lies on the southern road, which does not touch Nisabūr, from the Caspian Sea to Herāt, and between Turkān and Karī Kān Naḏīr on a tributary of the Ḥarūd. Preble and, following Macgregor, gives the total population as 15,000. According to Clerk, he describes the chief town Khaf as a town of 500 houses with several forts surrounded by pretty gardens; fields and villages stretch along the river for four miles from Khaf, of which latter the largest were Nāṣīrābād with 300 houses and Salama and Sungun with 400 houses. Sungun must correspond to the Sandjan of Yākūt; Salama may be the modern form of al-Muqaddasi’s Shūmāk and would have been the capital of the district in older times. According to Yākūt, Khardjīr lay near Būshendj and must therefore have been in the eastern part of the district of Khawaf, where in modern times there is no longer any settlement except the fort of Kān Naḏīr. The total number of villages in the district of Khawaf was given by Bunge as 26.


**Khafāḏīa, a subdivision of the Ḥawāzīn tribe of ‘Uqāil which remained as powerful Bedouins longer than most of the other tribes which inhabited the Arabian peninsula at the dawn of Islam. The genealogists give their affiliation to their kindred clans as Khafāḏīa b. Amr b. ‘Uqāil, and they were subdivided into eleven branches: Muʿāwiyah Dhū l-ʿAṣḥāb, Ḥabīb Dhū l-Nuwaqr, al-ʿĀkra, Kaʿb Dhū l-ʿAṣḥāb, Amr b. ’Uṣayd, al-Ḥadām, al-Wāṣṭī, Ḥamza, Ḥadām, and al-Ḥāfīz. They had their territory in the time before Islam to the south-east of al-Madinah and owned one or two villages, among which Sarw Luhb and Shahrāʾin are mentioned. A hundred years later we find them still much further east and at war with the tribe Ḥunayn in the Yamāma (Aqīl, vii. 122). Probably the ʿKarshānian movement in the Yamāma in the early part of the fourth century of the ʿIlām caused them to move further north towards the borders of the ʿĪrāq. Here we find them towards the end of the fourth century established as masters of al-Kūfah under their amir Thumāl and his sons. They may have been at first allies of their cousins the Banū Yūzid (not Buzid as in Wustenfeld’s *al-Athār*) or Yazid as otherwise stated) who established themselves as rulers of al-Mawṣil and the surrounding country. They were rather in opposition to them. In the year 391 (1000) Karwāsh attacked them in al-Kūfah and they were compelled to leave the country and move along the Euphrates towards Syria, where they remained only till the following year, when the ’Abbasid general Abū ʿUṣayf of al-Hadījī called them to his aid when the ʿUkailis besieged al-Madīn. This brought them again back to their ancient dwelling-places and as the Bāghdād government had probably supplied them with arms they utilised these a few years later, in 402 (1011), in an attack upon the caravan of pilgrims. They had seized the wells at Wāqis to the south-west of al-Kūfah a short distance into the desert, and prevented the pilgrims from approaching to the water and then fell upon them, slaughtering and plundering, making many of the survivors prisoners. Emboldened by this success they demanded the lands to the right of the Euphrates which had been in the hands of the ʿUkailis, and marched under the command of Sulṭān, ʿUthān and Ṭadbīr, sons of Thumāl to al-Anbār, looting the whole neighbourhood waste and besieging the town. An army sent against them from Bāghdād and supported by the ʿUkailis drove them out and Sulṭān was actually captured, but released upon the intercession of Abu l-Ḥasan ibn Mazday al-Asadi. No sooner had he been released than in the following year 403, news was received at Bāghdād that they were plundering the country round al-Kūfah under Sulṭān. An army was sent against them which was aided by Abu l-Ḥasan ibn Mazday and they were surprised at the river al-Rumān. Sulṭān escaped but his brother Muḥammad was made a prisoner, but this defeat and the result that many of the pilgrims who had been captured in the year 403 were liberated and reached Bāghdād, where they were believed to have been killed. Meanwhile the ʿUkail Āmīr Karwāsh had been captured and released and he now tried to make common cause with the Khafāḏīa, trying to join Sulṭān ibn Thumāl, but after they had joined they were attacked by troops sent from Bāghdād and routed. They both asked for pardon which, strangely, was readily granted. This gave a few years of comparative peace but in 417 (1026) Dubais b. All b. Mazday al-Asadi and Abu l-ʻIlīyān Manf b. Ḥassān, now chief of the Khafāḏīa, made a plundering expedition against the lands which belonged to Karwāsh in the Sawād [q.v.], assisted by troops from Bāghdād, and they encountered him near al-Kūfah of which he had made himself master. Karwāsh fled towards the North and was pursued by the combined tribes of Asad and Khafāḏīa, who actually took possession of al-Anbār, but after this success the two tribes dispersed again to the pastoral quarters. Manf b. Ḥassān then marched, with his followers to al-Djāmī‘ain a place between Bāghdād and al-Kūfah, which belonged to Dubais b. Ṣadāk b. Mazday and plundered the land round it; when pursued by Dubais they turned North and attacked al-Anbār. The inhabitants defended themselves for a while but
as the town was not protected by walls the Khafādja entered plundering and burning. When they learned that Karwāsh was being assisted by troops from Baghādād they left the town, but soon returned and looted the town for the second time. When finally Karwāsh was able to drive them out he spent the winter in the town and instructed walls to be built to protect the town from further surprise attacks. Now Māni3 swore allegiance to the Bahāyid ruler Abū Kālidār and marched south to al-Kūfa where he had the Khafādja said in the name of Abū Kālidār, for which he received jurisdiction over the waters of the Euphrates. This had the result that in 420 Dubais severed his allegiance to Abū Kālidār as he was afraid of the depredations of the Khafādja. In the following years the Khafādja held sometimes with one party and again with another and when in 425 (1033) Dubais had a quarrel with his brother Thābit they sided with the former but quarrels also arose among the Khafādja chiefs during which Ali b. Thumāl was killed and his nephew al-Hasan b. Abī 3-Barakāt became chief of the tribe. When in 428 (1036) the ḥājdāb Bāris Thugān rebelled in Baghādād, the general of the Caliph, al-Basāṣṣātī employed among others the tribe of the Khafādja to quell the revolt, as a result of which Bāris Thugān was executed. We do not hear much about the Kha-

According to al-Kalkashandi a branch of the tribe of Khafādja was settled in lower Egypt. Among the poets of this tribe in ancient time was Tawba b. al-Ḥumayir, celebrated on account of his love for Laila al-Akhyaṭiya and the ele-
gies which the latter composed upon his death when he was killed in a raid. Bibliography: Nāfiqī, Niḥyayt al-ʿArab, ed. Cairo 1342, ii. 340; al-Kalkashandi, Ni-
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similar corps being sent by the governor of al-

Kuṭa. They pursued the fleeing Khafādja along, the river Euphrates as far as Raḥbat al-Sharqi where the Khafādja made a stand as they could not retreat any farther and in the fight which ensued Qaṣṣar, the governor of al-Ḥilla, was slain while Arghāshī, the governor of al-Kūfa, took refuge with the governor of Raḥba. Khafādja then pleaded for forgiveness stating that they were constrained to fight by being driven to extremities. Their excuse was accepted as the warīr Ibn Hubaira who had marched out against them saw the futility of pursu-
ing them into the desert. The last time we hear of the Khafādja is in the year 588 (1193) when they came to the assistance of the town of al-

Bayra when the latter was threatened by the tribe of ʿĀmir. In addition to the events narrated we find that Khafādja were among the Arab tribes who assisted in the siege of Tiberias in 507 (1113) when Baldwin had taken refuge there after an unsuccessful raid upon Ḥalab. According to al-Kalkashandi a branch of the tribe of Khafādja was settled in lower Egypt. Among the poets of this tribe in ancient time was Tawba b. al-Ḥumayir, celebrated on account of his love for Laila al-Akhyaṭiya and the ele-
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both of which cities he was entertained by the men of learning. His expectations in Constantinople were not fulfilled and he gave vent to his anger in the literary outburst which he entitled al-Maṣāmaṭ al-Rūmiya. Instead of making matters easier for himself he incurred the hatred of the Muṭṭi Yaḥyā b. Zakārīya and was ordered to leave the city immediately. As an acknowledgment of his worth as a scholar he received the appointment of an ordinary Kāfī at Cairo, but he seems to have devoted his remaining years to study and the composition of his works. He died in Cairo on Tuesday the 12th of Ramadān 1069 (3 June 1659). Al-Khaḍafdi enumerates most of his works in his autobiography, many of them of considerable size, while he himself tells us that many of his treatises were never collected in book-form. His most extensive work, a commentary upon the Tāfīr of al-Bahlawi which he entitled ḳāfiya al-Kāfī, and which has been printed in Cairo in four large volumes. The work follows the usual tedious method of explanation almost every word, and for traditions and explanations he adduces the statements of a large number of other authors who have treated upon the same subject. The same is the case with his second largest work, a commentary upon the Shīfa of the Kāfī Ṭyāfī, entitled Naṣīm al-Riyāḍ, which we have seen, he studied under Ӏbrāhīm al-Akami. Here again he quotes all accessible literature dealing with the biography of the Prophet, giving the various authorities who have recorded the same traditions. Neither of these works contain anything original, because the subject did not call for anything new. All that was expected of the author was to bring together every detail on his subject he could find in the works on hand. This work has also been printed in Constantinople 1267 A.H. in four volumes. Of an entirely different nature are his two biographical works: Khabāya ʿl-Zawiyā fi mā fi ʿl-Ridād min al-Baḥṣiya and Khaṣūmat al-ʿAllāb wa-Nahdat al-Ḥayāt al-Dunyā. The titles prepare us for the style in which these two books are composed, the evil influence of the Yatimiyya, and the Shīra or of Imidd al-Din is in both works apparent; we get instead of biographies an exuberance of servility without any noteworthy information and in most cases we can only infer that the persons named lived during, or shortly before, the time of the author, but the arrangement according to countries gives us the information where the persons lived. For biographical details both works are useless. We get however a fair amount of contemporary poetry to enable us to judge to what miserable depth the art of rhyming had sunk. While the first named work existed only in manuscript, the Ruhāna has been printed three times in Cairo (1273, 1294 and 1306), which shows us that the work is appreciated in Egypt. The most valuable portion of this work is an autobiography of the author (in which he has omitted to state when and where he was born) and the Maṣāmaṭ al-Rūmiya which is directed against the learned men of Constantinople. The autobiography has furnished the material for the account of his life above and in the work of al-Muḥibbi. Of more value are his Tiwāṣ al-Muḍājilī and his Shīfa al-Alī. The former is a work of the class called anāfi in 50 sessions (muṣaffa), and he tells us in the introduction that Ibn al-Shadairi, Ibn al-Hādīb, al-Kālī or even Ṭaḥlab would acknowledge its excellence if they were able to see the book. Its value consists in having preserved extracts of older works now apparently lost or undiscovered. It is interesting to find him quote from the Kītab al-Maṣāni of al-Uṣūndināni (printed in Damascus 1340), the Miḥāl of Ibn Ḥazm, the Fihrīr of Ibn Nādir or the Ṣanīḥ of al-Zubair Ibn Bakktār, considering how rare manuscripts of these books are. The book is in fact a curious collection of odd information from all sorts of sources. Apparently there are two editions of this book, one Cairo 1284, and a second without date printed in Taṣta. The Shīfa al-Alī fi mā fi Kuṭāl ar-Raḥīm min al-Daḥīlī is, as indicated by the title, a work dealing with words of foreign origin in the Arabic language. The author has used for this purpose the Muṣarrāb of al-Djawālāki [q.v.] and similar works, but is not content with explaining, or simply mentioning, words of foreign origin, as he also gives ample specimens of vulgar errors in correct Arabic speech. Closely resembling this book is a commentary on the Durrat al-Ǧuswaal of al-Harīf, which has been printed together with the Durrat at Constantinople, in 1507. The author does not seldom corrects al-Harīf and frequently gives useful additional information and this work together with his Tiwāṣ are probably the best of his compositions. His Dīnān is mentioned by al-Muḥibbi and has actually been preserved in manuscript in Copenhagen, but my knowledge of his poetry is confined to what al-Muḥibbi quotes or he himself cites in his own work. It is not of a high standard, but his whole works are typical of his period and vividly reflect what we may expect from his contemporaries.
Khāyān al-Mulkī) about 1732–33. He was an intimate friend of Shāh Nawāz, the author of Muʿāṣir al-Umara (who was also a Ḥādīrābdī officer) (v. iii. 680 of the Bibl. Ind. ed. of that work, and Khwāfī Khān, ii. 678).

Khwāfī Khān wrote a history of the Indian branch of Timūrid dynasties, and called it Muntakhab al-Lūḥān (the Choice Compendium). It is a standard work and is much admired, especially by Orientals, for its style, and its accuracy and impartiality, though it is often too grandiloquent for western taste. Still, it is by far the most human and interesting of native histories of India, with the doubtful exception of Bāḍāūnī, and ought to have been translated long ago. After an introduction beginning with Turk b. Vaphiopulos, describing the origins, etc., of the Tartars and Mongols, it gives short biographies of Timūr, his third son, Mīrān Shāh, and the descendants of the latter, who were the emperor Bābur's ancestors. These are followed by a history of the emperors of Agra and Dīhli, beginning with Bāibur, of whom there is a tolerably full account, and ending with the beginning of the 14th year of Muḥammad Shāh. Bābur conquered India in 1526, and the 14th year of Muḥammad Shāh was 1732, so that the history covers a period of over 200 years. The last ten years of the history are given in a very abridged form. The most valuable parts of the work are the accounts of Shāh Djiānān and Awrangzēb, for both of whom the author had a high admiration. The history has been published in the Bibliotheca Indica (2 vols), but the edition is not complete, for it wants the first part or volume. This last, however, is very rare, and perhaps does not exist in its entirety. There is only a portion of it in the British Museum. The author refers to it in vol. i. p. 49 of the printed edition. Khwāfī Khān also wrote a history of the minor Muḥammadan dynasties of India, but this too has disappeared, though a small portion is preserved in MS. in the India Office Library (Eth., Cat., No. 407). It was apparently of little value, being mainly an abridgment of Farīṣtān.

The charm of Khwāfī Khān's history consists in his digressions and his frequent use of his own observations, and of information derived from his father and brother. He is a somewhat bigoted Muḥammadian, and he is too favourable to Shāh Djiānān and Awrangzēb. Thus he slurs over Awrangzēb's treacherous capture and subsequent execution of his younger brother, Murād Bakhsh. The capture he represents as a clever manoeuvre (it certainly was to the public advantage), but he is evidently half ashamed of it, for he declines to give the particulars. In his account of Murād Bakhsh's attempt at escape, and his trial and execution, which he got from his father, he does not plainly set down Awrangzēb's responsibility, and continues to pay him a compliment for his generosity in rewarding the man who declined to prosecute Murād for the murder of his father. He also deals lightly with Shāh Djiānān's conduct to Khurasan, and to his competitors for the throne, and says nothing about his debaucheries. Still he is far more honest than Abu 'l-Faḍl. His accounts of Shāh Shāh and Jahangīr are very fair, and in the latter of them there is a very interesting account of Nūr Djiānān. He says he got it at Shirāt in 1695–96 from a very old man, who as a child had accompanied Nūr Djiānān's father on his journey from Persia to Afghanistan and India. Khwāfī Khān too, though, like Tacitus, he may tell us too much about emperors and their wars, does not omit the more interesting subject of plague, and famine, and of internal administration.

Bibliography: Elliot-Dowson, History of India, vii. (which contains a very full abstract, by Prof. Dowson, of the 2nd volume of Khwāfī Khān); Colonel Lees, Materials for the History of India (Hertford 1868), p. 57 sq.; there is a manuscript translation of vol. i. by Major Gordon in the British Museum (Add. 26, 617).

Khafīf, the eleventh metre in Arabic prosody, containing three 'arūḍ and five 'darb:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fā'ilātun mustaf'īlun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fā'ilātun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ː           ː   ː   ː   ː   ː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fā'il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ː           ː   ː   ː   ː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fā'ilā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ː           ː   ː   ː   ː   ː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mustaf'īlun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ː           ː   ː   ː   ː   ː   ː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mustaf'il</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

All the feet lose their second quiescent letter when the last quiescent letter of the preceding foot is retained and vice versa. The foot fā'ilātun used as first 'darb is often changed to fā'ilātun (= mustaf'īlun) by toshīth. (Moh. Ben Chenefi)

Khībar, an oasis on the road from al-Medina to Syria, 100 miles from al-Medina. Doughty, who stayed in Khībar from November, 1877, to March, 1878, describes Khībar as a group of wide, well-watered valleys, which lie together like a palm leaf on the edge of the lava region (Harra) and all run into one main valley. These valleys are gashes in the lava-field, beneath which lies sandstone which, wherever it crops out, has a burned and discoloured appearance. The oasis lies 2,800 feet above sea level and Doughty puts its population at about 1,000 souls. The bottoms of the valleys are covered with rushes, the springs have a slightly sulphurous taste and are surrounded by incrustations of salt. In spite of its many palm trees, the land has an uninviting aspect and great stretches of ground lie untilled. The commanding height of al-Ḥijān, illustrated by Doughty on p. 104, consists of a great basalt rock, which rises out of the Wādi Zaidiya, like an erratic block. The modern settlement is built on its south side. The length of the walled platform of the citadel and their race the breadth 90. The floor is deep mould, which may be partly of the old clay buildings that have melted away upon the uneven rock. In digging, potsherds, broken glass, eggshells and horse-dung are brought to light. Two ancient pyramids of clay bricks, the lower parts of which are cased with stone, enclose an ancient covered well, which was used to supply the garrison.

The name Khībar is said by Yākūt to have meant "castle" in the language of the Jews who lived there; according to Sahl b. Muḥammad al-Kāthīb, it took its name from Khībar b. Kānīya b. Mahālīl, who was the first to settle there. The ancient Khībar, according to the old Arab geographers, lay in a very fertile district which was rich in palms and luxurious cornfields, and consisted of seven castles: Ḥīn Nā'im, Ḥīn Abī 'l-Ḥāgari, Ḥiṣn al-Shāk, Ḥiṣn al-Ν̄atāh, Ḥiṣn al-Sulālān, Ḥiṣn Wātī and Ḥiṣn al-Kāthība. Al-Bakrī further mentions Ḥiṣn Wādja in, in which there were palms and other trees and which later belonged to the Prophet Muḥammad, and the greatest stronghold
of Khaibar, Ḥiṣn al-Kamīs, which ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib, afterwards Caliph, captured, the lower part of which was occupied by the mosque of the Prophet (also called al-Manzila), built after the conquest by Ḥāfa b. Mūsā. The spring in the fort of al-Shīkā was called al-Ḥammā. The Prophet called it Riʿimat al-Malāʾika ("the angels' share"). It was much admired for the remarkable properties of its water. Two-thirds of its water flowed away in one channel and the other third in another. Both had the same direction. If three pieces of wood or three dates were thrown into the well, two went into the channel containing two-thirds and one into the other. No one could take more than a third of the spring water out of this channel and if anyone stood in the channel which took two-thirds in order to send more water into the smaller channel, the water overwhelmed him and flowed past him so that none went back into the second channel to increase its share.

The oldest mention of Khaibar in inscriptions is in the bilingual inscription of 568 A.D. of Ḥarrān in al-Ladja, of which E. Littmann has given the correct interpretation in "Osservazioni sulle iscrizioni di Ḥarrān e di Zibid", in R.S.O. 1911/12, iv. 193 sqq. The inscription bears the date in the year 463 (viz. of the era of Boṣra), a year after the expedition of Khaibar. According to Ibn Kantaib, Khaibar al-Maṣūrif, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 513, this expedition took place under King Al-Harith b. Abī Shamir (al-Ḥarīth b. Dhīlā), who reigned from 528 to 569/570 A.D.; the inscription now gives as the exact date for this event the year 567 A.D. Much more serious for the history of Khaibar and its Jewish population was Muḥammad's campaign; he set out in the beginning of the year 7 A.H. (628 A.D.) with about 1600 men against Khaibar, presumably with the object of obliterating the unfavourable impression made by the treaty of Ḥudaybiyya and of offering his followers a rich substitute for the booty they had lost. The Jews of Khaibar had apparently prepared for Muḥammad's attack, but they were not united among themselves. The population was not a solid body living together within one area, but was scattered among the surrounding valleys, where they occupied in little groups fortified houses in the midst of rich palm groves and cornfields. Every settlement had its own particular name. The valley was divided into three territories, called al-Ṭanāţa, al-Shīkā and al-Katiba. This strategically unfavourable mode of settlement was from the first a disadvantage, and the position of the Khaibaris became still more precarious when their allies, the Ghatafān, left them in the lurch, and their 4000 auxiliaries left Khaibar for their homes. Muḥammad thus had a free hand. The advance was carried out by night and in the morning the Khaibaris found the Muslim troops confronting them; they had taken up their quarters behind the Ḥarrā on the edge of the desert. It took Muḥammad about six weeks to conquer the whole district of Khaibar. Every strong house, every fortified place had to be besieged and stormed, frequently after heavy fighting. The castle of al-Ṭanāţa was the first to be attacked; it resisted for over a week. In revenge for the stubborn defence, Muḥammad's men had destroyed the splendid palm-trees around it and cut down 400 trees were destroyed before the politic Abū Bakr put a stop to further devastation. Al-Shīkā was next stormed. The successes of the Muslims had already much weakened the strength of the defence. Treachery had placed al-Ṭanāţa in the hands of the Prophet, and as engines of war had also been captured, in the use of which a Jewish traitor instructed the Muslims, the resistance of the Jews diminished considerably so that the other strongholds fell more quickly. The last bulwark of the defence, al-Katiba, fell almost without resistance. The Jews were sentenced to lose all their property and were left with their wives and children and allowed to till the soil which they had previously owned. Half of the harvest had to be handed over to Muḥammad. This tribute continued to be paid until the Caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Ṭhaḥād drove the Jews out of Arabia. Later, however, the Jews returned in certain numbers to Khaibar. Benjamin of Tudela says that in 1173 A.D. a Jewish colony, 1150 strong, which must have formed a closed community, lived in Khaibar. Not too much stress need be laid on his statement. Burckhardt, who saw Khaibar at the beginning of the sixteenth century, mentions that the Jewish community once settled here had entirely disappeared.


(Adolf Grohmann)

KHAIBAR PASS, the northern route between Afghanistan and India, leading from Kabul to Peshawar. The pass runs from Dākka to Djamrud and is about thirty-three miles long, its centre lying in 34° 6' N. and 71° 5' E. Its highest point, LāzART Kotal, is 5378 feet above sea-level. Alexander the Great probably sent the division of his army under Hephaestion and Perdiccas through the Khaibar, while he himself followed the northern bank of the Kābul river and crossed the Kūnar valley into Badgawar and Sawād. Mahommed of Ghazna used the pass only once, when he marched to meet Dījaḍān in the Peshawar valley. The Amir Timūr used it when invading India in 1398 and when retiring in 1399. Bābur invaded India by the pass in 1525 and Humayun, after capturing Kabul, on his return from exile, traversed it. It was the route regularly used by Akbar and his successors between the Pândjāb and Kābul, and Dījaḍānabad, first fortified by Humayun, was named after Akbar. The pass was held in Mughal times, as now, by the Afrīdīs, a turbulent tribe extremely jealous of foreign encroachment, and in the reign of Akbar their hostility was accentuated by the establishment in this region of a heretical and fanatical sect, the Rawshanīāyā ṣ (q.v.), who commanded the adherence of the Afrīdīs, Yusufozais, and other tribes. In 1586, on the death of Mirza Muḥammad Amin, ruler of Kābul and younger brother of Akbar, Rāḏā Mān Singh, marching to take possession of Kābul in the name of the emperor, was obliged to force the pass, an operation which was performed with
difficulty, and the suppression of the Rawshan Vilas cost much blood and treasure. In 1672 the tribes attacked Muhammad Amin Khan Awrangzeh, governor of Kabul, in the pass, annihilated his army of 40,000 men and captured the women and children and the imperial treasure and elephants.

Nadir Shah, advancing by it to attack Nasir Khan Qajar of Khorasan, was opposed by the Moghul government, but led his cavalry through Bazar, took Nasir Khan by surprise, and overthrew him near Djamrud. Ahmad Shahr Durrani and Shah Zamun used the pass on several occasions when invading the Panjaub.

The British first used the Khairab Pass in 1839 in the attempt to establish Shahr Shudja in Afghani-nastan, and have since used it on several occasions, more than once suffering disasters in traversing it.

By the treaty of Gandamak (1879) between the British and the Amir Yaqub Khan, the control of the pass was left to the former, who have exercised it latterly by maintaining an experienced political officer for the pass, at whose disposal are the Afghan Pasis, a corps of military officers of Afridis under British officers. The arrangement has not been entirely satisfactory, but was probably the best that could be made with so turbulent and treacherous a tribe.

**Bibliography:** al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje; Mirkhvard, Ravzat al-Safar; Mihajed-i Siradj al-Dzjdzjani, Tabarqati Nastiri, transl. H. G. Raverty; Shara al-Din Yazdi, Zafarnama; Zahir al-Din Muhammad Babor, Babornama, ed. Mrs. A. S. Beveridge, Gob Mem. Ser., vol. i., Index; Abu'l-Faql, Akhbarnama; Djalangiri, Tavukti Djalangiri, transl. by A. Rogers, ed. H. Beveridge, London 1900, Index; Abul-Hamid Lahib, Badshahnama; Khoji Khan, Mundilkhah al-Lubak, ed. Mawlavi Kabir al-Din Ahmad, cont. by T. W. Haig (Bibl. Ind. Series); N. Manucci, Storia de Mogor, transl. W. Irvine; Imperial Gazetteer of India; The Cambridge History of India, vol. i. (T. W. Haig)

**KHAIR AL-DIN**, an important Turkish architect of the time of Sultan Wali Bayazid II (1481-1512). As a result of the habit of Turkish historians of mentioning favourably every pious founder, writer of chronograms, and calligrapher, but only exceptionally giving the name of the creator of a masterpiece of architecture, or even giving any biographical notice of him, Khair al-Din's activities are veiled in obscurity. It is certain, however, that he is a historical personality. He is said to have been the son of the architect Ustaf Murad. His masterpiece is the Bayazid Mosque, a magnificent piece of architecture, in Constantinople (built between 1493 and 1497) (cf. also see Evliya, Siyabat-nama, Stambul 1314, i. 142; Sa'id al-Din, Tadji al-Tawarih, Stambul 1279, ii. 211; von Hammer, Constantinopolis und der Bosporus, Pest 1822, i. 402; Sklaratos Byzantios, Konstantinopolis, Athens 1890, i. 421).

The popular Turkish view of the importance of Khair al-Din, who is considered the real founder of Ottoman architecture and is approached by none of his predecessors (Eliaa b. Ali, Mehmend al-Madjaan, Mest, etc.) or his successors (M. Kasim, Kanai al-Din) down to Sinan [q. v.], the greatest of Ottoman architects and one of the greatest of the world's architects, is confirmed by his masterpiece, the Bayazid Mosque.

The scheme of two half-domes supporting the principal dome is modelled, it is true, on the Aya Sofia, but dominated by another conception and deliberately developed further. Fious legends are associated with the building.

There is also a little mosque by which bears his name, not far from the türbe of the Grand Vizier Sinan Paşa at Parmak Kapusu. His tomb is in front of this türbe.

**Bibliography:** Haase, Husain, Hadiyet al-Dervens, Stambul 1281, i. 286; M. Thomas, Siddiqui, 'Othman, ii. 314; Sa's, Terkhebir el-Bunyan, Stambul 1315, p. 5; Suritl, Die Baukunst Konstantinopels, Berlin 1912, p. 64, 76; E. Diez, Die Kunst der Islamischen Volker, Berlin 1915, p. 133; Babinger, Quellen zur Osmanischen Künstlergeschichte, Jahrbuch der Asiatischen Kunst, Leipzig 1924, p. 34.

(Th. Menzel)

**KHAIR AL-DIN** (Barbarossa), the famous Turkish corsair and Beylerbey of Algiers and brother of the Arudj [q. v.]. In spite of the statement to the contrary by Haedo, it is he who is referred to by a contemporary by the name of Barbarossa (Barbarossa, Aenobarbus) in the diplomatic correspondence of the French court. Born at Metellina about 1483 he was at first a pirate under the command of his brother and acquired a great reputation for skill and bravery. When Arudj set out on his expedition against Tlemcen he gave his brother the governorship of Algiers, which he had just taken. When the news of the death of Arudj arrived, Khair al-Din was unanimously chosen by his companions to succeed him. But he soon found himself in a very critical position. The towns of Cherchell and Ténès had rebelled; the Kabyls of Ibn al-Kahl, king of Kako, deserted him; Abu Hammak, king of Tlemcen, had invaded the Chelef valley; finally the Algerians, tired of the cruelty of the Turks, were only waiting an opportunity to throw off the yoke. Thus feeling unable to cope with all his opponents with the forces at his command, Barbarossa sought the help of Selim, Sultan of Constantinople. He paid homage to him for the lands conquered by his brother and promised to pay him tribute. The Sultan, who had just conquered Egypt (1517), eagerly seized this opportunity of placing the shores of the Western Mediterranean under his sway. He accepted the homage of Khair al-Din and gave him the ranks of Pasha and Beylerbey (cf. the article NEG). At the same time he sent 2,000 men with artillery to Algiers and authorised the enrolment of volunteers, to whom he granted the rights and privileges of the Janissaries [q. v.]. 4,000 Turks or Levantines thus came to serve under Barbarossa and formed the ogluk or militia of Algiers.

The arrival of these reinforcements enabled Khair al-Din to meet the dangers which threatened him. A conspiracy of the Algerians who had agreed with the tribemen to set fire to the fleet and massacre the Turks was put down and the heads of the ringleaders fixed on the gates of the Pasha's palace. A Spanish force under Ugo de Moncade was repulsed. The Christians landing at the mouth of the Harass (al-Harash) had taken up their position on the heights of Kudyat al-Sabun and began to bombard the town. Barbarossa succeeded in driving them out of their entrenchments by attacking their ships drawn up on the shore and forced them to re-embark (1519). In the east, on the other hand, he was less fortunate. A Tunisian
army was advancing on Algiers. He set out against that and met the enemy in Kabylia on the territory of the Flisat Ummellit. In the middle of the battle, the Sultan of Külê, secretly won over by the Hafsid Sulţan, deserted and turned against the Turks. The latter were cut to pieces and Barbarossa, with his road to Algiers barred, had to take refuge in Dijelijel [q.v.]. During this time the Kabylas laid waste Mitidja and occupied Algiers, while Cherchell and Tenès again revolted (1520).

Taking refuge in Dijelijel, Khair al-Din began to reconstitute his army and to gather reinforcements. He resumed his old trade of pirate and from 1520 to 1525 he ravaged the coasts of the western Mediterranean, amassing considerable booty and gathering numerous adventurers around him. He was soon strong enough to seize Collo (1521), Bône (1522) and Constantine. He also secured the help of the natives of Little Kabylia by making an alliance with ABD al-Áziz, the Ban of the first Abbas, rival of the Sultan of Külê. Thus he was able in 1525 to resume the offensive against Ibn al-Kađić. Defeated at the Wâdî Bugdare and again at the pass of the Bani Sâghâ, the latter was killed by his own soldiers. Mitidja and Algiers were reoccupied by the Turks, the rebel chiefs of Tenès and Cherchell were put to death and the inhabitants of Constantine, who had in 1527 expelled their kađić and massacred the Turkish garrison, severely punished. Finally, Jusain, who had succeeded Ibn al-Kađić, tendered his submission and agreed to pay an annual tribute (1528).

The capture of Peñón, a Spanish stronghold located on an island within cannon-shot of Algiers, completed the devastation of Turkish power. In the beginning of May, 1529, Barbarossa began the bombardment of this fortress, the garrison of which the Spaniards had neglected to strengthen; it was taken by storm on May 27 when there were only 25 unwounded defenders left. Khair al-Din had the governor, Don Martín de Vargas, put to death and ordered the outer walls of Peñón to be razed to the ground. The debris was used to build a mole joining the island to the mainland. This jetty protected the roadway from the west winds and enabled the corsairs to leave their ships in shelter which they had previously been obliged to draw up on shore during bad weather. This created the harbour of Algiers, a refuge and base for operations for the Barbary fleets. Disturbed by this new success of Khair al-Din, the Spaniards tried to secure a landing place on the coast by taking Cherchell, but the expedition led against this town by Andreas Doria ended in failure (1531).

Now definitely instilled in Algiers, Barbarossa set himself to increase still further his military forces by organising, alongside of the Janissaries, whose insolence and insubordination rendered them dangerous, bodies of troops personally devoted to him. He formed a guard of 500 renegades, for the most part Spaniards, raised 7,000 to 8,000 Greeks and Albanians, enrolled Kabyls, and entrusted the command of this new force and of his artillery to ra’iz, his old companions. He thus found himself able to undertake an expedition against Tunis, with the inhabitants of which he had long had secret negotiations. By taking this town he wished to anticipate the designs of the Spaniards and secure himself the control of all the eastern shore of Africa. The Sulţan, to whom he had communicated his plans, gave him the required au-

thorisation and sent him auxiliaries. Leaving the government of Algiers to his khâlifa, Hasan Agha, Barbarossa entered Tunisia, seized La Goulette (Aug. 16, 1534) and from there advanced on Tunis. Malây Hasan, who tried to stop him, was defeated in a battle fought near the gate of Al-Djazira, and had to flee (Aug. 18). The Turks entered Tunis and plundered the whole town. The rest of the kingdom submitted without resistance.

Barbarossa’s success was, however, of short duration. In the month of June, 1535, Charles V appeared on the coast of Tunis. On July 14th the Spaniards captured La Goulette and on the 20th became masters of Tunis. The Christian slaves, whom Khair al-Din had refused to massacre, burst their chains and joined the attackers. Fearing he might be surrounded by the enemy, the Beleyberi fell back on Bône, where he found his fleet, which he had sent there on receiving news of the preparation of the Spanish expedition. From there he sailed for the Balearic Islands, sacked Mahon and brought back to Algiers 6,000 captives and considerable booty.

A little later Khair al-Din went to Constantino-

nople by order of Sultan Suleimân, who in 1533 had appointed him Kapudân Paşa and wished to entrust him with the direction of the naval campaign against Charles V and his allies. He had not to return to Algiers, where authority was exercised in his name by a khâlifa. At Constanti-
nople Barbarossa devoted himself entirely to his new office. He reorganised and increased the Tur-
kish fleet and took an active part personally in the naval war. In 1537 he ravaged the coasts of Apulia, tried unsuccessfully to take Brindisi by surprise and took part in the siege of Corfu. Not having been able to capture the latter place, he turned his attention to the Venetian possessions in the Aegean Sea and occupied the islands of the Dodecanese. The following year he completed the conquest of the Archipelago by taking Scáros, Scyros and Carpathos; he then made a descent on the island of Crete where he burned two towns and 80 villages. In the Ionian Sea he gained two victories over Andreas Doria at Teneza and St. Maura. In 1539, with the help of his lieutenants, Hasan Corso and Dragut, he recaptured Castelnuovo in the Gulf of Cattaro and Malvafia and Nauplia in the Morea. The Venetians were forced to submit to concluding a truce with the Porte.

These successes secured Barbarossa a position of preponderating influence in Constantinople. Honoured by the friendship of the Sulţan, he persuaded Suleimân to continue the war in the Western Mediterranean. He was also decidedly in favour of the French alliance. From 1534 he had been in correspondence with Francis I; after the conclusion of the treaty of Baghâdâd, he was the confidant of the ambassadors of the most Christian King and leader of the French party in the Grand Diván. Charles V endeavoured to win him over to his cause by secretly offering to recognise him as sovereign of the whole of North Africa on payment of a small tribute. Barbarossa, while pretending to lend himself to the Emperor’s plans, at once revealed them to the Sulţan. The disastrous end of Charles V’s expedition to Algiers (1541) still further increased Khair al-Din’s prestige, although he had taken no share at all in the defence of the town.

Hostilities suspended since the truce of Nice (1538), began again between Francis I and Charles
V (1541). Barbarossa was given command of the Turkish fleet, which was to co-operate with the French forces. In 1543 he operated along the Italian coasts, took Reggio, ravaged the coasts of Calabria, then, after joining the Duc d'Enghien at Marseilles, laid siege to Nice. The town of Villefranche, where the Turks landed, was taken and destroyed. Nice was occupied but the castle could not be taken. The arrival of Doria's fleet and the Marquis del Vasto's army forced the Turks to withdraw. A portion of their fleet wintered at Toulon while the rest went along the Catanonian coast and sacked Palamos and Rosas. The peace of Crespy (1544) ending the war, Khair al-Din returned to the Levant, pillaging the islands and shores of Tuscany and the Kingdom of Naples.

After this campaign, Barbarossa retired to Constantiopole. He had great wealth in this town, including several palaces on the Bosporus.

He died on July 4, 1546, at the age of 63, and was buried in the mosque which he had built at Büyükk Dere (see the art. DERE). By his will he ordered all his slaves under 15 years old to be liberated and left the others, 800 in number, to the Sultan as well as 30 armed galleys. The rest of his wealth was divided between his nephew and his son Hasan, whose mother was a Moresco, and who on three different occasions filled the office of governor of Algiers (see the art. HASAN PASHA, above, ii. 281).

Barbarossa was not only a successful corsair and a remarkable soldier; he also possessed certain of the qualities of a statesman, an indestructible resolution which enabled him to surmount the greatest difficulties, and a very accurate sense of the conditions on which the establishment of a permanent state in Barbary depended. He understood that Turkish rule, being restricted to the coast, naturally tended to be precarious; he therefore tried to make himself master of the interior. His ambition was to unite in one vast state, of which he would be the sovereign, the whole of North Africa. If circumstances did not permit him to realise this plan, at least he finished the work begun by 'Arûdî and he may be regarded as the real founder of the Regency of Algiers.

interest. It has been a municipality since 1869. Trade has suffered owing to the rise in importance of Sītāpur, but there is a daily market, and a small industry in cotton printing survives.

At the time of Akbar the Sarkar of Khaibād consisted of 22 mahals or parganas, but many of these lay in the present districts of Kheri and Hardol. This pargana consisted of the Southern portion of the country lying between the Gond and Zanjān rivers. It was bouned on the North by Hargram, on the east by Lakpur and Biswan, on the west by Sītāpur and Ramkot, on the South-east by Machhrehta, and on the South-east by Purnagar. The whole of the Southern half of the pargana is a high lying tract with a high soil and good natural drainage producing in favourable seasons fine crops of wheat. North of the road from Sītāpur to Khaibād and from the latter to Biswan, the land lies low, the soil being stiffer and liable to flooding from numerous jhils and water-courses. However, the cultivation is generally poor, the majority of the tenants belong to the inferior cultivating classes, the holdings are large, the cattle are wretched, many of the landlords are heavily in debt and means of irrigation are deficient.


KHAIIRPUR, a state in Sindh, lying between 26° 10' and 27° 40' N. and 68° 20' and 70° 14' E. The state has no separate history until the fall of the Kalhora dynasty of Sindh in 1583 when Mir Fateh Ali Khan Talpur, a Balāt chief, aspired to the rule of Sindh. Subsequently his nephew, Mir Sahib, Khan Talpur, founded the Khairpur branch of the family. His dominions at first consisted of the town of Khairpur and its environs, but he enlarged them by conquest and intrigue until they extended to Sahzalkot and Kashmir on the North, to the Djasalmer desert on the East, and to the borders of Kachch Gandāva on the West. About 1813, during the troubles attending the establishment of the Bārkāli dynasty in Kābul, the Mīrs withheld the tribute which they had hitherto paid to the rulers of Afgāhānīstān and became virtually independent, but jealousy between Rustom, who had expelled his father Sahrab in 1811, and his brother Ali Murād, contributed to the crisis which led to British intervention. In 1832 the individuality of the state as a political entity was recognised by the British government, which secured for itself the use of the Indus and the roads of Sindh. The Mīrs of Sind were able to prevent the passage of British troops through their dominions during the first Afghan war, but Ali Murād of Khairpur supported the British policy, and after the battles of Mianān and Daba, his state retained its political existence.


KHAIIRULLAH EFENDI, an important Turkish historian. Born in Constantinople, of a family which had over 160 years unbroken service with the Sultan, the son of the famous 'Abd al-Haḳḳ Efendi (d. 1830/1854), a theologian and physician, who was thrice Ser-i Atība and from 1269 bore the honorary title Ra's al-ʻUlāmā), he began by following in his father's footsteps and adopted a theological career, his first office being Molla of Sinyara (1258/1842). Later he turned to science, medicine and education. In 1265 he became a member of the Board of Education, the Agricultural Council and a second president of the Academy of Sciences (Emţjuven-i Dāmār), president of various learned bodies, and filled high offices in the newly formed Ministry of Education, was for long head of the School of Medicine, till in 1281 (1864) he was sent as ambassador to Teherān, where he died suddenly in 1283 (1866).

His sons are 'Abd al-Haḳḳ Hāmīd, the most important poet and dramatist of the new Turki, and 'Abd al-Khālīk Naṣīḥī, who have both served their country as ambassadors and envoys.

Khairullāh left a large number of historical, geographical, medical, scientific and agricultural works, the latter of which are mainly translations; some of them have been printed, like the Mutʿal-i Dāmār, which was published in Europe (Auropa seqatāt-nāmē). But his importance rests on his work as a historian. Besides the Waḥṣī-ī Miṣrīye, he wrote a history, planned on a grand scale, of the Ottoman empire entitled Dewlet-i 'Aliye-i ʻOthmānīye Türkāhī, which began to appear almost at the same time as the excellent 12 volume history by the historian of the empire, Ahmed Djedwet [q.v.], which covers the period 1774—1826.

Khairullāh Efendi aims at giving the whole of Turkish history in one continuous work. He is the first Turkish historian to attempt to deal with Turkish history in its place in the world's history, in contrast to the method hitherto in vogue among Ottoman annalists of limiting themselves entirely to Turkish sources and affairs; he was actually the first to succeed to some degree in producing a Türkīh-ı Umūrî, a world history. With the exception of von Hammer-Purgstall's Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches, it is almost entirely French sources that he uses, as is obvious from the fact that he always writes foreign names as they are pronounced in French. At the same time he does not infrequently draws upon hitherto not fully utilised Turkish sources.

A special volume is devoted to the introduction and to the early history of the Ottoman empire, the period before the reign of ʻOthmān I. The further work is planned to have a volume to the period of each Sultan. At the same time a survey of contemporary Muslim and Christian rulers is always given. The treatment of the material is no longer annalistic but pragmatic. In comparison to the inflated style of early historians, his language is simple, clear and intelligible. His history is also meritously distinguished from those of his predecessors by the absence of bias and the lack of any fanatical hatred of non-Muslim culture and conditions.

Of his history, 15 volumes in all appeared (1271—1281 = 1853—1864), from ʻOthmān I to the time of Ahmed I (1603—1617), when death put a stop to his work. 'Ali Shewki, inspector in the Dāmār-i Aşkām-i Adīye, then tried to finish the book, of which Khairullāh had written barely half; but of the three further volumes, 16—18, appeared (1289—1302 = 1872—1875) bringing the work to the time of Sultan Ibrāhīm (1639—1648).

Al-Khayyāṭ, Vahīyā b. Gūzlih Abī ʿAllī, an Arab astrologer, pupil of Māghālīh, often mentioned in Christian writers of the middle ages under the name of Albohali. The exact dates of his birth and death are unknown but the latter may be put with some certainty between 210 and 230 (825-844). Of his works there still survive: Kitāb Sirr al-Anāl (“the book of the secret of action”) dealing mainly with the formulation of astrological questions etc. (in Berlin); Kitāb al-Ma-wālid (“book of births”) (in Oxford and Cairo (?)). The book on births was translated into Latin by Plato of Tivoli (1136) and later again (1153) by Joh. Hispalensis; the latter translation was printed in Nürnberg in 1546 with the title: Albohali Arabici astrologi antiquissimi ac clarissimi de iudiciis natiuitatum liber unus octoac non editus. Cum privilegio D. Ioanni Shenore concotto. In place of Albohali simply we find in MSS. also Albohali Alghihān, Albohali Alchehit, Albenhahit, etc.


Khākān, Arabic transcription of the Turkish regal title Қa̱ḵan. We find this title already borne by the rulers of the earliest people who called themselves Ҭurḵ (“victors” A.D.) and it had been taken by them from their predecessors, the “genuine Avars” or the Ӡan-ʃan of the Chinese (Kiesling in Pauly-Wissowa, Real- enzyklopädie, vii. 2587, s.v. H奴nny; also among the so-called Pseudo-Avars, cf. e.g. Frahm, Hist. Grac., iv. 233). In one of the oldest inscriptions, that of Tonuyuk (W. Radloff, Die alttürkischen Inschrüften der Mongolen, 2nd Series, St. Petersburg 1899), we find Қān alongside of Қa̱ḵan with the same meaning, perhaps only the result of a contraction of Қa̱ḵan. Later a distinction was made between Қān or Ӡan and Қa̱ḵan or Khākan and Khākan used in the meaning of “King of Khāns”, like the Persian ʃāh-ʃāh; this we find as early as the fourth (xii.) century in Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥawramī, ʿAttāfī all-ʿUmān, ed. van Vloten, Leiden 1895, p. 120; the word Қān which appears in the Mongol period and was not used later has the same significance Khākan is still regarded as the Turkish national title کاکان and has been used quite recently by champions of the nationalist idea in Turkey in preference to Sultan and Khalifat.

(W. Barthold.)

Khākan, (See Faṭḥ al-Shāh).

Khākan (Afḍal al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Ḥaṣīkī, named Khākan), a Persian poet, born at Gandja (Elizavetpol) in 1500 (1165-1167), the son of a carpenter, Ṭalī, and a Persian weaver whom he had purchased from a slave-dealer. His grandfather was a weaver. His uncle Kāfī b. ʿUḥmnā, who was his benefactor, was a physician and druggist. He was taken charge of by him when his father, sunk in poverty, abandoned him. Trained in the school of Abu ʿl-ʿUsh, the latter accepted him as his son-in-law and obtained from the Khāzan Manūchehr permission to give him the taḵallūṯ of Khākan. Later they quarrelled most bitterly and exchanged scathing epigrams (between 538 and 549). It was then that the poet quitted his native town to go to Bekū where the Shirvān-šāh Af簧sān, son of Manūchehr, was settled. Obtaining, not without difficulty, permission to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca he was well received on his return by the governor of Mosul, Djmāl al-Dīn, which earned him the disfavour of his patron and imprisonment in the fortress of Shirmān. Retiring to Tībrīz after the death of his wife, he died there probably in 1595 (1200) and was buried in the cemetery of Surkh Ab. Although the majority of his biographers say that his name was Ibrāhīm, it should be noted that his father called him Badū “the substitute” because he had come to replace the great mystic Ḥakīm Sanāʾī.

The Tawfīq al-Tawfīq = “Gift to the two Ṭawfīqs”, a poetical description of his journey to Bekū and back, was autographed at Agra by Mirzā Abu ʿl-Ḥasan (1855). His Dwān entitled Khulyiyyāt-i Khākānī was lithographed at Lucknow in 1293-1295 (2 vols.); it is arranged in the order of subjects: religious and moral poems, panegyrics, poems with refrains, funeral elegies, short mystical pieces, epigrams, satire; 44 ʃażdas were annotated at the beginning of the xth (xvi.) century by Muhammad b. Dāūd b. Shāhī-Abād (= Mandū, capital of Malwa in India).

Bibliography: N. von Khanikof, Memoire sur Қa̱ḵan, in the J. A., 1864, Series 6, vol. iv. 147 and v. (1865), p. 296; Muhammad ʿAflī, Luḥāb al-Abāb, ii. 221; Dawlat-shāh, Taqīkāt al-Shawārī, p. 78; J. von Hammer, Gesch. der schonen Künste Persiens, p. 125; Ričā Kuli-khan, Mīzām al-Fugūṣ, i. 200-213; Dīmā, Naṣḥāt al-Uns, p. 707; Sprenger, Cat. of the MSS. of the King of Oudh, p. 461; Milanges asiatiques, iii. 114; Ivanov, Descriptive Catalogue As. Soc. Bengol, Calcutta 1924, p. 201; (Cl. Huart).

Khākānī, a Persian poet of the second half of the xvi. century. His proper name was Muḥammad Bey and he was a descendant of Ayās Pashā [q.v.] who was Grand Wazir under Suleiman I. His life was not eventful; according to Sūdālī ʿOğlanı he was mutasfarraḵ and sandād-bey. Khākānī owes his fame to a not very long māḥsūmī called Hilyat al-Shāfī, written in a triposid ramāt-metāt. This poetry is a paraphrase of an Arabic text known as al-Ḥilya al-Navabiyya containing a traditional account of the prophet's personal appearance; each of the enumerated features is commented on by the poet in twelve to twenty bārs. According to Nādžī the poem has acquired the same degree of popularity as the Mawlid al-Shāfī of Suleiman Celebi. It was printed in Constantinople in 1264 and almost the whole
of it is incorporated in vol. iii. of Diya Paša's 
Karakâbât (Constantinople 1291). As Khâkânî states 
at the end of his poem, it was completed in 1007 
(1508–1599); at that time he had already 
atained a great age. The poet Djevri (d. 1056) 
rote a nasîra to the Hîlya. Of other poems by 
Khâkânî — he is said to have composed a 
Dvwân — are only known a mathâawi called 
Miyyâb al-Futûhât an a ghazal, both in a Gothâ 
MS. (Cat., p. 171). He died in 1015 (1606–1607) 
and is buried in the cemetery of the mosque of 
Edîrûn Kayf. 

Khâkânî is a striking figure in the transition 
period of Ottoman poetry after Bîkî, which is 
characterised by a growing taste for religious subjects. 

Bibliography: Mu’âllim Nâdî, Esmî, 
Istambol 1308, p. 130; do., Lughât Nâdî, 
p. 396; Bursâl Muhammed Tâhir, Ôkumânî mu’âliferi, 
Istambol 1338, ii. 163; Sigillêt- 
Ôkumânî, 1311, ii. 264; Gibbs, A History of 

(J. H. KRAMERS) 

Khâl (a.), maternal uncle. The khâl, al-
though, according to the traditional patriarchal 
family law in Arabia, not actually considered a 
relative of his sister’s son, was in popular regard 
equal to the latter’s father and his father’s rela-
tives. It usually took a good deal of effort to 
fight on the side of one’s paternal relatives against 
those of one’s mother, and to avenge the 
death of paternal relatives also on one’s khâl’s. Special 
stress was generally laid on the noble blood of 
one’s khâl’s because the sister’s children in par-
cular were considered to inherit all noble or 
ignoble traits of character of their khâl’s. 
The Muslim law, which, following the old Arab 
family law, paid most attention to paternal re-
liships, however forbids (on the authority of Sîra 
v. 27) the khâl to marry his sister’s daughter 
because the blood-relationship is too close. 

The word khâl, which often has the more 
general meaning of “maternal ancestor,” does not 
seem to go back to one of the original Semitic 
names of relationship. 

Bibliography: J. G. Wetzstein, in the Z. 
F. Ethnologie, xii. 244 sqq.; G. A. Wilken, Het 
matriarcaat by de oude Arabieren, Amsterdam 
1884, p. 31 sqq. (Ind. Gids, 1884, i. 116 sqq.; 
Verz. Geschriften, ii. 1 sqq.); W. Rob. Smith, 
Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia, Cam-
bridge 1885, p. 42, 58, 158, 165, 290; cf. Th. 
Noldeke’s review in the Z. D. M. G., 1886, xi. 
172; J. Wellhausen, Die Ehe bei den Arabern, 

(T. H. W. JUVNOLL) 

Khâl‘a. [See Khâl‘a.] 
Khâl‘ja, a Turkish tribe; the Turkish 
name was probably Khâl‘a (see below). As early as 
the fourth (tenth) century we find the Khâl‘ja 
living much farther south than the other Turks, 
in the southern part of the modern Afghanistan 
between Seistan and India. They are said even 
ten to have had their “in ancient times” (’kadi 
am ali‘yâm) (Al-Istakhri, ed. de Goeje, Bibl. 
Gogr. Arab., i. 254). The word is variously 
translated in Arabic manuscripts, e.g. al-Khâl‘ja 
in al-Istakhri, p. 281 infra; Khâl‘ja also in M. 
Longworth Dames (see the art. Afghanistan; 
J. Marquart (Erâniwâr, Berlin 1901, p. 253) con-
nects the Khâl‘ja with the Khlâdân of the By-
zanține sources and the Khlâdân of the anonymous 
Syriac narrative of the year 554–555 and pro-
cceeds to deduce an original pronunciation Khâl‘ja. 
In favour of Khâl‘ja we have two later Turkish 
popular etymologies, given in the legend of Oghuz 
Khân (cf. the art. Oguz) : kâl‘l “remain hungry!” 
in Rashid al-Din, text and translation in W. Rad-
lof, Kudatka Bilik, vol. i., St. Petersburg 1891, 
Introduction, p. xxii, and kâl‘l “remain open!” 
(imperative) in the anonymous legend preserved 
in the Uighur character (Klid, text p. 249, 
translation p. xiii.). The Khâl‘ja are never mentioned 
as an independent political unit but always as 
mercenaries or guards of foreign rulers; their 
leaders, like those of other Turkish guards, some-
times succeeded in founding independent dynasties, 
especially in India, where the pronunciation Khâl‘ja 
for Khâl‘ja prevails (see the articles following). 
It is usually assumed that the Afghan speaking 
Ghâlai of the present day in the upper valleys 
of the Tarânak, Arghandâb and Afgânan are 
Afghanised descendants of the Turkish Khâl‘ja. 
This assumption is disputed by some German 
Dames (cf. the art. Afghanistan and Ghâlai), 
although he grants that the Ghâlai have a good 
deal of Turkish blood. 

(W. BARTHOLOM) 

Khâlaf b. ’Abd al-Malik [q.v.]. [Seh Ibn 
Bashikwâl.] 

Khâlîli, the adjectival form of Khâlîad, the 
name of a Turkish tribe which migrated from 
Turkistan at a period which cannot be precisely 
ascertained and settled in Western Afghanistan. 
From long residence in this country they were 
regarded, even as early as the end of the thirteen 
century, when Firuz Khâlîli ascended the throne 
of Dîhil, as Afghans. They bore a high reputation 
as statesmen and soldiers, many served the early 
kings of Ghâzni and Ghûr, and many afterwards 
attracted to the highest rank in India, as, for in-
stance, Muhammad b. Bâkhûtâr, the conqueror of 
Bengal, Firuz, just mentioned, who founded the 
dynasty which reigned at Dîhil from 1290 to 
1320, and Ma’mûd, founder of the Khâlîli dynasty 
of Mîrâw (1436 to 1531), who was descended from 
Na’sir al-Din, the eldest brother of Firuz. The Lodi, 
the dynasty founded by Bâhlûl, which reigned at 
Dîhil from 1451 to 1526, were a clan of the 
Khâlîli. 
The late Major H. G. Raverty objected strongly, 
but with little apparent reason, to the identification 
of the Ghilaiz with the Khâlîli. Their identity 
cannot be conclusively established, but the Ghilaiz 
claim a Turkish descent and are found in 
the region where we should expect to find the 
Khâlîli; the corruption of the name is not unnatural 
among Afghans, and if the Ghilaiz are not Khâlîli it is 
difficult to say where the latter are to be sought, 
for no trace of them is found elsewhere, and there 
is no record of their extermination. 

Bibliography: Minhâdî-i Sîrâdî, Šâhâbâd Khlîli 
Nâîrî, and translation by H. G. Raverty, London, 
1873–1881; Niânâm al-Din Ahmad, Šâhâbâd-i Ab-
barî, and translation by B. Dhê (Bibl. Ind. Series, 
A.S. B.) ; Muhammad Khâsir Firâštî, Ghûlan-i 
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(T. W. HAIK) 

Khâlîli or Khâli, the dynasty of Dîhil, was 
found by Firuz al-Din Firuz (see Fârz 
Mâkî=i Khâlîlî) of the Ghilaiz or Khâli tribe 
of Afghanistan. A Turkish descent has been claimed for 
this tribe but they had long been domiciled in 
Afghanistan and were regarded as Afghans.
Ljâlî al-Dîn Frûz ascended the throne in Kilokhri on June 13, 1290, and was murdered at Karra by his nephew and son-in-law, ‘Alî al-Dîn Muhammad, on July 19, 1296. ‘Alî al-Dîn ascended the throne in Dîhilî on Oct. 3, 1296, and captured the two sons of ‘Alî al-Dîn Frûz, Arkuî Khan, governor of Mûltân, and Kâdî Khân, who had been proclaimed emperor in Dîhilî under the title of Rukî al-Dîn Ibrâhîm. Having blinded his two cousins and imprisoned their mother, ‘Alî al-Dîn punished with death and confiscation those amîrs who had deserted his uncle for himself. He annexed Gudjarât, Ranthambhîr, and Cîtor and in a series of expeditions to the Dakhân commanded by his favourite eunuch Kâfîr Hazâzînîrî, entitled Malik Nâ’îb, the Kingsdoms of Warangal and Dvâravatipûra were added to the empire. Five rebellions which occurred early in his reign were crushed with merciless severity and vigorous laws were issued with the object of suppressing disaffection. ‘Alî al-Dîn was dissuaded from a design of declaring himself a prophet and promulgating a new religion by the most famous decrees of his reign were those by which he regulated the price of all the commodities of life and its most disgraceful act was the massacre of between twenty and thirty thousand Mughul converts to Islâm, suspected of disaffection. After ‘Alî al-Dîn’s death on Jan. 2, 1316, the eunuch Malik Nâ’îb, having set aside Khîdîr Khân, the heir apparent, raised to the throne Shihâb al-Dîn ‘Umar, ‘Alî al-Dîn’s youngest son, a boy of five or six years of age, and attempted to blind Kâtûb al-Dîn Mubârak, the second son, but the prince corrupted the eunuch’s emissaries and persuaded them to murder their master. Kâtûb al-Dîn Mubârak then assumed the regency, and, on April 1, 1316, blinded and imprisoned his young brother and ascended the throne. The new emperor gained a fleeting popularity by the reversal of all his father’s harsher measures but his debauchery soon converted the love of his people into contempt. Like his father he was addicted to unnatural vice and was entirely ruled by Khusraw Khân, a vile favourite belonging to one of the scavenger castes of western India. A rebellion in Gudjarât was suppressed and in 1318 Kâtûb al-Dîn marched to Dewâgîrî, where he put to death Harpâl Dewa, son-in-law of Kâmânârâ and appointed a Muhammâdân governor to Dewâgîrî. On his return the emperor caused his three brothers, Khîdîr Khân, Shâdî Khân, and Shihâb al-Dîn ‘Umar, to be put to death, and, after scandalizing his court by indecent debauchery, proclaimed himself supreme pontiff and viceregent of God under the title of al-Wâhid bi-l-lah.

Khusraw Khân, who had been recalled from the Dakhân under a just suspicion of treasonable designs soon regained his master’s confidence and on April 14, 1320, caused him to be murdered in the palace and ascended the throne under the title of Nâsîr al-Dîn Khusraw. His brief reign was marked by the advancement of his profligate caste-fellows and an attempt to restore the predominance of Hinduism in Dîhilî, but Malik Fakhr al-Dîn Dâjwân fêd from the capital to Mûltân and persuaded his father, Ghâzî Malik, governor of that province, to march to Dîhilî for the purpose of restoring the supremacy of Islâm. Khusraw marched out to meet him but was defeated at Indârpat and captured and beheaded. On the following day, Sept. 6, 1320, Ghâzî Malik was proclaimed emperor under the title of Ghiyât al-Dîn Taghlagh Shâh. Bibliography: Diya’ al-Dîn Barâni, Túrijî-i Frûz: Shâh, Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Muhammad Kâsim Fârîsh, Ghiyât al-Dîn Ibrâhîmî, Bombay lithographed edition of 1832. (T. W. Hârî)

KHALÂDJI (Khalâdji), the dynasty of Mâlîwa, was founded in A.D. 1436 by Mâhmûd Khalâdji, of the same tribe as the Khalâdji of Dîhilî [q.v.]. Dîlawr Khân, founder of the Ghoji dynasty [q.v.], had been accompanied to Mâlîwa by his cousin, Malik Mughîth, and on the deposition of Dîlawr Khân’s grandson, Ghazînîn Khân (Mâhmûd Shâh), Mâhmûd offered the crown to his own father, Malik Mughîth, who declined it in favour of his son. Mâhmûd’s long reign was at first disturbed by rebellions on behalf of the late dynasty, fomented and supported by A’hâmad I of Gudjarât and the nânî of Cîtor. After the suppression of these he was engaged in almost continuous warfare with Gudjarât, Cîtor, Khânîsh, Khecâl, the Dakhân, Dîhilî and Dâjwânîr, and was usually successful, except against the Dakhân. He died on May 30, 1469, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Ghiyât al-Dîn, a mean-spirited monarch who occupied himself chiefly with the administration of his harem, for the management of which he drew up elaborate regulations, leaving the affairs of the kingdom in the hands of this advisers and, latterly, of his elder son, Nâsîr al-Dîn, whom he made his prime minister. The later years of his reign were troubled by quarrels between Nâsîr al-Dîn and his younger brother ‘Alî al-Dîn, who was supported by Râm Khurshîd, the mother of both princes. The King, too feeble to keep the peace, fell alternately under the influence of either faction until, in the autumn of 1500, Nâsîr al-Dîn captured Mândî, put his brother to death, imprisoned his mother, and seized the crown. A few months later Ghiyât al-Dîn died, poisoned, it was suspected, at the instigation of his son. Nâsîr al-Dîn’s warlike qualities found employment in the suppression of rebellions among his amîrs, due to his harshness and in war with the rânî Râyamal Simhâ of Cîtor. His later years were disgraced by debauchery and cruelty, his victims being chiefly his most faithful servants. He nominated his second son, Shihâb al-Dîn, his heir, passing over Shâhîb Khân, the eldest, but Shihâb al-Dîn rebelled and fled from his father’s wrath and Nâsîr al-Dîn was succeeded on his death (May 2, 1517) by his third son, who ascended the throne as Mâhmûd II. Mâhmûd was brave to rashness, but possessed no other virtue and was entirely devoid of political wisdom and administrative ability. He first forfeited the allegiance of his amîrs by the elevation of unworthy favourites, one of whom avenged his dismissal by proclaiming Mâhmûd’s eldest brother, Shâhîb Khân, king, under the title of Muhammad Shâh. Mâhmûd, the creature of a faction, reigned nominally and intermittently from 1510 to 1515, and issued coins. The adherents of Shihâb al-Dîn, Mâhmûd’s next elder brother, also rebelled and proclaimed their leader king, and on his death professed allegiance to his son, whom they styled Hâshang II. After the removal of these pretenders Mâhmûd II became a mere instrument in the hands of Medînî Râyâ, a Râjâpût whom he raised to the position of prime minister of the kingdom and who could command a force of 40,000 horse. He made spasmodic attempts to free himself from his ignominious
position but the result of these was to throw the Rājdūpis into the arms of Sangrama Simha, rājā of Citor, and Mālya would have become a Rājdūpis state but for the first apprehensions of a coalition of the neighbouring Muhammadan states. In 1517 Mahmūd II was compelled to implore the aid of Muẓaffār II of Gudjarāt against the Rājdūpis and, having been restored to his throne, reigned as a vassal of Gudjarāt. After his restoration Mahmūd II, aided by a contingent from Gudjarāt, made war against Citor but was totally defeated and made prisoner by the rānā Sangrama Simha, Bābūr’s Rānā Sangā, who, from motives of policy and generosity, restored him to his throne. His ingratitude to Sangrama’s son Ratan Singh and his foolish encouragement of a pretender to the throne of Gudjarāt, where Muẓaffār II had been succeeded by his son Bahādur II, drew on him the wrath of Bahādur Shāh, who invaded Mālya, captured Māndū, and imprisoned Mahmūd, who was slain on April 12, 1531, by his guards, who suspected an attempt at a rescue. The Khalīḍi dynasty ended with Mahmūd II, and Mālya became for a time a province of Gudjarāt.


(T. W. HAIG)

KHĀLĪD B. ʿABBĀS AL-KĀṢĪ, GOVERNOR OF THE ʿIRĀK. The Khāṣ family to which Khalīd belonged was a branch of the tribe of Badjā [q.v.]; his mother was a Christian. In the year 89 (709/710) or 91 (709/710) he was appointed governor of Mecca by the Caliph al-Walīd. He had obtained his head during the life time of al-Walīd; after the accession of Sulamīn in 96 (715), however, he was dismissed and lived in retirement until in Shawaʾl, 105 (March, 724), Hūsham appointed him successor of the governor ʿUmar b. Hubayra and gave him the administration of the whole of the ʿIrāk. He made his headquarters in Wāsīt. Khalīd had been brought up in the school of al-Hadīdī, and if he was not the latter’s equal in ruthlessness he was not lacking in vigour or tenacity. He did not hesitate to express his opinions freely to the Caliph, and, when Hūsham was planning to exclude his nephew al-Walīd from the succession in favour of his son Maslama, Khalīd vigorously resisted this scheme. In place of winning military glory he preferred to devote himself to peaceful activity and to the economic development of his province, and during his long tenure of office peace and quiet prevailed generally in the ʿIrāk. He paid special attention to the improvement of agriculture. The marshes were drained and great stretches of virgin soil made arable. With this fertile activity for the welfare of the state he was at the same time very successful in furthering his personal interests, and in time acquired immense riches, which, however, aroused the envy and dissatisfaction of the people. Other circumstances also contributed to make the doughy Khalīd unpopular. His predecessor in office, ʿUmar b. Hubayra, had been a prominent champion of Kašt opinions. Khalīd’s appointment as ʿUmar’s successor made the Kaštis regard him as an intruder who had driven ʿUmar from the position to which he was entitled, and from the first created an unsympathetic feeling against him, which in spite of his impartiality estranged him from the Kaštis and threw him closer to the Yamanis. His tolerance of members of other creeds brought upon him the charge of religious indiffer- ence. To please his mother he built a church in Kūfa and granted Christians and Jews generally the privilege of building churches and synagogues, and did not hesitate to give Zoroastrian posts in the government. Khalīd was very little troubled by rebels. In 119 (737) there was a conspiracy of a few Shīʿis led by al-Mughira b. Saʿīd in Kūfa, but it was promptly discovered and the culprits were publicly burned. In the same year a Khādirī named Bahamm b. Bīshr preached a rebellion against Khalīd in the neighbourhood of al-Mawṣil and twice defeated the troops sent against him, but was finally overcome. About the same time a certain Wasīr al-Salḥīṭyānī was active around Kūfa, where he was responsible for assassinations and incendiarism. When he fell into the hands of Khalīd he succeeded by his eloquence and his knowledge of the Kurʾān in so moving the gover- nor that the latter wished to spare him, but the Caliph was inexorable and had him executed forthwith. In the same year the Khādirī al-Salḥīṭ b. Shābīb collected a force and rendered the region of Djaḥbul on the Tigris unsafe, but was soon overcome and put to death with his followers.

Hīshām could not in the long run resist the pressure of Khalīd’s enemies. In 120 (738) he dismissed him and appointed in his place al-Ṭahṣifī, who had been for long governor of the province of Yaman. In Dju- mādī I (April-May, 738) the latter arrived in Kūfa. Khalīd was arrested and taken from Wāsīt to al-Hira, where he was kept in prison with his family for eighteen months, and had to defend himself against charges of embezzlement. After his release in Shawwāl, 121 (Sept.-Oct., 739), he wanted to go to the Caliph but was not allowed. In the following year he settled down in Damascus. Here also he was followed by the hatred of Wāṣuf but was able to live in freedom during the last years of Hīshām’s reign. He was again thrown into prison by Hīshām’s successor al-Walīd, and sold for a vast sum to his mortal enemy, Yūsuf, who had him brought to Kūfa and there tortured to death. Khalīd died in Muharram, 126 (Oct.-Nov., 743), and was buried in al-Hira. According to an- other statement, he was dead by Dhu’s-ʿL-Kaḍa, 125.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEN)

KHĀLĪD B. AL-WALĪD B. AL-MUGHIRA B. AL-MAṢĪḤI, A CONTEMPORARY OF MУHAMMAD AND A MUSLIM GENERAL. In the battle of Uhud,
where Khalid commanded the right wing of the Mekkan forces, and by his intervention at the right moment decided the battle in favour of the enemies of the Prophet he first displayed that brilliant talent for leadership to which in later days Islam owed so many successes. After Khalid had gone over to Islam with ‘Amr b. al-‘As at the beginning of the year 8 (629) he took part in the unsuccessful campaign against the Byzantines, and after the defeat at Mu‘a the town was with difficulty that he succeeded in bringing back the defeated army to Medina. As a reward the Prophet gave him the title of the ”Sword of God”; and in the same year he took part in the entry of the Muslims into Mecca. After the capitulation of the town he is said to have destroyed the sanctuary of the heathen goddess al-Uzza by order of Muhammad.

He was soon afterwards sent as ambassador to the Banu Qayyam [q.v.] and in Radjab of the next year (Oct./Nov., 630) he undertook an expedition against Uqaylid, the Christian king of Dumat al-Djandal (see the art. DUMI AL-SIRJÄN). At the beginning of the year 10 (summer of 631) Muhammad sent him to Najran to convert the Banu ‘Hantib b. Ka‘b to Islam, which was also done without bloodshed. In the following year he was sent by Abu Bakr against Tulaiba b. Khwaisil and defeated him at Baq‘ah (see the art. ASAD) and next turned his attention to the Banu Tamim who dwelled in the vicinity. One clan, which was under Malik b. Nukair, was at feud with the others. When the latter submitted, Malik also laid down his arms but was nevertheless taken prisoner and put to death and Khalid then married his widow. When an accusation was laid before the Caliph against Khalid he is said to have excused himself by saying that the incident was due to a misunderstanding. He said he had ordered warm clothing to be given to the prisoners and had therefore said to the soldiers: ”a‘żu aśrākum” which was interpreted by the Beduins to mean ”kill your prisoners”. In any case Abu Bakr was satisfied with administering a reprimand to him and kept him in office in spite of vigorous protests from Umar. Soon afterwards Khalid took the field against the fair ”Sword of God.” At Asr ‘Arab, on the frontier of al-Yaman, the Muslims were defeated and killed, whereupon his followers submitted (beginning of 12 = beginning of 632).

Khalid was then sent against the Persians. In Rabi‘ I, 12 (May–June, 633), or perhaps some months later he conquered al-Hira and soon afterwards occupied the whole Euphrates area. The Byzantines are said to have finally crossed the Euphrates and to have been defeated at al-Fir‘ad (Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da, 12 = Jan., 634) and in Muharram of the following year (March/April, 634) or, according to others, not till Rabi‘ II (June) Khalid set out on his campaign against Syria. In Djumada I or II (= summer of 634) the Byzantines were completely defeated at Adjudanin and retired to Damascus. Defeated again by Khalid, they were surrounded and besieged and in Radjab, 14 (Aug./Sept., 635), Damascus had finally to surrender. About the same time Khalid was deprived of the supreme command and replaced by Abu ‘Ubaidah b. al-Djarrä [q.v.] but continued to take part in the military operations in Syria. In the battle of the Yarmuk on Radjab 12, 15 (Aug. 20, 636), he commanded the cavalry and contributed largely to the victory of the Muslims. Himş was recaptured soon afterwards. Khalid then advanced against Khirbatin and after he defeated a Byzantine army under Minas the town had to surrender and Khalid took up his quarters here for the time. He was for a time governor of a part of Syria but was later dismissed. He died in Himş or Medina in the year 21 (641–642). A. Müller (Der Islam, i. 257) has admirably described him as follows: ”He was one of those characters whose military genius is the whole of their intellectual life; like Napoleon, he cared for nothing but war and did not want to learn anything else.”

Khalid Ziya, Uskaki-Zaide, the leading writer of prose and fiction in modern Turkish literature. Born in 1262 (1886) in Constantinople of a prominent family which came originally from the carpet town of Uskak — hence the epithet Uskak-zade — he spent his youth in Constantinople and Smyrna. He received his education from the Mechitarists in Smyrna. This laid the foundations of his love for and knowledge of the west. He translated industriously from the French and made literary attempts of his own. The collection called Nâbih in 6 volumes contains stories of his own alongside of translations from the most important French writers of fiction. In Constantinople he founded the paper called Neuriia and published the introduction (Melkat) to his never finished Gharibden Sharq Sisila Edebiye (Literary Current from West to East) in Constantinople in 1302 (1888). In Smyrna he continued his literary activity with the foundation of the periodical Khidżim in which his novel Sefile and his Menhüz Şîkrî (”Poems in Prose”) appeared in 1307 (1887); their unusual form aroused a storm of indignation until Ekrem defended them (specimens in Bikeran, Tureckj sbornik, St. Petersburg 1909).

In Smyrna he published in five series his Kaşik Kitaablâr which contain various literary productions, e.g. Bir Muhţerîmîn soû Yaprâkarî (”The Last Leaves of a Notebook”); Bir Islâmî-ajîbki Türkî- Muâshizat (”The Love-story of a Marriage”); Hi-kaya, Temâzi, his Menhüz Şîkrî reappeared in it) and Mezârîn Siser (”Voices from the Grave”), Smyrna 1307 (1889). At the same time he published a whole series of popularly written scientific treatises, with which he endeavoured to spread European learning, for example: Hamî ve-wa-fi Hamî; Kânîn ve-Fenn-i Wilâde; Mîb-hath al-Kîsî; Mîb-hath al-Ki-yâse; ’Imî Simâ; ’Imî Nûsûn; Hûsûb Oynularî; Hikicet Oynularî;
Bikalanın-i Kimiyá; Siniyáv-ı Kimiyá; and the anciodal Taht-i Leşif (1308). It is characteristic of his versatility that he even studied Sanskrit which, however, involved him in difficulties with the ever suspicious government.

Next came the novels Nümide ("The Hopeless Woman"), Constantinople 1311 (1893); Bir Ölınmın Deşteri ("The Diary of a dead Man"), Constantinople 1311, still bearing the imprint of the Alevi censor, which has been translated into German by Haiib Edib in 1918 (Romant des neuen Orient, Berlin), and Ferdi ve Şahvâri ("Ferdi & Co"), Constantinople 1812, dramatised by Ahmed Reâf, Constantinople 1325.

A new period began with his taking over the editorship in 1896 of the periodical Tercümet-i Fünumin to which he has contributed since the poet Tewfik Fikret [q.v.] gave an entirely new form. He opened the new period, which is known as the Tewfik Fikret and Khalid Ziya period, with his novel Mâvî ve-Siyâh ("Blue and Black") (1317 second ed.; 1338 eighth ed.). In the Edebiyât-i Düşûde Kütûb-kâhisi, a new foundation important for modern literature, appeared his next works, the novels Bir Yûnûş Türkiye ("The Story of a Summer") (Constantinople 1318) and Àkkî-Mevvâni ("Forbidden Love"), No. 4 (1316); with Mâvî ve-Siyâh his best novel, and the collection of short stories Selçuk Demet ("The Withered Wreath"), No. 8 (Constantinople 1317), from which a whole series of stories has been translated into French and German (Kaufmann, Türkische Erzählungen, Munich 1916; Die Neue Türkei, Constantinople 1306, etc.). The series ended with his Kitâb Hayâllar ("Broken Lives").

When, as a result of an article by H. Djâhid, the paper was suppressed, Khalid wrote absolutely nothing till the revolution and confined himself to his official work as first secretary to the Tobacco Regie. After the revolution he displayed a feverish literary activity and lent his collaboration to every possible periodical. The novel Nesli Àkkî ("The last Family") in the Sûâtî and many contributions to the İdâm, Tercümet-i Fünumin, Kesimî, Kitâb, Mehâsin etc. are evidence of this. At the same time for a certain period he lectured at the University of Constantinople on aesthetics and foreign literatures and wrote letters from Germany describing his travels there. His activities in this direction were interrupted by his appointment as first secretary to the palace of Sultan Mehemet V in 1909.

It came as a surprise when in 1918 he suddenly entered the ranks of dramatists with his Kullhas (1334), in which he demanded the same rights of divorce for women as for men. The play Furûtân (1334) is one of the adaptations of the "Francillon" of Dumas fils now so popular in Turkish literature.

A third drama, Fârî, is now announced as well as the new collections of stories: Bir Hikâyey-i Sûâtî (1338); Bir Şehr-i Kâyâyl and Onu bekleter, and works on literary history: Kınârde Kalmış and Eski Şehler.

With the poets Tewfik Fikret and Dînâbî Şehâb ed-Dinc, Khalîl Ziya is the principal founder of the modern occidentalising literature. Deliberately turning from the East, rejecting the eastern spirit and the Turkish Muslim attitude to life, they sought to create a modern literature with European affinities with the motto "art for art's sake", after the compulsion to write in Persian and Arabic forms had first been cast off by their predecessors.

With Serayî, Khalîl is the founder of the modern literary novel. He worked especially at the short story, of which he seems to be the greatest master. He is an artist and a poet. He is marked by great sentimentality and a pessimistic outlook, which only later gave place to a more reconciled attitude. He is an acute psychological observer. But he is an absolute Westerner, a Frenchman in Turkish dress. He has not unjustly been called the Turkish Alphonse Daudet. His writings contribute little to our knowledge of the Turks. In spite of the Levantine milieu he is strictly moral. He tells a story vividly and attractively; his style is clear. But his language is still markedly laden with Persian and Arabic words. He paid most attention to style, which owes much to him, for it is he who created the language of modern Turkish fiction. He has taken no part in the recent nationalist development in Turkey. He has remained the old cosmopolitan.

Bibliography: Kesimî Kitâb, Constantinople 1324, i. 202, 530, 755, ii. 251; Husein Djâhid, SâhÎâh, Constantinople 1326, Edebiye-i Düşûde Kutab-kâhisi, No. 23, p. 12; Daûûl, 1336, No. 11; Şehâb ed-Din Suleiman, Tercümet-i Fünum, Constantinople 1328, p. 159; Turerâ, Edebiyât-i Düşûde, Constantinople 1328; Newtâlu Milî, Constantinople 1330, p. 132 (Biography by M. Reeif); Râfi Nisîî, Haiib-i Edebiye, 1909—1922, Constantinople 1322, p. 348; Tercümet-i Fünumin, Mehâsin and other periodicals; P. Horn, Geschichte der türkischen Moderne, Leipzig 1902, p. 44; Edmond Fazy and Abdul Halim Memdouh, Anthologie d'Amour Turc, Paris 1909, p. 195; Osmanli Lâyûc, Constantinople 1319, i, No. 90 and 109; 1913, vi., No. 304; Wl. Girdlewski, Oterki po novoj osmanjskoi literature (Moskow 1912, Trudy po voskoreknedenni, xxxii), p. 133; M. Hartmann, Aus der neueren osmanischen Literatur, M.S.O.S.A., 1916, xix, 152; do., Dichter der neuen Türkei, Berlin 1919, No. 15, p. 60; A. Fischer and A. Mahieddin, Anthologie aus der neueren türkischen Literatur, Leipzig 1910, v. 7; Th. Menzel, Die türkische Literatur, in Himebeer-Kultur der Gegenwart, Die orientalischen Literaturen, Leipzig 1925, p. 310. (TH. MENZEL), AL-KHALIDAT, full form AL-DJAZIR EL-KHALIDAT, probably with allusion to the Arabic Khalîd, the Eternal Islands, are usually called Djaizir el-Sa'âda "Isles of Bliss" by the astronomers, a translation of the Greek Mistan Nôsu which probably came to the Arabs through the translation of Ptolemy. Al-Bakri also knew the Latin name Fortunatae Islands, in the form Forfüstâsh, they are the Canary Islands. Al-Beruni and al-Idrisi speak of six islands, al-Maâkari of seven, and al-Idrisi mentions two by name: Masfâhân and Lâghûs; according to Dozy and de Goeje, the former corresponds to the modern Tenerife, the latter probably to Gran Canaria. According to al-Beruni, they are nearly 200 parasangs (600 miles) from the mainland, while al-Maâkari says that on a clear day they are visible from Sarî. The meaning of the name given by al-Bakri points to the flourishing vegetation of the islands. "Trees and shrubs bring forth all kinds of pleasant fruits without it being necessary to plant or tend them, and the soil yields grain instead of weeds"
and valuable fragrant herbs instead of thorns". On Masafah as well as on Lughat there was a high pillarelike building (janam) of hewn stone, a hundred ells high and crowned by a figure of brass pointing backwards with his hand to the high seas. In Masafah this red column stood on a round hill; the column on Lughat could not be climbed. These were regarded as warnings to shipping to sail farther to the west (al-Maṣkari) says that each of the seven islands had a similar column; according to him, these were idols (qiblat) in the form of men. He distinguishes the Djà'za r al-Sa'da from the Djà'za r al-Khalīdīt and says that the former were of the latter and the first of them is Britain).

Among legendary features of the Arab descriptions of the islands we may mention the following. Since in Ptolemy and the Arab geographers who follow him the longitudes are calculated from the meridian of one of these islands (cf. the older European calculation from the meridian of Terro), it was thought that there was a race of astronomers living on the island; according to al-Maṣkari the "Christian Magicians" came from the Djà'za r al-Khalīdīt and lived as he were idol (qiblat) among them, he is apparently thinking of the Druids of the Celts. Dhu l-Karnain [q. v.], i.e. Alexander the Great, is said to have reached the Khalīdīt. The Himyarite Asad Abū Karib is said to have built the column in Masafah and he also is given the epithet Dhu l-Karnain. The column of Lughat is said to have been built by another South Arabian of the legendary past, Tuba Dhu l-Maraṭib; his tomb is said to exist there in a temple of marble and brilliantly coloured glass. The stories regarding "terrible wild beasts" on the island of Lughat given by the author of the "Book of Marvels", which al-Idrīsī hesitates to repeat, are probably the same as those given by al-Kawzānī on the authority of Abū Ḥanīfī al-Andalusi in his description of the Western Sea. There is also a description of a column on an island called Madīna al-Tarnī.

We may assume that there was trade (indirect) between the Canary Islands and Arabia even in the days of the ancient Arabs, if "andam "dragon's blood" came from Dracaena Dracaena; probably however, it came from another (Indian) plant.


**KHALIFA,** "successor, vicegerent", title of the supreme head of the Muslim community, the Imām [q. v.], as successor or vicegerent of the Prophet (khāliṣfat rasūl Allāh).

I. The word appears frequently both in the singular and the plural (khalīṣf, khalāfān) in the Karāf; in the latter case, the persons referred to are called "successors" as entering into the blessings enjoyed by their forefathers (e.g. vi. 165; xxvii. 15; xxvii. 15; xxvii. 63, used of the righteous; vii. 67, 72, of the idolatrous tribes of 'Ād and Thamīl); the singular is used of Adam (ii. 28), either as successor of the angels who lived on earth before him, or as representative of God, and of David (xxviii. 25). "We have made thee a Khalīf in the land; then judge between men with the truth, and follow not thy desires, lest they cause thee to err from the path of God." In none of these verses is there any clear indication that the word was intended to serve as the title of the successor of Muhammad. Muslim historians commonly assert that it was first so used by Abū Bakr; it is doubtful, however, whether he ever assumed it as a title (Cuvant, Annales d'Island, ii. 52 n.). But from the reign of 'Umar, it has been the common designation of the Amīr al-Mu'āminīn [q. v.]. The designation khāliṣfat rasūl Allāh, "successor of the apostle of God", implies assumption of the activities and privileges exercised by Muhammad, — with the exception of the prophetic function, which was believed to have ceased with him; the latter phrase, khāliṣfat Allāh, "vicegerent of God", implies a bolder claim, and is said to have excited the indignation of Abū Bakr, but it was used as early as 35 a.H. by Hassan b. Thabit in an elegy he wrote on the Khalīf Uṯmān (ed. H. Hirschfeld, xxx. 1, 9), and it became and is common under the 'Abbasids and later princes (Goldziher, Muḥammadische Studien, ii. 61).

In the course of Muslim history, however, the term Khalīfā has not been confined to such exalted reference. As early as the first century of the Hijra, it was used in the Aphrodito papyri for the ἀσκετοῦς or agent at the capital through whom the local official of the finance department made payments of taxes (Greek Papyri of the British Museum, vol. iv., pp. xxv. 35; C. H. Becker, Islamstudien, i. p. 257). It has frequently been used as a personal name (see Index to Tābarī, etc.). In the religious orders, especially among the Kādiyya, the Khalīfā is the delegate of the Shāikh of the order and is invested with a certain amount of his powers and represents him in countries remote from the parent zāwiya. Among the Tādiyya, the Khalīfā is the inheritor of the spiritual power (baraka) of the founder of the order, to whom alone the title Shāikh is applied (O. Depont and X. Coppolani, Les conférences religieuses marocaines, pp. 194—195, Alger 1897; L. Rinn, Moralistes et Khōnānum, p. 78, Alger 1884).

In the Mahdist movements, the Khalīfā is the successor of the Mahdī; Mir Dīlaw was thus Khalīfā of Sajīd Muḥammad Mahdī (ob. 910 A.H.) the founder of the Mahdīs [q. v.]; Abū Allāh was the Khalīfā of Muḥammad Ahmad the Mahdī of the 'Ādīn; and the son and successor of Ghalām Ahmad Kādiyyān (s. i. p. 206) is so described by his followers at the present day. Humber persons have also received this designation, e.g. in the household of the Emperor Bābūr, Khalīfā denoted a woman who exercised surveillance over other women-servants, (Gul-badan Begam, Humayūn-nama, translated by A. S. Beveridge, p. 136). In more modern times, the word Khalīfā was commonly applied in Turkey to any junior clerk in a public office (C. M. d'Osselin, Tableau général de l'Empire Ottoman, ii. 271), and is still a title in respect for an assistant teacher in a school. In Morocco it indicates the deputy of the governor of a city (L. Meakin, The Moorish Empire, p. 224). In modern India it is used even of such insignificant persons as a working tailor, a barber, a fencing master or a cook (H. A. Rose, Glossary of the

Encyclopédie de l'Islam, II.
Tribe and Caste of the Punjab, ii., p. 490. Lahore 1911). In Togo and neighbouring parts of W. Africa, alfa (or Khalifa) denotes a Muslim teacher or even Muhammadans generally (Die Welt des Islam, ii., p. 200).

Bibliography: In addition to the works already quoted, see Goldziher, Du sens propre des expressions Ombre de Dieu, pour désigner les chefs dans l'Islam (K. H. R., xxxv., 1897); D. S. Margoliouth, The sense of the title Khalifa (A Volume of Oriental Studies presented to Edward G. Browne, p. 322—328).

II. As a distinction can be drawn between the history of the Khalifa, or of the political institution of which the Khalifa was the head, and the theories connected with it, and as the former was chronologically prior, it is proposed here to deal with it first.

1. History. The immense wealth and power acquired by the early successors of Muhammad, through the conquest of such provinces of the Roman Empire as Syria and Egypt, together with the dominions of the Persian king, raised them to a status and a dignity which gave to the humble title they bore a new significance; so even before the Arab conquests had reached their limit, the Khalifa had become one of the most powerful and wealthy monarchs in the world. As Amir al-Mu'minin [q.v.] he was commander of these conquering armies and so he described himself on his coins; as Imām [q.v.], he took the foremost place in public worship and delivered the Khutbah [q.v.] in the mosque; as Khalifa he claimed from his Muslim subjects some of the reverence that had previously been paid to the founder of their faith. The civil war that broke out in the reign of 'Ali b. Abi Talib laid the foundation for those rival theories as to the qualifications of the Khalifa, which took definite shape in political and sectarian doctrines. Under the Umayyads [q.v.] the religious associations of the office of the Khalifa were not emphasised, though many of them kept up the practice of leading the public worship, for (with the exception of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Aziz [q.v.]) religious considerations appeared to have had little weight with them, and it was mainly in Medina that the foundations of Muslim dogma and the systematisation of the Shar'īa [q.v.] were laid, with little encouragement from the Khalifas in Damascus. The claim of the descendants of 'Ali to the leadership of the Muslim world found expression in the formation of the Shi'a party [q.v.], but for some generations their efforts met with no political success. The 'Abbasids [q.v.] came into power largely through their pretended support of 'Abd claims, and largely too through their professions of religious zeal. In Bagdad the Khalifas took on a new character; the Khalifa became a generous patron of the 'ulama' and laid emphasis upon his function as protector of the religion of Islam, and under his fostering care the capital took the place of Medina as the chief centre of theological activity, and the great schools of Law (see the art. right) received definite shape. The Khalifa was no longer regarded as a mere secular monarch, as many of the Umayyads had appeared to be in the eyes of devout Muslims, and the awe with which he was regarded was enhanced by the elaboration of court etiquette and ceremonial. The 'Abbasids, especially in their early days, had generally been readily accessible to their subjects; Mu'tawwiya [q.v.] had preserved in a great measure the frank, familiar manners of an Arab chief of pre-Islamic times, and moved among other Arab chiefs as prinses inter partes. But in the new capital, the traditions of the Persian monarchy reasserted themselves, the 'Abbasid sat on his throne in solemn majesty, surrounded by his guards, the executioner with drawn sword by his side. At the same time he emphasised the religious aspect of his office by wearing the mantle of the Prophet, and his relationship to the Prophet was reiterated in official documents and in the rubrications of eulogists and court flatterers.

From the 9th century onwards, the direct control of the Khalifa over the administration weakened in consequence of the increasing delegation of power to the Wāzir [q.v.] and the growing elaboration and efficiency of the government offices (v. art. Wāzir). About the same period began the decline of the temporal power of the Khalifa, in consequence of the break-up of the empire and the rise of independent principalities in the various provinces, till at last his authority hardly extended beyond the precincts of the city of Bagdad. Concurrently with this decline of his temporal power, increasing stress was laid on his position in the religious order, as Imām [q.v.] and as the defender of religion, and the persecution of heretics and of the adherents of non-Muslim faiths increased. By the year 946 all effective power had passed out of the hands of the Khalifa, and there were to be seen in Bagdad three personages who had held this high office, but now deposed and blinded were dependent for their livelihood upon charity. From this period until 1055 the Khalifa for the first time being was but a puppet in the hands of the Buways [q.v.] and the Seljūqs [q.v.] successively. But in spite of his entire lack of administrative authority, men could not forget the great position once held by his ancestors, and the important Khalifas was still regarded by theorists as the source of all authority and power in the Muslim world. Accordingly, there were to be found independent rulers who sought from him titles and diplomas of appointment, e.g. Mahmūd of Ghur [q.v.], when he renounced his allegiance to the Sāmānid prince in 997, received from the Khalifa recognition of his independent position, together with the titles Yāmīn al-dawla, Amin al-milla; and about a century later, Yūsuf b. Taṣṣifin, the founder of the Almōāvīd dynasty of Spain, received the title of Amir al-Muslimin from the Khalifa Mu'āwīya. When in 1175 Saladin [q.v.] assumed the sovereignty of Egypt and Syria, he was confirmed in this rank by the Khilifas, who sent him a diploma of investiture and robes of honour. The founder of the Rasālīd [q.v.] dynasty in the Yemen, Nūr al-Dīn 'Umar, likewise asked the Khalifa for the title of Sūltān and a diploma of investiture as his lieutenant, and Musta'sīm in 1235 sent a special envoy with the required document. This same Khalifa had in 1220 responded to the request of Iltutmish [q.v.], the Turkish ruler of Northern India, for the title of Sūltān and for confirmation in the possession of his dominion; and succeeding kings of Dīlīn continued to put the name of Musta'sīm, the last Khalifa of Bagdad, upon their coins for more than thirty years after this unfortunate prince had been put to death by the Mongols.

In contrast to this recognition of the Khalifas in Bagdad as the legitimate source of authority,
is the establishment of two rival Khalifs; in 928 'Abd al-Rahmân III of Spain assumed the title of Khalîfa, which continued to be borne by his descendants; these 'Omaysids of Spain, like their predecessors in Damascus, were Sunni's; but the Fatîmids of Egypt, whose founder styled himself Khalîfa first in Mahdiya in 909, were Shi'ite's, and were serious rivals to the 'Abbasids in Bagdad until the destruction of their dynasty by Saladin in 1171.

In 1258 Hulagu [q. v.] captured Bagdad and put to death the Khalîfa Mustâ'în, who perished, leaving behind him no heir. The catastrophe was without parallel in the history of Islam, and for the first time in the Islamic world found itself without a theoretical head whose name could be mentioned in the Khalîfa in the mosques on Fridays. Two members of the 'Abbasid family, who had escaped, the massacre in Bagdad, took refuge one after the other with the Manûlûk Sulûn of Egypt; the first, an uncle of Mustâ'în, was invited by Baibars [q. v.] to Cairo, and was there installed with great pomp as Khalîfa in 1261. Baibars is said to have conceived the idea of re-establishing the 'Abbasid dynasty in Bagdad and left Cairo with a large army, but after he had reached Damascus he persuaded the Khalîfa with only a small body of troops, which was destroyed by the Mongols on its way through the desert, and nothing more was ever heard of the Khalîfa. The second claimant arrived in Cairo in 1262 and was similarly installed as Khalîfa, but no attempt was made to repeat the rash experiment of regaining Bagdad, and the Khalîfa was kept a virtual prisoner in Cairo, though treated with outward marks of respect. For more than two centuries and half, his descendants one after another continued to hold this shadowy office in Cairo, dependent on the bounty of the Manûlûk Sulûn, who found the Khalîfa useful as lending a show of legitimacy to his rule. Each new Sulûn was ceremoniously installed by the Khalîfa, to whom he in turn paid allegiance. But not a single one of them (with the exception of Mustâ'în, who was made the plaything of rival political factions in 1412 and for six months was styled Sulûn) ever exercised any function of government or enjoyed any political power. Makriî [q. v.] describes his time among the nobles and officials, paying them visits to thank them for the dinners and entertainments to which they had invited him (Histoire d'Egypte, ed. E. Blochet, p. 76).

The rest of the Muslim world outside Egypt for most part ignored the existence of the 'Abbasid Khalîfa in Cairo. From the 13th century there had been Sunni Khalîfa in the Maghrib, and from time to time various princes in the eastern lands of the Muhammadan world assumed this title, Seljûks, Timûrs, Turkmans, Uzbek and Ottomans.

But a small number of independent princes, desiring to legitimate their claim to the obedience of their subjects, asked for formal recognition of their position and a grant of titles from the Khalîfa, e. g. the first two princes of the Ma'djarid dynasty in southern Persia (1313–1354); Muhammad ibn Tughlak (1325–1351) and his successor on the throne of Delhi, Firuz Shah (1351–1388); even Bayâzîd I [q. v.] is said to have applied in 1394 to the 'Abbasid Khalîfa in Cairo for a formal grant of the title of Sulûn (v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Osman. Reiches, i. 105), but doubt has been cast upon the accuracy of this report. For, from the latter part of the 14th century, when after the conquest of Adrianople, Philippopolis etc. his father, Musul I, was styled 'the chosen Khalîfa of God' (Firûdîn, i. 293), it became common for the Ottoman Sulûns, as for other contemporary Muhammadan potentates, to claim for themselves the Khalîfa and to find this claim recognised by their subjects and their correspondents in other lands. The qualification of belonging to the tribe of Kûsaî was ignored and sanction was sought for the usage in such verses of the Kur'ân as xxxvi. 25: 'We have made thee a Khalîfa on the earth'; and this and similar verses (e. g. vi. 165; xxx. 37) are constantly quoted in the diplomatic correspondence of the period. So when Selim [q. v.] made his victorious entry into Cairo in January, 1517, and made an end of the 'Abbasîd Khalîfa, by transporting the last representative of it, Mutawakkil, to Constantinople, he had already been accustomed to the use of the title Khalîfa as applied to himself, and to his ancestors for a century and a half. The legend that Mutawakkil made a formal transfer of his dignity to Selim was first published by Du Bos, 1707 (Tableau général de l'Empire Ottoman, i. 265–270, ed. 8vo, Paris, 1788–1824). None of the contemporary authorities who record the conquest of Egypt make any mention of such a transference of the office, and after the death of Selim, Mutawakkil was allowed to return to Egypt and was Khalîfa there until his death in 1543. For the next two centuries, there were only two Muhammadan potentates whose extent of territory and power could add dignity to the title of Khalîfa (in contrast to the indiscriminate use of it by insignificant princes) namely, the Ottoman Sultan and the Mughal Emperor in India. With the fall of the Mughal empire in the 18th century, the Ottoman Sultan became manifestly the greatest figure in the Muslim world; but even his power was being threatened by his aggressive neighbour on the north, and after the war with Russia (1768–1774) he was obliged to surrender territories on the north shore of the Black Sea and recognise the independence of the Tartars of the Crimea. Catherine the Great claimed the patronage of the Christians of the Orthodox Church dwelling in Ottoman territories, and the Ottoman plenipotentiaries who negotiated the treaty of Kûcûk Kainardji in 1774, took advantage of the title of Khalîfa, to make a similar claim for the Sultan, and get inserted in the treaty a clause asserting the religious authority of the Khalîfa over the Tartars who had ceased to owe him allegiance as a temporal sovereign. From this period onwards, it became a common error in Christian Europe to regard the Khalîfa as the spiritual head of all Muslims (just as the Pope is the spiritual head of all Catholics), and to credit him with the possession of spiritual authority over his co-religionists, though they might not owe him civil obedience as Sulûn of Turkey. There is reason to believe that this widespread error in Christian Europe reacted upon opinion in Turkey itself. Particularly in the reign of Sultan 'Abd al-Hamid II (1876–1909), emphasis was laid on his position as Khalîfa, and in the Constitution promulgated at the beginning of his reign it was affirmed that "I M. the Sultan, as Khalîfa, is the protector of the Muslim religion." He appears to have sent emissaries
to different parts of the Muhammadan world to encourage reverence for his own person as Khalifa, and his efforts met with a certain response, since thoughtful Muhammadans (and especially those whose minds were disturbed by the growing control of European Powers over the affairs of the Muhammadan world) recognised that Turkey was the only independent Muslim power left, which was of any account in the civilised world. But the dynamical and reactionary character of Abdul-Hamid's government, his cruel suppression of all liberal movements and all efforts for constitutional reform, alienated the more enlightened sections of his own subjects, and when he was deposed in 1909, the affairs of Turkey passed under the control of a body of men who had little sympathy with the Islamic spirit and realised the impossibility of reconciling an autocracy that claimed to be based on divine revelation with modern constitutional methods of government. In November, 1922, Turkey established a republic and abolished the Sultanate, leaving the Khalifa shorn of all temporal power; but it had not become clear what were to be the functions of the new Khalifah before, in March, 1924, his office was abolished altogether.

In the above account, attention has been confined to the history of Sunni Khalifahs which has played the most important part in Muhammadan history. The two other Sunni Khalifahs, that of Spain and that of the Maghrib, have been only of local importance, and did not inspire loyalty in any other parts of the Muhammadan world; nor has the assumption of the title Khalifa by some of the princes of Java been recognised except by their own subjects. Among the Shi'a, the attempts made from time to time to secure for the Alids a position of power and independence, met with but scant success, and the Fatimids [q. v.] of Egypt represented the only Shi'a Khalifah of any importance. In Persia the establishment of the Safawids [q. v.] dynasty in 1502 did not succeed in making Shi'ism the State religion in Persia until long after the doctrine of the hidden Imam had become a cardinal doctrine of the Sh'a faith in that country.

Bibliography: An enumeration of the sources for the history of the Khalifa would comprise the major part of the historical literature of the whole of the Muhammadan era. For the Arabic sources F. Wustenfeld, Die Geschichts- schreibung der Araber und ihre Werke, and C. Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Literatur may be consulted. Among the more important sources may be mentioned: Tabari, Annals; Ibn al-Azhir, Chronicon; al-Suyuti, Tarikh al-Khalifa and Hama al-Mahjarah; al-Maqari, al-Sulhia li-Mursiwa Dowl al-Malik (partly translated by Quaerevere in Historie des Sultanat Mustrebec); al-Maqrizi, Nafr fi Tarih Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, ed. F. Wustenfeld; Rashid al-Din, Qamari al-Tabarizzi; Ahmad Firdausi, Manzuri at-Saltana; Mustafa Sabri al-Tahiri, al-Nafir ila munirat al-matni min al-da'wah wa'refahiyati wa-luma'ama, Bahrul, 1924. Among European writers, Ca'ertini, Annali dell' Islam (Milano, 1905 sqq.); W. Weig, Geschichte der Chalifen; 5 vols. (1846—1862); E. Muller, Der Islam im Moslem und Abendland (1855—1887). W. Muir, The Caliphate; J. von Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches; A. de la Jonquière, Histoire de la conquête ottomane, 2nd ed. (Paris 1914); Oriente Moderno (Rome 1921 sqq.); C. A. Nallino, Le stori dei califfi di Colgato ottomana (Rome 1921 sqq.); R. Hartmann, Wesen u. Entst. des islam. Chalifats, 1 cykl. 1924; H. Ritter, Die Abschaffung des Khalifats (Arch. f. Politik und Geschichte, iii. 349 sqq., Berlin 1924). 2. Political Theory. As stated above, the theory of the Khalifah was largely an outgrowth from the political circumstances of early Muhammadan history, but speculation has elaborated many forms of the doctrine that have failed to secure for themselves expression in actual historical facts. Al-Shahristani (ed. Cureton, p. 12) says that no article of faith has given rise to such bloodshed and contention in every period of Muslim history as this. (a) The orthodox Sunni doctrine first found expression in the Hadith, which emphasised pre-eminently two essential characteristics of the Khalifa; one, that he must be of the tribe of the Quraysh (Qins al-'Uma'id, ill., No. 2583; vi, No. 3454, 3469), and the other, that he must receive unhesitating obedience from all the rebels against the Khalifah, rebels against God (id. ill., 2580, 2999, 3008). This claim on obedience to the despotic power of the Khalifah as a religious duty was impressed upon the faithful by the designations that were applied to him from an early date, — Khalifah of God, and Shadow of God upon earth. The first systematic exposition of the generally accepted doctrine is found in Mawardi's al-'Askar al-Sulhania (ed. R. Engler, Bonn 1853; Cairo 1298, 1327; trans. E. Fagnan, Alger 1845). Mawardi insists upon the following qualifications in a Khalifah: — membership of the tribe of Quraysh, male sex, full age, good character, freedom from physical or mental defects, competency in legal knowledge, administrative ability, and courage and energy in the defence of Muslim territory. In spite of the fact that the office became hereditary in two families successively, the Umayyad and the 'Abbasid, Mawardi maintained that it was elective, and was at pains to reconcile the doctrine of election with the historic fact that from the reign of Mu'awiya (661—680) [q. v.] Mawardi has not been a Khalifah who ever had nominated his successor. The fiction of election was preserved in the practice of hajja [q. v.], that is taking of the oath of allegiance, first by the nobles of the court and then by the general assembly before whom the new Khalifah was proclaimed. The functions of the Khalifah were defined by Mawardi as follows: the defence and maintenance of religion, the decision of legal disputes, the protection of the territory of Islam, the punishment of wrong-doers, the provision of troops for guarding the frontiers, the wages of ghilaf [q. v.] against those who refused to accept Islam or submit to Muslim rule. In the organisation and collection of taxes, the payment of salaries and the administration of public funds, the appointment of competent officials, and lastly, personal attention to the details of government. About three centuries later Ibn Khaldun [q. v.] approached the subject in a more critical spirit and discussed the institution of the Khalifah in his Muqaddima (chap. 25—8.); written between 1375 and 1379; he faced the facts of history and recognised that with the disappearance of the Arab supremacy there was nothing left of the Khalifah but the name. His account of the origin and purpose of the institution agrees with that given by
Mawardi; the Khalifa is the representative (wā'ilāt) of the Prophet, the exponent of the divinely-inspired law (shari'a), and his functions are the protection of religion and the government of the world; he must belong to the tribe of the Kurāsh and possess the other personal qualifications laid down by Mawardi. But there were other legists who frankly faced the fact that force had taken the place of theory in the Muslim world, and worked out a constitutional theory accordingly; of such writers Abū al-Dīn Ibn Dāvūd (q.v.) 733 = 1333) is a typical example; in his Tadhrīr al-Ahkhār fi Tadbīr Millat al-Islām (K. K. Hofbauer, Wien 1830), he lays it down that the Imām may obtain his office either by election or by force; in the latter case allegiance must be paid to an Imām who by force of arms seizes the office, and such usurpation is justified in consideration of the general advantage and unity of the Muslim community gained thereby (fol. 7–8). Another school of legists abandoned all such attempts to justify the fluctuating course of Muslim history and based their doctrine on the Hadith that the Kurāshīs endured for only thirty years, i.e. up to the death of 'Ali (Kanz, ii, No. 3512); this was the view of al-Nasafi (q.v.) (ob. 1337 = 1422) (see al-Iskandar, ed. Cureton, London 1851, p. 34), and it was adopted by the great Turkish jurist, Ibrāhīm Halāl (ob. 1549), whose Muṣāfaka l-Aḥkām became the authoritative code of Ottoman law. (6) The Shi'i theologians made the doctrine of the Imāmate a cardinal principle of faith; they laid stress on legitimacy, and confined the office of the Khalifāt not merely to the Kurāshī but still further to the family of 'Ali; with the exception of the Zaidīya (q.v.), they rejected the doctrine of election, and held that 'Ali was directly nominated by Muḥammad as his successor and that 'Ali's qualifications were inherited by his descendants, who were pre-ordained by God for this high office. Muḥammad is said to have communicated to 'Ali certain secret knowledge, which was in turn handed on to his son and was thus carried on from generation to generation; each Imām possesses superhuman qualities which raise him above the level of the rest of mankind, and he guides the faithful with infallible wisdom, and his decisions are absolute and final. According to some, 'Ali owed this superiority to a difference in his substance, for from the creation of Adam a divine light passed into the substance of one chosen descendant in each generation and has been present in 'Ali and in each one of the Imāms that succeeded him. The sectarian development of Shi'a doctrine was considerable, see art. EINX ASHARIVA, MUṢĀWILA, SAṬ'YA, ZAIĐYA. (Bibliography: al-Shāhrastānī, Kitāb al-Millat wa-l-Nihāl, p. 108 sqq.; Ibn Khalidin, Prolegomena, i, p. 400 sqq.). (7) The antithesis of Shi'i doctrine was taught by the Khwāridjīs (see KHARIJĪJTES), who so far from confining the office of Khalifā or Imām to any one tribe or family, held that no believer was eligible, even though he were a non-Arab or even a slave; they further separated themselves from other Muslims in maintaining that the existence of an Imām is not a matter of religious obligation and that at a particular time the community can fulfil all the obligations imposed upon them by their religion, and have an entirely legitimate form of civil administration, without any Imām being in existence at all; when, under special circumstances, it may be found convenient or necessary to have an Imām, then one may be elected, and if he is found to be in any way unsatisfactory, he may be deposed or put to death (al-Shāhrastānī, op. cit., i, p. 55 sqq.).

All the above classes of political theory found expression in some form or other of actual political organisation, but there were also statements of the doctrine of the Khalifāt that never emerged out of the sphere of speculation, especially those elaborated by thinkers of the Mu'ātāzila school e.g. that the office of Imām should not be filled during periods of civil war but only in times of peace; that no one could be Imām except with the unanimous consent of the whole Muslim community (al-Shāhrastānī, op. cit., p. 51; Goldziher, Helleinistischer Einfluss auf musulmānisches Chalifät-Theorien, in Der Islam, vi. 173–7).


(T. W. Arnold)
KHALIFA SHAH MUHAMMAD — AL-KHALIL.

KHALIFA SHAH MUHAMMAD, author of a collection of letters in Persian, entitled Djam' al-Rawani or Insha'i al-Khalifa, written while he was a student at Khamgil and collected by him at the request of his friends in 1085 (1674/5); it is much appreciated in India, and has been printed several times.

Bibliography: Rieu, Cat. of Pers. Ms. in the British Museum, i. 414.

AL-KHALIL, the ancient Hebron, so called after the "friend of God" (Ishqab), Abraham (see the art. BRHAIM), a town in South Palestine (also called Habbun, Habul or Madjid Ibrahim). It lay in an exceedingly fertile valley between the heights of the Jebel Naser (a reading uncertain) noted especially for its richness in fruits. According to a widely disseminated legend, Muhammad is said to have granted the four districts Habbun, al-Matun (so Yaght, ii. 1944 in Naseri Khusraw, Safarname, ed. Kaviani 1923, p. 46, tr. Matun, var. Maristan, Marsten; in al-Khalqashandi, Sheik al-Asha, ed. Cairo, xii. 120, c: al-Rufijan), Bait Aisin (i.e. Amun, St. John's, Gosp. iv. 23 etc., Khirbat Bit Ennun) and Bait Ibrahim as a gift to the Emperor Frederick I. Tamin al-Dari, a convert to Islam, and to his descendants. To Tamin al-Dari is traced the custom of having lamp-continuously lighted in the mosque (Clermont-Ganneau, Rec. d'Arch. Orient., vii. 216-220). Al-Khalil is still regarded as the snf of the Taminis. There is no doubt, however, that the alleged letter of the Prophet to Nu'am b. Awl al-Dari, the brother of Tamin, is a later forgery intended to confirm the claims of the Taminis (Caetani, Ant. dell' Islam, iii. 298, 9 A.D., § 69).

Our only information regarding the history of the town in the early centuries A.D. comes from a few scanty Frankish sources of which the most important is the full account of the examination of the sepulchral caves by Christian monks in the year 1199-1200 (publ. by Riant in the Acad. des Ins. et des Lettres, xiii. adv., v. 302-316). According to this (p. 309), the Jews showed the Arab invaders the entrance to the sanctuary, which had been walled up by the Byzantines, and in return they received permission to live on in peace in al-Khalil and to build a synagogue before the entrance to the "Abrahaim". When the Byzantine church was turned into the Marjid Ibrahim it cannot be exactly ascertained; the first information regarding the mosque is given by al-Ihtahi and Ibn Hawkal in the tenth century (not the eighth, as wrongly stated by La Strange, Palestine, p. 309, and Vincent, Hebron, p. 160). According to al-Mukaddas, who is the first to give us a more detailed description of al-Khalil, Abraham's tomb was covered over by a dome built in Muslim times (according to Maddur al-Din, translated by Sauvaire, i. 11, it was already done under the Umayyads). The tomb of Isaac was in a part covered over (mughffi) and Jacob's was on the opposite side. This writer is also the first to mention the rich endowments which were given to the sanctuary by pious princes from remote lands, and the hospitable reception and provision of oil and lentils which the Taminis in the hospice gave to pilgrims, but he thought for purely religious reasons it better to abstain from them. The Mughfiri theologian al-'Abhari of Fas (d. 1757 = 1356) later denounced the eating of these lentils (which were known as adas kalili) and issued a warning against praying inside the mosque (instead of in front of it), as the exact site of Abraham's grave was not known; he particularly vigorously against the dance associated with the "parade-music of al-Khalil" (from which comes the name khalil for a band intended for parades), which one could see every day in the sanctuary (Goldszmer, Z.D.P. V., 1894, xiv. 115-120; cf. also Schreiner, Z.D.M.G., iii. 51 sg.).

Half a century before the beginning of the Crusades Naseri Khusraw visited the town (1047), which in those days lay on the north side of the Haram only; in his journal he gives a minute description of the sanctuary. According to him, a gate was first made in the middle of the north-east wall by the Fatimid Caliph al-Mahdi (918 A.D.); the Haram had previously been three-walled. The covered part of the sanctuary (nakaera), which contained the graves (cenotaphs) of the patriarchs, was richly decorated and provided with numerous niches (mikhrab).

After the capture of al-Khalil by the Crusaders, Godfrey de Bouillon granted the seigneurie of Hebron in 1100 to Gerard d'Avesnes (5, 1102). He was followed by Hugo de Rebeque, Rohardus (Requesius), Gallerus Mahomet and lastly Baldwin, in whose time (in 1110) the explorations under the Crusades began, and the arches were discovered (see above). He and his successors were apparently simply governors of Hebron and were at first under the King of Jerusalem, and later, from about 1155, under the Lord of al-Karak. In 1168 Hebron was made a bishopric.

Ahl of Herat, who visited Jerusalem and al-Khalil in 567 (1171/1172), says that he made acquaintance of a Christian knight in Bait Laqm, who had once visited the sepulchral caves of the patriarchs, when a boy of thirteen, with his father; these, he said, were afterwards restored by command of King Bardawil (Baldwin II) by a knight named Djiwri b. Djurj (Godfrey, son of George). It was perhaps at King Baldwin II's invitation that the buildings around the Haram arose, in which the formerly flat roof of the masjidi was replaced by a system of arches with sloping roofs (Vincent, Hebron, p. 165).

After the battle of Hattin, al-Khalil again passed into the hands of the Arabs. According to a supposition of Maddur al-Din (ed. Balsi, p. 56 below; transl. Sauvaire, p. 16), which is not quite improbable (cf. Vincent, op. cit., p. 242-250), the minbar which stands beside the niche (mikhrab) in the Haram and, according to a still extant Kufic inscription, was originally donated by the Fatimid Caliph al-Mustansir in 484 (1091/1092) for the mausoleum (mashhad) of al-Husain b. 'Ali in 'Askalun, was brought to al-Khalil by order of Salh al-Din, father of Balaq (apparently in 1142 after his burning of the walls of 'Askalun) and put up in the Haram. (van Berchem in the Festschrift Edward Sachau gewidmet, Berlin 1915, p. 298-310; Vincent, Hebron, p. 219-250). After the death of Salh al-Din, al-Khalil passed to al-Nasir Daud al-Karak; it was, it is true, taken from him with other towns in 1244 by the armies of the Saltan al-Salih Ayub, but he recaptured it next year with the help of the Kharismis.

To this period belong two full descriptions of the Haram, that of Abu 'l-Fida' Ishtık al-Khalili, whose account written in 1351 was copied by al-Suyuti (1470) and Maddur al-Din (1496), and
that of Ibn Baṭṭuta, who visited al-Khalil in 1355.

The latter defends (as al-Idrisi had done previously [Z.D.P.J., viii. 127]) the correctness of the location of the tombs of the patriarchs (which others doubted, like his countryman al-Abd al-Qaddī; see above). Jāḥīṣ of Hebron quotes, giving a number of intermediate sources, the story handed down by an attendant of the mosque of Abraham, Muhammad b. Bakrān al-Khālidī (c. 520–952), which is already found in shorter forms in All Ḥarawi. In i: 1 a factor of the sanctuary, Abū Bakr al-Uṣayfī, relates how by his own request he was taken down to the sepulchral cave, to reach which he had to descend 72 steps. The details of the story, however, are obviously invented; the same Muhammad b. Bakrān is responsible for the fantastic “translation” by a learned Shāikh of Ḥalab of a still extant Greek inscription (Mader, Ḥīṣbīlī, p. 135, note 3; Vincent, Ḥībūn, p. 160 sq.).

The Mongols took the town in 1265 but were driven out by Baibars the same year. When Sulṭān, the latter visited al-Khalil in May, 1266. Jews and Christians were strictly forbidden access to the Haram (Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kont. des Jerusalem, p. 929). In 1267, by command of Baibars, the mosque was rebuilt and in 1268 the town (al-Muṣrif, transl. Quartomèze, ii. 48, 51) can only refer to quite unimportant structural alterations at the Haram (Vincent, op. cit., p. 190). Kālāṣīn (1279–1290), as we learn from his inscriptions in al-Khalil, also had decorations and facings for the walls made at different parts of the Haram.

Muḥājir al-Dīn gives us some further information regarding the embellishment and structural alterations in the sanctuary. The viceroy (naḥiyy) of Syria, Ṭankiz, Abu l-Fāid’s contemporary, had the four inner façades of the mosque covered with marble in 732 (1331/32) (van Berchem, Z.D.P.J., 1896, xix. 131 sq.). Considerable alterations took place under Sulṭān Baḥdān at the instigation of Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd ar-Razzāq, governor of Jerusalem and al-Khalil and guardian of the two sanctuaries. In 796 (1394), besides the erection of a new miḥrāb for Mālikīs in the Women’s Mosque, a new door was put on the west side of the former Byzantine church immediately behind the tomb of Abraham and another in the west wall of the Haram (in the so-called “Wall of Solomon”), the latter near the Maqṣūd of Joseph.

This was built by Sulṭān Naṣr ʿAbd ar-Razzāq (1347–61) beside the mediaeval Kaʿba (the later Madrasa). Its entrance lay opposite the “well of the eunuchs” (ʿAin al-Taṣwīṣī). Al-Yaghmūrī had a dome built over the Maqṣūd which was similar to those over the tombs within the Haram. In the reign of Sulṭān Muhammad al-Nāṣir (1293–1341), the Amir Sandjar al-Djāḥīṣī had already built the mosque against the north-east wall of the Haram in 718–720 (1318–1320), which is called Djāḥīṣīya after him, into the rocky sides of the Djabal al-Djāḥīṣī. The Manṣūk Sulṭāns al-Malik al-Aṣṣaf, al-Malik al-Qāsī (850–1454) and al-Zāhir Khoṣbāḏam (868–1426/27) were also benefactors of the Haram and the Djāḥīṣīya Mosque.

We know nothing further of the history of al-Khalil and the architectural history of its Haram after 901 (1496) when Muḥājir al-Dīn wrote his book; probably building in the Haram had finished about this time. From the 400 years of Turkish rule (1517–1917) we only possess a few inscriptions of the years 1068 (1599/1600) to 1313 (1895/1896), of ʿAbd al-Hamid, in Vincent, op. cit., p. 206, fig. 79), apart from the notices by western travellers.

The modern al-Khalil consists of the seven quarters Hāsīn el-Shēk (seil. Shēk ʿAbd Bakkā), Ḥāb el-Zāwiya, Ḥ. el-Kuzzāzin, Ḥ. al-ʿAkkābī, Ḥ. el-Ḥaram, Ḥ. el-Muṣṭirakīa and Ḥ. el-Ḳīṭān. It lies in the Wādī al-Khalil between the hills of al-Rumānīd, on which lay the ancient town, and Dār Abū l-Rumānī in the south-west and the Djiböl Dżabbīn in the north-east.

The number of its inhabitants was 17,000 in 1922, of whom 1,500 were Jews. Of the buildings in al-Khalil, the Haram is by far the most important. As a result of the fanatical suspicions of the people so far only a very few Europeans have managed to make a brief visit to its interior. It was not till the week from Jan. 26 to Feb. 2, 1920, that, after some preliminary work by Major Richard, the French archaeologist L. H. Vincent and Capt. E. J. H. Mackay were able to make a more detailed archaeological investigation and to survey the system of buildings. The tombs of the patriarchs, said, according to old tradition, to exist under the Haram, have so far not been discovered.

tative work is: L. H. Vincent and E. J. H. Mackay, Ḥībūn, le Haram el-Khalil, sculpture des Patriarcnes, Paris 1923, with Album (Pl. i.—xxviii.), (E. Honigmann).
He later lived retired from the world and devoted himself to study and work of piety. He made the pilgrimage to Mecca and spent some time in Medina.

From the legal point of view Khalil, like his model Ibn al-Hajib, represents the school of law a little affected by Shafi'i form, for the fusion of Egyptian and Maghribi tendencies in the Mamluk school. His Mukhtasar, in spite of its conciseness which verges on obscurity, is the manual of law which has been and still is most studied in Algeria. It was printed in Paris in 1855 and again and again till 1883; in 1900 a new edition was brought out in Paris by G. Delphine. E. Faggin has published "Concordances du Manuel de Droit, Algérie 1889, based on the edition of 1855. Dr. Perron has given a substantial translation in which he has combined the text and the commentary: "Précis de jurisprudence, ou Principes de droit public, civil et religieux, selon le rite malékite, Paris 1848–1854. Several partial translations have appeared since: Sautaya and Cherbonneau, Du Statut personnel et des successions, Paris 1873–1874; Seignette, Code musulman par Khalil, rite malékite. — Statut civil, Constantine 1878; Faggin, Le Dijhān ou Guerre Sainte, Algiers 1908; do., Mariage et répudiation, trad. avec comment., Algiers 1909. — Among other works by Khalil b. Ishāk are mentioned: 19. al-Tawqīrī, on the Muhākār, in front of the Khalīfah, Algiers, Bibl. Nat., No. 1077–1084; 20. Kīt. al-Mālikī, Bril. Mus., Cat., No. 259, ii., Bibl. Khed., Fikrist, iii. 184; 30. Mālikī al-Shāfi‘ī, Abī ‘Alā al-Mālikī, biography of his teacher, Bibl. Khed., Fikrist, v. 159; 40. Ḳād al-Muṣawwirī, wa-Tarbi‘ah, Bibl. Khed., Fikrist, vii. 278.


KHALIL, AL-MALIK AL-ASHMAR SULAYH AL-DIN, was the second son of Sulaym Kala‘un; his oldest brother is said to have been poisoned by him. As he lay under this suspicion and was also of an immoral and irreligious life (he was accused of pederasty and of drinking wine in maize), Kala‘un could not bring himself to sign Khalil’s appointment as heir-apparent. Nevertheless he was regarded as successor to the throne and acclaimed Sulaym on Kala‘un’s death in 689 (1290). His first official act was to dismiss the high officials of his father’s court with whom he was on bad terms and to prosecute them and appoint his favourites to important posts. But he continued his father’s foreign policy, the goal of which was the destruction of the Crusaders in Syria, and again took up the plan of besieging ‘Akka. After
careful preparation—he advanced with such superiority against the town that, in spite of a brave defence and help from Cyprus by sea, it could not hold out for long. The town itself was first taken, then the strongly fortified towers of the Knights which formed a kind of donjons within the town. The male inhabitants were put to death and the women and children deported to Egypt; but the women were later permitted to go to Cyprus. The other towns still in possession of the Crusaders offered no resistance worth mentioning. Stalis (Suliou), Tyre, Athish, Hafäa and Barutt fell. The last named alone he entered in triumph, as it was not destroyed like the others. The Christian inhabitants who did not migrate had to pay poll-tax. Rejoicings were held for a month in Damascus and the Sultan's name became celebrated as that of the final liberator of Syria for all time. Khalil afterwards planned a campaign against the Tartars in the 'Irak, but he contented himself with the occupation of their fortress Ka'at al-Rum. The King of Armenia, who felt himself threatened, ceded him several towns to secure peace. Khalil also carried out his father's plans for the fortification and development of the Syrian cities; in the citadels of Aleppo, Brälbek, Damascus and the great monastery of Tripoli he found himself as the builder of the fortress of Blakis.

He was after his fashion fanatical; for example he demanded that the Christian officials in Damascus should adopt Islam; those who refused were fined up to 1,000 dinars. He was personally hated by those around him for his evil life and his cruelty. He treated contemptuously even the highest officials, like his Atabeg Bairdar. The high dignitaries therefore could stand him no longer and conspired against his life in 693 (1293) and took advantage of a hunting expedition in Upper Egypt to murder him. This able and energetic prince thus only ruled four years. As he left only two daughters, the throne passed to his younger brother Muhammad [q.v.].

**Biography:**


(M. SOBERNHEIM)

**KHALIL EFENDI ZADE, MEHMET SAID EFENDI,** one of the 'ulamâ' of the time of Sultan Mahmûd I (1730—1754). He was the son of Birgili Khalil Efendi who was twice Kâdice of Anatolia. He studied under his father, then passed through the usual Madrasa course and beginning as molla of Veni-geber in 1135 (1722—1723) ascended the various steps of the 'ulamâ' hierarchy to the highest office. He was appointed Khalil al-Islâm in 1162 (1749) but was dismissed within ten months in 1750 on account of his stern and unyielding disposition and banished to Brusa where he died in 1168 (1754/55) and was buried near Amfî Sultan. He was regarded as a learned man, ready with his pen, and well fitted for all the claims of his office. Besides a commentary, he left the Turkish translation of a part of the history of 'Amîn (762). Of his sons and grandsons several were notable theologians.

**Biography:**


**KHALIL PASHA, name of three Turkish Grand Viziers.**

1. **CENDERELE KHALIL PASHA in the reign of Murad II, vide Cenderele.**

2. **KAŞAÇELI KHALIL PASHA, Grand Vizier under Ahmad I and Murad IV.** He was an Armenian by birth, born in a village called Ruswân in the neighbourhood of Kaisaria (Manadji Minâr; the statement of the Süleyî 1'Ôlhmân, ii. 286, that he came from Mu'âsh is incorrect). The date of his birth is not given but must be about 1560. Having been educated at court as îbîd dârî, he entered the corps of the falconers and became dârî chepî dârî, in which capacity he was in Sulân Muhammad's II immediate entourage during the Hungarian campaign of 1596. In 1616/1607 he became Agha of the Janissaries and fought bravely under the Grand Vizier Murad in the campaign against the rebels in Anatolia. Next year Khalil was appointed Kapudan Pasha as a successor of Hâfiz Ahmad Pasha [q.v.]. In this office he was very successful and captured many Maitese and Florentine ships, especially in 1616/1609, when he, in a battle with the Maitese near Cyprus, a big and famous galleon, called the Turk Aras (also known as "the red Galleon"). This success procured him the rank of vádär. From the end of 1020/1611 to 1022/1613 he was replaced as Kapudan by Öküz Muhammad Pasha, who had become dâmûd, but the latter, having been defeated by the Spanish when conveying Egyptian ships to Constantinople, Khalil was made Grand Admiral a second time. In 1023/1614 he went on an important expedition, first raided Malta, and then went to Tripoli in Africa, where he captured and killed a usurper called Safar Dîrî. During his admiralship Khalil displayed much diplomatic activity in trying to form a confederation against Spain with Holland and Morocco. Therefore he encouraged the Dutch to enter into relations with the Porte and became a powerful protector to the first Dutch ambassador Haga who arrived in 1612. Ever afterwards he showed himself a friend of the Dutch interests, although the planned confederation did not materialise.

In Muharram 1026/January 1617 he was appointed Grand Vizier in succession to Öküz Muhammad Paşa, who had been unsuccessful in the war against Persia and to the disappointment of the latter's Kâtim amir Atmakji Zade. In February of that year he showed his liberal-mindedness by protecting the Christian ambassadors in the capital against an attempt of the 'ulamâ' to impose the kharaj on them. In the same year the Austrian envoy Count Cernin after the failure of his negotiations left Constantinople and in Ramadân [September] preliminaries were signed with Poland at Buda. Khalil, however, seems to have been more interested in entertaining good relations with Venice, Holland, France and England and pacifying the Algerian corsairs. He did not play a prominent part in the course of events, when after Ahmed's I death (25 Dhu'l-Âdha 1026/22 Nov. 1617), Mustafa I was placed on the throne and three months afterwards replaced by 'Ohmânî II (1 Rab. I 1027/26 Feb. 1618). In the beginning of 1618 he took command of the army sent against Persia. The vanguard of the Turkish army was defeated in the plain of Sârên, but Khalil, marching against Ardebel, induced the Shah to
negotiate a peace treaty, which was signed on the same plain (5 Shawwal 1027/26 Sept. 1618) on the same conditions as the former treaty. On his return to Constantinople, he was dismissed from the office of Grand Vizier and had even to take refuge with the great Sheikh Mahmud of Skutari, one of whose adepts he was (1 Safar 1028/18 Jan. 1619). Sultan Othman reproached Khalil, that he had not helped him to succeed to the throne immediately after Ahmed's death, but, on the intercession of Sheikh Mahmud the ex-Grand Vizier was appointed Kapudan Pasha a third time. With an interruption of six months in 1621 he occupied this position successfully. In May 1622 Othman II was murdered by the Janissaries and Musafir restored. During the reign of terror of the Janissaries and their chiefs that followed, Khalil did not sympathize with them and even refused three times the Grand Vizierate offered to him by al-Walid al-Sultan (5 Febr., 1623). Two months before, he had been the object of a hostile demonstration by the Janissaries who accused him of protecting their enemy Abaza Pasha [q.v.]. Still he had great influence and protected in December 1622 the Polish ambassador against anti-Turkish demonstration. But after Merz Hussain Pasha had become Grand Vizier, he was dismissed from the office of Kapudan Pasha and banished to Malharia, where he went in April 1623, not without opposition, especially from the Sipahis. It is, for he was the most popular of the then living viziers, Abaza Pasha, who, as Erzurum had rebelled against the Government, claimed revenge for Othman's death, was a former protégé of Khalil's, who, as Kapudan, had given him the command of a galleys and, as Grand Vizier, had appointed him governor of Marash; his rebellion, however, was contrary to Khalil's advice. Three years after the removal of Musafir (4 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1032/30 August 1623) and the succession of Murad IV, when Abaza's rebellion continued, it was due to this fact, that Khalil was appointed a second time Grand Vizier — in accession to Hzaf Ahmedi Pasha [q.v.] — in a large assembly in presence of the highest 'ulama; as it was hoped that he would succeed in pacifying his former client (Dec. 1626). Three days afterwards he crossed the Bosphorus, visited his old friend Sheikh Mahmud, and reached Aleppo in March 1627. In July the army went to Diyarbekir. At first an expedition was sent against Akhisar, threatened by the Persians, while Khalil tried to obtain Abaza's submission and collaboration in this enterprise. But Abaza, fearing an ambush, declined and, having at first adopted a conciliatory attitude, he massacred the Janissaries at Erzerum. Khalil was obliged to march against him and began in September the siege of Erzerum. After 70 days, however, in November, an extremely severe winter began. The army was obliged to retreat to Tokat with heavy losses occasioned by snow and cold. This campaign was the cause of Khalil's dismissal; he returned to Constantinople, where he kept his position as vizier (1 Shawal 1037/6 April 1628). In the next year (1039/1629) he died.

Khalil Pasha is praised by European as well as by the Turkish authors for his moderation and love of justice. His personality contrasts favourably with the other Turkish statesmen of his time, nearly all of whom died a violent death. He is described as a religious man which accounts for his friendship with Mahmud of Skutari; he also built in Constantinople a mosque in the neighbourhood of the mosque of Muhammad Fadl. There exists an anonymous biography of Khalil Pasha, The Tarihi Khalil Pasha or Gerçek-i Name-i Khalil Pasha. The MS. used by von Hammer is now in the National Library at Vienna (Flieg, Die Arab. Poes. u. Turk. Handschriften der K. K. Hofbibliothek in Wien, ii. 253, 254).

Bibliography: Tarihi-i Nâmâ, Constantinople 1147, i. 278, 313 sq., 324 sqq., 333, 364, 367, 444, 453; Peder i Turkilli, Constantinople 1283, i. 343, 368 sq., 408 sq.; Hidayât al-Khulfa, Tâhirat al-'Akhbar, Constantinople 1141, fol. 46 sq., 49; Manadji'dâm Bashî, Şehîfî'î al-'Akbar, Constantinople 1275, ii. 677; Othman Zade, Ha'ifat al-Wizarât, Constantinople 1271, p. 62; von Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, Pest 1839, iv. and v. (see index); Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis van de Levantische Handel, verzameld door Dr. K. Heeringa, 's-Graavenhage 1910 (see index).

3 Khâlid Pasha, Grand Vizier under Ahmed III. He was an Albanian from Elbasan, born about 1655, and had entered the Bostandji corps where his elder brother Sinan Agha was Bostandji Bashî. Having served some time in Bakhchisaray, he returned to Constantinople as Khalik and became Bostandji Bashî in 1123/1711. In Muhammar 1128/January 1716, when the war against Austria was in preparation, he was appointed Beylerbey of Erzerum and sent to Nish to fortify this place. Six months later Khalil became Beylerbey of Diyarbekir and in Shabban (1st July 1716), when the Grand Vizier Damad Ali Pasha [q.v.] had entered Belgrade for the Austrian campaign, he became commander of that town. Damad Ali having been killed in the battle of Peterwardein (Aug. 5, 1716), the Sultan appointed Khalil Grand Vizier, while the Sultan's favourite and future Grand Vizier Damad Furud [q.v.] became his Kâbîl Meşhûr. The latter, however, was by far the more influential. After Temesvár was lost (13 October) a mutiny was feared and the army returned to Adrianople. In the next year the campaign was reopened and Khalil marched to Belgrade, where the Austrian army under Eugen of Savoy was already awaiting the Turks. In the battle of Belgrade (16 Aug. 1717) Khalil was completely beaten, which was due for the greater part to his own inexperience and to the bad advisers. Belgrade was occupied by the Austrians and the Turks retired to Nish. Khalil was dismissed in October 1717 and had to hide himself for two years, after which he was restored in the Sultan's favour. From 1133/1140 (1721–1727) he was banished to Mytilene, then he was given successively the command of several towns in Greece and Crete and died in 1136/1733. He is described as a mild, pious man, but seems to have had so little reputation, that the European historians writing on the battle of Belgrade were not aware of his existence.


KHALIL SULTAN, a ruler of the Timurid dynasty, grandson of Timur, son of Miran-shah and Suyûn-beg Khânsâda, grand-daughter of the Khan of the Golden Horde, Özbeg; born in 786
KHALIL SULTAN — KHALIL

KHALIL. Ottoman poet and mystic of the time of Sultan Meşhed II, belonged to the neighbourhood of Diyarbakır and came to Izmir to study theology where he formed an attachment for a youth and so succumbed to this homosexual passion then so prevalent particularly in the most cultured circles that he entirely abandoned his studies and gave expression to his woes in a book which is known as the Fıratnûma ("Book of separation"). The title Fıratnûma is equally well known, which Seki gives first and which takes the title of a book by Kâbi Hasan b. Allu of Monastir. The poem, which reminds one of the Hiver-nûma of Dīfar Čelebi (d. 1514) with its sincere unaffected verses, bears witness to Khalil's deep passion faithfully described. The book was finished in the year 866 (1461/62). It is written in epic and lyric metres, a varied alternation of muallaqāt and ghazals. Many biographers of poets interpret the poem as purely Sūfi, which does not seem to be correct.

Khalil died in 900 (1455) as superior of a monastery in Izmir. His Divan has not yet been printed. A number of his poems are contained in the Düa'î al-Nafīr compiled by İhadjiyī Kamal in 918, according to Brusali Tahir.


TH. MENZEL

KHALIL (A) is the term applied in the Kur'an (Sura ii. 159; xl. 59; lxvii. 2) to God's creative activity, which includes not only the original creation ex nihilo but also the making of the world and of man and all that is and happens. The verbal forms khalah and khalāhā are of the most frequent occurrence. Among the most beautiful names of Allah in the Kur'an (cf. Sura lix. 21) are al-Khalil (Sura vi. 102, et passim), al-Khalîl (Sura xv. 86; xxxvi. 81), al-fârî (besides Sura lix. 24 only 51) and al-Mawwaqûr. Epithets like the Almighty, the All-knowing etc. are also applied to the Creator. Their meaning is as a rule clear. The only obscure expressions are (cf. H. Grimm, "Morgenländische Überlieferungen der dt. Zahlwörter", p. 247) "Allah created us in his image" (Sura xvi. 33; xxxix. 2-7; xliv. 39; xlv. 2) or as "al-Haqq" (Sura xxii. 5; 95). If we are justified in supposing guetic speculations in the Kur'an it may be recalled that in the Gesner objectified or personified truth coalesces with higher reality (cf. St. John's Gospel, xiv. 6; also S. v. d. Bergh, Die Epitheten der Metaphysik des Atheneus, p. 218 sq.).

Allah is the Creator of all things (Sura vi. 101, et passim). He creates what He will (Sura xxxvi. 82, et passim) but the Kur'an describes at greatest length the creation of man from dust, earth or clay, drops of semen and compressed blood (Sura xv. 15 sqq.; xlii. 5; xxvii. 12 sqq., et passim) and the resurrection of the dead on the day of judgment, a new creation not more wonderful than the first creation (Sura ii. 26, et passim). How important the creation of man is, is evident from Muhammed's coming forward (in Sura xxvi. 1.
generally regarded as the earliest revelation) in the name of his Lord (who created, created man from congealed blood). Everything on earth was created for man (Sūra ii. 27, et passim), especially the animals (Sūra xvi. 5). The same thing is shown in the stages of the creation; it is regarded as taking place from the lowest upwards. In six days the world was completed, the earth first in two days, all that is in it in two more days and in the last two days the world of the seven heavens. Allah is only formally called the Creator of heaven and earth (Sūra vi. 101, et passim) and it is announced as a secret (Sūra xl. 59) that the creation of man was a new thing to Allah. The creation of man, i.e., according to the usual explanation, heaven and earth were created out of absolutely nothing but man was made from dust.

There is no creator but God. He is the One (Sūra xiii. 7, et passim; Sūra xxii. 14 is no exception). He has begotten no children, only created things and beings, none of whom are like Him (Sūra xxii. 11) But passages like Sūra xxv. 9, xxviii. 72, where it is said that Allah, after forming man, breathed of His spirit (rūḥ) into him, make the difference between the Creator and creature appear less rigidly marked. The creation of man is above all a mark of divine power or, in so far as that which has been created is useful to man, of divine goodness. Reference to the harmony of the heavens (Sūra lixiv. 3) and the beauty of the human form (Sūra lixiv. 3) are rare. Finally we may mention that God created all things with one kūdūd (Sūra lixiv. 49 sq.; kūdūd is here, perhaps a synonym for amr) and heaven and earth “for a definite period” (Sūra xvi. 2), i.e., probably to the last day.

The earlier traditions added very little to this (as Prof. Wensinck kindly informs me). Before the creation Allah was in the cloudb (al-Tirmidhī, Taṣāfi‘, Sūra xl., būt 1) and He created in darkness (I. M. lāh v; cf. Sūra xxxix. 8). He wrote a kitāb before the creation (al-Bukhārī, Taṣāfi‘, būt 55). The kitāb was the first thing created (al-Tirmidhī, Kūdūd, būt 17). Allah created man after his own image (Muslim, Fīr, Tr. 115; cf. Sūra lixiv. 3; lxxiii. 8).

In the later traditions the process of creation is elaborated with speculations regarding God’s throne, primeval water etc. and influenced by ideas of Hellenistic and Oriental origin regarding the manifestation or emanation of God in the world. The Neoplatonic expression put in Allah’s mouth is often quoted: “I was a hidden treasure but wished to be known and therefore I created the world.” Knowledge (śīm), or intelligence (‘āfī), is therefore said to have been the first creation.

Just as God’s superiority over man and the world is particularly apparent from the Kūmān (see Kitāb al-falākh, al-falākh, the distance between the Creator and the creature emphasised. In general it is concluded from the transitory character of this world that the Creator is eternal. In favour of God’s omnipotence causality in Nature (cf. Atomic Theory in Hastings’s Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics) and freedom of action on the part of man, if not absolutely denied, are suppressed as much as possible. I. M. (q.v.), one of the first Dāhā’ī, wished to define God simply as the omnipotent Creator (Kīlāj, al-falākh, i. 39; ii. 161 sq.) asserts that one can only show with regard to God that He is the Eternal, the Unique, the True, the Creator (al-lāh, man, al-la‘īlah, al-jā‘īla, al-khalq, al-‘āshib) for only by these qualities is He absolutely distinguished from this world.

But misgivings against this sharp distinction were raised, particularly under the influence of Christian dogmatics and philosophical speculation, from three sides i.e. by the Mu‘taṣīlī, the mystics and the philosophers. The Mu‘taṣīlī emphasised the wisdom of God in His creation much more than His omnipotence and His will. According to their teaching, God only creates what is good and man is the creator of his own actions. Nāṣir-i Khusraw summed up what is good and His creating is thought i.e. not an act of volition in the proper sense. According to others, like Abu Ḥamīd and Mu‘īn, God’s will is a kind of intermediary between the Creator and the created world. Al-Jāh ji teaches that God cannot destroy the created world (arguing on Platonic lines, like Philo etc.).

In contrast to this estimation of the world and of human activity, mysticism appears as a deprivation of all that is worldly — but only of the material world. While the mystics regarded this world simply as a ladder to God, they could intensify their spiritual life of the soul up to the feeling of godlike creative activity (cf. L. Massignon, La Passion d’al-Hallūf, p. 513 sq.).

Two schools may be distinguished among the philosophers: one older, more neo-Platonic (e.g. the Ḣawwān al-Safī‘), according to which the emanation of a series of spirits precedes the creation of a temporal material world, and a second more Aristotelian school (notably Ibn Sinā and Ibn Rushd) which makes the development of the intellectual and material world proceed by stages, but without beginning and parallel, after the first ‘āfī has emanated from the divine being. Both schools regard God only as the first cause between Whose activity and this world there are many intermediaries.

The attitude of orthodox Islam to these tendencies developed in very different ways in course of time. The Mu‘taṣīlī doctrine of the ‘ali al-falākh could only be accepted in a modified form; a kāsh (Aṣḥā’ī) or an ‘aṣḥā’ (according to al-Māturīdī, al-falākh was ascribed to man instead of the mosque). The philosophic assumption of a world without beginning was decisively rejected, but the theory of the spheres connected with it was adopted while the spirits of the stars were interpreted as angels of heaven. It was very easy to make common cause with mysticism, which, of course, always insisted that there was no creator except Allah. The creation of man in God’s image and the breathing of the divine spirit into him were of more importance to the mystic than the intellectual and material world (see the catechism and Kūdūd) (cf. Massignon, op. cit., p. 599 sq.).

In the struggle then against the Mu‘taṣīliya and philosophy, the Sunni doctrine developed — in part in alliance with mysticism — and with the greatest success in the Aṣḥā’ī school. According to the latter, Allah is the Omnipotent from eternity. Who can create if and when and what He will but does not need to create. Who with the creation of the material world at the same time places limits of time and space to it and every moment creates the world anew. Allah is
also the eternally speaking as regards the word of creation, especially the word of creation in the Kūran. If the eternalness of the word is taught contrary to the Mu'tazili view, there is hesitation, as regards the activity of creation in calling God the eternally creating, and therefore, the nosology of the 'āteslāt (ḥabīlāt, ṣalāt, etc.), which are regarded as temporal relations, are distinguished from the eternal qualities of His nature. In this respect the system of al-Matsikī diary differs from the teaching of the As'hrā' school: he as-assigns as an eternal quality in the divine being ʿaqıda, creative production. This means an approximation to the teaching of the philosophers that, because there is no cause without effect, God as the first cause created the world from eternity, and thus is really an eternal Creator, whose being and actions are alike unalterable. Some philosophers and certainly many mystics got over the difficulty of this doctrine by the assumption that before the manifestation of His creation the eternal Creator was concealed in God (cf. Massignon, op. cit., p. 657). This idea was born in Ash'arī circles and only later beliefs and gnostic-mystical speculation in al-Ghazālī. On the one hand, he teache quite definitely the temporal creation of the world as an act of divine freedom. After eternal but free deliberation out of pure goodness he created this world and He is creating it down to the last day. He is also the originator of human activities; man has only a kaʾb. On the other hand, however, al-Ghazālī is fond of adopting mystic theories of intermediation. God and man are not simply to one another in the relation of Creator and creature. The world is divided (e.g. in al-Majānūn al-Ṣaghīr, on Sūra xvii. 87; cf. Sūra vii. 72) into the ʿālam al-ghalī, i.e. the material spatial world, and the ʿālam al-anwr, the non-spatial world of the angels and the human spirits (the former in the ʿIḥā, iv. 20 sqq., is also called ʿālam al-nūk wa l-ʿīfahā, the latter ʿālam al-ghār wa l-ʿūlākātī). As a member of the tradition that Allāh or al-Rahmān created Adam in his own image, man in his being, qualities and actions shows similarity to God. The human will acts in his body (microcosm) like the Creator in the macrocosm. The above-mentioned division into sensible and supersensuous world, al-Ghazālī also gives the threefold division (al-Dwra al-fikhira, p. 2 sqq.; cf. Sūra v. 20 etc., where there is mention of the "kingdom of the heavens and of the earth and what is between"): ʿālam dunyawi (al-nūk), ʿālam malakātī and ʿālam djibrīlīt (cf. the art. DJABARĪ). Man thus appears as a citizen of three worlds, corresponding to the old triad: body, soul, spirit, as it was developed by gnosticism in the system of the heavenly hierarchy. On nūk, malakātī and djibrīlīt cf. KEPKON, ḌORU, KEPKON in St. Paul, Ep. to Col., i. 16. According to al-Ghazālī, the human spirit, related to God, will survive not only this material world and the spiritual world of the angels and ġibon but also the spiritual world of the highest angels.

In spite of the authority of this "father of the church in Islam", the development of the idea was not yet finished. Ibn Rushd then advanced against him (Takhrīf al-Tahfrīf) the doctrine that the world had no beginning; many theologians (from al-Rāzī, d. 605 = 1209, onwards) followed more closely the conceptions of the so-called Aristotelians, and extreme mystics, like Ibn al-ʿArabī, let the distinction between al-Ḥokk (the Creator) and al-ḥokk (the creature) disappear in the absolute primeval being (cf. the art. AL-Ḥissy AL-KH crime).

Bibliography: There is no comprehensive work on the subject. Besides books mentioned in the text we may mention: M. Woom, Die Lehre von der Anfangsgeschichte in den neuesten abendländischen Philosophen des Orient und in der Schriftganz durch die orientalischen Theologen (Beitr. z. Gesch. d. Philosophen des M. A., ed. by Eenemuller and v. Hertling, iii. 4, Munster 1900); A. Rohrer, Das Schafungsproblem bei Mose Maimonides, Albertus Magnus und Thomas von Aquin, ibid., xi 5, Munster 1913; T. de Boer, Die Widerspruche der Philosophie nach al-Ghazālī und ihr Ausgleich durch Ibn Rushd, Strassburg 1894; do., De Wijzigende in de Islam, in de Volkeninstitutbibliothek, xi, Haren 1921. See also the articles ALHAY and ṢIF. (T. de Boer)

KHALKHA, the name of a river flowing from it into the Buyr-Nur on the frontier between Manchuria and Mongolia. The river Khalkha is mentioned in the xiii century in the "Secret History of the Mongols" (Russian translation by Palladius in Trudi Ross. Dukhovnoi Missii v Pekine, iv., St. Petersburg 1886, p. 90, 91, 102 and 118 (the edition of the text promised by Pelliot has not yet appeared); in Rashid al-Din, ed. Berezn, in Tristi Vest. Old. Kuzhage Arab. Ogrod., xi., St. Petersburg 1886, Pers. text, p. 216, vol. xv., ibid. 1889, Pers. text, p. 3 sq.: Külä. Since the xviii century the same name Khalka has been given to the north-eastern part of Mongolia (from the western frontier of Manchuria to the eastern frontier of the district of Kobdo and from the Russian frontier to the Gobi desert) and its population, Sasang Ssetsen (Geog. der Ost-Mongolen, ed. J. L. Schmidt, St. Petersburg 1829, p. 191 and 197) speaks of twelve tribes of the Khalka; a distinction was made between five "nearer" and seven "remoter" tribes (op. cit., p. 205, and p. 191 and 285). Geresen (full name and title Gerensent Jālār Khun Taidji) was considered the ancestor of all the chiefs of the Khalkha; he was grandson of the last ruler over all Mongolia, Dayan Khán (d. 1543); on the genealogy see A. Pozdaņev, Mongolia i Mongolii, i., St. Petersburg 1896, p. 472. The four āimaq (q. v.) into which the Khalkha were nominally divided (the Mongol emperors long since deprived the chiefs of any power) have taken their names from the different branches of this dynasty; they are the āimaq (From E. to W.) of Taetsen-Khán, of Tashetut-Khán, of Sayin-Noyen (after 1725) and of Tsatsaktu-Khán. Another division is also mentioned as early as the occasion of the submission of the Khalkha to the Emperor K'ang-Hsi in 1691: Mongol inscription in Dolon-Noi, in text and Russian transl. pub. by A. Pozdaņev, op. cit., ii., St. Petersburg 1899, p. 291 sqq.); Geresen is said to have had 7 sons, whereof the population was divided into seven divisions (kēudan, written Ḍorhān in Arabic); it is not known whether there was a connection between this division and the seven "remoter tribes". Since about 1555, Buddhism has been dominant among the Khalkha; at that date a grandson of Geresen, Abatal-Khán, was reigning, called Abai Ghalsagho Taidji in Sasang Ssetsen, p. 253. (W. Barthold)
KHALKHĀL ("anklet"), the name of a place in Adharbarāḏān. Its position nearly corresponds to 38° N. Lat. and 49° East. Long. It does not occur on modern maps, but see the map in G. Le Strange, The Lands, etc., facing p. 87. It was situated in the mountains which in this region were beset with fortresses. Yākūt passed through this region when he fled before the Tatars in 617 = 1220/21.

According to Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi it was formerly a fair sized town, which in his days had sunk into a mere village with about a hundred hamlets belonging to it. It was the seat of the government of the province, after Fīrāzābād had gone to ruin.

There is another place of the same name situated at the mouth of the Oxus on the Caspian.


KHALWA, KHALWATI, etc. [See ṬASAWWUF].

KHAMR (A.), wine. The word, although very common in early Arabic poetry, is probably a loanword from Aramaic. The Hebrew ḫayin has in Arabic (ṣayin) the meaning of black grapes. The question has been fully treated by I. Guidi in his Delta sive primitiva dei popoli suiutici in Memorie della R. Acad. dei Lincei, series iii., vol. iii. p. 63 sqq.

Arabia and the Syrian desert are, in contradistinction to Palestine and Mesopotamia, not a soil fit for the vine; there are, however, exceptions, among which may be mentioned al-Tāʾīf (see II. Lammens, Taʾīf, p. 35 sqq., M. F. O. E., viii. 146 sqq.), Shibām and other parts of Yemen. Wine, probably of an inferior quality, is also mentioned in Madīna (see below). Usually, however, it seems to have been imported from Syria and Tāʾīf; in early Arabic poetry the wine-trade is chiefly connected with Jews and Christians, who pitched their tents (ḥāza, also loanword from Aramaic) among the Beduins and provided it with a sign denoting its character. In little olives were held, in the company of female singers who often also belonged to the establishment. The wine was kept in jars or skins, provided with a mouth-piece which was closed by means of a string.

In the days of Muhammad the people of Mecca and Madina used to indulge in drinking wine as often as an occasion offered itself, so that drunkenness often became a cause of scandal and of indulgence in a second vice, gambling. What together with wine, incurred Muhammad's condemnation. Tradition has not refrained from describing how Ḥamza b. Ṭābil, Allāmān's uncle, in a fit of drunkenness mutilated Allāmān's camel (Buḥkārī, Ṣahih, bāb 13; Khams, bāb 1; Muslim, Ṣahih, Trad. 1, 2; Maqāmah, bāb 12; Abū Dā'ud, bāb 19). And the commentaries on the Kurān relate how Muhammad's companion held drinking-parties which caused them to commit faults in ritual prayer (see al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr on Sūra xiv. 44; Muslim, Fadāʾil al-Salāḥ bāb 1, 4; cf. 45; Abū Dā'ud, La’alā, bāb 1, 185 sqq.).

The prohibition of wine was not on Muhammad's programme from the beginning. In Sūra xvi. 69 we even find it praised as one of the signs of Allāh's grace unto mankind: "And of the fruit of pomegranates and of grapes, ye obtain an unbecoming liquor, and also good nourishment". But the consequences of drunkenness manifesting themselves in the way just mentioned are said to have convinced Muhammad to change his attitude. The first revelation giving vent to these feelings, was Sūra ii. 216: "They will ask thee concerning wine and gambling (muṭārīf). Answer, in both there is great sin and also some things of use unto men: but their sinfulness is greater than their use". This revelation, however, was not considered as a general prohibition, as people did not change their customs and the order of prayers appeared to be disturbed in consequence thereof, a new revelation was issued, viz. Sūra iv. 46: "O true believers! come not to prayers when ye are drunk, until ye understand what ye say!" etc. But neither was this revelation considered as a general prohibition of wine, until Sūra v. 92 made an end to drinking: "O true believers! surely wine and muṭāʿrīf and stone pillars and divining arrows, are an abomination, of the work of Satan; therefore avoid them, that ye may prosper".

This sequence of revelations regarding wine is the accepted one among the traditionists and commentators of the Kurān (see Abūn b. Ḥanbal, Muṣnad, ii. 351 sq.; Tabāri, Tafsīr, v. 58 ad Sūra iv. 46).

The prohibition of wine may, however, also be looked upon from a wider aspect, as Islam is not only the monotheistic religion which has taken a negative attitude towards wine. It is well known that, according to the Old Testament (Numbers xii. 3 sq.) the Nazarite who had wholly devoted himself to Yahweh, had to abstain from wine and spirits, just as the priests before administering the sacred rites (Lev. x. 9). The Nazarite, according to Diodorus Siculus (xix. 94, 3), likewise abstained from wine and one of their gods is called in their inscriptions "the good god who drinks no wine". Likewise, the abstention from wine belonged to the rule of many Christian monks. All this has its roots in remote Semitic antiquity which ascribed a demonic character to wine and spirits. The same is true for Islam, especially singing, which is also prohibited by Islam. It is not improbable that negative feelings of this kind may have worked together with the motives mentioned above, to induce Muhammad to prohibit wine.

The prohibition of the Kurān has been taken over by the doctors of the law; all madhābīs, and also the Shīʿa, call wine ṣawār and the wine-trade is forbidden. For an exposition of the Shāfīʿī view, see al-Nawawī, Muḥātā, ed. v. d. Berg, iii. 241; for that of the Ḥanafīs, Fatūhā ʿAlāmgarī, vi. (Caliutta 1855), 644 sqq.; for that of the Mālikīs Zarkūshī in his commentary on the Muṣnad (Cairo 1280), iv. 26; for that of the Shīʿa Shahrārī al-Īṣāʿī (Caliutta 1859), p. 404. Theology reckons the drinking of wine among the gravest sins (kaḥār)".

Hādīth has many utterances regarding this theme. Wine is the key of all evil (Abūn b. Ḥanbal, Muṣnad, v. 238; Ibn Māḍīya, Ṣahih, bāb 1). Who drinks wine in this world without repenting it, shall not drink it in the other world (Buḥkārī, Ṣahih, bāb 1; Muslim, Ṣahih, Ṣahih, trad. 73, 76-78 etc.). Cursed is he who drinks, buys, sells wine or causes others to drink it (Abū Dā'ud,
Muhammad answered: It is no medicine; it is sickness (Almād b. Hanbal, v. 202 sq.). And not only those who drink and sell wine are cursed by Muhammad, but also those who press grapes and have them pressed in order to drink the juice (Ibn Mājda, ʿArḍa, bāb 6).

Another question of importance arose, in connection with spirits: Had they to be considered as wine or not? All the muḥaddīs, except the Ḥanāfīs, have answered the question in the affirmative sense. They have consequently extended the prohibition of wine, in accordance with the intention underlying it. Tradition, which is the best source for the history of the origin of several institutions, shows that the question belongs to the much debated ones. The standard hadith which is found very frequently in the classical collections runs as follows (I pick out Muslim’s version Ibtān, trad. 26, because it contains important details):

“Some men of ʿAlī b. al-Kāis went to the Apostle of Allah and said to him: O Prophet of Allah, we are a tribe belonging to Rabba’; between us and yourself dwell the infidels of Muṣār, so that we can only reach you in the sacred month. Tell us therefore what we have to tell our tribespeople which will open Paradise for us if we do cling to it. The Apostle of Allah answered: I order four things and I forbid four things, Serve Allah without associating anything with him. Perform salāt, deliver ṣakū, fast the month of Ramaḍān and deliver the fifth part of booty. And I forbid four things: ḥudūd, ḫuntaṭ, ṣalataṭ and ṣalāt. (two other kinds of dates.) In another tradition (ib., bāb 6) wine from fatty ʿalāb and ʿalāb (two other kinds of dates) is mentioned. ʿUmar is represented delivering a khaṭṭa which was meant to settle the question; according to his son ʿAbd Allāh he said: Wine has been prohibited by the Qur’ān; it comes from five kinds of fruits, from grapes, from dates, from honey, from wheat and from barley; wine is what obscures the intellect (tak ḍhāman mā ḍhāmanar alʿalāb; Bukhārī, ʿArḍa, bāb 2). The question remained, whether beverages prepared from grapes in a different way, were prohibited. There was e. g. a kind of syrup. When ʿUmar visited Syria, the population complained of its unhealthy and heavy climate and they added: This drink alone will heal us. Then ‘Umar allowed them to drink honey. Then they said: Honey cannot heal us. Thereupon one of the natives of Syria said to him: May we not prepare something of this drink for you? It has no inebriating power. He said: Well. Then they cooked it till two thirds were evaporated and one third of it remained. They brought it ‘Umar, who put his finger into it and licked it. Then he said: This is ṭila’ like camels’ ṭila’ (viz. the pitch with which they smeared their skins). Then he allowed them to drink it” (Mālik, ʿArḍa, bāb 44). According to the first chapter of the same book, however, ‘Umar who had become drunk on ṭila’ juice from grapes, prepared by pressing only, is considered as wine. Tārīkh b. ʿUwaid al-Ḥaḍramī said to the Prophet: We have in our country grapes which we press. May we drink the juice? He said: No. This negative answer is given three times and when Tārīkh asks whether the juice may be had, the sick to drink, ʿUmar is represented delivering a khaṭṭa which was meant to settle the question; according to his son ʿAbd Allāh he said: Wine has been prohibited by the Qur’ān; it comes from five kinds of fruits, from grapes, from dates, from honey, from wheat and from barley; wine is what obscures the intellect (tak ḍhāman mā ḍhāmanar alʿalāb; Bukhārī, ʿArḍa, bāb 2). The question remained, whether beverages prepared from grapes in a different way, were prohibited. There was e. g. a kind of syrup. When ʿUmar visited Syria, the population complained of its unhealthy and heavy climate and they added: This drink alone will heal us. Then ‘Umar allowed them to drink honey. Then they said: Honey cannot heal us. Thereupon one of the natives of Syria said to him: May we not prepare something of this drink for you? It has no inebriating power. He said: Well. Then they cooked it till two thirds were evaporated and one third of it remained. They brought it ‘Umar, who put his finger into it and licked it. Then he said: This is ṭila’ like camels’ ṭila’ (viz. the pitch with which they smeared their skins). Then he allowed them to drink it” (Mālik, ʿArḍa, bāb 44). According to the first chapter of the same book, however, ‘Umar who had become drunk on ṭila’ juice from grapes, prepared by pressing only, is considered as wine. Tārīkh b. ʿUwaid al-Ḥaḍramī said to the Prophet: We have in our country grapes which we press. May we drink the juice? He said: No. This negative answer is given three times and when Tārīkh asks whether the juice may be had, the sick to drink,
sell raisins if they are to be used for preparing nabidh (Nasā‘, Ḥabrīna, báb 51, 52). It is prohibited to mix together different kinds of fruits so that the mixture should become intoxicating. This tradition occurs frequently; see e.g. Bukhrān, Ḥabrīna, báb 11; Muslim, Ḥabrīna, trad. 16–29; Nasā‘, Ḥabrīna, báb 4–17; Ibn Sād, vii. 380; Ahmad b. Hanbal, i. 276; ii. 46; vi. 242, 292.

But each of these kinds may be used separately for preparing a non-fermented drink (Muslim, Ḥabrīna, trad. 81–83; Nasā‘, Ḥabrīna, báb 14–18 etc.). It can easily be seen that the difficulty in this matter was caused by two circumstances. People were accustomed to prepare from all kinds of dates, from raisins and other fruits, drinks which only became inebriating if they were preserved a long time and probably also if they were prepared after special methods. Where was the line of demarcation between the allowed and the prohibited kind? Several collections of traditions went so far as to mention nabidh among the drinks prepared by Muhammad’s wives and drank by him (Muslim, Ḥabrīna, trad. 79–89; Ahmad, i. 232 sq., 240, 287, 327 sq., 336, 355; 369, 372; ii. 35; iii. 304, 307, 313 sq., 328, 379, 384 etc.). Abū Dā‘ūd (Ḥabrīna, bab 10) and Ibn Madīja (Ḥabrīna, bab 12) have preserved a tradition on the subject which is instructive. I translate Ibn Madīja’s version: SAYS ʿAlī: We used to prepare nabidh for the Apostle of Allah in a skin; we took a handful of dates or a handful of raisins, cast it into the skin and poured water upon it. The nabidh we prepared in this way in the morning, was drunk by him in the evening; and when we prepared it in the evening he drank it the next morning’. In another tradition of the same bab Ibn ‘Abhās says that the Prophet used to drink this nabidh even on the third day; but what was left then, was poured out.

All this could, however, not persuade the majority of the saḥiḥ’s to declare nabidh allowed; three of the maḏhāb’s as well as the Shi‘a prohibit the use of nabidh. The Ḥanafī school, on the other hand, allows it, when used with moderation, for medicinal purposes etc.

It would take us too far to give here a detailed survey of the opinions of the saḥiḥ’s of all maḏḥāb’s; it would be superfluous, to some extent at least, because the more important differences regard chiefly nabidh only. The following rapid survey is based on the Fatwāh ilānugiri, vi. 604 sq. (cf. Sha‘rānī’s Mitār, Cairo 1279, p. 192 sq.).

Allowed according to the idgām is every non-fermented, sweet drink.

Prohibited (ḥarrām), according to the idgām, are wine and sāker of every kind. As to wine there are six cases: to drink it in any quantity or to make use of it is ḥarrām; to deny this is ḥarfi; to buy, sell, present it etc. is ḥarrām; no responsibility (dimān) rests on him who spoils or destroys wine (mutafṣaḥ); whether wine is a possession (māl) is an unsettled point; it is nafī just as blood and urine; who drinks any quantity of it is liable to punishment.

Several kinds of products prepared by means of grapes (bādīkh, minnafat, etc.) are prohibited according to the majority (ʿumma) of the saḥiḥ’s.

Allowed, according to the majority of the saḥiḥ’s are jilī (vide supra) or matulūth and nabidh from dates with the restrictions mentioned above. So is juice from grapes when the process of cooking has made to evaporate two thirds. Muhammad (viz. al-Shāfi‘i, q. v.) has a deviating opinion on this point.

As to the punishment of him who drinks wine, hadith tells us that Muhammad and Abū Bakr were wont to inflict forty blows by means of palm branches or sandals (Bukhrān, Ḥadrīn, báb 2–4; Ḥadrīn, trad. 35–47). Under ʿOmar’s caliphate, however, Ḥabrīn al-Walīd reported to him that people were indulging in prohibited drinks. Therefore, who advised him to fix the number of blows at eighty, a number suggested by the Qur’an which prescribes that those who accuse muhārīnāt of sin, without being able to prove that accusation by the aid of four witnesses, shall be punished with eighty blows (ṣūra xxiv. 4).

Repeated drinking of wine, according to some traditions, was punished by death at Muhammad’s order (Abū Dā‘ūd, Ḥadrīn, báb 36; Ibn Madīja, Ḥadrīn, báb 17; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 136, 166, 171; iv. 93 etc.); it is, however, added in some traditions that capital punishment in such cases is not according to the sunna of the Prophet (Ahmad b. Hanbal, i. 125, 130; cf. Ṭayālīs, N. 183). The different maḏḥāb’s have adopted ʿUmar’s view; drinking wine is punished with eighty blows; if the transgressor is a slave this number is however reduced to forty, because in the Qur’an the punishment of the handmaiden’s sin is fixed at half the amount of blows with which the free woman is punished (ṣūra iv. 30). The Shi‘a, however, cling to the practice ascribed to Muhammad and Abū Bakr; with them the number of blows is consequently forty, resp. twenty (see Zarkūš, iv. 42; Nawawi in Muslim, iv. 156).

The prohibition of wine and spirits (according to three of the four maḏḥāb’s) is one of the distinctive marks of the Muslim world; its consequences can hardly be overrated. This is not seriously affected by the fact that transgressors have been numerous, according to literary evidence. The praise of wine, not uncommon in pre-Islamic poetry, remained one of the favourite topics also of Muslim poets (cf. the wine-songs of Abn al-Mu‘azz; Abū Nu‘wās etc.) and at the court of the Caliphs wine was drunk at reveling parties even if no prohibition existed at all (see e.g. The 1001 Nights, pāsīnī). Even the common people could not always and everywhere refrain from their national drink, date-wine of several kinds; the caliph ʿUmar b. Abī al-ʿĀzīz deemed it necessary to promulgate a special edict in order to abolish this custom (see v. Kremer, Culturgeschichtliche Streifzüge, Leipzig 1873, p. 68 sq.).

Wine has a special place in the literary products of the mystics, where it is one of the symbols of ecstasy. In this point they only took over the language of their Christian and non-Christian predecessors. As early as Philo of Alexandria ecstasy is compared with intoxication (see especially De Vita Contemplativa). Among the Ibabīya, language may have been a reflex of practice; but this cannot be said of Sufi’s in general, who, on the contrary, clung to the ascetic methods of the via purgativa. As to Ḥāfīz wine-and-lovecups, it is an unsettled point whether they are merely metaphorical or not.

(A. J. Wensinck)

KHAMS (A.), the number five. This number has a magical character, from the fact that it is the number of the fingers of the hand and that it is found in certain Muslim dogmas (five foundations of belief, five religious duties, five daily prayers, prescribed by the canon). The hand stretched out with the palm open and the fingers expanded is a symbol that protects against the evil eye; in North Africa we frequently find, among Jews as well as Muslims, a hand painted on the door with the fingers spread out. Amulets in this form are made of gold and silver, called *khams, khoms* by the natives and *hands of Fatma* by Europeans. Thursday, the fifth day of the week, is favorable for magic rites against the evil eye and is the day chosen for pilgrimages to the tombs of famous saints to destroy the effects of the evil eye.


KHAMS, Khamse, the same word as the preceding, pronounced in the manner of the Arabs of the East, the Persians and the Turks; the name given to collections of five poems of which the most famous are those of al-Na'ẓim, also called Paddj-gandj "the five treasures": *Mukhtar al-Asrār* (559 = 1164), *Khusraw u-Shirin* (576 = 1180), *Leila u-Ma'dinān* (584 = 1188), Haft-pokhar (593 = 1197), *Iskandar-nāma* (597 = 1201); of Amir Khusraw of Dihli: *Mo'alla* al-Anwār (608 = 1299), *Shirin u-Khusraw*, *Ma'dinān* (same year), *Aijmān-i Skandari* (699 = 1300), *Hasht-bihāšt* (721 = 1320), of Khwajūj Kirmāni: *Khwās-e Alwān* (finished in 744 = 1343), *Humāyīn Majmūʿ, Kāmil-i Mas'ūda, Gul u-Urūs*, *Dhulqarnān-nāma* (792 = 1391), of Kābi, unfinished; we have the *Gulanzamān-i Abār* and a Leila u-Ma'dinān about 838 = 1434; of Dāmī: selection from the Haft-pokhar, and including the *Thuthaf al-Asrār* (886 = 1481), *Sūkhâb al-Asrār, Yūsuf u-Zulaikha* (888 = 1483), *Leila u-Ma'dinān* (889 = 1484), *Khurāb-nāma* Skandari; of Hāfiẓ, probably unfinished, containing: *Leila u-

Madīnān, Haft-Sangār, Shīrīn u-Khusraw, Ti-

mūr-nāma* (between 917 = 1510 and 927 = 1521); of Faiḍī: *Markaz-i Adwar, Sulhān-i Bālūč, Nal-dāman, Haft-hīdwar, Abāk-nāma* (1604 = 1595), unfinished; of Ḥasan b. Ṣayyid Fath-Allāh, to the glory of Muhammad and the four first caliphs (of 1035/1625 to 1039/1630). The *Khamsa-i Nātiẓa* of Mollā Ṭughrā-i Mughālī is a dratxyz against five persons at the court of Golconda. The author died at the beginning of the reign of Awarānāb (about 1069 = 1659).

Turkish poetry also contains a certain number of works of the same kind such as those of Ḥamd Allāh Cebeli, called Ḥamdi, son of Shaikh Aš Šams al-Dīn, d. 914/1509; *Yūsuf u-Zulâikha, Leila u-Ma'dinān, Nezâdī Nabi, Thuthaf al-'Asrār*, Ghūshā, Muḥammadīya; of Fuḍūl b. Baghādād, d. 963/1556 (mentioned by Lajūfī and Khānīzāde, probably wrongly); of the Albanian Yāhūy, bey of Dukānūgī, d. 993/1576: *Šāh u-Gūdā, Yūsuf u-Zulâikha, Kīūlā-i Cīl, Gūnghārī Rīz, Gulshēn-i Anwār*; of Muʿādī of Kankalandien, contemporary of Bābkī; of Bīhībī, d. 979/1572: *Wūsūk u-'Adīrā, Yūsuf u-Zulâikha, Ḥusūn u-Nūr, Sahīl u-Nawāb, Leila u-Ma'dinān*; of Siān b. Suleimān, surnamed Aṭā'ī and son of Newī, d. 1044/1634 (really only contains four poems, the fifth being the *Dīwān* of the poet): *Sūkhāb al-Asrār, Hafi-

ẓānī, Nāfīẓāb al-Asrār, Sākī-nāma*. The *Khamsa-i Rūmī* of Rezān of Andirinopel, d. 930/1524, mentioned by Shīrīn, probably never existed. That of Nergīš is in prose.


KHAMS (abbreviated from mulayat-i khamsa = the five provinces), the name of a province in Persia of which Zendān is the capital; Sulānīya also forms part of it. It is a small administrative division, forming quite recently a detached district of Yūẓ bīyār. It lies between the provinces of Ādbarāhidān and Kāzvīn and has 11,480 inhabitants. It appears in the Budget with the following statistics: revenue in cash 819,880 āstān, in cereals 10,540 kharwar (of 649 lbs.), straw 9,000 kharwar; value of payments in kind 978,638 āstān. Local expenditure, including the remissions of taxation, 19,129 āstān. The five towns which gave the name of this district are Abār, Farūm, Ġhelāb, Arman-khāne and Zerān-Ābād. The country is inhabited by the nomad tribe of Afghār.

Bibliography: [E. Dupré], Voyage en Perse, ii. 213–214; Jaubert, Voyage en Arménie, p. 197; G. Curzon, Persia, i. 437, 486. (Cl. Huart)

KHĀN (ت), a Turkish title: originally a contraction of Kāghan, Arabic khākan [ت]; in this meaning қ½ occurs alongside of Kāghan as early as the Orkhon inscriptions of the 8th century A.D.; cf. the Tonyukuk inscription in W. Radloff, Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolen, 2nd Series, St. Petersburg 1899, p. 3, and
The quotations in the glossary, p. 93. In the Muslim period the word Khân seems first to appear towards the end of the 8th (yith) century on the coins of the Ilk-Khâns [q.v., u. 465] and particularly in the 9th (yith) century in the texts relating to this dynasty (cf. the quotations loc. cit.) Not till the Mongol period is a distinction made between the Kâghan or Kân as supreme ruler and the Khân as ruler of a separate portion of the whole empire.

In course of time Kâghan and Khân were completely ousted from the popular language by Khân. In the last centuries before the Mongol conquest, the Turkish Khân like the Arabic Mâlek and the Persian Shâh was used as a princely title in contrast to the supreme title Sultan, Sultan only retaining the meaning in Western Asia and Egypt. In Central Asia in the various kingdoms into which the Mongol empire broke up Khân was the real sovereign title and Sultan the title of each individual member of the dynasties descended from Chingis Khân. In the administrative system of the more Persian kingdom founded by the Safawids the Sultan, as governor of a smaller district, was under the Khân, who was governor of a large province.

Khân Djiâhân Lōdî. An Afghan favourite of the emperor Djiâhân [q. v.], who called him his son (farcand). His original name was Pir Khân, and he was a son of Dowlât Khân and descended from the Dowlât Khân Lōdî, who was supreme in the Pandajab when Bâbur entered India. Pir Khân first had the title of Salâtât Khân, and afterward that of Khân Djiâhân. When Djiâhân died, he behaved badly, made the mistake of not recognising Shâh Djiâhân, and of not even answering his autograph letter, and sold the Bâlayghât of the Deccan to Nâzarât al-Mulk. The result was that he was superseded by Mâhabâr Khân, and though he got another appointment, and came to court, he was no longer a favourite, and became apprehensive that he would be arrested. So he fled at night from Agra with his family and dependents. He was pursued and attacked at the Cambal, and many of his people were killed. He continued his flight towards the Deccan, but eventually was killed in Central India in the fourth year of the reign of Shâh Djiâhân, to whom his head was sent.

Biography: Turânki Khân Djiâhân Lôdî; Djiâhânir, Memoirs, transl. by A. Rogers and H. Beveridge, i. 87 etc.; Elliot-Dowson, Hist. of India, v. 67; vi., viii.; Aârî Akbari, transl. Blochmann, p. 502; Bâlayghânâma, i. (Elliot-Dowson, vii. 20); Khâwî Khân, Mumtâzh Khân, Khân Djiâhân, (H. Beveridge) Khân Kâhanân, "Lord of Lords", a title given by the Dilli emperors to their highest officer. It corresponds to the Turkish Beş-tepâr. It was in use in Bâbur's time, the title having been given to Dîlâwar Khân, son of Dowlât Khân. The most famous Khân Kâhanân's were Akbar's ministers, Bâirâm and his son 'Abî al-Râhîm. — Khân Daurân, "Lord of the age", and Khân Djiâhân, "Lord of the world", have similar titles. (H. Beveridge)

Khan-I Djiâhân Mâkbûl Khân. Originally a Hindu by name Kunât or Kattâ, became a Mussalman on entering the service of Muhammad b. Taghâlak [q.v.], who gave him the title of Kâwâm al-Mulk and made him governor of Multân; he afterwards became nâîk wazir and distinguished himself by his administrative ability; on the accession of Fâtur-Shâh Taghâlak [q.v.,], he was raised to the position of Kâghan and enjoyed the confidence of his royal master for 18 years until his death in 776.

Kâhan, from the root Khân, "to dig", aspirated form from kow-kaan; hence: "local, a square on a chess-board". It is found in numerous combinations such as Kêf-kâhan, kâthrib-kâhan, "library"; mîbâz-kâhan, "regimental land"; tâbî-kâhan, "tilled land"; in the time of the Mamlûk Sulân of Egypt; sip-kâhan, "arsenal of artillery"; al-istâf-kâhan, "water-closet", etc. and is also found in Anglo Indian hybrids such as gym-kâhan, "sports meeting" in which gym is an abbreviation for gymnastics (Yule, Hobson-Jobson, s.v.). (Cl. H. Art)

Khânbalîk (usually written Khân Bâlik), the "Khân's town", the name of Pekin as capital of the Mongol Emperor after 1264 in Eastern Turki and Mongol and afterwards adopted by the rest of the Muslim world and even by Western Europe (Czambelev, variants in S Hallberg, Extreme Orient dans la littérature et la cartographie de l'Oisillon, Goteborg 1906, p. 105 sq.). According to Rashid al-Din (ed. Bezir, Târîkh-i Osbî, s. v. Persian text, p. 34), Pekin (Chinese then Tîng-Âl), i.e. the middle capital was called Khânbalîk even earlier by the Mongols, apparently as one of the chief towns of the Kin dynasty (cf. the art Tîng-Âl) as everywhere in the Mongol Empire, Muhammadans enjoyed considerable prestige in Khânbalîk also. Muhammad Yaflâwî h. Muhammad al-Kharîmî (W. Barthold, Tîng-Âl, etc. i. 139), who died there in Kâbi I. 652 (April 21-May 20, 1254), was several times confirmed in office as governor of North China (Rashid al-Din, ed. Blochot, p. 85 and 309). On the assassination of the vizier Ahmad Fânâkî in 1282 and the events that followed see ibid., p. 508 sqq.; Marco Polo, ed. Yule-Cordier, i. 415 sqq. On the town and its situation on the Imperial Canal cf. Rashid al-Din, ed. Blochot, p. 455 sqq.; on the distances between Khânbalîk and other towns by the land routes see W. Feis, ed. Hammer, p. 24, Indian ed., p. 12; N. E., xi. 395 sqq. (al-Umarî); Sharaf al-Dîn Ya'zî, Zafar Mânî, Indian ed., ii. 219 sqq. The name Khânbalîk for Pekin was also retained after the decline of the Mongol empire in Central and Western Asia and also in Europe. On the five months' sojourn (Dec. 1420-May, 1421) of the embassy of Sulân Shâh Khân by Khânbalîk see N. E., xiv. 320 sqq.; the original narrative, which survives in one MS. only (Elliot 422 in Oxford, Bodleiana = Zabulat al-Târîkhî of Hâfîz Abdî, f. 390b sqq.), has so far not been fully investigated (brief account in W. Barthold, al-Musaffariya, p. 27; M. I., p. 107). There was a mosque in Pekin even in those days. Khânbalîk is mentioned as late as the early years of the xvith century in an anonymous history written in Kashghar (Zap., xv. 251). In the reports of the Russian Ambassador of the xvith century, the form Kamâlbâlik (with variants) is used, under Western European influence (Ju. Arsenyev, Vostextestviya...) (Kutkutposlanika Nik. Spasaffyia, in the Zap. Geogr. Obzû, i ot, etnogr., xii, v. 1,
Index. Spăfant (embassy 1675) is the first to write Pechin, under the influence of the North Chinese pronunciation, and this pronunciation also explains the name in the modern literature of Central Asia for Pekin (Bačin or Bađin) (e.g. Tübbeg-Amân-nya, p. 24; cf. Zup., xvi. 0188 sqq.).

Bibliography (besides the references in the text): Ch. Schefer, Notices sur les relations des peuples musulmans avec les Chinois, depuis l'extension de l'Islamisme jusqu'à la fin du XVIe siècle, Centenaire de l'Ecole Or. Vien, Paris 1895, p. 1—43. (W. Bartholo)

KHANDAK (P. A.), ditch, moat. On the etymology of the word see A. Siddiqi, Studien über die Persischen Fremdwörter im klassischen Arabisch (Gottingen 1919), p. 75; it was taken over by the Syriac speaking population of Northern Mesopotamia in early times, as it appears already in the Book of the Himyarites (first half of the fifth cent.; ed. Mebrug, p. 30, l. 14) in the form Kandak. Consequently it may be an Aramean loanword in Arabic. Tradition, however, connects its first use in the latter language with Salman al-Farisi [q. v.], who, it is said, advised Muhammad to protect Medina in the year 6 A.H. against its besiegers by digging a moat, a means of defence hitherto unknown in Arabia but usual in Persia.

The episode of Medina's besiegerment in that year has ever since been connected with the term khandak or ahdab (allies). The sira as well as other historical works give different reports concerning the extension of the moat and the part of the town it was meant to protect. Still it may taken as probable that it started from the marketplace and the hill called Sal, and from there extended chiefly to the North and North-East, partly also to the South.

The digging of the khandak is often mentioned in tradition because Muhammad himself took part in the work (Bukhârî, Qībâhâb, b. 33, 34, 161; Muslim, Qībâhâb, trad. 125—130 etc.). He is said to have hewn a large stone-block in pieces, so that flashes of light emanated from it which shone into various parts of the world (Ibn Sa'd ii. l. 59 sq.).

Several lines of poetry in radiq uttered by him or his companions during the work are recorded amongst them the well-known 97a in behalf of Muâdh-ibn-Jumâh and Asâr. For further information see MADINA, MUHAMMAD.

Al-Khandak is also the name of several places; see Baladhuri, Fârûq, ed. de Goeje, p. 85; Yâkût, Muqâmî, s. v. Bibliography: Spranger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed, iii. 207 sqq.; Grimm, Mohammedi, Munster 1892, 1. 106 sqg. Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, A.M. 5, 21—43; A. J. Wensinck, Mohammed en de Joden te Medina, Leiden 1908, p. 26 sqq. (A. J. Wensinck)

Khwândâmîr, Persian historian. His real name was Ghiyath-al-Din, and he was the son of Khâwâda Hamâm-al-Din b. Khâwâda Bâlah-al-Din b. Khâwâda Bûrân-al-Din, Muhammad Shârâsî. The historian Mir Khâwând [q. v.] was his maternal grandfather, and Nûmân al-Din Sûlûn Aḥmad Sadr was his maternal uncle. His father was for many years the minister of Sultan Mahmûd of Samarkand, who was Bâbur's paternal uncle. Khwândâmîr must have been born about 1475, and probably in Herât, where his maternal grandfather lived. The Haft Iklîm, however, enters him under Bughârî.

His grandfather Mir Khâwând seems to have been originally an inhabitant of Balkh. He entered the service of Badî' al-Zamân and served Sultan Husain, and was with him in 1502 at Pul-i-Čâgh and heard him tell of his adventures before his defeat at that place by his father, five or six years before. After Sultan Husain's death in May 1506, Khâwândâmîr was with Badî' al-Zamân at Marâl in northern Persia. In the spring of 1507 when there was an idea of opposing Sha'bânî's advance, Badî' al-Zamân and his brother and co-king Mużaffar directed Khwândâmîr to go to Khânâbâr and induce Shah Beg Arghûn to join them. He got as far as Herât, but delay was caused by the death of Djinâk Bégam, daughter of Badî' al-Zamân, and also by the near approach of Shahbânî, and so he did not go to Khânâbâr. He also once went on a fruitless embassy to Khusraw Shâh at Kunduz. A feeble attempt was made at Marâl to encounter Sha'bânî, but the princes ran away, and the gâllant Dhu 'l-Nûn Aighûn was slain. The march upon Herât followed in March 1507, and Khâwândâmîr and his brother's son 'Uthmân, who was inspector (muqâlîb) for the city, were deputed by the inhabitants to interview Sha'bânî at his camp, and to obtain terms of surrender. The nephew went and succeeded in having an interview, though he was stripped and pillaged on the way. Khâwândâmîr remained in Herât after its capture, and he has given an amusing account of how he and his friends were squeezed by the Uzbeks. He was also in Herât when Shîh Ismâ'îl defeated and killed Sha'bânî and took possession of the city in 1510. But in 920 (1514) we find him in retirement at the village of Pasht or Bâshht in Ghûrdjîstân, in northern Persia (not in Georgia, as Elliot has it; see de Sacy on Ghârdjistân, Mines de l'Orient, i. 321), where he occupied himself in writing his books. He now attached himself to the worthless Muhammad Zamân, eldest son of his old master, and shared his fortunes for a while, at Balkh, etc. But when Muhammad Zamân was preparing to go to Khânâbâr, Khâwândâmîr preferred to leave to return to Pasht. He must have afterwards settled in Herât, for he was there in July 1527, when he left it to go to Khânâbâr. Nor did he stay long in Afghanistan, for he went off to India in March 1528. He reached Agra and presented himself before Bâbur in September, and in 1529 accompanied him to Bengal and was with him at the trumlohnî, or junction of the Sardjit and Ganges (Habîb al-Sijîr, lith., ii. 84, end of 4th part of vol. 2). Bâbur died in the end of 1530, and Khâwândâmîr afterwards served his son, Humâyûn, and wrote a panegyric on the latter's buildings and devices, which he called the Khwândâmîr in Humâyûnî, or the Humâyûnânâmâ (there is a MS. of it in the British Museum), and an account of the book accompanied by extracts, is given in Elliot's History of India, v. 116). It is commonly said that Khwândâmîr died in 941 (1534—1535) during Humâyûn's expedition to Gudjarat. But Farâighî's account shows that the death, caused by dysentery, occurred on the return march from Gudjarat. This was in 942, and Khwândâmîr was alive in that year, and made a chronogram on the death of his friend and fellow-traveller, Shîháb al-Din, the riddle-maker (cf. Badà'înî, Rânkîng's translation, i. 450). Khwândâmîr probably died in 942 or 943 (1535—1537). At his own request he was buried in Dihlî, near the tombs of Nişân.
al-Din Awliyā and Amir Khusraw. His age was then probably about 60.

Khāwandamīr was a voluminous writer. His first work was the Ḥabīb al-Alfūhrā (or, the Perfection of Narratives). It was written in 905 (1499–1500) and dedicated to ‘All Shīr, whose library furnished him in 5897 the necessary materials. It is a youthful work, and naturally there is little in it that is derived from personal knowledge. It is in fact a preliminary sketch for the Ḥabīb, but in some places, e.g. in the account of the capture and death of Yādghar Muhammad it is fuller than the latter work. Khāwandamīr’s most valuable work, and the only one that has been printed, is the Ḥabīb al-Siyār. It was begun in 1521 and substantially finished in 1523–1524, though he made additions to it after visiting India. The Ḥabīb al-Siyār — so called after his second patron Ḥabīb Ullāh — is a General History from the earliest times down to near the end of the life of Isma‘īl Ṣafawī I. Naturally, it is chiefly valuable for the author’s own time. The best parts are the lives of Sultan Ḥusain of Herat and of Isma‘īl I. Incidentally, he gives much information about Shabbandi and Bābur, and his account of the latter is the best source that we have for the two great gaps in Bābur’s “Memoirs”. He is a conscientious author, for he wrote the Ḥabīb al-Siyār three times over. He is also accurate, and often writes from personal knowledge. His great fault is his style. It is turgid and rhetorical, like the Anwar-i Suhailī of his contemporary Ḥusain Wallī, and is sprinkled with tags of verse. He bestows too much praise on Shabbandi and Isma‘īl Ṣafawī, and he is also sometimes unnecessarily prolix. For instance, he writes with wearisome detail of the adventures of Muhammad Ṣamān. The Ḥabīb al-Siyār has been lithographed at Tihra and Bombay. Khāwandamīr was also the author of the 7th vol. of the Rawdat al-Ṣafat.

Bibliography: Elliot’s History of India, vols. 4 and 5; H. Ferté, Vie de Sultan Hossein Baïkou, traduite de Khondimir (Paris, 1858); Mrs Beveridge, Translation of Bābur’s Memoirs, Asiatic Miscellany, vol. 1; F. B. Charmoy, Mém de l’Académie impériale de Saint-Pétersbourg, ser. 2, vii. 1. iii. and viii.; Quatremère, Journal des Savants, 1843, p. 386–394; Rien, Cat. of Persian Miss., i. 98 sq. (J. Beveridge)

Khānฟū, the region bounded on the north by the Narbadā, on the east by the province of Berār, on the south by the Adjanta Hills, and on the west by the kingdom of Gudjārāt. It became an independent state in 1352, when Ahmad Fārūkī, entitled Rāja Ahmad or Malik Rāja, having joined the rebellion of Bahārān Khān Ṣa‘īdān against Muhammad Bahānī of the Dakan, was obliged to flee from that country and established himself in Khānffū, which owes its name to him and his successors, who long eschewed the royal title and were content with that of Khān, whence their principality was known as “the country of the Khāns”. The country, surrounded by powerful neighbours, was too small to be entirely independent, and its rulers owed some degree of allegiance at first to Mālwa and afterwards to Gudjārāt, but the mutual jealousy of these two states prevented Khānffū from absorption in either. Mirān Muhammad I, the eleventh of the Fārūkī Khāns, was closely related to the ruling family of Gudjārāt, and was elevated to the throne of that kingdom in 1537, but died on his way to Ḥumādābād to assume his new dignity. His promotion encouraged his successors in Khānffū to use the title of Shah.

The administrative capital of the country was Burhānīr, but the fortress of Asir afforded a safe refuge to its rulers when danger threatened. Khānffū was captured by Akbar in 1601 from Bahādur Shāh, the seventeenth and last of the long line of Khāns, and when prince Dānīyūl was appointed viceroy of the Mughul Dakan, which included Khānffū, his father bestowed upon the province, in his honour, the fanciful name of Dāndehs, by which it was known, in official records, as long as the Mughul empire lasted, though the newer name never displaced the older, and is now almost forgotten.

Bibliography: Muḥammad Kāsim Firīṣta, Gudhants darbīhīt, Bombay 1832; An Arabic History of Gujarat, ed. Sir E. Denison Ross (Indian Texts Series), London 1910, 1921; Lt.-Col. T. W. Haig, The Pārīyā Dynasty of Khāndeh (Indian Antiquary), Bombay 1910 (T. W. HAGE)

Khānฟū, in the third (ixth) and fourth (xth) centuries the Arabic name for the most important seaport of China, the centre of trade by sea with the western Asiatic peoples. As is now generally believed, this town “is undoubtedly Canton” (cf. above, i. 842). On the other hand, it used to be urged (by J. Klaproth, J. A., 1824, v. 40 bis; I. Hallberg, L’Extérieure Orient etc., Göteberg 1806, p. 213) that Khānฟū was not Canton but the Gamūf or Gamūf mentioned by Marco Polo (transl. Yole-Cordier, ii. 189, and note on p. 199) lying much farther north, the harbour of Hang-chow-fu. This idea is refuted by the fact that, in the Chinese annals of this period also, Canton is mentioned as the most important harbour and centre of foreign trade; in 758 A.D. Canton was plundered by Arab and Persian pirates (e.g. E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Pou-blaine (Tours) occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 173). This event is not mentioned by the Arabs. Arabic sources (Abū Zaid al-Ṣirāfī in Reinaud, Relation des voyages fait par les Arabes et les Persans dans l’Inde et à la Chine, Paris 1845, ii. 63 [text]; al-Mas‘ūdī, Murājī, i. 303; Ibn al-Athīr, vii. 221) report the destruction of Khānฟū by the Chinese rebel Huang-bao in 264 (877–878) when a great number (120,000 or 200,000) of Muslims, Christians, Jews, and Zoroastrians perished. According to the Chinese annals, Canton was taken by Huang-bao in 879; in this connection also the importance of this town for foreign trade is mentioned (F. Pelliot in Toung Poo, 1923, p. 410). The statement of Ibn Khordhābīh (B. G. A., vi. 69, text) regarding the location of Khānฟū (four days’ journey by sea and 20 by land from the most southerly Chinese harbour Lūjkīn, now Hanoi) can, as F. Hirth and W. W. Rockhill (Chao Fu-Kua, St. Petersburg 1911, p. 22; with support from al-Idrīsī) observe, only refer to Canton. The reading Khānฟū (Chinese Kuang [čenfu]) is now regarded as certain although the manuscripts frequently have k for f and even de Goeje (B. G. A., loc. cit.) was inclined to prefer the reading Khānка (for Hong-Kong). According to the Arab authorities, the town brought the government 50,000 dinārs a day (about £40,000) (Reinaud, op. cit., text, p. 41). After the arrival of a foreign vessel, eunuchs were sent to it by the
Emperor to pick the finest merchandise (ibid., text, p. 73 q.v.); the road between Khatūnī and the capital Khudmān (Šīngan-fu) took two months to traverse (ibid., p. 77 and 103). The prince (mutif), i.e. governor of Khadna, bore the title Dīfū (ibid., p. 38); according to Reinaud, note 27, for Chinese Chi-ju. See also the article china, especially p. 840—842.

W. BURTHOLD

KHĀNĪKĪN, a town in the ʿIrāfī, on the Huwān-čai. The statement that Nuʿmān V, king of al-Hira, was kept here a prisoner till his death by order of his overlord, the Sāsānian Khusrav II, suggests that there was a fortress here in the Sāsānian period. The bridge of Khānīkin must also go back to Sāsānian times; it is built of brick and plaster in several arches across the river-valley. The number of arches is said to be 24, each 20 ells wide. At the Muslim conquest a battle seems to have been fought at Khānīkin for a "day of Khānīkin" is mentioned in Ibn al-Faqīh. Under Arab rule Khānīkin was a small town, which made a poor impression on the traveller compared with the splendour of Baghdad, and was an unpretentious station on the road from Baghdad to Kharṣasān. Ibn al-Muʿazzam praises the wine of Khānīkin. According to Muʿāz, a naphtha well at Khānīkin yielded a considerable revenue to the state. Lastly the Zūiß were deported to the region of Khānīkin after their rising in lower Mesopotamia had been suppressed in 219 (834).

The place was often mentioned in recent years as a junction connecting a branch of the Baghdad railway with the railway system proposed by the Russians in Iran.


(P. SCHWARZ)

AL-KHĀNSĀʾ is celebrated as the greatest poet of the Arabs; her proper name was Tumāḏīr, daughter of ʿAmr b. al-Šahrīd of the tribe of Sulaim, from which tribe originated among others the celebrated poet Zuhār b. Abī Sulma. Her father must have been a man of considerable reputation and wealth, for an account preserved in the Kitāb al-ʾAṣimma of al-Marzūkī (ed. Haidarabād, ii. 168 sq.) tells us that her father visited the fair of Uḫād and gave away property in al-Wahīda in the Mikhāl of Yaḥyri to Maʿmar b. al-Ḥāriṯ, the grand-nephew of the poet Diyāl, and al-Aṣmāʾi says that the document then drawn up was still in the possession of the descendants of Maʿmar in the time of the caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd. Assuming the document to be genuine (which I doubt) the brothers of al-Khānsāʾ 15 years before the Hijdīra, in 607 A.D., were already old enough to take part in the affairs of their father, but the year of the Elephant was probably much earlier than the date generally assigned to it by Muslim authorities.

The earliest event in the life of al-Khānsāʾ of which her biographers make mention is the proposal of marriage made by the aged Durad b. al-Šimrā, who was killed in the year 9 A.H. The latter was bound in close friendship to her brother Muʿāwiyah, both having promised to one another that the one surviving would mourn in an elegy the one who died first. Al-Khānsāʾ was then a young girl and as the proposal came through her brother we may assume that her father was dead. It is significant for those times that the girl was permitted to consider the proposal of marriage, and after seeing Durad her decision went against him. She even composed some verses against the rejected suitor in which she mocks him and his tribe and incidentally mentions that she had previously refused another man of the family of Bād, who is not otherwise known. After this she married a man of her own tribe of Sulaim named ʿAbd al-ʿUzza (or, according to Ibn Kutaiba, Raḥīma b. ʿAbd al-ʿUzza), who was the father of her son ʿAbd al-Ṣadr Ṭāhir, ʿAbd Allah, who took a prominent part in the apostasy after the death of the Prophet and did not come into al-Medina till the reign of ʿUmar. This ʿAbd al-ʿUzza probably lived early and had another man of his tribe, Mirdās b. Abī Ṭāhr, by whom he had three sons, Zaid, Muʿāwiyah and Ṭāhir, and probably her daughter Ṭāhirah, who was her youngest child.

There is considerable difficulty in reconciling the chronological data and to arrive at an approximate date for the birth of al-Khānsāʾ, but as her son Abū ʿAmr Shadrijat took a prominent part in the Kaida [q.v.] in the year 13 A.H. and may have been 30 years of age we may fairly assume that al-Khānsāʾ was then between 40 and 50, probably even older. Al-ʿAbbās b. Mirdās, who was one of the poets of the Prophet, was certainly not her son, but the issue of an earlier marriage of Mirdās, Mirdās, an enterprising man, had attempted with some companions to cultivate some swampy ground near a spring, and as a revenge the spirits which inhabited that place contrived to kill him slowly, i.e. he most likely contracted a fever in this unhealthy place.

The turning-point in the life of al-Khānsāʾ, however, was the double bereavement, the loss of her two brothers Muʿāwiyah and Šāhḥr. Muʿāwiyah, in accordance with Arab custom, went out with 18 companions to make a raid upon the tribe of Murra. He had had a quarrel with a man of this tribe, Ḥāshim b. Ḥarmula, at the fair of Uḫād and after one unsuccessful attempt he invaded the land of the Murrites in which he was slain by Durad, the brother of Ḥāshim. The duty of avenging the death of his brother fell upon Šāhhr and he succeeded in murdering first Durad, who had slain his brother Muʿāwiyah and was slowly recovering from the wound he received in the combat; then another Sulami killed the former's brother Ḥāshim. Not content with this double revenge for his brother, Šāhhr continued his raids upon Murra till he was fatally wounded by a man of Fakās, an Asadī clan allied with the tribe of Murra. He lingered for a long time in his tent, apparently becoming a burden to his wife, and finally succumbed. All these events happened before the rise of Islam, but al-Khānsāʾ lived long enough to see the final victory of the new faith and she is said to have been reposed both by the caliph ʿUmar and by ʿAlī for her unreasonable mourning for her brothers, especially Šāhhr. The new religion had no real influence upon her and her poems.
Fortunately several manuscripts of her elegies have been preserved and the indefatigable labours of Cheikhho have put us in possession of a very complete collection of her verses. Naturally we find among the verses recorded in this edition many which have become ascribed to al-Khansa, because of her paramount reputation as a poetess of elegies, but there is no doubt in my mind that we have many poems which are perfectly genuine, especially as the tradition of the undoubted genuine pieces emanates from men of her own tribe from whom the poems were collected at a very early date. It is significant that in these genuine poems we find expressed the true sentiments of the Qishita: there is no mention of a future life; only the blood of the slain demands retaliation and the despair is over and again expressed that no one can replace the departed, whose many mainly virtues are enumerated and extolled.

Both the biography and the merits of her poetry have been critically and elaborately dealt with by Cheikhho, Gabrieli and Rhodokanakis so that it is easy to get a fairly complete estimate of her life and work from these authors. Whether al-Khansa introduced any new features into the marziya or not is very difficult to say, but it is almost certain that her verses inspired many later elegists, among whom figures her own daughter ‘Amra. If we contrast her verses with those of other elegists among her contemporaries—I will only to mention Mutammmim and Abū Dā‘ūb—, we must confess that her verses do not possess the poetical attributes which are found in them, but we have in the contrary in her poems, which are also much shorter, a far more genuine mourning; on the other hand, there is a certain monotony in the repetition of the same thoughts and ideas.

**Bibliography:** Noldeke, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der altarab. Poesie*, Hanover 1864; *Divān*, ed. Cheikhho, Bairūt 1889; *Commenataire sur le Divain d’al-Khansa*, ed. Cheikhho, Bairūt 1895; Gabrieli, *I tempi, la vita e il canzone della poesia araba*: Florence 1899; N. Rhodokanakis, al-‘Akhansa und ihre Trauerlieder, S. D. Ak. Wur., 1897; H. Diener, *Le Divain d’al-Khansa* trad. par le Père de Cappièr, Beyrouth 1889; al-Djumahy, *Tabakāt*, p. 48 and 51; Kitāb al-Aghūnī, xii. 136 sqq.: al-Tabari, i. 1909 sqq.; Ibn Kutaiba, Kitāb al-Shīr, ed. de Goeye, p. 197 sqq.; in addition verses of and notices on al-Khansa are found in almost all works dealing with older Arabic poetry from the Humāsa and the Kitāb al-Aghūnī onwards and single poems are found translated in several European anthologies of eastern verse before the appearance of the edition of the Divain by Cheikhho. (F. Krenkel, *Khalfa or Khansa* in Raghd al-Din, ed. Blocher, p. 49; Khinsissi; in Wasif’s Khinsissi; in the lihagr. edition (Bomboy 1869), p. 21 sqq. Khiṭāb; in the *Nuzhat al-‘ulām* of Ḥamd Allāh al-Karwīnī (ed. I Strange, pp. 10, 7, and 261, 10: Khinsissi; transl. Khan by Ibn Batu’a (ed. Defremy and Sanguinetti, iv. 284 sqq.) and connected with the name of the celebrated poetesses (see the art. al-Khansa) a town in China, capital of the kingdom of the Sung dynasty overthrown by the Mongols, Chinese formerly King Shu, now Hang-tou-fu (cf. above, i. 845). The town is frequently mentioned in the Mongol period and described as one of the greatest commercial cities of the world in those days. Muslim and Christian sources agree in saying there were a large number of Muslims there, as many as 40,000.


**Khānāzadā Begām.** 1. Daughter-in-law of Timūr, of high rank and much esteemed by him. She was wife of Mirāṁ Şāh, and when he became mad, she went from Tibriz to Sarmāskard and reported about him to her father-in-law on his return from India. She is mentioned by Clavigo and by Sharaż ad-dīn Vazīd. (See Dawlat Khān, ed. Browne, p. 440).

II. Bābūr’s full sister and five years his senior. She was with him in Sarmāskard, and is said to have fallen in love with Shāhīnānī (see Muḥammad Şāh, Shāhīnānī-nāma, ed. Vambéry). Bābūr was obliged to allow the marriage in order to escape from Sarmāskard. Shābīnānī divorced her aunt in order to marry her, but he afterwards also divorced her as he suspected her of favouring his brother. She had borne him one son, Shāh Şāh, who became governor of Balkh, but died young. After her divorce she married a Saiyid, Shāhīk Hādí, but he, as well as Shāhīnānī, was killed in the battle of Marw. The emperor Shāh Ismā‘īl sent her to Bābūr. She afterwards married Mahdī (Hobē al-Siyyar, ii. 372, in account of Muḥammad Zamān). She died in Afghanistan in 1545. She had charge of Akbar, his grand-nephew, when his mother was in Persia. She seems to have been an excellent person, and was greatly respected. She delighted in the resemblance of the child Akbar to her brother Bābūr (Gulbānā, *Memoirs of Humāyūn*, transl., p. 37). (E. B. Bieridge)

**Khārāḏj.** The word khārāḏj, borrowed by the Arabs from the administrative language of the Byzantines, — Greek probably: *xpsypa*; see P. Schwarz, *Die Herkunft von arabisch khārāḏj*, (Grund-studien, in *Der Islam*, 1916, vi. 97 sqq. — originally meant the tribute in a general sense (just as did *dīya*), to which unbelievers in Muslim lands were liable. In the later Fīhān-works the word khārāḏj sometimes still has this general meaning (see e.g. *Fatāḥ al-Karīb*, ed. van den Berg, p. 620). But by the first century A.H. khārāḏj — probably because it was taken to be an original Arabic word in the sense of "yield of the fields" — came to mean particularly the tax paid on landed property as opposed to the *dīya*, which was now used exclusively in the sense of "poll-tax". When at the time of the great conquests the inhabitants of the newly acquired territory were left in undisturbed possession of their fields, it was, however, ordained that the soil should be liable to taxation. Henceforth the inhabitants were to pay a definite part of the harvest as a tribute to the Muslim treasury and remained bound to pay this khārāḏj for all time, even if they became converts to Islam (see the art. FAY).
They had been previously accustomed to a tax of this kind in these regions under Byzantine and Persian rule and the old methods of administering it were retained by the Arabs for many details. The tribute was paid mainly in kind. Definite contributions of corn or other foodstuffs were levied on villages or in some cases on districts. The Muslim officials turned these into money. Very considerable revenues reached the Muslim treasury in this way, especially in the first century A.D.

At the beginning of the ʿAbbāsid period we find different scholars (e.g. Abū Yūsuf, ʿAl-Ḥaṣāṣf and Yahyā b. ʿAdam) still endeavouring to collect the traditions and legal enactments on the kharājī and arranging them in special chapters in their books. The regulations regarding the collection of the kharājī in these days were still a very important subject. But after the peoples of the conquered territories had generally adopted Islam they began gradually to drop payment of the kharājī. It was thought that with the payment of the title of the yield of one's fields (see the art. ʿUSHR) enough had been done and the kharājī in the end fell everywhere into disuse. In the later fiqh-books we therefore only find the regulations regarding the poll-tax still given in detail, while those for the kharājī are only dealt with cursorily or even not at all. Only in al-Mawardī's special work on the Muslim system of administration do we find the regulations for the kharājī still dealt with in a considerable detail.


(TH. W. JOYNBOUL)

**KHARAK, an island in the Persian Gulf, the Aractia of the classical geographers.** In the Arab period the island belonged to the Persian province of Ardashir Khurra, and it was so still described by al-Balāghi. Al-Maʿmūd allots it more closely to Dīnānā which lies opposite it on the mainland. For shipping it was an important calling-place on the way from al-Baṣra to India and also to ʿUman. Ibn Khordāḏbih therefore gives a description of it. In his time Khārak was 50 parasang from al-Baṣra, had an area of a square parasang and was cultivated, yielding cereals, grapes and dates. So recently as the end of the xviith century, Niebuhr was impressed by the subterranean works partly cut out of the rock. That there was a large number of inhabitants and that they were Muslims is shown by al-Isḥāqī's mention of a pulpıt-mosque on the island. In Yāḥyā's time there was also a place of pilgrimage in Khārak, the alleged tomb of a son of ʿAlī. The pearl-fishery of Khārak is often mentioned. The pearl-beds here are very deep; it is therefore natural that complications of a poor harvest are made but occasionally very valuable specimens are said to have been found here.

In the xviith century, the island was for a time in the possession of the Dutch East India Co.; a certain Baron von Kniphausen planned fortifications on the island for them and built a factory behind their walls. Later a town grew up in which Arabs and Persians settled. The Dutch E. I. Co. seems to have abandoned the island at the end of 1765 as its occupation proved too costly.


(P. SCHWARZ)

**AL-KHARAKI, Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Abī Asīr Bākū Bāghā al-Dīn.** He was brought up by a Khwarizmshah (Kutb al-Dīn Muhammad q.v.), 490—521 = 1097—1127, or Atsir, 521—551 = 1127—1156) to Merw and was one of the scholars at the court of this prince. He was also connected with Shams al-Dīn Abu ʿl-Husain ʿAli b. Naṣr al-Dīn Muhammad b. al-Muqaflar. For him he wrote the work entitled al-Tahāra etc. (see below). Al-Khārākī died in Merw in 533 (1138/39). According to al-Balāghī, al-Khārākī devoted much attention to philosophical problems as well as to astronomy.

Al-Khārākī treated of cosmography in two works, extant in numerous manuscripts. The shorter al-Tahāra fī ʾIm al-Hāʾa deals only with astronomy while the fuller Muḥtatah al-Ibrād fī Taḥsīm al-Afhām (on this see Hādījī Khālīfī, no. 13, 124) also deals with conditions on the earth.

Very lucidly and with excellent illustrations al-Khārākī expounds the theory of the Al-kazīn, also called Ibn al-Haitham, according to which the planets are supported not by imaginary circles but by massive revolving basins. This assumption differs the difficulty that in the motion of a planet the ether is pressed in front of it and leaves a vacuum behind it.

Al-Khārākī's and Ibn al-Haitham's works were drawn upon by later Muslim astronomers and cosmographers while those of the West utilised Ibn al-Haitham's work Fi Ḥāʾaʾt al-ʿAlām in Hebrew and Latin translations.


**KHĀRDJE, one of the southern groups of oases in the Libyan desert.** The expression al-Wāṣīt al-Khārījīya recalls the *Oase *ē Ḫdrām* of the Greek writers, the word Wāṣīt being a transcription of the Coptic ṢQNA.

The oasis of Khārdje consists of a large valley which runs from north to south for about 100 miles and averages 12 miles in breadth. Khārdje was reached until quite recently from Esne or Fārāhī; from the latter place the journey took four
days by camel. A narrow-gauge railway (100 miles) now connects Farṣījū with the little town of Khārdje, the present capital of the Great Oasis. In 1910 the oasis had about 7,000 inhabitants; the principal places, besides the capital, are Bārīs, Būlāq and Dākhle. Dates are the principal article of commerce in this region. There are about 70,000 date-palms which produce the best fruit in Egypt. The cultivated area is about 4,500 acres, but in recent years artesian wells have been dug with the object of putting a greater area under cultivation. It is somewhat difficult to get accurate notices of the oases in the Arab writers (see the articles BĀRĪS, DĀKHLE; AL-ĀKHAṬ). None of them had their terminology varies with their informants; we feel nevertheless that the ancient tradition still survived with them, which divided the Oases of the Libyan Desert into Little (= Bahriye), Inner (= Dākhle) and Outer (= Khārdje). In the notice he gives of them, al-Makrizī is very hazy, for he repeats practically the same generalities for the Inner Oases as for the Outer Oases. One thing that all the geographers emphasise is the remarkable fertility of the Oases in general. Al-Yaḥṣūh mentions especially the lands watered by running water at Khārdje, on which the grape and rice were grown in addition to palm-trees. This impression of great prosperity is all that one gains from the fairly long but confused text of Ibn Duṭḥān: it is crammed with names of places. Al-Bakrī distinguishes two Inner Oases and al-Makrizī uses the same expression, al-Wāḥīn al-Khārdijain, but only when he is using an official document of the reign of Shāh al-Dīn. As a matter of fact the oasis of Khārdje may well be divided into two distinct groups.

We are badly informed as to how the oases were settled in the Umayyad and 'Abbasid period: one Kāra bears the name of Abshāh (the present Meṣhāh), the ancient Protolama-Poiq and of al-Wāḥīt. It seems very likely that it was the oasis of Khārdje that the Abbasid ravaged in 339 (= 950). Abā Shāhī mentions, for the end of the Fāṭimid period, the title wāli al-wāḥīt but in the course of a notice of the oasis of Bahriye. Under the Mamluks, according to Ibn Fadl Allāh, to whom al-Kalāshandī adds nothing, the Sūfān's government was not at first represented by any official. The oases were all granted as benefices (īfāt) to officers who administered them as best they could. Later the revenues of the oases were earmarked for the Sūfān's private purse.

