

Encyclopaedia Islamica

Preview

BRILL

Leiden, Summer 2008

Brill's *Encyclopaedia Islamica*

Dear Reader,

It is with great pleasure that Brill announces the launch of a new major reference work – *Encyclopaedia Islamica*.

The Persian edition of the *Encyclopaedia Islamica* is already one of the most authoritative reference works on Islam and Muslim societies from the Muslim world, and now Brill is proud to make this prominent encyclopedia available in English for the first time.

A projected 16-volume publication, this stalwart fixture will prove to be an indispensable source for all those interested in the field of Islamic studies, particularly Shi'i Islam, and all those interested in the history of Iran/Persia.

Please allow us to introduce you to this fascinating collection via this preview, consisting of pieces from the first volume (*A – Abū Ḥanīfa*)

Sincerely

Dr Dagmar Vermeer
Marketing Manager
Middle East and Islamic Studies

Encyclopaedia Islamica

Volume I

‘Abā’–Abū Ḥanīfa

Editors-in-Chief
Wilferd Madelung
Farhad Daftary

An Abridged Translation by the Institute of Ismaili Studies of
the *Dā’irat al-Ma’ārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī* published in Persian by
The Centre for Iranian and Islamic Studies

Editor-in-Chief of the Original Persian Edition
Kazem Musavi Bojnurdi

Brill
in association with
The Institute of Ismaili Studies
London
2008

Managing Editor

Reza Shah-Kazemi

Advisory Committee (Tehran)

Ahmad Pakatchi
Sadeq Sajjadi

Co-ordinating Editor

Wendy Robinson

Editorial Team of the English Edition

Marjan Afsharian
Rahim Gholami
Sara Haji Husseini Mesgar
Stephen Hirtenstein
Shahram Khodaverdian
Isabel Miller
Daryoush Mohammad Poor
Roxane Zand

Consulting Editors

Mohammad A. Amir-Moezzi
S. Jalal Badakhchani
C. Edmund Bosworth
Alnoor Dhanani
Nader El-Bizri
Feras Hamza

Mohammad Reza Jozi
Hermann Landolt
Toby Mayer
Eric Ormsby
Amjad H. Shah
Samira Sheikh

Members of the Supreme Academic Council
The Centre for Iranian and Islamic Studies

Afshar, Iraj
Amouzegar, Zhaleh
Anvari, Hassan
Aryan, Qamar
Azarnoosh, Azartash
Bojnurdi, Kazem M.
Bojnurdi, Mohammad M.
Bulookbashi, Ali A.
Daadbeh, Asghar
Dabirsiaghi, Sayyed Mohammad
Ebrahimi Dinani, Gholamhossein
Fani, Kamran
Fouladvand, Ezzatollah
Ganji, Mohammad Hassan
Gharib, Badrozzaman
THE LATE Hadidi, Javad
Hojjati Kermani, Mohammad Javad
Jalali-Moqaddam, Masoud
Kayvani, Majdoddin
Khaki, Mohammad
Khaleqi-Motlaq, Jalal
THE LATE Khorasani, Sharafoddin
Majidi, Enayatollah
Masoumi Hamedani, Hossein

Mohaghegh, Mehdi
Mohajerani, Ataollah
Mohaqqeq Damad, Seyyed Mostafa
Mojtaba'i, Fathollah
Mojtahed Shabestari, Mohammad
Movahhed, Mohammad Ali
THE LATE Mowlavi, Muhammad Ali
THE LATE Navvabi, Mahyar
Omidsalar, Mahmoud
Pakatchi, Ahmad
Pourjavady, Nasrollah
Rafi', Mehdi
Reza, Enayatollah
Rezai Baghbidi, Hassan
Sadeqi, Ali Ashraf
Saidi, Abbas
Sajjadi, Sadeq
Semsar, Mohammad Hassan
Shayegan, Daryush
Sorush, Abdolkarim
Sotoudeh, Manouchehr
THE LATE Tafazzoli, Ahmad
THE LATE Zarrinkoub, Abdolhossein
THE LATE Zaryab, Abbas

INTRODUCTION

The Islamic faith spread at a far greater speed than could ever have been anticipated, over an expanse of land stretching from the coast of the Atlantic Ocean across North Africa and the Iranian plateau to the threshold of China and India. This phenomenon resulted in the birth of a civilisation which encompassed a considerable portion of the creative and intellectual achievements of the human race to date. The extraordinary impact of Islam derived from a remarkable capacity to assimilate and further develop other cultures and civilisations, and this same capacity also accounted for the speed with which the new faith generated new, synthetic expressions of culture throughout the lands of Islam and beyond.

The teachings of the Prophet, at once simple and profound, gave rise to a spiritual and intellectual culture which was inclusive and humane, affirming a mode of society compatible with the immutable prerogatives of human dignity, and also capable of adapting to the ever-changing needs of different communities and their traditions. Muslim scholars, scientists and writers were able to travel in search of learning and employment throughout the Islamic world, nurturing a tradition of learning and creativity which served to further stimulate and unite the varied societies in which they lived.

The intellectual activity in the Islamic world in turn aroused the curiosity of scholars in the Christian world when they came into contact with it and, as a result, numerous works of Islamic philosophy, science and other disciplines were translated. In this way, classics of Islamic scholarship by al-Rāzī, Ibn Sīnā, al-Bīrūnī, Ibn Rushd, and many others, became integral to the thought of scholars and writers in Mediaeval and Renaissance Europe, generating thereby a deep and enduring influence.

Thus, the vast diversity of the Islamic legacy has become an integral characteristic of world heritage, and amongst all the works that are available to us from the rich sources of Islamic literature, encyclopaedic compilations enjoy a special importance. For instance, there are particular specialist works such as al-Rāzī's *al-Hāwī*, Ibn Sīnā's *al-Qānūn*, al-Bīrūnī's *al-āthār al-bāqiyā*, al-Faraghānī's *Jawāmi' 'ilm al-nujūm* and 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Khāzinī's *Miẓān al-ḥikma*, which deal with medicine, philosophy, astronomy or physics; and there are general works like Ibn al-Nadīm's *al-Fihrist*, al-Fārābī's *Iḥsā' al-'ulūm*, al-Kh^wārazmī's *Maḥāṭib al-'ulūm*, Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī's *Durrat al-tāj*, Zakariyyā' al-Qazwīnī's *Ajā'ib al-makhlūqāt* and the *Rasā'il* of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā', which belong to diverse genres of collections and can properly be regarded as the precursors of the modern encyclopaedia.

With the establishment of new maritime routes, the forging of political and mercantile relations between the East and Europe in the early modern age and the increasing military and political dominance of the European powers, numerous travellers flocked to the 'Orient' in search of insights into these exotic lands and their cultures. Centres of Orientalist learning and Islamic studies came to be established at European universities, encouraging a structured and systematic approach to the new fields of studies, along with a flood of publications. A major advance in the study of Islam appeared in 1697, with the posthumous publication of Barthélemy d'Herbelot's encyclopaedic work *Bibliothèque Orientale*. This pioneering work of Western Orientalism, which covered many aspects of the Muslim East, was to remain the standard reference work in Europe until the nineteenth century. This renowned French

Orientalist had read and utilised a variety of Arabic, Persian and Turkish sources and provided details on the history and religion of Islam hitherto unknown to Europeans. The study of Islam received further stimulus a century later as a result, firstly, of the establishment of the *École des Langues Orientales Vivantes* in Paris under the tutelage of Baron Antoine Isaac Silvestre de Sacy in 1795, and secondly, the Napoleonic expedition of 1798–1799 to Egypt and Syria. The foundation of learned societies and the publication of specialised periodicals and journals in the field throughout the nineteenth century greatly increased the information available for the expanding discipline. In fact, the sheer volume of these published or unpublished materials, treatises, monographs and scholarly works, was such that quick and easy access to them become an increasingly difficult task. It was this state of affairs that, in the early part of the twentieth century, led some of the most distinguished Orientalists to compile a collective work of the most important aspects of Islamic culture and civilisation, under the title of *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*.

The preparation and publication of this four-volume work, as well as its Supplement, in English, French and German, published from 1913 to 1938 in Leiden, under the supervision of scholars such as Houtsma, Baset, Hartmann, Wensinck, Gibb and Lévi-Provençal. The enthusiasm with which this publication was received led to a 12-volume second edition in 1954, that was finally completed in 2004. Most volumes of the first and second editions of this encyclopaedia were variously translated into Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Urdu and Dari in Egypt, Iran, Turkey, Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Notwithstanding the profile and status it deserved and rapidly gained, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* nevertheless failed to cover many cultural aspects of various Islamic schools and traditions, in particular that of Persian Shi'ism, one of Islam's most important and influential schools of thought. It was for this reason that when the decision was taken in Iran to translate it into Persian, local researchers under the guidance of Professor Ehsan Yarshater provided numerous additional articles aimed at filling the lacunae. This appeared as a supplement to the Persian-language edition under the new title of *The Encyclopaedia of Iran and Islam*. Not long after, Professor Yarshater with the support of Columbia University, embarked on the now well-known *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, which comprehensively addresses all aspects of pre-Islamic and Islamic Iranian history, literature, arts and culture. Simultaneous with the appearance of Fascicles VII and VIII of *The Encyclopaedia of Iran and Islam* in 1978, a general encyclopaedia in Persian was also published which was of particularly high quality – originally in two parts and three volumes, and entitled *Dā'irat al-ma'ārif-i Fārsī* ('The Persian Encyclopaedia') by Ghulām Ḥusayn Muṣāḥib. It eventually produced a great number of additional articles on Iran and Islam by eminent scholars, such that it was expanded to three times its original size. This, too, has been further edited and translated with the final result appearing in 1995.

Despite the significance and role of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, and the laudable efforts of Orientalist scholars in furthering an understanding of Islamic texts by providing extensive information on Islamic cultures and civilisation, and introducing sources and countless manuscripts in the field, thereby encouraging research, it has to be said that a number of new challenges had emerged which called out for new responses. Advances in education, rising standards of knowledge and information amongst Muslims and developments in Shi'i studies resulting from the establishment of an Islamic republic in Iran provoked a host of fresh queries and debates in every field, from ideology to spirituality, from the sciences to the arts. For the student of Islam, hunting for information amongst a multitude of different sources within each of these areas is a challenging task. Also, it is a well-known fact that when encyclopaedic compilations are undertaken with the necessary academic rigour

and appropriate research methods, they can prove of great value in promoting a better understanding between civilisations.

Such were the most significant driving factors underlying the rationale for the establishment of the Centre for the Great Islamic Encyclopaedia in 1983 in Tehran, dedicated to the production of a far-reaching, comprehensive and accurate encyclopaedia entitled *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī* ('The Great Islamic Encyclopaedia'), written by a prominent group of scholars and researchers in the field, with Kazem Musavi Bojnurdi as its editor-in-chief. The first steps proved arduous: defining the goals, identifying the audience, appointing the researchers and authors, providing research tools and a specialised library took several years, so that the first volume only appeared in 1989. To date (2008), 15 volumes have been completed, and the entire set is projected to consist of over 40 volumes. This encyclopaedia has been managed in a carefully systematic and structured manner, with special attention given to the selection of each entry, which follows a particular set of criteria filtered through a pyramid of editors, sub-editors and proof-readers, reporting to an editorial board. In a short span of time, this publication has grown from an information resource to a veritable research facility serving all manner of historians and students. Reviews and comments suggest that in the twenty years since its inception, *The Great Islamic Encyclopaedia* and its parallel ongoing Arabic translation have sparked a revolution in the methodology of such research projects, opening up new horizons and inspiring fresh topics of inquiry, dealing with manuscripts, publications, coins, archaeological remains, artefacts, and the like.