A description of the oasis of Khārdje and more particularly of its ancient temples is given in Brugsch, Reise nach der grossen Oase al-Khargh, Leipzig 1878. The Survey Department of Egypt has published a fascicule containing a topographical and geological memoir of the region (Bel. Kharga Oasis).


AL-KHĀRĪD or CHAḤIL AL-KHĀRĪD, a valley in al-Djāwīf in South Arabia which contains one of the few perennial streams in Arabia. According to J. Halévy, the river rises in the Bīlād Arūb near Shīrā, in several springs, of which are hot and contain minerals, and flows at first through a plain bordered by low hills. About 200 yards from its source, it becomes much broader and exceedingly full of fish. The people of Shīrā supply the market of Shāh with fish from the Khārīd so that it is of considerable importance to them. The river also irrigates the oases of al-Djāwīf. The water is held back by great dams and kept for the dry season when it is let off on to the fields every day by numerous channels. The Djāwīf owes its rich vegetation mainly to the Khārīd; it could hardly retain its verdure without this important water supply. According to E. Glaser, there is no water in the Khārīd until Bāt Dīḥānī; this place lies in the extreme north of the Bīlād Arūb. It drains the whole district of Shāh, Khawlān and Sawīkh and is the most important stream of the Eastern Sarat. In the land of Dīn Husain it joins the second great wādī of this region, the Wādī Hirān, and then flows through the whole of al-Djāwīf. The natives told J. Halévy that the Khārīd after twisting and turning round the Bālād Hamāti disappears in the sand and only reappears again in Haijamawt, a feature which the Khārīd, however, shares with other rivers of Arabia.


KHĀRĪDĪTES (A., Khawārīḏī, sing. Khārīḏī), the members of the earliest of the religious sects of Islām, whose importance lies particularly, from the point of view of the development of dogma, in the formulation of questions relative to the theory of the Caliphate and to justification by faith or by works, while from the point of view of political history the principal part they played was disturbing by means of continual insurrections, which often ended in the temporary conquest of the provinces, the peace of the eastern part of the Muslim empire during the two last years of the Caliphate of 'Ali and during the Umayyad period, and involuntarily facilitating first Muʿāwiyah's victory over 'Ali, then that of the 'Abbasids over the Umayyads.

I. The Origins of the Khārīḏī Movement.

Opportunity for the schism was given by the proposal presented to 'Ali by Muʿāwiyah during the battle of Shīfīn (Safar, 37 = July, 657; cf. above, i. 284) to settle the differences arising out of the murder of 'Uṯmān, which had provoked the war, by referring it to two referees who would pronounce judgment "according to the Kūrān."
While the majority of 'Ali's army readily adopted this proposal, either because they were tired of waiting or because "Kurrā" or "Kurān-readers" hoped there would emerge from this Surānic judgment the justification of the furious campaign that had conducted against 'Ummān which had ended in the latter's assassination, one group of warriors, mainly of the tribe of Tamīm, vigorously protested against the setting up of a human tribunal above the divine word. Loudly protest that "judgment belongs to God alone" ('llā hukma illa l-lāhī)" they left the army, and withdrawing to the village of Ḥartūrī, with (? v.), not far from Kūfa they elected as their chief an obscure soldier, 'Abd Allah b. Wahhāb al-Rāsibī (I. 32). These first dissenters took the name al-Ḥarūrīya or al-Mukhbalima (i.e. those who repeat the above phrases; cf. R. S. O., viii. 789, note 1), which is often applied by an extension of meaning to the later Khaṭārīdī also. This little group gradually increased on account of successive defections, especially when the arbitration ended in a verdict quite contrary to what the Kurrā expected (probably in Ramaḍān or Shāwāl, 37 = Feb.—March, 658); on this occasion a large number of partisans of 'Ali, including a number of Kurrā "went out" (khurādā; secretly from Kūfa (to which the army had gone during the truce) to join the camp of Ihn Wahb, who in the meantime had gone to the Dūkhā country on the left bank of the Tigris, to a place which commanded the exits of the roads from Fās and the bridge-head, at which in those days stood the little village of Bāghdād, which later was to become the capital of the empire. The rebel camp lay along the Nahrawān canal. It is to this episode of the exodus from Kūfah that the sect of the Khaṭārīdī owes its name ("those who went out"), more probably than to a general epithet describing them as having gone out of the community of the faithful, as it was later interpreted, probably at quite an earlier period (cf. the name of the Jewish sect of the Phasaeis, which Ed. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, ii. 283—284, derives from the incident of their separation from the partisans of Judas Maccebaeus in 163 B.C., quoting in support of his explanation the name of the Khaṭārīdī). Another name given to those first Khaṭārīdī (which has also been extended to their successors and seems to be the one which they gave themselves) is al-Shurā (plural of Shārī), the "vendors" i.e. those who have sold their soul for the cause of God (this idea is found in several contemporary verses). The extreme fanaticism of the Khaṭārīdī at once manifested itself in a series of extremist proclamations and terrorist actions: they proclaimed the nullity of 'Ali's claim to the Caliphate but equally condemned 'Ummān's conduct and disclaimed any intention of avenging his murder; they went farther and began to brand everyone infidel and outside the law who did not accept their point of view and disown 'Ali as well as 'Ummān. They then committed many murders, not even sparing women. Little by little the strength of the Khaṭārīdī army grew by the accession of other fanatical and turbulent elements, including a number of non-Arabs, attracted by the principle of equality of races in the faith that the Khaṭārīdī proclaimed. 'Ali, who had so far tried to avoid dealing with the rebels, in order to avoid a war in his rear so long as he had to face the army of Mu'āwiya, after the rupture of the preliminaries of peace was obliged to take steps to avert the growing danger. He attacked the Khaṭārīdī in their camp and inflicted a terrible defeat on them in which Ihn Wahb and the majority of his followers were slain (battle of Nahrawān, Sabrā, 38 = July 17, 658) But the victory cost 'Ali dear. Not only was the rebellion not at all suppressed and was prolonged in a series of local risings in 39 and 40, but 'Ali himself perished by the dagger of the Khāṭārīdī 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muljīm al-Murādī (cf. i. 283), the husband of a woman whose family had lost most of its members at Nahrawān. The tradition that a conspiracy of Khaṭārīdī had planned to kill simultaneously 'Ali, Mu'āwiya and the governor of Egypt, 'Amr b. al-As, is almost certainly apocryphal.

It should be noted that the narratives of Arab historians on the origin of the Khāṭārīdī movement are very confused and contradictory, and seem to have lost sight of the real connection between it and the arbitration; on the other hand the nature and date of the latter are quite uncertain. The reconstruction which is given above is that proposed by the writer of this article against the view of Wellhausen (followed by Lammens and Caetani) who thinks that the Khāṭārīdī rebellion and the arbitration are independent of one another and even dates the battle of Nahrawān before the verdict of the arbiters.

II. The Wars of the Khaṭārīdī under the Umayyads.

The wise and energetic administration of Mu'āwiya succeeding the feeble and vacillating rule of 'Ali prevented the agitations of the Khāṭārīdī from breaking out, but it did not succeed in extinguishing it any more than it succeeded in suppressing the feelings and aspirations of the Shā. Our sources mention several risings that broke out in Kūfa and Bāṣra during the twenty years of Mu'āwiya's reign (40—60 = 660—680), but they were promptly put down and only served to increase the roll of martyrs, the worship and avenging of whom became one of the features of the Khāṭārīdī movement. It is at Bāṣra in particular, under the governors Ziyād b. Abihi and his son 'Ubad Allah, that we find most risings and suppressions of risings. These insurrections, of which the most formidable was that of Mirdās b. Udaya al-Familī (q.v.), settled the tactics of the Khāṭārīdī, whose raids henceforth took the form of guerilla warfare and owed their successes mainly to the rapidity — which soon became legendary — of their cavalry (the names of some of their horses are preserved in Arabic works on hippology). They mobilized unexpectedly, swept through the country, surprised undefended towns and then retired rapidly to escape the pursuit of the government troops. The centres of concentration of the Khāṭārīdī were the marshy country of the Bāṣra'ī around Bāṣra (cf. al-Baṭṭa) and around Dūkhā, on the left bank of the Tigris, where their movement had originated, from which they could, if defeated, rapidly gain the mountainous lands of the Īranian plateau.

It was only with the great civil war that broke out after the death of Yazid I, that in the midst of the general disorder the Khāṭārīdī movement assumed serious dimensions and contributed more than anything else to render pre-
carious the pretender ‘Abd Allah b. al-Zuhair’s [q. v.], hold on the territory that he had at first been able to subdue. After the fall of Ibn Zuhair, it was the Umayyad governors who had to wage a hard struggle with these indomitable rebels, enemies alike of victors and vanquished. It is at this time that we begin to distinguish among the Khawārijī half political and half theological subdivisions the origin of which is not at all clear, for the tradition which makes them appear at the same time quite suddenly at Baṣra on the death of Yazid has probably altered the real succession of events. In any case we henceforth find the Khawārijī breaking out throughout the eastern part of the Byzantine Empire (Syria and Iraq), and Africa only knew them under the ‘Abbāsids into serious rebellions at the head of which they placed individuals who have given their names to the ʿAzrāk or ʿAṣrāk [see ʿAṣrākites], the ʿAbḍiyā or (better) ʿAbḍiyā [see ʿAbdītās and ʿAbbāsīyā] and to the ʿṢūṭiyā [q. v.]. Of all these movements the most dangerous to the unity of the Muslim Empire and the most terrible on account of its ferociously uncompromising character was without doubt that led by Nāṭīr b. al-ʿAzrāk [q. v.] which gave the Khawārijī temporary control of Mārnā, Fāṣ, and other eastern provinces, constituted a permanent threat to the security of Basra and surrounding country, and which al-Mahallāt b. ʿAbd ʿAṣrāf at first, and later al-Ḥadīdīyā b. ʿUthmān only overcame in 78 or 79 (698 or 699) — after long years of effort which ended in the defeat and death of the last and most remarkable of the ʿAṣrāk leaders, the valiant ʿAṣrāk b. al-Fudūsā [q. v.]. Less serious and less extensive and prolonged but quite as stubborn as the ʿAṣrāk movement was the insurrection which was called after Shāhib b. Yaṣir b. ʿAṣrāk b. al-Ṭabaṣmī (76–77 = 696–697), although he did not begin but it was only its most distinguished leader; it began in the high Tigris country between Mārnā and ʿAṣrāk and its object was the conquest and devastation of Kufa. The partisans of Shāhib, who advanced only in little bands of several hundred horsemen, but who often gathered round them large bands of malcontents, sowed terror throughout the ʿIrāq, and having several times defeated al-Ḥadīdīyā’s troops were only destroyed by the help of an army of picked troops summoned from Syria. Shāhib himself perished, drowned in the Ḥudayd, while trying to reach the mountains of Mārnā; his successors caused a certain amount of trouble to the governors of Yazid II and ʿAbdulrahmān but had never again been a serious danger.

Arabia was another field of Khawārijī activity, where during the generations of Ibn al-Zuhair between the years 65 (668/669) and 70 (690/691) their leaders Abū Ťalūt, ʿAmār b. ʿAbd al-Fudāika captured in succession Zāmān, ʿAṣrāk and ʿAbd al-Ḥadīdīyā captured in succession ʿAṣrāk and ʿAbd al-Ḥadīdīyā. They were only destroyed after the intervention of al-Ḥadīdīyā, but they left the seeds of future movements, especially in the eastern part of the peninsula.

Moving mainly to the energy of al-Ḥadīdīyā, Khawārijīsm seemed definitely quelled. Another factor contributed considerably to its failure, namely the fanaticism and intolerance of the rebels, whose religious disputes ended in splitting their ranks and sometimes resulted in the removal of their ablest leaders on the charge of having on some occasion failed to observe the absolute irreconcilability of their principles. Another cause of weakness may be recognised in the eternal feud between the Arab element and that of the ʿAṣrākī which brought fatal consequences along with it, especially among the remnants of the ʿAṣrākī after the death of ʿAṣrāk b. al-Fudūsā. But under the last Umayyads in the midst of the irreparable collapse of the central government, the Khawārijī again raised their heads, and resumed their exploits, this time not in little bands but in large bodies. While the two most serious risings of this period, that of ʿAṣrākī in 76 (3 AH) and that of the ʿAṣrākī in the Ḥudayd and that of Abū ʿAbd Allah b. Yaḥyā, surnamed Ṣāḥib b. ʿUthmān in Arabia (in the course of which Medina itself was occupied), ended in defeat, it is nevertheless true that the anarchy which they provoked destroyed the eastern rampart of Umayyad power and enabled the ‘Abbāsids’ insurrection to penetrate more easily to the heart of the empire. Under the ‘Abbāsids Caliphate, the Khawārijī movement may be said to be practically extinct in the ʿIrāq and adjoining regions. Except for a few local risings, promptly suppressed, Khawārijīsm no longer presented any serious danger and only survived as a religious sect, without, however, any remarkable vitality or wide dissemination. In Eastern Arabia, on the other hand, in North Africa and later on the eastern coast of Africa, one of the principal branches of the Khawārijī, that of the ʿAbdīyā (‘Abdīyā), played an important part in politics, and even after this role was ended it continued to be of importance from the religious point of view. It survives in our day with its dogmas, its rites and its special laws (cf. ʿAbdītās and ʿAṣrākīyā).

III. The political and religious theories of the Khawārijī.

The Khawārijī, who, as we have seen, never had any true unity of military and political action, did not have either a uniform body of doctrines. Their teachings seem to us like the particular views of a number of independent subsects (the collections of minor numbers, less than half a score including principal and subsidiary together), some of which represent theological schools as well as political movements of a collectivist character, while others confine themselves to expressing differences of individual opinions among the theorists of the sect. One article is common to all: it is that which treats of the question of the Caliphate, a question which has been the starting point of all the religious divisions in Islam. On this question the Khawārijī are opposed equally to the legitimacy of the ʿAṣrākī and the quietism of the ʿAbdīyā. On the one hand they assert what Weihhaus aptly calls their “non-conformity” i.e. the obligation on believers to proclaim illegitimate and impious doctrine that the ʿAṣrākī, who had gone both of the right path (this is how they justify their abandonment of ʿAli after his acceptance of the arbitration); on the other hand they declare every believer who is morally and religiously irreproachable to be capable of being raised by the vote of the community to the supreme dignity of the imamāte “even if he were a black slave”. The result is that each of their leaders has been re-
cognised by them as Amīr al-Mu'āminīn although none of them had, among other things, the qualification of Kūrādī birth. Consequently the only other caliphs besides their own that they recognise as legitimate are Abū Bakr and 'Umar (the latter is particularly venerated by them); 'Uthmān only during the first six years of his reign and 'Ali till the battle of ʿAṣabā." Another capital article of Khāridjī heterodoxy is the absolute rejection of the doctrine of justification by faith without works. They push their moral strictness to the point of refusing the title of believer to anyone who has committed a mortal sin and regarding him as a mu'tadd (apostate); and their extreme wing, represented by the Azrākīs, says that he who has become an infidel in this way can never re-enter the faith and should be killed for his apostasy along with his wives and children. Of course all non-Khāridjī Muslims are regarded as apostates. Here we have the principle of istīrād (religious murder) which we find applied from the beginning of the Khāridjī movement, even before it had been formulated in theory, and which the primitive examples of Abū 'Ubāda's word of war of the Azrākīs. This ferocious principle forms a strange but illogical contrast with the spirit of tolerance shown by the Khwāridjī to non-Muslims and which in some of their schools goes so far as to recognise as equal to Muslims in every way those Jews or Christians who will pronounce the ʿashādā with the modification: "Muḥammad is the Apostle of God to the Arabs and not to us." The tendency to the levelling of the Arabs and the Mawāli (which already was a result of their attitude to the problem of the imāmate) was pushed so far by one of the theorists of Khāridjī doctrine, Yazīd b. Abī Anīsā (founder of the Fāṣidīya), that he says that God will reveal a new Kūrān to a prophet among the Persians and that he will find a new religion for them, divine in the same sense as Judaism, Christianity and Iṣlām, which will be no other than that of the Šābiʿīn mentioned in the Kūrān.

The same Puritanism which characterises Khāridjīsm in its conception of the state and of faith is found in its ethical principles: it demands purity of conscience as an indispensable complement to bodily purity for the validity of acts of worship; one of their sects goes so far as to remove Sīra xii. from the Kūrān (Sīra ʿAṣaif) because its contents are worldly and frivolous and make it unworthy to be the Word of God. If, on the other hand, they seem to be less strict than the orthodox in the punishment they inflict on adulterers, for whom they do not allow Stoning, this is due simply to the fact that they do not recognise the authenticity of the famous verses added by Ḥumaydī to the primitive text of the Kūrān (cf. Noldeke—Schwally, Gesch. d. Qorānts, i. 248—252).

Outside of general principles and a few particular cases, the law and dogmatics of the Khwāridjīs are not known to us in their totality except for the Ḫabīya, whose survival to the present day has preserved in its integrity their religious tradition. The Ḫabīya represents (as does the ʿSufrīya on the other side) a comparatively moderate school and their present views, in dogma as well as law, have been to some degree influenced by other Muslim schools. Attention has recently been drawn (C. A. Nallino, R. S. O., vii. 455—460) to the very close connection between the dogmatics of the Ḫabīya and of the Muʿazzila. It may also be supposed that it was the latter which, in certain points at least, received a stimulus from Khāridjīsm. What seems beyond doubt is that, as Wellhausen points out, Khāridjīsm played a very important part in the development of Muslim theology either directly or by the impetus which it gave to reflection on the problems of the faith. Although Khāridjīsm seems to us an essentially popular movement in its origins, we must be careful not to think of it as devoid of intellectualism. On the contrary, the very radicalism of its theories must have exercised an attraction on many cultivated minds, much as similar doctrines have done in other times and countries. It is particularly at the time of the early ʿAbbasīda, under the influence of and at the same time in opposition to the refined and sanguine culture of the period, that we find many scholars and men of letters who were thought to cherish Khāridjī views, without this preventing their frequenting high society and enjoying the favour of the court. The best known of these Khwāridjī suq waṣa was the famous philos-opher Abū ʿUmar b. Muḥannā [q.v.], regarding whose fanaticism, in conversation at least, a rather piquant anecdote is recorded by Ibn Khallikān (i. 107 of the 1310 edition; the poetic quotation should be corrected from Amālī of al-Murtada, iii. 88—89). Poetry and eloquence were also cultivated among the Khwāridjī, which is explained by the fact that the majority of their leaders, especially in the early days, belonged to the Bedouin element in the military camps of Kūfa and Bāṣra. Collections were compiled of the Kāhēb pronounced by the Khāridjī leaders, and what survives of them, besides giving an excellent idea of their views, gives us a fairly high opinion of their oratorical talent. We also possess numerous fragments of their poetry (which had also been collected in particular davāns), especially of those of ʿIsār b. Ḥīţān [q.v.] (who is at the same time considered one of the founders of the Khāridjī sīkḥ). A long list of Khāridjī orators, poets and jurists was prepared by Dāhīh, Bayān, 1313 A. H. edition, i. 131—133, ii. 126—127.

The wars of the Khāridjīs had been recorded from the beginning of Arabic historiography in several works which have not come down to us in their entirety; we know, however, the substance of the more important among them, the authors of which were Abū Mīkhnaf, Abū ʿUbaīda and al-Maḏāmi from the extracts which have been preserved in the historical sources given below.

Bibliography: Sections I—II: al-Mubarrad, al-Ḵwāṣil, ed. W. Wright; passim scattered throughout this work, in no sequence or order, are abundant literary ad historical references to our subject; they have been translated by O. Rescher, Die Khāridjīkentenkapitel aus dem Kāmil, Stuttgart 1922; al-Ṭabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 3341 sqq., ii. passim; al-Bāḏawī, Anisū al-ʿAbrāf, R. S. O., vi. 488—497 (résumé and specimens of the text for the period of the caliphate of ʿAli; enate: ibid., p. 925); do., ed. Ahlwardt, p. 78—96, 125—151 (for the period of the caliphate of Abū ʿAbd al-Malik); al-Maṣʿūdī, Mūḍī, ed. Paribé de Meynard, vols. iv.—vi.; passim; L. Cautan, Anjāli dell'Iślām, ii. 541—556, x. 76—151. 168—195, and passim (translation by the author of this article of the historical texts for the period of the caliphate of ʿAli and of other material relating


(G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

Khwārizm or Khīwa, a country on the lower course of the Amu-Daryā (q.v.). Being a fertile delta area, Khwārizm must from the development of civilisation in Central Asia; in spite of the objections made by Noldeke (Z. D. M. G., lvi. 434 sq.), J. Marquart’s view (Erānīshār, Berlin 1901, p. 155) that “the much contested Aryanemvaçeṣṣ, the home of the Awestā, is identical with Khwārizm,” has much in its favour. According to Herodotus (ii. 117), the valley of the river Akes, which was of international importance, before Persian rule belonged to the Khwārizmīs, from which it may be deduced that the ancient Khwārizm was even then of some importance in the history of Central Asia. According to Hekataios (Fragm. 172 and 173), the land of the “Chorazmians” lay along the Parthia; the capital is called Chorasmia (Χοραζημία) according to Herodotus (vii. 66). Parthians and Chorasmians formed one division in the army of Xerxes under a common leader. Whether, as Herodotus (iii. 93), says, Chorasmia was combined to form one satrapy not only with Parthia but also with Sogdiana and Aria, is more than doubtful.

In the time of Alexander the Great the Khwārizmīs were no longer subjects of the Persians but paid a king of their own; how and when the Persian yoke was cast off is not known. According to Arrian (iv. 15), Alexander received in Bactria in the spring of 328 a visit from the Chorasmian king Pharasmanes, who appeared with a train of 1500 horsemen. The latter is said to have claimed that his territory stretched to the west as far as Colchis on the Black Sea. Curtius (viii. i. 8) only mentions an embassy from the Chorasmian king, whom he calls Phrataphernes.

Nothing is known of the later political history of Khwārizm down to the eighth century A.D., and the geographical situation is equally uncertain. According to Ptolemy, the Chorasmians lived on the east bank of the Oxus, which corresponds to the situation of the later capital Kāthī (q.v.) or Kāt (the modern ruins of Shāhīv Abābī Wālī); on the other hand the oldest Chinese name (given in the *Annals of the Later Han*) for Khwārizm, Vue-kien, suggests the town of Gurgāndī (now Kunya-Urgench). According to the native tradition given by al-Bīrūnī (Albr., ed. Sachau, p. 35), Fir or Fīl, the citadel of Kāthī, was not built till 616 of the Seleucid era (304 A.D.). The statements of al-Bīrūnī and the later notices lead to the conclusion that the later Muhammadan idea ( Ibn al-Âthīr, ed. Tornberg, ixi. 267) of an ancient Khwārizm on the Balkhān near the Caspian Sea is not in keeping with the facts.

What al-Bīrūnī tells us about the beginnings of civilisation in Khwārizm 980 years before the Seleucid era (1292 n.c.), of the coming of Sīyūsh and the founding of the rule of his son Kākhusrāw 92 years later (i.e. 1200) and regarding the descent of the local dynasty from this hero of the national epic is, of course, quite legendary. His statements regarding the genealogy of this dynasty cover the period from 304 to 995 A.D. We are told what princes ruled in the time of Mūhammad’s mission, and which was installed by Kūtaib b. Muslim after the conquest of the land about 93 (712). The son of this ruler is called Śawūshfīr. In the Chinese annals of the Tang dynasty (T’ang-shu) an embassy sent to China in 751 by Śhao-še-fen, the king of Khwārizm, is mentioned (E. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tarse aux provinciaux*, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 145); this agreement confirms the reliability of al-Bīrūnī’s account; very improbable on the other hand is what he tells us (cf. cit., p. 36, 2 and p. 48, 18) of the massacre of scholars and priests and the burning of books. His references to the calendar and the festivals of the Khwārizmīs show that in Khwārizm down to the viiith and among the Zoroastrians to the xith century A.D. a very ancient Iranian culture had survived. These Zoroastrians were at that time (i.e. in 1000 A.D., when the Chronology was written) no longer zealous adherents of their faith, and had only some knowledge of the external rites of their religion. Besides Zoroastrians there were also Christians in Khwārizm; the latter belonged not to the Nestorian Church like most Christians in Persia and Central Asia, but were Greek Orthodox (Melkites; cf. al-Bīrūnī, op. cit., p. 288, 13). Adherents of other religions, e.g. Jews, are not mentioned, although Khwārizm appears in the well-known “list of cities” (on which see Grundr. d. iran. Phil., ii. 118, and Marquart, Erānīshār, p. 7) as a foundation of prince Nares, son of Zevedegird 1 (399–420) and his Jewish wife. Whether, as K. Inostancev., *Zurn. Min. Narr. Prokotch*, 1911, No. 2, p. 293 sq.) assumes, the Aḥbār mentioned by al-Ṭabarí (ii. 1237, 17) were Jews, is to say the least, doubtful (cf. the expression Aḥbār al-Naṣīrā in al-Ṭabarí, i. 840, 14). An idea of the Iranian dialect spoken in Khwārizm may be gathered from the expressions relating to the calendar, names of festivals, etc., given by al-Bīrūnī; a few words are quoted in other sources, like gānu hewawra, meaning “cattle纵横” in al-Īṣākhīrī, p. 301; ṣeṣen meaning “bread” in Vākht, ii. 458, 15; from Ibn Paḏīla, Khwārizmī is described by the Arabs as a particularly unintelligible language for the inhabitants of other countries (al-Īṣākhīrī, p. 304 below; al-Muqaddasi, 335, 9). In the viith (xith) century written documents in this language still existed (al-Baihāqi, ed. Morley, p. 842).
In the history of the conquest, mention is made, in addition to the strongly fortified capital (like al-Bârûnî, al-Tabari also mentions three fortresses) of the town of Ḥazarâsp and of Khûmijdîr not mentioned again later, where a brother of the king ruled. After the conquest, according to al-Bârûnî, only the regal title (ḥâkîyâ) remained in hereditary possession of the native princes; the real power (sâlîyâ) sometimes was in their hands and sometimes in the hands of others. In 110 (728) mention is made of a rising of the people of Kurdish (near the Sea of Aral) (al-Tabari, ii, 1525). In Gurğândj (Arabic Dürdûjânya) arose a separate kingdom independent of the Khârârizmshâh; nothing is known of the genealogy of these chief and the origin of their rule. The statement of Ibn Fadlân, misunderstood by Yakût (ed. Wüstenfeld ii, 484, 13) only shows that Gurğândj no longer belonged to Khârârizm by 922. In 385 (995) the ruler of Gurğândj, Mâmûn b. Muhâmmed, succeeded in overthrowing the old dynasty, placing its lands under his rule and thereby restoring the political unity of Khârârizm. The title Khârârizmshâh passed to the ruler of Gurğândj.

Mâmûn died in 387 (997); he was succeeded in turn by his two sons, 'Ali and Mâmûn; an Arabic inscription of the latter has been found in the ruins of Gurğândj (recording the erection of a minaret) of the year 401 (1010/11) (published by N. Katânow, Zapiski vost. otdu. arch., nskh., xiv, 015 sqq.). The rebellion of this king's army when he had Suljan Muhâmmed's name introduced into the khâla on the latter's demand, his assassination and the resultant conquest of Khârârizm by Muhâmmed in Safrâ, 408 (July, 1017), are fully dealt with by al-Bâhêkaši (ed. Morley, p. 834 sqq.) following a lost work of al-Bûrânî (cf. W. Barthold, Turkestan ii, 289 sqq.). Rule over Khârârizm, with the title of Khârârizmshâh, passed to Aântûsh, who was appointed by Muhâmmed; on him and his sons to the fall of this dynasty in 432 (1041) see the article Aântûsh. The victor, Shâh Malik, ruler of Dîjand, was overthrown two years later by the Seldjûk prince (this is the right pronunciation in Muhâmmed Kâshâghârî, Dinwan Lâhîîrî Türk, i, 371, where the Arabic spelling Seldjûk does not correspond to the Turkish pronunciation) Çağûrî Beg [q.v.]. Khârârizm remained under the sovereignty of the Seldjûk dynasty till the death of Suljan Sandjâr (q.v.) in 552 (1157) with a few interruptions during the reign of this.

A new dynasty was founded in Khârârizm in the last years of the 12th century A. D. by Kûsh b. Din Muhâmmed [q.v.] to whom the administration of the country had been entrusted, first by the governor of Khursâ san and later by Suljan Sandjâr. On his son Afsâz, the founder of the power of his house, see the article. Afsâz remained till his death, in name at least, the vassal of Suljan Sandjâr and had also to pay tribute to the Kâr-Khâjî [q.v.]. Under the next rulers Ilrâsan (1146—1172), Tekêsh (1172—1200) and Muhâmmed (1200—1220) Khârârizm lost the position of the main power of a great power. The last ruler of Persia of the Seldjûk line, Toghurî, fell in battle against Tekêsh in 590 (1194). Henceforth the Khârârizmshâh could regard himself as the successor of the Seldjûk Suljâns in their dominion over Western Asia, and even assert such claims against the caliph himself. The yoke of the Kâr-Khâjî was only finally cast off by Muhâmmed's victory over the last Gûrkhân in 607 (1210).

Muhammad's empire stretched from the right bank of the Sir-Daryâ to the mountain passes between Irâz and the Tigris valley; in the south his suzerainty was acknowledged even in the Arabian peninsula (in 'Umân). The capital of Khârârizm was probably occupied by the Muslims, and in 604 (1209), the Muslims occupied the city. The rise of Khârârizm, for the first and last time in the history of the country, to the position of a first-rate Moslem power, is probably connected with the development of its wide trading connections, already mentioned as early as al-Istákî (B. G. A., p. 304 sqq.). Muhammad's attempts to utilise these commercial connections for his political advantage led to a war between him and Cîngiz Khân (q.v.) and the fall of his empire. Gurğândj, abandoned by all the members of the dynasty, fell in Safrâ, 618 (April, 1221), after a stubborn defence; the whole population is said to have been massacred or drowned in the waters of the Âmût-Daryâ.

After this, Khârârizm belonged for over 140 years to the kingdom of the Golden Horde, only the southern parts with Kâsh and Khîwa belonged to the Caghatâi empire (q.v.). Gurğândj, called Urgenç by the Mongols and Turks, was rebuilt on another site some years later after the conquest (Ibn al-Azharî, ed. Torberg, xii, 323), and is described in 1333 by Ibn Batûtâ (ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, iii, 1 sqq., and in 1340 by Baduâlî Pekgolotti (in H. Vule, Cathay and the Way Thither, ii, 279 sqq.) as a populous and splendid commercial town; it was probably the most important emporium on the land route from Eastern Europe to Eastern Asia. Arts and learning flourished in keeping with its economic prosperity; in this respect Khârârizm was "the rendezvous of the most distinguished men in the world" (ma'âjam' al-'âsînî jâihan, in 'Abd al-Razâkî Samârâkîndî, Mu'âza al-Sâ'dîn, MS. of the University of St. Petersburg, No. 157, fol. 738). The teaching of the Mu'tazîlî brought to Khârârizm in the 9th (xîhît) century (cf. I. Goldzâher in Islam, iii, 220 sqq.) had numerous adherents there as late as the second half of the viîh (xivîh) century, when there had long been no Mu'tazîlî left in Western Asia. (On the Mu'tazîlî in Khârârizm cf. Ibn Batûtâ, iii, 8, and Ibn 'Arab-shâh, Cairo 1285, p. 18; there also on the excellence of the musicians of Khârârizm). The buildings of this century surviving in the ruins of Old Urgenç are among the finest in Central Asia, notably the tomb of Tûrâ Beg Khânîm (mentioned by Ibn Batûtâ, iii, 4, 9, 11), the wife of the governor Kâthî Damûr. The Kâshî Sarâî in Kâsh at a later date was built for Timûr by Khârârizm craftsmen (mudâsilânî Khârârizmî; see Mu'âza al-Sâ'dîn, i, 73).

Shortly after 1360 there arose in Khârârizm an independent dynasty known as Sîfî of the family of the Küsgat. These rulers struck small anonymous gold coins bearing only the inscription al-mulk lîl-Sîfî. The earliest of these coins are of the year 756 (1363/4), the latest of the Khâns of the Golden Horde of 762 (1360/1). The founder of the line, Husain Sîfî, took Kâsh and Khîwa from the Caghatâi, whereupon Timûr declared war on him; only after several campaigns did Timûr
succeeded in 1379 in conquering Khârîzım. During the wars between Timür and Tökhânî, the Khârîzımids were allied with the latter; coins were struck in Khârîzım as early as 785 (1383/4) with the name of this Khân. In 1388 Khârîzım, where Tökhânî had left a prince of his own house and a representative of the native dynasty, Sulaimân Şöfi, was reconquered by Timûr. The capital Urgenç (frequently, like Kâth before it, called Khârîzım after the country), was sacked and levelled to the ground, and barley sown on its site. Khârîzım never recovered from the blow. In 1391 Timûr had a part of the town in the "Kâth's quarter" (this quarter was considered the property of the Caghatàî Khâns) rebuilt but the town remained limited to this quarter.

In the ixth (xvth) century Khârîzım was sometimes in the possession of the Khâns of the Golden Horde and sometimes under Timûrids. A member of the native dynasty, Ulûmân b. Muhammad Şöfi, is mentioned in 868 (1464) as a vassal of Khân Mustafà. The town of Wâriz was founded by this Khân below Urgenç, but Khârîzım seems at this time to have lost any importance in the social and economic life of Central Asia. Under the Timûrid Sultan Husun, Cîn Şöfi is mentioned as governor of Khârîzım; in 911 (1505) the country passed to Shâhânî, the founder of the Ózbeq kingdom in Mâ warâ'-al-Nahr (cf. the art. BUKHÂRÎ),

In the year 916 (1510) after Shâhânî had fallen in the battle of Marv, Khârîzım became united to Persia for a short time; soon afterwards the Persian governor was driven out by Şarraf Şöfi, but the latter could not hold out against the Ózbeq conqueror. A separate branch of the line of Dîjâtî, only remotely connected with the conquerors of Bukhârâ and Sâmarqând, now established themselves in Khârîzım (according to Abu 'l-Ğiûzî, ed. Desmaisons, St. Petersburg 1871/74, text p. 197, as early as the year of the Sheep = 1511; the year of the Hijra as given there is certainly wrong). The rule of this dynasty lasted till 1106 (1694/5). Only two rulers of Bukhârâ, Ubâd Allah b. Muhammad in 1538 and 'Abd Allah b. Iskandar [i. v.] in 1593 and 1595/98, above, succeeded in incorporating Khârîzım in their kingdom for short periods. Civilisation among the Ózbeqs in those days was in Khârîzım at an incomparably lower level than in Mâ warâ'-al-Nahr. It is a significant fact that the Khân Abu 'l-Ğâzi (1645/53) had to write the history of the land himself as none of his subjects had the necessary education to do so (Abu 'l-Ğâzi, text, p. 2). Even the holders of the most important civilian offices in the state, the viziers (later called Mîktûr) and the Kuskaçan, were only allowed to attend ceremonial gatherings standing, while the military leaders and shâhiqs had definite seats allotted to them (âtûn). This ancient home of civilisation had become a brigand state; as a result the caravan road through Central Asia lost almost all importance, as may be judged from the report of the only west European to visit Khârîzım at the time, the Englishman Anthony Jenkinson (1558). The name of the country had previously been transferred to the capital (first to Kâth, then to Urgenç); now the country is usually called after the capital, first Urgenç, later Khârîzım.

Khîwa (Khîva) (older form Khiwâk; the pronunciation Khiwâ mentioned by Vâlgût is also in keeping with the spelling of the geographers of the ivth [ixth century]), was probably, like Kâth, a pre-Muhammedan settlement. In Khîwî's time the people of Khîwa were Shâhs. While the Khârîzımids as a rule were elsewhere Hanafis, Fâhîwan-âtî Mahmûd (d. 722 = 1322) whose tomb is mentioned by Abu 'l-Âla (text, p. 260) is still regarded as the local saint of Khîwa. Khîwa first appears as a capital in the second half of the reign of 'Arab Muhammed (1603–1623); when the left arm of the river dried up (cf. above, ٣١٢٩٢). Urgenç must have become gradually deserted; in 1645 a new Urgenç arose about 20 miles N.E. of Khîwa; the inhabitants of the old commercial city were settled there, and their descendants made the new Urgenç the most important centre of trade in Khîwa. A new Wâriz arose at a later date farther down the river, also on the left bank. The ancient capital Kâth on the right bank had also to be abandoned on account of the drying up of the channel that affected it. The Khân Anûshî (1663–1687) had the modern Kâth or Kâtreb built on the site of the old bank of the river about 20 miles below New-Urgenç. In the year 1692 (1687) the Shâhâbîd canal was made by order of the Khân (see the map, one of the most important canals of modern Khîwa after the conquest Mezhîed the Khân had taken the title Shâhî). In the xixth (xxith) century the principality of the Khân of Khîwa is frequently called Besh-Kala ("five fortresses"); the names of the towns which make up the five are differently given. The "Island" (Turk. Aşâ Tur, i. e. the delta area proper of the Sea of Arab, which takes its name from them; cf. ٣١٩٥) is also separated politically from Khîwa.

After the extinction of the dynasty the Inaḳ (i.e. the senior of the tribe and military chief) of the Kungrat tribe was generally the real ruler. The throne was occupied by descendants of Cingize Khân, summoned from the steppees; their rule was only nominal and with a few exceptions they were soon sent back home again and replaced by another prince; ‘Abd al-Kâsin Bukhârî (ed. Schefer, Paris 1876, text p. 79) calls this custom "playing at khâns" (khânbaşî). Peter the Great's attempt to subject Khîwa to his rule had no success. Nâdir Shâh conquered Khîwa in 1740 but the Khân whom he installed there could not hold his throne. From the same period we have several descriptions of Khîwa also by Western Europeans (G. Thompson among others in Hanway, An Account of the British Trade on the Caspian Sea, London 1762, i. 240), and Russians (Glâdîkhew and Murawin, Geograf. lexicon (1849 and 1850). In 1740 the military offer Naizîrov made a plan of the town of Khîwa (Geogr. fæ., 1849, p. 200). In 1842 T. Fr. Russer surveyed the modern town (Naturewissenschafliche Reise durch die Kritigensteppe nach Khîwa = Beiträge zur Kenntnis des rусischen Reiches, vol. x., St. Petersburg 1848, p. 120): the difference between these plans is very considerable and suggests that the town had a very different appearance about 1842 from what it had a century earlier, and perhaps was not even on the same site. This is connected by Sawelyew (Geogr. fæ., 1849, p. 167 sq.) with the alleged destruction of Khîwa by Nâdir Shâh; but it can be proved that the town was on the same site as before in the years immediately following 1740. In 1747 a medrese of 'Arab Muhammed Khân is mentioned. On the other hand Khîwa was almost completely destroyed shortly before 1770 by the continual raids of the
Turkmans (of the Yomut tribe); only 40 — according to another account, 15 — families are said to have been left (MS. of the Asiatic Museum, 590 ob. f. 55b). In 1770 the Inaḳ Muhammad Amin succeeded in conquering the Turkmans and restoring the prosperity of the town and country. The destruction of the old and the foundation of the new Khiwa ought probably to be connected with this event.

In 1804 the Inaḳ Iltużer, the grandson of Muhammad Amin, assumed the title of Khan. When he fell in 1806 in the war against Bukhara, his brother and successor Muhammad Rahim (1806—1825) again placed a Cingird on the throne for a short time, but in the very same year took the title of Khan for himself. By the sucession of the Alar country in 1811, the political unity of Khwarzim was restored and was only broken for a brief period again by rebellions. In 1822 the Turkmans in Marw rebelled against Bukhara and submitted to the Khan of Khiwa. Under Muhammad Rahim's son Allah Kuf (1825—42) the principality of Khiwa attained its greatest extent. It stretched from the mouth of the Sir Darya in the Sea of Aral (about 46° N. Lat.) to Ka'fis Mawr on the Kusht (35° 30'). The ancient Urgene was restored in the same reign. The Russian campaign against Khiwa in 1839—40 was unsuccessful, but the Khan had soon afterwards to fulfil all the demands of the Russian government, although Khiwa at this time entered into negotiations with England. In the official history of Khiwa the English appear as "section of the Russian people whose land lies north of the Russian Empire" (MS. of the Asiatic Museum, 590 ob. f. 566b). During the following years Khiwa had to fight against Bukhara (to 1845) and against the Turkmans. The Khan Muhammad Amin (Madamin, 1846—55) fell fighting against the latter in 1855, as did his successor "Abd Allah in the same year. To the time of Muhammad Amin belongs the most important building in modern Khiwa, the blue minaret over 160 feet high (picture in Fr. v. Schwarz, Turkestän, Freiburg i. B. 1900, p. 205). Saiyid Muhammad Rahim Khan's reign (1864—1910) saw the conquest of Khiwa by the Russians (1873) provoked by the intrigues of the Russian government of the Khan. Only a portion of his former possessions (East of the Amu-Darya) was left to the Khan, and even in these he was to consider himself the "obedient servant of the Emperor of all the Russians." The Khan of Khiwa was later given the title of "Highness" but his position was never equal to that of the Emir of Bukhara (cf. above, i. 783a). Saiyid Muhammad Rahim and his successor Khan Asafidżar (1910—1918) several times appealed for help to the Russians against the Turkmans. During the negotiations between Russia and the Turkmans of Marw, Khiwa made an attempt to act as intermediary (1881—83) in the hope that Marw would not be united to Russia direct but handed over to the Khan of Khiwa as a vassal of Russia. During the fighting of the Revolution period, Khiwa was again been ravaged several times by the Turkmans. After the deposition and assassination of the Khan Asafidżar by the Turkmans Džumáid Khiwa, Saiyid Abd Allah (1918—1920) was chosen ruler; after the deposition of this Khan and the banishment of Džumáid, a "Republic of Khwarzim" was founded, only nominally allied to Russia.

Khiwa in the sixteenth as in the xvith or xvirth centuries was again a nest of robbers, but nevertheless, in contrast to those earlier centuries, more was done than in Bukhara for the promotion of culture and social progress. The development of the country was facilitated by the building of great canals; there were more bridges on the main roads than elsewhere in Turkestän. Khan Saiyid Muhammad Rahim founded a splendid library and made it also accessible to Russian students. The history of the country which was compiled for the government before the Russian conquest surpasses in fullness and reliability anything written in Bukhara or Khokand. Little has yet been done by the Russians for the exploration of the country, its history and its present conditions, although many features have survived which may be looked for in vain elsewhere in Turkestän. In place of the villages in a street usual in Turkestän, the landowner's house stands in the middle of his piece of ground a was usual among the original inhabitants of Turkestän, the Tadjik. The driver (arkabac) sits in the vehicle itself as in Kasghar and not on the horse as in Tashkent, Khokand, etc. The canals are given in the Turkish dialect of Khiwa as among the Turkomans the obviously Aryan names arma and yap ("great and little canal"); the buildings surviving among the ruins of old Urgene are among the oldest and most beautiful in Turkestän and have not yet been fully described.

Bibliography: E. Sachau, Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwarzim, i., ii., Vienna 1873, "B. A. Wiis., phil.hist. Kl. Lxxii. sq.; F. Lorch, Khiwa oder Khorezm, St. Petersberg 1873 (from "Russian Review," vol. ii.); N. Weselowskij, Otok istoriko-geografických spomienok o Khovhovskom Khomov, St. Petersberg 1877; M. J. de Goeje, Das alte Bett des Ouxus, Leiden 1875; A. Kuhn, in Materiali di ja statistici Turkestanskoj kraya, vyp 4, St. Petersberg 1878 (contains a description of the ruins of Khiwa, p. 251 sqq., and of old Urgene, p. 213 sqq.); K. A. Inostrowetz, O domanskimskoi kulture Khovhovskogo ursa (Zurn. Minist. Nar. Prov., 1911, Feb., p. 284 sqq.; A. Vinogradov, Khovhovskaja Sovetshaja Narodnaja Respublika (Zurn. Narodnoj, 1923, Nro. 1, p. 181 sqq.); W. Barthold, Turkestän, vol. ii., St. Petersberg 1900, esp. p. 141 sqq., 289 sqq., 345 sqq.; do., Nachrichten über den Alar-See und den unteren Lauf des Amu-darja, transl. by H. von Foth (Leipzig 1910); in Quellen und Forschungen zur Erd- und Kulturkunde, ed. by Dr. R. Stube, vol. ii.; do., K istorii orosjeniya Turkestana, St. Petersberg 1914; do., Sobitija pod khovhovskim pokojdom 1873 goda po račske Khovhovskogo istorika, in Kaufmannkij Shornik, Moscov 1910, p. 1 sqq. On the histories mentioned there (especially following the MSS. of the Asiatic Museum, 590 ob and 590 od) composed by order of Ittzer and his successors cf. also Milianos statistique x 231; the titles are given. The first work, Firdaus al-wilāli, was begun by Shir Muhammad, called Musin, by order of Ittzer and interrupted by the death of the Khan in 1806, when the author had not yet come down to Nądish Shāh; the work was afterwards being continued by order of Muhammad Rahim Khan down to 1512; the author was then ordered to translate the Kaʾwat al-Safā of
Mirkhawand into Turkish and died in 1244 (1828/9) before the completion of this work. The history of Khiwa was not resumed till 1255 (1839/40) by order of Allâh Kull by the nephew of Mawını, Muhammad Ridâ, called Ağahi; the history of the country was afterwards brought down to 1872 by this same Ağahi under different titles (each reign being dealt with in a separate work).

(W. Barthold)

AL-KHAWARIZMI, MUHAMMAD B. MUSâ; in al-Tabarî (ed. de Goeje, iii. 1385) al-Khwârizmî is still called al-Madjarî (the descendant of a magian) and al-Kutrubulli (living in or coming from Kutrubull, a district west of the Tigris near Bagdad). The accounts of his life are very scanty and unreliable in as much as we do not know in many cases whether the references are to him or to Muhammab b. Mâsû b. Shâkr (cf. H. Suter, Nachträge zu "die Mathematikher" etc., in Abhandl., zur Gesch. der math, Wissensch., 1902, xiv., note 19, p. 158). We do not know the year of his birth and the date of his death is uncertain. According to H. Suter, he died between 220 (835) and 230 (844); according to C. A. Nallino, after 232 (846/47). He flourished in the reign of al-Ma'mûn, was one of his astronomers, and probably took part in the measuring of the degree in his reign. He used to retire into al-Ma'mûn's library to study books. According to al-Tabari (op. cit.), al-Khwarizmi was one of the astrologers whom al-Wâhiq sent for in his last illness to foretell the result of it. They promised him a long life but he died soon afterwards. Al-Khwarizmi's labours were devoted to mathematics, geography, astronomy and history. He wrote a Kitâb al-Ta'arîkh which is given as a source by al-Masûdî and al-Tabari probably took it from it a passage about an event in the reign of al-Ma'mûn in 210 (825/826) (see C. A. Nallino, al-Huwârizmî etc., p. 12). His works, which are in part important and original, reveal in al-Khwârizmî a personality of strong scientific genius.

The writings of Al-Khwarizmi were composed before the period of great activity in translating from the Greek, although al-Hâdîjî populated his contemporaries for his life. In his achievements in algebra therefore al-Khwarizmi is particularly dependent on the work of the Hindus, Persians and the school of Gundissâpûr. Greek sources were secondary for him. It was probably rather different with astronomy and geography. A list of the writings of al-Khwarizmi is found in the Fihrist of Ya'qûb al-Nâdîm (p. 275) and in Ibn al-Kifî (p. 286). In the Fihrist Sanad b. Alî comes immediately after al-Khwarizmi. Karpinski (op. cit.) believes, probably rightly, that the works entitled al-Hisâb al-funûnî, al-Djamâ' wa 'l-Ta'arîkh and al-Djamâ' wa 'l-Mu'âalâa attributed to Sanad are really by al-Khwarizmi.

His most important mathematical work is the so-called Algebra, Hisâb al-Djâbr wa 'l-Mu'âalâa (according to J. Ryska "Processes of Calculation for Integration and Equation"). Here we have not an algebra in our sense but an introduction to applied arithmetic based on numerous examples worked out. At the same time the book contains very varied matter: a. processes of integration and equation, the simplest forms of equations; b. surveying and mensuration; c. testamentary regulations for division of inheritances. The book was translated into Latin by G. of Cremona, R. of Chester and others (see Bibliography under Rosen and Kar-
We know nothing about his book on sundials (al-Rukbāna) except that he wrote one.

Al-Khwārizmi also dealt with astronomical questions from the practical side; for example, according to a story of Abū Maṣḥar, he investigated how far the conjunction at the time of Muhammad’s birth indicated his future as a prophet (Hamza al-Ifsahānī, Tārīkh, ed. Gottwald, Lib., vii., Ch. iv. (text), p. 153 sqq.; transl. p. 123).

Al-Khwārizmi further prepared an atlas of maps of the heavens and the world at the instigation of al-⊤-māʾūn, probably with other scholars. To this belongs the Kitāb Sūrat al-ʿArḍ ("The Work on the Shape of the Earth") preserved in manuscript in Strassburg, or, as Abū l-Ḥasan calls it, Kitāb Rasīl al-Ruḥ al-Muḥīṭ ("The Book of Drawing of the Inhabited Quarters of the Globe"). C. A. Nallino has already shown that this is the text that accompanied the maps. In preparing the maps — in the two editions — Ptolemy’s Geography was used but edited and enlarged in a very independent way.


He also prepared a map based on al-Khwārizmi’s statements (cf. J. Rusk’a, Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der arabischen Geographie, in Geogr. Zeitschr., 1918, xxiv. 77—81).

genealogical succession cover the period from 616
A.D. to the end of the dynasty in 1286 A.D. (cf. A.M.). Of these rulers Shāwushāf, whose father was a contemporary of the conqueror Kutaiba b. Muslim, is certainly identical with the ruler Shao-shen-fen, mentioned by the Chinese, who sent an embassy to China in 751 A.D. (E. Chavannes, Documents sur les T'ou-Kiue occid., p. 145); on the other hand, the Khwarizm-shāh 'Abd Allah b. Ashkām mentioned by Ibn al-Attar (ed. Tornberg, viii. 310) under 332 (943/944) is not named in al-Biruni's genealogy. We have coins of the years 348 (959/960) and 366 (976/977) of the Khwarizm-shāh Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, the father of the last prince of this dynasty, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad (see A. Markov, Inventarny Katalog Muslim. drev. Imp. Ermitaze, p. 295 and 975).

The northern part of Khwarizm with its capital Gurgandād [q.v.] was politically separate from the kingdom of the Khwarizm-shāhs, a fact which is not mentioned by the Arab geographers, and was therefore not known to Yākūt, so that the references in Ibn Faḍlān [q.v.] were not understood by him (Yākūt, Muʿjam, ii. 484, and Baron Rosen in Zapiski, xv. 59). The Amir of Gurgandād, Abū l-Abābūs Maʿmūn b. Muḥammad, succeeded in conquering the southern part of Khwarizm and transferring the title of Khwarizm-shāh to himself and his house (385 = 995). He thereby became the founder of the second dynasty of the Khwarizm-shāhs. Maʿmūn died in 387 (997) and was followed in turn by his sons Abū l-Ḥassan 'Ali and Abu l-Abābūs Maʿmūn II. To the latter belongs the foundation inscription (mentioned above, in vol. ii. 184) at Gurgandād of the year 401 (1010/1011) in which he is described as Khwarizm-shāh. On the negotiations between Maʿmūn and the Ghaznavid Maḥmūd (see above, i. 155) and the murder of Maʿmūn II by his soldiers (Wednesday, middle of Shawwal, 407 = March 20, 1017) see W. Barthold, Turkestān etc., ii. 289 sqq., following al-Hāfiẓ, ed. Morley, p. 539 sqq. His young nephew, Abū l-Ḥārith Maḥmūd b. 'Ali, was elected to succeed Maʿmūn but by ینār, 410 (July, 1017), Khwarizm was incorporated in Maḥmūd's empire and the dynasty ended. The title Khwarizm-shāh then passed to the Amir Altūntād, appointed governor of Khwarizm by Maḥmūd, and there arose a third equally shortlived (to 1041) dynasty. On Altūntād and his two sons (above, i. 322 sqq. Although after the death of Altūntād (1032) the title Khwarizm-shāh was transferred to Saʿīd, son of Sulṭān Maʿṣūd b. Maḥmūd, and Hārūn b. Altūntād was only to govern the land as his representative (khalifat al-dar) (al-Balḥaḵī, p. 439), he is called Khwarizm-shāh by the same historian in another passage (p. 499). Towards the end of the fifth (10th) century a governor of Khwarizm with the title Khwarizm-shāh is again mentioned, namely Iktīfa b. Ḥaqqār (cf. W. Barthold, Turkestān, ii. 346; J. Marquart, in Abh. Göttingen, New Series, vol. 13, i. 48 sqq.). The same title was given about 490 (1007) to his successor Kuṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Anūshāfedīn (Ibn al-Attar, x. 181 sqq.; al-Dīwān, Ṭāhirī-k Dīhān-Ǧuḥā, ed. Mīrzā Muḥammad, ii. 3), the founder of the fourth and most brilliant dynasty of the Khwarizm-shāhs. On the foundation of the power of this house by Atṣaf see this art. Under Takaš (1172–1200) and Muḥammad (1200–1220) the dynasty assumed the position of a great power after conquering Persia and Central Asia—a position with which the title Khwarizm-shāh was no longer commensurate. Takaš calls himself on his coins Sulṭān, son of the Khwarizm-shāh, and Muḥammad Sulṭān, son of the Sulṭān; but outside his empire even Muḥammad continued to be called the Khwarizm-shāh (cf. e.g. Yākūt, Muʿjam, ii. 249 sq.; where the genealogical statements are wrong); and iii. 234, 13; on the relations of Muḥammad with Ǧīlīz Khān and the resultant destruction of the empire cf. Cinoi Kīn; on Ǧīlīz al-Dīn and the final fall of the dynasty (628 = 1231) cf. above, ii. 242. The governors of Khwarizm under the Mongols do not seem to have borne the title Khwarizm-shāh, nor the princes of the house of Sulṭān, whose independent rule (found ed not before 762 = 1360/1361 and not later than 765 = 1363/1364; cf. Bull. de l'Acad. etc., 1921, p. 212) only continued a short time (till the conquest of Khwarizm by Timūr in 781 = 1379); but later several governors of Khwarizm of this house are mentioned at a later date including Ǧīlīz Sulṭān, under whom the land was conquered by the Obeg in 911 (1505), and Sharīf Sulṭān, who, according to Ḥādīr Rāżī (cf. above, ii. 218), ruled in Khwarizm for a short time (about 917 = 1511) (W. Barthold, Sovremenya ob Arab. khor. etc., p. 85; in the German edition, Nachrichten über den Arab. etc., p. 88, the pertinent remarks are omitted). On the other hand the Amir Shāh Malik, governor for the Sulṭān Shāh Rūkh b. Timūr in Khwarizm from the end of 815 (1413) to his death in 829 (1426), is called Khwarizm-shāh in the Mudanjī-i Fażīḥī (MS. formerly in the possession of the Institute for Oriental Languages; cf. Collections Scientifiques etc., iii. 111 sqq., now in the Asiatic Museum, p. 737). He was followed as Khwarizm-shāh by his son Nāṣir al-Dīn Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, who was driven from his capital by 834 (1431) by the Obeg under Abu l-Khaʾir (cf. above, i. 95 sqq.).

The title Khwarizm-shāh is sometimes given in historical documents and literary works to the kheq rulers of Khivā; but they themselves seem to have laid no claim to it. Abu l-Ghāzī (cf. above, i. 86 sqq.) only gives the title Khwarizm-shāh to the dynasty destroyed by the Mongols (ed. Desmoulin, p. 137); otherwise he (p. 277) only uses the expression Khwarizm-shāh as the personal name of one of his brothers. Even when Anīsha, son and successor of Abu l-Ghāzī (1663–1687), took the title "Shāh" after the conquest of Mughed, the word Khwarizm was not added to the title.

Bibliography: Mirkhound, Histoire des sultans du Khirzām, ed. by Defremery, Paris 1842; al-Dūwaini, Tāhirī-k Dīhān-Ǧuḥā, part ii. (Gebb Memorial Series, XVI/i.); W. Barthold, Turkestān etc., Chap. III. (W. Barthold)

Kharābūt, a town in Turkish Armenia, built on a rock to the north of a great plain in the area bounded by the west and south by the Euphrates, in the north by the Murād Su and in the east by the chain of the Armenian Taurus; the site of the town itself lies in the Antitaurus. From the time of Diocletian this territory formed part of the Armenian districts incorporated in the Roman Empire and from the time of Justinian to the Roman province of "Fourth Armenia" which occupied the banks of the Arasians (Murād Su) and which the earliest Arab geographers still
KHARPUT

knew under this name. This district is often reckoned to belong to the old Armenian province of Sophene. Hübschmann wished to identify it with the district of Anziene (Arm. Handzit; Arabic Hinzit, Yâktî, iv. 993). The identification of Kharpit with Қарқайыр (should be Қарқайыр, Z.D.M.G., xxxi. 449) capital of Sophene (Strabo, xi. 527) previously suggested by Ritter could then no longer be maintained. Lehmann-Haupt, however, has come back to the older view (p. 513). In any case the town can be regarded as identical with "Ziata Castellum", the name under which the Persians are mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus (xix. 6, 1). Arab writers still know the town by the name of Hisn Ziyäd (Yâktî, ii. 276) probably with assimilation to the well known Arab proper name; in the same way in Syria we find the forms Ziyat (Land, Anecd. Syria, ii. 61, 4) and Hisna el Zâïd (Barthaeus). The form Kharpit is of Armenian origin; it comes from the Aram. Kharberad (or Karberd), which probably continues in any case the Armenian word kerd meaning "castle", although the first element cannot be accurately identified. The Arabs write Khartabt (Yâktî, ii. 417). The form Kharpit (vulg. Arm. K'arp'ut) is found as early as the xivth century in the Byzantine author Cedrenus (ed. Bekker, ii. 419, r3) in the form Xaphtut. This is the present Turkish name but in the time of Ewliya Celebi the tax register lists still had Hisn (sic) Ziyad. Among the popular etymologies given by Ewliya we find Kharbut, i.e. "ass-idol", which the Christians are said to have once worshipped there and which is said to be buried in a monastery on the island in the Lake of Guljak to the east of the town.

Lastly the Greeks and the Karamians call the town Quart-Pierre (William of Tyre) and by other forms. According to al-Dimashḳi (ed. Mehren, p. 190) Hisn Ziyad was the name of the castle only and Khartabt of that of the town.

The town is not mentioned in the three first centuries of Islam. Lying as it did on the frontier between Armenia and Byzantium it must have frequently changed hands. Its situation must then, as later, have kept it in a position of more or less dependence on Diyar-Bakr. In the fourth century Khartabt was still under the Greeks. In 367 (777/778) the Hämâtânid Abu Taghib driven out of Mesopotamia by 'Aḍud ad-Dawla was able to make a stand in Hisn Ziyad where his brother-in-law a vassal of the Byzantines supported him (Ibn al-Athir, viii. 510; Weil, Gesch. der Chal., iii. 25). In the sixth century we find the Urtukids in possession of the town but it is not clear from whom they took it; in 500 (1106) a certain Muhammab b. Djubukh al-Turkmânî is mentioned as lord of Hisn Ziyad (Ibn al-Athir, x. 296). But a little later we find it the residence of the Urtukid Balak (q. v.) b. Bahram b. Urtuk who in 1122 imprisoned there the Crusaders Joscelin and Waleran and in the following year King Baldwin in addition. Some months later (Rab. I 517 = May 1123, according to Ibn al-Athîr), the Armenians succeeded in the absence of Balak in taking the castle and liberating the prisoners. But Balak returning soon afterwards regained his residence (Rajjab 23, 517 = Sept. 16, according to Kamal al-Din), and Baldwin again fell into his hands. On this occasion the great tower of the fortress was thrown down (R. Hist. des Crois., Doc. Arm., ii. 133). Balak was succeeded in the lordship of Khartabt by the Urtukids of Hisn Kaïfa; an inscription of Fakhr al-Dîn Kara Arslân [q. v.] dated 561 (1165/1166) was found in 1899 in the court of the great Mosque (cf. van Berchem, in Abb. G. W. Gott., N.F., ix., No. 3, p. 142 sqq.). After the death of Nâr al-Dîn, son of Kara Arslân, in 581 (1185/1186) his brother 'Imâmûn b. Abû Bakr seized the fortress and founded a collateral line of the Urtukids there, which continued there under the suzerainty of the Aiûyûbs and later of the Seljuks of Kôm. The frontier with the lands of the latter was formed by the Euphrates after the extinction of the Danishmends of Malatia. During this period Khartabt was captured for a brief period by the Sultan of Kâmrân in 625, Liwaiûnî, Dîjânîn-Gûzî, ii. 180, then by the Mongols, after their capture of Amed (1290) but soon afterwards in 631 (1233/1234) took place the conquest by 'Alâ' al-Dîn Kaîtûbîd, a conquest which had been foretold to him by the mother of Ibn Bûbî (Houtsma, Recueil de l. réc. à l'hist. des Seljûq., iv., p. VII, 194). This was (p. 210) a certain Siû-Bâshî of Khartabt who hastened to drive out the Kâmrânîs. But as van Berchem has shown, the Urtukid line must have existed down to the xivth century though it is not clear if they remained at Kharpit (van Berchem, op. cit.). In the troubled period that followed the decline of the Seljuks, Kharpit seems to have been included in the lands of Kâdi Burhân al-Dîn of Siwâw who took refuge there about 800 (1397) during his fight against Kaïa Oţâmân of the dynasty of the Aḵ-Koyunlu (Sâd al-Dîn). According to Ewliya Celebi, Timûr himself was not able to take the town until his return from Asia Minor; after Timûr it was the Dhu 'l-Kadr dynasty that held Kharpit most frequently. Usun Hûsan took it from them temporarily in the reign of Malik Arslân (856-870); it was at this time that Jâṣapha Bârbûro visited Kharpit (Viaggi, Venice 1545, p. 48 sqq.).

In 913 (1507) Shâh Ismâ'îl took the town but soon lost it to Bûykîf Muhammad, general of Selim I who took Kharpit after his reconquest of Diyâr Bakr in 921 (1515) (Rustem Pasha, Târîkhi, ed. Forrer, p. 43; Ewliya Celebi). Henceforth the town was included in the Ottoman empire as capital of a sandjaq in the eyalet of Diyâr Bakr (Hâdîjûl Khalîfa, Dîjânînûmû, p. 439). The sandjaq-beys were usually Kurds.

At the beginning of the xivth century these governors moved their residence from Kharpût to the little town of Mezère lying in the plain near the hill of Kharpit to the S.W. Mezère is written Mezere, as if it were an Arabic word but it seems to be mentioned as early as by Ptolomy in the form Մացար (Hubschmann, o. c.). In the reign of 'Abd al-Medjîd, Râshîd Pasha, after a journey of inspection in Kurdistan suggested Mezère as the capital. He had barracks built there. Under 'Abd al-'Azîz, Mezere definitely became the residence of the governor and Kharpût-Mezere became officially known as Ma'mûret al-'Azîz in honour of the Sultan. This name, which was given it by the Wâlî Ismâ'îl Pasha was next extended to the whole sandjaq and in 1296 (1879) Ma'mûret al-'Azîz became the name of a new wilâyet formed in that year with Kharpût-Mezere as its capital. The wilâyet was composed of the sandjaqcs of Kharpût-Mezere (including the old province of Sophene as a merkez-kadî), and beyond the Euphrates the kadâs of 'Arabgîr, Eghin and
Kabūn Ma'den, and those of Malāţia and Dersim. The rock of Kāharūt rises to a height of about 1200 feet above the surrounding plain. The upper part is occupied by a mediaeval castle, at one time Balak's residence. The castle has only one gate: its walls have several inscriptions not yet published (Lemmann-Haupt). The town itself is also a fortress (dāgh kafta) but its ramparts have been for long neglected. It lies in the Ulū Dījānī as the largest mosque and also an Arsālānī Dījānī, it is probably the latter that has the inscription mentioned above. The population of Kāharūt-Mezere was estimated about 1900 at 28,000 inhabitants (in 1835 Brant put it at 9,000) with a majority of Muslims (Turks and Kurds) and a considerable minority of Armenians. There was an important American mission there which took an especial interest in Armenians of whom a great many had become Protestants. There were also Syriac Christians. The Armenians of Kāharūt suffered very much from the massacres of 1895 and during the war of 1914—1918 so that the Armenian element must now be very small. Ewliya Čelebi says the principal industry was saddle-making. The town is also noted for its manufacture of silks and the cultivation of silk in the districts has diminished (Cunnett). The surrounding plain is well watered and very fertile and at the beginning of the sixth century there was even talk of overcrowding. The nearest port is Kerešnāi [q.v.] but the great road to Şamsūn via Siwās and Amasia is more used. The roads to Dīyar Bakr and Malāţia are also very old.


(K. H. KRAMERS)

KHARRĀZ, Abu Sa'id Ahmad b. Tās, an independent mystic, propounder of the doctrine of ḫā'iḥ wa-lāḥaḏ, died in exile in Cairo in 286 (899). His Kitāb al-qidā has survived (MS. Shahid 'Ali Pāša, 1374).

Bibliography: al-Kūshairī, Rīḍā ed. Ansārī, i. 68; ii. 126; Hudjviri, Khāqf, transl. Nicholson, P. 143, 241; Ghazālī, Ḥiyā, Cairo 1312, iv. 349; Ibn al-'Arabī Fudūk al-makbī, Cairo 1269, i. 217, iv. 442; Dījāmī, Na'allāh, ed. Lees, p. 69, 81; Sharawī, Tabākhāt, Cairo 1305, i. 94 sqq.; L. Massignon, Lexique technique, Paris 1922, p. 270 sqq.

(L. Massignon)

KHARRUBA (the seed of the carob-tree, Cena
tonia Silvica L.), synonymous with ḫāyā. This term is frequently found on Egyptian glass weights of the first and second centuries A.D. usually to give the weight of a copper coin (e.g. fāls of 25, or 30 or 35 kāhrenum etc.). The weighing of well preserved glass weights gives an average weight of 0,196 gr. (3 grains) for the kāhrenum, i.e. rather more than a gold ḫāyā. In Tunis the word was applied to a copper coin down to quite modern times. For further information see the article ḫāyā.

(E. V. ZAMBUK)

KHĀRSĪNI (Kāhrūsīnī) is given as the seventh metal by many cosmographers, etc. in addition to the usual six, gold, silver, copper, iron, lead and tin; it is called mercury by the alchemists. As is evident from the statements of al-Būrī (q.v.) and al-Kāzī, the famous physician and alchemist, Arabs were not acquainted with it itself but at most with articles made from it, and perhaps even these they only knew by hearsay: mention is made especially of hard arrow-heads, harpoons, looking-glasses, and shells made of khārsīnī. The mineralogist al-Ghaffārī connected it with a meteorite. According to W. Hommel (Ziehr. f. angewandte Chemie, xxv. 100 [1912]) it is certainly not zinc, as has been suggested, but a hard lead, i.e. a composition of lead, a good deal of antimony and small quantities of ores, copper, iron and tin. This composition possesses the physical qualities ascribed to khārsīnī. The Arabs, however, credit it with further marvellous (including healing) powers. In the Ain-i Akbari (transl. Blochmann, i. 40) Ahcēnīsī is given as the description of Khārsīnī. ( Cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge z. Gesch. der Naturwiss., v. 403; xxiv. 80, 86 sqq. in Sitz.-Ber. d. Physik. Medizin. Soc. in Erlangen, xxvii. 1905; xlii. 1911; further literature is also given there and a series of references to manuscripts.)

Bibliography: W. Hommel, Über indische und chinesische Zink, Zeitschr. für angewandte Chemie, xxv. 1912, p. 100; E. Wiedemann, Beiträge z. Gesch. der Naturwiss., v. 403; xxiv. 80, 86 sqq.; L. Bruggens, Zur Chemie bei den Arabern, do., xlii. 1911, p. 86. Further literature is given in these articles and a number of notes added. (E. WIEDEMANN)

KHARTABĪR. [See KHĀRMUT]

KHĀRTUM (A.), "an elephant's trunk" (de
dscription of the narrowing spout of land between the two riverine villages of the capital town, seat of government, trade centre of the 15 provinces of the Sudan under the Government and of the Governor General, who holds his appointment under the British Government with the approval of the Plufer of Egypt, is situated on the left or south bank of the Blue Nile, which joins the White Nile about one mile down stream; it has a river frontage of two miles, is 1250 feet above the level of the Mediterranean, in 15° 36' N. Lat. and 32° 32' E. Long.; by rail it is 432 miles from Port Sudan on the Red Sea, and by rail and river it is 1345 miles from Cairo.

Across the river (here about 700 yards wide) is Khartūm North (population 16,000) with the dock
cyard, civil prison and military barracks. Omdurman is some two miles down stream on the left bank of the Nile proper, with a population of 60,000.

Before the conquest of the Sudān in 1899 by the Khedive Muhammad 'Ali of Egypt, Khartūm was a small native village on the main road from the north to Sennāf. This road, leaving the Nile at Shendi 100 miles north of Khartūm, led direct
Khartum — Khashabiya

to Soba, across the desert, and then southwards along the right or east bank of the Blue Nile.

Khartum was selected as their base by the Egyptians on account of its position at the junction of the two principal waterways. It became the capital town in 1823, but building in brick was not begun until 1839; as the centre of government and trade activities it became also the centre of the slave traffic.

In 1862 Sir Samuel Baker left Khartum to discover the sources of the Nile, and again in 1870 he went south to attempt to stop the slave trade, in response to pressure put upon Egypt by the Powers in Europe, and to open up the territories of the South. Here too came General Gordon in February, 1877, to be Governor General of the Equatorial Provinces, a post he vacated in October, 1876. With considerable reluctance he returned in February, 1877, to be Governor General of the Soudan, but resigned in December, 1879, in despair of effecting any improvement in the administration. When the Mahdist rebellion broke out, Gordon once more returned, in February, 1884, to be Governor General, and taking an active part in the defence of the town against the Dervishes he met his death on the steps of his palace on January 26, 1885, the British relief force arriving two days afterwards, too late to be of any assistance.

Khartum was abandoned by the Dervishes in favour of Omdurman, and was re-occupied after the defeat of the Dervish forces on September 2, 1898, by the British and Egyptian armies under Lord Kitchener. On the re-conquest of the Soudan the rebuilding of the town was at once commenced, a new palace of three stories being erected on the foundations of the old one, and in the extensive gardens still flourishes a rose tree known as Gordon’s from its association with him.

Khartum has been reconstructed on a plan designed by Lord Kitchener with a view to future development and military requirements. A series of barracks for native troops have been built at intervals along the old earth works used during the siege. The barracks of the British garrison are situated at the east end of the town, fronting the Blue Nile and adjacent to the bridge which carries the railway line from the north into Khartum.

The railway runs southward along the Blue Nile for 170 miles, and then turning west eventually crosses the White Nile and passes through the gum gardens into Kordofan.

The river front of Khartum extending for some two miles, with its conspicuous fringe of date palms, a distinctive landmark in the flat and treeless country, is reserved for official buildings and residences, with few exceptions. An embankment wall along a considerable part of it protects the bank from erosion by the river, which rises during high Nile to some 30 feet and has a swift current. Along this wall runs a continuous treeshaded public road bordered on the inner side by well kept gardens. Behind are situated the banks, the headquarters of the trading companies, shops, the native market, and residences; further inland the building regulations are relaxed to enable Europeans and better class natives to occupy less expensive houses. The poorer natives live in villages outside and to the south of the line of encircling barracks. A fine mosque, inaugurated by the ex-Khedive Abbas Hilmi in December, 1901, was built of local stone with funds from Egypt.

The Anglican cathedral was consecrated in January, 1912, by the bishop of London. There is a Greek church, a Coptic church, a Roman Catholic church in the Austrian Mission, a temporary church in the American Mission, and other places of religious worship. Gordon College, built and endowed with funds raised by Lord Kitchener, provides advanced education for natives of the Soudan in Muhammedan law and houses a training school for schoolmasters, as well as instructional workshops. There is a government elementary school and various mission schools. A first class civil hospital affords medical and surgical help for patients from all parts of the Soudan and has a high reputation amongst the inhabitants. There is a small zoological garden. Electric light was first used in 1906 and an excellent water supply laid on in 1909; steam tramways and ferries are now being taken over (1925) by a group of English firms who will also build a bridge to Omdurman.

The population of Khartum, about 23,000, is mixed. British and Greek subjects form the largest European groups. Syrians and Egyptians have migrated from the North, but the greatest majority of the inhabitants consists of natives of the Soudan, Arabs from the northern provinces and Blacks from the South.


Al-Khashabat (plur. of al-khashaba, pole), was the name given to the light-houses in the Persian Gulf near ‘Abbādān: they are mentioned in al-Khwārizmi’s Mafāštī al-Ulīm (ed. v. Vloten, p. 124) as columns placed in the sea, on the tops of which lamps were lit at night. According to Mā‘īr ibn Khūsraw (Safar-nāme, ed. Scheter, text p. 90, transl. p. 246), they consisted of four columns of teak which rose 60 feet above the sea; there was a platform on the top with a little house for the watchman. The latter lit the lamps which were surrounded by glass to shelter them from the wind. They served as guides to the ships and were also used to signal the approach of pirates. Places at which these light-houses stood are given in Bibl. Geogr. Arab., iv., Gloss., p. 225, and in E. Wiedemann, Über Leuchtefuni bei den Muslimein, Arch. f. Gesch. d. Naturwissenschaft. u. d. Technik, ii. 1909, 151—4, and A. Mez, Die Renaissance des Islam, 1922, p. 479. * (E. Wiedemann)

Mukhtar's order and released Muhammad b. al-Hanafiya [q. v.], who was imprisoned by 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair [q. v.], are called Khazabiyah (al-Tabarï, et. cit., ii. 693, 4 sqq.; Ibn Sa'd, Ta'khirî, ed. Sachau, v. 74, 16 sqq.; cf. 76, 15; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamil, iv. 206 sqq.). They themselves apparently called their cudgels kafir-kubrāt (from Persian čab, wood, club) "clubs for unbelievers" (al-Tabarî, et. cit., ii. 694, 13; Ibn al-Athir, op. cit., iv. 207, 7 [variant]); these weapons are afterwards found also with the partisans of Abû Muslim [q. v.], (al-Dinawarî, et. al-Khbar al-Tawârî, ed. Caven, p. 350, 30 sqq.; al-Jâhîz, 93, 21; G. van Vloten, Recherches etc., Verd. K. A., Amst., Afd. Letterk., i, No. 3, 1894, p. 67), and in the civil war in Baghdad in 251 (865) they were distributed among the plebs (al-Tabarî, et. cit., iii. 1586, 13, 1587, 4; 1589, 7; Ibn al-Athir, op. cit., vii. 99, 9; al-Dîhilî, Ta'likh Khasî'î, ed. van Vloten—de Goeje, p. 11, 9) mentions the kafir-kubrāt as weapons of the Turks.

The remark in Ibn al-Athir's chronicle (op. cit., iv. 207, 13) that the liberators of Ibn al-Hanafiya bore cudgels in order to avoid the use of swords in the harâm, is as improbable as is the interpretation which connects the name Khazabiyah with the wood piled up by Ibn al-Zubair beside the prison of Ibn al-Hanafiya with the threat to have him and his fellow-prisoners burned.

With reference to a hadith of 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar in which the performing of the ḥablât behind the Khazabiyah is mentioned, the latter name was explained as denoting people who reverently kept the pole or tree-trunk (khshasha) on which 'Aqib b. 'Ali [q. v.] had been executed. But, as Majd al-Dîn Ibn al-Athir (loc. cit.) observes, this explanation is chronologically untenable.

According to an observation made by Ibn Hazm (al-Faqîh et al-Limal wa l-Aswâq 'an al-Nahi, Ms. Leiden 4809, f. 138b infra; cf. F. Friedlander, The Heterodoxies of the Shiites according to Ibn Hazm, New Haven 1909, i. 63, note 1), the Khazabiyah regarded the bearing of iron weapons as not allowed till the expected Mahdi had appeared.

The fact that "Revenge for al-'Usayn!" (yâ la-ta'rayt al-'Usayn, c. g. al-Tabarî, et. cit., ii. 694, 14; 14) was the rallying cry of the Khazabiyah is possibly intended to supplement this name by al-'Usainiyah, which is graphically only slightly different; the latter is, however, to be retained in places like Ibn 'Abd Rabib, 'Abd al-Farîd, Cairo 1317, i. 190, 17 sqq. and Ibn Badrân, Sharî' Kātib 'Ibn 'Aqîdîn, ed. Dozy, p. 187, 12-14).

Thus al-Khazabiyah was another name for the Kaṣāsîyya [q. v.] and then was applied to the adherents of the doctrines which were current among the latter, like that of the return (ra'yâ'a, q. v.) and that of metempsychosis (tanâmîsh, q. v.). The poetical representative of these doctrines, Kudhayyir, is called a Khazabi and is said to have been gained for the Khazabiyah by the poet Khidrî al-Asadî (al-‘Abbânî, viii. 33, 16, 20-24, 34, 20; xi. 47, 29 sqq., where Khidrî is to be read instead of Khadîfî).

According to Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Khwârizmi (Mafâth al-‘Ulûm, ed. van Vloten, p. 29, 3 sq.), the name al-Khazabiyah was used for a group of the Zaidiyah [q. v.]. Known as Surkhâbîya alter a certain Surkhâb al-Tabarî of whom nothing seems to be known; it might be possible to think of one of the Surkhâb who played a part in Tabaristân in the time of Hasan b. Zaid [q. v.] (cf. Ibn Is-fandyi, Engl. transl. by E. G. Browne, Gibb Mem. Ser., ii. 1, Leiden—London 1905, Index.) It must be left undecided whether they were called Khazabiyah after their weapons or perhaps on account of Kaisâni doctrines which asserted themselves among them. The same statement occurs in Abu l-Mâ‘âlî, Bayân al-Adwânî, in Christomathie proem, ed. by Ch. Schefer, i, (P. E. L. O. V., 2nd Ser., vii., Paris 1853), p. 157, 48 sq., where Surkhâb is to be read instead of Surkhâb.

According to a statement given on the authority of Abû l-Lâ‘în (apparently Ibn al-Mu'âsîrî), al-Khazabiyah was also the name of a section of the Djihiyyah [cf. the art. Dîhah B. ‘Awâlam], which maintained that Allâh does not speak and that the Qurân is created (L. 'A., i. 343, 9; T. 'A., i. 234, 25).


AL-KHAŞĪBI. [See Ibn al-Khâṣîbî.]

AL-KHAŞĪBI, ABU l-'ABBĀS AḤMAD B. ‘UBAAD ALLĀH B. AḤMAD B. AL-KHAŞĪBI, A VIŻIĒR. After the deposition of Abu l-Kâsim al-Khâṣîbî in Ramaḏân 313 (Nov. 925) (see IBN KâKÂN, 3) al-Khâṣîbî, who at that time was secretary to the mother of the Caliph al-Muqtadîr, was appointed vizier. But as he neglected his official duties and made himself generally hated for his extortion, he was deposited on the advice of the chief of police Muḥsin in Dhu l-Ka‘da 314 (Jan. 927) and ‘Alî b. Ja‘f (see IBN AL-Dâ‘î), 2 appointed in his place. Till the latter could reach the capital, ‘Ubaid Allâh b. Muhammad al-Kawâdhî acted as his deputy. In 318 (930/931) the other vizier Ibn Makhâḏî [q. v. 2] entrusted al-Khâṣîbî with the government of Fârs and Kermân.

Al-Khâṣîbî was also the name of the vizier who succeeded Muhammad ‘Ubaid Allâh in Dhu l-Hijjâja 321 (Dec. 933) and held office till the deposition of the Caliph al-Kâhir; in Ibn al-Athîr (viii. 195) and Ibn Khalîlîn (iii. 394) however, his name is given as Abu l-'Abbâs Aḥmad b. ‘Ubaid Allâh b. Sulaimân al-Khâṣîbî. Al-Khâṣîbî died in 328 (940).


KHAŞSEKÎ (Arab. khâşa: “private” with Turkish suffix ki), a term applied to anything belonging to the domains, service or the palace of the Sultan of Turkey. The Khâṣseki were the guards of the serail, a body of 300 junior officers chosen among the bajtâmî; 60 of them formed part of the imperial retinue, as a bodyguard; they wore a uniform of red cloth, were armed with a dagger (kshâdârî) and carried a baton in the hand; their commander was the bajt-khâṣseki. The khašseki-agha was the lieutenant of the bajtâmî-
Khāṣṣekī — Khāṭa

bashi. The khāṣṣekī-bashi, who is not to be confused with the preceding, was an officer of the corps of bālṣadji and acted as receiver general of the revenues that came from the pious endowments of Mecca and Medina. He wore a large bonnet of red cloth.

Khāṣṣekī was the title given to the Sultan's favourite. In the early days of the monarchy down to Ahmad III (1115 = 1703), the wife of the Sultan who gave birth to a prince was honoured with the title khāṣṣekī-sultanī, while those who only had daughters were called khāṣṣekī-kulīn. In 1705 (1647), contrary to the rule followed by the house of 'Othmanī, the debarced Sultan Ibrāhīm, several of whose consorts bore the title Khāṣṣekī, married one of the latter, Tellī-Khāṣṣekī, and she received the name Shāh-Sultanī.

Khāṣṣekī-jamāt 'mosque of the favourite', at Constantiople, built by Kharrem-Khāṣṣekī (Rose-lane) in 945 (1538) with fountains, soup-kitchen (simāret), a school founded in 946 (1539) and a hospital built in 957 (1550). The building originally had only one dome; a second was added by Ahmad I. in 1201 (1612). These edifices are in the Awret-Bāzār (Forum Arcadianum) at Stambool. The Khāṣṣekī hospital at the present day is reserved for women.

Bibliography: Häfez Husain İwansaray, Haṣba al-Dawrāni, Constantiople 1281, p. 101; Daud-bey, Eyalet Osmanlı, p. 41; Barbier de Meynard, Supplément aux dictionnaires, t. 1, p. 681; d'Ohsson, Tableau général de l'empire ottoman, Paris 1824, vii, 29, 32, 63, 65; Hammer, Histoire de l'empire ottoman, trad. Hellert, x. 74. (Cl. Huart)

Khāṭa (A.), a mistake, which is made in thought speech or action — a fault which one has is called 'sit', the opposite of sawāb, the correct; hence in the field of knowledge: error; in that of action: omission, failure, all this, of course, unintentional; from the last meaning develops that of wrong which one commits, transgression; whether this is to be regarded as unintentional or — as in khat'a and khat' — deliberate (sin) is a disputed point with the lexicographers. Khāṭa and khat' (the latter is found only in the Kūfī so that it is hardly classical) are synonymous (or phonetic variants?). Khāṭa is sometimes regarded as an infinite of khat'a used as a substantive (which it originally was and still is), sometimes as a substantive from akhēda (which it has become through linguistic usage), and sometimes as belonging to both. The lexicographers have the most diverse opinions regarding the more accurate definition of the meaning of these two verbs, within the sphere of ideas above outlined. Khāṭa and khat' are exceedingly rare in classical poetry (e.g. Abu l-Atālahiya, ed. 1888, p. 120, i: "sin" [parallel with duḥū]; also Kurān, xvii. 33: "sin"), as a variant of khat'; iv. 94: "transgression"); more frequently only the verbal forms khat'a and akhēda are used as synonyms.

The use of khat' as a technical term is in keeping with the general use of the word; the principal uses of it are as follows:

1. Error in logic (opposite sawāb), synonymous with khat', the "invalid" (opposite haḳḳ); the former pair of concepts ought to be used in questions of iṣṭiḥād [q. v.] and the latter in questions of fiḳh [q. v.]; this may be the result of the corresponding use of the word in the Kurān), so that Islām and the other religions are contrasted with one another in haḳḳ and khat'; opposite views in the fiḳh of the fiḳh (see the article fiḳh), as sawāb and khāṭa; but there is only one verbal form for each, aṣbaḥa and akhēda, which points to the artificiality of this distinction, and in reality the rule is often not observed; in other branches of learning also khāṭa and khat' are used promiscuously, as indeed are sawāb and khat' also. The works which deal with the uṣūl al-ḥaḳḳ (see the art. uṣūl) discuss the question whether the mudātahid [q. v.] mutlaḳ can err. In the orthodox community the opinion has prevailed that the mudāṭahid can err and in cases of difference of opinion only one can be right at a time, as is the traditional point; the Mu'tazilis [q. v.] asserted that every mudāṭahid is right, and even celebrated orthodox teachers held this view, e.g. Abu Yūsuf, Muḥammad b. al-Hasan al-Shāhībīn, Ibn Suraicī, al-Maẓāmi, al-Ash'ārī and his school, al-Bākiliyy, al-Ghaẓālī; Abu Ḥanifa adopts a middle view. The champions of the orthodox view believe, in keeping with this, that Allah has already come to a definite decision before every iṣṭiḥād and that the correctness or otherwise of the decision of the mudāṭahid results from its agreement or not with that of Allah; those of the Mu'tazila assume either different decisions by Allah which coincide with those of the individual mudāṭahid's and are valid for them and their muṭaḍallīs [q. v.], so that all differing decisions of the mudāṭahid's are equally justified, or they consider one decision more justified than the others and believe that Allah has taken no decision in such cases but "if He did do so", would express quite a definite one: this supposed decision by Allah is then compared with those of the mudāṭahid's and the mudāṭahid who agrees with it is considered in the right in every respect; but those which differ from it are considered in the right with respect to the basis, the iṣṭiḥād (iṣṭiḥādān iṣṭiḥādān), as the mudāṭahid has endeavoured with all his power to find the decision, in the wrong with respect to the result, the decision of itself (iṣṭiḥādān kāmanān). The representatives of the orthodoxy view, who are essentially in close agreement with this form of the Mu'tazili view, make the same distinction (the opinion is rejected that the mudāṭahid who makes a mistake is completely in the wrong); the other Mu'tazili view, however, is in sharp contrast to this. But this difference only exists in questions of the derivation of legal rules from the uṣūl al-ḥaḳḳ (fi l-ḥaṣrīyyī) and only in the case where no clear decision is given in the uṣūl; if there is one, but it has not been regarded by the mudāṭahid, he is, of course, wrong. In the domain of the uṣūl al-dīn, of kalām [q. v.], particularly in reason abductions (fi l-ḥaṣrīyyī), according to the general consensus, only one view can be right in a case of differences of opinion. Only a few Mu'tazilis, as whose representatives Abu l-Hasan 'Abd Allah al-'Anbari and al-Dājżārī are cited, asserted that here also in doxographies every mudāṭahid (the word is used in a wider sense, meaning everyone who does all in his power to solve a problem) is right; while al-'Anbari adds so long as he can be still described as a Muslim, and al-Dājżārī without limitation. Tradition on this point is no longer certain, as is apparent in differences in detail and in a certain irresolution; in this Mu'tazili teaching, however, — as in the polemics regarding the mudāṭahid —
The meaning of 'khata' come into consideration so that it is doublets correctly explained that by "being right" is not meant agreement with the actual facts, but that the maqāṣid has fully fulfilled the task imposed on it and therefore cannot be punished (while according to the orthodox consensus every non-Muslim is doomed to the pains of hell eternally), that that to which his ijtiḥād leads him is the right for him by Allāh’s decree itself. This ambiguity in terminology must have contributed to the ambiguity in tradition. That, taken purely logically, several differing views could be right at the same time has never been asserted. — The maqāṣid in the wrong is not punished for his error and is not considered as being in a religious error (dīnī), but is usually excused and is rewarded as he has done everything that is demanded of him if he has really used all his energy for the derivation of the legal rule; if he has not done this he is punished for his error; others say that every error of a maqāṣid is a sin; but this view is rejected. All this holds only of the maqāṣid’s of the Sunna, those of the "twelver" Shi’is are infallible.

2. Unintentional action (opposite 'amūd; this comes from mushaf, p. 94 sq. (cf. the art. KATA, section ii. i; passages like ii. 286 and xxxii. 5 may have also influenced); this is of interest here in so far as it is illegal; it may be more accurately defined as an act contrary to law, in which the intention of committing an illegal act is lacking, while the action itself may be deliberate; any negligence is left quite out of the question in the juridical appreciation. The Mu’tazilis asserted that one could not be punished by Allāh for it, for punishment is only conceivable for a deliberate illegal act; orthodoxy on the contrary teaches that, while khata is not a sin (tashu‘), any negligence, however, is something deliberate, and the khata, as its result, is liable to be punished (it is regarded as belonging to the 'aswār muktasaha, happenings only indirectly intended, in themselves not deliberate), for which man can equally be made responsible, but Allāh in his mercy will overlook the punishment in the next world; the khata is thus considered as an ameliorating — often even exonerating — circumstance in the infliction of punishment in this world (shukha; q. v.); it cannot be punished by hadād (q. v.). But not all of Allāh’s rights are dropped: anyone who, contrary to the prohibition, kills an animal in the haram (q. v.), the sacred territory of Mecca, whether with 'amūd (deliberately) or from khata' (unintentionally), has in the opinion of all four madhāb’s (q. v.) to make the prescribed atonement; Dā‘ūd al-Zahiri alone in this case also considers khata as an excuse. This is doubtless connected with what is ultimately a pre-Islamic idea, that Allāh has an especial right of ownership to the haram, its plants and animals (cf. Gaudefroy-Dembynes, Le Pléniéreur à la Mekke, p. 7, 10).

It follows that an unintentional infraction of this right of property is to be atoned for like an intentional one; (the substance of this is also found in the following difference of opinion: Mālik and Ahmad b. Hannāl do not require a special compensation if the animal has an owner — who, of course, must be compensated — i.e. does not belong to Allāh; Abū Ḥanīfa and al-Shāfi‘i demand it in every case, so that they extend their area of application). In ḥala there also is a full liability for any injury done to another. Here ḥala (q. v.) is a special case: its application is excluded when khata is present; instead the amūd (q. v.) is to be paid and the ḥalāfa (q. v.) to be performed. For further details see the article KATA, Section i. 5, 6, where the variation of 'excuse' in the meaning of an unintentional act are given. From them it will be seen that this terminological use of the word is based on the two meanings "error" (in the case of khata' fi 'l-ḥaṣād) and "failure", "accident" (in the case of khata' fi 'l-ṣahād) and is no more uniform than the uses dealt with under i.

Bibliography: The dictionaries: their statements are collected in Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon, v. i, 761; on its use as a technical term see Dictionary of the Technical Terms used in the Sciences of the Muḥannafs. Bibli. Indica, Old Series, i. 401 n. 1; Habershon, Resümations, ed. G. Flugel, p. 104; for further details the works on Ṣuṣār and the Fikhi-books are indispensable. See also the art. KATI.

(I. SCHACHT)

KHAṬĀ‘, the "sinners", pseudonym (tashā‘i) of Shāh Ismā‘il (q. v.). Of his Persian poems we only know so far the single verse quoted in the anthology compiled by his son Šāh Mīrzā (q. v.) and some other lines. On the other hand his Turkish Dīwān is known from several manuscripts, although these are rather scarce and differ considerably.

E. G. Browne (Persian Literature in Mediaeval Times, p. 12—13) has discovered the curious fact that the founder of the Safavid kingdom wrote mainly in Turkish while his rival Šūlṭān Selīm used Persian for his poems. Khaṭā‘ is now rightly regarded as one of the precursors of the literature of the Turkish dialect of Ardabīlijī. His language, however, judging from the oldest Farā’i manuscript, is rather artificial; alongside of the true Ardabīlijī vocabulary we find parallel forms from Eastern Türkī: galiyar, ḥaylār, the accusative of stems in consonants: in-γu-γu-γu.

From the point of view of poetry, Khaṭā‘s work is only mediocre; his images are isma’īlī and his lyrical themes monotonous. On the other hand the autobiographical allusions are very interesting in which Ismā‘īl poses as avenger of the blood of his father or as protector of the "family hearth" (khamāda‘) of Ardabīl, fulminates against his enemies of Fārs, extols the bravery of his ghulām, qabīl and dārān, and puts forward very bold mystical claims. He identifies himself with Ḥa‘ī and the imām and goes on to proclaim: "I am that agent absolute (FI‘IL muṭlaq) of whom they talk; the sun and the moon are in my power; my being is truly dominus Dei (haft Allāh); to prostrate thyself before me (ṣugā‘) is thy duty morning and evening"... "I am absolute reality (ḥa‘aṣ).... I am the pearl in the sea of truth (ḥa‘aṣa‘)."

The place occupied by Khaṭā‘ in the beliefs of the Ahl-Ḥa‘k (mujal ‘Alī场面 [i. v.]) is very important. Khaṭā‘s verses are frequently quoted by adepts of the sect. The litany known as Khābānīma enumerating the successive manifestations of the divinity runs as follows: "In the person of Khaṭā‘ it spoke Turkish and became the sīr of Turkestān", where this geographical term is said to mean Ardabīlijī inhabited by Turks.

The Khaṭā‘ avatar of Shāh Ismā‘il is important for the study of the occult doctrine of the šafawīs.
which deviates far from the Shi'a canon. It throws a new light on the esoteric foundations of the political power of the Safawids (cf. the sources like the Safvat al-Safā, Sīhilat al-Nashī-i Saḥawīya and the history of the youth of Ismā'īl I published by Sir Ed, D. Ross in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 249-340). Von Hammer (Gesch. d. Arm. Dichtkunst, ii, 18) mentions a mysterious dervish nūrī Khāṭātī (d. 936/1529) who had gone to Persia to receive from the hands of the Emīr al-Dīn of Dījal al-Dun Rāmī which the Safawī monarch had taken to Persia. V. Hammer quotes four verses from it in translation.

Bibliography: Turk-i Sāmī: MS. of the Bibl. Nat. of Paris, Persian Suppl., No. 1492, f. 17 r.; cf. also S. de Sacy, N. E., ix, Paris Ann. 7, p. 278. The MSS. known of Khāṭātī's Turkish Dwān are as follows: 1. Bibl. Nat., Turkish Suppl., No. 1307 (83 ff.): 253 ghazals', matnāwī ʾī Ḫosrowāyāt (24 batās), another matnāwī identical with that in London (18 batās), a heroic matnāwī (60 verses in mūškābār); the MS. was written in 948, i.e. 18 years after the death of Shīb Ismā'īl; 1 his ibtidāl batās, turn-over No. 995 (the former Scherfer-collection), goes back to the xvith Cent., Contains on 64 leaves: in Turkish 205 ghazals', 9 quatrains, matnāwīs (one of them the Naṣīḥāt-nāma ?), moreover one ghazal and some batās in Persian; 2. Brit. Museum: Or. 3380 "apparently of the xviith century"; cf. Ricu, Cath Turc. MSS. in the British Mus. London 1888, p. 205 sq.: the matnāwī Naṣīḥāt-nīma (168 batās) and the ghazals (ff. 10b-83); 3. Asiatic Museum of Leningrad: Or. 297, copied in 1036, contains the matnāwīs Aḥkām wa-maʾākāhik and the ghazals; 4. Prussian Staatsbibliothek Berlin: Or. Fol. 209, written in 1777, only contains 34 ghazals' (204 batās); cf. Persich, v. (Pers. Handschr.), sub No. 16; 5. Shaikh Hasāin Zāhdī, Sīhilat al-Nashī-i Sāhawīya, ed. E. G. Browne, Berlin 1334/1922, pp. 68-72: 4 poems of Khandānī glorifying the 12 imāms; 6. V. Minorsky, Materials ... sekīʿ Aḥkāmī, Moscou 1921, p. 108-110; dò. Notes sur la secte des Aḥkāmī, in R. M. M. 1922, p. 57, 86; according to Babinger, Zur Geschichte der Schīhawīya, in Isl. xxi, 1922, p. 233, the MS. of Constantinople is preserved in the Umāniya-library; cf. Aḥl Emīr Efendī, Zārir ṭevve-elbāvāt madḫuṣāt, i. 29. (V. MINORSKY)

KHĀṬĀT. The Khāṭāts are a Paṭān tribe belonging to the Karštān division of the Afghans, and live in the North-West Frontier Province of British India and adjacent localities. Their origin is much disputed (see the art. AFGHĀNISTĀN, above, i. 150). At the beginning of the Muhammedan era they occupied the Sulaimān Range and the northern part of the plains between the Jumna and the Indus. The history of the Khāṭāts was written by Kushtāl Khandānī, a renowned chief of the tribe in the time of the emperor Avarangāz. Akora, Shāhāzgār, Kālābāgh and Makhad are their chief seats. They are warlike and for centuries have been at feud with their neighbours and with one another; active, industrious and good cultivators, they are also great carriers and traders. The Khāṭāts are all Sunnis and speak the western dialect of Pashto.

Bibliography: See the art. KHWĀT. (R. B. WHITEHEAD)

KHĀṬĀM, KHĀṬĀNI (I. murr), seal, signet, signet-ring, the impression (also khatm) as well as the actual seal-matrix; it is applied not only to seals proper, engraved in incuse characters with retrograde inscriptions, but also to the very common seal-like objects with regular inscriptions of a pious or auspicious character; for the latter which are amulets and further readily distinguished from seals by the absence of a personal name see the article TAŠĀMĀN; indeed anything with an inscription stamped upon it may be called khāṭām. Here we are only concerned with seals in the strict sense of the word. The word khāṭām is said by Noldeke, Mandaische Grammatik, p. 112 to be of Aramaic origin, and in this he is followed by Frankef, Aram. Fremde., p. 252, who also recognizes a loan word in karkās, seal-clay.

The part played by the signet-ring in the east cannot be better illustrated than by the following quotation from Lane (Modern Egyptians, 1860, p. 31). Describing the dress of a Muslim Egyptian he says:

"On the little finger of the right hand (it is allowable to wear it on a finger of the left hand) is worn a seal-ring (khatim), which is generally of silver, with a cornelian, or other stone, upon which is engraved the wearer's name; the name is usually accompanied by the words 'his servant' (signifying "the servant, or worshipper, of God"), and often by other words expressive of the person's trust in God, etc. The Prophet disapproved of gold; therefore few Muslims wear gold rings; but the women have various ornaments (rings, bracelets, etc.) of that precious metal. The seal-ring is used for signing letters and other writings; and its impression is considered more valid than the sign-manual. A little ink is dabbed upon it with one of the fingers, and it is pressed upon the paper; the person who uses it having first touched his tongue with another finger, and moistened the place in the paper which is to be stamped. Almost every person who can afford it has a seal-ring, even though he be a servant".

The use of seals dates from remote antiquity in the east and they have never been supplanted by the spread of a knowledge of the art of writing and the use of the signature as has happened in the west. In the east the seal takes the place of the signature and it is the former that gives validity to a document even if the latter is also used. The seal is also much used as a guarantee that property will be kept intact and thus takes the place of locks and keys. Goods are simply roped up in a packet and the knots sealed with the owner's seal, a plan which to Chardin, for example, appeared more reliable than the western system owing to the practical impossibility of counterfeiting a seal. It is also used to stamp property as a mark of ownership (e.g., books, carpets, jewelry) and in this way corresponds to a coat of arms in the west. The possession of another person's seal is evidence that the latter has delegated his authority. There is abundant evidence of these usages in the east from very early times. Pharaoh, for example (Gen. xii. 42), gives Joseph his signet,
as a sign of authority, just as the Sultan of Turkey did his grand vizier. Jezzebel (J. Irons, xxii. S.) forms a letter in Abû Hâim’s name and seals it with his seal to give it validity. The books of Esther and Daniel give similar examples of the power of the Persian king’s seal. Herodotus (i. 195) tells us that every Babylonian carried a seal and the abundance of seals, usually cylindrical in form, that have survived from ancient times in Mesopotamia, illustrates this statement. Seals of the Sassanian period still exist in large numbers, whether made for mounting in rings or pierced for suspension. In South Arabia also the Himyarites have left us numerous specimens of their signs.

No seals of the pre-Muhammadan Arabs are known. The earliest Arab seals come from Egypt with papyri and belong to the period soon after the conquest. Whether we accept or not the story that only seventeen men in Mecca could write in the time of Muhammad, we must suppose that seals were in common use in this important commercial centre as in other parts of the east. Tradition in any case has a certain amount to tell about the Prophet’s khâbat. Al-Buḫârî, Sahîh (Bûlûk 1926), vii. (Ihâq) p. 48, says that the Prophet wished to write to the Byzantines. He was told that they would not read his letter unless it had a seal so he adopted one of silver with the inscription Muhammad ra’sûl Allâh. According to al-Maṣûdî, he adopted this ring in Muharram of the year 7 A.H. The Prophet is also said to have originally worn a khâbat of gold, but gave it up when he forbade the wearing of gold rings and silk and brocade (Buḫârî, loc. cit.). Women did not observe the prohibition of gold rings and ‘Aṣâfa for example wore them (ihâq). The Prophet wore his signet on his right hand and used to take it off when he went to the priy (al-Tirmîdî, Sahîh Bûlûk 1449), vol. i, Ihâq, p. 324). Opinions differ as to the proper hand and finger for the ring and there is no established rule. Later stories illustrate the Prophet’s disapproval of metals other than silver for signet-rings. He is reported to have said that a brass ring savoured of idolatry, that an iron one was emblematic of souls condemned to eternal fire, while words could not express his horror of a gold ring; meeting the wearer of one, he cast upon him a terrible frown and turned away as if he had encountered a dog or an idolat. The Prophet’s seal was handed on and used by his successors who had however also their own seals, under ‘Othmân lost it in a well at Arîs, or Zemzem, or according to others in the Tigris near Maysûl. The Prophet’s interdiction has been generally observed and it is exceedingly rare to find signet-rings of the more precious metals or mounted with the more valuable precious stones, upon which there was no embargo.

The earliest known seal of a Muslim is that of ‘Amr b. al-‘As, conqueror and governor of Egypt whose signet was a bull (Rainer, Führer, etc. No. 556). Whether this is due to local influence or the representation of an animal was not unusual with the pre-Muslim Arabs it is impossible to say. Other Arab seals bearing animals are known of this period, but the rigorous avoidance of images of living things was soon applied to seals also, for we soon find seals in Egypt of the Muslim type, although as late as 85 A.H., we find the governor Kurra b. Sharîk using a wolf (Rainer, Führer, No. 593). The seals of Abû Hâim b. Vahyât (No. 572) and of the head of the Treasury Râshid b. Khâlid “who trusts in God” (No. 577) are already of the style that became stereotyped. A notable seal from Egypt is that of the tax-collector Nâjîd b. Muslim which bears his name in Greek and Arabic (No. 580). Bilingual seals are again found in Syria and Asia Minor in the tenth century (cf. Schlumberger, op. cit., and Halîl Edhem, op. cit.). Here also under Byzantine influence we find double-sided impressions of seals in lead (bulut); of these the most notable is that of the Kakoydî ʿAli al-Dawla of 430 A.H., with a horseman on the obverse (Halîl Edhem, No. 30). Another remarkable seal from the same region is that of the Hamândî Muhammad b. Sa’d al-Dawla Abu ʿI-Mâlî Sharîf with obverse a bust of St. Theodore and his name in Greek characters (op. cit., No. 31).

The materials of these early impressions are the same as in later times, a special kind of clay (karras), or lead, appended by cords to the documents as in the mediaeval west also. When the seal is stamped on the documents itself, it is done with a special thick kind of ink and the paper is moistened before receiving the impression; red wax is also used where the climate permits it. In the mediaeval Europe, there are instances recorded in the east of bullae of the precious metals, silver and even gold for very special occasions (Reinnaud, op. cit., i. p. 112).

Charles White (op. cit.) deals very fully with the use of seals among the Turks and the guild of engravers in Constantinople. The latter have, he says, a special quarter in the bazaar called after them hatakalar tarzi. The members of the guild are Muslims (in contrast to the dealers in stones who are usually Jews) of fair education conversant with Arabic, Persian and Turkish. A few can decipher the Kufic character. Their training is a long one. Apprentices after a good education take lessons from the best calligraphers of the day and then serve seven years with a master-engraver. When their indentures have expired, they become journeymen (kalfâ), until they can acquire a business of their own and be admitted into the guild as master-members (meta), the number of whom is limited to fifty. Their shops are regularly searched by the police lest they be tempted to put their skill to illegal uses such as the engraving of false coin-dies. Such great care is taken to ensure the genuineness of a seal that the trade are forbidden to engrave two seals exactly the same for the same person. When a seal is lost the owner has some trifling alteration made in the new one, such as a change in an ornament or the date, so that the forgery can be detected if his first seal should fall into evil hands.

The Stambul engravers date the origin of their art in the time of the Caliph ʿOthmân and say that the first engraver was a certain Muhammad al-Hijdâji who engraved seals for ʿOthmân and ʿAlî bearing their names with the additional epithet ʿabd Allâh; the rings were of silver and the stones bloodstone.

White’s account of the seals of several of the dignitaries of the Ottoman sultans follows d’Ohsson. The Sultan has three seals of different sizes all of emerald set in gold with the same inscription, the ushâbî [q.v.] and a religious legend. The first is a small seal always carried by the Sultan and handed to his secretary as required. The second is somewhat larger and is entrusted to the grand
treasurer of the harem, who uses it for all matters relating to the harem — the Mughal Emperor Akbar similarly had a special seal for all documents relating to the harem. — The third imperial Ottoman seal is the seal of state confided to the grand vizier of the day, who is supposed to keep it in his bosom day and night. The head of each department of state has also his own seal for matters relating to his office.

Persons of distinction do not usually wear signet-rings on their fingers. Great dignitaries have a confidential seal-bearer (mukhdar) who carries the signet in a small bag in his breast pocket and presents it when required inked for the stamp or clean if wax is needed. People of humble rank carry their seal in the breast pocket or suspended round the neck. The impression of the signet stands for a signature although for documents of importance the latter is also necessary. In the case of the Sultān, the seal used and the presence or absence of the signature vary with the importance of the document, as does the format of the latter.

Chardin's account of the seals used by the Shāh of Persia is similar. There are three seal-keepers (mukhdar bakhsh) but they only affix the seals, which are kept in a box in the palace sealed with the king's own seal. Friday is the usual day for sealing documents; the mukhdar prepares the seal and paper and makes the impression on a sign from the Shāh who does not usually do it himself. There are three great seals, used for military, civil and foreign affairs, and two small seals used for the palace accounts etc. The same inscription is in the centre of the three large seals, bandah Shāh wiliyaat Sulaimān ast 1080 (A.H.); the small seals have din in place of wiliyaat. One of the large seals has a quartain round it and another has the names of the 12 Shi‘a Imāms. At the king's death his name is erased and that of his successor engraved on it. Of the general use of seals Chardin observes that it would not be easy to steal one as they are worn round the neck and only taken off in the bath; they are also worn on rings. It is rarer to find a seal counterfeit than a signature in Europe. The seal engravers used a drill and a small wheel with emery.

Abu l-Fadl in the A‘imār-ib Akbari devotes a special chapter to the Emperor's seals, which are used in the three branches of the government — “indeed every man requires them in his transactions”. (Here we may note that English officials in India in the xviiiith and xixith centuries found it necessary to have a seal with their names in Persian characters.)

At the beginning of his reign, Akbar had a circular seal bearing his name and those of his ancestors back to Timur in the rī‘āda characters; later he had a simpler one with his name only in the nasarātīb character. The former was at first used for letters to foreign kings and the latter (known as munk) for home affairs but the distinction was not maintained. A second seal used for judicial business was lozenge-shaped (mukhrāb) and bore an appropriate verse in praise of justness, round his majesty's name. For other business a small square seal with the legend Allāhu Akbar, jalla jalaalu was used and the harem as already stated had its own special seal.

The great figures of Muslim tradition had of course their seals. That of Sulaimān b. Dā‘ūd ibn Dā‘ūd was particularly famous and plays an important part in many of the stories of his miraculous exploits.

It was held in particular awe by the djinns. Djamshid, the Solon of Persia, according to Sa‘īdi, was the first person to wear his signet on the left hand. In Firdawsī's story of Sasānp I's escape from captivity in Rūm, he reveals his return by sending an impression of his signet to the grand mobed.

Coming to more historical periods, we have a record of the seal impressions of all the early caliphs (e.g. in Mṣa‘ūdī, Kitāb al-Tamkh, under each caliph; collected by Hāmmer-Purgstall and von Mörr); specimens of the seal impressions of several early Caliph still exist; (cf. Hāili Edhem, op. cit.). Timūr's seal bore his special mark, three small circles arranged in a triangle, and the motto custodi rustum and an impression still exists in the Bibl. Nationale (de Sacy, op. cit.). Jonville mentions a ring of "moul fūn or" bearing his signet which was among the presents sent to St. Louis by the Shāh-ī Djudāl. Specimens of the seals of Sultāns of Turkey and other high Turkish dignitaries are given by Hāmmer-Purgstall (op. cit.). Of these the most remarkable is the original seal of Sultān Muṣṭafā II of 1106 A.H. found on the battle field of Zenta (1697) where its bearer, the Grand Vizier Elnas Meljened Paşa, was killed. A special medal was struck by the Austrians to commemorate this trophy. The tughra is a feature of the imperial Turkish seals; it is said to be an imitation of the impression of the hand, because Urukhan's sign-manual was a impress of his hand in red ink. Timur is also said to have used this primitive signature and we know that he was not illiterate. The tughra is also traced back to the Prophet himself.

Muslims have followed the example of the Prophet in having simple inscriptions on their seals. Sometimes the name alone is used, sometimes it is accompanied by a brief pious inscription, often indicative of humility; if the owner have the name of a person mentioned in the Qur'an, the reference is frequently worked into the seal inscription. The name is given in a simple form and titles are as a rule avoided in keeping with the general decorousness of the signet; for examples of real legends see Reinaud and Hamburger's work. In later times in Persia and India seals became much more elaborate and the seal of a minor official of the Moghul court of the end of the xviith century often has several lines of hombastic inscription and forms a striking contrast to the seal for example of the great Sinan Paşa, five times Grand Vizier of Turkey with its modest inscription O God Thou art full of mercy, pardon poor Sinān, son of 'Ali'.

The commonest materials for rings are silver or copper; and if a stone is mounted in it with the seal, it is one of the less valuable stones, corselet, garnet, jacinth, agate, coral; the turquoise is not uncommon and one often sees them carved as amulets with inscription inlaid with gold. When not worn on a ring the seal is mounted on a handle and carried in a bag; sometimes the stone itself is pierced for suspension and worn round the neck. The shapes of Arab seals vary, oval is naturally the commonest but they are also square, hexagonal or octagonal; round is not common except for the largest sizes.

The art of the seal engraver was at its best, like that of calligraphy, in the xviith and xixith centuries. Its decline in the xixith was followed
by the practical extinction of the art in the sixteenth century. Many of the few practicing engravers have been preserved. Altun at the court of Timur was reckoned a master of his art. Abu l-Fadl gives the names of four masters of the craft at Akbar's court, each of whom was a specialist in a particular branch.


KHĀTHAM, an Arab tribe (the name is triptite although in several European editions of Arabic texts we find it wrongly vocalised as a diphtote). They inhabited, at least from the sixth century A.D., the mountainous territory between al-Tā’if and al-Nadjarān along the caravan route from Yemen to Mecca. Historiographical theory on the migrations of the tribes which is bound up with their genealogical systematization, makes these settle at the time of the separation of the sons of Ma’ādīn in the mountains of al-Sarat [q.v.], from which the Azd are said to have driven them at the time of the migration of the South Arabian tribes after the burning of the dam of Ma’ārib, to the lands they occupied in historical times (al-Bakri, Mu’addīn, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 28, 38, 41–42 = Wustenfeld, Die Wohnsitze u. Wohnungen d. ar. Stamme, Ath. G. W. Gutt., v. 1845, 59, 58 = Muṣafalṭṣṭāt, ed. Ilyal, p. 113–114, 118, following Ibn al-Kalbī; Yaḥūt, Mu’dīn, ed. Wustenfeld, i. 404; ii. 326–327; Wustenfeld, Register z. d. genealog. Tabellen, 130–131). According to this theory the Khātham (like the Badjilā [q.v.] who figure everywhere as their brethren) were part of the Ismā’īlī tribes, their descent being Khātham b. Anmār b. Nīzār (Ibn Hīshām, Sīrāj ed. Wustenfeld, p. 49, 15–50, 51; Ibn Kūṭaibā, Ma’dīn, ed. Wustenfeld, 50, 18; [Pseudo-]Balkhi, ed. Furt, iv. 110–111, who all attribute this view to the genealogists of the Mu‘ādar). But another theory connects them with a branch of the Saba according to the genealogy: Aftal, son of Khatam b. Anmār b. ‘Irāsh b. ‘A’īr b. al-Ghawth (the latter is also the father of the Arab tribes) of mostly pure Saba. Khātham b. ‘A’īr b. al-Ghawth (Ibn al-Kalbi, Dīnanār al-Ma’āzīn, MS. of the Escorial, fol. 442r–119v, who is followed by Ibn Durāzī, Iḥrāq, ed. Wustenfeld, 301, 1–310; Ibn Kūṭaibā, p. 50, 1–50; Ibn Hīshām, p. 50, 3–5; Aṣćaḥi, xv. 154, 18; Wustenfeld, General Tabellen, 1–13; Hamdānī, Dīnanār al-Arād, ed. Muller, p. 116, 11, gives the isolated genealogy: Khātham b. Ra’bā b. ‘Amīr [†] and Ibn Kūṭaibā, p. 50, 16 makes Ammār the son of Saba’i, cf. Reiske, Prima rerum, p. 133). These contradictory statements seem to indicate that, like so many other tribes, the Khātham do not represent an ethnic unit but rather a confederation of clans of different origins. This seems also to be deducible from the etymological of their name, which connects it with the verb ṭakḥāth vita “to smear oneself with blood” on the occasion of a pact of alliance (on this custom cf. J. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten, p. 21–22, 25–26 and the authors he quotes). Other etymologies which make Khātham the name of a mountain or of a camel are not worthy of consideration (Ibn al-Kalbi, fol. 120r–121v = Ibn Durāzī, 93–94, 4 from below; Hamdānī, ed. Freytag, 72, 375, 1, 395, 56). In any case we always find the Khātham associated with tribes of the south either in alliances made on the occasion of expeditions (e.g. al-‘Āğiha, i. 17, xii. 47 sq.; xviii. 35–36) or during the ridda (al-Tabarī, 94: i. 1855 sq.), or latterly in the grouping of the tribes stationed in the military camps of Baṣra and Kufa (al-Tabarī, i. 2495, 3174; ii. 122; but ii. 1382, r., we find them also grouped with the Kinaān, Kays ‘Alkīn, Muzaina and even Kuraish, all tribes of the north under the general denomination Aḥl al-Alīya. It seems that at this time [101 A.H.] the territorial principle had prevailed over the ethnic one). Their principal clans were the Shahrānī, Nāhīsh and Aklūb, the latter according to the South Arabian genealogy was of another origin (Aklūb b. Rab‘a b. Nīzār) and was late in entering the tribe (cf. al-Bakri, p. 53 ult.–54 sq.).

We have no authentic information on the Khātham for the remote period in the history of the Arabian peninsula (the identification proposed by Blau, Z.D.M.G., xxii. 658; xxiii. 561, note 6 with the ‘Arṣaṣura Adramite of Uranios and Pliny who are to be distinguished from the Khaṣsarī of Hadramawt, is quite untenable). From the sixth century we find them inhabiting along with other tribes of diverse origins, the district of Bishā, Turabi, Dijarrā, Tabīla; this last was the centre of the cult of the God Dhu ‘l-Khaṣaṣa (on him see Wellhausen, Reise, p. 45–48), whom the Khātham like the Badjila, Daws, Bahitla etc. worshipped (Yaḥūt, i. 791; ii. 461, 703; iv. 62, 567 = Aṣćaḥi, xi. 152), 578, 15 sq., where there are numerous references to the neighbours of the Khātham and to the assassination of the part of the territory of Bishā at the end of the first century A.D. to some members of the Omayyad and Hashimi families; Hamdānī, 135–136; Ibn al-Kalbi, Kitāb al-Asmān, 34 sq.).

Among the numerous guerrilla wars in which the Khātham were involved (cf. Aṣğhī, vii. 119; xii. 47, 51–52; xiv. 25; xviii. 35–36; Naṣṣābī, ed. Bevan, 46; Yaḥūt, ii. 735, 16; iv. 56, 16–17;
Hamadani, 170, 21, the best known is that of Faif al-Riḥ in which their chief Anas b. Mudrik (or Murdiqa) allied to the greater part of the Madhīḥidi, defeated the Banū Ṭamir b. Saʿa`a commanded by ʿAmir b. al-Tufail [q. v.] who lost an eye in the battle (Naṣāʻid, 469–472; Ibn al-Atṭīq, ed. Tornberg, i. 474; 72d, ed. 1293, iii. 102–103; Dārūn of ʿAmr, ed. Lyall, Introd., p. 82–93, Nos. 1, 11. [= Muṣafadāt, ii. ed. v., 111, xii, xxv, xxvii, Suppl., Nos. 1, 19]. Anas b. Mudrik famous also as a poet was the hero of another enterprise of the Khṭḥʿām like that against the Banū Dūṣḥam (Aḵṭān, i. 17) and that in which he killed the famous poet-brandict Sulāk b. Sulakā (Hanūsa, 415–416; Aḵṭān, xviii. 137–138; Ibn Ḥumayd, Kit. al-Shīr, ed. de Goeje, 217). The biographical notes on Anas, who lived for several years after the introduction of Islam, have been collected by the author of this article in Caentī, Annālī dīll Islam, x. 499–500 (year 40 A. H., § 347). The position of the Banū Ṭamir of the Khṭḥʿām enabled them to play a part in the Abyssinian expedition against Mekka. They tried to oppose Abraha's advance but beaten by him, they were forced to guide the enemy's army as far as al-Tā'if (see the sources collected in Nadke, Gesch. d. Pers. u. Araber, p. 206–217). The spread of Islam at first left them indifferent (no heed need be paid to the story in al-Tābari, i. 1079–1080, of the Khṭḥʿām kāhīna of Tabālāh, Fāṭima bint Mūr, who saw a "divine" light on the face of ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, the future father of the Prophet. The only interesting feature of the story is that it was conferred on the kāhīna). Their first relations with Muḥammad were certainly hostile (Wāʿūs, transl. Wellhausen, 387; al-Tābari, i. 1730–1731), but they ultimately sent him an embassy and recognized him and accepted a letter from him which declared all the blood-feuds previous to Islam abolished (Ibn Saʿīd, i. 2, 34, 78; Annālī dīll Islam, ii. 330, year 10 A. H., § 28, cf. also § 23, p. 326–327). On the death of the Prophet, only a section of them rebelled (Annālī, ii. 573–574, 581, 585, year 11 A. H., § 87–88, 98-104). The destruction of the sanctuary of the Banū al-Khṭḥʿām by ʿAbdallāh b. al-Ruṣayd must have broken their resistance along with that of other tribes who were grouped round this turbulent centre (al-Tābari, i. 1985 sq.). During the wars of conquest we find them in the army of Syria (Ibn ʿAṣīkīr in Annālī, iii. 588, year 15 A. H., § 602, cf. also al-Tābari, i. 3287, 111, 3408, 8–17) as well as in those of the ʿIrāq (al-Tābari, 2188, 11–12), and as we have seen, they formed part of the tribes quartered at Baṣra and Kūf. Several Khṭḥʿāmī women were married to Kūraishīs. One of them played rather an important part in the early history of Islam: ʿAmmā bint ʿUmar is one of the first women converted to the faith of Muḥammad, who took part in the emigration of the first Muslims to Abyssinia. She was successively the wife of Djaʿfar b. Abī Ṭālid, Abū Bakr and ʿAli, which gives special prestige in Muslim tradition (Ibn Saʿīd, viii. 205–209 and cf. Annālī dīll Islam, x. 231–236, year 38 A. H., §§ 269–292). Her sister Salmā was the wife of Ḥamza b. Abd al-Muṭṭalib (Annālī, loc. cit., § 285), Ibn Saʿīd, viii. 209); a daughter of Anas b. Mudrik, Asmāʾ, was the wife of Khālid b. al-Walīd (Ibn Ḥudayr, Iyāb, Cairo, viii. 6, N. 39; Annālī, ix., year 37 A. H., § 412, x. 499). The Khṭḥʿāmī poets were few in number; the most notable is Ibn al-Dumaynīn (Aḵṭān, xv. 151–157; Ibn Kūtaibah, Kit. al-Shīr, p. 458–459, etc.), who flourished probably at the end of the first or at the beginning of the second century A.H. and who is famous for the sanguinary revenge he took for his wife's unfaithfulness.

The Bibliography (besides works quoted in the article): Ibn al-Kalbī, Qismhat al-ansāb, MS. of the Escorial, fol. 124v–127r, of which Ibn Durand, Ishkāk, ed. Westenfeld, 304–306 and 13H, ed. 1293, i. 78–79 are resumés. (G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

KHṬṬĀ (plur. Khṭṭāyā and Khṭṭāʾīn, sin), synonymous with ḏḥun. The root ḏḥ- has the meaning of stumbling (in Hebrew: Prverbs, xix. 2), committing an error (ṣḥṭṭaʿa is said e.g. of the Bowman whose arrow misses the aim); see the art. Khṭṭā. The definition of ḏḥṭṭaʿa is "a sin committed on purpose"; that ḏḥṭṭaʿ (see Sura xvii. 33) simply "a sin", whereas ṭḥɔm is applied to heavy sins. Probably these theological distinctions belong to the Islamic period only; it seems doubtful whether the pagan Arabs were acquainted with the term ḏḥṭṭaʿ at all. It occurs in the dīwān of Kās b. al-Ruṣaydāt, ed. Rhodokanakis, N. 18, vs. 3, p. 129, in the sense of fault, defect (kind communication from F. Krenkow). It is only in accord with the general character of the Kurʿān that this book does not contain an elaborate theory of sin; frequent are, however, the passages in which the consequences and forgiveness of sins is spoken of. Allāh, al-Ru ṣaydāt, al-Ruṣaydāt, through the preaching of His Apostles and Prophets, calls men unto forgiveness of sins (Sura xiv. 11; xlv. 30; lxxi. 4, 6). Who avoids heavy sins and immoral deeds will find plenty of forgiveness with his Lord (Sura lii. 33), who forgives sin and accepteth repentance (Sura xxi. 2); He is the best of forgivers (Sura vii. 154); He forgives sins totally (ṣḥṭṭaʿan; Sura xxxii. 54).

This is the general aspect of forgiveness of sins in the Kurʿān. Further details are also given. Ṣura Mūsā says: "O my Lord, I have wronged myself (ṣalāmu naṣīrī, forgive me", Allāh forgives him (Sura xxxvii. 15; cf. Sura xxxviii. 24 [Dāuḍ, etc.). But he who dies as an infidel or as a polytheist will not find forgiveness (Sura iv. 51, 136; xlvii. 36; κνὰρ [q.v.] is forgiven, however, when it is done away with (Sura viii. 39). But he who "is enveloped" by his sin will remain in Hell for ever (Sura ii. 75).

This is a mild view; it agrees, on the whole, with the position of Judaism and Catholicism on this point. But it is not to be forgotten that Allāh remains free: "He spareth whomsoever He pleaseth and punisheth whomsoever He pleaseth" (Sura iii. 124). The mild attitude regarding sinners taken by the Kurʿān is kept on by Islam. Yet the doctrine of sin, the distinction of light and heavy sins as well as their punishment were the object of serious controversy in early Islam.

The distinction between light (ṣḥṭṭaʿ) and heavy (khaṭṭaʿ) sins could be maintained in accordance with passages from the Kurʿān such as Sūra xii. 35, where the term khaṭṭaʿ is already used. Christian dogmatics have certainly exercised influence, as may be seen from the doctrine of the (seven)
capital sins which occurs in Ḥadith: “The Apostle of Allah said: Avoid the seven capital sins (mubākharāt). When he was asked what they are, he answered: Polytheism, sorcery, killing those who may not be killed except for a lawful reason, spoiling the possessions of orphans, usury, fleeing from battle against the enemy, and abusing heedless, faithful muḥṣamāt” (Muslim, Ḳāfīn, tr. 144; al-Bukhārī, Waqīyāt, bāb 23). In other enumerations of the capital sins there are deviations from this scheme; theology and ethics maintain the view that there are sins heavier than those enumerated in the tradition just mentioned. Al-Nawawī in his commentary (v. 170) cites a passage from Ḥaḍīth Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Salām the contents of which are the following. Whosoever wishes to know whether a sin belongs to the class of the light or to that of the heavy ones may compare its character with the character of the capital sins. If it is lighter than the lightest of capital sins, it belongs to the light ones; in other cases it belongs to the heavy ones. Who e.g. disdains his Lord or throws the Kur‘ān into the fire has committed one of the heaviest sins, though the law does not characterize it as such. Likewise, if a man should lay hold on a woman in order to give his companion opportunity to violate her, or if he should detain a man in order to give his companion to kill this man, such a deed would bear a much more sinful character than the spoiling of the possessions of orphans, though the latter figures among the capital sins. In the same portion of his commentary al-Nawawī speaks of the strongly deviating opinions concerning the distinction between light and heavy sins. He cites the saying of Ibn ‘Abbās: “Everything which Allah has prohibited, when perpetuated, is a heavy sin.” And other theological authorities have said: “Every action contrary to the law is a heavy sin with a view to Allah’s Majesty.” Yet the great majority of the theologians are unanimous in making a distinction between light and heavy sins. Although they recognize the view just mentioned to be right with respect to Allah, yet there is a gradation with a view to sins considered by themselves. Accordingly the law calls light sins those which are atoned by the five salahs, by the ṭawfīq of the Ḥaḍīth, etc. But how can light sins be distinguished from heavy ones? Several answers to this question are given. According to one view, every sin which is mentioned in connection with Hell, with Allah’s anger, curse or punishment belongs to the heavy ones. Another view: Every sin committed without signs of fear or circumspctation or with levity belongs to the heavy ones; but sins due to slips of the tongue, to a relaxed control of the passions and the like are to be reckoned among the light ones. Such contradictory definitions induce Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Wāḥidī to state that there are certain sins that are called heavy by law, others that are called light, and others that are not distinguished with either of these epithets. Prudence therefore commands men to avoid all sins lest he prove to have committed one of the heavy ones. — The ‘ulama’ say: Persevering in committing light sins makes them heavy; and on the authority of ‘Umar and Ibn ‘Abbās the sentence is handed down: “No sin is heavy if forgiveness is asked, no sin is light if the transgressor perseveres in it.” Thus far al-Nawawī.

This theory concerning light and heavy sins and their forgiveness, which may be called representative of the views of orthodox Islam, was not shared by two sects of so divergent tendencies as the Khārijīs [q.v.] and the Mu‘tazilīs [q.v.]. Both hold the position that the consequent of heavy sins will be eternal punishment. This position is connected with the question concerning the relation existing between faith and works. While orthodox Islam, theoretically at least, emphasizes the value of faith, these sects lay stress upon works as the criterion of a man being faithful or not; their most consequent opponents in this respect were the Murdīqis [q.v.]. The line of distinction which orthodox Islam draws between Muslims and Kāfir is quite different from the right by the Khawārijīd and the Mu‘tazīla, so as to add to the damned also the Muslims who were guilty of heavy sins. The echo of the fervent debates between the parties is still heard in the commentaries on the Kur‘ān. Al-Baidāwī comments upon Sūra ii. 75 (see above): “The ‘enveption’ mentioned here can only refer to ‘Kāfīr; consequently those who have committed heavy sins do not fall under the verdict of this verse.”

Verses like Sūra xxxix. 55: “Allah forgives sins in their totality” and Sūra ii. 284: “He forgives whomsoever He pleaseth and He punisheth whomsoever He pleaseth”; prove that punishment of sins is not necessarily that heavy and that light sins are also pardoned (Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Ma‘ṣūfah al-Ghāib, ii. 82). Al-Baidāwī (see also Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, v. 455): “It is not true that for the forgiveness of sins tawḥīd [q.v.] is necessary; this is only required for shirk [q.v.].” Still, however strong this assertion may be, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī does not fail to declare in his commentary on Sūra xxxix. 54: “Perhaps He will pardon sins in general and perhaps He will punish in Hell for a time and pardon afterwards.”

Al-Zamakhshārī, who was a moderate Mu‘tazīlī, combats such views. Commenting upon the words “He pardones whomsoever He pleaseth” (Sūra iii. 124) he remarks: “On account of tawḥīd, for He is not disposed to grant forgiveness except to those who repent.” And he fulminates against the interpretation of the verse which is put into the mouth of Ibn ‘Abbās: “He grants heavy sins to whomsoever He pleaseth and He punisheth whomsoever He pleaseth on account of light sins”; words, indeed, to bring a Mu‘tazīlī to despair. As is to be expected, the orthodox view of heavy sins being pardoned is also to be found in Ḥadīth. The Prophet said: “Dā‘īrī visited me and cheered me with the assurance: Any member of thy community who dies confessing Allah’s unity will enter Paradise.” I said: “Even if he has committed adultery and theft?” He said: “Even if he has committed adultery and theft!” (Muslim, Ḳāfīn, tr. 153). Al-Nawawī remarks in his commentary on this tradition: “This is a locus pro bana for the opinion of the Sunnites that those who have committed heavy sins will not suffer everlasting punishment in Hell and that they will be taken back from Hell if they have entered it: and that they finally will enter Paradise and remain there for ever.” All this is elaborately treated in the traditions on intercession (see the article Shajā‘a) where it is stated anew that Muhammad intercedes also on behalf of grave sinners and that through his intercession they are allowed to leave Hell.

Innumerable are the traditions in which Muḥammad mentions forgiveness of sins on account
of good works of every kind. In some of these traditions the qualification occurs: “except heavy ones”; this clause represents the common orthodox view (see above) that light sins are repaired by good works of every kind, that heavy ones require īstiqfār and that ẓhīk requires tawbah (q. v.). Ẓhīk, polytheism, is consequently the heaviest sin; the lightest is the so-called ḥadīth al-nafs, i.e. sinful thoughts which do not issue into result. It is even said that some of these thoughts are taken in the computation of sins on the Day of Resurrection. The idea is expressed in the following tradition: “The Apostle of Allāh said: Allāh does not take into account what the members of my community think as long as they do not pronounce it or carry it out” (Muslim, Imān, tr. 201–208). This tradition, which also occurs in other forms, is another proof of the mild attitude taken by orthodox Islam towards sin, an attitude which forms a counterbalance against the severe doctrine of kādar (q. v.). The tradition just mentioned and the attitude from which it arises are the more remarkable because Muslim theologians were strict proponents of the intention (cf. the art. Niyā). On the other hand, scrupulousness regarding sinful thoughts is highly praised. Once Muḥammad’s companions said to him: “We find in our inner selves thoughts which we would have scurped to pronounce.” He said: “Do you find them really?” They answered: “Yes”. Then he said: “This (scrupulousness) is pure faith” (Muslim, Imān, tr. 209). In this connection also the following hadīth may be mentioned. “Anas said: Verily, you do things which, in your eyes, are more significant than a hair is thick; but in Muḥammad’s lifetime we considered them as capital sins” (al-Bukhārī, Rāzīq, bāb 32). Finally one tradition must be mentioned which could be called a step in the direction of the attitude of Khaḍījī and Muʿaḍzīs regarding heavy sins. “The Apostle of Allāh said: Who commits fornication is not a believer at the same time, nor is he who steals or drinks wine” (Muslim, Imān, tr. 100; cf. tr. 101–105; cf. al-Bukhārī, ʿUbudī, bāb 1, 6, 20 etc.). Al-Nawawi in his commentary is anxious to prove that the words “is not a believer” do not imply a total, but only a partial lack of faith, and he states that “the ʿaṣūrāt of the people of the truth” is that those who commit fornication, theft, murder or any sin considered as one of the ʿaṣūrāt, except ẓhīk, are not for this reason infidels; no, they are believers lacking in faith; if they repent, their punishment is abolished and if they die persevering in heavy sins they are left to Allāh’s pleasure: if He pleaseth, He forgiveth them and maketh them enter Paradise at once; and if He pleaseth, He punisheth them and maketh them enter Paradise afterwards. — Similar views and their opposite lie also at the bottom of the much debated question whether faith is liable to increase and diminution.

In ethical and mystical literature we find a more systematic and elaborate classification of the sins; cf. Abū Ṭalīb al-Makki, intro. to al-Ṭūlānī, i. 85 sq.; al-Ghazālī, Iḥyāʾ, vol. iv., book ii. (on repentance). Abū Ṭalīb recognizes four classes of sins, a division which was borrowed from him by al-Ghazālī. Those of the first kind are called rabbādiya, sins such as haughtiness and pride, boasting, arrogance, love of praise, love of life, ambition, despotism; those of the second class are called satanic (ţartinayya); it comprises such sins as envy and deceit; those of the third class bear the epithet of “animal” (bāhinayya); these are avidity, covetousness, rage and lust; the fourth class comprises those sins which remind of the nature of the beasts of prey (tabū’īya), such as wrath, fighting and murder. Al-Ghazālī rejects the view of those who do not recognise a practical difference between light and heavy sins. He mentions the enumerations of heavy sins varying from four and eleven, and cites Abū Ṭalīb al-Makki’s view that “there are 17 heavy sins, four in the heart, to wit: polytheism, persevering in sin, despair of Allāh’s compassion, and ʿinān min māʾṣer; four in the tongue, to wit: false witness, abusing the muḥṣīn, false oath, and sorcery; three in the belly: drinking water and intoxicating drinks, spoiling the goods of orphans, and usury; two in the genitals: fornication and polygamy; two in the hands: murder and theft; one in the feet: fleeing from battle; one in the whole body: dishonesty regarding the debts of others.”

The mystics, notwithstanding such classifications, see sin in a more general light. It is man as such who is a sinner. It is necessary for him to know Allāh in His highness and to know himself in his baseness. For the soul is like a mirror disfigured by rust, which has to be cleaned and polished, so as to be able to reflect the higher world. This polishing process dominates the life of the mystic and gives rise e.g. to the muḥāṣaba, the daily examination of one’s self with a view to sins committed and to the means to avoid them in future (Iḥyāʾ, vol. iv., book viii.; cf. Aḥmad Palacios, La Mystique d’al-Ghazzâlî, M.T.O.M., viii. 90 sq.). It is this consciousness of sinfulness which lies at the root of the mournful attitude of the mystics and which has inspired so many sayings expressing their fear to appear before Allāh after death (cf. R. Hartmann, Al-Kescha’ir’s Darstellung des Sufismus, p. 11 sq.).

Two deviating attitudes regarding sin taken by the mystics have still to be mentioned: that of the Iḥšāsīya and that of the Malānātiya. The former have turned their back to the via purgativa of the mystic and maintain that the fetters of law and morals have no longer to be borne by him who participates in true mystic life. For a full description see the art. Taṣawwuf. — The Maḥmūdiya (q. v.), on the other hand, start from the conception that the mystic has to avoid all that may confer on him the praise of mankind and their admiration. They therefore do not shun actions which expose them to general reproval or disdain, actions which in their case are not the outcome of their indulging in sinful inclinations and which, without the purpose of incurring blame, would lose nothing of their sinful character.

(A. J. Wensing)}
absolutely definite but practically is that the ša'îr uses the poetic form while the khašî expresses himself in prose, often, however, also in ṣadu (cf. Dāhîjī, ṣ. cit. i. 159); his speech is introduced with annî bă’dus (al-Hârîrî, ed. de Sacy, 1822, p. 42). According to Dāhîjī, there were a few khašîbû who were also ṣâhra (i. 27).

In the Ḡāsîliyya the ša’îr is said to have been more highly esteemed than the khašî but when the numbers of poets gradually increased and the latter’s art declined and they became beggars, the khašî got more prestige (i. 136; iii. 227). The khašî is also associated with the story-teller, the kâfî, and with the ʿashâba al-ḥāłkar wa l-ṭalā’ûr (Dāhîjī, i. 167 sq. and passim); the office was sometimes hereditary in the same family. The khašîbû did not form a gild or caste; they were the men who had the ability to be spokesmen. They appear not only at the head of a waṣfî to negotiate as representatives of their tribe, as we know from the Ṣîra (cf. Goldhârī, Abânî, zîr arb. Phîlî, i. 20), but, like the poets, they were also the leaders in the war of wits with the enemy (muṣâfahâra). The khašî had to be able to extol the glorious deeds and the noble qualities of his tribe and to narrate them in perfect language and to be able likewise to expose the weaknesses of his opponents. He had therefore to be faṣîh and know how to employ bâlaţâha and in this way to overcome his opponents (cf. The Mufâsî- dâsilâyât, ed. Lyall, xcii. 22 sq., xcvi. 9; al-Ḳûţâni ed. J. Barth, xiv. 20; Ibn Kâs al-Ruḳtáyât, ed. Khodakansak, S. B. A. Wk., 1902, xlv. 19; Kamî, ed. Wight, 20, 15 sq.). Lampons give the following characteristics of a poor khašî: his pronunciation is bad, he turns over and fro, stammers, coughs, strokes his beard, twists his fingers, a sign of cowardice (Ḥanâša, ed. Freytag, p. 659, verse 5; Kamî, ed. Wight, p. 20, 7, 15 sq.). It is in keeping with the character of the ancient Arab khašî that he is included among the fighting knights and nobles (al-Ḳûţâni, ṣ. cit.; Dāhîjī, i. 134 sq. 172, 11), indeed, khašî itself is used as a name for a brave warrior (Dāhîjî, i. 129). When the khašî makes a public appearance his insignia are lance, staff or bow (al-mâkkâtîn), just as a man taking an oath carries tokens of masculine honour; he often strikes the earth with it (cf. al-Ḳûţâni, xxvii. 6; Labîd, Dwîmân, ed. al-Châlîdî, 7, 15 [p. 27], 9 sq. [p. 45]; Dāhîjî, i. 197 sq., iii. 3 sqq. 61 sqq.).

In the earliest days of Isâm the khašî retained much of his old character. “The prophet came forward as a khašî” after the conquest of Mekka (Ibn Ḥîṣâm, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 823, 3 from below) and spoke publicly with ceremony and authority. But the khašî now became solely an address to the Muslims, not a part of the war against the enemy and muṣâfahâra was no longer part of the activities of the Muslim khašî. But it is quite in keeping with the nature of early Isâm and with that of the Arab khašî that the ruler himself was spoken of and that he not only made edifying speeches from the minbar as khašî but also issued orders, made decisions and pronounced his views on political questions and particularly questions of general interest. This was the case under the first four caliphs and the Umayyads (cf. Dâhîjî, i. 190), and the governors appointed by them also acted as khašîbû (e.g. al-Yâsîbî, ed. Houtsma, ii. 318 infra); Dâhîjî, i. 179 middle, etc.); the local governors appointed by the latter were also entrusted with the control of the minbar and of the ṣalāt (al-Tâbârî, ii. 929, 1 sqq.). Diatribes against and curses on the enemy were part of their minbar speeches, e.g. the curses on “Ali and occasionally on Ṭalhâ and ‘Abbâs” (Dâhîjî, i. 165). Khaṭîb was therefore still synonymous with “hearer” in the political sense. A poet of the Khâwarîj says: “There will be no peace as long as there is a khaṭîb from the minbar of this world” (Dâhîjî, iii. 135). An inheritance from the ancient Arab spokesman is the staff or lance which the Muslim khaṭîb holds in his right hand during the ḡâhiba, a custom which provoked the scorn of the Persians (Dâhîjî, iii. 135). But the close connection between the khaṭîb and divine service gave the Muslim khaṭîb a specifically religious character. After the conclusion of the wars of the first generations, this element became more predominant and in the time of the ʿAbâlîsîs, as early as Hârîn al-Ḳalîfî, the caliph left it to the ʿâdsîs to deliver the sermon at the service while he himself was simply a listener (Dâhîjî, i. 161). But in theory the leaders of divine service in the great mosques are representatives of the caliph (cf. Ibn Khâlidî, Muḥaddîmî, Cairo 1322, p. 173).

The Egyptian Fâṭiμīs still occasionally preached themselves (behind a veil), namely 3 times in the month of Râḏânî and at the great festivals (Ibn al-Tâbârî, ed. Jyûnbîlî, ii. 482—486; ed. Popper, p. 331 sqq.; al-Mâkhrîzî, Khiṭṭat, Cairo 1334, ii. 322, 327, 329). On this occasion his highest dignitaries stood on the steps of the minbar (cf. op. cit., p. 327, 329), while on the other hand the râis of a district often stood on the minbar if the khaṭîb was preaching, while a custom which testifies to the original high rank of the khaṭîb, but was later condemned by strict authorities on morals (Ibn al-Ḥalîjî, Khiṭṭîb al-Madâhîlî, Cairo 1320, ii. 74). Special khaṭîbû were everywhere appointed. There were three of them in Cairo during the earlier Fâṭiμî period (for the ‘Ahrî, Ibn Ṭûlîn and al-Azhâr mosques); cf. al-Mâkhrîzî, Khiṭṭat, ii. 348 sq., as a rule it seems to have been the holy office of a kâfî; cf. op. cit., p. 224, 8 infra. On the Ḥâl al-Qâdrî, a special khaṭîb pronounced the khaṭba on a minbar with 9 steps in the sanctuary of Ḥusain in Cairo, while the chief kâfî conducted the ṣalât; the khaṭîb on this occasion was given a silk robe and 30 or 50 dinârs (al-Mâkhrîzî, Khiṭṭat, ii. 224 sqq.). On other occasions also the khaṭîb received a robe of honour (op. cit., ii. 387 infra). The khaṭîb usually was also the conductor (imâm) of the Friday ṣalât at which he preached and, according to Abî Ḥanîfa and an attribution of Mâlikî, he must actually do so unless there were special reasons for a deviation from the rule. The daily ṣalât’s are as a rule conducted by other imâm’s (al-Mâwîrdî, al-Mâkhrîzî al-Sulâmî, ed. Enger, p. 181, 3 from below) and according to al-Shârîfî and Mâlikî, the Friday service with khaṭba can only be held in one mosque in each town, if the size of the town does not make it impossible, while Abî Ḥanîfa has no such rule. The khaṭba was therefore delivered, for example, in Cairo after the end of the Fâṭiμî period in the Ḥâkim mosque only, because Saladin appointed a Shâhî chief kâfî. This state of affairs was altered by Baibars when he appointed a Ḥanâfî chief kâfî (al-Mâkhrîzî, Khiṭṭat, iv. 53). Abî Ḥanîfa on the other hand allows divine service
in which a khatib takes part only in a large town (miṣr), in which the ruler or his deputy is present in person. The other schools are less rigorous on the point. But the Imām-khatib of the Friday service is, according to the other schools also, in theory the representative of "the highest Īmām". Several Īmāms can be chosen, if necessary with their exact functions defined. According to al-Mawardi (p. 172), the Sulṭān appoints the Īmāms of the larger mosques, in keeping with the theory of their representative character. But, according to al-Kalqashandi (Ṣuḥḥ al-Ārāfā, Cairo, iv. 39), each mosque under the Mamluks had its own khatib while the Sulṭān only concerned himself with the larger mosques. The office of khatib of the important mosques was a very distinguished one. Thus, according to Ibn 'Abd al-Zahir, the Shafi'i chief ījāba himself was khatib of the great mosque in the citadel of Cairo (cf. P. Rasseh, Zentralblatt für islamische Wissenschaft, 1894, p. 92) and it was regarded as a special distinction, anxiously coveted, when Saladin after the conquest of Jerusalem chose the ījāba Muḥy al-Din Abu 'l-Maṣlālī to act as first khatib in the Aqsā mosque (Ṣuḥḥ al-Din, Khatib al-Rawdatān fī Akhār al-Dawlatān, Cairo 1288, ii. 108 sqq.). The document confirming his appointment under the Mamluks is further evidence of the khatib's dignity (cf. al-Kalqashandi, ib. ii. 222-223; al-Unari, Khatīb al-Tārīf bi 'l-Mustashfa al-Širīf, Cairo 1312, p. 126 sq.). He is the natural authority to whom new converts announce their conversion to Islam (Ibn al-Hāʾidjī, Khatib al-Madīhāl, p. 79); the people touch his robe li 'l-habbūr, etc. (al-Shārānī, Khatib al-Miṣrīn, i. 169). According to al-Mawardi (p. 185), the khatib ought preferably to wear black clothes, according to al-Ghazālī, white, while the first mentioned would be bid'a (ījāba), Cairo 1322, p. 131, to f. 6 sqq.). His insignia are al-ṣalātīn, the "two things of wood" i.e. the minbar and the staff or wooden sword which he has to hold in his hand during the sermon, according to the Fīhī books also. According to the law of 1911 applied to al-Azhar, art. 59, every one who has passed through the second of the three divisions of the institute can become a khatib. While in al-Azhar itself only one khatib is appointed (al-Zayyiātī, Taʾrīkh al-Azhar, Cairo 1320, p. 207), there were in 1909 in the mosque of the Prophet in Medina 46, in Mekka 19, khatibān; besides their deputies. They enjoy certain foundations and the office is on the whole hereditary (al-Batūnī, al-Kišla al-Ḥāṣibiyā, Cairo 1329, p. 101, 242).

Pride of the office of khatib, the waḥīf exercised the function of an elevating preacher, when he pleased (cf. A. Mez, Die Renaissance des Islāms, 1922, p. 318 sqq.).

Biography: I. Goldziher, Der Chatib bei den alten Arabern, W. Z. K. M., 1892, vi. 97-102; C. Snouck Hurgronje, Islam und Phonograph (Tijdschr. Bat. Gen., 1900, xliii. 401-404 = Verspreide Geschriften, 1923, ii. 426 sqq.); C. H. Becker, Die Kanzel im Kultur des alten Islām, Noldeke-Pietschsfift, i. 331-351 = Islamstudien, 1924, i. 450-471; also, Zur Gesch. d. islamischen Kultur, in Ḥadīth, 107, iii. 372 = Islamstudien, i. 472-509; T. W. Jumell, Handbuch des islamischen Geistes, 1910, p. 87-89; E. W. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians (Every Man's Library), p. 84; the Fīhī-books under Salāt al-Jumā'īn and al-Sha'īrāt, Khatīb al-Miṣrīn, Cairo 1329, i. 164-171; Ibn 'Abd Rabīhī, Al-Tārīkh al-Farātī, Cairo 1321, ii. 128 sqq. A few references are taken from A. Fischer's lexico-graphical collection (Joits. Pedersen) on Al-Khatib al-Baghdadi, whom as al-Khatib al-Baghdadi, was born on the 24th Dju'ādād, 392 (1002) at Darzidān, a large village on the west bank of the Tigris below Bagdad. The son of a khatib (preacher), he began his studies very early and spent his youth travelling in search of ḥadīth. In this way he visited Baʿṣa, Nishāzpā, Isfahān, Hamādān and Damascus. Finally settling in Bagdad, he held the office of a khatib there and this was the origin of the name al-Khatib al-Baghdādi by which he is known to posterity. His profound erudition in the matter of tradition gained him great fame and authority in his new abode; one of his biographers says that preachers and teachers of tradition used to have to submit the traditions they had collected to his expert opinion before quoting them in their sermons and in their lectures. On the other hand al-Khatib seems to have suffered from the hostility of the Ḥanbalīs, who were numerous and powerful in Bagdad at this period. His preference for the Shafi'i-school, after having been at first a Ḥanbālī, his theological opinions which were quite uncompromising in their Ashārahīsm, attracted to him the hatred of the pupils of the Imām Ṭāhirī who were enemies of all bold theological speculation. He succeeded however in spite of the opposition of the Ḥanbalīs and thanks to the protection of the Caliph al-Ḵāzm and the vizier Ibn al-Muṣlim in opening a course of lectures on ḥadīth (tāḥīṣ) in the mosque of al-Manṣūr. It seems, that retaining a bitter resentment for the cunning shown him, al-Khatib never lost an opportunity in his lectures and writings of making malicious insinuations against Ṭāhirī b. Ḥanbal and the Ḥanbalīs and even attacking them openly. He was on this account accused by later generations of taʿṣṣub (legal and theological bias) and there is a body of polemical literature against him (cf. Hāʾidjī Khāliṣa, iii. 632). When the successful rebellion of al-Baṣṣṭrī brought about the ruin of Ibn al-Muṣlima, al-Khatib fled to Damascus; arrested by order of the Fāṭimid governor, he only narrowly escaped execution by a precipitous flight to Shīr and Aleppo. Returning to Bagdad after the Sālājūks had restored order there, al-Khatib, "ḥāfīz of the east", died there a year later on Monday 7th Dhu'l-Ḥijja 643 (1071) in the same year as Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, "Ḥāfīz of the west". He was buried in the presence of a vast concourse beside the tomb of the venerated Bīshr al-Haffī.

Al-Khāṭīb's work was considerable: according to his biographers about a hundred treatises. The most celebrated of his works is the Taʾrīkh Bagdadī, a repository of scholars of tradition living in Bagdad; the geographical, topographical and historical introduction, which precedes the bibliographical collection has been abbreviated and partly published and translated into French by G. Salmon and utilised by G. Le Strange, British Embassy to Bagdad in 1917. J. K. A. S., 1897, p. 35-45; edition of the text . . . ; mention should also be made of his Kifāya fi muḥrīṣ waṣīf 'ilm al-risālāwīyā and his Taṣṣīṣ al-ʿilm, on which see the

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, II.
This latter meaning is probably derived from the earlier meaning of the lines which a diviner (kāf) drew in sand and from which he prognosticated the happy or unlucky issue of an undertaking about which he was consulted. For this purpose the diviner accompanied by an acolyte drew with utmost haste, so that he could not possibly remember the number, a quantity of lines in the sand. Then he slowly wiped out two lines at a time, while the acolyte recited the words: “Ye two sons of Ḣyān, hasten with the explanation!" If in the end two lines remained it was a sure sign of success, while one line meant disappointment. This being ancient priesthood was prohibited by Islam, but another mode of divining survived for a long time: and may be practised to the present day. The diviner in this art of khaṭṭ made only three lines in the sand and then used scraps of barley or date-stones which he flung upon the lines, and from the way they fell upon the lines he prognosticated the good or evil result of the enterprise (cf. Ibn al-ʿAbīr, Niḥāya, i. 303; Liṣān, ix. 157-158).

Further khaṭṭ means essentially "handwriting" i.e. the Arabic script with its development and various styles; so we find it used in a verse of Imr̩ al-ʿKās (ed. Alwātī, 63, v. 1): "I like the writing of the Psalm on Yamanite palm-leaf". Similarly ʿAbd Allah b. ʿAṣama (Mufādhiyyat, ed. Lyall, 114, v. 5) says: "Just as the ink is moved about in the writing from the inkstand". Later poems contain the mention of khaṭṭ for writing more frequently and the verse of the Islamic poet al-Ḥagamī (ed. Cairo, p. 26, 7) may suffice: "As in Taimā a Jewish rabbi writes Hebrew with his right hand and then draws straight lines across (the parchment)". From this verse it becomes clear that not only Arabic writing, but any script is named khaṭṭ.

In modern language the word khaṭṭ is used for manuscript copies of books in opposition to printed books. The history of the development of the Arabic script need not be enlarged upon here as the subject has been dealt with in an earlier article (cf. the art. Ar̩ábī, above, vol. i). The secretaries (kāṭib, q.v.) developed a science about the correct formation of the letters, while necromancers in their turn invented a science by attributing special virtues to certain combinations of letters (cf. Tāghkūrī Ṣāda, ed. Iḥādarābād, i. 75-80; al-Kalqasāndī, Sūb al-aʿlā, iii. 2-171, and elsewhere; and for the supposed mystical interpretation of writing principally the books of the Ḥurūfīs). Cf. further the art. Khaṭṭ-i Ḥumayūn.

Bibliography: Ibn Durūstawāh, Kāṭib al-Khaṭṭ, ed. Bairut 1921, and most works dealing with the instructions of the Kāṭib.

(From Krenkow)

**Al-Khaṭṭ**, a strip of coast on the Persian Gulf. The Arab geographers are not agreed as to its exact extent. While Yāḥyā limits the name to the coast of al-Bahrain and ʿUmān, which is also apparent from the mention of al-Kaṭīf, al-ʿUkkair and Ḥaṭar, al-Bakri says definitely that al-Khaṭṭ is the whole coast between ʿUmān and al-Baṣra on the one side and Kāţma and al-Shīr on the other. This difference of opinion is probably the result of the variation in extent of ʿUmān and al-Bahrain in the wider sense of these terms in course of time.

There are in any case authors who allot al-Khaṭṭ to either the one or the other territory. Al-Khaṭṭ in Ḥamād b. Muḥammad al-Ḥerawī, for example,
is simply a collective name for the villages in 'Umān, while Ibn al-Anbārī uses al-Khattī as the name for the coast of al-Bahrāin. In contrast to these wide applications of a fairly general term there is a narrow one, according to which al-Khattī was a particular settlement on the coast which belonged to the 'Abd al-Kaṣī. A. Sprenger has adopted this view, which was held by al-Ḥallūqī and others, and there is much in favour of locating al-Khattī preferably in the Gulf of al-Bahrain. The place was in any case noted as a market for the famous Khatti sailing-ships imported from India and sold to the Beduins. The name al-Khattī seems to be old. If A. Sprenger is right in connecting it with "regio Attene" and "Chateni" in Pinen, Nat. Hist., vi. 28, 147, and the "Atta vicus" in Polyb, the name dates back long before the Muḥāmaddan period.


(KHATT-I HUMAYUN, "imperial rescript," an ordinance referring to the organisation of the Ottoman empire, promulgated by the Sultan. The exact date of the act is unknown. It is primarily applied to the Sultan's fatwā written by the sovereign himself at the head of the document; later when the charge of the tughrā [q.v.] was left to a official called nishapūrī, the term was wrongly extended to the whole document itself. The expression is synonymous with khattī sharif but the usage in Ottoman administrative law is to apply the latter only to the khattī sharif of Gulkhān, a constitutional charter granted by Sultan 'Abd al-Majd (Shahān 26, 1255 = Nov. 3, 1839), while the former is generally applied to the khattī humâyūn of the first third of Djujudlā 11, 1272 (Feb. 18, 1856). The latter addressed to the grand vizier Muhammad Ahmad 'Ali Pāshā and obtained by the united action of French and English diplomats at the end of the Crimean War. By this document, the Sultan acknowledging that this subjects were united among themselves by cordial bonds of patriotism (sewandāzāt), an expression that appears for the first time here but did not catch on) declared he would maintain the guarantees promised by the charter of Gulkhān for the security of persons and property without distinction of class or cult, as well as the privileges and immunities enjoyed by non-Muslims; he accorded authority to repair churches and other buildings belonging to the various communities, put an end to the use of insulting appellations in administrative documents (for example of the term rījā, applied to tributaries); proclaimed all his subjects eligible for public offices; instituted mixed tribunals composed of Muslims; announced the coming codification of penal and commercial law, and better organisation of the police, the application of recruiting to non-Muslims with the right of buying oneself out, the reorganisation of the provincial councils, the right of foreign possession to landed property, reforms in the levying of taxes, the making of banks, roads and canals. This law remained in force until the constitution of Mīḥat Pāsha in 1876.

Bibliography: T. X. Bianchi, Khaththī humâyūn (1856) at the end of the Nouveau Guide de la conversation, 2. (Cf. III ART) KHATT-I SHARIF. [See KHATT-I HUMAYUN]. KHATTĀBIYĀ, name of a sect reckoned among the Shi'ite extremists (gūlārā), called after Abu l-Khattāb Muhammad b. Abū Zainab al-Asādī al-Adīdī, who is said to have issued the imperial (humâyūn) of the deity in the Imām Dja'far al-Sādīq (83–148 = 702–765) and afterwards in himself. He obtained a following in al-Kūfah, where he was attacked by Isā b. Musā, who was governor for some years till 147 = 764/765; he armed his followers with stones, reds and knifes, assuring them that these would prevail against the enemy's swords and lances. This promise proved deceptive; his followers, to the number of seventy, were slaughtered, and he himself was captured in Dār al-Rizāq on the bank of the Euphrates, impaled, his trunk afterwards burned, and his head sent to Baghādī. This disaster did not terminate the existence of the sect, some of whom maintained that neither Abu l-Khattāb nor his followers had been really killed, the appearance having been delusive. Their numbers are computed by the best informed writer about 300 A. H. at 100,000, their location being the Sowād of al-Kūfah and Yaman; they had, however, no power or force. There is a brief allusion to their doctrine in Ibn Kutāhah's Ma'rīf, which is somewhat earlier, and in the work of al-Muṭahhar b. al-Ṭibīrī, who is some fifty years later, but they seem to have done nothing which attracted the attention of the historians. After Abu l-Khattāb's death his followers are said to have transferred the imamate to Muhammad b. Ismā'īl b. Dja'far al-Sādīq, and are thus to be reckoned among the Ismā'īlīs.

The statements about their specific doctrines are scanty and to be accepted with caution. They held, it is asserted, that Muhammad transferred the prophetic office from himself to 'Ali on the Day of the Pond; and it would seem that Abu l-Khattāb must have asserted that similar transference had taken place from Dja'far to himself. Both Sunnī and Shi'ī writers maintain emphatically that Dja'far repudiated the claims made for him by Abu l-Khattāb, whose relation to him seems to have been similar to that of al-Mukhtar b. Abī 'Usaid to Ibn al-Hanafiyya.

Of his other doctrines the best attested is that he taught absolute ruthlessness in dealing with opponents. Men, women and children were all to be massacred, his argument being the same as was employed by the Aṣārīs. False witness was lawful in dealing with them. Al-Muṭahhar asserts that in consequence the evidence of members of this sect was not accepted in the courts.

The later heresiologists know far more about the sect than do the earlier. With al-Muṭahhar the Bazīghtā are a separate sect, but al-Shahrastānī makes them a subdivision of the Khattābiyya. The latter writer makes another subdivision, the 'Uma'iriya, who figure in 'Abd al-Kāhir's work as a subdivision of the Djanāhiyya. Al-Shahrastānī also treats the Mu'ammariyya as a branch of the Khattābiyya, but Ibn Ḥazm evidently regarded them as
independent. By the time of al-Makrit the number of subdivisions had reached fifty, and Abu i-L-Khatib's father's kunya was variously given as Abū Ṭhaˤr and Abū Yaʕil, probably through misreadings of the name Zainab. The seed is charged with preserving the whole of the moral law as well as the whole ritual of Islam. Transmigration also appears among their supposed tenets. Since the seed appears to have left no literature, it is difficult to check these statements.


(D. S. Magnus)
is a reference to its territory in the inscription Glaser, 119, 5 and a clan of the name is mentioned in Glaser, 204, 7. All these passages justify the suggestion that the tribe of Khawāl was already settled in this region in the first millennium b.c. where it still — in part at least — dwells in the land between Ṣanʿa and Mārib, which al-Hamdānī calls Khawāl al-ʿAlīya and which with Dī Ḫurra was one of the great granaries of the Yemen, where Ḫurra, barley and wheat in particular flourished exceedingly. The Khawāl tribe now belongs to the great tribe of Bākill which can put about 80,000 armed men in the field. The traveller E. Glaser wrote in the 1860s. The Arab genealogists give as the eponymous hero of the tribe Khawāl b. ʿAmr b. ʿAbd al-Ḥāfīz b. Murra b. Udad b. Zaid b. ʿAmr b. Gharib b. Zaid b. Ḫulkān b. Sāla. Some say the ancestor was Khawāl b. ʿAmr b. Ḫāfīz b. Ḫulkān, after whose ancestor they are also called Khawāl Khulqā. The distinction between the Khawāl al-ʿAlīya and the Khawāl Khulqā is, however, not genealogical but rather regional; for the former also belong — at least according to Nashwān — to Ḫulqā. The distinction comes from the fact that originally the whole tribe of Khawāl was settled in Mārib and Šīrīḥ but in the course of time a portion of them migrated to the highlands east of Ṣanʿa and received the name Khawāl al-ʿAlīya, while the remainder stayed in Mārib and not till a later date did a new migration take place to the region of Ṣaḍa, which is still the most important town of the northern Khawāl territory. As early as C. Niebuhr was the time there were two districts of this tribe which were, as they still are, under independent Shekhs. The last named according to Niebuhr 4 days journey from the port of Ḥali halfway between Ṣanʿa and Mecca, which according to E. Glaser extends W. and N.W. of Ṣaḍa, is Zaide. Ḥamdānī's statement is worthy of note, that here pure Arabic was spoken only in the highlands while in the valley and al-Káid and a good part of the town was the usual lingua franca. The name Khawāl in this particular area is still associated with two other features, the peak of Khawāl (Umr Khawāl), a mountain top, which can be seen from the Ḥijābl Tukhlah, and Bait Khawāl, the name given to the summit of the Ḥijābl Ḥaḍr. In Khawāl of Ṣaḍa, Niebuhr only mentions the villages of Akabat el Muslim (ʿAṣhabat el-Muslim), Heidān (Ḥāidān), ed-dāḥhār and Suk ed sjamma (Ṣūk el-Ḥumā), the golden mine at Ṣuq al-ʿAmr, which belonged to the Banū ʿAbd al-Māʾmar b. Zurāra b. Khawāl, probably — with other considerations — induced A. Sprenger to connect Khawāl with the Biblical Hawila. Niebuhr also had already done this. In Khawāl of Ṣanʿa Niebuhr mentions the villages of Beit Roeds (Bait Ṣaḥṣa), Tannaim (Ṭannīm), Beit el Kibis (Bait el-Kibis), Beit el-Numa, Seijān (Šeyān), Suradje (Ṣurādje) and Berres (Harrāsh). In Shabān of the year 10 A. H. (Nov. 631 A.D.) env. 1000 in Muḥammad al-Medina and professed Islam on behalf of their tribe. They were instructed in the teaching of Islam by the Prophet himself and promised to destroy their idol ʿAmr Anas, then received the usual gift of honour of 12½ ounces of silver and returned home. After the death of the Prophet they at first joined the general movement of apostasy, but ʿAṣhab b. Munaḥa whom the Caliph Abū Bakr sent against them with an expeditionary force, succeeded in regaining them for Islam in the course of the year 11 A. H. (632 A.D.). Politically they were on closer terms with the government in al-Medina than the other tribes of the Yemen, which was probably the result of their relations with the Persian rulers in ʿAmr. They afforded shelter to the two Persian princes Djughaš and Fairūz who were driven out of ʿAmr by the rebellion of the Arabs under Kāls b. ʿAbd Yaghūth b. Mākhrit and supported them till help came from al-Medina.

Members of the tribe of Khawāl after their lands were finally opened for Islam after the submission of the Yemen in 13 or 14 A.H., played an important part among the Southern Arabs who took part in the conquest of Egypt and settled there. We frequently find Khawāl in important positions in Egypt; in Old Cairo (al-Fustāṭ) they gave their name to a quarter, and the name generally is not rare in the papyri and on Arab tombstones in Egypt.

2) the name of a village near Damascus. One of the most distinguished of the companions of the Prophet is buried there, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Mīṣkham Abū Muslim al-Khawāl.


2) Yākūṭ, Muḥammad, ed. Westenfeld, ii, 499; Mārāṣid al-Īṭilaʾ, Leiden 1852, i, 375; ʿĀzīmuddīn Ahmad, Die auf Südarábien bezügliche Angaben nachw. im Sans. al-Ulūm, p. 76.

KHAYĀL, MIR MUḤAMMAD TĀṢĪ, of Ahmadābād in Gujrat, a writer of a collection of tales in 15 volumes entitled Būfānī Khayāl, composed in Persian prose between 1742 and 1756, at the
KHAYALI, also known as Bekâr Memi, an important Turkish poet of the time of Sulaiman the Great. Like the poet Lâli he belonged to the little Rumelian town of Wardar Yeniğesi. Like Sheikh Glâbi, he was precocious and developed his poetic talent very early. As a boy he was in the service of the Haideri dervish and mystic Iâba'îbî Mest, by whom he was introduced into mysticism which left traces in many of his poems. In the wanderings of his master, he came with him to Constantinople where he was removed from the influence of this dervish by the intervention of the authority. His poetical abilities ultimately won him the favour of the Deftedar Iskandar Çelebi and then that of the Grand Vizier Frenk Ibrahim Pasha, who introduced him into the circle of poets around Sultan Sulaiman. The Sultan granted him his favour and confidence: he became one of the intimates of the Sultan, the highest honour that could be attained by an Ottoman poet. After the execution of his patrons (Iskandar was hanged in Baghdâd in 1535 and Ibrahim strangled in the Serai in 1536), with the declining influence of the once powerful poet-favourites, Khayâl fell upon evil days, as he had never been able to save the presents and other tokens of favour with which he had been overwhelmed, but he was finally given a mandâj by the Sultan and the title of Bey. He died in 964 (1556—1557) in Adrianople where he was buried.

Khayâl, who was of an amiable friendly character and throughout his life retained a dervish-like humility and frankness, just as he retained his membership of the Haideri order, was one of the best poets of his time. None of his contemporaries surpassed him in poetic vigour and diction. His language is, however, now antiquated. He only worked in the lyric field (khasâl, kûšidâ). Careless of the fate of his work as of this world's goods, he left the task of arranging his strongly mystical poems into a divân to another. His son 'Umar Bey (d. 1010) was also a poet.

The play spread from Turkey to non-Turkish lands. It seems to have established itself with special fineness among the Greeks and down to quite modern times (notably in Athens, the Piracus and Salonika). In the same way it was very popular among all classes in Rumania.

Bibliography: C. Jacob, Geschichte des Schattentheaters, Hanover 1925, where the literature to be consulted is completely given. Cf. also I. Rouvel, Kândâvâ, ou un théâtre d'ombres a Athènes, Athens 1921; J. Kará Hészârinthein dien vol. 1, Ungarn Pestvâr, Wevelreme 1925; A. Samoilowâ, Kândâvâ, ou un théâtre en Transylvanie, in Russisk Muév, Ethnografiski öfle, Petrograd 1923, No. I.
Constantinople 1311, ii. 313; Flügel, Kat. der . . . . . . turk. Handschriften in Wien, 1865, i. 649. (In MS. written by the poet and calligrapher Ibrahim Celebi in the library of the Royal As. Soc. in London); E. J. W. Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, iii. 58; v. Harnack, G. O. K. B. 2, ii. 332. (TH. MENZEL).

KHAZAR, a people of uncertain origin; on their relation to the Bulgars and the rise of the Khazar state see above, i. 78c, where also the alliance between the Khazar and the Byzantines in the war against Persia in 627 is dealt with. In spite of the successful issue of the war for the Byzantines it is not recorded that their empire was increased at the expense of Persia; but the Caucasian lands taken at this time by the Khazars were not reconquered by the Persians and the Khazars were only deprived of them by the Arabs. Al-Baladhuri's statement (ed. de Goeje, p. 194) that the old capital of Arran, Ka'wawlak, Arab. Kabala (cf. the art. Arran), was also called Kharazan is important. On the ravaging of the countries of the Caucasus by the Khazars cf. A. Manandian, Beiträge zur palästinischen Geschichte, doss. Leipzig 1897, p. 39 sqq., following Moses Kalankatuač; ibid., p. 30 sqq., from the same source, on the alleged conversion of the Huns, i.e. the Khazars, to Christianity by the Albanian bishop Israel in the time of the Armenian Catholikos Sahak III (677-703); in this connection we are given some information regarding the pagan conceptions of the Khazars and the worship of their supreme deity Tengri-Khan. The "capital of the land of the Huns" there mentioned, Varačan or Varadjan, is, according to Marquart (Osterröpische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig 1903, p. 16), identical with Balandjara, where, according to al-Mas'udi (Tanzil, ed. de Goeje, p. 62, 16), in earlier times the capital of the Khazars was, according to Marquart on one of the streams that form the Kösi-su (Sulak). Al-Tabari relates the conquest of Balandjara and the fortresses in this region by the Arabs in the year 104 = 729/730 (Ibn al-Atihir, ed. Tornberg, v. 117) al-Bai'da (the "white city") is first given as the capital; according to Marquart, this is a translation of the name given in the earliest Arabic source (Ibn Rusta, ed. de Goeje, p. 139, 14; al-Gardzi in W. Barthold, Oseto e poekadze v Srednyuyu Asiyu, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 95) for the west side of the later capital Itil (at the mouth of the Volga); Marquart proposes to read the name Sarghishar (Turk. "yellow city"). According to Ibn al-Atihir (v. 160), Marwan b. Muhammad advanced as far as al-Bai'da in 119 = 737. Ibn al-Atihir only records the flight of the Khazar king from this town; according to al-Baladhuri (p. 207), he concluded peace with Marwan and declared himself ready to adopt Islam, whereupon Marwan confirmed him in his kingdom. A section of the Khazars was settled by Marwan between the river Samur and the town of Shahbārūn (cf. above, i. 943). In spite of this, the Arab kings were not firmly established on the Volga nor even in Daghestān (q.v.); even in the 15th century the rule of the Khazars reached almost up to the walls of Derbend (cf. the article DAGHESTAN). The Khazar kingdom was able to assert itself as a great power against the Byzantine Empire as well as the Caliphate. The emperor Constantine V Copronymus (741-775) married a Khazar princess; the Emperor Leo IV (775-780), the son of this marriage, was known as "the Khazar". About the same time the governor of Armenia, Ya'izir b. Usaid al-Sulami, is said to have married a daughter of the Khazar king at the request of the Caliph al-Manṣūr (754-775) (al-Baladhuri, p. 210). The Armenian Levond (Russian translation, by K. Patzhasin, St. Petersburg 1862, p. 92; cf. Marquart, op. cit., p. 5) connects the invasion of Georgia and Armenia by the Khazars in 147 (764/765) with the death of this princess; the leader of the Khazars is given by him as Radji Tarkhān; in al-Ya'kūbi (Turīz, ed. Houtsma, ii. 446) Kās (in the MS. Halis) Tarkhān, in al-Ṭabarān (ii. 328, 4) Astakhān al Khawārizm. There was therefore a Khawārizm at the head of the Khazar force that invaded Muslim lands while at a later date in the body-guard of the Khazar king there were Muslim soldiers from Khawārizm, who had bargained for the right "to remain neutral whenever the Bey of the Khazars waged war against Muslims" (Marquart, op. cit., p. 5, from al-Mas'udi, Murūjūd al-Dhabab, ii. 10). The frontier provinces of the caliphate were raided by the Khazars for the last time in the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd in 183 (799); this invasion also is said by al-Ṭabarān (iii. 647 sqq.) to have been brought about by the failure of a proposed matrimonial alliance between the daughter of the Khazar king and the Barmecide Fašl b. Yahyā (cf. above, i. 665 and ii. 36).

It was in the reign of Hārūn also that, according to al-Mas'udi (Murūjūd, ii. 8), the conversion of the Khazar king (the -bārūn) and of the nobles to Judaism took place; cf. the discussion of the sources in Marquart, op. cit., p. 5 sqq., and the alleged letter of a contemporary and subject of "King Joseph", since published by S. Schechter (The Jewish Quarterly Review, New Ser., iii. 181 sqq.); following him, P. Kokowcow, Żurn. Min. Nar. Prosw., 1913, Nov., p. 150-99 sqq.). We have again later an account of the conversion of the Khazars to Christianity (the missionary journey of the Slav apostle Constantin or Cyril between 851 and 863; cf. Marquart, op. cit., p. 13 and 22) and two reports of their conversion to Islam. According to Ibn al-Atihir (vii. 418), the Khazars and later their king were converted to Islam in 539 (948) in order to defend themselves with the help of the Muslim Khawārizms against an attack by a Turkish people; this story, which we find as early as Ibn Miskawayh (H. F. Amedroz and S. Margolithous, The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate, Oxford 1920-1921, text ii. 203, transl. v. 223), is undoubtedly taken from the last work of Thābit b. Sinān and we must agree with Fr. Westberg (in Żurn. Min. Nar. Prosw., 1908, March, p. 6) in referring it to the known campaign of Svyatoslaw (cf. above, i. 789). What al-Mu'addasī, ed. de Goeje, p. 361, 1, tells us about the adoption of Islam as a result of the campaigns of al-Ma'mūn does not refer, as Marquart (op. cit., p. 3 and index) supposes, to the Caliph Abd al-Malik bin Marwan, al-Mu'addasī’s carefulness is not shown in the particular figures he gives, and he shows, to the ruler of Gūrgānd (Arab. Jurjānī) and afterwards (after 995) of all Khawārizm, Abu 1-'Abbāṣ Ma’mūn b. Muhammad. In neither case is the story the change of religion historical. Al-Baladhuri's story (p. 203; Marquart, op. cit., p. 413) of the rebuilding of the town of Shamlor (Arabic Shāmkūr) with the name al-Mutowakkiliyya by Boghā the Elder (cf. Boghā al-Kabīr) is more important;
he is said to have settled Khazars there who had come to him "from an inclination towards Islam".

The danger which threatened the Khazars as a result of the movements of peoples in the 9th century caused the embassy to the emperor Theophilo-
(829–842) and the building of the Khazar fortress of Sarkel on the Don by the Greek Petronas. This story in Constantine Porphyrogenetos (De admin. imper.ъ, Chap. 42) is connected by Marquart (op. cit., p. 28) with Ibn Kusta, p. 143. 1 Ibn Khârîncheh's story (ed. de Goeje, p. 162 sq.) of the alleged murder of Sulaiman al-Tardjumân is quoted by Marquart (op. cit., p. 476) as proof of that "the Khazars were on friendly relations with the Caliphs at this time," but it should be pointed out that the Caliph there does not communicate direct with the Târkhân, king of the Khazars, but through the intermediary of several Caucasian princes. About 240 (855/856) the Canar' (Arab. Şanarî), who had fled before Bogha, applied for assistance to the kings of the Byzantines, Khazars and Slavs (al-Ya'kûbî, Târîkhî, ii, 598; transl. in Marquart, op. cit., p. 413 sq.). The attitude of the Khazar ruler was equivocal on the occasion of the raid made by the Russians on the lands on the Caspian Sea recorded by al-Mas'ûdî (Murȗd, ii, 18 sqq.; new transl. in Marquart, p. 330 sqq.). Various suggestions have been made regarding this date, which is not definitely given; according to Westergaard, Zânî. Min. Nar. Prov., Feb., 1908, p. 386), the raid did not take place till 925 but this is probably too late. The Russians were allowed a passage through Khazar territory on condition that they gave half their plunder to the Khazar king; on the way back they were fallen upon and almost wiped out — with the approval of this ruler who "could not prevent it," although he had informed the Russians of the danger awaiting them — by his Muslim mercenaries and the inhabitants of İtil, Muslim and Christians. Whether the more important Russian raid of 332 = 943/944 (cf. the art. Bar- 
Dâ'â') was undertaken by agreement with the Khazars or against their will is not recorded. Accor-

1. The most important source of revenue was the import and export of foreign goods, the land is said to have produced no wares of its own (Ibn Hawkal, p. 283, ii adds: "with the exception of isinglass."") Even the material for clothing was not prepared in the land itself but imported from Gurkân, Tâhâristân, Adharbâjî, and Kûm. Judaism was the predominant religion because the Khâkân, the viceroy, the prince of Samandar in Dâghestân who was related to the latter, and the high officials all professed it; in numbers, however, the Jews were less than the Muslims and Christians. In Īlû there were over 10,000 Muslims, a principal mosque, fifty minarets and 50 mosques. In the year 310 (922) the king received a report that in a Muslim country a synagogue had been destroyed (the name given in Yâkût, ii, 440, is not clear; cf. Marquart, op. cit., p. 447 sq.). He therefore had the minaret destroyed and the muâdhdîn killed. He left the mosque itself unharmed for fear that all the synagogues in Muslim lands should be destroyed.

On the extent of Khazar power in what is now Russia, on the campaign of Swjatowslaw and its con-
sequences see above, i, 789. Earlier (in the ninth century) even Kiev was subject to the Khazars; in this connection the author of the oldest — com-
posed about 1095 (according to the critical edition by A. Shakhmatov, Introduction, p. xxiii) —

Russian Annals observes that in his time the Khazars were under the rule of Russian princes (A. A. Shakhmatov, Priez vremenshch bêt, Pet-
rogad 1916, p. 17). In any case it is evident from the annalists that they did not consider the Khazar kingdom destroyed even by Swjatowslaw's campaign; in the legend of the attempts by the adherents of various religions to convert prince Vladimir, "the Khazar Jews" are also mentioned as foreigners not subject to the Russians (ibid., p. 104). The original home of the Khazars on the lower Volga and in Dâghestân was not conquered by the Russians at this time; the subjection of the Khazars mentioned by the annalists can only refer to a part of the Crimean peninsula and the peninsula of Tâman opposite it, where lay the Russian princely principality of Tmutarakan' first mentioned in 1022. This region may well have been the "Khâzar" which was conquered by a fleet sent by the Emperor Basili II in alliance with the Russians in January, 1016; its leader is called Sven, Greek Sfen-
gos, said to have been a brother of "King" Vladimir (according to Cedrenus, 464; Migne, Patrolog. Graeca, vol. cxxii), the Khazar king (arkhân) of this region was Georgios Taulos, apparently a Christian (Taulos is the Turkish title Çâr). In 1022 the ruler of Tmutarakan' was Matiaslav, a son of Vladimir (Shakhmatov, op. cit., p. 186); in the next year Matiaslav, in alliance with the Khazars, undertook a campaign against his brother Yaroslav. The Khazars are mentioned for the last time as neigh-
bours of Tmutarakan' and intervening in the civil confusion in this principality in 1035 (ibid., p.

253). The Muslim sources give us no information regarding the end of the Khazar kingdom. Ibn al-Athîr (ix, 279) makes the Kürd Fadlûn, ruler of Gandja (q.v.), make a raid on the Khazars in 421 (1030) and be attacked and slain by them on the way back. This was Fadlûn b. Matıs, a member of the Shaddâd dynasty; cf. above, i, 461 and ii, 129b

and see E. Schau, Ein Verzeichniss mukammellas-

nischer Dynastien (Abhandl. der preuss. Akad. d.
Wissensch., 1923, philol.-hist. Kl., Nr. 1, Nr. 22). According to Marquart, this is the last mention of the Khazars in Ibn al-Athir and in history generally (W. Bang and J. Marquart, Ostasiatische Geschichtskunde, Bd. 2, Leipzig: defending the kgl. Geschichts- und Wiss. zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse, N. F., vol. xii., Nr. 1, Berlin 1914, p. 56). But a raid from Gandja against the Khazars is very improbable on geographical grounds; the Khazars are probably mentioned here in error for the Georgians or Abkhaz, as in al-Bundari in Rec. des textes relatifs à l’histoire des Scythes, ed. Houtsma, ii. 31, 31. Similarly (confusion with the Ghuzz or Kiptchak) is probably to be explained the mention of the Khazars in Khâfânî about 1175 (cf. above, i. 943). In the xiiith and xiiith centuries the town and country of Sâkân (q.v.) or Sâkshen are mentioned north of the Caspian Sea, probably on the Volga. J. Marquart, op. cit., agrees with the suggestion of Fr. Westberg ( Bull. de l’Acad. des Sciences, St. Petersbourg 1899, p. 291) that Sâkshen is the site of the former Khazar capital but rejects the view of the same scholar that the Sâkshen are simply the Khazars under another name. According to Abû Hümîd al-Ghanmî (in Dorn, in Méll. asiatiques, vi. 710), the distance between Bulghur and Sâkshen was 40 days’ journey; on the other hand Sâkshen in the viith century in Ma’mûd Kâshghâri (Dîwân Lughât al-Turk, Constantinople 1333 = 1914—1915) is identified with Sauwar, only two days’ journey from Bulghur (cf. above, i. 788).

**AL-KHÂZINÎ, ABû DîJAFAR AL-KHURASÂNÎ (al-Brûnî adds the names Muhammâd b. al-Husain; we sometimes find al-Khâzinî instead of al-Khâzinî), born about 349 (960), was, according to his countrymen, one of the greatest Muslim astronomers. He belonged to Khurasân and conducted observations for Abû l-Faqîl Ibn al-A’mid († 359 = 969/970), a vizier of Rukn al-Dawla (326—366 = 932—976). He was better known by the kunya Abû DîJafar than by his own proper name. Like most students of mathematics, he dealt with all its branches. In arithmetic he dealt with numerical problems and problem sources in Archimedes which leads to a cubic equation (see E. Wopcke, L’Algèbre d’Omer al-Khayyâmi, p. 2 sq.; cf. also Hâджî Khâlîfâ, Nî. 3996); he also wrote a commentary on the first ten of the first hundred of Euclid which deals with division (Hâджî Khâlîfâ, Nî. 1070). Cod. Leiden Nî. 992 contains two problems from his book of tables of planes.

Cod. Leiden Nî. 1014 gives a geometrical problem; on one connected with the problem of parallels cf. G. Jacob and E. Wiedemann, Zu Omer-i-Chajjám, in Islam, 1912, iii. 56.

One of Abû DîJafar’s principal fields of research was astronomy. In the Kitâb al-Athâr al-‘Arabic, he gave a description of marvellous instruments of observation (Hâджî Khâlîfâ, Nî. 1122 and 987). This work is also mentioned by al-Akâmî, Irâhât al-Kâsîd and in Ibn Khaldûn’s Prolegomena (French transl., i. 111; cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitr. IX: Zu der Geschichte der Astronomie, in the S.B.P.M.S. Erlangen, 1906, xxxviii. 190). The same book probably also deals with an instrument for measuring the altitude of the sun (J. Frank, Über zwei astronomische Instrumente, 2. Das Instrument mit dem Dreieck (von al-Khâzinî), in the Zeitschr. für Instrumentenkunde, 1921, xii.)

199 sq.) and a ring 8 ells (about 13 feet) in diameter with which, according to al-Nawawî, he ascertained the obliquity of the ecliptic for Ibn al-A’mid with the help of a number of scholars. He found a smaller than his predecessors had done (Cod. Leiden, Catalogue, Nî. 1066, fol. 59).

Mention is often made of a work highly praised by Ibn al-Kifîf, “The Book of Tables of Planes” (Zîd al-Safâ‘îh for the astrolabe), which consists of several ma‘âlîn’s with a long introduction. In it, according to al-Bûrûnî (al-‘Îthâr al-Bûkîyî, p. 326; Chronologie, p. 322), there is probably an explanation of the progressive and retrograde movement of the spheres. It is perhaps a part of this work that is mentioned by al-Bûrûnî (Kitâb l-Ishârî etc., Cod. Leiden, Catalogue, Nî. 1066, fol. 679) as “On the Differences in the Ascentions (ma‘âlîn) for Equal Arcs etc.”. Possibly it is identical with the work quoted by Nasîr al-Dîn in his Kitâb Shâkîl al-Kâtî, (“Book on the Figure of Transversals”) viz. Mâjâlî Dîwânî Mâ‘îl al-Mu‘ayyîl al-Dîwânî wa l-Mâjâlî ‘l-Kurât al-Musâkîhîn (”partial investigations into some of the partial inclinations and of the ma‘âlîn in the spheres recta”) (Traité du quadrilatère, ed. and translated by Alex. Pacha Caratheodory, 1891, text p. 115, transl. p. 150).

The following were probably mainly theoretical cosmological works: 1. al-Madîkâl al-Athîr fi l’Iin al-Nuﬁîm (“the great introduction to astronomy”) (see al-Bûrûnî, al-‘Îthâr al-Bûkîyî, p. 123; Cod. Leiden, Catalogue, Nî. 1323); in it Abû DîJafar also discussed questions of chronology and gives methods of determining the sign of Mu’arram. 2. Sîr al-İhâmîn (Hâджî Khâlîfâ, Nî. 7140). In one of these two writings Abû DîJafar probably dealt for the first time with Ibn al-Hai’ham’s theory of the structure of the world mentioned by al-Khârîjî. In it he apparently relied on the hypotheses of Ptolemy, which Thabit b. Kûrra had translated (cf. Hâджî Khâlîfâ, Nî. 13,124). Abû DîJafar also evolved a form of the world which differs from that with the excentric sphere and the epicycle; in it the distance between sun and earth is also given, and the sphere of the difference in its rotation. He thus gets two regions on the earth, a northern and a southern which do not differ in heat and cold (al-Bûrûnî, al-‘Îthâr al-Bûkîyî, p. 259; Chronologie, p. 249).

Like almost all astronomers, Abû DîJafar also dealt with astrology; he was learned in the doctrine of tasâyyîs.

Abû DîJafar was also interested in philosophical problems, as is evident from a commentary on the beginning of the work of Aristotle on the heavens by a certain Abû Zâid al-Balkhî, who wrote to Abû DîJafar (Ibn al-Kifîf, p. 40). 3. Bibliography: H. Suter, Die Mathematiker der Araber, etc., Nî. 4, Ya‘qîb al-Nâhim, al-Fihrist, p. 266 and 282; Ibn al-Kifîf, p. 396.

(E. Wiedemann)

**AL-KHÂZINÎ, ABû ‘I-FATH ‘ABD AL-RAJMÂN AL-MANŞîR AL-KHÂZINÎ (AL-KHÂZINÎ), flourished about 500 A.H. (end of the xiiith and beginning of the xiiiith century). A pretty full account of him is given in the work of a certain al-Baihaqî (see below) and isolated references are given in his “Sîndjîrî Tables” (zîdî) and his Kitâb Mîzân al-Îjâma. Abû al-Khâzinî was a Greek slave brought up in the service of Abû al-Khâzinî al-Marwazî in Merw and received an education in geometrical and philoso-
phical knowledge worthy of his talents which enabled him to compose the books mentioned below.

He later became associated with the Sultan of Kharurán, Mus'ul al-Lama' Abú Hārij rád al-Sanjar b. Malik-shāh b. Alp Arslān (511-557); he had previously been governor of Kharurán for the twenty years 491-511). Al-Khāzīnī enjoyed the favour of this prince and his nobles; at the same time his style of life remained as exceedingly simple and modest, as that of al-Burānī.

Two works of his are known and have survived:

1. Al-Dājī al-Mu’tahar al-Singarī. This book of tables gives statements of the positions of fixed stars for the year 509 = 1115/1116 and also for oblique ascensions and time-equations for the latitude of Merw (37° 40'), which was in Sanjar's kingdom. This work was used by C. A. Nallino in his al-Battenī Opus Astronomicum; cf. e. g. vol. i, p. lxvii., and the Index.

2. Kitāb Miṣān al-Hikma (finished 515 = 1121/1122); its contents are discussed in the articles Al-Karaṣṭūn and Mizn. Al-Baihakī says that he rediscovered the book; a passage from it is mentioned in a manuscript in the India Office.

Bibliography: Zähir al-Dīn Zaid al-Baihakī, Ta'īšik ʿHubānāt al-Islām (Berl. MS.; Ahlaward, Catalog. Nos. 10, 105), contains the life of al-Khāzīnī (E. Wiedemann, Repr. XXV, Einige Biographien nach al-Bisṭānī, No. 103, in the S. P. M. S. Erleg., 1910, xliii. 73); H. Suter, Die Mathematiker und Astronomen der Araber, No. 293 and Appendix, p. 226. A considerable part of the Kitāb Miṣān al-Hikma is published by N. Khaiukoff, Analysis and Extracts of the Book of the Balance of Wisdom etc., in J. A. O. S., 1859, vi. 1-128. Other parts have been edited by me in Beitr. XV, Über Bestimmung der Zeitbestimmung von Legierungen, in the S. B. P. M. S. Erg., 1908, xl. 105-152; Beitr. XVI, Über die Lehre von der Schwemmen, die Nibelungen und die Konstruktion des Qasrāfīn, ibid., 1908, xl. 133-159. Here also the parts published down to the present day are discussed again; also Beitr. XXXVII, Über die Staudenwage, ibid., 1914, xlvii. 27-38; Beitr. XLVIII, Über die Pathe des Wechseln von al-Šāzīnī und über die Lehre von den Proporziomien nach Burānī, ibid., 1916, xlvii. 1-15; E. Wiedemann, Über die Kenntnisse der Muslime auf dem Gebiet der Mechanik und Hydrostatic, in Archiv für Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften, etc., 1910, ii. 394-398; do., Über die Welt von Eidelsteinen bei den Muslimen, in Archiv, 1911, ii. 345-358.

Al-Khazāndī is the name of the tribe who with their brother-tribe al-Aws were occupying the region of al-Madinā and farther north to Kūbara and Tāmā at the time of the beginning of Islam. On account of the important part which they played in the successful rise of Islam both tribes are designated by the honorific name of al-Ansār "the Helpers". It is the unanimous statement of genealogists and Arab antiquarians that the Khazāndī, together with the Aws and the Ghassānīdīs in Syria, migrated from South-Arabia at a very early date and in that reason for their emigration from their ancient homes is given in the burst of the dam at Mā'rib the exact date of which cannot be determined; it can be approximately dated in the fifth century of the Christian era. The genealogies of the divisions of the tribe are fairly well established because the different clans were registered in the Misūrān introduced by the second caliph 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, as they were entitled by their help to Islam to the second category of pensions allotted by the Dīnār. As regards the earliest names in their pedigree: al-Khazārdī b. ʿAmr al-Anṣārī b. Thalāha b. ʿAmr Mazuṣākiya, which they share with al-Aws, we may be more sceptical. When the tribes of al-Aws and al-Khazārdī in their migration reached Yathrib, which later received the name of Madinat al-Nabi, they found settled there a number of Jewish tribes among which the Banū Ḳainākār, Ḳuraṣa, the Nadīr and nearly twenty more clans are known by name. The latter possessed in Yathrib and its neighbourhood over 70 castles, named Afīn (plur. of Afīn), which formed one of the distinctive features of the city and which granted the inhabitants a measure of security not known in any other town of Arabia. If we had not the repeated affirmation of Arab antiquarians that these buildings were constructed by the Jews, we might think that they were built on the model of similar buildings in the Yemen and introduced by the immigrants. The Khazārdī settled at first on the outskirts of the town like the Aws, but as their numbers increased more rapidly than the resident Jewish population of the town, they soon asserted their power and made themselves masters of most of the Afīn. The immediate cause of their first war with the Jews is stated to have been that a prince of the Jewish family Zuḥra, named al-Kaṭṭāt, intended to enforce the jūn primae noctis with a bride from the tribe of al-Aws for which the prince was slain by the brother of the bride. (That the name al-Kaṭṭāt is fictitious is apparent; it is nothing but the Greek word κητατος). The consequence was that the allied tribes asked and received help, either from the Ghassānīdīs in Syria or from Yamanitēs from South-Arabia, and by treachery murdered many of the most prominent Jews. Being now in possession of a large portion of the town, the allied tribes fell out among themselves. The peculiar formation of the town, consisting of a number of detached settlements with castles between them, made it possible for such warfare inside the township to continue for a long time, and as neither al-Aws nor al-Khazārdī were very numerous, each in turn made alliances with the nomadic tribes in the country surrounding Yathrib. The Khazārdī were stronger in numbers and to equalise this the Aws made alliances at various times with the tribe of Sulaim and were generally also assisted by the Jews; it was only after the fight at al-Buʿūṣīn in which the Khazārdī were heavily defeated that something like equilibrium prevailed in Yathrib. However, the intermittent fighting between the two tribes and murders with the consequent retaliation continued. The momentous change was brought about by the Hijrat of the Prophet from Mekkah to Yathrib where he arrived at the suburb of Kubā' on Rabī' I 12 (Tuesday, June 29, 622) and engaged the hitherto antagonistic tribes to assist him in his struggle against his fellow-citizens of Mekkah. We get a fair estimate of the number of fighting men in each of the two tribes by the list of participants in the battle of Badr, for Ibn Sa'd in his Tabākāt (vol. ii/ii) gives us the names of 63 members of the tribe of al-Aws and 175 names of those drawn from al-Khazārdī. With the whole community accepting Islam, the Jewish
element in Yathrib soon lost all importance and the clans of Ka'b and al-Naḍhr were practically exterminated. Though the early converts from Mekka were always held in higher estimation, the Anṣār during the remainder of the Prophet's life were the mainstay of his power and it was not unnatural that upon his death, when he had not appointed a successor, the Khazrajī felt by their numerical superiority that they were destined to be heirs of the State created by the Prophet and it was only due to the timely interference of 'Umar that the choice for the ruler of the State did not fall upon Sa'd b. 'Ubāda. That the latter felt that he had been unjustly deprived of a position which was rightly his is proved by his irrec- cusable attitude after his rejection and his removal from al-Madina to Hawrān, where he died in the year 15 (637).

The Khazrajī were divided into a number of clans of very unequal numerical strength at the time of the Prophet. The most numerous were the Banu 'l-Naḍhr, while the other clans were approximately in the following order: al-Ḥarith, Dujājam, 'Awf and Ka'b. It was also from the ranks of the Khazrajī that the poets of the Prophet derived their origin, namely Ḥassān b. Thābit [q.v.], Ka'b b. Malik and 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥafram. During the rule of the Umayyads, descendants of the early followers of the Prophet continued to hold prominent positions and most of them were strong supporters of the Umayyads with the notable exception of 'Abd al-Nūman b. Ḥašīr [q.v.] who as governor of Hijāz unsuccessfully took the side of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair and lost his life. We also find numbers of the tribe of al-Khazrajī among the early settlers in Egypt and the descendants of 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥafram. The century men of note in Muḥammadan Spain; they were settled principally in Saragossa in the North. If we come to consider the large amount of immigrants from al-Madina and the South of Arabia to Egypt we may not be far from the truth in assuming that the last years of the Khazrajī, from their South-Arabian origin, had also influence upon the Arabic dialect of Egypt and that they pronounced the letter ḏīm, unlike Eastern Arabs, hard like ǧ.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, Tāhāt; ed. Sachau, iii.; al-Samhūdī, Khulāṣat al-Wafā; Mekka 1316, p. 73 sqq. (this work is useful for fixing with much detail the ancient settlements of the Khazrajī in Yathrib); A. J. Wen- sink, Mohammad en de Joden te Medina, Leiden 1908; Kowalski, Divān des Kays ibn al-Khatīb, Leningrad 1943; H. Lammens, Médine à la veille de l'Islam, Louvain 1933; dealing with the life of the Prophet and the early history of Islam. Wüstenfeld, Tabellen and Register; al-Kalqāshādī, Nihāyat al-Arab, Baghdād 1332; al-Nuwardī, Nihāyat al-Arab, ii. 316–317.

AL-KHAZRADJĪ, DIYĀ' AL-DIN ABU 'L-ḤASAN ALI B. MUḤAMMAD B. YUSUF B. 'AFF AL-KHAZRADJĪ AL-SAʼIDĪ, belonged to a family which was originally native to Granada; he was born at Bagha (Priego de Córdoba) about 590/1194, and established himself at Alexandria where he often met Ibn Rašīd (who mentions him in his Risāla) where he died about 619/1220, or 627, or according to others as late as 650 (1252–1252). One of his commentators, al-Zam-
1914. The new ruler then assumed the title of Sultan, which was replaced by that of Malik after the protectorate had been abolished on February 28, 1922. The title of Viceroy often applied to the Kedives in European literature was already used in Muhammad 'Ali's time.

The following members of the Khedivial dynasty have ruled Egypt under the suzerainty of the Sultan of Turkey:

Muhammad 'Ali (1805—1848)
Ibrahim (1848 (June—November)
'Abbas I (1848—1854)
Sa'id (1854—1863)
Isma'il (1863—1879)
Tawfiq (1879—1892)
'Abbas II Hilmi (1892—1914).

They were succeeded by:
Husain Kamil, Sultan, 1914 (Dec. 19)—1917 (Oct. 9).
Ahmad Fu'ad, Sultan from 1917 to 1922, King (as Fu'ad I) since 1922 (March 16)

Genealogical tree of the most conspicuous of the numerous members of this dynasty:

Muhammad 'Ali (1769—1849)

Ibrahim

Tusun

Isma'il

Sa'id

Abd al-Halim

Ahmad (m. 1858)

Isma'il (m. 1850—1895)

Mustafa Fadil (m. 1875)

'Abbas I (1813—1854) (m. 1876)

Tawfiq (1852—1892)

Husain Kamil (1852—1917)

Ahmad Fu'ad I (born 1867)

'Abbas II Hilmi (born 1874)

The firman of 1841 regulated the order of succession according to seniority in Muhammad 'Ali's family; by the firman of 1866 this regulation was replaced by the right of primogeniture limited to the descendants of Isma'il Pasha. A decree of April 13, 1922, has recently settled the order of succession of the kings of Egypt.

Though really of Albanian origin, the Khedives have always been regarded in Egypt as Turks, nor can they be said to have become a really national dynasty. The remark has been made that its various members have exhibited as many different types of character (Hasenclever, Geschichte Aegyptens, p. 199). The first five of them ruled with the absolutism of Oriental despots, but after the English occupation they had much less opportunity of developing an attitude of their own. The ties which bound this dynasty to Turkey always have remained strong enough to make it possible that, soon after the Turkish revolution of 1909, an Egyptian Prince, Sa'id Halim Pasha, could become Grand Vizier in Constantinople.

During the Khedivial period Egypt has been what is generally called 'Europeanised', viz. a great many technical, juridical, economic and social institutions have been introduced. The same thing has happened, during the same period, to other Muslim countries and with the latter Egypt shows the common feature that the models after which the western institutions have been fashioned were nearly all French, but the particular form of the 'Europeanisation' of Egypt—its revival under a nearly independent dynasty, the marvellous development of its economic productivity and its weakening to a point which brought the country under the control of a European Power—was quite different to the corresponding process in Turkey, Algiers and other Muslim lands. At the same time Egypt has remained the chief centre of Muslim civilisation and education and its rapidly increasing population now amounts to half the Arabic-speaking world (Massignon in R.M.M., livi. 75 sqq.). The main point of view from which in the following lines the condition of Egypt since the beginning of the nineteenth century will be traced is the way in which this Muslim country has reacted to the process of 'Europeanisation' and the results which have been the outcome of it.

I. Political History.

We can distinguish four periods before the war of 1914: 1. from the French expedition to the final installation of Muhammad 'Ali (1798—1805),

2. Muhammad 'Ali's reign until the end of his period as one of the Great Powers (1805—1841),

3. up to the English occupation (1841—1882) and

4. the occupation period until the English protectorate (1882—1914).

One of the chief motives for the French expedition against Egypt was the wish to prevent England from such an enterprise. During the eighteenth century France's commercial interest in Egypt had always been far more important than England's, but since this country had concluded a commercial treaty with the usurper Ali Bey [q. v.] and obtained in this way admittance for British vessels into the Red Sea for the Indo-Egyptian trade, the interference of England in Egyptian affairs had become a political danger. The geographical position of the country has destined it to become the first object of European political interests, as soon as the consolidation of colonial power in India could no longer be content with the sea route as the only line of communication. In France the idea of taking possession of Egypt had been
discussed throughout the eighteenth century, but the traditional good relations with Turkey had been one of the reasons that prevented its execution. Finally it was due to the initiative of Napoleon Bonaparte, seconded by Talleyrand, that the French Directory decided in favour of the expedition on March 5, 1798. As to Turkey, the unusually energetic measures taken by the Porte in 1768 against `Ali Bey proved too late; even at Constantinople, there had been a presentation of the coming events. In Egypt itself nothing indicated that a foreign invasion by a European power was seriously apprehended.

The French fleet, consisting of about 400 ships and a landing-force of 35,000 men, commanded by Bonaparte, landed near Alexandria on July 21, 1798. Alexandria was occupied without difficulty and the French immediately began their march on Cairo. The resistance organised by the Mamlûk Beys Murâd and Ilâshim near Embââle on the Nile was soon broken in the battle of the Pyramids and on July 24 the capital was occupied. Murâd Bey fled to Upper-Egypt and Ibrâhim into the Delta. The panic that for a moment had overcome the inhabitants of the capital soon disappeared, but they were far from showing confidence in the French "liberators" and "friends of Islâm", as the French soldiers had been styled in a proclamation. Bonaparte soon had to adopt more severe and more Oriental methods against revolts of the populace. A month after the landing the destruction of the French ships in the bay of Abû Kîr by Nelson (August 1) completely changed the character of the French enterprise and was the first of the blows struck by England, resulting in the final evacuation. The Porte, though reluctantly, declared war on France in September, but not before the middle of the next year (1799) did Turkish troops appear in Egypt. In the meantime the French had established a regular administration in the country. The Egyptian, however, maintained their ironical attitude towards the actions of the French, as well towards their zealous respect of local religious customs as towards the scientific investigations of the scholars accompanying the expedition. Besides, they soon were disappointed when they saw that the French also demanded the payment of land-tax, and the Muhammadan majority naturally did not like to see that the foreigners made a large use of the native Christians (Copts, Greeks, Syrians) as subordinate officials. On October 21, 1798, a rather serious revolt broke out in Cairo, which was only suppressed on the following day after a bombardment of al-Azhar. In order to prevent the invasion of a Turkish army, Bonaparte undertook in February, 1799, his famous expedition to Syria. Having failed to take `Akka, defended by Djaizâr Pasha [q. v.], he had to retreat in May. A month after his return the first Turkish troops (among whom was Muḥammad `Ali as an officer in the Albanian corps), transported by English ships, landed at Abû Kîr (July 14, 1799). They were utterly defeated and on August 2 Bonaparte took their last refuge, the fortress of Kéréb. After Bonaparte’s departure (August 22) the French maintained themselves another two years under Kléber (murdered in June, 1800) and Menou, but in August, 1801, their last resistance was broken by the allied English and Turks and they had to evacuate Egypt.

Apart from the immediate political results — the destruction of the Mamlûk power and the return of Egypt to Turkey — the results of the scientific work of the French expedition (centralised in the "Institut Egyptien" founded by Bonaparte on August 21, 1798, in Cairo, v. Brébier, L’Egypte de 1798 à 1800, p. 65—80) published in the eight folio volumes of the Description de l’Égypte (cf. the Bibliography) were enormous. The researches on the "present state of Egypt" constitute the basis of all modern studies of Egypt (e.g., the elaborate researches made by Lepère on the possibility of a canal between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea). The immediate influence, however, of the French on the cultural development of Egypt was almost nil. The gap between Eastern and Western civilisation was too wide to allow of any tangible results during the first period; this impression is given very strongly by reading al-`Abâbîr’s account of the foreign occupation.

After the departure of the French army, a struggle began between the Turkish authorities and the Mamlûk Beys who wanted to regain their ancient power. The Mamlûks were protected by the English; after Murâd Bey’s death their most important leader became `Uthmân Bey Bardîš. The Turks on the other hand naturally wished to take advantage of the opportunity to fasten their grip on the country, but their administrative methods and the inability of the successively appointed wâli’s to withhold their own troops from mutiny, for want of money, gave to Bardîš and partly a temporary advantage. His protectors, the British, had left Egypt in March, 1803, but one of his chief supporters was Muḥammad `Ali with his Albanian regiment. His aid enabled Bardîš and the old Ibrâhim Bey to maintain themselves in Cairo, while the wâli’s of the Porte exercised authority only in certain parts of the Delta. A last Turkish wâli, Khusraw Pasha, could reside for some time in the Cairo citadel, but finally Muḥammad `Ali, by his ever increasing influence, removed him.

After the rather negative results of the foregoing five years the second period proved to be of enormous importance for the country. From a political point of view the most notable effect of Muḥammad `Ali’s reign was that he gave Egypt a dynasty of its own. Although what Muḥammad `Ali did for the country was only a means of realising his own ambitions, the history of Egypt has been deeply influenced by his measures. He was determined to stamp his own mark and to settle the fate of the dynasty itself. They may be summed up as follows: firstly, the mobilisation of the national forces of the Egyptians themselves and secondly the introduction of European instructors and methods. From a cultural point of view it may be remarked that from the beginning of Muḥammad `Ali’s reign until the English occupation Egypt was much more exposed to Ottoman-Turkish influences than ever was the case before; personal and independent as the régime of the viceroy may have been, these administrative methods and the taste of himself and his surroundings were impregnated by the traditions of the Ottoman Empire (as an instance may be cited the so-called Alabaster Mosque built by Muḥammad `Ali in the Citadel of Cairo in Constantinople style). The great expansion of Muḥammad `Ali’s power between 1833 and 1840 was one of the natural historical consequences of Egyptian political power which always has implied the annexation of Syria (see the art. Égypte); Muḥammad
Ali's Great Power policy itself, however, was not very important for Egypt. The conquest of the Sudan was of far more direct and future profit for the country. In 1841, at the end of this period, closed by the Imperial Visit of Ramil II 2, 1857 (May 23, 1841), Egypt's international position was quite changed. To outward appearances it had become again a Turkish province, but in reality the fact of the intervention of four great European Powers (except France) showed the beginnings of political dependence upon Europe and especially upon England. The occupation of 'Aden by the British in February, 1858, was already a clear symptom of the new situation. Muhammad 'Ali was always fully aware of this fact (Cromer, Modern Egypt, i. 16). He remained himself a staunch friend of France, though this friendship proved to be of little avail to him. But as long as he reigned he was able to avert foreign intervention from Egyptian internal affairs; it is for this reason that he never gave his consent to the piercing of the Suez Isthmus.

The last years of Muhammad 'Ali, and the short reign of Ibrahim (q.v.), belong, with the reigns of 'Abbas, Sa'id and Ismail (cf. these articles), to the third period. During this period Egypt became more and more detached from the Ottoman Empire and it was drawn more and more into the sphere of European politics and economics. No territorial expansion took place except in the South (Abyssinian war in 1872; acquisition of Sawankw and Musawwa from the Porte in 1865). Egypt's relations with Turkey in this period were rather of a personal character, inasmuch as the Khedives sought to gain special favours from the Sultan in return for an increase of the tributes. But whenever the Ottoman government tried to exercise real influence on Egyptian affairs — as in the beginning of 'Abbas's reign — the results were illusory. Even the Sultan's prohibition of Ismail's contracting new loans without his assent could easily be ignored. The Egyptian army was only theoretically a part of the Turkish army (Egyptian troops, however, participated in the Turkish wars against Russia) and it was only due to special circumstances, that, in 1875, the Sultan had an opportunity of deposing Ismail. In the meantime the viceroys reigned with unlimited autocratic power after the traditional Oriental fashion. With the exception of 'Abbas, who showed himself an enemy of Western civilization — especially in his French form in, they encouraged the introduction of European arts and sciences and institutions. The result was that Egypt became more and more "Europeanised" than any other Musulman country. It is well known that all these works, far from increasing the prosperity of the country, brought about its financial ruin. The cause has to be sought not so much in the proverbial but much exaggerated prodigality of Isma'il as in the system that prevailed in the execution of the reforms. This system was based on the careless Oriental administrative methods, the disastrous effects of which were doubled by the readiness shown by the Europeans in granting financial facilities. Moreover, many of the European agents were no more than unscrupulous adventurers, whose only aim was to get an enormous indemnity for alleged breaches of contract by the Egyptian government. A great many public works remained uncompleted on account of difficulties of this sort. The first result was an ever increasing floating debt (the beginning of which is very clearly depicted by von Kremer, ii. 28). The main difficulties, however, were brought about by the different loans contracted in Europe by Sa'id and Ismail (1862, 1864, 1866, 1868, 1872); they grew to an extent which cost Isma'il his throne. The greater part of the bondholders of the debt were French and, to a less degree, British. So France and England, the ancient rivals in Egyptian affairs, became the leaders of the foreign intervention; representatives of both these countries took part in the "Dual Control" over the revenues and expenses of Egypt since 1876, interrupted only by the period in which an Englishman and a Frenchman were ministers (August 28, 1878—April 5, 1879). France's financial interests were unquestionably the greater, but England was already by far the more influential by its trade and by its political situation; moreover the British occupation of Perim in 1857 and of Cyprus in 1878 strengthened England's position considerably. Still, up to the English occupation of 1882, Egypt's formal relations towards other countries were nearly those of an independent state, limited only by the capitulations and, since 1876, by the mixed jurisdiction (see above). The Khedive was able to conclude treaties with other powers (except purely political); at the opening of the Suez canal (1876), Isma'il was treated as the equal of the European sovereigns who came to attend the ceremonies. As the European personnel in the Egyptian administration increased, however, the influence of the French and English consuls became gradually considerable.

The condition of the people of Egypt had become more favourable in the beginning of this third period, especially after the abolition of the state monopoly. But the sellâh's profit little by the favourable economic circumstances and, especially after 1876 when the heavy and ruinous taxation began which was the only means whereby the government could meet its obligations, there again a period of profound misery which was only to end towards 1890. This unsatisfactory situation was one of the causes of the first nationalist movement. This movement had originated in the indigenous middle classes, which had already come into existence under Muhammad 'Ali; by European as well as Oriental influences (Ismail al-Din Afghani) these classes had gradually become an important factor in social life, although, for the time, orthodox religious circles still stood aloof, as the modernist views of the first nationalists and their sympathy with Freemasonry were antipathetic to them. The nationalists criticised Isma'il's financial policy, his favourisation of European elements in the country and his predilection for the Turco-Circassian class to the detriment of the native Egyptians. The treatment of the indigenous element in the army especially had excited their irritation (the army was set up in the Sudan and against Abyssinia in 1875 consisted exclusively of sellâh's). Public opinion began for the first time to manifest itself in 1877. In that year the nationalists published some newspapers (a.o. Miṣr and al-Watan) and the device of Miṣr li 'l-Miṣriyin was heard for the first time. Notwithstanding repressive measures, the nationalist papers published sharp criticisms of the government;
a special subject of their criticisms was the participation of Egyptian troops in the Turco-Russian war. The “coup d’état” of April, 1879, which caused the fall of the ministry of Nūbār Pasha with the two European ministers was the first palpable result of the nationalist action (it seems even probable that the nationalists encouraged the deposition of Ismā‘īl) (M. Sabry, La Gîtîrîe etc., p. face). A still more serious question in Egypt was the movement in the army against the Turco-Circassian officers, which finally led to open revolt and, as a consequence, the occupation of the country by British troops.

This military movement, the revolution of ‘Arābil and his friends, opens the fourth period of modern Egyptian history. In the two preceding years, after the accession of Tawfīk Pasha [q. v.], the new Khedive and his ministers had tried to execute a more or less nationalist programme, but, when ‘Arābil had come with his claims of army reforms, the conviction of parliament and of a constitution, they soon came to feel that reforms in France or intervention as the only possible salvation. Thus the absence of a really strong and able power in the country — for ‘Arābil’s party was weak through inexperience and incompetence — had made possible the intervention of England. The chief cause which made it desirable for England to get a strong position in Egypt was the geographical situation of this country on the route to India. This desirability had much increased since France had taken possession of Algiers and Tunis and after the opening of the Suez canal, which it was in England’s interest to keep free from powerful foreign influence. The British policy in Egypt had no parallel in France, whose political interests were less engaged, shrank back from the responsibility at the last moment; Egypt’s history after 1882 shows how England has assumed this responsibility.

Theoretically, the international position of the country remained unchanged after the occupation; Egypt now enjoyed a double suzerainty, a financial tutelage, a threefold jurisdiction, a foreign military occupation and was the scene of the clash of two civilisations. The British policy had in the first place to face what Lord Cromer calls “Internationalism”, meaning by this term the intervention of other powers in special administrative affairs on the basis of former agreements. Only in 1904, the year of the Anglo-French agreement, did England practically get a free hand in Egypt. The man under whose direction the position of the English was consolidated in the Nile valley was Lord Cromer, British Consul-General from 1883 to 1907. Notwithstanding his comparatively modest official function, Cromer became the most powerful man in Egypt. He governed by the system of “governing the governors of Egypt”; his chief aids were the British advisers in the different ministries. It certainly was an advantage for Egypt that its interests had now become too important to be trusted by one man. Thus England succeeded by a new loan guaranteed by the great Powers and by very severe measures in the interior in putting the finances on a sound basis, so that in 1904 the power of the “Caisse de la Dette” could be considerably limited, so as to give back to Egypt its financial liberty. The public debt, it is true, was not much less in 1914 than in 1882, but the economic prosperity of the country had greatly increased (see 3). As to Turkey, its influence on Egyptian affairs became ever less. The sending of Ghāzī Ahmad Mukhtar Pasha in 1885 as Turkish High Commissioner had no political results, though the unofficial panislamic propaganda carried on by the Pasha was considerable at the time. The Sultan’s attempts in 1892 and in 1906 to assert his authority on the Sinai peninsula were complete failures. During the Turco-Italian war in England did not even allow Egypt to send troops to Tripoli. On the other hand Turkey could not sympathise with the nationalists, the Young Turks (many of whom had found an asylum in Egypt during the Hamidian régime) after 1906, even less than Sultan ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd. France’s opposition to the English occupation was more infulential on account of the strong French sympathies in the country. After ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd Hilmi’s accession a revival of French cultural influence took place, against which the English occasionally had to take measures (deposition of Nāṣir Pasha in 1894). It was from France that, until 1904, the nationalists always hoped for support. The position of the Khedives was of no political influence; ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd was no more successful in his nationalist attitude in the first years of his reign than later on in his entertaining good relations with Constantinople.

The Sudān, the possession of which had been most important for Egypt’s prosperity and its international position, theoretically was, like Egypt, a province of the Ottoman Empire; by a firman of 1841 Muḥammad ‘Ali had been granted the governorship over these regions “without hereditary” right. But, since the revolt of the Malāḥ Muḥammad Ahmad [q. v.] and especially the taking of Kharṭūm (January 26, 1885) had interrupted the Egyptian domination, the Sudān affairs were entirely directed by British policy; the same is true of the reconquest; the nominal chief of the Egyptian army was the Khedive, but after the reorganisation of this army in 1883 all higher ranks were occupied by British officers. After the reconquest (1898) the English policy did not allow the return of the Sudan to Egypt; by the Anglo-Sudanian treaty of 1899, an Anglo-Egyptian condominium was established in the Sudān. In this treaty the rights of the Porte were not taken into account and the Khedive, though the Sultan’s vassal, acted as an independent sovereign. The consolidation of the British power in the Sudān, on the other hand, has strengthened considerably England’s ascendancy over the Nile valley.

After ‘Arābil’s defeat the nationalist movement was crushed for the moment and until the end of Lord Cromer’s days it never became again a political factor of importance. During that time a new generation grew up and found a leader in the young Mustafā Kāmil Pasha [q. v.; died on February 10, 1908, at the age of 34], who founded in 1899 the paper al-Līla and became in 1907 the first president of the National League (al-Ifṣāh al-Waṭanī). This second generation of nationalists stood likewise under French cultural influence. Intellectually they were much better equipped than their predecessors: when they began their renewed campaign of “Egypt for the Egyptians”, they showed much moderation and rejected revolutionary ideas. After Lord Cromer’s replacement
by Sir Eldon Gorst (1907—1911) the attitude towards the nationalists became one of the chief problems of British policy. In 1906 the incident of Denshawai had proved that anglophobia was still widely spread and, though the culprits were punished in an exemplary way, the new British representative adopted a much more conciliatory attitude towards the nationalist aspirations. But this new policy had not the desired results: in 1909 freedom of the press had to be restricted again and al-Azhar had to be closed for some time on account of the anti-English demonstrations of the students. Then happened on February 20, 1910, the murder of the Coptic Prime Minister Būtros Ghāli Pasha (one of the members of whose cabinet was Sa‘d Zaghul) by a young Muḥammadan nationalist. This event brought about a breach between the Christian and the Muḥammadan element, in the nationalist party, which soon threatened to lead to serious disorders. In the same year the General Assembly rejected the prolongation of the Suez canal concession after 1968. So, with Gorst’s retirement and his succession by Lord Kitchener in 1911, the British policy made place again for a stronger rule which lasted until the declaration of the English protectorate over Egypt on December 18, 1914. Next day ‘Abbās Hilmi was declared to be deposed and replaced by his uncle Ḥusnān Kāmil as Sūlṭān. A fatwā of the Shāikh al-‘Ālī of Constantinople declared the new ruler to be a traitor to the cause of Islam whom it was obligatory to fight and who deserved death (text in Jacob, Hilljöch für Vorlesungen über das Osmanisch-Türkische, ii, Berlin 1871, p. 460). DURING THE WAR EGYPT WAS MERELY A LINK IN THE STRATEGIC ORGANISATION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE. From November 6, 1914, the country was at war with Turkey, but the defence of Egyptian territory was only in British hands. The sittings of the Assembly were suspended and martial law was proclaimed. The result of the war was the definite loosening of the ties with Turkey by the Treaty of Lausanne (May 25, 1923), to which Egypt, however, was no party. A much more important consequence of the war was the renewed growth of nationalism. Several causes had combined to incite opposition against the British protectorate, such as the heavy requisitions imposed on the people and the growth of the number of British officials. The Wilson principles too stimulated the Egyptians to claim political independence. The nationalists, this time, were supported by a much greater part of the population than before; the Copts had joined them again and even the circles of al-Azhar encouraged the nationalist propaganda. Its leader became Sa‘d Zaghul Pasha, before the war Minister of Justice and at that time known as a man of moderate political views. The indifference, however, which the Egyptian claims met in London caused the Egyptians to abandon moderate measures. A struggle of three years followed between them and England in which nationalists made use of disturbances (breaking-up of railways, anti-European outbursts), passive resistance (strikes, boycotting of the Milner mission) and the discrediting of the English administration. The British used military force (martial law was maintained) and deportation (Zaghul twice); at the same time Bolshevik agitators and partisans of the return of the former Khedive ‘Abbās Hilmi were at work. Finally the English government changed its attitude: it declared the British protectorate abolished and recognized Egypt as a sovereign and independent state (February 28, 1922). The settling of some important points, however, remained reserved (e.g. the defence of Egypt and the Sūlṭān question) Though by this attitude on the part of the English government the difficulties seemed to have been solved, this was not the view of the nationalists. The events after February, 1922, have shown that the struggle between the Sūlṭān to full independence and British intervention in Egyptian affairs has in no way become less violent and less dangerous for the peaceful development of the country.

2. Government and administration. After the departure of the French the number of Mamlūk Beys had been completed again to twenty-four, but the shock their government system had undergone by the occupation had deprived it of all power of resistance against the strong will of Muḥammad ‘Alī. The French occupation had lasted too short a time to permit the establishment of new governmental traditions. For tax-collecting the French had been compelled to make use of the existing institution; their chief innovation was the creation of a distān in Cairo composed of ten shāikh’s (with careful exclusion of representatives of the Mamluk class) to look into matters of government. Bonaparte was provided with a Kethkudā (Kikhya in Egyptian Arabic), as had been the custom with the Turkish pasha before.

As has always happened before when Egypt got a strong ruler, the government system of Muḥammad ‘Alī became again extremely centralised. All feudal powers were abolished (massacre of the Mamluks), the only great vassal being the viceroy himself who reigned in the name of the Sūlṭān. The character of his reign was still very Oriental and very “Turkish” at the outset. But the way in which this absolutism collapsed was no longer Oriental; Egypt did not fall back again into the hands of a number of feudal chiefs. For the country became ever more interwoven with European interests, which at last, though allowing the survival of the Khedivial dynasty, put the government into the condition of a constitutional monarchy, in which, however, the check to absolutism was not formed by a representative body of the people, but by the representative of a European government.

The relation of vassaldom towards the Porte has in practice never bound the hands of the viceroys in matters of interior administration, not even since the firman of May 23, 1841, the dispositions of which have theoretically formed the base of Egypt’s juridical international position up to 1914 (Turkish text in Ahmad Lutfi, Turāki Dūrūt-ı ʿAlīye-i ʿOthmānīye, Constantinople 1902, vi, 140; French text in Noradoughdian, Recueil, ii, 335). Its provisions for the interior administration are only: the application of the Khaṭṭ-ı Şerif of Guilkhāne (1839), the paying of a tribute from the revenue (fixed at 50,000 purses in a separate firman of the same date and raised to 150,000 purses or 750,000 Turkish pounds in 1866), the coinage in the Sūlṭān’s name, the reduction of the army to 18,000 men (this limitation was removed in 1873), the viceroy being authorised to
confer military grades up to the rank of colonel, and the prohibition of the construction of men-of-war without special permission. The firman's after 1841 only contained slight modifications and the one of June 8, 1873, resumed all former dispositions. The firman's granted to the Khedive Tawfiq and 'Abbas Hilmi on their accession contained nearly similar provisions.

Muhammad 'Ali's general government was made up of a system of divān's and mahfil's (the members of which were appointed by himself), forming together the central government. The most important was al-Divān al-Khilāfi in the citadel of Cairo, presided over by the kāiffa; it was at the same time a supreme court of judicature (Lane, i. 130). Besides there was a Mahfil al-Mashura (general government), a Mahfil al-Lükhālāna, a Mahfil al-Turāth, a Divan al-Tudjāri, etc. All these bodies had occasionally juridical and executive power. The gharīfa jurisdiction was exercised by a Ḥanafite kāfi, sent every year from Constantinople, in the mayyama of the capital. There was also a council of 'ulama', but this more national element, which had exercised a considerable influence in the time of the French occupation, soon lost its influence under Muhammad 'Ali. The number, the names, and the attributions of the different divān's were, however, far from stable (see Zaidān, Maṣbaḥat al-Sharī', i. 24). Sa'dī Pasha changed three of the divān's into ministries (uwāra) under a wāzir, viz. the ministries of Foreign Affairs, Finance and War, and the place of the kāiffa was taken by a kind of chancery called Muṣīra; the working system in these bodies was still very imperfectly established (cf. the description by von Kremer, ii. 9 sqq.). Ismā'il created the Ministries of Interior, Marine, Public Instruction ('Ali Mubārak Pasha), of Public Works and Commerce (1876), the central direction being given by a Mahfil Khuṣayyī. The wāzīf administration did not yet form an independent ministry. Although in the beginning this Khedive succeeded in keeping a strong hand on government, the different personalities of the ministers began to exercise influence; especially towards the end of his reign, when for a short period even two Europeans were members of the cabinet of Nebhār Pasha. At the same time a number of high European officials in Egyptian service had obtained influential positions in different departments. In 1866 Egypt had been granted a kind of representative body (Maglis Niyyābi, opened November 25, 1866) elected by the communes, but as this ger of an Egyptian Parliament possessed a limited power of advice and was convened only once a year, it did not yet play a role in the government. Only after 1879 did this Mahfil become a real parliament "with an opposition".

The constitutional régime inaugurated by Ismā'il in 1878 by his declaration that henceforward he would reign by the means of responsible ministers did not last long. After his deposition it was hoped that the Khedive Tawfiq — who gave a constitution on February 7, 1882 — would be able to work with his parliament, but these hopes were annihilated by the 'Arabi revolution. England, after the occupation, interfered in government matters through the mission of Lord Dufferin, whose well-known report was presented in February, 1883. It was followed in May of the same year by a new Organic Law, which restored the full legislative power to the Khedive, instituted a legislative council of 30 members and a general assembly which was an enlargement of the first body but with very limited powers. This system worked for 30 years; it enabled the English to direct the government of Egypt by means of "advisers" in the different ministries. In 1913 the two bodies mentioned became one single legislative assembly with consultative function, consisting of the cabinet ministers, 66 elected and 17 nominated members; this assembly, however, did not meet, after martial law had been proclaimed in 1914. Finally, after the declaration of Egypt's independence (February 28, 1922), a commission of 30 members was charged with the elaboration of a constitution, which was promulgated by the king on April 19, 1923. This constitution has established in Egypt a representative parliamentary, monarchial government. In outward appearance almost everything that could suggest that Egypt had ever had anything other than European traditions had vanished.

Muhammad 'Ali's reorganisation of the provincial administration began in 1813 and consisted of a reduction of the number of provinces (see the art. EGYPT, § 22) and the establishment of a highly centralised administration. In 1840 the number of provinces (muṣīriya) was only seven: Buḥaira, Manṣūfia, Daḫaliyya, Sharḳiya (besides the governorships of Cairo and Alexandria) in Lower Egypt, and Bani Suwāf (including Fayyūm), Minya and Ismā'īl in Middle and Upper Egypt. Each province was governed by a muṣīr; it was subdivided in markāz's each under a muṣīr, these again into nāhiyā's under a shaikh al-balad (whose title and function were taken over from the preceding period). In each nāhiyā there was an official called khawfī for agricultural matters, a sharīf for the tax collecting and a śabīd or maḏā'īn, who was a deputy of the kāfi. The muṣīriya were always "Turks". The khawfī's and the sharīf's were all Copts; most of the other officials were indigenous Muhammadans. Under Muhammad 'Ali's two successors the centralising control slackened and abuses entered freely. Then Ismā'il proceeded to a new division of Egypt into three great sections: Al-Bahari, with the muṣīriya's of Buḥaira, Dīja, Kalyubiyya, Sharḳiya, Manṣūfia, Gharbiyya and Daḫaliyya; al-Wustāni, with Bani Suwāf, Fayūm and Minya, and al-Sa'ād [q. v.] with Asyūt, Dīja, Kenā (Kennel) and Ismā'īl (Ezzeen). Besides these, there were the governorships (muḥafazāt) of Cairo, Alexandria, Damṣūq, Rashid (Rosetta), al-'Ariš, Port-Said, Suwāf (Suez) and Sawākin. The existing subdivisions were maintained; only over each nāhiyā there was put an 'umā, who was to be assisted by the shaikh al-balad; both were chosen by the inhabitants. The function of khawfī was abolished on account of the greater agricultural autonomy granted to the provincial representative bodies (cf. 3). Each markāz and each muṣīriya got such a haṭa' niyyābiya composed of notables. It was after the fashion of these bodies that in 1866 the Maglis Niyyābi was created in Cairo (see above) A no less important innovation was the replacement of "Turkish" muṣīriya by native ones; it was some time before the population became accustomed to obeying high officials chosen from their midst. The administrative system described is maintained in its main features up to the present day.
As in former centuries, the administrative system was closely connected with the land policy. Muhammad 'Ali abolished nearly all full property of the soil. All arable lands were distributed by his cadastral administration (จำรุประณี) among thefellahs (each getting 3—5 feddans), who were to be only usufructuaries. They could in no way dispose of the soil and had to pay kharāqī. Then land was called kharāqī. The taxes were collected by officials (see above) and the taxation system (စ္စ္စာ) was abolished. The former tax-farmers were indemnified by being allowed to keep as usufruct the tax-free ground (called ဗ်ဖြ) which they had already possessions under the Mamlik, and by an annual rent. In course of time this ဗ်ဖြ land has returned to the public domain as kharāqī or has become full property (milk). Also other kinds of exceptional private property (ရိုး) entered gradually the category of kharāqī. A new kind of lands were those called ဗ်ဖြ, uncultivated lands given by Muhammad 'Ali to notables and high functionaries for them to cultivate. The ဗ်ဖြ were free from taxes and could not be sold. Under the same conditions, large properties were granted as ṣubḥ (from Turkish şubh) to the members of the vice-regal family and some high functionaries; these became under Ismā'il the great d'īrā administrations. Now all the categories of land enumerated have gradually become full property. The limitations to the property rights of holders of kharāqī lands have been abolished by different laws, especially the mukābala law (see below). So there has been an evolution from a state in which nearly no private property existed at all to the present situation where milk property has become the rule. Foreigners have officially been allowed to possess landed property in Egypt only since the Turkish law of June 10, 1867, but Muhammad 'Ali had already given ဗ်ဖြ lands to several foreigners; still the portion of Egyptian soil actually possessed by Europeans is rather small. The Egyptian property law is now to be found in the Egyptian and the Mixed Civil Codes. As to the original waqf land, a considerable part of it had been confiscated by Muhammad 'Ali and now belongs to the milk category.

The financial administration of Egypt is better known than any other branch of government through the elaborate investigations made by European experts, beginning with the report of Mr. Cave in 1876. The collection of the chief revenue, the land-tax (cf. 3), always brought with it many abuses, especially the collection in advance under Ismā'il in order to meet the exigencies of the public debt. The mukābala law of 1871, changed many times and abolished in 1880, was a curious example of financial policy, as it exempted those who paid six years in advance for ever from the half of their future tax obligations. Another important branch of revenue, the custom duties, were still farmed to mulāzāms in the beginning of the 19th century. Since European officials have been introduced in the financial administration, these revenues have come in more regularly. A feature of financial administration under Ismā'il has also been the amalgamation of the administration of the Khedive's own domains (d'īrā saniya) with that of the government.

The first impulse to the reorganisation of jurisdiction was given by the institution of the mixed tribunals in 1876, obtained by 'Abdu Pasha after laborious negotiations with the Powers. As in Egypt, the jurisdiction of the foreign consulates had increased far beyond the limits laid down by the capitulations — as a result of the inactivity of indigenous jurisdiction — a reform had become an imposing necessity. After the creation of the mixed jurisdiction, consular jurisdiction was limited to processes between foreigners of the same nationality and penal jurisdiction over civilians and nationals. The mixed judges were to be Egyptian officials, but as the majority were subjects of the different western states possessing capitulations and as the mixed tribunals were given competence to judge even the Egyptian government, they assumed the character of a foreign power in the government, a very clear symptom of Egypt's "Europeanisation". On the other hand a serious resistance of the Pasha had to be overcome, as Turkey did not like to see the official establishment of so independent a jurisdiction in one of her provinces. By a formula of 1872 (Notadounghein, min. 349), however, the authorisation was given by the Sultan. Seven years after the institution of the mixed tribunals, there were organised new indigenous tribunals after the same pattern, by the decree of June 4, 1883, replacing the jurisdiction of the administrative authorities and their dawān. The codes applied by the two kinds of jurisdiction are nearly identical and fashioned chiefly by the French codes. The new indigenous codes were likewise published in 1883 (the penal code and the code of criminal instruction were renewed in 1904). On the penal code that existed under Sa'id Pasha and was a very confused compilation, see von Kremer, ii. 52—66. The jurisdiction of the personal statute of Muhammadans is reserved to the mukābala of the Hanafite mukābala, which were reorganised by a decree of 1897 (and later on again in 1909 and 1910). There exists, however, a codification in articles of the Hanafite law on marriage, tutelage and successions, made for the information of the judges of the mixed courts; a French translation of this compilation, in 647 articles, has been inserted in the recent edition of Egyptian Codes and Laws by J. Watelet and R. G. Brunton (Brussels 1920). The Arabic text was published in Cairo in 1917. Kadri Pasha, late minister of Justice, had also codified, for educational purposes, the dispositions of Hanafite law concerning property and obligations (Arabic edition, Cairo 1909), but, unlike the Turkish Medjelle, these codifications of Muhammadan law have no exclusive authority with the Egyptian mukābala's.

The different Christian communities have their own jurisdiction in matters of personal statute.

3. Economic Development

The great economic creations of Muhammad 'Ali were the introduction of cotton cultivation and his monopoly system. These, supported by his highly centralised government system, procured him the means of pursuing his vast political schemes. In itself the economic system was quite Oriental, but, in two ways, it brought about relations with Europe. Firstly the viceroy sought to apply European methods and for that purpose brought European experts to Egypt, secondly the products of agriculture were sold to Europe and the commercial relations with Europe thus created had again most important consequences after the monopoly
system had been given up under 'Abbās I. Free commercial relations then developed between the European buyers and the Egyptian cultivators, nearly always by the intermediary of other elements. This change, however, was accomplished under conditions which have proved highly prejudicial to a sound and independent development of the country. Firstly, European ideas of credit were introduced into a country which had known only very limited credit operations. The European merchants and their auxiliaries began to give large advances on the payment for the expected crop; the inevitable consequence was that the peasants got into debt and that the merchants lost their money. Here we see, on a lower plane, exactly the same symptoms that brought about the heavy debt burden of the state itself, due to exaggerated confidence in the prosperity of the country. The Egyptians evidently did not know how to use credit, as their economic traditions had not made them acquainted with the accumulation of capital. Secondly, the imports from Europe brought wares of a kind of which the population stood in no great economic need, but which were nevertheless bought in large quantities. In the first place mention may be made of cotton manufactures that came chiefly from England. So, notwithstanding the increased production, the country was not able to enrich itself; on the whole the population remained poor and in debt, as was the treasury. But indissoluble economic and financial ties had been formed with Europe and particularly with England. A glance into the import and export trade about 1850, as given by von Kremer, is enough to show how much England was commercially interested in Egypt and explains why it was England which, when the financial and economic crisis came, undertook the most active intervention resulting in the military occupation. After 1882 Egypt became economically still more dependent on England by the extension of cotton cultivation, though, on the other hand, English control prevented the country from falling back again into a state of unproductiveness. So here again we see how the work of Muhammad 'Ali created possibilities the profits of which, as in so many other Muhammadan countries, have not been reaped by Egypt's population itself.

A thorough investigation of the Europeanisation of Egyptian economics has not yet been written (as was done e.g. for Turkestān by Reinhold Junge in his book Das Problem der Europäisierung orientalischer Wirtschaft, dargestellt an den Verhältnissen der Sozialwirtschaft von Russisch-Turkestān, Weimar 1915). So, after the foregoing sketch, we shall point only to a few prominent features and figures.

Egypt has not only remained an almost exclusively agricultural country, but it has developed its agrarian character to an extent which has surpassed all former estimates. In the Mamluk time the country had produced scarcely enough ‘heatre for its own livelihood; it was Muhammad 'Ali who, in his typical centralising way, gave a power to the reawakening of Egypt's productive strength. The cardinal point was the care for good irrigation, very much neglected in the previous centuries. The French had only had time to make a thorough study of the existing canal system; a thorough study of the existing canal system; then Muhammad 'Ali took up the problem energetically. He wasted many thousand lives in the improvement and digging of new canals, the best known of which is the Maṭmāliya canal from Alexandria to the Rosette arm of the Nile. His irrigation works not only brought about a territorial extension of agriculture, but he created for the first time the possibility of perennial irrigation by canals containing water during the whole year. Besides, he entrusted the control of all irrigation works and the distribution of the water to special officials (the khāṭebs, see 2), leaving no liberty to the peasants themselves. This canal digging activity was continued by Ismā'īl (the Ibrāhimiya canal in Upper Egypt and the Maṭmāliya canal, linking the Nile with the Suez canal). In his reign the centralised control of irrigation was superseded by the local and provincial councils, acting under the supervision of government engineers, but at the same time abuses in the water distribution by the local authorities became frequent. This situation only improved when, after 1882, English officials were charged with the control. Care for the irrigation system was based on the first principles of the English administration; from the loan of 1884 an amount of £ 1,000,000 was reserved for this purpose, while all other expenses had to be reduced for lack of money. The results of this policy have entirely fulfilled the expectations. It was also by English engineers that the barrage of the Nile near Dīzā — already begun under Muhammad 'Ali by French engineers — was finished. This work was followed by the famous dam of Aswān (finished in 1902 and raised in 1912), which had already more than agricultural significance, as it made it possible to hold up, within a certain measure, the water necessary for the irrigation of the country below. The same applies to an even greater extent to the huge dams projected after the war in the Blue and the White Nile above Khartūm for the irrigation of the Sūdān (the first was opened in 1926); during the post-war disturbances in Egypt England's power over the Nile waters became one of its most powerful means of coercion in the struggle with the nationalists. In Egypt itself the irrigation administration is now almost entirely in the hands of Egyptian officials. Apart from the care for banks and dykes the felāhīs themselves still apply for the greater part the primitive irrigation methods of the šāhrā and the šārāf, while only on the larger estates modern machines have been introduced.

Besides the care for irrigation, the cultivable soil has also been extended enormously by Muhammad 'Ali's land policy (see 2). Further, he exercised by the monopoly system a decisive influence on the direction in which agriculture has developed. He succeeded in centralising the entire production in his own hands and of disposing of it freely; the peasants were no more than day-labourers who were obliged to sell their products at fixed prices to the government and to pay likewise their taxes in kind. Notwithstanding this prevention of all personal initiative, the peasants made still worse by the corvée and the conscription — the viceroy was able to force the agriculturists to produce larger quantities and so to increase the surplus destined for export. Wheat always had been the chief agricultural product of Egypt; in 1821 Muhammad 'Ali introduced cotton cultivation not without having to overcome the passive
resistance of the population. At first there was planted an indigenous wild cotton (Mako); in 1828 Sea Island seed was introduced. This cultivation soon developed to an enormous extent, the area of the cotton land increased proportionally much more than that on which cereals were grown. The difference was, however, that the bulk of the cotton crop was destined for export and the cereals — wheat, barley, maize (dau-ra) and rice (in the Delta) — for home consumption. After the abolition of the monopoly system the same development of agriculture prevailed and after the occupation the English — for many years previously already the chief purchasers of cotton — increased the cotton cultivation to a still larger extent. Between 1883 and 1908 the cotton growing area was doubled (from 800,000 to 1,640,000 feddan); cotton then covered a larger area than cereals. After that time a period of stagnation set in; during the war the cultivation of cereals had even to be encouraged (in 1919 the proportion was: cotton 1,573,000 feddan and wheat 1,274,000 feddan); it was even forbidden to plant more than one third of the cultivable area with cotton.

Another agricultural product introduced by Muhammad 'Ali was hemp, which had to provide the cordage for the ships of his fleet. Sugar-cane was likewise a new product, and was first planted by Isma'il on his domains in Upper Egypt (since 1867). This crop has not produced such remarkable results as the cotton. Among the ancient crops flax has much decreased: so has the formerly flourishing tobacco culture, which was entirely prohibited in 1890. After the war, experiments have been made to introduce this crop again. Apart from the produce in kind, agriculture provides also important revenues to the treasury in the form of the land tax. This tax has always constituted the bulk of the government revenue and has weighed heavily on the fellah class. Muhammad 'Ali levied the land tax in kind; those who failed to pay for more than three years lost the land granted to them. Afterwards the fellah's had to pay to the crown and under Isma'il they were often obliged to have recourse to usurers in order to fulfill their tax obligations; sometimes the government itself called in the aid of money-lenders to that purpose (as in 1878; Croner, i. 38). Later the Agricultural Bank rendered the same services, the results of which was in many cases sale of property by decree. The so called 3g feddan law of 1912, prohibiting the pledging and sale by decree of landed property of less than 5 feddan has proved to be only a partial improvement.

Industry remained of as little importance to Egypt as in previous centuries. The petty native industries (spinning and weaving looms, pottery, forgery, etc.), just as they had developed under mediaeval conditions, still existed in the beginning of the 19th century. Muhammad 'Ali included these too in the monopoly system; those who worked on their own account were punished in a drastic way (Lane, i. 149). At that time the ancient guild organization still existed, although it had decayed considerably after the Turkish conquest (see Thorning, "Turkische Bibliothek", xvi. 80). During the 19th century, however, the competition of the imported European wares caused a still greater decline; in 1850 the guilds were officially abolished, though up to the present day this archaic form of production has survived. Among the new industries should be mentioned the factories for sugar crushing in Upper Egypt and the flourishing cigarette industry in Alexandria (since 1873), which now works only imported tobacco. Cotton is but little worked in Egypt itself: there exist, however, spinning factories (Fidairat Nationale d'Egypte). Nearly all new industries (also brewing, soap, confectionery, rice processing mills) are in the hands of Europeans. They first employed European workmen, who have now been gradually replaced by natives. The latter have already learned the European forms of syndicalism.

The traffic possibilities have kept pace with the economic development. Next to the ancient traffic route, the Nile and its arms, the new big canals have rendered possible the extension of inland navigation. The Suez Canal, though lying entirely on Egyptian territory, has hardly any importance for the Egyptian trade. During its execution (1859—1869) Egyptian labourers were employed and the vicerey, Said Pasha, by furnishing half of the capital of the society, had created, at least for his dynasty, the possibility of future profits. But after Isma'il had been obliged to sell, in 1876, his shares to the English government, the now considerable profits of the exploitation are of no benefit to Egypt. As, after 1908, the canal has to return again to Egypt, the Egyptians have done what they could by refusing in 1909 the prolongation of the concession. Besides, the canal has put Egypt under other international obligations. The Suez canal treaty of October 29, 1888 (ratified by England in 1904), declares the canal to be open in peace and war time to all kinds of ships and charges, with the control of its execution the representatives at Cairo of the different contracting countries. But England, as occupier, has always taken all measures for the defence of the canal, especially during the war, when a Turco-German offensive was threatening from that side. After the declaration of Egypt's independence the defence of the canal has remained one of the points of dispute between England and Egypt. In the overland traffic railways now take by far the first place, as the canals make other land routes superfluous. Railway building was begun under Abbas Pasha in 1852 and in Isma'il's reign the greater part of the Delta system and in Upper Egypt the line up to Aswān were completed. Only after the occupation was this last line continued up to Aswān, but between Aswān and Wādī Halfa, where the extensive Sudan system begins, there is no railway communication. During the war a line was built to al-Kantara on the Suez canal which communicates with the other new line coming from Yūfā. The Egyptian railways have been subjected until 1904 — as a consequence of the financial difficulties — to a special international administration. Since Isma'il's reign the railway service is managed by Egyptian officials and engineers.

If, finally, anything proves clearly the new orientation of Egypt's economic — and in consequence cultural — orientation, it is its foreign trade. The commercial relations which the country, depossessed in the beginning of the 19th century, still were the remains of the great trans-sea century Indian products that had flourished in the trade of the Middle Ages, but was limited at the time to the products of the Sudān and South Arabia. Under Muhammad
‘Ali’s system of government trade or monopoly, Egypt, for the first time since antiquity, began to produce again for export. This system, however, gave much offence, as well to the Muhammadians who were treated less favourably by the viceroy than the European merchants, as to these merchants themselves. England even declared in 1858 an commercial treaty with Turkey directed against the economic policy of Muhammad ‘Ali. Under Sa‘id Pasha the export of cereals was still more important than that of cotton, but since his successor cotton has been leading; at that time it was particularly the civil war in America that had caused a great increase of the cotton export of Egypt. Since the middle of the century the chief purchaser of raw cotton has been England, which country, accordingly, was then already the most interested in the maintenance of cotton cultivation. By the development after 1852 Egypt has become, after America and India, the chief cotton exporting country of the world. The export figures are easily accessible in the literature on the subject; they are based chiefly on the custom-house statistics of Alexandria. Not so well known, however, is the manner in which trade has developed since the abolition of the monopoly system. Probably the foreign purchasers used mostly the services of intermediary agents, Syrians or Copts. It seems that methods were often adopted which had a detrimental influence on the development of trade, especially as in the form of advances to the peasants or the purchase in advance of the crops too great risks were taken, with the consequence that both producer and buyer suffered loss. The export of cereals has been much less constant than that of cotton (between 1910 and 1920 the proportion was about 1:9); there have been years (as in the war when wheat had to be imported. Among the exported industrial products sugar and cigarettes are the most important.

The import from abroad consisted and consists for the greater part of cotton goods and textiles from English factories, next coal (from Turkey), iron, tobacco, machinery. After England the chief importers before the war were Turkey, France and Austria (clothes and fæces). These European imports soon became indispensable to the population and have contributed in a large measure to the material side of Europeanisation.

It is clear that, since the beginning of Egypt’s commercial development, England’s part in it has been greater than that of any other country. Before the war this part was 37 1/3% while in 1919 it was nearly 60%. With a few exceptions, the Egyptian trade has always shown a favourable balance of trade; it is difficult to determine how the country has profited by this circumstance. A great part must have been used for the public debt obligations. In any case the riches which have flowed into the country have found a very unequal reparation, for the peasant class is still poor and indebted. And next to the rich landed proprietors (especially the Turco-Egyptian Pasha-class; see 4) the Europeans too are in a more favourable position, as the capitulations liberated them from all taxation, while the import tax allowed by the capitulations was never more than 5%. The inland trade too was monopolised under Muhammad ‘Ali; he forced the fellâh’s to buy iron, him at high prices the grain which they had been obliged to sell at a much lower rate. For Sa‘id’s time the inland trade has been described amply by von Kremers (ii. 212 sqq.). Here, notwithstanding the intrusion of European commercial methods, many ancient features have still been conserved. A special mention should be made of the ilâdâr system, which is still very lively (as at Cairo in Khan al-Khalîli), though the old charm of bazaar life and the quality of the wares are no more what they used to be.

4. Population

The rapid growth of the population of Egypt since the beginning of the 19th century clearly shows that the conditions of life have considerably improved. From the time of the French occupation to Sa‘id’s reign the population has nearly doubled (from 2,460,000 to 4,476,440), if the estimates can be relied upon. The increase has continued in the same proportion until the end of the century (in 1882: 6,813,919 and in 1907: 9,734,495), to diminish a little after that time, the figures being 11,287,359 for 1907 and 12,750,918 for 1917. As the cultivable surface is comparatively small (33,607 K.M.², according to K. M. M., liii. 119), the density of population is considerable.

Actually about 92% of this population constitutes the homogenous indigenous basic element whose tongue is Arabic. To it belong the cultivating class (the fellâh’s) and the native townsmen. About 93% of these are Muhammadians; the other are Christian Copts (854,778 in 1917). The non-indigenous element is composed of Turks, Oriental Christians and Jews, and Europeans. As in other Mohammedan countries the differentiation of religion and race corresponds to an analogous differentiation in social function.

The fellâh’s, the real native stock, live in villages situated on the Nile and on the canals in much the same primitive conditions as centuries ago. Muhammammad ‘Ali’s economic measures impoverished them extremely and since the days of Isma‘il the fellâh’s have often been the object of the commiseration of European authors on account of the heavy taxes imposed upon them and the brutal and abusive methods of the tax collectors. But the steady increase of the population in those days proves that, hard as their plight may have been, conditions of life were more favourable to them than in foregoing centuries. The Egyptian peasant always has shown a traditional aversion to tax paying, if not urged by the kurâbîs, while, on the other hand, their inability to accumulate capital has kept them as a whole in an inferior condition. When Muhammad ‘Ali began to form fellâh regiments, their dislike to military service made them often try to escape by self-mutilation; still the fellâh’s have proved good soldiers if conducted by able officers e.g. in the Südân campaign of 1897.

During the 19th century the settled population of several parts of Egypt still reckoned themselves to belong to Arabic tribes. The lowest class of agriculturists have no property at all and work as labourers on the larger estates. Next come the smaller proprietors (under 50 feddân). The best situated is the class of the shâîk al-hadâd’s (see 2), the ‘squatters’, as Lord Cromer calls them.

The khedivial period has been most important for the indigenous element, as it has allowed them gradually to take a larger part in the public life and the administration of the country. In the
previous centuries the natives had supplied almost exclusively the ranks of the ‘Iłmā; since Muḥammad ʿAlī—who still only admitted the “Turks” to higher positions—a kind of middle class had begun to be formed, and under Saʿīd—who has the reputation of having been a friend of the fellāḥ— their rise in the ranks of the army and the civil administration was encouraged. So towards the end of Ismāʿīl’s reign something like a public opinion (for the greater part turchophobe; see 1) was born. Some of the most conspicuous representatives of this native Egyptian intellectual class were ʿAli Pasha Mubārak [q. v.] and the mathematician Muḥammad al-Falaki [q. v.]. One of the concessions to the indigenous element was also the substitution of Arabic for Turkish as the official language under Saʿīd Pasha. These beginnings of nationalist development, however, had mainly been stimulated by European influence and had no root at all in the conscience of the masses (see 1). Only the revived nationalism of the 20th century seems to have been understood by a larger class of the V. The fellāḥs, however, have been only reached by nationalist propaganda as far as they live in the neighbourhood of the towns.

The four orthodox Muḥammadan rites are officially organised. The dominant madhhīb is that of al-Shafiʿī and a part of the inhabitants of Upper Egypt are Mālikīs. As, however, since the Turkish conquest, jurisdiction has always been exercised according to Ḥanafi law, the latter madhhīb is now nearly always followed in all not purely ritual actions. The hajja ḥ obligation has been performed during the last years by an average of 16,000 Egyptians. Besides the official Sunni festivals there are celebrated a number of local festive days according to the ancient Coptic calendar, which has survived as the agricultural calendar of the fellāḥs. The celebration of these days has corresponded from time immemorial to the annual return of certain natural occurrences, in the first place the movement of the Nile. Very famous was the big festival of the opening of the Khālisel in Cairo [q. v.] in August. Many feast days are connected with Muḥammadan saints whose mawlid are celebrated (e.g. Shāik Ḥasan al-Badawi in Tanṭā, Shāik Bāyiʿmī in Cairo). The number of mawlid’s is immense; many saints are even anonymous. Most places where they are venerated must be pre-Islamic holy places. A very full description of Egyptian popular religion and local uses is to be found in the Khiṣāṭ Liqādat of ʿAlī Pasha Mubārak (esp. part xvii—xxii; cf. Goldziher in W. Z. K. M., iv. 351). The most widespread mystical congregations are mentioned in the same work (iii. 129; also R. M. M., lii. 123). Since 1550 these congregations are under the authority of the Shāik al-Bakri who, since 1811, is at the same time Naqib al-Asfār. The “Turkish” element of the population, though numerically far inferior to the indigenous, has occupied the foremost place throughout the period of Muḥammad ʿAlī’s dynasty. The dynasty itself was the chief representative of this class, together with the high officials in the army and the administration. They were the bearers of Turkish political and cultural tradition, but, as to their origin, were composed of all non-Arabic elements of the Ottoman Empire. Those of Circassian descent were already numerous from the Mamluk period on-ward. Until the English occupation the number of “Turkish” families was occasionally supplied from other parts of Turkey. Apart from being the ruling class, the Turkish Pasha were also, by the favour of the viceroy, the great land proprietors (see 2). Many of these “Turks”, however, have become acclimatised in Egypt (‘Omrīr call them Turco-Egyptians) and have shown sympathy with the nationalist movement. The Prime Ministers Shārīf Pasha [q. v.] and Ryād Pāḥa (in the days of the ‘Arabi movement and immediately afterwards) are typical examples of this kind. The “Turkish” grandees have been for two or three generations the most sophisticated part of the Egyptian Muḥammadans and appear to be for the greater part agnostics.

The nomads inhabiting Egypt are now about 600,000 in number. They consist of pure Arabs in the Sinai peninsula, in the Delta and in Upper Egypt. The Berber tribes of the Libyan desert have been arabised, except those living in the Sinai oasis, Autochthonous tribes in Upper Egypt are the Abīlde and the Bedū (see these two articles). During the Khedival period the government has always been strong enough to protect the population against the raids of these Bedūns.

Muḥammadan is also the negroid element whose social position is that of slaves. Slavery had been an acknowledged institution in Egypt up to 1877, when, by an Anglo-Egyptian convention, the slave trade was forbidden on Egyptian territory. A new slavery convention of 1895 made interference with personal liberty a criminal offence, and art. 3 of the constitution of 1923 guarantees individual liberty to all Egyptian subjects. Practically slavery subsisted much longer and may not yet have wholly disappeared. The severe measures against the slave trade, however, have made the import of fresh slaves from the Sūlān nearly impossible. Most of the negro slaves were females; the other were eunuchs. The influence of negro blood on the racial characteristics of the Egyptians during the 19th century is still noticeable. White female slaves (manāṭī) were still imported in the first half of the century from the Caucasus and from Abyssinia.

Of the other foreign Muḥammadans the alumni of al-Azhar form a noticeable part. Muḥammadan, from North Africa and Syria are the most numerous among them; occasionally they enter the corps of the Egyptian ‘ulamā’. The Shīʿites only consist of a small Persian colony in the towns, amongst whom even Bāṭānī are to be found.

The call for the emancipation of Muḥammadan women in Egypt was raised at the end of the 19th century by Kāsim Amin (d. 1908), an Egyptian of Kurdish extraction, who in 1899 by his book Tahri il Marʿa and, some years later, his Al-Marʿa L-Qidāda (dedicated to Saʿīd Zaghlí) raised strong opposition and equally strong sympathies. Feminism has also been defended by Muḥammadan women themselves, as MalakḤifī Naṣīf (born 1856; she wrote Nīṣāṭ under the pseudonym of Bahṣīṭ al-Bādīyya). It was likewise strongly supported by some very able Christian Syrian women (see Oriento Moderno, v., N. 11). A result of this movement was the progress of female education (see 5 and Martin Hartmann, Die Frau im Islam, Halle a. S. 1909).

The Copts (see the art. Kipt), with the exception of the Coptic remnants in Upper Egypt, form a lower
middle class living for the most part as handicraftsmen in the towns and supplying the government with lower administrative functions. Lane estimated their number to be 150,000; so that their proportional increase has been greater than that of the Muhammadans. With the latter the Copts—though Christians—have many institutions in common: circumcision and the veiling of women; the formerly obligatory dark-coloured turban and clothes have only been maintained by the Coptic clergy. In Muhammad ‘Ali’s time the lower technical functionaries in the provincial administration were Copts (see 2). Other notable Copts of his time were quite influential—as they had been likewise in the days of the Mamluks—such were Mu’allim Djirgih al-Djewhari (d. 1811) and Mu’allim Ghalli (d. 1821). They held the function of ra‘is al-kuttab but at times had to suffer from the Pasha’s despotic rule. Dj. Zaidan gives their biographies after a Tarikh al-‘ummar al-Qaṣīya by Ya‘qub Bey Naghla Rūfi‘a, Batrous Ghalli Pasha (born 1847, murdered 1910) was the first Coptic Minister. His assassination put an end to the collaboration of the Copts with the Muhammadan nationalists (see 1). Asyūt is nowadays the great Coptic cultural centre.

The Armenian community in Egypt is small and consists for the most part of shop-keepers. In the 19th century some notable Armenians have occupied high positions in the government. The most conspicuous are Boghos Bey, a former tax-farmer who became a councillor to Muhammad ‘Ali (Mas‘āhir al-Shark, ii. 226), and Nilōr Pasha, several times prime Minister before and after the English occupation. These intellectual Armenians have been an important medium for the spread of French cultural civilisation.

Syrian Maronite Christians (Aklwīn) have been in Egypt since the Mamluk time; in Imāmī’s time they became the most useful element in the reorganised administration by their knowledge of languages and their aptitude for assimilating European procedure (Cromer, ii. 217). They hardly ever entered the higher offices. Other Syrians have immigrated to make their fortune by trade, and sometimes to be ruined again as a consequence of the economic difficulties of the time. A typical instance of this kind is Amīn Shamīl (1828–1897; biography in Mas‘āhir al-Shark, ii. 169); he was a Syrian immigrant, gained and lost enormous wealth in the cotton trade and ended his life as a prolific writer and publisher adapting himself to circumstances in a remarkable way. Syrians are to be met everywhere as the promoters of modern intellectual life in Egypt, as publishers, journalists and authors; they are found likewise among the first nationalistic propagandists (e.g. Salīm al-Na‘īṣāsh; see the Bibliography). Some of their characteristics have made them, as a class, especially hated by Muhammadans.

The Greeks form a transition to the European element. Their significance for Egypt is exclusively economic; an enormous commercial activity is displayed by the Greeks in Alexandria. Greeks of the lower classes are everywhere to be found in Egypt as bakūls and occasionally as usurers. As elsewhere in the former Turkish Empire the Greeks in Egypt keep to their particular Greek form of western civilisation.

The Jews are half natives and half foreigners; their number towards the end of the century was about 30,000. They nearly all live in Cairo and Alexandria and are largely engaged in banking business. They played a part—not unlike that of the Syrians—in the first nationalist manifestations of 1877. One of them, James Sanu, with the pseudonym Abū Nazara, founder of the first Arabic theatre in Cairo, published in 1877 a kind of paper in vulgar Arabic in which he criticized the Khedive. Subsequently he was expelled (Sāhīb, L. G. C. Gen., etc., p. 127). Since 1840 there have been Jewish schools in Cairo.

The steady increase of the number of Europeans is more a consequence than a cause of Egypt’s “Europeanisation”. Many Europeans are only foreigners by their passport and constitute the well known class of Levantines, prospering under the immunities still granted to them by the capitulations. The Europeans who have served the Egyptian government in the execution of reforms and technical works have had belonging to different nationalities: French (de Seve—Sulanman Pasha, the creator of Muhammad ‘Ali’s nizām-troops; Clot Bey, the inspector of the medical schools; Ferdinand de Lesseps, and others), Swiss (Dor Bey and Maunzinger), Austrian (Slatin Pasha in the Sudan; Blum Pasha, financial adviser under Ismā‘il) and English (Baker and Gordon as governors of the Sudan). An influential class is formed by the foreigners who, though theoretically Egyptian officials, hold or have held functions in institutions such as the mixed tribunals and the Debt Administration, and especially the high British officials in the ministry and other departments (after the occupation). The cultural influence of the English cannot be said to have been considerable as yet. Even the knowledge of the English language is less widespread than that of French, in accordance with the traditional preponderance of the French form of European civilisation in the country. Lastly, mention has to be made of the numerous European adventurers who came to Egypt in the days of Sa‘īd and Ismā‘il and, by pretended schemes of commercial or technical enterprises, tried to extort money from the too careless viceroyals.

5. Education, Science and Literature

Education continued during the 19th century along the traditional Muhammadan line, while, on the other hand, a European system of education was introduced by Muhammad ‘Ali. It has not yet been possible to fuse the two systems into a whole.

The ancient Arabic kuttab have continued to exist all over the country until the present day, without any government control (except as far as they were paid from workk’s administrated by government) until the law of 1876, which introduced arithmetic. The other pole of religious Muhammadan instruction is represented by al-Azhar [q.v.], which institution, after having been neglected by Muhammad ‘Ali, has been an object of the solicitude of the later Khedives. In 1924 the number of students at al-Azhar was given as 10,287, of whom 9,758 Egyptians (lecture delivered in August, 1924, by Muhammad Abū Bakr Ibrāhim On The University of al-Azhar, published at Cairo). Other mosque universities organised on similar lines as at Azhar are those of Alexandria, Tanjah, Duslik and Dimyri. Besides, there exists in Cairo a special school for the training of kadi’s.
The Egyptian University (al-Jumla' al-Miyā'a) was founded at Cairo in 1908 by means of large subscriptions and gifts and was started under the presidency of Prince Ahmad Fu'ad Pasha, afterwards King. During its first years only courses on literary and historical subjects were organised, given by Egyptian and European teachers and by European Orientalists expressly invited to that purpose (the lectures have been published at Cairo). This University has sent in the last years groups of young Egyptians to different European universities with the object of appointing them after their return university teachers in Cairo. In 1924 this university passed under government administration; since that time several projects have been elaborated for the extension of its organisation and activity (Oriente Moderno, v. 110, 434). As was to be expected, the new university has encouraged research the results of which have not seldom been in strong opposition to the spirit of orthodoxy prevailing in al-Azhar.

Apart from the already mentioned educational establishments the many foreign schools, among which the missionary schools — first American Missionary school in Cairo in 1855 — in Cairo and Alexandria, sometimes subsidised by the government (as under Sa'id Pasha), have equally exercised an influence on the intellectual education of the Egyptian upper classes.

The introduction of printing into Egypt is closely connected with the educational programme of Muhammad 'Ali; the printing-press which the French had brought with them for their own use has left no traces. About 1821 the first printing office was founded in Bilâk; it began to produce Arabic and Turkish books for the newly opened government schools. Already in these first years began also the important activity of printing and publishing classical works of the Arabic, Turkish and, to a less extent, Persian literature. One of the first works printed seems to have been the grammatical treatise al-Adā'imiyā (in 1230/1824; see Zirker, Bibliotheca Orientalis, i., Leipzig 1846, p. 19), used in al-Azhar (von Kroner, ii. 285). The greatest printing activity of this kind began about 1850, not without encouragement from Europe; this productivity, to which so many European literary catalogues bear witness, has been, however, more to the profit of Oriental studies than to the scientific and literary development of Egypt itself (Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 471). The same can be said of the "Bibliothèque Khediviale" founded in 1870 by 'Ali Pasha Muḥārak. The origin of printing in Egypt is also connected with that of the press, since in 1828 the official newspaper al-Walā'ī al-Miyā'ī began to be printed on another press in the Citadel. About 1875 the printing office at Bilâk (belonging to the Dā'ira Simiyā, as were also the paper factories at Bilâk) was still the most important; besides this establishment there were a few private printing and lithographic shops in Cairo and Alexandria. After 1876, however, printing has gained enormous importance by the services it rendered to the then beginning development of the Arabic press, mainly by the initiative of energetic Syriacs and under the influence of the first nationalist movement.

The Arab press which was to be more important for the intellectual development than the printing of books — see the art. 'Arabīs (especially on the press movement of 1878: M. C. A. C., viii. 546 f., pr. 1882).
Sabry, La Génese etc., p. 127). The great Muḥammad political paper al-Muḥājir ceased to exist in 1915, while al-Mekkattum and the nationalist organs have continued (K. M. M., iii. 124).

The religious Muḥammad Arabic literature, so far as it is a continuation of the tradition of previous centuries, has produced only a few remarkable figures and those only in the first half of the 19th century, the most conspicuous being al-Badjūri (q.v., d. 1861). A very important branch of Muḥammad literature was, however, the literary activity of Muḥammad ‘Abdūh [q.v.] and his school, who initiated a theological modernism in Islam. While following the methods of old Islamic science but with independent interpretation of the holy texts, they tried to prove that Islam is still a living world religion and in no way opposed to modern civilization. A great many of Muḥammad ‘Abdūh’s articles have appeared in the review al-Manār (published since 1897 by the Syrian Sayyid Rashīd Riḍā). Though obviously these modernist views — styled by Goldziher “Kulturwahabismus” — have originated under the influence of the introduction of modern civilization, it cannot be said to have come under the influence of western thought itself. It has met with strong opposition from the conservative circles of al-Azhār, the press organ of which is al-iṭḥāb.

Poetry (as literary form) has never abandoned the classical Arabic forms, and although some poets have earned renown in their time (e.g. Shaikh Muḥammad Shihāb al-Dirās, 1757–1858; see von Kremer, ii. 294), modern Egypt does not seem to have produced a generally acknowledged famous Arabic poet.

The other branches of literature have abandoned by a more or less gradual process the old forms and the old style for Western literary methods, the models of which had been made accessible by an extensive activity in translation. The first works translated were French scientific books for Muḥammad ‘Alī’s schools; since Sa‘d Pasha’s reign a great many European scientific and belletristic works have been translated; e.g. the translation of French historical and travel works by Rifā‘a Bey al-Tahštawī (1801–1872) have much contributed to the spread of knowledge of European literary methods. Prose writing has seldom been used for the composition of novels and plays after European fashion. But there has sprung up an extensive semi-scientific literature on political and social questions, to which belong e.g. the works of Muṣṭafā Kāmil and the other nationalist literature; also the treatises on feminism mentioned in 4. This literature has been published partly in the daily press and the numerous periodicals, partly in books; a large part has been contributed by Syrians and Jews.

In contemporaneous historiography the work of al-Dibbarī [q.v.] holds a prominent place; it was composed in the traditional style of historical writing. Later books on Egyptian history, such as Farīd Bey’s history of Muḥammad ‘Alī and Ilyās al-Ayābī’s history of Egypt under Ismā‘īl (see the Bibliography), follow the methods of European historiography and use European sources. The same applies to the important historical and biographical works of the Syrian Dīrījī Zādān.

In ‘Alī Pasha Mubārāk’s Khiṭāf Lajīdāda we may see — as was the intention of the author — a continuation of the typical Egyptian tradition of Khiṭāf literature; next to Lane’s Modern Egyptians it is a chief source of information on Egypt and its population in the 19th century. We may include in the same class the various descriptions of travels, particularly those on the pilgrimage to Mecca, as the work of al-Battānī (see Lammens in R. M.M., No. XXXVIII) and the account of different ḫaṭfī’s (1901, 1903, 1904, 1908) by Isḥāq Rifā‘a Pasha al-Liwā‘ in his book Mir‘āt al-Haramain (2 vol., Cairo 1344/1925).

It should not be left unmentioned that all through the 19th century a considerable popular literature has continued to exist in the vulgar dialect, in the poetical form of muwāla and raqī‘ūl and in the form of prose ballads or sīyara, describing the deeds of ancient Arab more or less Egyptianized heroes as ‘Abī Zād, ‘Antar and others. An endeavour to introduce the vulgar Arabic of Egypt into literature was made by Muḥammad b. Uṣūlm al-Dhālī, who translated, between 1880 and 1890, some works of Rūqain and Mūṭi‘i into Egyptian Arabic; they, however, found no favour with the educated public. An unsuccessful propaganda has been made about 1896 by an American for the introduction of the Latin alphabet to be used for a new popular literature in one of the vulgar dialects of Egypt. Even Orientalists such as M. Hartmann were convinced at the time that an undertaking of this kind might succeed (Z. A., 1898, p. 277 sqq.).

The ancient Oriental shadow-plays, that have continued a waning existence in Egypt up to the present day, have been studied by Praher and Kahle. In their present form these shows were revived by the Algerian Ḥasan Kāshkāsh in the second half of the 19th century (see the art. EJHAYAL-T WILL). The occurrence of the Turkish Kara-Goz play is mentioned by Lane (ii. 113).


Khidr Beg, an Ottoman scholar and poet, the first judge of Constantinople. He was born on the first of Rebi I, 810 = 6th Aug. 1407 at Sîvînîja, the son of the local judge Ilyâfî al-Dîn and belonging to a famous family which traced its descent from Khûtja al-Nâr al-Dîn. On the conclusion of his studies, which he conducted mainly under Mollâ Mîrza Yâkîn, whom his daughter afterwards married, he became a judge in his native town and later Mudarris. He was next appointed professor in Brussa, then judge in Ainogol and finally called to a teaching appointment in Adrianople and after the capture of Constantinople was appointed its first judge. His sons were the Mufrî of Brussa, Ahmad Pasha (d. 911 = 1495, buried with the Zeinûlis in Brussa), Sinân Pasha (q.v.) and Vaqîb Pasha, judge of Brussa (d. 891 = 1486; buried in the mosque of Mollâ Fârînû), all three distinguished for intellectual gifts and considerable literary attainments. Khidir Beg himself was a great authority on Muslim learning and had a wide knowledge of the literature of the three great languages of Islam. He composed a homiletic poem in Saint verses, al-Nînîya fi 'Akhbâr' (Stambul 1258, 32 fol. [cf. J. A. Ser. iv., Vol. iii., 1854, p. 222]), which has been often commented upon (e.g. by Dâ'ûd b. Muhammad al-Kâshî, Cairo 1297, 87 fol.), and a number of other, mainly poetical works. Khidir Beg died in 893 = 1458/1459 in Stamboul where he was
buried in the Eiyyûb cemetery. He founded the little mosque of Hadîdî Kadîn; cf. Hâgû Husein, Hadîdî al-Darawûmî, i. 85, sq. (with biogr. notes), cf. thereon J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ix. 62, No. 158. On his tomb cf. Hadîdî al-Darawûmî, i. 218, 7. The village of Kâhkî, opposite to Stambul on the Asiatic side, where Müllî Khîdr Beg had great estates, still bears his name ("the judge's village").


(FRANZ BABINGER)

KHîDR KHÂN, Saiyîd, of Dîhî, founder of the Saiyîd dynasty (1414—1451), was the son of Malik Sulaimanî, adopted son of Mardan Dawlat, one of the amîr's of Pirzâr Tughluk. Khîdr Khân succeeded to Mardan Dawlat's sif of Multan, but was expelled in 1396, during the usurpation of Nasrât Shâh at Dîhî. When Timûr invaded India in 1398 Khîdr fled into Mewât, but after the capture of Dîhî waited on the conqueror and received from him a grant of the fiefs of Multan and Dîpâlpûr, where he remained independent during the remainder of the troubled reign of Mahmûd Tughluk. On Nov. 12, 1405, he rebelled and slew, on the banks of the Satlaj, Mallû (Hûlî Khân), Mahmûd's minister, who was attempting to recover Multan, and having extended his territory towards Dîhî, formed a party in the capital. In 1412 he unsuccessfully besieged Mahmûd in Dîhî, but returned in 1414, after Mahmûd's death, and besieged Dâwlat Khân Lôdi, who had been acknowledged by the amîr's, at Dîhî as their leader, but surrendered the city on discovering a plot to admit the besiegers. On June 4, 1414, Dâwlat Khân was imprisoned in Hîşirî Firûzâ and was shortly afterwards put to death. Khîdr Khân, exiled from the royal title, and contended himself with that of Rûyêtî Âlî ("the Exalted Standards"). He is said to have remitted tribute to Timûr's son, Shâhrûkh, to whom he owned allegiance.

He first recovered the revolted provinces of Kotreh (Rohilkhand) and the Gangetic Doab, and in 1416 he asserted his authority in Gwalior, suppressed a rebellion of Turks under Taghân Râsî in Sirhind, and relieved Nâgâwar which was besieged by Aûmûd I of Gudjarât. In 1417 he completed the suppression of the rebellion of the Turks and in 1418 and 1419 was engaged in restoring order in Kotreh. In the latter year a rebel who pretended to be Sârang Khân, Khîdr's ancient enemy, who had expelled him from Multan, appeared in Mâtiwâra, but was defeated near Rûpar and fled to the mountains, and in 1420 was put to death by Taghân Râsî. Later in the same year it was again found necessary to send an army into the Doab and Kotreh, and Taghân rose in rebellion in the Sirhind district. In 1421 Khîdr Khân led an expedition into Mewât and to Gwalior, whence he returned by way of Iâwâ. Here he fell sick and returned to Dîhî, where he died on May 20, 1421.

Bibliography: Yahya b. Ahmad, Tâzîjî al-Muhabar Shâhî (MSS. are rare); Nîjûm al-Din Aûmûd Aûmûd, Tâbûkârî Akhûrî; 'Abd al-Kâdîr Badûnî, Mutâkeb al-Tawsîrik, transl. G. S. A. Ranking; Muhammad Kaşîm Firîshlî, Gûthânî al-lwâhimî; Edward Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Dîhî. (I. W. HAIJ)

KHIL'A (an Arabic word derived from khila' "to divest oneself of one's robe"), a robe from the wardrobe of the sovereign, which he no longer wears and which he bestows, as a gift, on the person whom he wishes to honour (syonym Âshrafî, pl. tahârîh, Ibn Khallîkân, transl., iv. 117; Abu'l-Fâkhr, Amânah, v. 5; Mâturidi, Khâtîf, quoted in History of the Mamelukes, part 4, p. 70, note 1; Shânîb al-Dîn, Mâslîk al-Abâr, in N. E., xii. 376). This garment is of course rich and sumptuous and of great value. It is also given as a sign of investiture to an official. Sometimes a sum of money is given instead. Thus it was that in Turkey the name khil'a-l-bcha, "the price of a robe of honour", was formerly given to a certain sum of money distributed to the officers of the Janissaries on the Sultân's accession (Barber de Meynard, Dictionn. turc., i. 709). The kings of Persia used to send a robe by a special messenger to governors of provinces whom they wished to honour and who wore it on special occasions. In return the latter treated the messenger handsomely and heaped presents upon him. In Central Asia these are made of cloth of gold of the Indies, of Kashmir shawls, of silk of all colours. At the distribution, the individuals who receive this favour put on the khila' (Pers. and Turk khâl'at) over the clothes they are wearing.

In Egypt, under the Mamelûks, these robes of honour were arranged in classes (menzûl, mertebe), according to the rank of the individuals for whom they were intended, and who formed three classes, (1) men of the sword, (2) men of the pen, i.e. officials in the civil service, (3) scholars. A sword enriched with gold was added to the present, taken from the siyâkh-khâne (arsenal) and a horse fully caparisoned, covered with a kânîshkh (Pers. kânîshkh covering) of gold and brought from the ri'kâbkhâne (royal stables). Fuller details will be found in the Mâslîk al-Abâr quoted by Quatremère in L'Histoire des Mamelouks, part 4, p. 72 sqq., note and in Gaudefroy-Demobynes, La Syrie à l'âge des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, p. lxxxix sqq. — On the use of these robes as a sign of authority cf. G. Meloni, 'Alcuni temi semanticî, in: R. S. O., iii., 1910, p. 533 sqq.; F. W. Buckler, Two instances of Khil in the Bible in Journal of Theological Studies, xxiii. (1922), 197 sqq. — For India, especially Lahkhan, see Mrs. Meer Hassan Ali, Observations on the Mameluns of India (1832; 2nd ed. 1917), p. 149; F. W. Buckler, The political theory of the Indian Mutiny in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, v. (1922), 81 sqq.


(ÇL. HUART)

KLHILA. [See KHALILA.]

KLILÁL. [See SIMAK.]

KLHILD. [See KLHILD.]

KHÎRKA (A.), "rag", hence "a mystic's coarse woolen robe", because it was originally made up of pieces (syonym murâbâ'a). "It is the inner
flame (jāla) which makes the Ṣūfī, said al-Hudūwī, not the religious dress (ṣamāmai). This dress was the outward sign of the vow of poverty taken by the Ṣūfī; it was originally as a rule blue, the color of the Sufi mystics; however, did not like to wear a special costume, saying that if a distinctive mark of this kind was adopted for God’s sake, it was useless, for God knows best what is; and if it is for the people, one cannot escape from this dilemma — either the vocation of the dervish is true and then it is pure ostentation, or it is pretended and it is hypocrisy. Nevertheless the distinctive dress was generally adopted. It could not be obtained by the novice until the expiry of the three years necessary for his education. The investiture of the muwaḍd with the khirba by his tutor (Shaikh, Pir) had a ceremonial character. The donning of the robe, in the Subrāwāndi’s ‘Awwārī al-Muṣirī, is the tangible sign that the man is entering upon the way of truth, the symbol of his entrance upon the mystic path, the sign that he is abandoning himself and putting himself entirely in the hands of the Shaikh”. There are two kinds of robe: khirāk al-irāda (robe of good-will), which one asks from the Shaikh, being fully conscious of the duties which this investiture imposes on one and of the passive obedience to which one commits oneself in accepting it; and khirāk al-tābārak (robe of benediction) given ex officio by the Shaikh to persons who come to him. It would be useful to cause to enter upon the mystic path, without their realising the significance of the investiture. The first is naturally much superior to the second and distinguishes the true Sufis from those who only resemble them in external appearance.” (E. Blochet, Études sur l’ésotérisme musulman in Mus- ston, X, 1909, p. 176 et suiv.).

**Bibliography:** al-Hudūwī, Kaṭf al-Majāhīd, transl. Michelhon, p. 45 sqq.; H. Thorning, Bitrāj鸟s zur Konstanz des islam. Ver- einigungsaus (Verlagsbuchh. v. w., vi.), index; S. de Saucy, Pend- naevák, p. 46; M. N. Es., Mar, 305; Cl. Huart, Kouts, la ville des derviches tournois, p. 204. (CL. HUART)

**KHIRKA-I SHERĪF,** the “mole mantel”, the name given to the mantle of the prophet (r. BURDA) venerated as a relic and kept in Constantinople. The day for visiting it is a fast day (the 15th Ramadān of each year). It was formerly kept in a special chamber of the sarai, where it was preserved in a chest of medium size covered by a green velvet cloth with a broad fringe of gold and silver. The ceremony of the pilgrimage was performed in the following manner. On the appointed day the ministers, the ‘ulamā, the generals of the janissaries and of the other troops, notified on the evening before by letters carried by the caṣlū, assembled before midday prayer in front of the gate of bliss (Gūb al-Sūfāda), the second gate of the sarai; the ministers and the ‘ulamā seated themselves on the right, the soldiers on the left and awaited the arrival of the grand vizier. The latter, as soon as he had been informed of the arrival at Ayā-Soṭṭāa of the Shaikh al-Islām, brought by the Ra’is al-Kuttah, proceeded thither with the functionaries of the Porte. Together they all performed midday prayer and proceeded thereunto to the imperial palace. After having passed by the ‘arḍ-ṣuqay and having obtained permission to proceed, the pro-

cession entered the chamber of the khirka sherīf. The first and the second men of the Sultan seated themselves before the chest containing the relic and each recited an ‘aṣr (thank) of the ‘Inān. The Sultan, in person opened the chest and authorised those who were with him to place their forehead (jān zamuk) on the relic, i.e. the grand vizier, then the Shaikh al-Islām and the other dignitaries, after which each one returned to his place, where he remained standing. The shaikhs (heads of religious orders) placed themselves before the chest, said prayers (iḥdhā’) and placed their foreheads on the relic. They went out with the same ceremony and mounted their horses outside the orta-kirāf (the middle gate). This fête was an occasion for distributing pastries called baḥlūs to the janissaries and to the other troops. The relic is a mantle with large sleeves, a white mohair camel. After the reception was finished, the grand vizier and the general of the silbikār wiped it with a piece of muslin (dhihād) and gave this muslin to their followers. Then they washed in a goldet of gold the spot where the forehead had been placed and dried the wet spot by fumigations of aloes and of ambergris.

In 1265 (1849) the mantle was moved to a mosque specially built for it by the Sultan Wāliye, the mother of the Sultan ʿAbd al-Majīd. This monument called Kharba sherīf Qamīs stands in Stamī in the Veni bāghi quarter, to the west of the mosque of Fatih on the south slope of the fifth hill. Situated in the middle of a large garden enclosed by a railing of iron, it is a type of construction unique in Constantinople and marks the tendency to follow European models; for it is the application of ironwork to the construction of religious buildings. It is an elegant octagonal building surmounted by a cupola and flanked by pavilions to which it is joined by glass galleries. A beautiful border of iron runs along the roof. A fluted minaret supports a light balcony of hammered iron.

**Bibliography:** E. Hal-Foebi, Tahrīfāt al-badūm, p. 14, 18; [L. Roussel], De Paris à Constantinople (Guides Joanne), p. 263; Tavernel, Nouvelle relation du Serail (Voyages, t. vi.), p. 180. (CL. HUART)

**KHITA.** [See KARA KHITĀIL]

**KHITĀN (A.), circumcision. According to the Liṣān al-ʿArab, s.v. kh-t-tn, the term is exclusively used in connection with the circumcision of males, whereas in the case of females khafid is the proper word. If this statement should be exact, the expression al-khitānī “the two circumcised parts” (viz. that of the male and that of the female) would be a dual a potiori. This expression occurs in the tradition “If the two circumcised parts have been in touch with one another, qatni is necessary” (Bukhārī, Qatni, bāb 28; Muslim, Haid, trad. 88; Abū Dīlākī, Tahār, bāb 81, 83).

Some words connected with the root kh-t-n denote the father-in-law, the son-in-law, the daughter-in-law (khṭān, khṭānā), or marrying (khṭthin). Some of these words must have belonged to the primitive Semitic language, as they occur also in the same or cognate forms in North-Semitic languages. We shall have to discuss the relation between this class of ideas and circumcision below.

Circumcision must have been a common practice in early Arabia. It is mentioned, not in the Kurān, but in old poetry (I am indebted to F. Krenkow’s
kindness for references to the Divine of the Hudhali's, to Farazdaq and other poets) and in hadith. The early language has also a special word for "uncircumcised" (agiral, Hebrew 'ard). In hadith is said that Ibrahîm was circumcised in his 80th year (Bukhârî, Abu'ûṣ, bâb 8, Muslim, Fâqîlî, trad. 151). This tradition is based on the Biblical report. Ibn Sa'd has preserved a tradition according to which the patriarch was already circumcised at the age of 13 (Tabâkî, 1. 24).

This tradition is apparently a reflex of the practice of circumcision in the first centuries of Islam. We may confront it with the statements concerning Ibn 'Abdâ's circumcision in hadith. According to some traditions (Ahmad b. Hanbal, i. 273) he was 215 years old when Muhammad died. In other traditions it is said that he was already circumcised at that time (Bukhârî, Isâdînâm, bâb 51; Ahmad b. Hanbal, i. 264, 287; Ta'âla'î, No. 2639, 2640).

Circumcision is mentioned in hadith in the story of the Emperor Heraclius' horse-scorpion (Bukhârî, Fad' al-Wabî, bâb 6). Heraclius read in the stars the message of "the king of the circumcised". Thereupon an envoy of the king of Ghassân arrived who reported the news of Muhammad's preaching of Islam. This envoy appeared to be circumcised himself and he informed the Emperor of the fact that circumcision was a custom prevalent among the Arabs.

It is further recognised in hadith that circumcision belongs to the pre-Islamic institutions. In the traditions which enumerate the features of natural religion (al-shifa'), circumcision is mentioned together with the clipping of nails, the use of the toothpick, the cutting of moustaches, the more profuse length of the beard etc. (Bukhârî, Lidhâ, bâb 63; Muslim, Tâhârâ, trad. 49, 50; Tirmidhi, Adab, bâb 14 etc.). Perhaps circumcision of females is implicitly understood here. In a tradition preserved by Ahmad b. Hanbal (v. 75) circumcision is called sunna for males, honourable for females. Circumcision of females is also testified by the nickname ibn musâsit al-huṣûr, i.e. "son of the woman who circumcised females", which is given some Makkans.

There are differences between the several madhâb's concerning rules for circumcision. Instead of giving a survey of the different views it may be sufficient to translate the passage al-Nawawi in his commentary on Muslim, Tâhârâ, trad. 50 (ed. Cairo 1283, i. 328) has devoted to the subject, also because it contains a description of the operation.

*Circumcision is obligatory (fadîl) according to al-Shafi'i and many of the doctors, sunna according to Malîk and the majority of them. It is further, according to al-Shafi'i, equally obligatory for males and females. As regards males it is obligatory to cut off the whole skin which covers the glans, so that this latter is wholly demunated. As regards females, it is obligatory to cut off the smallest part of the skin in the highest part of the genitals. The sound (gâfîl) view within the limits of our school, which is shared by the large majority of our friends, is that circumcision is allowed, but not obligatory in a youthful age, and one of the special views is that the wâli is obliged to have the child circumcised before it reaches the adult age. Another special view is, that it is prohibited to circumcise a child before its tenth year. The sound view according to us, is that circumcision on the seventh day after birth is mustahbî (recommendable). Further there are two views regarding the question whether in the "seventh day" the birthday is included or not".

The treatment of circumcision has not a prominent place in the books of law. More important, however, is the value attached to it in popular estimation. "To the uneducated mass of Muslims" says Snouck Hurgronje "as well as to the great mass of non-Muslims, both of whom pay the greatest attention to formalities, abstention from pork together with circumcision, have even become to a certain extent the criterion of Islam. The exaggerated estimation of the two precepts finds no support in the law, for here they are on the same level with numerous other precepts, to which the mass attaches less importance" (De Islam, Baarn 1912, p. 30; Vierjr. Geschiften, i. 402; cf. iv/1, 377). In Java circumcision is generally considered as the ceremony of reception into Islam and therefore sometimes called nijamakî-slam ("rendering Muslim"). Apart from this term many other words denoting circumcision are used on Java (o. J., iv/1, 205 sq.).

In A t e h i n circumcision of infidels only is considered as the ceremony of reception into Islam (Snouck Hurgronje, The Achenees, i. 398). The importance attached to circumcision appears also from the tradition according to which Muhammad was born circumcised (Ibn Sa'd, Tabâkî, ifi. 64). In North Africa a child born with a short foreskin is considered as a blessing (Douût, Moriskhe, Paris 1905, p. 353).

At M a k k a, where the rite is called ta'âlûr, children are circumcised at an age of 3—7 years, girls without festivities, boys with great pomp. On the day preceding that on which the rite will be performed, the boy who is clad in heavy, costly garments, is paraded through the streets on horseback, several footmen walking on both sides in order to prevent him from falling and to refresh him by means of a perfumed handkerchief. He is preceded by men with drums and duffs who accompany the alâ'ik's song by others. Nearest to the boy goes an elderly black handmaid of his father's, hearing on her head a brazier burning with charcoal, resin and salt. The second part of the procession is formed by the boy's poorer comrades, equally on horseback. The procession passes through the main streets during the time of 'asr and comes back to its starting-point a little before sunset. The female members of the family pass the evening with their friends; the party is enlivened by female singers.

Next morning, at sunrise, the harbâr performs the operation. The foreskin is pressed together by means of a thong, the boy lying on his back, while his mother tries to divert his attention by sweets. A plaster is applied to the wound which usually is healed in a week. The operation is followed by a breakfast for the nearest relatives. It is to be observed that Hajramites who still cling to their native customs, circumcise their children on the 40th day after birth (Snouck Hurgronje, Mekeâ, ii. 141 sqq.).

In Egypt boys are circumcised at the age of about five or six years. Before the operation the boy is paraded through the streets. Often the train is combined with a bridal procession in order to lessen expenses; in this case the boy and his
attendants lead the procession. He is dressed as a girl, in a gorgeous manner. The kerekh is used to cover a part of his face in order to avert the evil eye. As in Makka, he is preceded by musicians. The foremost person of the procession is usually the servant of the barber (who performs the operation), who bears his haal, a case of wood of a semi-cylindrical form, with four short legs; its front is covered with pieces of looking-glass and brass, and its back with a curtain. It is to be noted that the Copts also circumcise their boys (Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, Chapter on Infancy and Education).

D’Ollson in his Tableau de l’empire ethiopien, Paris 1787, i. 231 sqq., describes circumcision as practised in Turkey under the heading “Circumcision, sunnetath”, a designation which is also reflected in the word sunnet-jifi for the barber who performs the operation. It takes or took place in the presence of the imam of a mosque who accompanies the ceremony with prayers for the preservation of the child, who is usually 7 years old when he is circumcised. Plate 20 of D’Ollson’s work shows children dressed for the ceremony, plate 21 adorned victims who are slaughtered at this occasion. Parties for relatives, friends and poor people as well as the procession are also mentioned.

The circumcision of the imperial princes used to give occasion to the displaying of great pomp. Long before the appointed day intimation was sent to the high dignitaries of the empire, sometimes even to the other courts of Europe. D’Ollson gives in a translation of Mârâd’s III letter of invitation to the dignitaries on the occasion of the circumcision of the crownprince.

In North Africa children are circumcised at ages varying between the 7th day after birth and 13 years, by the barber who makes use of a knife or a pair of scissors. According to Dan, as cited by Dartt, Morsâkch, p. 351, at Algier a stone knife was used for the operation. Nowadays this custom seems to be no longer known. It reminds us of Joshua v. 2 sqq. where it is said that the Israelites at their entering the Holy Land were circumcised by means of stone swords or knives; some populations of the Dutch Indies also use a stone knife of the operation (Wilken, p. 212).

In North Africa as well as in Egypt often several boys are circumcised together, the father of the richest bearing the expenses of the ceremony.

On Java circumcision of boys is often combined with the khatem- or katanam-ceremony. On the different designations of circumcision in this part of the Archipelago cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Verstrekte Geschriften, iv/1. 206. The age at which boys are circumcised varies in the different parts of Java; among the conservative populations it is higher (14–15 years) than in circles which are in closer touch with Muslim law (10 years or younger). Before the preparations begin, the boy is taken to the tomb of his father or ancestors, where flowers and incense are offered and prayer is performed. Then a portico (tarup) is made before the house or pendopo, and a small room (kobongan) is prepared where the operation is to take place. In or before this room several objects and dishes are placed which have a symbolical or ritual meaning. These preparations are concluded by a religious meal at which several dishes are offered to several categories of awe-inspiring beings. Festivities such as nayang, toyahtan, dagangan precede or follow the ceremony. The dagangan always takes place in the preceding night and follows upon katanam, the performance of some chapters of the Kurâän by the boy.

On the day preceding circumcision a procession is held in which the boys are either conducted by their relatives, or are placed in a kind of car which have the forms of nago’s or other animals. They wear the bridgroom’s dress, and are hung with gold and diamond ornaments, the visible parts of the body being besmeared with harch. It occurs also that the boy wears the hadji’s dress. Just as in North Africa poor parents have their sons circumcised together with those of well-to-do people, who bear the expenses.

The boy has to keep quiet for some days before and after the operation and to abstain from hot dishes as well as to beware of any action which is considered to be unlucky in this time. Before the operation he is bathed with the recitation of a great many prayers and formulas. Then he is placed on the lap of an elderly person, usually a santri who has many children; a circumstance which is expected to exercise a wholesome influence on the boy’s marriage. For further details see Snouck Hurgronje, Verstrekte Geschriften, iv/1. 205 sqq.

Girls are not always circumcised on Java. The ceremony is called suna (sunna), whereas the Sundanese denote it by gusaran “filing of teeth”; a fictitious filing of teeth takes place the day before circumcision. Girls are circumcised on Java at an age varying between 2 and 8 years. During the last decades the ceremony has been, covered under a mysterious veil in some circles. Parents, however, who cling to the adat, do not share this tendency.

In Atchin boys are usually circumcised by the mudim (probably = muddâdhilân) at the age of 9 or 10 years, immediately after finishing their Kurâän study. The operation (for details see Snouck Hurgronje, The Achahinese, i. 399 sq.) consists in a complete circumcision; in some parts of Java it is rather an incision. The boy here also has to diet himself. In Atchin the ceremony is not usually accompanied by festivities. But in many cases the latter take place in consequence of vows connected with the ceremony. The father of the boy vows, e.g. to arrange a Rapa’s-performance or to visit a sacred tomb. In this case the boy, dressed as a bride, is conducted to the tomb, sometimes on horseback, where his head is washed and a religious meal given.

Girls are circumcised in Atchin soon after the peuron (the ceremony of taking the child from the house into the open air for the first time), consequently at a very young age. The operation is performed without any further ceremonies; even the father does not know when his daughter is to be circumcised.
In the literature on the subject different views regarding the origin, the original signification and the gradual extension and modification of the rite are to be found. For several reasons it seems unnecessary to review these opinions here. An exception may, however, be made for Wilken, who bases his opinion partly on that of Ploss, and for van Gennep (Les rites de passage, Paris 1909, spec. the fourth chapter).

According to Ploss the rite was meant as a chirurgical operation, serving to remove or to prevent phimosis, as it was believed that this anatomical deviation and perhaps the foreskin in general, was an impediment to the sexual function. Consequently the operation could take place at any age before marriage. Ploss' theory seemed to find support in the reports of some travellers (Wilken, loc. cit., p. 224 sqq.). Wilken combines this view with an extension in the religious direction. If the aim of circumcision was the promotion of fecundity, the rite became a religious one, because begetting children was a precept of religion among many peoples.

Ploss' and Wilken's theories do not regard, as may be seen from the short résumé just given, the circumcision of females. According to Wilken the rite is in this case originally nothing but a chirurgical operation serving to prevent abnormal deviations of the genitals.

These theories are open to several objections. The conjecture of a different meaning of the rite in the case of males and females, can only be admitted if a common explanation appears to be impossible. Further the rite is practised among peoples who do not know of a connection between sexual intercourse and the birth of children. Another objection regards Ploss' and Wilken's method as such. It may be observed that an enquiry into the origin and development of widely spread rites such as the one in debate, has scarcely ever led to satisfactory results, because such rites, if they may have originated from one clearly definable idea at all, sooner or later have become receptacles of other more or less cognate ideas, a process which has covered them under such a mass of tangle-wood that it is no longer possible to find a thread of evolution.

During recent years ethnologists have, therefore, given up the genetic method, in order to return to the descriptive one, hoping thus to be able to set the important sides of the rites in the best light. This method has been applied to sacrifice by Hubert and Mauss, to circumcision by van Gennep.

In his Rites de passage van Gennep has shown that a great many rites may be described as rites of transition from one state of life into another one. Circumcision must be placed on the same level with the first shaving of the hair (caška), the filing of teeth, with initiations of various kinds, etc.

This point of view accounts for many of the features of circumcision mentioned above. It accounts for the fact, that children are submitted to the operation at ages varying between the seventh day after birth and the beginning of the manly age or the time of marriage; that females as well as males are circumcised; that the rite is sometimes repeated; that its shows a deeply rooted connection with marriage; that it is considered as the act of reception into a religious community;
that it is sometimes preceded by a bath; that
ceremonies take place, which show a striking
similarity with bridal processions and so on.

(A. J. WENSINCK)

KHYWA. [See KHYWARIZM].

KHLOT, an Arab tribe of Northwestern
Morocco. Its name in literary Arabic Kḥalt
has become Kḥlot in the vulgar dialect by
regular metathesis, but the primitive form of
the word is found in the adjective Kḥalti fem.

Khlutiya.

The Kḥlot who came into North Africa with
the Filāšī invasion in the fifth (eleventh) century
formed a part of the group of mixed Arab ele-
ments, known as Djuṣham from the name of the
ancestor of one of them. According to Ibn Khal-
dūn and other Muslim historians, the Kḥlot were
the Banu T-Muntāk. In Little Africa, the Djuṣham
spread through Central Maghrib, settled there and
took part in all the fighting which devastated
Barbary. After the Almohad conquest, they tried
to rebel but were cruelly put down. A little later,
the Banū Ghanīya, rivals of the Almohads, had
no difficulty in getting them as allies after the
taking of Bagāg [q.v.]. But the Almohad Caliph
al-Manṣūr, victorious over his enemies, punished
their Arab allies and transported the Djuṣham and
Riyāḥ Arabs to Morocco to the coast of the
Atlantic. The Riyāḥ were settled in al-Ḥabat and
al-Gharb, the Djuṣham in al-Tamesnā (the present
Shawia), a country which had been empty since
the extermination of the schismatic Berghwāta by
the Almohads. Al-Manṣūr thought he would settle
these tribes permanently and make them auxiliaries
for the djīhād in Spain. His attempt was doomed
to failure.

Under the successor of al-Manṣūr, the intrigues
of the Almohad Shāikhs found excellent allies
among the Djuṣham (Kḥlot and Sufyān) and the
jealousy between the Kḥlot and Sufyān aggravated
the internal dissensions still further. In 621 (1224
A.D.) the Kḥlot took the side of the pretenders
al-Māmūn against the Caliph al-Adīl supported by
the Sufyān. In 625 (1228) al-Māmūn was pro-
claimed Caliph. In 630 his son al-Rashīd succeeded
him but he was forced to take strong measures
against the chiefs of the Kḥlot on account of
their robberies and other misdeeds. The Kḥlot
rebellied and took the side of the pretender Yahyā
b. al-Nāṣir. The Sufyān made their peace with al-
Rashīd. They attacked the Kḥlot on the banks
of the Unn al-Rabī' and wrought terrible carnage
among them. The Kḥlot in return proclaimed Caliph
the pretender Ibn Hūd from al-Andalus.

But al-Rashīd pursued and routed them, took their
chiefs prisoners and beheaded them (635 = 1237/
1238). Weakened and compelled to submit, the
Kḥlot took part in the expeditions of the Caliphs
but their rivalry with the Sufyān was not ex-
tinguished and proved fatal to the Almohads. In
640 (1248) at the siege of Tamzesdakt held by
the Ẓiyānī pretendent Yaghmūrsān, the rivalry
resulted in the death of the Caliph al-Sa'id and
the defeat of the Almohads.

The rise of the Marinids in Morocco again made
the Kḥlot feel the hand of the conqueror. Sulṭān
Abū Thābit took steps to punish them for their
brigandage (707 = 1308), but they used their
help to destroy the power of the Riyāḥ Arabs.
The Kḥlot, installed in the latter's territory, in Aẓghār
and in Ḥabat formed part of the makhzan [q.v.]
of the Sulṭāns of Morocco, contracted matrimonial
alliances with these rulers and furnished them with
governors of provinces, ambass-adors and councilors.

Vassals of the Marinids, the Kḥlot passed into the
service of the Banū Waṭṭāṣ, their successors. It is
even claimed that intermarriage between them and
Bū Hassān, the last Waṭṭāṣ Sulṭān, prevented them
from taking the side of the Sa'dīan Sherifs on
the latter coming to the front.

The Sa'dīan Sherifs at first had no dealings
with the Kḥlot, in spite of the importance of this
tribe which, according to Leo Africanus, could put
into the field 12,000 horsemen and 50,000 foot-
soldiers. But the important part played by the Kḥlot
in the Moroccan victory over the Portuguese at
Wādit Makhāzin made them admit them partially
into the Makhzan of the Sherifs. But the plunder-
ing and undisciplined spirit of the Kḥlot made
them dangerous to any regular authority. During
the decline of the Sa'dīan dynasty, the marabout
pretender al-‘Ayyāshī [q.v.], who wished to make
them take the field against the Christians of Larache'
could not subdue them and was assassinated by
them in 1048 (1638/1639).

Under the Filāšī Sherifs the Kḥlot took the side
of the petty chiefs of Northern Morocco who had
made themselves independent under cover of the
rivalry between Isḥāq and his successors after
conquering them deprived the Kḥlot of their posi-
tion as a makhzan tribe and encouraged the settle-
ment in this region of heterogeneous Arab elements,
the Ṭīlk and Badāwā groups who could only
disturb and weaken the older occupants of the
land. At the present day these groups have each
their īkā'ids who keep a jealous watch on one
another; any attempts made by the Kḥlot against
the Moroccan authorities have for a long time
been uniformly unsuccessful.

The territory occupied by the Kḥlot is now
about 50 miles in length from N. to S., and 20
in breadth from E. to W. It is bordered on
the N. near Asīla by the Wāḍī Salem, the tribe of
Banū 'Araš and the Wāḍī 'Ayyāshā; on the E.
by the tribe of Banū Gorfet, and of Ahī Şarif;
by the S. E. by the Jībial Şarṣar; in the S. by
the Gharb. In the W. from Asīla to Larache, the
Kḥlot are cut off from the Ocean by the narrow
territory of the Sāḥīl; from Larache they stretch
along the Atlantic as far as the marshes of Mar-
ḍja Żarka.

Bibliography. One could quote here all
the works dealing with the history of N. W. Africa
from the second Arab invasion. M. M. Michaux-
Bellaire and Salmon in Archives Marocaines,
iv., v., vi., Paris 1905-1907, have given a very
full account of the territory, ethnography, ad-
ministrative organisation, political position and
divisions of the Kḥlot in their article on Les
Tribus Arabes de la voûte du Lekhous.

(A. COUR)

KHODABEND. [See UZJAI'r].

KHODJĀ (Pers. Khoja), name of a com-
munity of dissenting Muslims, mainly to be
found (a) in the Panjāb; (b) in Sind, Kāshān,
Kabūsār and the Western Coast of India; (c) in
Zanżībar and on the East Coast of Africa; (d) in
scattered groups under the name of Māwānis or
Mawānis in the Hindu Kūsh region and the North-
west frontier of India, in Afghanistan, in the
Khānātes of Central Asia, in the hill districts of
Eastern Persia and in the Persian Gulf District.
The numbers enumerated in India at the Census of 1921 (Census of India 1921) were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>30,703</td>
<td>27,925</td>
<td>58,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandjab</td>
<td>45,029</td>
<td>41,852</td>
<td>87,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāshmir</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>4,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

British India 76,332 69,777 146,109

The Pandjāb Khodjas do not own allegiance to H. H. the Āgha Khān, but hold religious beliefs similar to those held by the Bombay Khodjas (Census of India 1901, xvii. 150 sq. They are, like the Bombay Khodjas, converted Hindus, who are usually engaged in commercial occupations, keep accounts in Hindi and follow Hindu customs. Allied to them are the Parācīs of whom there are about 4,000 in the Pandjāb. The Pandjāb Khodjas derive their origin from Ḥājīdī Ṣayyīd Sadr al-Dīn, who came in the 15th century as an Ismāʿīlī preacher from Khurāsān and lies buried in Trinda Gorōdī in the Pūshkārī of Gōhērīn in the Bābāwulārī State. He presented his doctrines to the Hindus in a form which would appeal to their Hindu traditions. He is reputed to have been the author of the Das-Avṭār, in which the incarnations of Viṣṇu are described as leading to Islam. The first nine incarnations are treated as a Hindu would treat them. The tenth incarnation (Skr. nīkālāngka, "unspotted") which the Hindus expect in the future is described as having materialised in the unrevealed Imām of the Ismāʿīlīs. Both the Das-Avṭār and Sadr al-Dīn's hymns are used up to the present day by the Pandjāb Khodjas as well as by the Āgha Khān's Indian followers and their offshoots in East Africa. For practical guidance the Pandjāb Khodjas look to Ḥājīrī and Čāhīrī sects and other Pās, whose religious beliefs are not, however, necessarily identical.

The Khodjas of the Bombay Presidency and their offshoots in East Africa form a much better organised community and are in direct touch with H. H. the Āgha Khān. Their religious ideas are in origin the same as those of the Pandjāb Khodjas, but their living contact with the Imām in the person of the Āgha Khān has isolated them from the influence of Muslim religious orders. Secessions have taken place from their ranks from time to time, but notably in the seventh decade of the 19th century, when a section of them attempted to declare the whole community Sunnī, and more recently, in 1901, when a small number under the leadership of men educated on Western lines declared themselves to be Iḥnā-Ashbīrīya [q. v.] Shīʿīs (what may be called the orthodox school of the Shīʿa's faith). They have built a separate mosque and made a separate burial ground in Bombay (called the Ārām Bāgh), but they maintain social intercourse with the main body of the Bombay Khodjas.

The Khodjas are mainly governed by customary law. The Bombay High Court has held (1847) that the Muslim law of succession does not apply to them and that, as under Hindu law, their females are excluded from intermediate succession (Sarjān Mīr Alī's case; cf. Sir Erskine Perry, Cases Illustrative of Oriental Life and the Application of English Law to India, London 1853, P. 110).

The Bombay Khodjas have a tradition of an

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, II.
the history of the Khōdja to date and rejects the contention of a minority that the community were Sunni); *Census of India 1901*, vol. xvii., *Punjab*, p. 150—151 (Simla 1902; account of the Pandājb Khōdja); J. Bādulchī, *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh*, Calcutta 1898 (slight glimpses of Khōdja). *M. J. C. E.* (1911), 175, *Brief History of the Aga Khan*, Bombay 1903 (uncritical, written by a Parsi author); S. Nāndānānī, *Khōdja Vīrītānī*, Aḥmadābād 1892 (written by a Khōdja, but before the results of modern research were known); Mīrāz Muḥammad Fānī, *Dastīr-i Maqāhlī*, Calcutta n.d., p. 348 sqq. (transl. D. Shea and Anthony Troyer, *Parsis*, 1843, ii. 397—451). (A. Yusef Ali)

**KHÔDJA EFENDI**

**SA'D AL-DIN B. HASAN DIJAN B. HĀFIZ MUHAMMAD B. HĀFIZ DIJĂM AL-DIN AL-ISFAHĀNI,** usually called Khōdja (Sa’d ed-Din) Efendi, a *famous* Ottoman historian and Shākh al-Islām. He was born in 943 (1538—1539) in Stambl, the son of a certain Hasan Dijān, who immigrated from Persia and served as a chamberlain to Sultan Selim I during the last seven years of his reign. Hasan Dijān told his son all sorts of anecdotes of the life of the Sultan which Sa’d al-Din worked into a *Selīm-nāme* and then added it as an appendix to his famous history (ii. 221—401) (cf. Pertsch, *Viert. Hist. Berl.* p. 241, No. 121; Flügel, *Die ..., Hss.* in Wien, ii. 210, No. 987; thereon J. v. Hammer, *G. O. K.*, ii. p. vi. 10; ii. 634; iv. 203, 59 and his *Letters sui mii orientali in Bibliotheca illyrica*, viii. [1826]; the *Selīm-nāme* was translated (without the introduction) into German by H. F. v. Diez, *Denkmäler aus Astan*, i. 26—502 [Berlin 1111]. Sa’d al-Din was called the law, became an *ulemā* early in 963 (1555—1556) *mawlawi* of the famous jurist Abu l-‘Abbās al-Qāsimī, in Muḥarram 981 (1573—1574) tutor (khōdja, whom his popular name, the one by which he is still generally known) to the heir-apparent Murād, then governor of Mahgīs. On the accession of Murād III in December 1574 he remained his trusted adviser and retained the rank of Khōdja-i sultānī, tutor to the Sultan, under Murād’s successor Mehméd III. In Shāhān 1006 (1598—1599) he became Shākh al-Islām and died in this office two years later in Stambl on 12 Rabī‘ I, 1st October 1600 (3rd October 2, 1599), just as he was preparing to celebrate the birthday service of the Sultan (menāb) in the Aya Sofia. Four of his five sons, some of whom attained high rank (Mehmed [cf. Sidīqī-i ‘otūm-i, iv. 144] and Mehmēd As’sad [cf. ibid. i. 330 sqq.], became Muftis, ‘Abd al-‘Āzīz [cf. ibid., iii. 338] and Sālīh [cf. ibid., ii. 200 sqq.]; ‘Āṣir, Mas’ud, died young as “guardian” [cf. ibid., iv. 365 sqq.]) bore their father’s coffin to Ayyāb, where he was buried in the school for the recitation of the Kurān.

Sa’d al-Din was the author of the famous Ottoman history known as the *Tādī al-Tawārīkh* which, although not written by the imperial command (S. was not the so-called imperial historian, *Waṣīk Nāsīr*, 303, cf. a work *тур. озм. Gesch.*, i. 241), is still generally regarded as an authoritative source for Ottoman history and not only consigned all earlier chronicles of the house of Īshānī, called Tawārīkh-i Ali ‘oṭāmānī into oblivion, but even made them appear contemptible (cf. Ḥâfīz Khaṭlā, *‘Alī al-zunnār*, ii. 112, No. 2158 and J. H. Mordtmann in *I.,* x. 160). The work dealt with the history of the imperial Ottoman house from its foundation to the death of Selim I (d. 21. ix. 1520), copying from the earlier historians and written in a style often bombastic and extravagant. The work which was finished in the reign of Selim II (1566—1574) and was strictly speaking intended as a supplement to the Persian *Mīrzā al-Dīn Abūl-Hajjāf Muḥāfiz al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Lārī, d. 972 = 1568* which Sa’d al-Din translated into Turkish (MS. in Vienna, cf. Flügel, i. 80, No. 845), was dis-segmented and read in numerous manuscripts until it was made generally accessible in a printed edition in 1279 (1861) in two large volumes (586 and 619 pp., large 800, cf. *F. A.*, 1863, ii. p. 262). MSS. of the book often beautifully produced (e.g. one in the Vatican) are common in European libraries. The most important and most useful for a future critical edition may be mentioned: Berlin, No. 213; Dresden, No. 386; Leiden, Cat., iii. 27; London, Rieu, *Cat. Turk. MSS.*, p. 51 sqq.; Mailand, Ambrosiana, No. 245; Munich, No. 76—81; Oxford, *Cat. No.* 1 and 4; Paris, Nos. 63—70; S.-Petersburg, Univ.-Biblioth., No. 1 and 2; Cat. von C. S. Leinemann, p. 21; Rome, Pius V, cod., *Historiæ Turcicæ*, a splendid MS. formerly belonging to the Swedish Queen Christina (cf. J. v. Hammer in *Bibl. vat.*, xvi. 35, 115 and P. Horn in *Z.D.M.G.*, ii. [1897], p. 45 sqq.; Uppsala, No. 245; Venice, Bibl. Naz. Marciana, No. 30, 85, 3 and 134; Vienna, Nat.-Bibli., Flügel, ii. 244; Konsular-Akademie, A. Kraft, *Die ..., d. or. Ak.*, No. 263. — The book found early recognition in the West and parts of it have been frequently translated: cf. W. Seaman, *The Reign of Sultan Orchan*, London, 1852; V. Bratutti, *Chronica dell’ origine e progressione della casa ottomana composta da Sadino Turco*, part. i., Vienna 1649, part ii., Madrid 1652 (cf. *W. I.* [1910], p. 110 and *I.*, xii. [1923], 226 sqq.); Sa’d al-Din’s Annals Turcici notae ad Muram I. Turrici et Latiue curiâ Fr. Kollar, Vienna 1755, fol.; incomplete, cf. Pertsch, *Viert. Hist. Berl.*, p. 243, note and *W. I.* [1910], p. 125 sqq.; parts transl. by J. H. Garcin de Tassy in *F. A.*, iv. 347; vii. 306, 340; ix. 152; *The Capture of Constantinople*, ed. J. E. W. Gibb (with a biography of Sa’d al-Din), London 1879.

A MS. of a French translation of the Tādī al-Tawārīkh was prepared by Antoine Golland in 1710; the MS., the first volume of which seems to be lost, is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale Paris as MS. anc. fds. fr. 6074.

Sa’d al-Din’s son, Mehmēd As’ad Efendi, is said to have continued the history written by his father; cf. Brit. Mehmēd Tāhir, *‘Uthmānī múlūfīt*, ii. 22 sqq.; *Imsīye Sāhānīs*, Stambul 1334, p. 426 sqq.

sons Meḥmed and Meḥmed Asʿad, ibid., p. 426 sq.; resp. 436 sq.); preface to the edition of the Tādqīq in Fardmānī; also Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry, i. 164, 165, 205—208 and his The Capture of Constantinople, London 1879, preface. (Franz Babinger)

KHŌDJA ILL [See KHOJA ILL.]

KHOI (in Arabic Khōwāyī), a town in Persia in the province of Aḏharābād, on a plateau 70 miles W. N. W. of Tabriz; population from 20,000 to 30,000. Its territory is irrigated by a water-course which rises in the mountains of Samarqand and flows into the Aras; the town is surrounded by gardens which produce, amongst other fruits, figs, and a superior quality of peaches called pavdužangi, "pears of the Prophet". At the present day cotton is cultivated in the neigbourhood.

The bazaars are large and busy. In former days a material called Khadīqīya was manufactured there. Now socks of knitted or woven wool are made here. The present defences (earthworks) were built at the beginning of the 19th century by General Gardane's expedition. The town was in part destroyed by the earthquake of 1842. It was near Khoi that Shāh Islam I lost the battle of Čaldīrān against Sulhān Selim I in 920 (1514).


KHΟKΑΝΔ, Arab. Khuwākānd, later written Khojand (which is given a popular etymology, Ḫoǰān = kanda = town of the boar), a town in Farghānā, cf. above, ii. p. 64, 66 where see also for the other spellings and the foundation of an independent Ozbek kingdom with Khojand as capital in the twelfth (eighth) century. The accession of the first ruler Shahrūkh was followed by the building of a citadel; another citadel later called Eski ʿarda was built by his son, ʿAbd al-Karīm (d. 1746). ʿAbd al-Karīm and his nephew and successor ʿĪsā Bātir are several times mentioned in te history of the Atūṭ Muhammad Ṭabarqānī, afterwards Khān of Bukhārā (d. 1759, cf. i, p. 782; Muḥ. Wāfā Karmānī, Taḥfūt al-Khānī, M. S. of the Amur. Mus., c. 581, especially fols. 33b sq., 145b sqq.). When the Kalmyk empire was destroyed and the frontiers of the Chinese empire advanced up to Farghānā (1758), ʿĪsā Bātir also was forced to acknowledge Chinese suzerainty; the Chinese records on this matter are cited by J. Klaproth, Magazin Asiatique, i. (1825), pp. 81 sqq. from the Tāi tīng yi tūng ī, ʿĪsā Bātir later was a member of a coalition of Muhammadan rulers of Central Asia, which applied to Ṭāhir Shāh Durrānī (cf. i, p. 169, 202 sqq.), the ruler of Afghanistan, for help against China. The alliance brought no further results, although Ṭāhir Shāh in 1763 appeared in Turkestan at the head of an army and occupied the territory between Khojand and Tashkend (at the same time an irrigation of the land of the Kara-Kirgiz was made from Khojand, Klaproth. op. cit., p. 83), but he had to retire again on account of the claims of his enterprises in other directions. ʿAbd al-Karīm's grandson, Nār Bāta Beg (probably reigned 1188—1213 = 1774/5—1798/9, cf. L. Zimin in Protokoll Türk. Krūka Lyūm. Arbūzōlī, xviii. 102, and Walidow, ibid., xx. 112 sq.), was also nominally under Chinese suzerainty.

To the early years of this reign belongs the journey of the Russian sergeant, Filipp Yefremov, who was taken prisoner by the Kirgiz in 1774 and sold in Būkḥārā and in 1782 returned to Russia via India and England. According to his Travels (F. Yefremov, Stranstroevye v Būkhistorii, Khivës, Persi w Indi 2 (St. Petersburg 1794, p. 59 sq.), Nārātāa was already entitled Khān "by the Chinese," was allied with China and at enmity with Būkḥārā. No mention is made of prominent buildings in the capital (the Medrese Mir was built in the reign of Nārātāa); on the other hand, a high pillar (apparently a minaret), said to be over 280 feet high in the market-place in Margūnān, is described. According to Filipp Nazarov (see below), this "tower" was visible for a distance of 50 verst (over 30 miles). Nārātāa's two sons, ʿĀlim and ʿOmar, are the real founders of the state and city of Khojand as we later know it. The chronology of these reigns (1213—1237 = 1798/9—1821/22) is not sufficiently established; even the year in which ʿĀlim was assassinated and ʿOmar raised to the throne is variously given in the sources. According to the Tārīkh Shahrūkkī (ed. Pantusow, p. 106) ʿOmar died in the year 1237 = 1821/22 (in the cyclic reckoning the year of the horse = 1822 is given); according to Nalivkin (Russ. original, p. 101; French translation, p. 124), who here follows another source (the Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh of Ḥakim Khān), ʿĀlim was not murdered till the spring of 1232 (i.e. 1817, not 1816 as in Nalivkin); on the other hand Nalivkin himself in another passage (Russ. orig., p. 185; French transl., p. 228) puts the building of the chief mosque of Khojand by ʿOmar Khān in 1231 (1815/16). The Russian interpreter Filipp Nazarov, who was in Khojand in the winter of 1813/1814, calls the ruler of Khojand Amir Wallamī (Zapiski o niektorých narodovských Srednye Azii, St. Petersburg 1821, p. 50 sqq.). This is probably for Wali al-Nīmā, not Wali Miyānī, as in Klaproth, op. cit., p. 43. The ruler at this time was only twenty-five years of age; this statement can only refer to ʿOmar, not to the much older ʿĀlim; according to ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Būkḥārī also (ed. Scheher, p. 102), this embassy and the capture of it (the murder of the Khojand envoy by a Russian soldier in Petrovolsk) both took place in the reign of ʿOmar Khān.

According to ʿAbd al-Karīm, p. 99, ʿĀlim had already been killed in 1224 (1809), which cannot be right, as we have a document of his dated Dūmādī I, 1225 (June 1810) (Protokoll Türk. krūka Lyūm. Arbūzōlī, iii. 165, sqq.). The change of ruler must therefore have taken place between 1810 and 1813.

In the oldest known document of his reign, dated 1213 (1798/9), ʿĀlim still regards himself as the representative of an un-named Khān; later he appears as an independent ruler with the title Khān or Amir; after the conquest of Tashkend, his power was as great as that of the Amir of Bukhārā. In ʿOmar's reign in 1814 (so Nazarov; not so late as 1819, as in Nalivkin, Russ. orig. p. 110 sq.; French transl., p. 134 sq.), the town of Turkestan with the parts of the Kirgiz steps
In spite of the great extent of his kingdom, the authority of the Khan was not firmly established; his vicious life and cruel rule had aroused general discontent. Naṣr Allāh, Amir of Bukhārā [q.v.], is said to have been asked by people in Khōkand itself to put an end to the rule of this blood-thirsty and godless tyrant. The Khōkand army was completely defeated; the capital itself was taken by the enemy (for the first time since the foundation of the kingdom); Madalī was killed while trying to escape (1258 = 1842). The conquerors were driven out again in the same year and Shīr ʿAlī, a cousin of ʿAlī and ʿOmar, was placed on the throne; but down to the Russian conquest domination of peace was never restored for any length of time. The reigns of Shīr ʿAlī (1842–1855) and his sons Khudayar (1845–1858 and 1865–1875) and Malī (1858–1859 and 1879–1882) and several short-lived rulers were a period of continual confusion and bloody fighting, notably between the Uzbek and the Kipchak tribe and the "Sarts", i.e. the native population. Khudayar, who was still a minor, was raised to the throne by Musulmān Kūli, the chief of the Kipchak; the Kipchak drove the Sarts out of their houses in the capital and took possession of the canals in the country; the Sarts were only allowed the water necessary for their fields on payment of a fixed sum. In 1269 (1852) Musulmān Kūli was overthrown by Khudayar and put to death; the land again passed to the Sarts. Malī then relied on the support of the Kipchak and restored to them the lands taken by the Sarts. Banished pretenders usually took refuge in Bukhārā. Under these circumstances Naṣr Allāh was able to advance as far as Khujand in 1275 (1858), his successor, Shīr ʿAlī, in 1279 (1862) and again in 1282 (1865) to occupy Khōkand itself. The struggle against foes at home and abroad was waged with mediaeval cruelty. Madalī's father-in-law, Muhammad Sharīf Aṭā'llī, governor of Tashkent, was bound to a horse's tail by order of Khan Shīr ʿAlī and dragged across the steppes; after the capture of Ura Tūbe by Khudayar in 1265 (1848) a tower of skulls (kelle-mimār) was erected of the heads of the enemy killed.

In spite of all this, the kingdom retained its former extent down to the Russian conquest. The Russian troops had been in contact with the troops of the Khan of Khōkand since 1850 on the upper course of the Sir Darya, about two hundred miles from the mouth and in the north-east since 1860 between the Ču [q.v.] and Ili. All these regions were still under the governor of Tashkent, who was also responsible for the maintenance of agriculture; the governor Mirzā Aḥmad (1853–1858) is said to have carried out irrigation works from the town of Turkestan to the valley of the Ču. It was only shortly before the Russian conquest in 1865 that Tashkent passed into the possession of the Amir of Bukhārā. From 1866 the kingdom of Khōkand became limited to Farghāna and remained nominally independent within the boundaries of the latter, even after the treaty with Russia in 1868. To this period belongs the digging of the Ulugh Nahr canal (Middendorff, Einblicke in das Fergana-Thal, St. Petersburg, 1881, Appendix, p. xxi) and several buildings (the urdu or palace of the Khan, frequently repurposed, e.g. in F. v. Schwarz, Turkestan, p. 412, and better in W. Masalski, Turkestanskiy Kril', St. Petersburg, 1913, p. 701 and 703; the
Medrese Häkım Ayin and M. Sultan Murad Beg, built by the mother and the brother of the Khân, reproduced in M. Ostroumov, *Islamovoljčenije*, p. 184) were erected at this time.

After the deposition of Khân Khudâyâr by a popular rising and the new troubles thereby provoked, the remainder of the kingdom was incorporated in Russia as the "territory of Farghâna". Khâqand still continued to be the largest town (113,636 inhabitants, according to the census of 1911) under Russian rule and the most important trading centre in the territory; the newly founded town of New Marghelân, later Skobelew, now called Farghâna, was the residence of the governor.

The last time Khâqand played a part on the political stage was in 1917, when an "autonomous government of Turkestan" was formed there; in the next year the victory of the Red Army put an end to it.


**KHÔL.** (See KHÔM.)

A people of northeastern Tunisia. Khûmiria has as its boundaries, to the north the Mediterranean sea, to the west the Algerian frontier, to the south the Wâdi Ghezala, a tributary of the Medjërda, to the east the country of the Nefta and the Chiâbia. The area of this region is about 350 square miles. It is a country with a very hilly surface, occupied by a mountain mass stretching as far as Algeria. Although the average altitude hardly exceeds 3,000 feet, these heights cut by deep ravines and steep gorges, give to the country a very rugged aspect. Khûmiria is for the natives "the mountain par excellence, Djebel Djëbaliye. The sandstone formations which constitute the subsoil are favourable for arboriculture. The forests of cork-oak and of Zèan-oak occupy here an area of a hundred thousand hectares. The rainfall here reaches 66 inches a year. The water filtering through the sand-stone reappears on reaching the impenetrable marl as springs and flows towards the valley of the Medjërda and especially towards the Mediterranean. Agriculture can scarcely be practised except in the alluvial plains of Tabarka. Everywhere, besides, a border of dunes stretches between the coast and the forest, and partly arrests the waters coming from the interior. Deposits of zinc, of lead, and of iron have been recognised at different points.

The population of Khûmiria is about 6,500 individuals. The natives called Khûmir or Khûmair are divided into 4 tribes: Khûmir of Tabarka, Atfâsa, Tâdamka, Sellûk. The rearing of animals, oxen, sheep, and goats is their means of livelihood. Only those who live around Tabarka devote themselves to agriculture. The women manufacture coarse cloth, and household utensils in common pottery. Lastly numbers of natives are employed by the administration for the exploitation of the forests of cork-oak. The Khûmiris are settled, or half settled. They live in huts or gourbis of branches, usually situated on the slopes of the mountains or in the neighbourhood of the river. Some of them have retained the use of tents. Near Tabarka there is also a small colony of Ziwâwa, the descendants of Kabyls of the Bougie district, settled at this place in the xvith century by the Bey Hammuda. They cultivate vegetables and fruit, live in stone houses, and enjoy a comfort much in excess of the other natives. The Europeans, who are few in number, are found in the centres of Ain Drahem [q.v.] and Tabarka [q.v.].

The Khûmir may be regarded as the descendants of the Sansâdja, who occupied the northern coast of Tunis and of the province of Constantine at the time of the Muslim conquest. This primitive stock has been reinforced by other Berber elements, driven from the centre towards the north after the Filali invasion, and finally by northwards.

In spite of their Berber origin, the Khûmir have for a long time been arabised. They have given up the use of the Berber language which has only left traces in their dialect and have given themselves an Arab descent. They claim, indeed, as their ancestor, a certain Khûmis b. Amor, of Arab origin, whose descendant Sidi 'Abd Allâh b. Djemâl, is said to have established himself near Ain Drahem. According to another tradition this personage is said to have attached himself to the tribe of the Hîmir or Kamir, who at the time of the conquest, had passed from 'Irak into the extreme Maghrib, from which 'Abd Allâh is said to have migrated into Tunis some centuries later. The different Khûmir tribes are said to be descended from the sons of Sidi 'Abd Allâh, whose "Marabot" is still at the present time the religious centre of this district. Twice a year in spring and in autumn, a much frequented Zerda is celebrated there. It has also been held that the Khûmir had for a long time inhabited the south of the Regency under the confederation of the Shabia, and that after the destruction of this confederation in the xvith century they fled for refuge into the mountains of the north.

In the shelter of their forests and of their mountains, the Khûmir retained until the end of the nineteenth century an almost complete independence. Their political organization was very rudimentary. They did not possess Kâdîs and their disputes were brought before the djâmâ'a. The tribes were often at strife with one another; they, however, sometimes formed federations to combat the populations of the valley of the Medjërda, or to resist the attacks of the Beys. The latter, under whom they nominally were, never could make them pay the taxes. Installed in the island of Tabarka, the soldiers and the officials of Tunis found themselves forbidden access to the country. The Ziwâwa settled on the coast by Hammûda, in order to prevent the incursions of the mountainiers, were content
to receive the pay which was granted to them, but refrained from entering into conflict with their dangerous neighbours. The Khimir, on their side, lived mainly by brigandage at the expense of the Tunis tribes, or of the Algerian tribes of the western frontier. The Beys of Tunis showed themselves powerless to put down these depredations. Acts of violence multiplied under the government of Muhammed al-Sadok. Thus the French government decided in 1881 to themselves to punish the guilty ones. This was the origin of the Tunis expedition which aimed at the establishment of the French Protectorate. The operations against the Khimir were very brief. At the end of the month of April, 1881, a column from Algeria under the command of General Delbecque penetrated into Khumiria from the west, while a detachment disembarked at Tabarja; on the 8th May the column occupied the marabout of Sidi 'Abd Allah b. Djemal and, on the 13th, 'Ata Draham. By the end of the month the conquest of the Khimir was achieved. The construction of a fortified post at 'Ata Draham assured the final pacification of the country. Since then the almost complete tranquillity has never ceased to reign, and Khumiria is to-day the region of Tunis where the fewest thefts and crimes of violence are committed.


Khorāsān (Country of the “rising sun”, from khur “sun” and ašan “rising”); P. Horn, Grundriss der iran. Etymologie, N°. 233; Grundr. der iran. Philologie, vol. i, 2nd part, p. 175; Wis a Kāmin, p. 119; cf. Yaḵša, s. v.; opposed to khorārān the “west”); a vast country to the east of Iran, comprising the lands situated to the south of the Amūdārya (Djīān) and to the north of the Hindū-kush (Paropamisus), but embracing also politically Mā-warā' al-Nahr (Transoxiana) and Sīdījān (Sakastana). Under the Šāhānṣāhs Khurāsān, classified under the fourth clime, was part of Erānšahr; it was administered by a ḫavābaḵ, who held the title pāḏagpān and by four marāṣfān, each governing a fourth of the territory: 1. Malḵ-i Ḫᵛorāsān; 2. Balḵ and Toḵtāzān; 3. Herāt, Būḥāndeh, Bādghīs, Sīdījān; 4. Transoxiana (Ibn Khordadbeh, p. 18). This province yielded a revenue of 37 million dirhems. To the Arab geographers this country had for its boundaries on the east, Sīdījān and India (including Wakkikhān), on the west the desert of the Ghuzz and Ljudjān; on the north Transoxiana (Mā warā' al-Nahr) and on the south-west the desert of Persia, and the canton of the Kūmis (Irāḵ-adjamī). The principal towns were: Nāsābār, Merw-Shāhjān, Herāt, Balḵ; other towns: Ťūs, Nāz, Abīward, Sarakhs, Aṣfūr, Bādghīs, Djudjān, Bāmilī; Ghurājān and Toḵtāzān were also included amongst them. At the present time the province of this name includes less than half of ancient Khurāsān; the rest of the country, to the east of a line starting from Sarakhs in the north and running directly to the south and passing half way between Meshhed and Herāt, belongs to Afgānistān; the region which extends from Merw to the Oxus is Russian territory. Meshhed has remained the capital of this shrunken province. The chain of mountains which runs along the southern border is from 11,000 to 13,000 feet high. Water is scarce in this province. The country offers the appearance of a group of oases, watered by intermittent rivers and by wells situated along their subterranean course. The population is sparse and mixed. At the time of the Muslim conquest Forestieri, Badghīš and Būšān were put under the authority of a chief whom Ballāḏūrī (p. 405, 1, 12) calls Žīmīn “the great”. Herat in particular was in the territory of the Ephtalite Huns (īratīt, Ballāḏūrī, p. 403, 15; Tabarj, 1, 2885) so that the last Persian territory to the north was marked by the district of Marw al-rūd, under the command of a Marzdān called Bāḏhām. In the year 31 (651–652) an army, which set out from Fārs and from Khūzestān, and was put under the orders of Dāhiḵ b. Kās whose surname was al-Ānuf, by the command of ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAmīr b. Kuraīz, invaded Khorāsān by way of Fahlī (Pahlīwān whence the Parthians originally came), conquered Toḵtāzān and brought about the capitulation of the inhabitants of Balḵ (cf. Sebībī, p. 137). According to Ibn Kūtaiba (Muṣṭaddas, p. 293), the inhabitants of this province were converted very quickly to Islam; at all times arrogant and unruly, they were often rebelled against the central authority. During the civil war between ʿAli and Muʿāwiyah, the Arabs were driven from Nāsābūr (Tabarj, i. 3249, 3350; Ballāḏūrī, p. 408) and the Chinese installed a Turk as governor of Toḵtāzān; ʿAli sent Kulaḏ b. Kaʿīs in 37 (657) to bring the inhabitants of Nāsābūr to submission (Dinawarī, p. 163).

As soon as Muʿāwiyah was the undisputed master of the Empire, he appointed ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAmīr b. Kuraīz governor of Baṣaṭān and bade him reconquer Khorāsān; the latter in the year 42 (662) named Kās b. al-Baiḫāmīs as his lieutenant, but in the year 43 (663) he sent ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Samuʿa, who had already governed Sīdījān under the Caliph ʿOṯmān, to reconquer Balḵ and Kābul. The first of these two towns was retaken in the year 51 (671) by al-Raḥīm b. Ziyādīy. In the year 90 (708) the Khurāšān Nāṣir of Bādghīs rebelled, took the yagbaḵt (yagbaḵt) of Toḵtāzān prisoner but in the following year was conquered by ʿOṯmān. The Muslim army was about to death. It was in Khorāsān that ʿAbū Muslim and the ʿAbbāsid propaganda recruited the troops which overthrew the caliphate of the Omayyads. Aḥādīth, without doubt made up after the event, claims that the Prophet declared: “When you see the black flags coming from Khorāsān, go to meet them, for in their midst you will find the Mahdi” (Muṭṭahar b. Tāhir al-Makdisī, Livre de la Création, ed. Huart, ii. 156). An attempt was made to find in this an indication of the coming of the resurrection; but even by the time of this author it was explained by the revolt of ʿAbū Muslim (op. cit., ii. 157). The internal disputes between the insurgent Arabs had for a long time fomented disorder; the ʿAzīz representing the Yemenites, the Tamīm and the ʿAbd al-Kās of the race of Mojar
fought for supremacy; the first seemed to triumph with the family of al-Muhallab, which remained for a long time in power. Naṣr b. Saiṣṣār had called the attention of the Damascus caliph to the 'Abbāsid movement without obtaining re-inforcements. When Abū Muslim, gathering around him the Sā'īfs, established a camp not far from Merw, he was then able to intervene successfully in the battle fought by Naṣr in the streets of this town against Ibn al-Karmāni and to put Naṣr to flight (443 = 745). The whole country was soon afterwards conquered.

Khorāsān really recovered its independence with the foundation of the Tahirid dynasty by Tahir b. al-Husain, nominated in 205 (829) governor of the eastern regions by the Caliph al-Ma'mūn. It was joined to his possessions in Sijjistān by 'Amr b. al-Layth al-Saffār in 283 (896), then it was annexed to Transoxiana by Ismā'īl al-Samānī in 287 (900); it was occupied by the Sūjan Mahmūd b. Subuk-takīn al-Qhazawī in 354 (994). Toghrilbēk the Selekū seized Naisibūr in 429 (1037) but the inhabitants revolted in 430 (1038) while the Sūjan Mas'ūd reconquered Khorāsān, but only for a short time, because Toghrilbēk finally captured the city and its castles in the following year. On the death of the Sūjan Sandjar in 552 (1157) the Ghuzz recommended their incursions and devastated anew the country, a part of which recognised the authority of Allâb al-Mo'ayyad, the slave of Sandjar [q.v.]. Anarchy and brigandage favoured the expeditions of the Khwarizmshāh and of the Ghurids, and the country finally remained in the hands of the former. The conquests of Chinghiz-Khān completely destroyed their independence in 617 (1220).

At the death of the Mongol Khūn Abī Sa'īd in 536 (1330), Khorāsān saw the dynasties of the Kert and the Serbedrīr [q.v.] give a certain life to the country up to the time of the campaigns of Tīmūr (783 = 1381). It was the centre of the empire of his son Shāh-Rukh, Shāheb-Khān Orbek conquered it in 913 (1507) after disputing its possession with Shāh Ismā'īl I. With the exception of Naisibūr and of Meshed, it was incorporated into Afghanistan by Ahmad Shāh Abdālī after the death of Nādir-Shāh about the year 1160 (1747). In 1249 (1833) Kämān defended Herāt against Abbās Mirẓā, the son of Fath 'Alī Shāh, who was supported by Russia and concluded with England, who had sent an expeditionary force to occupy the chief towns of Afghanistan, a treaty which was signed by Lieutenant Pottinger. In this treaty he recognised the sovereignty of Shāh Shudja [q.v.]. From this time Khorāsān has remained in two sections, the boundary of which starts from the Hârt-rūd at Sarakhs and runs from the north to the south, on the east side of the Persian province of Sijjistān as far as Lake Hāmūn.


Khorāsān (Band), a Tunisian dynasty. The establishment of the Banū Khorāsān in Tunis was a consequence of the Hīlālī invasion. Irritated because the Zirid Sulṭān al-Mu'izz did not protect them against the brigandage of the Arabs, the inhabitants of Tunis in 451 (1059) asked the Ḥammādīd sovereign of al-Kal'a to send them a governor. This prince chose for this office Ḥādī al-Ḥaḳḳ b. Ḥādī al-ʿAzīz b. Khorāsān, a personage originally from Tunis according to certain authors, but belonging, according to Ibn Khaldūn, to a Ṣanḥādī tribe. Ḥādī al-Ḥaḳḳ gained the support of the inhabitants by his good administration, and succeeded in putting an end to the plunderings of the Arabs by signing a treaty with them. But he had to fight the Zirids who wished to recover Tunis. Besieged by Tānim b. al-Muʿizz, he was forced to recognise him as sovereign. On his death (488 = 1095) his power passed to his son, Ḥaḥī b. ʿAzīz, and after him to his grandson, Ṭākim. This prince was, according to Ibn Khaldūn, the most notable representative of his dynasty. He put to death his uncle Ismā'īl, got rid of the council of shāiks, which Ḥādī al-Ḥaḳḳ had associated with him in the government, and ruled as an absolute monarch. He surrounded the castle and concluded a treaty with the Arabs, to ensure the provisioning of the town and the security of travellers. He constructed for himself a palace and surrounded himself by men of letters. The Zirids, however, had not disarmed. They supported Ṭākim b. Ṭākim, the chief of the Arabs, who were installed in the ruins of Carthage, which Ṭākim had attacked and obliged the governor of Tunis to submit to their demands (510 = 1116/1117). Four years later the Ḥammādīds, not wishing to allow their authority to be lessened for the benefit of the Zirids, came in their turn to besiege Tunis. Ṭākim saw himself forced to recognise the sovereignty of the Sūjan of Bougie. He kept, however, the government until 522 (1128). At this time he was deprived of power, imprisoned at Bougie and replaced by a Ḥammādīd official. After an interval of twenty years, the Tunisians having expelled their governor, the Banū Khorāsān regained their power. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥādī al-ʿAzīz was chosen by them as Amir (543 = 1148/1149). He died in 552 (1157) while the Almohads besieged the town. His nephew ʿAli b. Ḥādī replaced him, but at the end of five months, had to capitulate and make his submission to ʿAbd al-Muʿīn. Sent to Marrākesh with all his family, he died during the journey.

he might be able to begin excavating. Khorsabād is mentioned by Yākūt as Khurustābād, a village with good irrigation. The form given by Yākūt would seem to be in opposition to the derivation from Khorsabād, which is supported by Oppenheim. Yākūt mentions in this neighbourhood a town in ruins, which he calls Šarʿan, a dependency of Nainawā (Nineveh) where it is believed treasures were to be found. Šarʿan ought very probably to be corrected to Şarghūn, the form under which the name of the Assyrian king Sargon II (who died in 705 B.C.), the founder of this Assyrian capital, has survived.

The village was situated on the highest summit of a group of artificial mounds. The excavations were begun in 1843 by Botta, French Consul at Mosul, and were continued and completed from 1851—1855 by Place. The Assyrian town, Dūr-Šarrukin, was in the shape of a rectangular parallelogram with corners facing the four points of the compass. The palace of Sargon was on the southwest side, and the great temple was built on both sides of the northwest wall of the town. The antiquities which were discovered were transported to the Musée du Louvre in Paris.

Biography: Yâkût, Meşud, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 422, iii. 382; Ritter, Erdkunde, xi. 241; V. Quinet, La Turquie d'Asie, i. 811; von Oppenheim, Von Mittelmeermens Derschen Golf, Berlin 1900, i. 180 sqq.; Victor Place, Ninive et l'Assyrie, avec des essais de restauration par F. Thomas, Paris 1866—1869, i. 11, 12.

(J. H. Kramers)

KHOSRAW. [See KHOSSREW, KOHUS, KUSA, KISSA.]

KHOSREW, Molla, a famous Ottoman jurist, whose real name was Meḥmed b. Fīrūz b. Ali. M. Khoşrew according to one statement was of Turkoman (tribe of Warsak) descent and born in the village of Karghan (half way between Siwās and Tokat), according to others, however, he was of "Frankish" descent and the son of a "French" nobleman who had adopted Islam. According to Saʿd al-Dīn his father was of Rōm (Rūm) descent. Khoşrew became a pupil of the famous disciple of Taftāzānī, Barhān al-Dīn Ḥādīr of Herat (cf. Islam, xi. 61 and Saʿd al-Dīn, Tāḏī al-Tawārīḵ, ii. 430), and received a teaching post in the Shāh Malik medrese in Adrianople; in 848 (1444) he became kādī of Adrianople and later kādī-asker of Rumelia. On the death of Neyrīrbeg [q.v.], the first kādī of Constantinople, he succeeded him and was at the same time muḍarris at the Aya Šoḥā. Feeling hurt at Mollā Kūrān [q.v.] being promoted over him, he went to Brusa in 856 (1452) and built a medrese there. In 874 (1469) he returned to Stambul by command of the Sultan, became Şahīkh al-Islām and died there in 885 (1480). His body was taken to Brusa and buried in the court of the mosque founded by him. He also founded a mosque in Stambul, which bears his name (cf. Hāfiz Huseyn, Ḥādīkāt al-Dīnawārī, i. 201; J. von Hammer, G. O. K., i. 88, N. 428).

Molla Khoşrew was a celebrated jurist, many of whose pupils became famous in after life. He also attained a wide reputation as an author. His two most important works are the often annotated Durūr al-Ṯukkām fi Sharḥ Gharār al-だったので, a dogmatic work Mīrāt al-Wṣāṣīl fi Ḳim al-Wṣāṣīl (printed Cairo 1262 and Stambul 1304). On others works by him cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. K., i. 589 sq. and Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 226 sq.


KHOSREW BEG, also called GHAZI KHOSREW, Ottoman governor of Bosnia.

Khoşrew was the son of the governor of Bosnia (869/870), later of Skutari (Albania) Našūf Beg, who had married a daughter of Bāyezid II in 894 (1489) (cf. Die altm. anonymen Chroniken, ed. by F. Giese, Breslau 1922, p. 122, 5, i. col.; cf. also J. V. Hammer, G. O. K., ii. 302, and Szīqīl-i ʿothmānī, i. 555, s. v. Našūf Beg). He is therefore sometimes called Sultanazāde. Thanks to his connections, Khoşrew Beg was appointed governor of Bosnia at quite an early age in 924 (1518) and then transferred in 927 (1521) in the same capacity first to Skutari (Albania), later to Semendria (Smederevo, Serbia). In 932 (1525) Khoşrew returned to Bosnia, was later temporarily disgraced, dismissed, but restored again to office. He lived in Serajevo [q.v.] where he died in 948 (1541/1542) and was buried in the mosque built by him in 937 (1530). One of Ghażi Khoşrew's sons was called Maḥmūd.

Ghażi Khoşrew Beg attained fame for his numerous conquests in the frontier lands of Turkey, notably in Bosnia; but he also ravaged Hungarian territory with his raiding parties (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. K., iii. 189), when he plundered and occupied the country round Eszék and Pozega. Ewwīya Čelebi gives the number of his conquests as 170 fortresses, no doubt with the usual exaggeration. Ghażi Khoşrew however is still more famous, especially in his own district, for his rich endowments which Ewwīya Čelebi probably with less exaggeration puts at 300. In Serajevo alone his charitable foundations are many numerous. Besides the mosque which bears his name, he built opposite it a medrese, also baths for men and women and a bazaar with 90 roofed shops, a koḵ-ḵān with 60 roofed store-rooms. In a foundation grant (wakīf-nāma) of the year 938 (1531) the various foundations are detailed. The property which Khoşrew left for the maintenance of his buildings and for public kitchens was enormous. In money, gold and silver vessels and jewels alone, it amounted to 3,000,000 dirhems, an enormous sum for those days, which although the foundation has been reduced in course of time to less than a quarter of its former size, still yielded an annual income of £ 2,500 a few decades ago. The estates and the house-property of the endowment still exist. Khoşrew Beg therefore created himself in Bosnia a permanent memorial of gratitude and remembrance in the hearts of the people, who everywhere revere him as a saint and great benefactor.
KHOSREW BEG — KHOTAN

Bibliography: Ewliya, Seyahetname, v. 441; Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bonn, i., Wien 1893, 503 sq.; C. v. Peetz, Die ottomanischen Statthalter von Bonn (ibid., ii., 344 sqq.), based on the Sānāie of Bosnia for 1295, gives the tenures of office by Khosrew Beg as 924/927 and 938/949 and his successor Hasan or Mīkhālzāde [q. v.] Mehmēd. — The splendid letter of renewal, yards long (Muḥarrar-name) of Sulṭān Osman II for the foundations of Ghāzi Khosrew Beg dated 1290/927 (1618/1619) is in the Stischische Landesbibliothek in Dresden (cf. H. O. Fleischer, Catalogus codl. miss. err., Leipzig 1831, p. 47, No. 320, 2) and still awaits editing and publication; Kitāb Dāwūd al-Muṣīlih, Stambul, n.d., p. 8 sq.

(FRANZ BABINGER)

KHOTAN. There are two places of this name in Afghanistan. One is in the Oxus basin, near Andarab, in what is now called Afghan Turkistan, and is on the borders of Badakhshan. It lies S.E. of Balkh, S.S.E. of Haibak, N. of Kābul and Čārikār, and at the back of (i.e. north of) the the Salin Kābul river. It is not very well known, and is seldom marked on the maps, but was of importance in old times. Vākūt (Barber de Meynard’s translation) calls it “le chef lieu d’un petit pays fertile et boisé”, and it is several times mentioned in Bābur’s Memoirs. He spells it Khwāst, and it seems to be identical with the Khūst of Kāzwīn and the Khāsh of other writers. In S. Zain’s translation of Bābus “Memoirs” it is called Khošt-i Badakhšān. Two of Bābur’s daughters were born at Khost, one of his chief wife Māhām, and the other daughter Dīlār Bēgām. Evidently Māhām was closely connected with Khost. Her brother Muhammad ‘Ali Taghani was a Miḥrāzāda of Khost, and Bāyarzīd Bīyāt in his Memoirs, called the Tārīkh Hamayn (I. O. M. No. 223 of Ethē, p. 262), mentions that Hamayn (Maham’s son) visited his maternal grandparents at Khost. We also find Bābur making special mention of the place when sending presents from India (see the Tabakati-i Bābur of his ecclesiastical judge S. Zain, who notices that the people of Khost were distinguished for piety). This seems to point to Māhām’s family, for she was descended from the famous saint Ahmad Dījām. Vākūt says that Khost was the birthplace of an early Māhām (Barber de Meynard, p. 219). Ibn Baṭṭūta also speaks of the many cells of religions in the Hindu Khos. It is probable that Khost has been ruined by the Turcomans and Uzbeks. For references to Khost see Guy Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 410 and 417, Tārīkh-i Rashidi, translation, p. 103 and note, Vambéry’s Shāhūnāmeh, Canto 63, p. 360, and Khwāst Khan, i. 615, where there is an account of Dījāt Singh and his Rādpūts gaining a victory over the Uzbeks at Khost, and of their erecting a wooden fort there, as timber was plentiful. See also Bābdāgāhina, ii. 403; the year was 1645 (1655 A.D.).

The other Khost is a valley in the S.S.E. of Afghanistan, and borders on the Pashtur district. The inhabitants are warlike and have given trouble by making raids into British territory. See Raverty’s Notes on Afghanistan, p. 75; Clement Markham in Proceed. Geog. Society for 1879, p. 49; the Official Report of the Second Afghan War, London 1908, and The Times of March 28, 1914.

There is a third Khost in Balṣīstān, 35 m. E. of Quetta, which is the seat of a coalfield (Imperial Gazetteer of India, iii. 338 and vi. 306). Khwāst in Persian means an island, and so may have the same import as Andarāb.

(H. BEVERIDGE)

KHOTAN, a town in Chinese Turkestan. In the oldest Chinese records from the 2nd cent. A.D. the town is called Yu-tien for Yü-t’an; this is the name still given to the ruins of the pre-Muhammadan town, the most eastern part of which lies 5 miles west of the modern town. Later the name is written Khotaun and Ho-tan (cf. E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tchünke [Tarco] océaniques, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 125). The Indian name Kustana or Kustanaka “breath of the earth” in Chinese transcription Kiua-sa-tan-na is explained by Sir Aurel Stein, Sand-buried Ruins of Khotoan, 1903, p. 402, as a learned etymology of the native name. On the ruined site of Yü-t’an and its surroundings cf. especially M. A. Stein, Ancient Khotoan, 1907, p. 190 sqq. As Stein shows, old Buddhist places of worship are now revered as the tombs of Muslim saints. The oldest dated Buddhist monument found by Stein in the site of the town is of the year 269 A.D. (Sand-buried Ruins, p. 405); but Buddhism must have been disseminated in Khotoan much earlier. The oldest documents and writings are in an Indian dialect in which Stein now, in contradiction to his earlier opinion, sees not the language of the native population but a literary language which arose under the influence of Indo-Sythic domination (M. A. Stein, Ruins of Desert Cahlai, 1912, i. 290 sqq., 386 sqq.). Later we find instead of this in Khotoan and east of it the native Aryan language called “language II” by E. Leumann, which is Iranian in grammatical structure but has a vocabulary much influenced by Sanskrit, cf. Z. D. M. G., ixi. 648 sqq. and especially E. Leumann, Zur nord-östlichen Sprache und Literatur, Strassburg 1912, p. 29 (the language seems “an almost indiansed Iranian just as English is a romanised German”); whether this language had already been driven out by Turkish in pre-Muhammadan times, is not certain. In contrast to Kāshgar and the northern part of the modern Chinese Turkestan, Khotoan is not mentioned in the Hudud al-‘Alam (MS. of the Asiatic Mus., f. 144) in the description of Turkish tribes but their lands, but under China; in the frontier-land between China and Tibet and was under the rule of a separate prince who called himself suzerain of the Turks and Tibetans” (ażam al-türk wa ‘l-Tubut). On the other hand according to Gardizi (in Barthold, Odet o pišduke v Srednyavuyu Asiyu, p. 94) the town of Kai (?) fifteen days’ journey from Khotoan on the road to China was under the rule of the (Turkish) Tughughuz. According to Gardizi the people of Khotoan were Buddhists but he also mentions a Muslim cemetery north of Khotoan and two Christian churches in the town itself (neither Christian nor Manichean relics have so far been found in the ruins).

Islam spread much later in Khotoan than in Kāshgar and was brought thither by force of arms. Ibn-al-Athir gives as the conqueror of Khotoan Kādir Khan Yusuf who died in 423 (1032) of whom we have coins struck in Kāshgar and Yarkand from the year 404 (1013–1014) (A. Markow, Inventarny Katalog etc., p. 192 sq.) Khotoan like Kāshgar was later under the rule of the Yek-Ḵāns (cf. above, ii. p. 465) and the Kara
Khotan (ii, p. 728); on the conquest of the country by Kuchik, the ruler of the Naiman and the persecution of Islam instituted by him, see ii, p. 739. According to Djuwaini (Tārīkh-i Miḥān Gūshā, ed. Mīrza Muḥ. Kazwinī, i. 49 and 52 sqq.) he had the Imām ʿAlā al-Dīn Khotani nailed to the door of his medrese. Nothing was known of this martyr by the time of Ḥaḍar Mīrza (cf. ii, p. 232 sqq.); his tomb was also unknown (Tārīkh-i Rauḥūdī, transl. E. D. Ross, p. 298). There was therefore no native historical tradition in Khotan; the references to Khotan in the Arabic and Persian geographical works are extremely scanty; even the site is wrongly given by Ẓāmīn (D. S. Margoliouth, Gibb Mem. Series, f. 189b) and by Yākūt (ii. 403) who follows him.

In the xvi-th century Khotan according to Marco Polo (ed. Vule-Cordier, i. 188 sqq.) was under the rule of the Emperor of China, not like Yarkand under the rule of prince Kaidī (cf. above, i, p. 848). Khotan later seems to have regularly shared the political history of Kāshghar and other towns of this region, belonged like Kāshghar in the xvii-th century to the state of the Khodja’s (saints), had to submit to Kalmuck and later to Chinese rule, after the events of 1280 (1863–1864) to the rule of the invader Yāqūb Beg and returned after his death (1877) to its allegiance to China. On a history composed in Khotan quite recently (finishing on 15th Shaban 1311 == Feb. 24, 1894) dealing with events since 1280 (1863) cf. Bulletin de l’Acad., etc., 1921, 209; and see also the section on the Khodja of Khotan in the Tārīkh-i Emēnīya, ed. Pontosow, p. 161 sqq.

In the modern town the silk industry, much cultivated here from the earliest times, still survives. The number of inhabitants is very variously given; according to Kornilow, Kāshghariya, Taštīkent 1903, p. 275 only: 15,000; according to G. and P. Sykes, Through deserts and oases of Central Asia, London 1920, p. 246: 50,000.

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text see more especially: E. Bretschneider, Med. Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources, ii. 47 sqq., 246 sqq.; M. Hartmann, Chinesisch-Türkistan, Halle 1908, p. 93 sqq. — On the rule of saints in Islam and the relation of Khotan to this see M. Hartmann, Islamische Orient, Berlin 1909, i., p. 195 sqq. and ibid. (W. Barthold).

Khubaib b. ʿAdī al-Anṣārī, one of the first martyrs of Islam. The main features of his story common to all versions are as follows: After the battle of Uhud (on the chronology see below) a small body of ten of the Prophet’s followers was spied out and surrounded between Mecca and Ṭisam by 100 (or 200) Liḥyānīs who belonged to the Hudhail. The leader of the hard-pressed little band, ʿAsim b. Thībit al-Anṣārī (according to others the leader was al-Mardāḥ), loudly refused to yield. He and six others were killed whereupon Khubaib, Zaid b. al-Dāthina and a third surrendered; the latter fell a victim to his stubbornness and the two former were taken to Mecca and sold. Khubaib fell into the hands of the Banu l-Hārīth b. Āmir b. Nawfāl b. ʿAbd Manīf who on the expiry of the sacred period took him out of the Ḥaram to al-Taʿām, bound him to a stake and killed him with arrows (ṣabrac) in revenge for al-Hārīth whom Khubaib had killed in the battle of Badr. Before he was tied to the stake, Khubaib asked for time to perform two rakāʿas which was a sunna for martyrs, comparable to the last prayer of Christian martyrs. Khubaib is said to have recited two verses at the stake to the effect that he as a Muslim martyr cared nothing about the treatment of his body as Allāh was able to bestow his blessing even upon his severed members. Kūfīn formules uttered by him besides these verses have also been handed down in which he appealed to Allāh for vengeance on his enemies. Those present are said to have shown great trepidation at this curse of the dying man; it is related that Abū Sufyān hurriedly pressed the little Muʿāwiya to the ground to protect him from the consequences of the ill-omened words; and Saʿd b. ʿĀmir cried to fall into long swoons whenever he thought of the scene.

A comparison of the accounts shows discrepancies and idealising features. Before his death ʿĀṣim prayed to Allāh asking him to communicate news of the event to his Prophet in Medina, which actually happened. His corpse was protected by a swarm of bees so that the enemy could not reach it and later it was carried away by a deluge of rain. According to al-Wāṣikī, p. 155, however, Muḥammad received news of the event at the same time as that of Bīr Maʿānī; and according to Ibn Ḥishām, p. 641, it was not ʿĀṣim but Khubaib, who prayed to Allāh asking him to cause Muḥammad to be informed. — According to al-Zuhri and ʿUrwa (see the latter’s brief account in al-Wāṣikī, p. 156) the ten men were sent out as a ẓarjā to spy upon the Meccans; according to Ibn Ḥishām, p. 63 b, al-Wāṣikī, p. 157 and Ibn Saʿd, ii/ii. 39 sqq.: ii/ii. 33 sqq. ten teachers of religion, who were on their way to a tribe to instruct them, were treacherously placed at the mercy of the enemy by their guides. This story is too much like that which has been woven round the drama of Bīr Maʿānī, which happened at the same time. Al-Wāṣikī tells us under the year 6 A.H. that Khubaib was not yet at that time a prisoner among the Meccans (p. 227). The only certain chronological statement that can be made is that the event took place after the battle of Uhud as ʿĀṣim fought there. In the official ʾIṣra, the incident is recorded under the name Yawm al-Raḍī and put by Ibn Ḥishām in the year 3 and by al-Wāṣikī in 4 A.H.

The figure of the protomartyr Khubaib lent itself readily to embellishment. The daughter of al-Hārīth (according to others Mawṣīya, a client of Hudjair b. Abī Ḥādī) in whose house he was kept a prisoner, saw him one day eating grapes, although those could not possibly be obtained in Mecca. — When his martyrdom approached, he asked for a knife with which to remove the hair on his privy parts (as was usual in such cases); the woman sent a little boy with it to him, but became terrified at the thought of his possible revenge; when Khubaib noticed her terror, he calmed her with the assurance that no such cruelty need be feared from him. — The verses above mentioned, which he is said to have uttered at the stake have grown in Ibn Ḥishām to a whole poem. The same author (p. 644 sqq.) gives the lament for him. For how his corpse was taken from the ʿUrāfah and swallowed up by the earth, see Taʿbari, i. 1436 sq: Ṭāba, i. 862.

Bibliography: al-Zuhri’s or Abū Hurairah’s tradition in Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Munad, ii. 294
KHUDAWENDIGAR (p.), derived from Khu-
dawend, signifying master, lord, prince, and often used in literature to denote God. In the
history of the Ottoman Empire this word was:
1) the surname of the Sultan Murad I (1360–
1389, q.v.) and 2) the name of the sandjak and
later of the williyyet of which Brusa was the capital.
The earliest Ottoman chroniclers do not yet give
this surname to Murad I (generally called Sul-
tan Murad Ghazi, see e.g. Anonymous Chronicle,
ed. Giese). It does not appear until the xviiith
century (as Soy al-Din; see Harmer, G. O. R.,
i. 107). But the title of Khunkär is
found amongst the earliest historians (v. 'Ashik
Pasha Zade, Ta'rikh-i, Constantinople 1332, p. 68)
and is generally considered as an abbreviation for
Khudawendigar ("Ali, Khan al-Akhbar, v. 16;
Ferheng-i Shafüri, s. v.; Sani, Kamos-i Turki, i.
589; Nadji, in his Lughat, derives it however from
kunkur, "bringing happiness"; see also J.A.,
2nd Series, xv. 276, 572). The title of Khunkär
is given to all the Ottoman Sultans, at least until the
xvith century, along with that of Pâdishâh. The historian Ibn Iyas says that the Egyptians
were amazed at this strange title borne by Selim I
(see Barthold in Isl., vi. 393). But Khunkär is
also given as a title to several great men of
religion and mystics, especially to Djâal al-Din Rûmi,
who is often called Mollâ Khunkär. The title of
Khunkär derived from Khudawendigâr seems then
to belong to the same category as that of Pasha,
which is probably derived from Pâdishâh (see
Giese in Z.S., ii. 262) that is to say both these
titles originated in the atmosphere of mysticism
which surrounded the origins of the Ottoman
Empire. The surname of Khunkär in its primitive
and literary form Khudawendigar then became
attached more especially to Murad I (see however
below), in the same way as the words pasha and
pâdishâh have each had their special development.
Khunkär (Constantinople pronunciation kunkäb) is
also found amongst geographical names such as
Khunkär Iskelesi, etc.

2) After the conquest of Brusa by Orkhan, the
town with its surrounding districts, was given as
a sandjak to Prince Murad Beg; 'Ashik Pasha
Zade, p. 43, says that the sandjak was called
after him, Beg Sandjâghî. But the later historical
tradition had it that the sandjak and later the
williyyet of which Brusa became the capital, were
called Khudawendigâr after the surname of its
first governor (see Hâджî Khalifa, Djihan-Numâ, p. 656).
Ewliya Celebi, however, says that from
his time (1630) Brusa was the capital of the
province of Anadolu and the residence of the gover-
nor (hâkim) who bore the title of Khudawendigâr
(Const. ed., ii. 70). It is then probable that the
origin of the geographical name Khudawendigâr
does not go back exclusively to Sultan Murad I,
but that it is derived from a title borne by the
high official who had his head-quarters at Brusa.
The religious buildings in the town of Brusa
bearing the name of Khudawendigâr such as the
Djâa'i Khudawendigâr or Ghazi Khunkar Djâ-
mişî (Ewliya, ii. 14; Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie,
v. 127) and the Medrese-i Khudawendige (Ewliya,
ii. 17) are however connected with Murad I.

AL-KHUDJANDI, Hâmid b. al-Khîr Abd
Ma' another died about 391 (1000). He lived in
al-Raiy in the time of the Buyid Fakhr al-Dawla
(366–387 = 976–997); he gave the latter's name
to the sextant (not the sextant in our sense) which
he made (al-tinds al-fakhrî). This consisted of two
parallel perpendicular walls A and B 12 feet apart,
which reached 30 feet above the earth and 30 feet
below it (reckoning an ell at 18 inches). At the
south end and perhaps also at the north end of
the south wall was a dome with an orifice. Around
the latter a sextant with a radius of 60 feet was
described, which was formed by the formerly
polished surface of the wall erected between the
two walls. The sextant reached from 30 feet below
the earth's surface to the latter and every 10'
was marked. The rays passing through the orifice
were caught on a white plane which moved along
the circle. The greatest altitude of the sun was
thus obtained. Al-Khudjandi calculated with the
sextant the plane of the ecliptic in 384 (994).
As cloudy weather prevailed, the observations
which were made in the days before and after the
culmination of the sun in Cancer and Capricorn had
to be approximated for the calculation of the
ecliptic. By careful calculation and interpolations,
it was successfully done. The plane of the ecliptic
proved slightly different from earlier calculations
in 23° 31' 21". This figure differs by 15/4 minutes
from the true value then in use. From al-Biruni
we learn in the Mas'udi Canon that al-Khu-
djandi's value was falsified by the fact that the
instrument used for one of the two calculations
had been damaged. Al-Khudjandi explains at great
length that, as the astronomical values are variable,
there is no fundamental reason against a vari-
ability of the plane of the ecliptic also.

Al-Khudjandi also constructed the instrument
called al-'ala al-qamâla, "the comprehensive
instrument" (cf. J. Frank, L' une deux astronomie
arabe: Almanac, Zeitschr. fur Instr. Kunde,
1921, p. 193–200). It is a universal instrument,
filling the place of both astrolabe and quadrant,
but at first could only be used for one latitude.
Hibat Allah b. al-Humain al-Badi' Alu 'l-Kâsm
al-Asturlabi made it applicable to all latitudes

Bibliography: H. Suter, Die Mathematiker
und Astronomen der Araber, No. 173; L. L. R.
Sedillot, Memoire sur les instruments astronomic
| arabe des Arabes, Memoires presents par divers
santissimes a l'Acad. des Inscriptions, i. t., vol. i.,
1844, p. 202; L. Cheikh, Traite arabe de
Khidjandi sur le Sextant appele Fakhr, Période
| de l'Empire Fatimide, et sur le secteur en
| Machriq, vol. ii., 1908, p. 60–69; E. Wiedemann,
| Unter den Sextanten des Al-Khujandi, in Archiv fur die
| Geschichte der Naturw. und der Technik, ii.,
1910, p. 149–151; O. Schimmer, Studien zur
| Astronomie der Araber, S. F. P. M. S., 1926,
Lii., p. 43 and 65.

(E. Wiedemann)
KULUM, name of a place, situated 2 marsha (10 farsak) to the East of Balkh, on the road to the frontier of Badakshàn. Ibn Khurdamdib calls the station halfway between Balkh and Kholm, Waðå. A. Bures reckons a distance of 40 miles from Kholm to the ancient city of Balkh; the mediaeval geographers give the following distances from Kholm to Simindjân, Waralz (or Warwálz) and Bahará respectively: 2 days (Iṣja-khtí and Mukaddasset; acc. to Yâkût: 5 days); 2 days; 6 farsak (Ibn Khurdamdib; the extract from Ibn Dâ'far's Kitâb al-khârîjî gives 7 farsak, and notes besides 3 farsak from (sawâx) to Kholm).

The height of the place is said to be 1,800 feet above the sea (Ritter, Erdkunde, viii. 11). The river of Kholm, āb-i Kholm or Kholm-rûm seems to be the Artamis of the ancients (Pauly-Wissowa, Realenz., 2, ii. 1305). Ibn Khurdamdib (p. 33) mentions a nahr al-Dirâghân in the neighbour- town of the place; can this be the same as the Kholm-rûm? The fall of the river of Kholm amounts to 60 feet in each mile. On the upper course of the river of the village of Dâb is situated; the stream itself runs into the West of and parallel to another water-course, the Ghibi, to join the Oxus after passing Hâiakbâh and Kholm. Herewith may be compared the description in Bures' Travels (iii. 176): "Heibuk and Khooloom stand on the same rivulet, the water of which is dammed up on certain days, and allowed to run on others. The gardens on its banks are rich and beautiful, and among the fruit-trees, one again meets the fig, which does not grow in Câlool".

The town of Kholm is reckoned by the geographers to Tûkhrâstan, or, in a wider sense, to Khorâstan (cf. Yâkût, Mâ'djam, iii. 518: Tûkhrâstan is min navâhí Khurâstan). Al-Idrîsî seems to consider Kholm as a locality belonging to Badakshàn (Géographie d'Édrisi . . . , p. P. A. Jaubert, 1836, i. 474). The town belonged to the "mudîn laînat bi l-tâmîm" (Ya'shib, ed. de Goeje, p. 288); its dependencies were numerous (Mukaddasset); we find mention of Khârânjân (Ya'sib) and "Muzar" (Burnes; Mâzâr?). The climate is, according to the mediaeval authorities healthy, but breezy during the summer; the place was inhabited by Arabs from the Azd, Tamîm and Kás, who had settled there at the time of the conquest. Two theologians, Abu l-'Awdâq Sa'd and Ummân al-Khalîfî were, according to Yâkût, natives of Kholm.

As regards pre-Islamic times, it has been supposed, that the Aornos mentioned by Arrian, Anab., i. 29, was in the neighbourhood of Kholm, but this cannot be proved (comp. Grundriss der Iran. Phil., ii. 474, ann. 5; Pauly-Wissowa, Realenz., 2, i. 2659). Next, the Chinese traveller Huen Tsâng mentions the kingdom of Hu-lin (Kholm): it measures, according to his account, ± 800 li in circuit; the circumference of the capital is 5 to 6 li. There were more than 10 Buddhist monasteries, and above 500 monks. To the West of Hu-lin was Fu-ho (Balkh); but, though this identification seems to be correct, the transcription, according to Worans, "seems to require an original like Bokhar or Bokhara, the name of the country which included Bâchâ". Comp. S. Beal: Si-yu-ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World (Popular Edition), i. 43; Th. Watters: On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India (1904), i. 106, 109. Later, Kholm sometimes is mentioned during the struggles which the Muslims waged against the Turks of Central-Asia, e.g. in the year 785 (1380) in the war of Kutulâg b. Muslim with them; in 119 (737), when Abdallah b. Abdallah was in the field against the Khabzan, the latter tried in vain to take the town. Kholm is also met with in the assessment-list of 'Abd Allâh b. Tâhir of the years 211/212 (826/827-827/828): it is noted there for the sum of 12,300 dirham. On these data comp. Marquart, Erânisîêr, p. 82, 218 sg., where the authorities are given. In 268 (881/882) the rebel Ahmad b. 'Abdallah al-Khâjudjâni, after beating the army of Ablr Tâla, the general of 'Amr b. l-lâîf at Sarkhás, defeated him a second time near Kholm (Ibn al-Álbûlûk, vii. 209).

In the beginning of the 6th century, Kholm is described as having a mixed population consisting of Tadjjik's, Uzbek's and Kabûl's. Under the reign of Kiti'd Ali Beg (an Uzbek prince of Balkh, nominally tributary to the crown of Kabul), the town, then an important place, was liable to be harassed by the nomads of its neighbourhood. Because of this, the seat of government, which seems to have been at Kholm, was transferred to the locality of Tâsh Kurgân, situated on a distance of ca. 2 English miles from it. When Moorcroft visited these regions (1824), another calamity had also befallen Kholm. The year before, Murâd Beg, the prince of Kûnduz, had forced the inhabitants to migrate to Kûnduz, such compulsory removals being not uncommon during his reign. Since that time, Kholm proper has decayed, and its place has been taken by Tâsh Kurgân. This Muhammed Murâd of Kûnduz had held a command of minor importance under 'Ali Beg, but after the death of the latter, Murâd attained so much power, that he became in reality an independent ruler in the regions north of the Hindû Kush. New Kholm (Tâsh Kurgân) had, at the time Bures travelled there, some 10,000 inhabitants; it was the frontier town of Murâd's state. The sons of 'Ali Beg, in their turn, had become vassals of Murâd, and he settled in his name over the district, whose capital was Kholm, and which contained moreover Hâiakbâh, Chûrî, Andarâb, Talîkân and Ha'irá-Imâm.

KHUMĀRAWAIH B. AHMAD B. TULUN, born in 250 (864) was appointed by his father Ahmad his deputy in Egypt as early as 269 (882). Before his death, while on a campaign in North Syria, Ahmad at the request of his generals, dismissed Khumārawaih as his successor and died shortly after in al-Dirā al-Kaḍā'ī 270 (May 884). His older son Shāhīd had previously rebelled against him and was regarded as cruel and unjustly arbitrary. On his deathbed Ahmad had shown an inclination to make peace with Muwaffak, the all-powerful brother of the reigning Caliph al-Mu'tamid; the latter had readily considered the proposal. The negotiations however were interrupted by Ahmad’s death, for only his great prestige had induced his enemies to consider peace negotiations on a basis of his appointment as governor in Egypt and Syria. When the negotiations fell through, two partisans of the Caliph, Ibn Kindīdā’, who had previously been appointed governor of Damascus, and Abu ‘l-Sādīq, the governor of Northern Mesopotamia, went with their troops to Syria and sought Muwaffak’s support, which he promised them. The governors of Damascus joined them and handed over Antioch, Aleppo and Hims to Ibn Kindīdā’. Khumārawaih now sent troops to Syria who put down the rebellion in Damascus and advanced as far as Shāizar [q.v.] on the Orontes. The winter forced the two parties to go into winter quarters. Al-Muwaffak’s son Ahmad now arrived in Syria in command of the Caliph’s army. Ahmad along with Ibn Kindīdā’ attacked the quarters of the Egyptian army, inflicted a severe defeat on them so that they fled to Damascus; driven out of this city they retired to Ramla. Ahmad however now quarrelled with the Caliph’s two generals and was left with only 4,000 men. Khumārawaih had in the meantime reached Ramla from Egypt with a large army (70,000 men it is said). The armies met on Shawkāl 16, 271 (April 6, 885) in the famous battle of al-Tawrāhīn (north of Jaffa). Khumārawaih, who had never been in battle before, did not resist for long but fled back to Egypt with the majority of his army. Ahmad’s troops then fell upon the camp and were plundering it when a body of Egyptian troops that had been kept in reserve attacked them. Ahmad thought that Khumārawaih had returned with his troops and fled precipitately to Damascus. When the governor shut its gates against them, the troops went on to Tarsus in Southern Asia Minor. A great part of the army had already been taken prisoner and carried off to Egypt. On this occasion Khumārawaih showed his extraordinarily fair and peaceful character. He gave the prisoners the choice of returning to the ‘Irāq without a ransom or of settling in his kingdom. Ahmad returned to Mesopotamia.

One of his own generals rebelled against Khumārawaih but was defeated by him, as he had now regained his personal courage and he was also able by his bravery to conquer Ibn Kindīdā’ who had taken up arms against him. He now began negotiations with Muwaffak and in 273 (886) was recognised for a period of 30 years as governor of Egypt, Syria and the marches against Asia Minor and Armenia for a trilling tribute. In 273–277 (886–890) there was again fighting between Khumārawaih and rebel governors, which ended in Khumārawaih’s victory and also restored as suzerain of Mesopotamia. In Najdāb the year 279 (Oct. 892) the Caliph al-Mu’tamid died and was succeeded by Muwaffak’s son Ahmad, with the title al-Mu’tadid. The latter confirmed Khumārawaih in his office and the latter became ambitious to be closely related to the Caliph. He offered him his daughter as a daughter-in-law, but the Caliph married her himself. To attain his end Khumārawaih had to make enormous financial sacrifices. The dowry of the princess is said to have been 50,000 dinars.

On this occasion there was a contrast between the rich provincial governor and the poverty of the central government which represented the Caliph was striking. It was impossible for the latter to collect money from the provinces as the independent governors kept all the revenues for themselves and paid only a moderate tribute to him. It is related that when the princess came to Baghdad, the Caliph and his chief eunuch sought for candlesticks in order to receive her in a fitting manner. The chronicler records that he could only collect 5 silver and gold plated candlesticks and then heard that the princess was accompanied by 150 servants each of whom carried a gold and silver plated candlestick. He then said to the chief eunuch: “Come let us go and hide ourselves, lest we be seen in our poverty”. The princess Kaṭ al-Nadā’ was noted for her wit and beauty and must have ruled the Caliph as the anecdotes show. Once when the Caliph entered her room, she said: “Alas, my father is dead”. Asked how she knew, she said: “Itherto when you came to me, you sunk on your knees and touched the earth with your forehead to greet me, but now you say simply "good day".”

Khumārawaih’s extravagance in daily life and on the occasion of the wedding of his daughter naturally did great harm to the finances of the lands he governed. As an example of the boundless extravagance, which he displayed in the maintenance of his court and in the erection of costly buildings, the palace is mentioned, in the court of which he erected a basin of quicksilver supported by pillars, to alleviate his insomnia. He lay on cushions, filled with air on the surface of the quicksilver, and tied to the pillars, and was gently rocked to sleep by their motion on its surface. It was a particular misfortune for Egypt that Khumārawaih fell a victim to a plot while still young. He learned that his favourite wife was deceiving him with one of her servants and the latter, to escape punishment, resolved to kill his master. He and several conspirators fell upon him and killed him. On the whole he procured a period of peace for his lands. Egypt itself was spared from war during his reign. Nevertheless as a result of his extravagance the country was so injured that his sons who followed him steadily lost power. The family of the Tūlūnids had ceased to reign by 292 (905).

Bibliography: See the article AHMAD B. TULUN where the main sources are quoted and especially also the critical discussion, marking a great advance on Wustenfeld (Stadthalter) in C. H. Becker, Beiträge zur Geschichte Abyssiens, ii. 149–153 and 182–192; also Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, viii. passim, s. Index; Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen, ii. 432–434, 458, 481; Quartemere, Mémores géographiques et histo rigues sur l’Egypte, Paris 1811. i. 462–473 (translation of the chapter al-Kaṭā’ī from the Kitab of Makriti, where details of his life are given and Ibn Khallikān, transl. de Slane, i. 498–500). (M. SOBERNHEIM)
KHUMBARADI, in Turkish "bombunder", a body of regular troops formerly in the Ottoman army. It was composed of 300 men provided with military sieves; the Count of Bonneval became the chief (January 24, 1732) with the title of Khumbaradlı-bey, in the reign of Sultan Mustafa III, began to enroll it by 300 paid men. The force was increased to a thousand men by Sultan Selim III, latterly it was commanded by an Englishman named Ingliz-Mustafa. It was disbanded in the reforms. This body was included in the kapu-bülün, "slaves of the Porte," and thus attached to the personal service of the Sultan. It was treated, as one would say to-day, of the Imperial Guard.


(CL. HUART)

KHUMIR. [See Khimair.]

KHURDADH (Ab), the name of the third month of the movable Persian solar year, also the name of the sixth day of each month. The 6th Khurdadh as the day on which the name of day and month were the same was called Khurdadhan. To distinguish the day Khurdat seven months after Khurdat, the former was called Khurdat-rus ("day of Khurdat") and the latter Khurdat-mak ("month of Khurdat").


(M. FLEISNER)

KHURRAM (KZ "joyful"), the name of the favourite (kahşetki) of the Ottoman Sultan Sul-tan Su-laiman I, the Legislator, better known in European historians by the name of Roxolana. She was a slave of Russian origin ("altra donna di nazione Korsia, giovine non bella ma grassiata") in the report by Pietro Bragadin (1520), Marin Sanuto, xii.), who was the mother of the three sons, Sultan Selim II, princes Murad and Mahummad and one daughter, Mihrimah Sul-tane. She was anxious to secure the succession to the throne for her eldest son and is accused of having brought about the execution (960 = 1553) of Mustafa, eldest son of Sul-tanm by a Slav girl. It was owing to the superiority of her brain and courage that she was able to remain the Sultan's trusted adviser till her death in 965 (1558); but her genius for intrigue urged her to crimes; she brought about the overthrow and execution of two grand viziers, Ibrahim Paşa and Ahmad Paşa. Her son-in-law, Rustum Paşa, by birth a Croat, was through her efforts appointed grand vizier in 951 (1544). She was buried in the türbe specially built for her in the court of the Sulaimanlı Mosque in Constantinople. Several pious foundations and charitable buildings were built or instituted at her expense in Constantinople; these were the imperial mosque, the hospital, and the school of the Kḥāşetki in the Arvat Bazár quarter.

Khurram-Bēgum was the name of the wife of Mirza Sul-tān, son of Khan Mirza, son of the Timurid Sultan Abū Sa'id, ruler of Badakhshān, died at Lahore in 997 (1589). Khurram is also the name of an alleged king of Djişān, hero of the chronicle of Land al-Dun Asr and of its imitation the Kitāb al-Dun asr of Nādir (Gibb, Ottoman Persia, i. 379 sqq.)

Mirzā Khurram was the proper name of the Moghad emperor Shah Djişān, to which he bore his accession in 1037 (1628).

Pahlavan Khurram Khurssan, a general of the Mughal army, contributed to placing Shah Shuja' on the throne, appointed governor of Isfahan, after the deposition of Sultan Zain al-Abīdīn. He held office till his death (Hamdullah Mustawī, Tarikh-i Guang, ed. Brown, i. 704, 712, 731: Deforche, Monogra fie sur l'histoire des Mughals, ii. 1, 33, 1844—1845: Khurram, Bibl., i. 17, 158; al-Urdu, i. 422)

Bibliography: Pecci, Tarikh-i Guang, ed. 1283, i. 425; Hāfiz Husain Efrīmī, Islāhāt, al-Durānī, i. 17, 158; J. von Hammer, Hist. des Emp. ott., ii. transl., v. 329, 468, 538; vi. 99, 485; viii. p. 19. (CL. HUART)

KHURRAMABAD, capital of the province of Luristan with 6,000 inhabitants, situated in 33°32' N. Lat. and 45°15' West Long. (Greenwich) about 4700 feet above the sea-level between Isfahān and Kirmāshāh on the river of the same name. On an isolated ridge of rock between the town and the river lie the ruins of a castle Dīz-Sīyāh, "black castle," in the middle ages the residence of the governor, with annexes called Falak al-Aflak which at the beginning of the 18th century were the residence of the governor of Luristan. At the foot of the old castle is the modern residency, built about 1830 with commodious courts and gardens. Opposite the town are the ruins of the ancient Sanāk with a monolith, the inscription on which dates from the time of Maḥmūd, grandson of Malik Shīh. The town was visited by J. Rich and H. Rawlinson. The town is not mentioned by the older Persian geographers; on the other hand Yāḳūt and others knew two places of the same name near Kair and near Balkh.


KHURRAMIYA, a sect whose name is derived by Samāni from the Persian word khurram "agreeable", on the ground that they regarded everything that was agreeable as lawful; but it is more likely to be derived from Khurram, a district of Ardabīl, where the sect may have arisen. According to Mas'ūdī, Murādī, vi. 186, they came into prominence after the execution of Abū Muslim of Khurāsān in 136 A.H., but while some of them denied that he was dead and foretold his return "to spread justice in the world", others maintained the "immaculate" of his daughter, Faţīma, whence they got the names Muslimiyā and Fatimiyā. One Sanbādī started a rebellion in Khurāsān, demanding vengeance for Abū Muslim, but this was suppressed within seventy days. They are next heard of in the reign of Ma'mūn, when Bābak the Khurrami rebelled against the Muslim government and entrenched himself in Badshāh (sometimes in the dual Badshāh) "a village between Ašḥarābād and Arzūn"; he maintained himself from 201 till 225, when his fortress was taken by Afgān, an officer of Mu'taṣim; he was himself captured and sent to Sāmarra, where he was put to death, displaying marvellous fortitude under torture (Nihāyār al-Muṣjam, p. 75). His daughter was taken into
Khurramiya — Khuriyan-Muryan

Mu’tasim’s harems (Irfqal al-Arib, i. 369,7). Many odes of both Abi Tammâni and Buhuri are devoted to eulogizing the conquerors, who are said to have served the cause of Islam. In Mas’ûdi’s time (352), members of the sect were to be found in Kâf, Isháqi, Abúlharâmîn, Barjâd, Bu’âd, and in Masâbahdân. Shortly before Masâbahdân was taken, the fortresses held by them were stormed by ‘Alî b. Bu’âthi (afterwards ‘Imâm al-Dawla, 321 a. h.; Miskawâlhi, i. 278); and about 40 years later they were in possession of some fortresses in the neighbourhood of Tiz and Mukran, which they surrendered to ‘Aṣâd al-Dawla’s agent, ‘Abî b. ‘Alî (ibid. ii. 321).

The best account of their doctrines seems to be that furnished by Mu’tahhar b. Tâhir, who states that he had met members of the community in their homes, Masabhdân and Mihirdân-Kadak. It is as follows (Livre de la Création, ed. Huart, v. 30): “They are divided into various sects and sorts, but all agree on “return” (i.e. transmigration), asserting, however, that names and bodies are changed. They maintain that all the Apostles, though their codes and religious systems differ, are inspired by one spirit; that revelation never ceases; and in their opinion every adherent of a religion is in the right, so long as he hopes for reward and fears punishment. They do not approve of defaming any person or harming him, provided he shows no desire to injure their own community or attack their system. They strenuously avoid bloodshed except when they are in open rebellion. They highly esteem Abû Muslim and curse al-Manṣûr for having put him to death. They frequently invoke the divine favour for Mahdi b. Ferâ, owing to his being the descendent of Abû Muslim’s daughter Fatima. They have Imâms to whom they have recourse in legal matters, and Apostles who go on circuit among them, and whom they call by the Persian name Firîshkâh (Angel). Wine and liquors are in their opinion more fortunate-bringing than all other things. The basis of their system is Light and Darkness. Those whom we have met in their homes Masabhdân and Mihirdân-Kadak were found by us to be most scrupulous about cleanliness and purity, and most anxious to win people’s favour by spontaneous acts of kindness. Some of them, we found, permit promiscuity where the women consent, and indeed the enjoyment of anything craved by the natural mind provided no injury results to any one therefrom.”

Ijâkhîn (p. 203) similarly says of them “they have mosques in their villages, and they read the Qur’an, only it is asserted that secretly they hold no religious dogma but lawlessness” (Iba’). Probably then they differed from the Sunni Muslims in their theory of the Imamât, which they supposed to be inherent in the family of Abû Muslim, whereas their practice of promiscuity (if true) was similar to the Shi’it muta’. Further, believing in the continued existence of Abû Muslim and in supposing his daughter to inherit his rights they resembled various Shi’it groups.

Since the member of the sect who attracted most attention was Bâbak, we should have expected to learn something of his doctrine, and indeed a special history of this person by Wâkid b. ‘Amr al-Tamâmî is quoted in the Fihrist; it is a string of fables, translated by Fligel in Z.D.M.G., xxii. 531 foll. This writer agrees with Tâbari in assigning him a predecessor named Džawâidân. ‘Abî al-Kâhir (Farîk bain al-Farîk, p. 252) asserts that the followers of Bâbak make the founder of their religion a prince of theirs who lived in pre-Islamic times, called Sharwân, whose father was the Zanj, whereas his mother was the daughter of a Persian king. This would serve to be another form of a story told by Ibn Isfandiyâr (transl. E. G. Browne, p. 237) that one Sharwân of the house of Bâw (called by Tâbari, iii. 1295, 5: Sharwân b. Su’llâh b. Bâw) was the first person who took the title “King of the Mountains”. He adds that they have a feast on their mountains which is marked by gross licentiousness; but for all that they ostensibly maintain the ceremonies of Islam. The attempts made to connect them with the old Persian Mazdakites are probably without historical basis.

(D. S. Margoliouth)

Khursâd II, ippâsh-kadh of Tâbarîstân, the last prince of the line of Djilân Şâh which ruled this province for 116 years; he was the son of Dâdî Mîhr b. Farrukhân and had the title of Fârghwâr Marzbân; he was descended on the female side from the Nahâbîda (Arm. naha’pa “patrician”) of Sîl and reigned from 122 to 150 (757-767). His paternal uncle, Sârûya, the regent of the kingdom, wished to hand over the power to him when he attained his majority; he was prevented from doing so by a conspiracy amongst his own sons, and Khursâd was not able to reign until he gained a victory over his cousins at Kaşr-i Dâdûkân, between Tammîshâ and Sârî. He repaired the castle of Kisa and built a fortress called Se dîle (cf. Sadir near Hira); he established an army and built a caravansarai. After the assassination of Abî Muslim, Sombîdî handed over his treasures to the care of Khursâd when he rebelled against the Caliph al-Manṣûr. After his defeat he wished to take shelter with Khursâd but he was assassinated on his way by one of the cousins of Khursâd, Tûsî, in revenge for an insult. The Caliph demanded that the treasure should be surrendered to him but Khursâd refused, consenting however to pay tribute. Thinking of the large sums that Tâbaristân might yield him, al-Manṣûr determined to conquer it; the town of Amâl surrendered; Khursâd fled with women and children; he came to a place called 3î’âsha Kargil Dîz, called by the Arabs Kaš’al-ta’î, “the citadel of the vault”, while he himself went to raise troops in Gilân and Dailâm; the garrison of the fortress having been decimated by plague gave itself up to the invaders. Khursâd in despair poisoned himself and Tâbaristân passed under the sway of Islam. The date given by Tâbari and Ibn al-Athîr, 141 (758), is wrong. The last coinage known of Khursâd II belongs to the year 145 (765) corresponding to the year 114 of the era of Tâbarîstân.


Khuriyan-Muryan, the name of a group of islands in the bay of the same
name on the south coast of Arabia, consisting of Hellâniya, Karzawt (Karzawt or Akarziawt), Sûdâ (Swaidiya), Djebelija and Hâski. The first of these alone is inhabited; but the number of dwellers on it has greatly diminished in spite of the facts that the inhabitants of Sûdâ had all migrated to it. Vegetation on Hellâniya is also scanty; a few marine shrubs, some scattered tamarisks and mimosas here and there enliven the monotonous landscape. In the centre of the island a peak rises to a height of 3,900 feet above sea level. In front of it in the west lies a high plateau. The water is usually brackish, the best being found in a well dug by European sailors. The same is true of Swaidiya. Djebelija is quite waterless and desert and inhabited only by seafowl so that the island possesses extensive deposits of guano. Djebelija was once inhabited as a few tombs on it show. The most westerly island of the group is Hâski, which is only 20 miles from the coast and is commanded by two peaks 400 feet high; it also is devoid of water and vegetation but occupied by numerous flocks of pelicans and goosanders.

This group of islands which was early identified with the seven successive islands of Zenobios, formed the frontier mark between the kingdom of the Parthians and the kingdom of Hadramût, so that the Parthian frontier should be located in the innermost corner of the Khûryân-Mûryân Bay or in about 56° 45' E. Long. (Greenwich). The inhospitality of the land made the inhabitants dependent on the sea and they naturally became a race of fishermen. Idrist (d. 1164) already knows that the inhabitants of the Khûryân-Mûryân islands, who were then politically under al-Shîrîn, were very poor in winter and only managed to make a moderate livelihood in the safing season. They used to sail to Umân, 'Aden and the Yemen. Their main source of revenue was tortoise shell which they traded to the Yemenis and occasionally very beautiful amber, for which they sometimes got very high prices. Idrisî calls the bay containing the islands Djâvan al-Hâshish (Bay of Herbs). It was the Portuguese who first directed the attention of Europeans to the islands. In 1503 the Khûryân-Mûryân islands were discovered by Alfons d'Albuquerque. As the Curia-Muria islands they continually appear in Portuguese sources, while Swaidiya appears as Sodî Hâski as Asquî and Karzawt as Rodondo. The islands later passed into the possession of the Sultan of Mâskat, who ceded them to the English on July 14, 1854.

Bibliography: al-Idristî, Nashat al-Muhsâbî, transl. by Jaubert, i. 54; ii. 4. Historia del descubrimiento e conquista da India pelos Portugueses, por Fernão Lopes de Castanheda I, Coimbra 1554, chap. 54: Historia Oriental de las peregrinaciones de Fernando Mendes Pinto Portugues, traduzido de Portugueses en Castellano por Francisco de Herrera, Madrid 1620, chap. 3: Decada primeira da Asia de João de Barros, Lisabon 1628, livro vii., chap. 4, fol. 134, livro ix., chap. 1, fol. 172; Decada sexta da Asia, por Diego do Conto, livro x., chap. 18, ibid., Decada setima, livro i., chap. 5: P. Ma-
oel d'Almeyda, Historia general de Ethiopia a ala, por P. Balhissar Tellez, Coimbra 1660, libr. iii., chap. 2, iv., chap. 24; L'ambassade de Dom Garcia de Silva Figueroa em Perse, Paris 1667, p. 5, 498; C. Ritter, Die Erd-
graphie und Geschichte des alten Orteins, Mi-

KUSSHAL KHAN, warrior and poet, forebear of poets, father of fifty-seven sons, was the famous chief of the Khataś [q.v.] tribe of the Pathânns during the reigns of the Mughal emperors, Shâh Djahân and Awrangzêb. Born in the year 1622 (1613), he succeeded his father as chief in 1590. His father's fief was confirmed to him by Shâh Djahân together with the charge of protecting the royal road from Atak on the Indus to Peshâwar. After the death of Shâh Djahân he fell under the displeasure of Awrangzêb and was confined in the fortress of Gujrat for seven years. While in captivity, he wrote many of his poems. On release Kusshâl Khan returned to the Khataš country, of which Akora was the chief town, and later on we find him in alliance with the Afridis waging a determined war against the Mughals. Affairs at Peshâwar became so serious that Awrangzêb appeared on the scene in person and for about two years remained encamped at Atak. The Pathân confederacy was broken up and Kusshâl resigned the chiefship to his eldest son. He died in the seventy-eighth year of his age. From all accounts he was a voluminous author of poetry and prose in Persian and Patho. His poetry is of the patriotic and popular type.

Bibliography: DIWÂN, ed. H. W. Bellew, Peshâwar 1860; selections in The Gulshâni-

KHUSHKADAM AL-MALIK AL-Zâhir SAIF AL-

DIN AL-Nâzîrî (so called from his first master), Sultan of Egypt and Syria, reigned from 865-872 (1461-1467). He was the first Sultan to come from the Sultanate of Rûm (in Asia Minor) which however many also say of Balbars II [q.v.] and Sultan âdûn (696-698 = 1296-1298). Purchased as a slave by Sultan Shaikh [q.v.] he was enrolled in the corps of Dîmâhrs [q.v.] Under Shaikh's son Ahmad, who reigned only a few months, he became a member of the bodyguard (khâštî) and only in the reign of Sultan Câmaîsa [q.v.] did he become an amir of 10 Mamlûks in 846 (1442) and râs nawâba (leader of a company). In 850 (1446) he became command-er of 1000 Mamlûks in Damascus, in 854 Hâzîd al-Hûdâyîd (president of the military court) in Cairo. Three years later under Sultan Inâl he was War Minister and in 860 (1456) he commanded an expedition against the prince of
Karaman'ın daha çok毁灭没有 meeting his troops. Inil's son Ahmad (see under INAL) appointed him Ataheğ. The Aşırfiya (Sultan Ashraf Inil's Mamulüs) were however dissatisfied with Sultan Ahmad, conspired against him and offered the throne to Dinim, the governor of Damascus. The Zähiriyen (Sultan Zahir Çakmak's Mamulüs) however preferred Khusbirdadam. They therefore hurried to elect the Ataheğ Khusbirdadam Saltan before Dündim's arrival, took Ahmad prisoner and sent him to Alexandria. When Dündim later arrived in the vicinity of Cairo, there was nothing left for him to do but recognise Khusbirdadam and return to Damascus. As he did not feel safe for long there he sought refuge with Hasan al-Tawil, Saltan of the White Sheep Turkomans, where he was murdered not long afterwards. Another influential amir of the Zähiriyen, the governor of Dijidda, Dündim, to whom the Saltan owed everything, was murdered by his orders. He thus deprived the Mamulük corps of their leaders and was able to play one corps against another. The Mamulük were also weakened by the campaigns against Cyprus, which were a result of Inil's policy. The latter had supported king James against his sister Charlotte who in turn expected help from the Knights of St. John of Rhodes. The governor of Tripolis was entrusted by Inil at the end of his reign with a campaign against the Queen, but on account of the change on the Egyptian throne only engaged in it for a short time. The amirs, who had been sent with a corps to Cyprus to support James soon returned on account of the disturbances which broke out after the assassination of Dündim. Only one of the amirs with a small body of troops was left in Cyprus. The capital Famagusta had surrendered to James, who was now master of practically the whole island and thus the longer required the assistance of the Egyptians, who had acted arrogantly and impudently towards him. To get rid of them he had them attacked in the rear by the people of Famagusta and then fell upon them himself. To the Saltan he represented the massacre as a rising among his subjects, of which he was quite innocent. Queen Charlotte revealed the truth to Khusbirdadam to get his assistance and also gained his favour by slamming a ship that had been captured by the Knights of Rhodes, but the Saltan was glad to live at peace with James, especially as the latter paid him regular tribute. He was in close alliance with his vassal, the Saltan of the White Sheep (Hasan al-Tawil), because the latter had to rely on the help of the Egyptian Saltan in his continual struggle with the Saltan of the Black Sheep and the governors of Aloulustin of the house of Dhu T-Ghadir.

Hasan, whose relations with the Ottomans Saltan Muhammad II were also not of the brightest, therefore all the intrigues and fighting, Muhammad II had overthrown Hasan's relative, the Byzantine emperor of Trebizond. Hasan in turn along with Khusbirdadam supported Isikak, ruler of Karaman, who was at war with the Ottomans. He and the Saltan fought against the princes of Dagh and Rustam, successively against their rival for the governorship, Shish Suvor, who sided with the Ottomans (see KISIR). Although it never came to actual fighting between the two Saltan's, there was always a latent enmity. While Khusbirdadam was able to keep the Mamulük of his predecessors in check, his own Mamulük committed countless outrages on the people. The Saltan's finances were always in a muddle: he endeavoured to secure money by the sale of offices as well as by visits to his subjects (cf. KISIR). The Saltan fell ill in 872 (1457) and died in ten days. He was not really a great ruler but he was able to keep Egypt at peace. During his reign Egypt was spared epidemics. He was averse to reforms and adhered strictly to the old customs in contrast to the turbulent Khusbird. Bibliography: Ibn Iys, Bulik 1311, ii. 70-84; Well, Geschichte der Chalifen, v. 240—315; Muir, The Mamulük or Slave Dynasty of Egypt, p. 163—171.

KHSURAW [see AANSIRWAN, KISIR, FAHRIZ.] KHSURAW, AL-MALIK AL-RADM ABU NAṢR B. ABU KÜLŽ, A Buṣíy. After the death in Lijumula 1440 (Oct. 1448) of Abu Kuldilj [q.v.] Khusraw Firuz (var. Khusraw Firuz) was recognized as Amir of the Ṭālẖ and his brother Abu Mansūr Fūlāḏ Saltan seized the town of Shiraz. Soon afterwards Khusraw Firuz sent an army under Abu Sa'd Khusraw Shīr, who was also his brother, against Shiraz: the town had to surrender and Abu Manusir was taken prisoner (Shawwal 1440 = March—April 1449) but released after some time. In 1444 (1140/1140) he reconquered Shiraz and seized a part of al-Ahwāz but in Rabī II of the following year (Aug.—Sept. 1050) Khusraw Firuz invaded al-Ahwāz and soon conquered 'Askar Mukram. In Muharram 443 (May/June 1051) al-Ahwāz was invaded by Abūs and Kords. After they had sacked Surak, they were put to flight by the troops of Khusraw Firuz. The latter then invited 'Askar Mukram, because Abu Mansur in alliance with the Kurd chief Hazārasp intended to march on Tusar. Khusraw Firuz succeeded in anticipating him and when the advanced patrols met, Abu Mansur and Hazārasp had to withdraw. After a bloody battle Khusraw Firuz also took Kāmāhrūs, while Abu Sa'd took the two towns of Iṣṭaḵār and Shiraz. In the meanwhile Abu Manusir had applied to the Saljuḳ prince Toghril Beg: the latter sent him reinforcements and after two days' battle Khusraw Firuz had to retire to Wāsit (end of Rabī II = Sept. 1051). In 444 (1052) his troops conquered Başra: the governor there, Abu Ali also his brother, saved himself by flight and went to Iṣṭaḵār to Toghril Beg. Khusraw Firuz then invaded the town with Hazāra in the following year Abu Mansur again became lord of Shiraz and drove out Abu Sa’d; in Muharram 447 (April 1055) a Dilmāhi chief named Fūlāḵ seized the town and drove out Abu Mansur. Although Fūlāḵ declared he would submit to Khusraw Firuz and Abu Sa’d, they did not trust him and Abu Sa’d joined with Abu Mansur and marched on Shiraz. After a long siege Fūlāḵ had to fly, and the two brothers occupied the city in the name of Khusraw Firuz. In the same year the Buṭayl dynasty was overthrown. Under the pretext of making the pilgrimage to Mecca, Toghril Beg asked permission to enter Baghdad, which was granted him by the Buṭayl al-Khālid. On Kāmārub 22 Dec. 155; the Buṭayl was read in Isfahan and three days later he made his coronation entry into the capital. But as the people of Baghdad rose against the foreign troops, Toghril Beg in spite of the Caliph's protests had Khusraw Firuz
arrested as the alleged foment of the strife. He died a prisoner in the citadel of al-Raiy in 45
(1058/1059).

Bibliography: Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, ix. 374 sqq.; Ibn Khal'dun, al-Ibar, iv. 488—
494; Wilken, Gesch. der Sultane aus d. Gesch. Buech nach Mirchond, xviii.; Weil, Gesch. der
Chalifen, iii. 80 sq., 94—97.

(K. V. Zettersten) Khusraw Malik. [See ii. 157.]

Khusraw Pasha, the name of two Turk
ish grand viziers.

1. The Bosnian Khusraw Pasha, grand vizier
under Murad IV. Brought up in the imperial
palace by the dervish of Shahrizor and of Agha
of the Janissaries (from 1035/1624) and later
in Radjab 1036 (March—April 1627) he received
the rank of Wezari-i Khubeh-shikhan. In November
1627 after the failure of the grand vizier Khalil
Pasha [q. v.] to subdue the rebel Abuza Pasha at
Erzerum, a council called by the Sultan decided,
the proposal of the Sheikh al-Islam Yakhya
Efendi, to depose Khalil and to appoint Khusraw
Pasha as his successor. The latter was a "novus
homo", and his rank was not yet sufficiently
high. He was therefore at first nominated wali of
Diyar Bakr and at once he left the capital. The
great seal of the Empire was only sent to him
when he was at Inišik (Shirvan 1037/April 1628). The
campaign had been well planned and the new
grand vizier arrived at Erzerum before Abuza ex-
pected him. The latter surrendered after a fourteen
days' siege (18th September) and he returned with
Khusraw Pasha to Constantinople along with the
Persian general Sham Khan who had been taken
prisoner. The victorious entry of Khusraw into
Constantinople (9th December) — celebrated by
a hafta of the poet Nefi — was followed by the
pardon of Abuza (afterwards nominated Wali of
Bosnia) and by a period of absolute power of
the grand vizier; he reigned by terror, relying for
support above all on the troops of the Sipahis
and the Janissaries, to whom he guaranteed anew
the promise of privileges which, a short time before,
had been abolished. At this time the young Murad IV
had not yet sufficient power to counterbalance
the influence of his grand vizier. The latter again
left the capital — never to return — in July 1629
as serdar of a new military expedition, against
Persia. Radjab Pasha, the future grand vizier,
remained as Kātim-maşāfi at Constantinople. The
Army went to Aleppo, Diyar Bakr and Mousul,
where the inundation of the country caused by
torrential rains, forced it to wait for seventy days
until the end of January 1630. Great military
preparations were made for the capture of Baghdad
but in the meanwhile Khusraw Pasha himself
marched eastward. He crossed the two Zāb's and
advanced upon Shehrizor [q. v.] while the Kurd
chiefs came and offered submission to him. Then
after sending several bodies of soldiers against
Lower Mesopotamia he advanced to the Persian
general Zainal Khan who was at Hamadan.
Zainal Khan tried in vain to reconquer the castle
of Mihribān (on the Hamadān road) taken by
Noghāi Pasha, beglerbeg of Aleppo, by the orders
of Khusraw; the loss of this battle cost him his
head. The grand vizier arrived in person at Mih-
ribān on the 5th May 1630; thereafter he destroyed
Hassanabad and arrived on June 10th before
Hamadan. This town which had been abandoned
by its inhabitants was completely sacked. Khusraw
Pasha still continued his advance as far as Davrizin
(on the Karzin route); he then turned hew towards
Baghdād, the goal of the expedition. He passed
by the Derteng defile and by Kayır Shahr [q. v.]
and arrived on the 6th September before Baghdad.
The siege began a month later. Hājījī Khalīfā
was present as a scribe in the Ottoman army and
he describes the siege in the Fedālike (p. 299).
A general assault took place on the 9th November
but had no result so that Khusraw had to retire
on Mousul leaving garrisons at Hilla and several
other places. At Mousul where he arrived on
December 12th, he learnt of the capture of Sheh-
rizor by the Persians; soon the Turkish garrisons
left in the neighbourhood of Baghdad were also
put to flight. Khusraw then retired to Mardin in
order to spend the winter there; the following year
was passed in inactivity, due to the indecision
of the grand vizier and the discontent of the
Sipahis and the Janissaries. The Münasibât of
Feridun (li. 179—188) contains four documents
issued by the Sultan and addressed at this time
to Khusraw to testify that he was pleased with
him and to encourage him. But at last the Sultan
was convinced of the lack of capacity of the
grand vizier; he deposed him (25th Oct. 1631)
and nominated in his stead the former grand vizier
Hādīz Ahmad Pasha [q. v.]. A čüşh was sent to
and bring back the seal of office; near Malatia
he overtook Khusraw who complied immediately
and went to Tokat. His dismissal was, however,
the signal for a general revolt of the troops in
Constantinople as well as in Antiochia, a revolt
which very soon cost the grand vizier his life
(10th February 1632) and nearly led to the over-
throw of the Sultan himself. The rebellion was
secretly fomented by Khusraw and Radjab, who
was created grand vizier sometime afterwards.
Murad then commanded Muratşah Pasha, wali of Oezakow,
to see to the execution of Khusraw. Muratşah,
appointed wali of Diyar Bakr, went to Tokat, and
took the steps necessary for overcoming the re-
sistance of Khusraw Pasha. The latter resigned
himself to his fate and was strangled on the 29th
Shirvan 1041 (March 21st, 1632). His head was
sent to the capital where the rebellion could only
be quelled after the execution of Radjab Pasha
(30th May).

Khusraw Pasha left behind him the reputation
of a man, courageous but bloodthirsty and intriguing.
All opposition which he encountered was stifled
in blood; the roads by which he passed were
marked by a series of executions. This strategic
capacity is severely criticised by Naîma (i. 495)
because he wasted his time and his troops in
making minor conquests before attacking Baghdad.
His name is given to a bāgh which he had build
on the great road between Eski Shehir and Khoyen
(see Taeschner, Das anatolische Wingenetz, i. 102
and the map). Bibliography: The principal sources are:
Hâdīzī Khanī, Fedālike, p. 282—305; and
Naîma, i. 452—515; also Othman Zade, Hadżat
al-bawarâz, p. 74 sqq.; Siğili-i Othmanî, ii.
274 (there are errors in the dates); Peciwi,
Türkiye, ii. 409 sqq.; Munedjîbîn Bâhiî, ii. 677
sqq.; von Hammer, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman,
Paris 1837, iv. 99 sqq.

2. Muĥammad Khusraw Pasha, a states-
man and a grand vizier in the reigns of the Sultans
Maḥmūd II and ʿAbd al-Madjid. He was by birth an Abkhazian slave and served first in the enderian as servant of the Câlîsh Bâshî Saîd. In 1206 (1792) he left the palace as mîhârîâr and bayâşa to his compatriot Kûdîc Huseyn Pâsha, and later became Inspector and directly in charge of the Kûdîc's household. He gained promotion quickly in his military and administrative career and became in 1800 mîteqârî of Kârâ Hisâr. He accompanied the Turkish fleet which in March 1801 landed in Egypt under Kûdîc Huseyn Paša and afterwards became commandant at Alexandria. In September of the same year he was appointed wâli of Egypt, after having been raised to the rank of vezîr. Khusraw Paša made his ceremonial entry into Cairo in January 1802, and immediately began military operations against the Mamlûk boys. But his inexperience and avarice, which had caused him to dismiss his own troops, brought about his failure. The Mamlûk gained ground and the wâli was not able to maintain his authority over the Albanian troops, under the command of Tâhir Paša and Muḥaṃmad ʿAli. The latter encouraged the revolt of these troops and on the 3rd May 1803 Khusraw was forced by them to leave Cairo and to entrench himself in Damietta. At first he fought with success against the Albanian troops who were now allied with the Mamlûk, but in July 1803 the allies commanded by Muḥaṃmad ʿAli and Oğlûm Bey Bardis took Damietta and Khusraw was taken a prisoner to Cairo. Meanwhile the Porte had replaced him as wâli by ʿAlî Pasha Djezaîrîli. An attempt to escape from Cairo failed. On the 13th March 1804, the Albanian troops beat the Mamlûk in their turn and Muḥaṃmad ʿAli proclaimed Khawwâr once more wâli of Egypt, but two days later through the influence of the relatives of Tâhir Paša who had died in the meanwhile, the arrangements of Muḥaṃmad ʿAli were upset. Khusraw was taken to Rosetta where he was given leave to embark for Constantinople. From this Egyptian period Khusraw always had an inveterate hatred for Muḥaṃmad ʿAli, whom he considered, not without reason, as the principal author of his failure.

Thereafter Khusraw Paša began a long career as wâli of a great number of vilâyets; from the beginning of 1812 to 1817 he was Kapadâni Paša and again from December 1822 to February 1827. During this last period he took part in the taking of Missolonghi (April 1826). When the news of the massacre of the Janissaries reached him, he had all the Janissaries in the fleet thrown into the sea in order to show his zeal for reforms. On May 9th 1827 he became Sen-Aşker at Constantinople, an office which he kept until 11th November 1836. During this time his power was unlimited. Although he had little education (he never learnt either to read or write) no one was more in favour with Sultân Maḥmûd than he, on account of his great zeal for reforms. It was he who was the first to present the Sultân with a body of troops trained according to the European method. Moreover as minister of police, he was able to maintain perfect order in the capital in spite of the troubled situation in the Empire. The population knew him and feared him under the name of “Topal Paša”. “He was the very genius of intrigue of Turkish officials” (Rosen). He assembled around himself a large clientele of dependents amongst whom some gained the position of dâmid, for example his adopted son Khalîl Paša. Von Moltke, sent in 1835 to Constantinople as instructor of the new Turkish troops, has given a description of the Sers-Aşker who, by this time, had attained a considerable age. He was an old man, very active, with a red face and white hair (there is a portrait in the Taşkîb-i Lutfî, vol. viii., Constantinople 1328, p. 86). He had, however, a disastrous influence on the operations of the Turkish armies against the Egyptian troops of Muḥammad ʿAli. By his jealousy he thwarted the plans of the Turkish generals Ḥusayn Paša in Syria (April 1832) and Rasjîd Paša (battle of Konya, 21st Dec. 1832) so that the failure of the Turks must be largely attributed to him. In the period of upheaval which followed, he took very little part in the diplomatic affairs which he never showed a very definite sympathy either with Russian influence or with that of France. The fall of Khusraw in November 1836 was ultimately due to the influence of the conservative party, and also to the plague which had been ravaging Constantinople during these last years. He returned, however, to the head of the Government in March 1838 as chief of the cabinet with the title of rêîî-i şârâ and rêîî meqâlî-i wâli; in this cabinet the young Rasjîd Paša was minister for foreign affairs. His ministry continued until the 23rd of June 1839. In this time Khawwâr was able to maintain tranquillity in the capital even at the time of the death of Maḥmûd II, which took place on June 30th 1839. Thus on the accession of the young Sultan ʿAbd al-Madjâd, Khusraw was the person indicated to fill the office of grand vizier, an office which was re-established after having been temporarily abolished. The situation of the Empire was at this time very critical because of the defeat of the army and the loss of the fleet which had gone over to Muḥammad ʿAli. During this time Khusraw was the soul of the resistance to the viceroy, his ancient enemy, but he took very little part in the diplomatic negotiations with the Powers, negotiations the object of which was to save Turkey. It was Rasjîd Paša who directed foreign affairs and who took the initiative in the proclamation of the famous Khawwâr-i şârîf of Gülâmî on November 1839. Khusraw was not the man to appreciate such a measure and played a very passive role during the ceremony. Little by little the intrigues of Muḥammad ʿAli at Constantinople seconded by Khalîl Paša who had become Sers-Aşker succeeded in undermining the position of the grand vizier; the Sultan dismissed him in June 1840 and banished him to Roboto. At the end of a year, however, the conservative influence was re-established in Constantinople, so he was recalled and he held the office of Sers-Aşker again from January 1846 to December 1847. Finally he retired for good, and this, the last Turkish grand vizier of the old school, died on the 13th Djamâdâl-Ìl 1271 (4th March 1855) aged nearly a hundred years, without leaving any children. He was buried in a special nûbe at Fiyûb; at this place there is also a library which he founded. During his life-time he had amassed enormous wealth. Many of his old slaves and servants rose to positions of high dignity in the civil and military service.
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(3) Ghurrat al-Kamāl, the poems which were written during the 34th to the 43rd year;
(4) Bahīya-ỉ- Naḵeya, select remnants or poems of old age.

Selections from the preceding four divān’s have been lithographed with the title of Kulliyāt-ỉ-Amīr Khūṣrū in the press of Naval Kishore, Lucknow.

(5) Niḵūyat al-Kamāl, a collection of Ghazals (lyrical poems) and Ribāt’s (quatrains);
(6) Misfāḥ al-Fuṣūḥ, a poetical account of the campaigns of Dījal-al-Dīn Firūz Shāh II during the first year of his reign, i.e. from his accession, 689 (1290), to his return to Delhi in 690 (1291);
(7) Maṭla’-ỉ-Awrār, a moral and religious poem, written in imitation of the Makhzan al-Awrār of Niẓām;
(8) Shīrīn wa-Khūṣrū, an imitation of Niẓām’s Khūṣrū wa-Shīrīn;
(9) Maḏnūn wa-Laila, an imitation of Niẓām’s Laila wa-Madīnayn. It has been lithographed, Calcutta 1244, Lucknow 1286;
(10) Aʿīna-ỉ-Sikandari, a counterpart to the Iskandar Nāma of Niẓām;
(11) Ḥaḍīṯ Bilāḥ, a poem on the loves of Bahram, written in imitation of Niẓām’s Hafṣ Pasūr;
(12) Kīrān al-Sāʿdāin, a poetical account of the meeting of Sulṭān Muʿizz al-Dīn Kauably and his father Naṣīr al-Dīn Bughrá Khān, Sulṭān of Bengal, which took place on the bank of the river Ghūrā in Oudh, 688 A. H.; lithographed, Lucknow 1259;
(13) Ṣuhār al-Sīrāḥ, a poetical description of the court of Kublā al-Dīn Mubārāk Shāh, with an account of the principal events of his reign;
(14) Dwawrānī Khiḍr Khān, a poem on the love adventures of Khidr Khān, son of Sulṭān ‘Ala’-ỉ-Al-Dīn, with Dewal Rānī, the daughter of Rā Khān of Gujrat.
(15) IʿḌaʿ Khūṣrāwī, a work on rhetoric, lithographed in the press of Naval Kishore, Lucknow.

In 1914 an attempt was made under the guidance of the late Nawwāb Ḥājī Muhammad Isḥāk Khān, the then secretary of the M. A. O. College, Aligarh (now Aligarh Muslim University) to publish well edited texts of the Kulliyāt Khūṣrū, but, owing to the death of the Nawwāb, only Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14 of the above list could be lithographed.


(M. Hidayat Hosain)

Khusraw Shāh. [See ii. 157.]

Khusraw Shāh, eldest son of Dāhānγīr by the daughter of Rādījī Bhagwān Dās, was born at Lahore in 1587. He was a favourite with his grandfather, Aklār, who perhaps wanted him to make his successor. He rebelled against his father in the first year of the latter’s reign, was defeated and imprisoned. He made a second conspiracy in Afgānistan, and this having been detected, he was, with one interval, kept in confinement for the rest of his life. He died at Asīrgarh nearBurhānpūr in the Deccan in 1622, and was in all probability murdered by Shāh Dāhān. His sister had her body buried in the Khawb Bāgh at Ullahābād. His two sons, Dāwār Bākhsh, otherwise Dūlīdān, and Gārshāpān, were put to death at Shāh Dāhān’s accession. See Amāli-ỉ-Sālih (still in MS.), Dāhānγīr’s Memoirs (O.T.F.) vols. i. and 2, R. A. S. F. for 1907.

Khusrū, Abū ỉ-Ḥasan Amīr b. Amīr Saif al-Dīn Mahmūd Shāmīlī, born in India 651 (1253). His father was a Turk of the tribe of Lāḍīn, emigrated from Hazāra, near Balkh, during the reign of Dīngīz Khān, to India and settled at Pātāyā where he married the daughter of Imām al-Mulk, a great nobility of the court of Delhi. Khusrū lost his father at the early age of nine and was brought up under the care of his maternal grandfather. He was very intelligent and had great love for study. He was fortunate in enjoying the favour of several successive kings of Delhi: (1) Muḥammad Sulṭān b. Sulṭān Ghīyāb al-Dīn Balbān (664–686 = 1265–1287); (2) Sulṭān Muʿizz al-Dīn Ka(skbūd (686–689 = 1287–1290); (3) Sulṭān Dījal-al-Dīn Firūz Shāh II b. Dījal-al-Dīn (689–695 = 1290–1295); (4) Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh I, ỉ-Ala’-ỉ Al-Dīn (695–715 = 1295–1315); (5) Sulṭān Mubārāk Shāh I, Kūṯ al-Dīn (716–720 = 1316–1320); (6) Sulṭān Taḡḥlāk Shāh I, Ghīyāb al-Dīn (720–725 = 1320–1325) and (7) Sulṭān Muḥammad II b. Taḡḥlāk (725–752 = 1325–1351).

Khūṣrū was a pupil or votary of Niẓām al-Dīn Awiyya (d. 725–1324) for whom he had the greatest respect and sincerest devotion; and it is said that when he was accompanying Ghīyāb al-Dīn Taḡhlāk Shāh in his march to Bengal, the news of the demise of his spiritual leader reached him. On hearing it he hastened back to Delhi, gave up the royal service and distributed all he had to the poor, and took up his abode at the tomb of the saint, and died six months after in Delhi. 725 (1325).

He is the author of the following works:
(1) ỉ-Thāḥīf al-Sīrāḥ, the poems which were composed from the poet’s 15th to 19th year;
(2) Wāṣṭ al-Ḥayāt, the poems which he composed from his 20th to 34th year;
p. 40), one of the early Shāfi‘ī doctors, may be given here. a. One of the conditions for the validity of the Friday-service is that it must be preceded by two sermons. The conditions for the validity of these sermons are the following: the khātib must be in a state of ritual purity; his dress must be in accordance with the prescriptions; he must pronounce the two khutba’s standing and sit down between them; the number of auditors required for a valid dīwān must be present.

Regarding the sermon itself are obligatory: the hāmda, the salāt on the Prophet, admonitions to piety in both khutba’s, prayer (dū‘a) in behalf of the faithful, recitation of a part of the Kur‘ān in the first khutba or, according to some doctors, in both. It is commendable (żuna) for the khātib to be on a pulpit or an elevated place; to salute the audience when directing himself towards them; to sit down till the adhan is pronounced by the mu‘addhin; to lean on a bow, a sword or a staff; to direct himself straightforward to his audience; to pray (daw‘a) on behalf of the Muslims; to make his khutba short.

b. Regarding the khutba’s on the days of festival the same author says (p. 42) that they are like those of the Friday-service, except in the following points: the khātib must open the first with nine takbir’s, the second with seven. On the ‘id al-fitr he must instruct his audience in the rules for the salāt al-fitr, on the ‘id al-adha in the rules for the sacrifice of this day. It is allowed to him to pronounce the sermon sitting.

Regarding the khutba’s of the service during an eclipse, al-Shirāzi (p. 43) remarks that the preacher must admonish his audience to be afraid, and in the service times of drought he must ask Allah’s pardon; in the opening of the first khutba nine times, in the second seven times; further he must repeat several times the salāt on Muḥammad as well as isṭighfār, recite Sūra lxvi. 9, elevate his hands and say Muḥammad’s dū‘a (which is communicated by al-Shirāzi in full). Further he must direct himself towards the kibla [q.v.] in the middle of the second khutba and change his shirt, putting the right side to the left, the left to the right, the upper part beneath and keep it on till he puts off all his other garments.

These prescriptions give rise to the following remarks. C. H. Becker was the first to point out the relation between the Muḥammadan pulpit and the judge’s seat in early Arabia. This explains why the khātib must sit down between the two khutba’s; it explains also why he must lean on a staff, sword or bow; for these were the attributes of the old Arabian judge. It is not easy to see why the khutba precedes the services on Friday, whereas on days of festival and the special occasions salāt comes first. Hadrath tells us that Marwān b. al-Hakam was the first to change this order of things by pronouncing the khutba before the performance of the salāt on the days of festival (e.g. Bukhārī, Tārīkh, bāb 6 and especially the pathetic picture in Muslim, Tārīkh, trad. 9).

It is also said that Marwān was the first to hold the khutba on these days on a pulpit, the old custom being a service without minbar or adhan. According to other authorities (cf. Muslim, Imam, trad. 783, and al-Nawawī’s commentary) the khutba before the salāt was an institution going back to Ummān or even to Umar. The common opinion of traditionists is, however, that it was an innovation due to the general tendency of the Umayyads to favour their own dynastic interests rather than those of religion. If this opinion should be right, the innovation as well as the holding of the khutba in a sitting attitude, may be looked upon as an endeavour to go back to the pre-Islamic judicial rites concerning minbar and khutba.

Regarding the prayer on behalf of the faithful (dō‘a li ‘l-munimin) it must be observed that in this prayer before the Friday-salāt it has become customary to mention the ruling sovereign. The history of Islam is full of examples of the importance which was attached to this custom, especially in times of political troubles, the name mentioned in this dū‘a betraying the imām’s political opinion or position. Though it is not prescribed by law to mention the ruler’s name, the suppression of the name at this occasion exposed the khātib to suspicion on the part of the ruler. In countries where Muslims live under non-Muslim rule, it was a pracise that the worldly prosperity of the ruler may expose the khātib to suspicion on the part of his fellow-Muslims (cf. Snouck Hurgonje, Islam und Phonograph, p. 13 sq. = Verspr. Gesch., ii. 430 sq.; do., Mr. L. W. C. van den Berg’s boevening van het Mohammedansche recht, in Ind. Gids, v/f. 809 sq. = Verspr. Geschriften, i. 214 sq.).

Several of the characteristics of the khutba prescribed by the doctors are also found in hadith. The khutba’s of Muḥammad usually begin with the formula amma bā‘dum (Bukhārī, Dajmā‘a, bāb 29). Side by side with the hāmda, the khutba (Muslim, Dajmā‘a, trad. 44. 45) the shāhāda occurs (Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 302, 343: “A khutba without the shāhāda is like a mutilated hand”). In a large number of traditions it is stated that Muḥammad used to recite passages from the Kur‘ān (e. g. Muslim, Dajmā‘a, trad. 49—52; Ahmad b. Hanbal, v. 86 sq., 88, 93 etc.). The khutba must be short, in accord with Muḥammad’s saying: “Make your salāt long and your khutba short” (Muslim, Dajmā‘a, trad. 47). Just like the salāt the khutba must be right (to the purpose, Muslim, Dajmā‘a, trad. 41). The audience must be silent and quiet; “who says to his neighbour “listen”, has spoken a superfluous word”, Bukhārī, Dajmā‘a, bāb 36). The two khutba’s pronounced by the standing khātib, who sits between them, are based on Muḥammad’s example (Bukhārī, Dajmā‘a, bāb 27; Muslim, Dajmā‘a, trad. 33—35; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 91, 98). During the adhan Muḥammad used to sit on the minbar; the iskāma was spoken when he had descended (in order to hold the khutba standing); this order was observed by Abū Bakr and Umar (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 449 bis).