The Great Islamic Encyclopaedia project is sustained by a number of primary and secondary research departments, focusing upon specific subjects, such as the literature of Persian and other Islamic cultures, Arabic literature, Qur'anic sciences, *fiqh*, *uṣūl* and *ḥadīth*, history, geography, mysticism, comparative religion, philosophy, anthropology, the arts, and so on. These departments deal with research and editing, selection of entries, scientific categorisation and reference-verification, as well as printing. Each of these departments is managed by an editor with the help of assistants, and in the course of their work, extensive contributions are made by associate and affiliated editors. A highly-structured process of selection, cross-checking and final approval via several stages of editing ensures that the final product is the result of extensive deliberation and monitoring by a team of highly qualified experts and their assistants.

Following the enthusiasm with which the Persian version of *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī* was received, it was decided that an Arabic translation would also be undertaken in Tehran. The first volume of the Arabic edition appeared in 1991 and, to date, seven volumes have been published. Given that this version is based upon the Persian, an equal number of volumes in Arabic will follow in due course. The success of the Arabic edition prompted the decision to produce an English translation in order to make this work available to an even wider audience. The Institute of Ismaili Studies in London was therefore approached because of its high standards of academic excellence; the present publication is the fruit of an agreement between the two bodies.

The English translation of *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī*, named *Encyclopaedia Islamica*, will differ in some respects from its Persian original. The English version will not exceed 16 core volumes with supplementary volumes, given that senior consultants and editors have decided to omit a number of entries which would have been of limited interest or relevance to a Western readership. However, the integrity of the more important, lengthier entries has been preserved. A number of articles in English will be modified or abridged; many will need to be updated, given that since the publication of the original, new information, analysis or evidence has surfaced. Differences in the sequence of the letters of the alphabet

between English and Persian also mean that entries beginning with, for example, ‘d’, and ‘ch’ in English precede the corresponding entries in the Persian edition. Also, those entries that begin with the letter *‘ayn*, which will appear in the English edition under the letter ‘a’, will be published earlier than in the Persian edition. In addition, some entries will be specifically commissioned for the new English edition which will not have appeared in the Persian.

A professional team of consultants, editors and translators was assembled under the auspices of the Department of Academic Research and Publications at the Institute of Ismaili Studies; the head of this department, Dr Farhad Daftary, together with Professor Wilferd Madelung, Senior Research Fellow at the IIS, are the editors-in-chief of the *Encyclopaedia Islamica*. Under their supervision, each translated article was subjected to several stages of editing. Given the weighty demands of editing a work such as this, the final version of the entries presented here is the fruit of the efforts of both the editors and translators.

Encyclopaedia Islamica, like its Persian counterpart, *Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī*, is to be considered a specialist encyclopaedia. Its central contribution to Islamic studies is its coverage of specifically Shi‘i themes, personalities, culture and history – those aspects, precisely, which were either given scant attention in earlier encyclopaedias or ignored altogether, as a result of the Arabo-centric and Sunni-centric tendencies which have, until recently, prevailed in Orientalist academic circles in the West. At the same time, a major strength of the present encyclopaedia lies in its very comprehensiveness. It successfully covers an extraordinary range of themes and regions, seeking to do justice to the global nature of Islamic civilisation: it is far from being simply an encyclopaedia of ‘Shi‘i Islam’. While offering an objective and in-depth study of hitherto neglected fields of Shi‘i culture and history, it also presents biographies of political, military and cultural personalities, with accounts of events throughout the Muslim world; scientific, artistic, literary and philosophical themes; the disciplines of jurisprudence, Qur’anic studies, history and geography, logic and linguistics, faith and philosophy, and such sciences as medicine and mathematics. In this manner, scholarly attention to the specifics of the Shi‘i traditions of Islam is combined with an appropriate sensitivity to the global matrix of Islamic civilisation within which these traditions have emerged; a civilisation to which Shi‘ism has made such a creative and inspiring contribution, and of which it is itself an indisputably major manifestation.

LIST OF ENTRIES

Article	Author (translator)
‘Abā’	Yadollah Gholami (Jawad Qasemi)
Abābīl	Azartash Azarnoosh (Farzin Negahban)
Ābādah	Mohammad Hassan Ganji (Hassan Lahouti)
Ābādān	Majdoddin Kayvani (Farzin Negahban)
Abān b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Lāḥiqī	Azartash Azarnoosh (Nacim Pak)
Abān b. Taghlib	Ali Akbar Zia’i (Farzin Negahban)
Abāqā Khān	Abbas Zaryab (Jawad Qasemi)
Abarqūh	Ali Rafi’i (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abasa	Mahdi Muti’ (Farzin Negahban)
Ābaskūn	Ja‘far Shi‘ar and Sadeq Sajjadi (John Cooper)
Al-‘Abbādī, Abū ‘Āṣim	Faramarz Haj Manouchehri (Rahim Gholami)
‘Abbādī, Muẓaffār	Mohammad Javad Shams (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abbādīds	Manouchehr Pezeshk (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abbās I, Shāh	Yusof Rahimlu (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abbās II, Shāh	Yusof Rahimlu (Hassan Lahouti)
Al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib	Ali Bahramian (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abbās b. Abī al-Futūḥ	Sadeq Sajjadi (Hassan Lahouti)
Al-‘Abbās b. al-Aḥnaf	Azartash Azarnoosh (Farzin Negahban)
Al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī	Ali Bahramian and Ali A. Bulookbashi (Farzin Negahban)
Al-‘Abbās b. ‘Amr al-Ghanawī	Enayatollah Fatehi-nezhad (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abbās b. Firnās	Mohammad Hussein Ahmadi (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abbās Ḥilmī II	Nooshin Saheb (Rahim Gholami)
Al-‘Abbās b. Mirdās	Seyyed Mohammad Seyyedi (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abbās Mīrzā	Department of History (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abbās Pasha	Nooshin Saheb (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abbāsa (a woman of the ‘Abbāsīd court)	Sadeq Sajjadi (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abbāsa (a city in eastern Egypt)	Mohammad Reza Najī (Hassan Lahouti)
Al-‘Abbāsī, ‘Abd al-Raḥīm	Rezvan Massah (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abbāsīds	Ali Bahramian and Sadeq Sajjadi (Rahim Gholami)
‘Abbāsiyya	Department of History (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib	Babak Farzaneh (Hassan Lahouti)

‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal	Department of Islamic Law and Qur’an and Hadith Studies (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Alī	Ali Bahramian (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Āmir b. Kurayz	Shadi Da‘i Reza‘i Muqaddam (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ	Department of Islamic Law and Qur’an and Hadith Studies (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Allāh Bukhārī	Yadollah Gholami (Rahim Gholami)
‘Abd Allāh b. Dhakwān	Department of Islamic Law and Qur’an and Hadith Studies (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥanzala	Ali Bahramian (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥasan, Abū Muḥammad	Ali Bahramian (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abd Allāh b. Ja‘far	Farhang Mehrvash (Azar Rabbani)
‘Abd Allāh b. Jaḥsh	Babak Farzaneh (Shahram Khodaverdian)
‘Abd Allāh b. al-Kawwā’	Ahmad Pakatchi (Rahim Gholami)
‘Abd Allāh b. Khāzīm	Ruzbeh Zarrinkoub (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd Allāh b. Lahī‘a	Department of Islamic Law and Qur’an and Hadith Studies (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abd Allāh b. Maymūn al-Qaddāh	Farhad Daftary (Rahim Gholami)
‘Abd Allāh b. Mu‘āwiya	Sadeq Sajjadi (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd Allāh b. Mūsā b. Nuṣayr	Babak Farzaneh (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd Allāh b. Muskān	Mohammad Ansari (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abd Allāh b. Muṭī‘	Ali Bahramian (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa	Ali Bahramian (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abd Allāh b. Sa‘d	Enayatollah Fatehi-nezhad (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abd Allāh b. Salām	Faramarz Haj Manouchehri (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd Allāh Shīrāzī	Yadollah Gholami (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Allāh b. Sinān	Mahdi Ghaffari (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Allāh b. Ubayy	Ali Bahramian (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar	Ahmad Pakatchi (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Rāsibī	Ahmad Pakatchi (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr	Ali Bahramian (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd al-‘Azīm al-Ḥasanī	Sara Haji Husseini Mesgar and Sadeq Sajjadi (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Abī Rawwād	Ahmad Pakatchi (Rahim Gholami)
‘Abd al-‘Azīz ‘Uthmānī	Ali Akbar Dianat (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd al-Dār, Banū	Manouchehr Pezeshk (Suheyl Umar)
‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Azdī	Ahmad Pakatchi (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Maqdisī	Ahmad Pakatchi (Rahim Gholami)
‘Abd al-Ḥakam	Nurollah Kasa‘i (Suheyl Umar)

‘Abd al-Ḥamīd I (Abdülhamid)	Ali Akbar Dianat (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Yaḥyā (al-Kātib)	Azartash Azarnoosh (Daryoush Mohammad Poor)
‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Amānat Khān	Mahbanoo Alizadeh (Roxane Zand)
‘Abd al-Karīm Kh ^w ārazmī	Yadollah Gholami (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd al-Karīm Munshī	Seyyed Ali Al-i Davud (Rahim Gholami)
‘Abd al-Laṭīf	Ruzbeh Zarrinkoub (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd al-Majīd I (Abdūlmecit)	Ali Akbar Dianat (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān	Manouchehr Pezeshk and Isabel Miller (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd al-Malik I	Ruzbeh Zarrinkoub (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd Manāf	Babak Farzaneh (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib b. Hāshim	Ahmad Pakatchi (Shahram Khodaverdian)
‘Abd al-Nabī	Marjan Afsharian (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd al-Qādir b. Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Jazā’irī	Reza Shah-Kazemi
‘Abd al-Quddūs Gangūhī	Marjan Afsharian and Reza Shah-Kazemi (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd al-Raḥīm Khān-i Khānān	Huda Seyyed Hussein-zadeh (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abd al-Raḥīm Kh ^w ārazmī	Yadollah Gholami (Suheyl Umar)
‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Laylā	Hasan Yusofi Ishkevari (Farzin Negahban)
‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Awf	Ali Bahramian (Jawad Qasemi)
‘Abd al-Raḥmān Kh ^w ārazmī	Yadollah Gholami (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī	Ahmad Pakatchi (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd al-Ṣamad Shīrāzī	Fariba Eftekhari (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abd Shams	Ahmad Pakatchi (Rahim Gholami)
‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Zayd al-Baṣrī	Mohammad Javad Shams (Suheyl Umar)
‘Abda b. al-Ṭabīb	Ezzat Molla-Ebrahimi (Hassan Lahouti)
Abdāl	Hussein La-Shay’ (Farzin Negahban)
Abdāl Beg	Seyyed Ali Al-i Davud (Rahim Gholami)
Abdāl Chishtī	Hussein La-Shay’ (Rahim Gholami)
Abdālī	Department of History (Nacim Pak)
‘Abdān	Mas‘ud Habibi Mazaheri (Hassan Lahouti)
Al-‘Abdarī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad	Nooshin Saheb (Daryoush Mohammad Poor)
‘Abdī Pāshā (Abdī Paşa) (1)	Ali Akbar Dianat (Hassan Lahouti)
‘Abdī Pāshā (Abdī Paşa) (2)	Ali Akbar Dianat (Hassan Lahouti)
Abhar	Mohsen Ahmadi (Maryam Rezaee)
Al-Ābī, Abū al-Maḥāsīn Naṣīr al-Dīn	Maryam Falahati Movahhed (Rahim Gholami)
Al-Ābī, Abū Sa‘d Manṣūr b. al-Ḥusayn	Azartash Azarnoosh (Mansur Sana‘i)
Abīward	Enayatollah Reza (John Cooper)
Al-Abīwardī	Enayatollah Fatehi-nezhad (Saleh Nejad)