Neither the term khutba nor the verb khataba in their technical meaning occur in the Kur‘ān. Even in the passage containing an admonition not to abandon the Friday-service for worldly profit, it is only the salāt which is mentioned (Sūra lxii. 9—11). It would be wrong to conclude from this silence that the khutba did not yet form a constituent part of worship in Muḥammad’s time. Still, it is not probable that the different kinds of service were accurately regulated from the be-
gining. Ḥadīth has preserved descriptions showing that Muhammad’s ḥuṭba often did not have much to do with the regular sermon of later times. ʿAbū Dā‘ūd, Kātāb al-tādhīb, bāb 13: Muhammad had sent ʿAbū Dhājm b. Ḥudżāfa as a collector of the sakār to the clan of Lāṭih. When a man made difficulties concerning the payment of sakār, ʿAbū Dhājm knocked him on the head. Then his clan sent people went to Madina and laid before Muhammad a claim on retaliation. After a discussion they agreed upon a blood-fine to a certain amount. Then Muhammad said to them: to-night I will hold a ḥuṭba and propose to my people the amount you have agreed. At night Muhammad pronounced his ḥuṭba saying: These men of Lāṭih have come to me in order to claim retaliation. They did not accept several proposals, but finally have agreed to such an amount. Do you agree with it? They answered: No. Then the Muladhjirūn were angry with the embassy of Lāṭih, but Muhammad persuaded them not to importune them. Finally they received a greater amount after Muhammad had agreed on it with them in a second ḥuṭba. —

This kind of ḥuṭba apparently is a sample of the addresses of the early Arabic rulers to their people and has scarcely anything to do with a sermon. Still, it is not possible to distinguish between the two; it may appear from the following traditions. In a tradition on the authority of Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī it is said that Muhammad on the days of festival used to open the service with the ṣalāt; then he pronounced the ḥuṭba “and his ḥuṭba usually consisted in the command to participate in some mission or expedition” (Ahmād b. Ḥanbal, iii. 56 sq.). A similar statement is to be found in Muslim, Ḥājin, trad. 9: “When Muḥammad had concluded ṣalāt on the days of festival by the tahām, he remained on his feet and turned to the sitting audience; when he wanted to send a mission or when he desired some other arrangement, he gave his orders on it; he used also to say: give alms, give alms, give alms; ... then he went away. This state of things lasted till Marwān.etc.” This is a very simple description of the service and would be a considerable support to the view that a service with a fixed order only arose long after Muḥammad’s time. Yet, it must not be forgotten that the description just translated betrays the tendency to contrast the simple service of the Prophet with the highly official style introduced by Marwān, who had even a minbar built on the musalla. The following instance refers to the Friday-ḥuṭba: “Abū Rāfī‘a says: I addressed the Prophet while he pronounced the ḥuṭba, saying: Oh Apostle of Allah, I am a stranger who wants information concerning his religion which he does not understand. Therefore upon the Apostle of God abandoned his ḥuṭba and came to me. Then a chair was brought (it seems to me that its legs were iron); the Apostle of Allah sat down on it and began to teach me what Allah had taught him. Then he finished his ḥuṭba” (Muslim, Djam‘a, trad. 43). This tradition, interesting though it may seem, betrays the tendency to accentuate the absence of a minbar. Other traditions of this type give an equally simple picture of the Friday-service, e.g. those in Muslim’s chapter, Djam‘a, Nos. 54—59, which represent Muḥammad pronouncing his ḥuṭba, when a man enters. Muḥammad at once directs him the question: Have you performed the two rakʻa‘ēs? Apparently the tendency is to show that Muḥammad laid so much stress upon the two non-obligatory rakʻā‘ās that he even interrupted himself in his ḥuṭba in order to accentuate their importance.

However uncertain the value of these traditions may be, it seems not out of place to suppose that a fixed order of service on Friday and the days of festival arose only after Muḥammad’s lifetime. This order reposes on three elements: the early-Arabian ḥuṭba, Muḥammad’s sunna and the example of Jews and Christians.

In his study on the history of Muḥammad’s worship C. H. Becker has endeavoured to establish a close connection between the services on Friday and the days of festival on the one hand, and the mass on the other. The main features of his position are the following. The first ḥuṭba corresponds to the first part of the mass (“Vorlesung”). Adhān and ḥuṭba are an echo of the responses between the deacon and the priest who administers the mass. The obligatory recitation of the Qurān corresponds to the recitation of the scripture. Concerning the second ḥuṭba’s he states: this duality is subject to ḥuṭba on the part of the fajr’s; it has found its way to the service on the days of festival coming from the Friday-service. The second ḥuṭba corresponds to the sermon and the general prayer.

This view was combated by Mühn who found in the Jewish liturgy features corresponding The Apostles and the recitation from the Prophets (second ḥuṭba). It is perhaps impossible to decide the question; probably the example of the Jewish as well as that of the Christian liturgy have exercised influence on the final constitution of the Muḥammadan service.

Instead of a history of the Muḥammadan sermon which has not yet been written, a few notices only may be given here. Muḥammad’s first and second ḥuṭba in Madina are in Ibn Ishāk’s Sīra (ed. Wustenfeld, p. 340). It may follow here in translation, not because of its being considered as genuine, but as a standard specimen. “The Apostle of Allah praised Allah and said: Amma bā‘adhahu, My people, provide for yourself (by good works), accept instruction. By Allah you will be thunder-stricken and everyone of you will have his cattle without shepherd. Then his Lord will say to him, speaking without a dragonman and without a screen: Has not my Apostle come to you? He preached to you and I provided you with money and gave you abundance. What have you provided for yourself? Then you will look to the right and to the left, without perceiving anything (which can aid you); then you will look before you, but not perceive anything besides Hell. Therefore, whoever will be able to avoid Hell, even though it were on account of a piece of a date (given as alms), he should do it, or on account of a good word, if he should not possess a date. For good deeds are rewarded ten, nay even seven hundred times. May peace and God’s mercy and blessing be upon you.”

Muḥammad’s last sermon is communicated by Bukhārī’s collection, Djam‘a, bāb 29; his emotion when he preached is described in Muslim, Djam‘a, trad. 43. An accurate description of the Friday-service with a translation of two ḥuṭba’s in Lane, Manners and Customs, Paisley and London 1895, p. 99 sqq.
A collection of sermons ascribed to 'Ali is in the former Royal Library in Berlin; among them is a khatba without the letter alif.

As the office of the khatba was a regular function, the khatba became to the khatib what a calligraphic document is to the professional scribe; the one displayed his art in flourished initials, the other in rhymed prose. Collections of sermons are often arranged following the calendar, viz. four sermons for every month and additional ones for the days of festivals, the Prophet's birthday, and his Ascension; see Ahlwardt, Verzeichnis der arab. Hs., iii., p. 437.

It is customary to hold the khatba in Arabic. This rule has often been broken in Turkey.


KUṬṬAṬ, a district on the upper course of Amū-Dāryā between the rivers Pandj and Wakhkh, called Dārjāb and Wakhshāb in the middle ages; on the situation cf. also i., p. 339 sq. The pronunciation of Kuttal is given by Yakūt (Mudjam, ii. 402); for the frequently used plural form we have evidence for the pronunciation Kuttālān in the lampoon preserved by Tabari (1492, 1494 and 1602) on the reverses suffered by the governor Asad b. 'Abd Allah (d. 120 = 738). On the other hand in later Persian poetry the pronunciation Khatlān or Khatlān is required; the same pronunciation is given by the Persian lexicons (e.g. in Vullers, Leicon, s. v.).

Hulbuk, the capital of the rulers of Kuttal, must be sought to the south of the modern Kulab, according to the data given in the geographers; the largest town of Kuttal, Munk (so in the geographers; in Sharaf al-Dīn Yāzdī, Zafar-Nāma, Ind. edition, i. 38: Münk), must have corresponded approximately to the modern Balūjān, although we already find the latter mentioned in the Zafar-Nāma (i. 83). Yakūt (B. G. A., i., vii. 292) says the "largest town of Kuttal" is Washūljān, the modern Faizābād which really lies outside of Kuttal (west of the Wakhsh). Kuttal was a district specially noted for its sermons (cf. B. G. A., i., vii. 292, and the other sermons, p. 180).

The pre-Islamic titles of the rulers of Kuttal, Kuttālān Sāhī and Shir Kuttālān (B. G. A., text, p. 40), seem to have been no longer used in the Muslim period. The last battles of the Arab conquerors mentioned in Tabari (ii. 74) are of the year 133 (750/751); the king (mulk) of Kuttal had to leave his country and go first to Farghāna then to China. The Chinese accounts of the title granted to the king of Kuttal in 752 (E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tract aux centraux, p. 168 and 216) are thus explained. A genealogy of the "later rulers of Kuttal" has been compiled by Marqurt (Erinskiār, p. 302); in his opinion the kingdom of Kuttal later became divided into several small states; but in the time of the Sāmānids a ruler Ahmad b. Dja'far is mentioned as amir of Kuttalān (Gardizi in Barthold, Turkestān, i. 9, account of the events of 336—337 = 947/949).

Maljudādi (B. G. A., iii. 337, e) also mentions among the rulers from whom the Sāmānids received no taxes (kharāb) but only presents (ra'ādāt), the amir of Kuttal.

After the fall of the Sāmānids, Kuttal belonged to the empire of the Ghaznavids (see ii., p. 154) and being on the frontiers was exposed to frequent raids from the land of the Ikik-Khāns (cf. ii., p. 405). Under Sulṭān Mas'ūd (1030—1041) claims to the suzerainty over Kuttal were made, notably by 'Ali Tegin [q. v.] (Baihaki, ed. Morley, esp. p. 348); a separate ruler of Kuttal is not mentioned at this period. On the other hand in Ibn al-Athīr (s. 22) in the account of Sulṭān Alp Ar-lān's campaign of 1060 (1064) an amir of Kuttal who had put himself up in his fortress (his name is not given) is mentioned; it was only after a long siege, in which the amir himself was killed, that the fortress was stormed. In another passage (s. 155) Ibn al-Athīr tells of a campaign by the lord (jāhīb) of Kuttal, Ibn Shadījā, Farukhshāh in Rādjab 553 (Aug. 1158) against Tirmidh; this ruler is said, like the Sāmānids before him, to have claimed descent from the Sassanian Bahram Gōr (cf. i., p. 586). There is no further mention of a native dynasty in Kuttal after this. It probably belonged to the kingdom of the Ghūrids (ii., p. 161—164); we are definitely told of this district of Wakhsh on the lower course of the river of the same name (Tabakāt-i Nisīrī, transl. Ravy, p. 426) Among the many smaller principalities into which the Ghūrid kingdom broke up, the kingdom of Wakhsh is mentioned (ibid., p. 436 and 490; Nesewi, ed. Houdas, p. 39; cf. W. Barthold, Turkestān etc., ii. 400).

In the second half of the xv. century Kuttal was one of the many small Turkish-Mongol kingdoms into which Caghatāli empire had broken up (cf. i., p. 197); by command of Timūr the king of Kuttal, Kai-Khusraw was put to death for treacherous negotiations with Khwārizm (Sharaf al-Dīn Yāzdī, Zafar-Nāma, Ind. edition, i. 243). Kuttal later was one of the dependencies of Ḥīrār (cf. ii., p. 316); when in 903 (1497/1498) the Beg Khosrow Shāh had seized dominion over Ḥīrār, he granted Kuttal to his brother Wali Beg (Bābur-Nāma, ed. Beveridge, fol. 57); Wali Beg was killed in 910 (1504/1505) by Shālān, the founder of the Özbek kingdom (ibid., fol. 225). Under the rule of the Özekgh the name Kuttal for the region was changed to Hābūb. The district of Kuttal is mentioned as late as the Bayr al-Aṣrār of Mahmūd b. Wali (begun in Rabi' II 1044 = Sept.—Oct. 1634, cf. Zapiski, etc., xxv. 233) (Ind. Office MS. 560—575, fol. 228a and 238a); the name Kulab is already used in the history of Khān 'Ubid Allah (1702—1711); the work was begun in his lifetime (F. Teufel in Z. D. M. G., xxvii. 243, cf. esp. text, p. 29).


(W. BARTHOLD)
KHUZA’A. This name of a South Arabian tribe, a branch of the large tribe of Azd. The genealogists with few exceptions are unanimous in tracing their pedigree through ‘Amr, surnamed Luhayi b. Rabha b. Huragha b. Marzaqya and they agree further that they, together with the other branches of the Azd, left South Arabia at a remote time and wandered with them to the North. When they reached the territory of Mekka, most of their kinsmen continued their journey, the Ghasst to Syria, Azd Shubaita to Omam, but Luhayi remained with his clan near Mekka and thus separated (inekha’ada) from the remainder of the tribe. The city of Mekka and the sacred territory was at that time in the hands of the tribe of Djurhum and we may fix the time approximately in the fifth century of the Christian era, though Arab antiquaries, by assigning exceptionally long lives to some of the chiefs, date their arrival near Mekka several centuries further back. According to the same antiquaries the Djurhum had allowed the sanctity of the sacred territory to lose much of its splendour and in addition by extortions from pilgrims had caused the pilgrimage to have fallen greatly into disuse. The leader of the Azd, Thala’aba b. ‘Amr, had asked from the Djurhum permission to stay in the sacred territory till his foragers had found suitable pastures-grounds elsewhere. This permission the Djurhum would not grant and as Thala’aba said that he would stay, whether they allowed it or not it came to fierce fighting which lasted several days and ended in the utter defeat of the Djurhum. Only Muqadda b. ‘Amr al-Djurhummi who had held aloof from the fighting was allowed to leave the city, peaceful and founded a new settlement with his family and followers at Kana and Holy, where his descendants still resided in the third century of the Hijra. Having become the masters of Mekka and the sacred territory, they permitted the descendants of Isma’il, who were few in numbers and had taken no share in the quarrel, to remain peacefully among them. The very next year of the conquest brought epidemic fevers to the new population and according to some historians it was not till this time that the other clans of Azd migrated further afield. With a view to establishing a legal claim to the custodianship of the sanctuary, no doubt, Rabha b. Huragha b. ‘Amr married Fuhaira the daughter of ‘Amr b. ‘Amr al-Harith b. Muqadda, who had been the last ruler of Mekka, and thus became the richest man in the city. From this latter account it becomes almost evident that the two tribes lived for some time together in Mekka and that the rise of the Khaza’a was less violent than is generally concluded from the first account. There can hardly be any doubt that here the same process occurred as it happened continually, that the tribes outside a town by gradual pressure upon the more peaceful and prosperous town-dwellers became in time the masters of the situation, only to suffer the same fate a few generations later. Rabha is credited with having re-introduced the rites of the pilgrimage, especially by caring for the welfare of the numerous pilgrims who visited the sanctuary, but he is also credited with having been the first to order and place the idols round the Ka’ba and especially with having brought the idol Hubal from Hit in Mesopotamia, which with other idols still existed at the time of Muhammad. Rabha’s and his descendants remained custodians for a very long time (Arab historians mention 300 and 500 years — which figures must be highly exaggerated). The last ruler was Hulail b. Hubayya b. Salil b. Ka’b b. ‘Amr, who gave his daughter Hubayla in marriage to Kusa, the head of the small clan of Kuraish, a branch of the tribe of Kinana. Hulail when he grew old made it a practice to give to his daughter or his son-in-law the keys of the Ka’ba to perform such duties as were the privilege of the custodian of the sanctuary. When Hulail died he left his office to his daughter and his son-in-law, but when the latter wanted to claim this right, he was strongly opposed by the whole of Khaza’a, who forcibly took the keys of the sanctuary from Hubayla. Kusa who had many friends among the Kinana who were settled in the vicinity of the sacred territory as also among the Kuda’a, came to an arrangement with his friends that at the next pilgrimage-period and upon the termination of the rites of the pilgrimage it should come to open quarrels with the Khaza’a, and in the end it resulted in fierce fighting in which many were slain. To settle the dispute both parties agreed to submit to the judgment of Ya’mar b. ʾAwf al-Kilabi. Both parties were invited to meet at the portals of the Ka’ba and when Ya’mar had ascertained the number of slain of Khaza’a to be greater than that of the partisans of Kusa he gave judgment in favour of the latter. He was in consequence given the custodianship of the sanctuary and with it the rule of the city of Mekka, while the Khaza’a were permitted to reside with the Kuraish in the precincts of the sacred territory. Thus the end of the rule of the Khaza’a was also the commencement of the rule of the tribe of Kuraish [q. v.]. Another less heroic account, however, tells us that Kusa bought the custodianship from Abi Qubah, the last ruler of the tribe of Khaza’a, for a goats skin of wine; this is the account also given by Ibn al-Kalbi in his Kitab al-Mutqazib. With the advent of Islam we encounter the names of a number of persons belonging to the tribe of Khaza’a, and as the conquest of Egypt and the West was principally accomplished by warriors recruited from Western Arabia it is not surprising that we find descendants of the tribe of Khaza’a prominent in the newly conquered lands, especially in Spain.

That there was a great deal of confusion in the genealogies of this tribe is evident from their being at times not classed among the South Arabian tribes at all, so e.g. the Kabi ‘Iyad gives the genealogy: Khaza’a b. Luhayi b. Kama’ b. al-Yas Muqadd, which Suhaili in his commentary of the Sira tries to explain by saying that Huragha b. Thala’aba married the widow of his father Kama’, who was also the mother of Luhayi, in which way the genealogy is correct both in deriving their origin from North and South Arabian tribes. As regards the divisions of Khaza’a there is a great amount of divergence, some genealogists mention the clans of Ka’b, Mulaih, Sa’d and Sa’il, while other know only ‘Adiy, ‘Awf and Sa’d.

The great number of names of men who claimed descent from this tribe must make us believe that they were more numerous than we should conclude from the comparatively few names mentioned as companions of the Prophet, and it may be that by the time of the rise of Islam they
had gradually been pushed by the more energetic Kurish into the surrounding country out of the precincts of the city of Mecca itself.

**Bibliography:** Araqi, Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, i. 55—64; Ibn Darajd, Kitab al-
Iṣṭikākā, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 276—281; Nuwairi, ii. 317; Kulkhashani, Nihāyat al-Arab, Bagdād, p. 205—206; al-Ṭabarānī, ed. de Goeje, passim; Kulkhashani, Ṣubb al-Arāj; Ibn Hishām, Sirā, p. 59 sqq. and many works dealing with the early history of Islam. (F. Kronkow)

**KHŪZĪSTĀN,** the land of the Khūz (Husayni), Kevvāz of Ptolemy, a province of Persia corresponding to the ancient Susiana, now officially called "Abūbīs, the country of the Arabs" because its desert plains have been overrun by the nomadic tribes of the Ka'b (Bedouin pronunciation Ca'b) and of the Banū Lām. The present boundaries of the province are, to the North, the mountains of the Zagros chain; to the West, the Kūkh [q. v.]; to the South, the river Dīrāh or Tāb and a line drawn across the desert from the confluence of the Kūrūn [q. v.] and of the Khur with the Shat' al-Arab [q. v.]; to the East Kurdishtān. The chief towns are Shushṭar (Tustar of the Arabs), the seat of the governor, Dīzful, Hawizā (Sūk al-Ahwāz, "the market-place of the Qatammad"), Rām Hormuz, Muhāmmarna, Behbeshā; the most inhabited of these cities, namely Feli, Bahluli, Kāhgheldi and Mānası, is under the Sāmānids this province included in those of the South (Nīmūz), the Christians who inhabited it formed an ecclesiastical province called Bēth Hūzayy; the capital was Bēth Lūddā, later called Gundishāpur. Conquered by the Arabs in the year 19 (640), it was defended by the Satrap Hūmmūzān, who, after the capture of Sūk al-Ahwāz (Hāmza Iṣfāhānī: Hūdijštān-wādāj), and his defeat at Rām Hormuz by Iṣkāsha, was besieged in Shushṭar for 6 months and gave himself unconditionally to the Caliph 'Omar. It was occupied by Mu'izz al-Dawla Ahmad b. Buwayh before the capture of Bagdād in 334 (945) and during the reign of the Mongol Ilkhan Ābāka it was given as a fief to the Aṭtādeq of Lūristān, Yūsuf Shāh J, as a reward for having saved him from a sudden attack of the Dailamis. It was for some time occupied by the Ottomans after the battle, which was lost by the armies of Shāh 'Abbās I in front of Bagdād in the year 995 (1587).

For Arab geographers Khūzīstān has for its boundaries, to the West, the canton of Wāṣīf and Dīl al-Raśīb; to the South, the shore of the sea from Shatt al-'Arab to Mehrūbān; to the East, Fars and 'Irāk-Adjamī (the boundary is marked by the Tāb); to the North, the course of the Kerka and the mountains of the Lūr. Important towns were: Sūk al-Ahwāz (capital), Sūs, Gundishāpur, Tustar, 'Askar Mokram, Rām Hormuz, Dawrāk (later Ţīb, Korkūb, Djobbī, Hitān Mahī). Climate warm, air unhealthy, particularly for strangers, rivers numerous, soil fertile (dates, wheat, barley, rice, sugar-cane). Population ugly and of bad character; inhabitants quarrelsome and greedy, copper-coloured, slight figure, beard scanty, hair bushy. Probably they were the residue of the negrooid tribes of the region. They still spoke at the time of the Arab conquest a peculiar language (kūzhī) which was neither Indo-European nor Semitic — perhaps it was the remains of the language of the Anzatis or Elamites; the remains of it are said to be preserved in the patois of the Dīzītān. After the wars with the Romans the people of Khūzīstān were transplanted there in the reign of Shāpūr I; the magnificent band of Tustar was built by the prisoners of war taken after the disastrous expedition of the Emperor Valerian. Industry developed in the country under the influence of the workmen carried off from Byzantine territory. At the present time the country is ruined; a few inhabitants maintain themselves in a few large villages; the plains provide pasture for bodies of nomads.

**Bibliography:** A. H. Layard, Description of the Province of Khūzīstān (Fourm. Roy. Geogr. Soc., xvii. part. i, p. 1—105); Delamarre, Mémoires d'histoire orientale, i. 127 sqq.; P. M. Sykes, History of Persia, i. 54, 56; ii. 94, 179, 257; Abu 'l-Yazīd, Taḵkīm al-Ralbān p. 311 sqq.; Muḥammad, B. G. A., iii. 402 sqq. (not in the index); Iṣtākhīr, B. G. A., i. 88 sqq. (not in the index); Ibn-Iṣfāhānī, B. G. A., ii. 170 sqq. (not in the index); Yūsuf, Mirzājan, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 496 = B. de Meynard, Dict. de la Perse, p. 277; J. Marquet, Études babyloniennes, p. 27, 144.

(Cl. Huart)

**KIAYA.** [See KEKHUHAD]  
**KIbla,** the direction of Mecca (to be exact, of the Ka'bah itself, the place between the water-spout [mizāh] and the western corner), which has to be observed during the salāt.

I. From very early times the direction at prayer and divine service was not a matter of choice among the Semitic peoples. There is already an allusion to this in I Kings, viii. 44 and it is recorded of Daniel (Dan., vi. 11) that he offered prayer three times a day in the direction of Jerusalem (which has remained the Jewish kibla to this day). As is evident from the names of the quarters of the heavens, the whole life of the Semitic peoples was turned eastwards. The Essenes prayed in the direction of the rising sun and the Syriac Christians also turned eastwards at prayer (Ancient Syriac Documents, ed. Cureton, p. 24, 62; Acta Martyrum orient., ed. Assemani, ii. 125). It may therefore very well be assumed in agreement with the tradition that Muhammad appointed a kibla at the same time as he instituted the salāt. It is certain that in the period immediately following the Hijāja the direction taken by the Jews was also used by the Muslims.

Tradition places the alteration in the kibla to 16 or 17 months after the Hijāja, in Radelj or Shāhīn of the year 2, probably rightly, for in this period we have the important change in Muhammad's attitude to the Jews. Disappointed at the slight success of his preaching among the Jews of Yathrib, he began to turn more and more to the old Arabian tradition and make the religion of Ibrāhim the basis of all monotheistic religions. The Ka'ba was brought into prominence as a religious centre and the Ḥadījī began to be talked of as a Muslim rite. At the same time a beginning was made with the eviction of the Jewish tribes of Yathrib. The alteration in the kibla is a not unimportant fact in this series of events and this train of thought. The Ḥadījī vers. ii. 156 sqq., refer to this: "Thus are the kiblas among the Pagans: Say: "What has induced them to abandon their former kibla? Say: to Allah belongs the east and the west. He guides whomsoever he pleaseth"
unto the right path. Thus have we made you an intermediate community, so that ye may be witnesses for mankind while the Prophet is a witness for you. We only appointed your previous kibla to distinguish him who follows the Prophet from him who turns back on his heels. Verily this is a grievous sin from which he is free who is guided by Allāh, but Allāh will not allow your faith to be of no avail for He is gracious and kindly to man. We see how thy face turns to all the quarters of the heavens so we will cause thee to turn to a kibla pleasing to thee. Turn then thy face toward the holy masjid; turn your face to it wherever you are. Whatever signs thou wert to give to the people of a scripture, they will not follow thy kibla’ etc.

The importance placed by Muḥammad himself upon the change is clear from these words. It is not necessary to assume with the tradition that it was brought about by scornful remarks of the Jews regarding Muḥammad’s dependence on the prescriptions of their religion (so Ṭabarī, ed. of Goeje, i, 1280). In other traditions, the new kibla was of Irābāt (Ṭabarī, Ǧafṣir, i, 378, ii, 13). Here we have a glimpse of the real truth of the matter, namely the connection with Muḥammad’s new politico-religious attitude. According to one tradition (Buḫārī, Ṣahīṭ, B. 32; Ǧafṣir, Sūra 2, B. 14) the revelation of the above quoted verses from the Kūrān was communicated to the believers in the morning slāt in Kūhā; according to another story Muḥammad had with a portion of the community performed two rak‘ās of the Zuhur-ṣalāt in a mosque of the Banū Salīma, when he turned round to the direction of Mecca (Baijāwī, on Sūra II, 139). The mosque received the name of Mosqīd al-ʾKiblātayn, the mosque of the two kiblas.

If it may then be considered established that Muḥammad and his community turned towards Jerusalem at the slāt during the early days of the Ḥijrā, the question still remains what was his kibla before the Ḥijrā. In Tradition two answers are given to this question and a third deduced by harmonising the other two. According to one, Muḥammad in Mecca observed the kibla to the Ka’ba (Ṭabarī, Ǧafṣir, ii, 4; Baijāwī, on Sūra II, 138); according to the other story the kibla had always been Jerusalem (Ṭabarī, Ǧafṣir, ii, 3, 8, ed. of Goeje, i, 1280; Bālāḏūrī, Futūḥ, p. 2.) according to the third (Ibn Ḥīṣām, p. 190, 228) Muḥammad in Mecca was careful to have the Ka’ba and Jerusalem in a straight line in front of him at the slāt. The first view is influenced by the theory of the “religion of Ibrāhīm” for al-Ṭibrīzī also makes Ṭabīb al-Muṭṭalaḵī already know that Ibrāhīm appointed the Ka’ba as kibla (Ḫūmāsā, i, 16). If the second opinion had not an historical basis, one does not quite understand how it could have arisen, for Tradition does not like to acknowledge Muḥammad’s dependence on Jewish practice. This view is therefore, in my opinion, the most probable. It is further mentioned as a distinguishing peculiarity of Bara’ ʾb. Maʿrūr that even in the period before the Ḥijrā he would not turn his back on the Ka’ba (Ibn Ḥīṣām p. 204); this tradition would lose its point if the old kibla had been in the direction of the Ka’ba. Besides these traditional views, others have been put forward in recent years. According to Tor Andrae, Der Ursprung des Islam und das Christentum, Uppsala and Stockholm 1926, p. 4 (cf. Buḫārī, Muḥammad’s Life, p. 212) the original kibla was to the east. Andrae bases his view not on the material of Tradition but on the general agreement between early Muslim and Christian religious usages. Schwally said that the Jerusalem kibla was introduced into Mecca, it is true, but not as a specifically Jewish institution, perhaps a Jewish-Christian one (Gecke der Voraus, i, 175, note k).

The direction of the kibla was, or is, not assumed at the slāt only and with the points of the toes (Buḫārī, Ṣalāt, bāb 28; ʿAḏāb, bāb 131; Nasrī, Sukhr, bāb 25; Ǧafṣir, bāb 96), but also at the dīwān (Buḫārī, ʿAḏāb, bāb 24), at the ʿirām or ʿirām (Buḫārī, Ḥadīṯ, bāb 29) and after the stone-throwing at the central ʿIjārā (Buḫārī, Ḥadīṯ, bāb 140–142); the head of an animal to be slaughtered is turned to the kibla and the dead are buried with the face towards Mecca (Lane, Manners and Customs, Paisley and London 1899; Snouck Hurgonje, Verspr. Geesk., iv/v. 243; v. 409).

The name of the Ḥajj in it is forbidden to turn towards Mecca when relating nature (Buḫārī, ʿIḥāf, bāb 11; Muḥammad, al-Ṭahāra, trad. 61; Nasrī, Taḥāra, bāb 18–20). On the question whether it is allowable in doing this to turn one’s back to Mecca and thus in some parts of Arabia be facing Jerusalem no unanimity prevails (cf. Buḫārī, ʿIḥāf, bāb 14; Ḥanūṣ, bāb 4; Ṣalāt, bāb 29; Muḥammad, Ṣalāt, trad. 59. 61 sq.; ʿAḏāb, bāb 4); one should not expectorate in the direction of Mecca (Buḫārī, Ṣalāt, bāb 33),

The observance of a kibla is given in old traditions along with the performance of the slāt and ritual slaughter as a criterion of the Muslim: The Prophet of God said: “The command has been given me to fight the people till they say: There is no god but Allāh; when they say these words, perform our slāt and slaughter in our way. Their blood and their property shall be inviolate for us”; etc. (Buḫārī, Ṣalāt, bāb 28; cf. ʿAḏāb, bāb 12). One of the terms to which the orthodox community is Ahī al-Kibla wa ʾl-Ljamiḥa. In many Muslim lands the word has become the name of a point of the compass, according to the direction in which Mecca lies; thus kibla (pronounced ʾibla) means in Egypt and Palestine, south, in the Maghrib, east.

In the mosques the direction of the slāt is indicated by the Miḥrāb [q. v.]; in classical Ḥadīth, this word does not occur and kibla is used to mean the wall of the mosque towards which one turns. At a slāt outside a mosque, a ʿutara [q. v.] marks the direction. In Egypt, small compasses specially made for this purpose are used to ascertain the kibla (Lane, op. cit., p. 228). — It should be noted that many mosques are not accurately but only approximately orientated (according to the ḥība). It sometimes happens that this error has been later corrected by the drawing of lines or the stretching of threads. This is, for example, the case in many mosques of the Dutch East Indies where the faithful at the slāt take their direction not from the miḥrāb but from such indicators (information kindly supplied me orally by Prof. Snouck Hurgonje).

The laws relating to the kibla are here given very briefly only and according to the ʿAḏāb school as laid down in al-ʾṢūrūṭī’s Kitāb al-Ṭarnāb (ed. Juynboll, p. 20). The adoption of a kibla is
a necessary condition for the validity of a şalát. Only in great danger and in a voluntary şalát on a journey can it be neglected. But if one is on foot or can turn his steed round, it should be observed at the ikbál, rubá’ and sunğúd. One should turn exactly in the direction of the kibla, and one who is near it can do so with certainty, and one who is remote as nearly as he can judge. According to others, in the latter case only the general direction (dira) is obligatory. Outside of Mecca one turns towards the mihrab within a mosque; when not in a mosque one follows the direction of reliable people; only a man who is in a deserted region is allowed to ascertain the direction for himself by means of certain indications. For details of the laws see the Bibliography.

Bibliography: The Qur’ān commentators on Sura ii. 136 sqq., A. J. Wensinck, Moham med en de Žoden te Medina, Leiden 1908, p. 108—110, 133—135; Caetani, Annales dell' Islam, iii., register; Th. W. Juyboll, Handeling tot de keunis van de Mohammedaansche Wet, Leiden 1925, p. 67, note 5; al-Nawawi, Muḥājir al-Taqībīn, ed. van den Berg, i. 69—73; al-Fārisī al-ʿAlamgīrīya, Calcutta 1828, i. 86—89; al-Muḥājir Abu ʿl-ʿAtisīn, Sharāt al-Islām, Calcutta 1255, p. 28—30 (transl. Querry, Droit Musulman, Paris 1871, i. 56 sqq.); al-Khalili, Muḥājirat, Paris 1900, p. 16 sqq.; (A. J. Wensinck). II. In terms of astronomical geography the direction of Mecca in any particular spot Ω is identical with the tangent, at the point Ω on the circle Ω M (fig. 1). It will form with the meridian southwest which holds for by far the greater part of the Muslim world. Once during the day as a rule the shadow of the pointer falls upon the kibla or on its prolongation beyond the foot of the style, which is called mihrāb, shabkī or shatī'. The mawṣūjt (caller of the hour) made this moment known from time to time by calling aloud, and in the same moment every other shadow pointed to Mecca. The shadow itself was called gīl before the zawāl and fāt in the afternoon. For large towns (e. g. Cairo) Muslim astronomers calculated the daily altitude of the sun for the moment at which it came into the direction of the kibla on its daily course.

Every Zādī of any size (book of tables, from the Persian zād, Arabic z̲īd [chord because the tables of sines or chords were the same]) deals with the calculation of the kibla. Arabic literature is not very rich in special tracts dealing with the ascertainment of the kibla. If the difference between latitude and longitude of the place in question was not great, a method of approximation, known even to the early Arab astronomers was used which gave results, sufficiently accurate for practical purposes. We find this method already used by Al-Batānī (929), Ibn Yūnūs (1009) etc. The process is as follows: the difference between the longitude of Mecca and that of the place in question is counted off westwards on the Indian circle (i.e. on a horizon circle) starting from the south point and eastwards from the south point (i.e. the two equal arcs S A and N B on fig. 2) and the two points thus reached A and B are joined by a straight line A B. Similarly the difference of the two latitudes is measured southwards from the west point and from the east and the two points thus found are joined by a straight line CD which cuts A B in K. A straight line from the centre of the circle Ω of the circle gives the direction of the kibla.

There are in Arabic literature numerical formulae for the finding of the angle α (inhirāf) by this method of approximation. For Cairo Ibn Yūnūs gives:

\[ \phi_1 = 30^\circ; \quad \phi_2 = 21^\circ; \quad \phi_1 - \phi_2 = 9^\circ. \]
\[ \lambda_1 = 55^\circ; \quad \lambda_2 = 67^\circ; \quad \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 = 12^\circ; \]
\[ KG = \sin (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1); \quad OG = \sin (\phi_1 - \phi_2); \]
\[
\sin \varepsilon = \frac{\sin (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)}{V \sin^2 (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) + \sin^2 (\phi_1 - \phi_2)}
\]
\[
\sin \varepsilon = \frac{12}{15}; \quad \varepsilon = 53^\circ,
\]
while he finds by the exact rules of spherical trigonometry \( \varepsilon \) to be \( 53^\circ 17' \). — The Persian astronomer Ali Shih Olai al-Munafidjim deals in this way with the case of Hamadan. He puts:
\[
\phi_1 = 35^\circ 10'; \quad \phi_2 = 21^\circ 40'; \quad \phi_1 - \phi_2 = 13^\circ 30';
\]
\[
\lambda_1 = 83^\circ; \quad \lambda_2 = 77^\circ 10'.
\]
(reckoning the longitudes from the "Fortunate Isles"); \( \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 5^\circ 50' \). From the construction of the figure we get \( \varepsilon = 23^\circ \), while worked out exactly by spherical trigonometry \( \varepsilon = 22^\circ 15' \). We see then that this approximating method of calculating the direction of the kibla is very useful for small differences of latitude and longitude but of course breaks down when this is not the case. Fig. 2 gives the construction for Hamadan.

In contrast to this approximate method Ibn Yusus in ch. xxviii. of his al-Ziyd al-Kabir al-Hakimi ("The Great Hakimi Tables", Oxford, Hunt. 331) gives quite an exact method of finding the kibla and by three different methods, of which the first is very remarkable inasmuch as the transcription of the text of Ibn Yusus gives us in modern language the cosine and sine equation of spherical trigonometry. The author shows that:

\[
\cos \Omega M = \cos X = \cos \phi_1 \cdot \cos \phi_2 \cdot \cos (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \pm \sin \phi_1 \cdot \sin \phi_2
\]
and
\[
\sin \varepsilon = \frac{\sin (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \cdot \cos \phi_2}{\sin \phi_1} (\text{fig. 1})
\]

If the two latitudes \( \phi_1 \) and \( \phi_2 \) refer to different hemispheres, the product \( \sin \phi_1 \cdot \sin \phi_2 \) is negative hence the double sign in the cosine equation. The other solutions go back to the division of any spherical triangle \( \Omega MP \) into two right-angled triangles.

An exact and mathematically interesting calculation of the inhiraf of the kibla is given by Abu 'l-Wafa (d. 998) in his Almudjizat (MS. 2494 Paris) for the city of Baghbad. He finds \( \varepsilon = 13^\circ 49' 9'' \). Abu 'l-Wafa's method of ascertaining the kibla (by the rule of the shadow) is very similar to that which had previously been made known by the Persian mathematician and astronomer al-Fadl b. Hātim al-Nairiz (d. 922/923), except that he found for the inhiraf of the kibla at Baghbad \( \varepsilon = 29^\circ 7' \) which is remarkably far out.

A next study of a purely constructive but exact method of ascertaining the kibla was given by the important Muslim mathematician Hasan b. al-Husain b. al-Hasith (d. 1059). It is as follows: the circle \( ABCD \) (fig. 3) with centre \( H \) is described on a horizontal wooden plane with any radius. Two diameters are drawn at right angles \( AG \) and \( BD \). From \( A \) cut an arc \( AC \) equal to the latitude of Mecca \( = \phi_2 \) on the circumference of the circle, which represents the horizon of the place for which it is desired to ascertain the kibla. Similarly the arc \( GR \) at the other end of the diameter is made equal to the latitude of the place \( \Omega = \phi_1 \). Finally the arc \( AN = \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \) indicates the difference in longitude of the two places in question. The perpendicular \( CT \) is then dropped on \( AH \) from \( C \) and with the radius \( HT \) an arc is described from the centre \( H \), which cuts \( HN \) in \( E \). \( EF \) is then drawn at right angles to \( AH \). On the radius \( HK \) section \( HK \) is cut \( = CT \) and a perpendicular to \( HK \) erected at \( K \) and \( KM \) made \( = FH \). From \( M \) the perpendicular \( MQ \) is dropped on \( BH \) and \( FS \) is cut off \( FH \) so that \( FS = MQ \). The angle \( EFS = \varepsilon \) is the inhiraf of the kibla.

The proof of the correctness of this construction is given in our author by transferring the area of the triangle pole — Mecca — place (\( \Omega \)) in the plane of the horizon of the place \( \Omega \) for which the kibla is being ascertained. The correctness of Hāthami's construction can however be easily proved as follows. If the radius \( HA \) of the circle be taken as \( = 1 \), the following are the successive equations yielded:

\[
H T = \cos \phi_2; \quad F H = \cos \phi_2 \cdot \cos (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) = KM,
\]
\[
C T = \sin \phi_2 = HK; \quad H L = \frac{HK}{\sin \phi_1} = \sin \phi_2.
\]
\[
K L = HK \cdot \cot \phi_1 = \sin \phi_2 \cdot \cot \phi_1,
\]
\[
M L = KM - K \lambda = \cos \phi_2 \cdot \cos (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) - \sin \phi_2 \cdot \cot \phi_1
\]
\[
EF = \cos \phi_2 \cdot \sin (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1).
\]

It further follows from the two right-angled triangles \( H K L \) and \( L M Q \) that:

\[
M Q = HK; \quad M L = HK \cdot \frac{\sin \phi_1}{\sin \phi_2} \cdot \sin \phi_1
\]
\[
\cos \phi_2 \cdot \cos (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \cdot \sin \phi_1 - \sin \phi_2 \cdot \cos \phi_1
\]
\[
= \cos \phi_2 \cdot \cos (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \cdot \sin \phi_1 - \sin \phi_2 \cdot \cos \phi_1
\]

Finally
\[
\cot \varepsilon = \frac{FS}{EF} = \frac{M L}{H L} = \frac{\cos \phi_2 \cdot \cos (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \cdot \sin \phi_1 - \sin \phi_2 \cdot \cos \phi_1}{\cos \phi_2 \cdot \sin (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)}
\]

or
\[
\cot \varepsilon = \frac{\sin \phi_1 \cdot \cos (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) - \cos \phi_1 \cdot \tan \phi_2}{\sin (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)}.
\]
but the latter formula is simply the well known cotangent equation of spherical trigonometry, applied to the spherical triangle \( \Omega P M \) in fig. 1. This formula at once gives the angle \( \alpha \). A full discussion of all possible cases of the situation of the place \( \Omega \) with reference to Mecca cannot be entered into here; the author gives no numerical examples.

The ascertaining of the azimuth of the kibla, as given by al-Biruni (d. 1048) in al-Kanun al-Mas'idi (Berlin, MS. Orient. 275, Mašala 5, chap. 6, f. 129v) is a similar geometrical nature to the above, as already given by Ibn Haitham, mentioned above, although of course much shorter. The late Arab astronomers, so far as we can judge, had made no progress beyond those of the middle ages in their kibla calculation. We know the process followed by Muḥammad b. Muḥ. b. 'Umar al-Djaghminī (d. c. 1345) in his Mulakhabhāt; it is the approximative method already known to us. The Samarqand astronomer Ulugh Beg used spherical trigonometry for ascertaining the kibla.

To the sixteenth century belong two pamphlets dealing specially with the direction of Mecca, namely one by Maimon Cens (d. 1544/1545) entitled Rihāla fi Takhkīs Sana'at al-Kibla (Constantinople, Library of the Aya Sofā, 2628) and the other by Khalil Ghans al-Din Ajmat al-Naṣīb al-Halabi al-Shāfi'i (d. 1564/1564): Fi 'l-Takhkīṣ al-Kibla (Cairo). These two works begin with various horizon operations (jamāl ofakhya) such as ascertaining the four cardinal points, the azimuth etc., after which comes the trigonometrical calculation of the kibla. In the first of the above mentioned treatises the already often mentioned approximative method is again explained (for the kibla of Constantinople).

In modern times the kibla has become a subject of orthographical studies. Thus J. I. Craig repeatedly mentions a "Mecca retro-azimuthal projection", the object of which is to make a map in which the true direction of the kibla can at once be read for any point on it. On such a map meridians are taken to be parallel equidistant straight lines. If one combines with this quality of retro-azimuthal accuracy in defining the distance from the centre in such a map in addition to the azimuth of the kibla, the shortest distance of every place from Mecca could be read. C. Schøy has published a sketch of the map, in which of course the straightforwardness of the meridional lines is dropped.

A table of plans with the corresponding inābiyyī of the kibla is given in the Gotha MS. Arab. 1483, which is a fragment of the astronomical tables of Ibn al-Shāhīr (d. 1375/1376).


(C. SCHøy) al-KIBRĪT, Sulphur. It is numbered by al-Kazwini among the oily bodies along with quicksilver, the various kinds of tar, naphtha and ambergris. Other writers include it among the ethers, the evacuating bodies, with the two kinds of sarūlāk (sulphide of arsenic, orpiment, and realgar), salamnamicac and quicksilver. Among the Arabs they used them in Pseudo-Aristotle, three kinds of sulphur are distinguished, the red of fine quality, the pure yellow, and the white; the latter would be the so-called "bath-sulphur" which smells of sulphuretted hydrogen. Red, probably quite mythical, sulphur is said to be found in the west in the vicinity of the sea and to be very rare. A man possessing unique qualities is therefore called "red sulphur". Flowers of sulphur were obtained from ferrous sulphide by roasting. The important uses of sulphur are for explosives in fireworks and for the colouring of metals. One series of metals becomes black with sulphur, e.g. lead and silver; sulphur silver is used in niello inlaying; the quicksilver also becomes black at first but on being heated red (cinnabar). Sulphur had many uses in medicine (cf. Ibn al-Baitār, al-Kazwini etc.).

In its natural state sulphur is found in three forms; all these were known to the Arabs. 1. In gypsum, chalk beds etc. Lumps of sulphur occur; in this form it was exported from al-Ǧurūr in the land of the Jordan (al-Mukaddasi, p. 184); it was also found in this form in Persia, Balūṭūn and in Sicily. 2. It is found in volcanoes, extinct as well as active, e.g. on Etna, Demwend etc.

3. It is obtained from sulphur springs; for example there are hot sulphur springs at Dawrāk al-Furs in Khuzistān, at which yellow sulphur is found (Guy Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, 1905, p. 242. Information on the occurrence of sulphur in the east is given in C. Hintze, HANDbuch der Mineralogie, part i, 1904, p. 80 and 87; B. Dammer and O. Tietze, Die nutzbaren Mineralien, part i, 1913, p. 93; O. Stutzer, Die wichtigsten Lagersäiten der "Nicht-Feuer", i. 1911, p. 251).

Among the alchemists sulphur has numerous epithets (cf. J. Rüsch and E. Wiedemann, Reiter- lv., Alchemische Dicknamen in S B P M S, Etr., lv., 1924, p. 17–36). It is described as the yellow, red, or white bride, or wax. Its colouring properties procured it the name of the "enlumining spirit" (al-rūh al-tābiḥ). The asphyxiating smell
of burning sulphur gave it the name of al-ḥamādāk (the asphyxiator); it was also called the “fetter of the escaped” (guard al-dagās) i.e. of quicksilver which corrodes with sulphur to form solid cinnabar. Some other epithets are given in Shams al-Din al-Dimishki (op. cit.) e.g. “cuckoo bomb” (ādāf al-dūkā); “sea-bird” (ṭair al-bahr); “pomegranate seed” (ḥabel al-rumānā); “liquid yākūt” (ışyākīt al-dīgās) etc. See M. Bethelous, La chimie au Moyen Âge, ii; al-Tāghrīb in Kitāb al-Liṣawār al-naḍir fī Sināʿat al-Iklīr (Berlin, Ahlwardt’s Katalog, No. 18361).

According to the natural philosophers sulphur is composed of atoms of water, air, and earth. Mixed and exposed to great heat they become coherent and form an oil which on cooling down becomes solid.

According to the teaching of the alchemists, sulphur along with quicksilver plays the main part in the formation of the most varied substances, especially metals. Here however sulphur and quicksilver are only general terms which have nothing to do with ordinary sulphur or quicksilver.


KIBT, the Copts, the name given by the Arabs to the Christians of Egypt. According to Arab writers, the word is derived from the name of a king of ancient Egypt, Kibti, who is said to have been a descendant of Noah. It was thought in Europe that this word derived its origin from the town of Coptos or that it was a corruption of Jacobites. One Coptic manuscript alleges that the Greeks called the Egyptians Copti because they had their children circumcised. It is now generally agreed that the word Kibti is a corruption of Agiuptos [Kalkashandi, i, 222; iii, 413; transl. Wüstenfeld, p. 119; Maqrizi, ed. Wiet, i, 69, 82; Vansleb, (Novellae) Relation, p. 6; Quatremer, Recercures sur la lang. et la lit. de l’Egypte], p. 30—32; Égypte, (collection Unis.) pittoresque, iii, 104; Macaire, (Hist. de l’Égl. d’Alexandrie), p. 5—6; B.L.E., 1894, p. 20; Butler, Copt. Church, i, 370; Lane, Manners, ii, 274; Stern, Copt. Gramm., p. 1; Steindorff, Copt. Gramm., p. 2; ibid., ii, 5.

The Copts and the Arab Conquest. When the Arabs conquered Egypt in 640, for nearly twelve centuries the country had been under foreign domination. Egypt had ultimately sunk to the level of a colony administered by the prefects of the Byzantine Empire. The people of the Egyptians for their part, nourished by bondage, must have increased to such a degree during the Byzantine period that it restored to the natives the feeling of their lost nationality.

Under the caliphate of Umar and, somewhat against his desire according to Muslim tradition, the Arab army conquered Egypt [Maqrizi, ed. Wiet, iii, 141—159; x, 14—39; (Cataan), Islam (French), p. 210—220, 237—228, 240; Rev. historique, cxxv. 273 sqq.; Diet. d’arch. (chrét.), iv, 2474—2476; ibid., ii, 6]. It seems little likely that the Arab general Amr b. al-‘As wished to confront the Caliph with the fast a mumpīs [Cataan, Annali, iv, 85—86: ibid., i, 339; ii, 5]; for the opposite view: J. Maspero, Origine, de l’Égl. byzantine, p. 9; Rev. historique, cxxiv, 309—310. Indeed the conquest of Egypt took place at a moment when the Persians, crushed two years previously at Kādīsya, were unable to create any diversion and when the Byzantines, cut off from Egypt by the Arab occupation of Palestine and of Syria, were unable to come to its assistance.

The Greek army in Egypt was defeated, because the rôles of police which it had played, had not prepared it for war and because, moreover, it was unexpected. In the sixth century a certain number of high officials were of native origin. The native population, long exposed to humiliating treatment by the Byzantines, did not render them assistance in this new conflict, and the Greeks could not even count upon their neutrality [J. Maspero, Origine, p. 5, 16, 42—43, 49—50, 83—84, 95; Ameine, Actes (d. Martyrs), p. 3; Rouillard, Administration civile (de l’Égypte byzantine), p. 15, 164, 193; J. Maspero, Hist. (de) Patricarches d’Alexandrie), p. 39. The manifestations of Egyptian nationalism, which date from the fourth century, took an unexpected development after the council of Chalcedon, in the absence of a well-defined Jacobite dogma, there are good grounds for thinking that the Egyptians were Monophysites, because their bishops had founded the doctrine and Severus of Aphrodisias says that the Chalcedonian thesis had not been able to penetrate into a certain convent “because all the monks there were Egyptians” [Patrologia Orientalis, i, 498; cf. J. Maspero, Hist. Patr., p. 16—17, 24—25, 49—51, 53; Annali, iv, 65—86]. In fact the Egyptians almost welcomed the Arabs as liberators. “It was no little advantage for us”, writes Michael the Syrian (transl. Chabot, iii, 413; cf. also p. 222), “to be delivered from the cruelty of the Romans, from their malice, from their anger, from their cruel zeal against us and to find ourselves at peace” (cf. Annali, iv, 85; J. Maspero, Hist. Patr., p. 250; Basset, Mélanges (africains et orientaux), p. 2), The same writer (ii, 432—433), who, although late, is habitually well informed, definitely asserts that the patriarch Benjamin gave up Egypt to the Arabs in return for a promise given that the latter would grant the Jacobites their churches. The bishop of Nikiou, always very accurate in the facts which he recounts, records strange deflections amongst the native leaders, and declares that certain garrisons refused to fight against the Muslims and even rendered them assistance [Johannes of Nikiou, transl. Zobdenberg, p. 357, 559—561, 563, 570, 573, 585; cf. Ibn al-Hakam (ed. Torrey), p. 58—59, 73; Eutychius (ed. Cheikho), ii, 24; Abu Saliha, p. 80; P.O., xi, 563; Maqrizi, ed. Biliak, ii, 492; Macaire, p. 231—234; J. Maspero, Orig., 126, 131—132; Rouillard, admin. civile, 220 sqq., Rev. historique, cxxv, 303—304]. Indirect evidence is also furnished by the numerous qubūtih of the Prophet in which
he recommends the Muslims to treat the Copts well (Maqrizi, ed. Wiet, i. 99). The historical romance Fateh al-Rahmani, also shows that the troops which resisted were mainly Greeks, that the enemy contingents comprised Arab Christian elements and that the natives were often disloyal (transl. Goltier, p. 58, 85, 89, 95, 105—106, 128—129, 154, 191).

The war of the Copts enabled them to find an excuse for their conduct. They already regarded Alexander, Diosclitan and Theodore as their companions, they boasted of having received numerous prophets, they had put forward the hypothesis that Jesus must have been born in Egypt, they held that their church had been founded by Saint Mark, an assertion which remains to be proved, that their country had furnished the first martyrs, before St. Stephen (J. Maspero, Hist. Patr., p. 26, 108; Abū Ṣalīḥ, 108 20—21, 47; Maqrizi, ed. Wiet, iv. 2, 126; Amélineau, Actes, p. 15—14, 30, 38, 103 sqq.; J. A., 1887, i. 24—26; Dist. arch. i. 1098—1101). Muhammad is believed to have ordered the Arabs to be kind to the Copts because one of the names of the Concilium of the Prophet, were Copts (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, p. 2—4; Sahih, i. 12; Maqrizi, ed. Wiet, i. 97 sqq.; Muhammad ibn al-Camal, iv. 279, 316; v. 310). Finally the conqueror of Egypt was preceded for his mission, because, in the course of a former journey, he had been present in Alexandria at the games in the circus and the ball, which, thrown at hazard, was to point out the future sovereign of the country, fell upon him (Maqrizi, ed. Wiet, iii. 125—128; Mustakhib al-Muharrar, i. 241—242; this without denying the existence of such divinatory proceedings: Michael the Syrian, iii. 57; R. M. M., iv. 85; Huart, Père antique, p. 60).

Another factor, the help of neighbouring Arab tribes of Egypt, also played a part, but it is impossible to estimate its value. A number of Arab tribes led a nomadic life on the coast from the Red Sea, from Sinai up to the Thebaid, and it has been noted that Strabo describes Koptos as a town under the Arabs (J. Maspero Organ., p. 13, 66; Lesquere, L'armée romaine, M.F.A.O., xii. 426—427; ibid., ii. 7).

The Islamisation, its Progress and Causes. The Arabs imposed upon Egypt a treaty, of which Tabari claims to give the accurate text (Tabari, i. 2588; cf. Kalkashandi, xiii. 324; Bibliotheque des Arabiens, ii. 168—170; Lane-Poole, Egypt (in the middle Ages), p. 7; Clermont-Ganneau, R. A. O., v. 156—194; Butler, The Treaty of Misr in Tabari), which must be compared with the similar treaties concluded in other countries (Abū Yūsuf, Kitiab-al-Kharaib, transl. Fagnan, p. 108 sqq., 195, 214 sqq.; Yākūt, i. 858; Kalkashandi, xiii. 357—359; Sauvage, Hist. de Jérusalem et d'Hébron, p. 36—41; Annali, ii. 349—352, 792; iii. 22—23, 221—222, 381—382, 562; iv. 40, 43, 354; v. 459—460; vi. 178, 237; J. A., 1852, i. 101—102, 1894, ii. 222—223; Goldziher, Dogma et loi de l'Islam, p. 29, 30; Mustafar, Cairo 1285, i. 134—135; Mich., xii. 609, 615, 674—672; B. I. F. Q. A., iv. 211; Muir, Caliphate (1915) p. 134 sqq.). The Christians of Egypt were treated like the other non-Muslims (ābi al-dhimma) of the growing Arab Empire. They had to pay a personal tax (dirāya), fixed in Egypt at two dinars for each adult male, in recognition of which they enjoyed the protection of the Muslims (āhiq). This statement is found throughout the Arab literature, but the papyri show it is inaccurate, in as much as the tax was proportionate to one's fortune (Rev. historique, cxx. 280). In a word, this régime was at first the prototype of the modern protectorate; the Muslim government assured the Christians of protection for themselves and for their property; those who did not receive a share in the distribution of the dirāya were not obliged to give military service.

The treaty in Tabari omits two important articles in the other treaties: the rules laid down in regard to dress and the question of religious buildings. The situation of the Christians in Egypt will be here examined in detail in chronological order, but for the sake of clearness it is better to examine these two questions separately.

The alleged edicts of 'Umar forbade the Christians to adopt in their garments and in their turbans the same colour as that of the Muslims; they had to wear a distinctive distinguishing a distinctive piece of material (qafir) as well as the belt called sa'ād (J. A., 1852, i. 111, 115; Butler, Copt. Church, ii. 103—104). It seems, however, that such a regulation was really much later and owes its origin to Harun al-Rashid (J. A., 1894, ii. 175; below ii. 169; cf. however, Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 27). But the most celebrated edict, and one that is recorded by the historians of Egypt, emanated from Mutawakkil (Yaḥyā, Hist., ii. 594; Eutychius, i. 59; Tabari, iii. 1399 sqq.; Abū Sahl, f. 52; Kalkashandi, i. 256; iii. 366; Maqrizi, Būlāk, ii. 494; Renaudot, Hist. Patr. Alex., p. 293—300, 608—609; Lane, Mannur, ii. 298; Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 391; Lammens, La Syrie, i. 137). These measures were revived by al-Hakim, who made them more severe; by Badr al-Din Ali in 479 (=1085), by the caliph Zāhir in an ephemeral fashion; and lastly by Shīrkuh (Yaḥyā al-Antākī, ed. Cheikho, p. 187, 195, 202—203; Ibn al-Ajīrat, s.a. p. 398, 411; Kalkashandi, xiii. 359—360; Yaḥyā, Dirāṣāt, ii. 247; Maqrizi, ed. Būlāk, ii. 286—288, 495—496, 507; Blouet, Hist. d'Egypte, p. 101, note; Quatremère, Mem. (sur l'Egypte), ii. 447; Wustenfeld, Fait et Mémoire, p. 189; Renaudot, p. 493, 519, R.O.C., xii. 196). We only know of one Ayūbid decree (Renaudot, p. 587), but in 700 (1301) Muḥammad b. ʻAbd allāh al-Mālik al-Nāṣir, at the instigation of an African, vigorously enforced the ancient ordinances (Kalkashandi, xiii. 377—387; Maqrizi, Būlāk, ii. 489—499; Quatremère, (Hist. des sultans) Mamlouk, ii. b. 117 sqq.; Ibn al-Isf, i. 143; Renaudot, p. 602—603; Lane, Mannurs, i. 300; Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 301; Alī Pāshā (Mubārak, Khiṭṭāt), i. 32; ii. 101; J. Maspero, Hist. Patr., p. 378). The Copts however freed themselves by paying a sum annually which in 709 (1309) aroused the wrath of Ibn Tajmiya (Z. D. M. G., iii. 559—560). The decree was not long in force since it was necessary to revive it in 721 (1321), in 755 (1356), in 820 (1421) and in 854 (1450) (Alāʾ b. ʻAbdallāh, ed. Pappi, p. 186; Ibn al-Isf, i. 201; Sakhāwī, (Ṭābīn mushakhn), p. 306; Dory, Hist. des noms de vêtements, p. 28; Quatremère, Mem., ii. 246—247, 260; Dict. arch., iv. 2479). From these successive revivals it can be concluded that these regulations quickly fell into disuse (Gaudin and Mombay, In Syriac, lxxxvii. 95). The Ottoman govern-rons revived them once more (Alī Pāshā, i. 57; Djaburt, French
transl., iii. 275; iv. 208—209; Muhammad ’All is said to have abolished them in 1807, and it was in vain that subordinate officials attempted to re-establish them in 1816 and in 1817 (B.I.F.E., 1900, p. 133—139; Djaharti, ix. 247—248, 266). The Coptic clergy have kept to the present day the custom of wearing black turbans.

The question of religious buildings received more attention from the Muslim rulers. The conditions laid down by ’Umar are Draconian: The Christians are forbidden to build any new church or any convent and it is further forbidden to rebuild edifices which had fallen into ruins (F. A., 1852, i. 110; Mafriqi, ed. Wiet, v. 117, ii. 761). In practice, in return for a money payment the Christians were allowed to repair their churches and their convents and even erect new buildings. On their settlement in the country the Muslims converted some churches into mosques; this was the regular practice under the Umayyads in the whole Muslim Empire (Caetani, Chronographia, p. 1056, 1175; van Berchem and Strzygowski, Amida, p. 51—52; Thiersch, Phares, p. 212). The Christians of Egypt had earlier installed certain churches in temples of the Pharaohs (Dict. arch., iv. 2455 sq.). Even when they built a completely new mosque, the Muslims took the materials from the churches, especially the columns (P. O., x. 512—515; Mafriqi, ed. Wiet, iv. 6; Durembourg, Gnomina, ii. 151, n. 4); this was in the eyes of the Muslims the right of the conqueror. It seems, however, that the legal theory of "new churches" scarcely dates back to the second (viii-th) century, for during the first century the Christians could build and restore as they desired (Eutychius, ii. 41; P. O., iii. 268; v. 24, 42, 119; vii. 399—400; xi. 606; Abu Sallih, fos 23, 29, 53; Mafriqi, Bu’akr, ii. 492; Renaudot, p. 178, 179, 184: Marcell, Egypt, 28; Lane-Poole, Egypt, 26; B.I.F.A.O., i. 143; Chronographia, p. 520, 589, 618, 758, 775, 825—826, 939; ibid., ii. 8). This liberal official attitude was not in accordance with the sentiment of the mass of the people and a permit to rebuild in 117 (735) caused a riot (Mafriqi, ed. Wiet, iv. 155). Numerous Christian buildings were destroyed in the course of the struggle against the last Umayyad (Abu Sallih, fos 60, 76). But these acts of war. Under popular pressure the year 170 (786) the governor ’Ali b. Sulaiman ordered the churches founded since the Muslim conquest to be destroyed, a measure resinded by his successor after a consultation of jurists (Kindt, p. 131—132; Abu Sallih, fos 23; Mafriqi, ed. Wiet, v. 117—118; Bu’akr, ed. iv. 493; 511; Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 32); and building on the finest scale went on again, in spite of the protestations of the people (Eutychius, ii. 58; P. O., x. 418—419, 460; Kindt, p. 554—555; Ibn Sa’id, ed. Tallqvist, p. 32—33). With the Fatimids a great era of prosperity opened for the Coptic churches and the convents,—except under al-Fakih, which will be discussed later. Besides, the decision really rested with the Christians who at last obtained the government offices (P. O., iii. 387—388; v. 561; Yahya, p. 186, 229, 231—234; Abu Sallih, fos 17, 24—25, 27, 30—37, 39, 41—42, 44, 48—50, 61—62, 66—67, 69, 78, 81—82; Ibn Muyassar, p. 79; Ibn Du’mkawk, iv. 78—79; Mafriqi, Bu’akr, ed., ii. 283; Renaudot, p. 370; Wustenfeld, Fatimidien, p. 131; Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 119, 170). More strict in regard to the Copts, the Ayyubids began by despoiling the churches of a part of their revenue, and while authorising certain restorations, they did not hesitate to do away with buildings which annoyed them. Besides, the wars with the Crusaders brought about the ruin of many churches. It is from the Mamluk period that the ruin of the convents dates (P. O., xi. 617; Abu Sallih, fos 7, 27—28, 33, 38—39, 45, 50, 81—82, 88, 90; Blachet, Hist. d’Egypte, p. 518, 559—560; Marcell, Egypt, p. 28; Amelina, Acta, p. 222; ibid., ii. 44). But the real catastrophe dates from the reign of Malik Nasir Muhammad b. Kaldan; after being withheld in 700 (1301) the mob rushed to attack the Christian buildings, and a general demolition of the fortresses and churches in 721 (1321): sixty churches were demolished and according to Muslim writers many convents were henceforth deserted (P. O., xiv. 459; Mafriqi, ed. Wiet, iv. 208—209, note: Bu’akr ed. i. 511—517; Quatremere, Mamm الصين, ii. 179 sqq.; Sakhawi, p. 73; ’Ali Pasha, i. 98—101; vii. 74 sqq.; Quatremere, Mémo., ii. 225—239; Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 301, 310—312; Kromer (de l’Orient chrétien), xxii. 393: Dict. arch., iv. 2476—2482; Lane, Mommsin, ii. 300—302; ibid., ii. 8). Churches were again demolished in 755 (1354) and a large part of their revenues was confiscated. In the course of the nineteenth century the regulations of the Caliph ’Umar are said to have been at different times solemnly revived (Mafriqi, ed. Wiet, i. 296; Bu’akr ed. i. 490—500; Sakhawi, p. 36—40, 124—125, 145; Ibn Lyds, i. 206—207; ii. 35; Bull. Soc. Géogr. d’Egypte, xii. 79; ’Ali Pasha, i. 38; B.I.F.E., 1907, p. 167). Under Ottoman rule the authorities permitted the restoration and even the foundation of churches, although amongst Muslim legal circles less liberal doctrines were still upheld until the beginning of the nineteenth century (’Ali Pasha, vi. 84—85; Djaharti, iv. 20; v. 218; viii. 246).

After elucidating these two points, we can now review in chronological order the main events in the history of the Copts under Islam. The chief concern of the Caliph was to make no change in the administration of Egypt. He appointed a governor general sometimes the position was held by two officials, the one undertaking the political administration, the other carrying out the religious duties. The governor had under him two subordinates, a prefect of police and a kadi. The military occupation was reduced to a certain number of posts (ribaḥ or mākhū) scattered along the Mediterranean coast and on the desert frontiers of the Delta. Under ’Abd al-Aziz b. Marwan (65—86 = 657—705) there were 30,000 men. The country remained divided into pagarchies called ābāra, transcription of ṣūra; at its head was the šahīb al-būrā, translation of ṣāfāwūk; the subordinate officials also bear Greek names; these are the ḥalāj (avvōrdakos) the maqāī, the origin of which is not known for certain, the ḥulayfā (yavros).— Cf. Ibn ’Abd al-Hakam, Glos., 48, 58; Kindt, p. 414—419; Mafriqi, ed. Wiet, i. 114, 323; Bu’akr ed., ii. 259; Michael, ii. 35; J. Maspero and Wiet, Matrimmions (pour servir à la géogr. de l’Egypte), p. 170—171; Dict. arch., iv. 2836; Ill., ii., 254—255; 304 sqq.; xxv. 95—96; Bell, Ḡārīd. Papyr. xxvii. 477, xxxv., xxxv. 15, 65, 78, 447; W. Z. K. M., xi. 114; Z. A., xx. 76; Kilo, ii. 206—209; B.I.F.E., xi. 155—161. The absolute impossibility which the Arabs found of governing by means of their own is sufficiently established by the papyri. The
Arab occupation lived by the institutions which it found in Egypt and allowed itself to be administered by Copts who were supervised and docile. According to the papyri and the authors, all the provincial officials were Copts during the first hundred years of the occupation until the end of the Umayyad period (P. O. v. 5, 9—10, 12, 18, 48, 57, 64; Makrīzī, ed. Wiet, i. 249, n. 3; Michael, ii. 475; Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 15; Annali, v. 319—455; Chronographia, p. 253, 296, 758, 911, 1091, 1112, 1164; Muir, Caliphs, p. 167; Pap. Schott-Reinhardts, p. 21, 27, 37, 42; P. E. R. Mitt., i. 6—7; Bell, Ahr. Pap., p. xxxiiii; Z. A., xx. 72—75, 77; Id., ii. 245—246, 257—258, 271, 361, 364—365, 381; J. Maspero and Wiet, Matériaux, p. 10—12, 172, 229; Monneret de Villard, Sculpture ad Ahdās, p. 23; ibid., ii. 8, 12—15). The fiscal organisation was also modelled on the Byzantine, without regard for the rules otherwise laid down by the Muslim doctrine. The Christians, old men, women and children excepted, had to pay from 40 dinhars to 4 dinars, to provide for the upkeep of the army, corn, oil, honey, cloth and to procure a lodging for a period of three days for every Muslim. The Coptic officials continued to collect the Annona corn which was sent to Medina (Makrīzī, ed. Wiet, i. 322—323; Bib. d. Arabians, ii. 178; J. Maspero, Organ., p. 112; Becker, Beiträge z. Gesch. Aegypt., ii. 84—85; Pap. Schott-Reinhardts, p. 42 sqq.; Bell, Ahr. Pap., p. xxxii sqq.; Id., ii. 251—252, 271, 277—278, 282, 382, 384; J. Maspero and Wiet, Matériaux, p. 85; Chronographia, p. 241; J. A., 1886, i. 440; Bourdon, Anc. cahaux, anc. sites et ports de Sace, p. 6 sqq.; M. L. Egypte, vi. 337). At the very first the Copts were happier than under the Byzantine régime; the exiled bishops with the patriarch at their head once more took possession of their sees. They lived in such peace that they played no part in the grave events in which the Muslim troops of Egypt participated — the assassination of ‘Uthman, the duel between ‘Alī and Mu‘awiyah, the rivalry of Ibn Zubair. The Arabs did not persecute anyone on account of his religious ideas (P. O., i. 495—497; v. 12; Renaudot, p. 160; B. E. E., 1885, p. 340—361; Annali, v. 4). It would, however, be wrong to extend this observation to the Umayyads and especially to contrast the toleration of the Umayyads, “who did not seek to make proselytes”, with the spirit of persecution which is said to characterize the ‘Abbasids (Dict. Arch., ii. 2829, 2841). No doubt the Jacobites had cause to rejoice at being given back the churches formerly confiscated by the Melkites; besides, although it did not compensate for the losses, the adhesion to the Monophysites must be noticed of a few Melkites, with the object of escaping the double djisya which was imposed upon them by Kurra b. Shariq’s principal adviser, naturally a Jacobite (P. O., i. 341; Quatremercès, Méid., ii. 39; Id., ii. 364; Chronographia, p. 1091). It is, however, stated in accurate texts that the Umayyad governors were not always kind to the Copts (P. O., v. 13—16, 54—57, 60—61, 68, 75—76, 86, 92, 98—99; vi. 217—234; Abū ʿAllāh, fol. 83—84; Chronographia, p. 1024, 1091). It is necessary to add that it was a question of taxation which became more and more severe and not of religious persecution in the narrow sense of the word. Besides, the Copts, with very rare exceptions which will not be noted, were never put in the position of having to apostatise to save their lives, and we do not find throughout the whole history of Muslim Egypt a single measure that can be compared with the persecution of Diocletian. It shows contempt for historical statements to oppose Byzantine toleration to Muslim fanaticism (M. F. O. R., i. 109; Muir, Caliphs, p. 362—363). Finally it may be mentioned for this first period that Christian annals were compiled in the monasteries, and that the monks took good care to describe as persecutions measures which deprived them of the advantage of remaining a privileged class (Marcel, Égypte, p. 33). Under the Umayyads as well as under the ‘Abbasids the Christians enjoyed liberty of worship. The governors only took care to have their Coptic lessons and prayers translated for them in order to be sure that they contained no insults to Islam. The bishops were allowed to meet in councils; the government watched over these councils, especially in the case of the election of a patriarch. It enquired also into the relations which the clergy were allowed to enter into with a foreign power. The Christian writers praise the liberalism of the Caliph ‘Uthman; but at this time the fiscal system was well established and applied without favour (P. O., i. 24, 28—29, 34—37, 51, 56, 68, 73—75, 194; x. 371; Renaudot, p. 190; Chronographia, p. 825, 864, 952, 1337, 1340, 1472; Rev. histor. xcviii. 283—284). We shall now give a chronological exposition of the measures which were passed. In the year 70 (689) the religious problems on the outside of the churches were destroyed. Since the monks at first had been exempt from the djisya, many Copts assumed the robe in order to escape the tax. But these monks, according to the testimony of Byzantine authors, possessed considerable wealth. From before the year 86 (705) the monks were subjected to a tribute and forced to pay one dinar a year (P. O., v. 51, where the absurd must be corrected and its translation "translated"). This edict promulgated by ‘Umar II whose tolerant spirit is specially mentioned by Christian authors, was renewed by ‘Umayr b. Isma‘il in the same conditions. In 87 (706) Arabic became obligatory for all administrative offices. Some years later Kurra b. Shariq, whom the Muslims revile as much as the Christians, impoverished the churches to such an extent that the priests had to use chalices of glass and wooden dishes. It was the same governor who appears to have seen to it that the lower ranks of officials were Muslims, but the measure was not made general until the year 100 (718). The Caliphs Walid and Yazid II renewed in the year 95 (714) and 104 (722) the order to suppress religious emblems. In 109 (727) immediately after the first revolts of which we are going to speak, the government settled in the eastern region of the Delta 5,000 Arabs of the tribe of Kais. Finally in the year 112 (730) in order to obtain a better return from the taxes and following the example of what had been done in other parts of the Muslim Empire a general census of the population was taken (Talhawi, tr. Zotenberg, iii. 229; Abū Yusuf, tr. Fagnan, p. 64—65; Kindi, p. 69, 76—77; P. O., v. 24, 62, 64, 67, 70—73, 1(531,919),(661,957); xvii. 679; Michael, ii.
The Copts endeavoured by every means to escape from this tax. When it was useless to take refuge in the monasteries they decided to quit the villages where they were registered and to settle in other districts where, being not so well known, they had a chance of escaping the tax. This movement of fugitives (σκαλάντια) was general and every effort was made by the government to thwart it. No one was allowed to go out of his native district without being furnished with a passport, a measure which has wrongly been represented as vexatious; the delinquents were to be branded with a red hot iron (P. O., v. 64, 69-70; [Pseudo-] Denys, tr. Chabot, p. 123-124; Renanot, p. 199, 201; Marcel, 456, p. 37; Roillard, Admin. civile, p. 6, 9, 115, 171; B. I. E., 1880, p. 10-11, 100; Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 27; Dict. arch., ii. 2829; id., ii. 257-258, 269-270, 273-276, 279, 367-369, 378-380; Pop. Schot-Reinhardt, p. 40; Beck, Akadem. Pap., p. xx., xli., xliv., xlvii., xlii., xx, xxv.-97; xviii., 139 sqq.; Chronographia, p. 1025, 1211; B. I. E., 1908, p. 107; M. F. O., xi. 150-160).

Finally the Copts decided upon open rebellion for fiscal reasons. Blood flowed in Egypt, principally on the Delta, for more than a century. The first insurrection took place in 107 (725). Revolts followed in 121 (739), 132 (750), 135 (753), 150 (767), 157 (773). Lower Egypt was then convulsed by risings which have nothing especially Coptic about them — it must be said in passing — show already the numerical weakness of the Christian element. They lasted from 194 to 211 (809-826) and were a repercussion of the struggle for the Caliphate between Amin and Ma'mūn; the chief part was played at Alexandria by the Spanish Arabs exiled from Cordova (Kindi, p. 73-74, 81, 94, 96, 102, 116, 119; P. O., v. 76, 188-189; x. 427-428; Michael, ii. 500-501; Makrizi, ed. Wiet, i. 333-334; iii. 181-185, 201-207; Bu'llāk, ii. 492-493; Ibn Rāḥib (ed. Cheikho), p. 126; Renanot, p. 226 sqq., 251 sqq.; Bib. des Arabians, ii. 191-192; Quatremère, Rech., p. 153-159, 197-198, 201-212; Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 29-31, 35-36; Becker, Beiträge, ii. 109, 115, 120; Dict. arch., iii. 2829; J. Maspero and Wiet, Matériaux, p. 31, 42, 47, 59, 76, 99, 103, 130, 209, 217; Chronographia, p. 1107, 1151, 1524; Caetani, Cron. generale, i. 65, 88; ibid., i. 32).

The Coptic risings begun under Umayyad domination cannot then be put down to any particular brutality of the ʿAbbāsids; the governors of the new dynasty were led to regard the natives as rebels. The ʿAbbāsids increased the burden of taxation, but not especially on the Copts, since it was on this account that the Arabs revolted in the Delta in 78 (794), 156 (802), 191 (807) and in 214-215 (829-830). At this latter date, the Christians of the central part of Lower Egypt called ʿA-bmirī, entered into the struggle. The physician Ibn Rīḍūn at Dīmashq remarks upon their ferocity and their stupidity. The conduct scandalised the Christians themselves, and the Coptic clergy strove in vain to calm their unruliness. The Caliph Maʾmūn, at the time in Syria, was induced to come to Egypt; very liberal, he charged an ecclesiastical of his suite, the patriarch Denys of Tell-Mahīr, with the task of obtaining by kindness the submission of the rebels. The ʿA-bmirīs would not yield; they were crushed by Aṣḥān and a large number were massacred. A number of survivors, including women and children, were transported to the region of Baghbaḍ where some of them covered themselves with glory fighting against the Zarqāʾ (Kindi, p. 190-192; Enycch. ii. 26). The usurpers were completely exterminated in 486-490; Ibn Rāḥib, p. 129; Michael, iii. 76-84; Makrizi, ed. Wiet, i. 293, 334, 337-340; iii. 3, 7, 141, 186; Bu'llāk, ii. 494; Renanot, p. 272 sqq., 279 sqq.; Quatremère, Rech., p. 156-161, 170-174; Bib. des Arabians, i. 256-257, 263; Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 35; Becker, Beiträge, ii. 120-121; Mittheilungen L'agir, l'Ethiopien, i. 96; R. O. C., xiv. 279; J. Maspero and Wiet, Matériaux, p. 24, 43-45). This was the last rebellion of the Copts: "From that time they were in subjection throughout all the Egyptian territory, and their power was definitely crushed. None of them had the power to revolt or even resist the Government; the Muslims were the majority in the villages" (Makrizi, ed. Wiet, i. 334-335; Bu'llāk, ii. 1; ed. ii., p. 494; Quatremère, Rech., p. 198).

Denys of Tell-Mahīr has left a very severe judgment on the Coptic clergy. He is indignant at their ignorance and rages against the simony which flourished everywhere (Michael, iii. 80; Bibl. d. Arabians, i. 257-258). The Coptic bishops retorted that the simoniacal practices were necessary for the recovery of the wealth of the church, hard hit by taxation. It is a fact that one of the first ʿAbbāsids governors condemned certain bishops to work at the Arsenal because they refused to give up their sacred vessels (P. O., x. 374). This policy of an excessively severe system of taxation succeeded in emptying the monasteries. It is striking to note that the monastic inscriptions cease in the tenth century (Dict. Arch., iii. 2830, 2841). However in purely religious matters the government remained tolerant. The Christians were allowed to enter the mosque to bring a law-suit before the Kāḍī. In 169 (785) a Copt who had insulted the Prophet was only put to death on the reasoned opinion of the imām Mālik who was consulted at Madīna (Kindi, p. 382, 390-391).

Before the coming of the Fatimids there were two attempts to gain independence, which are worthy of note here; those of the Tābanīdīs and of the ʿAlīshīdīs. Ahmad b. Ṭūnūn imprisoned the patriarch Michael III because he did not pay a fine. Here again there was no religious persecution properly so called. For this dynasty as well as that of the ʿIkshīdīs seems to have taken into account Christian public opinion, from which they gained support against Baghbaḍ. It is
well known that Khumār Awaith [q. v.] ennumerated with art took pleasure in visiting the convents; it is reasonable to believe that the Copts knew how to profit by this. Under the Ikhsidids the influence of Christian officials appears. The government did not make peace for nothing during the popular troubles which burst forth at Fustat in 349—350 (960—961) on the news of the victories of Nicephorus Phocas. On the contrary a rescript from the Caliph dated 313 (925) had already prepared a pacification throughout the whole Muslim Empire, by deciding that the giyya would not be imposed upon the bishops, monks and necessary laymen. The Ikhsidids honoured by their presence the public celebrations of Christian festivals. A contemporary Muslim traveller, Mas‘ūdi does not appear to be shocked by this (Appendix to Eutychius, ii. 292; Abū Yusuf, tr. Fagon, p. 185; P. O., xvi. 242; xvii. 717, 779—780, 782—783, 799; Abū Sallih, fo. 49—50; Mursālik al-abhār, i. 563; Makrizi, ed. Wiet, iv. 231: Būlāk ed., ii. 152—153, 494; Renaudot, p. 324; Marcel, Egypte, p. 83; Schlumberger, Nicéphore Phocas, p. 125; Lane-Poole, Egypt, p. 66, 85—86; Becker, Beiträge, i. 62).

This attitude of the Ikhsidid government is confirmed by the edict imposed by the first of the Fatimid caliphs, Mu‘izz, who forbade these public rejoicings. This ostracism endured for only a short time and from the accession of his successor A‘zīz, Christian ceremonies recommenced with more pomp than in the past. Thus it was during the time of the Fatimid and with An eclipse under Hākim. The favour which the Christians enjoyed is attested by one of their first acts, the transfer to Cairo of the office of archbishop. A‘zīz had a Christian wife whose two brothers he himself appointed archbishops of Jerusalem and of Alexandria respectively. Being liberal, he encouraged controversies between Christians and Muslims and he refused to prosecute renegade Muslims. The resentment in Muslim circles must have been terrible. It explains and in part excuses the exasperation of Hākim who pursued the Christians with his hatred with the direct object of abating their growing influence (see the definite statement of Makrizi, Būlāk, ii. 31, 495). But it must be remembered that Hākim was a ferocious persecutor. He threw to wild beasts the patriarch Zachariah, to whom, according to Christian chronicles, they did no harm; this act of brutality was perhaps committed at the instigation of a monk. He prohibited the celebration of Christian festivals, forbade the Christians to possess slaves, to have Muslims in their service; he seized the property of the Church and he caused a considerable number of crosses to be burnt. Then he passed on to the destruction of the churches with such rage that he is said, — but this is without doubt exaggerated by Muslim writers — to have destroyed between the years 401 and 405 (1014—1016) no less than thirty thousand churches in Egypt and in Syria. He had decided upon the exile of all the Christians, but the decree was rescinded before it could be put into action. A measure of general dismissal of the Christian functionaries resulted in a complete check. In spite of everything the judgments of the Synagawe (on this Caliph are not malevolent (P. O., iii. 289). Zahir inaugurated his reign by a measure of justice authorising the Christians to return to their religion, who bewildered by the madness of Hākim had become converts to Islam (for a condemnation to death see however Yahya, p. 238). Under the Caliph Mustansir, the vizier Ya‘qūb made the Christians submit to numerous vexations; he ordered the closing of the churches and the incarceration of the patriarch Christodoulos, under the pretext that the latter had instigated the King of Nubia not to pay the agreed tribute to Egypt. These incidents which were terminated by a heavy fine inflicted upon the patriarch were perhaps not quite unconnected with the fall and the putting to death of Ya‘qūb. Under the Caliph ‘Amil, who liked to be entertained by the monks of the convent of Nāxya in the suburbs of Cairo, the tendency is to liberalism. Credits were provided in the budget for Christian ceremonies. Towards the end of his reign a monk Abū Nadjāḥ played the part of a kind of prime minister to him; this monk who assumed the arrogance of a grand seigneur had the effrontery to go even into the mosque and insult the Muslims; this action cost him his life. Hāfuq, who like his predecessor, loved a sojourn in the monasteries, had as his vizier an Armenian Christian, Bahram, who received the title of saif al-islam, the "sword of Islam". However of Muslim councilors of the Caliph, he accepted all his commands. Bahram, all powerful, made a large number of Armenians come to Egypt and contributed to the restoration of many churches. The Muslim revolt burst forth and overthrew the minister, his successor Riḍwān favoured a violent reaction against the Christians, driving them from the administration, bringing about confiscations, ordaining even summary executions. But the country was to be troubled by the rivalries of ministers who fought for power with armed force and the Christians suffered from this state of affairs neither more nor less than the Muslims. It is in this sense that we must interpret a very touching Coptic document, the; inscription of the jar found at Dār al-Nūn, dated 872/1256 (Ann. du Serv. des Antiquités, i. 117—119; B. F. A. O., iv. 75; Dict. arché, i. 1707—1710; ii. 2866; Crum, Coptic Monuments, no. 8104). The incident which commemorates should not be regarded as a persecution of the Christians, any more than we would charge the government with the plundering of the convents of Scete and the massacre of the monks in the region of the Fātimid Mustansir (Ibn Ribih, p. 128; Renaudot, p. 443; Quattremer, Mem., ii. 400). Churches and convents were destroyed wherever there was fighting and naturally Christian buildings were not spared in the burning of Fustat by command of Shāwar [q. v.], who had a church restored at Kyū. The Ghuzz troops who accompanied Shirkūh quarrelled with the Fātimid, negro, Turk or Armenian troops and then the Copts; just as the soldiers of Shirkūh [q. v.] violated the tomb of Shenoudi at the White Convent. The History of the Patriarchs records the execution of a monk who refused to apostatise. This can hardly be an isolated case at this time (Yahya, p. 195—197, 203—205, 235—236, 239; Ibn al-Kallânis, p. 66—68; Abū Sallih, fo. 25: 43: 47, 61—66, 81—82; Ibn Ribih, p. 135—136; Ibn Muyassar, p. 71—72, 78—79, 82, 84: P. O., iii. 288, 350—357; Kalâba-an, viii. 280: Makrizi, ed. Wiet, iv. 226, 228—229, 231—234, 240; Būlāk ed., i. 357; ii. 286—288, 495—496, 507; Abū ‘Iḥmaṣ, ed. Popper, u. 63, 101; Renan, ibid.
They were indispensable in the management of business and some Muslim writers had the courage to recognise this, while deploring their arrogance. 

In order to satisfy public opinion, the government from time to time decreed their dismissal, and a month after the decree, the Copts whom they found indispensable, resumed their offices. These periodic dismissals took place in 678 (1279), 682 (1283), 700 (1301), 712 (1321), 755 (1354), 822 (1419), 825 (1422), 852 (1447) (P. O., xvi. 777; Ibn Fadl Allah, Tarif, p. 63; Kalkashandi, viii. 36; Makrizi, ed. Wiet, ii. 88, 93, 110, 111; Bûlûk ed. ii. 42, 75, 85, 90, 237, 391, 497-498, 507; Quatremère, Sultans mamelouks, iii. 5, 123, 124; ii. 8; iii. 135, 179, 213; Abu l-Mahasin, ed. Popper, vi. 319, 400, 450, 456, 464, 468, 559, 665, 718, 724, 819-820, 823; vi. 160, 269, 272, p. 277, 578; Sakkhâwi, 215; Ibn Iyâs, ii. 93, 201, 268; ii. 48-49, 67, 80, 171, 197, 255; Ali Fâshî, ii. 27; vi. 40; Marcel, Égypte, p. 173; Quatremère, Mêm., ii. 223-225, 242, 247, 261-262, 288; B. I. F. A. O., i. 126-127, 175, n. 4; R. O. C., xiii. 196; Gaudemay-Demobynes, La Syrie, xvii.; Wiet, Les secrétaires de la Chancellerie, extrait de Müh. R. Basset, 22; C. I. A., Jerusalem, i. 334-335; ii. 132; ibid., i. 683, 846.

The government during normal times maintained courteous relations with the Coptic Patriarchate, on whom the Mamlûk chancery bestowed pompous titles. He forbade him to enter into secret engagements with the Negus of Abyssinia. There were incidents in regard to this in 826 (1423) and in 852 (1448) (P. O., xvi. 443; Kalkashandi, xi. 85, 100, 395-405; Sakkhâwi, p. 210; Abu l-Mahasin, ed. Popper, vi. 572).

At the same time popular manifestations forced the government to take more serious measures than a simple dismissal of officials. Besides, the most severe measures were continually passed with the object of exciting a ransom; for the Christians were more especially molested at times of financial crisis for the government. One single incident stands out as worthy of attention. In 700 (1301), a date often already cited, the Mamlûk government caused the greater part of the churches to be shut throughout the whole of Egypt. It excepted the town of Alexandria, perhaps in order not to provoke foreign interference, for the Mamlûks also suffered by this order and two ambassadors sent by the Byzantine Emperor and the King of Aragon, obtained the re-opening of some of the churches (P. O., i. 567; xii. 356, 477; xiv. 449; Makrizi, Bûlûk ed. ii. 849-1-32, 130, 292, 399; Quatremère, Sultans mamelouks, ii. 180; Renadouf, p. 604-605; Quatremère, Mêm., ii. 223-224, 257; Ibn Iyâs, ii. 35; Marcel, Égypte, 165; J. A., 1887, ii. 210; J. Maspéro, Hist. Patr., p. 378).

The Muslim writers relate the story of the sacrifice of a virgin thrown into the Nile to obtain an abundant harvest, a custom which the Muslims had abolished (Sakkhâwi, p. 12-13; Lane, Mammers, ii. 229-230; Bull. soc. Khédive. de. Geogr., vii. 158-159; J. Maspéro and Wiet, Matériaux, p. 216-217; Chronographia, p. 242).

It is hardly likely that the Christians had retained a human sacrifice, for which, besides, there is no evidence in classical texts (Maspéro, Hist. des peuples de l'Orient, i. 24, n. 2; Frazer, Myths, ii. 38-40; no analogy with sacrifices following military expeditions: Amelineau,
Actes, p. 80, n. 4). Special mention is made among the Christians of Egypt of a liturgical rite to secure the rise of the Nile (Dict. Arch., iv. 2561—2562). In the Mamluk period the Christians had still retained the custom of throwing into the Nile a little casket containing the finger of a martyr. This ceremony which gave rise to abuses, forbidden from 702 to 738 (1303—1337) was definitely suppressed in 755 (1354) and the Church of Shubra-Dammanhûr, where the festival took place in a suburb north of Cairo was destroyed (Idem, Descr. de l'Afrique, transl. 178; Matilik al-’Ahir, i. 361; Maqrizi, ed. Weit, i. 292—296; Bulak ed. ii. 500; Quatremère, Sultans mamelouks, ii, b. 213—214; Renautot, 606; Sakkâwi, p. 12; Ibn Yâsîn, i. 206—207; B. I. Egypte, 1907, p. 167—168; B. I. F. A. O., i. 176).

The Jacobite patriarchate in 1442 signified its adherence to the Council of Florence of two centuries after a fruitless attempt at reunion with Rome attempted by the Patriarch Cyril III. The Coptic Church was united to Rome for a century and a half by very loose bonds and it appears as if the most of the people did not trouble about it, in spite of the correspondence exchanged between the Papacy and the Patriarch of Alexandria, and its spirit of the Council of Memphis in 1582. In any case it was to regain the support of the Ottoman Pâshas that the Coptic Church dropped all relations with Rome (Renautot, p. 611—612; Macarius, p. 298, 309, 303 sqq., 323—326, 336; B. I. Egypte, 1904, p. 197—211; Machirch, x. 534—540; Bussearion, xxxiii. 133—161).

Under the Ottoman Pâshas, the financial administration remained largely in the hands of the Copts. Christian popular festivals, especially in the country, were held with the approval and even with the participation of the Muslim elements. This period saw the avanizis flourish, about which the archives of the convent of St. Saviour of Jerusalem give so many particulars (Castellani, Catalogo dei firmari, Jerusalem, 1923). The Copts had to endure these fines inflicted on the slightest provocation, and this resulted in the closing of the churches until the fines were completely paid. The first governors exacted the payment of the special imposts due from tributaries. In the first half of the xviiith (xviith) century the assessment of the dîziya was even increased. Then we come to a period of anarchy, where “nothing happened worthy of being recorded except irritating and arbitrary acts of the Emirs” (Djabarti, v. 208, 218). These troubles had economic reactions which affected the whole of Egypt, but it does not appear that the Copts suffered from them more particularly (Vansleb, Relation, p. 93, 110, 189—190; Bib. d. Arabisants, ii. 9—10, 12—13, 19; Marcel, Egypte, p. 234; Djabarti, ii. 10, 114—116; iii. 132, 157; iv. 144, 208—209, 217—221; v. 13, 23, 217—218; Savary, Lettres sur l’Egypte, i. 302; Ali Pâshâ, vi. 84—85; Ch. Roux, Les origines de l’expé. d’Egypte, p. 41—43; B. I. Egypte, vii. 166—167).

Ryme says that on the arrival of the French, the Copts were “poor, brutalized and engaged only in the most ignoble callings”; they were “tax-collectors, spies, managers of the business affairs of the Mamluks” (Egypte, Un. pitt., ii. 27 sqf). Bonaparte did everything to prevent the Muslims from thinking that he favoured the Christians, who had nearly been massacred at the landing of the French. To “secure himself the friendship of the people” Bonaparte forbade Christians to wear white turbans or to break the fast of Ramadan in public. After the revolt in Cairo the Muslims tried to put the blame on the Christians, who had not always been prudent. After various derogations the French administration created a system of taxation which “almost enabled them to do without the Copts”. The latter assisted in pointing out the inconveniences of it. Besides, Copts had already been enrolled in the French army (Egypte, Un. pitt., ii. 148, 152, 189, 193, 199; Djabarti, vi. 15, 26, 36, 40, 56, 58, 93, 95, 97, 119, 151, 175—178, 208, 210—211, 214, 216—217, 253, 255—256, 259, 267, 297, 306; vii. 30, 48, 220—221; B. I. Egypte, vii. 8).

The departure of the French made Muslim reprisals inevitable but an official circular ordered that the Christians were not to be molested in whom “it was excusable to have joined the French”. The Copts were again employed as tax-collectors, but it must be noted that the government was still able to extort money from them, and that in 1230 (1815) the poll-tax was again levied (Djabarti, viii. 38, 42, 46—48, 52, 56, 77, 177, 300, 306, 308, 318, 320, 393, 397, 405; viii. 149, 201, 283; ix. 17, 87, 89, 91, 111, 113—114, 166—167, 180, 184, 297; Maceiri, p. 397—372).

This exhibition shows the rapidity of the islamisation of the Copts. The energetic suppression of the first revolts weakened the power of resistance of the Christians, who from the third (ninth) century no longer had a majority in Egypt. According to the text of the treaty made after the Arab Conquest, there were six or even eight million Christians subjected to taxation; as women, old men and children were exempt from it the lowest figure would give 24 millions as the total number of inhabitants in Egypt, which is excessive. The reassessment of the year 112 (730) is said to have given five million Copts liable to taxation, a number which we also consider greater than the reality. In practice the poll-tax collected under Mu’awiyah (41—60 = 661—680) five million dinârs, a figure which was reduced under Hârûn al-Ra’îşid (786—809) to four million and a half, but still a little later to three millions. Besides, at the end of the first (viiith) century the governors wished to put an end to the conversions which were impoverishing the Treasury, and if the Caliph ‘Umar II had not been opposed to it, the new converts would have had to continue to pay the dîziya. Anxious to adhere to Islâm the Copts sometimes even tried to attach themselves to Arab tribes; a legal scandal on this point made some stir (Kindi, p. 397—399, 412—415). In this connection we may go back to the preceding paragraphs and reflect that each government measure of any importance brought about conversions en masse. We may recall the tragic visit of Marwân II, when 24,000 conversions were made, the great persecution of Hâkim, the dismissals of officials under the Mamluks; in 721 (1321) in a single day in the town of Kâlibâ 450 conversions to Islâm were registered. Nothing can better show the diminution in the number of Copts in the Mamlûk period than to give that in the number of episcopal see. The Council of Alexandria in 320 brought together almost 100 national bishops; at the end of the seventh century there were still over sixty. In the xivth century there were only 40 sees (Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, p. 70, 87; Euty—
From their marriages with native women were born delicate children, and the race was already persecuted, as far as the third generation. Without insisting too much upon its importance we note in regard to this fact an Arab saying which attributes a special fecundity to Coptic women. To sum up, agreeing with Masson and all the Orientalists, we estimate that 92% of the Egyptian population is of Coptic origin. On this particular point we know nothing so erroneous as the chapter devoted to Egypt (p. 520–528) in *Races et l'Histoire* by Eug. Pittard (Idrist, *Désert de l'Afrique*, tr., p. 193; Ibn Mayyassar, p. 1–2, 34, 79; *B. L. F. A. O.*, ii. 34–36; Kalâshândi, i. 203 sqq.; iv. 67–72; Ibn Khaldûn, *Hist. des États et des Empires*, i. 9–10; Majrûz, ed. Wiet, i. 13, n. 12, 214, n. 13; ii. 43–46; iii. 251; iv. 193, 83; Bulûk ed., i. 4, 12, 14; Quatremerè, *Mém.*, ii. 84 sqq., 190–219; Wustenfeld, El-Mabûs's *Abhandlung* ab. die in Ägypten eingewand. ar. Stämme*; Blochet, *Hist. d'Égypte*, p. 106–140; Quatremerè, Sultans mamelouks, i. a, 40–41; ii. b, 187 sqq.; Abu l-Mâlik, ed. Popper, vii. 81–82; Volney, *Voy. en Égypte*, i. 73 sqq.; Marcel, *Egypte*, p. 234; *Egypte, Un. Pitt.*, ii. 27–28; iii. 47, 103–115; *Bib. d. Arabisants*, ii. 24–25; Clot Bey, *Après sur l'Égypte*, i. 158 sqq.; Lane, *Mamers*, i. 31–32; Becker, *Beiträge*, ii. 192–193; Lane-Poole, *Egypte*, p. 28–29; *C. A. A.*, ii. 722–723; d'Harcoët, *L'Égypte* et ses États, *S. O.*, i. 85 sqq.; *M. F.* lvi. 12, 26, 75–77; ibid., i. 1, 842; ii. 4, 544).

Summing up the stages of the Islamisation of the Copts in a few lines, we may say that the Christians were no longer in the majority by the third (vith) century, two hundred years after the Arab conquest and it can be estimated that by the viith (xvith) the Christians were barely, as in our times, a tenth of the total population of Egypt. It remains to account for the causes of this strangely rapid conversion of a race which had been able to recover on many occasions, whom the persecutions of Decius and Diocletian had not subdued and whom the Byzantines were never able to settle. On the part of the Muslims, however, persecutions, in the sense understood in Roman times, were extremely rare. It is undeniable that there were martyrdoms which cannot be explained away; but the vast majority of the executions ordered by the Government show a particular characteristic on which it is necessary to insist. The Muslims have never wavered on two points; the death penalty was ordered in the case of a public insult to the Muslim religion and in that of a public insult from Islam to Christianity. This observation must, for Egypt, be applied to the majority of European monks martyred in Egypt; the latter were, besides, in the eyes of the government, more or less suspected of espionage. That the church should honour them as martyrs is to be expected, but it would be wrong to call this persecution. Indeed the records of Egyptian martyrs, which contain innumerable lists for the Roman period, are exceedingly poor for the Muslim period and Christian epigraphy furnishes no further light (*P. O.*, i. 653–636; iii. 436; xvi. 203–205; vii. 578–580, 754; Abu Sâlih, *Luk.* 84–86; Majrûz, *Bulûk*, ed., i. 493; Renoudot, p. 426–427, 564–565; Maillet, *Désert de l'Égypte*, ed. 1735; p. 93 sqq.; Quatremerè, *Mém.*, ii. 251 sqq.; *B. L. F. A. O.*, 1855; p. 553 sqq.; *J. A.*, 1887, i. 83 sqq.; Lane-Poole, *Egypt*, p. 27–28; *B. L. F. A. O.*,
The Copts had not been able to bribe their masters to obtain the withdrawal of the edict, which dismissed them from office (Yūkī, Ḥadīth, ii. 247; Makrizi, ed. Wiet, i. 335; ii. 24; Quatremère, Sultana mamelouks, ii. 66, 179, 221; Bib. d. Arabians, ii. 184, 192; J. Maspero, Hist. Patr., p. 140, 178; C.I.A., Egypte, ii. commentary on No. 589; M.I., Egypte, vi. 144).

The Coptic tax-collectors who seemed to aveange on the poor Arabs the fact that the Coptic nation alone was liable to poll-tax used a secret system of keeping accounts in order to make themselves indispensable. It was in vain for example that Napoleon tried to do without them. Muhammad Ali definitely suppressed this secret method of accounting at the same time as he imposed a check upon their embezzlements (Bib. d. Arabians, ii. 19; Volney, Voy. en Egypte, 1825, i. 64, 176; Egypte, Un. pitt., iii. 7, 160; Djabirîf, viii. 240, 242–243, 248, 275–278; ix. 88–89, 121; R.I.E., 1859, p. 285 sqq.; Macaire, p. 360 sqq.).

This general attitude of the Copts has not been without influence upon the verdicts of Muslim writers; for example one should read the opinions quite devoid of favouritism of the physician Ibn Rishwân and the Spanish traveller Umayya b. Abd al-Azîz; in his travels in the west, in their turn, very severe upon the Copts.

It may be recalled here that the word Kibît was even in Turkish used as an insult and applied to mountebanks (Nuwarî, i. 923–924; Makrizî, ed. Wiet, i. 193, 206–207, 215, 215; Bûlûkî ed., i. 340; Kalkashandî, iv. 43; Quatremère, Mamelouks, ii. 6, 247; Clot bey, Aperçu sur l'Egypte, ii. 132 sqq.; Lane, Manners, ii. 273 sqq.; Butler, Copt. Churches, i. 334–336; Basset, Mêlanges africains, p. 286–287; Actes du Congrès de Gêogr. du Caire, iv. 245–247; d'Harcourt, L'Egypte et les Egyptiens; Vansleb, Relation, p. 41–43; R. M. M., xx. 125; Isambert, Itin. de l'Orient, Egypte, p. 153, 178–184).

One last question arises: Has this wholesale conversion of the Copts to Islam had any economic consequences? It has been said that the Muslims of Egypt were not productive, relying upon the undoubted fact that the industrial centres were largely peopled by Christians. The question is difficult to decide. It is stated that at the Mamlûk period the greater part of the native industries had perished, and special mention is made of the disappearance of centres of the weaving industry which the early historians and geographers mention: Akhûm, Ashshûmân, Asyûtî, Bahâwâ, Dabik, Damietta, Tinnis, Tûnâ. It cannot however be believed that a simple change of religion could make the artisans abandon their occupations, and it is necessary rather to blame, after the terrible economic crisis of the reign of the Fâtimid Mustaṣûr, the excessive and exorbitant taxation of the Aïyûbids and especially of the Mamlûks. The Copts, moreover, had made themselves famous by a particular industry which has not yet completely disappeared; the ship-building yards were at the beginning of the Arab occupation prosperous to such an extent that on the establishment of an arsenal at Tunis, the governor of Egypt, Abd al-Âzîz b. Marwân sent 3,000 Copts there. A recent enquiry has shown how much the technical language of the boat-builders of the Nile still owed much to the secret method of the ancient national language (Bell, Aphr. Papyr., vii. 147 sqq.).

J. Maspero, Organ., p. 59; Z. I., xvi. 147 sqq.;

The Arabisation. The Arab occupation gave new life for a period to the Coptic language, a victory without result, since the Coptic language was monopolised and superseded by Arabic. At first the administrative offices continued to be conducted in Greek, as we shall show in detail later on. But in regard to geographical names we see a somewhat curious nationalist phenomenon. Greek place-names, especially the capitals of pagarchies disappeared completely and were replaced by transcriptions of the former Greek names. The Greek names only remained for places founded by the Greeks (Fustat, al-Iskandariya). This revenge of the Copts on the Greeks was final since at the present time numerous place-names are still based on the Coptic names (Champollion, *L'Egypte sous les Pharaons*, i. 267, 38 sqq.). At the same time, the Scripture lessons which were read in Greek in the church services and explained in Greek in the church services were henceforth only read in Coptic until Arabic commentaries became necessary. In the same way Christian epigraphy became Coptic, while it had been Greek up to the sixth century (Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 15; *Dict. arch.*, iii. 2821).

In the year 87 (706) the governor 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Malik ordered administrative documents to be drawn up in Arabic (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, p. 128; Kindi, p. 58—59; Mâkri, ed. Wiet, ii. 57—58; Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 200; *Bib. d. Arabians*, ii. 196; Becker, *Beiträge*, ii. 130—131; *Chronographia*, p. 949, 1024, 1056—1057, 1110; Chassinat, *Pap. médical*, p. 6). We now give some facts deduced from an examination of papyri. The first bilingual papyrus in Greek and Arabic dates from the year 22 (643). There is another of 57 (677), the last of 101 (719). But the protocols of these papyri remain bilingual down to 101 (720). Alongside of them are papyri written wholly in Greek of which the latest are dated 164 (780). The first papyrus composed wholly in Arabic is dated 90 (709). The Arab government readily accepted communications in Coptic but does not seem to have used it regularly (Becker, *Beiträge*, ii. 131, 145; Pap. Schott-Reinhardt, p. 28—29; Bell, *Aphr. Papyri*, xlv., 417; Z. A., xx. 68—104; xxii. 137—154; F. E. P. Mitt., i. 6, 50; Ist., ii. 245—283, 359—384; iii. 132—140, 369—373; iv. 87—120, 313—314; W. Z. K. M., xx. 139 sqq.: *Chronographia*, p. 254, 809, 911, 951, 1112, 1181, 1226, 1623; Ker., *hittorius*, exx. 276; Corp. *pap. Kritteri*, iii. a. 22; A. 2). The first inscription in Arabic found in Egypt is painted on a house at Antinoe dated 117 (735) (C. I. A. Egypt., i. No. 513; ibid., i. 388). It is probable that some Arab writers learnt the Coptic language — the case of the Kadi Khair b. Nu‘am (120—128 = 738—746) cannot have been isolated (Kindi, p. 349, note; J. E. A. S., 1910, p. 778). The patriarch Michael (728—752) had a petition sent to the governor 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân (132—133 = 750—751) written in Coptic and in Arabic (Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 32—33); but he himself did not know a word of Coptic, for he required an interpreter to converse with the Caliph Marwân II (Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 337; Chassinat, *Pap. Médical*, p. 6).

In 145 (762) at Fustat the Coptic language was generally understood (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, p. 30; Kindi, p. 113). During his sojourn in Egypt (217 = 832) the Caliph Ma'mûn was accompanied by an interpreter, whose services were by no means unnecessary (Ma'ârîz, ed. Wiet, i. 340; Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 43—44). The Patriarch Joseph (821—850) addressed the bishops who had become Muslims to their accusers in Coptic and some of the Muslims understood his discourse (J. O., x. 525; Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 34). The clergy in the ninth century had learned Arabic well, for a Muslim, who wished to be converted was instructed by a priest who expounded to him in Arabic the Coptic text of the holy scriptures (Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 34—35). Let us note in passing a Christian stele in Coptic and Arabic, dated 625 A. M. = 909 (Ann. du serv. des Antiquités, xii. 285—286). The Coptic medical papyrus published by Chassinat (M. I. F. A. O., xxxi.) frequently employs Arabic terminology, transcribed in Coptic characters and in some places in Arabic script. It was written between the ninth and tenth centuries by an author who used both languages with facility and a note might even lead us to suppose that he was more familiar with Arabic than with Coptic. He frequently gives the preference to Arabic terminology over Greek or Coptic, quotes numerous Arabic physicians, and even uses an Arabic translation of Galen, although he knew Greek (Chassinat, *Pap. Médical*, p. 4). On account of certain transcriptions, Chassinat would date about this time the alchemical fragments which Stern put to the xiiith or even as late as the xivth century (ibid., p. 5). But according to Mu'âzad (about 325 = 935) the Christians of Egypt still spoke Coptic (Mu'âzad, p. 203), which is confirmed by popular Coptic poetry of this period (An. Bolland., xl. 244, n. 3). The celebrated passage in Severus or AsçmâAIN is well known. "I have begged the assistance of Christians who have translated for me the facts which they had read in Coptic and in Greek into Arabic, which is now spread to such an extent throughout Egypt that the greater part of the inhabitants do not know Greek and Coptic". This statement is absolutely accurate on the first point, as we possess in Coptic the biographies of patriarchs that Severus has faithfully translated (P. O., i. 115; Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 35; Ladeuze, *Ciboriiat pachomian*, p. 69; F. E. G., i. 110; Chassinat, *Pap. médical*, p. 5). Thus in the fourth (tenth) century the Coptic clergy wrote in Arabic when they wished to be understood; this is especially the case in regard to Severus and Eutychius (Becker, *Beiträge*, ii. 131; ibid., n. 7). It is from the same period that an Arabic text written in Coptic characters dates (B. I. F. A. O., i. 1 sqq.; Chassinat, *Pap. médical*, p. 1, 23). Besides, the Coptic language began to be corrupted; this is the case with a document relating the persecutions of al-Hâkim (Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 247 sqq.). It seems however, too much to assert that in the xiiith century, or perhaps earlier, Coptic was no longer written (D. Arch., iii. 2821). The geographer Bakrî (d. 1084) even states that around Tripoli in Barbary certain groups still spoke Coptic (Bakrî in Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 293). Athanasius of Kûs prepared in Arabic his grammar of the Coptic language, but noted that from his time two dialects the Buhairic and the Saïdic were still used (Quatremeré, *Rech.*, p. 20—21). Mawhûb b. Maṣûr, the continue
of Severus of Asmûnain, still used biographies written in Coptic (ibid., p. 37; Renaudot, p. 418). Abû Sâlih, who records a Coptic inscription dated 1043 says that in the sixth (sixth) century educated men among the clergy still knew Coptic (Abû Sâlih, f. 43, 45; this was so in regard to the patriarchs Cyril II (1075–1099) and Gabriel II (1132–1145) who wrote as elegantly in Coptic as in Arabic (Renaudot, p. 407, 501; Quatremerâ, Rech., p. 292; Butler, Copt. Churches, ii. 84). The latter translated into Arabic the liturgical books (Michael, iii. 235; Renaudot, p. 467). The investiture of the patriarch Macarius (1101–1127) was celebrated in Greek, in Coptic and in Arabic (F. O., i. 231; Renaudot, p. 488). The heretic Mark b. Kanbar (d. 1166) to spread his doctrine expounded the Holy Scriptures in Arabic from the Coptic text (Abû Sâlih, f. 95 194; Makrizi, Bulak, ii. 496; Quatremerâ, Rech., p. 36; Graf, Ein Reformurscher innerhalb der Kopt. Kirche im zwolften Jahrh.).

At the end of the xiith century a converted Jew became fluent in the Coptic language (Renaudot, p. 525; Quatremerâ, Rech., p. 36–37). Abû Sâlih mentions that in his time at Esna Egyptians marched in front of wedding processions even Muslim ones, and chanted formulae in Sudic Coptic (f. 102; Quatremerâ, Rech., p. 43). We have already noticed the Coptic inscription of Dâd al-Aṣwân, dated 1156; we may here note that the tombs opposite al-Aṣwân dated 1173 which refers to the expedition of Turâną Shàh into Nubia (Dict. Arch., ii. 2879).

These two texts support a remarkable way a passage in Abû Sâlih who says that in 554 (1159) Coptic was still being studied (Abû Sâlih, f. 45). The story of the martyrdom of John of Phanadjoit which dates from the beginning of the xiiith century clearly marks a decline, for we find many Arabic words in it (Quatremerâ, Rech., f. 401; B. I. E., 1885, p. 356; f.d., 1887, i. 120–121; B.L.F.A.O., i. 113 sqq.; Chassinat, Pap. Médical, p. 6; Am. Bolland., xl. 245). The translation of the sacred books was continued and while the services were always celebrated in Coptic, the lessons were explained in Arabic (Villecourt, Observations littéraires, repr. from Le Museon, xxxvi. 49–50, 65, 111–112). Perhaps the clergy no longer understood Coptic; the patriarch Michael V (1165–1166) was not able to read either Coptic or Arabic (Renaudot, p. 514; Quatremerâ, Rech., f. 37–38).

The latest Coptic inscriptions are of this date, those of the White Convention in the xiiith century; those of the painter Mercury, one of which is dated 1301 at the Red Convent, the other 1318 at the Convent of St. Simeon; and lastly the bilingual inscription (Coptical and Arabic) on a rock between Aswân and Kûmm-ombo, dated 1337 (Dict. Arch., iii. 2870–2871, 2878–2879; J. of Thol. Stud., v. 554–555; M.F.O., v. 133; B.L.F.A.O., vi. 3–4; Monneret de Villard, Les Consuls préx de Schôh, i. 28 sqq.). While an ecclesiastical diploma was in 1256 prepared entirely in Arabic, an ordination diploma of 1363 was still written in Arabic and in Coptic (Ann. du Serv. des Antiquités, xi. 177–185; Proc. of Bibl. Arch., xx. 270–276).

The latest in date of Coptic manuscripts is of 1393 (Stern, Copt. Gramm., p. 2). The decline is quite complete and it is clearly wrong to say that towards the end of the reign of the Mamlûk Sûlân, an order was made to close the Coptic schools and that the teaching of the Coptic language was forbidden (Égypte, Un. pitt., iii. 159). At no time indeed does such a measure seem to have been taken. We may note here that Abyssinia has "received in a very singular fashion the imprint of Arabicisation by means of the Arabic literature of the Christian Copts in Egypt" (R.M.M., liv. 95).

The celebrated passages of Makrízí are well known which declare that in the majority of monasteries of the district of Asyût, Greek and Coptic were both known and that Coptic was still spoken. Some people naturally have been led to say that this assertion is an exaggeration. In our opinion one can go further; it is probable that Makrízí quotes on this occasion an early writer, Shâhûshîf for example (d. 390 = 999); it must not be forgotten that Makrízí is a contemporary who often does not give his sources (Makrízí, Bulak, ii. 507; Quatremerâ, Rech., p. 42; Dict. arch., iv. 2481, 2486; Lane, Manners, ii. 282; Steindorff, Kopt. Gramm., p. 2; R.O.C., xiii. 192, 194; Ladeuze, Cînâb. pâkânîn, p. 69; Chassinat, Pap. Médical, p. 6). — Chassinat holds that the copy of the Théothikes, a Coptic text written in Arabic characters, can scarcely be of an earlier date than the xivth or xvth century. It is also evidence that Coptic had been completely neglected for, in order to learn the pronunciation, it was necessary to have recourse to the Arabic alphabet (B. F. A. O., v. 91 sqq.; Chassinat, Pap. Médical, p. 23–24).

There remain to be noted certain isolated facts which show that a few Copts, until the middle of the last century, still used the ancient national language (Vansleb, Relation, p. 363: Quatremerâ, Rech., 44, 293; Dict. arch., iii. 2822; iv. 2486; R.M.M., livii. 177; Égypte, Un. pitt., iii. 117; Rech., f. 37–38). Spiritual care which the Coptic clergy took of their collections of manuscripts reference can be made to the work of Hyvernat (Rev. biblique, x. 442–428).

In brief a rude blow was dealt to the national language from the time that the Arabs firmly established the use of their own language in government offices. The conversions en masse which had taken place from the first century induced the new Muslims to learn the language of the Kurâñ. Step by step the regime of a military occupation to that of a colonisation, and, doubtless, this was the principal factor in Arabicisation. The necessity of buying and selling to the townspeople forced the Copts to learn the Arabic language, and even to write it. The Coptic language survived for several centuries, losing ground in each generation, ended by quite disappearing from everyday life, being restricted to the church services and was not understood by the people at least from the xivth (xvith) century (ibid., ii. 7). The vocabulary embellished by G. Maspero may be the latest document of spoken Coptic (Romania, xvii. 481–512; Chassinat, Pap. Médical, p. 36).

It is quite natural that a certain number of Coptic words have survived in the Arabic of Egypt, but it is wrong to think that Coptic grammar has in any way influenced Egyptian Arabic (Z. D. M. G., i. 653–656; Stern, Kopt. Gramm., p. 5–6; B. F. A. O., ii. 212–216; and the authors quoted in B. F. A. O., iv. 33–38).

Christinn Literature in Arabic.

Literature in the Coptic language consists almost
entirely of religious works, translations of the Old and New Testament, and Lives of the Saints for the most part translated from the Greek. This literature has been roughly handled by J. Maspero, who admits however that Greek had supplanted Coptic amongst the educated circles of the Christian population and that Egypt produced works of value in the Greek language under Byzantine rule. Coptic literature proper did not have the time to develop, and after having lived in translations, perished without producing a single original work (J. Maspero, *Hist. Patr.*, p. 17—18, 24, 27, 33; 51; *B. I. F. A. O.*, iv. 194—195).

Coptic literature, confined to the liturgy and to the moral education of the people consists of ecclesiastical works, lives of saints and of pious individuals, which were compiled in the monasteries and which we must deal with as with some of them are translations or adaptations of them in Arabic.

It has the faults and merits of a popular literature. The short stories of the lives of the monks in their convents, with their familiar apparitions, in which demons and even Christ appear frequently and often in a burlesque fashion, have in every way a very infantile character. In this literature always written for edification and for an uneducated class, the marvellous always plays a prominent part — the marvellous of a quite naive kind, and it is surprising to note to what extent miracles, clumsy imitations of those of the proponents, are admitted however this Coptic literature, the *Lives of Shenouda*, Pakhomios, Pisanitos, and of Victor, some of them are the best. These are panegyrics, not chronicles or biographies. It is convenient to place here the Arabic Jacobite Synaxary, published in the fifteenth century by Michael of Malidji, of which a contemporary recasting has been recently republished under the title *alm Amin al-Salih*. Certain quotations from the liturgical and ecclesiastical texts enable us to pass in review the old writers who enjoyed popularity among the Christians in Egypt. The latter translated into Arabic the canons, sermons and homilies of St. Athanasius, of St. Basil, of Ephraim the Syrian, of St. Epiphanius of Alexandria, the canon of St. John of Constantinople, the sermons of Cyril of Jerusalem, of Gregory of Nyssa, of Gregory of Nazyanze, numerous treatises and homilies by St. John Chrysostom, treatises by St. John of Damascus etc. (B. I. F. A. O., i. 20; Ladeuze, *Cénot. pakhômien*, p. 84 sqq., 116; Anal. Bolland, x. 91—113, 127—154; Haase, *Alchitris. Kirchgenese.*, p. 115).

Without producing a writer of the class of Firdawsi, the Copts have left us a history of ancient literature, but it was the Muslims who wrote it: Ibn Abi al-`I`i may, in his *Fat`l `I`mir*, Mas`udi in his *Mu`alib al-dhahab*, and notably in his *Ahbâr al-Salam*, later Ibn Wasi` Shih, so often quoted by Makrî. We know also these legends from the *Égypte de Marâdi fils du Géphîthi* (Ottâl. b. `Affî) and the anonymous *Alêkik al-Mâlîkîs*. G. Maspero has clearly brought out that the documentation of these works was mainly Coptic (*Journ. des Savants*, 1899, p. 69—86, 154—172, 277; *Kle*, ii. 20).

Nevertheless the Christians in Egypt produced a certain number of historians of note who do not make a bad show by the side of the Muslim annalists. They are very valuable for the history of their own country, and much use of their works has been made in this article. The first in date, *Eutychius* (263—328 = 877—940), in Arabic *Sâb`d b. al-Bârîk*, the Melkite patriarch of Alexandria, wrote, besides medical treatises, a history which extends from the creation of the world to events contemporaneous with the author. Mas`udi praises his work, in which important sources have been utilised. A continuation of his history written by one of his relatives, *Yahyâ b. Sâb`d al-Antiki* deals chiefly with contemporary events in Egypt and in Syria. An account of the years 328—425 (940—1034) is given there. The first Jacobite is *Severus b. al-Mu`ajjâs*, bishop of Ashmûnain about the year 958. He was a very fertile writer, since, according to Abu `l-Barakat, he composed twenty-six ecclesiastical and apologetic treatises, amongst which a *History of the Councils* and a *Refutation of Eutychius* are well known. But the most precious work is in our opinion his *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* which was continued by the deacon *Mawhûb b. Mansûr* (about 1087). Although an Armenian, Abû `Sâli`, cannot be omitted from this list, since he wrote in Egypt from native sources, especially Muslim ones. His *History of the Monasteries* contains information of every kind, geographical, archaeological, historical and ecclesiastical. With the help of this book compared with Muslim works, it is possible to estimate the favour which the Christians enjoyed at the Fatimid court. Towards the end of the thirteenth century, *Ibn al-Râhib* (Abî Shakîr Bûrus) produced a general chronology which starts from the creation of the world; he also wrote a *History of the Councils* and a lexicographical work. His contemporary, *Makri*, (George) *Abî `l-Vâsir* wrote a general history, following the method of nearly all Arab writers. So far the second part, which, after summarising *Tabari* as a beginning, deals with events following Islam, is the only one known; in the first, the author made use of Eutychius, Agapius of Manbûd, and different Greek writers. Al-Makín, an official at the court of Baibars I, a descendant of officials in the service of the Ayyûbids, died at Damascus in 672 (1274). His work was continued until the year 750 (1349) by Mafâdjal b. Abî `l-Fâdjal`, who belonged to a family of ecclesiastical writers. His history, *al-Nâhâf al-raddad*, which owes much to Nuwayzî, is as to the part still unpublished, very like the anonymous history published by Zettelstein, *Beitr. z. Gesch. der Manbûdken*. Lastly we must note Abû Dhakîn, who wrote in the eighteenth century, *a History of the Copts* (Graf, *Reformversuch*, p. 2, 17—18, 25; *Machr.,* xii. 488—492, 495; Mas`udi, *Tambîh*, p. 154; Ibn Abî Uṣaihîa, ii. 86—87; *P.O.*, xii. 345—354; Haase, *Alchitris. Kirchgenese.*, p. 30—31, 33; Graf, *Christ.-ar. Lit.*, p. 40—46; *R. O. C.*, xiv. 385;

Besides these, the Arabic Christian literature in Egypt possesses philologists of the first rank. They appeared at the time when the Coptic language, no longer in everyday use, ran the risk of being no longer understood by the ecclesiastics. Nourished on Arabic culture, these writers took for their models Arabic grammarians. An analysis of all these works, grammars or "scalsae" (in Arabic *sulam*), has been ably made by P. Mallon, whose conclusions are here summarised. The first in date is the Coptic grammar of *Athanasius* of *Kiš* who lived in the IXth century. The *scala* must have existed at that time; *Sulpicius Severus*, who wrote in the middle of the thirteenth century, wrote his own to take the place of the older ones, which through endeavours to be complete were too voluminous. Confined to the liturgy, it is arranged in a detestable manner, for it classifies the words according to the order in which they occur in the sacred books; it is entitled *sulam kanāsit*, the *scala ecclesistica*. John wrote in addition to the grammar to which he gave the name of "preface", *muqaddimah*. At the same period lived three brothers, all famous, the sons of *al-Assāl*, one, *Abū l-Faḍ'il*, known for his *Collection of Canons*, the second, *Abū l-Faḍ'il*, an expert, under whose name, which greatly resembles in method that of John of Semennīd; the third, *Abū l-Ishāq*, the author of the *Sulam muqaddah*, a *scala* in which the words are arranged according to their rhymes after the manner of the Arab dictionaries. The grammars of *Ibn Kāṭib Ḳaṣar* of *John of Kālyub* and of *Ibn al-Dhuḥairī*, who lived probably in the second half of the IXth century, are still in existence. They were immediately followed by *Ibn al-Raḥīm*, already mentioned as a historian; his *Preface* is very inferior to the preceding ones (M.F.O.B., i. 111—136; ii. 213—216; v. 57—90; Quatremer, *Rec. de V. 192*—211; Villermard, *Observations Liturgiques*, repr. from *L. Musion*, xxxvi. 3—4; Mallon, *Gramm. Copte*, p. 5—7; Macaire, p. 300).

The authors of these dictionaries were not the first, but amongst the whole group of lexicographers, who have just been mentioned, the great personality of *Abū l-Barrak ĸ Bābār*, stands out. He was the first of Christian writers in Egypt to be known in Europe, thanks to Kircher, who published his *Sulam Kabr*, or *Scala Magna* and to Vansleb who reproduced his *Lamp of the Darknesses* in his *Histoire de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie*. These are his two chief works of this ecclesiastic whose literary activity lay in the first half of the fourteenth century. In addition he collaborated in a *General History of the Mamlūk* of *Emir Baḥbur al-Dawādār* whose secretary he was. *The Lamp of the Darknesses* is an "encyclopaedia of the ecclesiastical sciences, containing in dogma, religious history, liturgy and discipline, all that a Coptic priest could wish to know". This work contains very valuable lists; those of the seventy disciples, the patriarchs of Alexandria, the saints of the Coptic year, and, above all, an important bibliography of Arab Christian authors (Dict. de Thél., Catholique, viii. 229—229).

The greater part of Arabic Christian literature was intended to be read to the people during the service, and its form shows signs of this. They are somewhat analogous to the sermons of the Middle Ages, written in a macaronic style, addressed to an illiterate audience, to whom Latin was not known. Let us add that from this result have been translations from Greek and Coptic, often word for word, and that the Arabic phraseology is clumsy. But it is a matter for astonishment that the editors of Christian manuscripts have thought that they must keep faults of orthography, which the Muslim copyists as well as the Christian ones had made and have thrown the blame for them upon the author. The result has been deplorable and with only rare exceptions, the editions of the *Patrologia Orientalis* and of the *Corpus scriptorum christianorum Orientalium* are almost unintelligible. Another inconvenience is that the results of these erroneous estimates of the Christian writers (Z. D. M. G., li. 453—471; B. I. F. A. O., iv. 140; Amélineau, *Actes*, p. 9; R. O. C., xxii. 383—384).

Bibliography for the literature:

[The author owes several essential references to the kindness of M. M. Noël Aimé-Giron and H. Munier. He expresses especially his thanks to Mr. W. E. Crum who in view of this article undertook long and fruitful researches.] (G. W.)

**Kiḏam** is said (1) of anything which is antecedent to another in time (*takādīm*, opp. *ta'ālāh*); (2) of the temporal, newly arisen, which no time has preceded; (3) of the absolute, i.e., in its nature without beginning (*kiḏam* in this sense is usually synonymous with *azal*, *azaliyā*; but some, e.g., Dīlī, *al-Insān al-Kāmil*, B. 30, endeavour to show that there is a subtle distinction). In the (3) sense, according to orthodox belief, the name al-*Kiḏam* can be applied to God alone. The question whether God's thought in relation to the (not yet) created world can be conceived as a simple relation or is a concrete part of his eternal prescience and the world is thus eternal in God was answered differently.

It was the custom in philosophical language to talk of the eternity of the real world. If the creation of the world was not denied, an eternal creation was taught and God called the first cause and the world eternally caused as a whole. In this reasoning one could appeal to the multiplicity of meaning of the conception "eternity" in Hellenistic tradition especially to the Aristotelian distinction between *πρότερον* and *υπότερον* (cf. Categ., 142, 26 sqq. and *Metaph.*, 1018b, 9 sqq.). Thus in general a distinction was made between a temporal (*zamān*) and an essential (-*hāl*) priority and posteriority but 3 to 6 varieties were distinguished, viz.: in addition to an order of precedence in time, one in order of place (*swāba*), in rank (*ṣawār*), in nature (*ṭab*), in causality (*tawlab*), and in knowledge (*ilm*).

Bibliography: Dictionary of the Technical Terms, p. 1211 sqq.; cf. the article *Khālaq*.

(T. J. De Boer)
KIFT (KUFT, KÂFT, the old KERTH), name of a place in Upper Egypt, nowadays insignificant (according to Baederker, Egypt, it has 8934 inhabitants only), situated under 26° north lat., on the east bank of the Nile, but at a certain distance from the river, where the latter comes nearest the coast of the Red Sea. This situation explains a certain importance of the place in antiquity, when it was an emporium where the wares coming from India, Punt, Arabia Felix, were directed to the North. Its commerce with India is still mentioned by Yakut who speaks also of the surrounding orchards. The territory was a sāhaf belonging to the Aṣhāf (‘Alids) and the inhabitants were Shī‘ites.

Traditions on the origin of Koptos are to be found in Makrizī’s Manawī’s.


AL-KIFT, nisba of a family of officials of pure Arab origin, several members of which filled high offices under the Ayyūbids. The honorary title al-Kādi al-Ahmūd was borne by ‘Abraham b. ‘Abd al-Wajhīd, whose son Yūsuf, afterwards al-Kādi al-Asraf, was born at Kift on Muḥarram I, 548 (March 29, 1153). He succeeded his father in the administration of his native town, but had to leave it in 1172 (1176/1177) on account of the rising of a Fātimid pretender. After filling several offices in Upper Egypt, he was summoned in 1183 (1187), after the conquest of Jerusalem, to Saladin’s court in the field, to assist his vizier al-Kādi ‘l-Feḍlī. When, on Saladin’s death, his brother al-Malik al-‘Adl deprived his nephew of his inheritance and occupied Jerusalem in 1192 (1196), al-Kift, along with other officials, left this town in 1202 and went to Ḥarrān, where he entered the service of Saladin’s son Asraf. But he soon decided to leave Syria and under the pretext of the pilgrimage went to Mecca, thence to the Yemen, where the Aṭṭāb b Suṣūr, the guardian of the minor Ayyūbid al-Nāṣir, gave him the vizierate in 1205. But he soon gave up this office and died in retirement at Dīn Dījil in Yemen in 1244 (1227).

His son ‘All, born in Rabī’ I or II of 568 (winter of 1172) at Kift, followed his father and grandfather in the official service, but his inclinations were rather towards scholarship. After studying in his native town and in Cairo, he went with his father to Jerusalem, where he was able for several years to gratify his inclinations. But his father had to leave Jerusalem, and he could not have stayed much longer, certainly not till 608, as Ya‘qūb, ‘Irshād, v. 4855, says. But the son went to Aleppo, where a patron of his, the former governor of Jerusalem and Nābulus, Fāris al-Dīn Mū’āmmal al-Kāsīrī, had become vizier to Saladin’s son al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Ghaðī. The latter took him into his service as secretary and he received thanks for careful administration of the i‘lās. After the death of his patron on Ramadan 13, 610 (Jan. 26, 1214), the Sultan appointed him his khāzīn. Although he would have preferred to devote himself to study, he had soon to take over the reorganisation of the Dīwān. After al-Ẓāhir’s death on Dūmād 22, 615 (4th Oct. 1216), he retired into private life, but had again to return to the head of the Dīwān in Sāfār 616 (April, 1219) and held this office till the end of Dūmād 31, 628 (April, 1231). He then already had the title al-Kādī ‘l-Akrām al-Wāzīr, as his protegé Ya‘qūb tells us in his Ma‘tādīm al-Bul‘dān, iv. 152, a passage written before 624 (1227). After five years’ leisure he again took on the office of vizier in 633 (1236) and held it till his death on 13th Ramadān, 646 (Dec. 31, 1248).

Before affairs of state entirely took up his energies, he had displayed considerable literary activity. In the Irshād, v. 4854, Ya‘qūb gives a list of his works written before 620, some, however, not quite compiled by then; this list was copied almost word for word by al-Safādī [q.v.] in his al-Wāfayāt (ed. Fleischer, in Abūlfeid’s Historia antitulonica, p. 234), and al-Kutubi borrowed it from him with minor corrections.

His historical works are all lost: they included a history of Maḥmūd b. Sūhākhtīgīn and his sons (qawānīnī) in al-Kutubi corrupted to waḥaṣyat, not recognised by Süsheim, Prolegomena zu einer Ausgabe der im Brit. Mus. zu London verwahrten Chronik des seldschuqischen Reichs, p. 31, No. 2) and a history of the Seldjūks from the beginning to the end of the dynasty, which must have been of considerable value. Of his works on literary history, only the posthumous work on poets with the name Muḥammad has survived to us (see de Slane, Cat. des Mss. Ar. de la Bibliothèque Nationale, No. 3335). Of his history of the grammarians we have only the synopsis by al-Dāhabī (d. 1248 = 1347) in the latter’s autograph, see Cat. Cod. Ar. Bibl. Acad. Lugduno-Batavae, ed. de Goeje and Th. W. Juybhn, ii. 26, No. xxvii. The most valuable of his works for us, the Kitāb Ḥijār al-Ulāmaw b. Akhṭār al-Hāfīzī, our most important source for the history of the exact sciences and Hellenistic tradition in Islam, has only survived in a synopsis by Muhammad b. All al-Zawzant, made in 647 (1249), see Ibn al-Qiftīs Tarīḫ al-Ḥukamā, auf Grund der Vorarbeiten Aug. Mülλers, ed. by J. Lippert, Leipzig 1903, repr. Cairo 1326.

KILÂB b. Râbî‘a, an Arabic tribe which was one of the principal branches of the large tribe of ‘Amr b. Sa‘āda. Their original homes were in the Ḥima Ḍariyya which corresponds roughly to the country North and South of the present Wâhâbî capital al-Riyâd. This district was considered one of the best in Central Arabia and we are told that the Kilâb occupied nine tenths of it. At a much later time than the rise of Islam they wandered North into the confines of Syria where they gained possession of the towns of Hit, Ḥalab and others and where their rulers were known as the ‘Abî Mirdâs [q. v.]. A large tribe like the Kilâb was divided into many clans and the whole tribe was divided into the following clans: 1] Dja‘far b. Kilâb with four divisions: Mâlik, al-‘Ayyaṣ, Khâlid and ‘Utbâ. 2] ‘Abî Bakr b. Kilâb with three divisions: ‘Abd, Ka‘b and ‘Abd Allâh. (3) Mu‘âwiya al-Djabîrî with thirteen divisions of whom five had names used for the lizard: Dâbîb, Mu‘âdib, Djamîb, Husâîl, Hîsl, ‘Amr, Anas, al-Awâr, Zufâr, Unais, Mâlik, Râbî‘a and Zuhair. Shâmîr b. Shu‘aîbîl who killed al-Husâîn at Karbalâ‘ was a member of the division of al-Awâr. 4] ‘Abî Kilâb with four divisions: al-‘Aqam, Ka‘b (one of the principal clans of the whole tribe), Tarîf and ‘Abî ‘Aqâl. 5] Ra‘bî‘a b. Kilâb with three divisions: Budjâr, ‘Ubâbîd and Nufail. 6] Al-Ashâb b. Kilâb the divisions of which are all derived through Wâbîr and of which seven are mentioned by genealogists. 7] ‘Amr b. Kilâb with two divisions: Nufail and Abî Åwî. 8] ‘Abî Allâh b. Kilâb with three divisions: ‘Amir, ‘Amir and al-Samûr. 9] Ru‘âs b. Kilâb with three divisions: Budjâr, Budjârî and ‘Ubâbîd. 10] Ka‘b b. Kilâb with four divisions: ‘Abî, Wâhâb, Râbî‘a and Åwî. The most prominent clan in the time before Islam was the Banû Dja‘far, who were powerful enough to have under their protection for a long time the tribe of Ghânî and also gave support to the tribe of ‘Abs in their long struggle with the Banû Ḍuhâyân. The most remarkable deed recorded of the tribe of Kilâb was their signal defeat of the confederate tribes of Ḏuhâyân and Asad in the battle of Djabalâ, where they with other ‘Amir tribes secured a signal victory which is reckoned as one of the three great battles in the time of paganism of which Arab authors have any record. We find notices of old settlements in the first centuries after the Hijra, but they were quite submissive to the governors sent to them from al-Madina or Damascus. In the year 231 Hijrî al-Kabîr was forced to capture 1500 of their men as they by that time had reverted to their ancient Beduin life of making predatory raids upon the neighbouring country.

Among prominent men who came from this tribe the poet Labîd [q. v.] is probably the best known, but it is astonishing how few of them are recorded as translators or scholars.  


**KILÂT-I NÂDÎRî (strictly Ka‘âtî),** a town in Persia (Khurâsân) on the Russo-Persian frontier to the north of Meshed and to the north-east of Sarâkhî.

It is a natural fortress perched on a spur of the Kara-Dagh mountains. When Arghânî rebelled against the election of Tâkûdar Ahmad as Mongol Ukhân, he took refuge after his defeat, in this fortress (680/1281), the entrance to the west of which is still known as Darbend-i Arghânî (it is also pronounced Arghawânî, probably by a popular etymology). It was besieged by Tamerlane which attacked it fourteen times without success. The conqueror withdrew, leaving troops to blockade it and it surrendered finally after a pestilence. This was the first place which Nâdir shâh, who had begun as a brigand, made his centre of action; later he built a palace there and a treasury for the spoils of Delhi.  

**Bibliography:** Mirzâ Mahdi-khan, Tawâhid Djâhan-kogâl Nâdîrî, Bombay, 1822, p. 18; Waṣâfî, quoted in d’Ohsson, Hist. des Mong., lii. 504; P. M. Sykes in *Journals of the Royal Geogr. Society,* December 1906, do., *History of Persia,* i. 185, 201, 341, 359 (photograph of the treasury of Nâdir-shâh). (Cl. Huart)

**KILÂD AL-BAHîR, a fortress and small town at the narrowest part of the Dardanelles.**

The reader is referred to the article *Ka‘le-i Sulṭâniye* when the fortress on the Asiatic side opposite Kilâd al-Bahr is dealt with, and here only the minimum necessary is given. The castle of Kilâd al-Bahr was planned and armed along with the Asiatic fortification in the years 1462/1463 by Ya‘qûb Bey, sandjak-bey of Gallipoli, by order of Meḥmûd II (*Krâînobulâ, ed. C. Müller, book iv., chap. 14 and book xv., chap. 3; cf. also: Châlkbakendîsî, ed. I. Bekker, p. 529, sq and J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., ii. 73). Suleiman the Great in 1598 (1551) renewed the fortifications which had fallen into decay in the interval and they were fundamentally remodelled and extended with those of *Ka‘le-i Sulṭâniye* in 1699/1700 (1659/1660). The further history of Kilâd al-Bahr is practically the same as that of the Asiatic fortress of *Ka‘le-i Sulṭâniye* [q. v.] 1500 years away. The ancient picturesquely situated fortress of Kilâd al-Bahr with its old round tower was strengthened in later times by the addition of the modern fort of the same name with an adjoining battery, the small earthworks of Yeni Mehdijîye and the large earthworks of Namâzgâh. Behind the old tower of the fortress lies the insignificant old settlement of the same name on the slope of a hill, which suffered a great deal during the fighting in the Dardanelles in the Great War.  

**KILIDJ ALAYI** (r.), the "ceremony of the sword" also called tašlid al-sa'i or tašlid-i qemşir. It was the ceremony of investiture of the Ottoman Sultan, which took the place of coronation. The ceremony generally took place shortly after the kariq, or homage to the new Sultan. The latter, leaving his palace went by large with great pomp to the faubourg of Ayivos. Here he disembarked and went to the türbe of Abū Ayıyūb al-Anşarī [q.v.], accompanied by the Shāhīk al-Islām, the Kādī Asker, the Grand Vizier, the Naḳb al-Aşḥāf and a limited number of other high dignitaries. In the türbe the Shāhīk al-Islām after a short şalāt of two rakʿa proceeded to the ceremony of girding on the sword (in Turkish, ḥilāş keşmətlik). After it, the Sultan returned on horseback through the town, always entering by the Adrianople gate. Tradition had it that the new sovereign should visit the great mosque and the türbes which contained the tombs of his ancestors.

This is how the ceremony is described by d’Ohsson (Tableau de l’Empire Othoman, i. 305 sqq.; ii. 256 and von Hammer (Der ers. Reiches Siedlungsgeschicht, vol. ii. for Türküssi Zade Muḥammad, i. 484). This description differs little from those we have of the middle of the xvith century (Ricaud, État présent de l’Empire Ottoman, Paris 1670, p. 10, 19) and from the way in which the Ḧilāş alaşı was performed in the xixe and xixe centuries. In the xixe century the part of the Shāhīk al-Islām was taken by other dignitaries such as the Naḳb al-Aşḥāf, in 1255/1839 at the accession of Ābā al-Mādjd (cf. Āḥmad Luṭfī, Ta’rīkh, vol. 1, Constantinople 1302, p. 51) and later the Čelebi Efendi of the Mewlewîs at Konya (cf. Čelebi). On the last occasion on which the ceremony took place, in August 1918, after the accession of Muḥammad VI it was the Shāhīk of the Sanûsîs who performed the rites (cf. the detailed description by Rāsam Aşhrāf, Ḫelâfetân araṣinda, Constantinople 1334, p. 34 sqq.). Several Sultans did not have the ceremony performed, such as Muṣṭaqfā II in 1695 and Muṣṭaqfā V in 1876 (Othman Nuri, “Abī al- İslām ve-devari Sultanları, Constantinople 1327, i. 91 sqq.).

The origin of the custom of Ḧilāş alaşı is obscure. Tradition, as recorded by d’Ohsson, says that Abū Shams al-Din, the holy man who discovered the tomb of Abū Ayıyūb performed the ceremony for the first time in the case of Muḥammad II. But nothing of this is mentioned in the Turkish historiographers (cf. especially Ewliya Čelebi, Seyahatname, i. 401). These rather give one the impression that the essential part used to be the pious visit made by the new Sultan, first to the türbe of Abū Ayıyūb and then to the türbes of all the other Sultans since Muḥammad II (cf. e.g. Selaniki, Ta’rīkh, p. 132 for Muṣṭaqfā III in 1575; and Na’ma, i. 195 for Āḥmad I in 1604). The first Sultan for whom the ceremony of the sword is definitely recorded seems to be Muṣṭaqfā I in 1617 (Na’ma, i. 320; Peçevli, ii. 361). It must be concluded that in any case no such importance was attached to the ceremony in the early centuries as in later times. The ceremony itself however no ancient tradition; d’Ohsson (i. 306) makes it go back to customs followed by the Maṇliḳ Sultans of Egypt, who were gilt with the sword by the ‘Abbāsīd Caliph. Such a ceremony is described for example by al-Kalkashandī (Ṣuḥāb, iii. 285 and 286, according to Gaudefroy-Demom-

bynes, La Syrie à l’Époque des Mamelouks, p. 24). In Egypt the Sultan was at the same time robed by the Caliph in a black ḩaja [q.v.]; this ceremony therefore has many points of resemblance to the formalities practised by the Caliphs of Baghdād when they wished to honour and recognise the services of their great vassals, such as the Būyids and Seljuḳs. Only in the ‘Abbāsīd period we find no mention made of the sword (cf. Ibn al-Ṭabarī, viii. 286). It is certain therefore that the ceremony of Ḧilāş alaşı rests on a very ancient tradition; it is moreover interesting to note how the Shāhīk al-Islām [q.v.] here has in any case assumed the office formerly exercised by the Caliphs. As to the sword itself, it is described by von Hammer (i. c.) as "the sword of the Prophet", while Āḥmad Luṭfī (i. c.) describes it as the sword of the Caliph Ĕmar al-Ĥārāṣ. These statements can only be based on a pious fiction. It is further to be noted that the expression tašlid al-sa’ai originally means putting the belt of the sword around the neck, which seems to go back to ancient Arab customs (cf. al-Sharîfī’s dictionary, Aḥrab al-Maḥārī, p. 1029). (J. H. Kramer)

**KILIDJ ALI PASHA. [See OCHIALY.]**

**KILIDJ ARSLAN,** the name of several Seljuḳ rulers in Asia Minor.

1. Kilidj Arslan I, Sulaiman was, according to Matthew of Edessa (ch. 225), not born till after his father had overthrown Sharaf al-Dawla (478 = 1085) but this seems hardly credible as he left an eleven year old son at his death in 1107. It is certain however that he was still very young when his father fell in battle with Tūtuṣ (479 = 1086). This explains why he played a subordinate part in the war with the Crusaders, so that Christian chroniclers do not once mention his name but always talk of Solimanius or of the Sultan. Only a short time before he had returned to his father’s capital Nicaea, for after Sulaiman’s death the administration of Asia Minor, Anjīk, Edessa and Iliab was re-arranged by Malikşah and the young Kilidj Arslan was taken by him to Baghdad. After Malikşah’s death in 485 (1092) Kilidj Arslan was granted permission by Barkiyaruq to return to Asian Minor and according to Byzantine sources he married a daughter of the powerful emir of Smyrna, called Tsaches, which did not please the Greeks so that they set about — and with success it is said — estranging him from his father-in-law. When the Crusaders advanced on Nicaea, Kilidj Arslan had been clever enough not to allow himself to be shut up in the fortress, but took part in the battles later fought between the Turks and Crusaders, although, as already mentioned, he not but rather Turkish emirs, notably Danishmand (Tanismanos) held the command. The relationship between the Seljuḳs and the Danishmandiya was already not of a friendly nature although for some time they united against the common foe. They were quarrelling about the possession of the town of Malatya, where an Armenian named Gabriel was ruling under the suzerainty of Tūtuṣ. Kilidj Arslan was actually besieging the town, when the Crusaders advanced and when he had retired for this reason Danishmand ravaged the country round the town. Gabriel therefore appealed for help to Bohemund but when the latter hurried up he was taken prisoner by Danishmand and Malatya had to surrender to the latter. (1101). The attempts of other Crusading armies
to relieve him failed and the only course left for the Christians was to purchase his liberty for a very high ransom. Kılıç Arslan, as the Christian chroniclers tell us, claimed a portion of the ransom for himself, which gave rise to a new quarrel with Danışmand to the great vexation of the Muslims, who knew how much the cause of Islam suffered thereby. When Danışmand died in 1106, Kılıç Arslan seized the opportunity to get possession of Malatya by a treaty. At the same time he also became master of Maiyafarıkîn, appeared with an imposing army in front of Edessa but when he could do nothing there he went to Harşın where he fell ill. He therefore returned to Malatya and there received an invitation from the people of Mösül to help them in their struggle with the Seljuk ruler Muhammad or more accurately his general Djawali Saka'û, who at the latter’s command had taken prisoner the rebellious lord of the town Djakarmish. Kılıç Arslan heeded the appeal and appeared in 1107 in Mösül, established himself on the throne there and had his own name mentioned in the kütya instead of Muhammad’s. He returned at once, after leaving his son Malikşah under the guardianship of an emir in the town, to resume the struggle with Djawali, who had in the meanwhile received help from Ra'wân of Damascus. On a hot summer’s day (June 3, 1107) the two armies met on the bank of the Khabir, but it was very soon apparent that Kılıç Arslan had lost the day. He threw himself in his heavy armour on horseback into the river, but the horse sank beneath this burden and Kılıç Arslan was drowned. The body was afterwards recovered, taken to Maiya-farîk and buried there in a specially built kübo. His son Mas'ûd’s wish to move it to Konya was not carried out.

Bibliography: See the article SELJKUS.

2. Kılıç Arslan II, b. Mas’ûd, reigned from 1155—1192. In the lifetime of his father he was appointed by him lord of the towns conquered in the southeast of Asia Minor and succeeded him on his death, thrusting aside his two brothers. He also succeeded — but only after several years — in putting an end to the Danışmandid dynasty in the peninsula and securing sole supremacy for the Seljuks. We cannot go into the details of this struggle here, but only mention that a member of that dynasty, Dhu ’l-Nun, brought a much more dangerous enemy, the famous Nur al-Din, against him. He was not on good terms with the latter even at the beginning of his reign because they could not agree about the possession of several places in the south-east of Asia Minor. Therefore when Dhu ’l-Nun, after Kılıç Arslan had seized his lands appealed to Nur al-Din, the latter was quite ready to take up his cause. He invaded Asia Minor with an army, occupied Marash, Kaisum, Behisni, Marzabân and even Siwâs (1173) Kılıç Arslan then began negotiations for peace, for which Nur al-Din was not disinclined in view of his continual war with the Christians but he insisted on rather harsh conditions and made Kılıç Arslan the repayment that he could not consider him a Muslim in view of his friendly relations with the Byzantines. But the peace was concluded, although the garrison sent to Siwâs remained there till Nur al-Din’s death in 1174. Kılıç Arslan thereupon seized all the towns which the Danışmandids had previously held, with the exception of Malatya, where a member of this dynasty held out till 1177 when Kılıç Arslan was able to capture this much contested town after a four months’ siege.

The relations between Kılıç Arslan and the Byzantines were by no means always of a friendly nature. The Turkish emirs in the frontier lands used to harass the Christians from time to time whenever the opportunity occurred, e.g. in 1159, when Manuel hurried back to Constantinople from Cilicia by forced marches, so that Kılıç Arslan, who was considered personally responsible went to Constantinople in person and was entertained in regal fashion by the Emperor (probably in 1161). Long negotiations were carried on in which the relations of the Seljuk to the Danışmandids were also discussed. Nevertheless the conduct of the Turks continued later to give rise to many complaints and when Dhu ’l-Nin, after his protector Nur al-Din had died was in Constantinople, the Emperor Manuel, who in any case had unwillingly seen the Seljukus obtain sole supremacy in Asia Minor to the disadvantage of the Greek policy dividetempora, resolved to undertake a campaign on a large scale against Kılıç Arslan. The latter was cunning enough to avoid a direct encounter with his impetuous and chivalrous opponent, but when the latter was encamped at Marioskephalon (Pass of Cardak) the Turks suddenly fell upon him and inflicted a disastrous defeat on the army (572 = 1176). Kılıç Arslan duly trumpeted his victory throughout the Muslim world as evidence of his ardent zeal for the faith, sent a portion of the booty to the Alhâsid caliph and was celebrated as a hero of the faith by poets such as Ibn al-Ta’âwîdî. An enterprise against Nîksar at the same time in the interest of the Danışmandids was equally unsuccessful and a nephew of the Emperor Andronicos Vatatzes fell in it. Henceforth the Greeks left the Turks in peace.

Some time afterwards Kılıç Arslan quarrelled with the all-powerful Şâlah al-Din, first about the ownership of the fortress of Ka‘bân, which Mas’ûd had conquered but had lost to Nur al-Din. When Kılıç Arslan was preparing to occupy the town, Şâlah al-Din sent troops thither under the command of Taqû al-Din ‘Omar b. Shâhînshah, who drove out the Turks, because Kılıç Arslan had no wish to involve himself in a war with Şâlah al-Din for the sake of a not very important fortress (575 = 1179/1180). Soon, however, the conduct of the Ortukid of Hisn Kaïfa who had married a daughter of Kılıç Arslan named Seljûka Khatûn, gave rise to further disagreement between the two rulers. Kılıç Arslan was incensed against Nur al-Din Muhammed (the Ortukid) because he neglected his daughter for a songstress, so that Nur al-Din out of fear of the wrath of his father-in-law appealed for help to Şâlah al-Din. The latter ordered Kılıç Arslan to leave Nur al-Din alone and when Kılıç Arslan refused to do so Şâlah al-Din himself marched with a force on Ka‘bân, but was dissuaded from continuing the war by the representations of the able periwan of Kılıç Arslan, Iklîyâr al-Din Ihsan. As to the Seljuk princess, it may here be mentioned that she later came to Baghdaad and died there in 586 (1188) as we know from an epitaph which Niebuhr copied in his journal.

If Kılıç Arslân had good fortune in all these matters, grave disasters overtook him and his kingdom at the end of his life; firstly the passage of the Third Crusade, in which even his capital
Konya was occupied in 1190, and secondly the quarrels of his numerous sons. The latter, nearly a dozen in number, if we include a few other relations, had each received from Kilidj Arslan rule over a certain town and its territory and when their father became old and weak conducted themselves as independent rulers. One of these, Kutb al-Din Malikshah, lord of Siwās, was able to arouse Kilidj Arslan's suspicions of the Parwana who had been Kilidj Arslan's greatest support, and had him murdered (1183). He then forced his father to instal him as heir to the throne, and henceforth acted as if he were sole ruler. The aged Kilidj Arslan escaped from his tyranny and sought refuge with another of his sons, and finally reached his youngest son Ghiyāth al-Din Kaikhusraw at Burglu where he fell ill and died (August 1192) Ghiyāth al-Din had the body brought in a litter to Konya, giving out that his father was ill, thinking that in this way he would himself gain possession of the Seljuk capital, which he did do for a time (cf. the article KAIKHSURAW). He had his father's body interred there and the tomb of the man still exists.

Bibliographie: see the Art. SELJÜGS.

The Chronicle of Michael the Syrian is particularly important here, as the author was personally acquainted with Kilidj Arslan.

3. Kilidj Arslan III b. Rukan al-Din Sulaiman had homage paid him as Sulīn after the death of his father in 600 (1203) but had to give way only a few months later to his uncle Ghiyāth al-Din Kaikhusraw.

4. Kilidj Arslan IV b. Ghiyāth al-Din Kaikhusraw II is better known by his laṣab Rukan al-Din. He has already been dealt with in the article KAIKTSīSI (cf. ii., p. 637) down to the time when his brother, joint Sulīn with him, sought refuge with the Greek Emperor (659=1261). Henceforth he was sole Sulīn but the real power lay in the hands of the Parwana Mu'in al-Din Sulaiman [q, v.]. When he became inconvenient to the latter he was treacherously put to death by order of the Parwana (664=1266).

KILLIZ, a town in Northern Syria between Halab and 'Aintab. It was apparently already known to the Assyrians, for a cuneiform inscription (Harper 1037, Brit. Mus. K. 13073, obs. 3) mentions a town Klizi-si. In the Roman period the town was called Cilissa sive Urmaggianti (Itin. Ant., ed. Pinder-Parthey, p 84). It must have been quite insignificant in the middle ages; it is mentioned in the rising against the patriarch Dionysius of Tellmahre in 817 A.D. (Killia should be read in Barhebr., Histor. eccles., ed. Abbeleos-Lamy, i. 339, 342, for Kalas or Scheles and in Michael the Syrian, ed. Chabot, Chron. syr., iii, 23, for Haltf). Kutb calls Killiz (as he writes it) a village of the nahiye of 'Araz; almost all the other Arab geographers do not mention it. The modern town has about 20,000 inhabitants including 15,000 Muslims (Cuinet 1891); the Arabs still call it Killiz and the Turks Xiz. According to M. Hartmann, the ancient Killiis was at the modern Tarzime Khân (1 hour's journey W.S.W. of the modern Killiis) where large stones are still found; while tradition still says that the little garden ilez bagheth (20 minutes east of Killiis) to be the old site of the town or of a part of it, as the name Killiz is supposed to survive in Ilezi and there are traces of an old site here.


AL-KILY, the salts (alkali, soda and potash) obtained from the ashes of different plants, especially those which belong to the salicaceae and allied families; it often means the ash itself and the lye obtained from it. Among plants special mention is made of al-hamd which therefore cannot here be sorrel. The best ash is said to be that of al-hūrūd which is defined as al-wadhanā. 'Usnān originally means saltwort but now it seems to be identical with arthrocnemium glaucum or anabasis articulata or seidlitzia rosmarinus. Hurd and uṣnān seem to be often nomina generis, even in old Arabic. Seeetan in several passages in his Reisebeschreibung (e.g. vol. iii., p. 68) mentions the obtaining of alkali but always from saline plants (the reference is therefore to soda).

Al-kily usually means sodium carbonate, soda, as the saline plants contain sodium salts. But another carbonate is also obtained, potassium carbonate (potash); for example, al-Rāzī in the Kitāb al-Āsrār mentions a salt of ashes (milh al-ramād) which is obtained from oak ashes. In alchemical works ashes of poplar trees and figtrees etc. are mentioned. There is also a salt of al-kily (milh al-kily) or ash from less, it is the ash of tar tar; we also have tartar = potassium carbonate (see Berggren, op. cit., p. 441).

A sharp distinction between soda and potash was not possible. Different ashes yielded different amounts of both which could only be distinguished at best by the taste and therefore with little certainty. In place of al-kily the Muṣafa al-Ulum (ed. van Vloten, p. 259) speaks of milh al-kily. According to J. J. Hess in Nedjd it is called dilsu, i.e. kiltu.

On the preparation of kily the Tādż observes that certain plants are burned in a moist condition and the ashes sprinkled with water (i.e. leyd) and that this lye is precipitated to al-kily (probably by steaming).

Al-kily, i.e. the lye, is primarily used for washing. According to alchemical works lime can be added to this lye, it then becomes stronger and more suitable for soap-making. The ancient Egyptians, Greeks and Romans used the ashes obtained in this way for cleaning and washing and had no soap (cf. against the contrary view the very full discussion by Blümner in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie, 2 s. Sei.), On the other hand the Arabs made and used soap probably usually the hard soda-soap. The kali-soap made from potash is soft soap. Ibn Duraid (321 = 933) is the first to use the word, Ibn Abī Mansūr Muwaffak.
several times in his work (composed in 668—977), Principles of Pharmacology; K. Kobert, Historische Studien, iii., 1893, p. 1—278) mentions soap (jābūn) and also the hard kind. We learn through al-Mustāmi that the soap (al-rakīḥ) made in Rašqā was a dry soap (read di̇āf) like bees-wax. It was made into cubes so must have been firm (cf. Dozy, Suppl., i. 874*). A full description of the manufacture of soap in Tripolis in Syria is given by L. Rawolffen (Aegentliche Beschreibung der Reise, etc., Laugnungen 1852, p. 38/39). Seaeed was burned there, hard potassium soap was obtained; one could stamp it or walk upon it. Whether kali or soft soap was made or not is not certain.

Al-kīlī is also used in the manufacture of glass; it brings sand to the melting point, purified it and makes it easily take a coloured glaze. Al-şamāk (al-sadajjūdur) use it: only sodium carbonate could be used for glass-making as the glasses of potash are very difficult to melt and part. That many ancient glasses contained potassium is natural. The al-kīlī obtained from al-hurūd is used by the dyers and is called šīlī al-qalāawān, the šīlī of the dyers; the name šabb al-šīfīr is connected with this, the alum of saffron and the passage in the Tādī; it is a grain with which one treats saffron as with alum. The reason for this statement is that alum is used in many dyers as a colouring matter; this is not however the case with alkali carbonates; they are used in saffron to dissolve the dye-material which is practically insoluble in pure water.

From what has been said above it will be clear that it is not correct to call soda (alkali) after the Arabic word al-kīlī. Medical and other uses are discussed in al-Kaswīnī, Ibn al-Bājīr etc. It should further be noted that the accurate botanical identification of the different plant-names is extremely difficult.


(K. WIEDEMANN)

KİMĀR (usually written: Kimak; and wrongly vokalised: Kaimak), name of a Turkish people on the lower course of the Irti. Ibn Khuradadhbih (text in B.G.A., vi. 28 and 31) mentions a road thither (80 or 81 days) from Tarāz (now Awdīyātā) or Kuwītā, seven farāhakt distant, and Gardżāz (in Barthold, Oktet o polevicatev Srednyazju Azji, p. 82 sq.) fully describes another route from Fārāb (Otrār) (via Jenikand, the modern ruins called Dānākent south of the mouth of the Sr-Darya). According to Muḥādassī and Mādīsī (B.G.A., iii. 274) a portion of the Kīmāk at the end of

the ivth (xth) century were already dwelling in the immediate neighbourhood of the Muslim territory in Tūrkestan. The historical importance of the Kīmāk lies in the fact that there sprang from them the later very numerous people of the Kīp-čāk (called Kumān in Europe and Polovtšy by the Russians), originally only a tribe of the Kīmāk. From the viith (xith) century (the mention in Idisī naturally comes from written sources) the name of the Kīmāk disappears and is not again mentioned in the Mongol period. Cf. also J. Marquart in Osttürkische Diatletstudien, 1914, index, s. v Kīmāk; on the pronunciation, p. 89, note 1.

(W. BARTHOLD)

KİMĀR, games of chance. The Kurān prohibited games of chance, under the name of maʾṣūr, at the same time as it forbade wine (ii. 216; v. 92); these arc, it says, a great sin. The pagan Arabs gambled a great deal, say the commentators and staked in play their families and their property. Zamakhshāri interprets maʾṣūr by kīmār, and applies this name especially to the lottery with arrows. There were ten inscribed arrows; a victim was divided into ten parts; the arrows were drawn by lot and to each of them corresponded a part; or sometimes twenty-eight parts were made, one part was allotted to the first arrow; two to the second, three to the third and so on up to the seventh; the three last arrows got nothing and paid the cost of the game. This lottery was practised chiefly in Mecca. According to a tradition of the Prophet, the prohibition also applied to kūbaṭaṭ (dice): “These accursed dice belong to the maʾṣūr of Persia”; and according to a tradition of ‘Alī (s.a.) they were back-gammon. According to Ibn Sirīn, it is extended to everything in which there is a stake or a bet (šāhtar).

As regards chess, it should be noted that certain forms only of this game, and these the less usual, necessitate the use of dice and can be regarded as games of chance; back-gammon, on the other hand, is always played with two dice (see ʿIbraṭ). The Persian dictionary of Vullers also classifies among the kīmār horse-racing, because betting takes places on it. It was in favour in the time of Arab paganism up to the beginning of Islam and under the Omāyads. The historian Mašʿūdī quotes about this a curious and ancient piece of poetry (Mašʿūdī, viii. 377).

Cards are called amongst Orientals “the leaves of fate”, warāk al-kīmār or kīmār bākāh; their origin or at least their diffusion, is more recent than that of the games which we have mentioned. The Arabs have never taken to them; but the Persians were great lovers of them and painted beautiful packs (for example a Persian pack of cards bought by Prisse in Egypt and bearing sabres, crowns, helmets and other signs, “Magasin Pittoreque”, 1846, xiv., p. 365). The use of cards was known in Italy at the end of the fourteenth century, and spread throughout Europe during the fourteenth century. It is said without any good reason to have come from the Arabs. The use which is made of cards for fortune-telling is not without an analogy in the proceedings of geomancy, an ancient superstition in vogue in the north of Africa. We must recall in this connection the opinion of Ettelāʾ whose work is the authority on cartomancy. This student of magic attributes to the Egyptians the invention of checked
cards, which he calls the book of Thoth; this “book” composed of 78 sheets of gold bearing hieroglyphics was the only thing which escaped from the fire of the library of Alexandria in the time of ’Omar; it passed afterwards from the Arabs to the other nations, who received it at the same time as the books on philosophy. Cards are certainly connected with the Chinese games played with tablets bearing figures or symbolical or moral characters which are grouped by families; such games were known in China from the twelfth century.

The Persians have always had gaming-houses which they call kimâr khâna (kimâr is also found with the simple k). The new ruler of Persia, Rizâ Khan, had them closed on his accession (Nov. 1925). “This world — says the poet Sauzeni wishing to express the sentiment of the uncertainty of fate — is the gambling-house of the gods.”


AL-KIMIYÂ, alchemy.

Introductory. The name. In modern chemistry, by a qualitative analysis of the substances occurring in nature the elements composing them are ascertained and by a quantitative analysis their proportions are obtained. From these elements the substances themselves and countless others can be built up by a synthesis; this is done as a result of theoretical considerations which are based on observations. They enable the elements to be combined and their formation to be ascertained in keeping with the facts and even the structure of atoms to be investigated. These purely scientific investigations then lead to inquiries on the obtaining by technical means of practically important substances and the manufacture of corresponding new substances.

In kimiya, alchemy, one starts off on the other hand from theories propounded a priori and isolated facts often wrongly interpreted and endeavours to manufacture precious metals and jewels, either by mixing in a suitable way bodies that occur in nature or by applying an elixir to them. If the study of kimiya was at first less fruitful for the development of knowledge than that of astrology, this was because the latter was able to use the achievements of a very advanced branch of knowledge and was able to advance by means of its investigations, while this was not the case with kimiya. It was only from its study and practice that methods of work developed and a more thorough knowledge of the substances occurring in nature and those obtained from them, was obtained; and this knowledge was later put to scientific use. It formed the starting point for the science of chemistry, especially when analytic methods of separation became more generally known.

Kimiya is in Arabic not primarily an abstraction but means a substance, the means by which the transmutation of metals is affected; it is therefore synonymous with ikâr. The word is usually derived from kam-it or kem-it, the black (A. Wiedemann, Das alte Ägypten, Heidelberg 1920, p. 14); according to H. Diels (Antike Technik, Leipzig 1920, 2nd ed., p. 123), it comes from kûmr molten metal. In the Miftâh al-’Ulwâ’ (p. 256) it is derived from kâmâr, to conceal, while according to al-Safadî, it comes from the Hebrew and is composed of kîm and yâ, according to him the word means that this science comes from God.

Kimiya thus comes also to mean a method by which one endeavours to obtain something, e.g. in kimiya al-’Aṣâ’ir, k. al-ghawîr, k. al-kalâb, i.e. means by which fortune or advantage is attained or hearts are moved (Hîdijdi Khalfa, ed. Flügel, v. 285); in this sense it is found in the titles of works by Arab mystics.

Alchemy itself is called san’at al-kimiya, san’at al-’Aṣâ’ir, ilm al-’Aṣâ’ir, al-iksmâ or briefly kimiya or al-’Aṣâ’ir. Other names are the science of the stone (haḏfar), of the key (mifṣâr). It is also known as the science of the balance or of the scales (mizân or mawâṣa‘); a much used work of Dâhir b. Hâyân, one of the first in this field, is called Kitâb al-Mawâṣa‘, while one of the last prominent alchemists, al-Dzhidjâki (d. about 1350), also wrote a work on Ilm al-Mizân (Berlin, Verz., No. 4185). Kimiya does not get this name, as might be thought, because scales are used in it but because in its problems the relations and considerations of the right measures and proportions of the lower world, of the elementary qualities to one another and of the lower to the upper world are discussed. Only when a correct equilibrium is attained can the desired results (see Berlin, Verz., No. 4185) be obtained. Just as the body is only sound when its qualities, its humors, are in the right proportions to one another, so it is with the precious metals. The alchemist is called kâzâmi (kawâsî, kând, cf. Dozy, Suppl.), kimiya’s (ibn al-Kifî, b. al-’Aṣâ’ir, ed. Lippert, p. 138, 20), san’â’i (Fikrist, p. 351), ikârî (Ain-’Akbari, text, p. 35, 4).

Alchemists and their writings. Just as in the middle ages alchemical knowledge was sought in Enoch, Homer, in the Greek myths, etc., so, according to Muslim writers, God taught Adam the science and he taught his sons: Abraham, Joseph (here = Enoch), David, Solomon and Kowâ, who however had got his knowledge from Moses possessed it. Muhammad and the Caliph ʿAlî were said to have been acquainted with alchemy (E. Wiedemann, Beitr. z. Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften, xiil.).

The Arab alchemists relied very often on works which were ascribed to Greek authors and as usual these included many pseudepigraphic works. We may mention Hermes Trismegistos, Ostanes, Zosimus, Krates, Democritus, Cleopatra, Maria, Apollonius of Tyana, Aristotle, also Pythagoras, Archimedes, Euclid, Ptolemy etc. A list is given by M. Steinshneider in the Z. D. M. G., l. 356 (1895). — Some of the Arabic texts ascribed to such authors have been published by Bertelot (sp. cit.). The knowledge of these writings was probably in part disseminated through the Syrians; indeed it is recorded that the teacher of Khalid b. Yânîzd to be mentioned below was a monk named Marînîs and translations were prepared for him by Iqîfân al-Kadîm.

In Arabic literature a large number of Muslim alchemists and their works are cited. The list is however not nearly so long as that of the astronomers and astrologers, who played a very different and scientific part and therefore were generally noticed.
The *Fihris* probably gives most names (p. 351); according to Stapleton, al-Kāthi quotes a few works with an appreciation of them; M. Berthelot (iii. 41 sq.) has given a number of names and books from al-Wāfi fi Tadbir al-Khams of Muhammad b. Aḥmad al-Maqmūli; al-Dijāfī makes al-Wāfi the most important to him in the introduction to his al-Maṣūḥ fi Ilm al-Maṣūḥ, "Lights of the Science of the Key" (Leiden, Cod. 935); finally there are numerous references in the section Kāshf al-Żamān on alchemy in Hūṣūdī Khāṣīf; the writings quoted at the end of it (in Flügel's ed., v. 284) are in any case those most read in his time. It is remarkable to find among them one by Ibn Sinā (Mirʿāt al-ʿAṣfāʾ, "Mirror of Wonders").

We now give a list of the best known Muslim alchemists with one or more of their principal works:

Khālid b. Yaẓīl, an Umayyad prince (d. 85 = 704); to him is erroneously ascribed *Firdaus al-Mīkma* ("Paradise of Wisdom") (Brockelmann, Gesch. der arab. Litt., i. 67) [see below].

Djābir b. Haiyān [q. v.] who is not identical with the Geber who wrote in Latin — Berthelot distinguishes them as Djābir and Geber — is the author of numerous works; a number of them have been published by Berthelot, *cf.* cit., iii.; but according to some he was a mythical personage. J. Ruska however has shown that he was by no means mythical [see below] cf. Brockelmann, i. 240 sq.

Ibn al-Wahshiyya [q. v.] (c. 870) wrote, in addition to al-Falāṣīf al-Nabāṣīyya, which contains some interesting information along with a good deal of nonsense, and is probably really from the pen of Ibn Tābiʿ al-Zayyāt, alchemical works, which were used for example by Shams al-Din al-Dimashqī in his *Cosmography* (Brockelmann, i. 242).

Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Zarkariya al-Rāzi (Rhases), the celebrated physician (c. 258 = 900), wrote, besides alchemical works the *Kilāb al-ʿArūr* (Brockelmann, i. 233 sqq.); this is now being edited by J. Ruska.

Ibn Umaiya al-Tamusī (eighth or tenth cent.) wrote the *Mīṣāṭ al-Mīkma al-ʿIṣnān* (cf. Leiden, Cat., No. 1274; Brockelmann, i. 241 sqq.);

Al-Farabi [q. v.], the famous philosopher (d. 330 = 950), wrote: "On the necessity of the art of alchemy, i.e. the *Elixir*" (Brockelmann, i. 210 sqq.).

Maslama b. Aḥmad al-Maqriti (d. 398 = 1007), also distinguished as a mathematician and astronomer, was the author of the *Taḥkāl al-ʿUmam* (Brockelmann, i. 243).


Muʿayyid al-Dīn al-Tughra b. (d. about 515 = 1122), the famous vizir and poet often mentioned by Ibn Khaldūn (b. *Sīra*), wrote for example the *Kīlāb al-Ansār wa l-Māfṣīf*; then *Mafṣīf al-Raḥma* and *Anwār al-Mīkma*, Paris, No. 2414, probably also al-Djuwār al-Munīr fi Ṣanʿat al-Iṣkār, Berlin, No. 1036.

According to Gildemeister he was the *Artephius* of the west (Brockelmann, i. 247 sqq.).

Abu ʿl-Ḥasan b. Muʿāṣar b. Arafāt Raʾis (d. 593 = 1197) is the author of the *Shudūr al-Dhahab,* the "gold-splange", which was often annotated (Brockelmann, i. 496).

Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Dīrāj al-Simwā (c. 700 = 1300?). From his pen comes the *Aḥsan al-ʿArūr fi Zirāʿat al-Dhahab,* on which al-Dijāfī wrote a commentary (Brockelmann, i. 496 sqq.).

Ali b. Aidāmīr b. ʿAlī al-Dijāfī (c. 1342) writings and commentaries were much used later as is evident from the numerous manuscripts that still exist. They all move in mystically speculative channels (Brockelmann, ii. 135).

Abu ʿl-ʿAṣba b. Tamnām al-Dīrāj (d. 762 = 1360/61) (Brockelmann, i. 524).

Unfortunately we still lack a compilation for the alchemists such as H. Suter has prepared in a masterly fashion for the Arab mathematicians and astronomers. For those who were also physicians the works of Wāṣentfeld and Leclerc on Arab physicians and Arab medicines give much information. For the earliest history of Arabic alchemy it is of great importance that J. Ruska has shown that the stories of Khālid b. Yaẓīl, b. Muʿayyid and Djiʿāf al-Sāliḥi are simply legends, at least so far as they are concerned with their part as alchemists and with the latter as teacher of Djābir b. Haiyān; on the other hand Djābir b. Haiyān, as is becoming more and more evident, was in reality the great founder of Arab alchemy and al-Rāzi his most important successor (Ruska and Holmyard).

The theories of the Alchemists. The formation of minerals, following Aristotelian views (c. e. g. the very lucid account in the *ʿAyn al-Akkāri*, text i. p. 33—36, transl. i. 38—41). So also the writings of the *Aḥsan al-ʿArūr* (Brockelmann, i. 233 sqq.) was imagined to be somewhat on the following lines. Under the influence of the heat of the sun watery particles rise into the heavens, which are cold and moist, out of the water which is moist and light. When they mingle with the air, which is hot and dry, vapours (bukhār) are formed; out of the earth which is hot and dry there arise from the same cause particles which, mixed with the air, form smoke (dukhan). Bukhār and dukhan thus together contain the four elemental qualities (cold, hot, dry and moist). Their mixture over the surface of the earth produces clouds, wind, rain, snow etc. and under it earthquake, springs and minerals. The bukhār is regarded as the soul of the substance. According to their quality and quantity different bodies are formed, including jewels; according to many alchemists the astrological constellations play a part in this. If bukhār predominates in the mixture, and the warmth of the sun produces a contraction after the complete mixture, quicksilver is formed, if both are present in almost equal quantities, a viscous, fatty, moist substance is formed; if this matures, particles of air emanate from it unless cold brings about a contraction. This mass is inflammable. If there is a small preponderance of dukhan, sulphur is formed, red or yellow, white or grey; in other cases we get zarnāk and naphtha. The substances thus formed, quicksilver, which is also called the mother, and sulphur which is also called the father of the seven bodies (metals) are their sol component.

Differences in the kind of body are due to differences in the purity of the components, to the mixture being made in a particular way, and to
the components affecting each other in different ways; the heat in the deposits may change, cold may supravene etc. — The components are found in the purest form and in the proper proportions first in gold and then in silver; this is less the case with the other metals which were therefore described as diseased gold and silver; tin is considered as leprous silver and quicksilver as apoliotic silver.

When the alchemists however speak of sulphur and quicksilver, they frequently do not mean the substances usually known by this name. Thus Dżābir distinguishes (Berthelot, op. cit., iii. 207) an eastern and a western quicksilver; but what he means by these is not clear from his statement.

The opinions just outlined vary much in individual points of detail but must have been assumed in principle by all Muslim scholars, without essential alteration; for example al-Akṣāfī briefly defines alchemy as follows (E. Wiedemann, in the Journ. für prakt. Chemie, Ser. ii., vol. xxvi., 1907, p. 106): — the doctrine of alchemy is a science by which one endeavours to take their quintessences from minerals and to give them qualities which they did not have.

The Arab scholars were however divided into two groups, one of which assumed the possibility of a transmutation of metals and the other denied it. The former took up the position that the metals and minerals likewise differ only in their accidental qualities, i.e. that they belong to a new and that it is possible, although difficult, with the means at man's disposal, to make the corresponding changes. To this school belong al-Fārābī and the alchemists above mentioned. As evidence for the possibility of alchemy numerous phenomena that had been observed were adduced, notably the continually asserted cases of spontaneous generation, according to which animals were produced from the most different inanimate objects (cf. E. Wiedemann, Die Lehre von der generatio spontanea, Naturwissenschaftliche Wech-enschrift [N.F.], xv. 381, 1916), and the hatching of hens' eggs in incubators in Egypt, or the manufacture of glass from soda and sand, the dissolving of stone (probably with vinegar, cf. O. Rescher, Der Islam, 1919, ix. 120 who quotes a passage from al-Balādhūrī), the manufacture of bronze from copper and ʿūṣiydā burned with coal, reduced zinc oxide, the dyeing of glass by adding various materials. From these processes bodies are frequently produced which bear no similarity to the original substances.

The opportunists of alchemy regard the metals as being different in their essential qualities — as not belonging to the same new; it might be possible to imagine the transmutation of a metal in theory but it could not be carried out for fundamental and practical reasons. Ibn Sinā (Hādżī Khalīfa, op. cit.) gives as reasons as follows: "Even if it was possible to stain silver with the color of gold etc., in such a way that something was taken from or added to the dyed body, I do not see from this the possibility of transmutation of metals. For probably the things observed do not correspond to the fundamental qualities which settle the nature of the body but are accidental things, only necessary to characterise the body. But the fundamental qualities are unknown; one can therefore not look for them, produce them or destroy them". Other writers emphasised that the time available to alchemists for their researches is too short, for very long periods of time have passed in the interior of the earth during which the elements etc. were being cooked sometimes under the influence of certain constellations, until they were transformed into precious metals (cf. al-Dżāhirī, who also wrote a work on al-īzāmī ʿarif, Journ. für prakt. Chemie, loc. cit., p. 73).

One of the most notable opponents of alchemy was al-Kindī [q.v.] whom Muḥammad b. Zakariyā al-Rāzī attacked with unseemly vigour (E. Wiedemann, Beitr. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften, i.).

Even in the xivth century and later when Muslim learning had considerably declined and it must be assumed that criticism had become much weaker, alchemy was still vigorously attacked. This is seen from a section in the Cosmography of al-Dimashki (d. 727 = 1327), who devoted some time to the refutation of alchemy (ed. Mehren, text, p. 58, transl., p. 64). The ardent alchemist al-Džaldakī considered it necessary to add to his commentary on al-Mukabara a chapter entitled: "On the possibility that the accident may disappear, which has entered into the specific kind (maw') that the body again assumes its specific kind by art, otherwise, on the proof that the art, its practice and the certain proof for it is beyond all need and finally on the refutation of him who ridicules it and says it is useless" (Leiden, Cat. Or., iii. 204). The great historian Ibn Khaldūn (op. cit.) also vigorously attacks alchemy and its representatives (see Wiedemann, Beitr. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaft, i.).

This refusal to have anything to do with alchemy was largely due to the repeated failures of the alchemists, which brought scorn and ridicule on their heads, and vigorous attacks on the pernicious study of alchemy. Ibn Khaldūn observes that it was usually poor people who studied alchemy, Ibn Sinā, who denied the reality of the elixir, possessed great wealth, while al-Fārābī who believed in it was one of the most unfortunate of men and did not always have sufficient food. — Abīd al-Laiyf says: "Verily, most men have been ruined by the work of Ibn Sinā and by alchemy." — There are two proverbs: "Three things cannot be attained by three things: youth by age, health by medicine, and treasure by al-ākimīyyāt" and "He who studies astrology is not secure from poverty". To conclude, al-Safadi gives very sorrowful remarks on alchemy and the fruitless endeavours of its followers.

The alchemists however consolved themselves with the reflection that at any rate the knowledge of alchemy had once existed but had later been lost, but it would certainly be found again (see E. Wiedemann, in the Journ. für prakt. Chemie, Series ii., vol. xxvi., 1907, p. 123: Ibn al-Fāqīh, ed. de Goeje, B. G. A., v., p. 205; Vākū, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 264; al-ʿIzzānī, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 164).

Among the alchemists we must carefully distinguish the men who were convinced of the possibility of the transmutation of metals, and went about their task in good faith and the swindlers. The serious students were in part philosophers who derived their doctrine of the elixir by pure deduction from Aristotelian views; of these the most notable was al-Fārābī. Others enlivened simple assumptions with mystic, gnostic, neo-Platonic etc. ideas and then wrote works of
which it may be said to be very doubtful whether the authors themselves understood them. As the latter admit, puzzling expressions are deliberately used, but these vary from school to school, simply, we are told, to prevent the masses and the rulers from making gold artificially, which would be very harmful. Each successive writer seems to try to surpass his predecessor in obscurity and the commentaries do not make the originals any clearer. It is often difficult to understand how intelligent beings could have written such things. They claim to have acquired their knowledge, as was indeed common among Muslim scholars, on distant journeys. The study of alchemy has had one undeserving result, in as much as the representatives of the mystical movement in Islam studied alchemy e.g. Ibn al-'Arabi (d. 1240) who called gold and silver the “great names” (see al-Dimashqi, op. cit., text, p. 51, transl. p. 56). To this school may be said to belong more or less the Pseudo-Khālid b. Yazid, Ibn al-Wahhâbiya, Ibn Ùmail al-Ṭamimi, Ibn Arfa’ ʿArif’s, al-Djâlibi, Abu ‘l-ʿKâsim al-ʿIrâqî and others. Many of these men, however, made experiments, at least, according to al-Ṣafâdi, the Imam al-Ḥarâmain (al-Ḍuwâlî) was burned to death by a jet of flame. Another group of alchemists describe experiments in their works, but it is not always certain whether these were actually made or whether they are purely imaginary; the latter is of course always the case when a real elixir is said to have been made and its effects even described. Of this nature are the works of Ḏijâr bi. Ḏiyât, the Kitâb al-Aṣrûr of al-Râzî, that of al-Tughrâ’s, al-Djâlib al-Ṣurî, etc., that of al-Kâthî and the Arabic writings on which are based the works of the western scholar known as Geber. Frequently as in al-Râzî the arrangement in these books on alchemy is such that the substances and apparatus are first described and then the various experiments are detailed, arranged according to the methods of treatment like sublimation, calcination, dissolution, etc. and not as with us according to the substances investigated; we thus see what great stress was laid on method.

Whether the alchemists ever had any laboratories on a large scale with a staff of assistants is not yet known, but their workroom was probably very like those often described later, as they required special arrangements for many purposes which could only be set up in a special room. At any rate this was the case with alchemists who worked for princes, who frequently employed an alchemist just as they had a court astrologer. The unsuccessful efforts of two may there be mentioned; al-Ma’mûn (198–218 = 813–833) said to an alchemist ʿUṣūf ʿUtub, who had had no success: — “Alas for you: there is nothing in al-kimyây”! The latter replied in excuse that the druggists swindled him whereupon the Caliph declared himself satisfied. Others did not fare so well, as is shown by the story, whether true or not, that Abû ʿṢâliḥ Mandûr b. Ṣâhid, a ʿAmmârî, beat al-Râzî so severely that he blinded him. It is more probable that, as al-Baḥrâkî records, his eyes were affected by the vapours which arose in the preparation of the elixir and that he had himself treated by a physician for a large fee. He thought that this the he was true al-kimyây and became himself a physician, al-Masûdî also talks of grave injuries caused by vapours (see E. Wiedemann, Beitr. Zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften, ii. 547). They resulted in loss of hearing or sight, and loss of colour in the face (in heating vitriol for example sulphuric acid escapes). Poisonous vapours are also mentioned by other writers (E. Wiedemann, op. cit., xxv. 127).

Alchemical swindlers. Alongside of these alchemists who are to be taken seriously, appeared a great number of swindlers who took advantage of the credulity of high and low to make money easily. In North Africa, according to Ibn Khâlid, it was particularly students of law and theology who used to deceive the people of the villages in this way. These swindlers either claimed they could make gold out of material but without ever producing it, or they brought gold into contact with the stuff to be transmuted into the apparatus itself, or they fastened it to the lid of the crucible with wax, or they coloured ordinary metals either with sulphide or by preparing coatings for them, so that they looked like gold. A series of illuminating stories is given by al-Djâlibi (E. Wiedemann, Journ. f. prakt. Chemie, loc. cit., p. 82 and E. Wiedemann, Über das Goldmachen, etc.). One is a delightful story of how the so clever al-Malik al-ʿĀdîl Nûr al-Dîn Zanjî (554–569 = 1146–1173) was swindled. The great Mughal Sultan Akbar q.v. fared no better when he allowed himself to be introduced to alchemy by bigotted jugglers, the Yogi, and publicly exhibited gold made by himself (Ishâq b. al-Blochmann’s translation of the ʿĀʾīn Akbarī, i. 201).

These swindlers naturally did a great deal of harm to the prestige of alchemists in general, so much so that according to al-Kazwînî (ii. 98) they were the lowest grade of students.

Methods of solving the problem of alchemy. It was thought that the solution of the alchemical problem might be reached by one of three ways (cf. E. Wiedemann, Journ. f. prakt. Chemie, loc. cit., p. 105, from al-Akînî). Whether and in how far they were ever really systematically prosecuted, research has not so far been able to ascertain. The methods were the following:

1) A start is made from the view above mentioned, that all metals have arisen out of sulphur and quicksilver which were heated in the earth as described. The alchemists proceed similarly, but in place of these two bodies many others are also taken, of which they suppose that they contain the fundamental materials and endeavour to increase the heat on account of the shortness of the time available beyond that prevailing in the earth. 2) They go back to the mutual (of course quite unknown) relation of volume and weight of the components and combine the metals so that a body is formed which in weight and volume is like the desired metal. In this process heed must be paid to the balancing of the qualities. These two methods, so far as their principles are concerned, may be called scientific, although they were hardly so in practice. 3) The third method starts from the view that the ignoble metals are diseased precious ones. A remedy was prepared which was called elixir (al-ḥisâr) or al-farrîr, i.e. the fugitive (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitr. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften, ii. 549): it was also called from its material the “honoured stone” (al-khâjähr al-mukhram); in place of the stone there
was also a "substitute (būdal) for the stone", out of which a more deeply hidden elixir is obtained; there was also a substance similar to the stone and its substitute. The elixir etc. also contained healing virtues to a high degree.

The most fabulous stories are told regarding the elixir's power to attain desired transmutation or the elixir is said to turn 60,000, 300,000 or 1,200,000 mithkāl into gold, — or even as much as is between heaven and earth (cf. Ḥādījī Khālīfā, op. cit., p. 276) (cf. also the statements in O. Rescher, Der Islam, ix. 33).

That kimiyā was practised down to modern times is shown for example by the statements in Snouck Huregronje (Mekkā, ii. 215, and E. W. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egypt-Egyptians, London 1860, p. 264). There is also a play by Faith "Ali Aḥkāmzāde "The Alchemist" (cf. G. Jacob, Türkische Volksliteratur, Berlin 1901; see also Barbier de Meynard, Journ. Asiatique, Ser. viii., vol. i. [1886], p. 5).

The substances used. The substances used by the alchemists are given in their writings: varieties of the individual bodies are detailed, for example a whole series of varieties of sulphur is given and of kinds of mārkašḵāštā, etc. In many cases we are at the same time told which are the good and which the bad varieties.

The Mafāthiḥ al-ʿUṯūm distinguishes, as is usual in other books: 1) metals: gold, silver, copper, the two kinds of ṭaḏīṣ (lead and tin), bārdīnī for al-ḥadīd al-ṭaḏī, usually hard lead; quicksilver is sometimes given in place of the latter; 2) evaporating substances (rīḥā): sulphur, sirīnīkh (realgar and orpiment), nūḏḏāḏīr (usually sal ammoniac but also ammonium carbonate), quicksilver; 3) all other mineral substances (in the Mafāthiḥ al-ʿUṯūm called drugs).

Al-Rāzī divides the substances into first animal, mineral (ebraḏāl) and vegetable drugs. The mineral are divided into the 7 bodies (metals), 13 stones (including precious stones etc.), 5 vitriols, 6 kinds of bārdīs (kinds of cathartic drugs etc.), 11 salts. The animal are hairs, brains, eyes etc. Only a few vegetable substances are used by him, namely usamān (alkali plants) and cinquefoil, chaste-tree, (būlud kūsh, vitex agnus castus), its fruits and an antieroticum. Al-Tūghrātī gives a similar division; only he divides the stones into four groups, the reason for which is not quite clear.

Al-Kāšī divides into metals and 12 stones which latter include sulphur, sirīnī kh and nūḏḏāḏīr. Al-Dimashḵī deals successively with quicksilver, sulphur, metals and then the minerals which include mythical stones and a few drugs.

Al-Kazwīnī classifies the substances he deals with into metals, stones and oily substances.

A very peculiar division with regard to the preparation of the elixir (see Stapleton and Azo, op. cit.) is the following: Quicksilver, sal ammoniac etc. are spirit of sulphur, sirīnī kh etc. are souls; gold, silver, iron, maghdīsīmān (as well as bones, copper and brass in the later manuscripts) are parts of the spirit, two parts of soul and one of body. An elixir which contains no spirit or no soul or no body is useless. Soul and spirit may however give colour even if body is absent; but this disappears on smelting. If all three are combined it is permanent.

The alchemist separates the substances he uses a great number of epithets (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitr. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften, x. 82) by which he refers to them in his works which makes it unusually difficult to understand them. The metals are called after planets to which they are subordinate. Mercury thus belongs to kharṣīnī. In the MSS. the name is often replaced by the sign of the planet. But the metals have countless other names. For sal ammoniac we frequently find nūḏḏā (eagle).

The works on jewels, drugs etc. are of alchemical but also of purely chemical interest. A number of Arabic sources with as full references as possible are given in the articles quoted in the Bibliography.

Apparatus used. We know a good deal about the apparatus used by Arab alchemists. In the first place we have lists of the apparatus used, sometimes with descriptions, e. g. in the Kābār al-Asrār of al-Rāzī, in the Mafāthiḥ al-ʿUṯūm, in the work of al-ʿAḏīrī, in al-Qaṣwār al-Manāḥir of al-Tūghrātī, which frequently agrees with the Kābār al-Asrār text published by Betheloth, op. cit. Information is also given in various passages, especially about distilling apparatus. The apparatus used is essentially the same as that used by the Greeks; a furnace for example is called, although perhaps without reason, the furnace of Zosimus (Gotha MS., No. 1349).

The apparatuses were used for heating are of course numerous. Various forms and names were given to the furnaces. The draught was regulated as required; its strength was judged by a leaf thrown into its current. The bellows were used to kindle the fire, but there were also furnaces with a self-acting draught. For special purposes, such as the treatment of glass, the manufacture of precious stones, the furnace was of a suitable form. For melting either an ordinary crucible was used or one crucible above another; in the latter case the upper one was perforated in the bottom. The molten metal in the upper crucible flowed into the lower one and the slack was kept back. Tongs etc. were used to pick things up; an alchemist complains that he very often burned himself in using them but without obtaining any results. Moulds were used for casting. To hold the substances to be heated one sees both old and new fits (alud al-taḏ īlāḥā) a longish pumpkin closed with a lid were used. The capital (anīk, al-dubā) was put on the still. Thus the alembic (q. v.) is made and if the still is closed at the end it is called "blind", if it is open and has a spout, still and capital together correspond to our retort and are used for distillation (teḵfīr). A kāḥila, our receiver, is then placed over the end of the spout. Al-Rāzī and al-Tūghrātī frequently point out that the vessels to be heated must be of uniform thickness and have no flaws, or they might easily burst. The kūrbises etc. were heated either on an open fire or in the hot air rising from one or in the steam rising from boiling water or a water bath.

To solder and polish the places where different parts of the apparatus are joined, clay of wisdom (of philosophy ʿin al-ḥikmā) was used, which was made of pure fermented clay, usually mixed with finely chopped hair and salt. There are numerous recipes for its manufacture. Different kinds of clay are given the names of the planets (Gotha MS., No. 1344). The outside of the vessels to be heated, as was still the custom with us in the sixteenth century, were also covered with clay to distribute the heat evenly and thus diminish the danger of explosion.
To break up substances the mortar (híma) and pestle (dákš) were used and for grinding them a hard, flat slab (siláyá) and a grindstone (fíh). Processes used. In their experiments the alchemists used a large number of processes, which again had many variants. The following is a list, of course not quite complete, divided into eight groups; it is taken from al-Khájarízi (Máshelf al-Ulum), Hadjíli Khâsha and alchemical writers.

1) Tadbir, the treatment of bodies in general.
2) Suká, grinding etc.; tafsil, breaking into pieces, mísád and tarísid, mixing; 3) hál and tahil (dissolving) are probably synonyms. These mean methods by which the body is either dissolved in our sense of the word or simply divided into very fine particles. Varieties are dissolution in corrosives, in dung (i.e. in a moderate heat), in moisture, by pounding with the pestle (dákš), by boiling, with the blind anbík (i.e. at a high pressure and temperature), with cottonwood and the anvil (the substance is wrapped in a roll of cottonwood and beaten on the anvil), by dripping (ta’tívr). Many alchemists distinguish the following varieties of hál: the substances are dissolved as usual or they are hung up in a sieve-like bag and the steam rising from water dissolves them (cf. al-Kâtí and al-Tughrí). taspíl, suspension, by which the substance is divided into fine particles in water; tashkíya, spraying, tashfiya and takhtís, cleaning and filtering.

4) ikíma, solidifying (over the fire without anything being burned); tashkíya, stewing (in oil) etc. or dry; to’kíd and perhaps also mutúbad, to solidify; the following varieties are given: with dryness, with the bottle, the kettle, burning (dáfí which plays a great part generally; bottles for burning are for example mentioned), with the blind anbík; tadýtís, a kind of tadjísid, changing into bodies. 5) sákab melting; itisíná, allowing to flow from the upper to the lower erasable. 6) takfír, allowing to drip, distilling and filtering; tajíd, sublimating; tajjíma „stoning“; a kind of sublimating. 7) takhírima, certification, making softlike wax; taklá, calcination; tajlé, to turn into dust; taimá, amalgamating. 8) I do not know the meaning of tajjí, „balancing“; takhírik, “strangling”, which is connected with certification.

Weighing was, of course, a process of special importance and frequently used; for it must have been very soon recognised that substances could not be mixed in any proportions one pleased. They must always occur in the proper proportions (on weighing see the article Mízán). Statements on the proper proportions are not very frequent. In the Máshelf al-Ulum we are told that to make cinnamon, one should take 1 part quicksilver and 1 part sulphur; the proportion calculated from the atomic weights is 209:32. It should be noted however that for the reaction to take place smoothly a considerable superfluity of sulphur is necessary. Another interesting quantitative statement (Yákut, ii. 139) is to the effect that 1 part of silver is obtained from 100 parts of lead in the making of litharge. Al-Kâtí gives a long list of the smallest quantities of all the different substances that the alchemists use (op. cit., p. 57 sqq.).

Synthetic and analytic methods. There were no general methods to produce definite bodies; a whole series was however obtained artificially, e.g. verdigris from copper and vinegar, white of lead from lead and vinegar, cinnamon from the heating of lead, also litharge, iron rust from iron, etc.; in these cases it was known that the substances concerned must contain the metal. It was the same when copper was obtained from minerals found in nature such as the varieties of malachite (Dáhmat, al-Dímean, text p. 83, transl. p. 97).

There was no analysis in our sense of the term. But there were a large number of rules for the chief of police (muftásáb) by which he could tell the apparently very common adulterations. Thus mineral adulterations of indigo were ascertained by burning. There are writings on this subject by Abú ’l-Fa’túl al-Dámí, Ibn Rassam and al-Nabúbáwí (E. Wiedemann, Beitr. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften, xxii. and xl.). Gold and silver are tested for purity by the touchstone or by purely chemical methods.

Technical processes. Very little has so far been accurately learned regarding chemical technical processes. A few indications may suffice here. In the first place we do not know much about the methods by which the metals were actually obtained. Gold was got by washing; in some places it was dissolved by quicksilver, the latter of course being regained by distillation (see E. Wiedemann, op. cit., xxv. 83). Quicksilver was obtained by distillation from cinnabar (either out of iron or retorts by the addition of splinters of iron) (E. Wiedemann, Journ. fur prakt. Chemie, op. cit., p. 111). On the manufacture of steel and especially its damascening, the providing with aríná, there are a series of works, e.g. one by al-Kíndí. According to a modern Oriental writer, Thábit (al-Máshirí, 1900, iii. 577 and 700), damascening is said to depend on the presence of titanium in the metal; but these statements are as a rule of an empirical and thumb nature (E. Wiedemann, Beitr. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften, xxv.; L. Beck, Gesch. des Eisens, vol. i.).

For a series of artificially prepared inorganic substances see above.

The methods of obtaining different scents from plants were very highly developed. These were especially cultivated in Persia and in Damascus and followed the processes of the ancients. In the district of Shíráz, special taxes were levied on the buildings in which rose-water was prepared (E. Wiedemann, in Diergarte, Beiträge, p. 234). The scents were partly extracted from the flowers or leaves by means of cold or hot oil and fat and then subjected to further processes. A great variety of oils, — olive, sesame, etc. — was used in the process (cf. Ibn al-Bárár under dhun). Water was poured on the different substances and they were put in retorts. These retorts were arranged around a shaft in circles, which were placed above one another in tiers. Hot air from a fire or steam from hot water heated the retorts. The steam developed in the retort carried off the sweet scented ethereal oils and was precipitated with them into a receptacle (pictures in al-Dímean, Nukkáh al-Dámí, text, p. 194; E. Wiedemann, in Diergarte, op. cit.).

The important sugar industry, about which we possess fairly full information will be dealt with in the article Sukkar (cf. E. A. von Lippmann, Geschichte des Zuckers, Leipzig 1910; E. Wiedemann, Beitr. zur Gesch. d. Naturwissenschaften, xii., iii., iv.) and the glass industry under zadásí. 
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On the manufacture of the usual inks, sympathetic and gold inks, of lacquers and jordans, and of cements, a number of works exist which still await editing; so far as I can ascertain, they contain purely practical rules.

A very great part was played by the processes by which drugs, pearls, jewels, etc., were imitated. This was done to a very great extent as we know from al-Khāzīnī’s Maṣāḥ al-Ḥikam. Many of the processes given by the different authors are simply pure inventions. Of particular interest are the statements by al-Djawbari in his Kāṣf al-Awrār (cf. E. Wiedemann, op. cit., xxxiii. and Mitt. d. Gesch. d. Medizin d. Naturwissenschaften, 1910, ix. 386) and those in the handbooks prepared for the muḥāṣbiūn.

A proper history of Kīmiyā and an account of its place in Muslim culture will only be possible when we are much better acquainted with the works of its representatives than at present, and also have a better idea of the sciences connected with chemistry, pharmacy, knowledge of drugs, etc., mineralogy, etc. As to chemistry a start has to be made almost from the beginning, as has been done by J. Ruskā and E. J. Holmyard. It is important that the processes described should be translated into modern technical terms as Darmstädter endeavoured to do for the Latin Geber.


Catalogues of the Libraries, especially that of the Berlin Library. The Sulṭáníya Library in Cairo is also said to be very rich. There are also the alchemical writings themselves so far as they have survived. The Latin translations of Arabic works on Kīmiyā are not here quoted (on them cf. M. Steinschneider, Die europäischen Übersetzungen aus dem Arabischen bis Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts in Sitzungsber. d. K. Akad. der Wissensch., Vienna, Philos.-hist. Kl., exlix., 1904 and cli., 1905).

II. Western Sources: C. Brockelmann, Gesch. der arab. Litteratur; H. Köpp, Gesch. der Chemie, Braunschweig 1843—1847; Do. Beitr. zur Gesch. der Chemie, Braunschweig 1869—1875; Do. Die Chemie in älterer und neuerer Zeit, Heidelberg 1886, 2 vols.; F. Hoefer, Histoire de la Chimie 3, Paris 1867—1869, 2 vols.; M. Berthelot, La chimie au moyen-âge, 3 vols., Paris 1893; E. O. von Lippmann, Entdeckung u. Ausbreitung der Alchemie, Berlin 1919 (in this work the material has been most carefully collected and utilised with the most accurate references to the literature); H. E. Stapleton and R. F. Azo, Alchemical Equipment in the Eleventh Century (contains "The Essence of the Art and Help for the Workers by one al-Ḵātīf" with transl. and commentary) in Mem. of the Asiatic Soc. of Bengal, 1905, i. 47; E. Wiedemann, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften u. w., in Stü.
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takh, Kitab al-`Illu al-Mukta`azab, etc., 1923, 53 p., text and transl. 57 p.; do., A Romance of Chemistry, Journ. of the Society of Chemical Industry, 1925, xlvii.; do., Chemistry in Islam, in Scientia, Milan, Nov. 1926, pp. 287—396; J. Ruska and E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, xlvii, Arabische alchemistische Dokumente, S.B.P.M.S. Ergl, 1924—1925, 157 p.; E. Darmstadtter, Die Alchemie des Gebirge, Berlin 1922 (translation of works by the Latin Geber with notes important for the Arabíat) (E. Wiedemann) KINÁLIZÁDE, Ar. Ibn al-Hinná (cf. Z.D. M.G., xiv. 544 and Gihb, H.O.P., iii. 199 note) a Turkish family of scholars and poets (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O.R., iii. 736), of which the following are the most important members: L. KINÁLIZÁDE, AL El-DIN ALI B. AMURULLÁH, Ottoman jurist and author, was born in 910 (1510/1511) in Sparta in the district of Hamidí, in Anatolia, in the son of the kâdî Emrullah (Mehméd) who died in 967 (1559) and grandson of Abd al-Kadir Hamidí. He filled jugendships in the following towns: Damascus, Cairo, Brussa, Adrianople, and from Dymmetrica in 978 Oct—Nov 1570 in Constantinople, was appointed Kâdî-lasker of Anatolia in Muharram 979 (May—June 1571) and died on 6th or 7th Ramadán of the same year (Jan. 22/23, 1572) in Adrianople. His brother was the poet Muslími, who was kâdî at Rhodes and elsewhere and is said to have died in 944 (1537). Of Ali's sons mention may be made of Mèhmèd Pehmî Efendi, also distinguished as a poet, who died when only 32 on 28th Shawwálu 1004 and Hasan Celébi (see below), the famous biographer of poets.

Mollá ALI El-DIN ALI was a very industrious writer. He wrote glossaries and commentaries on a series of theological works. He became famous by his ethical work Ahtúd-i ALI written in 972 (1564) for the Beyderley of Syria, Ali Pasha, the original MS. of which is in the library of Rághib Pasha in Stambul (N. 966). This work (cf. Hadíjí Kalaþa, Kafih, i. 203, No. 280) was written (256 + 127 + 52 pp.) in Shawwálu 1248 (Feb. 1833) at Búlak (cf. J. A., 1843, ii. 40, No. 68; Zeuker, i. 1357, where 'alamí is an error for alasting) and besides translated either in full or in parts; cf. the MS. transl. of the Venetian dragoman Giovanní Medun in the Bonn University Library, No. 47 in J. Gildemeister, Katael, p. 114, thereon G. B. Toderini, Letteratura Turcesta, Venice 1877, i. 95 as well as R. Peiper, Stimmen aus dem Moränglanzer, Hirschberg 1850, i. 840, 403 sqq. and do., Das Capitel von der Freiegebitt, Breslau 1848, esp. p. 97, 128. MSS. of the Ethics of Mollá ALI are numerous; cf. Flügel, Wiener Kat., iii. 204 sq.; Pertsch, BirI. Turk. Hst., p. 168 sq., where further details are given.

Another work is his collection of letters (Munshábat, cf. Hadíjí Kalaþa, Kafih, vi. 186) in the five sections of which, in a period in which written was decaying, he gives masterly specimens of the different sections of literary composition. There are MSS. of this work in the British Museum (Rieu, Turk. MSS., p. 94), Vienna, Nat.-Bibli., No. 289 (Flügel, Katael, i. 266 sqq.); Vienna, Konsular-Akad., i. lxxiv. Krafft, Kafih, 28 sq. BIBLIOGRAPHY: The fullest biography is in the MS. Tadklíra of his son Hasan Celébi; ALI, Qulá Shaláž al-mútmánya, p. 164—168; ALI, Kunh al-`Aláb (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O.R., iii. 755, No. 57); Pechézi, Ta'ríkh, i. 458; Sidjíl-i `othmáni, iii. 501 (with erroneous statements concerning the Kinálizada family); J. v. Hammer, G. O.R., ii. 341, i. 131; do., G. O.R., iii. 736 (also contains mistakes regarding individual Kinálizada's), iv. 603 (where the brother of Mollá ALI, Mollá Abd al-Rahim Kermiti Celébi, mentioned in Hadijí Kalaþa, Fethleke, i. 7 sq. and died in 1000 = 1591, is wrongly given as the author of this or another collection of letters; cf. thereon, W. Pertsch, BirI. Turk. Hst., p. 471 on No. 491); Brusali Mehmed Táhir, `Othmání múellíetleri, i. 400 (with scant list of writings); F. Wustenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber, No. 532, p. 248 sq.

II. KINÁLIZÁDE HASAN CELÉBI, an Ottoman biographer of poets. Hasan Celébi was the son of the Mollá ALI mentioned above and was born in Brussa in 953 (began March 4, 1546), where his father was judge. At the age of twenty he became assistant (mu'assam) to the famous Abú Suud [q.v.], in 975 (1567/1568) professor, in 990 (1582/1583) "guardian" (i.b.), e. müzèdís at the mosque of Mehmed the Conqueror (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O.R., vii. 186), five years later professor at the Suleimánîya mosque, at which his father had once been first muzèdís (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O.R., i. 349). In the year 999 (1590/1591) he became kâdî of Aleppo, then of Cairo, Adrianople and again in 1007 (1598/1599) he went as kâdî to his native town of Brussa, then to Gallipoli, became kâdî of Eiyûb, and in Safar 1011 (July 1602) of Eski Zagrha. He died, the holder of an arpaští [q.v.] on Shawwálu 12, 1012 (March 15, 1604) at Rosetta (Rashíd) in Egypt.

Hasan Celébi achieved fame by his comprehensive dictionary of poets in three sections (jašîf), Tadklírát al-`Alí, a work which according to Hadíjí Khalióa's view (Kasrál, ii. 262, No. 2817) surpasses all previous works of the kind in the beauty of its language and the compactness of its matter. The Tadklíra (finished in 944 = 1536 and dedicated to the great Sa'd al-Din [cf. KHOJA EFENDI], gives biographical sketches of nearly six hundred poets with specimens of their work. This most important work, of which many manuscript reprints exist, has yet not been printed. A definitive edition of this, the best and most comprehensive of all Ottoman anthologies, is urgently desirable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: ALI, Kunh al-`Aláb (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O.R., iii. 736, 756, No. 138); Hadijí Kalaþa, Fethleke, i. 240; Sidjíl-i `othmáni, ii. 127; J. v. Hammer, G. O.R., ii. 44; do., G. O.R., iii. 736; ix. 243, N. 137; Gihb, H.O.P., passim, esp. iii. 199 sqq.; Brusali Mehmed Táhir, `Othmání múellíetleri, i. 385; al-Muhíbi, Ta'ríkh al-Khúdá`al-`Aláh, Cairo 1254, ii. 29; F. Wustenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber, No. 547, p. 254. (FRANZ BAEBINGER) KINÁNA B. KHUZAIMA B. MUÐIRKA B. AL-YÁS B. MUĐÁR is the name of a large Arab tribe which had its camping grounds at the beginning of Islám in the territory round Mecca, extending from the Tihama in the South-west of the city, where they bordered on the lands occupied by the real tribe of Hudhail, to the North-east of the city, where their grounds adjoined those occupied by their nearest relations the tribe of Asad of Khuzaíma. They were very numerous and their chief
importance in the eyes of native genealogists lies in the fact that the Kuraish, and consequently the Prophet, derived their origin from this tribe. In view of this fact we have concerning them an abundance of notices of their subdivisions and of men of note who traced their descent from them. While later genealogists name as a rule only six large clans, Ibn al-Kalbi in the Lajmahar al-Nasab mentions the following fourteen sons of Kinānā: (1) al-Nadr i.e. Kaž as considered the ancestor of Kuraish [q.v.]; (2) Nuḍair; (3) Mālik; (4) Milkān (so this name is vocalised in the good MS. of the Lajmahar, while Kalkashaנהndi insists on the pronunciation Mālkan); (5) ‘Amir; (6) ‘Amr; (7) al-Hārīth; (8) Arwān (or ‘Arwān); (9) Sa‘d; (10) ‘Awf; (11) Ghannām; (12) Makrhamu and 13) Djarāwal. All these thirteen tribes are stated to be the offspring of Barra bint Murr, the sister of Tamīm b. Murr, for which reason they are brought into relationship with the large tribe of Tamīm. The fourteenth son of Kinānā named Abd Manāt was a son of al-Dhafira bint Hani b. Balāt of Khulafa for which reason this clan is often reckoned as belonging to Khulafa’s itself. The later genealogists as at the time only mention al-Nadr; Mālik, Milkān, ‘Amir, ‘Amr and ‘Abd Manāt of Most of which they also enumerate subdivisions. No divisions of Milkān, ‘Amr and ‘Amir are mentioned except al-Kaž as a branch of the last named, while al-Nadr as ancestor of Kuraish is dealt with in the article referring to Kuraish. Milkān was divided into the clans Thalaba b. al-Hārīth b. Mālik, with the subdivisions of Firās b. Ghannām b. Thalaba, and Muḥammad b. ‘Amir b. Thalaba, and Fūṣāmīn b. ‘Adī b. ‘Amir. The ‘Abd Manāt were perhaps the most numerous and are split up into a number of clans: (1) Ghifār; (2) Bakr with the subdivisions of Du‘il and Laiḥ; (3) Bil-Hārīth; (4) Muddūd; who were renowned as augurs; (5) Dāmara b. Bakr).

It would be absurd to assume that these names mean actual sons or descendants of Kinānā, but for the early period of Islām they are important as indicating the mutual relationship in which the various clans of Kinānā considered themselves to be and were possibly entered in the Dīwān created by ‘Umar. As with all other Arab tribes the exact knowledge of affiliation of single persons very soon became doubtful and only the descendants of men who had played an important part in the rise of Islām could trace their descent with some degree of certainty. The clans of Kinānā which in later times, i.e. in the sixth century of the Hijra were settled in Upper Egypt near Ḥmmim or in the Western Delta had no knowledge of their origin except that they claimed to be descended from the original stock and had immigrated into Egypt at various periods, the last immigration having been in the vizierate of Bilād b. Risāk (549–556 A.H.). As close neighbours of the sacred territory, the tribe of Kinānā played an unimportant part in the history of the city of Mecca in the time before Islām and the clansmen outside gave the final decision when the branch Kuraish wrested the rule of the city from the tribe of Khuzāya, for it was their chief Ya‘mar b. ‘Awf b. Ka‘b b. ‘Amir b. al-Laiḥ b. Bakr b. ‘Abd Manāt who was chosen to give his final decision which was in favour of Kuraish; and he received on account of his decision the nickname al-Shududhīk “the Crusher” because he crushed the dispute. Their attitude towards the Prophet as a united tribe is not recorded, but one of their clans the Banū Fīrās was among the chief supporters of ‘Ali at Šīfa. The last time Tabarits mentions them in his Anmusr is in the year 230 A.H. when they where in part still encamped near Mecca, but were too weak to resist the depredations of other tribes who had become more powerful. At this time a large section had their camping grounds in the Ḥawrān and near Sākha. Though not important as a tribe, the names of men of note as traditionists etc. are very numerous, too numerous to be mentioned in detail.