- Abjad
Abjadī
- Abkhazia (Abkhāz)
Al-Ablah al-Baghdādī
Abnāʾ
Abr
Abraha
Abraham
Ābrang
Al-Abrār
Abrī
- Al-Abṭaḥ
Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Isfārāyīnī
Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Mursī
Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Saffāḥ
Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Sayyārī
- Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAlawī
Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Baṣrī
Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Shīrī
Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Zanjānī
Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī
- Abū Aḥmad al-ʿAskarī
- Abū al-ʿAlāʾ ʿAṭāʾ b. Yaʿqūb Ghaznawī Rāzī
Abū al-ʿAlāʾ Bihishī
Abū al-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿarrī
Abū ʿAlī Ardīstānī
Abū ʿAlī Balkhī
Abū ʿAlī al-Daqqāq
Abū ʿAlī al-Fārisī
Abū ʿAlī al-Fārmadī
Abū ʿAlī Mīskawayh
Abū ʿAlī Sīmījūr
Abū al-ʿĀliya
Abū ʿAlqama
Abū ʿAmmār
- Azartash Azarnoosh (Rahim Gholami)
Department of Literature (Farzin Negahban)
Enayatollah Reza (Jawad Qasemi)
Azartash Azarnoosh (Maryam Rezaee)
Kazem Bargnisi (Farzin Negahban)
Yahya Dhokaʾ (Roxane Zand)
Kazem Bargnisi (Maryam Rezaee)
Sadeq Sajjadi (Farzin Negahban)
Yahya Dhokaʾ (Rahim Gholami)
Rasul Shayesteh (Rahim Gholami)
Mohammad Hassan Semsar (Roxane Zand)
Ali Rafiʾi (Hassan Lahouti)
Abolfazl Khatibi (John Cooper)
Fathollah Mojtabaʾi (Nacim Pak)
Ali Bahramian (Farhoud Bernjian)
Department of Mysticism (Farzin Negahban)
Hussein Farhang Ansari (Farzin Negahban)
Mohammad Javad Anvari (Rahim Gholami)
Masʿud Habibi Mazaheri (Suheyl Umar)
Seyyed Jaʿfar Sajjadi (Nacim Pak)
Department of Islamic Law and Qurʾan and Hadith Studies (Nacim Pak)
Enayatollah Fatehi-nezhad (Farzin Negahban)
Habibeh Danesh-amuz (John Cooper)
Muhammad Ali Mowlavi (Nacim Pak)
Sharafoddin Khorasani (Farzin Negahban)
Seyyed Ali Al-i Davud (Farzin Negahban)
Abolfazl Khatibi (John Cooper)
Hussein La-Shayʾ (Farzin Negahban)
Enayatollah Fatehi-nezhad (Simin Rahimi)
Naser Gozashteh (Farzin Negahban)
Abuʾl-Qassem Emami (Suheyl Umar)
Abolfazl Khatibi (Hassan Lahouti)
Abdol-Amir Salim (Rahim Gholami)
Rezvan Massah (Saleh Nejad)
Ahmad Pakatchi (Farzin Negahban)

Abū ‘Amr b. al-‘Alā’	Ahmad Pakatchi (Fatemeh Teimuri)
Abū ‘Amr al-Dānī	Mohammad Ali Lesani Fesharaki (Saeed Saeedpoor)
Abū ‘Amr b. Nujayd	Najib Mayel Heravi (Daryoush Mohammad Poor)
Abū ‘Amr al-Shaybānī	Department of Arabic Literature – Abu Muhammad Vakili (Maryam Rezaee)
Abū al-‘Āṣ	Abu’l Hasan Dianat (Rahim Gholami)
Abū al-Aswad al-Du’alī	Azartash Azarnoosh (Daryoush Mohammad Poor)
Abū al-Aswār Shāwur	Abolfazl Khatibi (John Cooper)
Abū al-‘Atāhiya	Mehran Arzandeh (Azar Rabbani)
Abū ‘Awāna	Mohammad Reza Najī (Hassan Lahouti)
Abū ‘Awn	Mohammad Ali Kazem Beigi (Jawad Qasemi)
Abū al-‘Aynā’	Mohammad Ali Lesani Fesharaki (Farzin Negahban)
Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī	Mohammad Ansari (Fatemeh Teimuri)
Abū Ayyūb al-Mūriyānī	Mohammad Mahdi Mu’azzin Jami (Rahim Gholami)
Abū Bakr	Hadi Alemzadeh, Ahmad Pakatchi and Fatemeh Lajevardi (Rahim Gholami and Shahram Khodaverdian)
Abū Bakr b. Aḥmad al-Marwazī	Mohammad Hassan Semsar (Rahim Gholami)
Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayyāsh	Maryam Sadeghi (Hassan Lahouti)
Abū Bakr Ḥaṣīrī	Ali Mir-Ansari (John Cooper)
Abū Bakr b. Ḥazm	Department of Islamic Law and Qur’an and Hadith Studies (Suheyl Umar)
Abū Bakr al-Kh ^w ārazmī	Maryam Sadeghi (Hamid Tehrani)
Abū Bakr Quhistānī	Ruzbeh Zarrinkoub (Jawad Qasemi)
Abū Bakr al-Sijistānī	Ahmad Pakatchi (John Cooper)
Abū Bakr Ṭīhrānī	Reza Rezazadeh Langaroodi (John Cooper)
Abū Bakr al-Warrāq	Gholam-Ali Arya (John Cooper)
Abū Bakra	Mohammad Asef Fekrat (Farzin Negahban)
Abū al-Baqā’ al-Kaffāwī	Mohammad Mahdi Mu’azzin Jami (Farhoud Bernjjan)
Abū al-Baqā’ al-‘Ukbarī	Maryam Sadeghi (Jawad Qasemi)
Abū al-Barakāt	Samad Movahhed (Maryam Rezaee and Jawad Qasemi)
Abū Barza	Younes Karamati (Farzin Negahban)
Abū Baṣīr	Ahmad Pakatchi (Hamid Tehrani)
Abū al-Bayān	Mina Hafizi (John Cooper)
Abū Dahbal al-Jumahlī	Enayatollah Fatehi-nezhad and Rahmat Pur Mohammad Shir Ju Posht (Saeed Saeedpoor)
Abū al-Dardā’	Abdol-Amir Salim (Simin Rahimi)
Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī	Ahmad Pakatchi (Shahram Khodaverdian)

Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī	Naser Gozashteh (Rahim Gholami)
Abū Dharr al-Harawī	Mohammad Asef Fekrat (Hassan Lahouti)
Abū Dhu'ayb al-Hudhālī	Seyyed Mohammad Seyyedi (Farzin Negahban)
Abū Du'ād al-Iyādī	Azartash Azarnoosh (Rahim Gholami)
Abū Dulaf al-'Ijlī	Enayatollah Fatehi-nezhad (Simin Rahimi)
Abū Dulaf (Mosque)	Nushin-dukht Nafisi (Saleh Nejad)
Abū Dulaf, Mis'ar b. Muhalhil	Enayatollah Reza (Rahim Gholami)
Abū al-Dunyā	Ahmad Pakatchi (Roxane Zand)
Abū al-Faḍl 'Allāmī	Mohammad Asef Fekrat (Simin Rahimi)
Abū al-Faḍl al-Sarakhsī	Najib Mayel Heravi (Farhoud Bernjian)
Abū al-Faḍl Sāwajī	Mohammad Hassan Semsar (Farhoud Bernjian)
Abū al-Faḍl al-Tamīmī	Ahmad Pakatchi (Maryam Rezaee)
Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī	Azartash Azarnoosh and Ali Bahramian (Farzin Negahban)
Abū al-Faraj al-Maghribī	Sadeq Sajjadi (IIS Translation Team)
Abū al-Faraj b. Mas'ūd al-Rūnī	Mohammad Abd Ali (Daryoush Mohammad Poor)
Abū al-Faraj b. al-Ṭayyib	Department of Science (Daryoush Mohammad Poor)
Abū al-Faḥ Bahādur Khān Zand	Abolfazl Khatibi (IIS Translation Team)
Abū al-Faḥ al-Bustī	Mehran Arzandeh and Azartash Azarnoosh (Simin Rahimi)
Abū al-Faḥ al-Daylamī	Simin Muhaqqeq (Daryoush Mohammad Poor)
Abū al-Faḥ Gīlānī	Younes Karamati (Rahim Gholami)
Abū al-Faḥ Ḥusaynī	Habibeh Danesh-amuz (Rahim Gholami)
Abū al-Faḥ al-Iṣfahānī	Younes Karamati (Rahim Gholami)
Abū al-Faḥ Khān Bakhtiyārī	Alireza Ala'oddini (Daryoush Mohammad Poor)
Abū al-Faḥ Khān Jawānshīr	Seyyed Ali Al-i Davud (John Cooper)
Abū al-Fidā'	Enayatollah Reza (Farzin Negahban)
Abū Firās	Seyyed Mohammad Seyyedi (Farzin Negahban)
Abū Fudayk	Ahmad Pakatchi (Farzin Negahban)
Abū al-Futūḥ al-'Ijlī	Abdol-Amir Salim (Farzin Negahban)
Abū al-Futūḥ al-Rāzī	Department of Islamic Law and Qur'an and Hadith Studies (Farzin Negahban)
Abū Ghānim al-Khurāsānī	Ahmad Pakatchi (Saleh Nejad)
Abū al-Ghayth al-Qashshāsh	Faramarz Haj Manouchehri (Farzin Negahban)
Abū al-Ghāzī Bahādur Khān	Ali Akbar Dianat (Farhoud Bernjian)
Abū Ḥafṣ al-Ḥaddād	Hussein La-Shay' (Simin Rahimi)
Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar al-Ballūṭī	Ahmad Tavakkoli Bid-hendi (Saleh Nejad)
Abū Ḥāmid al-Gharnāṭī	Enayatollah Reza (Simin Rahimi)

Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarāyīnī	Mahdi Salmasi (John Cooper)
Abū Ḥamza al-Khārijī	Mohammad Ali Kazem Beigi (Hassan Lahouti)
Abū Ḥamza al-Thumālī (the <i>du'ā'</i> of)	Farhang Mehrvash (Farzin Negahban)
Abū Ḥamza al-Thumālī	Hussein Farhang Ansari (Farzin Negahban)
Abū Ḥanīfa	Ahmad Pakatchi (Suheyl Umar)

Abāqā Khān, also known as Abqā Khān or according to Arab historians Abghā, was the second of the Mongol Īlkhāns, who ruled Persia in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, and the eldest son of Hūlāgū Khān. He was born in Jumādā I 631/February 1234 and ascended the throne on 3 Ramaḍān 663/19 June 1265 (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. ‘Alī Zādah, 3/95).

Abāqā was in Māzandarān when Hūlāgū died on 19 Rabī‘ II 663/8 February 1265 near the River Jaghātū (now also called the Zarrīnarūd) in the vicinity of Marāgha. As was common Mongol practice, the emirs immediately ordered the roads to be closed to prevent any movement. They sent for Abāqā, who was the eldest son, and summoned Arghūn Āqā who administered his affairs. Yūshmūt (Yashmūt), Hūlāgū’s second son, who governed Darband and Arrān on behalf of his father, arrived at Marāgha eight days after his father’s death and before Abāqā got there, but realising that all the emirs favoured Abāqā’s claim, he returned north two days later.

On 19 Jumādā I 663/9 March 1265, Abāqā reached the royal *ordu* (encampment), and the leading emirs came to welcome him. Īlkā Nūyān and certain other military commanders, particularly Siktūr Nūyān and Sūnjāq (Sūghunjāq) Āqā, proclaimed his right to the succession. In accordance with Mongol practice in such cases, Abāqā declined, saying that he could not ascend the throne without the permission of Qubilay Qā’ān (the Great Khan). Eventually, at the insistence of the princes and emirs, and in accordance with the astrological calculations of Khwāja Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, he was enthroned on 3 Ramaḍān

663/19 June 1265 at the Chaghān Nāwūr (or White Lake) in Farāhān, with all the Mongol ceremonies of coronation, and formally elected Īlkhān and successor to Hūlāgū. However, as a sign of respect, he sat on a chair rather than the royal throne until the ambassadors (*ilchis*) of Qubilay Qā’ān, the Great Khan, arrived and the royal mandate (*yarliḡh*) was announced to him (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. ‘Alī Zādah, 3/100–102). When the Great Khan’s ambassadors arrived in 669/1270 to proclaim and acknowledge his rule of the Īlkhānate, Abāqā Khān held a second enthronement on 10 Rabī‘ II/26 November 1270 in the district of Jaghātū.

Appointing emirs and governors: After his accession, Abāqā dispatched one of his brothers Yashmūt to Darband, Shirwān and Mughān, with a well-equipped army, and another brother, Tabsīn (Tūbsin), with another army to the east, entrusting the rule of Māzandarān and Khurāsān as far as the River Oxus (Jayhūn) to him. He dispatched Tūqū (Ṭūghū) Bītīgchī along with Tūdāwn (Tudāwn, Tutāwūn) to Rūm (Asia Minor), and Dūrbāy Nūyān to Diyārbakir and Diyār Rabī‘a, and gave Georgia to Shīrāmūn, son of Jūrmāghūn; the *Īnjū* or royal lands were given to Ultājū Āqā while Baghdad and Fārs went to Sūnjāq (Sūghunjāq) Āqā. Arghūn Āqā who was then *muqāti‘ al-mamālik*, that is to say financial affairs were entirely in his hands, remained in this position. The vizierate, as in the time of Hūlāgū, was given to Shams al-Dīn Ṣāhib Dīwān Muḥammad al-Juwaynī, and the latter’s brother, ‘Aṭā Malik al-Juwaynī, was appointed as the deputy of Sūnjāq Āqā, the governor of Baghdad

and Iraq. The vizierate of Khurāsān was assigned to Kh^wāja ‘Izz al-Dīn Ṭāhir and after him to his son, Wajīh al-Dīn. The governorship of the province (*wilāya*) of Fārs was in the hands of the Atābegs, and Shams al-Dīn Tāzīkū was the tax collector. Abāqā Khān entrusted the administration of Kirmān to Tarkān Khātūn, Tabrīz to al-Malik Ṣadr al-Dīn, Diyārbakir to Jalāl al-Dīn Ṭarīr and al-Malik Raḍī al-Dīn Bābā, and Iṣfahān together with most of the provinces of ‘Irāq-i ‘Ajam (the Persian provinces of the region known as Iraq) to Kh^wāja Bahā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad, the son of Shams al-Dīn Ṣāhib Dīwān. The governorship of Sistān and Nīmrūz was in the hands of al-Malik Shams al-Dīn Kart. Although Georgia had been given to Shīrāmūn, the actual control of the area was in the hands of the local Georgian rulers, who at that time were Dāwūd and his son, Ṣādūn or Sūdūn. Abāqā’s summer residences were at Alāṭāgh (present-day Takht-i Sulaymān in Ādharbāyjān) and Siyāh Kūh, and his winter residences were Arrān and Baghdad (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. ‘Alī Zādah, 3/102–103).

FOREIGN POLICY: CONFLICT ON THREE FRONTS

1. RELATIONS WITH THE GOLDEN HORDE (THE KHANS OF THE DASHT-I QIBCHĀQ)

From the time of Hūlāgū, the Īlkhānid state had two tenacious enemies and rivals: the Golden Horde in the north, and the Mamlūk sultanate of Egypt in the west. The latter’s expansion into Damascus and Greater Syria was a strong bulwark against Mongol raids on Damascus and an obvious hindrance to Īlkhānid ambitions to occupy Syria and Egypt. On the other hand, the khans of the Dasht-i Qibchāq were on the offensive against the Īlkhāns because they regarded Darband, Arrān and Ādharbāyjān as exclusively theirs by right, claiming that when distributing the

territories of the Mongol Empire amongst his sons, Chingīz had granted that area to Jochi and his descendants. Accordingly, and since many of them had converted to Islam, whenever the opportunity arose they attacked Darband, Arrān and even Ādharbāyjān on the pretext of taking revenge on the Īlkhāns for the overthrow of the ‘Abbāsīd caliphate. They persisted in this throughout the Īlkhānid period in Persia and for a while afterwards, but it ultimately proved fruitless.

The war between Hūlāgū and Berke (Barkāy), the third son of Jochi and the Muslim Khan of the Dasht-i Qibchāq, had resulted in defeat for Hūlāgū, who had been so upset by it that he had been planning to retaliate (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. ‘Alī Zādah, 3/89). On the death of Hūlāgū in 663/1265, Nūqāy the commander of Berke’s forces decided to launch an attack on Darband and Arrān, and when Abāqā came to know of this, he chose his brother, Prince Yashmūt, to ward him off. On 3 Shawwāl 663/19 July 1265, Yashmūt set out against Nūqāy (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. ‘Alī Zādah, 3/104) and on 20 Ṣafār 664/1 December 1265 a battle was fought in a part of Āqsū (in Arrān), called by the Mongols Chughān Mūrān. In the course of the battle Nūqāy was wounded in the eye by an arrow, and his army was defeated. Meanwhile, Berke with 300,000 horsemen had set out to come to Nūqāy’s aid, and Abāqā also marched towards him, halting at the bank of the river Kur (or Kura) and ordering the bridges to be destroyed. After 14 days on the opposite bank of the river, Berke was unable to cross and set off for Tiflīs in the hope of finding a ford across the Kur there. However, on the way he fell ill and died. His corpse was carried to the capital, Sarāy, and buried there, and then his army dispersed. In the same year, on Abāqā’s orders, a defensive wall (*sīpah*) and moat was built on the banks of the river Kur stretching from ‘Dālān Nāwūr’ to ‘Gardamān’ (in northern Arrān), and a

number of troops were assigned to protect it (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/104).

In Mongolian 'Dālān Nāwūr' means 'Seventy Lakes', which apparently was meant to refer to 'Buḥayra Shamkūr' (Lake Shamkir)—according to Ḥamd Allāh Mus-tawfī (p. 218), a branch of the river Kur flows into this lake. 'Gardamān' refers to the plain of Gardamān Chāy, and east of Gūg Chāy the Gardamān Chāy flows into the Kur (*Hudūd al-'ālam*, trans., Minorsky, 407). Thus it is the part of the river that lies between the confluence of the Gardamān river and its mouth which is on Lake Shamkir, which seems to have been fortified by Abāqā Khān. Having dealt with the problem of Darband successfully, he then left the prince Mankū (Mongke) Tīmūr there together with Samāghar Nūyān and Ūljāy Khātūn, and in the winter of 665/1267 set out for Khurāsān spending the season in Māzandarān and Gurgān (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/104).

Arab historians do not think that the death of Berke brought an end to the war with Abāqā, but instead claim that the conflict and hostility continued between Abāqā and Berke's successor, Mankū Tīmūr, who was the son of Tuḡhān, son of Bātū. Quoting from 'Aynī on the year's events for 666/1268, Ramzī says that al-Malik al-Zāhir (Baybars, Rukn al-Dīn al-Bunduqdārī, the Egyptian sultan) wrote a letter of condolence to Mankū Tīmūr on the death of Berke and welcomed his accession to the throne, also urging him to fight against Abāqā. Thereafter, numerous conflicts took place between Abāqā and Mankū Tīmūr, which resulted in Abāqā defeating Mankū and seizing a great deal of booty (2/456). Ramzī quotes similar material from al-Dhahabī on the events of 665/1267, setting the construction of the defensive wall on the banks of the river Kur during the time of Mankū Tīmūr. Like the Arab authors, Waṣṣāf also reports on the fighting between Abāqā and Mankū Tīmūr, stating: 'After Berke Aghūl died,

his son Mankū Tīmūr became khan [this *nisba* is incorrect] ... fighting broke out between them on several occasions, and on one occasion, as 30,000 of Abāqā Khān's horsemen were crossing the river Kur, the ice cracked and everyone was drowned. Subsequently, when Abāqā Khān realised the considerable size of the enemy army and the bravery of their troops, he built a wall on this side of Darband which was called the 'sībā' and so it became difficult for the Qibchāq army to invade his territories' (Waṣṣāf, 1(1)/51). Rashīd al-Dīn (ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/89), on the other hand, links the story of Abāqā's army crossing the ice and its cracking, which occurred in Rabī I 661/January–February 1263, with the period of the war between Hūlāgū and Berke, calling the river 'Tirik'. This appears to be correct, Waṣṣāf evidently having confused the events in Hūlāgū's reign with those of Abāqā's.

2. CONFLICT IN THE EAST

When Mongke Qā'ān, the Great Khan of the Mongols, died in Muḥarram 657/January–February 1259, a dispute arose among the Chingizid heirs and princes scattered throughout his extensive empire, the details of which are given in such works of history as *Jāmi' al-tawārikh* and *Tārīkh-i Wāṣṣāf*. Chagatai's offspring, who had settled in Transoxania, believed that their share of the vast empire of Chingiz Khān was as nothing compared with those of Ogedei, Tolui and Jochi. After acceding to the throne in early 663/1264 in Ūzgand, Barāq a great-grandson of Chagatai (i.e. the son of Bīsū Tawā, son of Mu'ātūkān (or Mo'etuken), son of Chagatai; cf. Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. Blochet, 168), attacked Qāydū, the son of Qāshī or Ghāzī, son of Ogedei, who was ruler of Mongolia, and defeated him. Qāydū, Qibchāq and Barkājār (of the Golden Horde) preferred to reach a compromise with Barāq and assign his share of Chingiz Khān's legacy, since he was planning to sack the cities of Transoxania.

In the spring of 667/1269, the Mongol princes gathered together in Talās and Ganjak, and decided to hand over two-thirds of Transoxania to Barāq. However, this did not satisfy him and he later tried to launch an attack on Abāqā's territories in Persia. To this end he sent a secret message to his cousin, Nikūdār, who was in Ādharbāyjān with Abāqā Khān, informing him of his intention. Nikūdār wanted to set out for Transoxania going north of the Caspian Sea to meet up with Barāq, but Abāqā became aware of his intention and sent soldiers to arrest him. War broke out, Nikūdār was defeated and tried to seek refuge with Dāwūd, the king of Georgia. The latter, however, sent a message to him telling him to leave Georgia, since it was in fact a vassal state of Īlkhānid Iran. In Rabī' I 668/October–November 1269, Nikūdār took himself, his wife and children to Abāqā, and the latter pardoned him. Nevertheless, he executed six of his emirs and imprisoned Nikūdār himself on one of the islands on Lake Urmiya, not releasing him until after Barāq had been defeated (Waṣṣāf, 1(1)/67–69, 71–72). In the winter of 665/1267—according to Waṣṣāf, at the end of 666/1268—Barāq and Qāydu sent Mas'ūd Beg, son of Maḥmūd Yalawāj, to Abāqā Khān, ostensibly to collect revenues from their appanages in the royal lands (*īnjū*) but actually for the purpose of spying and collecting information about the internal situation in his territory. As a precautionary measure, Mas'ūd Beg positioned two trustworthy mounted warriors at each stage along his journey. As the news of his impending arrival in Persia spread, Kh^{ra}ja Shams al-Dīn Ṣāḥib Dīwān, went to welcome him; Mas'ūd Beg, however, paid no attention to him, and took up a position in the presence of Abāqā which was superior to that of the other commanders apart from members of the Īlkhānid ruling clan. Abāqā gave orders for the revenues which he had demanded to be collected and handed to him within a week, but Mas'ūd

was in some haste and requested permission to return. A day after his return, it was reported that a number of Barāq's troops had been seen on the banks of the Jayḥūn. At this point, Abāqā found out that Mas'ūd Beg had been acting as a spy, and he immediately sent someone in pursuit of him; however, as he had taken all possible precautionary measures and put two armed horsemen at each station, Mas'ūd was able to cross over onto the other bank of the Jayḥūn quickly, preventing Abāqā's troops from arresting him (Waṣṣāf, 1(1) 69–70; Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/105).