KINDA, also called Kindat al-Muluk (the royal kind) was a South-Arabian tribe which, probably not numerous, was settled at the time preceding the rise of Mu’awiyah in the country to the West of Ḥaḍramawt. The Arab genealogists know their descent, but as usual with all South-Arabian tribes it is altogether imaginary. The line of descent is traced as follows: Thaw (i.e. Kinda) b. ‘Uqair b. ‘Adī b. al-Hārīth b. Murra b. Uداد b. Zaid b. Yashdhub b. Zaid b. ‘Arīb b. Zaid b. Khāliḥ b. Sābāh. They appear not to be mentioned in ancient South-Arabian inscriptions and are first mentioned in history in the fourth century of the Christian era. Ḥudjar b. ‘Amr b. Mu’awiyah b. al-Hārīth al-Aṣghar b. Mu’awiyah b. al-Hārīth al-Akbār b. Mu’awiyah. Kinda, called Akil al-Murār, was a step-brother of the Ḥimyarite ruler Ḥassān Tubba and in accordance with the practice of the Ḥimyarite kings, his son ‘Amr b. Ḥudjar was kept by Ḥassān Tubba at his court as a page and at the same time hostage. When Ḥassān Tubba made his expedition into the interior of Arabia and subdued the various tribes settled there, he was dispatched, upon his return to Yaman, his step-brother Ḥudjar ruler of the conquered tribes. Ḥassān Tubba was killed at the instigation of his brother ‘Amr, after an expedition against Djadis, who resided in Yamanā. The latter gave a sister of Ḥassān Tubba in marriage to ‘Amr b. Ḥudjak and when his father Ḥudjak had perished he succeeded him as ruler of the Arab tribes in Central Arabia; he was nicknamed al-Makṣūr. ‘Amr was succeeded by his son al-Hārīḥ who for a short time after the death of the Persian king Kūbād was made ruler of al-Hira but lost this possession upon the accession of Nushārān. After his death the now practically independent kingdom of Central Arabia was divided among the sons of al-Hārīḥ, while his son Ḥudjar retained the rule over the tribe of Asad, Shurayh became ruler of the tribe of Bakr, Ḥangab the tribe of Tamīm and the Rabāḥ, while Salama ruled over Tangib, al-Nāṣir b. Kāsim and Sa‘d b. Zaid Manāt and Ma‘dī Karīb had the tribes of Kais and Kinānā under his authority. They immediately began to dispute one another’s authority which resulted in the first battle of Kūlāb in which practically all Arab tribes took part. This place Kūlāb is difficult to identify: it is said to have been between al-BAṣrā and al-Kuφa, seven days’ journey from Yamanā.
Al-Kindi, Abu Yusuf Ya’qub b. Isḥāq, an Arab philosopher, called the falsāfī al-ʿArab on account of his South Arabian descent, was born probably in the middle of the ninth century A.D. in Kūfa, where his father was governor, and educated in Baṣra and Baghdād, then the great centres of education. He served in various capacities at the ʿAbbasīd court, especially under Mārānī and Muʿtaṣim, as translator or editor of Greek philosophical works, as tutor to a son of Muʿtaṣim, as astrologer, etc. Devoted to the Muʿtaṣili theology of the court, he was affected by the restoration under Muʿawwakkil and his library was confiscated for a time. He was still alive in 870, when he thought he could foretell a duration of about 450 years to the ʿAbbasīd empire then threatened by the ʿIraqis and a conjunction of stars.

Al-Kindi had acquired with tolerable understanding a knowledge of the so-called “ancient”, i.e. mainly Greek learning, as far as it was accessible to him; and all his life he furthered its dissemination in Islām by an industrious literary activity. In the tenth century we find everywhere, especially in mathematics and natural philosophy, the traces of his activities. Of his works very little has survived in Arabic, but many in Latin translations, including some by Gerhard of Cremona. Enough survives with some quotations and bibliographical references to enable us to estimate his position in science and philosophy.

Eclectic in the sense of the later Hellenism, he regarded the Neo-Pythagorean mathematics as the basis of all sciences and endeavoured in Neo-Platonic fashion to combine the views of Plato and Aristotle. He was fond of applying mathematics not only in physics, but also in medicine, e.g. in the theory of composite medicines. He explained the effect of these medicines from the geometrical proportions of the mixture of physical qualities, warm, cold, dry or moist. He was therefore still regarded by Cardan, a philosopher of the Renaissance, as one of the twelve sublimest minds.

Al-Kindi was celebrated in the Middle Ages as an astrologer; he was numbered among the nine judices of astrology, but he dealt not only with what we would call astrological fantasies but with exact astronomical measurements and calculations.

As regards alchemy, much studied in his time, which was defended against him by the physician Rāzi, our philosopher adopted a rather sceptical attitude. Gold and silver, he thought, could only be attained from mines, where nature has brought them into being, and not made by human skill.

Al-Kindi dealt very fully with optics. His principal work, which was much used in the east and west, next to the work of his greater successor, Ibn al-Haytham, is based mainly on the Optics of Euclid in Theon’s recession. In it he dealt with (1) the passage of light in straight lines, (2) the direct process of vision, (3) the process of vision by a looking-glass and (4) the influence of distances and angle of vision on sight along with optical delusions. According to him light takes no time to travel and vision takes place through a bundle of rays which, sent out from the eye expanding in the form of a cone, embrace the object. While the other four senses receive impressions from things, the sense of sight
grasps its object in an active and instantaneous manner.

We also possess him, like his principal works only in a Latin translation, a little work on the cause of the blue colour of the sky, in which it is explained that this colour is not really special to the heavens, but arises from the mixture of the darkness of the sky with the light of the atoms of dust, vapour, etc. in the air illuminated by the light of the sun. A work on ebb and flow, also preserved in Latin, is remarkable because the author tested experimentally the principles of the theory, an erroneous one, however.

Primarily a natural philosopher, al-Kindi also discussed the doctrine of the soul and of the intelligence (nafs). According to him the world as a whole is the work of an externally active cause, the divine intelligence, whose activity is transmitted in many ways from above to the world. Between God and the world of bodies is the world of soul, which created the world of heavenly spheres. The human soul is an emanation from this world-soul. In so far as the human soul is combined with the body, it is dependent on the influence of heavenly bodies, but in its spiritual origin and being it is free. For only in the world of the intelligence (nafs, nafs) is there freedom and immortality. If then we wish to attain the highest, we must turn to the eternal possessions of the intelligence, the fear of God, knowledge and good works.

In al-Kindi’s treatise De Intellectu, edited by Nagy, we meet for the first time the doctrine of ‘āki in a form that is significant of the whole course of Neo-Platonic-Aristotelian philosophy in Islam. Following Alexander of Aphrodisias (De Anima, ii.) a fourfold intellectus is distinguished: (1) which is always in acta; (2) which is in potentia in the soul; (3) which is realised in the soul by the first (3) (so far corresponding to the threefold wūs of Alex. Aphr.: wūnēs, wūkēs, wūnēkēs) and (4) an intellectus demonstrativus. According to a suggestion of P. Duhem’s (Le Système du Monde, Paris 1916, iv. p. 405) by the latter is meant the anima sensitiva, about which the Alex. Aphr. speaks in this context, but which he did not call wūs nor could have called it so. Al-Kindi seems to wish to mean by his fourth ‘ākī the effective participation of the third, just as Aristotle distinguishes between the possession of acquired virtue and its practice, acquired knowledge and mental activity. The fourth would therefore have to be distinguished from the first ‘ākī in later Arab terminology as ‘ākī bi l-fā’l from ‘ākī faṣāl.


AL-ΚΙΝΔΙ, Abū ' Omar Muḥammad b. Yūsuf, an Arab historian of Greece, was born on 10th Dhu l-Hijjād 283 (Jan. 17, 897) at some place not exactly known in Egypt and belonged to the Tudjib, a clan of the Kinda, who had come into Egypt with 'Amr b. al-Āṣ. He studied Tradition under Ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min (d. 312 = 924) and Ibn Naṣīr (d. 302 = 914; q.v.) towards the end of his life he is said to have himself been a teacher of Hādhāb. But his main interest was in the history and traditions of his native land. He seems to have spent all his life in al-Ṭūrūj, where he died on 3rd Ramadan 350 (Oct. 15, 961).

His two principal works are the history of the governors of Egypt (Tarniyat Wulāt Mīr or simply Umarā Miṣr) and the history of the judges of the country (al-Kutb). The former deals with the governors (umarā al-qalāb) and includes the chiefs of police appointed by them (wašt or šābi al-shurta or al-barāḥ) but excludes other higher officials; these bare lists are only occasionally interrupted by brief notes on the domestic and foreign policy of the country. The author brings the history of Egypt down to the death of al-İkhshidī in 335 (946); an unknown author continued it till the coming of the Fāṭimids in 362 (972). Sections of the book were first published by K. Tallquist in Ibn Salīd’s Kitāb al-Magāhirī, Leiden 1899 and by N. A. König in The History of the Governors of Egypt, New York 1908. This is a supplement to his first work al-Kindi where the history of the judges of Egypt down to the appointment of Bakkar in 861 (245). Here in connection with the lives of the judges he not infrequently gives us important legal decisions laid down by them and thus gives us valuable data for the history of Muslim law. Al-Kindi seems to have brought the work down to his own time in a second edition, but this has not survived. Instead of the latter we have two continuations, one by Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Burd to the year 366 (977) and an anonymous one for the years 347-424 (959-1033), the beginning of which therefore covers part of the ground of the original versions; both are rare chronological lists. This work has been edited by R. Gotthelf, The History of the Egyptian Qaidis, Paris 1908. Both works have been brilliantly edited by Rhuvon Guest, The Governors and Judges of Egypt or Kitāb al-Umarā (al-Wulāt) wa-Kitāb al-Qudsh of al-Kindi together with an appendix derived mostly from Rāf al-Iṣr by Ibn Hajar, G.M.S., xii., Leiden 1912.

Of other works by al-Kindi we know mainly
from quotations in al-Maki‘i’s al-Khita‘at and in Ibn Du‘mâk, Kitâb al-Lajnâd al-Gharîb or Asna‘ al-Adnâd al-Ghurabî (2), a K. al-Kahdân wa l-Tarârîsh (1) for the fight against the trench made for Ibn al-Zabîr’s governor Ibn Dja‘lâm for the defence of al-Fusâţ (a), a K. al-Khita‘at, a K. al-Qâhir Masqîd Ahi al-Kâya al-A’sâm and a K. al-Mawâli. A Sirat al-Surî b. al-Hakâm is only mentioned by al-Makrizî. Yâ‘kin in the Irshâd al-Arîb, ii. 156 quotes a history by al-Kindî beginning in 280 (894) and Ibn Du‘mîk (iv. 18, 3) gives him as a source for the event of the year 290 (903). Al-Suyûtî wrongly ascribes to him the short Kitâb Pâ‘ûlî Mîrî, which his ʿOmar composed for the Ikshidîd Kafûr (355—357 = 966—968). It has been edited by J. Osirî (ʿOmar b. Muḥâmmed al-Khârî is related by al-Fâyûmî, udgîvî dîgîvî) in the Bulletin de l’Acadîme Royal de Danemark, Copenhagen 1896, No. 4. But al-Kindî himself did write a larger work with the same title which the son quotes several times, according to Nallûn, Opus Astronom. Al-Battani, ii. 325. Bibliography: in the article; short biographies of al-Kindî are only given in the still unpublished al-Muqâfâ of al-Makrizî and the Ta‘rîkh al-Īlâm of al-Dhahâbî. (C. Brockelmann)

AL-Kindî, Abû al-Masîh b. Isâx, the fictitious name of the author of a celebrated Arabic apologia for Christianity, the Khita‘at ilâ Abûl’lāh b. Isâmîl al-Hâshîmî. Pro- fessing (ed. 1880, p. 47; cf. p. 2) to be a con- temporary account of a controversy held about the year 204 (819) before the Caliph al-Ma’mûn on the relative values of Islam and Christianity, it contains theological statements and a terminology probably posterior to the year 300 (912), for example in particular the allusion to the refutation by Tâbarî (d. 310 = 923) of the thesis of the Ḥanâbal Barbâhârî (d. 320 = 940) on the inscription of the name of the Prophet Muḥâammad on the base of the throne of God. The adaptation to Christian theology of the ideas of the Islamic Kalâm as in the distinction between ǧîfât dîhâr and ǧîfât fi‘l, would make one try to identify this “Kindî” with some Jacobite author with pre- Averroan tendencies, for example with the celebrated Yahyâ b. ʿAdî (d. 364 = 974). The text was used and its author quoted by al-Kindî, under his assumed name of a Nestorian Kindî, “son of Isaac”, addressing to a Hâshîmî “son of Isâmîl.” This apologia, often aggressive in tone, is a very remarkable document. It contains the first known outline of a critical history of the gradual formation of the present text of the Kûrân. The Arabic original, written in Syriac characters (Karshûn MSS.: Paris, Catal. Zöllner, p. 204, 205; Gotha, Cat. Moller, p. 160) was analysed, then translated into Latin about the year 1141 by Peter of Toledo (MSS. Lat., Paris, No. 3305, 3649, publ. in Bibliobib., Acurius, 1543, ii. 1—20) and resurrected in the sixteenth century by Sir William Muir. Bibliography: Dionysius Carthusianus (+ 1471), in Alchoran. Lib. V, Cologne 1523, ii. 70, 255, etc.; W. Muir, The Apology of al-Kindî, London 1882, 59 sqq.; P. Casanova, Mohammed et la Fin du Monde, Paris 1913, iii. 110—122; Khâshîf al-Ghîbî (Shî‘î), Al-Din wa l-Īlâm, 1531, ii. ii., fine; the text was first printed by Ant. Tien in 1880 (London, pr. Gilbert R. Wiwington, Turkish Mission Aid Society, 166 p.). (L. Massigny)

KINKIWAR, KANKIWAR, KANGAVA, a little district with a town of the same name and about 30 villages between Hamadân and Karmînî. The town has about 2,500 inhabitants; in its vicinity is a famous castle, Ǧâr al-Luṣûq or Ǧâr Dûdân, the “robbber castle”; it is said to take its name from the fact that several animals were stolen from the Muslims at the conquest; Tab. i. 2649. Bibliography: B. G. A., i. 195; ii. 256; iii. 393; Barbièr de Meynard, Dict. de la Perse, p. 450—451; Le Strange, Landi, p. 188 sqq.; Faïdîn, Voyage, i. 408 sqq. (J. Ruskâ)

KINNASRÎN, a town in North Syria at the point where the Nahr Kuwâr enters the swampy lake of il-Mâghtî. In ancient times it was called Xârîsh, Chalces ad Belum and lay in μεγάλα Ἀραβία (Diodorus, Bibl., xxxii. 48); perhaps it is to it that the note in Stephen of Byzantium refers, according to which a town named Chalkîs was founded by the Arab Mawûkî. In the late classical period a part of the Syro-Arabian limes was called τὸ Βουτάκις (Malalas, p. 296, s). In this region the Arabs very early immigrated into Byzantine territory; at al-Hîyûr (the later Hîjûr bani Il-Kasîš) in the district of Kînnsrîn in 554 A.D. the Ghassânîl al-Hârîth won a decisive victory over the Lakhmîd al-Mu’dhirî of al-Hûr (Nûdeke, S. B. Ak. Berlin, 1887, p. 18; according to Herzelh, Jahrbuch d. Preuss. Kunst- sammlungen, 1921, xlii. 123, al-Hîyûr is the modern Ǧâr ibn Wardîn). The Syrian name Kenneshrîn (not to be confused with the monastery of Ken- neshû on the Euphrates also written Kennesrîn; cf. G. Hoffmann, Auswege aus syr. Abt. f. pers. Mîrt, p. 161 sqq.) occurs several times in Syriac texts before the Arab period (Wright, Catal. Syr. MSS. Brit. Mus., ii. 537b, 707b; Severus of Antioch, Epist., 37, p. 117 ed., p. 104 transl. Brooks); also in the Talmud (Babyl. Talm., iii. 366, ed. Goldschmidt; Province of Kanneshîrayî). In the last struggle between the Byzantines and Sassanians, the town was taken in 573 A. D. (Michael the Syrian, ii. 312) and in 608/609 A.D. by the Persians. At that time Arab tribes were already dwelling round Kînnsrîn, Halab, Mahbûn, Kushtîn u. V. Vorstiehn, vi. 67: Lammens in M. F. O. B., i. 52). In 637 Abû ʿUbayda took the town (al-Baladûrî, Futâb, p. 137, 139, 144 sqq.). It then became the capital of an administrative district (al-Baladûrî, op. cit., p. 164, 189 sqq.). The Caliph Yâṣîd I in his reforms in the administration of Syria added to the four military provinces already in existence (ṣā‘īd) Filasîn, al-Urdûn, Dimashq and Ḥimṣ, a fifth the djund of Kînnsrîn, which he separated from the djund of Ḥimṣ (Baladûrî, p. 132; following him Yâkût, Muṣ‘ûdîn, iii. 742. Lammens, Le Califat de Yâsid Ier in M. F. O. B., vii. 1914—1921, p. 446 sqq.). Besides its capital, it included Halâb, Anqīkîya and Manbûdî. After the time of Hârîn al-Rasîhid, when the Ǧassîmî were the feudal lords, the djund of Kînnsrîn (in 170/786), the districts of Kînnsrîn, Halâb, Ma‘zâr al-Nu‘mûn, Ma‘zâr Ma‘shûn and Samân (Le Strange, Palestine, p. 36) belonged to it. Various changes in the frontier seem to have been made later. Thus Ibn Khûrîd-dâbbîh (B. G. A., vi. 75; c. 850 A.D.) in addition to the places mentioned and Hîjûr Bani Il- Ǧa‘fâ’.
and Martakhvān also includes the towns of Dulūk and Kābdān in the north, which, according to other authors, belonged to the ʿAbāsīm, and al-Makādisī includes in our district the places of Anṭākiya, Bālūs, Sumaiṣāt, the two Maʿarrā, Manbidā, Bāyās, al-Tinā, Kinnarsīn and al-Suwaydāyā (B. G. A., iii. 54; the list given in i. 154 sq. which is the only one noticed by Le Strange, p. 39 and Gildemeister in Z. D. P. V., vii. 147 is very defective). On the other hand al-Khnāṣira and Kafarṭāb are, probably really, included in Ḥimr (in spite of Le Strange, p. 40) although the former in Iṣṭakhrī's time belonged to the province (ʿamaṯ) of Kinnarsīn (M. Hartmann in Z. D. P. V., vii. 149). Kinnarsīn is no longer mentioned in ancient times to have far surpassed Beotia in importance, later became more and more overshadowed by Ḥalab; the Arab geographers are practically unanimous in saying that it had formerly been a strongly fortified and flourishing town but in their day was already quite ruined, depopulated and had sunk to be a mere village. According to Yāḵūt the inhabitants had left the town on the approach of the Byzantines (351/692); some fled across the Frāt, the remainder were settled by Saif-al-Dawla in Ḥalab. When in 355 (666) Nicephoros Phocas advanced on Ḥalab, the Ḥamāndīn retired to Kinnarsīn but, when he could not make a stand there, he destroyed the town. It was again populated under the Emperor Basil II, burned again in 389 (998). Rebuilt by the Buān 'l-Bašaun of the tribe of Tanūk, it was laid waste again by the Byzantines (422 = 1030) and once more destroyed by Tāḏī al-Dawla, Tūṣān, after the Seldjūk Sulaḵān b. Kūṭūmphī had restored and rebuilt it. Henceforth Kinnarsīn was uninhabited. In the Crusading period it was several times used as a depot for military stores (Röhrich, Gesch. des Königreiche Jerusalem, p. 131, 139, 140). It never seems to have fallen into the hands of the Franks, who wrote the name Canesterry (William of Tyre, xiv. 7). In Yāḵūt's time there was only a khan for caravans and the Sultan's tax-collectors there.

The modern Kinnarsīn, also called Eski Ḥalab by the Turks, still has great ruins of the ancient walls and those of a citadel on an eminence to the north east. A chain of hills in the north of the town is crowned by the sanctuary of Nabi ʿĪs in which fragments of Kafīt inscriptions of the viii th century A.D. have been found.


Kīnṭār (from the Latin centenarius, cf. German Zentner and English hundredweight), an avaricious with weight in the ancient Arab weight system mentioned as early as Kurān iii. 12, 68. Out of the wealth of tradition regarding the amount of weight we may select as the most usual and the one in keeping with its literal meaning, the equation 1 kīnṭār = 100 ratī, which however, is very indefinite. The term kīnṭār is, following its use in the Kurān, chiefly applied to a considerable sum in gold coins (usually 10,000 dinars = 85 lbs.).

On other weights (weqāb and kurr) see KAFĪT.

Bibliography: The authorities mentioned in the article ḤABBĀ, especially Sauvageau, Matériaux, in J. A., 1854, iv. 261. (E. V. Zambara)

KiOSK. [See KOSHK.]

KIPČAK, a Turkish people; usually also written Kipcak or Kifčak, the forms Khīpčaq and Khīpşaq are also found. In later popular and learned etymologies (first in Rāshīd al-Dīn, Ḫūnār al-Tawārisī, ed. Berezin = Trud ü. Völ. Mitl. Arkt. Ödçen., vii. 23, later in Abu ʿl-Ghāzāl, ed. Desmaisons, 19) Kipčaq is connected with kipçe or kipçe, and explained as a "hollow tree trunk"; at the same time a legend is told of the birth of a boy from a hollow trunk; the boy is said to have been adopted by Oğuz Khan (cf. CHUVIÇ, ii. p. 168) and to have been given a separate territory as a fief. Gardizi (text in W. Barthold, Olcet in polatje v Srednjem Asiyu, p. 82) mentions the Kipčaq along with the İmāk as a division of the Kımak who lived on the Irīšt, although the earlier anonymous author of the Hūdūd al-Ālam (i. 19a) say that the Kipčaq had separated from the Kımak and dwelled to the north of the Pečenegs. Ibn Khordādūbih (ed. de Goeje, p. 31-9) and, following him, Ibn al-Paḵī (ed. de Goeje, p. 329, 9) mention the Kipčaq along with the Kımak as a separate people. Maḥmūd Kāshgharī (i. 273) describes the Yımak (sic) on the Irīšt as a subdivision of the Kipčaq not of the Kımak. In another passage of the same work (ii. 22) we are told that the Yımak are a Turkish tribe (pašė al-türk), the same as the small Kipčaq (wa-ḵhāl al-kipçe-yāvat "indanā"); the Kipčaq themselves thought they were a separate branch (bullum atrakh ūfšaq yūḏūn anfasakun īḏānā kūhā). The Kımak mentioned by Muḥammad (p. 274, 3) at Šawrān must have been Kipčaq. In connection with the name of the Kipčaq from north to south is the appearance (first in the xi th century in the Diwan of Nāṣir-ī Khusraw; cf. Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia, i. 227) of the name Doḵt-i Kipčaq for Mafṣṣāt al-Chuz, cf. above, ii. 168. The Kipčaq (Khīpčaq) are already mentioned by Bāshaḵb (ed. Morley, p. 91) as neighbours of Khīrārim. According to Maḥmūd Kāshgharī (i. 253 and iii. 23) the dialect of the Kipčaq had the same phonetic peculiarities as the
KIPČAK — KİRÂN

KÎRÂN (A.) is defined by the Mevlefî al-Ulamâ, p. 232 (cf. also E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, Über die Astronomie nach den Mafâthî al-Čûmîn in Sitzungsber.
der physikal. med. Sêc. Érl., xiv., 1915, p. 235) as the conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter if the word is used without any qualification, but if the kîrân of two other planets is meant it is defined by giving the names of the two planets concerned. In the Kitâb Tafhim ii-avîî, and more particularly in Chap. ii. of the last book of the Kâtûn al-Maʃûdû, treating of the kîrânî of the upper planets, al-Bûrûnî, whom we here learn to be a convinced astrologer, deals very fully with this conjunction; according to him Saturn, being nearest the cone of fixed stars, has the greatest astrological influence, then Jupiter which is next and similar to it. From the course of the planets (cf. e.g. C. A. Nallino, al-Battânî, ii. 103, tabula motuum quince planetarum in singulis annis romanis) it is found that if a first kîrân takes place in Aries, the second will be in Sagittarius, the third in Leo and the fourth again in Aries and in cycles of about 20 years; and this occurs after Saturn has passed through eight zodiacal signs, which together form a trinity. But it is not exactly 8 zodiacal circles but these and $2^1/2^2 = 24^1/2^2$; the position of the conjunction shifts by this $2^1/2^2$ between every two conjunctions on the zodiacal circle. After this has happened 12 times, the $2^1/2^2$ has grown to 30° i.e. the size of a sign of the zodiac and the kîrân enters upon a second triplity, beginning with Aries, this is the case after $12 \times 20 = 240$ years. The kîrân which takes place 24 years after the first is called the middle kîrân. If the kîrân has gone through all four triplities which begin with Aries, Taurus, Gemini and Cancer, for which $4 \times 240 = 960$ years are required, then the kîrân again enters Aries. It is then called the great kîrân.

In all observations, geocentric observation is assumed; i.e. the planets go round the earth. According to al-Bûrûnî the word kîrân is especially used for the conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter in Cancer. Here we can only refer the reader to the very full calculations given by al-Bûrûnî. From the same stem as al-kîrân with corresponding meanings come al-kişîrân and al-muqârâna (see C. A. Nallino, op. cit., p. 349). Al-Battânî only uses the term al-ištîmâl for the conjunction between sun and moon. — From the kîrân, or ištîmâl as a technical term of ištîmâl see this article (ii. p. 455).


KÎRT (from the Greek kûptos = seed, grain of corn; the seed of the carob tree, Ceratonia Siliqua L.), a unit of weight in the Mû hammâdân apothecary's measure and coinage.

1. Apothecary's weight. The name and the weight had long been adopted from the Byzantines by the Arabs before Islam. The Constantinian weight system founded by the Arabs in Syria and Egypt and left unaltered by them as follows (the Arabic names are given beside the Latin):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Arabic Name</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tael</td>
<td>ته (Teh)</td>
<td>320 grains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter Tael</td>
<td>نصف (Nafis)</td>
<td>80 grains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Tael</td>
<td>ثلث (Thalith)</td>
<td>40 grains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteenth Tael</td>
<td>ربع (Rabù' or Rabù)</td>
<td>20 grains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty-Second Tael</td>
<td>مائة (Maj'id)</td>
<td>10 grains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These seven denominations have survived apart from inevitable variations to the present day. The rafî of this system of about $1/3$ rd kg, its $1/12$ nd part
the valley of the Tekes and to throw these lands open for Russian colonisation. An autonomous territory of the Kara Kyzyl came to be known as Russian Cossacks. In 1526, the region was annexed to the Russian Empire, and the local Kazakhs were subjugated. The term "Kara" was never adopted by the people themselves and is now definitely repudiated.

Until recently in both Russia and Western Europe the name "Kirgiz" meant particularly the Kazakhs; they are sometimes called also "Kirgis-Kaisak" (Kaisak, corrupted from Kazak, to distinguish them from the Russian Cossacks). On the separation of the Kazakhs from the Ozbegs, cf. the articles Agha Khans and Kazakhs. Their whole body of land was long under the rule of one Khân who therefore had a considerable military force at his disposal; Khân Kasim (d. 924 = 1518) was particularly powerful. In spite of several defeats from the Mongols allied with the Ozbegs in the xvith century, the Kazakhs still had a strong nomadic kingdom at the end of this century under the rule of Khân Tawakul, who, during the last years of the reign of Khân 'Abd Allah b. Iskandar q.v., was able to make a successful incursion into Ma warâ al-Naher and even later still held the town of Tashkent. In the xvith century the power of the Khân was extended over the whole country; but about this time Tashkent and Farghâna were frequently in the possession of the Kazakhs, sometimes under nominal recognition of the suzerainty or the Khân of the Ozbegs. At this time the Kazakhs had taken the Kazakhs into three "Hordes" (called by the Kazakhs themselves djuiz "hundred"); the great horde (nûm djuiz) occupied the most easterly, the little (kîhi djuiz) the most westerly part of the so-called "Kirgiz steppes" and between the two the central horde (orta djuiz). Towards the end of the xvith century this division was already an accomplished fact. Khân Tyawka, celebrated as the law-giver of his people (in 1694 a Russian embassy was received by him in the town of Turkestan and in 1698 one from the Kalmucks), still ruled all three Hordes and had a representative in each of them. In 1717 unsuccessful negotiations for the submission of all three Hordes to Peter the Great were conducted; in 1723 the towns of Sirdum, Tashkent and Turkestan were conquered by the Kalmucks. For a short period after this the suzerainty of the Khân of the Little Horde was recognised by the Kazakhs and the agreement doing this was sealed by the sacrifice of a white horse but the treaty had no practical results. In 1730, Abû 'l-Khair negotiated with Russia and concluded a treaty by which he declared himself and his people Russian subjects. This treaty was renewed several times in the xvith century; but it was not until the xiiiith century, especially after 1847, when the Russians were firmly established on the southern frontier of the Kirgiz steppes on the Sr Daryâ, that Russian rule became definitely established over the steppes and their inhabitants. The eastern part of the steppes was administered from Siberia and the western from Orenburg; regulations for the government of the Siberian Kazaks were published in 1822 and again in 1868. Even after the abolition of the Khân's authority, the descendants of Cingiz Khan or "Sultân" exercised a considerable influence over the people as a nobility (composed of Kazaks called "white bones", âk ëwëçê); their authority has been gradually destroyed by the measures of the Russian Government. The last popular leader of the Kazak, Kencsar, who fought against the authorities in Siberia and Orenburg from 1842, was killed in 1847 in the mountains of Ala Tau; several risings were stirred up down to 1873 by his son Sadik (so-called by the Russians, properly Südük). Another son, Ahmad, later wrote the life of his father Kencsar and of his brother Sadik, entitled: Sultan Kencsara i Sadik. Biografizkiye otkryi sul'tana Ahmeta Kencsara, translated from the Russian by I. T. Smirnov, Tashkent 1885. Review by V. Rosen in Zaïf, iv. p. 122 sq.

The most southern part of the Kirgiz steppes was conquered in the xiiiith century by the Ozbegs of Farghâna and Khiwa and partly colonised; the advance of the Russians in this part was therefore assisted by the Kazaks. After the foundation of the general-governorship of Murkestan (1867) and the general-governorship of the Steppes (1888), Semireyev belonged at first to the latter, but was later again united to Murkestan, the government of the Kirgiz steppes had less unity than before. On the other hand after the revolution an administrative unit was established called at first by the Russians the "Kirgiz Republic" and by the people themselves "Kazakistan"; since 1924 this "Republic" has included a vast territory, little smaller than Russia in Europe, but of course less thickly populated. According to the latest Russian figures before the revolution the Kazak number about 4,500,000 compared with about 500,000 genuine Kirgiz. The present numbers of the population cannot be very different from these. Çulshnikov's (see below) reckoning, by which the Kazaks and true Kirgiz would now be about 8,500,000 together is certainly much too high. In the northern part of the Kirgiz steppes between 1920 and 1923 the population is known to have declined by 21.2%o. According to figures in the official publication Sowetskaia Kirgizia (1924, N° 8—9, p. 4), the population of the "Kirgiz Republic" is 6,536,000 including 4,068,310 Kirgiz (61.3%).


KIRID. [See CRETE].

KIRK KILISE. A town in Eastern Thrace, situated twenty-four miles to the east of Adrianopol,
on the southern slope of the Istranjda mountains, which run parallel to the coast of the Black Sea from the north-west to the Southeast. It was conquered from Byzantium during the reign of Murad I, a few years after the capture of Adrianople and after the great defeat of the Serbians near this town (766). The chronology of the conquest is very uncertain, for neither the early Turkish chroniclers nor the Byzantine mention it. Hadjiji Khalifa (Chronologia Historica, Venice 1697, p. 110) and Sa'd al-Din (Tafi' al-Tawarih, p. 3) say that Murad, after having definitely established his residence in the new palace of Adrianople, commanded in person an expedition in the territory to the east of this town; on this expedition Kırk Kilise was taken, as well as some other places in the region of the Istranjda, such as Wise and Bušar Hisâr. Hadjiji Khalifa places these events in 769; Muncedžadin Bâshî (iii. 295) gives the year 770. The identification made by von Hammer (G.O.R., i, 175) with the ancient Tar podizus (see Pauly, Realencycloå‘pedia der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart 1852, vi. 1605) would appear to be very questionable. Leunclavius Pandectarum Historicarum Taurici, Paris 1650, p. 473) says that the town of Kırk Kilise was the site of the Greeks Sarante Ecclesiæ and that it was, in his time, the capital of the Sandjak of this name. Evliyâ Celebi (v. 79) says that it was the most important sandjak of the vilayet of Adrianople; he gives a short description of the town. It may be concluded therefore, that formerly Kırk Kilise was not a place of importance; under Turkish rule, however, its situation on the route from Constantinople to Shumla and to Prawadia made it gain in importance. As regards the name "the forty churches", the numerical kırk which is found here is also met with in other geographical names (e.g. Kırk Aglaç); it is perhaps permissible to find in this an allusion to the forty saints who play a certain part in geographical nomenclature, both Christian and Muslim (cf. Goldzweig in K.H.R., ii. p. 320).

About the year 1900 Kırk Kilise had about 16,000 inhabitants, of whom Greeks formed the greater part; after them came Turks and Bulgarians. There were eight džâms, one of which is attributed to the Sultan Bayezid I and two tekke. The most important local industry was the weaving of wool. Under the new administrative system of the sixteenth century Kırk Kilise remained the capital of a sandjak in the vilayet of Edirne; the sandjak stretches along the two sides of the Istranjda and contains seven kâdar. All this district is fertile and consists mainly of pasturage, especially to the south of the Istranjda; the rivers, of which the most important is Erkene Şu, all belong to the basin of the Marita. Agricultural products are grain, all kinds of fruit, and especially tobacco and wine. The pasturage is very suitable for the raising of cattle.

After the Balkan War had broken out in October 1912, the Bulgarians occupied Kırk Kilise during the last days of this month, during their advance on Catalja, to which the Turkish army had retired. As a result of the recapture of Adrianople by the Turks Kırk Kilise was restored to Turkey after the war and remained Turkish after the victory of the Turkish nationalists on 30 July 1922 (Treaty of Lausanne 23 July 1923). Kırk Kilise is now, with Adrianople, Rodosto and Gallipoli, one of the chief towns of Eastern Thrace.


Kırk Wazir. [See Şahbâde, II.]

Kırkûk, a town in Mesopotamia, in 44° 25' E. Long, and 35° 25' N. Lat., the largest town in the district bounded by the Little Zab in the north-west, the Djabal Hamrin to the south-west, the Diyâlî to the south-east, and the chain of the Zagros to the north-east, which even in the days of the ancient Babylonian empire and later in the Assyrian empire was much exposed to the raids of the hill-peoples of the north-east, was called under the Sâsânid, Gamarkân (Moses of Khurene) and in Syriac sources Bêth Garmê; the town of Kırkûk is called in these sources Karkhê de Beth Selôkh. The proof of this identification was given by G. Hoffmann (Auszüge aus syrischen Acten persischer Martyrer, Abh. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vii. no. 3, p. 267 sqq.). In the history of the martyrs of this town (op. cit., p. 43 sqq.) its foundation is attributed to the Assyrian King Sanherib who had built a bulwark against the Kassites. Seleucas in a later date built a tower in the citadel; henceforth the town bore the name of Seleucus (Selôkh) while the citadel was called Sarbû or Sarbûg (cf. Marquart, Erânahr, p. 21). Under the Sâsânid the town became a celebrated centre of the Nestorians; the Metropolitan of Bêth Garmê had his residence there and it was here that took place the persecution of the Christians under Yezdegird II (438—457) described in the martyrlogy above mentioned.

While the Christians continued to call the town by its old Syriac name, or in Arabic al-Karkhî, (Eliyâ of Damascus in Assemi, Bibl. Or. iii/ii. p. ccecvii.; cf. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 272) it is not clear what name the Arabs gave it. We find Bâджarna as a kûra of the province of al-Mawsîl in Ibn Khurdâdhîbî (p. 94; al-Baladhûrî, p. 265; Yâkût, iv. 683) but none of the towns enumerated can be identified with Kırkûk. Ibn Khurdâdhîbî (loc. cit.) knows a town Khûnîyâ Şabûr in Bâджarna (a conjecture of de Goeje which applies also to Tabari, i. 840). Hoffmann, (loc. cit.) suggests a connection with the town of Karkhînâ in Yâkût (iv. 257). The identification is made more difficult by the fact that the Arab geographers always describe the road from Baghîdî to al-Mawsîl as following the Tigris; the old road which is also the modern road by Kifri, 'Aţî, Kırkûk and Irbil does not seem to have been much used in the early centuries of Islâm.

In the sixteenth century the region of Kırkûk belonged to the territory ruled by the Begteginid dynasty which had its capital in Irbil [q. v.]. After the death of Mûazzâm al-Dîn Kîkûrî in 1232, the lands of this dynasty passed to the 'Abbâsid Caliphs to be conquered soon afterwards by the Mongols. The name Kırkûk is found for the first time in the history of Timûr by Sharaf al-Dîn 'Ali Yazdî (transl. Pêits de la Croix, Delft 1723, ii. 259), where we are told that after the conquest of the 'Irak, going via Ta'îk (Da'îkka among the Arabs), Carcec (Kırkûk) and Alîun Cuprû (Altûn Kupru) which he left on December 20, 1403. Next comes the rule of the Aks-Cûyulla followed by the
conquest of Mesopotamia by Šīh Ḣusain b. Isā ʿAmīr I in the early years of the xvth century. When finally Mesopotamia and the ʿIrāk had passed into the hands of the Ottoman Sultan Selim I and Sulaimān I, by the first Turco-Persian peace concluded at Amasia (May 29, 1555), Kırkük resumed its former role of an important bulwark against an enemy from the east. It appears also that from this time onwards the desolation of the banks of the Tigris encouraged the development of the ancient commercial and military route between Baghdad and al-Mawṣil (Ewliya Ḍabuli, who, took the road along the Tigris, cf. Siyāḥat-nāme, v. p. 6). Kırkük again was occupied by the Persians after the fall of Baghdad in 1623, but was retaken by Khusraw Paşa (q.v.) in 1630. In 1638 Murād IV passed through it on his way to recapture Baghdad. The real masters of the country however were the local Kurdis chiefs in the province of Ardalan (Hadždi Khalfa, Dīkhan-Nūmā, p. 435). But little by little Ottoman power was established there through the energies of the pashas of the eyalet of Shehrizār (q.v. or Shehrizail). This eyalet contained thirty-two sandjaqs one of which was the sandjaq of Kırkük and this town became the official residence of the Pasha of Shehrizār, after the title of this name was destroyed (Dīkhan-Nūmā, l.c.). In 1732, Nādir Kuli (the future Nādir ʿĀbār) besieged the town in vain; the following year there was a great battle near Kırkük, where the Turks were completely defeated under the grand vizier Topal ʿĀbār Paşa, who was killed in it. In 1743, Kırkük again fell into the hands of the Persians but was restored to Turkey by the peace of 1746. The town remained in the Ottoman empire down to 1918; under the modern Turkish administrative system it was the capital of the sandjaq of Shehrizār (although the site of the old town of this name was henceforth in the new sandjaq of Sulaimānīe) in the province of Mūsul. Kırkük had just been occupied by the English troops when the armistice of 1918 was concluded. It remained under the English and in 1920 passed under the government of the kingdom of the ʿIrāk. It was not till 1926 that it was definitely incorporated in this kingdom after the agreement came to between Turkey and Great Britain regarding the fate of the old province of Mūsul.

The modern town is grouped round an acropolis (baʿāra) about 120 feet high, which forms a little town by itself; on the south and east side in the plain lies another larger quarter. These two are separated from a quarter on the west by the Khasa Čai coming from the north-east and running southwards, under the name Adaima Şu, to reach the Tigris below Sāmmart. The population must now be 20,000 at most. The Turks are the dominant element, or to distinguish them from the Turks of Asia Minor, Turkmans. This Turkish population was probably there long before the conquest by the Ottoman Sulṭāns but it is uncertain whether its origin is to be traced to a Turkish garrison placed there by the Caliphs in the ninth century or to an immigration in the time of the Seldjūqs or Begteginids. In any case the town was always a bulwark of the Ottoman empire and a centre of its culture (cf. Türk Yurdu, 1915). In Turkish the name of the town is pronounced as Kırkük, although the correct official form is Kerkük (Śami, Qanūs al-Iʿlān, v. 3840). The Christians to the number of 350 families (Rapport de la Commission de Mosul quoted in the Bibliography, p. 52), also speak Turkish which they write in Syriac characters; they all live in the citadel. They are “Chaldæan” Catholics (Kirkük is the see of an archbishop or Maṣṭān) and descendants of the old Nestorians, although according to their own tradition they immigrated in the Seldjūq period. Since 1906 they have had a new cathedral. Arabic is spoken mainly by the Jewish population which is quite considerable. Finally there is a strong Kurdish element. The baʿāra was at one time surrounded by a wall; it contains the mosque of Ulu Djamiʿ, an old church, and on the slope of the hill there is a mosque called Mār Daniel.

Quite recently excavations have been begun in the hill which promise to give us information about the history of the town in the Byzantine period. Another Christian monument is the tomb of the martyr Mār Tahma Zagerd, who is known from the martyrlogy above mentioned; this tomb is to the east of the town.

Kirkük is of some commercial importance; it is the market for the cereals and animals raised in the surrounding country and its most important connections are with Baghdad (via Taʿūk and Kifri) and with Mosul (via Alfa Koprū and Irbil). A railway line is being built along this route.

Then there is the eastward road to Sulaimānīyeh and on to Persia. Between Kirkük and Sulaimānīyeh is the land of the Hamawand Kurds, who were redoubtable brigands in the Turkish period. The country round Kirkük is still a little hostile but to the west of the town the Mesopotamian steppes soon begins, mainly inhabited by Arabs. The immediate vicinity produces a great deal of fruit. Here we have the most northerly palms in Mesopotamia. The wealth of sulphur, naphtha, and bituminous products contained in the soil of the whole district of Kirkük has been known and exploited since ancient times. The bituminous springs are specially well-known, two hours north-east of Kirkük, called Bīlāb Gurğur where bluish flames rise out of the ground.


KIRMAN the name of a Persian province and of its present capital. The name of the town was derived later from that of the province. The usual pronunciation is Kirmān, although, according to the tradition of Arab scholarship (Yākūṭ, iv. 263) the form Karmān is more correct; the name, in any case, goes back to the form Carmania, which is found in Strabo (xx. 2, 14), and which in its turn is said to be derived from the name of an ancient capital, Carmania (Ptolemy, Geography, vi. 8; Ammianus Marcellinus, xxii. 6, 48). According to Marqui
The name Carmania placed that of Yitiya, which is found in the inscriptions of the Achaemenids (Beh., ii. 23) and corresponds to the Ohrm whom Herodotus (iii. 93) places in the fourteenth century. In Pehlevi the orthography khor-m-e is found. Legendary Arab historiography (Ibn al-Kalb) derives Kirman from the name of Kirman b. Faludj, the descendent of Japhet, who is said to have settled in this region. Later popular etymology has connected the name with the noun kirm, signifying worm or dragon, and derives it from the legend of Hafsan-Bōghit and the dragon of Kirman in the romance of Ardeshir (see Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia, i. 145).

1. The Province. From the geographical point of view Kirman is as a whole well-defined. Situated to the south-west of the great central Iran desert (Dasht-i Lūt, or, in the middle ages, Māızat Khurāsān), the province is bounded in the east by the steppes, and the mountains which separate it from Makran, while, from the direction of Yazd to the north-west, and from Fars, to the west, it is also bordered by desert and uncultivated lands. The chief feature which distinguishes Kirman from Fars, is, as Iṣṭakhrī observed (p. 163), that the cultivated part of Fars is an uninterrupted territory while Kirman consists rather of a certain number of fertile and cultivated areas, separated by desert plains through which the villages are scattered. This geographical situation quite naturally leads to the subdivision into five principal districts: that of Kirman to the north (in ancient times Baradust), of Sirdžan to the west, of Djiruf in the centre and of Bam and of Narmar in the east (Makdisi, p. 460). On the south, Kirman is bounded by the sea but this part is of little interest for the province; the only important port, Hormuz [q.v.], is sometimes counted as belonging to Kirman and sometimes to Fars; but this port has often been in different hands from its hinterland. The lords of Kirman have only once extended their domination over the opposite coast of Uman. Chains of mountains stretch across the province from the north-west to the south-east; to the north the highest chain is found which forms a part of the Kahrud and has summits like the Kuh Hasar to the north-west of Bam, with an altitude of almost 15,000 feet. This chain separates the district of Kirman from that of Sirdžan; its continuation towards the south-east is called Disbal Pāriz or Bāriz. Further to the south-west there are other parallel chains. In the middle ages these mountains were inhabited by savage tribes like the Balis (see Bal古典stān) and the Kufs; the latter inhabit the mountainous region to the south of Djiruf, along the coast, on the Makran side. Kirman has no important rivers; the cultivated districts receive their water from the mountains; the most important of these streams is that which flows across Djiruf, called Khalali Rūd (formerly Dīw Rūd) without ever reaching the sea. Thus Kirman contains within itself all the geographical features which are typical of the whole of Persia.

The Arabic geographers, beginning with Yaḥyā, treat Kirman as an independent geographical area (iktimā). They classify three-quarters of its surface amongst the warm regions (gūrān); the cold districts (mūra) are found mainly around Sirdžan (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 165).

From the point of view of traffic, Kirman lies on the great roads leading from Fars to Sīstān and Khurāsān and to India, and on the route for commerce and pilgrimage, which leads from the sea (Hormuz and later Bandar 'Abbās) to the north-east of Persia and beyond. This situation has exposed the province during its history to invasions from all sides: — a circumstance which has made it frequently change its political ownership, and which has been adverse to the development of its prosperity.

At the present day the desert part of Kirman is more extensive than in ancient times; in the first centuries of Islam there were still forests in which lions roamed around Djiruf (Hand Allah Mustawfi, Nasīh al-Kalb, p. 140). Now there are almost no trees except the date-palms which are found in large quantities around the villages and the towns. Irrigation is very laboriously practised by the subterranean khānit. The principal agricultural products are corn, barley, and opium. The higher regions produce in autumn millet, cotton and beetroot. In the āqur or garmār rice and maize are cultivated in summer and the environs of Bam and of Khabū produce ḫamī; besides, all sorts of fruits are found in great abundance — its dates especially are noted. The chief animal products are wool and goat skins (kark) which are used for the manufacture of celebrated shawls. The mineral wealth of Kirman, was exploited in the middle ages. Marco Polo speaks of the turquoise of Kirman, the mines for which have now been abandoned. The mountains contain iron also, which was often extracted from the iron ore discovered in the district of the town of Kāyser (Makdisi, p. 459 and 470 speaks of al-tīṭi āl Marzābān, see de Goeje in B.G.A., iv. 246). Kazvini (i. 172) seems to refer to the existence of anthracite.

History. Under the Sassanids the province of Kirman had been governed by a governor holding the title of Shāh (Ibn Khurāshāhī, p. 17); thus Bahram V was before his accession Kirman-Shāh [q.v.]; the semi-legendary tradition of the Shāh-nāma is also acquainted with a Shāh of Kirman under king Kai Khuršaw (ed. Vullers, iii. 1279).

Baldahūrī, on the other hand, speaks of a marzbān of Kirman (p. 591). Already, before Islam, Arab nomads had immigrated into Kirman and according to Ṭabarī (Nöldeke, Gesch. der Perser u. Araber, p. 57) it was Shāpur I who, after his expedition against the Arabs, had driven out by force the people of the tribe of Bālīr. While admitting with some reservation the historical truth of this, Nöldeke prefers to think there was an immigration of Arabs into Kirman in the period before Islam. The capital of the province at the end of the Sassanian period was Shārdjān (Sirdžan). 640-750. The Arab conquest of Kirman was recorded by al-Baladhūrī (ed. de Goeje, p. 315, 391 sqq.) was begun by al-Rabi' b. Ziyād, who was sent by Ablū Māsū al-Askāri, from 638 governor of Baṣra under the Caliph 'Umar; he conquered Sirdžan and made terms with the inhabitants of Bam and of Anadaghar. Another Arab invasion was made about the same time by the governor of Baṣra, 'Uthmān b. al-Ās al-Thaqafī; he killed the Marzbān of Kirman in the island of Abarkawān (which, however, belonged to Fars). But its pacification was only temporary. In 29
(649–650) Yazdagird fled from Iṣfahān to Kirmān, where the majority of the inhabitants were still loyal. Then ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmīr b. Kuraṣī sent Muzdiṣī b. Maṣʿūd al-Sulami with another general to pursue him. The Arab army perished in the snow at Baimard before reaching Ṣhirāḏjān, and Yazdagird was able to continue his flight to Khurāsān, where he met his death (the flight of Yazdagird has perhaps influenced the story of the end of the King Dārā whom al-Maḥmūd al-Vuṭṭār, ibi. 1975, makes take flight and perish in Kirmān). Muzdiṣī, appointed governor of Kirmān by Ibn ʿAmīr, succeeded in last at re-conquering the chief towns as far as the mountains of the Kufs; a counter-attack by the Persians from Hormuz was defeated. The historical data recording the conquests of this period are uncertain. Further information is found for example in al-Yaḵūbī (Kitāb al-Buldān, p. 286). After the conquest many inhabitants fled to Sistān or to Khurāsān or withdrew into the mountains where they for long retained their Zoroastrian creed. The mountaineers themselves kept for three centuries more their independence. This province being at a considerable distance from the centre soon became the theatre of the activities of the Khārīdji. A certain number of the inhabitants had joined as mawālī the Aẓrāḵ Khārīdji who had seized Fārs and Kirmān about the year 693, under the command of Kaṭārī b. al-Fuḍāja [q. v.]; their centre was Khurāsān. They remained there until about the year 699, when the general al-Muhallab succeeded in defeating them, after the separation of the Arab Khārīdji and the mawālī had weakened them. During the succeeding century Kirmān was a hotbed of rebellions and a favourite asylum for rebels. Thus ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. al-Aṣḥāḥ [q. v.] the enemy of al-Ḥadījādī took refuge there for some time after his defeat (after 701). Twenty years later, Kirmān was one of the provinces over which the usurper Yazīd b. al-Muhallab [q. v.] had established his dominion, which came to an end in 720. From this time the Umayyads (of whom we know several coins struck at Kirmān) seem to have exercised a sufficiently efficacious control over the province of Kirmān, which moreover had been exhausted by wars so that it was from here that their last armies set out to face the attack of the partisans of the Ābbāṣīs under ʿAhlād. The principal sources for this period are al-Baladhuri, al-Ṭabarī, al-Yaḵūbī and al-Maṣʿūdī.

750–1041. Under the first Ābbāṣīs Kirmān was not the scene of important events; the provinces had to suffer during this time the incursions of the Zuṭṭ, coming from India, until they were driven out during the reign of al-Muʿtamūsīn. There are Ābbāṣī coins struck in Kirmān in the years 165 and 167. Soon afterwards the province began to play a role, mostly passive, in the different Persian national movements, which gave rise to several dynasties. The first dynasty was that of the ʿAbbāsīs; Yaḵūb b. Lāṭḥ had obtained in 253/862, the governorship of Kirmān from Muḥammad b. Ṭahir, the governor of Khurāsān. Yaḵūb had to quell the opposition of the mountaineers around Dirjāf; he and his brother ʿAmīr seem to have left a favourable impression in the province (Sykes, History of Persia, ii. 16 according to the Chronicle of Afdal al-Dīn), but their reign was too short to leave more permanent traces. ʿAmīr succeeded his brother in 879, and, on his death in 902, the rule of the ʿAbbāsīs, or rather anarchy, was re-established in Kirmān. In 315/926 Kirmān received a new master in the person of Abū ʿAli b. Ilyās [q. v.], a former brigand, from Khurāsān, who looked upon the Šamānids as his suzerains (Maḵdūm, p. 472). He soon found himself in conflict with the Būyīd Ajmad Muḥammad al-Dawla, who attacked him in 935 and took Dirjāf. But Ibn Ilyās who had chosen for residence Bardāsir (the present town of Kirmān) had himself appointed governor for and tributary to the Būyīds. The quarrel which broke out some decades later between Ibn Ilyās and his son al-Vāṣī brought about the ruin of them both and resulted in the occupation of the province by the Būyīds in 357 (968). Soon after the descendants of ʿAḍūd al-Dawla began to fight among themselves for the province and a very confused period followed, during which even the Ghaznavids were for some time masters of Kirmān (Maṣʿūd I conquered it in 1032; see also the article ABU KAḤIYĀR). The Būyīds were the first to fight with energy the mountain tribes of the Kufs and Balus. Sources for this period: al-Ṭabarī, al-Yaḵūbī, Ibn al-ʿAthīr, Ibn Miskawī, Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, Tāʾirīḵ-i Gūstā. 1041–1222. The province was able to breathe at last when in 1041 a branch of the Seljūks foundered there a dynasty, which reigned until 1187. For the history of the members of this dynasty see the article SELJŪQIDS, III. The founder was Kāwūd Kaṭārī Arslān Beg, the son of Cāghri Beg. In 440 (1048/1049) he seized the capital Bardāsir and subdued the mountaineers of the Kufs and of the Shabānḵāra [q. v.], a Kurd tribe to the south-west who for some time had been terrorising the garrison of Kirmān. Kāwūd finally conquered the territory of Umān on the other side of the Persian Gulf. He made two attempts to resist the Great Seljūks, Alp Arslān and Malik Shāh; the second attempt cost him his life (466 = 1074) and nearly ended his dynasty. Kirmān prospered most during the long reign of Arslān Shāh (1101–1142) who was also ruler of Fārs, and this state of things continued under his son Muḥammad Shāh (1142–1156). Under the last Seljūks of Kirmān anarchy again reigned until the Ghuzz [q. v.], who came from Khurāsān, completed the desolation of the province. A chief of the Ghuzz, Malik Dinār, got the same in 1185 the ruler of Kirmān, his residence was at Zarand. Soon the turn of the Shabānḵāra came; their chiefs Kūb b. al-Dīn and Nūd b. Dinār took Bardāsir in 597 (1200), to the great joy of the inhabitants. But as the Ghuzz continued to resist under Ağdam Shāh, the son of Malik Dinār, some years of confusion followed; the result of this was that Saʿd b. Zangi, the Atābīk of Fārs, made himself master of Kirmān in 600 (1203). In 607 (1210), the province was conquered in the name of the Khūrāṣmāsh. In 1220 the half-independent governor of Kirmān was Shudūfī al-Dīn Jawzawī, who after the defeat of the Khūrāṣmāsh Muḥammad refused to admit the son of this latter, Ghīyāth al-Dīn, when he was fleeing before the Mongols. Sources for this period: Ibn al-ʿAthīr; Ibn Ibrahīm; Afdal al-Dīn (cf. Bibliography); Ibn al-Balkhī, Fārsnāma; Dwīnāt, Dīthān Gūstā; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, Tāʾirīḵ-i Gūstā; Rāwandi, Ḥabāt al-Sulān. 1222–1502. Soon afterwards in 619 (1222)
the famous Burāk Ḥādījī [q. v.] who was descended from the Kāra Khātātī and was at the time vizier of the already mentioned Ghiyāḥ al-Dīn, drove Shuṭrūṯ al-Dīn out by force and succeeded in playing a political game so cunningly, first against Ghiyāḥ al-Dīn, next against Djalal al-Dīn Ḧwārizmīshāh, and finally against the Mongols, that he succeeded in keeping his power so that Kirmān never knew the terror of the Mongol armies. Burāk Ḥādījī who had received from the Caliph the honorary surname of Kutlugh Khān thus became the founder of the dynasty called that of the Kutlugh Khāns. It remained under the sovereignty of the Mongols until 1303. A notable figure of the dynasty was Turkhān Khātūn, the daughter of Burāk Ḥādījī; she reigned from 1258 to 1282, and contributed to the prosperity of Kirmān by having the kūnār’s dug for irrigation. It was in her reign that Marco Polo visited the “kingdom” of Kirmān; it is evident from his account that at this time the ruler of Hormuz was also the vassal of the Šufīān of Kirmān. The end of the dynasty was brought about by an act of disobedience of the last Kutlugh Khān (1303). The province had several Mongol governors, until in 1340 Mūbarāz al-Dīn Muḥammad Muṣafār, the husband of the last Kutlugh Khān’s daughter, seized Kirmān. He took Shirāz in 1354 and founded the dynasty of the Muṣafārīs. His brother Imād al-Dīn in 1363 succeeded him in Kirmān; some of the buildings of the latter still exist (the Pā Minār mosque in the town of Kirmān). Not long afterwards the province became the theatre for the quarrels of members of the dynasty which was finally exterminated by Timūr in 1393. The Tumīrids who had at times put down rebellious governors (Shaḥkh Uwais in 1408) were followed in their turn in the ownership of Kirmān by the Kāra Koyunlu (about 1550) who soon had to give place to the Ak Koyunlu. As a rule Kirmān was from this time united with Fārs under the governorship of one of the relatives of Cūzīn Ḥasan. Sources: Djawaini; Nāṣir al-Dīn, Sinūf al-Ūlā (cf. Bibliography); Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi, Taḥrīr-i Guzāra; ‘Alī Yazdi, Sharaf-Nāma; ‘Abd al-Razzāq Samarkandī, Mata’h al-Sal dān; Mirkhwānd, Rawdat al-Safa; Ḫwādanīm, Ḥafiz al-Siyāṣa; Karim Khān Zand conquered Kirmān under the last usurper. It was the overthrow of the dynasty formed by the latter which brought upon the province and especially on the capital, the most terrible catastrophe which it had experienced in its history. The son of Karim Khān, Lutf ‘Ali Khān [q. v.] fleeing before the Kādjar Agha Muhammad Khān had retired to Kirmān in 1794 where a part of the inhabitants remained faithful to him. In the same year the capital had to surrender and Lutf ‘Ali Khān, although he succeeded in escaping to Bām, was betrayed and handed over to Agha Muḥammad. The terrible vengeance of the Kādjar, who according to the authorities, sold 20,000 women and children into slavery and blinded 35,000 male inhabitants, deprived the province of all strength and prosperity; it did not begin to recover until a century had elapsed. — Sources: Khwādanīm and the Persian histories of the Safawid and the subsequent Agha dynasties (see Grundriss der Iran Phil., ii. 586 sqq., 592 sqq.).

From 1794. The Kādjar [q. v.] governed Kirmān usually by governors who belonged to the dynasty. During the years 1830—1841 a certain Agha Khān made many fruitless attempts to free the province from the power of the Kādjar. From this time there were no further notable events in the history of the province. In proportion as Persia became an important element, although passive for the moment, in world politics, Kirmān entered little by little into the sphere of influence of Great Britain. This situation found expression in the Anglo-Russian convention of 1907.

The principal towns and districts. The province of Kirmān is now divided into 19 districts. Three of the five chief towns mentioned by Makdisi (see below): Sirādjan, Djarut and Narmāshīr are no longer in existence and are now only names of districts. Many of the towns and villages named in ancient geographies have also disappeared or have not yet been identified.

The northern part includes the capital Kirmān [q. v.]. On the route from Kirmān to Yazd still stand Zarand and Bāfī and, to the northeast of this route, on the edge of the desert we still have Kūh-banān (the Cobinan of Marco Polo) and Rūwar. Khābīs, a historic site to the east of Kirmān, in a much lower country, is famous for its sites. Māhān (now Māhīn) to the south-east of the capital is noted for the sanctuary of the Sufi Sayyid Nūn ‘Allāh (who died in 1431) built under Shāh ‘Abbās. From the time of Makdisī Māhān was inhabited by the Arabs.

The principal town on the west side was the old capital Sirādjan (often Shirādjan), situated very close to the province of Fārs. This town was larger than Shirāz in the time of Makdisī, but it was destroyed in 1396, after a long resistance against the armies of Timūr. The site is marked at the present time by a limestone rock rising in the plain to a height of 300 feet, called Kāl‘a-i Sāng. This rock, formerly the citadel, has been described by Sykes (10,000 Miles, etc., p. 431 and following), who found some inscriptions there. In the neighbourhood is the village of Sāyiya dāhād. The plain is much more fertile than that of Kirmān and contains many villages.

Bām [q. v.] in the eastern part of the province is still in existence. The road from Sirādjan to Bām passed by Rayfān and Darzān; from this last place a road ran (and runs) to Djarut. Narmāshīr (also Narmāshīr) situated at a short distance from Bām in a south-west direction, was formerly an important market for commerce with India; at the present time the name only marks a district. The village of Fahlādī which is in this district was a fortress in the time of the Afghāns.
Djufirt, formerly the capital of the southern part of Kirmân, occupied a site now called Shahr-i Da'¡iyání. In the time of Marco Polo the town had already been supplanted by its former quarter Kamâdín called Camadí by the Venetian; it was an important market. Basing his belief on a passage in Ídrísi (transl. Reinhard, p. 423) Sykes (of. cit., p. 445) thinks that the earliest capital Carmana must be looked for between Djufirt and Fahlabj; On the road from Djufirt to Hormuz are Bâlâšgird or Guâlishgird, which is still the name of a village.

Population. The inhabitants of Kirmân are described in general as possessing a dark brown colour and a slight physique because of the heat (Išâqêrî). In the garmûr indeed, the summer is very hot and unhealthy (Sykes). The most ancient inhabitants of Kirmân were probably represented in the Middle Ages by the mountain peoples called the Kûfs in the mountainous district of the south and the Bâris (turgâvâres) in Herodotus, iii. 92), in the mountains to the south-east of the town of Kirmân, still called Bâris Kûb. Ma¡âdî (p. 471) says that the language of the Kûfs and of the Bâris was unintelligible. These people were probably exterminated in the course of history or became assimilated from the tribes of the Bûyids and of the Seldjûks with the Iranian element. For the Bâris, who immigrated from the north-west (Bâlishgûrî and Tâbarî do not yet mention them) and who were established in Makrân from the twelfth century see the article BALOČISTAN. As regards the settled population it seems to be of Iranian stock; Strabo already says that their customs and their language are similar to those of the Medes and of the Persians (xv. 2, 14). From the time of the Sâsânis a part of the inhabitants was composed of Nestorian Christians; the bishop of Kirmân was under the authority of the metropolitan of Fârs. The conversion to Islâm was slowly affected; according to Tâbarî the mountaineers had been converted under the 'Abâbûs's; later they showed great sympathy for the Shî'a (Ma¡âдîs). Yâkû (s.w. Kûfî) insists upon the fact that while having no religion, they venerated 'Ali b. Ahi Tâlib. The Islamised population was very much exposed to sectarian influences such as those of the Khrâjîd, and later of the Ismâ'îlîs. From the theological point of view the inhabitants of Shirâdjân belonged, according to Ma¡âdîs, to the akh al-hâdïth and those of Djufirt to the akh al-ra'y. The advent of the Safawîs at last established the official form of Shî'a, ishrâq-æshârîya to which the great majority of the population still belongs. In the xixe century the sect of the Shâkhis (q.v.) gained many adherents in the province of Kirmân, so that it became one of their most important centres. Sykes reckons their number at 7,000. The Bûbîs are a little less numerous. Finally Kirmân is one of the districts where the adherents of the religion of Zoroaster were able to maintain themselves as a community under the spiritual direction of their ancient sacerdotal hierarchy. Tavernier (p. 390) says that in his time (about 1650) their number was still more than 10,000 in the town of Kirmân, after the great emigration to India. They had a temple at a distance of four leagues from the town; they were for the most part wool-merchants. Until the middle of the xviiith century there must have existed at Kirmân a school of dâstûr's whose influence was considerable. According to Khânîkoff there were still 12,000 Parsî families at Kirmân before its destruction in 1794 by Aghâ Muhammâd Shâh. About the year 1900 their number is given by Sykes as 1,700 souls (see also the article PARSî).

The Parsîs of Kirmân, like those of Vazî, speak the archaic dialect called Gâbûrî, which has been studied, e.g. by Houtum Schindler and Browne (cf. Grundriss der Ir. Phil., i. 351 sq. and more recently by O. Mann (Die Mundarten vom Kirmân, etc., ed. by K. Hadank, Berlin-Leipzig 1926). The other dialects spoken in Kirmân do not seem to have ever been specially studied; they belong to the southern group represented e.g. by the dialects of Fâs and of Kshân (see Geiger in Grundriss, i. 2, p. 422). Ma¡âdî remarks that the language of Kirmân resembles that of Khrâjân.

The nomads who form a strong minority of the population of Kirmân are probably the descendants of the Arab, Turkish and Kurd invaders.

The total of the population of the province was estimated at 750,000 about the year 1900 (Sykes).

II. The town of Kirmân situated in the north-east part of the province (30° 17' lat. N. 56° 59' long. E.) has been identified in al-Râfî's map of Iran with the city which Arab geographers call Bardasîr (Yâkût has Bardasîr) or Guwâshîr (see also Ma¡âdîs, p. 460). The two forms might represent the form Beh-Ardashîr, which is, according to Hamza Isfahâni (ed. Gottwald, p. 46) the name of a town built by Ardashîr, the founder of the dynasty of the Sâsânis. The building of the Kala'i Ardashîr, the ancient citadel to the east of the town, which, in the Middle Ages, must have been just outside the gate of the city, is also attributed to Ardashîr. But the town was thought to be less ancient than Bâm and Djufirt (Sykes, following Afdal al-Dîn). A district to the south-west of Kirmân still bears the name of Bardasîr. In the ninth century, when Ibn Ilyâs had just occupied it, it was not yet very large, but in the xixth century Yâkût describes it as the largest town of Kirmân.

The name of the town was given to it as capital of the province of that name. The official honorary name of the town is Dâr al-Amân.

The town is situated at the meeting place of three valleys at a height of about 6,000 feet, 12 miles to the north of the Djüpâr chain of mountains. The surroundings consist almost exclusively of steepes and possess very little cultivated land. Between Kala'i Ardashîr, already mentioned, and the town is a ruined citadel at a lower elevation, Kala'i Dukhtar, which must have been formerly in the town. All the plain to the east and to the south of the town has a large number of remains of buildings. There are found here very beautiful pieces of facynce and other archaeological remains. The town itself is surrounded by a wall of baked clay with four gates. A quarter outside of the walls to the north-east is that of the Zoroastrians, Mahâllâ, Gâbar. The citadel is situated on the western side. Hamd Allah Mustawfi (Nâzâkat al-Kuhûb, p. 140) speaks of a mosque built under ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Azîz, but the most ancient mosque is at the present time the Masjîd-i Malik built by the Seldjûk Tûrân Shâh (1054–1096); this mosque was already in ruins in the xvith century, but has been restored. The two other important mosques are the Masjîd-i Dâjân built, according to an inscription, in 1349 by Mubâriz al-Dîn Muñafar
and the Masjd-Pä-Miän, erected by the latter's brother 'Imâd al-Din. A monument destroyed by an earthquake in 1866 was the Gunbad-i Sabz, a building of cylindrical form covered with mosaics of a greenish blue. According to information given to Sykes it was the tomb of one of the members of the dynasty of the Kutlugh Khâns, built in 640 (1242). After the destruction of the town in 1794, it was rebuilt under Fath 'Ali Shâh, but it only began to prosper under the governor Wakil al-Mulk about the year 1860. (A plan of the modern town is given opposite p. 188 of Sykes, 10,000 Miles, etc.). The number of inhabitants increased in the last part of the nineteenth century. Schindler in 1876 gives the figure as 41,170 and Sykes in 1890 as 50,000. To-day the town is peopled mainly by Shûs, next come the Shâhîjs (6,000), the Bûsîs (3,000), and the Zoroastians (1,600). The Jews form a very small group of seventy souls. Kirmân owes its very great industrial reputation to its shawls, but this industry has been surpassed by that of carpets in wool and in silk. The workers are almost exclusively men; Sykes estimates the value of the exports at £40,000 annually. Another important industry is the manufacture of felt.


—(J. H. Kramers)

**Kirmân, Kamāl al-Dīn ābâ'ī Nâşir al-Dīn Mâhâmâd b. 'Alî Kirmânî, known as Kirmânî (the name Kirmânî is a diminutive form from Kirmân; cf. Grundriss der Iran. Phil., i., ii. 185; another instance of this formation, not noticed here, is pîrvû from pîr, Dâjûl al-Dîn Rûmî, *Mathnawî* ed. Nicholson i. line 2169), a Persian poet, born, as stated in the epilogue of his *Gul u-Nawbûr*, Shawkâl 5, 679 (Jan. 28, 1281) at Kirmân. He died at Shirâz, probably in 753/1352; the date 742, given by Dawlatshâh, is erroneous. Men of letters gave him the surname of Nâhîban-i Shâhûrâr (or Nâmahâdîn) (Dawlatshâh, *Tadh-kira*, p. 249; Vullers, *Lesion*, ii. 1301). Biographical details are scarce about him. He belonged to a distinguished family, and seems to have travelled widely. That he stayed some time at Baghdad, appears from the lines from his *Humâyî u-Humâyûn* quoted by Dawlatshâh, loc. cit. Kirmânî was a genûd of Rûkân al-Dîn al-Sammânî (7 353/1345) and lived some time as a mystic in Sûfîâbâd (in Khorasan, cf. Ritter, *Erkundungen*, viii. 396). His first patron seems to have been the Muâfarid ruler Muâbûrî al-Dîn Muâhâmad of Yazd [713/1314 — 759/1358 (deposed), died 765/1364]. Afterwards, Kirmânî was in the service of Amir Shâhîb Abû Bâhshâh (viz. Dâjâm al-Dîn Shâhîb Abî Bâhshâh, prince of Shirûz till 754/1353; killed by order of Muâbûrî al-Dîn in 757/1356). The poet died at the court of Abû Bâhshâh. A son of Kirmânî is mentioned in his *Kâmâlnâmâ* (see below).

Works. Kirmânî Kirmânî wrote a *Khamseh*, in imitation of Niâmâ, as is the case with many of the later Persian poets, and a *Diwân*. The *Khamseh* consists of:

1. *Humâyî u-Humâyûn*, a romantic poem, in the metre of Niâmâ's *Iskandârnâmâ* (i.e. mutâbârî, because it treats of a subject from Irânian heroic tradition). It contains 3203 *dabûts*, it was composed, according to the epilogue, at Baghdad in 732. The prologue contains the madâḥ of the Tâhâan Abû Sa'id and his wazir Chiyyâh al-Dîn Muâhâmad; it states, that the poet was induced to compose the work by the high dignitary Abu 1-Fâţh Majd al-Dîn Muâhâmad. This *maßnawî* describes the adventures of Humâyûn, son of Shâh Hûshang, and his love of Humâyûn, princess of China. Notwithstanding the intrigues of the princess's father, the Faghfrâh, the lovers are united, Humâyûn's father perishing in battle by the hand of Humâyûn.

2. *Nawbûr u-Gul*, a didactic poem in the metre of Khûsrâw u-Shirin, containing 2615 *dabûts*. It was completed in 742 (chronogram), dedicated to
Tādż al-Dīn Ahmad ʾIrākī (a wazīr to the Muẓaf-farīd Muḥārīr al-Dīn), and relates the love-story of Nawrūz, son of king Fīrūz of Khurāsān, and Gūl, daughter of the emperor of Rūm. With the main narrative are interwoven three minor stories, told to the prince to console him in his love-sickness.

3. Kamānīna, on ethics and religion, in the metric of the Ḭakīf Paḵār, composed 744 (chronogram); this year is given as the date of completion of the Khamsa (Rieu, Cat., p. 620). In the preface, the Muslim saint Abū ʾIṣḥāq ʾIrākī of Kāzerūn († 426/1035) is praised; in the epilogue the poet addresses Amir ʾIṣḥāq Abū ʾIṣḥāq, the ruler of Shīrāz, and also his own son Mutḍīr al-Dīn Abū ʾIṣḥāq ʾAlī. The poem is divided into bādī’ī’s, in one of the manuscripts numbered from 1—12.

4. Rawūd al-Awnâr, mystical; a counterpart to the Māziṣan al-Avrūr (Dawlatshāh, p. 251); composed 743 at Kāzerūn, according to the epilogue. It is divided into 20 māḥā’ī’s. The dedication is to Ǧāḥīm al-Dīn Muhâdī b. Ǧīṭīn (killed in battle 748/1345, as wazīr of Abū ʾIṣḥāq of Shīrāz). The Rawūd passes for the first poem of the Khamsa.

5. It seems not to be possible, to determine with certainty which of the other works of Kirkānī should be reckoned as the remaining part of the Khamsa. It may be, that it is the poem entitled Mafāṭīḥ al-Kulūb wa-Maṭāḥīḥ al-Gūdāyīb, which is found in the manuscript No. 332 of the Library of the king of Oudh. This poem, consisting of 28 ʾāʿādī’īs, appears, from the headings given in the catalogue, to treat of religious topics.

After the Khamsa, we have:

6. Gowbarāmā; the aim of this poem, also a māḥā’īw, is the praise of Bahā’ al-Dīn Muhâdī, who was wazīr to the Muẓafarīd ruler, and claimed descent from the renowned Nīṣān al-Mulk. Besides the wazīr, his ancestors are also praised in the work. The date of its composition is 746 (chronogram).

7. Dīwān. Dawlatshāh (or his authorities) say, that the dīwān of Kirkānī numbers 20,000 verses (cf. also Sprenger, Cat. . . . Oudh., p. 472); it contains ʾasīṣa’s, mostly panegyric, e.g. on the Muẓafarīd Muḥārīr al-Dīn and ʾIṣḥāq Abū ʾIṣḥāq; also on the persons, lauded in the Gowbarāmā, and besides on other great men, as for instance Shirwānshāh b. Mintūbīr. A letter to a Shirwānshāh, ruler of Ǧabābān and Shamsākhī, from the part of the great wazīr Rashīd al-Dīn is extant (Browne, Persian Literature under Turkī dominion, p. 83); the person, praised in the Dīwān of Kirkānī may have belonged to the family of Rashīd al-Dīn’s addressees.

Further, the dīwān contains ghastal’s, muṭṭāṭa’āt, rubāʿīyat, etc.

Finally, a tarḏī’ī of this poet (refrain: kih ʿaḏẖān ʾżarrat ast u ma’mā ḍar sat wa ba ma’mā nagh kuni, hama ust) occurs in the Leyden manuscript 274, fol. 463 verso — 464 verso.

The little that is printed of Kirkānī’s poetry will be found in the works, cited in the Bibliography. From these scanty extracts, it is impossible to form a judgment on his merits as a poet; therefore, the opinion of Browne, who had the opportunity of reading a great part of the Dīwān, may be repeated here: “his verse, while graceful and pleasing, lacks any conspicuous distinction or excellence”.


(V. F. BUCHNER)

KIRMANSHĀH, a town lying in a plain among the mountain ranges that border the Iranian plateau on the south-west, now the capital of a Persian province between Kurdistan on the north and Kurdistān on the south. The geographical position of the town is approximately 34° 20' North Lat. and 47° East Long.; the plain is traversed by the Kārā Šū which runs to the north-east of the town in a south-easterly direction, joining the river Gāmāsāḥīb (formerly the Gāmāsāhīb Rūd) farther south; the latter is a tributary of the Kerkhā [q.v.] and the most important water-course of the province.

It was probably in this district that the earliest kingdom of the Medes was established (A. Billerbeck, Das Samtāk Subimnīta und dessen persische Nach-barmächtsaft, Leipzig 1898, p. 162); and here also were the Parthian provinces of Ḡaḏān and Moḏa dān and Moḏa ʾh nātōb (Isidore of Charax, § 4, 5). It was the province called Māth under the Sāsānids (in Moses of Khorenē), and in the early centuries after the Arab conquest, De Morgan wished to identify the ruins of the ancient Cambadene to the north of Kirkānshāh. This town is itself not very old: it was founded in the Sāsānian period and only began to be an important town from the sixteenth century onwards. The older Arab geographers know it only by the name of Karmīn (other forms: Karmīn, Karmīn, Kirmān, Karmān); Māḳdīsī (p. 28) says that it is another name for Kirmānshāh, while Vāyū (iv. 69) regards Karmīn as an arabicisation of Kirmānshāh (Dimāšqī gives the same note with reserve but Ibn al-Fakhrī already explains the first form by the second). Ḥāzīnī (Geography, p. 290) however says that Karmīn is near Kirmānshāh.

To explain Karmīn, Ritter, ii. 374, calls attention to the name of the river Corna in Tacitus (Annals, xii. 13). The name Kirkānshāh seems first to appear in the tenth century, perhaps in the time of the Būyids, but the circumstances are unknown. A very widespread tradition found in Ǧamāl Allāh Mustawī, Nuzhat al-Kulūb, p. 108 makes Ǧibrān IV (388—399 A. D.) founder of the town: this king had acquired the title Kirmānshāh as governor of the province of Kirmān [q.v.]: the chroniclers do record that he founded a town but it was more probably the little town of Kirkānshāh between Yezd and Kirmān (cf. Tabari in Noldke, Gesch. d. Pers. u. Arab., p. 71). Another tradition found more or less explicitly in almost all the geographers attributes the foundation to king Kavāḏī b. Fīrūz (488—531; cf. especially Māḳdīsī, p. 257 sqq.). The country round the town contained and still contains many monuments of the time of the Sāsānian kings; they often resided there and their example was followed by later rulers, e.g. the Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd and the Būyid ʿAḏḏ al-Dawī, who built a palace there (Māḳdīsī, p. 393).

The new name of the town may perhaps be connected
with this event for it was under Aşud al-Dawla that the Büyids became masters of the province of Kirmān [q.v.].

Kirmān was peacefully occupied by the Arabs after the taking of Ḥulwan (in 640; Bālāshūrī, p. 301). The district of Māh, belonging to the province of Dībāl, was then granted as an appanage to the inhabitants of Kūfah and Bāṣrah. The upper part became Māh al-Kūfah with Dinawar as capital; the lower part was Māh al-Bāṣrah with Kirmānī as its capital (Bālāshūrī, p. 306; Rūḏdānī, p. 222). Dinawar [q.v.] was however a much more important town than Kirmānī (cf. especially Schwartz, p. 479) and the geographers of these times mention it mainly as a stage on the great road Baghadād — Khaṇīkī — Ḥulwan — Kirmānī — Bīsūtūn — Hamadhān. Another important road ran from Kirmānī to Nihāwānd. The town is described in this period as pleasantly situated in a very fertile plain. It was ruled successively by the ʿAbbāsīds, Büyids — in their time it must have formed part of the territory of the Kūr dynasty of the Ḥasanawāhīs [q.v.], although it is not mentioned in the Kūr chronicle of Ṣharaf al-Dīn — and the Sekhūs; in the Mongol period it had sunk to a mere village (Ismāʿīl Kāzvīnī).

The importance of Kirmānshāh began under the Ṣafawīs after it had become a frontier bulwark of Persia against the Ottomans who had established themselves in dangerous proximity in Mesopotamia, especially after the time of Murād IV. The Turks several times occupied it in their wars with Persia, for example in 1650 during Ḥusraw [q.v.] Pāshā’s expedition. It then was a fortified town with a brick wall; see the description in Ewliyā’s Čelebi (iv. 353) who attributes its foundation to Shah Ismāʿīl, which probably means that he fortified it for the first time. After the fall of the Ṣafawīs (1722) the Pāshā of Baghadād succeeded in occupying Kirmānshāh but he was driven out by Askarān Khan. In 1731, the Turks again occupied it to be expelled by the future Nādīr Shāh. The treaties of peace of 1732 and 1736 left Kirmānshāh to Persia (cf. von Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 404 sqq.). In 1754 Mīrza Muḥammad Taḵī Khan became its governor for Nādīr Shāh. He later made himself independent until Karim Khan Zand took the town in 1766 after a siege of two years. Under the Kāḏjarīs Kirmānshāh acquired its importance; in 1790 it had about 6,000 inhabitants (Beuchamps, quoted by Ritter) but by 1810 there were already 12,000 houses (Kinnier, in Ritter). Under the governorship of Muḥammad ʿAlī Mīrzā, son of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh, who lived at Kirmānshāh as an almost independent vassal, the town became a formidable bulwark against the Turks. After the Turco-Persian peace of 1823 ʿAlī Mīrzā was sufficiently powerful to annex to his province the large district of Zohāb which ought to have been restored to Turkey. A complete list of the governors of Kirmānshāh under the Kāḏjarīs to 1905 is given by Rabino (see Bibliography). As recently as April 1915 the town was occupied by Turkish troops; they conducted propaganda on behalf of the Central Powers there until they were forced to retire in March 1917.

Kirmānshāh at the present day is rather the name of the province; the town is called more correctly Kirmānshāh. About 1905 it had a population of about 60,000 (Rabino) and owes its prosperity to its position on the great trade route of considerable antiquity (al-dījda in Māḏrīs) from Baghadād to Hamadhān (Kirmānshāhān is 100 miles from each of these two towns); the through traffic is enormous. The same road is used by the Shīʿa pilgrims who visit the sacred places of the ʿIrāq. Kirmānshāhān possesses no ancient buildings; the ramparts have been demolished and the most remarkable building is the arsenal, which is also the residence of the governor, built beside the great Top Mādīn. The town contains a large number of caravanserais; there is not much local industry, the manufacture of carpets having disappeared. The majority of the citizens are Kurds, then come Persians, Turks, Jews and Christians. The surrounding plain is very fertile. Ewliyā’s (loc. cit.) and ʿAbdīgīūr Khallīfah (Dīhānānwaṭ, p. 302) make special mention of the cultivation of saffron.

The province lies between 34° and 35° N. Lat. and 44° 30′ and 48° 30′ E. Long., the capital is almost in the centre, in the western part are Kevin and Kaṣr Shīrīn [q.v.] and in the eastern Asadābād, Kangāwar (formerly Kaṣr al-Luṣūq), Bīsūtūn [q.v.], Nihāwānd [q.v.] and the ruins of Dinawar [q.v.]. It is rich in monuments of the Achaemenids and Šāhīds, which are mentioned with more or less detail by the old geographers, such as the famous sculptures of Taḵī Bustān, three miles east of Kirmānshāh, to which the geographers give the name of Taḵī Bustān from the horse of the king Khusrav and the plateau (dakka) where Khusrav Parwīz is said to have received the submission of the kings of the earth in a hall of audience with 100 columns (cf. also Bīsūtūn).

It is one of the richest provinces of Persia. It exports wheat and rice and grows for its own use, maize, clover, castor-oil and cotton. It has a population of about 300,000 and is divided into nineteen districts (bulūk), many of which are named after the tribes which inhabit them. Rabino gives forty-four names of tribes for the province (cf. also Curzon, i. 557) who are for the most part Kurds. The largest Kurd tribe is that of the Kālūr (mentioned in the Kurdish Chronicle of Šaraf al-Dīn) to the south-west who have given their name to a district. Another important Kurd tribe is that of the Sīdārīs west of Kaṣr Shīrīn. Their southern part is called the Kirmānshāh by O. M. Mann (Die Mandaten der Lusthümer in südlichen Persien, Berlin 1910, p. xxii.) although the Lakk in the proper sense of the word live in Lurīstān. In the south of the province there are tribes of Lurs. The greater part of the semi-nomadic population are ʿAlī Īlahī [q.v.]. Besides the two groups mentioned there are several small tribes of Arabs and Turks which have become allied to the great Kurd tribes.


KIRMAŠT, capital of the Kaža of the same name in Anatolia, 15 miles S.E. of Mikhaldij (cf. J. H. Mordtmann, in Z. D. M. G., lxv. [1911], 101) and 40 miles S. of Brussa with about 5,000 inhabitants, 3,000 of whom are Muslims. The town has 14 quarters with 800 houses and lies on both banks of the Edrenos Cai (Rhyndacus). The origin of the name often wrongly written Kirmasl, which points to a Greek *Κημάστη* or *Κημάστη*, is uncertain, nor is it known what ancient town was here. Perhaps the Kremastis in the Troas (cf. Pauli-Wissowa, ii. 743) mentioned in Xen., Hist., iv. 8, is to be connected with it. In the Byzantine period Aorata is said to have been here where the town of Alexius Comnenus was known as Kirmastis in 1113 by the Saldjiks (cf. Anna Comn., ii. 779 sq.). In any case there is close to K. a Byzantine castle in ruins which resembles that 6 miles farther up the Edrenos Cai at Kesterlek and presumably was intended with similar defences at Ulubad (Lopadium) and Brussa to keep back the advance of the Ottomans. In the town which has 6 mosques, including one large very old one with a türbe and 14 masjdhis, there are ancient remains (sarcophagi, inscriptions on the walls, ornamements) which do not seem yet to have been studied. The history of Kirmast under the Ottomans is quite obscure, as there are no records. Ewlyi Çelebi (v. 290) and European travellers (cf. W. Hamilton, Researches in Asia Minor, i. 77, 80, ii. 93, London 1842) say practically nothing about it. The Muslim inscriptions have still to be studied and edited. Kirmast, which did not suffer from the Greek occupation, was recently (1925) renamed Mustāfa Kemāl Paşa in honour of the Turkish President. Kirmast is the birth-place of Seyyid-i Wilayet (d. 929 = 1522 in Stamboul), son-in-law of the historian Aşkül-Paşa-zade (cf. Teşkpropazarzade-Medjidji, Şahkâb’-al-Nu’mânîya, p. 352, 13), known from the Memâdji-i Taqrd al-Arifin (i. e. Sheykı Ebü ‘l-Wefa); cf. Pertch, Türk. HSS, Götta, p. 137, N. 166 and Tornberg, Catal. Uppsala, p. 211, Nò, ccvii.

Two hours’ journey from Kirmast are two hot mineral springs, called Dümüldak and Akardja. Bibliography: (besides references in the text): Cuinet, Turquie d’Asie, vi. 155 sq.; Hâdji Abdul-Khalîfî, Liyâkunumâ, 656, 17, 660, 2; Ewlyi, Seyhânum, v. 290 at top; W. M. Ramsey, Historical Geography of Asia Minor, 155, 437.

FRANZ BABENGER

KIRȘH. [See GHRUSH.]

KIR-SHEHR (Turkish kır-shehrî — "town of uncultivated lands"), a town in Asia Minor, capital of a Sandjak in the province of Angora, 97 miles (33 hours) S. E. of this latter, on a river called simply Irmk, a tributary of the Kizil-Irmak which flows at a distance of two hours from the town and is crossed by the stone bridge of Kezik with thirteen arches (about 120 yards). Its height is 3,290 feet. The houses are scattered among gardens which extend in length to a distance of 10 miles and in breadth to that of 5 miles; these gardens bear in the North the name of Ož, in the West that of Çukur-Cair, in the South that of Deinek, and in the East that of Kandze; it has an abundant harvest of fruit, especially of grapes. The population consists of 8,462 inhabitants of whom 7,794 are Muslims, 651 Armenians and 17 Greeks. There are 25 great mosques (Seldjuk mosque of Qodebe), 19 small mosques, 4 medreses, a civil preparatory school, a secondary school, 2 primary schools, a church. Several Muslim saints are buried there: the poet Ashgul Paşa (d. 733 = 1332), Aghâ Oren, Shaik Sulaiman. In the suburbs is held the fair of Yapralı; it has hot springs: Termey (Tepsi) or Karghan-Kayam, ferruginous, used as a cure for anaemia, a quarter of an hour away; Kara Kürt, sulphurous wells, a cure for nervous disorders, 8 miles away. Manufactures of carpets of wool and mohair (tiftik) for the salah (sadGiljada, q. v.) and for the room (källye), for curtains (perde-luk, cîlek-i gilim), for wallets (kehe), in three qualities: striped (pallâde): the same in a finer quality; kerme, woven mats; chairs, arm-chairs, cupboards of walnut-wood. To the West the mountain of Enbirburnu, in the middle of it facing south the immense cave of Göbek-Kaya.

The Sandjak is divided into four Kažas (Kirşehir) to which are attached two nahiya, of which one is Hâdjid Bektâsh (q. v.), Keskîn (capital Ma’den), Medjidje (capital Boyâli, Kurd village), Awanos (Abanos). It does not include any high mountains; it has a chain of hills called Barani Dag which extends for 14 miles in length in the vicinity of the capital and terminates at Kurte Beli. Millstones are obtained from the hill Alı Korlu. Two lakes, one near the town at Shebili Baghlar, Dib-Siz Gol (the lake without a bottom), and the second in the canton of Medjidje, Yanar Golü, near the village of Yanaroglu, which has given it its name. Total population, 119,535, inhabitants, of whom 116,000, 1,794 Greeks, 346 Armenians. Agriculture is only slightly developed. Roads suitable for vehicular traffic are hardly made completed: towards Cesearea and Angora, 80 miles; towards Ma’den, 40 miles; towards New-Shehir, 55 miles.


KIRTAS (a.), paper. This word is found in the Kur’un (vi. 7) with its plural kârûfû (vi. 91) where they can only mean papyrus. The Egyptians wrote on the kîrûs manufactured from reeds called bârdî (Fikrist, 1. 21). Chinese paper, wûrâc sînu, is made from vegetable fibre, boisk; microscopical examination has indeed shown that this paper is made, not from cotton but from various fibres (J. A. 1925, ccvii., p. 159 sqq.); while the paper of Khao Tung is manufactured from linen fibre, kallûm, by Chinese workmen in imitation of that of their own country (Fikrist, ibid.). More details are found in the article Kâhêhû.

Kaṭāda in Tabari, Taﬁrî, vii. 90, translates kirûs by sâbûa which tells us nothing.

(Fe. HUART)

born at Kufa, died at Râbiyya, not far from al-Ray, about 189 (805). The following dates are also given for his death 179, 180, 182, 183, 185, 193 and 197.

After having studied in his native town, he came to Basra to study with al-Khalil b. A'mad (see this article) who advised him to go and study language amongst the tribes of the Najd, of the Hidjaz and of the Thamama. On his return to Basra he found that al-Khalil was dead and had been succeeded by the grammarians Yunus b. Harib al-Basri, who after several discussions on grammar gave up his place to him. Nevertheless he took up his permanent abode at Bagdad where he taught chiefly Kuranic diction, first in accordance with the method of his master Hamza al-Zayyât, and afterwards he followed a method of his own; he is the seventh badr, and because of that he is counted amongst the seven canonical readers.

Hârûn al-Rashid confided to him the education of his sons al-Amin and of al-Ma'rem. In spite of the opinion of the Imam al-Shâfi'i who praised exceedingly his grammatical knowledge, al-Kisa'i was especially weak in grammar, and his partisans admit that he only latterly concerned himself with this science. In any case he had numerous adversaries, whom he dealt with in a fashion neither honest nor just, notably Shibawaih, al-Yazdi.


Of his numerous works, it appears that we have no more than one, Kitâb fi lâyîn âl-ummâ, "a treaty on the mistakes of the vulgar language", which seems to be the oldest work composed on this subject and was published from the Berlin manuscript No. 7103, by Brockelmann in Zeitschr. f. Assyriol., xii. (1898), 29–46 (cf. below Noldeke, ibid., p. 111–115).


AL-KISA'I, the author of the Kitab Kiqas al-Abnîya, is identified by 'Hadîjî Hâlîsf, i.e., No. 9437 with the grammarians and Kur'ân reader, 'Ali b. 'Hammâ (see the foregoing art.). This identification, first adopted by Herbelot, Bibl. Orientale, 1964, but rightly disputed by

Lidzbarski, following Pertsch and Ahlwardt, in his De prophetis quae dicuntur legendis Arabice (Leipzig 1893, p. 25), was again accepted by Weilhnaus in I. Eisenberg's dissertation, Die Prophetenlegenden des Musâmmad ben Abdallah al-Kisâî (Berne 1898), p. v., on the assumption that the work was not actually by this celebrated scholar himself but had been ascribed to him. The evidence of most manuscripts is however contrary to this view; they sometimes call the author (Abû 'Abdallah) 'Musâmmad b. 'Abdallah, sometimes Musâmmad b. A'mad, sometimes 'Abdallah b. Mu'sîmad (sic). Besides it can hardly be doubted that the author is identical with the author of the Kitâb ad-Dhât al-Malakât (Hâdîjî Khâlfâ, iv. 8075) or simply Kitâb al-Malakât (ibid., v. 10527) whom Hâdîjî Khâlfâ calls Abû Dja'far Mu'sâmâb b. 'Abdallah al-Kisâî, and of the Kitâb Badr al-Dunyâ, whom he mentions by name without the kunya on iii. 991. This latter work is lost but perhaps it was only an independent edition of the first part of the main work, which in the manuscript is sometimes also called Kitâb Badr (Khalîq al-Dunyâ wa-Kiqa al-Abnîyâ). The period in which the author flourished is nowhere mentioned. Contrary to Eisenberg's view (Diss., p. ix.) nothing can be deduced as to this or the grammarians' authorship of the book from the statement of Hâdîjî Khâlfâ, iv. 9477 that Sahî b. 'Abdallah al-Tustari (q.v.) wrote a Multhaqat Kiqas al-Abnîyâ; for Hâdîjî Khâlfâ does not say that this work was the basis of that of al-Kisâî. Al-Thalâabi (q.v.) does not mention al-Kisâî but an investigation of the sources and the relation of the two authors has still to be made, so that nothing can be deduced regarding the age of al-Kisâî. From the whole character of his literary activity one must agree with Ahlwardt in putting the author in the fifth century A.H.; while al-Thalâabi's work grew out of Kur'ân exegesis and is intended for learned circles, al-Kisâî is a typical representative of the class of Muslim; he relates the legends to edify and especially to entertain the reader. He therefore quotes only the oldest authorities, like Kahb b. al-A'hâr and Wahb b. Munabbîb, although he likes to appear scrupulously accurate; but his quotations are not of the slightest value for literary criticism. The work, which exists in numerous manuscripts (to those in G.A. L. i. 350, may be added: Gobha, Perssch. Vers., No. 1893; Brit. Museum, Ellis and Edwards, A descriptive List, p. 34, Or. 5820; E. G. Browne, A supplementary Handbook, No. 1012; Princeton, Littmann, No. 28; Cairo, Fikrist, v. 113; Damascus, Zaiyât, No. 74, 39), being a popular work was not always carefully treated by the copyists, but often arbitrarily abbreviated; it has also been translated into Turkish, s. H. L. Fleischer, Catalogus cod. ms. or. ibid. Dresdensis, No. 128.

Bibliography: Hottinger, Promptuarium, Heidelberg 1658, p. 209; Lidzbarski, Diss. (s.l.), p. 20–25; Vita (sic!) Prophetarum auctore Muhammed Ben Abdallah al-Kisâî e codicibus, qui in Monaco (sic!), Bonn, Lugd. Batavor., Lipsia et Gothana (sic!) asseruntur editis Isaac Eisenberg, i., Leyden 1922, ii. ibid. 1923. (Brockelmann)

KISA'I, Hakim Majid al-Din Abu 'Isâk (or Abu 'l-Hasan) KISA'I, a Persian poet of the second half of the fourth century A.H. belonging to the first period of Persian poetry. He was
born in Meir on Wednesday 26th Shawwāl 341 (March 16, 953) and according to most authorities died in 392 (1002); one source however (Wāliyī, quoted by Ethē), says that he reached a very advanced age. A few of his poems have been preserved in the different ṭadhkīra: they have been published by Ethē (Die Lieder des Kisā‘ī, S.-B. Bayr. Ak., 1874, p. 133–149). These poems illustrate the whole repertory of Persian poets of the time; the best known is the kaṣīda in which the poet gives the date of his birth as above and says that he composed it at the age of 50; this kaṣīda is pessimistic and ascetic in tendency. The ṭadhkīra describes him as a poet who celebrated the family of the Prophet in numerous poems (a ḫifā of this kind is given in Ethē’s article). He is also said to have written kaṣīda’s in praise of the Sāmānids and of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna. He must have been a celebrated poet in the Sāmānīd period; the later ṭadhkīra’s however (such as Dawlatshāh) do not mention him.

The Diwān of Nāṣīr-i Khushraw contains several passages in which the latter speaks contemptuously of Kisā‘ī. Ethē (Grundr. d. iran., Phil., ii. 281–282) has concluded from this that Kisā‘ī must have been still alive in the time of Nāṣīr (c. 1040) so that he must have lived to a great age. Ethē further seeks the cause of the antagonism between the two poets in their theological views, Kisā‘ī being a “Twelver” (īkhānī) Shī‘ī and Nāṣīr-i Khushraw a “Sevenner” (ta‘bīya). But Browne (A Literary History of Persia, ii. 160–164) holding that Nāṣīr’s invective is only intended to maintain his superiority as a poet, thinks that Ethē’s conclusions cannot be accepted, even that regarding Kisā‘ī’s age, because there could be nothing astonishing in Nāṣīr-i Khushraw’s attempts to surpass one of the best known poets of the preceding generation.


KISĀ‘Ī (A.), synonymous with ḥuwad, retaliation (“settlement”), not “cutting off” or “prosecution”), according to Muslim law is applied in cases of killing, and of wounding which do not prove fatal, called in the former case kisā‘ī fi ʾl-nafs (blood-vengeance) and in the latter kisā‘ī fi-mā dīn al-nafs.


2. Muhammad takes it for granted that the blood-vengeance of Arab paganism — in which in contrast to the unlimited blood feud, definite retaliation, although not always on the person of the doer himself, forms the essential feature of the vengeance (cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 6 and note 5) — is a divine ordinance with the limitation assumed to be obvious, that only the doer himself can be slain: Kur’n xvii. 35; xxv. 68; vi. 152 (cf. Kalti, i. 1); in these passages only the jus talionis can be understood by the right to kill another; already in xvii. 35 the avenger of blood is forbidden to kill any one other than the guilty one; ii. 173 sqq. (before Ramādān of the year 2): “To you who are believers the kisā‘ī is prescribed for the slain, the freeman for the freeman, the slave for the slave and the woman for the woman; but if anyone pardons anything by his brother he shall be dealt with equitably ... and pay him compensation as best he can. This is an indulgence and mercy from your Lord. But he who commits a transgression after this shall be severely punished. In kisā‘ī you have life, you of understanding ...” (the first verse says that a freeman can only be slain for a freeman, a slave for a slave and for a woman only a woman [but probably a slave or a woman for a freeman, but this is not expressly stated and must be deduced], naturally of course only the guilty one and that in all other cases the payment of compensation [diya] takes place. This is an extension of what is presumed in the earlier passages: the treatment of the freeman in relation to the slave is a matter of course according to old Arab views and that of the woman, which cannot be completely explained from them, represents an independent decision of Muḥammad’s based on them [there is quite a different interpretation of the verse in Procksch, op. cit., p. 75 note 5]. The commentators had difficulty in reconciling the passage with later developments [cf. below 4]. Only one explanation, thrust into the background and later completely abandoned, interprets the verse quite correctly, but makes it abrogated by v. 49 [see below]. By “prescribed” is meant not a duty but a rule not to be transgressed; pardon is the abandonment of kisā‘ī with a demand for compensation instead; the law is described as an indulgence and mercy and life-giving in contrast to the often unlimited blood-feud of pagan times, because only the guilty one is slain and the life of the innocent thus preserved; v. 49 (after the first encounter with the Medina Jews but before the outbreak of open hostilities): “and we have prescribed for them (the Jews) in it (Torah): a life for a life, an eye for an eye, a nose for a nose, an ear for an ear, a tooth for a tooth, and kisā‘ī for wounds; but if anyone remits it, it is an atonement for him (i.e. for his sins)” (this verse of course does not cancel ii. 173). In the years 3 and iv. 94 sqq. there came the distinction between deliberate and accidental killing (of Kalti, i. 1); in this the application of kisā‘ī is excluded; in ii. 190 (before the campaign of the year 6) kisā‘ī is used metaphorically in the sense of retaliation of like with like (in the case of disregard for the holy territory and month by the enemy).

3. The facts gathered from the Sīra, the records of the life of Muḥammad, are in agreement with this. In the so-called ordinance of the community at Medina, which belongs to the early Medina period it is laid down that if any one slays a believer and is convicted (proof of guilt in a trial before the authority — Muḥammad — is therefore required as a condition for the carrying out of kisā‘ī), talion takes place even if the avenger of the blood of the slain man declares himself satisfied; all believers must be against the murderer and can only take an active part against him. Here the kisā‘ī is brought from the sphere of tribal life into that of the religious-political community (ummā) which finds an echo in the law, not however to be taken literally, that believers are one another’s blood-avengers for their blood
spilt for the sake of Allah, but is throughout re-
recognised as a personal vengeance, as is also laid
down in the case of the Medina Jews, no one is
to be prevented from avenging a wound. A
limitation of ījāz, logical from the standpoint of the
ummah, lies in the fact that the believer is
forbidden in the ordinance of the community to
kill a Muslim on account of an unbeliever. On
two occasions when Muslims had killed heathens
who had however treated with Muhammad, he
did not allow ījāz to be made "because they were
heathen" (this does not in any way follow from
the ordinance of the community) and even paid
the compensation himself; his utterance regarding
the possibility of ījāz à propos of the second of
these cases is however illogical. On two occasions,
also for political reasons, he obtained the acceptance
of compensation when the avenger of blood un-
doubtedly had the claim to ījāz, but in one case
he cursed the murderer — again an illogical
attitude. Muhammad in his turn after the capture
of Mecca in keeping with the regulation of the
ordinance of the community, abandoned his claim
to compensation for the slaying of a nephew of
his, which had taken place during the heathen
period. The question remains whether he has laid
down the principle that any blood-guilt attaching
to a Muslim dating from the period of heathen-
dom was to be disregarded (cf. Kātit, i. 2). But
Muhammad also intensified the operation of ījāz
and on two occasions had the murderer executed,
when there were aggravating circumstances, with-
out offering the avenger of blood the choice between
ījāz and compensation; the prescription and exe-
cution of murderers who were also murji‘āt’s (q.v.;
cf. Kātit, ii. 5), is however to be interpreted dif-
ferently; from everything it is clear that Muham-
mad also supervised the carrying out of ījāz.

Taking the evidence of the Kurān and the
Sira together, it is evident that Muhammad did
not recognise the blood-feud, but allowed ījāz
to survive as personal vengeance, only he subjected
its application to certain limitations and endeavoured
to free it from tribal customs of pagan times, all
important in a period when韦 were not unus-
common in character to a punishment. That Muhammad
at the same time, according to the demands of the
individual case, sometimes gave decisions deviating
from his own rules, is intelligible.

4. Among the traditions (hadith’s) that one
must be genuine according to which Muhammad
had a Jew, who had smashed the head of a Muslim
djāriya (slave girl or young woman) with a
stone, killed in the same way, because in this
case there was no question of an avenger of blood.
At a later period when Kurān ii. 173 (cf. above
§ 2) was interpreted in a new way, the attempt
was made to see in it evidence that a man might
be killed as ījāz for a woman, without observing
that the tradition referred to an unbeliever while
the Kurān passage was only concerned with Muslims.
But this Kurānic prescription regarding the
woman was very early neglected and interpreted
differently; it is true that ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Azīz
al-Hāsan al-Bawārī, ‘Āṭh and ‘Ikrama are quoted as
representatives of the Kurānic view that a man
cannot be put to death for a woman (Zamakhshari
on Kurān ii. 173) but Sa‘d b. al-Musayyab, al-
Shābi, Ibrahim al-Nakha‘ī and Katāda had held
the opposite view (ibid.) and the latter opinion
prevails in the law-schools without any opposition
(Zamakhshari’s statements on the point are not
quite accurate); at the same time it is remarkable
that traditions expressing the rejected view are
hardly to be found. From the point of view of the
difference of opinion in the law-
schools, the following is important. For the
view that ījāz could be inflicted on several, on
account of one individual, if they had committed
the crime jointly, no unambiguous tradition could
be found. Those who held this opinion had there-
fore to rely on a tradition which does not at all
prove what it is said to, and were only able to
quote in support (alleged) decisions of old author-
ities. Their opponents naturally pointed out this
flaw. The question how the ījāz is to be executed
is also disputed; the champions of the view that
it is to be inflicted in the same manner as the
slaying, quote the tradition mentioned above, while
those who insist upon execution with the sword in
every case rely upon a saying of Muhammad’s. There
are also varying opinions as to whether a man can
be put to death on proof by ḥāṣima (cf. 5 below)
and ancient authorities are quoted for both; the
historical truth is perhaps that Muhammad wished
to apply ḥāṣima in a case of bloodshed and when
he could not be managed, paid compensation him-
self; besides it is said (certainly wrongly) that he
confirmed ḥāṣima as it existed in the period of
heathendom. Among other traditions, mention may
be made of the story that among the children of
Israel there was only ījāz and no possibility of
paying compensation (this is wrongly cited in ex-
planation of Kurān ii. 174) and that Muhammad
granted the blood-avenger’s request to abandon
claim to ījāz, laid great stress on forgiveness,
and even asked him to do so (cf. above 3; in
these historically certain cases, however, his attitude
was influenced by purely political considerations);
finally we are told that he who raises a claim
for blood without cause is one of the men most
hateful to God. Other traditions agree with the
regulations mentioned and still to be mentioned
and need not therefore be quoted, especially as
the hadith’s on this subject are collected in Guillaume,
The Traditions of Muhammad, p. 107 sq.

Summing up the results of the traditions as
the expression of opinion of authoritative circles of
Islam in the early period, we must notice in
contrast to Muhammad’s period the important
change in the treatment of women, which marks
an undeniable advance, just as the request for
forgiveness is evidence of a loftier point of view

5. The ījāz fī ‘l-mafs according to the Shari’ā.
In the cases of illegal slaying noted in the article
Kātit, i. 5—7 ījāz comes into operation, i. e. the
next-of-kin of the slain man, who in this capacity
is called wali ‘l-dam (avenger of blood) has the
right to kill the guilty man under certain conditions.
From what has been said above, it is obvious that
this punishment still partakes for the most part
of the character of personal vengeance; this
is also clearly seen in the regulations — disputes
in points of detail — prescribed for the case
when the avenger in any way mutilates the murderer
and only occasionally the idea of punishment by an
authority for the sake of justice crops up [thus
in all cases of culpable, illegal slaying in which
ījāz cannot take place, ta‘ṣīr intervenes]; the
competent authority is therefore regarded as
the wali of one who has no wali; therefore anyone
who kills a dhammi, mu‘āhad (an unbeliever
connected with the Muslim state by a treaty) or a 

muṣṭaʿmīn (an unbeliever who enters a Muslim country after being given a safe conduct) must, according to Malik, be put to death and the waḥīb has no right to abandon claim to kīṣās. On the other hand, however, it is laid down that anyone who kills a waḥīb slave goes scot-free, but that this point of view is found at all is a step in advance, for Muhammad's decisions in this connection (cf. above 3) were only dictated by the demands of the individual case; in other matters also in certain points we see a looser attitude adopted, at least in some of the decisions. The application of kīṣās the fulfilment of the following conditions are necessary: 1) The life of the person slain must be absolutely secured by the ḥārāʾa; this is the case with a Muslim, dhīmmī and muṣḥāḥad, at least as long as they are in the Dār al-Īslām [q. v.], and Dār al-Ṣūlīḥ [q. v.] (in the case of the slaying of a Muslim prisoner in the Dār al-ʿĪṣrāʾ [q. v.] it is unanimously agreed that there is no kīṣās and for the slaying of another Muslim there is no kīṣās, according to the Ḥanafī school; there are corresponding regulations for the dhīmmī and muṣḥāḥad in contrast to the muṣṭaʿmīn, muṣlīmād and dhīmmī may be inflicted on a muṣlīmād if he kills another muṣlīmād, and Malik makes kīṣās the general rule if anyone kills a muṣlīmād, without the authority of the Imām). This point of view is to be distinguished from the conception of the illegality of the slaying (cf. ʿaṣāʾ, i. 5) although the two ideas have a certain amount in common; the killing of a muṣṭaʿmīn is illegal but there is no kīṣās (apart from the special case just mentioned). 2) The slain man must not be a descendant of the slayer, nor the slave of the slave of one of his descendants, nor must there be a descendant of the slayer among the heirs of the slain man. 3) It is further taken for granted that the man when he committed the deed must be of years of discretion and be in full possession of his faculties. 4) The further conditions are disputed (cf. below). — Any alteration in these relations of the doer after the deed makes no difference to the old blood-guilt (it is however to be noted that the adoption of ʿĪslām by a ḥārūʾ wipes out all previous blood-guilt) with the exception of lunacy (in which case kīṣās cannot be inflicted), nor does, for example, an alteration in the relations of the slain man after the doer has decided on the deed but before it is actually committed (but there are various views on this point). If one of several men who have slain someone jointly cannot be put to death for one or other of the reasons, the others also escape kīṣās; this is also the case if a further reason for killing leads to the action of the slayer. If the slayer dies before kīṣās is carried out, all claim by the avenger of blood ceases according to Abū Ḥanīfa and Malik; according to al-Ṣāḥīfī and Ahmad b. Ḥanbal compensation can still be claimed.

Malik, al-Ṣāḥīfī, and Ahmad b. Ḥanbal further demand, before kīṣās can be allowed, in addition to the conditions mentioned that the slain man is at least the equal of the slayer as regards ʿĪslām and liberty, so that they certainly uphold Muhammad's intentions, while the Ḥanafīs — of course interpreting differently the evidence cited — take no account of this and therefore occupy an undoubtedly higher position. A particular view of Malik's has already been mentioned. According to Malik the slayer can further be put to death, if he has deliberately slaughtered his descendant and this view is also admitted in the Shāfiʿī school. Several may be put to death for the killing of one, according to Abū Ḥanīfa, Malik and al-Ṣāḥīfī, if they have done the deed together, provided the part taken by each was such that if he had acted alone, the result would have been the same (Malik alone excluded ḥasāma [cf. below] on the basis of which, according to him, only a single individual can be put to death). There is unanimity on the point that anyone who has killed several people is liable to kīṣās; on the question whether compensation has also to be paid there are different views.

Kīṣās can only be applied after definite proof of guilt is brought. The procedure of proof in a murder trial is essentially the same as in another case; in kīṣās fi ʿl-waṣf there is however also the old Arab institution of the ḫamaṣa (cf. ʿaṣāʾ and Goldzieher, Zeitschr. für vergl. Rechtswissen-
schaft, 8, p. 412 sqq.; Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Hadschentums, 2, p. 187 sqq.) which ʿĪslām allowed to survive (cf. above); according to Malik, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and al-Ṣāḥīfī's earlier opinion, kīṣās can be inflicted on the avenger (but according to Malik on one only) if the ḥamaṣa is performed and the other conditions are fulfilled, according to Abū Ḥanīfa and the later view of al-Ṣāḥīfī, which became predominant in his school, he has only to pay compensation; among the Shāfiʿīs, with the limitation that he may be put to death if in the course of the trial the accusé sweats to his guilt twice with fifty oats each time. If the person entitled to inflict kīṣās does so without previous judicial proof he is punished with taʿzīr.

The execution of kīṣās is open to the avenger of blood and according to Abū Ḥanīfa consists in beheading with the sword or a similar weapon; if the avenger slays in another fashion he is punished with taʿzīr, but not imprisoned. According to Malik and al-Ṣāḥīfī the guilty person with limited killings is killed in the same way as he killed his victim; both views are given by Ahmad b. Ḥanbal.

Kīṣās takes place — among other conditions — only when the next of kin (waḥīb) of the slain man or the owner of the slain man, if he was a slave, demands it; if there are several (equally nearly related) avengers of blood all must express this desire; if one of them remits kīṣās, the refusal affects all. Views are divided on the case where the avenger of blood (or one of several) can give no definite expression of opinion. The waḥīb, or the wounded man before he dies if the case occurs, is permitted to remit the kīṣās and he is even urgently recommended to do so, either in return for the payment of compensation or for another equivalent or for nothing. There are many special regulations on detailed points and many differences of opinion between the schools of law.

6. Kīṣās fi-mā ḍām al-Nafs according to the Shāfiʿī. If any one deliberately (with ʿamīd, op-

positive ḥaṭṭ; cf. ʿaṣāʾ, i. 5) and illegally (this excludes the wounding of one who tries to murder or injure or rob a fellow-man, if it is not possible to repel him otherwise; it is for example permitted to strike someone in the eyes or throw something in the eyes of a man who forces his way into another's house without
permission] has inflicted an injury, not fatal, which could be inflicted on the doer’s person in an exactly similar way (what is meant by this is very fully discussed in the Fikh books) he is liable to kısăş on the part of the wounded man, (except that Mālik makes it be inflicted by an expert), if the conditions necessary for carrying out the kısăş fi ‘l-naṣr are present with the following modifications: according to Abū Ḥanīfa, kısăş fi ‘l-naṣr dīn al-naṣr is not carried out between man and woman or slaves among themselves, but it is according to Mālik, al-Shāfi’ī and Ḍāmīr and Mālik further allow no kısăş fi-nā ‘dān al-naṣr between freemen and slaves. According to Mālik, al-Shāfi’ī and Ḍāmīr and Māḥbūb this kısăş is inflicted for one on several, but not according to Abū Ḥanīfa. A sound limb may not be amputated for an unsound one; if the guilty person has lost the limb, there can of course be no kısăş. In the case where he loses it after committing the deed, there is a corresponding difference of opinion as in the case of his death before the execution of kısăş fi ‘l-Naṣr.

The further regulations correspond to those quoted in section 5.

7. If retribution is not permitted or if the person entitled to kısăş voluntarily renounces his claim, compensation may nevertheless be demanded; for an unlawful slaying, the blood money (diya; q. v.) is to be paid to the next of kin of the person killed, in an unlawful but not mortal wounding, according to the particular case either the full diya or a definite part of it or a contribution defined by the law (arba‘; q. v.) or a percentage of the diya laid down by the judge (the so-called hukūma) to the injured person; all this of course on the supposition that the slain or wounded man was a free man. If he is a slave his value must be made good. If the culprit is a slave, his owner has to pay these contributions for him; he can however escape by handing over the slave (parallels in the Romano-Celtic institution of in nexum dedere; cf. e. g. Girard, Nouvelle Revue Historique, 1887, p. 449 sqq.).

8. Of the regulations of the Shi‘a Fikh books, which need not be gone into fully here as they are essentially the same as the Sunni, we need only mention that among the Twelver Imāmīs, for example, it is taught that if a man has killed a woman, kısăş can be carried out if the woman pays the relatives of the man the difference between the blood-money on each side; an isolated interpretation explains Kur‘ān, ii. 173 in this way. Here we can scarcely have a late effect of the Kur‘ānic rule regarding woman, as similar calculations are also made in other cases.

9. On the practical carrying out of kısăş, cf. Kaṭl, ii. 10, in which we may note that breaches of his regulations are recorded of even the Prophet’s companions.

Bibliography: The Fikh-books; the works already quoted under Kaṭl: the article qīṣāṣ in T. F. Hughes, A Dictionary of Islam. For the Arabic expressions not further explained see the separate articles. (J. Schacht)

Kīṣām. 1) A long island in the Persian Gulf (also called Jawla because of its shape), off the coast of Lārīstan at the entrance of the straits of Hormuz, opposite the port of ‘Akhund. In length it is about 77 miles. It is separated from the mainland by a strait, called Clarence Strait, the breadth of

which varies from one to seven miles. It is composed of rocky and calcareous hills. The latter to the West form an elevation called Kīṣīm Kūh (mountains of Kīṣīm). Vegetation is rare; mines of sulphur and of salt are found here; the population, of Arab origin, amounts to 15,000 inhabitants. It was ruined by an earthquake in 1884. The chief pursuit is coral and pearl-fishing. Idrīsī (in Abu l-Fidā‘, Taḥqīm al-Baladān, ed. Reinaud, p. 373) mentions a great whirl pool in the sea near here; his name that it now bears is that of the capital, a small town with 5,000 inhabitants, situated at the eastern point; an old Portuguese port is still to be seen there; in the Middle Ages it bore successively the names of the Island of the Banū Kāwīn (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 107); Bārkīwān (Ibn Hawāk, p. 183); Ibn Kāwān, Abdārīm, Abdārāwīn (Baṭlīhūrī, p. 386); Iṣṭakhrī, p. 32, 118; Yākūt, iv. 341) from the name of a place still found at the present time on the Northern side. The English founded, at Bāšīdū, the factory of Basadore, soon afterwards abandoned. Other places are Guran and Sūxehe.

2) There was formerly a town of the same name in the upper basin of the Oxus which belonged for a short time to the Yabghū of Tokhārīs (Tabāri, Anwāl, ii. 1590A). It is found in Hiuontsang under the name of Ki-iti-sit-tme, corresponding to a hypothetical Sanskrit name Kiṃsa; it lay four days to the East of Hīwā, identified by Vule with Warwāzī near Ķunduz (J. Marquart, Erzählner, p. 79, 231).


(Ch. Huart)

Kīṣem (A., T.); this word, the Arabic meaning “distribution” of which is a synonym of iṣṭāmūl later came to mean lot, portion and developed as a third meaning “the lot which is destined for every man”. It is this meaning of the Turkish that is best known. In Turkish however kīṣem is not so much an expression of theological doctrines concerning predestination (cf. KADAR) as of a practical fact, it accepts with the signification the blows and vicissitudes of fate. The same sentiment is often expressed among Persian and Turkish poets by the words falak and tarkh to express the irrational and inevitable influence exercised by the spheres.

In Turkish, kīṣem is also another word for the judicial office called kasımlik, especially in the expression kīṣem-i ʾastariye, i. e. the authority charged with the supervision and maintenance of the weaving instituted by the Sultāns (cf. Sāmī, Kānî-ū Türkî, s. v.).

Bibliography: E. Littmann, Morgen- ländische Worter im Deutschen, Tubingen 1924; Else Marquardsen, Das Wesen des Osmanen, Munich 1916, p. 100. (J. H. Kramers)

Kīṣrā, the Arabic form of the name of two Persian kings of the Sassanian dynasty, Khusraw [q. v.] has become a general name for all the Persian kings; then it was given a broken plural akṣira (other forms: kūsīr, akṣīr, kāṣīr). The only remaining monument of the town of al-Madā‘in (Seleucia-Ctesiphon) before its recent destruction

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, II.

(Ch. Huart)

KISSA (A., plur. Kiṣas) does not occur in the Kurʾān. The Kurʾānic noun from the root ʿ-ṣ-ṣ, perhaps an infinitive, is ʿaṣaṣ which occurs 5 times: iii. 55; vii. 175; xii. 3, 111; xxviii. 25; and in the title of xxviii. 25. The root does not mean simply “narrate”, as usually translated; but has a particular meaning and usage which have conditioned the whole after use of ʿaṣaṣ. It will be for clarity in this connection to look shortly at the usual Kurʾānic expressions meaning “narrative”, “narrate”. In Muḥammad’s earlier career (for such broad considerations the order of the Kurʾān is sufficiently significant), he used exclusively the root ʿ-ṣ-ṣ; thus ḥadīth (meaning strictly “a new thing”, “news”, “an event” as opposed to ḥadīm) occurs 23 times in all: e.g. lxvi. 3; lxvii. 44; lxviii. 50; lxix. 15; lxxv. 17; lxxviii. 1; ḥaddath, xxiii. 11; xxiv. 4. In lxvi. 3, ḥadīth is combined with root n-ḥ-ḥ which occurs before that only twice: lxxvii. 133; lxviii. 2. In Muḥammad’s later career root n-ḥ-ḥ preponderates by far: stem ii occurs 46 times and stem iv. 4 times, apparently in much the same meaning, but al-Kāghib in the Mufradāt (p. 499, l. 5 from below; Lane, p. 2753a) says that nāḥaḥa is more intensive than ʿaṣaṣ; stem x occurs once; the noun nāḥaḥ occurs in the sing. 17 times and in the plur. 11 times. Of the root ḥaḥ-b the verb does not occur and the 52 noun usages are curiously scattered from Suras ii. to lxvii., with two isolated, and apparently early, in xxiv. 4 (abbāḥar) and c. 11 (khaddir). Of these 52 occurrences 45 are khaddir, “well informed”.

The root ʿ-ṣ-ṣ is much more difficult. Leaving aside ʿaṣaṣ [q.v.] “tale” (ii. 173, 175, 190; v. 49), the fundamental and primary meaning is given in xviii. 63; far-taddā “alā ʿaṣarikāmā ḍaṣaṣ, “so they went back in their foot-prints, tracing them”, in xvii. 10 where the mother of Moses says to his sister, ḥusṭhi, “trace him up”. This meaning persists in all the Kurʾānic usage; cf. the similar development of root t-t-t, “to follow, imitate, recite from, relate a narrative (nāḥaḥ),” Kurʾān, v. 30; xxviii. 2, etc. So ḍaṣaṣ means “he traced out, step by step, the facts in the case of some one or something and (on) he made a statement upon it”. The lexicons all add the explanation “aṣaṣ maḍāḥiḥi which Lane (p. 2546c) renders, “in its proper manner”, perhaps better, “straight on, point by point” (dīn maʿdīn). In Suras ii. the Prophet (mostly), Kurʾān, iv. 162; vi. 57; vii. 6, 99; vi. 102, 121; xii. 3; xvi. 19; xxviii. 12; xxviii. 99; xl. 78; by the Kurʾān, xxvii. 78; by Moses to Shuʿaib of Midian, xxviii. 25; Jacob tells Joseph not to recount his dream (rūyā) to his brothers, xii. 5; Allah tells the Prophet to state the case (fa-ḥaṣṣṣelim-Ṭaṣṣeṣ) to the people, vii. 175; messengers (rūsāl) make a statement of Allāh’s signs (ṣaḥḥa) to the people, vi. 130; vii. 33. It is combined with nāḥaḥ (sing. or plur.): vii. 99; xii. 102, 121; xviii. 12; xx. 99; with ḍaṣaṣ, iii. 55; vii. 57. It might be possible in all these cases to translate roughly “narrate”, but that would obliterate the basic idea in the root of following up traces (ittibāʿ al-ḥadīth, Lisan, viii. p. 341–343) which, in these cases, are ideas and expressions (Lisan, p. 342, l. 4 from below). This is sometimes expressed as a baṣṣān, “explaining”; so, while Balātawi (ed. Fleischer, i, p. 451, l. 19 sqq.) quotes Kurʾān xii. 3 as a following of traces, the Lisan (p. 434, l. 5 from below; p. 432, l. 5 from below) explains as a baṣṣān.

It is significant that in the lexicons the usage for narrating is very subordinate and in the case of ḍaṣaṣ sometimes vanishes. The fundamental ideas in the root are two, “to cut off, shear”, as hair with scissors (not, apparently, in the Kurʾān) and “to follow traces”; the Lisan quotes only traditions and never, āhuwālīd of poetry in illustration of the usage ḍaṣaṣ “alā ishīn ḥaḍar,” he recounted the information to him”. In the Miṣbah the only meaning given to ḍaṣaṣ is ṣaḥīn, amr, “affair”, “matter”, “case” — not ḥadīth or khāṣar. In the Sahih the meanings are (i) amr and (ii) ḥadīth, and the plural ḍaṣaṣ is restricted to the ḍaṣaṣ which is written. In the Lisan (p. 341, l. 5 from below) ḍaṣaṣ is said first to be known (muʿāṣa) and then there is quoted, fi raʾṣa ḍaṣaṣ (“there is a ḍaṣaṣ in his head”), as meaning “the whole thing is merely talk” (al-ṣuṣma min al-kālum); cf. the judgement on ṣaḥā as ḍaṣaṣ, “words”, opposed to ṣaḥīn, “works” (p. 343, l. 2 sqq.; Lane, p. 2526c). Later in the Lisan, p. 342, l. 7 from below) ḍaṣaṣ is given two meanings, amr and ḥadīth, and several traditions bearing on the ḍaṣaṣ (evidently the religious exhorter and storyteller; see below) are quoted. In one he is said to be either an ʿanār, whose duty it would be to exhort his people in his ḍaṣaṣ, using stories of the past, or his appointee — such do not seek gain, or he who does it out of pride and hypocrisy, whose exhorting and talk have no reality in them. Cf. several forms of this tradition and remarks upon them by Muṭrād al-Zabīdī in his Ḥaṣaṣ al-Sāda, a commentary on the Ḥaṣaṣ al-Ghazālī, vol. i, p. 153. In another it said that the ḍaṣaṣ may expect (divine) hatred (maḍāḥ) because he will inevitably add to or take from his stories as he tells them. In these traditions, evidently of late origin, the connection of ḍaṣaṣ with ḍaṣaṣ, “stories”, is taken for granted but others held that the ḍaṣaṣ was so called because he followed ṣaḥā, one story with another in his kālum, here apparently “patter” in contempt (above, p. 671a; Lisan, p. 343, l. 10). From all this it is plain how uncertain was the original meaning of ḍaṣaṣ. Lexicographically the existence of the word is assured and it may be conjectured that, beside ṣaḥā and ḍaṣaṣ, meanings it was originally an im naw, “a kind of tracing out” — but what kind? So in the Ṣaḥih of Muslim, Ṣaḥān, ṣāḥ al-ṣīḥ, trad. 44: ṣāḥ al-ḥadīth bi-kiṣṣiṣirak nakwah ḍaṣṣāḥ, “he carried on, or pursued, the ḍaṣṣāḥ, in his way of tracing it out step by step, just like the ḍaṣṣāḥ of …”. In later Arabic the word had two distinct meanings: (i) “story” mostly of a religious and edifying kind, but used also much more widely and even, in Spanish Arabic, “history”, if we can
trust the Vocabulary of Pedro de Alcalá (Dozy, Supplement, ii. p. 352a. b, under kāṣīṣ and mukāṣīṣ). Cfr. too, “historián” in Redhouse’s Turkish and English Lexicon, p. 1458a); (ii.) “request”, “petition”, “claim”, laid before a superior; a number of examples of this are given by Quatremère in his Sultans Manolbeks, 1, i, p. 256, note 111; there was an official for the purpose of dealing with these called kīṣga-dār; see, too, Gaudevery-Demobhymes, La Syrie, p. 811. This second meaning is almost certainly more original and goes back to the šān, amr of the lexicons. It is worth notice also that kāṣīṣ similarly retained two separate meanings: (i.) the professional reciter of such tales = kīṣa above and (ii.) a police-agent, detective, “tracer”. For the second meaning Dozy (loc. cit.) refers to the Breislau text of “The 1001 Nights”, vol. vii, p. 313, l. 4 from below, derived here from one of Do Sady’s Egyptian MSS., although the printed text of Zoteberg’s Egyptian Recension is quite different (II Calcutta, ii. 246; I Bulaik, i. 506). In the grammatical usage damir al-kīṣa = damir al-šān the meaning šān is explicit; Zamakhshari in the Mafāṣiṣ, p. 54, l. 8 sqq., explains such a prefixed huwa as meaning “the case, and the event, is...” (al-šān wu’t-ladīh...)

In rubrics of Bukhārī’s Sahih kīṣa occurs several times and always apparently in the sense šān or amr, “the matter, affair, case of”; see ed. Bulaik, 3134, iv. 189; v. 72, 129, 171, 172, 174.

In the Fihrist (c. 400 A. H.) kīṣa does not seem to occur; certainly it is not there one of the normal words for “story” in any sense. These are: tarīkh, khabar, hadith, stori, samar, kihārīs; kīṣa in the Fihrist is used only in the exact sense of a verbatim reproduction (see kīṣa, above). Undoubtedly the kīṣa was at work for more than two centuries, but their labours had not reached literary form and recognition.

In a very few years more that had taken place. There are two books with which the word kīṣa is peculiarly connected, the so-called Kīṣa-ṣan-i-nabī (commonly rendered “Stories of the Prophets”) of al-Kisâkî (q.v.) and of al-Thalâbî (d. 427 A.H.; cfr. on both Liddaberski, De prophetis legendis arabicis, Leipzig 1893). Yet in the rubrics of the first book hadith is the word used throughout except of the Kīṣa-ṣan-i-nabī (ed. Eisenberg, p. 45) and there is no mention of kīṣa in the introduction. The second book begins: “This is a book which contains the kīṣa of the prophets mentioned in the Kurān with commentary” and then quotes Qur. xi. 121, “and each (piece of information) we trace out (or give in detail, or explain, naḵṣeta) for thee of the information (anbā’) concerning the Messengers, that by which We establish thy heart”. Five romances are then given which justify, e.g., recanted to Muhammad such records of the past, apparently interest in the kīṣa, for some people, required justification. Therefore kīṣa is used regularly in the rubrics and it is probable that Thalâbî understood by kīṣa-ṣan-i-nabī very nearly, “The Records, or Accounts of the Prophets”, records from the Kurān and from hadīth. While it is plain that Thalâbî was not regarded as a very careful traditionalist (see Murtaḍa al-Zabîdî, Ilkāf al-Sāda, vol., iv., p. 556, but contrast Ahwardi’s judgement on his Kurān commentary in the Berlin Cat., i, 293) yet a gulf still separated him from the utterly unprofessional professional kīṣa who made a living out of the pious gullibility of the masses and drew as freely on their imagination as did the popular entertainers with secular āmār and khurāṣ. It is unnecessary to give details on these as Goldzihér (basing on the Kitāb al-kīṣa of al-Djawi, d. 597 A.H.) has already dealt with them in his Muḥammadanische Studien, vol., ii, p. 161 sqq. (also his Richtungen der isl. Koranauslegung, p. 58 sqq., 61). They began as stirrers up of religious enthusiasm before the Muslim armies, like the poets in the old days, making free use of sajj, or rhymed prose. Thus they naturally became popular exegetes of the Kurān and public homilists, passing into story-tellers for religious purposes. From these the professional class must have quickly developed and it is certainly strange that there is no mention of them in the first Fanz of the eighth Manṣūrī of the Fihrist where the varieties of story-tellers are dealt with in detail. Further, there is only one trace of them in the Amīlān of al-Maīdānī (d. 518 A.H.) in a muwadda proverb, al-kīṣa la wuhusu `l-kīṣa, “one kīṣa does not love another” (Cairo 1310, ii. 51; ed. Freytag, ii. 304, NP. 180). But in the Ḥiyā of al-Ghazālī (d. 505 A.H.) there are a number of references. In Book I of the Ḥiyā, in the section which deals with the perversion of religious expressions, it is pointed how dīkhr and tadhkīr have been twisted by homilists (wuṣṣa) to apply to kīṣa, poetry, stāth (q.v., cf. also Macdonald, Religious Attitude, p. 173) and fīhmāt (overmastering outpourings); Dozy, Supplement, ii., p. 592). Kīṣa are a bid’a and evidently not one to be approved. The kīṣa appeared only in the troublous times (al-fāra) after ‘Emar, i.e., under ‘Uthmān and ‘Ali. ‘Ali excluded them from the mosques but made an express exception of Ḥasan al-Baṣri because of the truly edifying and terror-striking character of his kalām. A madījī for dīkhr may be more edifying even than reciting the Kurān, according to traditions from the Prophet, but such traditions do not apply to the madījīs of the kīṣa who give the name of tadhkīr to their khurāṣ and are occupied with kīṣa which breed nothing but controversies and which are quite different from the kīṣa of the Kurān. So al-Damārī in his Ḥiyā al-Hayawān (Cairo 1313, ii. 170), giving the story from Tamim al-Dāfī about al-fāra, the strange beast in attendance on al-Daddālî in his island, says that Tamim was the first who kīṣa `ala ‘l-nās. So there are kīṣa the listening to which is for edification and there are kīṣa which are the reverse. The difficulty is to distinguish; truth may easily lead to falsehood and the useful to the harmful. A long statement as to which is quoted from Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (ed. with commentary of Murtaḍa al-Zabîdî, Ihlāf al-Sāda, i. 240 sqq.). Again, in the Book on the Ṣādā, in the section which considers how the pious should pass their leisure time on Friday, there is a warning against the frequenting of the kīṣa (i. 277 sqq.). It is worth noticing that the commentator Murtaḍa (d. 1205 A.H.) uses kīṣa, akhībār and kihāyāt quite indiscriminately. So, too, Ibrahim al-Baidāfī in his Ḥāshiya on Abū Shujā’i’s marr on canon law, written in 1258 A.H., speaks of “lying kihāyāt like the kīṣa of ‘Antar and of al-Dalhama” (Cairo 1307, i. 131, 12). But Massignon in his Essai (pp. 141 sqq., 221) has shown that, in spite of this condemnation,
the labours of the mystics of Islam and of the ḥaḍīth among them were what gave to Islam its permanent type as we know it to-day. Their spontaneous movement, preaching to the populace directly in rhymed prose pointed with religious legend, was the first apologetic and catechetical literature of Islam. They naturally shocked the canonical and theological and religious authorities generally. They were sincere and terribly in earnest and the kāfī who worried ʿAlī with holding forth in the court of her chamber until she sent to Ibn ʿUmar who drove him away and broke a stick over his back, may have been like an over-zealous street-preacher with us (ḥiyā, iii. 279). All depended on the character of the men, as the exception of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī by ʿAlī shows. In Ramaḍān the daily preaching in the mosques is still of this character. It cannot, then, be surprising that ʿaṣūṣa has come to be one of the most popular words for "story" and especially for "religious legend". In the index of book-titles in Alhwardt's Berlin Catalogue (x. 493–496) it occurs 216 times; of these 27 are in the form ʿaṣūṣa ḍuṣūrul ... on which occur for the cases from Buḫārī abové. These are mostly religious stories, but quite large portions of the title are non-religious and of the Arabian Nights type. In the same index ḍīṣṭa occurs only 48 times and there are very few uses of ṣaḥīḥ simply as "story".

Bibliography: A has been given in the article. (D. B. Macdonald)

KİŚI (ṣerār, sestatius, sèt, Sester etc.), an Arab measure of capacity for fluids equal to about a pint. In the early period of Islam the use of measures of capacity seems to have been more general than in the later period for in the mounds of ruins in Egypt, we find numerous broken bottles with the official stamp indicating their capacity expressed in kāfat. We get an idea of the volume from statements such as a kāfat of palm oil weighs 18 ʿaṣūṣa, a kāfat of wine 20, a kāfat of honey 27; assuming a troy ounce of 27.886 grammes and taking into account the specific gravity of the liquids above mentioned, we get a value of c. 0.54 litre for the early Arab kāfat (the old French sèt = 0.46 litre). A multiple was the ʿaṣīra (amphora) = 48 kāf (c 25 litre). — Cf. also the article ʿaṣūṣa.


Kiśwa. [See ʿaṣr, ʿAṣhar.]

Kiṭāa (A.), pl. ḥāṭṭ, "piece cut off", "section", means in the geometry of the Arabs (a) a segment of a circle, the part cut off by a chord; (b) a segment of a cone, the part cut off by a plane; (c) a section of any other figure (parabola, ellipse, etc.). From the same verb ḥāṭṭa come three other geographical expressions, ḥāṭṭ (so written in the Dict. of Tech. Terms, ed. A. Sprenger, etc.) or ḥāṭṭ (so in the Cod. Leidens. 339, i, ed. R. Besthorn and J. L. Heiberg, and in the Muḥāfīz al-ʿOlam, ed. van Vloten) = sector of a circle, i.e. an area bounded by two radii and the portion of the arc of the circle between them; ḥāṭṭ better ḥāṭṭ ḥāṭṭ, a line cutting through the circle, i.e. a sector; ḥāṭṭ = section (through a body) e.g. ḥāṭṭ al-makārah al-mustadār = conic section.

Bibliography: Besides the above mentioned works cf. The Elements of Euclid in the recension of Naṣir al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, Rome 1594, and Traité du quadrilatère, attribué à Nasiruddin al-Ṭūsī, ed. et trad. par Alex. Pacha Cavathoody, Constantinople 1891. (Here quadriiotore is the translation of al-ṣabīl al-ḥāṭṭa where ḥāṭṭa is apparently an intensive form of ḥāṭṭ i.e. "the polysectant figure"). (H. Suter)

Kiṭāb (A., pl. Kitāb) book. With the art of writing the Arabs had taken over from their Northern Semitic neighbours also the words for book and for writing and in the earlier phraseology Kiṭāb means simply something which is written, not necessarily a book and in fact the word is also applied to a "letter" simply. As we do not possess any Arabic book earlier than the Kurān and the only other remains, besides inscriptions on stone, are the poems of early poets to which we may add in some cases the tale or ḥāṭṭa [q. v.] explaining the occasion on which the poem was composed, we cannot be certain whether books existed or not. The word Kiṭāb occurs rather frequently in the Kurān in several meanings but the outstanding meaning is the sacred book containing the revelation of God to his worshippers and in consequence the adherents of the three great religions known to Muhammad, the Christians, Jews and Mazdians are named the "People of the Book" (Aḥl al-Kiṭāb). For the first the Injīl or New Testament is meant, for the Jews probably only the Pentateuch and Psalms, while we do not know whether any book of the Mazdians was known to him at all. However the Kurān knows of another Book i.e. the Book in which God has written the destiny of every man and in which during his life-time all his good and evil deeds are continuously recorded to be brought before him as witness for his reward or punishment on the Day of Judgment. The "Book" most excellence is however the Kurān itself, if it is the revelation of God, and further through falsifications through ill-will or human error and according to its own assertion there is no book in the world equal to it, nor can it ever be equalled, being the true word of God. As the Kiṭāb is the word of God it has also the meaning in the Kurān of "a decree of God" or it becomes the "impression" which God stamps upon the hearts of men; and as anything written down is lasting so God himself has "written" or made incumbent upon himself to have mercy upon men. Finally it means a simple letter or message written to a distant person.

If we investigate the meaning of the word as applied in the verses of the Arabic poets before Islam we find it used in almost all the same meanings, though perhaps we have to be more sceptical when we find the word in the meaning of divine revelation, though ʿAdi b. Zaid, a Christian poet who lived shortly before Muḥammad, uses the verb in the meaning of a destitution (Qambarat al-Aṣfar al-nafirāna, ed. Cheikho, p. 102 ult.), it may be that the poem was attributed to him by a later forger. I am, however, not so confident that such old references to ideas expressed in the Kurān are of necessity falsifications. More frequent are the references in old poems to
writings in a foreign script, and there is every evidence that the ancient poets were at least acquainted with the appearance of manuscript books adorned with illuminated title-pages. In a verse by Ṭūfāli al-Ghanawi (x. v. 3) the poet refers to a written safe-conduct which he calls a Kitāb. At the same time the word appears to have also the meaning of a book as a literary product and though I believe that poems etc. were committed to writing very early, some elapsing time after the Kur'ān had been fixed in writing in book-form before any other works were committed to paper or parchment and it is very difficult to say which Arabic work was first written in this manner. The collectors of the traditions of the Prophet for a long time insisted upon the Ḥadīth being handed down orally, and the same was probably the case with the commentaries of the Kur'ān by Ibn ʿAbbās. This must have been fairly comprehensive and al-Baghawi in the Muṣālim al-Tanţīl states that he received the book through three different channels. The books on the Maghazi or biographies of the Prophet also were very early committed to writing, but as all the earlier works are lost, except in extracts, it is difficult to say that they were books. This may however be certain, that in Dr. of the poet Lahab existed in written copies before the end of the first century of the Hijra from the verse of al-Farazdāk (Naṣāḥī, ed. Bevan, i. 201, 6) where he states that he possesses his poems in a complete book. After this, books were written in the lands of Islam with feverish activity, to which the thousands of titles of lost works found in biographical works bear witness. Finally, one work has had the distinction of being simply called al-Kitāb, namely the great grammatical book of the Baṣrīan Sībīḥ (Shīwahī) and it is certainly the most extensive work of early Islam which has come down to us.

The Arabic lexicographers try to find an etymology of the word from others meanings of the root in the language which can easily be consulted in the existing dictionaries, but it would be vain to seek the derivation there for a word which had been imported from the North with the art of writing. (F. Krekowsky)

KITABKHANA, library, is a Persian word for which we find also the Arabic mahāba, which is applied to public libraries founded and endowed by princes and private individuals for the benefit of scholars, sometimes for those of a special sect or for some particular study. With the zeal for literary pursuits and the ever increasing composition of books, after the period of conquests, men of literary tastes accumulated handsome private collections of books and from the example of the Kūfī philologist Abū Ṭāmir al-Shaḥibānī we can reasonably assume that it was a custom for authors to deposit copies of their works for reference in the mosque of their town or quarter. The earliest record of anything like a public library is connected with the name of Ḥālid b. Yazīd b. Muḥāwiyah who devoted his life to the study of Greek sciences, particularly alchemy and medicine. We are told that he caused such books to be translated, and when an epidemic occurred at the beginning of the reign of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, he commanded the books to be fetched out of the library (khhāna) to be made available for the people. However, the first public library on a large scale was the Dār al-ḥikma (Temple of Wisdom) inaugurated by the ʿAbbāsid caliph al-Maʾmūn in Baghdād. To make this library as comprehensive as possible he had valuable Greek manuscripts purchased in the Byzantine empire and translated by a number of competent scholars into Arabic. This library contained books in all the sciences cultivated by the Arabs and it flourished till the city was taken and sacked by the Mongols in 656 A.H. Equal in importance was the library of the Fāṭimid rulers of Egypt in Cairo, which contained untold literary treasures and we learn that in the year 435 = 1043/44 the wazir Abu l-Ḵīṣṇi ʿAli b. Aḥmad al-Dājūḏi gave instructions for a catalogue of the books to be made and the bindings to be renewed, and he appointed Abū ʿAwālī al-Kuṭāfī and Ibn Ḥalaf al-Warrākī to superintend the work. This library remained intact till the death of the last Fāṭimid caliph al-ʿĀḍid, when Ṣaḥāb al-Dīn ordered it to be dissolved and the ʿAḏdī l-Fāḍīlī [q. v.] bought most of the books and deposited them in the library of the Fāṭihya Madrasa which he founded, where they were soon neglected and by the time of al-Kālaḵšandī most of them had disappeared. This library is stated to have contained 6,500 volumes of mathematics, astronomy etc. and among its treasures was a globe of copper stated to have been constructed by Ṭolomeis and bearing an inscription stating that it had been acquired by Khālid b. Yazīd b. Muḥāwiyah. The third great library was that of the Umayyad caliphs of Cordova, which was also dispersed after the Almoravid conquest of Spain early in the fifth century of the Hijra. Among the minor libraries was one founded by the Ghaznavi Sultan Maṣʿūd, most of whose treasures were later transferred to Bukhārā. We are frequently told of valuable private libraries which were placed at the disposal of learned men as e.g. in the biographies of al-Ṣūḥi [q. v.] we read of his large collection of books which were bound in tasteful leather-bindings in red and yellow leather. Al-Ṣafādī [q. v.] records in the biography of Ghara al-Nīfmat al-Ṣāḥī that he founded in Baghdad a library of about 350 volumes for the use of students and that this library was shamelessly robbed by the librarian who had been placed in charge. But even earlier reports of Abū Tamīnī, detained by wintry weather in Hamadān selecting from the books, which he found there in the libraries, the contents of his celebrated poetical anthology, the Ḥomūs. A great impulse was given to the foundation of libraries by the wazir of the Saljuḵ Sultan Malikshāh, Nizām al-Mulk, when he founded in Nishāpūr and Baghdād and other places colleges or Madrasa's for public instruction. These colleges were not only endowed with funds for the salaries of the professors, but also provided with the most precious manuscripts of works dealing with the sciences taught at these institutions. When early in the seventh century of the Hijra the Mongols swept over Persia we read that in addition to the loss of human life and the destruction of other valuable property untold quantities of priceless books were wantonly destroyed. The Ayyūbīd amirs of Egypt and Syria emulated the example of the great Saljuḵ wazir in founding colleges, but from a remark of Kālaḵshandi, neither they nor those in charge of the Madrasa's appear to have had a proper conception of the value of great public libraries (Ṣūḥ al-ʿAšrā, i. 467). For the centuries which
follow we still find learned men endowing mosques and colleges with their books, where they were deposited as Ṭabīʾ or inalienable property, but the custodians with incredible dishonesty in most cases not only did not prevent, but actually connived at the loss of most of these treasures. How many a manuscript which once was deposited in these libraries for all eternity has found its way into private hands, or into the large libraries of Europe! In addition to this in most cases a fearful neglect set in soon after the foundation of the library and instead of being the source for enriching the knowledge of students the books became the breeding places of worms. As the control over the guardians of the libraries was rarely as strict as it should be, the books entrusted to their charge fell frequently into such a condition that they could no longer be used without falling to pieces. A striking example are the books which formed part of the Imperial Library of Delhi, now deposited in the India Office in London; though the volumes may contain many a valuable work, worms and long neglect must at least drive the librarian to despair in his task of making the books again accessible to students. In more recent times this state of things has improved; the Khedival (now State) Library in Cairo has led the way in again collecting the treasures in books which have survived several centuries of neglect, and its treasures are available to students who can afford to visit Cairo. Inestimable are the treasures in valuable books deposited in various libraries in Constantinople of which catalogues have been printed, though these are in many cases very inaccurate. Many valuable libraries exist in Madina and in the ʿIrāq and it is occasionally possible to those who possess Muslim friends in those countries to obtain information about rare manuscripts existing there. We also have incomplete catalogues of the Zāhiriyah library in Damascus and the libraries in the great mosques in Fās and Tunis, but as yet it is very difficult for European students to make use of the treasures deposited in these libraries. In India also we find a new era as is testified by the care which is bestowed upon the books preserved in the State-Library in Haiderabad, the Khudābādsh Library in Bankipore, the Library in Ramnāpur and the Molla Feroz Library in Bombay. I have been told by those who have visited the Imām Vahlīya in Șanāʿ in Yaman that his extensive library contains many very ancient manuscripts among which some are as good as lost to the other world for the present. The Shiʿa shrines at Kāhrībaʾ and Nāḏafāʾ have also valuable libraries, but the hope that these together with manuscripts from other centres in the ʿIrāq might be collected into one central State Library is probably very remote. The very fact that continually valuable ancient manuscripts are brought to Europe from the East is a proof that far more ancient manuscripts are preserved than might be expected from the neglect of many centuries, but the excellence of the paper and ink used in early times for writing has preserved many a volume which would have perished, and in addition it is also probable that at the dissolution of the large libraries their contents found their way into private hands from which they gradually reappear. Testimony for this is also that in the East exist many very valuable private collections of ancient manuscripts as e.g. the library of the Saiyid Șār ʿAl-Dīn in Baghdād and of ʿAḥmad Taʾmīr ʿAṣṣā in Cairo, besides others known to us. Unfortunately the owners are in many cases, the two named excepted, very unwilling to give any information about their possessions. As it is more and more realised that the remains of ancient literature, whether Arabic or Persian, should be made accessible, the owners commence by having some of the rarer works made accessible by the press and when the value is fully recognised we may hope that within the next fifty years much may be in the hands of the students which is now guarded in Eastern libraries.

(First Arrangement, administration and use of libraries. In the fourth (tenth) century there were already buildings devoted solely to libraries and erected specially for this purpose. For example ʿAbd b. Ardashīr, the vizier of Bahāʾ ʿAl-Dawla, built in 381 (991) in Baghdād in the Karkh quarter a Dār al-Kutub, which contained over 10,000 volumes (Ibn al-ʿAṭīr, Kāmil, ix. 246; ʿAṣṣā, Muṣjam, i. 799). The geographer al-Muḳaddasi (p. 449) found in Ṣirāṣ a huge library which had been built by the Bayyid ʿAṣṣād al-Dawla (338–372 = 949–982). This library was a separate building and consisted of a great hall and a lower vaulted building along the three sides of which were a series of rooms (khāiziʾ). Along the walls of the central vaulted room and along the side-rooms were cases of carved wood three ells high and three broad, with doors which were let down from the roof. The books lay on shelves one above the other. The cases used in the Fāṭimid library in Cairo were somewhat different (Makhtīr, Kālit, Cairo 1270, i. 409); the bookcases (rufūf) were divided by partitions into separate compartments (jāfīṣ) each of which was closed by a door with hinges and locks. Open cases which also were divided into small compartments, are illustrated in a miniature by Vahlīya b. Maḥmūd of the year 634 (1237) in the Paris MS. of Ḥarīrī (MS. Arduino, 3847), which shows a library in Baṣra (Blücher, Les ex-libris des MSS. orientaux, Paris 1926, Pl. io). Unlike our custom, we find the books lying one above the other in the small compartments, as is still usual in the East. This explains the Oriental custom (which is only occasionally found in the west) of writing a short title of the works on the upper or lower edge. The books were systematically arranged, classified according to the various branches of knowledge. Copies of the Kurʾān had usually a special place; in the Fāṭimid library for example they were kept on a higher level than the others. The various books were often present in several copies; this made it possible not only to lend the same work to several readers but the scholar was also enabled to read corrupt passages at once in a manuscript by referring to another copy. The Fāṭimid library of Cairo for example had thirty copies of the Kitāb al-ʿArab al-Khalī, twenty copies of the Taʾżīk of al-Tabarī and if the figure is not wrong actually a hundred copies of the Dīkhāra of Ibn Durādī. The catalogues consisted either of several volumes in which (probably according to the various branches of knowledge) the titles of the books were arranged, or, as in the Fāṭimid library, a list of the books within was fastened to the door of each room.)
Libraries usually had a director (قاضي) and one or more librarians (خابين) according to the size of the institution, also copyists (خابي) and attendants (فرزس). We find that some of the most celebrated scholars were librarians: thus the historian Ibn Miskawaihi was librarian to the vizier Abu l-Faḍl b. al-Amid in Raiy (Ibn Miskawaihi, Ṭadżārī al-Umam, ed. Amedioz and Margoliouth, Oxford 1921, text, ii. 224, transl., v. 237); al-Shābāni (d. 390 = 1000), the author of the book of monasteries, was librarian of the Fāṭimid library in Cairo under al-ʿAzīz (Ibn Khalīdān, Wafayāt, i. 358).

The books were acquired partly by purchase and partly by the copyists attached to the libraries copying manuscripts. Maqrizi has preserved for us the budget of a library (i. 459); according to this, the Caliph al-Maḥk (386–411 = 996–1020) spent 567 dinars a year (c. £150) on the Dār al-Īm founded by him. This was allotted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mats from ʿAbbadān, etc.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper for copyists</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary of the librarian</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages of the attendant</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages of the keeper of paper, ink, and reed pens</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing the door-curtains</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairing books</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt carpets for the winter</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets for the winter</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Libraries were open to everyone free of charge. Paper, ink and reed-pens were supplied by the authorities. Some private libraries even provided for the maintenance of scholars who had come from a long distance. A deposit had usually to be made if books were taken outside the library buildings, at least Yāqūt (Muqaddam, iv. 509 sq.) (d. 626 = 1229) praises the liberality of the libraries in Marw where he always had two hundred and more volumes to the value of two hundred dinars in his house without a deposit. Instructive in this connection also is the waqf document of 21st Ṣafar 799 (Nov. 24, 1396) by which Ibn Khalīdān bestowed his Kitāb al-Ībar on the library of the Dīmāl al-Karawiyyīn in Fās; according to it, this manuscript was only to be lent out to trustworthy, reliable men for two months at most in return for a substantial deposit; for this period was long enough to copy or study the borrowed work; the director of the library was to take care that this rule was observed (Lévi-Provençal in J. A., ccxxi. [1923], p. 164).

But at the same time we find in Muslim lands purely reading libraries. One of these was the library of the Madrasa al-Maḥmūdiyya founded in Cairo in 797 (1395). By the will of the founder the Uṣṭād Dīmāl al-Dān Maḥmūd b. ʿAlī (d. 799 = 1397) no book was to leave the rooms of the Madrasa. The manuscript of the Ṭadżārī al-Umum of Ibn Miskawaihi (Gibb Mem. Ser., vii/6) published in facsimile by Caetani belonged to this library; in the waqf document on the first page of this manuscript dated 15th Shāban 797 (June 5, 1395) it is written: "The above-named donor makes the condition that neither the whole work nor a single volume of it shall be lent from the library either against a deposit or without one".

Nevertheless by the year 826 (1423) when the books were checked, it was found that 400 volumes (exactly a tenth of the total) were missing, whereupon the then director of the mosque was dismissed (cf. Ibn Ḥaẓjar al-Aṣkāliānī in Quatemère, op. cit., p. 64, 70; Maqrizi, Kāfīf, ii. 395).

If we think of the above statements, which are true even of the fourth (tenth) century, it can safely be asserted that Muslim libraries were in every respect centuries in advance of those of the west. There was a general need for public libraries felt in Muslim lands much earlier than in the west.


**KIṬAL** is one of the names of the xviith Sūrā of the Korān.

**KIṬFĪR** is the name in Muhammadan legend of the Biblical Potiphar. Kitfīr is corrupted from Kitfīr like Bilkīs, queen of Saba, from Niskaurl, or as in the Yūsuf legend we have Aïnām or Haïnām from Muppīm, Huppīm. Kitfīr was then further corrupted to Iṣfīr (so generally in Ṭabārī and Ṭahlābī), Iṣṭīn and almost unrecognisably to Kīṭṭīn (Ṭabārī, ed. de Goeje, i. 377) and Kīṭṭīn (Ṭabārī, Tāfṣīr, xii. 98). On the other hand al-Kūsāt always has Kīṭṭīfar, a direct borrowing from Potiphar. Kitfīr is quite arbitrarily called Ibn Rahaib. In the Kūrān xii. 30, 51, the Egyptian who buys Joseph is called al-ʿAzīz. This is not considered a personal name but a title of honour, for after his elevation we find Joseph likewise addressed as al-ʿAzīz (xii. 78, 88). Joseph succeeded Kitfīr as Treasurer of Egypt, according to some in Kitfīr’s lifetime after his dismissal from office, according to others only after his death, when Joseph inherited his office and his wife. Legend numbers Kitfīr, along with Jethro’s daughter who offered hospitality to Moses and Abi Bakr who magnanimously appointed ‘Omar his successor — as the three aflare, most chivalrous and noblest in their dealings among mankind (Ṭabārī, Ṭahlābī). Cf. also ʿAzīz and Yūsuf b. Yaʿkūb.

**Bibliography:** Ṭabārī, ed. de Goeje, i. 378, 381, 382, 391, 392; the commentaries on Sūrā xii.; Ṭahlābī, Kīṭṭās al-ʾAnbīyāʾ, Cairo 1325, p. 74, 75, 76, 80; al-Kūsāt, ed. Eisenberg, p. 161, 162, 164, 168. (B. HELLER)

**KIṬMĀN.** [See TAKIYĀ.]

**KIṬMĪR.** [See AŠAB AL-KAHF-]

**KIYĀFA** is an infinitive of the 1st stem (form of name of office or trade, Wright, i. 1140) of root k-w-f, meaning “trace, follow traces, follow”.

**KITABKHANA — KIYAFFA**
The root does not occur in the Kurâń except as a variant in xvii. 39 (Baidawi, ed. Fleischer, i. 539 sq.), but the cognate root ḫ-f-n, with the same meaning, occurs five times. Technically in old Arabia ściif (pl. ściifs) was used not only by one who followed and interpreted actual tracks on the ground but also of one who professionally established kinship between individuals by likeness, primarily likeness of the feet. This ability was ascribed peculiarly to the tribe Muljudi, who were called simply al-Kiṣa (Ibn Kutaiba, Ma‘arrif, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 32 sq.); so muljudzius meant ściifs. Other synonyms are mujjudziss, lit. “shearer” (Lisan, xi. 202 sq. where cf. whole article for ściifs in general; Goldziher, Muh. Studien, i. 185) and kāṣir, lit. “conjecturer, guesser” (Goldziher, p. 184, note 9, who refers to Aqabhi, x. 38 sq.).

In a story given from Muhammad al-Anbârî by Freytag (Chrestomathia, p. 31 sq. “a person” of the Prophet tells by his firâsâ [q.v.], that he is a foster-child and foretells his future eminence. And the Prophet himself in tradition (Bu‘haq, Farâ’dî, b. 17; Muslim, Raf‘a‘i, trad. 36, bab: al-walad li l-ṛiḥâḍ) decides a case of kinship by resemblance (ghabābâ). In the same passages and other traditions giving prophets sanction to the practice and others as synonyms ściifs, muljudji and mujjudzius: it is plain from them that the ściifs paid special attention to the feet, as was natural in a race of trackers. From the fact that a poet in the Hamasa (ed. Freytag, p. 504) is named simply Ṭiṣṣa b. al-Kiṣâ if the profession was evidently one of distinction. From the beginning, also, it had in it a certainty: it was an innate power belonging to certain individuals or the peculiar inheritance of a tribe. It, therefore, attracted the special attention of Mu‘azzilites who felt driven to accept certain facts as to it but had, on their principles, to seek rationalistic and philosophical interpretations of them. Al-Mas‘ûdi in his Mu‘aṣir gives to it and some allied phenomena a whole chapter (ii., Paris ed., iii. 333—340) and refers to other books of his where he has treated the same subject more completely. Kazwini in his ‘Agâlah al-mu‘asirî (ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 218) treats it similarly to psychical power in those who profess it and places their “souls” (nafsîr) as, in the class of the nafs al-fâsîlka, “super-souls,” among which are those of the prophets, the wâli’s and kâhin’s: all these possess a certain instinct of insight. In canon law ściifs of necessity plays little part. The services of a ściifs are to be called in only when the paternity of the child of a female slave is in doubt as between a former and a present owner (Juyboll, Handbuch des Islam. Gesetze, p. 187 sq.); for further details see Sachau, Muh. Recht nach Schaf. Lehre, p. 89 sq.; Baiduri, Ḥusniya on the Sharh of Ibn Kásim on the text of Abu Shu‘îda, Cairo 1307, ii. 184 (in amkan kawwnu minhumma ‘urîsa ‘ala l-ṛiḥâs); Nawawi, Minhadî al-Qâlîn, ed. van den Berg, iii. 450 sq.

In present day folk-lore usage ṭiṣṣa has become chirocyany and physiognomy, called also ‘alîn al-simiyâ and ‘alîn al-nasirî (Boehrer, Dictionnaire français-arabe, vol. i. p. 154b; Doutte, Magie et Religion, p. 370 and references there). Very strangely the word has come to mean in modern Egyptian colloquial, “style, fashion,” sâkh ṭiṣṣa, “a stylish person” (Sprio, Vocabulary of the col- loquial Arabic of Egypt, p. 595, who gives no other meaning). This apparently connects with Turkish and Persian usage of ściifs in sense “ap- parel, form, gait, costume” (Redhouse, Turkish and English Lexicon, p. 1503b; Steingass, Persian-English Dictionary, p. 997a).

Bibliography: The principal treatments of this subject are in Robertson Smith, Kinship and marriage, ii. 169 sq.; Goldziher, Muh. Studien, i. 184 sq. Doutte, Magie et Religion, p. 370; Dozy, Suppl., ii. 4200; see further references in all these. (D. B. Macdonald)

Al-Kiṣâma, “the Arising” (of men at the Resurrection), and al-Sâ‘îna, “the Hour” (or Day of Judgement), come for theologians under the general term al-Mu‘âd, “the returning” i.e. the return to life after death; and they rank them among al-ramîyât, things on which traditional teaching is based, as the prophetic office, or which for their authority go back to the prophetic office, as this Return and such causes of eternal happiness and misery, connected with it, as faith and obedience, unbelief and disobedience (Mawāzik of al-İdî, Bai‘lî, 1266, p. 544 sq).

A schematic statement of the order of events in Muslim eschatology. I. The Signs which will announce the coming of the End, especially the appearance of the Antichrist, al-Daddjâl (see above, i. 886 sq.), who will lead almost all men astray, followed by the descent of icles (see above, ii. p. 524 sq.), or the Mahdi [q.v.], or ‘Isâ (both), who will kill al-Daddjâl. A period of faith will follow. II. The First Blast of the Trumpet; all living things will die. The Interval. The Second Blast of the Trumpet, bringing all living things to life again and uniting them at the Place of Gathering (al-mu‘asir), the long standing there (al-mu‘asir) in the presence of Allah and the Sweat (al-‘ârba‘). III. The Judgement begins. The questioning of each individual directly by Allah. The Books of Record. The Weighing of the deeds of those as to whom there might be doubt. Adjustment of enmities and requital of wrongs between man and man, and man and beast. IV. The Bridge over Hell into Paradise (al-Sirâf). The Intervention (see Hâfûzah). The Tank of Muhammad. V. The Fire (Hell and Purgatory; see Hâannah above, i. 998 sq.); the Garden (Pardise: see Wannah above, i. 1014 sq.); a Limbo (according to some theologians). — Ḥa‘ûl of al-Ghazâli, Cairo 1334, iv. 436—453; Ḥâfî, commentary on Ḥa‘ûl, x. 447—520.

For Muhammad, a revivalist preacher seeking to strike terror in his hearers, the doctrines of the Resurrection and of the Judgement were of the first importance, and the Kurâń, in consequence, is full of references to them. The word mu‘âd occurs once only (Kur. xxviii. 85) and evidently has not this application there: it may mean the place of Muhammad’s resurrection or Mecca to which he will return from exile (Baidawi in loc.). But the verb is used very frequently; in Kur. iv. 10, 35; xxi. 104; xxx 10, 26; lxxvii. 13, of Allah’s bringing men back at the resurrection, in contrast to his first production of them (ada‘a‘); in contrast to his andha in Kur. lxii. 16, 17; in contrast to his faqara in Kur. xxvii. 53. The same verb is used of the regained processes of creative power in the earth in Kur. xcvii. 65; xxix. 18 and of man being brought back to the earth at death and burial, Kur. xx. 57, al-Kiṣâma, only in the phrase yarìm al-kiṣâma, occurs 70 times, e.g. ii. 79, 107, 169, 208; iii. 48, 71, 155;
whelming terrors — passing into descriptions of the Fire and, in contrast, of the Garden. In the Kur'ān it is a Judgement of individuals and not of peoples or of religious bodies in masses; this, as Wellhausen pointed out, shows the Christian, as opposed to Jewish, theological influence upon Muhammad. Later traditions and still more the theologians were going to change all that with the according with the “agreement” (iddmā) of Islam. As examples of these multitudinous, longer or shorter descriptions, reference will suffice to Kur. vi. 22—31; xix. 67—74; xxii. 1—7; xxii. 101—end; xxxix. 69-end; li. ix.; lxv.; lxxvi.—lxix.; lix.—cx. Naturally the most the picturesque details are in the earlier and more poetical sūras. The descriptions of the Garden changed also with Muhammad’s changing circumstances and age; cf. Josef Horovitz, *Das Koranische Paradies*, Jerusalem, 1923.

In these descriptions there are certain references and allusions which (i) tradition has developed more precisely and elaborately, of which (ii) the systematic theologians have made chary use in their short eschatological statements but which (iii) the writers for religious edification have expanded in intolerable and contradictory detail. Thus (i) the sírāj is only once in the Kur’ān (xxvii. 23) sírāj al-dajālim — a mere allusion to “the road to Hell”. This has become in tradition “the bridge”, elaborately described, “over the back of hell” (Sahih of Muslim, i, 113, 116, Kitāb al-ʿimām; Sahih of Bukhārī, i, 128, 130, Kitāb al-tawḥīd). (2) The noun muḥāl does not occur in the Kur’ān, but four times (vi. 27, 30; xxxiv. 30; xxxvi. 24) there are allusions to man standing in the presence of Allah on the Day. This has become the awful scene al-Ḡazzālī develops so fully in his *Durra* (ed. Gautier, 1878, p. 50 sq.). (3) Kur. lxviii. 42, “on the day when a shank (sāk) shall be uncovered” means, according to the commentators (e.g. Baidawi, Fleischer’s ed. ii., p. 350, l. 10), a day of stress and trouble when skirts will be tucked up for flight. In the traditions (Sahih of Muslim, i, 115 foot — Kitāb al-ʿimām; Sahih of Bukhārī, i, 130 — Kitāb al-tawḥīd) the sāk is that of Allah and the uncovering of it is a sign between him and the true believers.

(4) On the resurrection trumpet there is much more in the Kur’ān. The Kurānic formula is muḥāl fi ʿl-fur (vi. 73; xviii. 99; x. 102; xxii. 103; xxvii. 89; xxxvi. 51; xxxix. 68; l. 19; lxii. 13; lxviii. 18), except in lxiv. 8; where it is muḥāl fi ʿl-nakār. In lxiv. 13 a single blast, muḥāl fi ʿl-wāhīd, is enough; but in xxxix. 68 there are two blasts; at the first all in heaven and earth, save whom Allah wills, swoon (ṣaḥka); at the second they are restored and stand up. This whole passage has evidently been of the first importance in the forming of the later picture of the Day. In tradition the first blast of the trumpet is reckoned among the Signs of the Day (Sahih of Muslim, vii. 101 sq.; xxvii. 29; Kitāb al-ṣiṣan wa-ṣirāj al-wādā). (5) The word for “lalances” when used in the singular in the Kurān expresses the general idea of justice (xiii. 16; lv. 6, 7, 8; lii. 22 and Baidawi on these passages) but the plural, muḥāl wa-mudawwān (vii. 7, 8; xxi. 48; xxxii. 18, 105; ci. 1, 6) is used only, in fixed phrases, of weighing men’s good and bad deeds in the eschatological Balances on the Day. (6) There is a personal
account between Allāh and every man (hiyāth and other terms; cf. C. C. Torrey, Commercial-theological terms in the Koran, Leyden 1892, p. 9 sq.) and there are books written by recording angels (isfāra, habībīn; lxxxi. 11—15; lxxxi. 10—12; lxxsii. 7, 18). Each man has a book of his own deeds or there is simply the Book (x. 62; xxxiv. 3; xvii. 14, 15; xvii. 47; lxix. 19, 20, 25—7; lxxxiv. 7—12); Allāh himself is a witness (shahāth, or he is watching in a lurking place, like a hunter waiting for game (lxxxi. 13, al-bi‘l-mirzād); or Ḏjahānan, personified, is such a mirzād (lxxviii. 21), a dubious phrase which gives the commentators much trouble. (7) Again, Ḏjahānan (occurs 77 times) is brought as though it were moveable (lxxxi. 24) and there is a description of it (xvii. 7, 8) as being braying and boiling and almost bursting with rage as though it were a wild animal. What this became in tradition is seen in the Ṣāliḥ of Muslim, vii. 149 sq.; Maqāṣid al-sunnah, Cairo 1318, ii. 154—156; Miḥkāt al-maṣājiḥīh, Dihli 1327, p. 428—430. Al-Ghazālī develops the idea still further, for pious edification, in his Durra, p. 41, 56 sq. (8) In Kur‘ān xlv. 9 there is a very obscure expression, “Then look for the day when the heaven shall bring plain smoke” (dakhān musākin). Baijāwī (Fleischer’s ed. ii., p. 246 sq.) gives as a possible interpretation a reference to smoke as one of the Signs of the Day; for the traditions on this see Ṣāliḥ of Muslim, vii. 130 sq., 179, 208. (9) For a supposed Kur‘ānic allusion to the descent (nasrīt) of Isā as one of the Signs of the Day see above Ḥāyā, ii. 525 and add to the references there Ṣāliḥ of Muslim, i. 93—95, 107 sq.; vii., p. 175—208. (10) Another of the Signs to which allusion is made in the Kur‘ān (xxvi. 84) is the Beast of the earth (dāḥbatan min al-ard); cf. Ṣāliḥ of Muslim, i. 96; vii. 179. Baijāwī (in loc.) identifies it with al-ghurūk, ‘the searcher out’, described in a tradition in the Ṣāliḥ of Muslim (viii. 203—206) as in attendance, according to Taimi‘ al-Dā‘ī, on the false Masih al-Dadjudjīl, apparently the Antichrist, in a certain island; see also, i. i, xvii. 357; Danīr’s Ḥāzir al-yawmiyān, Cairo 1313, i. 170. (11) On the Day of Judgement, who is not in the Kur‘ān at all, see traditions in Muslim, vii. 161, 194—208; on p. 189 thirty lying Dadjudjīl will come before the end; Bakhārī, i. 159 sq. See, also, Dadjudjīl, above i. 886; the name is evidently Aramaic, not Arabic. (12) The Tank (hawd) of Muḥammad also plays an obscure part in the picture of the Day, although it does not occur in the Kur‘ān. There is doubt especially as to the end of the Sīrat at which it should be placed; in later collections of traditions (Maqāṣid, ii. p. 145; Miḥkāt, 415) it is grouped with the Intercension and after the Reckoning and the Weighing. See, also, Bakhārī, i. 46. (13) In the story of Ḫūl ‘l-karmān in the Kur‘ān (viii. 82—98) he builds a great wall to keep back Yādjudjīl and Mādjudjīl. But that will hold them only until the Day; then it will be made dust (verse 98) and they will come out (Kur. xxi. 96). For this, among the Signs, in tradition see Ṣāliḥ of Bakhārī, i. 61; Ṣāliḥ of Muslim vii. 165 sq., and often.

There is thus very little in the Kur‘ān as to the Signs preceding the Last Day; but such picturesque and accidental references as there are have proved useful in the later development. The systematic theologians have been by far the most cautious in this. Nasāfī in his ʿAṣīt‘ī gives only five: the appearance of al-Da’djudjīl; the Beast of the earth; Yādjudjīl and Mādjudjīl; the descent of Isā; the rising of the sun in the west. Taftāzānī in his commentary on this passage (p. 145) gives ten: the Smoker; Da’djudjīl; the Beast; the rising of the sun in the west; Isā; Yādjudjīl and Mādjudjīl; three eclipses, in west, in east and in Arabia; a fire which will break out in al-Yaman and drive men to the Place of Gathering; cf. a similar list in the Ṣāliḥ of Muslim, vii. 179. But the traditionalists have luxuriated in tendentious details. A section of tradition is devoted to al-fītān wa ‘asārū or ‘ayyāt al-sā‘ā, “trials and signs of the Hour”; Ṣāliḥ of Muslim, vii. 165—210; Ṣāliḥ of Bukhārī, ix. 46—61; Miṣkāt, ii. 128—42; Miḥkāt, p. 392—410. To give any full analysis of these would be impossible here. Reference may be made for this and for details on the Resurrection and Judgement to Hughes’ Dictionary of Islam, p. 539—449. This is largely based on Sale’s Preliminary Discourse”, Section 4, p. 76—103 of ed. 1734, and he, in turn, was greatly indebted to the learning and research of Edward Pococke, in his Porta Mosis, ii. p. 235—313 of ed. Oxford 1654—55, who gives Arabic passages and other terms at length. These details were then taken up by the writers for religious edification and an immense literature was based upon them. Even among mystics in Islam religious conversion has normally been wrought by fear of the wrath of Allāh; in consequence their books are full of pictures of the horrors of death, the resurrection and the judgement. This is the whole bearing of the last Book of Al-Ghazālī’s Iḥyā‘ (iv. 361—469) on “Taking thought of death and that which comes after it” (Dhikr al-mawṣa wa-ma būdallū), until it ends in a few pages on the Beatific Vision in Paradise and the wideness of Allāh’s mercy, for luck! (ṣalih sunb al-tashrī‘). His smaller treatise, al-Durra al-Fāḥihah, on the same subject, goes still further in this direction.

Yet in this mass of tradition certain drifts of influence and development show themselves, theological and historical. Reference has already been made to the development of the two judgements, one a lesser on the death and burial of the individual and the greater on the Day itself. It is difficult to say whether this was in the mind of Muḥammad, but it was a natural development of the doctrine of the Punishment of the Grave which is so strongly represented in traditions. The doctrine, also, that the Fir‘ will itself be a temporary place of purgation for “certain rebellious ones of the believers” would naturally grow out of this. It, too, is represented in tradition and has become fixed in theology (Taftāzānī on Nasāfī, p. 114—19). On the whole question, see Immortality in Mohammedanism by the present writer in E. H. Skeat’s Religion and the Future Life, New York 1922, p. 311 sq. This leads naturally to the relation of faith and works and of sins, greater and lesser, and that involves a classification of different ranks even among the saved believers. On the whole question, see Imām, above ii. 474 sq. Some believers will enter Paradise without any punishment or even reckoning (hiyāth); there will be 70,000 of these (Muslim, i. 136—138). Then there are the shu‘ā‘ārā, whose spirits (arwāḥ) seem already to be in Paradise (Muslim, vi. 38)
and a man who is killed in defence of his property is a āḥādī (q.v.) and his slayer is in the Fire (Muslim, i. p. 87). But the theological question which seems to have weighed most heavily in the Muslim world when traditions were being formed was that of Intercession (ṣuḥfaʾ, q.v.).

The historical influences are equally plain in these traditions. Some may go back to Muhammad himself full of forebodings as to the future of his people; the times must be evil before they are better. Such are those which tell that the Hour will not come until no one in the world says "Allah" and "Muhammad" — i.e. there is no faith left (Muslim, i. 89—91). But others seem clearly connected with the later civil strife. The traditions prophecying the murder of ʿUṯmān run into prophecies of the Hour (Muslim, viii. 170 foot) and show the deep feeling of despair produced among the pious by the civil wars and the growing unbelief. Again, when the dream of the speedy conquest of Constantinople faded, the belief rose that that conquest would be one of the Signs of the End. As soon as the cry of Muslim triumph was heard in that city their armies would be recalled to face Antichrist, al-Dādijāl (Muslim, viii. 187 sq.). Then Īsā would descend. So some traditions see the whole world plunged in unbelief before the end, and others make the crowning conquest of Islam introduce the end.

The theologians have seen quite clearly that it was impossible to construct out of these materials a consistent narrative of what would take place on the Day. So they have abandoned the attempt and contented themselves with saying that such and such things — the ẓirat, the Weighing, the Tank, etc. — are Realities (ḥākīkāt) and leave generally untouched what kind of reality is meant. Philosophically, they knew very well, there are different kinds of reality (Nasāʾī and Taftāzānī, p. 110 sq. ʿĪḍā, p. 592). They thus abandon picturing the Day to such religious writers as have edification for their object and not fact. Apparently the distinction was quite clear in their minds, and it goes back to the fundamental principle in Islam of the economy of teaching ("Speak to the people according to their understanding" — a saying ascribed both to ʿAlī and to the Prophet) which was the ultimate source of the medieval doctrine of the two-fold truth. The situation may be illustrated by al-Ghazālī's method which was at least three-fold. In the last book of the Ḥiyāʾ and, still more, in the Durra his frank object is to strike terror; these are all Realities — very dreadful Realities! Yet his philosophical conscience troubles him and even in the Ḥiyāʾ (Book of ṣawāḥel, "Repentance", iv. 20 sq.) he teaches that words applied to concrete things in this world can be used of things in the world to come only by metaphor, as amthāl, and he defends this by ʿUṯrān xix. 42. But in his Ikhtīṣād (Cairo 1920, p. 96—98) he is a sober scholastic — the Mīṣān and the ẓirat are ḥākīkāt by revelation and the reason cannot deny them; in his Maḥṣūn (Cairo 1903, intended for theological specialists) he develops to a certain extent the philosophical bot-tomming of these ideas — the Intercession (p. 28), the Reckoning and the ẓirat (p. 36), the pleasures of Paradise (p. 38 sq.) which will be sensuous, imaginative, rational (kissīt, ḥāyālī, ʿabīdī). The feeling left in the mind is that there are still more distinctions, explanations and refinements behind the two Maḥṣūn's, and that feeling is strengthened by his Miṣḥīṣīt al-answāʾūr; see the translation of this by W. H. T. Gairdner in "Asiatic Society Monographs", vol. xiv. Further, al-Ghazālī developed the doctrine of a Limbo for those who, by reason of youth, mental affliction, historical and geographical situation and environment, had not been able to become Muslims and, therefore, had no works of obedience, in the technical sense, to their credit. There was nothing against them and punishing them in the Fire would be unjust: but there was nothing also for which they could be rewarded. He found a place for them, therefore, in the ʿUṯrān al-Aʿwāf (vii. 44—46) which he explained as a "Heights" whence those in the Limbo look down on both Heaven and Hell and their inhabitants. Such a conception was beyond doubt very far from Muhammad's mind, but as a theological fiction it was sufficient for al-Ghazālī's purpose. For the four-fold classification of man which thus resulted see his Ḥiyāʾ, iv. p. 20—28; Ḥiṣāf, viii., p. 548—570; for this particular class see his Faṣāʾī al-tafṣīla, ed. Cairo 1913, p. 75 sq. and Ḥiyāʾ, iv. 27 sq.; the Ḥiṣāf, viii., p. 564—568 gives different views on the subject and there is an attack on al-Ghazālī's position in Les Problèmes Théologiques de l'Essoussi by J. D. Luciani (Alger 1908), p. 106 sq. On the whole subject see Miguel Asín, La Escatología musulmana en la Divina Comedia, Madrid 1919, p. 99 sq. The treatment of eschatology by al-Īḍā is in his Mawākbīf is of the dryest scholasticism, in startling contrast to the picturesque ness of the materials he uses. Like al-Ghazālī he makes no use of the Signs; they were history, apparently, and not philosophical theology. He begins with the possibility of a Return to existence of a nomeny (naḏāʾūn) and fights that out with the different unbellying philosophical schools: the different elements that follow suggest to him only dogmas to be demonstrated, and even the doctrine of the Intercession of Muhammad interests him only by its connection with the Muťāzīlī heresies. For eschatological ideas as developed among the mystics see Louis Massignon, La Passion d'el-Hallaj, Paris 1922, ii. 664—698.

Bibliography has been given in the article.

(D. B. MacDONALD)
In some traditions (Nasir, Addāh al-Ku‘lī, b. 11) there is mention not only of the Kur'an and sunna, but also of the “usage of pious individuals” (al-Sāliḥūn) taking precedence of kiyas among the uṣīl. “The usage of pious individuals” has taken the place usually accorded to knobma [q.v.] which is the third “root”, kiyas occupying the last place.

Although it is admitted, kiyas is nevertheless surrounded by restrictions. Here are some examples. The opponents of kiyas quote Sūra iv. 62 “and if there are differences of opinion between you and your chiefs, try to settle them, relying on Allāh and his Messenger”. Allāh and his Messenger, according to them, means Kur'an and Sunna. The verse therefore passes over kiyas in silence. Ḑaldāwī replies to this objection “Settling the differences by referring them to the texts is done by tamkif (see below) and by deduction” i.e. by kiyas.

This verse has given rise to a full exposition of the limitations of kiyas on the part of the commentator Fadl al-Dīn al-Rāzī, who lays down the rule that Kur'an and Sunna have precedence absolutely over kiyas. Only when it is impossible to use these “roots”, the use of kiyas is permissible, cf. the tradition about Mu‘ādh (translated above) and the example of Iblis, who argued instead of obeying the commandment of Allāh (see above). The text of the Kur'an is established by tawitter, while kiyas is only maqfūn and following one’s zann (individual opinion) is what the kūffar do (cf. Sūra x. 67). If traditions require to be verified by the sacred text, kiyas does still more so. The Kur'an is the word of Allāh, while kiyas is the work of the feeble intelligence of man.

See also the articles Fikr, Īṣārā and Uṣūl.


(A. J. Wensine)
Strait of the Dardanelles. *Kiz-tash* is the name given to Marcian’s column at Constantinople, because this ancient monument was credited with the power of distinguishing virgins from others (Galland, *Journal*, ed. Schœfer, ii. 125).

*Kizlar Ağa*, “the Aga of the maidens”, a title borne among the Ottomans by the chief black eunuch, the negro supervisor of the Imperial Harem. His official title was dar âsî-şerâdet al-şerifî ahâzî, “the Aga of the noble Gate of felicity.” He was entitled to be called deyân-ül-nümay-ül-ayvan ve “Highness”. In the Sultanate appeared at the head of the following officials of the *Müällim*, which were the rank of mey身边的 (marshal). ([Cl. Huart]

**Kizil Ahmadi** [See ISFANDYâR OGHUŁ].

**KIZIL ARSLÂN** [“Othman b. Ildegis, an Aţabeg of AĎarbâjadi d. His father, the Aţabeg Ildegis [q.v.], had been the real ruler in the whole Seldjuk empire. Kizil Arslan’s mother was the widow of Sultan Toghril I and mother of Sultan Arslan b. Toghril [q.v.]. When Ildegis died in 568 (1172), he was succeeded by his son Muhammed Pahlawan; in 570 (1174–1175) the latter besieged Maşgha while Kizil Arslan advanced on Tabriz and when the lord of these two towns, the Kâdi Südr al-Dîn, entered into negotiations and declared his willingness to give up Tabriz, Muhammed Pahlawan declared himself satisfied and gave the town over to his brother Kizil Arslan. In the beginning of 582 (1186), or according to another statement as early as 575 (1160), as Sultan Ahmad Pahlawan and Kizil Arslan took over the government. Muhammed Pahlawan had been on good terms with Sultan Toghril II who had long before succeeded his father Arslan. But Toghril was treated almost like a prisoner by Kizil Arslan. When he fled from Hamadhan to Semanî, Kizil Arslan pursued him and overtook him near Đâmaghân but had to retire after a desperate battle. While the Sultan returned to Hamadhan, Kizil Arslan appealed to the Caliph al-Nâşir who promised to help him and sent his vizier Djalal al-Dîn ‘Ubaid Allâh b. Yûnus against Toghril. ‘Ubaid Allâh was however defeated in the beginning of Rabi’ I, 584 (May 1188) and the Sultan threatened AĎarbâjadi. Kizil Arslan then again occupied Hamadhan and had Sindjâr b. Sulaiman Şah (or b. Malik Şah) proclaimed Sultan, while his nephew Kutlugh İnâdî b. Muhammed Pahlawan rebelled in İsfahân. Kutlugh was soon driven out by Toğrîl but when he was pursued and an encounter took place fortune did not favour Toğrîl and he had to return to Hamadhan which Kizil Arslan had in the meanwhile abandoned. The latter then suddenly appeared on the scene, captured Toğrîl and interned him in the fortress of Kahrân in AĎarbäadjînd, and then by arrangement with the Caliph set aside his protégé Sindjar and assumed the title of Sultan himself. But in the night before his coronation, or according to another authority, some time after it, he was murdered. This took place in Sha‘bân 587 (Aug.–Sept. 1191) or according to others in Shawwât (Oct.–Nov.) of the same year; but see Houtsma, *Some remarks on the history of the Sultuks, Acta orient., iii. 143: The murderer was never identified.*


(K. V. ZETTERSTÈEN)

**KIZIL-BÂŞH** (fr. “Red Head”); the name given by the Turks to the confederation of seven Turkoman tribes, Čstâqlu, Şâmli, Tekelî, Bâhârî, Dţâ ‘l-Kârî, Kasâtîr and Aşfârî, who placed the sheikhs of Arslabî on the throne of Persia and helped Shah Ismâ’îl to found the dynasty of the Şâlûwîd [q.v.]. The latter had given them as a head-dress the red turban worn by the disciples of his ancestors.

This name was taken by J. Morier for the title of one of his novels, *The Kuzelibash, a tale of Khurasan*, 3 vols., London 1828, the period of which is the reign of Nâdir-Shâh.

**The name of a religious sect found throughout Asia Minor and regarded as Shi‘i by the Muslims; it is closely connected with the Nusairis of Syria. Its adepts call themselves ‘Alawî, i.e. followers of ‘Ali. Some are Kurds; the others are for the most part Turks and only speak Turkish. Unlike the Muslims, they do not shave the head and let their beards grow freely; they do not observe the canonical prayers (jâ’il) or ablutions. They drink wine and do not observe Rama‘ân. They fast for the first twelve days of Muharram and lament the deaths of al-Hasan and al-Husain. ‘Ali is an incarnation of God who had already manifested himself in other incarnations, such as Jesus. God is one in three persons; below him are five archangels, intermediaries between the divinity and man, twelve ministers and forty saints. They have a reverence for the Virgin Mary and recite litanies in her honour. They celebrate as a service during the night. The priest who officiates sings prayers in honour of ‘Ali, Jesus, Moses and David, accompanying himself on musical instruments. He holds in his hand a willow wand which he steeps in water; this consecrated water is then distributed among the houses. During the ceremony those present publicly confess their sins; the priest imposes penances, such as fines in money or kind. The lights are then extinguished (hence the Turkish expression zarik-sundurun, “extinguisher of torches”, by which they are popularly known) and they abandon themselves to lamentations and weeping for their sins. The lights are again lit; the priest pronounces the absolution (which may be refused, at least for a certain time); he takes pieces of bread and a cup of wine or similar liquid and after consecrating it steeps the bread in the wine and distributes it among those present. Those whose neighbours cannot report favourably upon them are excluded from it. Among the Kurds a sheep is also sacrificed and its flesh is distributed at the same time as the bread and wine.

They have a hierarchy at the head of which are two patriarchs regarded as descendants of ‘Ali and invested with divine power; one of them is the Shaikh of Khubûrûn, who lives in a tekke built in the wilds. He is recognised as Šâfî Shaikh by the government. Below him are bishops and at the bottom of the hierarchy, priests (delev), intermediaries between God and man. The Kizil-bâşh observe several Christian festivals, Easter, which falls on the same Sunday as that of the
Armenians, preceded by a week's fast, and that of St. Sergius celebrated on February 9th. They do not permit divorce. Like the Muslims they have a religious veneration for certain trees; they revere the sun, moon and the sources of rivers. Their principal sanctuaries are the tekke of Khabyar, those of Sewidji, Pir Suljian-li Yalindjek and Hadjidji Bekatsh. Their religion seems to consist of survivals of pagan beliefs mixed with forms of Christianity current in the Circassian part of Islam. They number some six million (Kurds of Dersim, Malatya, Terjman, Etindjek, part of the wilayets of Siwás and Bitlis, Turks of the wilayets of Ma'meret al-Aziz, Siwás and Angora).

In Afghanistan, the name is given to immigrants of Turkoman stock who form with the Tadjik and Hindi the principal representatives of the bourgeois class; they came from Persia in the train of Nadir Shah who settled them in Kábul and several other towns as garrisons. They keep themselves aloof from the rest of the population; at Kábul the court and government officials are recruited from them; at Herât they are engaged in commerce and industry. They speak Persian, while using Turkish among themselves. Their number is put at 75,000.


**KIZIL-IRMÀK** (r. "Red River"), the ancient Halys ("Azuç"). Alys ("Azuç"), the largest river in Asia Minor. It rises in the mountains which separate the wilayet of Siwás from that of Erzerüm, waters the towns of Zarrá (4,530 feet high) and Siwás (4,160 feet high), then enters the province of Angora where it meets the mountain of Arjijsh and the Köjja Dágh range which force it to make an immense detour of over 160 miles. Its course is at first south-east, then it turns northwards, and finally it reaches the Black Sea below Hafra in the middle of marshes. It is nearly 600 miles long. Its waters of a dark yellow when they are in flood diminish enormously in the summer; its bed is wide and its banks high. Its principal tributaries on the right are the Köhân-süyu and the Delidje-Cati; those on the left are the Sérnamak-Cati which flows by Kársariye, the Dewrek-Cati from Tiosia, the Gók-Irmák which comes from the Iłháš-Dágh (the ancient Olgasus) and waters the town of Kashtshmi (q. v.). — According to Strabo (xii. 561), the river Halys ("Azuç") took its name from the mines of rocksalt, the produce of which was exported in the form of large blocks; these mines thirty miles to the north of Váshdén near the village of Sét-Kámish, are worked among the red sandstone, covered with clay and marl of a reddish colour; this soil washed down by the heavy rains gives the river a reddish colour, whence its name.

In ancient times, this river marked the boundary between the autochthonous peoples of Asia and those who had come from Europe to colonise the country. Herodotus (i. 72) makes it a frontier between Lydia and Media. It seems to have been known to the Arabs by its ancient name, if it is it is referred to by the name Ais in a verse of Abü l-Ihsan al-Màrri (S. de Saucy, *Christianthef ar*), iii., text, p. 45; trans. v. 50, it gives by mistake "Aou" an error reproduced by Defrémery, *Mémoires d'histoire orientale*, ii. p. 221.


**KIZIL-KUM** (r. "Red Sand"), a desert between the Sir-Dârâ and the Amú-Dârâ, cf. above, p. 741, *Kax-Kaxum*. The country is less uniform, especially in the central part, than the Karâ-Kum; the desert is crossed by several ranges of hills. The Killz-Kum becomes more and more inhospitable as one goes southwards. The region called Adam-Kârlshgan ("where man perishes") between the Amú-Dârâ and the cultivated region of Bukhârân consisting of sandhills (barûkhân) is considered especially uninhabiting and dangerous. In the summer there is absolutely no life in the desert, in the winter a few springs are visited by the Körliz (Kâzak). In the middle ages also, we are told, a campaign could be conducted from Djend against Khvarism i. e. through the Killz-Kum in winter only when the desert was covered with snow (Baijâli, ed. Morley, p. 858 sq.). As usual, the desert sands are encroaching on the cultivated lands as a result of the normal life of the scene and the resulting destruction of the scanty supply of wood. In the second half of the sixth century several villages on the lower course of the Zarafshân have become buried in sand.


**KIZIL-ÖZEN** (in Turkish Vzeri, "Red River"), the ancient Amardus, a river which flows through A dabábélijan and enters the Caspian Sea, forty miles east of Enzeli, after having received the Persian name of Sefid-Rûd, "White River", at its junction with the river Shâh-Rûd at Mendiuj. Its source lies in the province of Ardilân, and it begins by crossing Irak-adjacent to the north; its right bank tributary is the Zendjân, on the left it receives the Kara-gol at Mîyâné, then it runs along the southern slopes of Ellbur, describing a great arc 125 miles long and crosses this range through the defile of Rûdbâr and the narrow valley of Rustam-šâd, a kind of couloir through which rush violent winds from the south in winter and from the Caspian in summer. It was known to the Arabs as Nahr al-Abâd "White River" (transl. of the Persian Sefid-Rûd); cf. Dimashkî, *Coxograpie*, transl. Mehrer, p. 145; at one time the Turks called it the Hûlân (Hadhrî Khalafla, Dizân-numal, p. 294).


**KÖC HİSÁR**, the name of several places in Asia Minor. The meaning — if it is not
simply a corruption of Ködža Hisâr — is “castle of the ram” and it may be compared with proper names like Köyan Hisâr, Toklu Hisâr, Keçî Hisâr.

1. Köc Hisâr in the sandjak of Kanghîr is a little town on the Deryk Cai, twenty-five miles north of the town of Kanghîr. It is on the high road from Constantinople to Boli, Amasia and Erzerum, and not far from Karadjâ Wiran and Tusi. According to Ewliya Çelebi, this Köc Hisâr was captured by the Ottomans in 708 (1308) and completely ruined, but this statement is not confirmed by any of the old Turkish chronicles. The country of Kaşahîn must have been a site for a town outside the dynasty of Isfendiyâr-Oghlî. In the xvith century there was a fort outside the town.

2. Köc Hisâr, a little town, the capital of a köç in the sandjak of Konya ninety-six miles north-east of Konya and 110 miles east of Kaşarîya on the eastern shore of the great salt lake called Tuz Gölü in the central plateau of Asia Minor. The town is surrounded by gardens and vineyards. It is an oasis, in the between Karadjâ Wiran; it lies on the infrequent road from Angora to Kapıçâ. A little is done in weaving kilims and saddle-jackets there; the köç is used to be called Eskişahî.

3. Köc Hisâr, a little town, capital of a köç on the right bank of the Köz İrmâk [q.v.]. 20 miles north-east of Sivas on the road from Sivas to Zara and Erzerûm. The ruins of an ancient encircling wall still exist and in the neighbourhood are many artificial coves, dating from a very remote epoch.

4. Köc Hisâr, a village ten miles south of Mardin, famous for a battle fought in 1515 between the Turkish General Hüsâni Muhammad Pasha and the Persians under Kara Khan [cf. sklit D]. The earliest Turkish historians do not mention the place in connection with the battle. Meñiçdijim Bashî, iii. 460, calls the scene of it Eski Köc Hisâr.

5. Köc Hisâr, a köç in the sandjak of the Ottoman empire.

Köc Hisâr belonged to Görka (Korynta) in Macedonia (Greece, cf. H. Gezer, Von. III. Berg and aus Makedonien, [Leipzig 1904], 201 sqq.) and was therefore probably of Albanian descent. Other statements, which as a rule make him a native of Gümîlîdija are wrong. He came when still young to Constantinople, was brought up in the Seraî and in the service of the Sulṭâns Ahmed I to Murad IV. He was in particular favour with the latter, whose trusted adviser he became. In this capacity he wrote for his sovereign the famous treatise, Rûstâ-i Köc Beg, in which with ruthless frankness he exposed the causes of the decline of the Ottoman empire. He finds the main reason for increasing decay in the neglect of and breaches of the old principles of the constitution. Köc Beg, the Montesquieu of the Ottomans, gave an excellent political and statistical exposition of the decline of Turkey, a power in his memoir, which clearly reveals all the disorders that had entered the body politic from Murâd III to Murâd IV. The document composed in 1640 (1630) did not receive special attention till a later period. It has been several times printed, first edition Stambul 1277 = 1860 (cf. J. A., 1863, ii. 234, Nö. 133), and without place (London), edited by Ahmed Weâf Pasha 1279, 6a. 32 pp. and Stambul, 1303, 8b. 124 pp. — W. F. A. Behrens published a German translation in Z.D.M.G., xxv., 1861, 272 sqq. (cf. also Z.D.M.G., xi. 111, and xvi. 271) and J. Thür a briefly Hungarian one in Torok történelemből, vol. ii., 1896, p. 406 sqq., Budapest, 1896.

The book entitled Canon de Sultan Suleiman II, représenté à Sultan Mourad IV pour son instruction, traduit du turc en français par M [i.e. Périer de la Croix], Paris 1725, 12°, is said to contain a French translation. A Russian translation with Turkish text was given by Vassili Dmitrievic Smirnov in Kotchubey Gümîlîdijînîq (i) i drugie emansipisjnsjexy XVII. veka, St. Petersburg 1873. Köc Beg according to the Siğiî-i Othmannî, iv. 63 presumably following Naîmâ, composed for Sultan Ibrâhîm (1640/1648) a further treatise, Rûstâle, probably of a similar nature. He was the teacher of the great Ottoman historian Naîmâ [q.v.] he died at the beginning of the reign of Sultan Mehmed IV (1648/1658) and is said to be buried in his native town. His brother Khurrem Beg was said to have fled to Russia and to have become a Christian there.

Kodja III, the name of a sandjak in the old territorial division of the Ottoman empire. This sandjak covered the north-west part of Bitânia, including the whole of the shore of the Gulf of Nicomedia. In the north it was bounded by the Black Sea, in the east by the Bosphorus and the Gulf of Nicomedia, in the south by the sandjak of Brusa and in the east by that of Boli; on this side the Sakaria forms the natural boundary but in the administrative division the eastern bank of this river was included in the sandjak. The name Kodja III is connected with Akgê Kodja, the famous gheis and companion-in-arms of Othman. In the last years of the latter's reign, Akgê Kodja and his companions such as Karâ Mursal had made gheis into this territory and thus paved the way for the conquest of Iznikmid and other towns by Orkhan after his accession. When the town of Iznikmid fell into the hands of the Turks (c. 730 = 1329: the date is uncertain cf. izmid), Akgê Kodja was already dead but his son of II was given as a sief to his comrades-in-arms who had to defend the territory from the Greeks. Sulaiman
Pasha, son of Orkhān, was given the sandjak of the newly acquired territory. The descendants of these feudal frontier-guards were still to be found at a later period in the country.

In the xviith century Ködja Ili, along with Bigha, formed part of the çaylêt of the Kapudan Pasha and the west bank of the Bosphorus was under the direct administration of Constantinople. In the centuries following, Ködja Ili was incorporated in the çaylêt of Khudawandidžär. After 1867 the old name was abandoned for that of the capital Izmid and in 1888 this territory became an independent mutteşarrijīk directly under the Minister of the Interior. A large area along the eastern shore of the Bosphorus was at this time included in the vilâyet of Constantinople. This mutteşarrijīk had five kazâs (Izmid, Kara Mursal, Ada Bazar, Kândere, Geiwe). Hâdijet Kâhula enumerates 19 of them.


( J. H. Kramers)

**KOH (v.), mountain:** cf. the following compounds.

**KÖH-I BĀBĀ, Köh-i Bubuk, Köh-i Mālik Sîyāh, Köh-i Safid, Köh-i Siyāh, Köh-i Taštân.**

The dominant mountain system of Afghanistan is the Hindu-Kašr, and the huge extension westwards which forms the western half of the west of Kâbul and of the double range dividing and drained by the Hari Râd River flowing due west towards and past Hâşā. The southern component of this double range is the Köh-i Safid; the northern chain is called successively from east to west the Paropamisus, the Köh-i Bubuk, and the Köh-i Sîyâh. The Safid Köh is also the name of the important range which divides the valley of Džalâlâbâd on the Kâbul River from the Kûrân Valley and the Afridi Tirâh. The altitude of its highest peak Sîkârâm is 13,600 feet.

Köh-i Taštân is the name given to the system of parallel ranges on the Persian side of the western border of Bâlûcîstân; they attain an extreme height of 13,500 feet and extend north-westwards into the Köh-i Mâlik Sîyâh, lying to the west of the Sîstân basin.

The culminating peaks of the Köh-i Bābā overlook the sources of the principal rivers of Afghânistân — the Hari Râd, Helmand and the Kâbul River — and nearly reach 17,000 feet (height of Shâh Fuladî: 16,870 feet). This range is a part of the continental divide of Asia, high, rugged, desolate, and almost pathless. Sir Thomas Holdich in The Gates of India describes it as a rolling, barren tableland, wrinkled and intersected by narrow mountain ranges whose peaks run to 13,000 and 14,000 feet in altitude. The winter is long and severe and the range is then impenetrable; the sparse Mongol population live a life of hard privation. The Hari Râd flows due west to Herât through a deep, narrow trench bounded north and south by the straight flat-backed ranges already named. These chains gradually decrease in elevation till they run out into the Persian plains towards Mashhad.

The central Afghan highlands are practically unexplored.

**Bibliography:** See S. V. Afghânistân.

( R. B. Whitehead)

**KÖH-I NÜR, a diamond, now weighing 106 1/16 carats, but originally much larger; the early history of it is obscure, and authorities are not agreed as to whether it may be identified with the diamond mentioned by Bâbur in his Memoirs; but about 1656 it was preserved by his son, Nâzûn [q. v.] to the Mughal emperor, Shâh Džâhân, and was seen in 1665 by Tavernier in the treasury of Awrangzêb; in 1739 it was carried off to Persia by Nâdîr Shâh, who gave it the name it now bears. Nâdîr Shâh's grandson, Shâh Rukh, gave it in 1751 to Aḥmad Shâh Durrânî, whose grandson, Shâh Shukrê, when in exile in Lâhôr in 1813, had to surrender it to Mâhrâdzâ Rândjî Singh. On his death-bed in 1839, Rândjî Singh is said to have expressed a wish that the diamond should be sent to the temple of Džâgganâth, in Orissa, but it remained in Lâhôr until the annexation of the Pindâb in 1849 by the East India Company, who presented it to Queen Victoria.


( T. W. Arnold)

**KÖHÂT, the central district of the North-West Frontier Province of British India, lying between Peshâwar and Bannî, with the river Indus as its eastern boundary. The district is a broken hilly tract and the area is 2,694 square miles. As a whole it lies at an elevation of about 2,000 feet; the rainfall is very capricious, the average annual fall at the town of Köhât, the administrative headquarters, being 18.6 inches. There are three tahıls, Köhât, Terf and Hangû. The tract is divided between the Bangash and Köhât branches of the Pâshân race, the Bangash occupying the Mirânzâi valley and the western portion of the district, while the Köhâts are found on the eastern side down to the Indus. The total population at the 1921 census was 214,123, and the language commonly spoken is Pashî. The only town is Köhât; the district contains the military outposts of Thal and Fort Lockhart. A large and increasing trade with Tirâh and Kâbul passes through by the Khushâlghâb–Köhât–Thal railway; imports and exports, apart from this through-traffic, are small, with the exception of salt which is the chief export. The thickness of the rock-salt at Bahâdur Kheyl exceeds one thousand feet, perhaps the greatest amount of exposed salt in the world.

**Bibliography:** Imperial Gazetteer of India, Provincial Series. North-West Frontier Province, Calcutta 1908, p. 167 sqq.

( R. B. Whitehead)

**KOHRÜD, arabicised form of Köh-rûd, 'river of the mountain'; a village seventy-five miles from Isfâhân on the road from Kâshân [q. v.] in a valley in the midst of trees and orchards. The col which separates the two slopes of the mountain is here; Oliver St. John in 1871 from this applied the name to the chain of mountains which separates 'Irâk–Adjami from Fârs and stretches into Bâlûcîstân (chief peaks: Shîr-kûh**
south of Yazc c. 12,000 feet high and Hazar-küh south of Kirmän c. 13,500 feet high.

Bibliography: de Gubernatis, 

KÖCH, J. [See KÖY.]

KÖKMBRÜ, ABD SALİD MUZZAFFAR AL-DIN B. 'ALI B. BEGTEGİN, LÖRD OF IRBIL, the most celebrated of the Begtegins. Kökmbur was born in Muhammād 549 (April 1154) and was 14 when his father died. Although he was older than his brother Yüsuf, the Ataheg Madījādīl Al-Din Kaímaz succeeded in obtaining the succession of the latter to the throne under his guardian-ship, whereupon Kökmbūr left Irbil and went first to Māhid and then to Al-Masqil. Here he was welcomed by the Zangid Saïf Al-Din Ghāzī b. Mawdūd, who took him into his service. Later Saïf Al-Din, or according to another statement, his brother and successor 'Îzz Al-Din Mas'ūd granted him the town of Harrān as a fief. As a faithful follower of Ṣalāh Al-Din he received from him Edessa in 578 (1182/1183) and later also Sumāsāt. In 582 (1185) he was imprisoned by Ṣalāh Al-Din on an old charge but soon released again because the latter feared that the people of Mesopotamia would desert him, if he dealt too harshly with Kökmbūr. After Yüsuf’s death in 586 (Oct. 1190) Kökmbūr received Irbil and Shahrazur in exchange for his former possessions, which Ṣalāh Al-Din gave to his nephew Taṭā Al-Din 'Omar. As Kökmbūr left no family he willed his lands to the 'Abbasid Caliph Al-Muṣṭaṣṣir. He died in Ramadān 630 (June 1233). See also the articles BEGTEGINIS AND IRBIL.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallikān, ed. Wüstefeld, No. 558, transl. by de Sane, i. 555; Ibn Al-Āthir, Al-Kamil, ed. Tornberg, xii, xi, passim; Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen, iii. 387, 390, 399, 438, 449, 468; Lane-Poole, The Mohammedan Dynasties, p. 165.

(K. V. Zettersten)

KOKÇA. [See BADAKŞHAN, i. 552b.]

KOMIS, A PROVINCE IN PERSIA, the Komoum of the ancients (Polibius, Excerpta, x. 25) between Irāk-Adjam, Khōrāsān and Tabaristān; capital Dānagāh; other towns Bistām and Bīlār; the canton of Sennān is sometimes included in it. Through it passes the trade-route between Ra-al (and now Teherān) and Khōrāsān. Mukaddasī (p. 355) places it in the Dailam country. Industry flourished there; kirāz were made there, woollen blankets used both as cloaks and for beds (Dozy, Dict. des noms des vêtements, p. 383) which were exported abroad, cotton handkerchiefs with embroidered designs, small and large, single or double (savaddik, muhshikh), sometimes of the value of 2,000 dirhams; muslims for hanging down on the shoulders from turbans (fāṣerān) and fine woollen robes (Mukaddasī, p. 367). In the time of the Seleucids and Arsacids it formed one of the six divisions into which the ancient satrapy of Parthien was divided; it held the old capital of the Parthians, Heatampylē, identified with Dānagāh; it was the property of the family of Mihrān.


(CL. HUART)

KONAČ, A Turkish word (derived from Kon, "to settle, to establish oneself", reflexive from ko, "to place"), meant at first a hostelry (Meninski), a caravansarai and then by extension of meaning a relay, a stage, the distance at the end of which one stops to spend the night; later it acquired the sense of large house, hotel, palace; the term is commonly applied to the mansion of the governor of a province, or the place where the administrative offices are installed (in Eastern Arabic, sarāyā, from the Pers. saray). (CL. HUART)

KONG, the word Kong is a corruption of Kpon, the native name for a place in the north of the present French colony of the Ivory Coast, near the watershed between the basin of the Comoë and that of the Nzi, a tributary of the Bandama.

The town was founded at a comparatively early date by some Senufo of the tribe called Falafala, who still retain rights over the soil but except for this privilege are now of very little importance. These Senufo were and have remained pagans.

From the twelfth or thirteenth century onwards a number of Muslims who claim to be of Sarakollé origin, known by the name of Dyula, which they say is their real name, and speaking a dialect of the Mandingo language, settled in small groups in the region of Kong where they devoted themselves mainly to commerce. According to their traditions they came from Mâsina and had founded several settlements on their way, notably one where now stands the town of Boko-Dyulass. At first these Dyula had no political influence in the country. Favourably received by the native Senufo to whom they brought an element of prosperity by their experience of the world and commercial aptitude, they gradually acquired an undisputed influence.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century a chief of one of their factions called Seku Wataara seized by force the village of Kpon or Kong and made it the capital of a state which was not long in incorporating all the country between Bobo-Dyulass in the north and the outskirts of the dense forest in the south, but did not go beyond the Comoë in the east or the Bandama in the west. The different provinces of the kingdom were governed by Dyula chiefs the majority of whom resided at Kong beside the sovereign, while others lived among the Senufo tribes who had become their vassals.

The kingdom of Kong does not seem to have played any considerable military part beyond its territorial limits, the Dyula being in general little warlike in disposition. But its influence was great both at home and abroad, not only from the political point of view but also as regards the development of civilisation. The old village of the Falafala had been transformed by Seku Wataara and his successors into a regular town, which had about 15,000 inhabitants when it was visited in 1888 by the explorer Binger. It was at once an important commercial centre and a focus of Muslim culture, the influence of which was felt in the
neighbouring provinces, especially in the south in the districts of Gimini and Dyammala. Alongside the wretched huts of the Senufo the Dyula had built houses with pylons and terraces in the style called Sudanese, resembling those of Dyenné and Timbuktu, and five mosques with double pyramidal minarets dominated the eastern quarters of the town. The number of literates, able to read intelligently and write Arabic correctly was relatively high. A well supplied market attracted to the town people from outside it and weaving, dyeing, and basket-making were busy industries.

The fame of Kong was wide spread in the Nigerien Sudan. Mungo Park heard of it on his first voyage in Africa revealed its existence and name to Europe and at the same time, relying on inaccurate information, gave currency to the idea of an important chain of mountains called mountains of Kong, alleged to lie near this town. In reality, the range of which he had heard is over 200 miles to the south-west of Kong and forms the extremity of the eastern branch of the massif of Futa-Djallon.

The first European to reach Kong and bring back an accurate report on the region was the French explorer Binger. Coming from Ramako, he reached Kong on February 20, 1888 and stayed there till March 11. In December of the same year Treich-Laplène, resident of France aux Établissements de la Côte d’Or (now Colonic de Côte d’Ivoire) arrived in Kong, coming from the south via Bondouk and persuaded the king Karamoko-Ule Watara and his dignitaries to accept an agreement placing the State of Kong under a French protectorate. This treaty was signed on January 10, 1889 in the presence of M. Binger who had rejoined Treich-Laplène at Kong five days before. M. Binger at the head of a mission, which included three other Frenchmen, again visited Kong in 1892.

Two years later Captain Marchand went there and learned that the town was threatened by the conquering Samori. The latter, at war with the French, had informed the king and the notables of Kong that they had to submit to him. Karamoko-Ule had replied to this ultimatum with soft words and the despatch of a kind of tribute. Nevertheless he desired to remain faithful to the treaty concluded with France and he begged Captain Marchand to get the French government to send troops to protect his kingdom from Samori. This is how it came about that an expedition called the Kong column was concentrated at Great Bassam in August 1894 and sent under Lt. Col. Monteil from the Ivory Coast. Its advance was hampered by the hostility of the tribes of Baulé, a land south of Kong. Encountering Samori’s army in March 1895, with his effective much reduced, Lt.-Col. Monteil was obliged to retire without inflicting a decisive defeat on the enemy or being able to advance as far as Kong.

Once freed from the French offensive, Samori wished to punish Kong for having provoked it and decided on the gradual and systematic destruction of the town. The king, the notables and the greater part of the population fled to Bobo-Dioulasso, the remainder were massacred or reduced to slavery. The mosques were razed to the ground, houses pillaged and set on fire and in 1896 there were only the few ruins left of the once great and wealthy town. The kingdom of which it had been the capital, broken up and dismembered, was annexed by Samori who had made his capital at Dabakala in the province of Gimini, SS. E. of Kong.

In January 1898 a detachment of French troops coming from the north occupied the site of the town and built a station there. This was besieged a little later by bands of Samori’s soldiers and relieved at the end of February by Commandant Caudrelier. It was then that Samori left the district to take refuge on the Bandama and later fled to the south-west. He was taken prisoner soon afterwards on September 29, 1898 near the Liberian frontier by Captains Gouraud and Gaden.

Once peace was restored to the country, the French authorities endeavoured to bring back the people of Kong to their town and to make them rebuild their houses. Karamoko-Ule had died in the meanwhile. His successor agreed to return to Kong with several Dyula families and there gradually arose on the ruins of the ancient town, beside the French station, new houses some in the Sudanese style like the old ones, others of humber style, simple huts with thatched roofs. A market was built, a grove of the survivors of the old population of Kong preferred to remain at Bobo-Dioulasso or in its vicinity and although it is slowly growing, the new town of Kong had only 3,000 inhabitants in 1925. The ancient kingdom however has been gradually restored and is administered as before under the suzerainty of a prince of the Watar family through Dyula chiefs, called chiefs of districts. But it is under the authority of the French administrator; the suzerainty of the prince is only nominal and the native Senufo tribes actually enjoy an independence such as they never had under the old regime.


(Maurice Delafosse)

KONYA (the ancient Iconium), a town in Asia Minor on the railway from Bagdad, the capital of the province of the same name, in a barren plain. It is 5,000 feet above sea level; of its 44,000 inhabitants, 39,300 are Muslims, 1,500 Greeks, 3,000 Armenians, 50 Protestants, 150 Catholics. The streets are broad and unpaved. The houses are built of terre pisée, except public and special buildings, 44 mosques, 147 madrassas, 5 libraries, 42 medreses, 1 Greek church, the Armenian church, 68 schools, 7 caravanserais and 8 baths; the exports are wheat, barley, maize, cotton and Angora wool; saltpetre and tobacco (manufactures of the state). It was formerly the capital of the Seldjûks of Rûm of whom monuments still survive. It was girt with walls by "Ali" al-Dîn Kâî-Kâîbâ I and the stones of these walls have been used in the erection of modern buildings. Texier and von Moltke were still able to record that 168 towers of the walls were still standing. Ruins still exist of the palace of the Seldjûks and of the citadel (610 = 1213/1214). The mosque of "Ali" al-Dîn began by "izz al-Dîn Kâîbâ I in 616 (1219–1220) and finished in 617 (1220–1221) by an architect of Damascus, Muḥammad b.
Khawāt; in front of it is the tomb of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kāi-Khusrāw I built by the architect Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār and containing a minbar in black wood adorned with arabesques, the work of an artist from Khālīf, made in (550/1155). The college of Kāraṭāi is adorned with faience (649-1251/1252); the medrese called Injīl minaret, "with the slender minaret", has been recently destroyed by an earthquake; mausoleums of Shahīk Sadr al-Dīn (d. 673 = 1274), of Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Allī summoned Sāhib ‘Aqīč (d. in 684 = 1285) who was minister of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kāi-Khusrāw III, and of Shams al-Dīn Taḥrīrī. We may also mention the Sūrābī medrese "college of glass" of 640 (1242/1243) and some monuments of the times of the Bābān dynasty. The tomb of Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmi [q.v.] and of all his successors, the grandmasters of the Mawlāwīya order, down to the present day is surmounted by a cupola in the form of a pyramid in eight tiers covered with tiles in blue enamel. A few remains of the Roman period are collected in the bezestān or "cloth market", and lions called Phrygian but probably Hitite. The Emperor Frederick Barbarossa spent a week there in the reign of Kīlādī Arslān II (May 18-26, 1190) a fortnight before he perished in the waters of the Calycadnus. It was the scene of a victory of Ibrāhīm Pāsha, son of Muhammad ‘Alī, over the Ottomans (December 21, 1832). A kind of apricots called kūmar al-dīn is grown there of which a tart called by the same name is made, as at Damascus; a kind of blue flower called ḏūch jīlāyī, "flower of the vineyard," is used to dye cloth blue. Lime water is obtained from the springs at Merām one hour's journey to the west (gardens and promenades at the foot of the mountains), which improves by being matured in jars.

Bibliography: Yākūt, Mu‘ājam, ed. Wustenfeld, iv., 204; Ḥadīdī Khālīf, Liqā‘āt-nāma, p. 615; ‘Alī Djawād, Dīghyāṣyā Lughātī, p. 643; Sāmī Bey, Kūmās al-‘Ālam, v. 3781; Ḥub Rawūtala, Khītā, II, 218; Texier, Asian Minor, Paris 1852, 661; V. Cuinet, Turkish d’Asie, i. 818; Cl. Huart, Konia, la ville des der维che tourneurs, Paris 1897, p. 132 sqq., 158, 169, 183 (drawings and photogravures); Fr. Sarre, Reise in Kleinasiens, Berlin 1856, p. 28 sqq. and Pl. xvi.--xx. (photographs). (Cl. Huart)

KOPAK, a Persian and Transoxiana coin. Kopakī dinars are mentioned in the Sharafnama (the life of Timur), and Bābur (Memoirs, G. M. S., p. 185) speaks of 300 tomān Kopak (see also P. de Courteille's transl. i. 420). P. de la Cive, as quoted by Quarteméri (N. E., xiv. 74, n.) says that dinārs cophies are gold ducats worth 7-10 French money. See also Tavernier, Hobson-Jobson, and Murray's English Dict., s. v. Copeck. Though the Transoxiana and Persian Kopak was a gold coin, the word may still be etymologically identical with the Russian Copeck, just as dinār and denarius degenerated from being gold and became silver coins.

(II. Beveridge)

KÖPRÜ (in Turkish "bridge"); East Turk: Köprü also called Bezir Köprü, "the vizier's bridge" (from the famous grandvizier Köprüli Muhammad Pashī, of Albanian origin; see below Köprüli), capital of a kaçah in the sandjak of Amasia in the province of Siwās on the river Astawolz, a tributary on the right of the Kızıl-İrmak; it has 8,600 inhabitants, mainly Muslims, 17 mosques, 2 libraries, one of which is a waqf founded by Köprüli-zade Faḍl-pasha, 6 medreses, numerous charitable buildings erected by Köprüli Muḥammad Pasha, 6 caravanserais, five baths, and three dervish monasteries. The houses are covered with red tiles and the chimney tops have a metal cap like the minarets of Turkish mosques. It contains the palace of al-Ḥāgī Muhammad Yūsuf-āgha and in the citadel, the mosque of the same; monasteries of the Kādiriya and Khalwetia dervishes; eleven caravanserais, two "maerets (poor kitchens)" and eight schools. The best baths are those of Ahmad Pasha. The Bezestān (central market) was built by Yūsuf-āgha. The ports of the town are Bafra and Sinope on the Black Sea; a road suitable for vehicular traffic connects it with Şamsin.

Köprü-su ky is the name of a river which rises in the Tawshān-Dagh and flows into the Kızıl İrmak [q.v.] near Vezir-Köprü. It is also the name borne by the ancient Eurymedon which flows into the Mediterranean sea in the Gulf of Adalia; at its mouth is the little town of Koprelişite. Bibliography: Ali Djawād, Dīghyāṣyā Lughātī, p. 687; Sāmī Bey, Kūmās al-‘Ālam, v. 3905; Ewliya Efendi, Traveys, transl. v. Hamner, ii. 217. (Cl. Huart)

KÖPRÜ HIŞAR, "fortress of the bridge", a village in the province of Kudâm-ândigâr in Asia Minor on the Çuruk-sî near Yeşi-Şehir. It was the site of a Byzantine castle taken by Sultan Əlîşems in 688 (1289) after the capture of Bilecik where he slew his uncle Dündar by shooting him with an arrow.

Bibliography: Sāmī Bey, Kūmās al-‘Ālam, v. 3906; J. de Hamner, Histoire empire ottoman, transl. Fr. de Hellert, i. 87—89; Cl. Huart, Konia, la ville des der维che tourneurs, Paris 1857, p. 18 (view of the bridge). (Cl. Huart)

KÖPRÜLÜ, a family of Ottoman viziers. This celebrated family which provided the Ottoman empire with its most prominent statesmen at the period of its commencement of decline, was probably of Albanian origin. In his Mémoires, contemporaneous relations très curieux de l'Empire Ottoman (Paris 1864), Sieur de la Croix says the founder of the family was the son of a Greek or Arab priest, a statement adopted by L. von Ranke. It is more probable that the ancestor of the family was an Albanian who migrated in the xvith century from his native district to the town of Köprü Merzifon in Anatolia. Köprü, now usually called Wezir Köprü, was at this time an important settlement, which had a long history (cf. Ḥadīdī Khālīf, Liqā‘āt-nāma, 625, 4 infra and 628, 9 where Korda kara [kara kade in J. von Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 3] is given as the old name and also Ewliya, Seyhhennâme, ii. 399), and only began to lose its importance at a later date (cf. M. Kinneir, Journey through Asia Minor, London 1818, p. 298). Near it lies Taşköprü which gave their name to the famous family of scholars, the Taşköprüzade. To distinguish it from the latter Köprü was later renamed Wezir Köprü in honour of the Köprüli family. Here Mehmed Köprüli, the grandson of this Albanian immigrant, was born, the first to make the family name famous and widely known. The number of important men who came from this family is not small. A certain Bahdži Hasan (of Ratgrad, d. 1094 [1683] at
Belgrade) composed a Türkîi-i Sulâleî Köprülu, a history of this family, the original manuscript of which is in the Köprülu Library in Stambul (No. 212). It contains details of the ancestry of the Köprülus. Among the most important members of the family are the following:

1. Köprülu Mehmed Paşa, grand vizier of Turkey, or better, administrator of the Empire, born it is said in 991 (1583), died November 1, 1661 at Adrianople. In his youth he was a humble scullion and then cook in the imperial palace; entering the service of the grand vizier Khosrow Paşa he became his page-bearer and then rose to be chief marshal in the service of the grand vizier Çiçek Paşa [g.v.], a native of Merzifun. He then rose steadily up the ladder of the higher offices of state. As a paşa of two tails (çavuş) he was appointed governor of Damascus, Jerusalem and Tripolis and in 1651 (1651) became vizier of the cupola. Soon afterwards however he was granted the unimportant sandjak of Kustendil and retired in chagrin to his native town. After a brief imprisonment at the hands of the rebel Wâdâr 'Ali Paşa against whom he had taken the field, he was liberated by the grand vizier 'Abdul Paşa and appointed by him governor of Tripolis. Before he entered upon the duties of the office he was deprived of it and retired again to Kopr. Then the grand vizier Mehmed Paşa, "with the crooked neck" (egi boyun) took him to Stambul where he was soon to become his most dangerous rival. By Dhu 'l-Hijja 3, 1066 (September 22, 1656) he had received the seal of the empire. He attacked religious zealots with great energy (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 5 sq.), had the ringleaders in previous risings executed without mercy and purified public life. In reorganising the shattered finances of the State, he was incorruptible and inexorable and in doing this made many enemies. He renewed the courage and lowered national feeling of the Ottoman people and endeavoured to revive the ancient glory of the Ottoman arms by a war with the Venetians. He fought in the Dardanelles in 1667 (1657) with Admiral L. Mocenigo, a battle which ended in the loss of the Ottoman fleet and the capture of the Venetian flagship. Mehmed Paşa endeavoured to compensate for this by the conquest of Tenedos and Lemnos; and in the following year 1668 (1657) Transylvania was conquered. He next turned his attention to Persia where he occupied the town of Yanova, then suppressed threatening risings in Northern Syria and in Egypt, built the new fortresses on the Dardanelles (cf. the article Kâl-Ari in G. O. R., vi. 86 sq.). He succeeded in considerably enriching the state treasury. Before his death on 7th Rabî 1, 1072 (October 31, 1661) he recommended on his death-bed to the Sultan his 26 year old son 'Ahmad as his successor in the grandvizierate. He was interred behind the School of Tradition beside the burned pillar.

A brother-in-law of Mehmed Paşa was Kâlîl-î-zade Mustafa Paşa (died 1074 = 1665; cf. Sîgîli-i ʾethmâni, iv. 397), whose son the chief marshal Kâlîl-î-zade 'Ali Bey was executed in 1114 (1702) (cf. Rashid, Türkîk, i. 201, and J. von Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 49). From them was descended the literary historian Köprülûzade Mehemd Fuâd Bey, born 1306 = 1890 (cf. on the genealogy of 'Ali Emet in 'Olmûmî Türkîk we Ededîyât Mûmadezîsi of 30th vi. [p. 79 sqq.] and 31st viii., 1334 [1918] [p. 116 sqq.] and M. Hartmann, Dichter der neuen Türkîe, Berlin 1919, p. 91 sqq.).

Bibliography: the histories by Naʾmä, J. v. Hammer, Zinkeisen, and especially Sir Paul Rceant and Richard Knolles, also Andrea Valiero, Storia della guerra tra Candia, Venice 1675, 547 (where it is stated, as in G. Brusoni, Storia dell' ultima guerra tra Veneziani e Turchi, Venice 1675, i. 292, that Mehmed Köprülu was a renegato Perugino di casa Ferrisiti); the historical novel Storie dei Grandi Vizîrer Mahomet Cepoglu Paşa et Ahmet Cepoglu Paşa, celle des trois derniers Grandi Signori etc. etc., Paris 1676, is quite fictitious (where for the first time we have the oft repeated fable that Mehemd Köprülu was of French origin); M. Brosch, Geschichten aus dem Leben dreier Grosswesir, Gotha 1899; L. v. Ranke, Die Osmanen und die spanische Monarchie, Leipzig 1877, p. 74 sqq. (Brilliant summing up of the personality of Mehmed Paşa); Z. Hâli, Hâli, ʿAbd al-Wâli, p. 104 sqq.; Sîgîli ʾethmâni, iv. 173 sq.; 'Ahmad Râfi, Köprüluçele, Stambul 1331, 1 part, 143 p.

II. Köprüluçeli Fâqi ʿAhmad Paşa, son of the preceding, Ottoman grand vizier, born 1045 (1635) at Wezir Köprü, died 26th Şaban 1087 (October 30, 1676) near Adrianople. Mehemd is said to have been unable to read and write, therefore he wished his son to become a scholar. The young ʿAhmad, while still a child, was entrusted to the famous historian and later Şehîk al-Islâm ʿAkeb b. ʿAbd al-Azîz [q. v.], became his mulâzim and when only 16, held the office of a muqaddim in the mosque of Mehmed the Conqueror. For ten years he held this position before he decided to enter the civil service. Three years before his father's death he went as governor to Erzerum and in the following year to Damascus in the same capacity. From here he conducted a successful campaign against the Druzes (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 93) but in consequence of his aged father's increasing dropsy he was recalled by the Sultan to the capital where he was given the rank of qâim maḥâm after an audience with the Sultan. On 7th Rabî 1, 1072 (October 30, 1661) he was given the imperial seal immediately his father died. He was then only 26. For fifteen years he filled the office of grand vizier with ability and strength and far surpassed his father in education and statesmanship. He undertook numerous campaigns during his tenure of office. His defeat against Hungary, where he took over from Jâhâd (Ujvár, September 29, 1663), beset several fortresses, razed Zerinva to the ground and finally suffered a severe reverse at St. Gotthard on the Raab on August 1, 1664 at the hands of Count Monteuccoli. At the end of May 1667 the Cretan war was begun which he conducted in person and ended with the occupation of Candia at the beginning of October 1669. Shortly before then he had placed two of his brothers-in-law in the two most important offices in the empire: Kaplan Mustafa Paşa was made Grand Admiral (Kârîdan Paşa, q. v.) while Kara Mustafa Paşa [q. v.] had been appointed Qâim maḥâm in the imperial camp (J. von Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 227). The
Kapudan Pasha Saiyud Mehmed Pasha is mentioned as a third brother-in-law (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 533) whether rightly or not is uncertain.

In the summer of 1672 (1083) he turned his attention to Poland and took Kamieniec Podolsk after a several days' siege, celebrated by the poet Nabî, on 3rd Dhimmâda I, 1083 (August 27, 1672). On the other hand the grandvizier lost the next battle, that of Chotin (Polish: Chocim, Turk.: Chotin); the fortress was lost in November 1673 (Radjab 1084); Ahmet Pasha had to take to flight. While he was able to make up for the loss of the battle of St. Gotthard by a satisfactory peace of Vassâv (August 10, 1664), lie had to prepare for a new war the next year, which ended with the recapture of Chotin and the taking of Ladzyna. On the way to the imperial camp, Fâţil Ahmet Pasha died after eighteen days, illness on 22nd Shabân 1087 (October 30, 1670) at the farm-place of Kara Biber near the bridge of Erkene (between Burghas and Adrianople). The body was brought to Stambul and he was buried beside his father. His early death is said to have been caused by over-indulgence in spirits and to dropsy caused thereby (cf. Péris de la Croix, État général de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris 1695, ii. 81). As early as the siege of Candia he had been liable to epileptic fits, and already looked a tired old man, weary of life. He afterwards indulged in all kinds of vices, surrounded himself with women (he is said to have had 80 wives, including slaves) and liked to drink Polish brandy which the doctors had prescribed for him.

Ahmed Paşa certainly surpassed his father in intellect and intelligence and still more in his love for the arts and sciences, which he encouraged even when in the field. In Stambul he founded a comprehensive library (cf. Mouradgea d'Ohsson, Tableau, ii. 488) which is still in existence, (Catalogue, Dossier, 248 sqq., 4th ed., n.d.) as a monument to his fame. His seal-bearer Hasan wrote his life under the title Dəwâlıl al-Âlâm and his campaigns were several times celebrated in verse and prose (cf. F. Babinger, Die Geschichts- schreibung der Osmanen, Leipzig 1927, p. 211 sqq.). Contemporary European writers are unanimous in praising the sound judgment and keen penetrating intellect of this distinguished statesman.

Bibliography: the above mentioned historians and M. Bosch, Geschichte aus dem Leben dreier Grosswesirs, Gotha 1899; L. van Ranke, Die Osmanen etc., Leipzig 1877, 75 sqq.; Olumazâde Ahmed Tâlib, Hadiyet ul-Ustûrû, 106 sqq.; Siddîli 'othmânî, i. 222; Ahmed Râfiq, Kopruluiler, ii., Stambul 1331, 156 p.; Barozi-berchet, Relazione degli stati Europei, ii. part (of which the relaciones of the baile Nani are specially important); J. Covel, Early Voyages in the Levant, London 1893 (C. describes him as a small bearded man with large eyes and a round face; p. 195, 206, 267); J. Chardin, Voyages, i. 81 sqq., 87 (according to whom he limped, cf. Covel, p. 206); Sir John Ryeaut, Present state of the Ottoman Empire, 135 sqq.; C. Magni, Quanto di più curioso, et uogio ha punto raccorre etc., Parma 1679, 466, 471 sqq.; Antonio Geropoldi, Bilancio historico politico dei Impero Ottoman, Venice 1686, 139 sqq. (to be used with caution).

III. Köprülüâde Muṣṭâfa Paşa, son of I and brother of II. He was born in 1047 (1637), the second son of Mehmed Pasha. He was appointed vizier of the cupula in Dhimâda II, 1091 (July 1680) and became successively muṣṭâfizî (commandant of a fortress) of Bender, Silistria, Baba Dağlı, the Dardanelles, Chios, etc., then in Dhu 'l-Ḥijja 1098 (October 1687) he was appointed the grand vizier's deputy ('âlîmumâr) and ultimately received the seal of the empire on 24th Muharram 1100 (November 7, 1689) after once again being muṣṭâfizî of the Dardanelles and of Candia. He was by this time 52 and was reputed to be a strict observer of the laws of Islâm and an enemy of the Christians. His mind inclined more to learning than to military affairs. Queto gran vestro, says a contemporary Italian relatione, è un altro mufti asteno, nemico del vino, nemico dei Cristiani, zelante della sua fede, uomo scrupoloso, scarno, bruno e brutto, stimato per un santo e dottor della sua legge, politico ma non ha nessuna pratica di guerra (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 547) which gives a very clear idea of his character and qualities. His aim was to make the grand vizier as independent as possible, wherefore he reduced the number of viziers of the cupula and dismissed many of the officials whom he did not like. His wise measures to improve the finances of the State, such as publicly farming out the tobacco tax and regulating the currency, showed his clear insight into the needs of the kingdom. He had the superbious silver of the imperial palace melted down and gave his own to the mint, contenting himself with pewter. In the summer of 1690, he went with the army against Serbia, recaptured Belgrado (October 18, 1690), took Esseg (Hung. Eszék) and fell on September 19, 1691 before Sklâmken, near Belgrado. His body was not found. Like his brother he was called the virtuous, Fâţil. He was a distinguished statesman, who clearly recognised the needs of his day and therefore introduced various innovations, the correctness of which time proved.


IV. Köprülüâde Husâin Paşa, nephew of I, Ottoman grand vizier, usually called 'Amuqâzâde, i.e. paternal nephew. Husain Paşa was a son of iki'teri (i.e. little) Hasan Ağa, a brother of Köprüüt Mehmed Paşa and had the opportunity of being trained for public life among his cousins. He filled the offices of grand admiral (Kabudan Paşa) and of governor of Chios. Entrusted with the defence of Belgrado in the summer of 1108 (1696), he attracted the attention of the Sultan Muṣṭâfa II by his wise counsels and was promoted by him from the governorship of Belgrado on 1st Rabî' 11108 (Sept. 17, 1697) to the grandvizierate (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 641 sq.). He proved an advocate of a moderate and peaceful policy and his first important act was to conclude the peace of Carlowitz on Jan. 26, 1699 with Austria, Russia, Poland and Venice. This peace restored to Austria almost all she had lost to the Porte since 1526 and formed the basis of later agreements between Austria and Turkey. Husain Paşa was also the friend of learned men and poets to whom he often gave liberal and handsome gifts. Like his cousin, he tried to improve the treasury, the army and the fleet and notably to lighten the lot of the Christians by
reducing and remitting the poll-tax (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G. O. R.*, vii. 44). He founded a large number of buildings in Stamboul, Adrianople, Gradičca, and Lepanto, built schools, colleges, waterworks and wells of all kinds (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G. O. R.*, vii. 47 sqq.). The execution of his cousin by Köblerzade Ali Beg, because of a secret passion, it is said (cf. Rašid, *Ta’rikh*, l. 261; the story in Kantemir’s *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, Hamburg 1745, p. 618 sqq., is quite absurd) affected him deeply. An incurable disease finally forced him to tender his resignation, which was accepted 12th Rabii’ II, 1114 (Sept. 5, 1702). He retired to his estate on the heights of Bučuk Tepe near Adrianople and died almost immediately afterwards at his country house near Silwiri on 29th Rabii’ II, 1114 (September 22, 1702). He was buried in a special tomb on the “Saddlers’ market” in Stamboul.


V. Köprüluçâde Nûmân Pashâ, son of III, Ottoman grand vizier. He began his career by filling several governorships (Erzerûn, Anatolia, Negroponte, Candia), became comman-
dant of the Dardanelles, then again governor of Candia, Negroponte, Bosnia and Belgrade. He married Aţîsha Sultan, daughter of Muştafa II (June 1710; cf. J. v. Hammer, *G. O. R.*, vii. 145), and immediately afterwards was appointed grand vizier. His period of office did not in any way confirm the hopes that had been placed upon him on all sides as saviour of the empire. He opposed a war with Russia to assist the king of Sweden, was disgraced and on Aug. 12, 1710 sent back to Negroponte as governor. He later became governor in succession of Candia, Bosnia and Belgrade, Cyprus, île-el, Mentesh [q. v.] and finally died after a busy life on 7th Rabî’ I, 1131 (Jan. 21, 1719) after a fever in Crete. His son was the nizâming-i buçhî and later several times governor (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G. O. R.*, vii. 115, 153, 185, 264), Hâfiţ Aḩmad Pashâ, the last Köprüluçâde mentioned in Turkish history as holding a public office. He died in 1183 (1769) as governor of Cairo. On him and on his descendants see Siddîli-i oṭhmânî, i. 262 sq.

**Bibliography:** Dilâverzade ‘Omar, *Dhail* on the *Hâdiţat ül-Wuswar*, p. 12 sqq.; Siddîli-i oṭhmânî, iv. 585 sq.

The following genealogical table may help to show the connections between the various bearers of the name Köprülu (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G. O. R.*, vii. 623):

**Genealogical Table of the Köprülu:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mehmed Köprülu Paşâ (No. I);</th>
<th>(a daughter married Köblerzade Muştafa Paşâ);</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aḩmad Paşâ (No. II)</td>
<td>Muştafa Paşâ ‘Alt (No. III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>′Abd Allâh Paşâ</td>
<td>Nu’mân Paşâ (No. V);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>′Abd al-Rahmân Paşâ d. 1146 (1733) as governor of Trebizond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâfiţ Aḩmad Paşâ cf. under No. V.</td>
<td>As’ad Paşâ d. end of Maharrâm 1138 (end of Sept. 1726);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Crete (Retimo); cf. <em>G. O. R.</em>, vii. 224, 376.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Franz Babinger)

**Köprülu (T.), a musical instrument, a kind of guitar with one string which the bards of Central Asia used to accompany their songs. The body of it was made out of a gourd.


**Kör Oğlu (T., “son of the blind man”), the hero of a popular romance in prose mingled with verse which there are Persian and Turkish recensions. He was, it is said, a Turkmen of the Tekke tribe named Rûşhân son of Mirzâ Šârîf who lived in the reign of Şâh ʿAbbâs II (1051–1077 = 1641–1666). He was born in the north of Khorâsân and lived there in the second half of the xviiith century of our era. In the valley of Salmâs (Aţharbâdîjan) are still shown the ruins of the castle of Çâmil-bel built by him. He used to plunder the caravans on the road from Turkey to Persia via Erzerûn and Khoi. He is the national hero of the nomad tribes of Persia of Turkoman origin. Poetical versions of the story of his exploits are sung at the festivals to the accompaniment of music. His horse Kîria shares his fame; the song lamenting his death is considered an elegy in existence. Nomadic singers call “aţkîb”, “lovers”, sometimes accompanied by jugglers and rope-dancers wander through the towns, villages and encampments of Transcaucasia and Aţharbâdîjan and recite this epic in sections called *majlis* or “seances”. They are known as *kör-oğlu-khêân* “reciters of Kör-oghlu”. The Turkish recension puts the scene
of Kor-oghli’s exploits in Asia Minor, locating them around Boli (the ancient Claudopolis in the province of Kastamuni).

His name is derived from the fact that the lord of the district (in the Fer-yan version, Sultan Murād, sovereign of a part of Turkestan and in the Turkish the Dece-beyi of Boli), furious at seeing that the head of his stable, the father of our hero, sent by him to pick the best out of the horses brought to him in tribute, had chosen a thin one, had his eyes gouged out. The area of the adventures of Kor-oghli in the Persian version is very extensive for it includes successively Khorasan, Adidasbādjan, Erivan, Naḵchivan, Anatolia, Kār, Syria, and Egypt. The Turkish version does not go beyond the district of Boli.


**Kūrā, an ancient decayed town,** situated at 26° 7’ N. and 80° 22’ E. on the old royal road from Agra to Allahabad (Hāhābād), now in the Pathūr District of the United Provinces of Northern India. Under the Sultan of Delhi it was the capital of a province and in Akbar’s time it was the head-quarters of a sarqar in the sūbah of Allahabad.

A copper coin of Akbar is known of Kūrā mint. The place was also a mint-town of the later Mughal emperors from the time of Raṣf al-Daraḏij dānj onwards.


**Korah.** [See Kārnān.]

**Koran,** the (*al-Kur’ān*), the sacred book of the Muḥammādans contains the collected revelations of Muḥammad in a form fixed by committal to writing.

1. Even among Muslims there is no unanimity regarding the pronunciation, derivation and meaning of the word. Some pronounce it *Kūrān* without hamza and say it at a point not nowhere, like *tawār* and *injīl* or they derived it from *korana*, to tie together. Others rightly began with *korān* with hamza and explained it either as an infinitive in the sense of a past participle or as an adjective from *kāra’s*, to collect. It is really very easy to see an infinitive in it as it occurs as such in Sūra lxxv. 17 (cf. Taraff, ed. de Goeje, s. v.).

The exact meaning must be sought in the usage of the Kurān itself where the verb *kāra’s* frequently occurs. In Sūra xvii. 95 it certainly stands for “to read”, but the most frequent meaning is rather “to recite, to discourse”, which does not necessarily presuppose a written text. Thus Allāh says, lxxv. 17: “Move not thy tongue too quickly for it behoves us to collect and recite it”. Similarly the word is used of Muḥammad who recites the revelations made to him, xvi. 100; xvii. 47; vili. 203; lxxiv. 21; cf. the 4th form in lxxvii. 6 or of the believers when they recite the revelations at prayer, lxxviii. 20. Cf. also, “If thou mentionest thy Lord, the unique, *al-kur’ānī* in reading aloud”, xvii. 49. We thus come to the meaning, *lecture, discourse what is uttered*, i.e. what Muḥammad heard from Allāh and repeated (“follow our recital”, lxxv. 18;

“We enable thee to repeat so that thou mayest not forget”, lxxvii. 6), and then later uttered before men. Schwally, Wellhausen, *Z.D.M.G.*, 67, 634; Horovitz, *Der Islam*, xiii. 67, on the other hand see in it a Syriac or Hebrew loanword *kara’ān, geyrana* (lectio, reading, or what is read) and they rightly insist that the *Kurān* is not genuine Arabic with the meaning “to read”. We should have to imagine that Allāh actually read to the Prophet out of the heavenly book, but even then the further use of the word is no easier explained. It is in any case quite absurd for E. Meyer to explain the Kurān as a book read by Muḥammad, somewhat after the fashion of Joseph Smith, for the heavenly book, the contents of which were communicated to him, was really a concealed book and he heard the voice of Allāh and read nothing (xvi. 1 notwithstanding). It was rather the case that the Kurān was first made intelligible to him by Allāh making it into an Arabic Kurān, i.e. translating it into Arabic.

The word is not found in the Kurān itself in the above sense of “collected revelations in written form” because they were only collected after the death of the Prophet. It is used either for the separate revelations which were made one by one to the Prophet (e.g. x. 16; xii. 3; lxxii. 1; cf. ii. 181, the Kurān sent down in Ramadān) or as a general term for the divine revelation which was sent down piece by piece (xvi. 107; xx. 1; lxxvi. 23; cf. xxv. 34; lxx. 21) which he received from Allāh (xxvii. 6) so that he could communicate it to men (xxviii. 85).

The term *al-Kitāb* (the scripture or the book) is used as an alternative of Kurān. They often appear to be synonymous. The “scripture” is also sent down (e.g. xl. 1; xlv. 1; in “a blessed night”, xliv. 1, i.e. like the Kurān of a single revelation). It is said in xvi. 1, “these are the miraculous tokens (*ayyārī*) of the scripture and of a perspicuous scripture”, and in xxvii. 1, “these are the miraculous tokens of the Kurān and of a perspicuous scripture”. On further consideration however there is a distinction between the two expressions. When we read xii. 1, “These are the miraculous tokens of the perspicuous scripture and we have sent them down as the Arabic Kurān”, cf. xx. 12, or “we have made the perspicuous scripture into an Arabic Kurān”, xliii. 1 s.v., or, when the Kurān is called (x. 38) an exposition of the scripture of the Lord of Heaven, it is evident that *al-Kitāb* is the more comprehensive term and that it is “Korān” in so far as its contents are revealed in a way intelligible to man. It was not the heavenly book itself that was sent down to Muḥammad, but portions of its contents in an Arabic form, and for this the word Kurān is used.

From its contents the Kurān is frequently called *Dīkhr*, a word of several meanings, which in this case means a admonition, warning, xxi. 43; xxviii. 87 etc. The *dīkhr* also is sent down, xv. 7; xxi. 51; xxviii. 7 and is called a noble scripture in xli. 41; cf. “This is an admonition and a perspicuous Kurān” xxvi. 69.

How the conceptions flowed into one another is seen in xii. 7, where the “people of a scripture” (*Akh-al-Kitāb*) are called on one occasion *Akh-al-Dīkhr*. Al-Ḥifka the wisdom, may be mentioned here as it is not only associated with the scripture in ii. 123, 146; iii. 158; lix. 2, but in ii. 311; iv. 113, there is a reference to its being
sent down, and in xiii. 34 to its recitation. On the loanword *kurān* see that article. A term peculiar to the *Korān*, the origin and original meaning of which is still obscure, is *Sūra*. It is used only for the separate revelations, while *Kurān* has sometimes a more comprehensive sense and is found in the Mecca as well as the Medina sections; for further details see the article *Sūra*.

 smaller sections of the *Kurān* were called *aṣya*, plural *ayāt*. It means properly, like the related Hebrew word *ʾāṯer*, *ʾaṯr*, *ʾastār*, *ʾaṯār*, etc., “mark, token, token of belief” (i, 249; ii, 35; xxvi, 197); and especially a token of Allāh’s existence and controlling power, xii, 105; xxi, 133, hence often “miracle” (ii, 105; xiii, 45 sqq.), and gives a very instructive glimpse into Muhammad’s ideas and consciousness. In Mecca the demand of his opponents that he should give proof of some miracle of his credibility as a messenger of Allāh caused him serious difficulties. The gift of performing miracles, possessed for example by Jesus, was denied him but the revelations offered him a very good substitute, of the divine origin of which he was firmly convinced (vi, 158; vii, 202; xx, 133; xxix, 49 sqq.).

 They were the only convincing miracles and thus received the name *ayāt*. They were sent down from heaven (n. 93; xxviii, 87) to the Prophet of the meccan community (xi, 25; xiv, 5) and proclaimed by him to men (i, 149; ii, 2; xxi, 1) as in former times by the Prophets (xxviii, 59): “Allāh proclaims his *ayāt*” (ii, 183); “the unbelievers dispute them” (xxiv, 46, etc.). The only noteworthy point is that Muhammad when he expresses himself more definitely does not use the word like *sūra* of the revelations but only of the smaller parts of which they consist; e.g. “a *Sūra* which we have sent down with perspicuous *ayāt*” (xxvii, 1), “a scripture which we have sent down so that they may reflect on its *ayāt*” (xxxviii, 28); “these are the *ayāt* of the wise scripture” (x, 1; xili, 1; xii, 1; xxvii, 1; xxi, 1); “these are the *ayāt* of the *Kurān* and of a perspicuous scripture” (xxvii, 1); cf. xxvi, 1); “in the scripture the *ayāt* of which are firmly linked together” (x, 1; xili, 2) and especially “in the scripture and unambiguous *ayāt* and others which have several meanings” (iii, 5); and “if we abrogate an *aṣya* or consign it to oblivion, we put a better or a similar one in its place” (ii, 100); “if we exchange one *aṣya* for another”, etc. (xvi, 103). Unfortunately one cannot see from such passages how large or small these component parts of the revelations were. Later scholars took them to be verses in the technical sense but this does not agree with xxx. 58 and other passages where the reference is clearly to divisions required by the sense without it being possible to define their length more exactly.

 2. From what has already been said we can see how Muhammad regarded the origin of his revelations. They came from heaven and were taken from a well-guarded tablet (lxxvi, 21), a concealed book only to be touched by the pure (lvi, 76), the “mother of the scripture” (the original scripture, xlii. 3; otherwise iii. 5). The book is called “an admonition on noble, lofty, pure leaves through the hands of noble scribes” (lxxvi, 11 sqq.; cf. iii, 2, where Muhammad swears by a scripture written on unrolled parchment, and lxii, 2: “by the word and what it writes”, xxvi, 4 sqq.; “with the reed-pen he taught men what they did not know”). The Prophet did not become acquainted with the whole of this book but only with isolated sections of it, which were given to him in Arabic dress: “Proclaim!” it is said in xviii. 26, “what is communicated to thee of Allāh’s scripture; no one may alter its words”, and in iv, 162; xii, 78, he says expressly that Allāh told him of some of the Prophets but not of all. Nevertheless, we can obtain from the revelations given by Muhammad an idea of the heavenly scripture, from which they are taken, for it is apparent that it contained a similar mixture of instruction dealing with the being of Allāh, the creation of the world and especially of man, good and evil spirits, the coming judgment, paradise and hell and the experiences of the older prophets, and in addition all sorts of regulations regarding the worship of Allāh, and the life of the community, including quite special laws (iv, 104, 126, 139; xiii. 6). The field of cosmology is touched on in the reference to the twelve months (ix, 36), the temptation of man by Satan in xxii. 4. But further perspectives are opened up when it is said that the heavenly book comprises all that has happened in the world and will happen (x, 65; xxvi. 69; xxvii, 77; xxxiv, 3; vi, 38; 59; xi, 8; cf. xx, 55 sq.; lv, 57; xxvii, 60, etc.); even if the Muslims had remained in their houses at the battle of Chud, those who were destined to die would have been attracted to the places where they were to fall (iii, 148); (cf. my essay in the Haupt-Festschrift). The *Kurān* contains only a few and very obscure hints regarding the process of communication of the revelations; it is wrapped in a secrecy which Muhammad either could not or would not illuminate. It is not from the *Kurān* but from reliable hadiths that we learn something about the half diseased ecstatic conditions, with which he was overcome (cf. the article *Muhammad*); the revelation lxviii. 1; lxvii, 1, at most might contain only a slight reference to them. The main thing was however, as already observed, not what he saw but what he heard, which is also emphasised in the descriptions of the visions (iii, 10; lxxxi, 9); that he had visions is evident from liii. 5 sqq.; lxxxi, 23 sqq. It was the voice of Allāh that with a few exceptions talked to him in the stereotyped “we” and stamped even what the Prophet had to say by a prefixed kal “say!” as a divine utterance. But he did not hear this divine voice directly — for this his conception of Allāh’s superiority was too great — but through the intermediary of the “spirit” or of an angel, according to the later passage ii, 91, Gabriel. “The trustworthy spirit brought the revelation down into the heart of Muhammad” (xxvi, 192 sq.); “the spirit of holiness brought it down from Muhammad’s Lord with truth” (xvi, 104); “Allāh sends the angel down with the spirit of (‘neia) his word to whom He will” (xxii, 1); “The Lord of the throne sends the spirit of his word to whom he will of his servants so that he may admonish” (xl, 15); “We have revealed to thee a spirit of our word” (xlii, 52). — All somewhat obscure expressions, which are not made any clearer by the fact that the spirit is in other passages (lx, 4; lxxviii, 38; xxvii, 4) associated with the angels, but which at least show that the Prophet had formed some idea for himself of the
How" of the revelation. It is also certain that one particular revelation must have had decisive importance for him, without doubt the one by which a prophetic mission was imposed upon him. Ramadān was later chosen as the month of the fast because the Qur'ān was sent down in it (ii. 181); "the perpicious scripture was sent down in a blessed night" (sliv. 2 syy.), namely in the "night of all-power" in which the angels and the spirit at their Lord's command descended on account of every matter (to be settled) (xxvii. 1 syy.) (Schaede proposes to read ranazzil— they bring down commands of all kinds)— apparently a late offshoot of the old Babylonian idea of a day on which the events of the year were settled. That Muhammad was able to distinguish the words heard by him from his own thoughts is evident from xx. 113; lxxy. 16 syy.; lxix. 44 syy.; x. 16 syy.; vii. 202, just as it is in general certain that he was firmly convinced of the reality and truth of his revelations (see MUHAMMAD). Like the earlier prophets (xx. 51) he had to fight with the whisperings of Satan (viii. 199; xxii. 99; xli. 30) and that sometimes endeavoured to mingle with the revelations seems to be indicated by xvi. 100. To protect himself from these he sought protection with Allāh, but a reliable tradition reports that at least once he allowed himself to be tempted by Satan to recognise the Meccan goddesses al-Lāt, al-Uzza and al-Manāt to some extent. But he afterwards discovered his error, whereupon the revelation is said to have received the form now found in lii. 19 syy.

It would certainly be wrong to identify those inspirations received under the mysterious conditions with what we now read in the Qur'ān. Even the oldest short Surahs which might have been heard by him in their present form very probably received their present form with rhymes etc., in a later recasting. At any rate this is evident in the later long sections, like the histories of the prophets or the reproductions of dialogues between Muhammad and his opponents, where of course his answers can only be based on inspirations. An exact distinction between the auditions of the Prophet and their later formulation is however an impossibility, although it may be assumed that the former consisted essentially of fundamental ideas and suggestions which the Prophet afterwards developed.

3. A special feature of the revelations which much occupied Muhammad himself and his opponents, was that they were communicated piecemeal, although they exist complete in the heavenly book (xvii. 107; lxxy. 23): "The unbelievers say, why was the Qur'ān not sent down to him as a whole? We wished to strengthen thy heart thereby and we arranged it in this way" (xxv. 34).

That the breaking up of the Qur'ān into small parts was in reality connected with the fact that the separate revelations were provoked in Mecca by the attacks of the opponents, in Medina by political and other conditions, was a fact Muhammad did not clearly realise and yet this circumstance had a decisive influence on the form and contents of the Qur'ān. Its striking incomplete ness is connected with this. Nowhere do we find an extensive treatment of the principles of belief or of law but the Prophet as a rule goes quickly from one subject to another according as conditions demand. In the Qur'ān we thus find for example only a few scattered indications regarding the great pilgrimage so that it would not be possible to reconstruct the whole ceremony from the Qur'ān without the help of hadīth. In such cases one must always consider the possibility that hadīth antedate all sorts of later customs; and that this actually happened we see from the instructive example of the settling of the times of daily prayers. According to tradition, the angel Gabriel taught them to the Prophets but the Qur'ān talks only of two obligatory periods of prayer, to which ii. 239 adds the afternoon prayer (cf. salāt); when there is mention of the five times of prayer in Muhammad's letter to 'Amr b. Ḥāzm (Ibn Hibān 962), this is probably an indication of a later recasting of the text (cf. thereon Ibn Sa'd, iv. i. 155). That Muhammad knew quite well that the full contents of the heavenly book had not been communicated to him is evident from the passages mentioned above, according to which Allāh had told him of some of the Prophets but not of others.

Of special significance for Muhammad's own conception of the revelations is the distinction which he makes between them. Thus it is said in iii. 5 of the Qur'ān: "In it are unambiguous āyāt which are the mother of the scripture (its firm foundation, otherwise in liii. 3) and others which are ambiguous; those in whose hearts there is a tendency to err adhere to the ambiguous because they seek vexation and (arbitrary) exposition; yet no one knows the exposition except Allāh; but those who are strengthened in knowledge say we believe in it, everything comes from our Lord". The obscure passages which to the pain of the Prophet produced criticism and quarrelling, are ascribed to divine inspiration equally with the clear passages. But there are cases where the divine revelation not only abrogated principles of the earlier religions of revelation but even regulations which Muhammad himself had proclaimed. How he reconciled this with the idea of an original scripture in heaven, the contents of which were revealed to him, is not easy to see, if he ever really reflected on the point at all; but in any case the idea itself that Allāh revoked and altered the announcements of His will caused him no difficulty. This is the doctrine, later thoroughly discussed by the theologians, of nasīb and masūbīb, the abrogating and abrogated.

There were special works on the subject, e.g. by Abu l-Kāsim Ḥibat Allāh b. Salāma (d. 410 = 1019) and 'Abd al-Kāhir b. Tahār (d. 420 = 1030). The terminology goes back to ii. 100 where it is said with reference to the alteration of the direction at prayer, "if we abrogate an āya or consign it to oblivion, we offer something better than it or something of equal value"; cf. also xvi. 103: "if we put one āya in the place of another—and Allāh surely knows best what He sends down—they say 'thou art simply romancing'; but this verse may also refer to unintentional variations in the repetition of earlier pronouncements.

If Muhammad did not have quite a clear conception of those points of view, he was all the more sensitive when the Meccans pointed out that his wisdom was communicated to him by mortal teachers, some of them foreigners (xvi. 105; xxv. 5 syy.; xlv. 13). His defence on this point is very weak and he really concedes the justice of the charge. What he learned in this way was probably
transformed into indubitable divine words when it re-echoed in his fits of obscured mentality.

4. Among the most far-reaching of Muhammad's conceptions is the idea that not only his mission but also the revelations of the earlier Prophets and the holy scriptures of the Jews and Christians were based on the original heavenly scripture so that they coincided in part with what he himself taught. The Kur'an was sent down in perspicuous Arabic language and it is in the scriptures of the ancients; is it not a sign that the learned men of the Jews knew it? (xxvi. 195 sq.) The Kur'an thus confirms what was earlier revealed (iii. 75; vi. 92; xxxv. 28; xlv. 11, etc.). The law is given to Moses, the Gospel to the apostles, and in addition there is the Psalter which David received (iv. 161; xvii. 57). They all came out of the heavenly book and therefore the Jews and Christians are called Ahl al-Kitâb, the people of the (original) scripture. From such statements alone it can be seen that Muhammad had no idea of the real contents of these books and that he can never have read them, so that it is labour lost to try to ascertain what is meant by the "leaves of Abraham", which are mentioned alongside the leaves of Moses (lii. 37 sqq.; lxxxxvii. 18 sq.), or the books which the Prophets brought according to xxxv. 23. The Kur'an expressly confirms this position of the Prophet by the umma, like fadaks from faa'; according to Wensinek, Acta Orientalia, ii. 191, rather ethnikos, cf. however, ii. 72, i.e. a layman, who could not read the holy scriptures of the earlier religions of a revelation (ii. 73; i. 19, 60). *Allâh has sent amongst the un instructed a messenger from their midst, who proclaims his aîr to them and teaches them the scripture and wisdom* (lxi. 2); *Thou didst not know what scripture or belief was* (xlii. 52; cf. xxix. 47). This idea of the essential identity of his teaching with the earlier books of revelation, is found all through the Meccan period and in Medina also he still adheres to it although with some modifications. He now regards the older religions in a more critical spirit and emphasises their differences from his own. The Jews only received a part of the "scripture" (ii. 222; iv. 47) and, what is more important, there are in their laws regulations which have only a limited validity like the observance of the Sabbath which is only binding on them (ii. 61; iv. 50, 153) or the forbidden foods which were intended as a punishment for the Jews (iv. 158; vi. 147; no doubt a medical interpolation; otherwise in v. 7). The main point however is that he defends himself against Jewish criticism by the assertion that in their scripture the Jews had forgotten (v. 16) or concealed (ii. 160), or actually corrupted all sorts of things. *They have perverted the words from their places* (iv. 48; v. 16, 45), and a similar charge is raised against the Christians because they worship Jesus as God and have introduced monasticism.

5. Although Muhammad owed not only his general religious and moral ideas but certainly also the idea of God's revelation through prophets sent by Him to contact with Jews and Christians, or probably more correctly with the numerous sectarian offshoots of these religions settled in Arabia — his series of prophets, strange to Judaism proper, in which the regular prophets of the scrip


tures are lacking, recall somewhat the Clementine writings for example — his teaching developed in the early period, not according to Biblical models but in the style of the pagan Arab soothsayers with their oracles, formulae for blessings and curses, etc. In the introductions to the oldest sûras, he swears by the most remarkable things, by the fig- and olive-tree and by Mount Sinai (xxv. 1), by the heavens and the signs of the Zodiac, by the dawn and by the ten nights, by the double and the single (lxxix. 1 sq.) etc. He also uses a form found with these soothsayers which gives the older parts of the Kur'an a distinctive character. While he rejects with indignation the assertion of his opponents that he is a poet (xxv. 51; lxxxxvii. 35; lii. 39; lxix. 41 cf. also the verdict of the poets xxxvi. 224 sqq.) and his discourses really have nothing in common with the productions of Arabic poetry of the time. highly developed as regards language and rhythm, he used after the fashion of the soothsayers, rhymed prose, sajdâf, which consists in two or more short sections of the utterance being linked together by a rhyme. In view of the constant suffix forms and endings and wealth of the vocabulary of Arabic, such sentences can be formed without much trouble especially as the finer rules of the rhymes of poetry do not apply to sajdâf. Muhammad also used the sajdâ form with great freedom, frequently repeated the same rhyming word and used "false" rhymes. In his later revelations he became still more negligent in their application (cf. the material collected by Völlers, Volksprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien, 1905, p. 15 sqq.; Noldeke-Schwy, Geschicht des Qurâns, i. 36 sqq.) so that Muslim scholars assert, not quite without justice, that the Kur'an is not composed in proper sajdâf. Nevertheless this form may be used with caution for critical excisions (e.g. lxxiv. 31—34; lxxv. 10 sq.) or emendations (e.g. lxxiv. 43, daâhim for saâbak). Rhymed prose was of importance for the style of the Kur'an as it enabled Muhammad to use peculiar (e.g. xxxvii. 130; xcv. 2) or rare words (e.g. lxxxiii. 18 sq.) or even had a definite influence on the contents (e.g. the nineteen angels lxxix. 30, the eight, lxix. 17, the dual form, lv. 40 sqq. etc.). Among other arts of Muhammad occasionally using the refrain (e.g. sûra lxxvi and especially lv.) without however definitely achieving a regular strophe formation. Among the rhetorical arts may also be mentioned the frequent similes, as Muhammad attributed a special value to them and reflects on Allâh's use of them (xiv. 30; xxiv. 35; xxix. 42; lix. 21; and notably ii. 24). The amthâl are as a rule simple comparisons which are not infrequently very effective and much to the point (e.g. xiii. 15, 18; xxiv. 39). In so far as they are taken from nature, it is made to appear in vii. 56; xiii. 18, as if Allâh had so formed the processes of nature as to express a moral lesson. In other cases the amthâl are taken from history, as warnings or inspirations (xiv. 47; xiii. 57; lxvi. 10 sq.); a remarkable simile is found in the "Licht-Verse" (xxxiv. 35) which is practically isolated in its strongly mystical colouring. On one occasion a simile is spun out into a regular parable (xviii. 31 sqq.), but it is rather spoiled by the confusion of the picture and the truth to be illustrated by it. That Muhammad at any rate later heard something of the parables in the
Gospels is shown by xviii. 29, from which however it can once more be seen that he possessed no real knowledge of the New Testament.

6. The language in which Muhammad delivered his revelations was, according to the most natural assumption, the Hijjazi dialect of the people of Mecca. The view put forward by Volkers that it was a purely popular speech, distinct from literary Arabic with its strict grammatical rules, so that the present text only came into existence as the result of a later revision, has been rightly refuted by R. Geyer and Noldeke, as there is no support for it either in the oldest traditions nor in the evidence of language, although the inadequate reproduction in an alphabet of consonants does not exclude the possibility that the pronunciation on the lips of the Prophet may have offered all sorts of shades of variation. It might rather be asked whether Muhammad may not have used the language in general use among poets; but this could only be settled if we had other specimens of language for comparison from the Mecca of the day. The style is quite different in the earlier and later parts of the Qur'an, although it bears everywhere undeniably the stamp of the same individual. The Muslim is the absolute perfection of the language of the Qur'an, an impregnable dogma, the acknowledgment of which is not however easy to a reader with some stylistic training and a certain amount of taste. In the earliest revelations one is carried away by the wild fancy and grotesque presentation, sometimes also by a warmer feeling, so that it would be pedantic to lay much weight on faults in language or logic. In the later sections also higher flights are not lacking, for example when the Prophet expresses his admiration for the wonders of creation and of life; but as a rule his imagination soon exhausted itself and gave place to a prosaicness in which the slips in reasoning and style, a comprehensive catalogue of which has been made by Noldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft,* p. 599, make quite a bad impression. The Prophet becomes fond of wearisome repetitions of long stories interspersed with religious and moral platitudes which have an unpleasing effect, for example, "the most beautiful tale, Sūra xii.) or close psychological explanations, or polemics which prove little to those who do not share his premisses. As an example, the naive argumentation iii. 39 may be quoted, in which he sees in the fact that he was not present, when the events narrated took place, a proof that it must have been communicated to him by revelation. We should however not forget that the really effective element in his preaching lay not in his speeches but in the unusually suggestive power of his personality and also that many weaknesses in his style may be explained by the fact that (like the Alexandrine translators of the Old Testament) he had first to create a language for ideas new and remote to his countrymen, a task for which he had apparently no special gift.

7. What was the exact state of the Qur'an at the death of Muhammad is a question that cannot be answered with absolute certainty. One thing only is certain and is openly recognised by tradition (al-Suyūṭī, *Iltān, i. 71) namely, that there was not in existence any collection of revelations in final form, because, so long as he was alive, new revelations were continually being added to the earlier ones. But, on the other hand, everything points to the fact that even then much of the later Qur'an must have already been written down. In the early period of his mission his discourses were probably preserved as a rule in the memories of his hearers, after he had repeatedly delivered them, and, as the last importance of his words probably only gradually dawned on them, we must probably consider the possibility that a good deal has been lost, of the earliest revelations in particular. Passages like lxxxvii. 6 sg.: "We will enable thee to discourse and thou shalt only forget what Allah wishes", or ii. 100: "If we make thee forget an āya" (the reading nan-sa'uhā is of course a dogmatic correction), clearly suggest that the discourses in question were not written down. But it cannot have been long till they felt obliged to secure the revelations from Allah by writing them down, and it is easy to understand that the material readiest to hand, like shoulder-blades, palm-leaves, stones, etc. were used, as we are told in the stories of the later collection of the Qur'an. What we are told of the knowledge of the art of writing in Mecca and Medina (al-Baladūrī, *ed. de Goeje,* p. 471, 473; cf. Goldziher, *Mukht. Sīrāt, i. 110), is not much, although the story is without interest that among the wives of the Prophet, Ḥafṣa and Umm Kūlzhum could write and ʿĀisha and Umm Salāma could read but not write. There can be however no doubt that in a commercial city of the importance of Mecca with its international connections not a few were able to write more or less well — according to al-ʿAzraḵī, *History and Description of Mecca,* ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 102, etc., documents and bills were prepared there before Islām — and there were certainly not lacking either there or later in Medina people who wrote down Muhammad's revelations. Whether the Prophet himself could read or write is therefore of minor importance, however eagerly this question has been discussed by Muslims, but only from dogmatic points of view and as a rule with an erroneous application of the term ūmūd already mentioned. From the Meccan passage xxix. 47, it cannot be concluded that he only recited, not wrote, but the expression is obscure and probably only refers to the reading of sacred texts. All the more important therefore is the passage xxv. 6, where his opponents say, "These are nothing but old fables which he writes down (or causes to be written down) and they are dictated to him morning and evening". But such remarks refer rather to the matter collected by the Prophet, than directly to his discourses themselves. But when Muhammad (xi. 16) challenges his opponents to produce ten sûras like his own, this undoubtedly presupposes that sûras were available for comparison in writing. This is still more clearly shown by the already mentioned formal abrogation of earlier utterances, which would not have been necessary if these had only been orally transmitted. In the story of Omar's conversion (Ibn Hist, *ed. Wüstenfeld,* p. 226 sq.) there is a reference to a page of writing, but not much stress can be laid on such details in tradition. When ruling in Medina, Muhammad made several of his followers prepare a number of documents, several of which were preserved with a note of the writer (cf. also Wākidī, abbrev. transl. by Wellhausen, p. 35, on the Nakhla letter), and it is obvious that the same was the case with
the later revelations especially with such as refer to legal regulations. The traditions (Balâdhûri, p. 472 sq.; al-Tabarî, ed. de Goeje, i. 1782) give the names of Meccans and Anãr who helped him as secretaries, including two in particular, Ubaî b. Ka'b and Zaid b. Thâbit. According to a curious story, ʻOthmân’s foster-brother, ʻAbd Allâh b. Abî Sa‘îr [q. v.] often acted as Kurã’în-writer to him and he had the honour of an enthusiastic exclamation of his on listening to the dictation of Sûra xxiiiiiiiiiiiiiii. adopted in it (Balâdhûri, p. 473 and the commentators). According to other stories (cf. Wâkidî, abrev. transl. by Wellhausen, p. 55), he boasted before the Kurâçî that he had often induced the Prophet to alter the wordings of the I. a. d. Saihûkah. Verheugen, Mittelalter und Seminars für orient. Sprachen zu Berlin, vol. xii. 2, 83) it is laid down among other things that no one may touch the Kurân except in a state of purification; but Caeti, Annales dell’ Isthûn, ii. 1, 319, note 1, is undoubtedly right in thinking that the regulations laid down in this document were in many cases formulated from a point of view of later date (cf. above, p. 1065b).

8. With the death of the Prophet the position was radically altered. The source of revelations ceased to flow, and the believers in cases of doubt had no one whom they might consult, as no one had inherited Muhammad’s prophetic gift. The discourses left by him thus acquired increased importance, for in them spoke the Prophet or rather God through him to his community, if they were able to interpret his words correctly. The task therefore naturally presented itself of collecting his valuable legacy in as complete and accurate a form as possible and preserving it from destruction. This obvious development is also confirmed by the traditions but unfortunately in a way which leaves much obscure. The most popular view (see Noldeke-Schwally, ii. 11 sq.) finds the stimulus to the first collection of revelations in the circumstance that many who knew the Kurân (kûrûţ), reciters; on the later meaning “pious ascetics”, see Goldscheider, Vorlesungen über den Islam, p. 189) had perished in the battle with the false prophet Musailima. This aroused in ʻOmar the fear that all knowledge of the revelations might be lost wherefore he, although with some difficulty, induced the caliph Abû Bakr to begin the collection of the scattered discourses. The work was entrusted to the already mentioned secretary of Muhammâd, Zaid b. Thâbit. He collected everything that was written on different, often primitive (cf. above), materials, and what people retained in their breasts (i. e. memories) and wrote it on separate leaves (ṣuhûf, pl. of ṣabîfah, written leaf), which he gave to Abû Bakr. After the latter’s death, this book passed into the possession of ʻOmar who bequeathed it to his daughter Ḥaʃâ, the widow of Muhammâd. In this story the first thing that strikes one is that there is no reference to the official transcripts made by order of the Prophet himself, although they would at any rate have reduced the danger threatened by the death of the kûrûţ. Caeti moreover (Annales dell’ Isthûn, ii. i., p. 713 infra) has called attention to the fact that those who fell in the battle with Musailima were, according to the lists, which had been handed down, mainly new converts, none of whom could be expected to have an extensive knowledge of the Kurân. If the whole story is thereby rendered uncertain, it becomes more important to note that there are other traditions, according to which it was ʻOmar himself who ordered and supervised the collection (Ishân, i. 73) and indeed we are even told (Ibn Sa‘îd, iii.l. 212, 4) that ʻOmar died before the task was completed. As it is easier to understand how such a pious work could have been antedated than that it could have been transferred from Abû Bakr to his successor, the second story is perhaps somewhat more probable, although the mechanical way in which ʻOmar is said to have tested the genuineness of the separate parts (if they were known to two authorities) does not sound very trustworthy. Zaid’s participation in the work remains uncertain, and the realistic feature that the Shuhûf came into the possession of Ḥaʃâ. But this very point raises other difficulties. If the Shuhûf was to be an authorised standard codex it is difficult to understand why it was given to a woman. G. Weil thinks that Ḥaʃâ was to take care of it but this could have been more safely done in other ways; and if it was to be a standard MS. from which copies could be made, it was quite inconvenient to leave it with Ḥaʃâ, as not every one had access to the widow of the Prophet. There is never any reference to any authorisation. The whole business was done in a spirit of great freedom, as we hear of several variant versions of the Kurân from the pre-ʻOthmânîc period. The only solution of the difficulty may be in the hypothesis suggested in the next section, that a distinction should be made between the simple material collection of the Shuhûf and a regular arrangement and editing by Zaid of the sûras contained in them. If this is so, the “leaves” would lose any real importance and it is not
difficult to believe that they might be given to 'Omar's daughter as a gift of honour.

9. The men to whom particular editions are ascribed were the already mentioned Ubayy b. Ka'b (Ibn Sa'd, ii/ii. 103; iii/ii. 59—62), 'Abd Allah b. Mas'ud (see Ibn Mas'ud), Abū Müsa 'Abd Allah al-As'īrī (see al-As'īrī) who became famous in the story of 'Ali, and Miqdād b. 'Amr (see Ibn Sa'd, iii/iii. 114—116). All these recensions gradually disappeared after the authorisation of 'Othmān's Kūrān; but several very valuable items of information regarding the first two are given in the Fihrist, ed. Flugel, p. 26 sq. and in al-İkhān, l. 80—82, which throw some light on the oldest phases of the history of the Kūrān. They had the same sūras as 'Othmān's Kūrān but in a somewhat different order and with the important difference that Ubayy had two additional sūras (prayers recalling Sūra i.) while in Ibn Mas'ud, Sūra cxiii. and cxiv. and probably also Sūra i. were not given. Besides these recensions there was a further one, on which 'Othmān's edition was later based, and which is associated with the Zaidī already mentioned. If, as Schwell does, we tried to identify Zaid's edition with the al-khūf, it would be difficult to understand the divergencies of the other recensions in view of the former's prestige. Besides, the name 'the leaves' suggests rather a loose collection of separate leaves, and not a definite arrangement of the portions. This is definitely expressed in another tradition, according to which Zaid collected the sūras with much difficulty in no particular order (Noldeke, Geschichte des Qurān, p. 195). These difficulties are not easily dispensed of by the assumption that Zaid after collecting the al-khūf, had set his own with a definite order of the Sūras, which added a fifth to the already mentioned four editions, one by which the others did not feel themselves bound. The Sūras in it were, as in Ibn Mas'ud and Ubayy, arranged on the principle of decreasing length; but it was only a general principle (taken from Jewish examples?) the details of which were left to the individual. Zaid's version later received authoritative importance, when it was used as the basis for 'Othmān's Kūrān. A further light might be thrown by a phenomenon which, although in itself exceedingly obscure, seems to permit some significant deductions. We refer to the mysterious letters, discussed more fully below, which are found at the beginning of about a quarter of the Sūras. In this connection Noldeke and following him H. Hirschfeld and more recently especially H. Bauer, Z. D. M. G., lxxv. 134 sq., have called attention to the fact that some of these letters are repeated before several several sūras and that these sūras form little consecutive series. Thus ḤM is found before xl. — xlv. (according to Bauer originally before xxxix. also; before xii. with following 'SK), 'LR before x. — xv. (before xiii., 'LMR), ṬSM before xxvi. — xxviii. (before xxvii. however without Ḥ), 'LM seems to be an exception, as it is found not only before xxix.—xxx. but also before ii.—iii.; but we can easily see that the reason is that the order in this case is upset by the principle of decreasing length, by which the sūras already mentioned are placed at the head of the collection while the others being shorter are placed later. This remarkable phenomenon can have only one explanation, namely that these groups formed little separate collections, which Zaid found already formed and would not break up. Bauer has also called attention to the interesting fact that Ibn Mas'ud did not feel himself bound by them but inserted the separate components approximately where they belonged from their length, with the exception however of the ḤM group which he left together, although in a different order. It seems therefore to have had a particular significance for him which is also indicated by the fact that he called this group Dihāj al-Kūrān (see Itkān, i. 71; cf. the article Dīhaj, in Lane, s.v.); Ubayy on the other hand paid no attention to the small series but arranged all the sūras according to their length, although in a very inexact fashion. We see then that there were links between the separate scattered sūras and the al-khūf, small collections probably of a purely private character. This gives us definite evidence that the collection in its present form cannot go back to the Prophet himself.

10. On the other hand, it is a very difficult question whether the sūras which Zaid found were given the form in which we know them by the Prophet himself or whether other hands intervened. That the oldest, quite short, revelations are original units is generally recognised. This is also true of several longer ones, especially xii. which forms a connected story or of Sūra iv. with its refrains. Noldeke moreover rightly utters a warning against assuming that whenever the thread of continuity appears to break, we have the work of a later hand, as abruptness and lack of coordination is really characteristic of Muhammad's style. There are also certainly small pieces of later periods which the Prophet himself may have inserted for some special edition in old pieces. In other cases, however, we have the impression that various accidents, which we can no longer know of, may have played their part in the shaping of the Sūras, among them the circumstance that several short discourses might have been written on the same piece of material, which would simply explain, for example, the transitions from xcvii. 5 to v. 6, or from lxxix. 10 to v. 11. The most difficult thing is undoubtedly to suppose that Muhammad himself composed the unusually long second Sūra in which we find in the middle of speeches of the second year A.H., without any explanation, pieces from the Meccan period (v. 19—37, 158—166) and also of the later Medina period. That the beginnings of the Sūras (with perhaps the exception of xlvii., lxxiii., xviii., which begin with innaj) regularly coincide with the actual beginnings of the revelations is proved by the introductory conjurations or formule like "These are the yād of the Book" or "This is the Book", or "See, a Sūra, which we have sent down, etc.". But the next question is whether such exordiums refer to the whole Sūra or only to what immediately follows, to which the rest may have been later joined; cf. e.g. the introduction xix. i, which only fits the story of Zakariyā' and Maria while, on the other hand, the formula v. 16 is adopted in v. 42, 52, 55 and 57. In brief we are here unfortunately usually confronted with questions which cannot be answered with certainty, however important the correct answer would be for an understanding of the Kūrān.

11. With the reign of 'Othmān we enter upon more solid ground. According to a statement of Ibn al-Athīr (ed. Torber, iii. 86) the four
recessions mentioned above found acceptance, each in a particular region: Ubaiy’s in Damascus, Miṣ-
dād’s in Hims, Ibn Masʿud’s in Kufa and al-
Aṣḥārī’s in Basra; support is given to this statement by the fact that the two last named held offices in the province mentioned. That the existence of several different versions would produce uncertainty is easily understood. We are told in a widely disseminated tradition that the general Ḥudhayfa thought that the quarrels among his followers about the correct form of the sacred book, while on a campaign in Armenia and Adhjar-
bīšājan, were dangerous and asked the Caliph Ṭūḥmān to try to abolish this unfortunate state of affairs, so that believers might not quarrel like Jews and Christians over their scriptures. The Caliph recognised the justice of the request and asked Ḥafṣa to let him have the ḥudūf for a time so that copies might be made of them (nashāḥa bi ʿi-masḥaḥ). Ḥafṣa agreed and the Caliph entrusted the task to a commission consisting of Zaid, already mentioned, Abd Allāh b. Zayd b. Asad b. al-ʿĀṣ (Ibn Saʿd, v. 3, 21a—24a), and Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḥarīrī (ibid., v. 1 sq.). Other individuals are also named but the usual tradition appears the most reliable and in any case it may be considered practically certain that Zaid, on account of his previous services, shared in the work. From the attitude which ʿAbd Allāh and his father al-Zayd soon afterwards took towards the Caliph, one might perhaps suppose that the members were chosen, not so much by the Caliph in person, as by a wider circle. Besides it is not easy to see clearly what their work really was. If they had only to make copies of a standard text, reliable scribes would have sufficed so that the men named would at most exercise some sort of supervision over the work. According to the tradition, they were to retain the Kurān dialect in cases of doubt, but this probably only reflects a later notion of the dialect of the Kurān. Further they could not have made clear fine distinctions of pronunciation with the imperfect Arabic alphabet. At any rate the most important point is that the version of Ṭūḥmān was based on the ḥudūf or as just explained on Zaid’s edition of them, so that we can in this way gain some idea of the contents and form of this basic manuscript. We are next told that of the copies then made, one was kept in Mecca, while three were sent as standard texts to Kufa, Basra and Damascus, that is practically to the regions in which the four differing versions above mentioned were current. Mecca however is added and other authorities give a large number (cf. Noldeke-Schewally, ii. 112 sq.). The authorised edition was readily accepted everywhere; the people of Kufa alone are said to have refused to give up their Ibn Masʿud. Against the accuracy of the whole story, it might perhaps be urged that a knowledge of the Kurān and interest in its correct form must really have been much too slight among Muslim soldiers in this period of the great wars of conquest to give rise to dissensions in the army. But on the other hand, it may be recalled that in the fighting which soon afterwards broke out between ‘Ali and Muʿāwiyah, there is mention of Kurān-readers (kaṣṣāṣ), not only among ʿAli’s troopers but also among the Syrians (al-Dinawari, ed. Guirgass, p. 175, 204; cf. the article ʾṣiffin); the very fact that there were different versions of

the Kurān in Syria and in al-ʿIrāk must have given rise to comparisons and disputes. Whether the Caliph, as we are told in the different traditions, had the extant differing versions burned, torn up or obliterated, has been doubted by Schwally and is without reason, especially as such steps would have been quite inexpedient against the Kurān-reciters who carried the sacred texts in their memories. In any case the alleged destruction cannot have been completely carried out, for according to al-Muʿarrirī (in Lane, s. v.), Sulamīn al-ʿAṣmī could recite the whole of the Kurān (cf. khātim) according to both Ṭūḥmān’s and Ibn Masʿud’s versions and the author of the Fihrist even asserts that he had seen a two hundred year old copy of the Kurān according to Ibn Masʿud (cf. the obscure statements in Noldeke, Gesch. d. Qurān, 1st ed., p. 276 sq.). Even without any such drastic measures, the new version must have gradually driven out the variants because of its official authority and the general desire for uniformity. It was in this way that there came into being the authorised Kurān, which has remained generally authoritative to the present day. All vicissitudes that all vicissitudes has formed, with the Sunna, the solid foundation for Muslim life and thought. It differed from Ubaiy’s Kurān by the omission of the two sūras only found in his version, while it was a little larger than Ibn Masʿud’s Kurān, which omitted Sūra cxiii. and cxiv. and probably also Sūra i. (see Noldeke-Schewally, ii. 39 sqq.) While its order generally, with the already mentioned exceptions was based on the principle of decreasing length, the first sūra, the celebrated fašūḥa, stands outside of this arrangement, apparently because it was intended to serve as an introductory benediction and prayer. It is specially noteworthy because of its lack of any distinctively Muslim thought and the presence of Jewish and Christian terminology. Sūra cxiii. and cxiv. are not the shortest and are thus not in their proper place, but it is hardly necessary to lay much stress on this point. Although they are made into utterances of Allāh by the prefixed ʾal, these formulae for protection against evil powers (cf. xvi. 100; xii. 36) are very different in character from the rest of the Kurān. In these circumstances the omission of the three sūras in Ibn Masʿud becomes significant and the question arises whether they do not represent a secondary arrangement of the sūras about the origin of which nothing definite can be said, whether the work of the Prophet himself or others.

12. This leads to a further and very important question, whether all the revela-
tions in the authorised Kurān come from Muḥammad himself or whether foreign matter has been added or passages forged for propagandist pur-
poses. As a matter of fact, there has been no lack of such assertions, in the Muslim world and by modern scholars. The arguments brought for-
ward on this point, within Islam, are however of no real importance as they are based on purely dogmatic premises. For example, some of the puritanically-minded Khārijis are said to have rejected Sūra xii. as a love-story unworthy of the Kurān (al-Shahrastānī, Kitāb al-Milāl waṭ-Ṭahā, ed. Cureton, p. 95 sq). But it so undeniably bears the stamp of the Prophet’s style that the forger must have had an astonishing power of imitation: forgery is all the more improbable as
the Sūra was found in Ibn Ma'sūd and in Ubayy and must therefore have been very old. The fact, that some reject as false passages those in which Muḥammad curses his opponents is due to the more refined religious ideas of the Mu'tazila and perhaps to Christian influence. But in general it is the Shī'īs who have pronounced against the integrity of the 'Othmānī Kurān. This however was only a result of the fact that they missed very much in it pronouncements on the prominent position of 'Alī and his family and their claims to sovereignty and to the coming forth of the hidden Imām at the end of the world; and they roundly insisted that all this had been most maliciously suppressed by the godless ‘Othmān. In support of this assertion, they very cleverly point to the undeniable lack of coherence in several sūras, but the situation is not improved by filling the gaps with references to ‘Alī. But not only are odd verses said to have been suppressed but whole sūras, which glorified ‘Alī, only two of which have been published, the sūras al-Nūrān and al-Walīyā (see Noldeke-Schwally, ii. 102 sq.; Goldziher, Die Richtungen der islamischen Kuran- auslegung, p. 271). As there is no agreement among the Shī'īs themselves regarding the genuine form of the book of revelations, the attempts made by them to produce the complete text have regularly failed, and they have therefore retired to the safe position, that the authentic form is secretly transmitted by each imām to his successor, to be communicated with the true exposition to the believers ultimately on the coming forth of the hidden imām. Till then, faut de mieux, they use the 'Othmānī Kurān and make shift with an exegesis which enables new interpolations to be made unrestrictedly, and arbitrary alterations in the text, which however they refrain from in all passages used liturgically.

Several modern scholars have endeavoured in a different fashion to prove the occurrence of passages in the Kurān which are not genuine. Théodat de Sacy (Journ. des Savants, 1832, p. 535) suggested that ‘Omar’s doubt about the death of Muhammad would have been impossible if the verse quoted against it (iii. 135) by Abū Bakr were genuine, so that it must have originated with Abū Bakr. G. Weil agrees but, as a logical result, he rejects a series of verses of similar content (iii. 182; xxi. 35 sq.; xxix. 57; xxxix. 31 sq.). But it is just this increase in the number of passages attacked (which even yet is not sufficient, e.g. g. vi. 163 and notably xxxii. 53) which makes criticism unreliable and what is to be deleted in perfect keeping with what Muhammad says out of his purely human nature. The question is usually attacked from the wrong side: for the fault is not in the Kurān but in the tendentious tradition, which in reality is attacking the belief that crops up in a disappearance off and returneth between the worship of Allāh and of Muhammad. Weil’s doubt regarding xvii. 5 and xlvii. 14 is no better founded, nor are H. Hirschfeld’s objections to v. 73, 101; lx. 6 and all passages in which the name of Muhammad occurs. When Weil in particular asserted that ‘Othmān falsified the Kurān by all sorts of omissions, this is refuted, like the Shī'ī charges before mentioned, by the simple fact that nowhere in the oldest records is there any hint of such a thing although his opponents collected a long list of charges against him.

13. Another question is raised by the additional sūras in Ubayy’s recension, which, according to Ḥiṣām, i. 82, are also found in Abū Mūsā’s version and in the Kurān of Ibn ‘Abbās: do we really have in the authorised Kurān all the revelations in existence at the death of Muhammad? Although by the completion of the collection, the utterances that came from the heavenly book and Muhammad’s own words were rigidly limited there are references in the traditions to several utterances which really belonged to the Kurān but were not included for various reasons, including some that are said to have been in the Kurāns of Ubayy and Abū Mūsā cf. Noldeke-Schwally, i. 234—261; ii. 44 sq. and thereon al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 1627, 16, and the glossary under ‘Ṭ’. We need not reject this statement off-hand. It would really not be surprising if the difference between the two kinds of pronouncements was at first not rigid, especially in so far as they were only preserved by memory. But nowhere is the genuineness of the revelations said not to have been accepted conclusively proved; of some the falsity is much more probable and it must be further remembered that they would not contribute any real addition to the Kurān. The best known is the so-called “verse of the stoning” (ayat al-rafīḥ) according to which infidelity in women not virgins can be punished by stoning. As regards matter it might well belong to Sūra xxiv.; but it is in direct contradiction to its second verse and on the other hand it cannot be included among those abrogated, as, according to the traditions, ‘Omar punished this crime in this drastic fashion. It seems therefore to be a secondary verse intended to authorise the more severe punishment.

If a critical examination of the Kurān on these lines leads to a satisfactory result, it must not be taken to mean that the canonical Kurān gives an absolutely true and faultless reproduction of the utterances of the Prophet. On the contrary it undoubtedly contains not a few explanatory additions (cf. e.g. the probably secondary kābir, ii. 216) and harmless interpolations (cf. e. g. A. Fischer in the Noldeke-Festschrift, 1906, p. 33 sqq. whose arguments however are hardly cogent). Transferences of sentences may also have taken place, cf. the striking example quoted by Goldziher, xxiv. 60a, which breaks up the context. But this is something quite different from a deliberate and tendentious falsification of the revelations, against which protests would certainly have been raised at once.

14. The Sūras were originally separated from one another by the basmula (“in the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate”) placed at the beginning of each (see vol. i., p. 672). It is only lacking in Sūra ix., probably because Sūra viii. was originally joined to it. In the text itself, the formula is found in xcvii. 30 at the head of a letter from Solomon to the queen of Saba’, a proof that the Prophet regarded it as a regular form of introduction. In keeping with this, is the fact that it often occurs in his dispatches (Ibn Sa’d, ii. 23—37 passim) and according to Ibn Hishām, ed. Wüstefeld, i. 341, at the beginning of the ordinance of the community. But he also used the older formula: “in Thy name,”
read, mentioned has sought a safer basis for interpretation, starting from the fact that some sūras take their name from the introductory letters, e.g. xx., xxxvi., xxxviii., i., xli., and lxxvii., the two latter however with variants. Now as the names of the sūras are catchwords taken from the sūras concerned (see below), he supposes that these letters are something similar. But this conclusion is by no means certain and his ingenious attempts to find the passages concerned in the sūras are, as a rule, not very convincing and it should be remembered also that he cannot apply this explanation to the letters that occur before several sūras, but has to be content with seeking an internal or external relation between these sūras and the letters. The same may be said against Gossen's attempt in *Der Islam*, xiii. 191 sqq. H. Hirschfeld revived Noldeke's earlier explanation that the letters were originally marks put on by the owners of some of the manuscript copies made by Zaid to show they were their own property, except that he regards the group of letters not as single names (e.g. ṭḥ for ṭaḥa) but names of several owners (e.g. ṭḥ for ṭaḥa and abī ḥurayra). In comparison with earlier suggestions, this strikes one as very moderate and unfanciful. Nor is it refuted by Noldeke's argument that such abbreviations are not to be expected in the beginnings of written Arabic literature; for it is not at all improbable that the people of Mecca with their highly developed trade may have marked, e.g. in the annual trading-caravans the goods of individual citizens taking part in them in some such way, and that this custom was adopted in another branch of life, where it was no longer necessary, but perhaps because of the genuineness of a document or some such thing. It might also be possible that there was an imitation of the Jewish practice, cf. the article "Abbreviations" in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*. In any case this hypothesis would agree very well with the above discussed connection of the letters with small private collections of copies of the revelations. But even this view does not lead to any final result, as the expansion of the letters to names offers so many possibilities.

16. Among the secondary elements in the Kurān are the names of the Sūras. These are catchwords which refer either to the beginning of the sūras (e.g. lxxii.—cxix.) or to some subject dealt with in them (e.g. "The Cow" in i. 63 sqq.; "The House of 'Imrān" in iii. 30; "Hūd" in xi. 52 etc.). That they were generally known in the first half of the eighth century is certain, as some of them are mentioned by John of Damascus in *Patrol. Graecae*, xcvii. 769, 772; viz: "the Cow" (Sūra ii.), "the Women" (Sūra iv.), "the Table" (Sūra v.) and in addition a name no longer found, "the Camel", which might refer to vii. 71—75, xi. 67 sqq. or xxvi. 155 sqq. This however does not prove that they were already adopted in the manuscripts at this time; and that they do not all come from Muhammad himself, as John says, is evident from their varying (Sūra ix. for example is also called al-Tawbah: cf. Ikāb, i. 66 sqq. and the above notes on Sūra xii. and lviii.). Besides, they originally ran "the sūra in which the cow is mentioned" etc. and appeared in the manuscripts not as superbut as subscriptions (Nöldeke, *Geschichte des Qurān*, p. 320). The two non-canonical sūras of Ubayy had similar names, Sūrat al-Kāhil and Sūrat al-Kafād.
The sūras were divided into "verses," which were called "ayāt," following the linguistic practice of the Qurʾān already mentioned. The verses were generally arranged according to the rhymes, but as the divisions were originally not marked in the manuscripts, there is a difference of opinion about their divisions and numbering (see Ikšān, i. 83 sq.; Noldeke, Gesch. d. Qurʾāns, p. 300).

17. Although the ʿOthmānī ʿArabic prevailed over its rivals, it did not provide for the Muslim world a real textus receptus, and yet one would think that, if ever one were necessary, it would be for such a book as the Qurʾān, as ʿAllāh speaks in it everywhere. Even ʿOthmān himself, according to one story (al-Tabari, Tafsīr, iv. 24), did not adhere to the text authorised by him, but read Sūra iii. 100 with an addition not now found in it; and if this is correct, it is no wonder that others took still greater liberties. Various circumstances contributed to the continual variations in the form of the text. First there was the carelessness of the few trained copyists; even the copies of the Medina standard codex (al-Inām) sent to the provinces are said not always to have been identical with it, and lists are given of Medina, Damascas, Baṣra and Kīfa readings, to which a few from Mecca are added. These refer however only to minor points, which are of interest for the history of the language and orthography, but not for the matter. The cause of variation in the text was of greater importance, namely, the different readings which the Qurʾān retained in their memories and would not always abandon, even when they had a written Qurʾān before them. These are primarily readings which were found in the rival versions and had thus gained currency. Finally there was a third factor, the deficienci es of the Arabic script. It lacked not only signs for the short and to some extent for the long vowels, the pronunciation of which was left to the reader (which meant, for example, also the choice between active and passive) and for double consonants, but different consonantal sounds were expressed by one character, e.g. ʾ, ʾ, and ḏ, ḏ, ḏ, etc., and in the degenerate Arabic script, very different letters had come to assume the same form, so that for example ṣ and z, b, t and th and at the beginning or in the middle of a word n and y also were indistinguishable. In any case this seemed to be little affected by such however possibilities, e.g. ʾxxi. 0, where it was a matter of indifference whether one read ʾašāʿ or ʾal-išāʿ; but in other cases a different pronunciation was a matter of moment, e.g. v. 8, where the alteration of a case-ending modifies the rule about ablation before prayer. Such possibilities afforded a means by which perplexed spirits could get rid of various passages that offended them, e.g. xii. 10 where in place of the troublesome ʾašāʿ, ʾašāʿ or ʾašāʿ could be read. In this way there arose a perplexing confusion of readings and in place of the striving for uniformity that one would have expected, people became accustomed to unlimited liberty in these matters, so that they did not hesitate to substitute for particular words, their synonyms or insert short explanatory additions. This freedom was all the more unbridled in its development, as Umayr had established little feeling on such questions and preferred to take care that passions were not aroused by state interference in such matters.

18. Gradually however, the situation came to arouse misgivings. As by this time the state of affairs just described had developed to such an extent that the preparation of a canonical text was not to be thought of, and there was, besides, no authority who could enforce the adoption of one, the endeavour was made to eliminate the worst defects by more general principles. Not every variant was allowed, but only those which were based on recognised authorities, preferably such men as had received their reading from the successors of the companions of the Prophet. At the same time the overwhelming mass of small details led the art of reading the Qurʾān, hitherto transmitted orally, to be replaced by critical writings. The first book of this kind is said to have been written by a Jewish convert to Islam Ḥabīb b. Mūsā (d. c. 800 A.D.). Of later works dealing with variant readings, special mention may be made of that of Abu ʿUbayd al-Kāsim (d. 837 A.D.; Brockelmann, Gesch. d. arab. Litt., i. 166, 186) and of the celebrated Tābarī's al-Djami. The measures taken were however too indefinite to be really effective and the attempt was therefore made to limit the number of authorities, for example by emphasising the importance of ten recognised teachers. The number seven however was especially popular in this connection and support was found in it in an alleged saying of the Prophet regarding the seven ʾabrūf in which the Qurʾān is revealed and which all possess divine authority. Although "seven" in this tradition is probably only a round number meaning "several" and it was quite uncertain what the word ʾabrūf really meant, the number was taken literally and ʾabrūf was given the unauthorised meaning of variant readings. The complete historical inaccuracy of this assertion was sharply criticised by several scholars, but it found wide acceptance, especially after Abū Bakr b. Muḥājir (d. 936 A.D.) had chosen seven from among well known teachers and declared them authoritative Kurʾān-readers, and with each of them two men were associated as transmitters (ruʾūāt). The seven were Nāṣir, Ibn Kāṭīr [q.v.], Abū 'Amr al-ʿAlī, [q.v.], Ibn ʿAmīr, Abū Bakr ʿĀṣim, Ḥamza and the famous philologist al-Kisāʾī. The selection was quite an arbitrary one, but the method used elsewhere by Muslims, e.g. in the four madhābi, of declaring several rivals authoritative and equally trustworthy had decided practical advantages as it averted endless and passionate disputes. There was of course no lack of protest by prominent scholars who rightly objected to the unjustifiable exclusion of other equally authoritative teachers. In the 11th century A.D. however, the exclusive authority of the seven canonical teachers began to prevail and their readings were specially dealt with by several authors, among them Abū ʿAmr ʿOthmān al-Dānt (d. 1053 A.D.) whose Kitāb al-Tafsīr displaced Ibn Muḥājir's work, in Abū ʾIsām Kāsim al-Shābī's (d. 1194 A.D.) version. But a number of students with critical ability did not hesitate to take into consideration readings of other readers not included among the celebrated ten, especially those of Yaḥyā b. Ḥaḍramī. What degree of liberty in selecting readings was claimed by the able critics is seen from the rule laid down by Muḥammad al-Dāzār (d. 1420); cf. Brockelmann, ii. 201) who is followed by al-Suyūṭī (Ikšān, i. 94), "every reading which is in consonance
with the Arabic language — although only in some respect — and with the ‘Othmanic manuscripts of the Qurʾān’ — although only a possibility — and whose chain of tradition is faultless, is considered a correct reading and must not be rejected but belongs to the seven ʿāḥrūf, in which the Qurʾān is revealed, whether it comes from the seven or the ten or from other recognized Imāms; but if it does not fulfill one of these three conditions it is to be branded as weak, arbitrary or false, whether it comes from the seven or from any one who is older than they”. But this freedom was only exercised in learned works; in all public readings before the people the readings of the seven canonical readers were observed. At the present day only two methods of reading are in general use, that of Ḥafs, rāwī of ʿAṣim and in Africa, except Egypt, that of Nāf. This is the extent to which Muslim textual criticism has prevailed. A proper critical edition of the Qurʾān making use of all available material is a task which still awaits modern scholarship.

19. This work on the text was considerably facilitated by the introduction of different means of restricting the ambiguity of the old script. Diacritical points were introduced to distinguish letters of the same form, marks indicating the pronunciation of the vowels, and the feminine ending -at, the consonantal pronunciation of ʿalif, and the sign for the doubling of a consonant. As is usual in such cases, all recollection of the period of their introduction had been lost among the Arabs. It is certain that they are based on an imitation of the Syrian practice and recent finds of coins, inscriptions and particularly of papyri have thrown some light on the question. These show that at the beginning of the viiith century the diacritical points were in use, at any rate to some extent; but they were certainly older and had perhaps been already introduced in the pre-Muḥammadan period. The vocal signs were originally dots in varying positions and were only replaced after the middle of the viiith century by the signs now in use, modelled on the semivowels, ʿ, ʾ, w and y (for further details see i., p. 383; Nöldeke, Gesch. d. Quʾān, p. 305 sqq.). In some the use of these signs in the manuscripts of the Qurʾān aroused mufīwīg. According to the Ikān, ii. 202, the Medinas Raḥīm b. Anas (d. 795 A.H.), for example, only permitted their use in copies intended for students and did not permit them in the large manuscripts used in public worship. Others, on the other hand, permitted their use without hesitation, as the signs from their form could not be regarded as a component part of the sacred book. To make the distinction clear, the vowel signs were originally distinguished by another colour, while the diacritical points were written in black as parts of the letters. On the incorporation of the names of sūras into the Qurʾān, see above; on the different marks for separating the verses, especially for every 5 and 10 verses, see Nöldeke, Gesch. d. Quʾān, p. 324; see ibid. on the sūqīdā, the mark for the passages in the text where one should prostrate oneself.

20. In editing the Qurʾān, no attention at all was, as we have seen, paid to chronological order, a result of the composite character of many sūras, which also made an arrangement according to their contents impossible. Instead, the sūras were arranged, although only approximately, according to their length, which however only led to the inconvenient result that the very earliest sūras, being the shortest, were put at the end. As a chronologically arranged is of fundamental importance for the understanding of the text, the commentators were faced with a task, the necessity of which had already been recognized by the Muslims. The main thing was to establish whether the sūras arose in the Mecca or Medina period, or whether they were composed of pieces from both periods. This problem has on the whole been solved, although views differed on many points of detail (cf. Ikān, i. 15 sqq.). In practice this question can be satisfactorily answered in most cases, if a series of criteria are used, some of which may be outlined here. When Muḥammad disputes with his countrymen about the resurrection of the dead or the oneness of God, when he refutes the assertion that he is a magician, a poet or one possessed, when he fights against the custom of burying newly born girls alive, we know that we are in Mecca. The difficulties only begin, when we try to arrange the separate pieces of this group in their chronological order, for there is an entire lack of distinct references to definite events; and even if there were any, it would help very little as the chronological statements in the old traditions of Muḥammad’s life in the Meccan period are quite unreliable. A rare exception is formed by Sūra xxx. with the mention of the defeat of the Byzantines by the Persians, probably in the year 614 A.H. More uncertain, although not improbable is the connecting of Sūra liii. with the emigration of some of the Prophet’s followers to Abyssinia. There is also the further difficulty that Muḥammad, not unintentionally, delivered his orations in a kind of chiascuro and it is exceedingly rarely that personal names are mentioned (xci. 1; xxx. 37). The traditions however are everywhere able to tell us exactly who the anonymous individuals that appear in the Qurʾān were, but these identifications are certainly due to horror of a vacuum and are often definitely wrong. We have therefore to rely essentially on internal criteria. G. Weil laid the foundations for a classification of the Meccan Sūras by dividing them into three classes. He was followed by Nöldeke, who in turn is followed by H. Grimm, although with certain variations in the order which are not of great importance, and show that generally accepted results are not to be obtained in this field. The most certainly recognizable is the first group, a series of short addresses full of excited passion, glowing imagination and no little dramatic power. These are such distinct features that it is certainly a mistake when Lammens, Fatima, p. 64, wants to transfer Sūras xliii. and xcv. to the latest Medina period. Characteristic of the group are also the already mentioned conjunction formulae; and the peculiar phrase occurring thirteen times mā ʿāvrān’, “thou surely knowest not”; mā yudrīka, xlii. 16, lxxv. 3, also belongs here, in which case xxxii. 63 is perhaps a verse that has been separated from its context. Lastly Snouck Hurgronje, De Gids, 1886, ii. 259 sqq.: lii. 109 called attention to the very important point that Muḥammad did not from the very first proclaim strict monotheism as the principal thing but the approach of the Last Judgment, from which he was to save his countrymen. The assertion
that there is no god but Allāh appears sporadically from lxxiii. 9 onwards: and it must certainly have taken some time before there was a definite breach with the idolators (Sīra cix.) and before he met them with the declaration of the oneness of God (Sūra cxii.). It is not till the second group that everything centres round monotheism and for this reason the polemical passages lli. 25 sqq. and lii. 19 sqq. directed against the daughters of Allāh are probably a little later than the adjacent verses. Starting with the assumption that the Kurān gives a complete picture of Muhammad’s preaching, the Muslims have discussed the question which Sūra is the oldest, probably containing his call to be a Prophet (see above). The majority decided for Sūra xxvi. 1—5 (see Itlān, i. 29) and many modern critics have followed them in this. Properly understood, the passage really does fit this view very well; but it is not absolutely certain and, as already mentioned, we must deal with the possibility that it is just of the earliest revelations that much may have been lost before people began to learn them by heart or record them in writing.

Of the next two classes, the third is probably the easiest to define. It is the weakest part of the Kurān, in which Muhammad’s imagination apparently became exhausted, and he was content with tiresome repetitions of his earlier ideas and especially with the tales of the prophets. The form becomes discursive, and more prosaic, in which this group resembles the following ones. The passages belonging to it show clearly that Muhammad would have become intellectually bankrupt if the migration to Medina had not aroused him to a new effort. The transition to this group is formed by the second. The opening enthusiasm gives place to calm and the Prophet’s aim is to influence his hearers by proofs, which to tell the truth are often not very convincing, such as descriptions of phenomena of nature and in the life of man, in which occasionally we have a flash of the old poetic fire. Considerable space is occupied by the stories of the experiences of earlier prophets, which were intended to warn his enemies and to encourage himself, because he constructed them with great daring on the model of his own experiences. The introductory conjunction formulae become rarer and rarer and completely disappear in the third group. To the second group belongs the remarkable episode in which Muhammad is fond of using for Allāh the name al-Rahmān, unknown to the Meccans. In the Sūras of the first group it is found once only, in Sūra lv. 1, rarely in the third and nowhere in the Medina sections.

Instead of this simple grouping, which excellently characterises the Meccan sūras, H. Hirschfeld has proposed another, quite artificial, system, in which the sūras following cxvi. 1—5, are arranged under the following heads: declamatory, narrative, descriptive and legislative. The result is not so very different from Nöldeke’s, but the system is mechanical and often arbitrary in its application, e.g. when xciii. 9 sqq., where the change of rhyme alone proves nothing, is cut off and added to the legislative series.

21. In the revelations of the Medina period, the question is much easier to settle. Everywhere that we find Muhammad attacking the Jews or the mumnīfūn [q. v.], that he summons to the holy war (“on the path of Allāh”) or where he lays down criminal or civil legislation, we are in Medina, whether we are dealing with whole sūras or small sections or single verses, e.g. vi. 143 sqq.; xxix. 1—10; lxxiii. 31—34a. The references to events known to us from the Sīra in the Medina period, the battles in Muhammad’s wars, his discourses etc., afford us a particularly safe means of arranging the sūras chronologically. There are also all kinds of details in which an investigation of the pertinent passages reveals at least their relative order, e.g. his opinions on wine and his varying utterances on the attitude to other religions and on the holy war. Such details are very suitable for the subjects of special studies and are often yield very important results. Snouck Hurgronje has clearly revealed one point of fundamental importance in Het Meekmaansche Feest, p. 33 sqq.

In the Meccan sūras it is often said that no prophetic admonisher had been sent to the Arabs before Muhammad as to other peoples (xxxi. 2; xxxiv. 43; xxxvi. 5). Abraham occupies a prominent position among the prophets (xix. 42); he is however only a prophet like the others and has nothing to do with the Arabs. When he is called hānif [q. v.], this is in contrast to the polytheists, just as Muhammad himself is called a hānif; and where there is a reference to the millāt ʿAlīn (vi. 162; xvi. 124), it may that he stood of monotheism, cf. the words of Joseph in xii. 38. Abraham on the other hand gains quite another significance in Medina, after the definite breach with the Jews had been made. In direct contrast to the previous neglect of the Arabs, we are now told that Abraham lived in Mecca and founded the sanctuary of the Black Stone with his son Ishmael: ii. 119—123; iii. 89—91, a legend (?) invented by Arabian Jews? which had never been heard of in Mecca (xxxvii. 57; xxix. 67). When Abraham is now called a hānif, the word is used not only in contrast to the polytheists but also to the Jews and Christians: iii. 60; iv. 144; cf. ii. 167; and the millāt ʿAlīn is now the original pure religion, which Muhammad wishes to introduce (ii. 124, 129; iii. 89; iv. 124), for Thora and Gospel were only sent down after Abraham (iii. 58) and the Jews and Christians corrupted the original religion (see above). This certainly shows that passages like xiv. 39—40; xcv. 77, 77, could not have arisen in Mecca, but only later in Medina, which may perhaps also be true of vi. 162, and xvi. 124 above mentioned. Less certain is another criterion of criticism pointed out by the same Dutch scholar (De Gids, 1886, ii. 460). He sees in Muhammad’s polemics against the Christians a result of the breach with the Jews and therefore thinks that all passages in which they occur must be Medinese. In the great majority of cases this dating is certainly right, but there is at least one or such passage which can only be Meccan. In one of the frequent verbal duels between the Prophet and his polytheistic countrymen xliii. 57 sqq., the latter endeavour to involve him in the difficulty that Jesus, whom he himself takes as a model, is actually worshipped as God by the Christians; and Muhammed sharply repudiates this view for “Jesus was and only professed to be a man”. Muhammad was however in the Meccan period always convinced of the full agreement of his teaching with that of the Jews and Christians; but we must remember that,
as already mentioned, the main thing with him at first was not monotheism but the proclamation of the imminent judgment, an idea which he certainly adopted from the Christians; what they thought about Christ was quite subordinate to this and it is also possible that the very Christians with whom he was in contact at this time had heretical views with regard to ecclesiastical Christology. He would soon learn that there were differences on various questions among the "peoples of a scripture" (xxii. 55; xxvii. 48; xiii. 18) and a strict monotheism had become to him the central element in religion, he had at once to reject orthodox Christology as a degeneration of pure Christianity. Passages like xix. 35—41 may thus have already originated in Mecca.

Just as the first revelation received by Muhammad was sought among the Meccan sūras, so did the Muslims seek the last among the Medinese, especially as this question was of some importance for possible abrogations. But the Muslim statements vary rather much: cf. Isḥān, i. 33 sq. Sūra v. or ix. or cx. is given as the last sūra; ii. 278 resp. 281 or iv. 175 as the last verse, while others say v. 5 or ix. 29 sq. The last is connected with a tradition which says that Zaid in collecting the Kurān found these two verses last. Much more various is the view that v. 5 is the last, which is probably rightly connected with the farewell pilgrimage (cf. the emphasized "to-day"); as regards contents, it would be very suitable as a final verse, although the meaning is not that Muhammad's mission was completed but that Allah's cause had been victorious. The claims of the other verses suggested as the last verse are not capable of any further proof.

22. For the Muḥammadans, the Kurān is not the sacred book in the usual sense but something of much greater significance. It is, as already mentioned, the faithful reproduction of the original scriptures in heaven. This sounds rather strange, when we remember that this heavenly book, according to the passages above quoted, only became by Allah's grace an "Arabic" Kurān, intelligible to Muhammad and his people, as the scriptures of the Ahl al-Kīlah were closed to them; but this distinction gradually disappeared for the religious consciousness. After the conception of eternity and the uncreatedness of the word of God had become known to Muslim theologians through the polemics of Christian theologians (cf. C. H. Becker, Zeitscrbr. f. Assy., xxvi. 186 sqq.), it was applied to them by the copy in heaven and then finally by the strictly orthodox school to the Arabic copies of the Kurān and expressed, epigrammatically in the sentence, "What lies between the two covers, is the word of God". The Muḥtasīls and the more free-thinking theologians raised a protest, it is true, but after Al-Shābī himself, in the last version of his dogmatics, had championed the view that the written or recited Kurān is identical in being and reality with the uncreated and eternal word of God, the victory was won by the orthodox school.
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KORDOFĀN is a province in the Anglo-Egyptian Sūdān which lies roughly between Latitudes N. 10° and 20° and Longitudes E. 32° and 27°. The word Kordofan or Kordofal, as it is often pronounced locally and written in old documents, does not occur, we think, in any Arabic historian or geographer of the middle ages. It is generally supposed to be derived from a small hill of the same name some ten miles S.E. of al-Khad (Lat. N. 13° 11', Long. E. 36° 14'), but the meaning of the words, the language from which it is drawn, and the territorial limits to which it was applied before the last century, are all uncertain. In the
Tabakat wa'd Da'ifulla (1805) the name occurs in the lives of three holy men of the seventeenth century: one of them, called al-Kordofani, came from Kurün which is south of Tegali and another from Zalaţa which is west of Naḩūd. Burckhardt, whose knowledge of it was mainly obtained from merchants in Şendi (1814), refers to Kordofan frequently as if it were a region comparable to Dāfir or Sennār. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it seems, therefore, to have included a broad corridor running between the southern Nuba mountains and Dār Kabābīsh; to this day Arabs north of Lat. N. 14° 30′ speck of "going to Kordofan". After the Egyptian conquest in 1821, the name was applied to one of the greater administrative areas into which the Sūdān was divided and for the next sixty years it covered a region reaching from or near the White Nile westwards to Dāfir, and from Dongola province south to the line formed by the Bahr al-Ghazal and the Bahr al-'Arab. After the Khallifa's defeat in 1899 the province was reconstituted for a few years on the old lines but it has since been reduced by the formation, first, of the White Nile province and, later, of the Nuba Mountains province. As at present defined, Kordofan province covers an area of about 115,000 square miles with a population estimated in 1925 at less than half a million; the capital and the chief local centres are at Bāra and Sādiri (north), Umū Buḥba and Rabād (east) and Naḩūd, Abū Zabād, al-ʻAqāiyya and Mūglad (west). The capital of the Nuba Mountains province is at Talūdī.

In this vast area there is considerable variety of soil, rainfall, fauna, and flora, and the inhabitants are perhaps still more diverse, the region in these respects being typical of a series of African territories between the same parallels of latitude, though unlike some of these Kordofan has never formed the centre of an independent native state. The middle zone through which a railway passes to the Obi'ed, is and has long been the most important commercial road from Central and Western Africa. Before the Egyptian conquest the Dāfir slave-trade, a trade then chiefly in small children, passed through this zone, and during the Egyptian rule it was the centre from which slaves were recruited for the army from the Nuba mountains. Gum, ivory, ostrich feathers and a little gold have also been traded through this region for many centuries, but only the first of these commodities is still of importance: to-day large quantities of the finest gum are exported from Kordofan to the world markets, also cattle to Egypt from the Bakṣār tribes in the eastern district of the Sūdān (Bukba) to Arabia. The opening of the railway, the sinking of deep wells, and the clearing of motor roads have given a great impetus to the development of this country. North of this zone the rainfall is light, semi-desert conditions prevail over large areas, and the country is divided between various camel-owning tribes except for a few hills still occupied by small communities of sedentary Nuba and a few oases, like Bāra, where gardens can be cultivated. In the southern third, on the other hand, and particularly in the Nuba mountains, natural conditions are much more favorable to the production of crops like cotton and the breeding of cattle and horses: this part of the country has now been tranquil for some years and is steadily increasing in wealth as communications improve.

The population is formed of the most diverse elements. In the north and centre Arabic is universally spoken and Islam of the usual African type is the religion of the people: in the south, Arabic is now spreading along the trade-routes, but most of the people on the hills have kept their own languages and forms of religion. Most of the Arabic-speaking people whose conversion to Islam is not very recent, claim Arab pedigrees but it is impossible to say what amount of Arab blood is now flowing in any particular district here or elsewhere in the Sūdān. The Arabs filtered into the land in small bands and intermarried freely with the natives, Libyan, Nubian, Beja or what not, according to their own traditions which are confirmed by their customs and appearance. The Kabābīsh, for example, in the north of Kordofan, who are counted, probably with right, one of the most 'Arabian' of the tribes, infuse their women according to the Sūdān 'Pharaonic' rite and observe the marriage customs which are characteristic from Dongola to Sennār, and the tribe is a recent amalgam of heterogeneous elements, different sections speaking different dialects of Arabic. The Bakṣāra tribes, on the other hand, are, or until recently were, strongly opposed to infibulation and the more characteristic wedding customs of their Muslim neighbours, yet they can hardly be considered more Arab than the Kabābīsh. It is obvious that the term 'Arab' when used in the Sūdān as an ethnic term must be understood with a difference. This difference must be still further accentuated in the case of the more mixed communities in the centre of Kordofan and on the more advanced Nuba hills where Arabic is spoken and Islam practiced as it is understood on the Nile. When one turns from these to the naked Pagans on the hills, one enters a sphere which is quite as heterogeneous as the sphere one has left: the term Nuba which is applied by the natives here to any black pagans suggests a relationship which has no existence in fact. In a recent study Meinhof has enumerated 27 languages spoken on the Nuba hills and has traced them to three distinct African language groups which reach back to remote prehistoric days. It may be added that Meinhof's list is probably incomplete and that the inhabitants of different hills also differ profoundly from one another in physical type and in the acquired knowledge and dexterity observable in primitive crafts and pursuits.

Bibliography: MacMichael, The Tribes of Northern and Central Kordofan, 1912, and A History of the Arabs in the Sudan, 1922, contain bibliographies of the early literature and a great deal of new material bearing especially on the Arab period. Meinhof in Eine Studienfahrt nach Kordfam, Hamburg 1916, gives a useful résumé of recent work on the southern languages and, among other things, disposes of the view that the languages belonging to the Nubian group are of recent origin there by showing that the southern group must have broken away from the Nilotic group before the adoption of Christianity had brought enough Coptic loanwords into the language. Reference should be made also to the official publications of the Sudan Government, to papers by C. G. and
KORÇUD, eldest son of the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid II, was appointed to the governorship of the province of Teke in Asia Minor; incurring the enmity of the grand vizier Ali Paşa, who preferred his brother Ahmed Sultan to him, he decided to quit his father's territory after the grand vizier had seized certain estates in his province; obtaining sanction to set out on the pilgrimage to Mecca, he embarked in Muharram 915 (April 1509) with 87 persons in his train on five ships commanded by Raśś Akbash; after a voyage of five days, he landed at Alexandria and was accorded a magnificent reception in Cairo by the Mamlûk Sultan but the latter refused him passage through his territory for fear of displeasing the Ottoman Sultan; Korçûd thereupon resolved to come to terms with his father's vizier and was restored to his governorship. While he was on his way back to Cilicia his flotilla was attacked and defeated by the Knights of Rhodes; the prince was forced to land on the nearest coast. In passing through the province of Teke, he had his baggage plundered in the vicinity of Elmauû by brigands commanded by Karâ-biyil, called Shâh Kâli (cf. Der Istâm, xi. 88 sqq.). Suspecting intrigues on the part of his brothers, he went in disguise to Constantinople and stayed at the mosque of the Janissaries, but the latter took the side of Selim and distrusted Korçûd's incapacity. The forced abdication of Bâyazid made him abandon all hope of succeeding him (8th Safar 915 = April 25, 1512). After the massacre of the imperial princes, Korçûd was in terror of his life; Selim, setting out unexpectedly from Brussa under a pretext of going hunting, arrived five days later in front of Magnesia the capital of the province of Sârkhân [q.v.] of which his brother was governor. Korçûd fled from his palace by a back door accompanied by Pîyâle, whom alone he trusted. After hiding for twenty days in a cave, they took refuge in the province of Teke in disguise but were betrayed to the governor Kâsim Beg by the Turkomans, who were surprised at the handsome trappings of the horse lent by Pîyâle to one of them who was sent to procure them provisions. Korçûd, taken prisoner and separated from his companion, was strangled during the night by Kâpûdjîbasî Sinân's men by order of Selim (Nov. 1512).

Korçûd was a poet and musician. He assumed the poetic surname (makbîha') of Harîmi and composed melodies, one of which is still famous under the name Ghaziî Rûh "food of the spirit". He surrounded himself with men of letters and scholars and was the patron of musicians in whose company he delighted. At his court he had the poet Ghaţî of Brussa, called Deli Birâder "the next brother" on account of his whimsical gaiety, who later wrote a funeral elegy on his patron (von Hammer, Gesch. d. osm. Dichtkunst, ii. 201); this did not prevent him also mixing in legal circles and preparing a collection of fetwâs entitled Korçûdîya.

— His name means in Turkish "terrifying".
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Köreüde, the legendary councillor of Oguz Khân and reputed author of the book of Dede Köreüde. Köreüde Dede is said to have been the sage adviser of the eponym of the tribe and first ruler of the group of peoples, to which the Anatolian Turks at first belonged, Oguz Khân, for whom he composed a book in the simplest antique style with wise sayings and admonitions, intermingled with all kinds of traditions and counsels. Whether Köreüde Dede was a historical personage or not can no longer be ascertained. A. Diwajew in the article discussed by W. Barthold in the M. S. O. S., i. (1898), Pt. 2, p. 154 and iv. (1901), Pt. 2, p. 183, has dealt with the tomb of the saint Körekst Ata (ata = dede, "father") in the Russian district of Kazanlûk not far from the mouth of the Sâr-Daryâ. There is perhaps some connection here. The book, usually called simply Kitâb-i Dede Köreüde, is regarded as a part of the epic of Oguz, the Ogûns-name and in its present form is believed to be barely older than the xvth century. It can be shown to have arisen in Eastern Anatolia. The Kitâb-i Dede Köreüde was published in 1332 in Stambul (172 p.) from a modern Dresden copy taken from an older Berlin MS. (cf. W. Pertsch, Kulat. d. Türk. HSS., No. 203, p. 227 sqq.). On the contents cf. W. Barthold in Zapiski voslochnogo otdel'linia imperat. russk. archeolog. obšestva, viii., 1893/1894, 203—218; xi., 1897/1898, 175—194; xii., 1899, 937—958; xv., 1902/1903, 139 sqq.; cf also 'Abd al-Kâdir in the Türkûyât Ma'âmiscă, i, Stambul 1925, 213 sqq.

Bibliography: cf. F. Babinger, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen, Leipzig 1927, p. 8 sq., where the older literature is collected; also K. A. Inostran'ev's article Köreüdî v istorii i legende in the Zapiski etc., x. 40—46 and Mehmîd Dâwât's article Köreüde Ata in Derg-yâh, No. 15, Stambul 1337.

(FRANZ BABINGER)

Köse Mîkhâl (T., "Michael the beardless"), an Ottoman general, a Greek renegade, was lord of Kharman-Kea, a fortified town situated at the foot of Mount Olympus in Myisia, to the east of Edrenos, when he was made prisoner by prince 'Ogîmân, the future Sultan, during a raid made by the Lord of In-Önd (698 = 1299). When 'Ogîmân had succeeded his father Er-Taghîal, he became the intimate friend of the sultan, who on his advice seized Lefke, Yeênidje, Ak-Hîşar, Geiwe, Tekfûr-Qâ, Modreni, Beldije (699 = 1300). Converted to Islam (706 = 1306) he was entrusted with the direction of the campaigns of Örkhân, was a member of the council of war which accompanied
the young prince, and negotiated the surrender of Brussa (726 = 1326).

His descendants called Mîkhâl-oghlu (sons of Michael) for a long time held from father to son, the command of the őşindj (scouts). One of his sons had taken the side of Prince Sulaiman, son of Bayazid I; later he left him to offer his services to Muḥammad.

Yahchâh-Beg, his second son, supported Muḥammad against Mûsâ and commanded his vanguard. Another Mîkhâl-oghlu, Muḥammad Beg, nephew of Yahchâh-Beg, was on the contrary among the party of Mûsâ in the quality of beyler-bey of Rumelia and, after the defeat of that prince, was imprisoned at Tokat. Lastly a descendant of the same name was sent to ravage Transylvania at the time of Sulaiman's expedition against the Hungarians in 927 (1521).

Bibliography: Sa'd al-Din, Tâdż al-Tawârîkh, Constantinople 1279, p. 19, 24, 28; Kara Çelebi, Hâkin, Yâha, Bâsk 1248, 341; Sâmi Bey, Kânûns Alâ'îm, v. 3921; J. v. Hammer, Gesch. des osmanischen, transl. Hellert, i. 64, 77, 102, 129, 147; ii. 143, 151, 152, 156. (CL. HuART)

KÖSEM WÂLÎDE also called Mâhpêker, the wife of the Ottoman Sulînân Aḥmâd I [q.v.] and mother of the Sultan Murâd IV and İbrahim I. — Kösem (lit. "bell-wether", "courageous") or Mâhpêker was a Greek by birth. In 1637 she was about 45, so must have been born about 1592. Contemporary accounts describe her as a woman, still beautiful even at an advanced age, with fine features, vigorous looking, with an expression of benevolence and superior intelligence.

For nearly thirty years this statesmanlike princess exercised a great influence on the government of the country. While, even in the lifetime of her husband Aḥmâd I, she took an active part in public affairs and through her beauty and intelligence was able to share in the government, at a later period she had firm control of the reins of government, when her minor son Murâd IV ascended the throne. For five years she ruled as his guardian. On his death in 1649 (1640), when the weak and effeminate İbrahim I (1649—1648) came to the throne, she was active in warding off trouble at home, began a war with Crete which dragged on and increased popular feeling against the incapable Sulînân. Kösem Wâlîde strove in vain to prevent his deposition, although she had been thrust aside by him, as previously by Murâd IV. İbrahim was deposed on August 8, 1648 (18th Radjab 1058) and executed a few days later. Three years afterwards however, when the minor Mehemed IV had ascended the throne and a rivalry arose between the old Wâlîde Kösem and İbrahim’s widow, Tahkân Khaṭîdja, in the course of which Kösem was accused of trying to murder Mehemed IV in order to put his brother Sulaiman in his place, she met a miserable end in a mutiny of the Janissaries in the palace 16th Râmaʃê (September 2, 1651); she was strangled with a curtain-string. She was buried beside her husband. Kösem Wâlîde is still celebrated and honoured among the Turks on account of the numerous foundations which perpetuate her name. She was a noble, magnanimous, truly queenly woman of great intelligence and a good heart but of strong character. She devoted the annual income from five royal domains belonging to her entirely to building (1646) a house of rest called after her (Wâlîde Khaṭî, collapsed on the morning of March 21, 1926), a Friday mosque bearing her name in Scutari and a mosque begun by her but finished by the younger Wâlîde in Stambul (Wâlîde Dîmân-ı-i) and to the laying out of waterworks in Egypt, to the support of the poor in Mecca, to providing for debtors who had no means of payment, and to supporting widows and orphans (Na’îm, Ta’rîkh, ii. 298, 310; J. von Hammer, G. O. R., v. 547, where details are given to show her benevolent disposition).

Bibliography: The histories of J. von Hammer and Zinkeisen, where the Ottoman (especially Na’îm and Hâdîdî Khaṭîf) and European sources (Rasûls of the Venetian bâlît) are utilised; cf. also Aḥmâd Râfîk, Râdînîr Sülfâînî, 2 vols., Stambul 1332 and 1924.

KÖSÖR. [See KUSAIK].

K ÎŞH (Ottoman Turkish pronunciation of the Persian kishk; the Arabic derivative diwaṣâh, pre-supposes an unattested form *gishak, ǧişhā, "corner"), isolated pavilion in a park, kiosk. This name was given to the country houses of the caliphs (as opposed to their house in the town), such as the Diwâṣâh al-Khaṭîfîn of Sâmarra, the plan of which has been given by Ernst Herzfeld (Mitteilung über die Arbeiten der zweiten Kampaign von Samarra, Ist., 1914, v. 203). There were in Cairo a certain number of these pavilions, also called šafar (pl. šâjar), at the cemetery of Karafa (Makrizî, Alâ'îm, ii. 452); these two expressions are synonymous, as is shown by a passage in Ibn Batûta, iii. 212.

(CL. HuART)

KOSMA is originally a general term for poetry among the Turkish peoples. In the later usage of the word it was applied to the native Turkish popular poetry, in contrast to the classical poetry taken from the Persian and based on the laws of the Arabic 'arâ'id [q.v.]. The term corresponding in Eastern Turki to the Western Turkish köşmâ is köşük or köşük. In the oldest sources e.g. in the Nâşrîh Bukî (composed in 1609/1070) köşük still has the same meaning of "little, verse", e.g. in Radloff’s edition, St. Petersburg 1891, p. 1, l. 4 from below: bu külubî köşükblîn âinîkâl has composed this book, this poem”, ibid., p. 5, l. 4, bu türkîl köşükblâr tâwîttam saîna “I have polished (i.e. composed) these Turkish verses for thee”. In Mahmûd al-Kâshîgî also, Diwan Lûqât el-Turk (1073/1074), i. 314, köşük is equated to the Arabic shîr, râdîs and khaṭîd. The Persian musician and scholar Ābd al-Kâdir of Marâgha (xiv—xvth century, cf. E. G. Browne, A History of Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion, Cambridge 1920, index, s.v.), in his work entitled Maṣâṣîd al-Âlâm does not yet discriminate between köşûk and the quantitative quatrains tâwîk (see Raśîd Vekî, Erki Türk musâkâlma dîştir tehbeûter Milli tehbeûter móqâmûs, i. 461). On the other hand in a verse by Āli Shîr Nava’î (d. 1501; q.v.) quoted in Pavet de Courteille, Dictionnaire Turc-Oriental, p. 432 s.v. and in Radloff, Versuch eines Worterbuch der Türk-Dialekte, ii. col. 640 the tâwîk is definitely contrasted with the tâwûk.

Later we find poems and songs composed according to the rules of Turkish popular poetry expressly called köşmâ, köşük. The characteristic
features of this poetry are the following: 1. Strophic structure. The strophes are usually quatrains. The köşma poems contain at least two strophes. 2. Syllabic or accented syllable rhythm, i.e. the lines of the strophe have the same number of syllables and the value of the syllables as regards stress is either a matter of indifference or stronger and weaker syllables follow one another in definite order, which is repeated. In the latter case after a definite number of syllables, we always have necessity a caesura in the middle of the line. In the later köşma strophes the most popular lines are headendicasyllabic divided into 6-5 with one caesura or 4-4-3 (with two caesuras). 3. There is rhyme or assonance of at least two endings in the strophe. The rhyme is usually grammatical and may extend to several final syllables according to its nature. It usually arises as a result of strict parallelism in the syntactical structure of the two halves of the verse. The rhyming in the köşma strophe is usually abcb or aaba. 4. Alliteration of the initial syllables of the lines is not maintained among all Turkish people (cf. T. Kowalski, Études sur la forêt d’Algeriennes des Ménages de la Comm. Orient, de l’Acad. Polonaise, N° 5, Cracow 1922; in French with a Polish résumé, p. 157 sqq.).

In earlier times the köşma songs were usually sung by the hards (scans) to the accompaniment of a musical instrument, especially the köbus [q.v.] beloved of the Turks, at court festivities or in the camp of the army. The köşma poetry was always industriously cultivated among the people, in spite of the increasing popularity of the classical quantitative poetry. The popular forms like kaya bayğı, weyhid, ekti lr, türki, warsaglı, turkmání, were cultivated among the Adhahrídlíjan and some among the Ottoman Turks all belong to the köşma. The songs of popular mystics called stâkâ and mîsîr from the time of Yûnis Emre (xii-xiv. century) are composed according to the rules of the köşma (see Kopruluzade Mehdum Fu'âd, Türk edebiyyâtında iki metin, Constantinople 1918, p. 334—335). Köşma poetry is now, sometimes produces really beautiful lyrics, was mainly cultivated by wandering singers ('âşık, also called sâs šârî or tawûjî). Many of them like 'âşık Omer, 'âşık Kerem, 'âşık Gharib, Derdûl, Dżwherif, attained great fame and the collections of their songs or life stories are among the most popular books among the Turks (cf. Kopruluzade Mehdum Fu'âd, Türk edebiyyâtında ‘âşık Târîhî Menteşe ve-Tekâšülu; Millî t Eve-sânî ve-Teârîhî, 1. 2; ‘âşık Džwherî Entislâyî ‘âid îki tawûjî in the periodical Yûnis Mejdîmâ, N° 54; G. Jacob, Türkische Volksliederliteratur, Berlin 1901, p. 17—18). There were even singers of popular songs in the corps of Janissaries; cf. J. Deny, Chansons des Janissaires turcs d’Alger, in Mélanges René Basset, Paris 1925, ii, p. 33—175.

The term köşma (but not the kind of poetry to which it was applied) seems to have fallen out of use and if the modern Adhahrídlíjan poet Dżwâd who died recently called his collection of songs köşma, this is probably simply to be explained by an archaizing popular movement in modern Turkish literature. The name has survived in the form köşen among the Altai Turks (Tatars). The Altai kösh (on them cf. W. Radloff, Uber die Formen der gebundenen Rede bei den altaiischen

Tatarren, Zeitschr. f. Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft, iv., 1866, p. 85—114 and Kowalski, Études, etc., p. 140—151) are very important in so far as from their structure and name we can make a definite deduction regarding the original meaning of the words köşma, köshik, etc. They are pairs of strophes connected by a close parallelism between the two in form and content. From is seen that köşen from kösh- "to join together", kösh- "two and two" etc., refers to the parallelism in thought and syntactical structure, which originally formed the essential feature of Turkish popular poetry.

The köşma poetry was not without influence on literature. The modern Turkish poets for example took many of their forms from popular poetry.


KOSOWA (from the Yugo-Slav kosovo pole) — "plain of the blackbirds", from kos "blackbird" in Old Slav, Bulgar and Czech; the Turkish köş eva "plain of the kettle-drums", Sa’d-al-Din, 117 (a literary invention), the name of a plateau in Upper Macedonia (Old Serbia) of an average height of 1,500 to 2,000 feet, surrounded by high mountains which form the watershed; it sends some streams to the east to the Adriatic by the Drina, to the south to the Aegean Sea by the Vardar, to the north to the Danube by the Ibar, a tributary of the Morava. It was here that the Ottoman army under the command of Sultan Murad I Khâdâwendiëdar defeated the Serbs in a great battle, which resulted in the ruin of the Serbian empire and the conquest of the country in 791 (June 15, 1389). The kril of Serbia, Lazar, had appealed to his allies in Bosnia and Albania; the Sultan on his side had brought from Asia the forces of his two sons Bâyazid (from Kutahiya) and Ya’âkub (from Karasi) and those of the vassal princes of Şârîkânan, Menteşe, Ain and Hamid. At dawn a Serb, Miloh Obili, arrived in the Ottoman camp, professing to have desired and begged the honour of being admitted to the presence of the Sultan; after pronouncing himself, he suddenly jumped up and plunged his dagger in Murâd’s breast; he then fled, but was caught just as he was mounting his horse and cut to pieces by the Janissaries. The popular ballads of Christian origin, an echo of which is found in Coluccio Salutati’s letter of congratulation to King Wladko, speak of twelve brave young men, bound together by an oath, who fought their way right through to the Sultan’s tent and stabbed him twice with the dagger, one wound being on the neck and the other on the lower part of the body. The Turks attacked, furious with rage to avenge the death of their Sultan. The kril Lazar, abandoned by Wladko and the Bosnians, seized with panic, fell into the hands
of the Turks and was decapitated with the nobles who accompanied him by order of the dying Sultan. The monumental erected on the battlefield marks the places where Milosh twice escaped from the Janissaries and where he was killed (Sokolžade). A mausoleum was built on the spot where Murad died; the body of the Sultan was however taken away and buried at Brusa. — In Şehban 852 (October 17, 1448, Eve of St. Luke) a Hungarian army, commanded by John Hunyadi and including also Wallachians and German and Bohemian arquebusiers, met at Kosowa an Ottoman army commanded by Sultan Murât II: the battle at first indecisive, turned in favour of the latter as a result of the treachery of the Wallachians and the flight of Hunyadi; it ended on the 19th with the glorious but fruitless defence of the German and Czech auxiliaries behind a barricade formed of waggoons and artillery.

The name Kosowa was given to a wilayet formed after the Russo-Turkish war of 1877: it was bounded on the east by Bulgaria, in the west by Montenegro, Bosnia and the wilayet of Scutari in Albania, in the north by Serbia and in the south by the wilayets of Monastir and Salonika. It was divided into six sandžaks: Uskub (capital of the province), Priština, Prizren, Yeni-Bazr (Novi-Bazar), Tašhića (Plevle) and Ipek; at a later date the sandžak of Yeni-Bazr was changed into a kaza and a new sandžak made called Seula (Sittena) with Košub as a kaza (Sittena, 1325, p. 932). This territory was ceded to the Serbs by the Treaty of London (May 30, 1913); it is now part of the kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.


(II. Huart)

KOSTA b. LUKA, al-Ba’albakki. Our authorities for his life are Ya‘qüb al-Nadim (Fihrist, p. 295), Ibn Abi Uṣairīa (i. 244, who quotes a very large number of works, mainly medical), Ibn al-Kift (p. 292), Abu l-Faraj (text, p. 274; transl., p. 197). These give as their sources the same manuscripts as al-Hassān, Ibn al-Nadim al-Baghdādi, 'Ubaid Allâh b. Qifri and others not mentioned by name. There are also references in other passages of the Arabic biographical and bibliographical works mentioned above. For those which we have utilised below, see the indexes.

Kosta b. Luka belonged to Ba’albak (the Heliopolis of the Greeks) in Syria; he was of Greek descent and a Melkite i.e. an orthodox Christian. In this capacity for example he disputed with a Nestorian cleric regarding the duality of the natures in Christ (cf. G. Graf, Die christlich-arabische Literatur, in Strassburgs Theol. Studien, vol. iv, 1905, p. 38 sqq.). We know the years of birth and death of many Arab mathematicians but not of Kosta b. Luka. We have however the following chronological data for his life. For the Caliph Musta’in (856—866) he translated the work "On the lifting of heavy burdens" (Barulus) of Heron and the Sphaira of Theodosius; he wrote an introduction to geometry for Abu l-Ḥasan Ali b. Yaḥyā who belonged to al-Mutawakkil’s (847—861) court and died in 885—889. To Ismā’il b. Bulbul, Mu’tamid’s vizier (870—892) he dedicated his work on the use of the sphere with an axe. He was still alive in the reign of al-Muqtadir (908—932), for he was on terms of intimacy with the latter’s contemporary Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allâh ibn al-Mutaddib (The Table-Talk of a Mozaffarīd Judge, ed. D. S. Margoliouth, Oriental Travels Fund, 2nd ser., xxvii, xxviii, text, p. 131, transl., p. 144). Suter supposes that Kosta b. Luka died about 912; as he can hardly have begun to translate before he was 25 years old, it would result from the above data that he was born about 850 and lived to be 70 or 80.

Kosta b. Luka was regarded as a talented and very brilliant physician and a sound scholar in many branches of learning, such as philosophy, astronomy, geometry, arithmetic and music. It was impossible to find him lacking in any aspect of his knowledge. According to the Fihrist, it was the general opinion that Kosta b. Luka ranked higher than the celebrated physician and translator Ḥunain b. Isḥāq (d. 873). But, according to the same source, there were others who held the view that Hunaïn was the better. In any case both were brilliant scholars. Modern opinion ranks Kosta below Hunaïn. Kosta b. Luka could write Greek, Syriac and Arabic; he had a perfect knowledge of Greek and was an excellent translator, especially of medical works; this was natural as he was a physician. His Arabic style is famed as well as the way in which he arranged his works; his concise presentation is justly praised; its lack makes difficult the study of the works of others, notably those of Ibn al-Hajījam.

Kosta b. Luka left his native district in the Abbasid period and went to Asia Minor, the land of Rûm; here he acquired a number of Greek writings and returned with them to Syria. He was summoned to 'Irāk, probably by one of the Caliphs, to translate works there. At the same time he revised many existing translations; Kosta b. Luka thus rendered great services to the East in making accessible classical learning. The Muslims therefore say that the reason that many branches of philosophy are studied in the Muslim world is that Kosta b. Luka introduced them on his return from this journey. Towards the end of his life Sahnârîb, an Armenian prince took Kosta b. Luka to his land, where he lived till his death. The Armenian Patriarch Abu l-Γhaṭrif was a learned and distinguished man for whom Kosta b. Luka prepared many excellent works on the most different subjects. It is evidence of the great prestige enjoyed by Kosta that a copula was erected in his honour over his tomb, as was only done for princes and high religious officials.

Ibn al-Ṣālih celebrated Kosta’s merits in verse (Ibn Abi Uṣairīa, ii. 166).

Of his relations to his contemporaries,
we know that he wrote medical works for some of them or translated medical books, for example even for Christian officials. Among such were Abu 'l-Qāhir Ābān al-Bāriṭī, al-Bāriṭī al-Fatān, al-Hāsan Mūhammad b. Āḥmad, the secretary of the Chief Patriarch, Abū Mūhammad al-Hāsan b. Mūhammad, the chief Kāṭīb, Abū 'Alī b. Bānān b. Ḥārīth. It is probable that Kösta b. Lūkā also met the philosopher al-Kindī at the Caliph's court, as Ibn al-Kīfī specially mentions that the two had met. Of a certain Abū 'Īsā b. al-Mu'addājidīn (astronomer or astrologer), we unfortunately know nothing; Kösta b. Lūkā sent him a letter from Armenia on the subject of Mūhammad as a prophet (for his relations with other men see the sources).

The literary activity of Kösta b. Lūkā covered the most varied fields, as in the case of the Banū Mūsā, 'Īsbāb b. Ḥunain and Thābit b. Qurra; it does not seem however to have been quite so comprehensive as in the case of the two latter; but it should be remembered that we are extremely well informed about the latter. Lūkā b. Ḥunain, for example, himself provided a list of his translations from Greek (G. Bergsträsser, Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq über die syrischen und arabischen Galenübersetzungen, in Abb. zur Kunde des Morgenlandes, xvii, No. 2, and a record of Thābit's works was made by a relative.

A list of translations of Greek works was made by M. Steinschneider in Z. D. M. G., vol. 1, 1896; see the index of names under Kösta b. Lūkā as the order is that of the Greek authors. The titles of a series of very valuable medical treatises are given by Wustenfeld and Leclerc (op. cit.). Only a few of these seem to have survived, for example that on the treatment of the body in jaundice (K. fi Tādīr al-Aḥlān fi 'l-Sāfīr etc.), on phlegm (K. fi 'l-Balqām), insomnia (K. fi 'l-Sāhār). None of these writings has so far been utilised. He also dealt with problems of hygiene, for example, baths (K. al-Ḥammān) and the standards for foods (K. Kawnin al-Ṭālībiyya).

In addition to these and similar works on philosophy, science and mathematics, Kösta b. Lūkā also wrote on dyes and colours: K. fi Khālid (on the staining of ḥaqqī, a coarse linen, and its alteration); K. al-Falāh li Ṣawāq'id al-Khaṭīb wa-Tāzqā'īr min al-Rasūlī. Other works deal with fans and the causes of wind (K. fi 'l-Mirwağa wa-Aṣbāb al-Ribā), and on date wine and the drinking of it at feasts (K. fi 'l-Nabāl wa-Sawāhībi fi 'l-Walā'īm) and how to avert poisoning (K. fi Dā' al-Samā'i).


In the field of philosophy his principal work deals with the distinction between soul and spirit, pneuma (al-fāšik or al-fāsīḥ hāni al-nafṣ wa 'l-ruḥ). The genuineness of the work has been disputed. The difference between soul and pneuma lies 1) in their nature: the soul is corporeal, the pneuma incorporeal; 2) in their qualities: the soul occupies no space, the pneuma does; the former cannot be but latter can be enclosed by the body; 3) in the condition after death: the soul is immortal and the pneuma mortal; 4) the pneuma is the instrument of the soul for communicating the functions of life to the body and for sensual perception. It controls most processes of the body, such as breathing, the pulse, sensation and movement. The pneuma goes to the eye in the hollow nerves. In its finest form, it is active in the higher processes of the mind, imagination, memory and reason. It is of special interest to explain, as Kösta b. Lūkā endeavoured to do, the physiological processes; here he shows his medical knowledge.


Koṣṭā b. Lūkā dealt very fully with occult subjects; his most important work in this field, which survives in a Latin translation, is "On natural affinities" or more explicitly "Letters on incantations, conjurations and appendages for the neck (amulets)"; in which he assumes such things to be facts and discusses them more fully (cf. Thonndike, op. cit.); he interprets them however by autosuggestion and in the case of amulets thinks they have effect because they have an encouraging and strengthening influence on the spirit. It was probably through such studies that he came to deal with the subject of sand-figures in his K. fi 'Amal al-Ašār aš-ṣūrān al-Ḍawānīn wa-ta'wilası minaḥ al-Naṭājīn, "On the use of the instrument on which the ḍawānīn are marked and with which they are sustained".

In mathematics Koṣṭā b. Lūkā, like many others, dealt with the difficult and obscure passages in Greek works. His treatise on the proof of the wellknown rule of the two errors (Kīṭāb fi 'l-Burhān 'aṭla 'Amal Ḥisāb al-Khaṭā'īn), is pure algebra, that on numerical problems (Kīṭāb al-Masā'il al-adādiyya) on the al-Talāfī calculation (coincidence) are on the way to algebra, K. fi Ḥisāb al-Talāfī 'aṭla Diqat al-Djar wa-l-Mušābala. From a treatise by Ibn al-Haithām (Fi Masā'il al-Talāfī, "On the problem of coincidence; cf. on this method of calculation, E. Wiedemann in S. R. F. M. S., Erl., 1917; St. Petersburg, Rosen, Catalogue, S. 179") we see that it dealt with problems like the following: two men A and B came to the market and wished to buy an article. Neither has sufficient money: A says to B, give me 3rd of what you have then I can buy the article. No, says B to A, give me 2 of what you have then I can buy it. — From the title in Koṣṭā b. Lūkā it is evident that he solved the problem with equations, while Ibn al-Haithām took a more roundabout way. We know practically
nothing of any geometrical work by Köstâ b. Lûkâ. He wrote an introduction to geometry in the form of questions and answers (K. Mu'âkhal ilâ 'Imr al-Harâsâ 'ala al-Masâ'il wa l-Lûqâdâbî); he dealt with cones and spheres etc. To this part of his work probably belonged the treatise, on the part which cannot be divided (like the point) (K. fi 'l-Lûqâ 'âllâghî lâ jâhâzûsû). We know more however of his astronomical work. He wrote a treatise (Oxford, Uri, 879, No. 2). On the form (structure) of the spheres (K. Hâyât al-Afâkhû). It must have been composed at the same time as, or very little later than, the famous Astronomy of al-Farghânî (d. 861); from the scientific point of view it is on a much higher level than the latter and goes more into details; excellent diagrams make the subject clearer. It also deals with problems not in al-Farghânî, for example the measurement of the degrees between Tadmor and al-Râkâ and a method hitherto ascribed to al-Birûnî of measuring the circumference of the earth. Köstâ b. Lûkâ's work seems to me to have been used as a foundation by numerous later writers.

Köstâ b. Lûkâ devoted a good deal of attention to the construction of astronomical instruments; the first work to be mentioned in this connection is his K. fi 'l-Amal bi 'l-Kura dâ'â al-Kursî, on the use of the sphere with an axis (cf. Kûrâ). It survives in several manuscripts some complete, others incomplete, and has also been copied or utilised in other works. Another astronomical work is "On the use of the great astronomical cones", K. al-Amal bi 'l-Kura al-kabira al-nu'dûniyya. Whether working with other instruments e.g. on a ball-shaped astrolabe, K. fi 'Amal al-Afâkhûlâbî al-kursî, are by Köstâ b. Lûkâ need not be discussed here (cf. H. Seemann and Th. Mittelberger, Das kugelförmige Astrolab, Abhandl. zur Gesch. der Naturw., part viii., 1925, p. 46). In keeping with the spirit of his age Köstâ b. Lûkâ also wrote an introduction to astrology (K. al-Mu'âkhal fi 'lmu al-Nu'dûmî). The "Paradise of History", K. al-Fîrûdûs fi 'l-Tabiîbî, composed in Armenia perhaps was similar in nature. Of writings on physics may be mentioned those on the burning glass (al-Mawâya al-nuhrîkâ), and on the Kûrâ (cf. the book on weights and measures (al-Awsân wa l-Mâjîrî) which was certainly used by the Archbishop Elijâ for his book of the same name (cf. Th. Ibel, Über die Wage etc., Inaug. Diss. Erlangen 1906, p. 97). Of special importance is the translation of Hero's Bâguvûkûs (Kitâb fî Râf' al-Azîyâ al-thâ'lî), "On the raising of heavy bodies"; it has been edited with French translations by Carra de Vaux, J. A., ix., 1893, i. 386—472 and ii. 152—269, 420—514 and German by L. Nix and W. Schmidt in Heroëns Opern samtl., f.; further bibliographical references were given in these editions and also in C. Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 204. Not the least important point about this work by Köstâ b. Lûkâ is the insight into Greek mechanics that it gives us.

Bibliography: For the Arabic sources see at the beginning of Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichte der arabischen Ära, No. 100; L. Leclercq, Histoire de la médecine arabes, i. 1970, p. 157; H. Suter, Das Mathematiker-Verzeichnis im Febist etc., Abb. zur Gesch. der mathem. Wissenschaften, vi. 1892, p. 43; do, Die Mathematiker etc., ibid., xi. 1900, p. 40 and appendix, xiv., 1902; C. Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 204; L. Thornâdé, A History of Magic and Experimental Science, i. 1923, p. 652 sq. (E. Wiedemann)

Kôtel (from the Armenian kâhê, bank, "side"); Frânkel, Aram. Fremdwörter (p. 223) in Persian means a mountain pass, a neck between two peaks. This word, which does not appear in any Persian dictionary, is borrowed from Eastern Turkish, which took it from the Armenian; it is found in the Bahâr-nâma, ed. Ilinsky, p. 99, l. 23; p. 100, l. 1; p. 172, l. 18; p. 166, l. 22; cf. Radiol, Opîn., ii., col. 1277; Pavet de Courteille, Dict. türkoriental, p. 463. (C. Huart)

Kîy, the word used in western Turkish for village. It is the form in which Turkish has borrowed the Persian gîy (cf. Bittner, Der Einfluss des Arabischen und Persischen auf das Türkische, S. B. Ak. Wien, exil., No. 3, p. 103) or perhaps more correctly kîy (Vullers, Lexicon; Burhan-i Kâtî, p. 759) meaning originally path, street. In the geographical nomenclature of the Ottoman empire we find many place-names composed with kîy, like Boghâz Kîy, Ermeni Kîy, etc. It seems that these names are not found before the end of the Seljûk period. Kîy in the sense of an open village is opposed to kahâba meaning a small town. In eastern Turkish place-names we always find the word kund used for a village. Sometimes this last word seems to have replaced by kîy (cf. e.g. Ritter, Erdkunde, xi. 221 sqq.: Kâdi Kend, near al-Mawûlî, becomes Kâdi Kîy). (J. H. Kramers)

Koyun Baba, lit. "father of sheep", a Turkic saint. He is thought to have been a contemporary of Hâddîji Bektaş [q.v.] and is said to have received his name from the fact that he did not speak, but only bleated like a sheep five times a day at the periods for prayer. Sulân Bâyazîl II, called Wâli, built a splendid tomb and devotional monastery on the site of his alleged grave at ʽOthmândîk (near Amasia, in Anatolia) which was one of the finest and richest in the Ottoman empire. Ewliyâ Čelebi in his Travels (Seyahetnâme, ii. 180 sqq.) describes very fully the great Bektaşî monastery there, at which he was cured of a malady of the eye and was initiated into the order. Cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., i. 608, on Ewliya's pilgrimage to the tomb of Koyun Baba. Nothing is known regarding the life of this remarkable saint not even whether he really existed. That he is represented as a disciple and contemporary of Hâddîji Bektaş means nothing, as almost all early Ottoman saints are credited with having enjoyed this privilege. The sanctuary itself does not seem to have been examined; but see Maercker in Z. E. G., xxxiv., 1899, p. 376.

Bibliography: Hâddîji Khalîfâ, Dîkânâmâmî, p. 625 sq. (brief mention of the tomb); Ewliyâ, Seyahetnâmâ, ii. 180 sqq.; cf. also J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 230 and 608 (extracts from Ewliyâ). (Franz Babinger)

Koyundîk, a little village, which was built on the great group of artificial mounds, that cover the ruins of the royal palaces of Nineveh, opposite the town of al-Mawûlî, to the east of the Tigris. The name of this village is not found in the middle ages nor in the Turkish authors of the xviiith century; it has been thought, however, that the name is connected with the dynasty of the Kara Koyunî, which reigned in this region.
in the xviith century (von Oppenheim). After being for the most part destroyed by Kurds in 1836, the village was moved to the alluvial plain between the mounds and the Tigris, after archaeological excavations had begun in 1845. The Arab authors of the middle ages, from Ibn Khordadhbih, know the site of Nineveh under the name of Ninawā (the vocalisation of Yākūt, iv. 780; nowadays it is also pronounced Nainawā) and connect the place with the story of the prophet Yūnūs b. Mattai. Al-Makdisi also calls it Nānawā (Niebuhr likewise speaks of Қa’l Naun’ia; perhaps the name was changed under the influence of the Arabic word meaning the fish of Yūnūs) and he mentions near it the mound of Tell al-Tawba, on the top of which was a mosque surrounded by houses of  {	extit{mudāwāra}}. This last place is the present village of Nabi Yūnūs, to the south of Koyunjik and also within the bounds of the ancient Nineveh. This village is separated from the ruins by the little stream of Khamṣār (the name is already found in al-Makdisi) and was called Ninia in the time of Niebuhr. Ibn DIJBAYR (ed. Wright—de Goeje, p. 236) says that the ancient walls and the gateways can still be distinctly seen and Ibn Batūṭa says the same thing in almost identical words. In the xiiith century Ninawā was inhabited by Christians (Abu ʻl-Faraj Barhebnaeus,  {	extit{Tāriikh makhṭūṣar al-Dunāl}}, ed.  {	extit{Saḥiḥ}}, p. 393). The mounds of Ninawā have always been an inexhaustible quarry for building materials for the inhabitants of al-Mada’in.

Excavations were begun in 1842 by the French consul Botta, already famous for his work at Khorsabād. A. H. (afterwards Sir Henry) Layard then took in hand the excavations, first from 1845 to 1847 and again from 1849 to 1851, employing Arab and Nestorian workmen. A great many of the objects discovered were taken to London. Since then excavation has definitely ceased, all the trenches have been filled up so that now the ruins present the same appearance as before the discoveries.


{	extbf{KRĪM}} (the Crimea), a peninsula on the northern shore of the Black Sea. The name (of uncertain origin) was at first given in the xiiith century to the town of Solghat or Solkhād, now called Starfy Krīm ("Old Krīm"), then the residence of the Mongol governor, in the interior of the country south-west of Kafa [q. v.] and north-east of Sudak. Towards the end of the xviith or beginning of the xviiith century, the old name was driven out by the new one as is shown by the words of al-Kalāshandāi (ma‘adīn Solghatī—wa-qād ghulahu  {	extit{al}-alīshī  {	extit{tābial}}}  {	extit{a}}) quoted by Tiesenhausen, Sbornik materialov, otvyashchih k istorii Zolotoi Ordii, St. Petersburg 1884, p. 401). The old name, the origin of which is likewise unknown (cf. the very artificial Turkish etymology in Muḥ. Rıḍa, al-Salih al-Sayyīr, ed. Kazem-Bey, Kazan 1822, p. 78) and which must be presumed to have been in existence before the Mongol period, cannot be found before the xiiith century. In Greek legends of saints and lists of bishops, we find the fortress of Fulla or Fullai mentioned, the residence of the Khazar governor of the eastern part of the peninsula along with Sugaia (Sudak); it is assumed that the position of this fortress corresponded to the site of Solghat.

There are only scanty references in the Arab geographers to the peninsula; Idrisi's statements (transl. Jaubert, ii. 400) about the harbours are, as the forms of the names show, probably taken from the reports of Italian sailors; apparently the trading relations of the Italian cities even then reduced to 28 nakhods (5.37 grammes = 83 grains) and in order to check the export of Persian silver to Russia and India it was again reduced to 26 nakhods (4.98 grammes = 77 grains) in 1857. The standard of fineness was normally .960, but both weight and fineness varied considerably at the different provincial mints with the probity of the provincial authorities. In 1877 (1294) the provincial mints were abolished and all the coins were henceforth struck at Teherān with modern European machinery under the supervision of an Austrian mintmaster, Bergrath von Pechan. Since this date the two-krān piece (do ḥazar dinār) has been the common silver coin; the one krān is not uncommon. Five krān pieces, half and quarter krāns have also been occasionally struck but are rarely seen in currency. The weight of the krān continued to be reduced (in 1327 = 1909, it was 4.54 grammes = 71 grains, just half its original weight) and the fineness has also suffered. On the coins the denomination is as a rule expressed in multiples of the dinār (1 krān = 1,000 dinārs) except that the quarter krān is called a ṭābiyah. On a few 2 krān pieces of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh, on those of Muḥammad ʻAlī Shāh (1324—1327 = 1907—1909) and of the first two years of Ahmad Shāh (1327—1345 = 1909—1926) however the name krān is found on the coins.
extended to the northern shore of the Black Sea. The first Muhhamadan campaign to the Crimea was undertaken shortly before the Mongol conquest by the Turks of Asia Minor under Sultan ʿAlī al-Dīn Kaikubād (616–634 = 1219–1236) (Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seljoucides, ed. Houtsma, iii. 328 sqq.). In the reign of the Khān of the Golden Horde, Berke, about 1265, ʿizz al-Dīn Kāwūs, who had been driven out of Asia Minor and liberated from Byzantine imprisonment by Berke, was given the towns of Sołkhād and Sūrā (Sołdak) as a fief (Recueil, etc., iv. 298; cf. above, i. p. 708); in these towns he was followed by his son Ghiyāḥ al-Dīn Masʿūd (Recueil, iv. 335). Tartar coins were struck in Krīm, as the town is always called on the coins, from 686 (1287/1288).

In Arabic sources of the Mongol period the name is always written al-Krīm and is vocalised by Ibn Batṭūta (ed. Defrémery-Sanguinetti, ii. 359) as "Kīram". In the report of the first Egyptian embassy to the court of Berke (text in Tiesenhausen, Sbornik, etc., p. 54), Krīm is described as a "village" (karya) inhabited by different peoples (Kipchak, Russians and Alans); on the other hand Ibn Batṭūta calls it "a large and beautiful town". In 686 (1287/1288) an architect and 1000 men were sent to Egypt by the Khān to build a mosque in Krīm to bear the name of the Egyptian Sultan (Maḳṭriti, text in Tiesenhausen, Sbornik, p. 423); among the ruins of Old Krīm there have actually survived ruins of a mosque built in the Egyptian style. The mosque built by Khān Uzbeq in 714 (1314/1315) is in quite a different style of architecture.

Even the earliest rulers of the house of Gīrāy (cf. above, ii., p. 171 but better perhaps Gīrej) lived in the town of Krīm and struck coins there. During the civil troubles of the second half of the 12th (xvth) century under Mengli-Girei, the town is said to have been completely destroyed; but we find coins struck in Krīm as late as 923 (1517) in the reign of Muhammad Gīrej (O. Rotsowski, Die Münzen der Girej, Moscou 1905, p. 71). On the ruins of Old Krīm, which have been several times explored and described but have suffered severely from depredations, cf. especially P. Köppen, Krīmskiy Sbornik, St. Petersburg 1837, p. 340 sqq.; W. Smirnow, in Zap., i. 275 sqq. Excavations were begun there in 1925 under the auspices of the Association for Oriental Studies and continued in 1926.

Under Ottoman suzerainty (from 880/1475) the name of the former capital was extended to the whole peninsula and its population (Krīm Khali, Krīm Tartar, Krīm Khali, Krīm Tartar, 1827, ed. W. Radloff, Berlin, 4 ser., 1. Wörterbuch des Turk-Dialecites, ii. 745). The peninsula with its population of different stocks (this was the only place where remnants of the Goths had survived) and its monuments of ancient and early Christian culture became in this period almost completely influenced by Islām and Turkish culture. For the history of the Crimea in this period and the pertinent literature see the articles BACHE SARKI and GIREJ.

After the final incorporation of the Crimea in Russia (1783), the Muslim population was expressly guaranteed complete religious liberty. The text of this edict was later incorporated in the articles of the Russian code relating to religious liberty. A special office of Mufīs for the Crimea was created, completely independent of the Mufīs of the Volga area in Ufī, and as in Ufī a "spiritual authority" was appointed. On the other hand under the influence of Greek ideas then favoured by the government, Greek culture was encouraged at the expense of Turkish. The kingdom of the former Tatar Khāns was now called the "Tauric territory" (1784, abolished 1797), later (from 1802) "Tauric government".

The capital of the government was Aḵ Mečet, which had been burned by the Russians in 1736 and now received the name of Simferopol; other towns arose on other sites with Greek names, notably the naval base of Sebastopol. Old Krīm was now called Livadia and the name never became popular. Russian and Greek immigration and the migration of a large part of the Tatar population to Turkey has wrought a complete change in the character of the population. The Muslims (according to the census of 1913, M. I., 1913, p. 761 only 206,113) are now small in numbers compared with the Christians (less than one third of the total population).

After the revolution of 1917 the Muḥammadan population, as everywhere in Russia, endeavoured without particular success to constitute themselves into an independent community on a religious and not a national basis, acting independently of the government. The government itself, however, was not actually in control of the state. The territory north of the isthmus of Perekop was later separated from the former "Tauric government" and joined to the Ukraine republic. The peninsula now forms the "Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republic of Krīm".

Even before the Revolution, the educated "Krīm Tartars" disclaimed this name given them by the Turks; (the name of "Tatars" also occurs in native documents). They wished to be known simply as Turks and their language to be called Turkish (it is really very much influenced by the literary language of the Ottoman empire). At the present day the language of the literature, produced mainly in Simferopol, is called "Turkish", even officially, in contrast to the "Tatar" literary language of the Volga territory.

Bibliography: (so far as not given in the text): Jū. Kulakowskij, Pragłowy Trawód, Kiew 1914; A. Garkavi (Harkavy), Kitābīskī poluostrov do mongolskago nashestviya v arabskoi literature (Trudy IV Arch. Selsda, ii., 1891, p. 239 sqq.). For the later literature see especially the article "Krīm" in Geogrǎfo-statističeskij Slovar Russkoi Imperii, St. Petersburg 1863–1873 (with full bibliography). On the "nationalistic aspirations of the Krīm-Tartars" in the years 1917–1918 cf. Velagin in Novyi Vestnik, v. 190 sqq.; vi. 205 sqq. — On the excavations in Old Krīm cf. ibid., xiii.—xiv. 271 sqq.; xv. 360 sqq. (W. BARTHOLD)

KROYA, a town and fortress in Al-bania, once the headquarters of Skanderbeg [q.v.]. Kroya (Turk. Aḵ-Ḫeşār) sometimes also called Aḵe-Ḫeşār or Aḵ Serāy has had a storied history. It is believed to be built on the site of the ancient Euriboea. Its history in the middle ages has still to be investigated. It is said to have been founded by the Neapolitan noble Carlo Thorip, whose ancestors held the land between Tirana and Durazzo about the middle of the xivth century. The remains of the ancient defences seem to be of Italian origin. Kroya only acquired renown when the Albanian patriot George Kastrioti,
The administrative district of the Kuban — before 1918 the province (oblast) of the Kuban Cossacks — also included the valleys, further north, of the Baisug, Cephau, Starlka and the left bank of the Yeya, all flowing towards the Sea of Azov or ending in lakes and marshes. This territory between the chain of the Caucasus and the sea stretched to the north as far as the province of the Don Cossacks and to the east as far as that of the Terek Cossacks. The area of this great province, which is divided into 7 arrondissements (Yeya, Temrui, Kawakzi, Ekaterinodar, Maikop [in Turkish: *much oil*], Laba, Batial-pashinsk), was estimated at about 32,000 sq. miles. Klaproth, Tabulae du Caucase, Paris 1827, p. 89, estimated the tribes of the Kuban at about 100,000 families. According to the Russian Encyclopaedia, the native population about 1861 was 200,000 men (7) but as a result of expatriations, decreases in population and the number of population which was begun by the Cossacks about 1861 had reached 1,500,000 by 1894. In 1916, official statistics put the whole population of the province at over 3,000,000. The number of "highlanders" and "Sinnis" included in this total had also increased and reached 139,000. The native elements indicated by these official terms which lack precision, included the remainder of the Cerkies and Abaz tribes (q. v.) (related to the Akhaks, q. v.) and Turks of Kara-Chai. The latter (about 15,000 in 1900) lived in the villages (*ontu*) of Khurt-Djurt, Uz-Kulan and Khoruzhuk, etc. in the upper waters of the Kuban and spoke a northern Turkish dialect (Noghai). They were at one time under the Cerkies princes of Kabarda and in 1822 submitted to the Russians.

After 1920, the territory of Kuban was re-organised on an ethnic basis: besides the Kabardab-Byal region (on the Terek) two autonomous (within the Soviet system) areas were created on the Kuban: 1. Kara-Chai-Cerkies, east of Urup with its capital Batial-pashinsk; it has about 150,000 inhabitants of whom 45% are Turks, 25% Cerkies and 30% Cossacks; 2. Adighe, a strip of territory along the Kuban, and Laba; its 100,000 Tuk-tamukai and it contains about 70,000 Cerkies.

The new divisions do not correspond to old administrative divisions.

The basin of the Kuban has been inhabited since the bronze age. The oldest tombs at Maikop go back to the second (according to Rostovtzeff, to the third) millennium B.C. The Scythian tombs of the fourth-fifteenth centuries B.C. are very numerous (Kelermes, Voronezksamia and Sarmatian tombs from the second century B.C. to the first A.D. The Greeks called the Kuban Hypanis, Vardanes, Antilites. In Byzantine authors we find Koubak, Koubak (Marquart, Osteurop. Streifzüge, p. 72), and of Christianity among the Adighe (Cerkies) according to local legends dates from the emperor Justinian (527-565); cf. Shora Nogmow, Istoria adigheiskago naroda, Tiflis 1861, p. 43.

The Arabs were not well acquainted with the district. According to a bold conjecture of Marquart (ibid.), p. 37, 161, 164, Kuban is read for Duba (Kubba), which according to Gardizi (quoting Djalhani, c. 301 = 914) formed the southern boundary of the Madjar (Madyara) and to the south of which (on the left bank) lived (Ibn Rusta, p. 139) the Twals, probably an Allan
tribe [q. v.] (cf. the southern Ossete tribe of Tsiai-ta and the name of the Alans: A.). On the other hand Mas'ñi (Miriñi al-Dhabab, ii., p. 45–46) says that the immediate neighbours of the Alans were the Kašak living between the Caucasus and the Black Sea. The Kašak (a parallel form is al-Kašakiya, Mas'ñi, Kit. al-Tanbih, p. 157) are the Cerkès, whom the Russian chronicles call Kasagî and with whom the Russian principalities of Tmutarakan (on the peninsula of Taman in the xi.—xiiith century) had continuous relations.

The later history of the territory of Kuban is at first the story of the struggle between the Russians and Ottomans and more particularly the Khans of the Crimea for the possession of the fertile plains south east of the Sea of Azov and later of the struggle of the Russians with the warlike tribes of the left bank of the Kuban.

In the xviith century, Moscow's interest in the northern Caucasus was stimulated by the marriage of Ivan the Terrible with the Kabardian princess, Maria Temriukova (in 1561). Soon afterwards Sultan Selim II. seized the Caspian ports from Astrakhan and Dewlet-girai of the Crimea invaded Kabarda. In 1589 the Cossacks appeared before Azov, a former Venetian and Genoese colony which the Ottomans had taken in 880 (1475). A long series of struggles began for the possession of Azov (cf. Aza) and the Cerkès principality of Kabarda (to the east of the Kuban on both sides of the middle course of the Terek). Down to the beginning of the xviiith century the Khans of the Crimea had the upper hand and by about 1717 the Cerkès had been converted to Islam (Nogmow). By the Russo-Turkish treaty of 1739 the two Kabardas were proclaimed independent to constitute a buffer state between the two powers. By article 21 of the treaty Kubuk-Kainardji [q. v.] (1774), Great and Little Kabarda were placed under the suzerainty of the Khan of the Crimea whose independence was recognised (art. 3). In 1782 the Turks occupied Taman but by the edict of April 8, 1783, Catherine II proclaimed the annexation by Russia of the Crimea, Taman and the “Täitâs of Kuban”. On Dec. 28, 1783, the Porte recognised the course of the Kuban as the frontier. Between 1787 and 1791, the movement in the western Caucasus led by the religious leader Shaikî Mansîr caused the Russians considerable trouble but the Russo-Turkish treaty of Yassi (a town which owes its name to the A = Alân; cf. Tomaschek, in Pauly-Wissowa 2, i. 1282–1284) confirmed the frontier of 1753. The treaty of 1787 (art. 4) moved it southwards to the roadstead of St. Nicolas (between Poți and Batum) but the territory within these bounds was only effectively occupied 32 years later after a stubborn and heroic resistance of the tribus of the Kuban.

The line of defences of the Caucasus had been planned under the Empress Anna (1730–1740). In 1777 the line started from Azov and went by Stavropol, Georgiaw to Ekaterinograd (on the Terek). In 1792 it began at Pugaz (north of Anapa) and following the Kuban for a while, left it to go to Georgiaw (1794) and then 1758 to Ekaterinograd (cf. the map in the Arkiyogr. komissiis, Titlis 1668, i). In 1834 General Wielamino established a military cordon on the left bank of the Kuban as far as Gelendzij (on the Black Sea). In 1838 Noworossiisk (Tsemes) was founded on the site of the old Turkish fortress of Sudjuk-Kafâ. After risings provoked by the operations of the allies in the Crimean War, General Yewokimow in 1861 carried out an enveloping manoeuvre with the object of making the highlanders descend into the plains and of driving the rebels towards the coast to force them to migrate to Turkey. According to native sources (H. Bamme, in the Revue Politique Internationale, Nov.–Dec. 1918), 75,000 (?) refugees left the Caucasus in 1863; Russian sources give the number of emigrants at 13,586 from 1870–1884. In 1864, the Russians reached the passes of the chain of the Western Caucasus.


KUBBA (now Kuba), a district in the eastern Caucasus between Bâki and Derbend [q. v.]. The district of Kubba with an area of 2,800 square miles is bounded on the north by a large river, the Samûr, which flows into the Caspian, on the west by the “district” of Samûr which belongs to Dîghistân [q. v.], on the south by the southern slopes of the Caucasian range (peaks: Shâh-Dagh, 3,951 feet high, Hâba Dagh 11,900) which separate Kubba from Shamâkha (cf. the article shîrwân), on the S. E. by the district of Bâki and on the east by the Caspian. The area between the mountains and the flat coast land is called Dîft (Vullers, i. 499: Dîft, and generationen principis dominium principis.”). The plain between the rivers Yalama and Belbela is called Muslim; Shâbarâm lies further south (cf. shîrwân). The other contours are Barmek (so-called after a member of the Barmecide family, who sought refuge here in the reign of Hârun
his plans with those of the king Irakli of Georgia, Fath 'Ali met the latter at Shamkūr (Shamkhor) but soon afterwards fell ill and died in 1203 (1789).

The political and military work of Fath 'Ali Khān crumbled away under his successors. His young son Shāhi Khān 'Ali Aghā (from 1791) had a very adventurous career. This young Khān relied on the support of the Khāsjār but Count Zabow took Derbend on May 4, 1796 and entrusted the government to his sister Peri-Djash Khānum. Taken prisoner by the Russians, Shāhi Khān 'Ali Aghā escaped. The struggle. On the accession of the emperor Paul, Russian policy suddenly changed and the Russian troops were withdrawn. Shāhi Khān 'Ali returned to Derbend. In 1801 he and the other Khāns sent a delegation to Alexander I, but by 1805 we again find Shāhi 'Ali rebelling against the Russians to whom he caused continual trouble till 1826 (1811). The Khānate of Kubba was occupied by the Russians in 1806 and by the treaty of 1813 Persia renounced her claim to the eastern Caucasus. From its incorporation in the Russian empire, Kubba formed a "gouvernement" of Shirvan (later of Kuban). Since that time Kubba has been part of the republic of Acharbadjān, an autonomous and then Soviet; this is not to be confused with the Persian province of the name [q.v.].

Bibliography: cf. the articles Dāḡhīstān, Derbend, Shēkki and Sīrān. See especially the work of the local historian 'Abdūs Kuli Aghā Bakr-Khānow (a descendant of the Khāns of Bakr, who were related to Fath 'Ali Khān), the Gūliştān-i Iram of which a Russian version by the author himself (1794–1846) was published at Bakr in 1926 (Travaux de la société scientifique de l’Azerbaïdjan, part 4). The principal documents are in the collection by Aṭṭā Kāvāzākī, Avi-geografiteskö Komissii, publ. by A. Bergé, Tiflis 1866 sqq., i.—xii., index under Derbend—Kubba.

(V. Minorsky)

KUBBAT AL-ŠAKHRÁ, the Dome of the Rock, Jerusalem, often erroneously designated the Mosque of Omar. In the first place, it is not a mosque but a shrine or oratory erected above the sacred rock (saḥra) and similar to the other domed edifices scattered over the hārān area; in the second place, it was not built by Omar but by the fifth Umayyad Caliph, 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān. Jews, Christian and Muslim alike revere the sacred rock which they regard as the onphalēs of the world. It is even said to be 18 miles nearer heaven than any other spot. Muslims set it next to the Kāba in order of sanctity.

Although there is no specific mention of the saḥra in the O. T. it is referred to nevertheless in the Talmud and Targums. Here Melchizedek set up his altar; here Abraham sacrificed; here was the Bethel of Jacob; here was the threshing-floor of Arauna the Jebusite (II Sam., xxiv. 16 sqq.); here David worshipped; and here were the altars of Solomon, Zerubbabel and Herod. But Muhammadan tradition has greatly magnified all this legendary material. Angels visited the Rock 2,000 years before Adam was created, and Noah's ark rested here after the Deluge. It is said that it actually one of the rocks removed by Paul and that here on the Resurrection Day this Angel of Death, will blow the last trumpet. Preceding to this the Ka'ba will come from Makka as a bride unto the Saḥra. They assert that it rests on a
palm-tree beneath whose shade Asia, Pharaoh's wife, and Miriam, Moses' sister, will give the faithful a cooling draught from one of the rivers of the Garden. All the sweet waters on the earth are believed to originate somewhere beneath it. The Rock itself is, by others, reported to be miraculously hung between heaven and earth, but since this wonder was too remarkable for human eyes to behold, it has been purposely hidden by the surrounding building. Beneath the Rock is a cave (maghāra) the floor of which when stamped upon emits a hollow sound pointing to the presence of a cavern beneath, perhaps the well, the so-called 'Well of the Spirits' (bi'r ār-rūbēj) where the souls of the departed are believed to assemble twice weekly. This hollowness of walls and floor has no doubt given rise to the legend of its being suspended in mid-air. Tradition states that all the prophets of God up to the time of Muhammad have come to pray here at the Rock which is daily surrounded by a body-guard of 70,000 angels (Ali Bey, Travels, ii. 220). God is said to have ordered Moses to institute the sākhra as the ābā, and Muhammad intended doing likewise only he was told by God to take the Ka'ba at Makka as the ābā. The change took place in Radjāb A.H. 2.

When 'Umar conquered Jerusalem (he (guided by Ka'b al-Aḥbār, the converted Jew) found the sākhra scandalously covered with filth. This he ordered to be removed by the Nabateans, and after three showers of heavy rain had cleansed the Rock, he installed the prayers there (Le Strange, Palestine under the Muslims, p. 139 sq.). In the years 69—72 (688—691), 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwan built the Dome of the Rock. The political situation at the time was the immediate cause of this undertaking. The rival claimant to the Caliphate, 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair, was favoured by the inhabitants of the Haramain (Makka and Madīna). Fearing lest his Palestinian subjects who visited the Ka'ba on pilgrimage should return infected with the spirit of revolt, 'Abd al-Malik determined on a plan to divert the Makkan pilgrims from the seditious area and lead them instead to Jerusalem. After sending out feelers in the shape of circulars stating his intentions, and after receiving warm support, he proceeded with his project, the embellishment of Jerusalem (de Vogüé, Le Temple de Jérusalem, p. 75). Then he declared to his people: "This Rock (sākhra) shall be unto you in the place of the Ka'ba" (Yā'qūbī, ii. p. 311). For the expenses of the building he is said to have set apart a sum equal to the revenue from Egypt for seven years, and as a treasure-house for this money he commanded to be built after his own design the edifice in the neighbourhood that is now known as the Kubbat al-Sitāla (Dome of the Chain). This building is said to have pleased him so much that he ordered the Dome of the Rock to be modelled after it. The Sākhra was surrounded by a latticed screen of ebony and curtains of brocade. At this time also a precious pearl, the horn of Abraham's ram, and the crown of Khosraw were suspended to the chain which hung in the centre of the Dome, but with the coming of the 'Abbāsid these were transferred to the Ka'ba (Palmer, Jerusalem, p. 86). In those days the building was so full of incense that a person who had been there was known at once by the odour which clung to him. Another reason why 'Abd al-Malik built the Kubbat al-Sākhra is given by al-Mu'addadī, who says that the Caliph "noting the greatness of the Dome of the Kūmanā [the Christian Church of the Anastasis (kīyâma corrupted to Ḥumāma ordure)] and its magnificence, was moved lest it should dazzle the minds of the Muslims, and hence erected, above the Rock, the Dome which now is seen there" (Le Strange, Pal. Explor. Fund's Q; 1887, viii., p. 103). For long, controversy has been waged regarding the true founder and builder of the Kubbat al-Sākhra. It seemed too wonderful an achievement for the Arabs. Ferguson argued that it was the work of Byzantine architects under Constantine and that it marked the site of the Holy Sepulchre. Conder was the chief opponent of this view. No doubt 'Abd al-Malik employed Greek architects in the construction, and there was abundance of Greek columns and capitals at hand among the ruins of the churches destroyed by the Persians, which could easily be incorporated into the structure. Ferguson's argument, besides being fallacious, is contrary to the evidence of Arab historians.

That the Kubbat al-Sākhra was erected by 'Abd al-Malik is indicated by the famous Kāfic inscription in yellow and blue tiles above the cornice round the base of the Dome: "Hath built this dome the servant of Allah, 'Abd al-Malik, commander of the Faithful, in the year two and seventy — Allah accept him". When the 'Abbāsid Caliph al-Ma'mūn repaired the place in 831 A.D. and built the octagonal wall, some of the tiles were removed and others containing this Caliph's name inserted in place of 'Abd al-Malik's. But the forgery is easily detected, the tiles are of a darker blue while the letters of the name are closer together (a chromo-lithographic facsimile is to be found in de Vogüé, ibid., pl. xxii.).

In the year 846 A.D. on the night of the great earthquake, the keepers of the Kubbat al-Sākhra testified that the Dome was cleft in twain so that they could see the stars and feel the rain on their faces. Then a still small voice said: "Put it back again"; and soon the dome resumed its former position. During another earthquake in 407 (1016), the dome fell down on the Sākhra (Ibn al-Aḥḍar, al-Kāmil, ix. 209). Six years later was restored by Ḥākim (see de Vogüé, ibid., pl. xxxvii.). There is a fragmentary inscription (pl. xxiii.) inside on the tile-work dated 418 A.H. (1027 A.D.) marking further repairs. The author of the Muhār al-Chirām ("The exciter of desire", i.e. to visit Jerusalem) says: "In the year 452 (1060) the Great Lantern (tannûr) that hung in the Dome of the Rock fell down and there were in this lantern five hundred lamps". This was taken as a bad augury (Le Strange, ibid., p. 130). In 1099 the Crusaders entered Jeru- salem and the building, endowed by Baldwin II, became the Templum Domini, the Church of the Knights Templars. It was redecorated inside and outside with Christian paintings and images of the saints. A marble altar was set up on the Sākhra, and a large golden cross on the summit of the dome. A large iron screen of French workmanship with four gates was erected between the pillars of the inner ring. The cave beneath was transformed into a Chapel. They believed it to be the Holy of Holies, and called it the Confessio (Janoes Phocas, P. P. T. S., p. 20). The building thus became the type of "Temple" Churches built...
in Europe. The dome was the symbol of the order and appeared on the Grand Master's seal. A polygonal type of building reminiscent of the Dome of the Rock appears in Raphael's *Marriage of the Virgin* as the Jewish Temple (de Vogüé, *ibid.*, p. 78, note).

In 1187 Saladin captured the Holy City. The Golden Cross on the dome was knocked down amidst the cheers of the Muslims and all impurities, such as the marble casing on the Rock, removed. In the cave below, prayers were made in his presence, led by the Kāfīl of Damascus. (For a contemporary account see Ibn al-Alhār, *ibid*.) The lengthy inscriptions copied down by John of Wurzburg must have been destroyed at this period since no trace of them now remains. Instead there can now be seen inside the Cupola the inscription set up by Saladin to record his restoration (text in de Vogüé, *ibid.*, p. 91 sq.). There have been other restorations since. In 1447 part of the roof was destroyed by fire, caused it is said by certain young noblemen hunting there for pigeons with a lighted candle. A complete renovation took place under Sulaimān the Magnificent (1520–1566). Until recent years little was done to remedy the ravages of time. *Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem*, 1865, p. 32. Nowadays the authorities are anxious to maintain the building in a condition worthy of its past splendour.

The building itself is of harmonious proportions and stands, along with some minor edifices, on an irregular platform, 10 feet in height, paved with limestone slabs. The Šakḫra is almost on a level with this pavement, the highest point being only five feet above it (or c. 2,440 feet above the Mediterranean). Six flights of steps leading up to the platform end in elegant columns or arcades called *marwaḥi*, or *balances*, because here on the Resurrection Morn all things will be duly weighed in the balances of justice. The building is in the shape of a regular octagon, with side 66 feet in length. The diameter within is 152 feet; that of the dome at its base being 66 feet. The dome, 99 feet high, is wooden, covered outside with lead, and inside with stucco, beautifully gilded and richly ornamented. The exterior of the building was formerly covered with marble but this has partly been displaced by the Қašẖāni porcelain tiles added by Sulaimān the Magnificent in 1561. Indeed during the xvth century, the whole edifice was restored and embellished so that the external incrustation of the walls, the beautiful stained glass windows, and numerous other decorative effects throughout are characteristically Turkish. Kurānic passages wonderfully inscribed in interwoven characters form a frieze round the building. There is a perfect harmony in the colour scheme. The fenestration is remarkably fine, especially in the case of one window near the Western Doorway.

In the interior four massive piers and twelve columns surround the Šakḫra in the centre. The dome rests on these. Another series of supports consists of an octagonal screen composed of eight piers and sixteen columns, two columns occurring between each pair of the six-sided piers. In this way the interior is divided into three concentric parts. The outer octagonal aisle is 13, the inner, 40 feet wide. The doors face the four cardinal points: North, Bah-i-Djanna (Gate of Paradise); South, Bah-i-Khila (South Gate); East, Bah-i-Nabi David (Gate of the Prophet David) or Bah-i-Sīhla (Gate of the Chain); West, Bah-i-Ǧāhr (West Gate). The teak (*jadi*) doors have very artistic old locks and are covered with bronze plates stamped with a Küfe inscription (dated 216 A.H.). The building consists of basement (16 feet high) with the aforementioned doors; a storey of plain masonry (20 feet high) with seven round arches on each side, 38 of which are pierced for windows, the rest being blind; and, lastly, the wonderfully proportioned dome above. The pavement is laid with marble mosaic fastened down by clamps run in with lead.

The Rock, about 36 feet long by 42 feet wide, is almost semi-circular in form, the curved sloping side lying to the East, and the higher straight side to the West. Geologically it forms a portion of one of the harder grey beds of the Jerusalem plateau, and has been left practically in its rough unshaven state throughout the ages. In visiting this sacred spot the devout pilgrim has to be careful to keep the Šakḫra on his right hand, so that he performs the circumambulation of the holy relic in the opposite direction from the circuit of the Ka’ba. Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi (in his *Ibl al-Farid*, transl. in part by Le Strange in *Pal. Quart. Stat.*, 1887, p. 99) states: "Now when thou enterest the Šakḫra make thy prayer in the three corners thereof, and also pray on the slab which rivals the Rock itself in its glory for it lies over a gate of the gates of Paradise". This slab is a portion of the marble pavement near by the Bah-i-Djanna and is supposed by some to mark the place where the prophet Elias knelt in prayer. Others believe it covers the Tomb of Solomon (Kabir Sulaimān). All, however, assert that it was originally part of Paradise, and is generally termed the Flagstone of Paradise (Bahārat al-Djanna). A tradition has it that Muḥammad drove into this slab nineteen golden nails which are destined to drop out periodically. When all have fallen through, the end of the world has come. The Devil almost succeeded in removing them but the angel Gabriel intervened in the nick of time. Nowadays three nails remain in place, while one has sunk a little. It is with humble steps and slow, therefore, that the pious pilgrim treads this holy place lest by dislodging one of the nails he should hasten the day of judgment.

On a detached piece of a marble column on the S.W. of the Šakḫra, covered by a rude shrine which also contains hairs from the prophet's beard, is to be seen the *Kudam Muḥammad* (or Footprint) which he left behind him on the night of his ascension to heaven on his steed al-Barāḵ. During the Crusades when the Christians occupied the Kubbat al-Šakḫra this was known as the Footprint of Jesus. The round hole in the middle of the Rock was where the prophet's body pierced its way upwards. And near by is shown the very Saddle of al-Barāḵ in the shape of several marble fragments. There is also pointed out on the West side of the Rock the impression of the Handprint of Gabriel (Kan Sayidina Liğn-i II) where he held down the Rock when it was about to rise to Muhammad. Directly opposite are preserved the banners of Muhammad and 'Umar, and the buckler of Ḥanẓa. The cases containing these relics are dust-covered. Once a year this dust is carefully gathered and sold in minute quantities as a panacea of miraculous power. A slight depression in the pavement on the East side of the Rock is pointed
out as the Footprint of Idris. In the N. E. corner is the recess known as the Prophets' Kibla (Kibbat al-Anbiyā'). There are also several ancient Kur'an and a dwarf screen known as Ta'ākjīd Sa'īd 'Ahl (the imitation of the sword of 'Ahl). The entrance to the cave beneath is by means of the Bāb al-Magharah, at the S. E. corner of the Rock, the pilgrim humbly descending the eleven steps with the following prayer on his lips, known as the "Prayer of Solomon": "O God, pardon the sinners who come here, and relieve the injured". The average height of the cave is six feet, and on the roof may be seen the impressions of Muhammad's head. The floor is paved with marble and the sides are whitewashed. It is said to be able to hold 62 persons (Ibn al-Fāţih, B.G.A., v. 100). A projecting piece of rock known as the Tongue of the Rock (Liṣān al-Sakhra) is so-called because it greeted 'Omar on one occasion. There is also to be seen the slender column supposed to uphold the Rock. The guide points out on the right the Mihrāb Sulāmān (Solomon's prayer-niche); on the left, the Māṣjām al-Khalīl (Abraham); on the N. corner, the Māṣjām al-Khīḍr with the Mihrāb Dā'ūd opposite.

On the S.E. of the Sakhra a staircase leads upwards to the gallery of the dome whence the crescent on the summit may be reached. The eulogy pronounced on it by Muḥammad (F. F. T. S., iv., p. 46) still holds good at the present day. At dawn on the roof may be seen the sun first strikes the Cupola, and the Drum catches the rays; then is this edifice a marvellous sight to behold, and one such that in all Islam I have never seen its equal! Bibliography: Besides the works mentioned in the text: R. Hartmann, Der Felsdom in Jerusalem, Strassburg 1909; Warren and Conder, Jerusalem; C. M. Watson, The Story of Jerusalem; Schick, Beit al-Maklās, index; Sepp, Die Heilskümmel, eine Justinianische Sophienkirche, Munich 1882; Ferguson, The Temple of the Jews, London 1878; Conder, The High Sanctuary at Jerusalem (paper read at the Institute of British Architects opposing Ferguson's views) and 'Ent Work in Palestine, ii. 320 sqq.; Lewis, The Holy Places of Jerusalem, ch. iii.; E. Pierotti, Jerusalem Explored, London 1864; ch. ii.; Wolfe, Der Tempel von Jerusalem, Graz 1887, p. 20, 50, 76; A. Goodrich-Free, Inner Jerusalem, London 1904, ch. xv.; W. M. Thomson, The Land and the Book, 1913, new ed., p. 699 sq.; Baederker and Murray; Hughes' Dict. of Islam, s.v.; Palest. Quart. Stat., index; Palet. Pilgrims' Text Society, index; J. K. A.S., xiii. 258 sqq.; al-Ya'qūbī, Ta'rikh, ed. Houtsma, ii. 311; H. Sauvêtre, Histoire de Jerusalem et d'Hebron (part translation of Muqīr al-Dīn, Ittāl-Dīlāyī); Idrisi, ed. J. Gildemeister, Z.D.P.V., 1885, viii. 7; M. Stanislaus Guyard, Géographie d'Al-Andalus, ii. 3 sqq.; Ibn Battiże, Qudīz, ed. Defremery and Sanguinetti, i. 120 sqq.; Ibn Khallikān, Biogr. Dict., tr. de Slane, iv. 521; Rabbi Petachia of Ratisbon, Tour du Monde, Paris 1831, p. 98 sq.; Benjamin of Tudela, Itinerary, tr. A. Asher, London 1840, i. 70; Zimmermann, Karten und Flächen zur Geschichte des Alten Jerusalem, Basel 1864; C. Diehl, Manuel d'Art Byzantine; H. Hagenmeyer, Fulkeri Carnotensis Historia, i. xxvi. 7 sqq.; K. A. C. Cresswell, The Origin of the plan of the Dome of the Rock, British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, supp. papers, No. 2, London 1924; E. T. Richmond, The Dome of the Rock, Oxford 1924; Gaudefoy-Demolybes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mauretanks, p. 60 sqq.; Mariti, Histoire de l'État présent de Jerusalem, p. 249 sqq. Paris 1853; Nāṣir Khusraw, Sefer Namah, ed Schefe, p. 89 sqq.; Muḥammad al-Batānūnī, al-Riḥla al-Hāfīṣiya, i. 162 sqq., Cairo 1329; van Berchem, C.I.A., p. iii., v. 267, 754; Z. D. P. F., xiv. 34 sqq.; Finn, Stirring Times, ii. 250; Robinson, Biblical Researches in Palestine, London 1841, i. 40 sqq.; Conder, The City of Jerusalem, 236 sqq. (J. Walker) KUBILAI (usually written Kūbīlāi but also "Kubilai"), Mōngol emperōr (1260–1294), brother and successor of Khān Mongke. He was probably born in 1214; when Cīngiz Khān returned in 1225 to Mongolia from his campaign in Western Asia, Kūbīlāi, who was then eleven years old, had just gained his first trophy of the chase; after the Mongol fashion, Cīngiz Khān himself smeared his thumb with flesh and fat (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. Bersezin, Tratt. Vest. Oud. Arkh. Oth. d'Est., v. 141, text). In the reign of his brother he was governor of China from 1251 and devoted himself to the conquest of the Sung dynasty, which was only completed in his own reign (1279), whereby the whole of China, for the first time since the tenth century, was again united under one ruler. After a victory over his brother Arīgh-Baga who was proclaimed Emperor in Mongolia (cf. the article BEREKE), Kūbīlāi remained in China and transferred the capital of the Mongol empire to Peking (Khānbalīk, q.v.). In spite of great achievements at home (Imperial Canal, new code of criminal law, Academy) and abroad (great, although unsuccessful campaigns at sea against Japan and the island of Java, such as had never been undertaken in the history of China, before or after), his reign was for China a period of oppressive foreign rule. Kūbīlāi was, like most Mongol emperors, favourably disposed to Islam and the Muslims; only for a time (seven years, 1282–1289, of which the first four years are described as a period of severe persecutions) as a result of the events connected with the assassination of the minister Ahmad (see KHANBALIK) did the Muslims fall into disfavour with him. Bibliography: fullest source: Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. Blochet, p. 350–580; cf. also Waqīṣī, ed. Bombay, 1269 H., p. 16 sqq.; d'Ossius, Histoire des Mongols, The Hague and Amsterdam 1834, ii. 275 sqq. (Kūbīlāi in China under Mongke), 338 sqq. (Kūbīlāi's own reign); Hollow, History of the Mongols, i. p. 187 sqq., 216 sqq. On the persecutions of the Muḥammandans also Zafr., xxii. 160 sqq. (W. BARKHOLD) KUBU, a district with self-government under the suzerainty of the Dutch Government in the southern part of the delta of the Kapuas river; it is of administrative purposes it belongs to the Pontianak division of the residency of "Westerafdeling van Borneo". In the north it is separated from the kingdom of Pontianak by the Great Kapuas river, in the east it is bounded by the districts of Tayan and Simpang, in the south and west by the China Sea. The ruling family is of Arab
KUBU — KÜÇÜK KAINARDJE

descent, the founder of the kingdom was Siyid Aïrûs al-Aïrûs who settled not far from the mouth of the river Têrente with a few Arab, Buginese and Malay followers about 1750, soon after his brother-in-law, the Arab adventurer Şafîj Aâlî al-Râhîmân al-Kâdrî, had founded the sultanate of Pontianak. The capital and kingdom received its name from an entrenchment (Malay: kubu) thrown up as a defence against raids by pirates. He put himself under the protection of the Dutch East India Company who recognised him as ruler with the title tânu (lord). The land is of little importance; it consists for the most part of a swampy wooded plain which is only in parts drained (mainly in the Ambawang district in the north-west) and fitted only for primitive tillage and growing cocomanuts. The population is not numerous and is very scattered. It consists almost entirely of immigrants; besides Arab half-breeds and a number of Chinese they are mainly Buginese. There are very few Dayaks. The predominant religion is Islâm but its observances are for the most part neglected; only here and there one finds a mosque which is falling to pieces. The ruler, whose capital is quite an insignificant settlement, governs with three notable (see) members of his family, each of whom is allotted a certain territory as an appanage.


KUBÛR, pl. of the Arabic kbur, which, besides its usual meaning of "tomb", has also that of "box, sheath or needle case", although it is not given in any dictionary; cf. Aâlî Vásîn, Kûbûr al-Khârûzî, p. 17. In North Africa one finds kbury, pl. kbur, "holters" (Beaussier). This plural passed into Ottoman Turk, as a singular, and was borrowed later by Arabic dialects of Africa (kbur, pl. kburâh, "leather pistol-belt worn round waist" (Beaussier)). It has the same meaning of case, sheath, to which one can add that of quiver; it is commonly used (by an abbreviation of kalm-kburu "case for reeds") for a case for holding cut reeds, a pen-holder, vulg. Ar. dawâya (class. dawâd), Pers. kalm-dan (illustrated in Huart, Caligraphies, p. 16; Lane, Modern Egyptians, i. 288).

KUČAK (Mizra) Wînâ, surname of Mujammad Shâfi, Persian poet of the xinî centuries, born at Shirîz, a clever calligrapher and musician, died in 1262 (1846). Author of numerous poems (âtwaîn lithographed at Teherân 1275) the Bâsîn Wîjâ, the completion of theFarhâd n-Sîrîn of Wâshî (lithographed at Teherân 1263) and of a translation into Persian of the Awaîk al-Dhahab (golden collars) of Zâmakhshari. His sons, Wîkân, Maître Hâkîm (the physician), Abu 1-Kâsim Farhangî, Dâwâtî, Yâdînâ and Hîmmet had inherited the paternal talent.


(Ch. Huart)

KUČÁN, a town in Persia, in the northern part of the province of Khorasan [q. v.] on the upper course of the Atek [q. v.], perhaps the ancient Ashak or Arakka, in the older Arab geographers Khauhishân, later Khûdân, e.g. Mukkaddasî, B.G.A., iii. 319, 3 and Bahâkî, ed. Morley, p. 761; also Yâkît under Ustâwâ (i. 243, 20) according to Samîni (G.M.S., xx, p. 31); according to Yâkît, ii. 487, 21, the usual local pronunciation was Khâshân; Samîni, i. 219, here also has only the form Khauhishân (Suvânî and others have himself been there). The origin of the pronunciation Kuçân is stated by Rašîd al-Din (ed. Quatrempère, p. 183) for the Mongols. The ruins of the ancient Khauhishân (this name is still borne by a large village) lie 3 farasak west of the latest town, which was destroyed in the xinîh century by a series of earthquakes. Towards the end of the viiih (xiiith) century Ghâzân, afterwards Ilkhan, when governor of Khorasan built a Buddhist temple in Kuçân (C. d'Ossian, Histoire des Mongols, The Hague and Amsterdam, 1834/1835, iv. 148, quoting Rašîd al-Din). In the reign of Abramsî I (q. v.) a Kurd principality (tribe of Zafarânlî) was founded with a hereditary Ilkhanî at its head. Like most towns of Persia of some size, Kuçân also has the tomb of an Imâmâd, Ibrahim b. Ali, son of Ali b. Mûsâ, who is buried in Mechedh. On the hill now called Nâdir-Tepê near Kuçân, Nâdir Shâh was killed in 1160 (1747). In the reign of Nâdir Shâh (after his campaign of 1740 against Baghdad) a few leaves of a copy of the Kurân written by the Timurid Baisongor Ghiyâth al-Din [q. v.] preserved in Samarkand (according to others in Shahri Sarbi i.e. Kash) were brought to Kuçân. Shâh Nazîr al-Din in 1883 had two of the leaves brought to the Museum in Teheran. In the suppression of a rebellion of the Ilkhanî by 'Abbas Mirza [q. v.] the town suffered severely, and the great earthquakes of 1852, 1871, 1893 and 1895 were still more disastrous to it. When Curzon visited it in 1889, the population was under 12,000; but we are also told that 12,000 perished in the earthquake of 1893 and about 10,000 were left. The present Kuçân was only rebuilt after the last earthquake about 8 miles east of the ruined town.


KUCUK BIAIRAM. [See ID AL-FITR.]

KUCUK KAINARDJE (Tur. "a small hot spring"), a town in Bulgaria, 45 miles to the South of Silistria, was until the treaty of Berlin (July 13, 1878) a part of the Ottoman
Empire. It was in this town that a treaty of peace between 'Abd al-Ḥamid I, the Ottoman Sulṭān and Catherine II, the Empress of Russia, was signed on the 12 Dżumādā I, 1188 (July 21st, 1774). The Russian army having appeared before Shumila and the troops of the grand vizier Muḥammad-Dżamāl Pasha, having abandoned it in a body, the latter decided to send plenipotentiaries to Field-Marshal Romanzoff; he chose the reś-efendi Muhim and Khiya-beg Ḥaḍidż Rısami; Prince Tepnine, the Russian Ambassador, represented the Empress. After a discussion which lasted for seventeen hours, the plenipotentiaries came to an agreement on July 17; but the signature was postponed for five days in order to make it coincide with the date of the treaty signed by Peter the Great after his defeat on the Pruth (July 22, 1711); and the town of Kūčā Kainarije was chosen because it was the place where the General Weissmann had perished. The treaty consisted of twenty-eight articles which established the independence of the Tatars of the Crimea, of Bessarabia, and of Kūčān, while reserving religious supremacy to the Sulṭān (a phrase which gave rise to the idea of the Caliph-Pope, which became so widespread throughout European literature, see also KHAŁIFA). It restored to the Khān of the Crimea all the lands conquered by the Russian Army, except the two ports of Kerč and Veşni-kašâ; the restoration of the conquests of the Russians except the two Kâbraĵa, Azof and Kiļburun. It restored prisoners to liberty without ransom; and provided for the free navigation of the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. It established freedom for commerce, security for travellers and in particular for the pilgrims from Jerusalem (this article later allowed Russia to intervene in the affairs of the Holy Land). The Porte acknowledged the Empress of Russia's title of Ḵadījihâ and her right to build a church at Pera. The question of Poland, which had been the chief cause of the war, was not dealt with in the treaty. By two additional secret clauses (Merket, Recueil des traités, ii. 287) the Porte promised to pay as war indemnity the sum of 15,000 purses = 7,500,000 piastres, worth at this time four million roubles, within three years. Russia on her side undertook to order her fleet to evacuate the Archipelago as quickly as possible. This treaty contributed largely to strengthen Russian influence.


KUCÜK KHAN, a Tatar Khan of Siberia, in whose reign this country was conquered by the Russians. Abū ʿAbd Allāḥ Khān (ed. Desmouls, p. 177) is the only authority to give information regarding his origin and his genealogical relation to the other descendants of Čingiz Khān. According to this source, he reigned for forty years in "Turan," lost his eyesight towards the end of his life, was driven from his kingdom by the Russians in 1003 (1594/1595), took refuge with the Manghilt (Nogai) and died among them. References to Kucum are also found in the work of the Ottoman Turk Saifī, who had been written in 990 (1582) (Leyden MS., No. 917; transl. without a reference to the MS., by Ch. Schefer as an appendix to his translation of the history of Central Asia, Histoire de l'Asie Centrale, by 'Abd al-Karim Būḥārī, Paris 1876, p. 305 sqq.). Kucum's kingdom and its capital are there called "Tūrā"; the Russians had taken this town during Kucum's absence. Kucum afterwards returned and drove out the Russians after a long siege (1-2 years) but the latter carried off his son a prisoner to Moscow. These stories seem to show that Saifī's work was probably composed later than the year given in the title (Schefer, loc. cit., Preface, p. iv., even gives the year 990 A.H. as date of death of the author). The name "İsker" for the capital of Kucum (near the confluence of the Tobol and Irish) seems to be found only in Russian sources; it is only from the latter also that the principal events of his reign can be chronologically arranged. Kucum did not inherit his kingdom from his father but had expelled his predecessor Yadiqar; in 1563 Yadiqar is still mentioned as king of Siberia, while in 1569 we find Kucum. In 1581 Isker was conquered by Russian Cossacks under Yermak; the Cossacks owed their victory to the use of fire-arms, then still unknown in Siberia. Kucum's son Maḥmud-Kul (Muḥammad-Kul) was sent a prisoner to Moscow. He was not till Yermak fell in an unexpected attack (1584 or 1585) that Isker was vacated by the Russians; but by the year 1587 we find troops, who had just arrived, building the Russian town of Tobolsk near this town. Kucum did not suffer his last defeat at the hands of the Russians till August 20, 1598. He is said to have been slain by the Nogais, with whom he had taken refuge, out of revenge for his father's raids on them. The document used by Radloff (Ausz Sibirien, Leipzig 1893, p. 146 sqq.) dealing with an embassy from Kucum to Būḥārī and the order by 'Abd Allāh Khān [q.v.] his governor in Khvārizm to send teachers of religion to Siberia, cannot be genuine. Khvārizm was at this date an independent kingdom and not under the rule of the Khān of Būḥārī. The form "Kuzim" adopted by Radloff is also not to be found in any historical sources.


KUDĀ'A, a group of tribes. When Islām was first preached, the genealogical division of the Arab race into three main bodies, Moṭār Maʿadd, Rabīʿ and Yemīn, had just been completed. The poets refer to it as a well known principle. Agreement had not been reached regarding the fourth group, claiming descent from a common ancestor, called Kudā'a. This group comprised several important tribes, settled in the northern Ḥijāz and leading a nomadic life between Arabia, Ḥiraq, Syria and Egypt.

Without protest, the Kudā'a had allowed themselves to be classed with the Yemen group. Wellhausen (Das arabisch. Reich, p. 113) observes that this group was not old. This is quite correct but decides nothing. If Kudā'a had allowed it, it was because their interests coincided with those of the Yemenis. They might have perhaps stopped there if the matrimonial alliances of the Sufyānī caliphs with the Banū Kalb [q.v.]
had not upset the political equilibrium of the Arab tribes. Kalb formed the main nucleus of the Kūdāʾ and the old genealogical fiction was intended to secure it the unconditional support of the Yemeni tribes of Syria. At any cost the Kūdāʾ Yemeni tribes had to be kept up. The old faith of Kalb, which had for long lived alongside of the Moḍaris and contracted temporary alliances with them. This could be usefully exploited. Evidence of the importance attached to the discussion of these questions is the fact that they were raised in the presence of the Prophet.

Now nothing could be more unstable than the grouping of the Beduin tribes. To understand how down to the Omayyads and in spite of the institution of the dīwān, the ethnographical connections of the Kūdāʾ had remained floating, it is sufficient to read in the Naḥawī Ḍhariʾ on Ḍariʾa, Volume 104 (verses 23–24; cf. Dhibāʾ, Havamān, iv. 107 below). They were unable to produce charters or base their arguments on historical documents. Vague traditions and especially poetry were appealed to. Did not the poetry contain the “archives of Arabia”, dīwān al-ʿArab? In this connection the author of the Aḥkām (xvii. 77–78) speaks of verses fabricated by the Kūdāʾ, anxious to connect themselves with the Yemen group. Apocryphal poetry is the curse of the whole of pre-Muslim history. A vast and disastrous activity was displayed in this field. But it would be a great mistake to charge this exclusively to the genealogists of Kūdāʾ. In fact the Kūdāʾ seem the least desiring of suspicion, because under the Omayyads they were better able than some others to do without alliances. The supremacy assured to the Kalbīs in Syria freed them from the necessity of seeking allies among the Moḍaris, to say nothing of their antipathy to the Kaisīs with whom they were soon in open conflict. In their verses Ḍhariʾ and Ḍariʾa appeal to an old alliance between Tamīm and Kalb. The latter tribe had probably lost all recollection of it. But they could not be displeased to see their importance recognised by the best poets of Tamīm, the great Moḍarī tribe, whose friendship was also sought by Kais.

The Kūdāʾs were only represented in small numbers in Egypt. In 102 A.H. a Kalbī governor of Egypt reconstituted a distinct group with various Kūdāʾ clans, which he had found scattered among the Moḍarī and Yemeni tribes in his province. Besides Kalb and its numerous subdivisions, the following are the main tribes of the Kūdāʾ group: Sāliḥ (the predecessors of Ghusān in Syria), Taṣḥīkh, Ḍariʾ, Bāt, Ḍujairān, Kān (Banu Ḥaṭṭa or Bākkan), Baharʿ Mahraw, Khushān (to be retained in the text of al-Kindī, p. 72, 11). For these tribes the reader is referred to the separate articles on them. Their proximity to the Syrian frontier or their settlement in Syria had encouraged the spread of Christianity among them. We therefore find them at the Arab invasion at first taking the side of the Byzantines.


**KUḌAṆA** or ʿAbū ʿAṯār, ʿAbā al-Ḥakīm, an Arab author. Born a Christian, he adopted Islam under the Caliph al-Muktafi (289–295 = 902–906) and served in the central administration at Baghdad in which he obtained the office of Maqālīṣ al-Zimam in 297 under the vizier Abū ʿIshaʾi b. al-Farāhī. The date of his death is not known. Most writers (Ibn Taghibirdī, ed. Juyboll, ii. 323; Reinad, Géographie d’Abounfida, ix., lxxiv; de Goeje, B G. A., vi., 22; Dénoron, Mis. de l’Escarial, ii, x.) give 337 (958) but according to Yākūt, Islām al-Aribī, vi. 204, that date is due to Ibn al-Ṭawāfi who is not to be relied on for such matters. The only certain thing is that he was still alive in 320 as in that year he was present at a disputation between Abū Saʿīd al-Sirāfī and the logician Mattāī. One result of his official activities was the for us most important book, the Kīṭāb al-Kharaḥīd which he seems to have compiled soon after 316; only the second volume of it survives in the Kūprūlī library in Stambul; de Goeje published extracts from it in E. G. A., vi. The work first begins by discussing of the provincial division of the empire and the organisation of the postal services and gives the yield in taxation for each district. The author then gives a survey of the adjoining foreign countries and their inhabitants and next gives a very full account of the financial system, taxation and administrative law. A short history of the Arab conquests is simply copied from al-Balkhabī. He devoted his leisure to belles-lettres and produced a work on style and rhetoric, Kīṭāb ʿAbdālf al-Nāṣir al-muṣrīṣ bi-Kīṭāb al-Bayān, edited by his pupil Abū’l-Aḥdālī Muhammad b. Ajiyūb and a poetical Kīṭāb Naṣaʾ al-Shīr. Both works are preserved in the Escurial MS. 242 of Dénoron’s Catalogue; the latter is also in the Kūprūlī library i. 445; 2 (see Rescher, M. S. O. S., xiv., 17) and has been printed from it at Stambul in 1902.


(C. BROCKELMANN)

**KUDATU BİLLIK** [See VUSUF KHAŞŞ HAJÎBJ.]—AL-KUDS, the usual Arabic name for Jerusalem in later times. The older writers call it commonly Bait al-Maqdis (according to some: Muḥaddah, cf. Gildemeister, Z. D. M. G., xxxvi. 387 sq.; Fischer, ibid., lx. 404 sqq.) which really meant the Temple (of Solomon), a translation of the Hebrew Beth-hammikdāṣh (e.g. Ibn Ḥishām, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 263, 2) but it became applied to the whole town. They also frequently use the name Ḫiṣṭa, from Aelia (see below). They likewise knew the old name Jerusalem, which they produce as Urshīlām (or um) (variants in Yākūt, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 402). The name al-Balāṭ also occurs in Muḥaddah, a word of uncertain meaning derived from palatium, but which probably means “royal residence”. For other names of rarer occurrence see Gildemeister, op. cit.

When the Roman soldiers of Titus became masters of the whole city after a long and strenuous siege at the end of September 70 A. D., the splendid temple had already been burned down, according
to Sulpicius Severus by order of Titus, according to others against his desire (see Williamowitz, Kultur d. Götzennest, i, 170; Windisch, Thäl. Tijdsschr., 1914, p. 519 sqq.) and for the last few nights the city had looked like a sea of fire. The Roman soldiers, maddened by the stubborn defence, continued the destruction after the capture of the city and plundered without mercy. But it is certainly wrong to think of the conquered Jerusalem as being razed absolutely level with the ground. The eastern part of the city had suffered most, notably the area of the Temple, but a considerable piece of the city wall with a prominent tower was left at the south-east corner and on the western side Titus left the city wall and the three great towers of the palace of Herod intact, to serve as a shelter for the Roman camp. Many of the old houses must also have been still standing, or at least have been in such a condition that the Jews, who were gradually returning, could find some sort of shelter in them.

For the first half century after the fall of Jerusalem we are completely without information about the unfortunate city. Risings continually flamed up in the country round but nothing is said about the capital. At the beginning of the reign of Hadrian, it was ultimately restored but later (132—135 A.D.) another revolt broke out when the Emperor forbade circumcision and wanted to build a new city upon the ruins of Jerusalem. After the rising had been suppressed with difficulty, he carried out his plan and a purely pagan city arose which was called Colonia Aelia Capitolina. While on the north side it observed the boundary marked by the so-called third wall, it left out the southern half of the original city and in the south-west a part of the upper town; these remained the bounds for the whole period following except for a brief interruption under Nahan al-Din. The new city had the usual buildings, baths, theatre, sanctuaries etc. (see Chronicon Paschale and on it, Vincent and Abel, Jerusalem, ii, 6 sqq.) and was divided into 7 parts, each under an administrative official. The Emperor had a sanctuary built in honour of the Capitoline Jupiter as the principal god, for which the great masses of ruins there formed a rich quarry (cf. Eusebius, Dem. evangel., viii, 3). According to Dio Cassius, Isix. 12, Hieronymus, Comm. in Esaiam, xi, 8, etc., this temple was built exactly on the site of the old Jewish temple, which Vincent and Abel, op. cit., ii, 15 sqq., doubted, but without sufficient reason. That the "rock" which had formed the old altar for burnt offerings, remained practically untouched is evident from its later history, but unfortunately we do not know if it was actually used in connection with the worship in the new sanctuary. With the help of a few coin-types we can form some idea of the appearance of the temple of Jupiter, and we also know that two statues of Hadrian (probably one of the Emperor and one of Antoninus) were erected near it. If this temple of Jupiter raises questions which are difficult to answer, this is still more true of the temple of Aphrodite built in Jerusalem on the site of which was later built the Constantinian Church of the Holy Sepulchre (on presumed remains of this temple, see Schmalz, Mutter Ecclesiarum, p. 351). According to Eusebius, wicked men, inspired by demons (pagan deities) had done everything they could to conceal and to pollute this place by covering τὸ δείπνον ἀντιπ στερίφων with earth brought for the purpose and building a temple of Aphrodite with a pagan cult. Whether this was the real reason for the building of the temple of Aphrodite is very doubtful. For even if we grant the possibility that a recollection of the place of the Crucifixion and of the tomb of Christ had been preserved among the earliest Christians, it is unlikely that Hadrian to whom the building may, with most probability, be credited paid so much heed to the Christians that he would deliberately insult them so deeply (cf. P. Mickle, Die Konstantinkirchen im heiligen Lande, 1923, 116 sq.; Dalmann, Palastinayahrbuch, ii, 102 sqq.). At most it could have only been the nuisance the temple of Aphrodite was a nuisance. On the other hand we may ascribe to Hadrian's rebuilding of the city the broad pillared way which runs through Jerusalem from north to south on the mosaic map of Madaba of the viiE century (see Guthe, Z. D. P. V., xxviii, 130 sq.; Gisler, Das Heilige Land, 1912, p. 214 sqq.), of the pillars of which a series of remains have been unearthed (cf. Vincent and Abel, op. cit., ii, 22). It debouched on the north into an open square with a single pillar standing alone, after which the North Gate in the middle of the "gate of the Pillar" (Bāḥ al-Amūd or Bāḥ Amūd al-Ghirāb), Jews were forbidden under pain of death to enter the new city. This prohibition remained in force under Antoninus Pius, but they were again allowed to practise circumcision. As the Christians were not affected by the prohibition, their numbers must have increased in the centuries following Hadrian's reign. Their place of worship in this period was the Church of Sion on the southern peak of the next hill, which was therefore regarded as the mother of the other churches in the Holy Land. It was at first a small building, which was not replaced by a large basilica until a later date. In the same period pilgrimages to Palestine, especially to Jerusalem, began to become more numerous (cf. Windisch, Z. D. P. V., xliv, 145 sqq.). The faithful came thither from all countries, and especially when the earlier obstacles and dangers had been diminished by the conversion to Christianity of Constantine I, numerous bodies of pilgrims followed the example of the queen-mother, Helena, who visited Palestine in 320. The appearance of Jerusalem about this time (c. 350) is described to us in the work of the monk Simeon of Bordeaux, the exact character of which cannot however be readily defined. We learn that the two Hadrian statues were still standing and perhaps also the Temple of Jupiter, although the words are not clear (et in aede ipsa ubi templum fuit quem Salomon aedificavit). If this was the case, the temple had very soon afterwards been taken down when the Emperor began to build his church. The lapsus permixtus over which the Jews were allowed to weep and pour oil on one day of the year, is probably the stone in which the altar for burnt offerings had stood, which therefore must have been lying exposed in those days. If it did not take place earlier, the complete desolation of the site of the temple must have begun at this time, when the Christians, remembering Christ's words (Matt. xxiv. 2), rejected any thought of rebuilding the temple; Eucharius (Itinerar Hierosol. Latina, i, 52) expressly mentions it. But this was not true, at least about 348, of the outer enclosures of the site which Cyril (Patr. Grac.,
xxxiii. 889) mentions as still in existence, and at a still later date there is a reference to the outer wall at the S.E. corner with a high tower. The name given it, "Tower of David," which is found about 350 in Ephippius, is based on an erroneous transference of David's citadel to this site and invalidates this period in general with the many pilgrims asking about sites mentioned in the Bible, proved very productive of local traditions with no authority or even quite false.

In his great buildings the Emperor Constantine was only concerned with Christian associations. Besides the basilica on the Mount of Olives mentioned by the pilgrim of Bordeaux, his main work was the building (completed in 335) of the large and splendid church on the spot where Christ had been crucified and which was therefore consecrated to the victorious Cross. Proof that it was the true site was according to Eusebius the πατρίκια θανάτου at the lightning emanating from the Holy Sepulchre when they began to dig out the soil.

It was the Emperor's intention to build a great sanctuary for the whole of Christendom, which was to surpass all others in the splendour and costliness of its materials. Eusebius gives a very rhetorical picture of this building and therefore one that is not easy to visualise. The sepulchre, discovered by a miracle, was adorned by the Emperor with beautiful pillars and rich decoration. East of it lay an open paved square, which was enclosed on three sides by pillared halls. On the east side was a great basilica through the eastern exits of which one entered the outer gateway and reached the street of the market through them. The basilica had a sloping roof. Eusebius also speaks of a hemisphere, which some take to be a cupola on the roof, others an apsis. Eusebius does not mention a building over the Holy Sepulchre (Mickley, op. cit., p. 38 sq. however finds a reference to it in the hemisphairion just mentioned, which he supposes is mentioned in the wrong place in the city and weep to the stone on the site of the Temple. Further scope was given to the idea that Constantine who first built over it the so-called anastasis, the rotunda form of which, later maintained, is first mentioned by Cyril in 350. In the account of the building there is no mention of the principal relic, the remains of the Holy Cross; but they were in existence barely 15 years later; they were perhaps old pieces of wood found in excavating for a cistern. They were later preserved at the S.E. corner of the basilica in a silver case. Constantine's reign brought some relief to the Jews as they were permitted, as already observed, to enter the city and weep to the stone on the site of the Temple. Further scope was given to the idea that Constantine who not only completely abolished the old prohibition but gave them permission to rebuild the Temple, which however they were prevented from doing by flames bursting forth, according to Ammianus. After the Emperor's death Constantine's regulations were again enforced.

The more peaceful period that now began gave the Christians leisure to devote themselves to their own theological and hierarchical disputes, which had for the Jerusalem Christians the satisfactory result that they were freed from the suzerainty of Caesarea, as, at the Council of Chalcedon (451—455), the bishopric of Jerusalem was recognised as an independent patriarchate, comprising Palestine, Prima, Secunda and Tertia. The Emperor's family devoted continual attention to the embellishment of the town. Thus the Empress Eudocia in 460, built a church of St. Stephen and a church at the pool of Siloah. A still more dazzling epoch came with the reign of Justinian who was fond of building. He had churches and hospitals built in the country round, including a nosokomium in the capital (cf. Cyril in Z. D. F. V., xxxvi. 305). He also bestowed a splendid church of Theotokos on the city of which Procopius gives a florid but by no means lucid description (De Aedificiis Justiniani, v. 6). According to him the church was supported by pillars and had a roof of cedar trunks. From a statement by Theophanes it seems to have been in the shape of a cross. One very important statement in the description of Procopius is that the ground was not large enough for the intended building, so that the Emperor had great substructures made on south and east until the ground reached the level of the adjoining rocks. This is in favour of the assumption often made that this church was the predecessor of the mosque of Aksa, the oldest parts of which undoubtedly belonged to a church.

The part of the site of the Temple which lay in ruins and which would not be built upon for the reasons already mentioned must therefore have stretched so far south that the remaining area was too small for so large a church (cf. R. Hartmann, Z. D. P. V., xxxii., 185 sqq.). Others like H. Dressaire, Echos de l'Orient, 1912, p. 146 sqq., 234 sqq.; K. Schmalz, op. cit., p. 385, look for the site of Justinian's church in the Jewish quarter southwest of the Temple area.

A sudden end was put to this idyllic state of affairs by the devastating invasion of the Persians in 614 A.D. When they were before Jerusalem, the Patriarch Zacharias, who, like Jeremiah of old, saw in the attack a punishment for the immorality prevailing in the city, advised surrender but the people would not listen to him, although the Byzantine troops in Palestine were leaving the city to meet their fate. With the help of their siege machinery, the Persians entered the town and bathed the city in the blood of old men, women and children. The churches were destroyed and the crucifixes trodden under foot. The Jews, who had as a rule been on good terms with the Persians, are said to have used the occasion to avenge themselves on the Christians. The Patriarch was sent into banishment with other dignitaries and the palladium, the Holy Cross, to the horror of Christianity was carried off by the victors (cf. K. Schmalz, op. cit., p. 69; P. Peeters, La Piste de la Jerusalem par les Perses, Messes de l'Univ. de Bourgtheroulde, 1914; A. Jaffé, Jerusalem, in Vincent and Abel, Jerusalem, ii. 242). The change only came when Heraclius began his marvellous campaign of conquest which led him far into Persian territory. Kawadh II, Shereq, who ascended the throne on the assassination of his father in 628, sought peace and withdrew all the Persian troops from Byzantine territory. After his brief reign, complete confusion reigned in Persia so that the war could not be continued. The Holy Cross was sent back in its case which the Persians by God's providence had never opened and restored to its former place on September 14, 629; in the meantime while a month passed showing great energy and succeeded in restoring the destroyed church, including the Church of the Holy
Sepulchre built by Constantine, which was restored to its former size and decorated as far as the modest means allowed. The remains of the Cross did not however stay in Jerusalem, but were sent in 633 by Heraclius to Constantinople, when he was doubtful of being able to defend Syria. Nevertheless a piece seems to have remained in Jerusalem, as the continuation of the festival of the elevation of the Cross shows (Vincen and Abel, op. cit., i. 227).

But scarcely had the Christians in the Holy Land begun to breathe a little more freely again after this severe visitation, than events occurred which were to prove the greatest and most fatal consequences. The politico-religious community formed by Muhammad, little heeded outside of Arabia up to the time of his death, became a few years later with startling suddenness a danger threatening the neighbouring countries. Although Jerusalem lay outside the regular orbit of the Prophet's interests, he mentioned it several times in the Koran, a natural result of his indebtedness to Jews and Christians. As he had no idea of the actual appearance of the town, the cursory mention of the mihrab (Sura, ii. 32 sq.; xix. 12) is of no importance, but Jerusalem became of real significance for him in the period which he had preserved in his letter to the Jews, when he returned at prayer in the direction of the holy city. The tradition is certainly right which says that the earlier hajja mentioned in Sura ii. 136, 138, which he exchanged for the sanctuary at Mecca after the breach with the Jews, was Jerusalem, whether he already used this direction in the Meccan period or only introduced it after his migration to Medina in order to win over the Jews there (cf. the article MUHAMMAD). In the former case which is more probably right, Jerusalem must from the very beginning have been of very considerable significance to him as a religious centre. According to the usual explanation, moreover Sura xvii. 1 with the expression masjid al-aqsa indicates Jerusalem as the goal of the Prophet's nocturnal journey, not however the later mosque of the name but the site of the old Temple of Solomon. The correctness of this interpretation is however not certain for there is a certain amount of support for Horowitz's (Ist, ix. 159; following Schrieke, ibid., vi. 1 sqq.) suggestion that Muhammad was rather thinking of a place in heaven in this phrase (see MUHAMMAD). But the traditional view, which must have arisen very early, gained the greatest importance for Jerusalem, for on it is based the classing of the sanctuary at Jerusalem among the three most holy places of prayer in the world; indeed it is sometimes even given the preference over the other two.