According to Rashīd al-Dīn (3/113–115), in the summer of 668/1270 Abāqā moved to wage war against Barāq. Having reached a point near the Jayḥūn, Barāq sent a message to Qāydu appealing for help. Qāydu dispatched two princes, Qjbchāq and Jabāt (or Jabā), who were descendants of Ogedei Qā'an, at the same time telling them secretly to find some excuse to enable them to return. They were joined by al-Malik Shams al-Dīn Kart, the ruler of Herat. Qāydu's objective was not for Barāq to win the war against Abāqā Khān but rather, through his defeat, to be protected against Barāq's incursions into the plains of Turkestan. After Barāq had crossed the Jayḥūn, an argument arose in the *ordu* in his presence between one of his leading emirs, Jalāyir Tāy, and the prince Qjbchāq. Finding some pretext, the latter left Barāq's assembly in a rage and made his way to Transoxania. Barāq sent a party of soldiers to pursue him, but they were unable to seize him as he vanished into the desert. After that Jabāt also fled from Barāq. As for al-Malik Shams al-Dīn Kart, when he saw the pillaging and plundering carried out by Barāq and his troops, he returned to the citadel in Herat, waiting to see how things would turn out.

As reported by Waṣṣāf (1(1)/71), after crossing the Jayḥūn, Barāq pillaged all the places he came to; even the city of Bukhārā was not safe from his predations. When he

reached Khurāsān, he fought the army of the prince Tabsīn, Abāqā's brother, and defeated him. According to Waṣṣāf, Abāqā also marched to Khurāsān with an army of 50,000 men and prepared a trap for Barāq by spreading rumours that he was turning back, and then releasing one of Barāq's spies whom he had captured, and sending him off to Barāq with this false information. Delighted by what he heard, Barāq immediately headed for Herat, where al-Malik Shams al-Dīn Kart gave orders that the gates were not to be opened to him, forcing him to cross the river. On his way he saw the abandoned camp and stables of Abāqā Khān's army, and gave orders that they should be looted and then the army should set off home. However, after about eight miles they suddenly encountered Abāqā's army. They were compelled to halt beside the Herat river (Harīwah-rūd) to prepare for battle. With exhausted horses, Barāq was in no condition to fight and found himself in serious trouble; however, Jalāyir Tāy and Marghāwal, two of his bravest and most bellicose emirs, gave him heart and urged him to fight. A fierce battle took place on 1 Dhū al-Ḥijja 668/22 July 1270, in which Marghāwal, who was one of Barāq's most famous generals, along with many of his soldiers, was killed, and Barāq was defeated. He managed to get across the Jayḥūn with a small band of soldiers, and then suffered a stroke which left him paralysed (Waṣṣāf, 1(1)/73, 75).

3. ABĀQĀ AND HETHUM

The king of Lesser Armenia (Cilicia): From the 4th/early 10th century in southern Asia Minor along the Adana (now Sayḥān) and Jayḥān rivers, in the region known as Cilicia, or Qilīqiyā, an Armenian colony was established which then later expanded and became known as Lesser Armenia. In this way a semi-independent Armenian state was set up which initially supported the powerful neighbouring Muslim regimes, but after the outbreak

of the Crusades and the Franks' seizure of Jerusalem and the Holy Land, this Armenian principality gradually began to take the side of the Franks.

The king of Lesser Armenia, or Cilicia, in the time of Hūlāgū, was Hethum I (or Hetoum). Abū al-Fidā' (2/3) calls him Haythūm b. Quṣṭanṭīn b. Bāsīl (a name which is given in an Arabicised form, *Hātīm*, by Ibn al-ʿIbrī, *Mukhtaṣar al-duwal*, 285).

Hethum was also a contemporary of Abāqā, and stood with him and the Crusaders in opposing the Egyptian Mamlūks. In fact, he acted as Abāqā's ally against al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars. In 664/1266, al-Malik al-Zāhir, who was in a state of war with the Crusaders, as well as being angered at Hethum's relations with them, dispatched a great army under the command of al-Malik al-Manṣūr, the lord of Ḥamā in Syria, to invade Cilicia. The author of *Mukhtaṣar al-duwal* (Ibn al-ʿIbrī, 285) writes that his intention was to bring Hethum under his control and to collect the poll tax (*jizya*) from him, as a means of obtaining horses, mules, wheat, barley and iron from the regions under his rule. The Armenian king, however, fearful of the Mongols, did not allow such transactions to be carried out. On receiving the news of the Egyptian military expedition, Hethum left Cilicia and went to Rūm, that is to say to the Saljūqs of Rūm, in order to seek help from the Mongol emir, Tūqū Bīgīchī, who was Abāqā's deputy in the region (the author of *Mukhtaṣar al-duwal* has given his name as 'Nafjī' which is clearly a misspelling). However, on the pretext that he did not have permission from Abāqā to do so, the emir declined to assist the Armenian king. Meanwhile, the king's brothers and sons, as well as the emirs or commanders appointed by Hethum, proceeded to mount a defence of the Cilician kingdom, but were ultimately defeated. One of Hethum's sons, Thoros, was killed, and his other son, Leo or Leon (Lifūn), was taken captive. By

the time Hethum reached Sīs, the Cilician capital, with an army comprised of Mongol and Rūm Saljūq troops, the Egyptians had already sacked and destroyed the city.

In 666/1268, al-Malik al-Zāhir made peace with Hethum, the condition being that the former would release Leo, Hethum's son, in return for the latter asking Abāqā to set free Sunqur al-Ashqar, one of the great emirs of Egypt who had been taken captive by Mongols in the time of Hūlāgū, and also handing over certain cities and fortresses in Cilicia to the Egyptians. In 668/1270 Hethum went to Abāqā and asked him to release Sunqur al-Ashqar. After taking leave of Abāqā, and having married his daughter to Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwāna, one of the most influential emirs of the Saljūqs of Rūm, in 669/1271 Hethum sent Sunqur al-Ashqar, now released from his captivity in Persia, to al-Malik al-Zāhir and the latter released Hethum's son as well (Ibn al-ʿIbrī, 447). According to Abū al-Fidā' (2/7), Hethum died in 669/1271 and his son Leo succeeded him. The author of *Mukhtaṣar al-duwal*, on the other hand, reports that in order to show Abāqā his appreciation for the vital role he had played in freeing his son, Hethum went to the Īlkhān and renounced his throne, asking that his son Leo be appointed his successor (Ibn al-ʿIbrī, 448).

Abāqā's relations with the Mamlūk sultanate of Egypt: Relations between the Mamlūks of Egypt and the Mongol Īlkhāns of Persia were hostile. Hūlāgū and Abāqā were trying to extend the Īlkhānid Empire's boundaries from the banks of the Euphrates as far as Syria, Palestine and Egypt. For their part, the Mamlūk state in Egypt, in its role as the protector of Islam, strongly resisted this, adopting a defensive attitude against Mongol expansionism. After killing al-Malik al-Muzaffār Quṭuz (Qutuz, Quduz), al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars al-Bunduqdārī ascended the throne in Dhū al-Qa'da 658/October 1260. The former was

the same ruler who had inflicted a heavy defeat on Hūlāgū's army in 658/1260 at ʿAyn Jālūt. Hūlāgū being so upset by this had been planning his revenge, but he died not long after the event.

Al-Maqrīzī (1(2)/553), writing about the events of the year 664/1266, says that in this year Abāqā's envoys went to al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars taking gifts to him and seeking peace. The sending of envoys was apparently intended to proclaim Abāqā's accession to the throne rather than to negotiate a peace, since Abāqā was following the same expansionist policy as Hūlāgū, remaining at war with the Muslim state of Egypt, while being on good terms with the Crusaders who were perched on the eastern Mediterranean coastline. In the hostilities between the Persian Īlkhāns and the Egyptian Mamlūks, the khans of the Golden Horde or Dasht-i Qibchāq sided with the Egyptians because of their disputes with the Īlkhāns over Arrān and Ādharbāyjan; and Abāqā, as a non-Muslim and supporter of Christians, was considered an ally and friend of the Crusaders and the rulers of Lesser Armenia.

On 5 Jumādā I 671/28 November 1272, it was reported in Egypt that Abāqā's forces had reached the stronghold of al-Bīra, had set up mangonels to capture it (al-Maqrīzī, 1(2)/606), and had seized the crossings over the Euphrates. The city of al-Bīra (present-day Birecik, situated in southern Turkey) is situated where the Euphrates flows out of the narrow passes of the Taurus Mountains and is navigable. Al-Malik al-Zāhir immediately sent a detachment of his troops on ahead as an advance guard, and then on 18 Jumādā I marched until he arrived at the Euphrates to find the Mongols waiting on the opposite bank. He launched the boats which he had brought with him on the river, and the troops also went directly into the water, and holding the reins of their horses and wielding the paddles of the boats instead of spears, they defeated the Mongols in a fierce battle. Al-

Malik al-Zāhir entered al-Bīra, bestowing gifts of money on the deputy governor and the townspeople who had sacrificed so much, and finally, on 3 Jumādā II 671/26 December 1272, together with his Mongol prisoners he entered Damascus (al-Maqrīzī, 1(2)/607).

In *Tārīkh-i Waṣṣāf*, the siege of al-Bīra by Abāqā, and the appearance of al-Malik al-Zāhir on the banks of the Euphrates, are mentioned as events in the year 679/1280, which is clearly a mistake. Waṣṣāf deals with the siege of al-Bīra in a degree of detail not found in the works of the Arab historians: for example, he claims that in order to cross the Euphrates, al-Malik al-Zāhir put 35,000 camels in the water so that his troops could cross to the other side under the bellies of the camels (Waṣṣāf, 1(1)/88–89).

DEALINGS WITH THE SALJŪQS OF RŪM AND THE STORY OF MU'ĪN AL-DĪN PARWĀNA

As mentioned above, those parts of Asia Minor held by the Saljūqs came under the suzerainty of the Mongol Ilkhāns, as was the case also with Georgia, Fārs and Kirmān. After his accession to the throne Abāqā had sent two of his chief emirs there with an army to watch over the Saljūqs of Rūm and to ensure their obedience.

Mu'īn al-Dīn Sulaymān b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Daylamī, known as Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwāna, was an experienced and astute statesman at the court of the Saljūqs of Rūm. He rose so high in the court of Rukn al-Dīn Qilīj Arslān b. Kaykhusraw that Rukn al-Dīn himself was fearful of him and tried to have him murdered. But Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwāna, in collaboration with the Mongol emirs at Qilīj Arslān's court, seized him and strangled him with a bowstring (which was a standard Mongol method for executing anyone of royal blood), and then put his son Ghiyāth al-Dīn, who was still a child, on the throne in 666/1268. After a

while, disagreements erupted between the Parwāna and the vizier Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī, as a result of which Mu'īn al-Dīn had the vizier arrested and imprisoned in the citadel of 'Uthmānuq. Sometime later, these hostilities were brought to an end through the mediation of Abāqā Khān.

In 675/1276, Abāqā's son married al-Sulṭān Ghiyāth al-Dīn's sister, Saljūqī Khātūn, and Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwāna went with a number of the most important relatives of the bride to Ādharbāyjān to meet her new husband. In Mu'īn al-Dīn's absence, an emir known as al-Amīr Sharaf al-Dīn b. al-Khaṭīr rebelled, sending his brother Ḍiyā' al-Dīn b. al-Khaṭīr to al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars in Egypt to appeal for aid. This event is also mentioned in the *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh* (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/143–144), where it states that in 674/1276 Ḍiyā' al-Dīn b. al-Khaṭīr and the son of the Parwāna (sic) left the province of Rūm with 100 men for al-Shām to persuade Baybars (al-Malik al-Zāhir) to undertake an expedition against Rūm. The author of the *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh* is incorrect to include the son of the Parwāna (namely Mu'īn al-Dīn) among those who went to Baybars, since Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwāna had then gone to the *ordu* of Abāqā Khān in Ādharbāyjān with the vizier and Saljūqī Khātūn, sister of al-Sulṭān Ghiyāth al-Dīn. It was in their absence—as described in certain historical works including in the *Tārīkh* of Ibn Bībī (pp. 662 ff.)—that Sharaf al-Dīn and Ḍiyā' al-Dīn, the sons of al-Khaṭīr, rebelled and Ḍiyā' al-Dīn made his way with a number of emirs to Egypt. How then could the Parwāna or his son have appealed to the Egyptians for aid against themselves?