The Muslim armies that crossed the frontiers of Arabia after the death of Muhammad entered Palestine as well as the lands of the Euphrates. With the defeat of the Imperial troops at Adinadain (q.v. and add to the Bibl. Masudi, Muruj al-Dhabab, v. 225) in July 634, after which the Byzantine general Aretion had to take shelter in Jerusalem, Byzantine rule in Palestine began to totter and its fate was settled on the Yarmuk in August 636; the fortified towns then surrendered one after the other to the victorious Arabs. Two different accounts of the taking of Jerusalem have been handed down. According to the most usual version, the Arab general Abi 'Ubida in 17 (638)

asked the Caliph 'Umar to come to his headquarters at Djbayh [q.v.] as the people of Jerusalem would only capitulate on condition that 'Umar himself concluded the treaty with them. According to the other story, which de Goeje, Memoire sur la conquête de la Syrie, 1864, p. 110 sqq., rightly prefers, the Caliph came to Djbayh of his own accord to arrange the affairs of the conquered regions and from there (according to Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 139) he sent Khalid b. Thabit to Jerusalem to besiege the town and the terms made by the latter for the surrender were then approved by 'Umar. These terms, which are preserved in the Various sources (e.g. the year 678-679; 2402-2404 sq.: cf. Baladhuri, p. 139; Ya'qubi., ed. Houtsma, ii. 167; cf. de Goeje, op. cit., p. 122 sqq.) were quite mild. The Christian inhabitants were granted security for their lives, property, churches and crucifixes, while the Jews were not to live among them; the churches were not to be used as dwellings, and not to be torn down or reduced in size, and the Christians retained their religious liberty; in return they were to pay the jizya and assist in warding off the Byzantine troops and raiders. The statements on the date of the taking of Jerusalem also vary; Tabbri for example gives 678 (see p. 93). The further details of 'Umar's conduct at the capture of Jerusalem are given by various Christian and Muslim authors. Theophanes (ed. de Boor, i. 339) who wrote towards the end of the viii century, records under the year 627 that the Caliph on the conclusion of the treaty, so favourable to the Christians, entered the holy city wearing a gold breastplate — according to this author a sign of his devilish hypocrisy — and demanded to be led to the site of the Temple which he then made a place of pagan worship. Writing in the tenth century, the Egyptian Christian Euthychius (Analet, ed. Pococke, ii. 285 sqq. and in Vincent and Abel, Jerusalem, ii. 243) tells somewhat more fully how 'Umar refused to perform his gislaz in the basilica of the Church of the Resurrection and instead said his prayers on the steps at the entrance in order, as he explained, to prevent the Muslims from using the authority of his example to turn the church into a mosque and that he gave the Patriarch Sophronius a document confirming this. At his request, Sophronius then pointed out the "Rock" covered with debris on the site of the Temple as a suitable site for his masjid. The Caliph at once began to clear off the rubble and as the Muslims followed his example the rock soon came into sight. At the same time he gave instructions that the masjid should be so planned that the worshippers had the rock behind and not in front of them. It is apparent that the story is intended to confirm the alienable right of the Christians to their churches by the authority of the great Caliph. There is therefore no such tendency in the Muslim historians — the earliest is al-Mugharrab in the tenth century with whom Shihab al-Din al-Makdisi, Shams al-Din al-Suyuti and Muqaddim al-Din (see below) are in substantial agreement — who on the contrary show the Christians in a less favourable light. According to them the Patriarchs, who appeared here more correctly in the service of the Patriarch, at first tried to deceive 'Umar when he demanded to be taken to David's masjid, by showing him the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Church of Sion
But the Caliph saw through the deception, as the Prophet had described to him the place as he had seen it on his normal journey; he was ultimately taken to the site of the Temple, which he recognised as the right place, but it had first of all to be cleared of debris. In another story, recorded as early as Tabari, i. 2408, Ka'bah b. al-Ahmar [q. v.] a Jewish convert to Islam plays a part which gives the story a point directed against the Jews. When 'Umar entered the Temple area he summoned Ka'bah to obtain his opinion regarding the choice of the place for the masjid; but when the latter proposed that the place of prayer should be placed behind the Rock (north of it) the Caliph declared that he saw in the proposal a concealed attempt to plan the masjid for the benefit of the Jews, so that the kibla would actually strike the site of the old Temple. If we examine these traditions more closely, we see that they all agree that 'Umar had a Muslim place of worship erected on the deserted Temple area. That we are on firm historical ground here is corroborated by Bishop Arculfus about 670 (Itinerar Hieraecumitana, ed. P. Geyer, 1898, p. 226 sq.; cf. Arculf, transl. by Mckley, 1917, 19 sq.) who describes this masjid as a very simple building (Saracen quatrangularum erationis domum quam subrectis tabulis et magnis praebuit) super quondam ruinarum religiosi viti fabricati suo aere 12 frequentant?, but it could however hold 3000 men. In reality this was a very practical settlement of the situation that had arisen from the conquest of Jerusalem; the Caliph acquired a site long held sacred, without coming into conflict with the privileges granted to the Christians, as they would not build a church on the site of the Temple for reasons already stated. It is further clear that what Euthychius tells us about 'Umar's praying on the steps of the basilica of the Sepulchre is an unhistorical invention intended to avert any encroachments by the Muslims. But this bias of the story only becomes evident from a further story of Euthychius, according to which the Muslims "of our day" (i.e. the first half of the tenth century) overrode 'Umar's regulations, when they took possession of the half of the forecourt on the steps to the Constantinian Basilica and built a masjid there, which they called the Masjid 'Umar, because 'Umar had prayed there. Schmalz (op. cit., p. 361) thinks a few remains of columns from this mosque can still be seen.

Under the Umayyads the political conditions contributed in a peculiar way to increase the prestige of Jerusalem. Their interest in Muslim foundations was considerable, and that it was not difficult for them to abandon the holy cities in Arabia when the prescribed visits to them met with difficulty for any reason, and Jerusalem in particular, the holiness of which the Prophet, according to the usual exposition of Sura xvii. 1, had recognised, formed a welcome substitute, all the more so as it was much easier to reach from Damascus than Mecca or Medina. Evidence of the esteem in which Jerusalem was held, was early shown by the Sawis who had himself proclaimed Caliph here. A Syriac source published by Noiicke, Z.D.M.G., xxix., 90, records that in July 971, Seleuc. (660 A.D. = Safar-Rabi' 4 A.H. 40) many Arabs assembled in Jerusalem to make him king and that he ascended to Golgotha and prayed there and next went through Gethsemane to the Tomb of Mary, where he again prayed. Arabic sources (Tabari, ii. 4; Mas'udi, v. 14; Ibn al-Muqri, iii. 385) say that homage was paid to the Rock in Jerusalem in the year 40, and this must have happened only after 'Ali's assassination on 17th Ramadán, which is less probable than the Syriac story. Abd al-Malik (65-68 = 685-705) took a further step in this direction. When the anti-caliph Ibn Zubair had become master of Mecca, 'Abd al-Malik feared, not without reason, that the Syrians who made the pilgrimage thither, might be persuaded or forced to join him. He therefore forbade them to go there and when the people appealed to the definite command of the Prophet, he ordered them to go on pilgrimage to the holy Rock in Jerusalem and referred them to a tradition recorded by the famous traditionalist al-Zuhri, according to which Muhammad clasped Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem as places of pilgrimage of equal value, nay, from what is apparently the original form of the hadith, the last town was to be placed above the other sanctuaries (cf. Yaqūbī, ii. 167; Baladīrī, p. 143; Yākūt, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 818; Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, ii. 390; Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien, ii. 35 sq.). To express this esteem for the town in fitting and splendid form, the Caliph had a cupola built on the Rock upon which the Prophet had placed his foot on his journey to heaven. The Kūbat al-Šaḫrā' [q. v.] around which the 'qasr was to be performed. That (Muṣṭaddas, R.G.A., iii. 159) the Caliph in building it intended to surpass the beautiful cupola of the Church of the Sepulchre is probably quite in keeping with his general aims. Others make Wālid I the builder of the Kūbat al-Šaḫrā', but this is at once contradicted by an inscription that survives, in which however the name of 'Abd al-Malik has been altered to that of the 'Abbāsīd Caliph al-Ma'mūn but in such a way that not only does the difference in colour betray the alteration but the date 72 (691) has fortunately remained intact. According to later writers (Ibn Taghribirdi, Ulaimi, etc.), 'Abd al-Malik also built the Ašrā Mosque, which was given its name from Sura xvii. 1: but if the mosque was built out of the Church of Justinian (see above) this can only mean that the Caliph in converting the church into a mosque committed a direct breach of the promise made by 'Umar. In any case the Christians in Jerusalem retained their churches, such as the Church of Sion, the Church of Gethsemane (corrupted by the Arabs to "al-Djismâniya") and notably the Church of the Resurrection, the name of which al-Kiyāma (i.e. resurrection, the Arabs turned in ridiculing into al-Kūba). On the south side of this church, there stood in the time of Arculfus a square church of the Virgin which later disappeared. The last Umayyad Caliph Marwān II razed the walls of Jerusalem to the ground in 128 (746) after a rising in Palestine and two years later it was visited by an earthquake recorded by al-Musharraf and later writers, which was followed by another soon after the 'Abbāsīd had seized the empire. The Caliph al-MAshūr had the damage repaired, perhaps on his visits to Jerusalem (Tabari, iii. 129, 372) in 140 (758) or 154 (771). But afterwards another earthquake so damaged the building that it had once again to be restored in the reign of al-Mahdi, perhaps when he visited the city and prayed there in 163 (780) (Tabari, iii. 500) (cf.
Muḥammad, *op. cit.*, 168). On this occasion the Caliph had the building made broader and shorter perhaps in order to emphasize the mosque from strongly. Of work on the Dome of the Rock there is no mention in the sources. But something was done a little later under the Caliph al-Maʿmūn (198–215 = 813–833) is evident from the falsified inscription already mentioned and from another of the year 216 (831) put up by the Caliph’s brother who was then governor of Egypt and Syria (Ṭabarī, iii. 1100).

The gradual dissolution of the ʿAbbasid empire Palestine also became involved in political troubles and the land once again became a bone of contention between powers in Egypt and in Western Asia. In 265 (878) it was taken by the Tulunids and in 292 (905) by the Fāṭimids. In this period the hitherto quite tolerable relations between Muslims and Christians became worse. How the Muslims, contrary to the treaty with ʿUmar, in 936 cut off half the outer court of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre by building a masjid already been mentioned. Yahyā of Antioch (Vincent and Abel, ii. 243) tells of a very serious outbreak of fanaticism in 355 (966). The Muslims, who were joined by the Jews, set fire to the doors of the Basilica and the Church of the Resurrection, so that the dome of the latter fell in, entered the Church and looted all the treasures and destroyed the Church for the occasion. The Patriarch, who had hidden himself was dragged out, put to death and his corpse burned. The destroyed churches were restored under his successor, but not long after they were finished an even more terrible blow struck them when that strange character the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Ḥākim in ʿSafar of the year 400 (October 1009, see Vincent and Abel, Jérusalem, ii. 249; on the other hand according to Ibn al-ʿĀthir, ix. 147 in 398 = 1008) ordered this sanctuary to which the eyes of all Christendom turned, to be destroyed. The order was carried out as thoroughly as the solidity of the building permitted, but afterwards the Patriarch Nicetas in a letter dated in 1010 to the Caliph stated that he allowed the Christians to worship on the ruins of the Church. Clermont-Ganneau has with great acuteness connected with these events a Kūfic inscription found in 1897 on a large block beside the central gate of the old east wall of the basilica, forbidden those under protection (al-ʿaṣmam, i.e. Christians and Jews) to enter the masjid (the mosque of ʿUmar above mentioned) (Recueil d’Archéologie Orientale, iv. 283 sqq.; cf. M. D. P. V., 1897, 70 sqq.). Ḥākim’s successor, al-Ẓāhir, was forced to conclude a peace with the Byzantine Emperor Romanus III by which he permitted the latter to rebuild the Church of the Resurrection at his own expense. Another new earthquake in 1034 destroyed the sore tried church, which was now left in ruins on account of the poverty of the Christians, until it was restored in 1048 by the liberality of the Emperor Constantine Monomachos. But it was only the Church of the Resurrection, that was rebuilt while Constantine’s Basilica never rose again. Only the Chapel of St. Helena, the site of the finding of the Cross was preserved. Another earthquake in 407 (1016) severely damaged the Dome of the Rock (Ibn al-ʿĀthir, ix. 295) and the Caliph al-Ẓāhir had to have the dome of the then built, but not built as an inscription testifies (see ʿAli al-Herwī, *Archives de l’Orient Latīn*, i. 602).

The Seljūk put an end for a time to Fāṭimid rule in Palestine, and their leader Tughrīl Beg was recognised as ʿUthmān in Baghīdā in 447 (1055). Jerusalem also felt the effects of this when the Turkish general Atsiz on his campaign against Fāṭimīn in 463 (1070) conquered the city as well as Ramla and the adjoining country, which, as the Seljūk confiscations posed as protectors of the Caliphate, resulted in the ʿAbbasid Caliph being again after a long interval mentioned in the *kufa* in the mosque there. When Jerusalem soon afterwards rose in rebellion, Atsiz in 469 (1076/1077) had to besiege it again and after its capture, there was a wholesale massacre from which only those escaped who took refuge in the Aṣṣā Mosque (Ibn al-ʿĀthir, x. 46, 64, 68 sqq.). The Seljūk Sultan Tutush in Damascus had Atsiz put to death and in 484 (1091) Jerusalem was given to Sukmān, the son of a Turkoman officer. In 489 (1096) the Fāṭimid Sultan al-Mustaʿīn again succeeded in taking the city and in holding it successfully next year against Kīdāwān, son of Tutush. The triumph of the Fāṭimids was however of short duration only, for a couple of years later the Crusaders arrived and made their victorious entry into the Holy City on July 15, 1099.

For the tenth and eleventh centuries, the period of the events outlined above, we have valuable material available in a series of Arabic descriptions of Jerusalem and its holy places. Even as early as the end of the ninth century we have the brief account by the geographer and historian Yaʿ ṭūbī, who however deals mainly with questions of administration and population only (*R. G. A.*, vii., 328 sqq.). The next is Ibn al-Ḥāfīz who wrote in 1290 (903). After relating the legends and hādīths associated with Jerusalem he gives a good description of the Haram with its gates and sanctuaries, notably the Mosque of the Rock and al-Aṣṣā. His measurements are of interest because some of them agree very well with present day measurements (*R. G. A.*, v. 94 sqq.). Soon after Ibn al-Ḥāfīz, Ibn ʿAbd al-Rabbīh (*p. 328*) in *al-Maʿṣūmah* (*C. L. F.,* i. 274 sqq.) gives a description of the Dome of the Rock, which in many ways recalls that of his predecessor but the figures show considerable divergence. He likewise mentions different sanctuaries in Jerusalem and gates of the Haram. The information in al-Iṣṭāqīrī’s version of an older work now lost (c. 340 = 951/952) is very concise; the same applies to Ibn Hawāʾil’s version of the same book (367 = 977/978). There are references to the al-Aṣṣā Mosque, unsurpassed in size, to the Sakhra with the Rock and the cave below, and to David’s Miḥrāb (*R. G. A.*, i. 57, ii. 112). All these writers are thrown into the shadow by the great geographer al-Muḥammad, or al-Maqdīsī, who was born in Jerusalem (375 = 986/986). He begins with a list of the great attractions of Jerusalem and the advantages of living there but also mentions the disadvantages. He then describes the Aṣṣā Mosque rebuilt after the earthquakes, the new parts of which stood out clearly from the older parts. There were 15 doors on the north side (a remarkably large figure, which does not agree with the other statements), the central one being a great iron door; there were 11 doors on the east side. Along the north side ran a court with marble pillars, built by the Tahirīd ʿAbdallāh (d. 230 = 844). Later the centre of the building from north to south was a pyramidal roof with the beautiful
of the Rock. It was an octagonal building with a high dome, which was intended to serve as a church or mosque. The interior was divided into three concentric halls, and the outer wall was covered with wooden panels. The main hall, which was dedicated to the Prophet Muhammad, was surrounded by a wooden screen. The south side of the dome was the most significant part of the building, as it was the site of the Muslim pulpit. The Rock was also an important landmark in the city, as it was the site of the first mosque built in Jerusalem, the Omayyad Mosque (715-724). During the Crusader period, the Rock became a symbol of Christian pilgrimage and was associated with the Legend of the Three Trees. The Rock was later converted into a church by the Crusaders, and its name was changed to Church of the Holy Sepulchre. In the 17th century, the Turkish sultan Mahmud II converted the church into a mosque, and it remained a mosque until the 19th century. Today, the Rock is a UNESCO World Heritage Site and is an important religious and cultural landmark in Jerusalem.
the Rock, and the Aḵṣā Mosque, Gethsemane, the Church of Sion and several churches in the vicinity of the town. As he does not appear to have been there himself, his statements are probably based on information supplied by men sent by Roger. A little later in 1173 ʿAli al-Herewi (from Herāt) visited Palestine; his description (not yet printed) was translated by Schefer (Archives de l'Orient, 1886, i. p. 587—609). He describes the Dome of the Rock with its four pillars, 12 columns and 16 windows, the iron work round the rock, the cave of the Spirits, the Aḵṣā and its portico with 16 marble columns and 8 pillars, gives their measurements, mentions the stables of Solomon, and the candle of Jesus, the Tower of David, with the Mekhāb mentioned in the Kurān, Siloḥ and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. There are also numerous descriptions by pilgrims, only a few of which can be mentioned here. In 1102 and 1103 i.e. shortly after the conquest of Jerusalem, the Saxon Saxewulf was there and left a short account of his visit (Recueil de voyages et des mémoires, publié par la Société de Géographie, 1839, iv. p. 830—846) in which he describes the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, Maria Latina, the site of the Temple, the Church of St. Anne, Gethsemane, and the Mount of Olives. The Russian Abbot Daniel's journal of the year 1106 is also of value (transl. by Leskien in Z. D. P. V., vii. 23 sqq.). He gives brief but vivid descriptions of the country and the buildings and had an eye for all sorts of details which are rarely mentioned elsewhere. He describes in order the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Tower of David, the Dome of the Rock (the holy of holies), the house of Solomon (al-Aḵṣā), Gethsemane, the Mount of Olives and the situation and natural features of the city. The next important authorities are John of Würzburg (Descripiones terrae sanctae ex sac. viii., ix. ii. et iviv., ed. Toformerly, Theodorici Libellus de locis sanctis, ed. Tobler, 1865). On the Jewish side there is Benjamin of Tudela (1165), who does not however deal with the Christian sanctuaries.

The period of the Crusades is one of the least inspiring periods in the history of Christianity. Its pitiable collapse is in striking contrast to the splendid enthusiasm with which it was opened, but even this was overcast by the deep shadow of the inhuman bloodshed at the taking of Jerusalem. The Crusaders owned advantages they won in the first period less to their own ability than to the political weakness of the caliphate at that time and the newly founded kingdom of Jerusalem soon broke up in confusion in which selfish individual interests were openly displayed and Christians occasionally fought with their fellow-Christians and freely concluded alliances with their Muslim opponents. Therefore when powerful personalities appeared on the side of the enemy in Iṯmād al-Dīn Zangī and his son Nūr al-Dīn and still more when the highly gifted Aḥyūb al-Salādīn (Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn) became master of Egypt in 1169 and began to conquer Syria after the death of Nūr al-Dīn, the fate of the Christians in Palestine was sealed. The battle of the Christians in Palestine was sealed. For them disastrous battle of Ḥattīn (q.v.) resulted in Salādīn's advance on Jerusalem. When he appeared before the town, the inhabitants who had appointed Bāilān of Nābulus commander-in-chief declined the favourable conditions offered them and decided to fight to the last. Salādīn however moved his camp to the weaker north side of the city and when his siege artillery began to demolish pieces of the wall, the defenders lost courage and endeavoured to reopen negotiations with Salādīn. After Salādīn had several times refused to see the envoys, Bāilān informed him that the inhabitants, if their surrender was not accepted, were resolved to put all non-combatants in the city to death along with the Muslim prisoners, to burn all that might be looted and to destroy the sanctuaries on the site of the Temple. This made such an impression on Salādīn and his emirs that the terms were accepted (1187). The inhabitants were allowed to leave the city on paying a poll-tax and Salādīn's attitude was so lenient that not only was the amount of the ransom reduced but many people were allowed to depart, although they could not pay the necessary money. He also ordered armed soldiers to accompany the columns of emigrants to protect them from attack, while at the same time in some parts of the country Christians were preventing their co-religionists from passing through (cf. Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, xi. 361—366; Röhrich, Geschichte des Kurfürstlichen Jerusalem, p. 451 sqq.). It was mainly the Latin Christians who left Jerusalem while the Greek Christians, the so-called Syrians, were allowed to stay in the city without becoming slaves. It is quite evident from several sources that even after the retaking of Jerusalem by the Muslims, a considerable number of Christians remained there and in Palestine generally (cf. Rotermund, Z. D. P. V., xxxv. 24 sqq.). But Jerusalem lost its Christian character and Salādīn actively removed the traces of the period of Christian occupation. The golden cross on the Dome of the Rock was thrown to the ground amid the applause of the Muslims and laments of the Christians and replaced by a crescent. The wall round the Rock with the altar was removed. Salādīn, as an inscription shows, had the cupola regilt (de Vogué, Le Temple de Jerusalem, p. 91 sqq.) but otherwise the building was allowed to remain as it was. The restoration of the Aḵṣā Mosque cost great labour, as it had not only to be cleared of all trace of Christian worship but the architectural alterations of the Christians had also to be removed. An inscription mentions that ʿAbd Allāh and his son Mīrābīrīs restored by Salādīn's orders (de Vogué, p. 101). The armoury of the Knights Templar in the southwestern part of the Aḵṣā was transformed and given the name “Mosque of the Women". Salādīn had a very elaborate and beautiful minbar ordered by Nūr al-Dīn for the Aḵṣā, which was in Ḥalāb, brought to the place for which it was intended. The cross over the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was removed and the bells broken as in the other churches. He spared the Church of the Holy Sepulchre itself but forbade the pilgrims to visit it; this prohibition was however removed in 1192. The great hostel of the Knights of St. John was presented as a waqf to the Mosque of ʿUmar and the church there turned into a hospital under the name "al-Ḥurairāt". The convent of the Church of St. Anne, which the nuns had to leave, was turned into a large handsomely endowed school, the name of which, al-Salāḥiyā, recalled its founder (the church however had already been used as a school before the conquest by the Franks; Tobler, Topographie von Jerusalem, i. 429). The dwelling of the Patriarch northwest
of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was turned into a hostel for pilgrims (θήβας). The walls round Jerusalem which had suffered during the sieges, were renovated under the personal supervision of Saladin — a deep ditch was dug in front of them — and the towers between the Gate of the Pillar (see above) and the Gate of the Mihrab on the west side were rebuilt (Mujadir al-Din, p. 338). On this occasion a part of the west hill hitherto outside the walls was incorporated in the city (cf. Rotermund, op. cit., p. 21).

After the death of Saladin (389 = 1193) his brother usurped his son’s inheritance and seized the power in his own hands and then divided it among his own sons, of whom al-Mu’azzam received Damascus and Palestine. This anti-Christian ruler, fearing that the Christian kings might establish themselves in Jerusalem, ordered it to be destroyed in 1219, and this was done so thoroughly that only the Holy Sepulchre, the Tower of David and the Mosque on the Haram were spared. He further showed his reverence for the sanctuaries on the Haram by building a new wooden tower for the Aksa and restoring the arcades on the south side of the Dome of the Rock. From him also probably dates the porch on the north side of the Aksa (see de Vogüé, op. cit., p. 103, and thereon Hartmann, Z. D. P. V., xxxii. 204). He also built a school for the Hanaifs beside this mosque. After his death the Emperor Frederick II, then excommunicated, achieved by his statesmanship, what the arms of the Crusaders had failed to do, by concluding a treaty with al-Mu’azzam’s brother, al-Kamil, in 626 (1229) whereby Jerusalem — except the Muslim sacred places on the Haram — and a narrow corridor to the sea were ceded to him for ten years. The Emperor crowned himself there in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, without the assistance of any of the priesthood. In this way the Latinos again came into possession of the city for a brief period. When the period had expired, a son of al-Mu’azzam who ruled in Kerak and, like his father, hated the Christians fell upon the holy city, destroyed the citadel and forced the inhabitants to capitulate. The Christians were relieved by the disputes which broke out between the Ayyubids in Damascus and those in Egypt; they realised the value of their support and the rival princes began to make great promises to win it. The Christians preferred to support Sâlih Isam’îd of Damascus and in this way they came once more into undisturbed possession of the holy city (1244). The Egyptian Ayyubid al-Sâlih Nadjam al-Din however summoned the Khâwarizmians to his assistance and they at once carried fire and sword through Syria, slew a large number of fugitives from Jerusalem, plundered and murdered in the city, desecrated the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, where the tombs of the kings were ruined, and other churches. He had now full freedom of action and, when his allied enemies were defeated at Gaza, he seized Jerusalem and henceforth the town remained in Muslim hands. This was the real end of the Crusades, the permanent political result of which was a burning hatred between Christians and Muslims which has only rarely flamed up before. Not long afterwards, the Ayyubids were superseded by the Ma’mûlî Sultans in Egypt, under whom Syria and Palestine formed one province, after Küçuz had won great fame in 1260 by defeating the advancing Mongols in the battle of ‘Ain Djalût (q.v.).

In the Mamlûk period, Jerusalem fell into the background after being for a time the centre of interest in the east. What we know of its history in this period we owe mainly to the compiler Mujdir al-Din ‘Ulama, who, as an appendix to the earlier history of the town, tells us what various Mamlûk Sultans had done for it. The frequently necessary repairs of the sanctuaries there gave these princes an opportunity of displaying their pious interest and the mosaics on the outer wall of the Dome of the Rock, which had suffered from the wind and rain, in particular needed frequent repairs, which need not be detailed here. We are told of several Sultans that they lightened the taxes which the town had to pay and that other Sultans gave splendid copies of the Koran to the mosques. The great Sultân Baibars I (q.v.) had the Aksa restored and in 662 (1263) built a Khân northwest of the town which was intended for the relief of the poor. Al-Ma’ânîr Kala‘în (678–689) restored the roof of the southwestern parts of the Aksa beside the Mosque of the Women. Al-Ma’ânîr Lâdjin (696–698) restored the mihrab of David on the south wall of the Aksa. Al-Nâṣîr Muhammad in his third reign (709–741 = 1309–1340) paved the back part of the Aksa with marble slabs, had two windows pierced right and left of the Mihrab, restored the arcades on the north side of the raised part of the Haram, and the Gate of the Cotton-Merchants, gilt the domes of the two sanctuaries on the Haram in such brilliant fashion that in Mujdir al-Din’s time, 180 years later, they still looked like new (an inscription in the Dome of the Rock mentions this gilding and a renovation of the outer roof; de Vogüé, op. cit., p. 91); the aqueduct which brought the water from the Sultan’s Pool to the town was also repaired in the same reign. In 851 (1447/1448) lightening set the roof of the Dome of the Rock on fire and a portion of it was consumed whereupon Sultan Djalâm (842–857) had it repaired. This ruler was hostile to the Christians and ordered all the new buildings in the Sion monasteries and in the Holy Sepulchre to be destroyed. He took away from the monks the so-called Tomb of David and the site where, according to Church tradition, the Apostles were filled with the Holy Ghost and took away a balustrade from the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and carried it to the Aksa Mosque. The able Sultan al-Ashraf Kâtîb-Hey (873–901 = 1468–1495) who took a great deal of interest in the sacred places of his kingdom, built, as an inscription tells us, the well between the raised part of the Haram and its west wall and rebuilt the school which bears his name at the Gate of the Chain in the Aksa and extended it (Mujdir al-Din, p. 387). In his reign also several aqueducts which led water into the town were restored (ibid., p. 621, 655, 661 sq.).

Of the geographical works of the Ayyubid and Mamlûk period, Yakû‘î’s great dictionary the Mü‘jam al-Bulhân (ed. Wustenfeld, 1866–1873) is in the first rank with its great use of older sources. In the main article on Jerusalem (iv. 590 sq.) he gives a description of the town, its history, its climate, its wealth in fruit and the Haram sanctuaries, and details the famous men who have lived there. To the sixteenth century belong
the geographical works of al-Dimashqī (Cormography, ed. Mehran, 1866) and Abu ‘l-Fidā’ī (ed. Reinard and de Slane, 1840) and Ibn Battūta’s Travels (ed. Defrémeury and Sanguineti, 1869–1879).

To the xyth century belongs Khālid al-Zahrī’s (d. 872 = 1468) work, which exists in two synopses, on Palestine and Syria (K. Hartmann, Die geographischen Nachrichten über Palastina und Syrien in Khālid al-Zahrī’s Zubdat Kafṣ al-Munatā, 1907). In the section on Jerusalem he deals with the geographical passages and traditions relating to Jerusalem, the Dome of the Rock, the four rites used there, the pious foundations, bazaars, schools, lights and baths with white, green, blue and yellow, the rock from which Christ spoke to the brothers, the marble slabs used instead, while at the top a dark blue band with an inscription in white ran round the octagon. Perforated sheets of gyppum, filled with panes of variegated glass, were put in the windows. The Sulṭān also had the city-walls renovated and gave them the form they still have to-day. At some places they rest not upon the rock but on the débris of earlier walls. On this occasion a part of the west hill was again cut off from the unwalled town. In Sulaimān’s reign in 1545 the dome of the bell-less bell-tower on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre fell down in an earthquake. In 1555 the little building in the rotunda over the tomb was removed and replaced by a new one regular in shape. The whole Church was now divided among the different denominations, who jealously watched one another. These feuds and the hostile attitude of the Muslims for long delayed the very necessary restoration of the dome of the Anastasis and the bell-tower, until finally in 1719 the work was taken in hand. In rebuilding, by order of the Turkish government, the existing forms were retained and the attempted alterations at the Anastasis had to be removed. In 1808 a fire broke out in the Armenian chapel, which destroyed most of the western part of the church. The Greeks succeeded in asserting their claim to do the restoration and they entrusted the work to an architect from Mytilene, named Kononos Kalaf, who, by the unfortunate way in which he performed his task, has acquired a kind of heroïque renom. The Sulṭān who had given authority to the Greeks by a firman was Mahmūd II (1808–1839); he also, according to an inscription, renewed the gilding of the Dome of the Rock and had its outside restored. This is the not very edifying end of the story of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. But for the unfortunate rivalry among the different denominations, it would possibly have been decided much earlier to remove the ugly new buildings and the plaster covering the old walls, so that the Church of the Crusaders could be restored by using the old materials.

In the xixth century Palestine was again disturbed from the state of vegetation in which it had lapsed. Napoleon invaded the country and fought the Turks on the old battle-ground of the plain of Vire’el, but his plan of taking Jerusalem was abandoned. Next Muhammad ‘Ali seized the country and Jerusalem surrendered to him in 1831. The European Powers put a stop to the furtherance of his adopted son Ibrahim Pasha and when the discontent with Egyptian rule in the land continued to increase, France withdrew her protection from Muhammad ‘Ali and with the support of England and Austria, Sulṭān ‘Abd al-Majīd once
more came into possession of Palestine and Jerusalem in 1840 and the Turks held it till the World War, which deprived them of the country and opened up a new epoch in the history of Jerusalem. Palestine is now governed under an English mandate and Jerusalem is the capital of the central district, Jerusalem–Jaffa.

In the course of the sixteenth century, a new life began to invigorate Jerusalem, which altered more and more the medial character of the city. Ibrahim Pasha's government introduced progress in various directions, which however threatened to be checked when the city passed to the Turks again but was gradually revived when increasing security began to attract Europeans thither. The number of visitors increased very much and many strangers settled in the city. It was a great step forward when European consulates were instituted, who afforded foreigners legal protection. It was significant of the altered conditions that the prohibition to non-Muslims to enter the site of the Temple was abolished after the Crimean War and that bells, forbidden since the time of Saladin, were restored to the churches. Postal and telegraph services and other modern institutions, the most recent of which was the railway from Jaffa, were introduced and hostels on modern lines were erected. A new era in building began in this period, partly in the city itself, where ruined houses were restored or replaced by new ones, and partly in the vicinity. Schools, pilgrim hostels, hospitals including one for lepers, an orphanage etc. were built. Several churches were built or old ones restored, including the Church of St. Anne presented by the Sultan in 1816 to Napoleon III and the Church of the Redeemer on the Muristan, which was given in 1856 to the King of Prussia. The number of Jews who migrated there, which nearly doubled between 1881 and 1891 (Z. D. P. V., xvi. 196) has greatly increased since the World War. Ibrahim Pasha allowed them to build synagogues, which they have continued to do and several synagogues with high cupolas were built having Talmudic schools attached to them. The Jews have now built a building for a medical faculty, as the beginning of a university. The excavations undertaken in Jerusalem in recent years throw light mainly on the earliest history of the city and were therefore not dealt with here; we need only mention the excavations conducted by the Russian Palestine Society as they are of importance for Constantinian buildings. The most striking feature about Jerusalem and one that makes quite a painful impression on the visitor is the conflict of different creeds and denominations, for all of which it is a holy city. Not only Christians, Muslims and Jews are more or less at enmity with one another, but the various Christian denominations are also rivals and each is striving to extend its influence at the expense of the others. Now, down to the Crusaders, the Greek Orthodox Church formed the main body of Christians and after the expulsion of the Latins, came into their own again has already been mentioned. They were the subjects of successive Muslim rulers, but had their own self-government and elected their own Patriarch, whose supremacy over the Orthodox Church however passed to the Patriarch in Constantinople after the Turkish conquest. The fact that they restored the Church of the Holy Sepulchre burned down in 1808, gave them a considerable advantage but cost so much that they found themselves in a difficult position. They were rescued by the Russians, but the result was the Russian Church and government gained an increasing influence, which was still further extended by the building of hospices and splendid churches. The Roman Catholic Latinus whom the Crusaders brought into the land were expelled after Saladin's conquest, the Latin Patriarchate abolished in 1291 and his palace fell into the hands of the Muslims. In 1305 Robert of Sicily bought for the Roman Church the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the coenaculum but the Dome of the Rock remained in possession of the Greeks. Only the Franciscans were able to remain there, even after they were expelled from the Sion monastery in 1551 and in spite of the most oppressive conditions, they have been untiring and beneficial in their activities. France under Louis XIV endeavoured to exercise a protectorate over the Holy Land but this disappeared under Napoleon who had no interest in it. In 1848 the Roman patriarchate was revived and since that date Roman Catholic influence in Jerusalem has considerably increased. To strengthen the Protestant element, the Anglo-German bishopric of St. James was instituted in 1841 at the suggestion of Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia but it never had any vitality and was abolished in 1887.


(F. Buhl)
The Temple area with the Dome of the Rock
Façade of the Aksa-Mosque
Main Entrance to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre
KUDSI, the real name of Ḥaddījī Muḥammad Khan. He adopted this name (meaning holy) because he was a native of Mashhad. He came to India in the 5th year of Shīb Ithnān (1611-1612). There is a notice of him, with some extracts, in vol. 1, p. 351, of the Dabāṣhānā. He is highly praised by the author of the Amlā-i Sāleḥ, who gives the complete which Kudi composed for the Peracow-throne (see also Kāshānī), i. part ii, p. 83. He wrote a poetical Shāhī-Sha‘bānāmeh, and a poem in praise of Kashmir. He died at Lahore in 1650-1656. Kriu (3. 635) is mistaken in saying that he died in Kashmīr (Kashmiri). He wrote ode’s and quatrains, as well as Mā‘anāt, for a festival in praise of Shīb Ithnān, which he was weighed against rapaces.
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- Muhammad ʿAbd al-Hayy al-Laknawī, Kit. al-Fawād al-bahūṭā, fī Tarāqīs al-
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AL-KUFR, a once celebrated city south of the ruins of Babylon, on the western arm of the Euphrates (cf. al-Fakrār), which later disappears in the swamps west of Wāṣīṭ. After the battle of al-Kūtisayy [q.v.] the Arabs by command of ʿOmar built a strongly defended camp on this site in order to control more easily the people of the newly conquered province, while the old capital Česiphon was ruthlessly destroyed, and the capital of the Lakhmīd dynasty, Hira, only a few Arab miles south of Kūfr gradually lost its former importance. For military reasons this settlement which was called al-Kufa and the somewhat older Basra were placed on the west side of the river, so that communication between the capital Medina and the army headquarters should not be affected by any natural obstacles. While Basra was built quite near an already existing village, al-Khurāba, which later became a suburb of Basra, Kūfr was an entirely new settlement founded by Sād b. Abī Wākāṣṣ according to some in 7 (638) to others not till 18 or even 19. According to the Persian tradition, however, there had been on the same site a town built by the mythical king Hūṣang of the Pishdād dynasty, which fell in time completely into ruins and Sād b. Abī Wākāṣṣ had to rebuild it: not much importance need be attached to this story. The usual meaning of the Arabic word Kūfa is “a round sandhill”. The name therefore would indicate that the oldest part of the town was built on an eminence of this kind; other explanations however are given, cf. Yāqūt, iv. 322. According to the Arab geographers Kūfā occupied an extensive area in the wide plain on the bank of the Euphrates; its position was considered more healthy than that of Basra, and the principal products of the country round were dates, sugar-cane and cotton. The importance of Kūfa grew with the eastward advance of the Arabs; the general in supreme command there was also the political representative of the Caliph and governed the province. The two sister towns of Kūfah and Basrah had usually separate governments; but sometimes they were combined; on this, see the article AL-KUF. With the great importance which Kūfah gradually attained for the ruling Arabs as well as the subject Persians, the number of inhabitants grew very rapidly. In addition to the families of Arab soldiers, merchants, artisans and other workers mainly of Persian origin settled in vast numbers. The original camp consisted simply of tents and a few other public buildings, but in course of time it grew into a permanent settlement of clay huts. Finally (according to the usual statements) in the governorship of Zipāy b. Abīh, i.e. after about 50 (670), a regular town with brick houses was built. The people of Kūfah, who were

AL-KUDSĪ, whose full name was ABU ʿL-ḤASAN (var. al-Husayn) Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. Dā‘far b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Ḥaqqādī b. Kudsi, a Ḥanafi lawyer, born in 362 (972), died at Baghdad on the 5th Rajab 428 (April 24, 1037). He studied law under Muḥammad b. Yāḥyā al-
Dājdīnī and hadīth under Muḥammad b. Abī Suwaid al-Mu‘addib, Ṭibād Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Dawāshī. Amongst his pupils may be noted the celebrated traditionalist and historian al-Khāṣibī [q.v.] al-Fāḥēdī, Al-Kudsi had to hold several public disputations in defence of the Ḥanafi school against his contemporary the Sha`fi`i lawyer Ḥamīd al-Isfā:kī. The two following of his works have been preserved:

1. al-Mukhtār, a manual of law of great compassions, composed, it appears, for his son Muḥammad and containing 12,500 questions: a) the chapter on marriage has been translated by G. Helmsdorfer, Frankfurt 1832; b) the chapter on the Holy War (al-Siyar) has been edited with a translation and notes in Latin by Rosenmuller (in Analecta Arabica), Leipzig 1825-1826. The Mukhtār was published at Delhi in 1847, at Constantinople in 1291, 1309, at Kazan in 1880.


The Encyclopedia of Islam, II.
partly members of different Arab tribes, particularly South Arabian Beduins and partly all kinds of Persian elements, cannot be denied military ability. At the same time the Kūfans were distinguished by brilliant intellectual gifts and their considerable achievements in the field of Muslim learning. Among their most striking characteristics however was a remarkable fickleness and lack of reliability, which in the long run proved highly disastrous in political life, and was responsible in a high degree for the civil wars which interfered so much with the prosperous development of the Caliphate. Even ‘Omar to whom the town owed its existence had occasion to complain of the insubordination of the Kūfans, who were never satisfied but had always some objection or other to the governor, appointed by the Caliph. When he was induced to yield to their wishes, their demands became more and more intolerable, and during the last six years of his reign, he had to change the governor in Kūfa no less than three times. When the opposition to ‘Uthmān long prepared in secret finally broke out in 34 (655), the Kūfans were the first to proclaim their fidelity to ‘Ali. After the battle of the Camel in 36 (656), where ‘Ali was victorious over his enemies, he went to Kūfa, and now it looked as if this town would become the seat of the Caliphate. But when ‘Ali encountered Mu‘āwiya in the plain of Siffin, the Irāqis were outwitted by the Šyārīs; victory slipped from the Prophet’s son-in-law, when just within his grasp, and after he had declared himself satisfied with the arbitration, the Khāridjīs abandoned him. After the assassination of ‘Ali in the year 40 (661), the Kūfans had to acknowledge Mu‘āwiya as commander of the faithful. The stalwart governors of the new caliph, first Ziyād b. Abihi and next his son ‘Ubayd Allāh, who received in 55 (674/675) the governorship of Baṣra, which after the death of Mu‘āwiya was combined with that of Kūfa, were able in a masterly fashion to keep the turbulent people of Kūfa in check, and when Hūsain b. ‘Ali [q.v.] decided to accept the appeal of his many followers in al-Irāq and set out from Mecca for Kūfa, ‘Ubayd Allāh’s energetic measures easily suppressed the rebellious tendencies of the Kūfans. In Muḥarram 61 (October 680) Hūsain fell at Kābāl. After the death of the second Umayyad Caliph, Yazid I, civil war broke out once more. As ‘Ali’s younger son, Mu‘ammad b. al-Ḥanafīya, was not inclined to put himself at the head of the Shi‘ī party in Kūfa, the Kūfans paid homage to ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair, who had already been proclaimed Caliph throughout the Ḥijāz, and for years disputed the supremacy with the Umayyad Marwān and his son ‘Abd al-Malik. In 66 (685) the unscrupulous adventurer al-Mukhtar b. Abi ‘Ubayd [q.v.] succeeded in taking Kūfa and a regular reign of terror began, which lasted about a year and a half. All who did not openly profess the doctrine of the Shi‘a, which was general among the Persians especially, were ruthlessly persecuted until the Arab population appealed for help to Muṣ‘ab b. al-Zubair who had been appointed Governor of Baṣra by his brother, the anti-Caliph ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair. In a battle at Ḥarūtā near Kūfa (67 = 687) al-Mukhtar was defeated and slain and Muṣ‘ab took a bloody revenge on the rebels. From this time the Persian elements in the population were more and more suppressed and in the end the old hereditary points of conflict between the different Arab tribes played a much greater part in the political history of Irāq than the national differences between Arabs and Persians. After Muṣ‘ab had fallen, fighting the Umayyids (72 = 691), Kūfa had to submit and ‘Abd al-Malik was able to enter the town unopposed. From 75 (694) till 95 (714) the administration of the whole of the Irāq was in the hands of the energetic ‘Abd al-Malik b. Yūsuf [q.v.] who in order to break all resistance founded a new capital in Wāṣit, from which he could easily control both Kūfa and Baṣra. During the long governorship of Khalid b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḵāṣṣ (105−120 = 724−738) peace and quiet generally prevailed in al-Irāq. In 172 (745) however the Khāridjīs seized Kūfa and it took the troops of the Caliph Marwān II two years to drive them out. Soon afterwards the ‘Abbāsidis appeared in the field. The Umayyad governor of Khorasan, Naṣr b. Sajjār, was defeated and in 173 (749) the long prepared rising in Kūfa broke out. The ‘Abbāsidis had no difficulty in occupying the town; Kūfa was made the capital and remained so for nearly two decades although the ‘Abbāsid rulers usually lived, not in Kūfa itself, but sometimes in Ḥāṣhimiyah, farther north on the Euphrates and sometimes in Baṣra. After the foundation of the new capital Bāṣrā al-Bāṣrī and the ‘Abbāsid Caliph al-Mansūr, Kūfa gradually sank in importance, but it retained for a considerable time a large garrison, and the renown for learning, which the inhabitants had won by the first half of the second century A.H. remained down to the fifth century. In spite of the altered political conditions, ‘Alid sympathies and the old fondness for all sorts of new movements and rebellious tendencies remained undiminished. In 199 (815) a descendant of ‘Ali named Mu‘ammad b. Ibrāhīm, also called Ibn Ṭabṭāba, appeared in Kūfa and tried to assert his claim to the caliphate. The governor was expelled and the pretender won numerous adherents. Although he died in the same year, the dangerous rising was only put down by great effort. In the reign of al-Musta‘īn [q.v.] Kūfa was again disturbed by the ‘Alid. In 250 (864/865) the ‘Alid Vāby b. ‘Omar raised a rebellion against the government with all sorts of rabble. The governor had to flee and the rebellion rapidly spread; order was however soon restored. After some time, another ‘Alid set up in the always turbulent city but his rule was of only short duration. In 256 (870) ‘Abi b. Zaid, likewise a descendant of ‘Ali proclaimed himself there and drove the governor out. He then routed the commander of the government troops, al-Shāb b. Miktāl, who had been sent to suppress him; but on the advance of a new army he had to vacate Kūfa. When western Irāq and Syria were devastated by the Karmātians, Kūfa did not escape; in 293 (906) they entered the city and in 312 (924/925) it was conquered and sacked by the famous Karmātian leader, Aṣḥāb Tāhir. It was similarly sacked in 317 (932/33) and 330 (947). The increasing collapse of the caliphate in the fourth century contributed to the decline of Kūfa, although the Būyids, who seized the capital Bāṣrā in 334 (945) and thus gained political supremacy, as Shi‘is took a special interest in Kūfa or rather its suburb Naqja‘f, because the latter was believed to contain the holy tombs. But in time the power of the Būyids also weakened; in 375 (985/986)
Karmatians once more occupied Kufa, and eleven years later it was granted as a fief by Ihâhâ al-Dawla (q.v.) with other places to the 'Ukhûlûd b. al-Muayyâd. It then passed to the Banî Mazyaq; but when the latter in 495 (1107/1102) built a new capital, Hilla, which rapidly grew, to the north of it, the former capital gradually lost any importance. When Ibn Djibaur visited it about 90 years later, the old walls had been taken down and Kufa showed other signs of decay. From the Mongol period onwards it rapidly fell into oblivion. When Ibn Taghûna visited the town, it was for the most part deserted, mainly as a result of the raids of the neighbouring Beduins of the tribe of Khâfûdja. From his description it appears however, that the mosque was still fairly well preserved. Of the old government buildings (kâfû al-mârâ) which Sa'd b. Abî Waqâ היש had built, only the foundations were left. Its decline at this time is corroborated by the Nûshat al-Kûliû of Hamd Allah Mustâwofi Kâzîmî written in 740 (1339/1340). Later we only find Na'dîf in its vicinity mentioned, which retained a certain importance as a Shî'ite place of pilgrimage and is now usually called Maqâshid Ailî, "the tomb of Allî". Niebuhr gives the following description of the country round Kufa: "The land around is all desert and the town has no longer any inhabitants. The most noteworthy object here is the great mosque in which 'Allî was mortally wounded; but even of this little is left but the four walls".

On the services of Kufan scholars to Arabic philology, see the article ARABIA, Litterature. There was also considerable activity in Kufa, as in Bâṣra, in other fields of Muslim learning during its palmyest days. Especially after the battle on the Harra in 63 (665) many of the old companions of the Prophet, who were regarded as authorities on Muslim tradition, emigrated to al-Iraq and settled in the most important towns. Only two of these traditionists need be mentioned here: the celebrated 'Abd Allâh b. Ma'sûd, who was one of the earliest converts and was sent to Kufa as a guide and teacher, and the no less distinguished 'Amîr b. Sharâhîl al-Shâbî (d. circa 104 = 722).


KUFYA (in the dialects of Syria, kefîye, Cuche, Dict., p. 577; Burckhardt, Notes on the Bedouins, p. 27; G. Fesquet, Voyage en Orient, p. 185), an Arabic word borrowed from the Romance languages (ital. cuffa, Span. cofra, Port. cofa, French coiffé, coiffe, the name of a silk handkerchief, which the Bedouins of the Syrian desert, as far as the region of Mecca, wear as a head-dress; it is kept on the head by a cord of camel-hair dyed black and fastened at intervals with cords of bright colours called agâl (class. 'ıqâl). This handkerchief is square-shaped, yellow or yellow and green in colour and is placed on the head in such a way that one corner hangs behind, while two others fall down in front of the shoulders; the square is first of all folded in two to form a triangle, what is called a gore in dressmaking. The corners on the shoulders may be brought over the face to shelter it against the rays of the sun, against the cold wind, against the rain, or to conceal one's features when one does not want to be recognised. The wool of the ends hanging down much below the edge of the material are twisted into cords like a long fringe (J. B. Fraser, Travels in Koordistan, i. 228). The head-dress used also to be worn by the Mamlûk Sûltâns of Egypt.

Bibliography: R. Dozy, Noms des vêtements, p. 390; Lane, Thousand and one Nights, i. 130, 614; [A. Socin] Palestine and Syria (Baedeker), p. xiv, 1912; Buckingham, Travels in Mesopotamia, ii. 195; Ker Porter, Travels, ii. 292, 293; R. P. Jaussen, Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab, p. 32, note 3 (black, occasionally white, in colour); M. Tilke, Orien- talische Kostüme, Berlin 1923, pl. 29.
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KUFRA. [See KAFIR.]

KUFRA, a group of oases in the Eastern Sahara, halfway between Cyrenaica and Wadai. It was for long only known from the account by Rohîf, who succeeded in reaching it in 1879. Since then it has been visited by two other Europeans, Marshal des Logis-Lapierre (1918) and Mrs. Rosita Forbes (1920-1921). The group of oases to which the name Kufrä is given extends from S. E. to N. E. for a length of about 120 miles between 24° and 26° N. Lat., and 31° and 34° E. Long. The most southerly is about 850 miles S.E. of Tripoli and 600 miles S. of Benghâila. They number five, separated from one another by serir or stretches of banks of gravel; Taiserbo in the N.E., Bûseima in the centre, Erbêhna (the Ribiana of Mrs. Forbes) in the S.E. and Sirhen, N.E. of Bûseima and to the S.E. of Kufra properly so-called, the Kebabo of Rohîf, the largest of all. The total area of the group according to Rohîf is about 7,000 square miles of which Kufrä has 3,400 and Taiserbo 2,500.

Kufra lies in the bottom of a depression, the height above sea-level of which varies from 800 feet at Taiserbo to 1,400 at Kebbo. The soil consists mainly of marl and sand covered with dust in the north, which perhaps are connected with those of the Libyan desert. One chain of dustes extends from the north of Taiserbo, another surrounds Bûseima. In the central and southern parts, the depression is crossed by calcareous ranges lying upon Numidian sandstone. The hills Djebel Erbêhna, Dj. Bûseima, Dj. Sirhen, Dj. Neri (north of Kebabo) assume a tabular form like that of the gur of the South Algerian Sahara. There are neither springs nor streams in Kufrä, but everywhere at a depth of 3 to 10 feet an abundant water-bearing stratum can be tapped. At various parts the waters form on the surface of the ground brackish lagoons or even permanent
lakes, of which the most remarkable are that of Erbehna and especially that of Bâseima, which measures about 6 miles in length. They may be regarded as relics of a former period in which the lacustrine character of the oases was much more marked than to-day.

These subterranean waters make up for the scarcity of rain and are sufficient to nourish an abundant and varied vegetation. In the dry beds grew the kûd (cornula ca monacanthâ), and the dîs which provide excellent camel food; among the lakes and marshy hollows fields of cereals, wheat, dûra (sorghum vulgäre), vegetables, orchards of olive, fig, orange and citron trees form a verdant girdle but usually a very narrow one. The breadth of this zone does not exceed 1,000 yards at Bâseima. Date palms constitute the principal wealth of the oases. According to Rohîfs there are 4 millions of them, many of them however growing wild. There are none however in the oasis of Sirhen. As to the fauna, it is represented by gazelles, many varieties of birds (crows, falcons, and cranes) and reptiles like lizards and non-vomous snakes.

The population of Kufra does not exceed 5,000. Almost all belong to the tribe of Zâwîya, Arabicised Berbers who supplanted the Tûbûh, the former owners of the oases. The majority of them are semi-nomadic and only have temporary camping-places. There are only settled groups at Kufra where the village of Djöf has 250 inhabitants and where some 500 individuals live about the Sanûsî zâwîya of al-İstât. The geographical situation of Kufra gives it a certain commercial importance. It is a stage on the caravan route leading from Cyrene to Wadai, a route used since the beginning of the xîth century, the period when Sulîn Sabîn made it known to enable travellers to escape the brigandage of the people of Tibesti. According to Muhammad al-Hâshînî there was a market at Djöf where business was entirely done by barter. But as in all the markets of the Sahara, the principal traffic was in slaves, a trade which gradually tends to disappear.

We know very little of the history of Kufra. According to Rohîfs it was a settlement of the Garamantes and there are still to be seen there buildings similar to those noticed in Fezzân by Duveyrier, which seem to date back to a remote antiquity. In the historical period, the land was occupied by the Tûbûh, who have left numerous traces of their occupation, cemeteries, houses, fortified villages on the tops of hills. Their Sulîn lived at Djârangeidi, in the oasis of Taiserbo. The people were pagans, whence perhaps the name Kufra (kufara, pl. from kûr, infidel) given to the region where they were settled. They were dismissed about 1750 by the Zâwîya and the Hässûna, tributary from Tripolitania. The Tûbûh had almost completely disappeared by the beginning of the xîth century, and are now represented by Kufra by only 300—400 individuals. Towards the middle of the same century the Senûsîyâ appeared, who founded a settlement at Taiserbo, then built the Zâwîya of Al-İstât in the oasis of Kebabo, near the village of Djöf. They bought up the best land and the richest gardens. At the time of Rohîfs’ journey they already held a quarter of the palm-trees of the oasis and had begun to plant new groves. Already very important in those days, the Zâwîya of Al-İstât is now the residence of the grand master of the brotherhood. In 1895 Sidi al-Maḥdi, son and successor of Sidi Muhammed al-Senûsî, the founder of the order, left Djârangeidi [q.v.] and came to settle in Kufra.


(Indeed. G. Yekor)

Kûhîstân (Persian) or Kûhîstân is the arabicised form of the Persian name Kûhîstân meaning a mountainous country (derived from kûh, “mountain”) with the suffix -îstân and corresponds to the Arabic designation al-Dîjîbâl. As the Iranian plateau is very mountainous, we find many more or less extensive areas in it to which the name Kûhîstân has been given, as Yâkût has already remarked (iv. 204). Many of these names have disappeared in course of time. Thus Kazwîn (ed. Rüttenfeld, p. 228) says that the term Kûhîstân is used for Media, which other geographers always call al-Dijâfâl. In the Shâb-nâmâ of Firdawsi we even find Kûhîstân used as the old name of Mâ wâr Îl-Nahr (ed. Vullers, p. 531), but this is probably a case of an erroneous identification made by Firdawsi himself (cf. also Vullers, Lexicon, s. v. Kûh).

The principal districts that are or have been called Kûhîstân are as follows:

1. Kûhîstân-i Khûrâsân. This is the mountainous and partially arable region which stretches south of Nishapûr as far as Sistan in the south-east. It is surrounded on all sides by the great salt desert of the Central Iranian plateau and consists of scattered groups of oases; one feature of its geographical unity is the fact that its whole belongs to one of the great centres of civilization that surround it. These are the north Nishapûr, in the north-east Herât, in the south-east Sistan, in the south-west Kirmân with Yazd, and in the west Media. Although Kûhîstân has always been connected with these by caravan routes and is therefore not absolutely cut off, its isolated position, combined with the relatively low productivity of the soil, has caused it to be little known and neglected and its inhabitants have usually been ruled by a number of independent lords. If it has been reckoned a district of Khurâsân, this is only because Nishapûr and Herât are relatively the nearest places to it. Kûhîstân has therefore never been a very clean cut geographical term; a modern traveller like Curzon, although he describes the different districts, does not even mention its name.

The orography of Kûhîstân is still little known. The mountain chains which in the north run more east to west, assume the direction N.W.—S.E. as one moves southwards. These chains, which have passes rising to over 3,000 feet, enclose cultivated areas of which the principal are, beginning in the north: Turshiz and Turbat-i Hai- dâri [q. v.] now called Turbat-i Shaikh Ishâk and to the east Djâm; next comes the district of Djinâbâd (formerly Yunâbîd) and more to the east, that of Kûhâf with the old town of Zawzan;
then comes Tūn, with the district of Tabas on the west of it, which latter extends so far to the west that in the middle ages it was not included in Kūhīstān; next come to the south of these, Kān and Bīrjand, to the south of which there are no more oases of any importance until we reach Sistān by the Neh route. The rivers of the region are of little importance; irrigation is done by canals and khārōsī; Māklistī (p. 322, reading of the Constantine MS.) says, that the only running streams known in Kūhīstān is near Tabas; the latter is also the only town which he includes with the neighbouring district of Kuri, in the dīwīrī or warm regions.

It is probable that various places in Kūhīstān have a history going back to pre-Muhammadan times, but so far we have no information on this period. To realize this, it is sufficient to glance at the second map given by Herzfeld in his article Khorasan in Der Islam, vol. ix. The journey of this writer in 1925 confirmed his first impression. Moses of Chorene does not mention this region in his Geography. In the period of the early Arab conquests we find Kūhīstān under the rule of the Epiphalites. Historians say that it was first conquered in the caliphate of ‘Omar by ‘Abdallāh b. Badal al-Khuza‘ī; the latter setting out for Kirmān took al-Tabasain— it is by this dual (for Tabas and Kurīn, according to al-Baladhuri) that the Arabs always refer to the district of Tabas—in later times the “two gates of Khuraśān” (Tabar, i. 2704); a deputation of the inhabitants is said to have concluded a treaty with ‘Omar (Baladhuri, p. 403). In 31 (653) when Ibn ‘Amir undertook the conquest of Khuraśān, his advance guard under al-Afnāf passed through Kūhīstān and defeated the Epiphalites there (Tabārī, i. 2885, and Baladhuri, p. 403, who give other traditions also). In the years following, Kūhīstān was the centre of a great national revolt under a chief called Ārīn (a village in Kūhīstān still bears this name), a rising which was put down by Ibn Khāzīm (Tabarī, i. 2905; Marquart, Eränzahr, p. 135). In 51 (671) it was again necessary to reconquer it; this was done by al-Kabīr b. Ṣiyād from “the Turks” or rather Epiphalites (Tabarī, ii. 156). Henceforth Kūhīstān formed from the administrative point of view a part of Khuraśān and more particularly of the provinces which the Arab geographers still call by the old name of Aharshār with its capital Nushāpūr (cf. particularly al-Va‘ūlīb, Kitāb al-Buldān, B. G. A., vii. 278, who gives a rather limited definition to Kūhīstān, for he mentions al-Tabasain, Djam and Zawzan separately). These remote countries became in the early centuries of Islam the principal refuge of Zoroastrians driven from their homes by the new religion (cf. particularly Inostrantsiev’s work quoted in the Bibliography). In the ninth century the province was under the rule of the Tāhirids (Ibn Khordakhbībib, p. 35) and later of the Šaffārīds. The Arab geographers of the ninth and tenth centuries know it very well. In this period Kān was the capital and the commercial centre of Kūhīstān, especially for through trade between Kirmān and Khuraśān. The province was further noted for a very fine linen woven there, which Abū Nuwās mentions under the name ʿAqīya (cf. al-Dājiyī, Kitāb Bayān, Cairo 1332, i., p. 79); this industry flourished at Tūn in particular. Prayer-carpets also were made there. In the year 552, Nesīr-i Khusraw passed through Kūhīstān, going from Isfahān. He went by Tabas, Tūn, Kān and Sarakhs and describes them as large flourishing towns. In the time of the Sādji, Kūhīstān, the old asylum of the Zoroastrians, became a refuge for the Ismā‘īlī heretics, who for this reason were often called “al-matāhiba al-šāhiya”. They built here strongholds on the model of the famous citadel of Alamu; there are still many ruins of these castles which have not yet been examined (Herzfeld, Reiseberichte, p. 273). The Khwārzmshāhs had on several occasions to send military expeditions to punish the matāhiba (cf. e. g. Djumayn, Turāfiqī Dījkān Guzār, ii. 47, 49). The coming of the Mongols who exterminated the Ismā‘īls at the same time brought about the ruin of Kūhīstān. The region lost all importance and the geographers—like Abu ‘l-Fida’—only quote their predecessors of several centuries before. It is improbable that this is the district ref-reed to by Marco Polo under the name of Tunocain, which Le Strange (p. 352) proposes to identify as Tūn-u Kān. During the following centuries the region must have very often been in a state of anarchy (cf. Idrisi, trans. Jaubert, i. 430) when power was in the hands of chiefs of Arab origin. The ʿAfṣawīds exercised some authority there but after them, power lay in the hands of the amirs of Tabas and of Kān. At this time Kūhīstān inclined towards Afghānīstān rather than Persia, until the Kāḏjārs succeeded in bringing it under their sway towards the middle of the sixteenth century. The chiefs of the ruling families kept their positions as governors for the Šītī and received pompous titles from the Persian court. About 1900 the amirs of Kān no longer lived in this town but in Bīrjand; they claim descent from the Arab tribe of Khuzaima. Some members of this family have also ruled Sistān. The rulers of Tabas also govern the district of Dūnābād (capital Dūnain).

The settled population of Kūhīstān is of a very ancient stock: their houses are also of a very archaic type. Their dialect seems to offer few peculiarities. Ivanov distinguishes in Kūhīstān the dialect group of Tūrĝūzja and Dūnābād and that of Kān, Tūn and Bīrjand; many villages around Kān and Bīrjand are inhabited exclusively by Kāḡīs. In some places we also find descendants of the Ismā‘īls, who recognise the authority of the Agha Kān. There are also small colonies of Bahā’īs, while the Sunni Afghān element is relatively strong. The nomads are for the most part Arab Sunnis, still speaking Arabic; they live along the main routes; a few Turkish tribes are found only in the north, as far as Turbat-i Haidari. Finally in the south there are Bālūcīs, who move in summer towards Sistān.

The towns are very small. Kān, the old capital, had in 1900 about 4,000 inhabitants (Sykes). The land around this town is more fertile than that of Bīrjand. The commercial relations with the Gulf of Persia are greater than with Meshhed (export of silk, opium, saffron and hides). For the other towns like Tabas, Tabas Sunnīkhāne Turbat-i Haidari, Turṣiz and Zawzan, cf. the special articles.

Bibliography: All the Arab authors in the B. G. A.; Nesīr-i Khusraw, Safar-nāma, ed. Schefler, p. 95; Ibn Batūtā, ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii. 79; Abu ‘l-Fida’, Tašjam.

2. The Arab geographers appear to have known two towns of the name Kūhīstān in the province of Kirmān. One of them was called Kūhīstān al-‘Akhchāmīm and was in the district of Djarākh, between this town and the Djarākh al-Kuf (Maḥdis), p. 52, 461, 467; Vākī, iv. 206; Le Strange, p. 318. The other Kūhīstān was situated on the road from Sirdān to Bām, 6 farsaks from the former town (Ibn Khurdābīb, p. 66; Kudāmā, p. 196; Maḥdis, p. 473; Le Strange, p. 311).

3. Kūhīstān of Kābul in Afghanistan is a district N. E. of the town of Kābul and includes the districts of Pandžābīr, Nidjar, Tagān, etc. The population is composed of an element called Tagājs, who speak Persian and Pashtō and other elements called Kūhīstānī who speak Paγhal (a Dārīc dialect) and Fārāviz (Iranian) (cf. Imperial Gazetteer of India, xiv., Oxford 1908, p. 241). 4. The northern part of the native state of Swāt in the north-west of India is also called Kūhīstān. It is the mountainous region around the upper course of the river Swāt; it stretches eastwards as far as the Indus and westwards as far as Pasangkīr so that a distinction is sometimes made between Kūhīstān of Swāt and Kūhīstān of Pandžābīr. The people of the valleys (estimated to number 20,000) have suffered since the 14th century from Afghan invasions. Under the rule of the Afghāns they became very zealous Sunni Muslims; the religious chiefs (aγghāns) have an enormous influence in the country. Another consequence of the Afghan invasions has been the expansion of Pashtō all over the country. This language has gained ground at the expense of the old local dialects. The latter — to which the general name of Kūhīstānī is given — are very numerous and belong to the Dārīc group which according to recent research (Morgenstierne) seems to belong to the Indian group of languages. The principal dialects are: Gāgw (Swāt Kūh.), Tōrmwālī (Swāt and Pandžākīr Kūh.) and Mājwāy (Indus Kūh.).


5. Lastly Kūhīstān is the name of a barren and mountainous region in the eastern part of the district of Karachī. The population is nomadic and consists of Sindis and Balochis. The population in 1901 was estimated at 12,877 (The Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford 1908, vol. xvi., p. 353).

(J. H. Kramer)

Al-kūhl is, in the first place, a name for a mineral, stibnite (antimony sulphide) and secondly for galena (lead sulphide), for both of which the name iθimid is also used. The word iθimid comes from the Greek ἰθιμίδης and according to J. Ruska the words antimony and bismuth are derived from iθimid. In Persian al-kūhl is called surma from the place it comes from. Arabic synonyms are al-miθīs al-muθarraq (burned copper) al-isfahānī, kūhl dījān, kūhl sīzāman, kūhl aswad, etc.

Although the Mafṣūth al-Ulūm (ed. van Vloten, p. 262) says of kūhl that it is a substance of lead (surma) and the Pētōlogi of Aristotle says that iθimid contains lead, according to E. Seidel (Mechitar, p. 185, No. 215) the iθimid corresponding to it is almost always antimonite. Confusions naturally occur. According to M. Meyerhof al-kūhl is a pure antimony.

In the Mafṣūth al-Kūhl (ed. Lo Strange, G.M.S., xxiii./iii., p. 197) Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi for example gives places where it is found, at Isfahān, on Damūwend and in Spain. The latter is said to be particularly rich in the second quarter of the month. Stibnite is still found in Persia and in Spain. In Persia there are mountains called Kūh-i Surma and al-Ḳawwānī mentions a Ḍījabal al-Kūhl near Baṣṭa (text, p. 171).

It is to be noted that stibnite can be crushed to a much finer powder than galena; the former is much less hard than the latter. From its principal use al-kūhl comes to mean also the cosmetic made from it and then cosmetic in general. As it has to be crushed to a very fine powder, it means a fine powder in general.

As a cosmetic for the eyes, al-kūhl, after being ground up with other materials, is used to dye black the eye brows and eyelashes, or the edges of the lids, especially by women. It probably came to the Arabs from the ancient Egyptians. Stibnite has been several times found in their cosmetics (X. Fisher, Archiv für Pharmakologie, cxxx., 1892, p. 9). But the Egyptian cosmetics are usually of pulverised galena, with other materials added. According to M. Meyerhof (Der Basar der Drogen etc. in Kairo; Archiv für Wirtschaftsforschung im Orient, 1918, part 3/4, p. 210) sulphur antimony and sulphur of lead (kūhl) are sold to this day in Cairo as in ancient times as a cosmetic for the eye. The best still comes from Persia (al-isfahānī). That brought by the pilgrims is very popular (al-iθimid and al-iθimid). Surma is used as a cosmetic in Teherān also. The imitation cosmetic contains galena (kūhl al-iθimid) with isinglass (ansarān). In place of galena, graphite, smoke-black, especially that from the cheaper kind of frankincense, from burned almond shells etc. is used.

Besides the already mentioned black substances, some of other colours were used as cosmetics (kūhl). In his pharmacological principles al-Muwafak mentions a very black and one not quite so black, a black violet and even a pinkish and one quite white and also a yellow. The adjective kūhlī is therefore used not only for black, but
also for all dark colours, e.g. dark blue, purple, the dark red of the carthanne.

As a cosmetic, al-kahf is applied by means of a small probe (nih or mirwand), the point of which is sometimes moistened with rose-water. The cosmetic is kept in a box (mukhadh). From a picture in Lane, this resembles an old-tin glass. Al-mukhala however is also a sundial or a truncated pyramid (cf. E. W. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, p. 29 sqq. and 405; E. Wiedemann and J. Wurschmidt, "Über eine arabische gekelformige Sonnenuhr, Archiv, f. Gesch. der Naturwiss. und Technik, 1916, xii., p. 359.

Al-kahf is very much used as a unguent for the eyes. Ibn al-Baitâr and others give particulars on this subject.

Numerous imitations of kahf are given by al-Djawbari in his work: Kitâb al-Mukhâr fî Kâfî al-Asârî in the section: "Revelation of the secrets of ophthalmists"; al-kahf is in this connection not used as a cosmetic but as an unguent for the eyes. Women painted with kahf are particularly praised by the poets, or such as do not find it necessary to resort to it. E. von Lippmann quote passages from al-Mutanabbi, Hàfîz and Firdawsî.

The name alcohol for anything ground down into the finest and softest powder was transferred quite arbitrarily by Paracelus in the sense of quintessence to the spirit of wine as the noblest component of wine, a name which gradually came into general use for it.

The Muslims were not able to obtain our alcohol by distillation before about the xiith century, as they were not able to condense the vapours escaping from solutions of alcohol for lack of suitable apparatus. Alcohol was probably first obtained in the xiith century in Western Europe. (On this cf. the researches of E. von Lippmann, printed in his Beiträge zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Technik, Berlin 1912, p. 56—127.)

We have for a later date (second half of the xvith century) from the time of the Mughal Emperor Akbar a description of the preparation of arak (cf. the Ains-Akbari by Abu I-Faad Lalli, transl. H. Blochmann and J. Jarrett, 1895, l. 69 and E. Wiedemann, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Zucker in Der deutsche Zuckerindustrie, 1921, p. 302; see also E. von Lippmann, op. cit., p. 124.)

From al-kahf is derived al-kahhal, ophthalmist, on this see — in addition to a number of articles on separate points by M. Meyerhoff — the full and comprehensive treatment of the subject by J. Hirschberg in Geschichte der Augenheilkunde, Bk. ii., Gesch. d. Augenheilkunde im Mittelalter, forming part of Graeven Saemisch, Handbuch der allgemeinen Augenheilkunde, vol. xiii., Leipzig 1908. — The following is J. Hirschberg's summing up:

Very different estimates have been placed on the value of the work of the Arab ophthalmists. Want of knowledge of their works has led to their being undervalued in many quarters. But as early as 1490 A. Benedetti (Professor in Padua) said: "The most brilliant ophthalmists at the present time are in Asia, Syria and Media; in other lands, including Italy, they are exceedingly few in number." The greatest authority on the history of ophthalmic medicine, J. Hirschberg, then goes on to say that the name of the Arabs will never disappear from the records of the study of ophthalmic medicine and surgery (op. cit., p. 243).

Bibliography: All our knowledge of the history of antimony, stibnite and kahf and their uses as cosmetics is excellently summed up by E. O. von Lippmann, in Entstehung und Ausbreitung der Alchemie, etc., Berlin 1919, p. 629, and notices of their use in Muslim lands are very thoroughly utilised; Dozy, Supplement, ii. 446; Vallera, Lexicon Persico-latinum, ii. 286/287 has a detailed article; Bildt, Den Ge- brauch und die Zusammenstellung der orientalischen Augenmittel (al-kahf), Z. D. M. G., 1851, v., p. 236—242; F. Seidel, Der Medici- thar aus Her, ärztliches Werk über drei Arten der Fieber, Leipzig 1908, p. 215; E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, xxv.: "Über Charlatane bei den Mus- limen nach al-Gâbourî (Entkühlung der Geheimnisse der Augenärzte), S.B.P.M.S. Erlg., 1911, xiiii., p. 210; do., Beiträge, xl.: "Über Verfalschungen von Drogen, etc., S. B. P. M. S. Erlg., 1914, xl., p. 176 and 180; Das Steinbuch des Aristoteles, ed. and transl. by J. Ruska, Heidelberg 1912, p. 119, 175. — References to al- kahf are found in the different codifications e.g. that of al-Kâzimi, the works on pharmacology, e. g. those of Ibn al-Baitâr and al-Mu- wañâî, in the books on ophthalmics, etc. (E. Wiedemann)

KULU HISAR, a town in Asia Minor, in the province of Siwâs in the sandjak of Šaršî Shamâr, the capital of the kaza or the right bank of the Ilgî, on a rocky hill, height 3,900 feet; inhabitants 1,599, of whom 995 are Muslims, 604 Greeks and 300 Armenians. The capital of the kaza has been moved to the village of Mishâr. Near it is Köse-dagh, a mountain covered with vast forests.

Bibliography: 'Ali-Djawâr, Dîgînâiyyâ Lughât, p. 644; Sâmi-bey, Khâmus-î-Îlamîn, v. 3787; V. Quinet, Turquie d'Asie, i. 237, 793 (Kollat-Hissar). (Cl. Hoart)

KUKA, capital of Bornû, situated in the 55° N. Lat. and 30° East Long. (Greenwich). The town was founded in 1814, by the SHAÎKH Muhammad al-Kanomi, 9 miles east of Lake Chad in a sandy plain doted with boobah's (adansonia digitata) called kuka in Kanuri, whence the name Kaukaua or Kikoa, "town of the kuka's", given it by the natives. It was visited by Denham and Clapperton (1822—1823). Sacked in 1846 by the Wadians, it was rebuilt almost immediately. It had already recovered its prosperity by the time of Barth and Vogel's journey. Rohfis (1868), Nachigal (1871) and Monteil (1892) also made stays of some duration there. During all this period, Kuka was one of the most flourishing towns in the Südän. It was again destroyed in 1894 by Rabah, who transferred the capital of Bornû to Dikoa.

Kuka really consisted of two towns: an eastern and a western. The latter contained nearly two thirds of the population and was inhabited by Arab traders. It was traversed for its full length by a broad avenue called Dendal which spread in the market place which lay between the two towns. The most common type of dwelling was an enclosure divided into several courts in which stood huts of earth covered with straw or cubicle earthern buildings. The eastern town was the residence of the Sulîân and the chief officials. The population was estimated by the travellers mentioned above at 50,000—60,000. An almost equal number were encamped in the immediate vicinity.
Kūka in those days was a very important commercial centre where the products of the Südän (cloth-stuffs, hides, salt, patron, ostrich-feathers, kola nuts) were exchanged for European products brought from Tripolitania. There was also a considerable trade in camels, horses and slaves. Unlike the custom in the other markets of the Südän, coined money was rather plentiful here and business was done with a standard coinage (Maria Theresa dollars). The principal merchants were Arabs, agents of houses in Tripoli and Murzak. Kūka in conclusion, had a reputation as a literary centre; although education was confined to reading and writing and the knowledge of a few sūras of the Qur’ān, there were not less than 2,000—3,000 students.

Since the destruction of Rabah’s empire and the occupation of Bornū by the English, the town of Kūka has been rebuilt but has not regained its former prosperity, chiefly in consequence of the moving of the capital of the British and the native administration to Maiduguri, a healthier site.


(K. G. V.)

Kūla, a town in Asia Minor in the province of Aidin in the sandjak of Sarukhān, 130 miles east of Maghniitas (Magnesia), capital of a kāza; it is 2,200 feet above sea-level, has 6,100 inhabitants, of whom 5,653 are Muslims and 345 Greek Orthodox; it has 38 schools, four of which are secondary, 30 mosques, 2 Orthodox Churches, 3 baths and 2 caravanserais. It manufactures Smyrna carpets. The town is built of black lava except the mosques, the walls of which are white; it lies at the head of a valley running southwards out of the volcano of Kara-Su. Its citadel is in ruins and it retains numerous marble remains from antiquity.


AL-KULATÁ. [See al-Golâ.]

Kulaib, the chief of the Banū Taghlīb of the pre-Muhammadan period, whose murder by his brother-in-law Djasās b. Murra al-Shābāb was the cause of a long and bloody war between the two sister-tribes Taghlīb and Bakr [q. v.], which was known as "the war of Basās" [q. v.]. His genealogy was: Kulaib b. Rabī'a b. al-Hārīf b. Murra b. Zuhair b. Djasām (Wüstenfeld, Geneal. Tabellen, c. 22). Kulaib’s real name is said to have been Wâlî and the name of Kulaib ("little dog") to have given to him because of his habit of taking a small dog with him and making it bark by beating it in all the places which he wished to reserve as his own private property; the people who heard the barking of the dog refrain from using the place. This story, the point of which, however, eludes us, is evidently a later invention: the name Kulaib is frequently met with in Arab nomenclature and does not look like a surname.

Kulaib is represented as having all the characteristic traits of the tyrant, of which the independent and critical spirit of the Beduins has always had a profound horror; he is said to have been proclaimed "king" (on the use of this title cf. Lammens, Le Berceau de l'Islam, Rome 1914, p. 210) after the brilliant victory won at Kharāz over the united Yemeni tribes and to have ruled not only over the Banū Taghlīb but also over the Banū Shābān; the most important section of the Banū Bakr. After a short time he is said to have abused his power and to have usurped the rights of hunting and of pasturage at the expense of his subjects (the usurpation of the hīnā is the regular grievance of the Beduins against "tyrants"; the same reproach was made against the caliph 'Uthmān). Indeed it was because the she-camel Sarāb, belonging to a Ta'immī woman al-Basūsī or to one of her clients of the tribe of Banū Dājam, trespassed upon the private property of Kulaib, that the latter put her to death (or killed its young one and injured the mother) and this act of violence was the cause of his murder by Djasās, whose mother was the sister of al-Basūsī.

The details of the story are given in our sources with some variations, most of which are found as early as the work of Abū Ḫabid who, as is well known, the source of almost all our information on the afīyūn al-ʿArab (q. v., i. 230). Certain features, especially in the K. Al-ʿAgānī, have been borrowed from Ibn al-Kalbī, and the account of al-Mufaddal al-Dabbi has also been preserved. It is evident that we are no longer able to ascertain if the history of Kulaib (and in general that of the war against the Banū Taghlīb and the Banū Bakr) contains a nucleus of historical truth along with a mass of features undoubtedly legendary. This is a problem which can only be solved in connection with the general question of the historical value of the whole of the traditions of the pre-Islamic period. Considered by itself the episode of Kulaib has nothing improbable about it. We might be tempted to recognise in it a fairly clear memory of an attempt to form a political organisation among the Banū Taghlīb and the Banū Bakr of a kind superior to the ordinary Beduin tribes; the attempt, similar to that which gave the royal crown to the chiefs of the tribe of the Banū Kinda, must have been suggested by the example of the kingdom of the Lakhmids of al-Ḥira, not far from which the Banū Taghlīb and the Banū Bakr have their homes. The story of the tyranny and the death of Kulaib must have taken form at a very remote period; this is evident from the verses of "Abbas b. Mirkas and of al-Nabigha b. Djasās (both contemporary with Kulaib) given in our sources; in that of al-Nabigha in particular, the history of the killing of the camel is already told in detail. An allusion to the power of Kulaib is found as early as the maṣālaḥa of the Taghlīb ʿAmr b. Kullūm (? 65). We have, moreover, contemporary documentary evidence of the accounts relating to the fate of Kulaib in the numerous allusions contained in the elegies on his death, which were attributed to his brother Muhāhil (one of the earliest Arab poets; cf. Ibn Kūtaba, Shīr, ed. De Goeje, p. 164—166; Muḥ. Ibn Sallām, Tabākāt al-Shīrāz, ed. Hell, 13 lines 11—16 etc.), but naturally their authenticity is more than doubtful.
The story of the murder of Kulaib is developed in a quite arbitrary fashion in the romance cycle of the Ilanu Hitel (cf. Mittwoch, Poesia Arabum Pagorum, Berlin 1899, p. 11).


(G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

KULBARGA. [See GULBARGA.]

KULDAQ, a town in the upper Ilī [q. v.] valley. A Muhammadan kingdom is first mentioned in this region in the viith (xiiith) century: its founder, who is said to have previously been a brigand and horse-thief, is called ʿOẓūr in Diwainā (G. M. S., xvi., p. 57) and Būr in Djamāl Īrāshī (in Barthold, Turkistan, i. 156 sq.). According to the latter, he assumed the title of Toghrul ʿKhān as ruler. The capital of the kingdom was Almāghī, first mentioned in this connection and later a great and wealthy commercial city. We owe our information about its site mainly to the Chinese (in Brechtneider, Mod. Researches, Index); it lay south of Lake Sairam and the Talla pass, north of the Ilī, probably northwest of the modern Kuldā.

Like the other rulers of these regions, the king of Almāghī had dealings with Cingiz Khān. He was surprised and killed while hunting by Kūltūk, the governor of the kingdom of the Īrāshī Khātarīs [q. v.]; but Kūltūk could not take the town of Almāghī. ʿOẓūr's son and successor Suḡnāk (or Suḥnāk) Ṭegin married a granddaughter of Cingiz Khān (a daughter of Djūtā). On his death (651 = 1253/1254, cf. Diwainā, p. 58; 648 = 1250/1251 in Djamāl Īrāshī) he was succeeded by his son whose name (Danishmand-Ṭegin) like the names of the other rulers of this line are given only by Djamāl Īrāshī (Barthold, Turkistan, i. 140 sq.). Almāghī in his time (beginning of the viith = xivth century) was still ruled by this dynasty. How long this line continued to reign is not known. The silver and copper coins struck at Almāghī in the viith (xiiith) century apparently belonged to them.

As a great commercial city on the main route through Central Asia to China, Almāghī is frequently mentioned by European travellers and missionaries.

Like the towns on the Īlī [q. v.], the Talas and elsewhere, Almāghī was completely ruined by the constant civil wars and other fighting in the viith (xiiith) century (cf. Bubur, ed. Beveridge, p. 1; Mirzā Muḥammad Ḥaidar, Tūrīkkī Rāshīdī, transl. E. D. Ross, p. 364). Muḥammad Ḥaidar mentions the ruins of the town with the tomb of Tūrīkkī Timūr Khān (d. 764 = 1362/1363; cf. Buḥrat); these ruins lie between the Khorgos, the boundary river between Russia and China and the village of Mażār and have been completely described by N. Pantusov (Kafunmanskī Sbornik, Moscow 1910, p. 161 sqq.). Inscriptions from graves of Nestorian Christians have also been found there.

The town now called by the natives Kuldā or Ghulda (Radloff, Aus Sibirien, ii. 336 gives the meaning "Elk"; cf. also Kuldā Bāshī, name of a mountain between the Īlī and the Ilī, Masalskyi, Turkest. Kr., p. 42) was founded in 1762, after the conquest of the Kalmuck empire by the Chinese, under the name Ning-yüan-čōng; whether, as Radloff (Aus Sibirien, ii. 321) says, a town of Kuldā had already been in existence for an considerable time, is doubtful. Somewhat later than this "Tatar" Kuldā, in 1764, the town of Hoi-yüan-čōng was founded, also called "Chinese Kuldā", "New Kuldā" or "Great Kuldā", the headquarters of the Chinese commander-in-chief (tanständ). The Chinese government transferred 6,000 families from Kashgaria into this region which had been almost completely desolated in the war with the Kalmucks; these immigrants came to be called "Taranči" (agriculturists). In 1851 a treaty of commerce was concluded in Kuldā between Russia and China, whereby Kuldā was opened to Russian trade. In 1862 Radloff visited both Old and New Kuldā and gave a very full description of them in his Aus Sibirien, ii. 395 sqq., 336 sqq.; the population of Old Kuldā had been said to have been "at least 80,000" but this must be exaggerated.

This prosperity was almost completely destroyed by the Muhammadan rebellion of 1863–1866. New Kuldā was taken after hard fighting in 1865 and completely destroyed; so far as we know, this town is still in ruins. After some fighting among the insurgents, the rule ultimately passed to a Sultān of the Taranči; he is usually called Sultān ʿAlī ʿKhān or Abu ʿAbū-ʿAlīt (in Russian accounts frequently corrupted to "Abil-Oglaya"). In 1871 the sultānate was occupied by the Russians and the Sultān deported to Woryenšy where he received a pension of 5,000 rubles a year till his death. Kuldā was administered by Russia for ten years and was only restored to China by the St. Petersburger treaty of 1881. The population of Kuldā (i.e. the older town "Old Kuldā") in 1872 was only 7,693 of whom 4,098 were Muslims. The Chinese removed the administrative offices to Sudun (about 25 miles N.W. of Kuldā), but Kuldā still remains the most important town in the Ilī territory; it also contained a Russian consulate. At the beginning of the xixth century Kuldā is said to have had about 30,000 inhabitants (N. Bogoyavlenskiy, Zapadny sudenny Kerry, St. Petersburg 1906, p. 108 sqq.).


KUL-OGHĽI in Turkish "son of a slave". The Janissaries being the slaves (serv) of the Sultan, the children whom they had by native women, especially in the Barbary States, were given this name. They occupied a special position among the population. While slaves born of the Christian women-slaves were regarded as Turks, and enjoyed the same rights as their fathers (service in the ranks of the Janissaries, and admittance to all the offices of state), those who were born of alliances between Janissaries and women of the country (Moors) were classed with the relatives of their mothers. They could not be enrolled in the Janissaries and could only claim admission to a limited number of offices. They became mixed with the native population, but being related to the Turks they had not to suffer the same vexations as other classes of society. They were in general fine men with white skins and well marked muscular development; they were of a sluggish temperament and a peaceful character.

Bibliography: P. Rozet, Alger (Collection de l'Univers Pittoresque), p. 13. (Cl. Huary)

KULTHUM b. IYAD AL-KHAJAH, a native of the tribe of Kas was chosen by the Caliph Hisham to avenge the disastrous defeat inflicted by the Sufi Berbers on the Arabs on the "Day of the Nobles" (Ghazawat al-Ashraj) in the beginning of 123 A.H. He set out at the head of 30,000 men, to whom were added the garrisons of Al-Iffiyya and the Maghrib, and joined Habib b. Abū Ubbaid who was trying to stop the advance of the Khāridjīs near Tlemcen. The tactless attitude of the Syrians and particularly the arrogance of Badr, nephew of Kulthūm and his successor-designate, dissatisfied those who had come to assist. The Berber leader Khalīd b. Hamīd (or Hamaid) retired before the Arabs to Wādī Sebīt in the centre of the Maghrib, and a battle was fought at Nabīlūr (var. Naftūr, Baqīlūr). The wise advice of Habib was not heeded. The Arab cavalry concealed by Badr succeeded after great efforts in piercing the Berber lines but the latter reformed behind them and overwhelmed the Caliph's troops. Habib and the other leaders were killed. Kulthum fought with the greatest bravery reciting verses of the Qur'an to encourage the others, but finally fell. One third of the army was killed and a third taken prisoners (Dhū l-Hiddjār 123 = Oct.—Nov. 741). Badr's cavalry's only hope was to take refuge in Ceuta, whence after much suffering they were able to cross to Spain.


AL-KULZUM, a seaport on the Red Sea (Arab. Baḥr al-Kulzum, q.v.), Baḥr al-Hind or Baḥr al-Habash). The name is a corruption of the Greek Κόλυμα (as in Arabic almost always without the article, i.e. τῷ κόλυμα, the "siloce" at the mouth of the canal, which led from the Nile to the Red Sea). This canal begun by Pharaoh Necho finished by Darius of Persia, was later restored by Ptolemy II Philadelphos and by Trajan. After the latter it was called under the Roman Empire and even down to the eighth century occasionally θερασίων θαλασσίως or ιεράς ταύρουs (Ptol. iv. 5, 24; ed. Müller, p. 713; Bell, Αποθετοντος Θερασίων, Ν. Ε. G. W., 1904, p. 354 sq.). In the Muslim period, when the making of the canal was wrongly ascribed to Hadrian, labour was repeatedly spent on it (J. Maspero and G. Wiet, Mœurs arabes, i., p. 84, under Khalīd al-Khārī). 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb in 23 (643/644) for example had it repaired to facilitate the transport of corn for Mecca from Fustāt to the Red Sea (Yābuq, Muqāma, ed. Wustenfeld, ii., p. 466; John of Nikiu, ed. Zoschen, p. 577); it was called after him al-Muqāma an-Nabīlī (al-Mukaddasi, ed. de Goeje, p. 198; Yābuq, op. cit., p. 465; Ibn Duḥmān, ed. Volkers, iv, p. 128). According to Abū Sāliḥ (in Evvets, Churches and Monasteries, p. 88) its mouth was at al-Kulzum, according to Mas’ūdī (Muqāma al-Dhakāh, iv., p. 97) and others (more accurately) at Dhūnub al-Timsīh, 1 mil from the town, where the Meccan pilgrims from Egypt crossed the canal by a large bridge. The Caliph al-Mansūr in 775 had it partly filled in, fearing an attack from his uncle Muhammad b. 'Abbādalāh, who had rebelled against him in Medina, so that in Abū Sāliḥ's time it ended at al-Sadir at the entrance to the Wādī Ṭūmālt. New but fruitless attempts to make it navigable again were made by the Caliph al-Rashīd (Muqāma, ed. op. cit., p. 98 sq.). He is however said to have abandoned the attempt out of fear of the Greeks. Henceforth the bulk of its water flowed into the Birkat al-Djābb (al-Idrisī, p. 164) till it was completely filled in in 1899 for sanitary reasons.

The town of al-Kulzum owed its importance mainly to this canal; for according to the descriptions of the Arab geographers, it was a desolate and miserable site without water and vegetation; neither trees nor fruits could flourish there. In antiquity and in the early Muslim period its only importance was as a point of departure for shipping on the Red Sea, the commonest name among the Arabs for which was derived from it. The caravans of al-Fustāt after they had passed the canal continued from here to the Red Sea. Next to the Jewish merchants called al-Rādābītāhī. Ibn Khurṣīdāhsī (ed. de Goeje, p. 153) says that they came from the lands of the Franks to al-Farama; thence they carried their wares 35 farsakhs on camels to al-Kulzum, where they were loaded on ships which took their course to India and China. According to the same geographer, al-Kulzum with al-Ṭūr and Aila formed a district of Egypt (op. cit., p. 81).

The country round al-Kulzum was inhabited at an early date by Arabs. They are already mentioned in the Acta of the hermit Sisoes (Copitc: apa Dīdīq) and John Kolobos who lived there. In the History of the latter, Kulzum (sic)
appears for the first time in the Arabic Synaxarium as the name of the ancient Klyisma.

When under the last Abbasid governor in Egypt, Anbara b. Ishâq, the Bu'djâ rebelled in Nubia, invaded al-Ša'di' and laid waste many towns, al-Mutawakkil sent against them an army under Muhammad b. Abdallah al-Šummi which went from Kûs straight through the desert to the emerald mines, while seven ships with stores sailed from al-Kulzum to Sanga near Aidâb and provided the victorious army from there with the necessary supplies.

In the autumn of 971 the Karmathian leader Ḥasan b. Ahmad on his campaign against the Fātimid Djawhar took the town of al-Kulzum, al-Fārāmâ, and Tiniss; after his defeat before Cairo (Dec. 24, 971) he retired under cover of night via al-Kulzum to Arabia.

Reynald de Châtillon (in Maqrizi, Arâbî) at the beginning of his naval expedition against the holy cities in the winter of 1182/1183 sent two ships from Ḍe Ṭur, which were to watch the citadel of al-Kulzum and prevent the garrison from procuring water (Maqrizi, Soltân, transl. Blotchet in R.O.Z., 1900/1901, vii., p. 550 sqq.; Ibn al-Athir on the year 578 in Recueil des hist. or. des crois., i. 658). But soon afterwards the Ḥadiqâ Ḥusân al-Din Lulu built a fleet by order of Shaḥ al-Din's brother, al-Malik al-Âdî, in al-Kulzum which sailed for Aidâb and put a sudden end to the desperate enterprise (G. Schumacher, Renseau de Châtillon, 1898, p. 259 sq.; Moriz, Arabien, Hanover 1923, p. 119 sq.). When al-Dimashki (ed. Mehrin, p. 213) includes al-Kulzum among the lands under al-Karak (cf. R. Hartmann in Ist., 1911, ii., p. 141), this is perhaps a memory of these events of a century before.

In the time of Idrisi, Yâkût and Dimashki, al-Kulzum was already a deserted town. Maqrizi found among old documents in the palace of Cairo accounts of the expenditure on the civil and military administration of the town and district and concluded from them that it must once have been most flourishing. According to Idrisi the Beduins had occupied and plundered it. The only water-supply he knew of in the vicinity was the well at al-Suwâr which yielded only a scanty supply of brackish water. Al-Mu'âkaddâsi (tenth century) already mentions al-Suwâr as a town which gradually took the place of al-Kulzum, a mile from it (cf. Maspero-Wiet, op. cit., p. 107 sq.).

The view occasionally expressed in later Arab geographers and astronomers (Nâṣir al-Din al-Tûsî, Ulugh-Bey) that al-Kulzum once consisted of two towns, which goes back to a statement of al-Idrisi taken from Ibn al-Wardi (Gildemeister in Z.D.P.V., vii., p. 119 note) and the hypothesis, based on it, of two towns of al-Kulzum in different places, were already shown to be untenable by Quäremère; but it has recently been repeated of the ancient Klyisma, as Naville found an inscription near Herenopolis (or Hero, in Tall al-Maskhûta) according to which the distance was ab Ero in Klyisma Marratu 10°. (Naville, The Start-City of Python and the Route of 10°. to Calais, London 1885), while it is elsewhere correctly put at 68 Roman miles (Müller on Prolemy, Geogr., i. 2, p. 685 sq.). In this connection, Dillmann has rightly pointed out that it is very doubtful whether the milestone has not been moved from its original position, as all other references leave not the slightest doubt as to the location of Klyisma.

The name al-Kulzum still survives for the mound of ruins, Kûn al-Kulzum north of Suef; perhaps also in the name of the well of Khizmîl (or Khizmî) near Suef (Lüttmann in Z. D.M.G., lxx., p. 511, suppl. to p. 14, note 2; Moris art. Klyisma in Paulus-Wissowa, Realezykld., xi., p. 881).


al-Kâma, al-Kúma and al-Kawma, one of the seven kinds of poetry created by the moderns. Invented by the poet Allâh, who, when under the 'Abbasids, it was at first used as a call to announce during Ramadan the last night of the month, at which it is still permitted to eat or drink. The singers said to their colleagues at the end of each night: kâma âlnasâhîr kâma 'arisâ! to tak thy meal before the dawn of day, arise! Later, verses were made in this style for venders of flowers, wine, etc. It does not seem to be true that Abû Nu'ât invented the kâma. It is more probable that the form was already in existence before the reign of the Caliph al-Nâṣir.

According to the prosodists, this kind of poem which is always in the vernacular, should have as metre in each hemistich mustaf'sân fa'llân; but, according to the specimen given by al-Ishâhî (al-Mutâṣâri, Bulâk 1202, ii., 175), al-kâma is a poem composed of strophes of two verses rhyming in the first, second and fourth hemistich; the metre is mustaf'sân fa'llân or fa'llân or fa'llân and rarely fa'llûtan. Mustaf'sân may be mustaf'sân = mofa'sân and rarely mustaf'sân = mofa'sân.

Bibliography: see the article Kân wa-kân.

(Moh. Ben Chenen)
KUMAIT b. Zaid, an Arab poet of the tribe of Asad, born in Kufa about 60 and died in 126. Of his compositions, the most famous next to the Mughahhaba (see below) are the Ḥāshīmiyyāt so called because they sing the praises of the Banū Ḥāshim, the family of the Prophet. But not the whole of the Banū Ḥāshim are considered worthy of the honour and praise of the poet; besides Muḥammad we find only ʿAli and his descendants. Verses i. 79 and ii. 105 sq. in which ʿAbbas and his sons are commemorated were perhaps only added in the ʿAbbasid period. The Ḥāshīmiyyāt consist of four long and two short qaṣidas; a fragment, the larger part of which is a typical qaṣida opening and four quite short songs, three of which have only two verses each. These poems are not all of the same period; the oldest seems to be II which should be dated about 96—99 A.H.; III is not much later; I cannot be earlier than 105, IV than 118, IX—XI are composed not earlier than 122, and VI is perhaps as late as 125/126. In his qaṣidas Kumat follows the model of the old poets. Although as a townsman, he is remote from the life of the desert, he describes the camel which carries him to the city, the wild bull and the baṣṭ bird, and he devotes many panegyrics to the ʿAlids in the traditional style for Beduin sayyids. He borrowed much from the Kurʿan as well as from the old poets, and a Kufan philologist of the second century a. d., Ibn Kunāṣa, composed a Kitāb Sarīfāt al-Kumait min al-Kurʿan (see Fihrist, p. 70). The Ḥāshīmiyyāt, the poetical value of which was not highly esteemed by Arab critics, were much thought of in Shiʿa circles; for modern scholarship, their importance lies mainly in the fact that they reflect ideas current in the moderate wing of the Shiʿa at the end of the first and beginning of the second century A.H. While Kumat regards the first caliphs as usurpers (vi. 10), he declines to curse them, like the fanatical Shiʿis; if they did wrong in withholding Fadak from the daughter of the Prophet, they will be forgiven on the day of judgment. ʿAli is the wag of the Prophet, who handed over to him the wilāya at the pool of al-Khumm (vi. 6; the verse seems to be oldest evidence of this Shiʿa belief); guidance is to the ʿAlids alone and they will again consolidate the foundations of Islam. The poet however cannot summon himself to assist by deed the ʿAlids, whose praises he sings so enthusiastically, and in X and XI he reproaches himself for not obeying the call of Zaid. But he is not afraid to make fierce attacks on the reigning dynasty; he reproaches the Umayyads with having no right to the leadership of the community and with abusing the position of ends. When however these attacks came to the ears of the Caliph Hishām — a longish poem directed against the ʿAbd Shams is also preserved in Djamhara, p. 187 sqq. — Kumat tried to atone for his indiscretion by panegyrics on the Umayyads. Such opportunism is not uncommon among poets and Kumat himself calls his conduct taṣīya (iv. 86; the expression according to Goldziher, Z. D., M. G., lx. 219, is here used for the first time in the Shiʿi sense) and such forced tributes to the Umayyads do not affect his real feelings for the Banū Ḥāshim. — The Mughahhaba, Kumat’s poem directed against the Yemen tribes is notable for its length — the expression ‘longer than a poem by Kumat‘ became later proverbial. It is said to have had 300 verses, of which about a third survive from different parts of the poem. There is no trace of a hostile attitude to the Yemenis in the Ḥāshīmiyyāt, although the poet lays stress on the fact that the Prophet like himself belonged to the Khālid group. Between 97 and 101 Kumat had even composed a panegyric on the Muḥallabis, the champions of South Arabian influence and the revulsion only came later, probably not till 118 after the composition of the fourth poem of the Ḥāshīmiyyāt. Kumat is said to have been induced to attack the South Asians by a lampoon by a Kalbi poet on the ʿAlids and it is said to have been Khalid b. ʿAbdallāh-al-Ҡsri, governor of al-ʿrak, who was dependent on the support of the South Arabian tribes, who brought Kumat’s anti-Umayyad verses to the Caliph’s notice, to have him rendered innocuous. It is certain at any rate that Kumat continued to lampoon Khalid even after his death; he brought his own destruction on himself by this. Yemeni troops, who heard him reciting his lampoons on Khalid, wounded him so seriously that he died in consequence.


KUMĀN. [See KIPĀR.]

KUMBARĀJID. [KUMBARĀJID.]

KUMIS, a Turkish word meaning “a drink of soured mare’s milk”, which has passed into this form into Russian and western European languages; it is explained in Radloff’s Versuch einer Worterbuch der Türkischen Türk-Dialekte, vol. ii., St. Petersburg 1899, p. 853 under kumis. The word is found as early as the Kudatuk-bilik where it is mentioned in the first place among the products of cattle-breeding (kumis, milk, hair, fat, curds and cheese [W. Radloff, Das Kudatuk-Bilik, Pl. ii., St. Petersburg 1910, p. 379]). Wherever the Turkish horsemen went they carried kumis with them. According to Kutubi, ’Uṯun al-Tawārīkh (cf. Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 48), MS. in Constantinople, Koprulû 1121, f. 69a, Baibars I just before his death 676 (1277) drank kumis (al-kumis) for several days in the “variegated castle” (al-Kṣar al-ʿAbid) in Damascus. In the earlier cartas of ʿAbd al-Azīz princes in the xiii. (xivth) century, fully described by Mahbūbī M. Wali, Baḥr al-ʿArār fī Manākhib iʿAkhbār (Granddris d. iran. Phil., ii. 362, Ind. Off., No. 575, Text publ. by W. Barthold in Zap. Geogr. Ostk., po otdel. etnografii, vol. xxxiv., 1909, p. 205 sqq.) “the drinking of kumis” (ibshāmidan-i kumis) is treated as an important affair; it is described minutely, how the kumis has to be poured from skins (ṣabā) into cups (ayatā), how the cups are to be taken, who is to take the first, who the other cups etc. In every place where the nomadic people have passed to a settled life, the customs associated with the taking of kumis have gradually fallen into disuse. (W. BARTHOLOD)
KÜMIYA. In the Middle Ages, one of the most important tribes of the Maghrib; they were at one time called Sa’fara and were descended through Fāzin from Mādghīs al-Abtar. Tradition says that the brothers of Kūmiya, the eponymous ancestor of the tribe, were Lēmāya and Matghara from whom were descended numerous families, some of whom still exist at the present day. The most important representatives of the Kūmiya, who live in the N.W. of Algeria between Tlemcën and Areschāl (Raschān) are the B. ʿAbd, from whom was descended the first Caliph of the Almohad dynasty, ʿAbd al-Muʾmin [q.v.], born at Taḍjera between Humain and Nedroma; the Nedroma who gave their name to an important town; the Ṣaghāra, now represented by the Matīla; the B. IIūl, of whom a section the Masīa still exist. The Kūmiya showed themselves devoted to ʿAbd al-Muʾmin, who was one of them. They formed the second dūnūd in the Almohad army; but they exhausted themselves in supplying the dynasty with soldiers for the wars in Spain and North Africa. Subjected to kharāj [q.v.] by the Zenīta, some of them joined another group, the Uḫaṣa and formed the powerful confederation of Trārā in the N.E. of Algeria.

Bibliography: R. Basset, Nidromeh et les Trarata, Paris 1901, and the writers there quoted. (RÉNE BASSET)

KUMU, a town in Persia in ʿIrāq ʿAdjamī near a stream, not however sufficient for local needs, which comes from Djurbdīshān (Gulpāīgān). It was conquered by Abū Mūsā al-Asḥārī in 23 (644); it rebelled in the caliphate of al-Maʾmūn and refused to pay taxes, under the leadership of Yāḥyā b. ʿImrān. Against it the Caliph sent ʿAli b. Ḥishām al-Marrawi who demolished the wall surrounding it and levied a war indemnity of 7,000,000 dirhams. The treaty was broken in the caliphate of Muʿtaʾz (252–255 = 860–868) who sent a force against it, an army under Mūsā b. Boghā, governor of ʿIrāq ʿAdjamī; most of the inhabitants were massacred and the chief notables carried off as hostages.

In the time of al-ʾIṣṭakhri (B. G. A., i. 230) one stage distant was a little town inhabited by Mazdaeans (Karyat al-Madjūs). The family of the Persian poet Niẓāmī, born at Gandja, originally came from Tafrisb, near Kumū.


KUNDUZ, the name of a river, town and district in Northern Afghanistan. The district is bounded on the east by Badakhshān, on the west by Tashkurgān, on the north by the Oxus, and on the south by the Hindū Kush, and is inhabited chiefly by ʿOzbs, who overran it from the north in the sixteenth century. The river rises in the Hindū Kush, flows northward and is one of only two rivers in northern Afghanistan which reach the Oxus. The town is the trade centre of a considerable district which produces the best horses in Afghanistan.


KUNFDA, a seaport on the Red Sea, 45 miles from Hāt. The town is in the form of a large rectangle enclosed by a wall, strengthened at several points by towers and pierced by three gates. Practically the only stone buildings are at the harbour, where is the bazaar with its one-storied warehouses in an irregular line, and the chief mosque and smaller mosques with low minarets. On a little island about a quarter of a mile away is a small castle which used to be the residence of the representative of the Sharif of Mecca. The town is now estimated to have a population of 10,000, but S. Langer in 1882 put it at only 2,000.

The harbour, which is enclosed by a number of sandy islets and is only accessible to Arab vessels of medium size, has great disadvantages, notably that the boats cannot land there. Trade and commerce are moderate: Kunfuda exports the myrrh collected in ‘Asir and also hides and honey; the harbour used to be frequented by slave-dealers who brought their Abyssinian slaves for sale here, but England’s sharp control has made slave smuggling practically impossible. Trade with the
Kūnūt, a religious technical term, with many meanings, regarding the fundamental signification of which there is no unanimity among the lexicographers. "Refraining from speaking", "the prayer during the žalāt", "humility and recognition that one's relation to Allāh is that of a creature to his creator", "standing" — these are the usual dictionary definitions which are also found in the commentaries on different verses of the Kūrān where kūnūt or derivatives from the root gūn occur. There is hardly one of these for which the context provides a rigid definition of the meaning (cf. Sūra ii, 110, 239; iii, 15, 38; iv, 38; vi, 121; xxx, 25; xxi, 31, 35; xxxix, 12; lxxv, 5, 12).

The Ḥaddith gives more definite contexts. The best žalāt is a long kūnūt (e.g. Muslim, Žalāt al-Musajirīn, trad. 164, 165, Ḍābī Aṣṣal Žalāt Tanal al-Kūnūt; Tirmidhī, Žalāt, bāb 168). Here in the unanimous opinion of all the commentators (see Nawawi on the passage) kūnūt means "standing". In the well known Ḥadīth: "alike to the fighter on the path of Allāh is he who fasts, who stands, who kūnūt bi āyāt Allāh" (Muslim, "Iṣnād, trad. 30), gāmūt, and the Žalāt on the earth, the "recite standing" (cf. Abū Dāūd, Šahr kūnūt, bāb 9: "And he who recites 100 verses of the Kūrān standing, is enrolled among the kūnūtān"). Kūnūt, however, usually seems to be connected in meaning with dāʿā, e.g. in the oft quoted tradition which tells how Muḥammad in the žalāt al-ṣūbḥ appealed to Allāh for a month against the tribe of Rīl and Ḍakhwān, as they had slain the kūrāt at Bīr Maʿīna (Witr, bāb 7); in this case the meaning is certain from the explanation yāmāʿa ala (Bukhārī, Witr, bāb 7; Dīmādh, bāb 184). In the parallel tradition, Bukhārī, Maqāṣīd, bāb 28, trad. 3, there is added "and till then we were wont to perform the kūnūt". Some sources (see Goldziher, loc. cit., p. 323) add that this was in the month of Ramāḍān.

The rite also appears in parallel traditions in a more precise form; it is said that the kūnūt took place in the žalāt al-faḍīr (Bukhārī, Dāʾwāt, bāb 59) after the ruḥūk (Bukhārī, Witr, bāb 7). It is still more precisely defined in a Ḥadīth in al-Nasāʾī, Tābiʿī, bāb 32: "... that he heard how the Prophet when he raised his head after the first ruḥā at the žalāt al-ṣūbḥ, said: "O Allāh, curse this and that man (i.e. some of the munāshāṭūn); thereupon Allāh revealed: "It does not concern thee whether he turns to them with favour or punishes them" (Sūra, iii. 123). The following is another example of kūnūt: "When the messenger of Allāh lifted his head after the second ruḥā at the žalāt al-ṣūbḥ, he said: "O Allāh, save Walīd b. Abī Walīd and Saʿīma b. Ḥiyām and ʿAyyāsh b. Abī Rabīʿ and the weak ones in Mecca. O Allāh, tread heavily on Muṣṭafā and send them years of famine, like the years of Joseph" (al-Nasāʾī, Tābiʿī, bāb 28). According to another tradition, which also goes back to Abū Ḥūrāra (Bukhārī, Aṯān, bāb 126) the kūnūt consisted of prayers and blessings for the Muslims and curses upon the unbelievers.

We are also told that the kūnūt was regularly performed at the morning and evening žalāt (ṣūbḥ and maghrib). Tirmidhī, Žalāt, bāb 177; al-Nasāʾī, Tābiʿī, bāb 30). Tirmidhī gives the following note on this tradition: "The learned differ in their views about the kūnūt at the žalāt al-faḍīr. Some of the scholars of the Žahāba and later generations

(Adolf Grohmann)
advocate this ḫunūt, such as Mālik and al-Ṣaḥḥārī'. Aḥmad (b. Ḥanbal) and ʿIṣḥāq say: "There is no ḫunūt uttered at the ṣalāt al-fajr except in a calamity, which affects the Muslims as a body." In such a case the Imām has to pray for the Muslim armies. Zakāt and ṭahrī are also mentioned as ṣalāt into which the ḫunūt was inserted (Bukhārī, Abbott, bāb 126; Nasāʾī, Taftāṣī, bāb 29).

There is further a difference of opinion as to where in the ṣalāt, the ḫunūt should be inserted. ʿAṣim is said to have asked Anas b. Malik about the ḫunūt. Anas replied: "The ḫunūt took place . . ." I asked: "Before or after the ruḥā?" He replied: "Before the ruḥā." I said: "But I have been told on your authority: after the ruḥā." Anas replied: "Then they lied. The apostle of Allāh only uttered the ḫunūt prayer after the ruḥā for a month. I think, after he, etc. etc." (here follows the story of Bīr Maʿūna, see above, Bukhārī, Witr, bāb 7). It is even said that the ḫunūt is a bidʿa. Abū Mālik al-ʿAṣhdāt records a tradition on the authority of his father, that the latter had performed the ṣalāt under the direction of Muḥammad, Abū Bakr, Umār, ʿUṯmān and ʿAli and that none of these uttered the ḫunūt prayer. He adds "it is therefore also a bidʿa, my son" (al-Nasāʾī, Taftāṣī, bāb 33).

Nevertheless it continued to be known as the name of the prayer (dawā) at the ṣalāt. In the books of tradition a formula is given for the ḫunūt al-witr (it occurs often and in different forms, though it is not always called ḫunūt but is given names like dawā etc.): "O Allāh, lead me amongst those whom Thou guidest, and pardon me amongst those whom Thou pardonest, and care for me amongst those for whom Thou carest and bless me with what Thou distribuest, and protect me from the evil that Thou has decided upon; for Thou decidest and none decides about Thee. Disgrace will never come upon him for whom Thou carest. Thou art blessed and exalted, O Our Lord!" (Tirmīzī, Witr, bāb 29). The same formula is found as an element in the ṣalāt in Nawawi, Mīnāqāt, ed. van den Berg, i. 83, 455 sq.; Lane, Lexicon, s. v. k-n, who gives another.


(A. J. Wensinck)

KUNYA (A.), properly meaning a metonymical appellation, is however also the technical term for the naming of a man (or also of a woman) after his eldest son, i.e. Abū . . . , a name which is omitted from very few Arab personal names (cf. also ʿAqāb) and in many cases is even the only one known to us. The origin of the custom lies in the value placed by Semitic peoples upon children, especially sons; which again points to the importance placed on the paucititious performance of funerary rites, a duty that was incumbent on the eldest son in particular. There is negative evidence of the connection between the kunya and funeral rites in the fact that slaves as a rule had no kunya and that they, when not adopted into the family, were buried without ceremonies.

In Arabic literature the kunya, if not absolutely a title of honour, is at least regularly thought more highly of than the simple name. According to the Lisan, s. v. the champion who challenged to single combat between the hostile armies called himself by his kunya. When a warrior is appealed to for help by his clan, he is called by his kunya (Kāt b. al-Khaṭīr, ed. Kowalski, Leipzig 1914, fragment, iv., l. 38). ʿAṣḥāb said on one occasion to Muḥammad: "All thy wives have a kunya but I alone have none". Thereupon he replied: "Assume the kunya Umm 'Abd Allāh!" (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, i. 151). From this tradition, otherwise unknown — that childless people could have a kunya. In other cases it did not express paternity but some other characteristic. Abū Hurairā [q. v.] "he of the kiten" is said to have received this kunya from his kindness to cats. History does not record why the first Caliph was called "Father of the Camel-foal". The Abū of the kunya often indicates a physical peculiarity e.g. Abū Shāmā "he with the birthmark". In other cases the kunya is given in malicious or good natured irony e.g. Abū Djahl [q. v.], Abū Labah [q. v.]. Finally we may note the many geographical names in the form of a kunya e.g. Abū Simbel [q. v.], Abū Kubais [q. v.], Abū Ḥabbā [q. v.], Abū Arsh [q. v.].

In the Oriental dictionaries of all kinds, the kunyas are usually classed together in one group. There are also dictionaries which deal exclusively with kunyas.


(A. J. Wensinck)

KUR, Russian Kura, in the Arab geographers Kur, the largest river in the Caucasus, over 600 miles in length, according to Ḥamd Allāh Kazwīnī (Nusḥat al-ʿUḫūd, G.M.S., xxiiifl., p. 218) 240 faraḵ. Iṣṭakhrī (B. G. A., i. 189) describes the Kur as navigable and full of fish; even at the present day very little would require to be done to make the river accessible to modern steamers from Mingecair (a little below the mouth of the Alazan) to the Caspian Sea. The Araxes, regarded as a separate river in ancient times, always appears in Muslim sources as a tributary of the Kur. According to Ḥamd Allāh Kazwīnī (op. cit.), the Kur in those days in addition to its mouth in the Caspian Sea also sent a branch out which flowed into the Sea (kuḥaira) of Shāmḵūr. This statement (only found here) must be due to a misunderstanding. In Ḥamd Allāh Kazwīnī there is no reference to any such sea. He only mentions the town of Shāmḵūr (Russ. Shamkhor), two faraḵ from Ganūja on the road to Tiflis (op. cit., p. 181 sq.), which in his day as now was in ruins. The navigation of the Kur has only once played a part in political history, at the destruction of the town of Bardja on the Russians in the year 332 (943/944). In addition to the references to this event given under the article BARDJA see D. S. Margoliouth, The Russian Seizure of Bardja in 943 A. D. (Bull. of the School of Oriental Studies, 1918, p. 82 sqq.); A. Yakubovski, Ibn Miskawayh o pokhode Rusov v Berdav v 332 g. = 943/44 g. (Viz. Vremennik, 1923—1926, vol. xxiv., p. 63 sqq).

AL-KURA, the sphere. The Arabs studied the properties of the sphere, following Euclid, Archimedes and Theodosius. They also dealt with certain principles of the spherical trigonometry, which form the foundations for astronomical theory, the principle of the transversal (ṣahāl al-batluʾ), the principle of the four magnitudes (al-ṣahāl al-muṣāhāt) and the principle of the shadow, i.e. of the shadow of a sphere, al-ṣahāl al-qillāt. Following Media, and Ptolemy. (On the translations cf. M. Stein- schneider in Z. D. M. G., 1896, p. 161 sqq.; the mathematical principles are discussed by H. Burger and K. Kohl, Axel Börsbo Thälits Werke über den Transversalen in Abhandl. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaft und Medizin, 1924, part 7, p. 1—91; references are given there to the earlier literature also).

2. Al-Kura ḍhāt al-kurṣī (the globe with the axe) is used in two senses:

a) The globe of the heavens (instead of al-kura) we also find ḍhāt al-kurṣī in this sense, the egg, e.g. in Maḥṣūṣ al-Uṣūm, p. 235, in al-Battānī, Šūrāh al-anwarīn, C. A. Held, 1913, i, p. 58; cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitr. III., S. B. P. M., Erlg., 1905, xxvii., p. 239 sqq.). The constellations are painted on a globe. It is placed in a ring which stands on 3 or 4 legs. Such globes have been prepared and described perhaps as early as by Hipparchus, at any rate by Ptolemy. Ptolemy’s description is given in the Arabic translations of the Almagest and in separate treaties. One such globe, erroneously ascribed to Ptolemy, was seen in Cairo in 435 (1043/1044) by Ibn al-Sanbādī (cf. Ibn al-Kūfī, p. 440). — The globes were made of wood covered with paper or with different metals. Hollow globes could also be made of metal, which were then fastened to wooden spheres. ‘Alam ad-Dīn Kaysar al-Ta‘āsīf used a girt wooden globe (Abū ‘l-Fīdhā, Annalen, ed. Reiske, iv. 479, H. Suter, N. 358). The making of such globes and the errors that occur in them have been fully discussed by al-Brūnī (Beiträge zur Gesch. der Mathematik, etc. in Abhandl. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaft und Medizin, part 4, 1922, p. 79—93; cf. also H. Schnell, ibid., in a later part).

The astronomical instrument prepared by al-Idrīsī for King Roger was apparently an armillary sphere.

b) Al-Kura ḍhāt al-kurṣī is also an arrangement by which one follows the movements of the heavens. The horizontal ring is directed to the horizon, it is notched at right angles in two opposite points, a meridian ring is placed in the notches and allowed to go to its lowest position in a groove. The globe itself turns round an axis which is placed in round holes at two opposite points on the meridian ring. Divisions are marked on the horizon and on the meridian ring. By turning the meridian ring in its grooves the axis of the globe can be inclined at will to the horizon and the instrument can thus be used for all latitudes. A quadrant with divisions which can be placed on the globe enables many kinds of measurements to be taken. With this globe, the magnitudes of importance in astronomy, al-ṣahāl, al-maṣāfāt, the props of the earth etc., can be obtained.

The oldest Arabic work on the subject is by Köṣāb b. Lūkā [v. IV] and exists in Arabic in several editions, e.g. that of al-Marrākūshī; it may go back to classical originals, as is probable in view of the author’s relations to the Greeks. It was also translated into Latin, and into Spanish by Alfonso of Castile (Libros del Saber, vol. i.).

If the globe is left out and a series of other rings its added to the horizon and meridian rings, which correspond to circles in the heavens, we get the armillary sphere (alam ḍhāt al-batluʾ), the instrument with the rings, with which the ancients, the Arabs and notably Alfonso of Castile occupied themselves for a long time following Media, and Ptolemy.


3. Al-Kura al-muḥarrīkā, the burning-glass (lit. the strongly burning globe). Even the ancients knew the property possessed by rock-crystal and glass globes of concentrating the sunlight by focusing them on one point and setting alight an inflammable material there. But we find no indications that any scholar of antiquity studied the theory of this phenomenon. Ibn al-Haitham and Kamāl al-Dīn al-Fārisī investigated this theory very brilliantly. Ibn al-Haitham starts from the values given in a table of Ptolemy’s and collected by himself also, of the angle of incidence, angle of divergence and angle of refraction of a ray of light falling on a smooth surface of glass, and investigates the path of the rays when they strike the surface of the globe at different distances from the axis drawn between the sun and the centre of the ball. It is proved that after refraction they all meet on the opposite surface of the globe in a little section from which they emerge with their direction altered. They cut the axis at different distances from the ball: the majority however meet at a point distant less than half the radius of the ball, this is the burning point. If drawings are placed in the cone of rays formed by the rays coming from it, for example a red circular surface with a black ring upon it and looked at it through the front of the ball remarkable figures are seen; these were also studied very fully by Ibn al-Haitham and Kamāl al-Dīn; they were able even then to reach the same results as Schellbach at a later date.


(E. Wiedemann)

KURA (A.), "lot, drawing lots" is regarded by the lexicographers as a synonym of šuḥma, just as most verbal stems of the root š-ר-א are equated to those from s-h-m. The reason for this is that lots were cast in pre-Muhammadan times with arrows (šuḥma). Muhammad, it is true, forbade drawing lots with arrows as a means of prophesying and as a game of chance (Sūrah ii. 216; v. 92) but this prohibition is in turn much limited by two other passages in the Qur’an in which drawing lots is described as at least permitted (Sūrah iii.
Einleitung in das Studium der Arab. Sprache, Bonn 1864, p. 154 sqq.). But, from the fact that arrows were not used and especially because the well-known legal term kurz is used for permitted decision by lots was transferred to this really illegal form of casting lots, it looked as if with the alteration in the name of this kind of fortune-telling the thing itself had been altered, especially as quotations from the Kur'an and the citing of names of the prophets were used to give it an appearance of sanction.

The kurz is still one of the most usual methods of consulting the fates, especially in the Arabic speaking parts of the world of Islam. Along with the still more common augury by pricking (fa'd) and by drawing on sand (rami) it is to be regarded as an augury from dice, inasmuch as in the kurz the starting-point is almost always numbers or letters, which are obtained either directly by throwing dice or in a similar way. According to the way in which this number is obtained or the course from this number to the oracle, finally uttered in the form of verses, three different literary forms of the kurz are distinguished: 1) kurz al-ja’dariya (this should be read for jauhariya in Ahlwardt, iii. 565) which is traced to Djarfar al-Sadiq, has most clearly retained the character of an augury from dice, inasmuch as in it a definite poetical interpretation corresponds to each of the possible combination of three letters of the dice. It is to this variety of kurz that the definition of "science of drawing lots" given by Badjad Khalifa seems to refer (ed. Fligel, iv., p. 513, No. 9413). 2) The kurz al-Adhab is the simplest form, as in it the answer is given according to which of the names of the Prophets the finger falls upon. The most detailed and complicated, but for this very reason the most popular form, which is traced to Caliph Ma’mün is 3) kurz al-ma’muniya, which begins with a number of questions out of the daily life of men written in separate circles out of which the one concerned has to be chosen. But before the oracle delivered in verse is learned from the mouth of a king, one has to run through a series of figures which include constellations and birds of fate and end in towns (hence also called kurz al-muluk or kurz al-tayar). This kind of kurz offers the greatest scope for the imagination and experienced the greatest development and variations; it is just in this account however that it has almost completely lost any character of fortune-telling but looks more like a harmless and entertaining game.

This also explains why the word kurz in popular usage ultimately came to be used by an erroneous generalisation for all kinds of oracles (e.g. kurz al-Ram in Persch, Gotha, No. 73, 4, and kurz al-Ilahadi al-Fal wa l-Danir or kurz fi l’Im al-Ram in the Cairo Catalogue, v., p. 350 sq.). Although the last kind of kurz in particular seems to be comparatively modern — the oldest manuscript only dates from the xth century A.H. — the idea that there is old material in it, dating back to Hellenistic times, is not to be dismissed offhand. The reference in the Fihrist (C. 1, p. 374, 15-18) to Greek authors and the fragments of Greek books of fate that have survived from the period of the Diadochi, which contain almost word for word the same answers as the Arabic books now in use make such a supposition very probable.

Although the importance of the Arabic kurz is
for similar literature in the west has been exaggerated, it is certain that the Arabs had a not inconsiderable influence on the Hebrew books of fate and either through these or directly on mediaeval European books of fate.


KURABIYYA, the name of a group of the Kaysāniyya [q.v.]. This reading of the name is probably to be assumed in al-ʿAshārī's Maḥālikāt al-Islāmiyyin (without diacritical points in the MS. mentioned below) and is also found in 'Abd al-ʿAlāʾ al-Dhili; the author of the Mafārith al-ʿUṯūm has Kūriyya as 'Abd al-ʿAlāʾ al-Baghdādī, Abū ʿl-ʿAlāʾ and al-Ṭabarī in favour of the former reading is also the form al-Kūriyya (transl. Kūriyya) given by Muḥāshār b. Tāhir al-Makdisī, which may be due to a corruption of the text. This group is said to be called according to a certain otherwise unknown Abū Kuraib (in al-ʿAshārī without diacritical points; in 'Abd al-ʿAlāʾ al-Dhilī, in the printed text as well as in the Leyden MS., Or. 335, f. 96a; Ibn Kuraib; al-Ḥawāzim, al-Baghdādī, Abū ʿl-ʿAlāʾ and al-Makārizī; Abū Kuraib; Muḥāshār b. Tāhir al-Makārizī: Ibn K-r-a-b) al-Ṭabarī. It was probably he who spread the Messianic views regarding Muḥāshār b. al-Ḥanafiyya [q.v.], which are characteristic of the Kurabiyya. The forerunners of Abū (Ibn) Kuraib is therefore to be placed in the period after the death of Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya (probably in 81 = 700).

According to al-ʿAshārī, the Kurabiyya believed that their imām, Muḥāshār b. al-Ḥanafiyya, was still alive and was living in the mountains of Raḍwa [q.v.] west of Medina, with a lion on his right hand and a leopard on his left, guarding him, while his food came to him morning and evening, until the time for him to appear again. In their view the reason why the imām was kept hidden in this way was that Allāh had a special plan for him. No one knew him in Raḍwa in similar terms; according to him, there was a spring of water and another of honey beside the imām, which provided his daily food. Al-Shahrastānī and al-Manṣūr bi-llāh 'Abd Allāh b. ʿUmr (al-Nadr al-ʿAswānī, B. M. MS. Or. 3976, f. 8v infra) also mention this, without referring explicitly to the Kurabiyya. The last-named author also mentions the idea that the imām holds intercourse with the angels in Raḍwa (as does Ibn ʿHzam) and that in his concealment he is considered "the eye of Allāh watching over his creatures'.

Most of these traits go back to older Messianic ideas. They are nearly all found in verses by Kuthayyir [s.v.] and al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī (cf. al-ʿAṣhārī2, vii., 41, 5 sqq.; viii., 36, 5 sqq.) from whom others in Futuristic sects seem to have taken their information.

Al-ʿAṣhārī mentions Kuthayyir as a champion of the views of the Kurabiyya and quotes the same verses by him as al-Baghdādī (p. 28 sq.) and al-Shahrastānī (cf. also al-ʿAṣhārī2, viii., 31, 8 sqq.).


(C. VAN ARENDONK)

KURAIISH.

1. Before the Hijira. About the time of the Hijira all the clans of this tribe, which then held pride of place in Mecca, thought they could claim a common ancestor. Was he called Fīhr or Kuraiish or perhaps al-Nadr, sur- named Kuraiish? They did not take the trouble to examine closely the problem of the name. Did the names given to the supposed ancestors refer to a historical personage? Were they not "names without substance" like those which the Meccans according to Kurān lii. 23 gave to their divinities? The only authority, the nasab, the Meccan genea-
logists, could give was that they had found them in the old onomatopoeic of Tihama and in poems of doubtful authenticity. Yıküt (Müzid, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 79)summing up the statements of his predecessors, thinks the explanation which derives the name of the celebrated Meccan tribe from the word kuraish “shark” kārid i.e. worthless. He further adds that the poetic fragment cited in support of this etymology is maṣūl, apocryphal, and I think it can be recognised as a Beduin satire directed against the rapacity and aggressive spirit of Mahammad’s fellow-tribesmen.

In any case, there is nothing of which we know the first after the beginnings of the imperial tribe of Kuraish. The tribe was leading a nomadic life in the desolate country round Mecca, have always been looked upon as the most disinherited of western Arabia. In the confused mass of starving Beduins of the southern Hijāz, the Kuraish formed in their early days one of the poorest branches of those who claimed to belong to the main stem of the Khāna. Numerically inconsiderable, lost among the Khānī tribes, the primitive clan of the Kuraish led a precarious existence “in the depths of wild ravines and among the bare mountains encircling the sacred territory” (Balaḥuhr, Anṣab al-ʿAlaḥrāf), made up of shepherds and robbers, by turns the auxiliaries and the scourge of Meccan commerce. They hired to the Meccans their camels and lent their services as guides and caravan-leaders; in a word they played the part assumed by the Ba’bûn Ḥudhali [q.v.] in the time of Abū Suṣyān and again at the present day. No more scrupulous than the latter, they never hesitated about stripping pilgrims and isolated convoys. They steadily prepared and watched for an opportunity of driving out of Mecca the Banū Khuzayma who ruled there and of seizing their treasure which they coveted.

A condottiere called ʿUsayy q.v. gave them a place in history and laid the foundations of their political career. He was of foreign origin and came from the steppes of the north, on the Syrian frontier. A fiction connects him with the genealogical tree of the Fihr-Kuraish through Ghūlub-Luʿayya-Kaʿb and Killa. This adventurer reunited the scattered groups of the tribe and succeeded by a coup de main in installing them in the heart of Mecca. The Kuraish gave only a confused explanation of how, led by ʿUsayy, the Kuraish were not long in securing political supremacy over the Khuzayma, a predominance which they soon strengthened still further by gaining possession of the sanctuary of the Kaʿba. If we may base a conclusion on such slender foundations as the traditional genealogical lists, and calculate from the number of generations mentioned in them, this revolution must have taken place in the last quarter of the fifth century A.D., a hundred years before the birth of the Prophet. At the latter date then, barely a century separated the Kuraish, now Meccans, from the period when their ancestors had led a nomadic life.

Some ten clans were considered as Kuraish in those days: Owmaiya, Nawfāl, Zahra, Makhramah, ʿAsad, Dujmahl, Sahm, Ḥāshim, Taim and ʿAdiy. The three last named owe their fame mainly to Islam, even Ḥāshim although like Owmaiya it was related to ʿUsayy, the noble who brought them to Mecca. This noble descent did not bring great fortune to the Ḥāshim. The Owmaiys and Makhramah gained predominance over the other families through their wealth and influence. The ten clans began by occupying the centre of the town, the bottom of the valley al-Batḥā, into which issued the water of Zamzam, the hollow in which stood the little house of the Kaʿba. This gained them the name of ʿAbdāl, Bīṭāl” or “Kuraish al-Batḥā”. They kept it even after the impoverished clans like the Ḥāshim, had had to abandon this central position which was considered the quarter of the Kuraish aristocracy.

The “Kuraish al-ʿAzwāhir” were held in much less esteem. The Jūṣīḥ or suburbs of the town and the ṣifū ravines of the hills which surrounded the town were left to the Beduins, to foreign camp-followers and to slaves. It seems that the “Kuraish of the suburbs” were mixed with these foreign elements. As regards bravery, they were creditably distinguished from their fellow-tribesmen of the Batḥā. They provided the Meccan republic with its bravest soldiers and never failed to make the most of it. The main occupation of every one in the centre as well as in the suburbs was trade. “They were merchants”: this phrase re-appears with monotonous regularity in the notices of the more illustrious Kuraish.

The Sirā and Idaṣṣih preserve the memory of several confederations (ḥilf) or secondary groupings formed among the principal clans of the Kuraish. They have been discussed in the article HILF. The ḥilf al-ʿaṣīṭil seem to be associated with a historical event of which the Meccan chroniclers have exaggerated the importance. This pact must date from the last years of the sixth century, since the Prophet in his youth was present at its conclusion and never failed in consequence to recall it, “the most glorious which history records” (Ibn Saʿd, Tahāfūṣ, ed. Sachau, i. 82).

Outside of Tihama, the Kuraish seem to have had trading colonies at Tabālī, Dujraṣ, Nadīrān, stages on the road to the ports of the Indian Ocean. Much the most important of these was Taʿāf [q.v.] in the mountains of Sarāt. It was a country resort for the rich bankers of the Kuraish, who acquired country houses and farms there.

If we examine orthodox tradition, the Beduins before the Hijāz are represented as never missing an opportunity of recognising the political and religious superiority of the Kuraish. The latter was practically guaranteed to them by the possession of the Kaʿba, a kind of national sanctuary and centre of an annual pilgrimage for the western half of the Peninsula. The Christian Arabs themselves do not seem to have entirely escaped this religious influence. The prerogative of ḥilīm was not disputed to the Kuraish. They owe it to the fact that they were able, in spite of their small numbers and their barren territory, to exercise a kind of spiritual supremacy among the jealous Beduins. It is again the ḥilīm, as we shall see, which explains their glorious destinies on the vast theatre on which the sudden expansion of Islam was soon to place them. Ḥilīm meant the equilibrium of the intellectual faculties, all intent on the business of life to the neglect of scientific speculation. Nothing is more common than the mention of this ruling quality in the notices of the notables of the Kuraish. This prerogative, which in the opinion of Arabs, denotes men born to govern, has even been said to have been proclaimed by the Prophet. “A Kuraish”, he said
"is worth two men of any other tribe". And according to al-Zuhri [q.v.], himself a Kuraishi, this saying referred to their acuteness "the rare quality of their intelligence". In them the Beduins admired the diplomatic ability, the style of speaking, the ready rejoinders always à propos, the precision of their eloquence. They were able to condense into a few telling sentences, when the Beduin as a rule would lapse into his usual prolixity. The purity of their dialect was less generally granted. It was Islam and in particular the influence of the Kur'ân which gained the Meccan dialect its triumph over its rivals in Naj'd, although the latter had been refined and perfected by several generations of poets.

Although they did not love them, the nomads felt for the Kuraishi that respect which is inspired in the inferior for the prestige of a superior organisation, capital and the possession of great wealth. In Mecca alone were the Beduins familiar with the idea — rudimentary, it is true, — of a form of government and political solidarity concepts foreign to their individualist mentality, and it impressed them by its novelty. But in the inferiority in inferiority which impressed them more than they would have been tempted to acknowledge the Beduins declined to acknowledge poetic talent, which they claimed as a monopoly of the nomads. They placed the Kuraishi rhymers far behind those of Tâ'if and particularly of Medina, not to speak of the poets of Naj'd and not without justice. We know no poet of Mecca before the Hîdjrâ whose name is worthy of record. The Kuraishi had for the first time in the person of ʿOmar b. Abī Rab'a [q.v.] a poet worthy of a place in the Arab Pantheon already quite crowded.

The Beduins also did not like the exclusiveness of the Kuraishi and the control they exercised over their everyday life. Acting as guides, and convoyos to Meccan caravans, and in debt to the financiers of Mecca, they alleged they were exploited by the "sharks" of the Kuraishi. It is the eternal complaint that divides capital and labour everywhere. Their grievances united them in the contempt they professed to feel for this corporation of merchants, "cowardly and avaricious". Their poets boast of having pierced the wineskins, then broken the skulls of these greedy haggler, "eaters of pollenta" (zâhîna), the favourite dish of the Meccans. They boasted of being able to humble the pride of the Kuraishi, proud in the shadow of their sanctuary, trembling with fear outside the sacred territory. The Meccan custom of relying on the bravery of the "Ahâbîsh" and other Beduin mercenaries, of sending negroes to fight for them was not calculated to raise them in the esteem of the nomads, and a quarter of a century after the death of the Prophet, we still find the Arabs refusing to allow the Kuraishi the virtue of bravery.

We may put to the credit of Muslim tradition the story of the general supremacy of the Kuraishi being accepted without demur by the Arabs before the Hîdjrâ. This legend was put about to make the seizure of the caliphate by the Kuraishi appear less shocking. Considering the individuality and mentality of the Beduin, it may have been rather a question of moral supremacy. Did it extend much beyond the frontiers of the Hîdjrâ and the districts bounding on Naj'd? We do not think so.

The great Kais confederacies — like the Hawâsin and the Ghatafàn — possessing pastureage on both sides of the common frontier could not escape this supremacy. Since the decline of the Ḥimyar principalities, Mecca had become the largest and most powerful city of western Arabia. The spectacle of this power solidly based on a close alliance of economic and religious interests could not fail to impress the Beduins, who were intelligent observers and very susceptible to the prestige and influence of the capital.

The activities of the ancient Kuraishi consisted as we have seen of commercial and financial speculations within and beyond Arabia. In the article MECCA we describe the trade-routes that ran to it, and the agreements concluded by its people with their neighbours in Arabia and foreign countries; next we examine the form of government, the part played by capital and lastly the organisation of the great caravans on which the prosperity of the Kuraishi metropolis depended. The reader may be here referred to this article.

II. Aft the Hîdjrâ. With the preaching of ʿMuḥammad the story of the Kuraishi becomes practically that of Islam. The two histories become one. The Sîra does not discriminate between them. On the other hand, after the death of the Prophet, the destinies of the Kuraishi develop independently of those of Mecca. After having bitterly opposed the new religion, the Kuraishi notables gained control of it as being in their best interests. The first eight years of the Hîdjrâ were filled with fighting with the Prophet, who had taken refuge in Medina. In the year 8 (al-fâṭî), the surrender of Mecca without a blow being struck put an end to the institutions by which the tribe had hitherto been governed and brought about its break up and dispersal throughout the Arab world. To the casual observer, nothing seemed to have changed. In reality Mecca had lost its autonomy; it was now politically dependent on Medina and governed by an agent of the Prophet. The Kuraishi were under no delusions. The exodus began; the principal families gave the signal for it and came to settle in Medina, which had become the capital of Islam, because ʿMuḥammad was there.

The death of the Prophet raised the problem of his successor, the question of the caliphate. Two illustrious Kuraishi, Abû Bakr and ʿOmar seem to have foreseen this eventuality and to have been prepared for it. Upon whom was the political guidance of Islam to fall? ʿMuḥammad had left no stipulations on the subject. But his constant partiality for his fellow-citizens, who had fled from Mecca, had aroused the protests of the Ansâr, which are preserved in the poems of Hassân b. Ṭâbit [q.v.]. There seems no reason to doubt that if death had not suddenly taken him, if he had thought it prudent to express his opinion, it would have been to the "emigrants" of the Kuraishi in preference to the Ansâr that he would have entrusted the destinies of Islam. Throughout his career as a prophet, he never ceased to proclaim himself a true Kuraishi. In spite of the Hîdjrâ, in spite of the resounding rupture and the eight years of war with Mecca, he never for a moment thought of linking his cause with the fortunes of Medina. If this idea had arisen in his very susceptible mind, he would not have been long in rejecting it, when he considered the political incapacity of the Ansâr and their lack of preparation. As if he wished to suggest
to them the superiority of the Kūraish, the Prophet made the Medinites turn in prayer towards Mecca, now the sacred city of Islam and made its conquest a task for the zealous converts.

That the Kūraish had the exclusive right to this succession must have been the attitude adopted by Abū Bakr and ‘Omear before the Anšārs assembled in the ṣafīyya of the Banū Sā’īda. What we can gather from the arguments put in the mouth of Abū Bakr is that, speaking in the name of the Kūraish refugees, he insisted upon their priority in adopting Islam, the superiority of their noble blood, their prestige with the Arabs and their relationship to the Prophet. From these premises, the speaker thought he could deduce that his fellow tribesmen had a monopoly of the supreme power. He concluded by proposing a division to the Anšār: “let us have the duties of an amir and you those of vizier”. But after having appealed to the Kūran (ix. 101) where the supremacy of the Kūraish is said to be implied, why was an explicit decision of the Prophet not put forward? One word would have sufficed instead of all this rhetoric. For a childlike people like the Anšār, accustomed for ten years to anticipate the slightest wish of Muḥammad, his will would have finished the debate. If Abū Bakr did not pronounce this word, if none of his acolytes appealed to it, we must believe there was no such decision.

The Sunna took this into account when it tried to collect all the pronouncements possible ascribed to Muḥammad and all recorded by the Sahīh. Let us quote the most characteristic of these hadiths: “The Kūraish are the heads of this government”. “The Imāms are Kūraish”. “Power will remain with the Kūraish so long as two Muslims exist”. “The kingship (muḥirī) — and still more explicitly — the caliphate remains in the Kūraish”. In the last sentence we have the classical formula as approved by the Shari‘a and accepted by all orthodox tradition. The latter however had not dared appeal to the Kūran. This book simply makes no reference to the Kūraish monopoly. In reply to the verses quoted in their favour by the Meccans, the Anšār readily quoted the attitude of others, proclaiming the worthiness and faithfulness of their Kūraish rivals.

It cannot however be denied that the Prophet had a preference for the Kūraish nor that he had a low opinion of the fitness of the Anšārs for governing. But he was too wise to give voice to such sentiments. He knew too well the causes of dissension that were already at work in the young community to do anything to make matters worse. In the course of his wars with the Meccans, he had let drop remarks like the following: “In good as in evil, the Kūraish are always in the first rank”. It is by recording exactly such utterances, and giving them a political significance, which they did not really have, that tradition has formulated hadith unambiguously reserving the caliphate for the Kūraish. If they had the slightest knowledge of it, the Anšār would not have been able to dispute the Kūraish monopoly nor to propose to Abū Bakr to recognise it on condition that the supreme dignity was held alternately by a Meccan and a Medinite.

This seems also to be the conclusion to be deduced from the attitude of the Khāridjīs. If in the first century of the Hijra, we want to find strict and logical believers, placing Islam above caste prejudices and ambitions, we have to look for them in the ranks of these dissenters. Their implacable logic never ceased to protest against the privileges claimed by the Kūraish and to give more weight to their protests, they gave themselves caliphs chosen from different Arab tribes.

Although they did not hold the same views as the Khāridjīs, the ‘Alīdīs and Shī‘īs came inevitably to the same conclusion. This is how in the first century A.H. their most authorised interpreter, Kūnimāt [q.v.], argued the claims of the ‘Alīdīs; if contrary to the Shī‘ī theory, the supreme dignity in Islam is no longer the exclusive privilege of the family of the Prophet, it ought to become the common patrimony of all the Arab tribes, not only of Muṣṭar but also of Rabī‘a and Yemen and above all of the Anšār. These extreme legitimists therefore were ignorant of the alleged veto laid by Muḥammad on non-Kūraish.

The creation and monopoly of the Kūraish, the caliphate — while greatly benefiting the Kūraish individually — only served to precipitate the break up and dispersal of the tribe, a phenomenon, the beginnings of which we have already seen just after the fāh (8 A.H.). Their cohesion and the prosperity of the capital Medina depended entirely on commerce. Now in a quite unexpected fashion, at least for the Beduins, the conquests of Islam upset all the economic conditions of Western Arabia. The direct route from India via Mesopotamia was opened up again by the union under one rule of the valley and mouth of the Euphrates, and international trade avoided the difficult detour by the Arabian desert. Nothing could be less like the Mecca of Abū Sufyān than that of the Caliph ‘Omear. The continental blockade established by the Prophet after the battle of Badr, was slackened; then his death suddenly stopped business going to Mecca. One after another the neighbouring fairs, e. g. that of ʿOkāq were suppressed — at least there is no further mention of them after the fāh of Mecca. Deserted by commerce, the barren valley of Mecca, strangled as in a vice between two ranges of bare hills, could not maintain its former inhabitants, all brokers, caravanners and traders for generations past. Gradually shops and offices closed and their owners came to Medina, now the capital of the caliphate, to rejoin their fellow-citizens who had made new positions for themselves there.

The old Kūraish had foreseen this decline. They had talked of it to Muḥammad when their ardent fellow-townsman had urged them to adopt Islam. These shrewd conservatives were reluctant to upset the religious and social institutions to which they attributed the prosperity of their town. Allāh will not fail to provide”, the Prophet replied; “He will furnish them ample compensation; he will enrich them of His abundance when He thinks the time has come” (Kūran ix. 28; xxviii. 57). Among the less prominent Kūraish families a small number were ready to await the promised compensation on the spot. Apart from the period of the annual pilgrimage, the town did not begin really to revive until the day when under the Omayyads the Kūraish officials, enriched by the exploitation of the provinces, came to enjoy their retirement in Mecca, spent their wealth there and as a result attracted the poets and musicians whose presence was to turn the sacred city into a city of pleasure.
But the attraction exercised by the new capital in Medina was not at first very great. After the election of Abū Bakr, the old members of the Dār al-Nadwa or grand council of the Kuraish flocked thither, all the merchant princes of Mecca. They understood the necessity of becoming reconciled to the old friends of the Prophet, now the arbiters of power, while waiting the time when they could supplant those novices in the art of ruling. The reiterated appeals of the Kuraish to emigrate in the direction of Allāh and his Prophet, had for long fallen on deaf ears. It required the revolution, the economic crisis produced by the triumph of Islam and the prospect, depressing to business men of "eating their capital" by letting it lie unproductive in their strong boxes. This prospect led them to discover the economic advantages and the spiritual merits of the "Hijja", the migration of the Muslims. But these "emigrants" of the eleventh hour were not destined to find a suitable milieu for their business enterprise among the Anṣār. The Omayyad and Makhzūmi financiers did not succeed in setting up their offices once more in the oasis of Yathrib. The future had something better in store for them.

This was the period of the conquests which by opening up the eastern provinces to them was to introduce them to a stage of new and manifold activities. Henceforth they were to command armies, to govern provinces and for several centuries, to rule the whole Arab empire. One marvels at the number of remarkable men who sprang from this city of shop-keepers and tried their skill in careers hitherto unknown to them, such as governors and generals. What is no less surprising than the novelty of these roles is the aptitude and decision of character with which they filled them — and this prevents us from regarding the Kuraish founders of the caliphate as mere novices. The fact is that for them, commerce on a large scale as it had been practised in Mecca before the Hijja had been for them a long preparation for a political career.

When therefore Muḥammad thought of entrusting the destinies of Islām to them, his patriotism had not exaggerated the capacity of his fellow-citizens. He had the ability to foresee that the prestige of Mecca, the influence which it had exerted in the centuries before Islām, had gone to give the Meccans intellectual predominance. In the period of paganism, the Kuraish had completed their education. It was to fit them to govern the Arabs, at a time when the latter were dominating the world. They ceased to be Meccans but they remained Kuraish." (Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, 2, p. 94).

This brings us to say that after the creation of the caliphate, the history of the tribe of Kuraish is separate from that of the town of Mecca. It develops at first in Medina, — which by the first century A.H. had become as Kuraish as Mecca, — then beyond Arabia, in Syria, Damascus, Bagdad and in the conquered provinces. The history of the Kuraish dīnāpora becomes merged in that of the Kuraish dīnāpora or descendants of Muḥammad. From these princely lines, those descended from 'Ali and Fāṭima, after the overthrow of the 'Ali caliphate in the 1st Rāy, alone returned to Arabia, to settle, not in Mecca but in Medina. They found there several Ḥāshimī families, among others the descendants of Dīfār b. Muḥammad. The Ḥasanids bore the stock from which descended the dynasty of Grand Shāfs of Mecca. The Ḥasanids held for some time the amirate of Medina. Another 'Alīid dynasty, that of the Zaidīs, descended from Zaid, grandson of Ḥusayn b. 'Ali, is still ruling in Yemen. All these 'Alīid families soon multiplied enormously within and beyond Arabia. They produced the innumerable shāfs and sayids who filled the Muslim world. In Arabia some returned to the nomadic life and there we have the spectacle of Ḥasanid shāfs leading bands of brigands, and infesting the main routes.

In the xiii-th century A. D. the Spanish traveller Ibn Djuibair (Ribâd, ed. Wright, p. 73—74) testifies to the great number of Ḥasanids, Ḥusaynids and Dīfārárids scattered over the Hijāz, as well to the depths of poverty into which many of them had sunk. Even before this time, if we may believe a text quoted by Snouck Hurgronje (Mekka, i. 42) we would have to admit that as a result of the continual revolts of the 'Alīids and the rigorous measures they provoked against them, the Kuraish element in the population of the interior had been practically exterminated. Yet they discovered everywhere in Syria the presence of Arab tribes notes in Southern Lebanon, towards Saida, a Kuraish group, but does not mention whether it was important or not. The geographer Hamdāni mentions others in Najjd, at Tabāla and at other parts of the Yemen. Those of Hamdāni were renowned for their bravery (Djassarīt al-'Arab, ed. H. D. Muller, p. 119, 122, 165, 194, 258). Among the tribes settled in the east of Mecca, Barckhardt (Voyages en Arabie, transl. Eyries, ii. 307) mentions Kuraish. According to him: "of this famous tribe there are only left: 300 men capable of bearing arms. In spite of their great name and ancient fame, they are little thought of by the other Beduins. They camp in the neighbourhood of Mount 'Arafat." At the present day, apart from the Sharifs, as regards true Kuraish we find only the Shabi at Mecca, the guardians from time immemorial of the keys of the Ka'ba, at least if we do not accept their problematical descent from the anti-caliph 'Abdallāh b. Zabair (q. v.).

Bibliography: This is given in the article MECCA.

KURAIŠH. B. BADRĀN, 'ALAM AL-TAMM, ABU l-MASĪH, an 'Ukālid or descendant of the Prophet. After the death of Badrān in 425 (1033/1034) Kuraish was recognised as lord of Nāṣibin. In the struggle between his two uncles, Kārwāsh (q. v.) and Abū Kāmil, he took the former’s part. After the death of Abū Kāmil in 443 (1052) al-Mawṣil and Nāṣibin were united under the rule of Kuraish. Soon afterwards 444 (1052/1053) he became involved in a war with his brother al-Muṣallād and another 'Ukālid, Kāmil. The war did not last long and the situation remained unchanged. In 446 (1054/1055) Kārwāsh recaptured the town of al-Anbār, which really belonged to the 'Ukālis but had been seized in Kuraish’s time by al-Bassārī (q. v.), governor of the province of Bagdad, and had the khāla read there in the name of the Saldjük Toghrilbeg. In Dhu l-Hijja of the same year however al-Bassārī advanced on al-Anbār and laid siege to the town, which very soon surrendered to him. When Toghrilbeg entered Bagdad 447 (1055) al-Bassārī left the capital, but when he
reappeared at the head of a large army and declared for the Fatimid caliph al-Must`an, Toghrilbeg sent his son-in-law Kutalmush against him. The powerful Amur Dubais b. 'Abd b. Mazyaq had joined al-Kaṭarqī into which Kuraish who had long been devoted to the Awar had joined the latter. At the end of Shawwal 448 (beg. January 1057) al-Baṣrī and Dubais inflicted a severe defeat on the troops of Toghrilbeg near Sindiār; Kutalmush escaped but Kuraish was wounded and had to surrender. Toghrilbeg himself then took the field and seized the town of Takrit which belonged to the 'Ukāids. After his brother Yaqūt had joined him at the beginning of 449 (1057), al-Mawsil also was occupied whereupon the Sultan himself set out for Nasībin and sent his general Ḥazārasp with another army against Dubais and Kuraish. They were defeated and had to sue for peace. While Dubais returned to his own territory, Kuraish joined al-Baṣrī who had settled in al-Raḥilā. In 450 (1058) the two later regained Mawsil, but again abandoned it on the approach of Toghrilbeg from Baghdaḍ. The Sultan, who did not find them in Mawsil set out after them and followed them to Nasībin; when however he had to turn his attention to his brother Ibrahīm whom he suspected of rebellious intentions, al-Baṣrī and Kuraish advanced against him. The followers of the Sultan tried in vain to defend the capital; in Dhu `l-Ka`da of the same year (Dec. 1058) al-Baṣrī entered Baghdaḍ and the caliph al-Kā'im had to take refuge with Kuraish, who brought him to safety. Al-Baṣrī could only hold out for a year, when Toghrilbeg put an end to his rule. Kuraish died in 453 (1061) as lord of Nasībin and al-Mawsil at the age of 51.


Cf. also the article al-Mukallad b. al-Musayyab in Ibn Khallīkān, ed. Wustenfeld, No. 745, transl. de Slane, III. 415 sqq.

(K. V. Zetterstén)

**KURAIZA, BANI, one of the three Jewish tribes of Yathrib,** related to the Banū `l-Nadr. The two tribes together bore the name of Banū Darī, and were said to have settled in Yathrib much later than the other Jews. In what proportion their original Palestinian stock had intermixed with the Arabs, it is not possible to say, but al-Yaqtīnī's statement that both tribes were only hebraized Dhu`lham (Kuṭa`da), is incredible.

The Banū Kuraiza consisted of three branches: Banū Kā'ba and Banū Amir; they resided outside the city on the southern side, along the Wadi Malāk, with the sister-tribe of Hadal, having the Aws Allāh on the N.W., the Banū `Abd al-Ashḥal on the N.E. and the Harrā on the E. Landowners and cultivators, the Kuraiza had brought agriculture to a high degree of development, and lived prosperously on the products of the soil and their commerce. At the time of Muḥammad's arrival in Madina, they had 750 warriors, and possessed large stores of arms and armour.

Allied, like the Naḍīr, to the Banū Aws, they had fought on their side in the battle of Bu'āth [9.v.], which took place on their territory a few years before the Hijra.

In Muḥammad's communal constitution they, like the other Jewish tribes, are not mentioned by name, but appear only as allies of different sections of the Aws (art. 25, 30, 31 and 47).

Their attitude towards the Prophet was hostile from the first, like that of the other Jews (see above, article KAIKĀZ), and ap. Ibn Hishām, p. 352, a list of Muḥammad's Kuraizā enemies), but no definite break took place until the siege of Madina (Dhu `l-Ka`da, 5 A.H.), when the Kuraiza, who in the beginning had contributed spades and baskets to the digging of the trench, drew their support. According to tradition Ghuaybī b. Akhtāb, sent by Abū Sufyān, had succeeded in gaining the support of their chief, Ka'b b. Asad, despite a written treaty of alliance with Muḥammad. The Prophet sent Sa'd b. Mu`āwīya, Sa'd b. Ubāda and two others to ascertain their attitude; they returned after a stormy interview, confirming the Kuraiza's defection.

The latter seem to have planned an attack on Madina, together with the Kuraiza and Qaṭaṭāfān; it was not executed through lack of mutual confidence, and their only exploit was an unsuccessful night-expedition of eleven men. Having failed to reach an agreement with the Kuraiza, who refused to give them hostages in exchange for military support, the Kuraiza finally abandoned the campaign, thus hastening its end.

- This traditional version is open to many doubts: the existence of a particular treaty with Muḥammad does not seem plausible, as his relations with the Kuraiza were already defined by the communal constitution, it was probably intended to justify the action taken against them. Their support of the Kuraiza appears to have been of a purely negative character, on the other hand it is easy to see how the important position they occupied on the side of the town not defended by the trench practically put Madina at their mercy. One of the fortresses incorporated in the line of defence, Rādīdī, belonged to Jews (tribe unknown), and formed a dangerously weak point in the Muslims' position. All these circumstances caused much anxiety and hatred of the Jews during the siege, suggesting immediate action against them: on the very day of the Kuraiza's departure Muḥammad was ordered by Gabriel not to lay down arms until he had punished the Kuraiza; the siege of their fortresses began the same evening (23rd Dhu `l-Ka`da), and lasted 15 or 25 days, with an active exchange of arrows, stones and strong language, but no casualties.

Having at last decided to surrender, the Kuraiza asked for the same conditions as obtained by the Banū `l-Nadr, but were told they must yield without condition, giving up all they possessed. They turned to their ally and protector Abū Lubābā b. 'Abd al-Mundhir, hoping through his intercession to emigrate, but he gave them to understand that the situation was desperate, and that inevitable surrender would be followed by destruction. His repentance for having revealed to them the lot, seems to show that Muḥammad did not intend the Kuraiza to suspect how they would be treated; the Prophet's conduct on this occasion is far from clear and certainly not blameless.

Having surrendered without attempting any resistance, the Kuraiza were separated from their women and children, and put under custody. The Aws interceded on their behalf, and obtained that
their fate should be decided by their own chief, Sa'd b. Mu'âdh; the latter, however, not daring to cross what he knew to be the Prophet's wishes, decreed that all males who had reached puberty should be slain, and the women and children sold as slaves. On the morrow, in the market-place, from 600 to 900 men were beheaded, the execution lasting all day. It is worthy of note that only four chose to save their lives by conversion.

The women and children were sold at auction, mostly in Madina, the remaining in Syria and Najd, and the price divided in the usual way of spoils. Their land was partitioned into five portions: one went to Muhammad, and the various families, divided into four groups, drew lots for the rest. Among the captives Muhammad chose for himself Rafaela bint Zaid al-Nadariya.

The exceptional cruelty shown to the Kuraia, as compared with the other Jewish tribes, is due to the fact that they had remained alone and defenceless, and to their warring, feebly, and altogether unwarlike behaviour. This last circumstance makes it all the less probable that they ever took an active part in the hostilities against Madina.

Several passages in the Kūrān are referred to the Kuraia; see especially viii. 60 and xxiii. 26—27.


For references to Bukhārī, Muslim, Ibn Hanbal, Abu Dāūd, etc., see Wensinck, *A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition*, Leiden 1927, under Kuraia.

(V. VACCA)

**KURAMA.** According to Radloff (Versuch eines Worterbuches der Turk-Dialekte, St. Petersburg 1890, vol. ii., p. 924) "a Turkish tribe in Turkistan"); the same authority gives the Kirgiz (i.e. Kazak) word kurama (from kura, "to sew together pieces of cloth") with the meaning a "blanket made of pieces of cloth sewn together". In another passage (Aus Sibirien, Leipzig 1893, i. 225) Radloff himself says that the Kurama are "a mixed people of Usbeqs and Kirgiz" and their name comes from the fact, asserted by the Kirgiz, that "they are made up of patches from many tribes" (kura to "patch together"). According to Radloff, the Kurama are "a settled tribe" between Tashkent and Khodjand, to be more accurate, on the river Angren (a corruption of Ahengerin) south of Tashkent. In Russian sources we find it stated as early as 1875 that the Kurama first arose in the xvii century; the same view has been put forward by Aristov (Zametki ob etnografickom sostave' turyshskikh plemen, etc., St. Petersburg 1897, p. 112) and more recently by I. Zarubin (Spisek narodnosti Turkestanskogo Kraia, St. Petersburg 1925, p. 12). But as early as 1045 (1635—1636) in the description of the wars between the Kazak and Ozbegs on the Angren we find the "leaders of the Kurama" (tardaruni Kurnâma) mentioned (Mahmûd b. Wali, Bahr al-Aurar, Ind. Off. 575, f. 1195). Under the rule of the Khâns of Khokand in the viiith century the word Kurama is used not only as an ethnographic but also as a geographical term and the name of an administrative division. The road from Khokand to Tashkent over the Kendir-Dawar pass was called the Kurama road (Kūk-ī Kūrama, e.g. Tūrikī Shāhīrūkhī, ed. Pantusow, Kazan 1885, p. 238). The Kurama were ruled by a Beg who lived in the fortress of Kercuci (in the written language Kürti; on Russian maps also Kelyäuîi). This use of the word Kurama was retained for some time under Russian rule. In the division of the territory (oblast) of Sir-Darya into districts (ueld), what later (after 1886) became known as the "district of Tashkent" was called the "district of Kurama" (Kūraminskii ueld). The centre of government of the district was intended to be the little town of Toi-Tube founded in the reign of Madi Kūhân (1822—1842; cf. KHOQAND) here are the ruins of a mediaeval fortress examined in 1885 by Professor Veselovskiy; but the district headman (uezdny naal'nik) actually lived at Kūyluk on the Čirik. Under Russian as under Khokand rule the district of Kurama was of considerable economic importance as a centre of rice-growing. Russian ethnographers put the Kurama in a class by themselves as descendants of nomads (Kirgis, i.e. Kazak) who have become agriculturalists (Sarts, q.v.). In spite of the adoption of the Sart mode of life, the Kurama never quite lost their particular characteristics inherited from their nomadic ancestors.

To this day this can be noticed among them; unlike the Sarts, the Kurama live, like the Kazak, in yurts; their wives as with the Kazak are unveiled. In other respects however the Kurama have advanced further from their nomadic ancestors than they had at the beginning of Russian rule. At that time Radloff and other students could still distinguish among them the division into families. According to Radloff there were five of these: Djalair, Telau (this name is still borne by a village inhabited by the Kurama), Tama, Djagaltai, and Tarakli. This division is now quite lost; where traces of it still exist, marriages between members of one family are no longer — as among the Kazak — considered illegal. The fact that the Kurama are a mixed people can still be recognised; besides the mixture of different stocks among them there has been, according to Zarubin (op. cit.) a mixture of different social ranks. The Kurama themselves do not use this name although they do with the addition of another ethnic (Kirgiz-Kurama, Sart-Kurama). The number of the Kurama in the district of Tashkent (formerly Kurama) was in 1917: 52,335; in 1920: 49,697 (but in recent years there has of course been a decline in numbers of the population in Turkistan generally on account of the great famine). There are further some 9,330 Kurama in the district of Khodjand. The word with the meaning of "mixed people" is also found in the area where Turkman languages are spoken, but these Kurama have no connection with those on the Angren.

**Bibliography:** (in addition to works mentioned above): Kostenko, Turkestanskiy Krai,

KURĀN (also GURĀN), SHAHS AL-DIN AḤMAD B. ISMĀʿĪL, Molla, a celebrated Ottoman jurist and author. Molla Kurānī belonged to Shehzādī [q.v.] in Kudistān. He studied in Cairo, where he met Molla Vekān (i.e. Mīhmed b. Er-magħān b. Khāli, cf. Taškūpruz-Ẓaḏḏī, i. 99 sqq.; Saʿd al-Dīn, i. 438 sqq.) who brought him to Asia Minor and introduced him to Sulṭān Murād II. He was appointed professor at the Kapūículo and later at the Bāyazīd mosque of Brussa and then entrusted with the education of prince Mīhmed, afterwards Sulṭān, who was then governor in Maḥnis (cf. von Hammer, G.O.R., ii, 244 sqq.). When Mīhmed came to the throne, Molla Kurānī declined the vizierate offered him, but took the office of kāḏer-ʿasḵer (855 = 1451). When deprived of this office, he went as kāḏer and administrator of the pious foundations to Brussa, but came into conflict with the Sulṭān, whom he always met boldly, was dismissed and returned to Egypt. Sulṭān Kāhīb received him with honour and distinction. Mīhmed II recalled him in 1467 (i. 497) and in 1485 (i. 480) made him Shaḵkh al-ʿĀlā in Istanbul. Here he died in 1488 (1493) after a long illness. Sulṭān Bāyazīd II paid his debts amounting to 180,000 ʿaḏi [q.v.] out of the treasury. Molla Kurānī, who is described as a tall man with a long beard, was buried at Yūkseḵ Ṭaḏḏī in Galata in the court of a mosque founded by him (cf. Hāfiz Ḥusain, Ḥadīqat al-Dawwīn, i. 207; J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ix, 89, No. 445). A quarter of Istanbul bears his name but it is usually pronounced Gūrānī. Molla Kurānī wrote a number of poems and important works of exegesis, of which the most important are Ẓāḥiyyat al-Amāni fi Tašṣir sabḥ al-Makhtūm and Ṭaḥa al-Muṣṭaq al-ʿĀṯār. Taḥa Rūḥ al-Makhtūm on Baḵšī’s work on Ḥadīṣ and other works on Kurānic studies. Molla Kurānī was a Šafīʿ but became a Ḥanafī at the request of Murād II.

Bibliography: Taškūpruz-Ẓaḏḏī, Shaḵkī Ṭal Nāmāniya, ii. 102—111; Saʿd al-Dīn, Taṣṭi al-Tavārīḵ, ii. 441–449 (with numerous anecdotes); Brūṣaftī, Ṭal Mīhmed Ṭāhirī, ʿOthmānī Muʿāʾīlī, i. 3; Ḥanīfa Sānūsī, Istanbul 1334, p. 334 sqq.; J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 532, ii. 244, 589; Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 228 sqq. (with list of some of his works, more fully in Mīhmed Ṭāhirī, op. cit.); Rūḥ, Taḥa al-Maḡāḵā, Istanbul n. d., p. 20 sqq. (Franz Bucinger).

KURBĀN, sacrifice. The word goes back to the Hebrew kurbōn, perhaps through the intermediary of the Assyrians (cf. Mingana, Syriac Influence on the Kurān in Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol. xi, No. 1, p. 85; S. Frankel, De vocabulis in coram peregrinis p. 20). The language of the Kurān, as is well known, shows a preference for religious technical terms ending in -ān and some of them are not always used with their original significations. This is true of kurbān, which occurs three times in the Kurān. In Surā iii. 179 and v. 30 it obviously means sacrifice. In Surā xlii. 27, however we read: *Did those help them, whom they had taken for kurbān as gods to the exclusion of Allāh!* Here the word must be more or less synonymous with "gods". Probably it has a meaning which is connected with the Arabic _itrāb (see below); the commentators take the same view and the word is explained as "mediators" (cf. the article SHAKA). The word hardly seems to occur in classical hādīth. The ʿĀzīs mentions two traditions which are striking enough: "The characteristic of the community (i.e. the Muslims) lies in the fact that their kurbān is their blood", i.e. instead of sacrifice they have offered the blood of their martyrs. And the other: "The ʿalāt is the sacrifice of every pious man". We may suppose there are apologetic tendencies in both traditions.

The term also came to be applied in Muslim ritual to the killing of an animal on the 10th Dhu 'l-Hijja, and the whole celebration on this and the following six days is called 'I'd al-Kurbān (cf. 'I'd al-ʿAshīr, in Turkish speaking countries Kurban-Baʿram (cf. Bahrām). In ʿĀṣīr-Arabic the word means the eucharist. — In conclusion it should be pointed out that there seems to be a genuine Arabic word kurbān, plural kurbanī, which means the courtiers and counsellors in immediate attendance on a king; the word probably comes directly from kurbān to be near (see above). (A. J. Wensinck)

KURBUKA, ABD SĀDQ KĀWĀM AL-DAWĀLI, lord of al-Mawsil. In the war waged by Tutush b. Alp Arslan, Barkiyārīk’s uncle [q.v.], against the two rebellious governors Aḵ Soḵqar and Būzān which ended with the capture and execution of these two, the amīr Kurbūka who had been sent to their help by Barkiyārīk was also taken prisoner. After Tutush had been taken in Safar 488 (February 1095) (cf. Barkiyārīk), Kurbūka was released by his son Riqāwān, and with his brother Aṯūntash collected a band of adventurers and occupied Harrān. Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Kurāšī lord of Našibin then applied to him for help against his brother ʿAlī who had been appointed governor of al-Mawsil by Tutush; Kurbūka made an alliance with Muḥammad but had him murdered after he had seized Nišābin and set out against al-Mawsil, which ʿAlī had to surrender after a long siege (Dhu ʿl-Кaḍa 489 = Oct. Nov. 1096). After the capture of al-Mawsil he disposed of his troublesome brother Aṯūntash and occupied al-Raḥla. In 491 (1098) Barkiyārīk sent him with a large army to retake Aṯūntash [q.v.] which had just been conquered by the Christians. Edessa, which had also just been taken from the Muslims, was besieged by Kurbūka on the way but he had to give up the siege and soon afterwards appeared before Aṯūntash. When the Christians made a bold sortie against the besiegers, he inflicted a disastrous defeat on them in spite of their superior numbers; Kurbūka’s own conduct is said to have contributed towards the disaster, as his arrogance irritated his commanders so that they only awaited a favourable opportunity to abandon him. In the battle between Barkiyārīk and his brother Muḥammad in Dhu 493 (May–June 1100) which ended in the defeat of the former, Kurbūka commanded Barkiyārīk’s left wing. In the following year he was sent to Aṯūntashī, where he conquered the greater part of the country but when he was besieging the town of Khwājī, he fell ill and could not continue the campaign. He died in Dhu ʿl-Кaḍa
495 (Aug.—Sept. 1102) after appointing Sončordja his successor. 


B) Thus (for the Eastern Turkish:ṣr, "guard, defence", and suffix -li forming nouns indicating trades) he who bears arms, the sword, chief huntsman (Pavet de Courteille, Dict. Turk. Or., p. 425), armouër; sword-cutter; troop of cavalry; captain of the watch; leader of a patrol; gendarmerie; governor of a fortress or of a town (Sulaimān Efendi, Lughat-i Ḏhāḥīrāt, p. 232); sentry, sentinel, guard, inspector (Vambéry, Caghataische Sprachstudien, p. 316).

Under the Şafavids, this word, borrowed by Persians, was applied to the bodyguard employed to protect the king's person, who accompanied him to war. After the battle of Căldără, those who were taken prisoners were led before Selim I and massacred (J. von Hammer, Hist. de l'empire ottoman, iv. 200). 

Bibliography: Raphaël du Mans, Estat de la Perse, p. 25, N. 8 (Ch. Schefer). 

(CL. HUART) 

KURDISTAN, "land of the Kurds". The name can be regarded from two points of view: historical and ethnographical. 

I. From the historical point of view the term Kurdistān seems to have been invented by the Saldjiaks as a name for the province including the lands between Aḏharbājān and Luristān (Senna, Dainawar, Hamadān, Kirmānsjāh etc.) as well as a name joining a joining areas to the west of Zagros (Shahrizār, Khuran = Košt-sanjak). The capital of the province of Kurdistān was first Bahār (N. E. of Hamadān) and later Sulţānābād of Čamāştāl (near Bāsūtān). Its 16 cantons are enumerated by Hamd Allāh Mustawfi, Nuzhāt al-Kulūb (ed. Le Strange, p. 168). 

This author also refers to western Kurdistān as Wilūfīyāt-i Arman and Dijzara (Arbil and Amidiya forming part of the latter). In the Mongol period, we have in general little information about the mountainous region containing Hakkarī, Bohtān and Armenian Anti-Taurus. It is possible that in the west the term Kurdistān was at first applied to the region of Darsim, for according to the Sahrāf-nāma, i. 163, in official documents (parvānadāt wa-akhlām) as well as among the Kurds themselves, the term wilūfīyāt Kurdistān was applied particularly to the sief of Camishgazak. But by the time of Timūr, the Zafar-nāma, i. 686, speaks of the Amir of Bīldis as the most important man in all bilād-i Kurdistān. In the history of Selim I (Selim-nāma, MS. of the Bibl. Nat. Pers. 285, fol. 109, v.) its author Hakim Idris says that after returning from Tabriz, Selim ordered him to go through the whole country "starting from the beginning of the land of the Kurds (bilād-ā Ākrād), i.e. from Urmia and Uşhā to Amīl and Malālyā"

in order "to win over the princes and rulers of the country of Kurdistān (tuʿlīf-i muṭlaḵ wa-hukkām-i muqált-i Kurdistān) and to ratify treaties and the protection granted them" ("wāḥād wa-mīnān-i ʿisān"). Thus the name of the became generalised and applied to the rest of the Kurdish Kurds, in Turkey as well as Persia, cf. the map in the Sahrāf-nāma, and the Travels of Evišā-Čelbi, iv. 74—75: "Kurdistān diyaṭ. Gradually the affairs of Kurdistān were dealt with by the pashas of Diyarbekr, Van, Bagdād, Erzerum etc. (cf. Sāmi Bey, Kāmān al-Aṭān, v. 3540). Towards the middle of the sixteenth century the administrative term "wilīyat of Kurdistān" is applied to the lands of Diyarbekr, Muğl and Darsim; but as a general rule, official nomenclature was based on the names of capitals and towns. A list of geographical terms (I have been unable to consult Mokrīnī Khalīl Bey's article on the scope of the term "Kurdistān" in Yeni-Türk, 1925, N. 21). 


II. What has been in geographical applications of the term Kurdistān, it is evident that it has nothing to do with the actual dissemination of Kurdish people (cf. the article Kurds). The word Kurdistān in its common acceptance means simply the regions inhabited by Kurds, cf. the Persian expression Kurdistān-i Khorāsān referring to the Kurd colonies in Khorāsān. Now the country continuously occupied by Kurds is a strip of territory running from S.E. to N.W. Its length is about 600 miles (Luristān-Malāyţa) and its breadth averaging 120 to 150 miles is greatest (250 miles) on the line Mawsil-Arar (cf. Dījhān-nāma, p. 445—449). 

Before 1914, the Kurds were divided among Turkey, Persia and Russia. As a result of the treaty of March 16, 1921 concluded between Moscow and Angora, the majority of the Transcaucasian Kurds are now in Turkish territory. On the other hand by the final settlement of the Mawsil problem, Turkey lost the Kurds of this wilāyat who are now in Irāq. In consequence the position at the present day is as follows: 

A. In Persia where the position is best known, the Kurds occupy the provinces of Kirmānsjāh [q. v.] and Senna [q. v.] as well as the southern part of Aḏharbājān (cf. SAWIJ BUŁAK) and the canton of Biedān. The Kurds also occupy the mountainous region of the districts of Urmia (especially the cantons of: Uşhā, Mergewer, Dastā, Tergewer, Biadāt), Salmaḳ [q. v.] (the cantons: Somāt [q. v.], Čahriḵ, Kīb (the cantons: Koštār, Aland) and Māmū (where the Kurds live on the slopes of Ararat). We find colonies of Kurds in Khorāsān (the khānats of Kučān, Budjārd and Daragaz) in Kirmān, Fārs, northern Luristān, Puqht-i Kāh, Warāmīn (near Teherān; cf. Brugsch, Reise, ii. 496), Kazvin, Mandji (cf. Rabino, R.M.M., xxvii., p. 259) etc. The number of Persian Kurds may be put at not more than 500,000. 

B. As regards TURKEY, it is at present (1927) impossible to evaluate fully the repercussions of the war on the geographical distribution of various peoples, such as the flight of the Kurds before Russian troops, the deportation of the Armenians, the expatriation to the ʿIrāk of the Nestorians of Dījlāmger, the punitive expeditions of the Turks into Darsim (1921) and to Kharpū and Diyarbekr (1925). The map given by Sir Mark Sykes
settled there in the wilayet of Aleppo (especially at Kilis) before the war numbered 125,000 according to the Russian Consul Zimmermann (cf. also CuiNet, ii. 124; Hartmann, Das Livia Halab, Berlin 1894, p. 83, 92, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100 and 105). According to the "K. M. M.," i., p. 317 there are 20,000 Kurds in Syria under the French mandate (to the north of the A'Alawis and at Bellān). There is also a Kurd quarter in Damascus. On the Kurds of Sindjar, where the administrative position is not quite clear, see the articles of Nazerīdī.

F. The Kurds had also advanced far to the west. In Balādistan (q.v.; i., p. 636) there is an important Kurd tribe settled among the Bahāris (and speaking Baharī). Recent researches (Tedesco) have ascertained a certain affinity between Kurdish and Balārī. As regards Afghanistan, the Shahrāf-nāma, i. 327, noted the move to Gharzāstān of a part of the Cigānti tribe. Morgenstierne, Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, Oslo 1926, p. 5 thinks it possible there are people speaking Kurdish west of Herāt.

Bibliography: Cf. the articles ARMENIA, BOHTYAN, ŞÊXWÊD-JULAK, ŞÊXWÊ, ŞÊXWÊ, SHÊKH, SÎWÔ, SÎWÔ and SULAMAINYA. There is an excellent bibliography of Kurdistan to 1856, in Lerch, Ifzedewaniya, St. Petersburg 1856, i., p. 5-19 (it is not included in the German translation).

The only general description of all the lands inhabited by the Kurds is in the monumental work of Ritter, Erdkunde, 1835, viii., p. 392-400 (Kurds of Khorasan), 1840, ix., p. 612-762, 1006-1048 (Persian Kurdistan), 1843, x., p. 690-734, 769, 1008 (the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates), 1844, xi., p. 128-146 (Western Kurds), 709, 749, 1007, 1026 etc.


C. The Kurds of al-"Irák (in the former wilayet of Mawsil) according to the census of 1925-1924 number 494,007; they occupy the whole of the liwā' of Sulaimaniya (189,900), form a considerable majority in the liwā' of Arbil (170,650 out of 191,780) and a majority in Kirkuk. The ethnographic position and the migrations of the tribes are summed up in maps No. 6 and 8 prepared by the Commission of Enquiry of the League of Nations (c. 400, m. 157, 1925, viii.).

D. In the Russian Transcaucasia the Kurds of Erivan and of Karç in 1910 numbered 125,000 including 25,000 Yazidis. Of the Kurds (speaking Kurdish) only a small number are incorporated in the Soviet Republic of Armenia. On the other hand the old Russian censuses did not reckon separately the Kurds of the cantons of Zangazur, Djawanshir, Djibar-d and Aresh in the government of Elizawetpol (= Gaudja). These Kurds of Gaudja (cf. the evidence of Arab authors on the presence of Kurds in Arta) now form a separate canton (tyaql) in the Soviet Republic of Adharbajjān; but it seems that their language is the ordinary Turkish of Adharbajjān (cf. Cursin, Azerbaidjanskiye Kuri'd in izv. Kawk. Istor.-Arkeol. Instituta, Tiflis 1925, iii.).

E. As regards Northern Syria, the Kurds long
KURDS, an Iranian people of Nearer Asia, living in Persia, Transcaucasia, Turkey and al-Irāq (cf. KURDISTAN). Before 1914 the number of Kurds living in compact bodies or isolated colonies (Khordis, Asn Minor, Cilicia, southern Syria) was estimated at two to three millions.

Although many travellers have passed through Kurdistan and there are a large number of important works dealing with the Kurds from the linguistic, historical, ethnological and political point of view, we still lack a general study devoted to this people. Its preparation is rendered difficult by the fragmentary and sporadic character of our information and by the diversity of the methods employed by the writers on the subject.

A. Origins.

The classification of the Kurds among the Iranian nations is based mainly on linguistic and historical data and does not prejudice the fact there is a complexity of ethnic elements incorporated in them. The type of the latter varies visibly from place to place. It is probable that the expansion of the Kur element took place from the Caucasus (Western Persia) to west (Central Kurdistan) but there is nothing to have preserved the existence in Central Kurdistan, before the coming of the Kurds, of a nationality of different origin but bearing a similar name (Kurd) which later amalgamated with the Iranian Kurds.

On two Persian inscriptions dating from about 2,000 B.C., Thureau Dangin (Revue d’Assyriologie, v. 99; vi. 67) found a country Kar-da-ka mentioned (in which word the editor tells me privately the initial is k and not ḷ and the function of the element ka is uncertain). This country was beside the “people of Su” (cf. Z. A., xxxv, 230, note 3) which Driver locates south of Lake Van; there is an old fortress Sūs in the region of Bādis (Sharaf-nāmā, i. 146). A thousand years later Tiglath Pileser waged war on the people called Kur-ki-e in the mountains of Aza, which Driver (ibid., p. 400) identifies with the modern Hāzū (Husun). The reading Kur-ti-e is not certain however.

Herodotus in the fifth century mentions no name like this, but, according to him (iii. 93), the thirteenth name of the Achaemenid empire included next to the Armenians a Pādrūk which Noldeke (Gramm. d. neusyrän. Spr., Leipzig 1888, viii.) and Kiepert (Alt. Geogr., § 81) have connected with the name of Bokhātān (= Bohātān).

The retreat of the Ten Thousand described by Xenophon (401–400 B.C.) made famous the name of Carduks (Kāpūsya) whose country lay to the east of the Kentrites (Bohātān). From this time onwards we continually find the name on the left bank of the Tigreis near Merv (ibid. [q.v.]). In classical authors the country became Cerdicus (on the numerous forms of this name probably produced by the difficulty of reproducing the Semitic ḷ, cf. Driver, op. cit.). In Aramaic the district was called Beth-Kardā and the present town of Dżarizat Ibn ‘Omar, Gazarkt of Kardā. The Armenians had the name Kordudh, the Arabs (Baladūh, p. 176; Tabari, iii., p. 610), Bādkūr (Kardāi). According to Yākīt (iv. 56) who relies on the authority of Ibn al-Athīr, the canton of Bādkūr formed part of Dżarizat Ibn ‘Omar, contained two hundred villages (al-Thamānī, Dīrūt, Fīrūt-šāhr) and was situated on the left bank
of the Tigris opposite Erbil on the right bank (cf. the full analysis of the texts in M. Hartmann, *Kurdistan*, p. 33–35). Later, the name which was only applied to the district *di*-appears from Muslim terminology and is replaced by Džazar Ibn Omar, Bohūn etc. to the Armenians and Arabs as the territory of Kürd in the strict sense had a very limited application. We do not know the exact frontiers of the province of Corduene; its three towns, Sereč, Sanaka and Pinaka (= Finik) lay on the Tigris, but the statement of Strabo (iv. 12, 3) is remarkable, according to which the term *Kúrḍ* was sometimes applied to the mountains between the modern Djuflan and Mābūs.

Now, who were the K̲ar̲š̲er̲ez̲̲es̲ whose name undoubtedly survived in the later names (the termination -ez is the Armenian plural in -ezh, which is perhaps explained by the fact that the Greeks learned this name from an Armenian) according to Xenophon (iv. 3, 4) the Kardochoi recognised neither the authority of King Artaxerxes nor that of Armenia. When in the first century n. c., Corduene was conquered by Tigranes II he had its king Zarbiuzn executed in 115 A.D. the king of Corduene was called Manišas. According to Hubschmann, *Die altarm. Ortsnamen*, p. 239 and *Armen. Gramm.* 1897, iiii, p. 518–520, the province of Corduene was only superficially arménised.

There is nothing truly surprising in finding at the time of Xenophon an Iranian tribe settled to the north of the Tigris, but we have nothing but the evidence of the name from which to judge the etymology of the Kardochi. The name has Semitic analogies (Acad. Assyr. karduū, "strong", "hero", kardū "to be strong"); on the other hand there is a certain consonantal resemblance with the name of a people Kahlid, better known under the Assyrian form *Uraša Uraštū*, in Hebrew Ararat, among the Greeks Καλαδός, Καλάδος and sometimes Χαλαζία. This people appeared in Armenia towards the end of the 1st century B.C. and afterwards established a powerful kingdom in the region of Lake Van which lasted until the beginning of the sixth century. Lehmann-Haupt, *Mater. z. alter. Gesch. Armeniens*, Gottingen 1907, p. 123, sees in them Kahlid immigrants from the west; E. Mayer, *Gesch. des Altertums*, iiii, 1913, § 474 sees their original home on the central Araxes. As a result of the arrival of the Armenians, towards the 7th century, the Kahlid were dispersed and driven towards the mountains (Cyrządch, iii. 1–3). But their name survived in the toponymy of the region north of Lake Van (the Byzantine theme Xαλάδια near Trebizond the town of Kḥlāt = Akyazı, etc.; cf. Belekov and Lehmann, Z. A., 1894, 98; 1895, 84; de Goeje, *ibid.*, xii, p. 100; Struck, *ibid.* xiv, p. 112). Parallels for the name Kahlid have been sought on the other side of the Caucasus: the Georgians are called Khart-ul-Khart-ul-kal (in Svanian k’khv’rd) in Mingrelian, khor-kh’; cf. Adontz, *Armenia v epokhu juzdiniy*, St. Petersburg 1908, p. 398.

Whether we identify the Kürd with the Semites or an indigenous people, it is certain that the land of the ancient Kardouchoi is at the present day one of the principle centres of the Kurds. It has therefore been concluded that the Kardouchoi were identical with the Kurds and this view was still considered axiomatic at the beginning of the 19th century; cf. *Grundrisse d. Iran. Phil.*, ii, 464.

Going a step further the Kürds were directly connected with the Kādā; in his commentary on Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Cronicae*, B. 13 (713, 11) said "Chalid et Kordi vel Curti Gordyaei idem". A similar opinion is expressed in the title of Lerc’s work (1856), *Recherche sur les Kurdes Iranien et sur leurs Ancêtres, les Chaldéens Septentrionaux*.

A new turn was given to the problem by the re-searches of M. Hartmann, Noldeke and Weissbach, who showed the philological necessity of distinguishing between the stems *Kur* and *Kādē.* These scholars at the same time proposed to recognise the Kürds in the *Kīrēn,* Cyrtii mentioned by classical writers in Media, Persia and Persia (Strabo, xi. 5, 4 and xv. 3, 1). This hypothesis is confirmed by the presence in Fars of numerous Kūrdish tribes in the 8th century (cf. *Kīrānān-i Arabkašk-i Pābak,* translated by Noldeke, Gottingen 1879, p. 37, 43 and the testimony of Arab writers).

The justifiable distinction between the names Kūrd and Kādē does not, however, decide the important question, how the Cyrtii (= Iranian Kürds) came to colonise lands west of the Zagros, the country of the ancient Kārdē and the mountains of the Anti-Taurus as far as northern Syria. The problem still requires careful research. In the first place the Median and Persian conquests must have brought about irremovable displacements of the Iranian peoples. We have an example in the migrations of a part of the Asagartiya whose original home was in Sisītān. In the Assyrian period we find these Saragantes in Media (Zikbitu or Zakritu, cf. Streck, Z. A., 146) and in the time of Darius (Bahistūn inscription 2, 90) their capital was already in the Assyrian plain at Arbela, where Darius had their chief Čirantarākha executed, whose portrait on the rock of Bistūn suggests a Kürdish type (L. W. King, *The Sculptures of Beziata*, London 1907). Between 220 and 171 B.C. we find Cyrtii mercenaries taking part in the wars between Rome, the Seleucids and the kings of Persia (*Lucy*, xii, 58, 15; xxvii, 40, 9; Polybius, v, 52, 7; cf. Weissbach, *Strata-Pauly-Wissowa*, s. v. Cyrtii, and A. J. Reinach, *Les Monnaies de Persiennes, Revue Archéologique*, 1909, p. 115–119). A very interesting state of things is seen from the Armenian Geography of the 16th century, in the case of the province of Kōrēkkh (according to Adontz, *Armenia*, p. 418: Korčk in *Korčč-akhe* where korčč means Kūrd as *arapči* means "inhabitant of Atropaten*.

In the time of Faustus Byzantius (17th century) Kōrēkkh was only a canton near Salmas [q.v.]. As a province, Kōrēkkh stretched from Džižān to Džazar Ibn Omar and included the following cantons of Kōrēkkh, the Kōrēkkh, the Džitak, the Aštān, the Ažār, the Mošul, Otofakkān, Orsirāk (Orsirakh), Karanak (Sarapokh), Čahuk and Little Abak (Hartmann, Bokhtan, p. 93; Hübschmann, *Die altarm. Ortsnamen*, p. 255–259).

We see the changes that were gradually brought about. Of the three districts, Kordukch, Kordik and Tomirikh, which Faustus mentions in place of the ancient Corduene, Kordukh had become a mere canton of Korēkkh and Tomirikh disappeared altogether to the advantage of Kōrēkkh (Kōrēkkh) of which simply upper, middle and lower cantons were distinguished.

Hübschmann (*t.* p. 385) confines himself to the
distinguishing between the Kurdish (Kordhi) or the
Kurdish but in general the linguistic distinction
established by M. Hartmann and Noldeke does
not preclude the existence of hybrid and corrupt
forms (M. Hartmann, l. c., 92: "es gingen wohl
schon früh die Namen durcheinander"). Noldeke
even distinguishes a third group of names: Aramaic
Kartăwĕyi (Arabic Kartawiyā), meaning the true
Kurds; cf. Hoffmann, "Auszüge", etc., p. 207,
note 1639.

We thus find that about the period of the Arab
conquest a single ethnic term Kurd (plur. Ahrūt)
was beginning to be applied to an amalgam
son of Iranian or Turkic tribes. The latter, some
names were autochthonous (the Kardi; the Tmorokhi/
Tamarūyā in the district of which Alkī was the
capital; the Xobārīz [= al-Khuwaihiyya]
in the canton of Khojī of Sāsūn, the Ṭarījūyā
[= al-Ṭarījān] in the bend of the Euphrates); some
were Semites (cf. the popular genealogies of the
Kurd tribes) and some probably Armenian (it is
said that the Mamakān tribe is of Manikonian
origin).

In the twentieth century the existence of an
Iranian non-Kurdish element among the Kurds
had been definitely established (the Gūrānīsīn group).
It is based on the political domination of newcomers
that had been established (at Sulaimāniyya [q.v.], at
Sāwīj-Buškā [q.v.], at Kūtār where we find
remnants of the Kūresīlī [?] in subject to the
Shekākh). Systematic investigation may discover
traces of ancient peoples overlaid by a Kurdish
element giving an appearance of unity.

Genealogies and popular Etymologies.
The Muslim sources and Kurdish traditions do not help us
to solve the problem of the origin of the Kūrs. 
Mas'ūdī already (Murdūj, ed. Barbe
de Meynard, iii. 251) speaks of their descent
from those Persians who escaped from the tyrant
Dāhāḵān. This legend is best known from the
version of the Shāh-nāma (Macan, i. 27–28;
Mahāl, i. 71; Vallers, i. 36, verses 29–38). In 1812
Morier (Second Journey, p. 357) mentions
the celebration at Dāmān (on 31st August) of a
festival commemorating the delivery of Persia
from the tyranny of Dāhāḵān, known as the 'Aid-i
Kurdi, "the Kurdish festival". On the other hand
the Kurds sought Arab genealogies for themselves.
Some (Murdūj, iii. 253) claimed as their ancestor
Rahba b. Nīzār b. Mā'add, others Mūdar b. Nīzār,
both eponyms of the districts of Dīyār-Rahba
(MoSul) and Dīyār-Mūdar (Kaḥḍa). They said the
Kūrs had separated from the Arab stock as a
result of feuds with the Qassāndēs and, having
retired to the mountains, intermingled with strangers
and forgot their mother tongue. Of more interest is
a series of ancestors among whom we find
Kurd b. Mard (cf. ʾal-Maddī the neighbours of the
Kūrs) b. ʾayyās b. ʾiḥarb b. Ḥawāzīn (Mas'ūdī,
ibid., and al-Tantūkh, p. 88–91: Kurd b. Isfandā
ābī b. Manšūshār; Ibn Hawkāl, p. 185–187:
Kurd b. Mard b. Ṭamīr. All these genealogies
may contain a few grains of historical fact (iran-
isation of Semites, intermingling of the tribes of
Zagros and of Fars). Nor is there any lack of popular etymologies.

The attempt has been made (Murdūj, iii. 251) to
connect the name with the Arabic root karradā;
the Kurds would thus be the children of young
slaves and the demon Djasad ("driven out" by
Solomon). Very frequently (cf. Driver, J. R. A. S.,
1923, p. 403) the name Kurdi is connected with
the Persian word gurad (herd) although this root
really had a 7 in Pahlavi and goes back to the
root far "to protect" (Horn, Neuer. Etymol.,
p. 200).

In later times the names of tribes were often
explained by those of their eponyms. The Shāh-
nāma, i. 158, makes all the Kūrs (the Badjwāni
and Bokhit tribes) come from Badjān and Bokhit;
the former of these names may be connected with
that of Bawār, a tributary of the Tigris (An-
dezas in Harran) who were also Bawār, calls the
Perezīyōr of Herodoto, or the "dragon-
king" (Kurd) Ḥafīn-Bokhit killed by Artaḵshir
Pāpakān; cf. Noldeke, Ṭabarā, p. 11. According
to another legend, especially popular in the north
and west, the Kūrs were at one time divided
into two branches, Mīnān and Zīltān, the former
coming from Arabia and the latter from the east;
the Zīltān were regarded as an inferior race (cf.
M. Sykes, Jour. R. Anthrop. Inst., 1908, xxxiii.,
p. 470).

Bibliography: F. Justi, Kürdische Grammatik,
St. Petersburg 1880, p. xxii.; W. Tomá-
scheck, Sāsūn und d. Qutteingebiet d. Tigris,
St. Petersburg 1895, cxix; M. Hartmann,
Bohtan, Mitl. d. Vorderasiat. Gesell., 1895/6,
1897/8, p. 90–103; Noldeke, Kurd und Kur-
den, in Festschrif f. H. Kiepert, Berlin 1898,
p. 73–81; Ihluschna, Die alien. Orten-
255–259; Weissbach in Pauli-Wissowa, Real-
encyclopaedie, s. v. Kudschis und Kordis; Driver,
The Name Kurd and its philological connexions,

B. History.

We have detailed notices of the Kūrs from the
time of the Arab conquest onwards. During the
five first centuries of the Hijra the Kūrs
frequently played a considerable part in events
and often took the initiative in them. Several
Kūrd dynasties arose at this time. Waves of Turk
and Mongol invaders seem to have submerged
the Kūrs from the vii th to the viii th century A. D.
But the period of the wars between the Ottoman
and the Safawī Shāhs produced a state of
affairs in Kurdistān favourable for the growth of
a feudal system, of which a faithful picture is
given in the Shāh-nāma (1003 = 1596). The
Turco-Persian frontier became gradually stabilised
and the Persians fell back behind the wall of
the Zagros and its northern extension. Then Turkey
began the work of strengthening the authority
of the central power within her eastern provinces.
Towards the end of the viii th century the last
Kūrd principalities disappeared in Turkish ter-
ritory (Hakkārī, Bīlis, Sulaimāniyya) and in Persia
(Ardalān). But the great tribes still exist and their
cares assure the preservations of the Kūrdish
element with its social and ethnic peculiarities.
Persia hardly ever interferes in the domestic affairs
of her Kūrdish tribes while Turkey tries to use
the Kūrs as a political support for the central
authority. Sometimes the Kūrs are overwhelmed
with favours and sometimes they have to resist
the attempts to abolish the remnants of their ancient
autonomy. Several risings of the Kūrs took place
in the vii th century and towards the beginning of
the viii th century a Kurd movement added one
more to the nationalist agitators within the Turkish empire. The revolution of 1908 drew the Kurds into politics; newspapers, magazines and Kurd societies began to multiply. During the war of 1914-1918 the idea of an autonomous Kurdistan was first mooted by the Pachas, but the plan has only been partially realised and only so far as the part of the old vilayet of Mawzil attached to the new state of Iraq is concerned.

The Kurds after the Arab conquest

We shall find it useful to begin by collecting the information given by Arab authors regarding the distribution of the Kurd tribes.

The term Kurdistan being first known before the time of the Seldjuks, information regarding the Kurds is usually to be found in the Arab authors under such headings as Zawzarn, Khilis, Aramiya, Adharabijan, Djib, Fars, etc. (cf. Driver, Dispersion of the Kurds in Ancient Times, J.R.A.S., Oct., 1926, p. 563-572).

Mas'udi (about 332 = 951) and Isakhtari (340 = 951) are the first to give systematic information about the Kurds. In the Mur odd al-Dhahab (ii, 253) Mas'udi enumerates the following groups: at Dainawar and Hamadhan: Shudjan; at Kangwar: Madjurdan; in Adharabijan (so the text should be emended): Hasibh十几at and Sarit (probably Shabik = Khurji [q. v.]; cf. the story of Daisam below); in Djib: Shidaddan, Lazha (Lurri); Madjurdan, Mazdanakhan, Baxis, Khali (Djalali), Djarvik, Djik, Mubakhan; in Syria: Dababila, etc.; at Mawzil and Djidi the Christian Kurds: al-Ya'kubiy ("Jacobites") and the Djurkan (Djurkhan). To this list the Tunki of the same author (p. 85-91) only adds Bazdikdan (cf. Isakhtari, p. 115), Naushwara, Buxik and Kikan: at the present day found near Marash) but he gives a list of the places where there were Kurds: the rumaun (rumun) of Fars, Kirman, Sidjistan, Khorasan (Isakhtari, p. 282: a Kurd village in the canton of Asadabad), Isfahan (a section of the Bazandidan tribe and a flourishing town described as Djuk, Ya'kif, p. 275; Isakhtari, p. 125), Djib, notably Mах Kufa, Mах Baza, Mah Sabardjan (Masabadan) and the two Ighir (i.e. Karadji Ibn Dafal and Berdji), Hamadhan, Shiraz, with its dependencies Darabad and Sanghan (Zinikan), Adharabijan, Armania (about whom on the Arab texts the Kurds lived in houses built of clay and of stone; Mu'addassi, p. 277), Arran (one of the gates of Barda was called Bahl al-Alkind and Ibn Mislawi says that at the invasion of the Rus in 332 [1042] the local governor had Kurds under his command), Balaik, Bahl al-Alwab (Darband), Dizjara, Syria and al-Tughur (i.e. the line of fortresses along the Cilician frontier).

Isakhtari, p. 98 particularly mentions 5 rumun in Fars, this term being applied to districts over which the Kurds were distributed (in spite of de Goeye, B.G.A., iv, p. 250, it is preferable to keep the reading ram-ramun [from Persian ram, "flock", "crowd"] for it is improbable that zanun could have given a plural rumun). Each ramun had its town, its Kurd chief in charge of the khurji and responsible for public safety. These ramun were: 1) Djib, 2) Ramiidan, bordered by Isfahan and Khuzistan; 2) Lawadijan, between Shenz and the Persian Gulf; 3) Divan, in the Kura of Sibur; 4) Nikriyan in the direction of Kirmans; 5) Shahriyar, along side of Isfahan also called Bazandidan after the principal tribe, a part of which had been transferred to the province of Isfahan. As a supplement to the list of rumun, Isakhtari, p. 114, gives a list of 33 nomad tribes (bun, plur. akhva) of Fars, based on the records of the Djawalin and reproduced by Ibn Iqwal, p. 185-187 and Mu'addassi, p. 446: Kirmans, Ramans, Madalith, Muhammad b. Bashar, Bajli (Mu'addassi: Taibati), Bandmadhari, Muhammad b. Isakh, Sahali, Ishak, Adharban, Shahraki, Shahmadan, Zabali, Shahrawi, Bundadaki, Khurawi, Zandji, Safar, Shaharyar, Mihraki, Mu'abari, Iskhan, Shahani, Farati, Salami, Siri, Atsidokht, Barzakdokht, Murtali, Shihab, Kadjti, Djallali, in all 500,000 families living in ten thousand.

The Fars-nama (c. 500 = 1107) says, p. 168, that the Kurds of the old large ramu of DJuky, Dhwian, Lawadijan, Kariyan and Bazandidan, who formed the most brilliant element in the old army of Fars, all perished in the wars at the time of the introduction of Islam, with the exception of a single Akal, who became a Muslim and left descendants. Other Kurds were transferred from Isfahan to Fars by Ajud al-Dawla. It is difficult to admit that 500,000 (+) families of Kurds were exterminated, but we must recognise the possibility of regroupings among the tribes of Fars and of their denationalisation. The old ramu of DJuky (Khub-Guli) is now a new enervated tribe; thus, we do not know how long they have been there. For the rest Isakhtari's list mentions a tribe al-Lurriya (variant: Lazha) among the Kurds of Fars. On the other hand the Fars-nama distinguishes from the Kurds the Shabankara (q. v.) clans, who had become very powerful in Fars at the time of the last Buysids. The Masalik al-Abyar of al-'umari speaks of the Shabankara under a separate heading and the Sharaf-nama does not mention them among the Kurd dynasties. One of their clans however (Ramani) bears the name of one of the "Kurd" tribes of Iskhtari. Everything then suggests that the Kurds of Fars differed considerably from the tribes of Kurdistan (cf. Iskhtari).

The term al-Zawzan which corresponds broadly to central Kurdistan (nadan in Kurdish "summer pasturages") is not well defined. According to Ibn Hawkal, p. 250, the king of Zawzan was called al-Dairami (Darinak, Armenian king of Waspurak). Mu'addassi, p. 137 regards Zawzan as a nahiya of Djarizat Ibn 'Omar. Later this region which had a mixed Kurd and Christian population extended in area. According to Ibn al-Athir (in Yatkit, ii, 257) al-Zawzan began at two days' journey from Mawil and stretched to the borders of Khilis; on the Adharabijan side it extended to Salmas. Many strong places belonged to the Bashi-nawi and Bokhti Kurds; the former held Barja, Bashir (and Fanak); to the latter belonged: Djurjkhal (Gurgil) residence of their malik Atik (Sharaf-nama, i, 117: Nash Attil); Allias, Baz al-ahmar. To the lords of Mawil (the Zangl) belonged: Atik (El), Arwak, Bakauka (Bekoki in Barwar), Barkho, Kingwar (?, Nirwa (east of Akr) and Khashab. The text of Yakut is not very certain; in any case the reference here may be to Kurd strongholds gradually annexed by the Hamidans and the Zangl (see below).

The Kurds under the Caliphs and Buyids. Mas'udi (Mur Odd, ii, 249) has preserved traditions from the pre-Muhammadan period of feuds between the Arab princes of Qussan [q.v.]
and the Kurds. The Muslim Arabs came into contact with the Kurds after the occupation of Taqrit and Hulwân in 16 (637). Sa‘d b. Abi Wakkâ, marched on Mawsil where the districts with a Kurdish population were occupied (al-Mardj Bâ–Nuhadhâr, Bâ‘-Adhir, Hibûn, Dâsn etc.); cf. Ibn al-Ashtîr, al-Kâmîl, ed. Tobenberg, ii. 408. The conquest of the region was completed by ‘Iyâd b. Ghanam and ‘Utba (Badî‘uri, Futûh al-Badî‘i, ed. de Goeje, p. 331). The Banû of al-Zawwân in 19 (640) obtained confirmation of his authority on payment of Zarghûf (Futûh, p. 176). In Susiana in 18 (639) the Arabs fought against the Kurds, who had taken up the cause of the Persians, Persian governor of A’hwân (Kâmîl, ii. 425). In Fârs likewise the Kurds supported the Persians in 23 (642) at the defence of Fâsûn and Darâbîjârî (ibid., iii. 32). ‘Omar had sent several expeditions against the Kurds of A’hwân (Futûh, p. 382, 389; Kâmîl, iii. 37). On the other hand in the reign of ‘Omar the Kurds invaded the region of the central Karkhâ (Şimara, Mâsbâdbâdîn) the language of which was still Persian in the time of Ya’qûbî (B. G. A., vii. 236). The Arabs had reached Shahbûrûz before Isàm (Ibn al-Fâqîh, p. 130), but the final occupation of Shahbûrûz, Dârâbîjârî and Samînîn in 22 (643) was only achieved after bloody fighting (Futûh, p. 334; Kâmîl, ii. 29). In the south Abû Mâsûl, governor of Basrâ, had to put down risings of the Kurds at Bûrûkî and Balasalâm in 25 (645), but the Kurds, forcibly converted to Isàm, apostatised in masse (Kâmîl, ii. 66, 76). Under the caliph ‘All, the Kurds, along with the Persians and Christians, took part in the rebellion of al-Khârîrî near A’hwân and in Fârs, but the chief was defeated at Râm-Hurmuz (ibid., iii. 309). ‘Abd al-Muktâhir, who had seized Armenia and Adharbâjdâjn in the reign of the Omâyâyîd caliph ‘Abd al-Malik, appointed in 66 (685) a governor at Hulwân whose task was to fight the Kurds (Kâmîl, iv. 187) but the death of al-Muktâhir prevented the plan from being carried out. Under the same caliph the rebel ‘Abd al-Rahmân made an alliance in 83 (702) with the Kurds of Sâbîr in Fârs (ibid., iv. 352). In 90 (708) the Kurds ravaged Fârs and were punished by al-‘Âshâdijârî. In 129 (746) the Kurds of Sâbîr resisted the ally of the Khârdijî, Sulâmîn, who had rebelled against the caliph Marwân II and had besieged Sâbîr (ibid., iv. 387, 341; v. 283). The caliph Marwân himself was the son of a Kurdish slave-girl (Tabânî, iii. 51) whose blue eyes and fair complexion he had inherited (Sir W. Muir, The Caliphate, London 1801, p. 429).

Under the `Abbâsîd Caliph Mansûr the invasion of Armenia by the Khazâr, 147 (764) resulted in numerous risings. A few years later the Kurds (inittûhr al-Abrâdî) are again mentioned in connection with the rising at Mawsil and its repercussions in Hamadân (Kâmîl, vi. 448; vi. 9). ‘Abd ’Askâfir, son of Mansûr, was the son of a Kurdish slave-girl (Tabânî, iii. 442). In the reign of al-Mu’tasîm, a Kurdish rebellion is mentioned under 225 (839); it broke out in the district of Mawsil, led by ‘Abd ’Askâf b. Fathardjîs, a scion of a noble Kurd family. Defeated at Bâbâghîsh, ‘Abd ’Askâf took refuge in the mountains of Dûsnîn where he defeated the troops of the Caliph. A new army commanded by the Turk Aîtâkî put an end to the rebellion (Kâmîl, vi. 360–361). A Kurdish rising broke out in 231 (845) in the regions of Isfâhân, Dâsnîn and Fârs; it was speedily suppressed by the Turk general Waṣîf. The Kurds of Mawsil in 252 (866) joined the Khârdijî Musâwîr who had seized Mawsil. In 262 (875) they played a considerable part in the Zandjî slave-revolt (cf. Noldeke, Sketches from Eastern History, London, p. 146–175: A Servile War in the East) led by an ‘Alî Khârdîjî (?) ‘Abî Muhammâd called al-Khâbîth and in the rising of Ya’qûbî al-Saffar, founder of the Safârî dynasty [q. v.]. At A’hwân, Ya’qûbî appointed a Kurd lieutenant Muhammâd b. ‘Usâdallâh b. Hâsrârî, who, cherishing ambitious plans, engaged in secret negotiations with al-Khâbîth. With reinforcements sent by the latter, Muhammâd marched on Sîs but was defeated by Ahmad b. Lâilîbây, the latter, also a Kurd and commander of the Kurd levies, had been sent by the Caliph to put down Ya’qûbî’s rising (Ibn Khâlîkîn, Waṣay’a, ed. de Slane, iv. 304–308). When Ahmad had departed, Muhammâd, after securing from al-Khâbîth further reinforcements consisting partly of Kurds, seized Shuṣtar where, according to the arrangement he had to have had the Khârîb read in the name of al-Khâbîth, but instead he did it in the name of the Caliph al-Mu’tamîd and his adversary Ya’qûbî al-Saffar. His Zandjî allies deserted Muhammâd and Shuṣtar was recaptured by Ibn Lâilîbây. Muhammâd retired to Râm-Hurmuz but he was dislodged from it by al-Khâbîth’s generals. As a result of difficulties with the Dârnân Kurds, Muhammâd again sought the help of al-Khâbîth. The latter sent him troops which Muhammâd sent into battle but suddenly left them in the lurch and attacked them. To avoid a breach with al-Khâbîth Muhammâd agreed to proclaim him Caliph. The death of Ya’qûbî (265 = 879) and of al-Khâbîth (270 = 883) put an end to these exploits (Kâmîl, vii. 264). About 281 (894) the Kurds were among the partisans of the Arab ‘Âbdânîân b. Hâmîdân (cf. Hâmdânîs) when he established himself in Mawsil. The Kurd rebellion raised in 284 (897) by Abû Lâilî did not last long (ibid., vii. 325, 337). In 293 (906) the Hadîbhânî Kurds led by their chief Muhammâd b. Bîlâl laid waste the region of Niniveh. ‘Abdallâh b. Hâmîdân, the new governor of Mawsil, pursued them but suffered a reverse at Ma’ûbâ. With reinforcements sent by the Caliph he resumed next year the pursuit of 5,000 Hadîbhânî families. The Kurds began negotiations to gain time and retired to Adharbâjdâjn. ‘Abdallâh returned to Mawsil and with new troops set out once more against the Hadîbhânî who had entrenched themselves at Dîbal al-Salâq (probably Lâhîbîân, cf. Sâvîq-Bûlâk). The Hadîbhânî were forced to surrender and their pacification was followed by that of the Hûmâdî tribe and of the people of Dîbal Dûsnîn (ibid., vii. 371). In the reign of the Caliph al-Muktâdir, the Kurds plundered the environs of Mawsil but were punished by the Hûmâdîn government; the Dîbalî tribe put up a particularly stubborn resistance (ibid., vii. 118). Under the year 337 (943) Ibn Miskaḵwâl, Fâqîhîr al-Umân, G.M.S., vi. 105 speaks of the expedition of the Hûmâdîn Husain against Adharbâjdâjn; on this occasion he had as an ally Dîbâr b. Shâkbîyâ chief of the Hadîbhânî who were settled at Salmûn.

About this time Daisâm b. Ibrâhim appeared on the scene and his adventurous life is closely
associated with the Kurds. He himself was the son of an Arab by a Kurd woman. His followers were Kurds with the exception of a small body of Dailams. Daisam was a Khaṭānī. He seized Aḍharbāḏjān after Yūsufs b. Abū l-Šādīj and in 327 (938) used his Kurds to drive out Lashkārī b. Mardī, one of the lieutenants of the Ziyārīd Washmīg. But the Musafīrīd Marzūbān, a noted Shīʿī, succeeded in taking Aḍharbāḏjān from Daisam and the latter took refuge with his friend Ḥaḍīb b. al-Dairānī (the Armenian king of Waspurakan Khaṭīb-Gaghiṅ, son of Deranīk). Then the people of Tabriz appealed to Daisam but again he suffered a reverse and with the consent of the Musafīrīds fell back to Tabrīz. In 357, Marzūbān was made prisoner by the Būyids Rukn al-Dawla who sent a representative to Aḍharbāḏjān. Marzūbān’s brother Wahšūdān then thought of Daisam to whom his Kurds had remained faithful and sent him against Rukn al-Dawla’s representative. Daisam was defeated but held out in Aرادābīl and Barḏāhā. When Marzūbān returned from his captivity, Daisam had to take refuge first in Armenia and then in Baghdad where the Būyids Muʿizz al-Dawla treated him generously. As his friends were urging him to return to Aḍharbāḏjān, he went to the Ḥamdānīds of Mawsīl and Syria to ask for assistance. In the absence of Marzūbān, Daisam returned to Salmās in 344 in which he had the Khaṭba read in the name of Saif al-Dawla of Syria. Once more driven out by Marzūbān, Daisam sought refuge with his Armenian friends. Ibn al-Dairānī (Deranīk b. Khaṭīb) had to hand him over to Marzūbān much against his will. Daisam was blinded and died in prison in 345 (Taḏjīrī, ed. Ahmadzādeh, i. 345 ii. 148—151; Kāmil, viii. 289, 361, 375—377).