Al-Maqrīzī, who includes these events among those for the year 674/1275 (1(2)/621), then adds that in 675/1276, a number of emirs from Rūm who were furious with the Parwāna (which title he gives as 'Barwānāh') met Baybars after he returned to Damascus from Karak. The

group included Ḥusām al-Dīn Bayanjār Rūmī, his son Bahādur, Aḥmad b. Bahādur, and twelve Saljūq emirs with their wives and offspring, accompanied by two Mongol emirs. Following the Parwāna's return from Persia, the Mongol troops in Rūm seized Sharaf al-Dīn b. al-Khaṭīr, and killed him. It was while they were bringing the chaotic situation in the region under control, that reports suddenly arrived of al-Malik al-Zāhir's invasion of Asia Minor and the lands held by the Rūm Saljūqs (al-Maqrīzī, 1(2)/625).

According to al-Maqrīzī, after the emirs of Rūm had gone to al-Malik al-Zāhir's court in Damascus and he had then returned to Egypt, the sultan resolved to attack Asia Minor. With his army provisioned, he set out for the region. The Mongol army which was at Ablistayn, or Ablistān (Elbistan), was made ready for war under the command of Tūqū (Tūghū) son of Īlkāy Nūyān, his brother Ūruqtū and Tūdāwn (by al-Maqrīzī given as Tutāwūn) the son of Sūdūn; Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwāna was also with them in the army of Rūm. The Mongol army consisted of 11 *tulb* (each *tulb* being over 1,000 cavalry), and the army of Rūm comprised a distinct *tulb* on its own (al-Maqrīzī, 1(2)/628).

Battle was joined on 10 Dhū al-Qa'da 675/15 April 1277 on the Hūtū plains of Elbistan, resulting in a heavy defeat for the Mongol forces and the deaths of Tūqū and Tūdāwn. The Parwāna fled to Qaysāriyya and, accompanied by Sultān Ghiyāth al-Dīn, then proceeded to Tūqāt (Tokat). Diyā' al-Dīn b. al-Khaṭīr, who was among the Egyptian troops, was also killed (al-Maqrīzī, 1(1)/628–629). Following this clear victory, al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars arrived in Qaysāriyya and awaited the Parwāna. However, fearful of Abāqā, the latter held back from going to meet him and instead congratulated him by letter. Al-Malik al-Zāhir invited him to come to Qaysāriyya, but the Parwāna, who had

appealed to Abāqā for help, held back from going. Al-Malik al-Zāhir confiscated the Parwāna's assets as well as those of his wife, Gurjī Khātūn, which were of great value, and then left Qaysāriyya, marching through Elbistan in order to view the corpses of those who had been killed. He ordered those of his army to be buried, leaving the Mongol dead untouched. He reportedly also left some of his own dead soldiers unburied, so that the Mongols could not easily see how many of his forces he had lost (al-Maqrīzī, 1(2)/631–632). According to Rashīd al-Dīn (3/144), on the march back the horses in the Egyptian army fell ill with *ṭabaqa* (a sort of horse sickness), so that much of Baybars' army had to go on foot.

In the dispatches announcing the victory (*fath-nāmah*), which were composed by al-Qāḍī Muḥyī al-Dīn and which are referred to in *Ṣubḥ al-a'shā*, the shortage of forage for the Egyptian horses is also pointed out. The document refers to the letter which Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwāna wrote to al-Malik al-Zāhir regarding his route via Qaysāriyya, and describes how in reply al-Malik al-Zāhir accused him of disloyalty, implying that the Parwāna had written inviting him to Rūm, but that after al-Malik al-Zāhir's arrival he had gone into hiding. It also mentions Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwāna's son, his daughter's son and his mother amongst those taken prisoner (al-Qalqashandī, 14/139 ff.).

On being told of the destruction of the Mongol army, Abāqā instantly left Tabrīz for Rūm, and when he saw the corpses of the Mongol army in Elbistan he began to weep. He was greatly distressed to find that Tūqū and Tūdāwn had been killed, and in a fury gave the order to lay waste the Anatolian provinces. Shams al-Dīn Ṣāḥib Dīwān, who was present, managed to save several cities and prevent their inhabitants from being killed, but on Abāqā's orders half of Siwās was plundered. Shams

al-Dīn interceded and asked him to treat the people with mercy and not to inflict a general punishment for a crime committed by an individual. His intercession was accepted and Abāqā pardoned them (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/144–145).

Abāqā Khān was planning to go on to al-Shām, but it being summer, his emirs and soldiers asked him to postpone the expedition until the end of autumn or the beginning of winter. Abāqā agreed, writing a threatening letter to al-Malik al-Zāhir. When the latter, who was in Damascus, heard the news of Abāqā's Syrian expedition, he mobilised his army to face him, and only ordered them to stand down when he found out that Abāqā had turned back. Then al-Malik al-Zāhir became ill, or according to one report, was poisoned, and after 13 days, on 17 Muḥarram 676/20 June 1277, he died.

While Abāqā was in Rūm, he sent Mu'īn al-Dīn Parwāna to capture the citadel of Kūghūniyya, but when he failed, Abāqā became angry with him and put him in prison. When they reached Ālādāgh, Abāqā's messengers arrived from al-Malik al-Zāhir's court, bringing the letters which the Parwāna had written to him inciting him to launch an attack on Rūm and on Saljūq territories, and showed them to Abāqā. Having sent these letters to Abāqā, al-Malik al-Zāhir asked him to take revenge on the Parwāna because of his treachery. During this period the wives of Tūdawn and Tūqū, who believed the deaths of their husbands in the battle and the defeat of the Mongol army to be the result of a plot by the Parwāna, repeatedly called on Abāqā to kill him as blood revenge. After reading the Parwāna's letters to al-Malik al-Zāhir, Abāqā ordered him to be killed (Ibn Bībī, 682–684). At the beginning of Rabī' I 676/2 August 1277 he also had Kawjak Tūghchī put to death (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/147).

MANKŪ (MONGKE) TĪMŪR'S WAR WITH THE EGYPTIANS

On 20 Rajab 678/26 November 1279, after deposing al-Malik al-Ādil Sulāmish, who was the son of al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Sayf al-Dīn Qalāwūn al-Alfī al-Šāliḥī came to the throne. In 679/1280 Sunqur al-Ashqar, who had declared himself sultan in Damascus with the regnal title of al-Malik al-Ādil, was compelled to leave the city and he wrote a letter to Abāqā Khān inciting him to attack Greater Syria. This was reiterated by al-Amīr Sharaf al-Dīn 'Īsā b. Muḥannā, one of the Arab emirs (al-Maqrīzī, 1 (3)/677–678). In the meantime Abāqā's troops invaded Greater Syria. According to al-Maqrīzī, they were made up of three contingents: one from Rūm led by Samāghar Nūyān (in Arabic sources: Ṣamghār); one from the east headed by Bāydū, son of Turqāy (Tūrghāy), son of Hūlāgū; and another led by Mankū Tīmūr, another son of Hūlāgū. On 11 Jumādā II 679/18 October 1280, the Mongol army launched an assault on Ḥalab (Aleppo), capturing the cities of 'Ayn Tāb, Baghrās, Darbsāk or Dayr Wāsāk (Tempesak), and plundering and destroying Ḥalab. They then returned home. When he heard the news, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn set out with an expeditionary force from Egypt and reached Gaza, where he stayed until 10 Sha'bān/5 December. There he received news that the Mongol army had withdrawn, and he also turned back (al-Maqrīzī, 1(3)/681–683).

In 680/1281, it was reported that Mankū Tīmūr, Abāqā's brother, had marched with the Mongol army into the land of Rūm. Al-Malik al-Manṣūr, who had gone to Damascus, was informed that the Mongol army intended to launch an expedition against Syria, and so he prepared his army. Abāqā himself moved towards Ruḥba, causing the people of Ḥalab to

flee the city and go to Ḥimṣ and Ḥamā in fear of the Mongols. Al-Malik al-Manṣūr also set out for Ḥimṣ with his army, while Mankū Tīmūr made a rapid march to the same city to confront him. His army is reported to have consisted of 50,000 Mongols and 30,000 Georgians, Armenians, Saljūq Turks and Franks (Crusaders). On Thursday 14 Rajab 680/29 October 1281, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn deployed his army outside Ḥimṣ, and with 200 of his chosen Mamlūks took his stand on a hill-ock. The Mongol forces were twice as numerous as the Egyptians. Battle was joined on the arid plain around Ḥimṣ, near the tomb of Khālīd b. al-Walīd. The left flank of the Mongol army mounted a ferocious assault on the right flank of the Egyptian army. The Egyptians fought back and then counter-attacked, reaching the centre of the Mongol army where Mankū Tīmūr was fighting. However, the right flank of the Mongol army launched an offensive at the Egyptian left flank, scattering it and forcing the Egyptians to retreat to Ḥimṣ, and a large number of the people of Ḥimṣ were killed by the Mongols. The defeated left flank of the Egyptians was unaware that the right flank had gained a victory. Similarly, the Mongols who had defeated the Muslim left flank knew nothing about their own left flank. Certain of their victory, they dismounted from their horses setting them free to graze, only to receive news of Mankū Tīmūr's flight, at which they also fled.

Abāqā heard the news that his army had been defeated while he was besieging Ruḥba, and he then made his way to Baghdad. Wounded and defeated, Mankū Tīmūr came before Abāqā and the latter said angrily: 'Why did you flee and why did neither you nor your army give up your lives?' Abāqā left Baghdad for Hamadān where he was to die shortly afterwards (al-Maqrīzī, 1(3)/690–694, 698, 704).

Rashīd al-Dīn, in his *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*, also gives an account of the battle between Mankū Tīmūr and al-Malik al-Manṣūr de-

scribed above. He writes about the 4 *far-sangs* (24 km) of battlelines, giving Mankū Tīmūr's youth and inexperience in warfare as the reason for his defeat and flight. He also says that when he heard of his army's defeat Abāqā became enraged, declaring that at the time of the *qūriltāi* (the great gathering of the Mongols) in the summer he would punish the offenders, and that the following year he would go himself and take revenge for this defeat (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/163).

ABĀQĀ KHĀN AND SHAMS AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD KART

Al-Malik Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Kart was a son of al-Malik Rukn al-Dīn Kart, and his forebears had been in the service of the Ghūrīds. After his father's death in 643/1245, he succeeded him as ruler of the regions around Ghūr. Competent, knowledgeable, courageous and experienced, he was able to turn the events of the age to his advantage. In the war between the Mongol princes, he initially sided with Yīsū Mankā (Yāsūn Mankū) son of Chagatai, but after he was defeated by Mongke Qā'ān, the Kart took the latter's side and was present on the day of his accession to throne of the Mongol empire. Pleased with his eloquence and courage, Mongke Qā'ān entrusted to him the rule of a significant part of the Sind valley and Khurāsān, including Herat.

In 665/1267, while Abāqā was engaged in a war against Berke Khān on the frontiers of Darband and Shirwān, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Kart, who was travelling to Abāqā's *ordu* but without any intention of meeting him, came upon the battle lines, and so he fell on Berke's army and fought courageously. Abāqā was amazed at his valour and daring, and when he recognised him treated him with great favour and kindness.

As mentioned above in regard to the war in the East between Barāq and Abāqā, Shams al-Dīn would not let Barāq enter

Herat, but was accused of collaborating with him when he also refused to go and meet Abāqā. He likewise declined to attend on the prince Tabsīn, the governor (*farmāndār*) of Khurāsān, despite being summoned several times. In 674/1275 Abāqā decided to dispatch an army to Khurāsān to seize him, but Shams al-Dīn Ṣāhib Dīwān, fearing that such an expedition would utterly lay waste Khurāsān, managed to prevent this by promising that his own son Kh^wāja Bahā' al-Dīn Muḥammad, the governor of Iṣfahān and 'Irāq-i 'Ajam, would go to him and take him to the *ordu*. Shams al-Dīn Ṣāhib Dīwān wrote an eloquent letter to the Kart ruler. Bahā' al-Dīn Muḥammad did so also, asking him to set out for the *ordu* as Abāqā had ordered, and assuring him that he would not be harmed. Al-Malik Shams al-Dīn set out for the *ordu*, and was warmly welcomed in Iṣfahān by al-Kh^wāja Bahā' al-Dīn, who accompanied him to Tabrīz. Abāqā, however, who had taken great offence, ignored him, thereby frustrating al-Kh^wāja Shams al-Dīn Ṣāhib Dīwān's attempt to bring about a reconciliation between the two men. On Abāqā's orders Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Kart was imprisoned in the citadel of Tabrīz and his palace was plundered.

According to Rashīd al-Dīn, al-Malik Shams al-Dīn met his end in 676/1277 in the following manner: he put poison which he had hidden in the stone (of his ring) into a dish of *tutmāj* (a kind of potage), and thus died. Abāqā, however, saying that he was not to be trusted and perhaps this was also a trick, gave orders that his coffin be fastened down with nails and then placed in his tomb (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/148–150). According to al-Isfizārī, he died in the middle of Sha'bān 676/January 1278 when he was given a poisoned watermelon on Abāqā Khān's orders and then Abāqā had his coffin fastened with iron bars and sent to Jām province, where his mausoleum was erected (al-Isfizārī, 2/421–422). Waṣṣāf's version of his end

(1(1)/83) is incorrect and at variance with the statements of such reliable historians as Rashīd al-Dīn, al-Isfizārī, Faṣīḥ (2/345) and others. Waṣṣāf probably confused him with his son because, according to certain historians (including Faṣīḥ, 346), Abāqā Khān gave the son of Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Kart, whose name was Rukn al-Dīn Muḥammad Kart, his father's honorific title (*laqab*).

FĀRS AND KIRMĀN

The Salghurs or Salghurid Atābegs, known also as the Atābegs of Fārs, were the rulers of Fārs, and after Mongol hegemony was established over Persia, they asked to be placed under their protection. They agreed to pay taxes to the Mongol officers (*bāsqāqs*) and chiefs of police (*shahnas*). After the murder of Atābeg Saljūqshāh in the time of Hūlāgū (d. 662/1264), there were no surviving members of the Salghurid clan apart from Abish Khātūn and Salghum Khātūn, the daughters of Atābeg Sa'd. Salghum Khātūn was given in marriage to Yūsuf Shāh, the Atābeg of Yazd, while in Fārs coins were struck and the *Atābigī khuṭba* was read in the name of her sister, Abish Khātūn. However, this was not regarded as an appropriate choice and, as Waṣṣāf explains, from this time on, the kingdom of Fārs remained entirely under the control of foreigners, namely the Mongols (1(2)/190). In 665/1267, Shādī Bītakchī and Damur were sent to Fārs to collect the annual revenue; but as there was no governor specifically designated for the region, the collection of taxes was not carried out in the proper fashion until the year 667/1269, when Angiyānū was appointed governor of Fārs (Waṣṣāf, 1(2)/193).

When Angiyānū started treating people oppressively and sought to act autonomously, completely ignoring Abish Khātūn's officers and administrators, some of the Atābeg's followers rose up against him and besieged his house. Angiyānū also

ordered the killing of the Atābeg's chief vassal, Kulja. The people of Shīrāz complained at the court (*dārbār*) of Abāqā Khān about Angiyānū's tyranny and the way he was amassing wealth. Abāqā dismissed him as governor of Fārs and dispatched him to the *ordu* of the Qā'ān to take up the wearisome task of being an ambassador. In 670/1272 Abāqā commissioned Sūnjāq (or: Sūghunchāq Nūyān) to go to Fārs. Sūnjāq reorganised the financial affairs of Fārs and managed to recover the island of Kīsh, or Qīs, which had been captured by Maḥmūd, the governor of Qallahāt, during a naval conflict. Since Abish Khātūn had been given in marriage to the prince Mankū Tīmūr, Abāqā's brother, Sūnjāq set out for Tabrīz with the bride, bringing with him two years' worth of taxes from Fārs (Waṣṣāf, 1(2)/196–197).

In the winter 677/1279, rumours spread in Shīrāz that 2,000 Nikūdārī horsemen were planning to raid Fārs for plunder, coming by way of Sīstān and Kirmān. These horsemen were apparently from the forces of Nikūdār, a descendant of Chagatai, who after his captivity in Arrān and Georgia at the hands of Abāqā Khān, had gone all the way to Sīstān. This is what the chroniclers reported, but given the authority and control which Abāqā wielded over Persia, it is unlikely that Nikūdār's forces could have travelled through these territories, namely from the northwestern corner of Persia all the way to Sīstān in the east, without encountering any opposition. It is possible that after the defeat and capture of Nikūdār himself they went to Barāq's *ordu*, since it was he who had provoked Nikūdār to attack Abāqā, taking a route north of the Caspian Sea, and then after the defeat of Barāq, they might have stayed in Sīstān. Thus, if the opportunity arose, they were able to cause trouble for Abāqā. What supports this last theory is that they had previously been followers of Barāq's sons. As Rashīd al-Dīn reports, up to 698/1299 the ruler of the Nikūdārīs was a descendant of Chagatai called 'Abd Allāh, who later on

'was summoned and detained' by Barāq's son, Duwā (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/151, 153).

To counter the Nikūdārī threat, Bulghān, the *shahna* of Fārs, and the emirs of the province set out with Shams al-Dīn Tāzīkū for Karbāl (*Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*: Kalbār), but near the gorge of Shikam, a disagreement broke out between them as to who should cross the river first. They eventually crossed the bridge, and the Nikūdārīs, who were lying in ambush, attacked and killed many of them. Bulghān and Shams al-Dīn Tāzīkū managed to reach Shīrāz after many trials and prepared the city's defences. The Nikūdārīs advanced as far as the walls of the city, seizing a wealth of booty and horses, but their attempt at besieging the city was unsuccessful and they had to turn back. Three years later, in 680/1281, they attacked and plundered again and, according to Waṣṣāf, plundered the Garmsār regions as far as Dashtīstān, and the coastline and districts (*wilāyāt*) as well (Waṣṣāf, 1(2)/203).

KIRMĀN

At the time of the Īlkhāns, Kirmān was ruled by the Qarā Khitay of Kirmān. During the reign of Abāqā Khān, Sulṭān Ḥajjāj, son of Quṭb al-Dīn, was in control, and the administration of the area was run by Quṭb al-Dīn's wife, Qutlugh Tarkān. Once his daughter, Pādīshāh Khātūn, had been given in marriage to Abāqā Khān and the latter had lost his heart to her, Qarā Khitay rule in Kirmān was consolidated. Sulṭān Ḥajjāj fought on Abāqā's side in his war against Barāq, but he was later forced to abandon ruling Kirmān and go to India, when he came into conflict with Qutlugh Tarkān.

ABĀQĀ KHĀN AND CHRISTIANITY

Hūlāgū Khān was not a Christian, and it is likely that he was a Buddhist. His burial rites, as described by Waṣṣāf (1(1)/52),

followed Mongol practices and rituals. His wife Dūqūz Khātūn, however, who came from the Karāyt clan and who had a higher social status than his other wives, was a Christian because her family were Christian. She supported the Christians in the Īlkhānate and, in Hūlāgū's reign, a number of churches were built throughout the empire; and a church was also constructed next to her *ordu* (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. 'Alī Zādah, 3/6–7). When he was Īl Khān, Hūlāgū Khān planned to marry a daughter of the Byzantine emperor, Michael Palaeologus. The emperor sent one of his illegitimate daughters, Maria, with a great deal of ceremony to the court of Hūlāgū, where there was a tent for a church adorned with gold icons and crosses and other sacred objects. When they reached Qaysāriyya, reports came that Hūlāgū had died. Nevertheless, the princess continued on her way, and when she reached Abāqā's *ordu*, she was given in marriage to him. The Mongols named her 'Tasbīna' Khātūn ('despina' in Greek meaning princess). Eastern Christian chroniclers suggested that the bishops who accompanied the princess baptised Abāqā at her request (Howorth, 3/223), but this seems unlikely.

Although Abāqā never converted to the Christian faith, he was a political ally of Christian regimes and hostile to Muslim states, as is clear from the events described earlier. He formed an alliance with the Crusaders, who controlled the eastern Mediterranean coastline, against the Mamlūks of Egypt, corresponded with the pope and European kings and commanders and sought help from them in his fight against the Egyptians. Nestorians and other Christians were very active in his administration and entertained hopes of his support; however, the authority of Muslims inside the empire, particularly in Persia, was so great that Christianity was unable to gain a foothold, nor did the Mongol emirs show much of an inclination for it at that time. But as the histories

show, after a number of years the Īlkhāns and their Mongol emirs embraced Islam, and the Īl Khān Ghāzān became one of its most powerful defenders. The authority of Muslims in the Mongol Empire and their influence over the Mongol princes can also be deduced from the conversion of the khans of the Golden Horde. The debate which took place between Angiyānū, Abāqā's *shahna* in Fārs, and Najīb al-Dīn 'Alī b. Buzghush, the important Sufi of the Suhrawardiyya order, described in detail by Waṣṣāf (1(2)/193–194), is clear evidence that the Mongols were attracted to Islam.

SHAMS AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD AND HIS BROTHER

Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī and his brother 'Aṭā Malik were from a noble family and known for their learning. Their grandfather, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad, was a government accountant (*mustawfi*) for Sulṭān Muḥammad Kh^wārazm-Shāh, a post he also held in the time of Sulṭān Jalāl al-Dīn Kh^wārazm-Shāh. Their father, Bahā' al-Dīn Muḥammad, served under Mongol *shahnas* and *basqāqs* (military governors and officers) and died in 651/1253. 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Aṭā Malik al-Juwaynī was for many years in the service of Amīr Arghūn, who ruled a significant part of Persia on behalf of the Great Khans of the Mongols, and then served Hūlāgū once he came to power in Persia. A year after the capture of Baghdad, 'Aṭā Malik was appointed governor of Baghdad and Mesopotamia, and held the post (except during the investigation made of his actions) throughout the reigns of Hūlāgū and Abāqā, as well as for a brief period in the early reign of Sulṭān Aḥmad Tagūdār. He made serious attempts to restore prosperity to Baghdad and Iraq. In Baghdad he governed as the deputy of Sūghunjāq or Sūnjāq Nūyān, who had been actually appointed governor (*hākīm*) of Iraq and

Fārs by Abāqā. His brother, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī, who was known as ‘*Ṣāhib Dīwān*’ after becoming vizier, was appointed in the reign of Hūlāgū following the execution of Sayf al-Dīn Bītakchī in 661/1263.

Shams al-Dīn assumed control of the vast Īlkhānid Empire from the Jayḥūn frontier as far as the Euphrates, the Caucasus mountains and Asia Minor. As a result of his long career as a vizier in the reigns of Hūlāgū and Abāqā Khān, he himself owned extensive lands throughout this region and in order to run them, as Waṣṣāf has described, he established an independent office, devoting a significant portion of them to charity and alms. Likewise, according to Waṣṣāf (1(1)/56), the annual revenues of the ‘*ṣāhibī lands*’ (*amlāk-i ṣāhibī*) were 360 *tūmāns*, equivalent to 3,600,000 dinars. His sons also attained high positions and posts, the most important being Kh^wāja Bahā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad who became governor of Iṣfahān, ‘Irāq-i ‘Ajām and Yazd, and had an extremely dictatorial style of government. Examples of his strictness and authoritarian rule are described in detail in the *Tārīkh-i Waṣṣāf*.