During Marzūbān’s captivity in Rayy, several independent governors set up in the northwest of Persia. One of them (about 340/951) was Muḥammad Shaddād b. Kāṭūrī the Rawābī tribe out of which later sprang the great dynasty of the Ayyūbids. The principal sieges of the Shaddādīds were Dabīl and Gandja. The Shahādādīds were allies of the Byzantines and of the Saljuqs. In 465 (1072) Abū Sulwār bought Anī for his young son Manūcī. From this time onwards the dynasty was divided into two branches: that of Gandja and that of Anī. In 1124, Anī was taken by the Georgians but between 520 (1126) and 557 (1161) and again from 1165 to 1174; Anī was again held by the Shaddādīds. The Shahādādīds were enlightened princes and left a number of remarkable buildings. Cf. the articles ARAKAN, DWIN, Gandja, Shaddād; the Armenian bibliography in Lynch, Armenia, i. 363—367; cf. also Barthold in the appendix to his Russian translation of Muḥamm. Dynasties, by Lane-Poole, St. Petersburg 1899, p. 294; Barthold, Pers. nadvīn in . . . melīti Manīlec, Aniyskaya Seriya, No. 5; N. Marr, Elze ovo “izleč” Zapiski, 1911, xx, p. 120; E. D. Ross, On Three Mughmammadan Dynasties, Asia Major, ii/ii, 1925, p. 215.

In 349 (960) a pretender appeared in Aḍharbāḏjān. He was called Isḥāk b. ʿIsā and was supported by Faḍḥ, chief of the Kaṭtānī (Turd) Kurds, while his adversary the Musafīrīd Dastān b. Marzūbān relied on Ḥaḍhānī support. Isḥāk was soon disposed of (Taḏjīrī, ii. 179). The Kurds and the Dailams also played a considerable part in the quarrels between Dastān and his brother Nāṣir al-Dawla and between ʿĪbrahim b. Marzūbān and his cousin Ismāʿīl b. Wahṣūdān (Taḏjīrī, ii. 219, 229; Kāmil, viii. 420—423).

About 348 (959) the second Kurdish dynasty arose in al-Dījāl (Lane-Poole, Mūhamm. Dynasties, No. 57) founded by Ḥasan waḥīd (Ḥasanīya) b. Ḥasan (q.v.; cf. also the Shāfaʿī-nāyī, i. 20—23), chief of the Barzīkīn (Barzīnī) tribe who had assisted the Būyid Rukn al-Dawla on his expedition to Kharāsān. Rukn al-Dawla showed great tolerance to the Kurds and when someone complained to him of their excesses he used to say: “Even the Kurds must live” (Taḏjīrī, ii. 281). Ibn al-ʿAthīr (viii. 519) praises the noble character of Ḥasan waḥīd, his prudent policy and the purity of his morals. When Ḥasan waḥīd died in 369 (979) in his capital Sarmāḏāī (south of Busīṭīn), ʿAṣūf al-Dawla overran his possessions (Ḥamādān, Dānawar, Niḥāwān) to bring it under his authority, but in the end he granted investiture to Bādr b. Ḥasan waḥīd (360—405 = 979—1014) (q.v.). who remained loyal to ʿAṣūf al-Dawla and even fought against his own brothers who had taken the side of the rebel Fakhr al-Dawla. The Caliph gave Bādr the title of Nāṣir al-Dīn waḥīd al-Dawla. The historians give an extremely favourable verdict on Bādr; he had his tribe educated, distributed taxation fairly and protected the peasants (Taḏjīrī, [Abū Shudjaʿ], p. 287—299, 327; Ibn Muḥassin, p. 429, 449—454; Uthī, Kitāb-y Yamni, transl. Reynolds, p. 424). Bādr’s successor Tāhirī (Tāhir?) only reigned a year and in 406 (1015) was driven out by the Būyid Ǧāḥīs al-Dawla. Ḥasan waḥīd’s uncle Waṇdād, chief of the ʿAṣīḥīya section, died in 349 (960), his brother Abū l-ʾĀḥānām in 350 (961) and a little later his son Abū ʾUmmī Daisam, the last of this collateral branch was dispossessed of his castles (Kaṭān or Kaṭān [Keslan?] near Bābā Yādīgār on the Zohāb, Ḥaṭmīn-Bāzī, etc.).

ʿAṣūf al-Dawla had to deal with the Kurds on several occasions, but he was much more severe with them than his father Rukn al-Dawla. In 368 (978), the Kurd Ibn Bādīyā with the help of the Ḥamdānīd Abū Taghlīb became an independent ruler at Ardamašt (Kawāshīr near Djabal-Djīdī, Yāḵtū, i. 199) but soon allowed himself to be seduced by the promises of ʿAṣūf al-Dawla (Taḏjīrī, ii. 392). In 369 (979) the latter sent an expedition against the Kurds of Ǧawharī who wished to separate from the Banī Ṣhabīn Beduins whom he had business and matrimonial ties with them. The town of Shahrīzūr was occupied and the Arabs went back to the desert (Taḏjīrī, ii, 398; Kāmil, viii. 516).

Another expedition was sent in 370 (980) against the Hakkārī Kurds who were besieged and surrendered, relying on a promise that their lives would be spared. But the leader of the expedition crucified them along the side of the road for five farsakhs between Maʿallāhāyā and Mawsīl (Kāmil, viii. 521).

Even in the lifetime of ʿAṣūf al-Dawla, the Humaidī chief, Abū ʿAbdALLĀH Ḥusain b. Daṣāhanī (or Abū Shudjaʿ Bāḍ b. Daṣṭāk) known as Bāḍ b. Ḥusain is said to have ascended considerable notoriety. At first a shepherd, he gradually rose to be lord of Ardishīk, Amedī and Māvārānhanī. A rising in Nāṣīrīn brought him into conflict with Ǧāḥīs al-Dawla. Bāḍ defeated the latter’s forces at Bā-Bīlāyā (on the Kābūr al-Husainīya in the canton of Kawāshīr = Ardamašt) seized Mawsīl and was planning a march on Baghdad to end Būyid rule.

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLAM, II
when he was defeated by Şamsan al-Dawla. He fell back on Maişafirink and, by an arrangement with the captain of the army sent against him, secured possession of Diyarbakr and the western part of Tur ʿAbidin (374 = 984). Badh did not relinquish his designs on Mawsil and in 379 (990) having collected a large number of Bashlawi Kurds, encamped under the walls of this town and engaged in negotiations with its inhabitants. But the Hamdâf princes who had just regained possession of their hereditary fee, secured the help of the Banu ʿUkail Arabs and attacked the invader. An accident put Badh hors de combat and he was slain. His body was crucified, but the people of Mawsil obtained his burial with unusual rites because he had fought against the unbelievers (Kanîlit, ix. 25, 27, 38, 49; Tugîrîb [Abû Shudja'], p. 83–84, 176–178; Abû ʿl-Faraḍî, Mukhtar al-Dawal, ed. Pococke, 321–323).

In 380–390, Šamsan al-Dawla made an attempt to improve his position and with this object, made an alliance with Fülâd b. Mundhir, who was supported by the Kurd cavalry mobilised at Shîrâz. After the failure of the enterprise he sought refuge with the Kurds but the latter betrayed him and he took refuge with Fakhr al-Dawla, who was notorious for his hatred of the Kurds (Tugîrîb [Abû Shudja'], p. 184; on Ibn Fâlak, see H. R. I., x., c. vii.).

The Kurdish dynasty of the Marwâniids (Lanepoole, No. 47) is closely connected with Badh. After the defeat at Mawsil, Abû ʿAli b. Marwân b. Dustâk, the son of Badh's sister and his ally, withdrew to Hîn-Kalâb [q. v.] where Badh's Dai-lanî wife lived. He married her and took one of the strongholds that had belonged to Badh. He twice took prisoner Abû ʿAbdallâh al-Hamdanî who had defeated Badh, but treated him generously. Ibn Marwân established himself in Diyarbakr and by his conciliatory attitude won the sympathy of the inhabitants. The Marwânîids reigned from 380 (990) to 489 (1006). Their power extended not only over Diyarbakr (Amir, Arzanî, Maişafirink, Hân-Kalâb) but also to Khîšâ, Mûrafgerd, Arûjsh and the canton to the northeast of Lake Vân. On the west they held Urfa for a time. Abû ʿAli Hasan in 381 (991) invaded Syria and took it from the Byzantine Emperor Basîr II. He was killed in 387 (997) by the people of Diyarbakr who had rebelled. His brother Âbû Mansûr Mumahhid al-Dawla who after the death of Badh had seized Maişafirink reigned there till 402 (1011) (Abû ʿl-Fardi, Annales Mestemec, ed. Reiske, ii. 569). His brother Abû Naṣr Ahmad (Ibn Khallîkan, i. 157–158) succeeded him and remained there till 453 (1061). In 422 (1031) Al-Faraj, the Byzantines re-established their power in 422 (1031) (Abû ʿl-Farajî, p. 342). He earned the reputation of being a just and enlightened ruler, and able, though given to pleasure. In 442 (1050) Abû Naṣr had to pay homage to the Sâlûk Tughrî. His son and successor Abû ʿl-Kâsim Naṣr, called Niğâm al-Dawla (453–472), shared the power with his brother Saʿîd (d. in 457). He added to his possessions Harrân, Suwaštê etc. His successor was Mansûr b. Saʿîd, who nominally reigned from 472 to 489 but by 478 (1085) the Salchuk general Pakhr al-Dawla b. Djijîhar had taken almost the whole of his lands, which were placed under the authority of the Atabeg of Mawsil (Abû ʿl-Fidâ, iii. 77–79, 87, 121, 125, 249). On the Marwânîids cf. the special study by Amadeus, F.A.A.S., 1903, p. 123–154.

On the eve of the Turkish invasion we find frequent reference to exploits and expeditions of the Kurds. In the reign of al-Kâdir (381–422) the historians record the exploit of the Kurd Ahmad b. al-Dbâjî who killed the Emperor Basîr II's general and thus stopped the Byzantine advance (Tugîrîb, [Abû Shudja'], p. 247). Between 366 and 388 the Kurds took part in the struggle between the Byzids and the Ziyârîs for the possession of Dughmân (Uthâ, p. 298–302; Ibn Isfanîyâr, G. M. S., p. 226–228). A few years later we find Malikzâdî of Shurîr Ùzâr in the campaign of 366 (1077).

The Kurds took part in the civil wars of the Byzids, in the struggle of the Banu ʿUkail for the possession of Mawsil, etc. In 411 (1020) they fought against the Turkish troops who mutinied in Hamdân. In 415–420 we find them fighting in Fars and Khuzistan against the last Byzid, Abû Kâlidjâr (Kanîlit, ix. 100, 134, 226, 232, 239, 247, 249, 254, 265; Tugîrîb, [Ibn Muḥassin], p. 348, 376, 381). Thus the Kurdish element was exhausting itself in continual fighting when the Turkish hordes arrived who were destined to modify radically the ethnic aspect of the Near East.

The Turkish Conquest. When in 429 (1029), the Gbuz precursors of the Saldâjks reached Râйj, Tâsh Fassâh, the Turkish general of the Ghaznavids went to meet them with 3,000 horsemen including a number of Kurds. The leader of the Kurds being captured by the Gbuz sent a message to his men to cease fighting. This caused a tumult and Tâsh was killed (Kanîlit, ix. 268). In the same year the Gbuz reached Marâgha and executed many Hadîbbânîs. The Kurds made an alliance with the ruler of Adharbaîjan (Wâhsûdân II) and the Gbuz had to retreat. Another body of Gbuz after a raid into Armenia returned to Urmiya and the lands of Abû ʿl-Hâjîd Hadîb/cloud; the Kurds attacked the Gbuz but suffered a defeat. In 432 (1041) the Musafîr�d Wahsûdân II b. Mâmil massacred a large number of Gbuz at Tabriz; the Gbuz of Urmiya went into hakkârî, a dependency of Mawsil, and ravaged the country, but while they were involved in the mountains the Kurds attacked them, killed 1,500 men and took many prisoners and much booty (Kanîlit, 270–272).

On the approach of Tughrilbeg's troops, the Gbuz took fright and pushed onwards. Kurîsh guides led them through al-Ẓawzan to Dijîshra. One section of the Gbuz under Mansûr c. Buottu marched on Dijîsh while the other under Buîkî marched on Diyarbakr and going on pillaged the districts of Kûrdî, Bâzâdî, Hussainiya (Yâkût, ii. 270: a town between Mawsil and Dijîshra) and Fesbûr. The Marwânîd Sulaimân b. Naṣr al-Dawla, ruler of Dijîshra, persuaded the Gbuz to wait till the spring before traversing his lands to join the other Gbuz who had settled in Syria. Then by a ruse he seized Mansûr and with the help of the Bashlawi Kurds of Fûnîk, pursued the Gbuz. But the latter did not cease their depredations; they ravaged the districts of Diyarbakr and seized Mawsil (Kanîlit, ix. 100, 134, 226, 232, 239, 247, 249, 254, 265; Tugîrîb, [Ibn Muḥassin], p. 348, 376, 381). Thus the Kurdish element was exhausting itself in continual fighting when the Turkish hordes arrived who were destined to modify radically the ethnic aspect of the Near East.

The Turkish Conquest. When in 429 (1029), the Gbuz precursors of the Saldâjks reached Râйj, Tâsh Fassâh, the Turkish general of the Ghaznavids went to meet them with 3,000 horsemen including a number of Kurds. The leader of the Kurds being captured by the Gbuz sent a message to his men to cease fighting. This caused a tumult and Tâsh was killed (Kanîlit, ix. 268). In the same year the Gbuz reached Marâgha and executed many Hadîbbânîs. The Kurds made an alliance with the ruler of Adharbaîjan (Wâhsûdân II) and the Gbuz had to retreat. Another body of Gbuz after a raid into Armenia returned to Urmiya and the lands of Abû ʿl-Hâjîd Hadîb/cloud; the Kurds attacked the Gbuz but suffered a defeat. In 432 (1041) the Musafîr�d Wahsûdân II b. Mâmil massacred a large number of Gbuz at Tabriz; the Gbuz of Urmiya went into hakkârî, a dependency of Mawsil, and ravaged the country, but while they were involved in the mountains the Kurds attacked them, killed 1,500 men and took many prisoners and much booty (Kanîlit, 270–272).

On the approach of Tughrilbeg's troops, the Gbuz took fright and pushed onwards. Kurîsh guides led them through al-Ẓawzan to Dijîshra. One section of the Gbuz under Mansûr c. Buottu marched on Dijîsh while the other under Buîkî marched on Diyarbakr and going on pillaged the districts of Kûrdî, Bâzâdî, Hussainiya (Yâkût, ii. 270: a town between Mawsil and Dijîshra) and Fesbûr.
to a new family the Banu 'Annaz (cf. Sachau, Ein Verzeichnis Muham. Dynastien, p. 191). Sharaf-
nama, i. 22: 'Aiyār' which is often called Abu 'l-Shawk. Previously in 340 (951), during a Turkish
rising in Hamadan, the Bayyū Ma‘ız al-Dawla had had recourse to the services of Ibn Abu
'l-Shawk, chief of Hulwan (Tağārib, i. 2). The real founder of the dynasty seems to have been
Abū 'l-Fāth Muhammad b. 'Annaz (Kāmil, i. 158) who ruled 380-401. His son Abu 'l-Shawk
slew the last of the Ḡasanawīs, Zahir (Tahir) in 406. The possessions of the Banū 'Annaz included
Ṣahrūzir, Kirmānšāh (occupied in 431: Kāmil, i. 300, 316), Bilawār, Šāmgān, Daḵūša, Khufti-
dākhān. In 437, Ṭaghrīl sent his brother Ibrahim Yanāl to pacify Djaʿbāl. Ibrahim drove the Bayyū
Garāšp out of Hamadan and he sought refuge with the Djaʿbāl Kurs. At Kirmānšāh there
was a garrison of Abū 'l-Shawk composed of Dailamis and Shāḥjānān Kurs. Kirmānšāh was
occupied and Abū Shawk died in 438 (1046) at Sirwān. Ibrahim took Šamīra (Šamīra? Saimara?)
and subjugated the Djaʿbān. Saʿādī, son of Abu Abū 'l-Shawk submitted to the Šaljūqs. The dynasty
lasted till 520 (1116) (Mūnedjīdīm-bashi, quoted by Sachau, loc. cit.).

The defeat of the Emperor Romanus IV at Ṭe-
laşged (463 = 1071) delivered all Armenia into the
hands of Abū Abūl. Under the Great Šaljūqs
there arose in Fars the turbulent dynasty of the
Šahānkāra (q.v.), but it is very doubtful if this
dynasty, the fortunes of which can be traced from
421 to 756, was strictly Kurdish (cf. above). On
the other hand the small Kūr dynasties were rut-
lessly wiped out in favour of Turks. In 493
(1100) the Šaljūqs disappeared in the region of
Khašt where the Turk Šukmān Kūthi founded
the dynasty of the Šūh Arman which lasted a
century until the coming of the Ayyūbids. Under
the date 495 (1101) Ibn al-Ŷahhār (i. 238) mentions
the killing of two thousand Kurs of Surkhbāb b.
Badr, a scion of the Banū 'Amānā by the Turk-
mons of Šalghūr Karabūlī. Other Turkomans later
took all the lands of Surkhbāb except Šahrūzir,
Daḵūša and Khuftidākhān. In spite of this crushing
blows the Kurds are often mentioned in the xiith
and xiiith centuries. In his struggle with Kaured of
Kirmān, Malik Šah employed Kurdish and Arab
forces, whom he later rewarded with fiefs at
Kirmān (Kāmil, i. 53) there were already colonies of Kurds (cf. Maṣūfī, Tanbih, p. 88;
Ibn Khallīkān, i. 516). Raids of Kurds took place at
Dudjail, Mārdīn etc. in 496, 498, 503. In
Muḥammad b. Malik Šah's campaign against
Syria 504 (1110) there took part the lord of
Maḥrūgha, Aḥmad b. Wahsūdān, a Kurd of the tribe
of Rawādī (cf. Kāmil, i. 391) and the "Šah of
Armenia" Šukmān. The campaign was a fiasco
and the Kurs left to lay siege to the Turk Šuk-
mān (Recueil des Hist. des Croisades, Docum. Orientaux, iii. 542, 599).

During this period we often find the Kurds
mentioned in Syria, where they came into contact
with the Franks (cf. Deroenbourg, Ouâma b. Muńṣīb). Under Šanḍar the province of Kūr-
distān was formed of the western part of Djaʿbāl.
Salīmānīn, the nephew of Šanḍar, became its
ruwer with Bahār (N. E. of Hamadan) as its
capital. The province was in a flourishing state.
In the reign of Šanḍar also the Kurs took part
in the troubles of 513. In 516 a punitive expedition
passed through the Khaštār, Šūzān and Bāšgaw districts (Kāmil, x. 374, 377, 426), but shortly
afterwards the Kurs seized the stronghold of the
Christian patriarch at Ṭūr 'Abīdīn (Assemi, Bibl. Or., ii. 221).

The Atabak of Māwṣīl. The Atbahāk, the immediate neighbours of Central Kurdistān,
played an important part there. 'Imād al-Dīn al-
Zangi several times invaded Kūṛ territoriy. In
528 (1134), he took Šanž (on the left bank of
the Ḡokhān) and to punish the Ūmāidī who had
supported the Caliph Mustaṣṣulād when he was
besieging Māwṣīl, seized their fortresses, all
'Ākr, Šūh etc. (Shams al-Dīn in Recueil, iii.
666-667; Ibn al-Ŷahhār, al-Šaṭḥiyya, ibid., ii. 87).
Abū Šaḥīd, lord of Arbīl, Šaḡīb etc. submitted
to Zangi (he must have been a Hakkār?; at this
period this tribe lived south of the territory
which now bears its name; cf. Hoffmann, Ausserg.,
p. 203). After the death of Abū 'l-Ŷahhār, Zangi
intervened in the quarrels among his successors,
seized Šaḡīb and dismantled its defences; the
fort of Djaʿbāl received the name of Šāmīya
(= Šāmīya, in honour of 'Imād al-Dīn). In 534
(1139) Zangi took Šahrūzir from Kiḏjāk b. Arslān
Tāsh the Turkomān. In 537 (1142) he sent a new
expedition against the Hakkār and took the
fortress of al-Šaḥbān (= Šaḡīb) which he rebuilt.
In 538 Irūn and Khiẓīn were taken (Shams al-
Dīn in Recueil, iii. 685). 'Arī, lord of al-Ŷašībīya
(cf. Sharaf-nama, i. 284, Šaḏīb-bulak?), Šaraḥ
and Aḵḵa (Elk?) joined Zangi of his own accord.
The last expedition of Zangi was against the
Bāšgawī of Panak (Finnik) but the siege of this
town was raised on the death of Zangi 541
(1146) (Ibn al-Ŷahhār, al-Ŷaṭḥiyya in Recueil,
iii. 114, 129, 158). Karāḏja Tiḏjān Mašīrād (?)
of Khaštār, who was sent in 547 by the Atabak
of Māwṣīl against the Atabak of Āḏarbaḏān,
seems to have been a Turk foreign to the tribe.

Later after the death of Šalāḥ al-Dīn (583)
the Šangīds consolidated their position in Central
Kurdistān. In 607 (1211) 'Imād al-Dīn, a younger
son of Arslān Šāh Zangi, received as a fief the
strongholds of Hūmāidān (‘Aḵḵ and Šūh).
In 615 (1218) the same prince seized Šāmīya and "the
remainder of the fortresses of the Hakkār and
Zawān" which were ceded to him by Muẓaffar
al-Dīn Kūkbař of Arbīl (Abu l-Ŷaḏafī, p. 433,
438). It must have been these events that caused
the Hakkār to be driven back towards the lands
at the sources of the Great Žāb.

The Īrūḫjīds, Atbahāk of Diyarbakr several
times came into conflict with the Kurs (Abu
l-Ŷīdīs, iii. 583; Ţūmā, i. 321). The 'Abbāsid
Caliph, freeing themselves from the tutelage of
their protectors negotiated with the Kurs (cf. the
case of Ḥaḏī Ūmāidī in 528 and Kāmil, xi. 7,
188) and sought to weaken the Turks. In 581
(1185) under the Caliph al-Nāṣir, a minor incident
resulted in a war between the Kurs and the
Turkomans (Kāmil, i. 342) which extended over
a vast area (Syria, Diyarbakr, Diţaţa, Māwṣīl,
Šahrūzir, Ḡaštār and Āḏarbaḏān). Two years
later the rivals stopped fighting in order to join
against the Christians of Armenia, Assya, Meso-
opotamia, Syria and Cappadocia. The Turk
feuds soon broke out between the Kurs and Turko-
mans. After many fierce battles the Kurs fought
their way back into Cilicia. The Turks practically
exterminated the Kurs of Cilicia and Syria.
the Kurds on leaving their old homes had entrusted their goods to their Christian neighbours and as the Christians concealed some Kurds, the Turks finally fell upon the Christians at Thel-muzen (?) and Arabthil (= Arabgir?) (Michael the Syrian, in Recueil, Doc. Armén., p. 395). The Aïyûbîds. The Kurdish origins of this remarkable dynasty are well established (Sharaf-nâma, i. 55—82). The Armenian historian Hayton (Hethum) says on this point: "Fosteva vero Sarraceni in Armenia numerosissimis Egiptio et Persia, unde et usque Cordis vulgariter diecebratur, regni Egipti dominii occupaverunt," Recueil, Doc. Armén., ii. 225, 343.

The grandfather of Saîl al-Dîn Shâhîd b. Narwân was a Rawâdî Kurd (Râwâdî, Rawanda, a clan of the Hadîbîn) of Dvin [q. v.].

The important fact is that it was from Dvin that the Shâhadî dynasty had come, the memories of which must have been still alive in the time of Shâhîd Aïyûb [q. v.] and Shirkût [q. v.], son of Shâhîd, born in the old village of the Ağdânakân. Saîl al-Dîn [q. v.] was born at Takrit but Kurd traditions were certainly familiar to him through his father and uncle. The persistence of Iranian names in Aïyûbid family is significant. Nevertheless the scene of the main activities of the dynasty was Egypt and Syria. The families of the old Sâlîqân Atabak, even when they became vassals of the Aïyûbîds continued to rule in Diyarbakr (Urtuks), Mawsil (Zangids) and Arbil (the Begtjetgoïds, at first deputies of the Zangids). By the treaty of 585 (1187), with 'Izz al-Dîn Zânî, Saîl al-Dîn annexed only Aleppo and Shahrîzûr (Ibn al-Athîr, al-Atabakîya, Recueil, ii. 334; Kâmîl, xi. 340; Baha' al-Dîn, Recueil, iii. 85). Later (in 585, Saîl al-Dîn gave Shahrîzûr to his Mamlûk Kheïchqoî (?) a relative of Yaçîb b. Kifîlût. The only independent way by which the Aïyûbids penetrated into Kürdistân was that of Kifîlût. This district was at first conquered by Taîq al-Dîn in 587 (1191) (Kâmîl, xii. 49) but it was only after the death of Saîl al-Dîn that his nephew Awhâd Aïyûb installed himself there in 604 (1207).

Later Kifîlût passed to his brother Ashraf, who assumed the title "Shâh Arman", and finally to the third brother Muzaffar who ruled there till 642 (1244). The peace of this fief was several times broken by invasions of Georgians, of the Kâbirmîzshâh and of the Mongols. The Georgian troops who were operating round Kifîlût at this time were commanded by the Armenian princes Zakare and Iwane whose genealogies make them descendants of the Kheî Bahirrâhan, i. e. of the Kurd tribe of Bîşpirâlan; cf. Marr in Zât, 1911, xx., p. 120.

The Aïyûbîd forces were composed mainly of Turks but the Kurdish element was by no means negligible. In 583 (1187), Saîl al-Dîn addressed an appeal for a holy war to the Kurds on the upper Tigris. The Dîjîzârî forces were disbanded in 584 (1188) but the Diyarbakr detachments and particular tribes are often mentioned. These Kurds were sometimes on bad terms with the Turkomans (Baha al-Dîn, Recueil, iii. 86, 315, 381).

Kurds were numerous in the civil and military service of the Aïyûbîds but were often they acted against the dynasty's interests. When Shirkût died, there were Kurds who opposed the appointment of Saîl al-Dîn as his successor (Ibn Klâlîkân, iv. 494).

An important part was played by the family of Abu 'l-HâIdjâ (Hadîhîmâ) hereditary chief of Arbil (?). He directed the defence of Akkâ against the Crusaders and was appointed isfâhâûîr of the army and governor of Jerusalem. In 1196 he was transferred to Baghûd: he conducted an expedition against Hamadân and died at Dağlûka. His nephew Kûthû al-Dîn built the Kûthûâyî madrasa in Câinî. Another Kurd, of the tribe of Hakkân, Saîl al-Dîn b. 'Abd al-Mâshûûû, succeeded Abu 'l-HâIdjâ at Akkâ. His descendants had exciting careers; his son 'Abdâm ended his days in the prison of Harrân; his grandson, the Khân Imaûd al-Dîn plotted against al-Kâmîl, and had to go into exile.

Khârîzîm Shâh Djalâl al-Dîn. In 614 (1217) the Kurds of Zagros inflicted a defeat on the troops of the Khârîzîmshâh sent from Hamadân to Baghûd. Djalâl al-Dîn's operation against Kifîlût (623—626) disorganised the life of the country and the Kurds were decimated by famine (Kâmîl, xii. 207, 308). Defeated and pursued by the Mongols, Djalâl al-Dîn took refuge among the Kurds of Diyarbakr and in 628 (1231) was killed, probably by one of them (Djwâinîn, ed. Muhammâd Karwînî, Tâhirî, Kâmîl, iii. 325; d'Ohsson, Historie des Mongols, ii. 625, note 4 (1237) against the remnants of the Khârîzîm hordes traversed and plundered the region of Khârûpû (Abû 'l-Faraûd, o. c., p. 477). After the death of Djalâl al-Dîn, the Mongols laid waste the region of Diyarbakr and Kifîlût. Another horde had descended from Marâ-da on Arbil; this latter region was three times invaded. In 645 (1245), Shahrîzûr was laid waste and in 650 (1252) Diyarbakr.

The Mongol Ilkâhân. The Kurds are rarely mentioned under the Ilkâhân. As these rulers — at first pagans and later Muslims — were on good terms with the Christians and the latter had sufficient causes of complaint against their Muslim neighbours, the Kurds so recently involved in the wars of the Aïyûbîds had to remain confined to their mountains and to hope for success for the enemies of the Mongols.

The province of "Kûrdstân" formed in the time of the Sâlîqân, the capital of which was Bahâr (near Hamadân) was conquered by Malik b. Tûdân, father of the celebrated Amir Çobân. Leaving Hamadân in 615, Hûlûfû marched on Baghûd. At Kirmânshâh the Mongols began to murder and plunder (Rashîd al-Dîn, ed. Quatremère, p. 225, 255, 267). Before the capture of Baghûd, Hûlûfû sent troops to take Arbil. The governor of this stronghold, Tâdj al-Dîn Shâlîka (cf. Rashîd al-Dîn, ed. Blocket p. 261), submitted to the Mongols but the Kurd garrison refused to follow his example. Arbil was taken with the help of the Atabak of Mawsil, Badr al-Dîn Lu'lî (d'Ohsson, ii. 256). The taking of Baghûd resulted in the depopulation of Shahrîzûr [q. v.] and its Kurd inhabitants, according to Shîhâb al-Dîn al-Umarî, left for Syria and Egypt (cf. d'Ohsson, op. cit., iii. 309, 330, 337). An echo of these events is found in the appearance in Algeria of two Kurd tribes: Lawûn and Babin (Ibn Klâlîkân, Hist. des Berbères, transl. de Slaane, ii. 461 and iii. 417).

Returning to Adharbâdîjân, Hûlûfû set out for Syria in 657. In the Hakkâri country, the Mongols put all the Kurds they found to the sword (Rashîd al-Dîn, ed. Quatremère, p. 328).

Dîjîzârî, Diyarbakr, May法sîkîn (held by the Aïyûbîd Kâmîl) and Mardin were taken in succession.
After the death of the Atábak Badr al-Din Lu'lu' who had remained faithful to Hulagu, his son Sâlih went over to the side of Baibars, Sultan of Egypt and received confirmation of his investiture from him. The Kurds around Mawsil at once fell upon the Christians. The garrison of Mawsil consisting of Kurds, Turkomans and Shiites, courageously resisted the Mongols.

In Syria also the Kurds threw in their lot with the Mamlûks. In his letter to the Khân Berkâi, Baibars boasts of the number of his troops, who were Turks, Kurds and Arabs (d’Ohsson, iii. 385). In the time of Ahaba, the Armenian Hayton tells how after an invasion by Egyptian troops (before 677/1278) the Kurds took 5,000 houses of Kurds (Gordins) living in Northern Syria (Recueil, Dec. Arme., iii. 179). But after the defeat of the Mongols in 680 (1281), a body of Muslim troops, made up of Turkomans and Kurds, laid waste Cilicia. The rare cases in which Kurds are found allied to the Mongols were generally in distant Fârs. Under Ûljâjîtâ there were Kurds in the troops that invaded Gîlân in 706. A little later a Kurd, Mûsâ, who had proclaimed himself the maddî of the Shi'is was executed by Ûljâjîtâ. In 712, Badr al-Din, the Kurd lord of Ra'ba resisted the Mongols.

The Kurd provinces were governed by the Mongol Amir. The fighting in Arbil never ceased. The Kayacî, Christian highlanders, forming part of the Mongol army and stationed in Arbil, brought a charge against their chief Zain al-Din Bâlû and came into conflict with the Kurds whom the Arabs supported. Incidents began in 1297 but the situation came to a height in 1310. With great difficulty the Mongols drove the Christians out of the citadel. The Mongols had summoned the Kurds to help them in the siege but their amirs who were friendly with the Christians, wanted to use the Kurds to prevent the massacre of the Christians by the Arabs. The massacre took place but the Kurds had no share in it (Histoire de Mar Jâbâlahâ III, transl. Chabot, Paris 1895, p. 152–177). The country between Marâgha and Arbil was a kind of high road for the Mongol armies; at this time the country south of Lake Curna was still for the most part occupied by Turks and Mongols (cf. Sâwûd-Bulaq).

The capital of the province of “Kurdistan” and Ûljâjîtâ was moved from Bahâr to Sultanâbâd (of Çamçâmîl). The extent to which the province had suffered may be judged from the statement of the Nasihat al-Aabdî (p. 107) according to which its revenues were reduced to one tenth of what they were under the Sâlîsîs.

When the Ilâksân had disappeared, two families of Mongol chiefs of the tribes of Sudûz [q. v.] and Djalîîr [q. v.] became rivals for power. By virtue of the division of the fiefs between “the two Hasans” (in 738/1338), (Persian) Kurdîstân and Kûzhdîstân returned to the children of the amirs Akrandzî or Akrârî (?). In 784–785 the Djalîîr Bayazid carved a fez for himself out of Persian Kurdîstân and Îrâk ‘Adhamî (Lane-Poole, op. cit., No. 86 and d’Ohsson, iv. 747).

Table of the Kurd tribes in the time of the Mamlûk Sultanâs. The Mongol conquest had completely eclipsed the political part played by the Kurd tribes but in Egypt where the Mamlûk Sultanâs were cherishing secret plans against the Ilâksân, much interest was taken in the fate of this Muslim element. The Maâlik al-Ashrî of Shîhâb al-Dîn al-Umrâ (d. 749/1348) shows how exactly the chancelleries of the Mamlûk Sultanât were informed about Kurd affairs. According to al-Umrâ there were Kurds near al-Irâk and al-Dîyâr al-‘Ârab and in Syria and Yemen. The mountain country (al-Djîblî) inhabited by the Kurds began near Hamadân and ended in Cilicia (bîlîd al-Takfûr); to the west of the Tigris the Kurds of al-Djazîrât and Mârdin were at the mercy of all their neighbours. At Mârdin however a certain Ibrahim al-‘Arîs Bâlû (?), had shortly before proclaimed himself independent and had attained considerable power. The author then gives a list of twenty tribes living between Hamadân and the part of al-Djazîrât that lies between Mawsil and Karwar (cf. Kûwîr in the Sharaf-nâmâ).

1. The Gûrânî, who were warriors and agriculturists (qund wa-ra’îya).
2. The Gîlânî (cf. the mountain called Gâlâla among the Sohrân; Sharaf-nâmâ, i. 286 and Rich, Narrative, i. 123: Ghele-lâ). A portion of this tribe migrated to Syria. Their prince Sharaf al-Dîn was governor of Arbil under the Mongols but was killed by a Mongol.
3. The Zangâlî (= Zangânaî). 4. The Kûsâ and the Mâbir (?) of Shahrizûr (q. v.) migrated to Syria and Egypt.
5. The Sâbûlî (Sutûni?), lived in Shahrizûr and Ushnî. Near them lived the Kûrtâtî (cf. Hoffmann, Auszüge, p. 207).
6. The Hasânîn (Khuşnîwî?), several thousand in number divided into three branches, one of which living at Karkar alongside of the Kârtâwî (?), levied tolls on the pass Darband-i Karabolî (the defile of the Little Zâb; cf. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 263).
7. Near Kûrnî (? Kûrkûk) and Dâjkû lived a tribe of 700 men.
8. A tribe living “between two mountains” (bîn al-djâbalîn) on the territory of Arbil in winter sought the good graces of the Mongols and in summer assisted the invasions of Egyptian troops.
9. The Mâzdânjân (=) to the number of 500 lived near Arbil and Mâzdânjân, Nûrâ and Bêkhum (these two latter cantons are situated on the Great Zâb east of ‘Arîr). The chiefs of Mâzdânjân also ruled the related tribe of the Hamadânîs (of which there were 1,000 men). The chief of the Mâzdânjân called Kâk had received the title Mûhârîr al-Dîn from the ‘Abbâsîs. The Mongols divided his lands into two and Kâk remained nâîb of Arbil. He was dispossessed for a time under Arghân but according to the Şîh al-Ashrawî, his sons and his grandsons retained their fief (‘Arîr and Şîsh).
10. Near Tell-Haftûn was the land of the numerous Sohrî tribe (Sohrân).
11. Their neighbours were the Zarrârî (“children of gold”). They also possessed Malazgîrd (Îfbûlî Barûgîd) and Rustûk (the southern part of Shammadân).
12. The Djuâmîr, of Omaiya origin, numbered 3,000 men.
13. The Kurds of the district of Markawan (read Margarû) were allies of their Djuâmîrîs and Zarrârîs neighbours.
14. Near Djuâmerî was the canton of Gâwîr.
15. Near Djuâmerî beside ‘Arîr and ‘Amâdiya was the canton of Zîbûrî inhabited by 500 men.
16. The Hakkâris lived at 'Amâdiya and numbered 4,000 men.
17. Near the Hakkâris beside Mardin were the Djabal al-'Amrani and the cave of Khaib Dâwûd where lived the Bestikli (??).
18. Near Dülâmêr towards Mawsil lived the Bokhtli, rivals of the Hûmûdî.
19. The Dâsîni had been very numerous but their chief Badr al-Din came down to more accessible country and there were no more than 1,000 Dâsîni in the province of Mawsil. 500 Dâsîni lived at 'Agr.
20. The Dumbulli (?) inhabited the high mountains.

To this information given by the Mustik the Şâlî al-Asâhî basing on al-Tâkhîf adds a list of 25 Kurd chiefs with whom the chancellories of Cairo were in correspondence.

Timûr and the Turkoman dynasties. After the Mongols, the rival Turkoman dynasties extended their power over Kurdistan. This period, of which little is yet accurately known, was of considerable importance for the Kurds. The Kârakoynulu dynasties penetrated into the heart of Kurdistan, involved the Kurd tribes in political and religious quarrels (cf. the extreme Şhârî of the Kârakoynulu) and provoked considerable movements of the population: it was at this period that the Mûkri Kurds seized the country south of the Lake of Urmia (cf. Sâwûl-Sulak). In contrast to this, the conquest by Timûr which temporarily swept aside the Kârakoynulu had only a transitory character.

Many incidents in the history of Hîn Kâifa and Dzira between 796—807 (1393—1401) are recorded in the Syriac Chronicle (written at Hântum) publ. by Behnusch, *Serüm setula XV in Mesoopotamia gestarnu über*, Breslau 1838.

Timûr had to deal with the Kurds in his campaigns of 796 and 803. After overrunning Baghdad and Dijârbakr Timûr attacked Dzira which was destroyed. The dependencies of Dijârbakr were likewise conquered. Timûr next crossed the mountains separating Dijârbakr from Mûsh and gave a favourable reception to Şaraf al-Dîn of Bidîl “renowned for his kindness and justness throughout all Kurdistan”. In 803 Timûr returned from Baghdad to Adhârîbîdjan and on the way was attacked by the Kurds.

After the death of Timûr, Kârâ-Yûsuf Kârakoynulu returned to Kurdistan and sought refuge at first with Şams al-Dîn of Bidîl. He gave him his daughter and with his assistance re-established his power. In 820 Kârâ Yûsuf by a nizâhî confirmed the princes of Bidîl in their possessions. When in 824 (1421), Shâhrehk, son of Timûr arrived in Armenia, homage was done to him by Şams al-Dîn of Bidîl, Malik Mûhammad Hakkâri, Malik Khalîl of Hîn Kâifa, the amirs of Khiçan etc. The Kurds of Khoi also remained loyal to Shâhrehk’s governor (Mattâs al-Sa’dîn, *N. E.*, xiv., p. 153).

The Aş-Köyunlu (the Bayandur dynasty) whose principal centre was in Dijârbakr, conducted a systematic policy of exterminating the great Kurd families (Şaraf-nîma, i 164: itstîsîhî khanawâdah-yi Kurdistân) and in general persecuted tribes who had compromised themselves by their attachment to the Kârakoynulu like the great tribe of Câmishgezek. Uzun Hasan’s generals Şufi Khalîl and ‘Arab-Shâh conquered Hakkâri, which was later taken for a brief period by the Dumbulli tribe from Bûhûn. In 875 (1470) (cf. Behnusch, *op. cit.*, p. 14) Dzira passed entirely into the power of the Aş-Köyunlu who appointed their own governor Calabî Beg, whose merits are recognised even by the Şaraf-nîma, i. 123. The Aş-Köyunlu general Sulaimân b. Bûzân drove out of Bûhûn the Îbrâhîmî Khân who was later put to death by Ya’ûtî b. Uzun Hasan.

The Şafa’î Shîhîs and the Ottoman Sultânîs. Şhâh Ismâîl had invaded Armenia at the beginning of his war with the Aş-Köyunlu. After the battle of Şarûr 907 (1502) he won all the country between Baghdad and Marâsh. Ismâîl’s policy with regard to the Kurds did not differ from that of the Aş-Köyunlu. Like the latter the Shâh relied on the Turkoman tribes but being a zealous extreme Shî’î (cf. Kiat Kait) he was still more predisposed against the Sunni Kurds. When eleven Kurd chiefs presented themselves at Khoi to pay homage, Ismâîl imprisoned most of them and appointed in their stead governors chosen from the Khiçîl-bash tribes.

Henceforth, for about three centuries Kurdistan became the arena for the struggle between the Ottoman Sultânîs and the Shâhs of Persia. The defeat at Çarivan 914 (1514) was a terrible blow to the prestige of the new Persian dynasty. In spite of the temporary successes of the successors of Shâh Ismâîl, their conquests never attained the importance of his early victories and Persian territory west of the Zagros melted away. Ismâîl’s attempt to thrust Persian governors upon the Kurds was a marked contrast to the Ottoman policy instituted by the able Hâkim Idris, himself a Kurd, which aimed at giving Kurdistan a feudal organisation securing the predominance of the Kurd nobility.

The battle of Çaldärîn deeply affected Kurdistan. Malik Khalîl (Şaraf-nîma, i. 155) the dispossessed prince of Hîn Kâifa had regained possession of Shîrûd and was trying to regain his hereditary fee. Mûhammad Beg of Şasân was fighting against the Persians. Aşmad Beg of Maiyâfîrîk, Kîsîm Beg of Agîl, Qamshîd Beg of Pûlû, had declared in favour of the Ottomans. The governor of Dzira had succeeded in repulsing the Persians of Mawsil. Sa’dî Beg Sohrân had taken Arbûl and Kûrûkû. Some twenty other chiefs were wavering in their loyalty to the Persians. A personal visit by Idris to all these chiefs won 25 of them over to the Sultân.

When Selim had left Tabriz, Ismâîl sent reinforcements to Dijârbakr and Hîn Kâifa. Idris summoned to his flag the Kurd levies and defeated Kurd Beg, a former Persian Governor of Kurdistan. The Kurds of Dijârbakr resisted the Persian attack until help arrived from Bîlykîl Mûhammad Pûshâ, Bîlykîl and Idris met at Hîn Kâifa and defeated the Persians. Then reinforced by 5,000 Kurds (from ‘Amâdiya?) the Turks relieved Dijârbakr and took Mûrdân, except the citadel which remained in Persian hands. The Persian commander then executed a successful diversion from Baghdad and Kirkûk and the people of Mûrdân drove out the Kurds and invited the Persians to re-occupy the town. The two armies met on the Nasîban-Urfa road. The Persians were defeated and Bîlykîl forced Sulaimân Khâtân who was still at Mûrdân to surrender. The occupation of Nasîban, Dûra,
Maiýtärıkün, Diýäríbêk and Sinđär followed and Idris completed the administrative organisation of the sandjak. In the province of Diýäríbêk eleven sandjak were put under Turkish officials, eight under Kurds (Akbîd beylükê). The walls confirmed the investitures of the new begs but the latter were always chosen from the same family. Five hereditary Shêrrifat (Kurd-beshîkatê) retained their dynasties with the transmission of power direct from father to son (cf. Tischendorf, Das Lehnswesen in d. moslem. Staaten, Leipzig 1872, ch. ii. and iv., quoting 'Ain-i 'Ali Mu‘âdhünînâdie who wrote at the beginning of the xiiîb [xviiîb] century). A similar system was later applied throughout Kurdistan from Malâtía to Bayazid and Shahrizur (cf. below the Şaraf-nâma), and the very interesting remarks of Ewliya Çelebi [iv. 176–180 and 271–316]; on the 37 sandjakcs joined to Wân by the law of Sulaimân I and the order of march of the local army). Only the province of Kırımshâh remained to the Persians. Idris was liberally rewarded and the firmans of investiture were sent him with the spaces left blank for his fill in the names of the recipients (von Hammer, C. O. K. 2, i. 749).

In 1356 (1530) Şêh Tahmûş recovered Baghêdäd from Dîlêr-Fâkûr, a Kurd of the tribe of Mûsûl (Movullû). A long series of wars began again. Sultân Sulaimân led an army against Persia in 1533, 1534, 1535, 1548, 1553 and 1554. In this last year the Baghêdäd troops conquered the Kurds of Bellûks and Shahrizur while the Persians were occupied in Georgia (von Hammer, op. cit., ii. 236).

By the peace of 999 (1500) 'Abbâs I had to cede to the Turks the western provinces including Ağıdarbâdjan, Shahrizur and Luristan (ibid., ii. 559) but in 1010 (1601) fighting was resumed and by the peace of 1021 (1612) Persia regained possession of the lost provinces, except Shahrizur (ibid., ii. 745). Şêh 'Abbâs transported 15,000 Kurds to the frontier of Kûrdsân to serve as a bulwark against the Turkomans.

Towards the end of the reign of Şêh 'Abbâs, Turkish efforts were concentrated on Baghêdäd. During Hâfiz Pâshä's first campaign (1623) his army included the Kurdistân troops. The Kurds fought bravely. The Persians having defeated the attackers, sent punitive columns to Mûrdân. After the death of Şêh 'Abbâs, the grand vizier Khûraw Pâshä advanced on Baghêdäd in 1039 (1629).

Sayid Kháân of 'Amidîya, Mirj Begr Şêmân and the mixed Kurdo-Arab tribe of Bàjdilân took the side of Khûraw Pâshä while Ahmad Kháân Ardalan threatened the Turkish flank. Khûraw Pâshä advanced, as far as Sennä [q. v.] and Hamûpin. On their way back the Turks defeated at Çamçamal and Dartang a Persian force. Baghêdäd still held out however and when Khûraw Pâshä had retired Ahmad Kháân Ardalan re-occupied Shahrizur (von Hammer, op. cit., iii. 17, 23, 49, 86, 93). Not till 1048 (1638) did Mûrâd IV finally take Baghêdäd and in the next year the treaty was signed with Persia grosso modo which fixed the Turco-Persian frontier down to the xiiîh century (Tuîrîkî-kê Naînê, i. 686). Persia was now completely behind the Zagros chain.

The great struggle between the Safawids and Ottomans made the Kurds conscious of their political importance. The Şaraf-nâma has preserved for us an accurate picture of the feudal life of the Kurds and principalities at the height of its development about 1005 (1596).

Şaraf-nâma. This book by the chief of Bidlis, Şaraf al-Dîn (cf. Bîdîsî) finished in 1005 (1596) occupies an exceptional place among the sources for Kurbîsh history. The history of the Kurds in the strict sense (vol. i. in Vêlimînob Zêriof's edition) is divided into four parts (pâhîfa): the first three of these deals with those Kurd dynasties which have actually enjoyed the privilege of royalty (salçanat); the second with those whose members sometimes have had coins struck and the khûstî recited in their name; the third enumerates the families of hereditary governors (çukkâm) and the fourth is devoted to a detailed history of the chiefs of Bidlis. Part i. gives five dynasties, the Marwânîs [q. v.] of Diýäríbêk and Dîzîra, the Hâsan-wâhidîs [q. v.] of Dînawar and Shahrizur; the Fâčlâyids of the Great Lûr; the princes of little Lûr [cf. Lûsî] and the Aîyûbîds [q. v.].

As the distinction between the second and third class of princes is rather subtle and the order in which Şaraf al-Dîn enumerates the dynasties is quite arbitrary it is better to arrange these dynasties according to the geographical position of the fiefs, taking Dîzîrat ibn 'Omar as the centre. This list will be followed by that of the Kurd tribes in Persia. The fiefs of the second class (including Bidlis) will be marked with an asterisk (*).

Şaraf al-Dîn distinguishes as far as possible between the tribes and the families of their chiefs and it is necessary always to bear in mind the bases of feudal organisation in Kurbîsân. Chiefs of varied origin rule the Kurbîsh, Kurbîcised and Christian tribes, with the help of warlike Kurd tribes (çagîrat), which are sometimes settled, sometimes nomad or rather semi-nomad.

Group A. Between Dîzîra and Darûsim. 1. The chiefs of Dîzîra* claimed Omaiyad origin but gave as their ancestor Kháûtî b. Wallî. In such confused genealogies we have a combination of memories of the Kurd alliances of the Omaiyads with the local cult of the descendants of the famous general Kháûtî b. Wallî [q. v.] whose tombs are shown near Sîrûd (Hartmann, Bohtên, p. 19, 124). These chiefs were at first Yazidis and only later became converted to be orthodox Sunnis. After the death of Sulaimân b. Kháûtî his three sons divided his possessions: Dîzîra fell to Mir 'Âbd al-Âzîz, Gurgil to Mir Hâdîdî Beg and Finik to Mir Abdâl. These three branches each kept their own fiefs in later times.

The Şaraf-nâma refers to the possessions of this family as vilâyêtê Bokhî (i. 320) and enumerates in detail but without system the 14 nâhiya forming this important fief: Gurgil, Arwaqûh, Pirûz, Bâdân and Tânê (Kalûq) occupied by the tribe Kûsî; Finik; Tûr, Hâtâm (Hethum) and Şâkî inhabited by Christians; Nîsh Atilî; Arasmâh the tribe of the (Kêspî) is the chief among those of Bokhî; Kêwaror Kêmîz (?); Dair-dîh which belongs to Tânê.

In spite of the careful study by M. Hartmann, Bohtên, Mitt. d. Vordeuts. Gesell., 1896, 2 and 1897, i. p. 1—165, the localisation of some of these places is not quite certain.

The fief of Dîzîrat ibn 'Omar lay between the right bank of the Bohtên and the Tigris. It did not include the sources of the Bohtên. Towards the east, the neighbours of the Bokhî were the
Sindijān (cf. under 'Amādiya) settled on the Khābūr. 2. The ancestors of the rulers of Khirtān, Isbāyā erd (Sparhet, Ispert; in Ewlyāv Celebi: Isbā'ird) and Murks (Mukus) were three brothers who came from Balīdjān (Kynis) in the time of the Saldūqs (Sharaf-nūma, i. 217). The tribe of the principal fief was Namārān; this fief lay along the right bank tributaries of the Boštān and stretched as far east as Morsāt. 3. Šhirwān (on the right bank of the Boštān below Khāzān and north-east of Si'ird). The ancestors of the “Shirawi” chiefs were in the services of the Ayūbdids and came to Šhirwān at the same time as the “Malikūn” to Īṣān-Kaftā. The Shirawi played even the rôle of vikings by the Malikīn (ep. cir., i. 155). The capital of Shirwān was Kufrā. The other dependencies were Āwil, Shabīstān (also called Garnī = Kīrkī?) and Īrān. 4. Bīdlīs. * The Rūzāgi (Rūzagi) tribe is said to have taken its name from the fact that 24 clans, assembled one day (rāzā) in the village of Tān in the canton of Kūhīt (now the kāhā of Mūdēk west of Bīdlīs), formed a confederation which later became divided into two sections: Bībsāsī and Kāwāsīs. Sharaf al-Dīn (i. 361) enumerates the 24 (read 25) clans of the Rūzāgi, of which five were old settlers and the others newcomers: Bībsāsī (10 clans) and Kāwāsīs (10 clans). The Rūzāgi took Bīdlīs and Haiş (Ṣaṣīn) from the Georgian king Tavit (David the Couroupalate, p. 984—1001). Later they brought from Akhūsh two brothers of Sāsānian origin. One became chief at Bīdlīs and the other at Ṣaṣīn. 18 chiefs of the line of Diyā al-Dīn had ruled at Bīdlīs before 1056 (1651). The only interruptions took place under the Saldūqs (1044—570), under the Ak-Ḵoyūnlu (871—900), under Šāh Ismā'īl (913—920) and between 941 and 956. In this last year Sultān Sulaimān wanted to exchange the hereditary fief of Amir Šams al-Dīn for that of Malāṭiyā. Šams al-Dīn had to leave Bīdlīs but fearing new intrigues went to the court of Šāh Tahmāsp, who treated him with generosity. Šams al-Dīn died in Persia in 965. His son Šaraf al-Dīn, born in exile in 940, was carefully educated at the court (the Šāh even had him taught painting). He ruled several Persian provinces in succession, and was appointed chief of all the Persian Kurds. After the accession to the throne of Ismā'īl II, Šaraf al-Dīn fell under suspicion and was sent to Nakchūwān. From there he succeeded in reaching Wān and received from Murād I investiture for Bīdlīs, to which Mūshā was added in 991. For the year 1065 (1655) Ewlyāv Čelebi (iv. 81—121) gives us a detailed description of Bīdlīs. The last prince of Bīdlīs, Šaraf Beg was dispossessed by the Turks in 1849 (Lynch, Armenia, ii. 149). 5. The rulers of Šaṣīn (Haiš) were called Ḥezān from their ancestor Ḥezā al-Dīn, brother of Diyā al-Dīn of Bīdlīs. The ‘asḥars of Šaṣīn were at first Širwāli, Bābūsī, Šūshinī and Ṭāmūkī. The Rūzāgi (cf. Bīdlīs) arrived afterwards; later after the annexation of Arzan the clans of that district: Khiādī, Dair Mughānī, Ṭūsānī, who had at first belonged to Ḫiṣn Kaftā, came to join those of Šaṣīn. 6. The Suwāidī chiefs claimed a Barmaic origin. Their ancestors were adopted by the Suwāid tribe. The hereditary fief of the Suwāid was Gandj (this should be read for Kibb in Vélimarinozneri, i. 260). 7. The ‘Azāqué tribe which Sharaf al-Dīn places among the tribes of Persia (i. 328) is said to have been of Suwāid origin. According to the Sharaf-nūma, i. 328, it had no definite religion and showed signs of heresy (raṣā ‘in-wiḥīnd). The tribe was divided into two branches, Khiādī-Beglu and Šekhrūbān, and one of the descendants of Bīdlīs, Khālid received as fiefs Kynis, Malāzergerd and the canton of Ujkān (? or Mūshā. They grew so proud that they thought of proclaiming their independence. After the battle of Caldıra in the Suwāid dispossessed the ‘Azāqué from many of their fiefs (ibid., i. 257). In the time of Šāh Tahmāsp, Kliďd Beg appointed chief of the ‘Azāqué received Zagam (near Tīfīs). Later Pāzātkī were transferred to Alashkert where the tribe increased. 8. The Mirdāsī chiefs (Mirdāsī in the Selim-nūma) claimed to be descended from the ‘Abbasīds. Their ancestor was a religious man who came from Hakkār to Īṣān and whose disciples the Mirdāsī became. The tribe themselves said that they were of Arab origin, being Banū Kilāb from around Aleppo who migrated about 420 as a result of troubles with the Fatimids (cf. Lane-Poole, The Muhām. Dynasties, No. 45: the Mirdāsī of Aleppo). The main one of the three branches, the Bulduṇān, lived at Īṣān; it maintained good relations with the Ak-Ḵoyūnlu but under Šāh Ismā’īl, Īṣān was occupied by the Persians. Of the two other branches of the Mirdāsī, one ruled at Pālū, at Bāγhīn (below Kīghtī and at Kharpū and the other first at Bārdangī and later at Dārmīlk (south of Arghana-aʿnān). 9. The rules of the Čamīšghezkez claimed to be of Abbaṣid descent, but their names rather show a Turkish origin (Saldūqs). Their ‘asḥar was called Mulkishī (Malik-Šaḥī). There were about 1,000 hearts of Mulkishī in the Persian service (in Persia). The lands of the Mulkishī were so numerous that the name Kūrdistān had become synonymous with Čamīšghezkez (Sharaf-nūma, i. 163). They kept them in the Mongol period, under Timur and Kara Yūsuf but the Ak-Ḵoyūlun did all they could to weaken the tribes faithful to the Kara-Ḵoyūnlu and sent the Turkish tribe to Kharbandu against Čamīšghezkez. Šāhīk Hasan drove out the Kharbandlu and submitted to Šāh Ismā’īl. The latter put a Persian governor in his place. Selim I restored the hereditary amīr Pī Ḥusain. Group B. Between ‘Azārir and Killūs. 10. Ḥasan-keīf* (cf. ‘Hesn-Kaftā). The local chiefs (malikān) claimed to be of Aiyūbid descent, which seems very probable. Their ancestor was alleged to have received the fief of Ḫiṣn-Kaftā from the ruler of Mārdūn. The first chief mentioned by the Sharaf-nūma, is Malik Sulaimān who died in 736 (1335). The Ak-Ḵoyūlun seized Ḫiṣn-Kaftā but Malik Khālid who had taken refuge in Hamā, later regained possession of his fief. At a later date the Ottomans dispossessed the sons of Malik Khālid. Among the dependencies of Ḫiṣn Kaftā, the Sharaf-nūma mentions Siʿrīd, Bishḩī, Tūr (which sometimes figures among the possessions of Dżazira, cf. ibid., p. 117, 127, 157) and Arzan. 11. Sulaimān, rulers of Marwānid origin (Omai- yad), established themselves at first at Khābūr.
the canton of Ghazālī (between the Kulp and the Bağmän–su before they join) and gradually captured many strongholds and territory as far as the Tigris. They ruled a powerful confederation of tribes, the majority of which were nomads and in summer moved to the Ala-Tagh (Niphates). The chief of these tribes was Ibrāhīm, but the more enterprising was Bashābūn, 1,000 families of which migrated to Bayzad under their chief Şāhāsawār. A number of the tribes refused Yazidi doctrines. The Sulaimān lived on bad terms with their neighbours of Sā-ūin. They were divided into two branches, that of Kulp and Bağmän and that of the Fijāršāfīrīn. 12. Zira (the modern pronunciation attested by Adādī Scher, J. A., 1910, p. 119–130); according to Sharaf al-Din, Zira, is a contraction of the Arabic Aṣra. The ancestor of the family who was an Arab holy man from Syria of ‘Alīd origina arrived in Mārūn in the time of Ortoq (d. 516 = 1122; Abu ‘l-Faraj, Majkṣaṭ, p. 379). The family formed connections by marriage with the Ortoqids and later with the Ak-Koyunlu. There were four branches of Zira, the principal branches were those of Tardjīl (the head of the Bağmän–su) and Atākīl. The other branches were that of Darzān (an old Christian convent Deiz Darz) and that of Kuriq (between Diyarbakır and Fijāršāfīrīn) the latter descendants of the marriage of a Zira chief and a gipsy woman (dakhtar-i kūsīfū). 13. Kīlis. The ruling dynasty believed it was related to those of Hakkār and Amādiya. Their ancestor Mand (Mantasha) had rendered services to the Ayyūbidids who gave him the canton of Kuśārī (near Antioc). He united under his rule the Yazidis of Kuśārī and those living between Hammā and Marāsh as well as the Kurds of Dijam and Kīlis. Under the Mamluk Sultāns and under Selim I disputes broke out between the Yazidis (Shaikh Izz al-Din) and the family of Mand, which ended in favour of the latter, but the hereditary rights of this North Syrian sect do not seem to have been on a very solid basis. Group C. Between Dijzīr and Khoi. 14. Hakkārī (cf. Hakkārī and Shamāndīn). Sharaf al-Din does not seem to know the old quarters of the tribe around Amādiya from which the Zangid Atābegs had driven them northwards. The emirs claimed to be of ‘Abbasid descent. The first Amir mentioned in the Šahr-e Nāma is Izz al-Din Shīr (probably simply an arabisation of the name Yezdīn–Shīr) who held out against Timūr in 789 (1387) in the fortress of Vān. Under the Ak-Koyunlu the tribe of Dumbuli (of Dijzīr) took possession of Hakkārī but the Christians of Dij (Aṣuri = Nestorians) went to Egypt to bring back the scion of the ancient family Asad al-Din Zarrīn Cang (“Golden arm”). The restored dynasty received the name of Shamsī (M. Garzoni, Grammatica della lingua kurda, Rome 1787, p. 4; Sattora). In the time of Ismā’īl I, the Shamsī chief lived in the castle of Bāt (in Shamāndīn); a member of the family ruled at Mosul (south-west of Vān) but the possession of the niatia of Kawāfīg west of Mosul was disputed to the Hakkārī by the Rūsa. Hakkārī ruled extended to Albā in the north. The last representative of the Hakkārī house, Nūr-Allāh Bega, was dispossessed by the Ottomans after the rebellion of Badr Khan Beg of Bokhtar and in 1845 Halime Khānīf surrendered Bash-Kāra to the Turks. The tribe of Pinyānīsh (ibid. i. 97, 100) which still exists is mentioned as living near the Hakkārī. 15. The Māmūdī fīf lies north of Hakkārī on the rivers which feed the lakes of Vān and Arvār. The rulers (Marwānīsh of ‘Abbasīf of Hakkārī) who originally professed the Yazidi faith (Šahr-e Nāma, i. 307), settled there in the Kāra-Koyunlu period and soon came into conflict with the Hakkārī and Dumbuli. 16. The Dumbuli are a tribe of Bokhtar (Šahr-e Nāma, i. 118, 310: Dumbuli Bokht) which for long remained Yazidi. The Dumbuli later came into Aḥharbādja where they received as a fīf Sulaimānābād (Sogmanābād) north-west of Khoi (now: Zūrāwā). Under the Ak-Koyunlu the Dumbuli had seized the castle of Bāt (in Shamāndīn) and a part of Hakkārī (ibid., i. p. 193). To their qājav of Sulaimānābād Shīh Tahmās p added Khoi. Under Sultān Sulaimān the Dumbuli received Kojuš [q.v.] and Bārgīr, later they annexed Abagha, Sulaimān-Sarai (the modern Sarai) and Cədīrūn. Zaín ‘Alī’s Shīhīnī in his Būtaqān-Shīyāb (beginning of the 15th century) says that all the Dumbuli are Shīhīs (cf. the allusion in the Šahr-e Nāma, i. 312) and speak Turkish (!). 17. Brādūst. The ruling family was of Gūrīn or Hasanwaihī descent [q.v.]. Its lands lay west of Urmiā. One branch ruled at Sōmāi [q.v.]; another at Tergewe and at Kāl’a Dāwūd. The remnants of the brādūst tribe now live south of Shamāndīn on the Rūsbārī Brādūst (a tributary of the Great Zāb, the sources of which lie west of Ushūr). 18. Ustūn. The chapter which is wanting in the manuscripts must certainly refer to the first dynasty of Shamāndīn, whose headquarters were Sūnū in the niatia of Harkī (cf. Shamāndīn). 19. The history of the Zaṛrā (cf. the Zar-zari of Shīhāb al-Din al-Umari) announced in the preface to the Šahr-e Nāma is lacking in the text. 20. Zaṛr. The paragraph is lacking in the manuscripts and we know nothing of the tribe. Group D. South of Hakkārī. 21. Amādiya [q.v.]. We have seen that the town of Amādiya was built on the site of an ancient castle under ‘Imād al-Din Zangī (541–541). The local dynasty of Bahdānīn mentioned in the Šahr-e Nāma seems to have settled in the country after the end of the Zangīds (9th–11th century). The chiefs of Amādiya were known for their fervour in religious studies. The Šahr-e Nāma gives their names for the Timūrid period. Later (under Ismā’īl I) the Bahdānīn annexed the Zēbāb district inhabited by the Sultāns and Sīlāmānī which had at one time formed a separate fīf (wittāyet-i Sīlāmānī). In this way the fīf of Bahdānīn incorporated the greater part of the mountainous country north of Mawsīl (Mount Gara, etc.). 22. Tašāni (Dāsini). The chapter dealing with this important Yazidi tribe is lacking in the manuscripts but in the text we find a reference which shows that the Amir of Amādiya took Dohūk from the sandjaḵ-i Tašāni (i. 109) and that in 944 (1534) Sultān Sefīn I gave the sandjaḵ of Arbil and the whole wilāyat of Suhra to Hūsān Beg Dāsini, a Yazidi chieftain who provoked a bloody war with the Suhra (i. 274–277). The latter ended by regaining their patrimony.
and Ḥusain Beg was executed at Constantinople.

On the region called Uşūn, cf. Hoffmann, Anu-

23. Sōhrān (“the red ones”), descendants of Kalûs, an Arab shepherd of Bagḫdād who had fled to the village of Ḥūdāyān in the nājīya of Āvān (in the Sōhrān territory). His son was proclaimed Amir of Balakān (east of Rawānduz) and seized the castle of Āvān. The capital of Sōhrān, which was embellished by their buildings (Rich, Narrative, i. 157) was Harrār (on a tributary of the Great Zāb below Rawānduz). The Sōhrān were still a powerful tribe about 1005 A. H. but later succumbed to attacks of neighbours and the Bībān (Narrative, i. 157) benefited by their decline.

24. Bābān. This name is really applied to several successive dynasties. Their principal seat lay south of the Little Zāb and has as its capital Shārī-Bāzīr but in 1199 (1784) the Bābān built a new capital Sulaimānīya (q. v. for details).

25. Mūktir, who now occupy the region south of Lake Urmiya (for details see Sāwūl Balak) had broken off from the tribe of Bābān.

26. Bānān. The Ikhtūyār al-Dīn chiefs bore this name because they had adopted Islam of their own free will (izhāyār) (for details see Sāwūl Balak).

27. Ardalan: see the articles, Ardalan, Shah-
razur, Senna, Sisar.

28. Gāl-Bāgh (Sharaf-nāma, ii, suppl. 36–45, the addition is dated 1092). Their chief ‘Abbās Aghā of the Turkish tribe of Uṣṭādjalu received a “spring of water” in Martān (cf. Senna) from Bige-beg Ardalan (900–942). ‘Abbās Aghā later settled at Bīlāwar, a former seat of the Kalhur. His followers were recruited from different tribes. Shāh Ṭahmāsp confirmed him in his rule over Bīlāwar and the “Twelve Oīmāk”.

Later the Porte gave ‘All-Khan Gāl-Bāghī the sandjak consisting of Kirind, Shākhīn, Čakārān (?), Khorkhora, Zend, etc., while Yār Allāh received the timar of Erekle (?), Rangraza and Sahbānān (?).

29. Kalhur (Kalhur). The chiefs claimed to be descended from Gūdarz, son of Gīw, in the Persian epic. The ‘aẓīrat of the Kalhur is called Gūrān (i. 317) but some manuscripts talk of “Kalhur and Gūrān” (Sharaf-nāma, ii, suppl. 6).

There were three branches of the Kalhur, those of Palang (cf. Senna), Darang (cf. Zohra) and Māhdašt (cf. Kirdāshah).

The possessions of the chiefs of Daran and Dargān (now Rūdāb in the district of Zohbā) according to Sharaf al-Dīn, i. 319, corresponded to the older Hulwān [q. v.]. About 1005 the power of Kuḥbād Beg stretched from Dainawar and Bīlāwar to Baghdād. Māhdašt and Bīlāwar (south of the Murwārī pass) formed the territory (eγaγ) of the third branch of the Kalhurs. The Māhdašt branch was nomadic. All this perhaps explains the scantiness of the information given by Rāshīd al-Dīn. The Gūrān now keep their old patrimony but the Kalhur tribe occupies the region south of the great Baghdād-Kirmānshāh road.

Group E. The Persian Kurds.

The plan of the section (jirka) of the Sharaf-
nāma devoted to the Ahrār-i Īrān is not very clear. The author was writing at a time when the Perso-Turkish frontier was not settled.

The principal tribes of Persia were three in number: Siyāh Maṃṣūr, Čigani and Zangana. Their eponyms were three brothers who came from Luristān or “Gūrān and Ardalan”. Besides those tribes and the lesser ones mentioned by Sharaf al-Dīn there were 24 tribes (yīrmī i dor) of Karabagh (in Trans-
caucasia), about 30,000 men under one ruler, and the Gil tribe in Khūrāsan without counting tribes of minor importance.

The tribe of Siyāh Maṃṣūr. In the time of Shāh Ṭahmāsp its chief had become Amīr al-ulmār of all the Kurds in Persia (over 24 tribes).

A part of the Čigani emigrated to Ghārsīstān. The tribe of Zangana (Zengene) distinguished itself in al-Irāk and Khūrāsan.

From 1650 to 1730, “Great Kurdistān”, as it has been described by Sharaf al-Dīn, and in so far as it consisted of a series of autonomous Kurd chiefships had been already reduced in size by the introduction of Turkish rule in the sandjaks of Dīvārbakr and Vān. Not only did the treaty of 1604 (1639) put an end to Persian expansion westwards but Turkey during the reign of the Safawī epiphanies succeeded in re-occupying the western provinces of Persia as well as Trans-
caucasia (von Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 235). Practically all the Kurds in this way were reunited under Ottoman rule. Having no longer cause to fear the Persians, the Turks systematically undertook the task of centralisation.

As early as the reign of Murād IV, we find Malik Aḥmad Pāsha, appointed governor-general of Dīvārbakr in 1638, making an expedition against the Yazidi of Sīmlār. Later (1605 to 1655) the same Pāsha after his transfer to Vān subdued all the Kurds in this region.

In 1666 a Kurd, the son of a shāhīk, declared himself Mahdī but was captured by the rulers of Mawār and Ḥamāḍiya. The affair ended harmlessly by Sulṭān Muhammad IV taking the title of sīd-dānt Mahdī into his personal service (v. Hammer, iii. 589).

In the reign of the feeble Shāh Ḥusain, the Kurds of al-Irāk, in 1719 besieged Hamādān and carried their depredations up to the capital itself. In 1722 by order of Shāh Ṭahmāsp II an attempt to retake Iṣfahān, which had been occupied by the Afghāns, was made by the Kurd chief Fandun (Peridūn?) but it was confined to an attack on the Armenian quarter. The Afghāns drove off Fandun who went back to his lands and submitted to the Turks (Hanway, A Historical Account of the British Trade, 1753, vol. iii). Fortune deserted the Sāfawīs. Even ‘Abbās Kuli Khan Ardalan submitted to Ḥasan Pāsha (J. v. Hammer, iv. 211; cf. however, R. M. M., xlix., p. 87). His example was followed by the chiefs of Djawānūr, Darān, Dājaft, Harūn and finally by the sīpālātār ‘Ali Mardan Bakhitiyar [Faiľi] (v. Hammer, iv. 227).

The Afghāns. During the bloody and transitory period of Afghan rule in Iṣfahān, Afghār defeated the Turks (battle of Andijān in 1726) who had in their ranks 20,000 Kurds under Bebek Sulaimān Bābān. The Turks attributed their defeat to the conduct of the Kurds, upon whom Afghār had lavished promises; indeed shortly before some of the Kurds had gone over to the Afghāns. In spite of his initial success, in the next year 1140 (1727) Afghār had to repurchase his sovereign rights by ceding to the Turks the whole of western Persia including the Kurd and Lur cantons.

Nādir Shāh. Towards the end of the reign
of Sulṭān Ahmad III affairs began to change. By the
the western provinces and soon Nādir invaded
Ottoman territory and advanced up to the gates of
Baghdād. The Turks tried in vain to check his
advance with Kurdish troops until in 1733
Topāl ʿOṯmān Pāshā appeared on the scene with
Kurd reinforcements and he was also joined by
Mawṣūl. Nādir was defeated. In 1734, he operated with success in
the Caucasus and took Tiḥiş which had a
garrison of 6,000 Kurds. By the peace of 1736,
the old frontiers of 1649 (1639) were
restored. In 1743, Nādir again invaded Turkish territory
but in spite of Kurd and Arab help was driven back to Senna where he was finally defeated
(Ibid. iv., 317, 398—599).
Nādir was not popular with the Kurds although
there is an epic poem in the Gūrānī dialect on his
struggle with Topāl ʿOṯmān Pāshā. Among the
Ardālān, Nādir replaced Subhān Werdī Khān
by his brother who provoked a popular rising
(R. M. M., xlix., p. 88). In 1727 during a revolt of
the Turkmans the Kurds of Khorāsān (Camiš-
ghezuk and Ḫuṭrūl) refused their help to Nādir
who punished them and transported them to
Mashhad. Nādir was assassinated in 1747, while
on his way to punish once more the Kurd
rebels of Khorāsān (Jones, Histoire de Nādir,
London 1770, p. 118—120). The Kurds (Dumbulī
etc.) played their part in the anarchy which followed the
death of Nādir but the Porte refrained from
intervention.

The Zand dynasty. After the death of
Nādir Shāh, Karim Khān Zand (q.v.), one of the
best rulers Persia has ever had, ruled the greater
part of the country. The Zand were a Kurdish
tribe of secondary importance (Sharaf-nāma, i. 323)
living between Hamadān and Mālaḵī (in the
formerly called Ighār). Under Nādir they had been
transported to Khorāsān but after his death they
went back to their old homes (Taʾrīḵ-e Zandiyā,
ed. Beer, p. x, xviii.). With the death of Luṭf
ʿAlī Khān in 1209 (1794) the dynasty came to an
end. The Zand tribe was certainly too weak
to be a serious support to the dynasty but Karim
Khān, like his predecessors, had brought several
Kurd tribes from Kurdūstān to Shirāz (Aḥmadawand,
R. M. M., xxxviii.; Kūrmā, who lived in a partic-
ular quarter in Shirāz, O. M. M., Ṣaḥīb Tājūndar e. D. P. Fars, Berlin 1900, xix.).
The ʿAḡā Shāh ʿAbdallāh Kāḏūr in the death of Aḥḡ Muhammad
Shāh Kāḏūr (1211 = 1797) ʿAbdī Khān Shākṣār
seized the crown jewels and for some time tried to
gain the throne (The Dynasty of the Kajars, transl.
by Harford Jones Brygdes, London 1833,
P. 29, 27—32, 37, 50, 78, 106; R. G. Watson,
A History of Persia, London 1866, p. 107, 115,
125). In 1221 (1805) the Persians had intervened
on behalf of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Pāshā of Sulaimāniya
[q.v.] (cf. Rich, Narrative, i., 384; Watson, op. cit., p. 155 and the Mukri Kurd song in the
collection made by O. M. M., xvi.). In 1236
(1821) as a result of troubles caused by the Kurd
tribes of Ḥafīdrūnlu and Ṣipkān the Persians
invaded Turkish territory as far as Bīlād and Mūḏūd;
at the same time they advanced as far as Ṣerābān
Baghdād by the Kirmānšāh road. The peace of 1238 (1823)
signed at Erzerûm restored the frontier of 1209
but the Persians refused to evacuate the district of Zohāb people by force. The
fate of Sulaimāniya remained in suspense.
The Russo-Turkish Wars. In 1804—1805, the Russians came into contact with the Kurds and this new influence soon made itself felt. The Russo-Turkish wars of 1828—1829, 1833—1835, 1877—1878, each had far reaching effects in Kurdistan (the question has been specially studied by Averianov, Kur'di v. voinakh Rossii, Tiflis 1900). As early as 1829 the Russians had raised a Kurd regiment. As a result of the expatriation of Christians, the Kurds after the war began to spread considerably farther north and west. During the Crimean campaign, the Russians raised two Kurd regiments. On the other hand when the Turkish troops had left for the north, a considerable rising was stirred up in Bohotan by the popular Yezd-i-Shir, nephew and a former rival of Baddr Khan.

The war of 1877—1878 was at once followed by a rising among the Hakkari Kurds of Baladin and Bohotan directed by the sons of Baddr Khan and later by the rebellion under Shaikhi "Ubaidallah of the Naskhanbodi order. The Kurd invaders in 1880 ravaged the Persian districts of Urmiya, Savid-Bulak, Miyando-Ab and Maraga and threatened to seize Bane and threatened the town itself. The chief victims were Shysis. Russians who attached some troops to protect the Araxes frontier. Persians mobilized considerable forces including the Mikid [q.v.] cavalry, Turkey, which had already finished the war with Russia, endeavored to avoid complications. Finally the Shaikhi returned to Shandizn and whence he was sent to Constantinople. He soon escaped from the capital and via the Caucasus returned to Shandizn but he was again captured and in 1883 died in Mecca.

The Hamidiya troops. The weakening of Turkey after 1878, art. 61 of the treaty of Berlin securing for the Armenians reforms and security against the Kurds and Circassians, the stubborn re-action of the Ottoman government against reforms, and from 1885 the development of the Armenian revolutionary movement with branches in Russia, Switzerland and London brought complications into the hitherto quite peaceable relations of Kurds and Armenians in as much as the latter had hitherto submitted to the authority of the Kurd feudal chiefs. About 1891 Shaikhi Pasha, later appointed to bring into operation the reforms in Anatolia, conceived the idea of creating irregular Kurd regiments, like those of Russian Cossacks. The object of the reform was to train the Kurds and attach them to the Ottoman government. The attempt was not considered satisfactory for later the Hamidiya levies were transformed into regulars (Aqofig swawri). The creation of the Hamidiya in any case by the part given to the Kurds and the ambitions aroused, made a considerable stir. There was even bloodshed between the tribes.

Armeno-Kurd relations. At the same time relations between the Armenians and the Kurds (these "brothers of land and water" according to a phrase recorded by the European consuls) were changing for the worse. The summer of 1894 was marked by bloody encounters at Sashun which ended by the devastation of five villages and the whole of the canton of Talor (Dalvoroh) inhabited by Armenians. The events at Sashun were the first of a long series of Armenian demonstrations and their sanguinary suppression in which the Kurds took an active part. In 1895 an attempt of a rising had been made among the Hakkari Kurds but was speedily suppressed; it was not directed against the Christians. From the beginning of the xixth century to the world war the relations between Armenians and Kurds seem to have been fairly peaceful. On the question in general see Abowian, Kur'di in the Kouzak newspaper, Tiflis 1848, Nos. 47, 48, 49, 50 (where the "father of Armenian literature" gives a very sympathetic picture of the Kurd character); Creagh, Armeniis, Koords and Turks, London 1880; A. S. Zelenov, Zapiska k karte raspravedelnya avrama, nasledenija, Zapiski Kavkaz. Obs. Ges. Obsh. Tiflis 1860, xviii.; Vambéry, Armenien u. Kurdistan, Deutsche Rundschau, 1890, xxxvi., p. 216—231; Rorphach, Armenien u. Kurdistan, Verhand, d. Gesell. f. Erdkunde, Berlin 1900, p. 128—133; Contenson, Chrétiens et Musulmans, Paris 1901; Lynch, Armenia, passim; Mayewski, Opisanie Wanzako i Biliis. vilayetov, Tiflis 1904 (the authoritative work); N. Marr, Yeşile o sino "celebri", Zap., 1910, xx.; Zarzecki (consul of France at Wán), La question kurdo-arménienne, La Revue de Paris, N°. of April 15, 1914 and the diplomatic correspondence, publ. in the "Livres jaunes", the "Blue books" and the Russian Orange book of 1914.

The xxth century. At the beginning of the xxth century a new figure appeared on the Kurd horizon outside of the usual centres of Kurd movements: Ibrahim Pasha b. Mahmud b. Timawi b. Ayyub, chief of the tribe Milli (Milian) in the canton of Shariveron (between Diyarbakr and Aleppo). Ibrahim Pasha had made himself an almost independent position. When the constitution of 1908 was proclaimed he openly rebelled and retired to the mountains of 'Abd al-Azize where he was killed (M. Wiedemann, Ibrahim Pashas Glück und Ende, Asien, 1909, viii. 34—57, 52—54 and M. Sykes, The Caliph's Last Heritage, p. 317—327).

A considerable agitation was aroused among the Kurds when the question of the Turco-Persian frontier was re-opened. After the check to the Russians in the Far East (Russia-Japanese War), Turkey in 1905 occupied the disputed cantons of Urmiya and Savid-Bulak inhabited by Kurds. The latter were drawn into the very complicated political game. Turkish occupation only ceased at the beginning of the Balkan War (in October 1912) but only to make room for Russian troops sent into the districts of Khio and Urmiya. Seions of noble Kurd families travelled in Russia. On November 17, 1913 a protocol of delimitation was signed at Constantinople and just before the World War, a four Power Commission (Turkey, Persia, England and Russia) succeeded in settling the frontier of the disputed regions by re-establishing generally the status quo of the beginning of the xixth century (cf. Minorsky, Turetsko-persidsk. razgranitieniya, Izvestia Russ. Geogr. Obsh., Petrograd 1916, iii., p. 351—392).

The War of 1914—1918. In the course of the war from 1914—1918 the Kurds were between two fires. On the activities of Ismail Agha Simko cf. the article shāhāk. — On the interallied plans (March 1916) regarding Kurdistan, cf. the documents in Rasdel Asiahati Turisti, Moscow 1924, p. 185—187, 225.

After 1917—1918 the situation was radically changed. Kurd committees were formed every-
where (cf. Driver, Report on Kurdistan, Mount Carmel, Palestine 1919; this publication is in the British Museum). Sharif Pasha assumed the role of Kurd representative in Paris and on March 22, 1919 and March 1, 1920 presented to the Peace Conference two memoirs on Kurd claims with a map of "Kurdistan intégral" (cf. L'Art France,- 1919, No. 175, p. 192—193). At the same time, on December 20, 1919, an arrangement was reached between Sharif Pasha and the Armenian representatives and the two parties made conjointly declarations to the conference (cf. the text of the agreement in the newspaper Peyam-i Şahāt, Constantinople, Feb. 24, 1920; cf. also Le Temps, Paris, March 10, 1920). The Treaty of Sèvres of August 10, 1920 having created Armenia (Art. 85—93) of the four wilāyets (of Trebizond, Erzerum, Van and Bīlis), provided in articles 62—64 for "a local autonomy for the land where the Kurd element predominates, lying east of the Euphrates, to the south of the frontier of Armenia and to the north of the frontier of Turkey with Syria and Mesopotamia". If the Kurd population within the limits mentioned shows to the Council of the League of Nations that a majority of the population of these regions desires to be independent of Turkey and if the Council then thinks that this population is fit for independence, Turkey agrees to conform to the recommendation and in this case the allied Powers will raise no objection to the voluntary adhesion to this "independent Kurd state" of the Kurds living in the wilāyet of Mawṣil. As a result of later events the Kurd question reduced itself to the fate of the Kurds in the wilāyet of Mawṣil. The Turkish representatives held that "the Kurds differed in nothing from the Turks and that although speaking different languages, these two peoples formed a single bloc as regards race, faith and customs" (Conference at Lausanne, speech of Ismet Paasha at the meeting of Jan. 23, 1923). By the decision of the Council of the League of Nations on December 16, 1925 the wilāyet of Mawṣil was allotted to "Irañ but with a stipulation reserving to the Kurds the film of their desires, notably that "officials of Kurd race should be appointed for the government of their country, for the administration of justice and for teaching in the schools and that the Kurd language should be the official language of all these services". During the long negotiations concerning Mawṣil serious troubles broke out in the region of Khar- pūt and Diyārbakr as a result of the insurrection of Shaikh Sa'id Nakh ṣabandī. Shaikh Sa'id was captured on April 16, 1925 and executed at Diyārbakr. Since the settlement of the Mawṣil question, the Angora government has enforced a policy the tendency of which is to eliminate from Kurdistān feudal and tribal influences; cf. Gentzien, L'insurrection kurde, La Revue de Paris, Oct. 15, 1925.

Bibilography: The writer has to thank Mr. C. R. Driver, who with the greatest disinterestedness put at his disposal a large quantity of historical material on the Kurds. A history of the Kurds, the preliminaries of which have been outlined above would necessitate a great deal of preparatory work and research in Arabic, Persian, Armenian, Aramaic, and Georgian sources. A systematic ransacking of sources like the Selim-nāma of Ḥakim Idris and his son Abu l-Fadl and the Tarīḵ-i Ālam-arā-yi Abūzī would yield a rich reward. The basis of our knowledge of Kurd history is certainly the Shaerāf-nāma (down to 1005 = 1595). The text was published (mainly from a manuscript collated by the editor himself) by Veliaminof-Lēzinof, Scherēf-namē, vol. i. (history of the Kurds), St. Petersburg 1860; vol. ii. (variants of volume i. and general history of Turkey and Persia from the beginning of the Ottoman dynasty to 1005 = 1595), St. Petersburg 1862. The French translation by F. Charmoy: Scherēf-namē or Fastes de la nation Kurde in 2 volumes and 4 parts, St. Petersburg 1868—1875, includes commentaries (including a translation of the relevant chapters in the Dīwān-nāma of Ḥaddīj Khalīfa) but is now in many respects out of date and lacks an index. Cf. also the works of H. Barb, Über die Kurden- Chronik von Scherēf; Geschichte der Skizze d. 32. verschiedenen kurdischen Fürstengeschlechter; Geschichte v. 5. Kurden-Dynastien; Gesch. v. weiteren Kurden-Dynastien; Geschichte d. kurdischen Fürstenkreuzes in Bīlis, which appeared respectively in the Sitzungsbs. A. W. Wien, x. 1853, p. 258—276; xxii., 1857, p. 5—28; xxvii., 1858, p. 5—9; xi., 1859, p. 159—179. The lost history of Kurdistān by Muḥammad Efendi Şahrażūrī (d. 1737 = 1662 at Medina, cf. Taḏī al-Arūs, s. v. Kurd) has not yet come to light again (1927). For the histories of the house of Ardalūn cf. Sena where should be added the history (to 1254 = 1834) of Khusraw b. Muḥammad b. Muḥiẓūr, cf. Blenet, Catalogue des manuscrits persiens de la Bibli. Nationale, i., p. 305, No. 498. On the Rūṣalat Ansāb al-Abrād, belonging to the Asiatic Museum of Petrograd cf. Romaskewi, in the Melanges Asiatique, new ser., Petrograd 1918, p. 392. The newspaper Zārī Kurmanjī (of Rawandūz) has published in Kurdistān a short history Khunāy-yi Baḵūristān (1926) and announces this publication of the Tarīḵ-i Kurdam of Zain al-Abīdīn Beg. General information on Kurd history will be found in G. Campanile, Storia della regione di Kurdistān e delle sette di religione ivi esistenti, Naples 1818; Quartemère, Notice sur le Marālik al-Abār, N. E., xii., 1838; Rich, Narrative (cf. Sulaimānīya); Charmoy in the preface to his translation of the Sharaf-nāma; Lerch, Isedowamnaya ob iranskikh Kurdakh, St. Petersburg 1856, i., p. 20—33; Hoffmann, Auszue aus syrisch. Akten, 1880; Tomasech, Sazun, Sitzb. A. W. W., p. 133—134, 1895; Bittner, Der Kurdistangau usch- nijel, Sitzb. A. W. W., p. 133, 1895; Rawlinson and Wilson in the Encyclop. Britannica, 1911, xv. 949—951; Addai Seber, Episodet de l'histoire du Kurdistān, J. A., 1910, xx., p. 119—140: the events of the 1202, 1508, 1510—1512 (Džaihra), 1523, 1689, 1712 (O' Amadiya), 1820—1836 (Rawandūz); Soane, To Mesopotamia.... in disguise, London 1912, Chap. xvi.; Minorsky, Kurd, St. Petersburg 1915; Driver, Studies in Kurdish History, Bull. School of Orient Studies, London 1922, ii.3, p. 491—513. — In November 1926, Mr. Cl. Huart made several communications to the Institut des Inscriptions on the history of the Kurds but the death of the author has delayed their publication.
C. Anthropology, Sociology and Ethnography.

It is sufficient to compare the photographs of the Mill (“Arab type”), Girdu (“Mukri type”), Kočkiri (“Biblical Jew type”), Shämän (“Nestorian” and “Hakkan” types) Kurds, that figure in Mark Sykes, The Caliph’s Last Heritage, on p. 321, 343, 372, 425—429 or the types of northern Kurds given by Lynch, Armenia, ii., fig. 19 (“Turkoman” type) and fig. 114 (original and very marked type) to be able to say at once that any idea of finding a general formula for the “Kurd type” is quite illusory.


All these characterisations with their contradictions evidently refer only to individuals that the authors had seen but no one has ever examined all the Kurd tribes. Scientific measurements have been rarely taken; cf. Duhamel, a. l., tables 7—8; Khanikoff, a. l., p. 138, and the Russian works of Dr. Elsiseyew, Anthropol. ezhegodnia, Izv. Geogr. Obshch., xxii., and Po štehu Sultana, St. Petersburg 1806, iii. 319, 332, of Dr. Danilow, A. A. Ivanowski (Vestid, in Russki Antr. Journal, 1900, No. 3 with Russ. bibliography) and Dr. Pankowskow (cf. C. H., Einige Notizen über die Karden und Karapachen nach Panjwache, Ausland, 36, 1879).


Three things are characteristic of the mode of life of the Kurds: the historical tendency of the Kurds to group themselves on territorial fiefs around strongholds occupied by their chiefs, who are often of origin foreign to the local tribes; the existence of a warrior caste which supports the chief and conserves the ethnic agglomeration formed; the presence among the Kurds of shepherds (nomads and semi-nomads) as well as of agriculturists (settled or semi-settled).

 Completely nomad tribes living in tents the whole year round and spending the winter in the form of a single tribe. The pouring rain and the vicissitudes of the seasons make the nomad Arab far more available (cf. the list given by Sir Mark Sykes). The majority of the Kurds are semi-nomadic or settled. The former, following the climatic conditions of the country, live in villages during 5 to 8 months of the year and in summer after the harvest go to the mountains where they occupy strictly defined areas. Even the stages of migration of tribes like the Džaf (cf. SENNA) are rigorously fixed. More often the Kurds of this class confine themselves to ascending the heights adjoining their villages (called Saran in the region of Sâwâj-Bulăk).

The settled Kurds seem very often to represent the older population who were conquered by the ‘aghârat soldiers or accepted this domination to secure protection against their neighbours (cf. the article SÂWÂJ-BULÁK). Strabo, xvi. 3, 1 noted the presence of agriculturists among the Cyritti of Fars. At one time the nomad tribes of Mūsh found shelter in winter in the Armenian villages of the plains but gradually (since 1842) exclusively Kurd villages arose beside the Armenian villages; cf. Correspondence respecting the condition of population in Asia Minor and Syria, Blue Books, Turkey 1879, No. 10; 1880, No. 4 and 23; 1881, No. 6 [Trotter’s reports were translated into Russian in Izv. Kauk. Otd. Geogr. Obshch., Tiflis 1882, vii., appendix]; Lynch, Armenia, 1901, ii. 423; Mayewski, Iran, Tiflis 1909, iii. 264; Willemsen, Turkey, XVII (lists of Armenian and Kurdish villages). The general tendency of the Kurds is towards a settled existence. In northern Mesopotamia the Kurds have shown themselves fairly skilful agriculturists and for this reason have an advantage over the Beduin Arab element; cf. the Handbôk (No. 57)”Turkey in Asia” publ. by the Foreign Office, p. 104: “Northern Mesopotamia seems destined to become Kurdish land”.

The statements of an ethnographic character (costume, occupation, games, etc.) differ from tribe to tribe in Kurdistan and a premature generalisation might prove misleading. Only the Kurds of Erivan (living far from the great Kurd centres) have been the subject of a complete monograph by Egiyarov (a professor of law speaking Kurdish from his infancy), Kratkii ethnogr. ocherk Kurdov Erivana, gubernii, Zap. Kauk. Otd. Geogr. Obshch., Tiflis 1894, xvi/2; cf. also Khachaturian, Kurdî v Persii, Izv. Kauk. Otd. Geogr. Obshch., XVII/1, 1904; de Morgan, Miss. scientifiques, Ethnogr. geogr., ii.; Nikitine, Quelques observations sur les
The Kurds themselves believe that their ancestors were mədzik̲ (Zoroastrians), cf. M. Sykes, The Caliph's Last Heritage, p. 425, and perhaps the name Bahdānī ("Anāyāla") may be a relic of Mazdaean terminology (ibidin "orthodox, layman"). Arabo-Christian sources however rather suggest that the Kurds first professed some kind of paganism. In the third century Mār Māri of Urfa (d. 226) made converts to Christianity at Shāhgert (Shāhgert between Daktīs and Arbil, cf. Hoffmann, Auszüge, p. 270) of the king and the people who "worshipped trees and sacrificed to the idol of copper" (Raabe, Mār Māri, p. 26). Ḫis̲y̲abh built a convent near Ṣhamānīn (near Dṣārāt Ibn ʿOmar) at the "spot where the Kurds had sacrificed to devils". The Kurds whom Mār Sābīs (d. 485) converted to Christianity were worshippers of the sun, cf. Hoffmann, Auszüge, p. 73.

Statements regarding the attempts at evangelizing the Kurds are very scanty but it is a fact that Maʿṣūdi, Ṣurāqī, iii. 254, mentions among the Kurds al-Yaṣaʿibīya and al-Dīrājīn Christians living near Mawṣil and Djbāl al-Djūdī (cf. Marco Polo, Ch. xxiv.). After their conversion to Islam, the Kurds frequently supported the Khāridjī movement (the rising of the Zanjī slaves in the region of Baṣra, that of Daisam in Aḏharbāḏjan; cf. Maʿṣūdi, ibīd., v., p. 231; the Kurds scattered throughout Aḏharbāḏjan are known as sharāt = Khāridji). There were also Kurds who denied the authority of the Caliphs ʿOthmān and ʿAlī (Maʿṣūdi, ibīd., iii. 233). According to the Sharaf-nāma, i. 14, all the Muslim Kurds followed the Shāhī Sunna (Ewliyā Čelebi, iv. 75, says the same). It is however certain that there were Shīʿīs among the Kurds under Persian rule. In the reign of Uṯmān there was even a Kurd mahāḏ. The ʿUlāmā (cf. the living among the Shāh-sewān Turks became Shīʿīs; cf. also the evidence of the Sharaf-nāma, i. 316 on the Dumbul following Shīʿa doctrine (the meaning of the term šuṣaši which the same author, i. 117 applies to four tribes in contrast to the three Yazidi tribes is not very clear).

On the other hand the testimony of the Sharaf-nāma, i. 14, is very convincing on the spread among the Kurds of Yazidi doctrines (the Dasaeni, Ḵāhīdī, Basiyān tribes and parts of the Bokhātī, Mahmūdī and Dumbul, not to speak of the Sirdār which the Sharaf-nāma does not mention); cf. YAZIDIS.

Of the Pāzūkī tribe, the Sharaf-nāma remarks (i. 328) that it has no definite religion; from its close connection with the Safāwis, one might suppose that it held extreme Shīʿa views.

At the present day the great majority of the Kurds are still Shīʿī Sunnis. Even in Senna only the former ruling family of the Wāli Ardašīn was Shīʿī. The Shīʿī tribes of the provinces of Kirmānštān are for the most part extremist; cf. Minorsky, Notes sur les Ahi-le ḡāʾek, R. M. M., 1920, xi., p. 59; for the district of Mawṣil see the article SARKĀL and Shābān. As a general rule extremist views, more or less Shīʿī, find adherents rather among the Iranian tribes of Kurdistan who are not true Kurds (Gürān, Zārā). On the other hand the Kurds are much under the influence of Shāhīks of the various Sunni orders (especially the Naḵšbandī and Ḵāṭarīs whose head-quarters are at Awrāmān, Salīmānīya, Mūri, Shāhmān, Khurūp, etc.). Their influence was apparent in the risings of Bād Kūn (cf. Layard, Discoveries, London 1853, p. 375); Ubaidallāh (1850), Shāhīk Saʿd (1926) etc.; cf. SHĀHMĀN and the articles by Nikītīne therein mentioned.

Bibliography: In addition to the works quoted, cf. N. Marr, Yehāke a slove "telēb", Ţaz, 1910, xx (the author studies the cultural part played by the Kurdish nation in the history of Nearer Asia and thinks he can find among the Kurds [Yazīdia]?] survivals of pagan beliefs; cf. ĖLĪRĪ); S. Reinach, Charme pour obtenir la pluie (in Kurdistan), L'Anthropologie, 1906, xvii., p. 653; Volland, Aberglauben in Armenien und Kurdistan, Globus, 1907, xci, Nr. 22, p. 341—344 (on caps covered with magical inscriptions); Driver, The religion of the Kurds, Bull. School of Oriental Stud., 1922, i., p. 197—215; Nikītīne, Les Kurds et le Christianisme, E. R. H. R., 1922.

E. The Kurdish Language.

Kurdish, like Persian, is a western Iranian language but its descent is different from that of Persian. The history of the separation of western Iranian into a northern and a southern branch has been traced by Andreas, Salemann, O. Mann (Die Tajik Mundarten d. Provinz Fars, Berlin 1909, p. i—xxvi); Meillet, M.S.L., 1911—1912, xvii.; Lentz, Die nordvaimischen Elemente in d. neupers. Literatursprache bei Ferdosi, Z. fur Indologie und Iranistik, 1926, iv. But P. Tedesco, in
his Dialektologie d. westiranischen Turfantexte, Le Monde Oriental, 1921, xv., fasc. 1—3, has shown that "western" Irânian (distinguished from Eastern Irânian: Soğhdian, Saka) shows a considerable interpenetration of its northern and southern branches and this result has been corroborated by the work of W. Lenz quoted above.

In spite of this confusion and the co-existence of heterodox elements in the modern languages of Kurdish as a whole shows a character clearly distinct from that of Persian. This fact would be more obvious if our Kurdish documents were not of much later date than the period in which the Persian literary language established its supremacy. The main characteristics of Kurdish compared with Persian are as follows:

a. Its specific pronunciation, the frequency of the Semitic  and even in Irânian words like āsp (horse), havot (seven); the velar  (a little different from the Slav and Turkish t), the rolled r distinguished from the weak r; the bilabial w; two consonants tolerated at the beginning (e.g. bera, delet), and the sonant n and r acquiring a vocalic character (almost  and ).

b. The fundamental difference in the phonetic treatment of the same Irânian material is illustrated by the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>Kurdish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dil</td>
<td>sîr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ādhar (ātash)</td>
<td>āhir and āgir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māhi</td>
<td>māsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namāz</td>
<td>nuwēl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Morphological differences: the survival of the oblique case; determinative suffix ("definite article") in åkā; different personal inflections: 3 pers. pron. poss. -i-sam, plur. of the present: 1st person in in, 2nd and 3rd in; a form of išfāt (especially in the plural) in t(-d) (cf. the Ossetic plural in a), e.g. yār-i te "thy friend," yārīd te, "thy friends;" the old passive in -ya (cf. Salemann, Zum mittelpers. Passiv, St. Petersburg 1900; Meillet, Grammaire du vieux persé, p. 102) and a passive in rī.

d. Syntactical differences: survival of the passive construction of transitive verbs in the pretetite, particularly complicated in verbs compounded with prepositions (kuštist-an li hrišin "they have cut us off from the mountains" literally: "the mountains [by them] from we have—been cut").

e. Lexicographical differences: Not only, like the majority of the dialects of the north-west, does the Kurdish oppose kar-, kap- (and væ-) respectively to the kun-, uft- (and gē) of the south-west but it has hāt for āmad, ūmī for āward, bîst for qhind, nīrd for fersîn etc. The many borrowings from literary Arabic form an element connecting Kurdish with Persian but Kurdish also borrows from spoken Arabic, Ottoman Turkish, Aramaic and Armenian. In addition, Kurdish and Armenian may have borrowed from the same indigenous sources not yet identified.

While then the Irânian dialects of the north-west and south-west are not separated by an abyss, for all practical purposes Kurdish has its own well-marked type, which differentiates it not only from Modern Persian but from the other dialects of the north-west (Samâni, "central" dialects, etc.).

Kurdish itself moreover includes very different dialects. The majority of the Kurdish dialects are included under the term Kûrmândji. According to the Sharaf-nâmê, the Kurdish nation consists of four sections: Kûrmândji, Lûr, Kalûhr, and Gûrân. Of these tribes the Lûrs [q.v.] as far as their physical appearance and their language are concerned gravitate towards the south-west group (O. Mann, Die Mundarten der Lûr-Stämme, Berlin 1910) and form a unity apart. The Gûrâns (cf. zohān) like their relatives the Awrâms (cf. senna), Zâzâ [q.v.] etc. speak dialects of the north-west differing considerably from Kurdish (cf. "three in Gûrâni: yerî, in Zâzâ: kirîye agreeing with the Samâni āhîrâ, while Kurdish has hî), the Zâzâ, according to Andreas (recorded by Christiansen) are related to the old Dalanites and this hypothesis is corroborated by traditions still alive among the Awrâms (E. Soane, In Disguise to... Kurdistan, p. 377).

According to the Sharaf-nâmê the Kalûhrs occupied the region between Senna, Kûrmândshâh and Zohâb. The term Kalûhr seems therefore to correspond in the Sharaf-nâmê, p. 13, to the Kurd group "non-Kûrmândji" of the districts of Senna and Kûrmândshâh. These dialects have been studied by O. Mann but this part of his collections has not yet been published. According to the prospectus of his Kurdisch-persische Forschungen (the publication of which has been taken up by K. Hadank) one volume is to include the southern dialects of the province of Kûrmândshâh; Kûrmândshâh, Kalûhr, Lûhr, Pahrawandû, Nînaklû and Kûlûyâ, the latter in the district of Sunûk [q.v.]; another volume will be devoted to the dialects of the province of Kûrdistan [cf. senna] and to those of Kûrin [q.v.] an'â' Gârûs (otherwise Bidjâr, east of Senna). The people who speak these dialects usually call them Kurdî or by the name of the tribe concerned. On the borders of Luristân (in Lâstân) the southern Kurdish dialects are known as Lakî (cf. O. Mann, Kurze Skizze der Lûrdialleute S. B. A. W., 1904, xxxix.; Cîrikov, Putewoi journal, St. Petersburg 1875, p. 227). There are Lak at Salmâs [q.v.] and in the Province of Fârs (but the Kurdish dialect of Kûlûn-Abdûl, described by O. Mann, Die Tâjîk Mundarten, p. 135 is not Lakî). The southern Kurdish dialects of western Persia have lost the important features of Kurdish (e.g. the passive formation of the preterite in transitive verbs). The existence of these non-Kûrmândji dialects may prove to be of some importance in settling the problem of the Kûrdî—Kpîrîu.

We do not know the origin of the name Kûrmândji. Is it a compound of Kurd with the name of another tribe of Media? In the Kûrmândji area properly so-called two groups of dialects are distinguished: the eastern group (or rather south-east) and the western. Their exact boundaries are not yet defined. Eastern Kûrmândji is spoken in the Mûkri region [cf. sâwî-dûlak] and in the region of the tributaries of the Tigris: The Little Zâb, Aďâm [q.v.] and the Diyâlas [q.v.]. It is a very pure dialect and rich from the morphological point of view. The western branch includes the Kûrmândji dialects with their local peculiarities (Diyârbakr, Mûrdân, Bûkhârû, Bahdûnû, Hakkûrû, Ürmia, Erivan, Erzerûm and the Kurd colonies in Asia Minor and Khorsâd). The Kûrds of Northern Syria seem to use various dialects full of borrowings from Turkish (cf. Le Coq's collection).
Ewliya Celebi, iv. 75, enumerates 15 Kurdish dialects (liāmān).

Garzoni, Grammatica, distinguishes the dialect of 'Amādiyā from those of Bdeīla, Dijāmerg, Bokhātān and Sulaimāniyā. Cf. also the scheme of classification in Soane, Grammar of the Kūrmānji.

Bibliography: A list of all studies of Kurdish from 1783 to date is given in Lerc: Isledovanija, iii., p. i.—xxi. and in the Grundriss d. iran. Philol., i/2, 253—254. The only scientific Kurdish grammars are: Justi, Kūrmānji Grammatik, St. Petersburg 1880, and Socin, Die Sprache der Kūrmānji in Iran. Philol., i/2, 249—286; these two are mainly connected with Western Kurmānji. In Eastern Kurmānji the fundamental work is: O. Mann, Die Mundarten der Mukri-Kurden, Berlin 1909, i., p. xxxii.—cvi.: Grammatik Skizze; cf. also Soane, Notes on the Phonology of Southern Kurmānji, J.R.A.S., 1922, p. 199—226. The only Kurdish dictionary in existence is that of A. Jaba-F. Justi, Dictionnaire kurde-français, St. Petersburg 1879; it sums up all that had been published before this date (the supplement by H. Schindler appeared in Z.D.M.G., xxviii/i) but it is not sufficient for practical purposes. On the manuscript of a voluminous Kurdish dictionary compiled by E. B. Soane and belonging to the School of Oriental Studies, cf. E. D. Ros in the Times, Feb. 19, 1926.

The following is a list of the specimens of Kurdish dialects that are so far available:


III. Northern and Western Kūrmānji:


Folklore, Literature, Newspapers.

The collections of Kurdish stories made by Jaba, Leroche, Prym-Socin, von Le Coq, O. Mann, Makas and Nikitine give a fair idea of the Kurds as story-tellers. The themes are often taken from folklore common to the Near East (fables, fairy-tales, stories of fools; cf. Mirza M. Djewad al-Kazi, Ein Kurdisches Märchen, Globus, 96, p. 187); more numerous and more interesting are the stories of the loves of popular heroes, of the wars of the clans etc. Prym-Socin and Makas have given detailed commentaries on the subject matter of stories of this category. O. Mann illustrated the ballad of the siege of Džendimkā'Fa in 1017 (1608) from the evidence of the official history of Abābās I. Many popular subjects are treated both in prose and verse. Some cycles with their variants form regular epics like the Mem-un Zin, the story of a pair of lovers at the court of the emir of Bohan, of which we have Ahmad-khān's version and very numerous popular variants: Lerch, Mislanges Aristiquestes, iii. 60—225; Prym-Socin, No. xxxi.; Mann, No. ii.; Makas, No. i. Cf. also: Chalat Rain, Kurdische Sagen, Zeitsch. d. Vereins f. Volkerkunde, 15, 1905, p. 322—330; 16, 1906, p. 35—46 and 402—414; 17, 1907, p. 76—80. (Recueil de notices, p. 7—8) furnished him with a list of 9 Kurdistan poets but the data must be taken with some caution. These poets are:

Ali of Ḥarīf (in Šamīdīnā) who lived 400—471 (1009—1078), which almost makes him contemporary with Firdawsi (?). He is the author of a Kurdish ḍīwānā.

Shaikh Ahmad Maḷā-i Dīzīrī, a native of Dījazār where his tomb is still to be seen. He is said to have flourished between 540 and 556 (1145—1160) in the time of a chief Ḥīmad al-Dīn. But the ḍīwān of Maḷā-i Dīzīrī publ. in photograph by M. Hartmann, Das Kurdische Dinwān des Schīch Ahmad, Berlin 1904, mentions the name (fol. 221) of the Persian poet Dīzīrī, who died in 898 (1492) so that he cannot be earlier than the end of the xvth century. An ode dedicated to Kūhā-i Kūhān, who is the Shāh of Kurdistān (f. 171) who rules at Tabriz and who is greater than the Shāh of Kūhān (f. 177) may refer to some Ağ-Koyunlu [q. v.] ruler.

Fakhr Teirān (707—777 = 1302—1375), born and buried at Mukus, was really called Muhammed and used the tahrulūs of Mīm Ḥaʿī. He wrote the Hikāyāta Shaikh Sima (Sarān), "Stories of Barṣīsā", the Kāwī ṣarp-i raż ("The words of the black courser of the Prophet") and other poems.

Maḷā-iBatē (Mullā Ahmād), born and buried in the village of Baykān in Hakkān (820—900 = 1417—1494), is the author of a Dīwān and a Mawlid. The latter has been published in photo-type by H. von Le Coq (Kurd. Texte, i. 49—95). Ahmad Khānī of Hakkān flourished between 1000 and 1063 (1591—1652) and was buried at Bāyazid near the mosque bearing his name. He wrote the poem Mem-un Zin, analysed by Jaba-Lerche, Mislanges Aristiquestes, iii. 242—255 and publ. in 1538 (1920) at Constantinople by the publishers of the Ţi newspaper. His rhymed Arabic Kurdish glossary Šawār ("Firstlings") has been published by Yusuf Dīya al-Dīn, who gives it the date of 1094 (al-Hadiya al-Hāmidīya, p. 250—297), and in facsimile by Le Coq, i. 49—47. Ahmad Khānī also wrote many poems in Kurdish, Arabic and Turkish.

Ismāʿīl of Bāyazid, an imitator of Ahmad Khānī (1065—1121 = 1654—1709), is the author of a Kurmanji—Arabic—Persian glossary Gūlawr and many ghazals and poems. Shariʿī Khān, born and buried in Djiyāmūr (1101—1161 = 1698—1748), belonged to the family of the Amirs of Hakkān. He is the author of a large number of verses in Kurmanji and in Persian. Murād Khān of Bāyazid (1150—1190 = 1737—1784) wrote lyric poems.


In the Kurdish newspaper (cf. below) we find biographical information about and specimens of the poetry of the following poets: Shāh Pārtu of Hakkārī whose diwānās finished in 1221 (1866); Nātī who is very popular in the region of Eastern Kurmanji, flourished towards the middle of the xvi century; a selection of his poems appeared at Constantinople in the anthology entitled Šamīdī (by Amin Faḥīṭ); Hādījī Kādīr Kāʾī, very conscious of his Kurdish nationality (sixteenth century); Abulʿūlāṣ Ṣahba ʿAl-Dīnāw ("Adāb"); in the collection of Shāhīn Khān during television, a poet from Şirvān; Shaikh Rāba (Kāʾī) of the tribe of Talbānī (the Sirvān), d. about 1910; Tāhir Beg Dījāf, son of ʿOṯmān Pāša of Alabā, d. about 1920. The contemporary poets are: Ali Kāmil of Sulaimāniyā, "Abū al-Kādir Zawāhī of Baghdād, Ahmad Beg Fattāḥ Şahbūkīr of Sulaimāniyā, Muṣṭafā Beg Dījāf (a satirical poet), Ahmad Beg Dījāf, son of ʿĀdīla Kīhāṁ Kūrkū ("Athir"). Other poets, whose names are found in the newspapers are: Shaikh Nūrī Bāṭāʾ al-ʿĀlī, "Abū Siğār Siğār, Mullā Ṭohijī Mūkri (Wafāʾī), Kāka Mīnī (= Amin) Mūkri, Kāk Muṣṭafā Trānt (= Murshid-ī Kāmil), "Abd al-Khālīk, ʿĀlīm, etc.

Jaba's authority (Recueil, p. 12) gives several authors of textbooks in Kurdish (All of Tārīmakh [after 1000 = 1591] wrote an Arabic grammar in Kurdish and Mālī Yusūn of Hakkārī wrote three grammatical works on tarjīf, parfūf and tarīkhī. To the same category belongs the "canonical Muslim prayer" written down about 1783 and published by C. Huart in J. A., 1895, No. 1, p. 86—109, as well as the works already mentioned by Ahmad Khānī etc. But as a rule Kurdistān authors writing on general subjects prefer Arabic, Persian or Turkish.

Among those who wrote in Arabic were the celebrated jurists and theologians: Ṣāḥib Hakkārī, d. 585 (1189); Ṭaḳī al-Dīn Shahrāzārī, d. at
Damascus in 643 (1245) (Ibn Khalil,ina, Wafayt, ii. 188, 430); Abdullâh- al-Kurdi of Sinjâr (Ibn Baṭṭûša, i. 142). On the Ayyubid prince Abu I-Fida', historian and geographer, see the article on him. Ibn al-Athir, ix. 49, quotes the Arabic ode of Ḥusain Bashnawi, a poet at the court of the Marwânids and mentions (xi. 7–8) the existence among the Kurds of men versed in local traditions. The Sharaf-šâma (i. 341–342) mentions among the natives of Bidlis Mawldân 'Abd al- Raḥmân, Mawldân Muhammad Barâkâ', and Sadiq Shâh Shirvanî, Ama'mar Yûsuf (cf. Naṣa'îj-šâma, ed. Nasiru- Lees, p. 479) and speaks of the 'ulama' and fudâla' of 'Amâdîa. On the Kurd theologians of the modern period see the review Rêza-kurd, No. 2, p. 23.

Many historical works have been written by Kurds in Persian (cf. above). The Divân of the Kurd poetess Mâh Sharaf-khânâm, d. 1264 (1847) (cf. Sena), was published with a biographical notice at Têherân in 1926.

Among writers in Turkish of Kurdish origin was reckoned the very celebrated poet Fuâdî [q.v.] of Bagdâd, d. 968 (1556). But Koprulu- Bej, Mehmed Fuâdî, Fuâdî, Hûdu, Khoş-Tezambâd, Stamboul, 1914, p. 14, says that Fuâdî was a Turk of the Bayât tribe. The Bayât are certainly Turks, but it may be noted that Khurshid Evendi, Sîyâhat-nâmâ-i Hûdu, Russ. transl., p. 193–194 mentions the Bayât clans (fîrka) of Kifîr and Tuz-Khurmatî among the Kurds. Modern Turkish literature has quite a number of writers of Kurd origin (cf. J. Deny on the origin of the sociologist Dîyâ Gîk Alp, R. M. M., 1925, ixi, p. 3).

The publications of the Christian missionaries form a special category in Kurdish literature. The Gospel has been translated into several dialects: the Kirmânsîhvi version was published in London in 1900. The Gospel according to St. Mark in Mûkri was published at Philippopolis in 1909. M. Fossom has published a Protestant catechism in Mûkri and in his grammar has given a rhymed translation of "Onward, Christian Soldiers" adapted to local conditions. Several of these publications are printed in the Armenian alphabet (Justi, Kurd. Gramm., p. xxix.) and seem to be intended for the Armenians (of Diyarbakr) whose usual language is Kurdish. In April 1914 the Protestant missionaries of Urmiya published the first number of the magazine Kurdistân (in Mûkri).

The first Kurd newspaper that we know of is Kurdistân published successively in Cairo, London and Folkstone, by 'Abd al-Raḥmân Beg, son of Baḥr Khân Beg of Bohûtn. The Preussische Staats- bibliothek has Nos. 1–31, 1355–1320 (1892–1902); cf. W. Z. K. M., xli, p. 112 and Makas, Kurd. Stud., p. 10. After the Young Turk revolution, the Kurdish students (tullab) who had formed an association called Ḥuwî (Unity) founded the monthly review Rêza Kurd (The Kurd Day) of which the first two Nos. embellished with portraits of Šâlah al-Dîn and Karâm Khân Zand appeared in Stamboul on June 6 and July 6, 1329 (1912) under the editorship of 'Abd al-Karîm of Sulaimanîya; later this review got the name Hatwî Kurd (The Kurd Sun). The magazine Kurdistân published by the missionaries of Urmiya has already been mentioned above. The renewal of Kurd activity after the war of 1914–1918 was marked by the production of several newspapers in Constantinople, Egypt and Kurdistân (Diyarbakr, etc.). The earliest was

the weekly Zîn ("Life") founded in 1919, which, though published in Turkish and in Constantinople, was dedicated to the propagation of the idea "Kurdistân for the Kurds." No. 32 appeared on 1st Dju'mâdî I, 1338 = Jan. 23, 1920. As to Kurdish newspapers, in default of a complete list we may mention Kurdistân, a bi-monthly published in Cairo by Âsmâ' Asîrî (i.e. of the tribe of Baḥr Khân); No. 2 is dated 1357 Dhu-l-Hijâja, 1335; No. 11, 15th Rabî' I, 1336. The first newspaper published in Sulaimanîya was Pîkhabûsîn ("Progress"), later replaced by Bâng-i Kurdistân, which was edited, before the English evacuation, by Hâdîjî Mustafâ Pasha (13 Nos., between Aug. 2 and Oct. 1922); Rûbi Kurdistân, organ of the "king of Kurdistân" (Mahmûd I = Shâh Mahmûd), pub. at Sulaimanîya by Muhammad Nârî, No. 1 dated 15th x. 1922 and No. 15 xii. 1923. Bâng-i îbârî, pub. by Shâh Mahmûd after his flight (Nos. 1–8, iii.; Nos. 3–12, iv., 1923); cf. Edmonds A Kurdistân, Journal, Cent. Asia Soc., 1925, i, pp. 83–90; Ziyânsât ("Resurrection") official (zûkâmâyî) weekly of Sulaimanîya (No. 1–10, viii., 1924); Dîyâ-îî Kurdistân ("The Gift of the East"), a weekly, e. a. in three languages published at Baghâbî by Siyâh-Teamâ-za-de and Rashîd Shawâk, No. 1–11, March 1925; Zûrî Kurdistânî, a weekly review publ. at Rawandûz by Siyadî Suṣûn Mûkri and 'Abd al-Raḥmân Gîw, founded 16th Dhu-l-Ka'da, 1344.

Kûrkûb, a t o w n in Khûzistân, on the road from Wâṣit to Sûs (Susia). The statements regarding distances given by the Arab geographers are now collected and arranged in P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter nach den arab. Geographen, 1921, iv., p. 396 sq.; also p. 431. The town was noted for its carpets; there was also a fire, of the Sultan there. A material called sânûdîr was made there, cf. de Goeje's glossary in B.C.A., iv., s.v. Al-îshâkhri says that the sânûdîr of Fas (q.v.) is better than that of Kurûb; the latter was a mixture of silk and cotton while in the former wool was used.

Bibliography: G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 241, 246; Schwarz, loc. cit., ii. 98, where all the important quotations from the Arab geographers are given.

(M. Plessner)

Kûrra b. Shârik b. Marhîb b. Hâzim b. Aḥârît al-ʿAṣir b. Kaḥîr, gōve r o f E y g p y, belonged to the tribe of Kaḥîr b. Châlîn and was therefore a north Arabian. His native town was Kinnissîn in Syria. We do not know whether he had already held a high office before his appointment as governor of Egypt, but it is exceedingly probable, especially as the Umayyads were particularly careful only to appoint to this important office men of proved ability. As conditions then were, only a tried man in whom the caliphs had entire confidence could be considered for the governorship rendered vacant by the departure of Prince Abd Allâh b. Abd al-Malîk. Kurra entered al-Fusâtân on the 3rd or 13th Rabî' I, 90 (Jan. 20 or 30, 799) and assumed complete control of the country, including its financial administration. He remained in office till his death on 23rd Rabî' I, 96 (Dec. 6, 714). Later biased historians have given us a very erroneous picture of the man. He is put alongside of the notorious al-Hâdîjî b. Yûsuf, which meant that he was of the lowest moral character and is described as
a brutal tyrant and heretic. The historian loves to dwell on the story that he did not hesitate to have a drinking bout with music in the newly built mosque of 'Amr. We get a very different picture of the unassuming important figure from contemporary documents, yielded by the finds of papyri in the last fifty years. They reveal him as a conscientious and faithful official, strict towards his subordinates, lenient towards the people, the ruthless exploitation and oppression of whom by the minor officials he did his best to check. He devoted all his energies to a just and wise rule, always keeping the future of the land in view. That there were occasional hardships is easily understood, they never became a system with him, as with other amirs of the land. The serious economic damage which the famine of 86/87 (705/706) inflicted on the land with its terrible increase in prices, which was not made good even in 88, forced Kurra to devote his whole energy to increasing agricultural production in Egypt. A measure as effective as it was far-sighted was the recultivation of fallow lands, and great public works, of which the name 'Istāb Dār Kurra for the Birkaṭ al-Hashāb still reminds us, which Kurra restored to cultivation in its entirety. He is said to have planted fields of sugar-cane. In these circumstances quite a different light is thrown on the fact that Kurra found himself forced to depart from a very old tradition in the distribution of tax and to make newly converted Copts pay the diqa, from which they had hitherto been exempt, by making them share in the cumulative quota of their community. Kurra's name is also connected with the rebuilding of the mosque of 'Amr in al-Fustāt (old Cairo). In the year 1 Maslama b. Muqlah had carried out the first and 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Marwān the second extension of this notable building and Kurra was ordered by the Caliph al-Walid I to remove the whole mosque and erect a new one on its site. The work under the direction of Yāhiya b. ʿAḥṣa took from Shabban 92 till Ramadān 93 to complete.


KURSI, an Arabic loan-word from the Aramaic kurshayy (Syriac form; Hebrew: kisiت; Nöelke, Mandäische Grammatik, p. 128; S. Fraenkel, De vocabulis pergrinus, p. 25), throne. It is only found twice in the Kur'ān (ii. 256; xxxviii. 33); its occurrence in the first of these has given the verse the name of the Throne Verse (ayāt al-kursī); the reference is to the throne of God, which is large enough to embrace the heavens and the earth. In the second passage the reference is to the throne of Solomon. The use of two different words, 'arsh and kursi, for the throne of God, very early troubled the exegesists; some have seen in the second the stool placed in front of a throne on which a sovereign rests his feet; cf. the sculptures of Persepolis (Abū Mūsā, Asbāt, according to Soddī etc., in Ţabarī, Taṣfīr, iii. 7) while others took it to be only a synonym of 'arsh (al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, ibid.), and one school interpreted it allegorically, saying that the kursi of God is simply his knowledge (Šaʿīd b. Dūjbair according to Ibn Ṭabība, ibid.). The use of this word in the second passage for "a throne on which one sits" shows clearly that it is a synonym of 'arsh.

The idea of an erection square in shape (which is also the origin of the word 'arsh) is retained in the different meanings assumed by the word. The four sides of the rectangle intended to enclose the letters forming a word or a number of phrases is so called. In Persian, these four sides are called Khufiqti kursi and the rectangle itself, kursi-kendi (Huwart, Calligraphic, p. 352). The Persians use it to describe a frame on which a carpet of wool or felt is stretched and under which a brazier is placed; the legs are slung under the carpet to warm them in winter time (the tandīr of the Turks; Polat, Persien, i, 65; Frasier, ii. 188). The Arabs apply the name to the four sides of a mecca, a kind of portable or moveable staircase on 4 wheels (now 6) which had nine steps and was placed against the wall of the Kaʿba so that its upper end was level with the threshold (Ibn Dūjbair, Rīṭā, p. 91; Ibn Bāṭṭa, i. 309; Dozy, Supplément, i. 455); a lectern on which the Kurān is placed (Makkjari, i. 404); the stand for an astrolabe; the carriage of a ballista; a seat with a back for 3 or 4 persons; a table on which a plate is placed (Lane, Modern Egyptians, i. 195); a stand on which a turban is laid at night (kursi al-imāmā; Dozy, Viements, p. 343, No. 1; Lane, Modern Egyptians, i, 50, 221); a holder into which is put the lower end of a pointed instrument (Y. A., 1850, p. 251); the card for pulling a tounbār (Description de l'Égypte, xiii, 251).

The Moors give the name to lockets, silver boxes, square or triangular, which they wear in necklaces, on account of their shape (Dozy and Engelmann, Glossaire des mots espagnols, s. v.; Beussier, p. 584). It is also the support for the pan and percussion apparatus in a flint lock; the bezel of a ring, conning bench (naut.) (Beussier, l. c.); a chair of a particular shape on which a woman sits when about to give birth to a child (kursi al-walīdā) (Lane, ii. 275). Figuratively it is the capital of an empire, royal residence, see of a patriarch or a bishop (Dozy, Suppl., i. 456; Cuche, Dict. ar-français, s. v.). (CL. Huwart)

Kūs, a town in Upper Egypt on the east bank of the Nile. The form Kūs (Kū in al-Fargḥānī and Ibn Rusta) comes from the Coptic Kēs (or Kēs Bēbīr) which Coptic etymology later connected with the Coptic verb meaning "to bury." In the Roman period the town was
Kusair, in spite of the sage warnings of Abu l-Muhādjir. Therefore when after his epic cavalry campaign in the west, the Arab general, on his return to Kairawān made the mistake of dividing his army, Kusaila, who accompanied him as a living trophy, came to an arrangement with the Greeks and Berbers who were following the Muslim march. The latter were surprised near Tahdīda (63 = 682–683) and almost all fell including Abu l-Muhādjir died fighting. Kusaila entered Kairawān as a conqueror whence he governed Irfikyia for five years, Arabs as well as Greeks and Berbers. When the Caliph Abūl-Malik was suddenly relieved of the difficulties, caused by the civil wars in the east, he sent an army to Zubair b. Ka‘īs, at Barka, with which the latter fought Kusaila at Mena, west of Kairawān. He defeated and slew him and regained the lost territory (69 = 688/689).


KUSAILA OR KUSAIR, A SEAPORT ON THE AFRICAN COAST OF THE RED SEA. There is no reason to doubt that all the references of Oriental and European writers to Kusair on the Red Sea are to the same place; the contradictions between different authors are simply due to inaccuracies as, in the first place there is not sufficient ground for supposing that there were two places called Kusair and secondly Kusair is unanimously described as the harbour of Kūs. If we were to have two places called Kusair, they would have to be so far apart that one of them could not be described as the port of Kūs; but the place marked on our modern maps as Kusair fulfils the condition of having been the port of Kūs perfectly so far as its position is concerned. The references therefore must be to this place which lies a little north of Lat. 26. Vakit is unreliable because he makes Kusair lie near ‘Aidhāb and then puts the distance from Kūs at 5 and from ‘Aidhāb at 8 days’ journey. Even in Egypt where they are used to great distances, two places 8 days’ journey apart would not be described as near one another. A glance at the map shows that if it is five days from Kusair to Kūs, it cannot be 8 from Kusair to ‘Aidhāb. The distance could not be covered in 18 days if the first statement is correct. As a matter of fact from ‘Aidhāb to Kūs is according to al-Maqrīzī 17, according to al-Idwās 20 days’ journey so that it cannot be only 8 to Kusair.
Even if we put 'Aidhāh farther north, as C. H. Becker (cf. 'Aidhāh) and S. Lane-Poole have rightly done, the contradiction between these figures is not disposed of.

The significance of the harbours on the Red Sea for European trade with India and China and for the pilgrims to Mecca has often been described. At the same time the relative importance of the different harbours varied considerably in the course of centuries (cf. Baḥr al-Kulzūm). While Kuṣair flourished particularly in the 'Abbasid period, 'Aidhāh later became the principal port and still later al-Tīr. After Selim I had conquered Egypt, he tried again to revive Kuṣair and built a fortress there. The further history of the town to 1876 with a very full description of its condition in the seventies was given by C. A. Knunzius, who was Egyptian military officer there. He calls particular attention to the disastrous effect on its Suez Canal. While in the fifties the traffic at Kuṣair along with that of Suez was “steadily increasing” (van Neimans), the port is now only important for traffic to and from Egypt; through traffic through the Red Sea has no longer any inducement to touch Kuṣair; the decline of the town is most clearly seen from the figures given by Sami Bey at the end of the century in the Kānaṣ al-ʾAṭīma.

Biographie: Yākūt, Muǧjam, s. v.; al-Kaṣṣanī, Die Geographie u. Verwaltung von Ägypten, transl. by Wustenfeld, N. G. W. Göttr., 1879, xxv., p. 169; Abu 'l-Fidā', Tabikwī, ed. Reinaud, p. 23, 111; Muḥarrīr, Ḥifarṭ, ed. Wiet, I, 61; S. Lane-Poole, A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, 1901, p. 304 and map; C. B. Knunzius, Bilder aus Oerhügten, der Wuste und dem Roten Meer, 1878, p. 265 sqq.; do., Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben als Arzt und Naturforscher zu Kuṣair am Roten Meer, 1915 (with a map of the town, many views and a bibliography of the author's works containing 89 numbers); v. Neimans, Das rothe Meer und die Küstenländer im Jahre 1877 in hohem Reliefe, ed. Z.D.M. G., 1878, xii., p. 308, 395, 418; Sāmī Bey, Brahīm al-Kaṣṣanī, al-ʾAṭīma, s. v.—For the history of its commercial relations the fundamental work is: Heyd, Geschichte des Levantehandelns, Index s.v., and more recently studies by C. H. Becker (art. 'Aidhāh, Baḥr al-Kulzūm, Egypt, the later is reprinted in Islamstudien, 1924, i, esp. p. 185 sqq.; also Grundlinien der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung Ägyptens in den ersten Jahrhunderten des Islam, in Klio, ix., 206 sqq., reprinted in Islamstudien, i., esp. p. 213 sqq). (M. Pleßner)

Kuṣair ’Amra. See ’Amrah. Kuṣaiy, an ancestor of Muḥammad in the fifth generation and restorer of the pre-Islamic worship of the Ka’ba in Mecca. His genealogy is unanimously given in all sources as Kuṣair b. Kiāb b. Murra b. Kaḥb b. Luʿayi b. Fihr-Kuṣair (cf. Wustenfeld, Geneal. Tabellen, O.-T.), and his life and exploits are recorded by our sources in three recensions which only differ from each other in trifling details; these go back to Muḥammad al-Kalbī (d. 146), Ibn Ḳīḥād (d. 150) and ’Abd al-Malik b. ’Abd al-ʿAzīz b. Djarāḏī al-Makki (d. 150). Kuṣair is represented, like the usual legendary type of hero who founds a city, as having passed his childhood and youth far from his native land and in obscurity: a younger son of Kiāb b. Murra, a descendant of the Kuṣair whose supremacy in Mecca had been replaced by that of the Banū Kuṣair, he loses his father soon after his birth and is taken by his mother Ẓufīma bint Saʿd b. Sayal who had married again, her second husband being a member of the tribe of Banū ʿUdār, to his tribe in the north of the Arabian Peninsula (in the neighbourhood of Sargh according to al-Kalbī in Ibn Saʿd, i., 36, 25, a place on the Syrian frontier of the Ḥīdāz, near Tabūk [Yākūt, Muḥjam, ed. Wustenfeld, iii., 77]), or right into Syrian territory near Yarmūk [al-Bakri, p. 773]; here his original name of Zaid was changed to Kuṣair from the root ʿṣ-r-y, “to draw away”. Having learned his true origin from his mother, he returned to Mecca where as a result of his marriage with Ḥubbā, the daughter of the Kuṣair chief Ḥulail b. Ḥubshiyā, who controlled all the arrangements for the worship of the Ka’ba and the pilgrimages, he soon acquired an important position in the city. On the death of his father-in-law, Kuṣair managed to succeed him in his offices, either after a long struggle with the Kuṣairā, or as a less reliable tradition has it by means of a tricky bargain like that of Jacob and Esau, which he made with (ʿAbī) Gūbāsh, son of Ḥulail or only some more distant relative of his (cf. Ibn Durād, al-Iṣbāḥānī, 277, line 7 with 282, line 2; the two complete genealogies are given in the source used by Ibn Durād, the Dār al-ʾĀnāb al-Inbālī of Ibn al-Kalbī). The detailed narrative of the events which brought Kuṣair to fame is given in the article Kuṣair [q.v.].

Becoming master of Mecca and guardian of the Ka’ba, Kuṣair rebuilt the latter and organised its worship; he united the clans of the Kūraʾish, who were previously scattered, into a solid body which assured them the mastery of the town for the future; indeed it is even said that it was on this account that the name Kuṣair (from tabarruṣa, to combine) replaced the old name Banu ‘l-Nadr; Kuṣair is said to have been called Muḥjam mī, the “re-uniter”. On his death the sacred oils that had become his perquisites, were distributed by his four sons ʿAbd al-Dāʾir, ʿAbd Manāf, ʿAbd al-ʿUzza, ʿAbd Kuṣair, the second of whom through his son Ḥāshim was a direct ancestor of the Prophet. The house which Kuṣair had built himself quite close to the Ka’ba was henceforth the centre of the civil and religious functions of the Kūraʾish under the name Dar al-Nadwa [q.v.]; the interesting description of the working of the Dar al-Nadwa goes back to Muḥammad b. Džubair b. Muʾīm, d. circa 100 (cf. Sprenger, Leben und Lehre d. Mohammed, iii., note cli). To Kuṣair is also attributed the discovery and digging of the well of al-ʿAǧāl (Kut b. al-Makki, Chron. Stadt Mekka, ed. Wustenfeld, iii., p. 107 infra; Balāḏūrin, Fustāḥ, ed. de Goeje, p. 48; Yākūt, Muḥjam, iii., 19—20; Bakri, p. 646, cf. 766).

From what has been said above it is evident that the Kūraʾish regarded Kuṣair as their true founder and the founder of the Ka’ba. The antiquity of this tradition is attested by a verse of al-ʿAṣhā (Bakrī, p. 489) and by several of Ḥassān b. Ṭabīḥī. Later historiography has tried to harmonise this old native tradition with the genealogical system which later became established and according to which Kuṣair = Fihr b. ʿAbd al-Nadr (Wustenfeld, Geneal. Tabellen, N.) as well
as with the tradition quite different in origin and character of the Abrahamic cult of the Ka’ba (Q.v., i., p. 587?) and its vicissitudes under the Qur’ān [3.v.] and the Khuṣţā. Kuṣayj is therefore to Mecca “what Theseus was for Athens and Romulus for Rome” (Caëntani). In the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to say whether he should be regarded as a historical personage transformed into a hero or the mythological transfiguration of a hero. His name is found, although by no means commonly, in the Arab onomasticon: a Nahīk b. Kuṣayj al-Salāfī, a contemporary of Muḥammad, is mentioned by Ibn al-Athīr, Usd., v. 14—15; Ibn Ḥadājr, al-Īsāba, ed. Cairo, vi. 257; another contemporary of Muḥammad, whom Ibn al-Athīr, Usd., v. 205 calls Ḫāṣl (i?) and Ibn Ḥadājr, al-Īsāba, v. 212, 241 Fudайл or Ḫāṣl b. Zālim al-Sūbīsī, according to the Qūṣayjāt al-Ansâriyāt (f. 58 r.) of the latter as Kuṣayj. Lastly the same work (MS. British Museum, f. 162 v) mentions a tribe Kuṣayj b. Mālik b. Thālāba b. Bahrāb b. Sulaim. The fact that this name is to be recognised in the Ḫūṣṭa of the Nabataean inscriptions and probably also in the Kουρας of a parchment from Dura on the Euphrates (cf. Cumont, Les feuilles de Doura-Europos, Paris 1926, p. 320) does not justify us in concluding that it is of northern origin, since as we have seen, it is found among different tribes. The tradition which makes Kuṣayj pass his childhood in Syria is in favour of the hypothesis which makes the worship of the Ka’ba introduced, or at least renewed, as a result of influences from the north; perhaps in some statements of tradition (e.g. al-Kalbī quoted by Ibn Sa‘d, v. 39, 1—11) we have an echo of an actual fact, namely that on the occasion of Hubal, the idol of the Kharijites (cf. Ibn al-Kalbī, K. al-Anṣārīyāt, 1929), there was super-imposed that of al-Uṣā and Maḥfūz Maṣ‘ūd, for which we have definite evidence in Northern Arabia in particular.

In any case the figure of Kuṣayj soon became legendary; his story, as we have seen, has the characteristic features of the legends of eponymous heroes; his alleged sons are only symbols of the part played by Kuṣayj in the religion of Mecca. It is not quite true that he was the object of regular divine worship (the name ‘Abd al-Kuṣayj borne by one of his sons does not necessarily imply the divine character of the father); he was undoubtedly venerated according to the ancestor worship, which certainly existed in pre-Muḥammadan Arabia, although we know very little about it. The eponymous hero of the people of the Tādhīl Ṭuḥāf is analogous in character to Kuṣayj. The latter’s memory remained particularly associated with the Dār al-Nadwa, which Lammens, developing a suggestion by M. Hartmann, has shown was not the “senate of Kuṣayj”; as tradition has it, but rather a place for the celebration of rites, essentially social and religious in their origins. Its proximity to the Ka’ba, with which it is however never confounded, suggests that it was one of these private dwellings built beside Semitic temples, which, without being identified with the temple itself, came in time to acquire a religious character and certain religious functions. We have an example of this type of house in the “house of Lysi’s” in the precincts of the temple of the Palmyran deities at Dura (Cumont, Les feuilles de Doura, p. 36—37).

Whatever the origins may be, it is certain that at the beginning of the sixth century A.D. the control of the Ka’ba and of the Ḫūṣṭa was in the hands of a clan claiming descent from Kuṣayj and that the Kuṣayj were agreed that he was the founder of their tribal unity. It is to be noted on the other hand that even if this clan included among its members some of the recognised chiefs of the Kuṣayj, among others the Banū ‘Umaiyā, it was far from having complete political and financial control in its hands; the Banū Makhzūm for example, one of the most powerful families in Mecca, were not descended from Kuṣayj. It seems probable then that the Meccan republic was constituted on the initiative and under the direction of the Banū Kuṣayj, but that the latter were forced to admit into their social organism other clans having the same rights and privileges as themselves, although the prestige of noble blood and supremacy in religious matters always remained the exclusive prerogative of the Banū Kuṣayj; it is a process which presents striking analogies with that which may, we think, be noted in the formation of national unity among the Israelites, as a result of the fusion of the tribes of Judah and Levi with the Ephraimite tribes.


Kūṣārī, or Kuṣārā, is the name of a town in 27° 48’ N. and 66° 27’ E. and of the district in which it is situated, a long, narrow valley, important by reason of its central position at the point of convergence of roads from Ka‘b on the north, Karāni and Bela on the south, Ka‘b on the east, and Makrān and Khārān on the west. Yāḵūt describes it as a small town in a fertile district, which he calls Tūrān, producing grapes, pomegranates, and other fruits, but not dates. It is a city of India, or rather, he says, of Sind, situated at a distance of eighty farsakhs from Būst. It was conquered by the ‘Abbas shortly after their conquest of Makrān, and Ibn Ḫawkāl says it was governed by an ‘Arab residing at Ka‘bān, who admitted the name of the ‘Abbasid Khalifa into the public prayers, but Yāḵūt quotes a travel writer who describes the district as the abode of the Khawāridj, and its capital as the seat of their Khalifa. In A.D. 977—978 it was taken by Subuktigin, and its ruler was captured, but was restored on condition of his agreeing to pay tribute and causing the Khāṣb to be erected in Subuktigin’s name. At a later date he was again attacked by Subuktigin,
owing to his failure to remit tribute. Küsdär is now the principal town of the Jhalawán division of the Kalat State in Baluchistan.

**Biography:** Ibn Hawkal, B.G. A.D. 11,

**KÜSHAIR, an Arab tribe forming part of the great group of the Banû ‘Amir b. Sa‘aâ[a] [q.v.] whose fortunes we find them almost continuously sharing in the period before as well as after Islam. They had particularly close associations with the tribes of ‘Uqlâl and Dîja‘a [q.v.] whose genealogical table makes them brothers. Their genealogy is Küshair b. Ka‘b b. Rabia’ b. ‘Amir b. Sa‘a‘a. Tradition makes the mother of Küshair Rabia’ bint Küshuf b. Mâlik of the tribe of the Banû Sulaim [q.v.]. During the pre-Muslim period, the Banû Küshair settled in al-Yamâma were involved in all the wars of the ‘Amir b. Sa‘a‘a especially in those against the Tāsim, the Shâbân, whose chief Hâdhîb b. Zurâra was made prisoner by Mâlik b. Salama al-Khârî b. Küshair, called Dhu ‘l-Ruqaiya, at the battle of Djâbala, and against the kings of al-Hira (cf. Nâḥî‘, ed. Bevan, p. 70, 404–405). After Muhammad’s successes in Central Arabia, the Küshair joined with the other tribes of the ‘Amir in sending him envoys and coming to an arrangement with him; it is to this time that tradition dates their conversion to Islam (cf. the texts in Caetani, Annales dell’ Islam, i./i., 297 [9 a. ii., § 78]). Later they took part without particularly distinguishing themselves in the wars of conquest in Syria and the Iraq, and settled particularly in the eastern parts of the Arab empire. In the Omayyad period, they were very numerous and powerful in Khurásân, of which several Küshairs were governors (among others Zurâra b. ‘Uqla whose family possessed a very highly esteemed breed of horses). This Küshair colony had as its founders and common ancestor Hâda’ b. Ma‘‘awiyâ b. Küshair, a half-mythical personage who is said to have lived to a fabulous age and to have had a thousand descendants (Ibn Hačâr, Iddâ, Cairo 1325, ii. 56, No. 1890; Abû Hâtim al-Sîdjastâni, K. al-Mu‘ammânin, in Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arab. Phil., ii. 97). On the other hand we find in Mubarrad, ed. Wright, p. 273, a similar longevity attributed to Dhu ‘l-Ruqaiya, the Küshair chief mentioned above, and indeed almost all the Küshairs of note settled in Khurásân, recorded by history, belonged to the clan of Salama al-Khârî to which Dhu ‘l-Ruqaiya belonged, and which seems to have been the aristocracy of the tribe.

The Küshair did not number many poets of note among them; the best known is Ya‘zîd Ibn al-Tâhîra who lived between the end of the Omayyad period and the beginning of the ‘Abbâsid period.

The genealogical sources and in particular Ibn al-Kalbî also mention other ethnic groups bearing the name Banû Küshair, two of which belonged to the southern tribes of the Aslâm and the Aws (Anṣâr).


**KÜSHAIRI, Abu l-‘Ḳâṣim ‘Abd al-Karim b. Ha⽰zn b. ‘Abd al-Mali̇k b. Tā‘îb b. Muhammad, born in 376 (986), died in 465 (1074), was in dogmatic theology the pupil of the Ashâ‘îrî Abû Bakr b. Fârik and in mysticism a follower of al-Sulami and ‘Abû ‘Ali al-Dâkîkî, whose daughter Fâtima (d. 480 = 1087) he married. He was persecuted by some of the Ashâ‘îrîs, by Hanbali jurists and the Sâlîkî officials from 440 (1048) to 455 (1063). His best known works are the two manifestoes, the Risâla ila lijam‘at al-sûfiyya bi-Bulûdân al-Islâm, written in 438 (1046) to adapt Sûfiism to the charge of heterodoxy laid against his atomist metaphysics (publ. in Subki, Taβâkât, first ed. Cairo, n. d., ii. 276–385). We also have from Küshairi’s pen a mystical commentary on the Kur‘ân entitled Lâ‘îf il-li‘l-hârat and a manual of mystic paths, Ţarîk al-Sulâk, the esotericism of which is deliberately obscure. The Risâla, a classical manual of Muslim mysticism was criticised from the Imamî point of view by Ibn al-Darî (Taβârî, lith. Teherân 1312, p. 495–409) and published with the Sharî‘at an-Ensârî at Cairo in 1290 in 4 volumes.—This is the only useful edition; the little editions in one volume (1318 A.H., etc.) are swarming with typographical mistakes.


**KUSKUSU (Kouscouss), a dish prepared with semolina. Throughout northwest Africa (Tripolitania, Sahara, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco) it is the basis of the food of the people. It is sometimes called fâ‘am i.e. food par excellence. The Beduins of Eastern Algeria also call it n’ouâma, which has the same meaning; those of Western Algeria, ma‘âda; those of the South and of the Sahara, ‘aţiz also with the same sense. In Tunisia, the name fâ‘am has even become applied to feasts at which this dish is particularly used, feasts known elsewhere as sarâ (Eastern Algeria), ma‘âda (Western Algeria) and musîm (Morocco). In the Judaism of Africa kuskusu is called ful. Kuskusu may be prepared at any time. Some however prepare it in the nights of Monday and Friday, which according to the sunna are peculiarly auspicious nights. The ceremony of preparation, which has been given a kind of religious character, at which certain rites have to be performed, always begins with an invocation or pious formula. The woman preparing it must not hear or see anything which might be a bad omen. Those near her avoid speaking of anything except saints or agricultural prosperity, the wealth of the produce of the land or of the family in which she is.

To make kuskusu, the woman sits on the ground, puts in front of her a wooden dish called ṣâŷnâ or ṣâ‘d‘a according to the district. Beside her is the bag of semolina and a vessel of slightly salted water. Some add to the salted water two or three drops of water of Nūn (the rain that falls at the beginning of May, which is kept in a flask) which
has peculiar virtues. She then takes a handful of semolina, puts it in the djafna, sprinkles salt water over it with the hollow of her hand and rolls it under her fingers in the dish to right and left until little pellets are formed like lead drops. She goes on in this way, handful by handful. From time to time she stirs the djafna to separate the little pellets from the large and rolls the latter to make them smaller.

In the meanwhile she is boiling on a brazier, in the kedra (a kind of earthenware saucepan) water and meat, if the kususu is to be prepared with meat, or vegetables (chick peas, beans, carrots, etc.) if it is to be made with vegetables, water alone if it is to be with sugar. Finally the required quantity of semolina for the kususu having been prepared, the woman shits it up for some time in a bag or bottle of leather. In this the little pellets run together as they dry up and form a kind of rough ground paste. The cook then turns out this paste into a special sieve and taking up her pestle crushes it through the sieve. The round grains that pass through the holes of the sieve are the real grains of kususu; the grains too large to go through are used to make barhaktes (cf. below) or semolina cakes called melaffle.

In the meanwhile the kedra has been boiling on the brazier. The cook then takes the keskas, a kind of earthenware pot shaped like a funnel without a neck and pierced with little holes in the bottom. The keskas is placed on the kedra, the edges of which are wrapped in cloth to prevent the steam escaping between the two vessels. The keskas is filled with grains of kususu. The steam in order to escape has to pass through the holes in the bottom of the keskas and through the grains of kususu which it cooks. From time to time the cook puts her finger in the middle of it to see if it is done to a nicety. When it is she pours the grains into the djafna, rolls them again with her hand to prevent them forming a paste or clotting, then stirs them again in the keskas. This time as soon as the kususu begins to give off steam, she puts it finally in the djafna.

Now if the cook wishes to make masfuf or sweet kususu she powders it with sugar and puts here and there little pieces of butter which melt and impregnate the little pellets of semolina under the influence of the heat. The water is thrown from the kedra. If the kususu is to be made with meat or vegetables the woman adds water to the kedra so that the bouillon or sauce may go farther and a little salt. The bouillon is used to sprinkle on dishes before they are served. Whatever is the number of courses to a meal, the kususu is always served last. According to the manner of its preparation the kususu has different names, which vary also in the different linguistic areas. To those already mentioned may be added: 1. masfuf, very fine ground with sugar, 2. maawar, very fine ground with meat, 3. barbik (Tunis, Constantine), fine ground, eaten cold with butter or fat of any kind, sprinkled with butter milk, in the west called sikh, 4. mahammas, kususu with very large grains, 5. barbik or barbikesh or maawad of large grains swollen by steam and cooked in bouillon or milk — called sikh in Southern Algeria, 6. barbikesh, made with barley semolina, in place of wheat semolina — in the west called breful.

Bibliography: Delphin, Textes pour l'étude de l'arabe périodique, 2nd period, Algiers 1913, p. 179 sqq.; Destaing, Dialecte berbère des S.ounis, i. 312; Douüte, Marrokoche, Paris 1906, p. 242 and the sources quoted in the note. (A. Cours)

KUSS IBN SĀDYA of the tribe of Yād, a half legendary figure, called "the sage, the arbiter (ḥakam) of the Arabs". His eloquence is proverbial. He seems to have been a Christian, but not Bishop of Nadjarān as has been said. There was a proverbial expression: "eloquent as the bishop of Nadjarān." This must have facilitated the confusion, of which there is no trace in the oldest references. The Sira and Ḥadīth take an interest in Kuss because his personality, surrounded with a halo of asceticism, increased by one the lamentably small group of the ḫanīf. He is also said to have predicted the imminent coming of the Prophet. The latter is said to have heard him preach at the fair of "Ukā. If Kuss really was a historical individual, he must have lived at a much earlier period than the generation contemporary with Muḥammad; it is impossible to think that he could have become a legendary figure if he lived about the time of the Ḥijrā. At this time the tribe of Yād had ceased to exist as a separate group.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Athīr, Cst al-Ghāba, iv. 204; Aghāni, xiv. 414-42; Dājjāl, al-Bayān wa l-Tawbīn, i. 137; Ali b. Burhān al-Dīn, al-Sīra al-halabiya, i. 210—212, 216—218. In Shu'ārāʾ al-maṣrīn, ed. Cheikho, pp. 211—212, are given the poems attributed to Kuss and a critical examination of the legend in Sayūtī, al-Luḥān al-maṣrīn bi Ḥādīth al-mawṣūla, i. 95—100; A. Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Muḥammad, i. 102—106. (H. Lammens)

KUSUF, KUSUF, eclipse of the sun or of the moon. As regards linguistic usage, it may be noted that al-kusuf is used alike for the eclipse of the moon (kusuf al-ḥamar) and for that of the sun (kusuf al-ḥams), e.g. in al-Farghānī, Kostā b. Liqā, al-Battānī, al-Bīrūnī; but they are often distinguished as al-kusuf, eclipse of the moon, and al-kusuf of the sun; e.g. by al-Karwīnī (on the linguistic usage, it should be noted that according to the Masūfī al-ʿIlam, ed. van Vloten, the verb form should not be used, although this is very often done; e.g. by al-Karwīnī and others).

The eclipse of the sun and of the moon have from the earliest times attracted the liveliest attention. Ptolemy, following Hipparchus, studied the theory of eclipses, and following him the Arabs and Syrians, etc. We shall deal first with the eclipse of the moon. It must be premised that the apparent path of the moon — we must adhere to the geocentric view — cuts the ecliptic in two opposite points, which however in course of time come to move on to the ecliptic. These points are called al-ijawasāh (Versian) (dawn, not-shape, or less correctly ḥaf, globe-shape); they are also called al-limān, "dragon" (see below). All the planets have of course such ijawasāh; without an addition the word always refers to the moon. Their positions are given in the Ephemeresis. The massive ball into which according to Ibn al-Haitham the moon is inserted, and which carries it along as it moves, is called falak al-ijawasāh.
The eclipse of the moon is caused, as was early recognised, by a dark body coming between the sun and the moon. It is at one time thought that this was a dragon, which, when placed at two opposite points on the globe of the heavens and had the same motion as the nodes of the moon, eclipses occur when we cannot see the moon, because the head or tail of the dragon comes between us and the moon. From this idea comes the name for the crescent and waning nodes, i.e. the points where the moon passes through the ecliptic, “head, al-ra’s” and “tail, al-dhanāb,” which were retained long after the “dragon” had disappeared. The sign Ω for the length of the node is a distorted dragon. The astronomers credited this dragon with certain influences on the horoscope. But Sevère Schuck (c. 650) (J. Neu, Notes Astronomique Syrienne, J. A. [Ser. 10], 1910, xvi., p. 15) long ago denied this, as there was no dragon and the calculations in question referred to the movements of the nodes. But we still find in al-Birūnī’s Taṣfīm etc. the assertion that head and tail have separate natures. The head is hot, auspicious, and indicates increase (of property etc.). The tail is cold, brings misfortune, and indicates diminution of wealth etc. Eclipses of the sun or of the moon are really caused by the earth coming between the sun and moon or the moon coming between the earth and the sun. Instead of saying we often have the word “node” ʾaṣd and ʿuṣdai used, also in combination with ra’s and ḍhanāb.

The shadow of the earth arising in the first instance, because the sun is considerably larger than the earth, consists of a cone-shaped convergent shadow (the shadow) on one side and a divergent shadow (penumbra) on the other side. Only in the shadow is there absolute darkness. As the diameter of the shadow at the place of the moon’s path is considerably greater than that of the moon at the same point, under certain conditions, the moon may remain some time in the shadow and therefore be perfectly eclipsed for the period. Ibn al-Haitham in his example, investigated these conditions very fully (E. Wiedemann, Beitr., xiii., „Über eine Schrift von Ibn al-Haitham, „Über die Bescbonheit der Schatten”, S. B. P. M. S., Erlg., 1907, xxxix., p. 226).

If earth, sun and moon were very small bodies, mere points, eclipses would only take place when the sun and moon were exactly in the nodes. But as they are large, eclipses also occur when these bodies have passed beyond the nodes, i.e. have experienced an alteration in latitude and longitude. A total eclipse occurs when the breadth is smaller than the difference between the diameter of the shadow and that of the moon, a partial eclipse when the latter is not smaller than the sum of the diameters; if it is however equal to the latter, there is only a contact but no eclipse.

Taking into consideration the shadow alone, the maḵṣūf (cone) or ʿamāhar (pine-apple) — its cross-section is called dāʾira al-ġil — we have the following: the entrance into the shadow is called ʿadād al-kuṣūf, beginning of the eclipse; the phase from the beginning of the eclipse, to the beginning of totality, is called suḵūf (falling, the ḫaṭṭaṣf of Ptolemy), the middle of the path covered in shadow is called ṣaṣṣ (middle). The phase which corresponds to complete emergence is called ṭaḏuʿu ṣaʿiṣ (the completion of disappearance); al-maḵṣūf (stop, stay) means the phase in which the moon is eclipsed in a partial eclipse there is no such stop. A ḫaṭṭaṣf al-kuṣād ʿaṭā al-maḵṣūf, a total eclipse without a stop is said to occur when the moon’s path is such that the darkened moon touches the cone of the shadow at only one point; then a total eclipse exists at this point only. For the case of total eclipse, the place where it begins is called aw-wal al-maḵṣūf and where the moon begins to emerge from the shadow, ʾabīr al-maḵṣūf.

A diminution of light but no complete extinction also occurs when the moon moves through the half-shadow. In his classical work on the shadows Ibn al-Haitham (see above) discussed the theory of this question and checked it by observation. In very rare cases, however, the whole of the eclipsed moon does not appear quite black but shows different colours, especially a dark red; this was observed by various early astronomers and minutely described by Ibn al-Haitham (his statements agree with modern observation, e.g. J. Müller, Lehrbuch der kosmischen Physik, § 9, p. 196). Al-Birūnī further studied these colours (al-charsetn al-Maṣūdī, maḵāṣix, bāb vii., faṣīl iii.); he also examines critically earlier views and particularly Indian ideas on the astrological significance of the colours (cf. F. Wiedemann, „Über die verschieden bei der Mondhintergrund ausfärben Farben nach Birunī”, in Edels „fahrbuch für Photographie, etc., 1914.”)

This light on the completely eclipsed moon is explained by the fact that the sun’s rays are diverted in passing through the earth’s atmosphere and thus enter the shadow and illuminate the moon. According to the amount of moisture in the atmosphere, these diverted rays are more or less coloured. For the possibility of a solar eclipse, the conditions are the same as for a lunar one.

Solar Eclipse: As the angle at which the moon appears to us is smaller, although only slightly, than that at which the sun appears, the moon can be seen in a form or other even at a so-called total eclipse of the sun, even if the centres of sun and moon and earth all lie on a straight line, a narrow rim of light still remains. Bright formations, the corona and the protuberances radiate from this. They are described by al-Birūnī in al-charsetn al-Maṣūdī, maḵāṣix, bāb, xi. (cf. F. Wiedemann, „Erscheinungen bei der Dämmung und Sonnenphanomene”, in Arch. f. Gesch. d. Med., xv, 1923, p. 43). The local times at which the same lunar or solar eclipse appears at different places is obtained from the difference of their geographical longitudes. The calculations are made difficult by the fact that these isler, considerable parallax. This partly explains the great differences between the calculated and true values.

It would take us too far to go into the details of the theoretical considerations, for example when each eclipse begins, how long it lasts, its periodicity, etc. In the works of al-Farghānī, Kostā b. Liḡša, al-Kaẓwīnī, al-Djaghmīnī, al-Khīrākī, and particularly in that of Abu l-Farāǧī, Le Livre de l’ascension de l’esprit, ed. F. Nau, Paris 1849, also in the Kitāb Taṣfīm etc. of al-Birūnī we find more or less full general descriptions while the works on astronomical theory like the Zīdī (table) of al-Khīrīzminī, of al-Battūnī, the_charset al-Maṣūdī
KUTAI. [See KITÁ.]

KUTÁHIYA (the ancient Cotaenum), a town in Asia Minor, the capital of a sandjak in the province of Kudadwendigir, on the river Pursak, which enters the Sašriya, near it. It is 3,000 feet above sea-level, has 22,266 inhabitants, of whom 4,000 are Greek Orthodox and 3,000 Armenians; it contains 24 mosques, 21 madrasas, 2 libraries, 16 dervish monasteries, 4 churches, 9 caravanserais, 11 baths, 12 potteries. It is a station on the Bagdad railway. In the sixteenth century it was the capital of the Germanyakh; the mosques of this period are in ruins; other notable buildings are the Medjidi Medrese (704 = 1304), the Kursh-en-Djami (777 = 1375–1376), another mosque (783 = 1381), the mosque of Yakûb Celebi (837 = 1433–1434); the great mosque, Ulû-Djami, the building of which is attributed to the Germanyakh, but is not earlier than Bayazid I. It has an old citadel in ruins built on a height. The marble lion and the Byzantine sarcophagus mentioned by Texier no longer exist. There are promenades called Ak-su, Sultan-bâghi, Kebgir, Sultan Bayazid Bagheesi; there are hot springs in the neighbourhood. It was once an important centre for the manufacture of glazed pottery with floral decorations (the so-called Khodian pottery); an attempt has been made to revive this industry but the recent products are not so good as the old ones.

The town formed the dowry of the daughter of the Germanyakh who married Bayazid I; it was taken by Timur after the battle of Ancyra (1402). The conqueror left his son Shâhrûkh there as governor, while he advanced on Ephesus (H. A. Gibbons, The foundation of the Ottoman empire, Oxford 1916, p. 156, 258).


KUTAI, an independent district (sultanate) in Eastern Borneo, belonging to the
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of al-Birûni, the Zîdî of Naṣîr al-Dîn al-Ṭûsî etc. give information about mathematical considerations and the particular observations to be made (on the above scholars, cf. H. Suter, Die Mathematiker und Astronomen der Araber in Abhandl. zur Gesch. der math. Wissensch., Heft x., 1900).

To obtain a standard for measuring the amount of the eclipse, the diameter of the sun or of the moon, was divided into twelve equal parts, called "fingers" (isba or isba al-kitâb) and the number of these that were eclipsed was calculated. In the West one spoke of "digits". In the same way the surface is imagined to be divided into 12 equal parts and it is calculated how many of these are eclipsed. The latter may be calculated from the former which refer only to length. Al-Battâni, for example, gives tables in connection with this. The dioptr of Hipparchus was used to measure the magnitude of a lunar eclipse. Two rods are fixed at right angles to a rod. The one with a small round hole is fixed and the other with a larger round hole can be moved towards the other. The second hole is so placed that at an appropriate distance from the other the moon is seen to fill it exactly. A dark plane is pushed in front of the second hole. The amount a of the shifting of its edge from one side of the hole, which bounds the dark side of the moon, to the edge of its bright part, is measured, and the magnitude b of the shifting over the whole surface of the moon and their relation expressed as a : b. The amount a in fingers of the eclipse is $g = \frac{a}{b}$.

(E. Wiedemann)
administrative division of Samarinda in the residency of "Zuiden- en Oosterafdeeling van Borneo". It comprises mainly the valley of the very important and for a great part navigable river Mahakam as far as Muara Mujub. The road from Makasar marks the eastern frontier. The Dutch assistant resident lives in Samarinda on the Mahakam; the capital of the Sultan, Tenggarung, is a little farther up the river. The country is prosperous; the land is rich in arable and petroleum and under normal conditions there is a busy trade in most products and dried and salt fish. The opinion has been expressed that in the name of the sultanate the name Yava-koti (Sanskrit koti = end, point), known from Indian geographical works, survives. It is certain that even before the fifth century A.D. Hindus had founded a colony here directly from India and not through Java. The inscriptions, written in pure Sanskrit, found in Kutai on four stone dedicatory pillars prove the existence of a flourishing Hindu kingdom here under a king Mulavarman, and very probably other antiquities, notably the Brahmanistic images of deities found in a cave on Mount Kompong have also to be traced to this kingdom. Any later Hindu civilisation that existed in Borneo came through Java; in the twelfth century, Kutai formed a vassal of the Javanese empire of Madjapahit. A native tradition of the origin of the kingdom and the genealogy of the royal house of Kutai is known to us from a Malay manuscript in the possession of the Sultan in Tenggarung (there is another copy in Berlin); according to this "salasila", the first part of which, largely mythical, has been published with a Dutch translation, Islâm was introduced here about 1600 in the reign of Radja Makoe of Celebes.

The population is of a very mixed character. The Dayaks, the original inhabitants of the country, are for the most part still pagan. Along the Mahakam there are practically no settlements of them left; they are being more and more driven into the interior by other peoples who are settling there. The chiefs of the tribe of Tundjung Dayak are said to be related to the royal house of Kutai; according to the salasila already mentioned, the Tundjung prince Këra married a sister of the reigning chief Radja Patéri about 1450. There are still a few nomadic tribes away in the interior. The other peoples, Kutainese, Buginese, Bajau and Badjau all profess Islâm, although in many customs and even in court ceremonies at Tenggarung old animistic conceptions are still very prevalent. The Kutainese who form the principal element in the population are probably descendants of early immigrant Malays of various stocks; they are found all over the country. As to the origin of the Buginese settlements we again have a native tradition preserved in a work entitled Salasila Bugis; this immigration had probably begun by 1686 mainly from Wado and it is still going on. The Buginese lived at first exclusively in Samarinda; they formed a well defined section of the population, who were practically independent of the Sultan of Kutai, and were ruled by a chief of their own (pua adu), who was elected by the elders of the different groups of families. This Buginese republic in Kutai no longer exists and at the present day the Buginese stand in the same relation to the Sultan as all other inhabitants; they have settled in the whole country and are mainly engaged in trade. The numbers of the Bandjarese immigrants from the south of Borneo are also increasing; their main industry is the collection of forest products. The Badjau come from the Sulu Islands; they used to be pirates but now they have permanent settlements at the mouth of the Mahakam where they live by fishing. The heterogeneous composition of the population is reflected in the language, a not yet sufficiently investigated variety of Malay; one feature is the large number of Javanese words that occur in it. The first contact of the Dutch with Kutai took place in 1693, when the Dutch East India Company made their first treaty with the chief. By treaties of the years 1825 and 1844, the Sultan recognised Dutch suzerainty. The Sultan governs with the help of four notables. The Dayaks are under their own chiefs, whose rank is hereditary with the approval of the Sultan.


(W. H. RAESSER)

KUTAIBA b. MUSLIM, Abu Hafs al-AS-SULH, an Arab general. Kutai was born in 49 (669/670). In the war against 'Abd al-Rahman b. Mahammad b. al-AS-SULH [q. v.], al-Hajjaj b. Caliph recognized his ability and when the caliph 'Abd al-Malik in 85 (704) had to fill the vacant governorship of Khorasan, he gave the post to Kutai on the condition that the governors of Khorasan were subordinate. After his arrival in Merv, Kutai was able to make full use of his military gifts and by a series of successful expeditions against the neighbouring Turkish tribes, he extended the frontiers of the Arab caliphate to such an extent that he must be reckoned one of the greatest conquerors of the Umayyad period. In 86 (705) he undertook his campaign against Tokhristan, where the lord of Akrūr and Shūmān bought peace. According to some historians, Kutai first attacked Saghāmīn, the king of which surrendered at once, and next Tokhiristan from which he returned to Merv. In the following year he turned his attention to Buḥārā. After he had succeeded in concluding a peace with Nēzak, king of Bāghghis, against whom the previous governor of Khorasan b. Nīqād b. al-Muhammad had conducted a campaign, he crossed the Oxus and advanced on Bānikand. The people of the town however sought help from the adjoining states: the latter barred the routes and for two months Kutai was completely surrounded. He finally succeeded in defeating the enemy and the town had to surrender. But, as soon as he had gone, the people rebelled and killed the governor appointed by him, whereupon Kutai returned and stormed the town. After he had put down all resistance he returned to Merv. In 88 (706/707) a campaign against Buḥārā was undertaken, in which he took the towns of Nūmushakhan and Rāmīthāna. Fighting was renewed next year but seems to have been indecisive. In any case Kutai returned in 90 (708/709) and defeated the people of Buḥārā after a stubborn resistance and the king of Soğhidana had to sue for peace. Nēzak then rebelled, imprisoned his suzerain, the king of Tokhiristan and called upon several neighbouring rulers to join him against Kutai. As winter was approaching, the latter however could do nothing, but he sent his brother, 'Abd al-Rahman to occupy Balīk. In 91 (710) he took the field again and after bringing the rebels to terms, advanced on Nēzak. The latter fought his way to Farghānā and entrenched himself in the citadel of al-Kurz. After a two months’ siege, Kutai captured him through treachery and had him put to death, although he had definitely promised him a pardon. In the same year he conquered Shūmān, which had rebelled against him, along with Kiss and Nasāf, and installed a king loyal to him in Buḥārā [q. v.]. In 92 (710/711) Kutai is said to have undertaken an expedition against Soğdistan, but the ruler there sought peace, and he returned without a blow being struck. Next year he helped the king of Khwarizm against his rebellious brother. He then advanced on Sā-}

marjand, defeated the forces from al-Shāh and Farghānā, which had hurried to the help of the Soğhidanas and seized the town, which was occupied by his troops in spite of the terms of peace. In 94 (712/713) he sent an army against al-Shāh and advanced victoriously as far as Khō)djand and Kāshān in Farghānā. In the summer of 95 (714) he had advanced as far as al-Shāh or Kuşmīshān, when the news of the death of al-Hadījādī reached him. He therefore returned to Merv but in 96 (715) he began a new campaign of conquest against Farghānā. Here he heard of the death of the Caliph al-Walid and as Kutai feared the vengeance of his brother Sulaimān [q. v.] because he had supported the plan of extinguishing the latter from the succession, he declined to pay homage to the new caliph. This however incited his troops to mutiny and in Dhu 'l-Hijja 96 (Aug.-Sept. 715) or, according to another statement not till the beginning of 97, Kutai was killed by the mutinous soldiers (cf. FARGHANĀ).


(K. V. ZETTERSTEDT)

AL-KUṬĪ, the poet 'Umar b. Shuyā`ā b. `Amr of the clan of Taim b. Usāma of the Taghibī, a contemporary and fellow-tribesman of the poet al-Achkālī and like the latter played a part in the feuds which raged in the second half of the first century A.H. between the tribes of Taghibī and the Kais 'Ailān. His own experiences in battle and the glorification of the exploits of his tribe in war form the main themes of his poems. In contrast to al-Achkālī however he does justice to his opponents, while veiling particular hatred on the Yamānis. His panegyrics are mainly devoted to the Umayyads, e. g. one to Walīd I. The date of his death is not known; according to Ḥādījī Khalīfā, iii. 5619, he died in 101 A.H. According to several sources he was a convert from Christianity to Islam, but in his poems he shows himself a thorough Beduin, always ready for a fight, anxious about his property in camels, not averse to wine drinking, and looking down upon the townsman with the haughty pride of the nomad.

The name al-Kuṭī is also borne by two otherwise little known or quoted poets, one of the tribe of Kalb and the other of the tribe of Dābirā', but in practically all references al-Kuṭī without further names means the Taghibī first mentioned.

Bibliography: Kitāb al-Aghārī, xx. 118 sqq.; Hamāsa, ed. Freytag, p. 170; much quoted in lexicographical and Aṣāb works; his Dīwān with the commentary of an unknown writer was edited by J. Barth, Leyden 1803, mainly from the Berlin MS., Fm 589 A and Arwārī, Katal, vi. 548.

AL-KUṬĪ, the pole (Latin alceor), in addition to the usual meanings has also the following: In a circle the poles lie on the perpendicular erected in its centre thus the poles of the
meridian are the north and south point of the horizon. In places on the equator they lie on it. The poles of the equator (kuṭb mu'ākūlī al-nahār) are the north and south poles of the earth (al-kuṭb al-ghāmālī and al-kuṭb al-ghānāmī also kuṭb al-‘alam); they are also called poles of the first movement. They are transferred to the globe of heaven. The pole of the ring of the four constellations is the pole of the meridian and the poles of the ecliptic (kuṭb fašak al-burūjī). The north pole is also called kuṭb al-dhijaddiy (Pole Star) or kuṭb banāt al-naḥār (Great Bear) and the south pole kuṭb al-suhail. For the north pole we also find the term kuṭb al-dhīq (pole of the place). (On these last names cf. G. Ferrand, Contributions à l’Histoire de la boussole, Publ. de l’Inst. des Hautes Etudes Marocaines, Mélanges, R. Bassett, i. 1923, p. 1—10). The poles of revolving spheres are always the point in which the line around which the sphere revolves intersects the globe of the heavens.

Technically al-kuṭb means the axis, i.e. if two opposite parts of a ring have been attached to them inwards which rotate in corresponding directions as in the case of the rings of the armillary sphere inserted in one another. For axes in the usual sense the word al-nithwar is generally used, but al-kuṭb is also found. Thus for example the round rod placed through the cylindrical hole of an astrolabe holding the spider on the north side and the alidade on the back is called al-kuṭb or al-nithwar. The axis is prevented by a pin from slipping out of the instrument. The latter is called from its shape al-faras i.e. horse. The pin which connects the separate parts of the paralelactic lineal, is called al-kuṭb by al-Battānī who says that he uses a kuṭb like that on the astrolabe. The hole or pin in the centre of the astronomical quadrant is also called al-kuṭb, to which is fastened the measuring thread.

In theological and mystical language (cf. the article TASHAWWFUF) al-kuṭb is the name for the holiest of saints, who however is unknown to the world. The founders of the dervish orders are also called Kuṭb (for the literature, cf. Duzey, Supplement, s. v.). Kuṭb was the name given by Tipū Sultan of Mysore (1783—1799) to his smallest copper coin = 1/16 paisa. (E. Wiedemann)

KUṬB AL-DĪN. [See MAWŪD B. ZENGĪ.]

KUṬB AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD KHĀRĪZM-Shāh, founder of a dynasty in Khwārizm [q.v.]. His father Anūṣṭagin (or Nūṣṭagin) Gharā was in charge of the silver and crockery (ṭabikhānah) at the court of the Sājdāḵs; the expenses of this branch of the court household were defrayed out of the tribute from Khwārizm just as the expenses of administration of the clothing-depot (dżaṁaḵẖāna) were defrayed by the tribute from Khorāsān; Anūṣṭagin therefore, without actually governing Khwārizm, held the title of a military governor (shāhānche) of this country. He had his son educated in Merw. After the assassination of the Khwārizm-Shāh Iκīnči b. Koččar in 490 (1007) or 491 (1008) Kuṭb al-Dīn was appointed governor of Khwārizm with the title Khwārizm-Shāh and ruled till his death in 521 (1127) or 522 (1128). He was succeeded by his son Asīr [q.v.]. As Khwārizm-Shāh Kuṭb al-Dīn was a faithful vassal of Sultan Sa‘d b. Sāqāt [q.v.]. Every two years he went himself to the court of the Sultān and in the interval he was represented there by his son. He is reputed to have been a patron of learned men. The medical textbook Dhokhara-i Khwārizm-Shāhī by Dūrjānī [q.v.1] is dedicated to him (cf. Rieu, Catal. Pers. MSS., p. 466). [The statement in Brockelman, G. A. L., i. 487, also given above under Dūrjānī, is from, from the Catalogue of the Veini Dīmā that this work is extent in two Arabic MSS. (N. 915 and 916) is probably due to a mistake by the author of the Turkish Catalogue, especially as the title is also given there in the above Persian form, impossible in Arabic].

Bibliography: Dūrjānī in G. M. S., XVii/1, p. 2 sq.; W. Barthold, Turkistan, ii. 346. (W. Barthold)

KUṬB AL-DĪN AL-NAHRAWĀNĪ. [See AL-NAHRAWĀNĪ.]

KUṬB AL-DĪN AL-SHĪRĀZĪ MAHMŪD B. MAṢŪD B. MUSLIH, was born in 634 (1236) in Shirāz and died in Tabriz on 17th Ramaḍān 710 (1311). Like many Muslim medical men, Kuṭb al-Dīn belonged to a family of distinguished physicians; at the same time however he was not only a prominent medical man, at least as regards his writings, but he distinguished himself in astronomy, philosophy, and the treatment of religious problems. This versatility induced Abu ’l-Fidā’ to give him the name al-mas’afamīnī "experienced in many fields". He received his medical training with his father Diyā al-Dīn Mas’ūd al-Kāzīrūnī, i. e. of Kāzīrūn (a town west of Shirāz), in the hospital of Shirāz. He lost his father at the age of 14 and then became a pupil of his uncles Kamāl al-Dīn Khār al-Kāzīrūnī and Sharaf al-Dīn al-Zakī al-Rūshānī (Suyūṭī has: Rūshgawī) and Shams al-Dīn al-Kutūbī; he then went to Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Fūsī, studied with him and surpassed everyone. It was probably Naṣīr al-Dīn also who stimulated him to study astronomy. While still quite young he conceived the idea of editing the Kulliyāt, the first theoretical part of the Kānūn of Ibn Sinā. He next sought instruction with the physicians in Shirāz and then studied deeply the works of earlier scholars. He then travelled in Khūrāsān, the two Trāk, Persia, Asia Minor, and Syria. Everywhere, as he tells us in the introduction to the commentary on the Kulliyāt, he sought the acquaintance of scholars. It was probably after these journeys that he became associated with the Tatar rulers of Persia, the Il-Khāns; in what year and under which ruler this happened, we do not know. In any case in 681 (1282—1283) he was Kāčī of Siwās and of Malatya (in Asia Minor) under Ahmad (Nikurad, 680—683 = 1281—1284). There he was still engaged on the Kulliyāt; he must have played a part in politics, as Ahmad sent him with his uncle Kamāl al-Dīn to Egypt to the Mamlik Sultan al-Mansūr Saïf al-Dīn Kalīn (678—689 = 1279—1290). He was sent to report the former's conversion to Islām, no doubt the result of Kuṭb al-Dīn’s influence and to conclude a peace between Muslims and Tatars. The latter part of his mission was a failure. In Egypt also he collected material for the Kulliyāt. He dedicated the work, probably finished shortly after his return from Egypt, to Muḥammad Sa‘d al-Dīn, Ahmad Khan’s vizier, and called it al-Tawfīq al-Sa‘diyā, "the present to Sa‘d", or Nasihat al-Sa‘diyā = Rawdat al-Atīkhā, "the delight of the wise and garden of the physicians". In his later years Kuṭb al-Dīn retired to Tabriz. Towards the end of his life he ardently studied Ḥadiṯ and made critical notes on the subject,

One work is entitled Ṣārḥ al-Tadkhirāt al-Maṣ̄īṣiyya. As an appendix to the Niḥāya, Kuṭb al-Dīn wrote the Fi Ḥārakāt al-Dabrādja wa l-Nīsha bān al-mustāwi wa l-munḥāfi, "On the motion of rolling and the connection between the straight and the crooked". Other works are al-Takūfira fī l-Ḥa'ātā and a work with a very peculiar title: Kitāb fā'alāt fī tālum fī l-Ḥa'ā, "Work on astronomy; I have composed it but blame it not!"

Besides the works by Kuṭb al-Dīn already mentioned there are also recorded a treatise on diseases of the eye and a commentary on the Urdqāsā of Ibn Sīnā; also commentaries on the work, mainly grammatical of al-Sakkākī and on a work of Ibn al-Ḥājīj.

After his death Zain al-Dīn Ibn al-Wardi wrote verses on Kuṭb al-Dīn, in which he expresses surprise that the mill (rahān) of knowledge still turns after it has lost its axis (kuṭb). Bibliography: Abu l-Fida', Anāma musālimi, ed. J. J. Reiske, 1794; v., p. 63; 243; Tākī al-Dīn Ibn Sīnā, Šāhīd al-Shāhīda (Cod. Goth. 1763). The larger work by al-Sukkī on the Shāhī's according to Prof. Dr. Schnade hardly contains any more; F. Wüstefeld, Geschichte der arabischen Ärzte und Naturforscher, 1840, p. 247; H. Suter, Die arabischen Mathematiker und Astronomen, Nr. 387 and the supplement; L. Leclerc, Histoire de la médecine arabe (contains the substance of the autobiography at the beginning of the Kuṭbīyāt), 1876, ii., p. 129—130; G.A.L., ii. 211 sq.; According to Brockelmann also contain biographical information. Habīb Wādīmī, Ḥādīs al-Ad agricultural, p. 67, 112 (Lit. Bombay 1857) and Suyūtī, Buḫṣuṣī al-Walā, p. 386.

E. Wiedemann

Kuṭb al-Dīn Mubārak, the fifth and last king of the Khalījī dynasty of Dīlī, was the third son of "Alā" al-Dīn Muḥammad. When his father died, on Jan. 2, 1316, the minister Malik Nābib raised to the throne Mubārak's youngest brother, Shīhāb al-Dīn Umar, a child of six, blinded his two elder brothers, Khādir Khān and Shāhī Khān, and would have blinded Mubārak, had he not persuaded the soldiers sent to perform the task not to put Malik Nābib to death. He assumed the regency, but on April 1, 1316, blinded his infant brother and ascended the throne as Kuṭb al-Dīn Mubārak Shāh. He began his reign by releasing all prisoners, by rescinding all the harsher edicts of his father, including the compulsory tariff, and by restoring confiscated lands. He was addicted to the grossest immorality and appointed his vile favourite, a scavenger who had been named Hasan on his nominal conversion to Islam, and was entitled Khusrūw Khān, minister of the kingdom. Mubārak sent an officer to restore the royal authority in Gudjarāt, and marched to Dacca, where he slew the rebellious Harpāl, restored order throughout the Dakkan and the Peninsula, and built the
great mosque. During his absence a conspiracy was formed, with the object of putting him to death and raising to the throne a son of his brother, Khıdır Khan, but he discovered the plot, executed the conspirators, and on his return to the capital put all his relatives, including his blind brothers, to death, and married Khıdır Khan's widow, the beautiful Deval Devi of Gujdarat.

His court was a scene of the most disgusting debauchery and buffoonery, and he arrogated to himself the style of Caliph and the pontifical title of al-Wathiq bi 'l-lāh.

Rebellions broke out in Gujdarat and Devagir, but were suppressed, and Khüsaw Khan, absent on an expedition to Madura, met with a signal defeat in the latter city, but abandoned the design as hopeless and, returning to the capital, succeeded in persuading the king that he had been falsely accused.

Mubarak's assassination permitted Khüsaw Khan to surround himself with a large body of troops and to acquire supreme power in the state, and on the night of April 14, 1320, the favourite caused his master to be assassinated in his palace, seized the throne, and married Deval Devi.

The usurper, who assumed the title of Nâṣir al-Din Khüsaw Shah, was defeated and slain on Sept. 5, 1320, by the warden of the north-western frontier, Ghiyath al-Din, entitled Ghâzâ Malik, who, on the following day, ascended the throne as Ghiyath al-Din Tughrûk Shah.

**Bibliography:** Digâ-i al-Din Barâni, Ta'erîkhi Firûz Shâhki; Niẓám al-Din Âhmad, Ta'âbir-i Akhâri; Kâfi Khan, Manzâlahî al-Tawârikh, and translation by G. S. A. Rankin (all in the Bibl. Ind. Series of the A. S. B.). Muhammad Kâsim Firîghta, Gulshan-i Ibrâhîmî, Bombay 1832. (T. W. Haig)

**Kûtb Mînâr,** a lofty tower of red sandstone, said by Fergusson (ii. 266) and Diez (p. 165) to be one of the most beautiful buildings of its kind in the world, is situated about 11 miles from the modern city of Dîhl [q. v.], in the ruins of the first city of that name, — about 160 feet from the great mosque which was erected by Kûtb al-Din Aibeg [v. 1939. l. 209] in 1208, just after the capture of the city from the Hindu king, Prithârîdâ. Like the Mînâr at Ghazâna [q. v.] and the Mînâr at Koel (no longer in existence), it is an isolated structure, from which the maqâdîkhî gave the call to prayer, and is 238 feet in height; it is not attached to the mosque, but stands in the S. E. corner of the southern outer court, which was added in 1225 to Aibeg's mosque by Iltutmish [q. v.]; it is not straight, but tapering, and is divided into five stories, above each of which (with the exception of the topmost story) are boldly projecting balconies, with richly-sculptured bands of inscriptions below them. The basement story appears to have been built while Aibeg still recognised the overlordship of Mu'izz al-Din (i.e. before 1205); the second, third and fourth stories were built by Iltutmish, but during the reign of Firûz Shâh [q. v.] the building was struck by lightning and this king in 1368 it had repaired and added a fifth story. The two uppermost stories, both of which in their present form are probably the work of Firûz Shâh, have a plain surface, chiefly of white marble, with bands of red sandstone; but the rest of the surface of the tower is entirely of red sandstone, and is not round but made up of flutings, which in the base-
ment story are alternately round and angular, in the second rounded only, and in the third angular only. The line of each fluteing is carried up unbroken through each story. The inscriptions are partly historical in character and partly made up of quotations from the Qur'an; they have been reproduced and translated in Epigraphia Indo-Moesonica, 1911-12.

The tower derives its name from the saint Khwâjâ Kûtb al-Din Bakhtyâr Kâkî, who was held in high honour by Iltutmish; he died at Dîhl in 1235 and his tomb is not far from the Mînâr.

**Kütbshâhî, one of the five independent Muslim dynasties of the Dâkân, which arose on the ruins of the Bahmanî Kingdom, named, like the others, from the title (Kûtb al-Mulq) borne under the Bahmanî kings by its founder, Sulţân Kûli, a Karâkûyunlû Turk of Sa'dâbâd, near Hamdân, who, entering the service of Muhammad III, was entitled by his son, Mahmûd, Khâwâs Khan. When, in 1490, the provincial governors of Ahrâm-nagor, Bîdîpûr, and Barâr proclaimed their independence of Bîdar, Sulţân Kûli was still at Mahmûd's court. After the death of Kûtb al-Mulq the Dâkân, before Dîmâkhandi in 1493, Sulţân Kûli received his title, captured the fortress from the rebels, and in 1495 was rewarded with the government of Tellingâna. He maintained a semblance of loyalty to Bîdar until 1512, when he declared himself independent in Golkonda, but never assumed the royal title, though historians usually style him Sulţân Kûli Kûtb Shâh. He was assassinated in 1543 at the instance of his son Dîmâshid, who succeeded him. The names of the Kings of his house, with the dates of their succession, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sulţân Kûli</td>
<td>1512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dîmâshid</td>
<td>1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subbîn Kûli</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrâhîm</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammâd Kûli</td>
<td>1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammâd</td>
<td>1612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abîd Allâh</td>
<td>1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu 'l-Hasan</td>
<td>1672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each was distinguished by the title Kûtb Shâh, which, however, was never accorded to them by the Mughul emperors, who invariably addressed them as Kûtb al-Mulq. All were Shî'îs, and their religion, the grievances of Mîr Dîmâla, and the licence accorded to Hindus were Awrangzâb's pretexts, if any were needed, for the destruction of the independent state of Golkonda, effected by the capture of the fortress and the imprisonment of Abu 'l-Hasan Kûtb Shâh in 1687.
KUTB MINAR — DETAIL.
Kūthā is a very old town in the Ḫūlā; on one of the canals joining the Ephraim and Tigrius. The town as well as the canal are often mentioned in cuneiform inscriptions (cf. the references in Mes.-met. Dig. nomen und Assyria, 1920–1925, Ind. Rev. v. Kusa or Kutḫa and the map by Schumacher in the 1st volume). The town is said to be identical with the place mentioned in Kings iii. xxxi. 24, from which came a part of the people whom the king of Assyria settled in Samarra in place of the deported Israelites. The course of the canal, at least for its western part, coincides with that of the modern Habil Ḫūlā; on the most recent maps (e.g. Karte von Mesopotamien [temporal edition for official use only published by the Map Dept. of the German General Staff, Dec. 1917. 1:400,000, Sheet 51]) the Habil Ḫūlā ends in the Shatt al-Ḫalīl; the Arab geographers make no reference to this but make this canal flow direct into the Tigius (cf. G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Map xx). In other respects also the Arab geographers regarding the geographers of the canals vary considerably; and when Streck, Die alte Landschaft Babylonien, i. 28, in his description of the canal relies solely on Ibn Serapion, it must be pointed out that al-Iṣṭakhri for example (B. G. A., ii. p. 85) makes such confused statements about the canal as that one is forced to assume that in the period of the Caliphs the canals were not unchanging, but the canals and their courses in three centuries had a history which is reflected in the contradictory statements of the geographers and has to be reconstructed. But little progress can be made in this direction without archaeological research. The Arab geographers distinguish two places called Kūthā in al-Ḫūrā, Kūthā Rabbā and Kūthā al-Ṭarīq but only give further information about the former. The distances from other places are collected in Streck, op. cit., p. 11. The geographers also mention the bridge of boats over the canal at Kūthā and the Ḫūlāhah legends, which are associated with the town; al-Muqaddasī (B. G. A., iii. 1, p. 121) actually calls the town Madīnat Ḫūlāhah and to this day the ruins of the town are located in the Tell Ḫūlāhah which lies approximately on the site of the ancient Kūthā; and the name of the town comes from that of his maternal great-grandfather. When his mother (her name is very variously given: Yaḵtā writes Bûnā bint Karnaba b. Kūthā; the Talmud, Baḥaʾ hata, 91a, בַּתֶּל הַתַּחַשׁ; for other names see Eisenberg, art. Ḫūlāh, and Das Leben der Propheten nach d. ar. Legenden, II. Das Leben Abrahams [Hebr., 1912], p. 99 note) was about to give him birth, she had to take refuge from Nimrod in a cave outside the town. Later Nimrod threw her into a fiery furnace; therefore in the time of the Arab geographers, many heaps of ashes were still pointed out which came from this fire.

Kūthā is also the name of the ṭaṣquš around the town in the district of Ardahār Hābūn and is in turn divided into 10 ruṣṭās. According to al-Maʿṣūdī (Ṭawāqī, B. G. A., vii., p. 79), Ur Kaḥāl (the Biblical Ur Kasdim) from which Abraham migrated is a place min bilād Kūthā. The nisba from Kūthā is Kūṯā or Kūṯānī. Besides Kūthā in Mesopotamia Yaḵtā and al-Bakrī also mention a place of pilgrimage of this name in Mecca.


(M. Plessner)

**Kuthayyir B. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Aḥū Sākhī al-Khuzā'ī** also called Ibn Abī Ḫumāf after his maternal grandfather, one of the great poets of the Umayyad period. From his beloved 'Azza whose praises he sang he was called Kuthayyir 'Azaż.

He lived as a rule in Medina but also in the Ḫulāh. A member of the Khuzā'ī family he was fond of connecting himself with al-Salt b. al-Nadr b. Khinān, a group which, according to al-Yaḵūbī (i. 268, 8–11), had joined the Khuzā'ī. He was on this account despised by some. His unpleasing, dwarflike figure also readily provoked ridicule. His stupidity and foolishness are also said to have pleased people caused to ridicule him. He held extreme Shīʿa views and under the influence of his friend the poet Khidif followed the doctrines of the return (rādīʿa, q. v.) and transmigration (tanawwul, q. v.); but his utterances on these matters seem hardly to have been taken seriously by his contemporaries. He professed loyalty to the son of the 'Alids as the little prophet'. The Imām (Māhid) was for him Muhammad b. al-Hanāfiya [q. v.] and he was one of those Kāsānīs who expected his return from concealment in the mountains of Rādwa [q. v.] (see KĀSĀNĪYA, KHASARĪYA, KURAIHĪYA).

But his opinions did not prevent him addressing panegyrics to the Mawānids. The Caliph ʿAbd al-Malik thought highly of his poetry and several times rewarded the poet richly. He devoted an elegy to the Caliph on his death. After a long period of waiting he was admitted with other poets to 'Umar ibn al-ʿAṣim and was able to strike the right note with him also. 'Umar however is said to have distrusted those 'Alids who showed sympathy with Kuthayyir. The Muhallabids were also patrons of the poet.

There are contradictory anecdotes about Kuthayyir's relationship to 'Azaż, whom he mentions in many verses. Critics asserted that, in contrast
to Djamil's [q.v.] emotions, his love was not a real passion but a simulated one.

Kuthayir was the rāzīya of Djamil, whom he regarded as the greatest of poets and took as his model. The rāzīya of Kuthayir was Sādīb b. Dhakwān (e.g. al-Azhānī, xi. 18, 3; xiv. 155, 5; ibid., x. 50 infra: al-Sādib b. al-Hūkaim al-Salūsī).

Kuthayir died in the reign of Yazid II in 105 (723), as is often mentioned, on the same day as the theologian Ikrima (cf. however Ibn Ḥaḍjar, Tahāhib al-Tahāhib, Hidāyāt al-Badru al-Tanbūhī, 1327—1371, vii. 271).

Some scholars of the ijiith (viiiith) century regarded Kuthayir as the greatest poet of Islam. Ibn al-Salām al-Dhahabī says that the people of the Hijāz regarded him as the greatest of poets while he was less esteemed in al-Ṭirāq. According to some his talent was best displayed in the panegyric (maṭbaḥ), according to others in the part of the poem dedicated to his beloved (nasĪth) although Djamil surpassed him in this. Many of Kuthayir's poems were set to music and sung.

Al-Zubair b. Bakkār and Iṣāḥāk b. ʿIbādīn al-Mawjūli collected information about Kuthayir (Abūbār Kuthayir, Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Fihrist, p. 111, 10, 142, 20). There was also a Kāb Kuthayirr wa-l-Aṣira in circulation (e.g. ibid., p. 306, 17). MSS. of the Dīwān of Kuthayir, two parts of which al-Kālī had read in Ibn Durād (Ibn Khāyir, Fihrist, etc., i. [B. A.-I., ii.], p. 306, 4) and which is also mentioned by Ḥādżījī al-Sulīfī (ed. Flügel, iii. 307, No. 3650), do not seem now to be known. The MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris 181, i. p. 273 does not contain the Dīwān, but only one Kitāb (see P. Schwarse, Exzerential-Studien zur arab. Literatur- und Sprachkunde, Stuttgart 1922, i, p. 1—17). A few Kitāb's exist in MS. in Berlin (Ahlwardt, Verzeichn., No. 7524, 2; 8255, 41; 8471, 6).


(C. van Arendonk)
power and she went to Tabriz, where she died in 681. Her daughter Bibi Khâtîmân, who had married the amir ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd, remained her remains to Kîrmân. Marco Polo went through Kîrmân (about 1272) in the reign of KÎtûgh Turkân.

Ujûl al-Dîn Abû Muʿâzûfâr Suyurghâtîmî (681–693) received his investiture from the Ilkhan Ahmad b. Šâh. He could not agree with his sister Pâdshâh-Khâtûn. She had been brought up among her brothers under the name of Ḥasan Šîh (cf. Mîkhânând) to enable her to escape compulsory marriage with a Mongol prince. She became however the wife first of ʿAbâkâ and after his death of his son Kai-Khâtût. The latter on coming to the throne in 690 gave Kîrmân to Pâdshâh-Khâtûn. The princess who was a poetess of talent was of a vindictive and passionate nature. At first Suyurghâtîmî governed the province in the name of the Pâdshâh but she later threw him into prison. He was freed by his wife Khâtâwân-zâde Kardûlîn, daughter of Mangû Timûr b. Ḥâlîgîn and the Salghûrîd (q. v.), Princess Abûshî, ruler of Fârs, and by his daughter Šâh-al-ʿAlam. Kai-Khâtût however had had his ears cut off, had him strangled. His death was followed by the execution of his vizier who was captured by stratagem. In 694 Bâdî, husband of ʿAlam Khâtîmân, became king. Pâdshâh was handed over to the vengeance of the wife and daughter of Suyurghâtîmî. In the reign of Pâdshâh Marco Polo (ed. Yule-Cordier, p. 23, 91) passed through Kîrmân on his return journey (c. 1293).

In 695 Muʿâzûfâr al-Dîn Abû l-Hâsîrî Muḥâmmad Šâh Sûltân b. Ḥadîjîdîn succeeded his aunt by command of Ḥâzân Khân but his brothers slew his vizier and rebelled in Kîrmân. The troops of Fârs and ʿIrâk besieged Kîrmân for 18 months. Muʿâzûfâr al-Dîn came from Tabriz, forced the town to surrender and executed the ringleaders. His methods must have been summary, for his new vizier left him in terror. Muʿâzûfâr al-Dîn, who loved wine, died in 703 as a result of his excesses.

His nephew Sûltân Kûtb al-Dîn II Šâh Dîjâhân b. Suyurghâtîmî succeeded him and ruled for two years and a half (to 706 = 1306). As he was very cruel and did not pay his dues regularly to the Mongol treasury, Uljûlîzâdî deposed him and appointed a simple governor to Kîrmân, Nâshr al-Dîn Muḥâmmad b. Burhân. Kûtb al-Dîn II retired to ʿIrâk to Kardûzân, wife of his father. His daughter Kûtûgh Khâtûn (sülün-lát al-sâtîfû) in 729 (1328/1329) married the wife of Muḥâbrîz al-Dîn Muḥâmmad, the real founder of the Muṣârarid dynasty, who later took possession of Kîrmân (in 741).

Before the earthquake of 1896 there still existed in Kîrmân Uzbek-yisâb (remains of the Madrasa of Turkânâbâd) bearing the date 640 (1242) (i.e. contemporary with Rukn al-Dîn). This “green mausoleum” was the family tomb for the dynasty (cf. P. M. Sykes, Ten Thousand Miles in Persia, London 1902, p. 60–62, 104, 264). Turkân Khâtûn founded the little towns of Sar-āṣîyâb and Čâţrûd to which she brought a water supply. Suyurghâtîmî built the madrasa of Darb-ī Nav, where he was buried.


(V. MINORSKY)

Kuçr, means in Arab geometry 1) the diameter of a circle or of any section of a cone and the diameter of a circle inscribed in the diagonal of a parallelogram or of any quadrilateral; 3) in trigonometry, the hypotenuse of the so-called umbra triangle; as such it is either the secant or the cosecant of an angle, according as the side opposite it is the tangent or cotangent of this angle; in the first case it is called kûtr al-qâzî al-aqwaî (hypotenuse of the first umbra), in the second case kûtr al-qâzî al-dînî (hypotenuse of the second umbra).

(H. SÜTER)

KUTRUB, surname of the famous grammarian and lexicographer Abû Ḫâfî Muḥâmmad b. (Amad) al-Mustânî, born at Baṣrâ and died in the caliphate of al-Mâmîn in 206 (821/822).

He studied grammar with Ṣibâwî (q. v.) and Muṭâzîlî doctrine with the celebrated al-Nâṣîrî (q. v.). He was tutor to the children of Abû Dâlî al-Kâsîm b. ʿĪsâ, who was vizier under al-Mâmîn and al-Muṭâṣîm and was thus allowed to preach in the mosque, where he taught his heterodox views and read the commentary on the Qurʾān which he had composed according to Muṭâzîlî teaching. As regards language, his authority is rather disputed; nevertheless, as Ibn Khâlikân observes, he was the first to compose a work on Arabic words of the same form, which change their meaning according as they are pronounced with one or other of the three vowels. Out of some twenty works attributed to him, we only know the following: 1. Kit. al-Muṭârzîlî, a collection in prose of thirty words which may be read in three different ways and change their meaning with each vocalisation, e.g. kalîm “discourse”, kîlîm “wounds”, kûlîm “rocky”, each group is followed by a philological commentary and examples taken from the Qurʾān and very often from pre-Islamic poets (Paris Bibl. Nat., Nos. 825, iv.; Leyden, Cat. Cod. Arabici, i. No. 43; Berlin, No. 701–703; two copies belonging to the writer). The Muṭârzîlî was verified by several scholars, among them Abû al-Wâhîb b. al-Ḥasan al-Muhâlîbî al-Bahnâsi, whose poem has been published several times in Cairo and edited and translated with a Latin commentary by Ed. Vilmât (Carmen

(Moh. Ben Chemel)

AL-KUTUB, Ṣāliḥ (or Fārīk) al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥalabi, Arab historian and biographer. The only known sketch of his life is in the Kitāb al-Durar al-kāmina fi 'Ayn al-Mil al-ḫalīma of Ibn Ḥadār al-Asḥāfī (q.v.), but used by Brockelmann in G.A.L., ii. 48. According to this, Kutubi studied in Halab, Aleppo, and Damascus, and made a considerable fortune as a bookseller; he died in Ramadan 764 (June-July 1363), but the best known and the only one printed of his works, a continuation of Ibn Ḥalabīn's Wafṣyāt with the title Fa'awīl al-Wafṣyāt (Būlāk 1283, 1299), contains a biography which gives the year of his death as 773, which caused the editor of the Būlāk edition to write a note on this doubtful point. The contradiction had already been satisfactorily explained in Wustenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber und ihre Werke (repr. from A. G. W. Göt., 1882, xxviii. sq., p. 178): in the biography the date should read 753.

Further works of his are: 1. Rawḍat al-Adhāb al-Ḥalabi, al-Adhab, a collection of glosses (Ḥaddīṣi khalīfah, No. 5624); 2. Liyāla al-Waḍūrīlī (cf. Brockelmann, loc. cit.), the whole comprises 6 volumes according to Ḥaddīṣ al-Khalīfah, No. 8487.

(M. Plessner)

KUṬŪZ al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Ṣaḥib al-Dīn al-Muṭṭizzī (so called after Sulṭān al-Malik al-Muẓīr Aibak), the third Bahri Sulṭān (cf. Bahrī) ascended the throne of Egypt towards the end of 657 (1259). He is said to have been a nephew of the Khwārizmshāh Djalāl al-Dīn Khwārizmshāh and to have been originally called Maḥmūd b. Maṃūd; he was captured in war with the Tatars, sold in Damascus and purchased and brought to Cairo by Sulṭān Muẓīr al-Dīn Aibak. In 650 (1252) Sulṭān Aibak appointed him his deputy (Nāṭib al-Sulṭūna). When the Sulṭān was murdered in 655 (1257) by his wife Ṣadāqat al-Durr (q.v.), the Mamluks placed his son ʿAlī on the throne; Kuṭūz remained deputy and administrator of the kingdom and guardian of the young prince. These first Mamluk attempts were continually threatened by the danger of attack from the Ayyūbids Sulṭāns of Syria who regarded themselves as the legitimate successors of their relatives in Cairo. The Ayyūbids Sulṭān of Karak, al-Malik al-Muhūth, tried to invade Egypt with the help of the Mamluks of the late Egyptian Sulṭān Nadīm al-Dīn Ayyūb. Kuṭūz collected his forces and met the enemy at Shihiyya near Cairo. Although some of his amirs went over to the representative of the old dynasty, he completely routed the king of Karak and forced him to retreat. Meanwhile, the great danger was threatening from the east, the advance of the Tatars under Hūlagū (q.v.). In this difficult situation the ambitious Kuṭūz thought he had better assume the reins of government of iṣṭiṣār which he already held de facto. He deposed the boy sulṭān and seized the throne without meeting with serious resistance. During his short reign he won great renown by breaking the power of the Tatars in Syria and saving Egypt from being laid desolate. Hūlagū had conquered Syria, installed his governors everywhere and demanded the submission of Egypt through his envoys in an arrogant letter which is preserved by the historians. Kuṭūz determined to resist to the last, executed the envoys to make negotiations impossible. For the fear of the Tatars was so great that the amirs only reluctantly obeyed him and were inclined to negotiate, although the example of the devastation of Syria was sufficient warning to them. In Shaʿbān 658 (1260) Kuṭūz led his troops to Shihiyya and revived their failing courage. Baibars (q.v.) afterwards Sulṭān commanded the vanguard and met the Tatar outposts at Gaza. The main army marched on Aīn Djālī (Goliath's Well), where they met the Tatars, commanded by Ketboghā, governor of Damascus. At the first onslaught the Egyptian left wing was driven back. In this critical moment the Sulṭān himself took command; inspired by the splendid example of his bravery, the Egyptian forces rallied for a tremendous attack and put the Tatars to flight. The defeat was decisive. Ketboghā and other Tatar princes fell in the battle; defeated in further fighting as they retreated, the Tatars were forced to leave Syria. The whole country was occupied by the Egyptians and the separate principalities given back to their owners as fiefs. Aleppo alone, the ruler of which remained in Hūlagū's camp, was given to Malik al-Saʿūd, son of Bādur al-Dīn Iłlu' of Mōsul one of the few princes who had preferred leaving his country to acknowledging the suzerainty of Hūlagū. But this gift proved the ruin of Kuṭūz. His friends, the Baibars, had hoped to get Aleppo for himself and now disappointed, planned vengeance. On the homeward journey through Syria, while hunting, he murdered Kuṭūz with the help of a few fellow-conspirators. He was then elected Sulṭān. In spite of his bravery Sulṭān Kuṭūz was not popular. The needs of his army led to great expenditure and he had to raise the money by harsh taxation and levies. Therefore, according to Makrizi, there was neither indignation nor mourning at his assassination. Ibn Taghibirdī tells a different story. He says that the corpse of Kuṭūz lay unburied for three days and then was interred in Kuṣār by his Mamluks. The tomb was visited like a place of pilgrimage and his assassination deeply lamented. Sulṭān Baibars therefore had the body dug up and buried secretly in another place, which was not made known. Thus he became gradually forgotten. B. Bibliography: Well, Geschichte der Chalifen, ii. 8 sq.; Quatremère, Sultans Mamlouks, ii. 86 sqq.; Ibn Taghibirdī, al-Manṣūr al-Ǧāfī, MS. Ar. Vienna, Mīxt. 3294, ii. vol. fol. 1832 and b. (M. Söbernheim)

AL-KUWAIT, a seaport on the Arabian coast of the Persian Gulf, capital of the
In 12 (633) there was a battle here between the Arabs under Ḥālīl b. al-Walīd and the Persians under Hurmuz, in which the latter were defeated. In the xvith century the Portuguese established themselves on the coast here and the remains of a castle built by them can still be seen, but they never mention the name al-Kuwait. Whether the name of the place — al-Kuweit means "the little castle" — owes its origin to this building seems doubtful. It is in any case interesting that the Persians call the place al-Krūn, as Nebihr tells us. Al-Kuweit was therefore presumably settled at the beginning of the xvith century, whether by members of a central Arabian tribe or by Umm Ḳṣrān of Khūr ʿAbd Allāh is not certain. The former version, which has much in its favour, is found in the records of the Bombay government and the plans of the Turkish general Midhāt Pāsha.

In any case the town grew very rapidly. In the beginning of the sixties of the xviith century, according to Nebihr, it had 800 ships and 10,000 inhabitants, who were mainly engaged in pearl-fishery and fishing. It grew rapidly and became prosperous, especially as after the conquest of al-Baṣra by the Turkish Pasha in 1775 Nebihr, Tāpūr, Baghdād, Aleppo, Smyrna and Constanținople no longer went by Bāṣra but by al-Kuweit. In 1793 the English transferred their factory from al-Baṣra to al-Kuweit and the at first very modest port at once attained considerable importance for England’s position and policy in the Persian Gulf. As early as 1805 Great Britain was to take the Shaikh or al-Kuweit under her protection to defend him from aggression by the Wahhābī, but the plan came to nothing. In 1821 the British resident in al-Baṣra moved to Fālakāh which belonged to al-Kuweit. Even then we find al-Kuweit adopting a hostile attitude to the Porte and it seems to have been fairly independent. In 1829 the lord of al-Kuweit had to recognise the suzerainty of Turkey and to pay tribute, a circumstance which later led to a closer association with the vilayet of Baghdād. The mutual confidence and good relations between the Porte and the Shaikh of al-Kuweit found expression in the latter’s flying the Turkish flag and undertaking the defence of the harbour of al-Baṣra in return for a subsidy (1843) and in 1853 placing himself directly under the protection of Turkey and in 1863 and 1865 al-Kuweit undertook the defence of the mouth of the Shatt al-ʿArab. In 1869/1870 the able and energetic Midhāt Pāsha succeeded in getting the then lord of al-Kuweit, ʿAbd Allāh b. Sabbāḥ, to join him with Nebihr, the chief of the Māntābāk, in his expedition against al-Haṣa in which the young Mūḥārak b. Sabbāḥ took part as leader of the land forces. The result of this joint enterprise was the conquest of the territory of al-Haṣa which became a Turkish administrative area under the name Nadjīl but soon the position of the Porte changed when al-Kuweit was drawn into the new developments of central Arabian politics.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Saʿūd, the ruler of al-Riyād, defeated by Muḥammad b. Rashīd, had taken refuge in 1891 in al-Hūfūl, where he placed himself under Turkish protection and later went to Baghdād and Constantinople. He returned laden with gifts to al-Baṣra but had soon to recognize that his hope that the Turks would restore him to his throne would not be realized. He therefore decided to settle at the court of Mūḥārak b. Sabbāḥ.
lord of al-Kuwait. His enemy Muḥammad b. Ṣabhāḥ, whose kingdom in 1892 comprised over two-thirds of Arabia, but nowhere touched the coast and had therefore no harbour, had hitherto been dependent on the favour of the lord of the various coast-towns, and of the Turkish officials in al-Ḥasā', Mesopotamia and Syria. Most of his arms came from al-Kuwait and from the little Turkish harbour of al-ʿAṭīr (al-ʿUṣayr) in the district of al-Ḥasā'. But since ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Ṣaʿīd had been in Constantinople, and had settled in al-Kuwait, great difficulties were put in Muhammad's way in both harbours so that he decided he must possess a harbour of his own. As he did not wish to irritate the Turks, on whose goodwill he was dependent for trade with Mesopotamia, he decided to attack al-Kuwait, which suited his purpose better from its geographical position and the fact that from the end of the sixteenth century it had been the terminus and starting-point for the trading-caravans of al-Riyyūd. In addition the Shaikh of al-Kuwait had recently shown himself insubordinate to the Porte on several occasions, so that it was hardly to be expected that Turkey would interfere seriously on his behalf. In 1895 war broke out between Muhammad b. Ṣaʿīd and ʿAbd al-ʿAṭīr b. Ṣaʿīd which was to prove fatal to the dynasty of the former and make the Shaikh of al-Kuwait king of all al-Riyyūd. In 1895 Muhammad b. Ṣaʿīd was poisoned, but the war with al-Kuwait did not cease but continued under his successor ʿAbd al-ʿAṭīr, especially as the banished prince of al-Riyyūd, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Ṣaʿīd, was working against him in al-Kuwait. ʿAbd al-ʿAṭīr found support for his campaign against al-Kuwait in the Turkish government, which would have liked to depose the untrustworthy Shaikh Muḥārāk b. Ṣaʿīdūḥ, who although appointed Turkish Kāʿīmātām in 1897, paid no attention to his superior officer, the governor of al-Brasā, but under pressure of circumstances asked England to assume a protectorate over his territory, from which he also hoped to gain material advantages. His request was refused at the time. But when in connection with the proposed Baghdad railway the proposal was made to link up a branch-line to the Persian Gulf from Zūburān, that via al-Brahīl, Kerkēlā, Nadifān and Zūburān to a head of operations at Jīlānīshār and Turkey an agreement was made on land on the Persian Gulf, England, who, in view of her interests in India, was attentively watching the development of the Baghdad railway project, took measures to meet eventualities. Lord Curzon, the Viceroy of India, who pursued with all his influence and energy the policy of allowing no other power than England to gain influence on the Persian Gulf, gave the English resident in Būshīr, Colonel Meade, authority to contract a treaty with the Shaikh of al-Kuwait, the contents of which were at first secret, but it contained the important clause that the lord of al-Kuwait bound himself not to let or otherwise cede any part of his territory to other governments or subjects of other governments than England, and to receive no representatives of foreign powers without being authorised to do so; for this concession he received a subsidy and was assured of the good offices of the British government, which soon found in consideration increased imports of arms and munitions from England and France. The treaty was concluded on Jan. 23, 1899. When at the beginning of 1900
confirmed. Turkey was permitted to have a representative at the court of the Shaikh. At the same time the question of the continuation of the Bagdad railway was discussed and it was agreed that the Bagdad Railway Company should take over the stretch from Bagdad to al-Basra, but that the branch line to al-Kuwait should be built by an English company. The outbreak of the World War prevented the ratification of this treaty as well as that of another on the Bagdad railway, Mesopotamia and other questions. On the outbreak of war England declared al-Kuwait an independent kingdom under British protection. The points in dispute with 'Abd al-Aziz b. Sa'ud, who as lord of Central Arabia had no less interest in al-Kuwait than the Shammar prince 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Rashid whom he had conquered, were settled in a treaty concluded between Mubarak and Ibn Sa'ud on Dec. 26, 1915. Ibn Sa'ud withdrew any claim to al-Kuwait and the surrounding country for a breadth of 70 miles and this region was recognised as belonging to the amir of al-Kuwait. Mubarak b. Sabha died on Jan. 3, 1916 and left three sons, Djibir, Salim and Nasir who began to fight about the succession. Nasir gained the support of the settled people of al-Kuwait, Salim of the nomad tribes and with their help fought his brothers and their followers. Djibir was however regarded as the real successor of his father. After his death at the end of 1916, Salim was recognised as his successor, although his brother Nasir had the support of England. In the Great War, Salim was a Turkophile and showed this by facilitating the caravan traffic of the prince of Shammar who was an ally of the Turks. In September, 1917, a caravan of 3,000 camels succeeded in getting through from al-Kuwait to Haidil in spite of the English blockade. Salim died on Feb. 2, 1921. He was succeeded by Djibir's son Ahmad, who had represented al-Kuwait on Oct. 31, 1919 when the Arab kings were received at the English court.

**Genealogical Table of the Amirs of Al-Kuwait**

Mubarak b. Sabah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Djibir</th>
<th>Salim</th>
<th>Nasir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(d. end of 1916)</td>
<td>(d. Febr. 2, 1921)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ahmad**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>Date of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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