As indicated in the historical accounts, Shams al-Dīn Ṣāhib Dīwān was successful in putting a stop to the appalling massacres carried out by the Mongols in Muslim lands and, as mentioned above, he prevented Abāqā from plundering and slaughtering in Anatolia. Although his provocative act in plundering and destroying Bukhārā as revenge against Mas‘ūd Yalawāj is unpardonable, on the other hand his efforts at bringing peace and prosperity to the land, as well as his brother’s efforts in the reconstruction of Baghdad after so much of it had been laid waste, were exceptional and remarkable acts. The absolute authority that the two brothers wielded over the Īlkhānid lands greatly contributed to the restoration of culture, knowledge and learning, and prevented other, Buddhist and Christian, cultures from spreading through these re-

gions. However, Shams al-Dīn’s excessive accumulation of wealth and land aroused the jealousy of the Mongol emirs and the Persian accountants (*mustawfīs*), and led to Majd al-Mulk al-Yazdī’s attempts to discredit him. The story of Majd al-Mulk accusing Shams al-Dīn Ṣāhib Dīwān of disloyalty and of unlawfully appropriating state property is set out in detail in *Tārīkh-i Waṣṣāf* and the *Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh* of Rashīd al-Dīn. While Majd al-Mulk had little success in his denunciations of Shams al-Dīn Ṣāhib Dīwān, his attacks on ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Aṭā Malik al-Juwaynī proved highly effective and, as a result, all of ‘Aṭā Malik’s lands and property as well as those of his sons were sold and he himself was put in prison. After Abāqā’s death, in the reign of Sulṭān Aḥmad Tagūdār, Majd al-Mulk was imprisoned and brutally killed and ‘Aṭā Malik was reappointed governor of Baghdad. However, this renewed governorship did not last long and ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Aṭā Malik died on 4 Dhū al-Ḥijja 681/5 March 1283.

ABĀQĀ’S DEATH

According to Rashīd al-Dīn (3/164), Abāqā left Baghdad for Hamadān on 3 Dhū al-Qa‘da 680/13 February 1282 and on 6 Dhū al-Ḥijja 680/18 March 1282, he arrived in Hamadān and stayed with al-Malik Fakhr al-Dīn Manūchihr, spending his time in the pursuit of pleasure. Eventually, on 20 Dhū al-Ḥijja 680/1 April 1282, having drunk excessive quantities of alcohol, Abāqā walked out of his tent in the middle of the night and imagining that he saw a huge black bird in a tree, ordered it to be shot, but no bird could be seen. Then he suddenly closed his eyes and died (cf. Waṣṣāf, 1(1)/105). Within a month, his younger brother Mankū Tīmūr, depressed by his defeat at the hand of al-Malik Manṣūr Qalāwūn, also died on 16 Muḥarrām 681/26 April 1282. His coffin was taken to Ādharbāyjān and buried at

Lake Urmia next to Hülāgū's grave. Ibn al-ʿIbrī's version of these events (p. 289) relates that Abāqā went to the church of the city at Easter and participated in the Christian ceremonies. On Easter Monday a Persian called Bihnām invited him to a great banquet in his home. That night Abāqā suffered a collapse, imagining he was seeing things in the air. On 20 Dhū al-Ḥijja/1 April he died. From the above discussion one may infer that Abāqā, seeking to alleviate his distress at hearing that his army had been defeated, got excessively drunk and it was this which made him ill and hastened his death.

Abāqā Khān had many wives, the names of whom are given in the *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* of Rashīd al-Dīn. The most well known were Maria or Tasbīna Khātūn, daughter of the Byzantine emperor, and Pādishāh Khātūn, daughter of Quṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad of the Qarā Khitay of Kirmān. Only two of his sons survived him: Arghūn Khān and Gaykhātū, both of whom came to the throne (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. ʿAlī Zādah, 3/96–98).

Abāqā was praised by contemporary chroniclers as brave, prudent and determined. Al-Yūnīnī (4/100) says: 'He was a great king, powerful, determined, courageous, daring and experienced in battle, and apart from his father he had no equal. He held to the traditional Mongol beliefs. His territories were extensive and very wealthy, and his army large and entirely loyal to him. He was a man of good judgement and resolution.' Because of his association with the Christian states, Christian chroniclers admired him. Likewise, Persian historians talked of sense of justice. According to Rashīd al-Dīn (3/120), in 668/1270 when Abāqā crossed Ādharbāyjan to wage war against Barāq, it was harvest time and he ordered his troops not to touch anything, not even a single ear of wheat.

Nevertheless, like other brutal tyrants, particularly the Mongol and Tatar rulers, when infuriated he would call for a bar-

baric act of violence and order destruction and massacre, as he did with the cities of Rūm. Generally speaking, however, he is to be regarded as a moderate king rather than a just one; and if he were to be called just, it would simply be as compared with many of the medieval despots who ruled in the East. His wisdom and experience in state affairs, as the events of his reign indicate, are undeniable. However, like most of the Īlkhāns, he was so acquisitive and materialistic that to this end he was prepared to sacrifice his most able and loyal servants. This is evident in his treatment of Kh^wāja Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Juwaynī when Majd al-Mulk made his slanderous accusations, even though he was not so extreme as to simply hand him over to an executioner, as his counterparts usually did in such cases. As for military strategy, here also Abāqā proved his competence and ability. He never lost wars when he himself was in command on the field of battle. Nor was he present at the battles in which the Egyptians defeated the Mongol army.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abū al-Fidā', *Tārīkh* (Istanbul, 1286/1869); Ibn al-ʿIbrī (Gregory Bar Hebraeus), *Tārīkh mukhtaṣar al-duwal* (Beirut, 1958), see also *Makhtebhanuth zabhne*, Part 1. English and Syriac, tr. E. A. Wallis Budge (London, 1932); Amitai-Preiss, Reuven and David Morgan (ed.), *The Mongol Empire and its Legacy* (Leiden, 1999); Baumer, Christoph, *The Church of the East: An Illustrated History of Assyrian Christianity* (London, 2006); Faṣīḥ Kh^wāfi, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, *Mujmal-i Faṣīḥī*, ed. Maḥmūd Farrukh (Mashhad, 1340/1961); Grousset, René, *The Empire of the Steppes: A History of Central Asia* (New Brunswick, 1970); Howorth, Henry Hoyle, *History of the Mongols*, part 3 (New York, 1888); *Hudūd al-ʿālam*, trans., V. Minorsky (London, 1937); Ibn Bībī, Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad, *al-Awāmīr al-ʿalāʾiyya*, ed. Adnan Sadik Erzi (Ankara, 1956); al-Isfīzārī, Muḥammad, *Rawḍāt al-jannāt fī awṣāf madīnat Harāt*, ed. Muḥammad Kāzīm Imām (Tehran, 1339/1950); Lane, George Edmund, *Early Mongol Rule in Thirteenth-Century Iran* (London, 2003); al-Maqrīzī, Aḥmad, *al-Sulūk*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā Ziyāda (Cairo, 1957); Mustawfī, Ḥamd

Allāh, *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, ed. Guy Le Strange (Leiden, 1915); al-Qalqashandī, Aḥmad b. ‘Alī, *Ṣubḥ al-a’shā* (Cairo, 1383/1963); Ramzī, M. M., *Talḥīq al-akhbār wa talqīh al-āthār* (Orenburg, 1908); Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh, *Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh*, ed. E. Blochet (London, 1911); *ibid.*, ed. ‘Alī Zādah (Baku, 1957); Waṣṣāf al-Ḥaḍra, ‘Abd Allāh b. Faḍl Allāh, *Tajziyat al-amṣār wa tazjiyat al-a’sār* (Bombay, 1269/1853); al-Yūnīnī, Mūsā b. Muḥammad, *Dhayl mir‘at al-zamān* (Hyderabad, 1374/1954).

ABBAS ZARYAB
TR. JAWAD QASEMI

Al-‘Abbādī, Abū ‘Āṣim Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbād (d. Shawwāl 458/September 1066), was a Shāfi‘ī *qāḍī* from Herat and the author of the first *ṭabaqāt* (a biographical dictionary arranged by generations) about Shāfi‘ī *fuqahā’* (jurists). He also figured prominently in the intellectual confrontations between the Shāfi‘īs and the Ḥanafīs.

The title ‘al-‘Abbādī’ was derived from a forebear some five generations earlier, ‘Abbād (al-Sam‘ānī, 4/123). It would appear that the ‘Abbādī family were included among the dignitaries of Herat (Ibn Nuqta, 4/237) and that the family also produced other scholars (see al-Baghḍādī, 2/299).

Initially, al-‘Abbādī studied *fiqh* (jurisprudence) under Qāḍī Abū Maṣū‘ al-Azdī in Herat (al-Dhahabī, 18/180–181; al-‘Abbādī, 94), and later in Nīsābūr, though ‘Abd al-Ghāfir al-Fārisī does not mention him in the *Siyāq ta’rīkh Nīsābūr*, it is known that he studied under Qāḍī Abū ‘Umar al-Bastāmī (al-Sam‘ānī, 4/123), Abū Ṭāhir al-Ziyādī (al-‘Abbādī, 101), Abū Ishāq al-Isfarāyīnī (al-Subkī, 4/104, 105) and Abū al-Ṭayyib al-Ṣu‘lūkī (al-‘Abbādī, 104). Abū Ishāq al-Isfarāyīnī, who was a leading exponent of Ash‘arī theology in the east, seems to have been a major influence on al-‘Abbādī (al-Subkī, 4/104–105).

Al-‘Abbādī heard *ḥadīths* from Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Qarrāb (al-Dhahabī, 18/181; al-Subkī, 4/105) as well as Ḥusayn b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Marwazī (Ibn Nuqta, 4/238). It is reported that he went on extensive journeys to numerous places (al-Subkī, 4/104), yet there are few *ḥadīths* narrated on his authority (al-Subkī, 4/105).

Qāḍī Abū Sa‘d al-Harawī (d. ca. 500/1106) is included among al-‘Abbādī’s students of *fiqh* (al-Dhahabī, 18/181). Ismā‘īl b. Abī Šāliḥ al-Mu‘adhḍhin al-Kirmānī (al-Dhahabī, 18/181) and Muḥammad b. Faḍl al-Farāwī (Ibn Nuqta, 4/237) also learnt *ḥadīths* from him.

Al-‘Abbādī was a prolific author and his works were mainly on *fiqh*. Perhaps the reason that few of his works survived or did not become widely known was that he wrote in a very abstruse manner. Even during his lifetime he was notorious for his recondite style of expression (al-Subkī, 4/105). Of all his works, the *Ṭabaqāt al-fuqahā’ al-Shāfi‘iyya* is the one that was most consulted and made use of by subsequent generations (al-Subkī, 1/219; Ibn al-Šalāḥ, 1/107, 366, 474). Indeed, it is the only book by al-‘Abbādī which has survived. In fact the *Ṭabaqāt* enjoyed such widespread acceptance that it overshadowed his personality and as a result the sources that deal with his biography. For the same reason his other works, and the overall nature of his scholarship and his views, have remained somewhat obscure.

However, a brief look at the titles of his other works not only gives a better understanding of al-‘Abbādī’s character, but also helps to understand the intellectual milieu of the time in which he lived. Al-Muqaddasī’s description (second half of the 4th/10th century) of Greater Khurāsān (al-Muqaddasī, 323) and his picture of the general environment of Transoxania reveals that the followers of the Ḥanafī and Shāfi‘ī *madhhabs* (schools of law) co-existed in these regions. On the subject of Herat in particular, he specifically mentions that in those days the followers of these schools lived and worked side by side, and judges were selected from both of them (al-Muqaddasī, 323).

Al-‘Abbādī lived and grew up in Khurāsān in this sort of intellectual and cultural ambience. There is evidence in his works of his relations with the Ḥanafīs, and it appears that the confrontation between the two *madhhabs*, Shāfi‘iyya and Ḥanafīyya, was one of his main concerns. The introduction to his *Ṭabaqāt* is a good example of this. Here he highlights the importance of the *ṭabaqāt* genre, and comments on how

the followers of other schools have achieved mastery of it. He then refers to the inadequacy of such sources for the Shāfi'īs, and contrasts this with examples of this genre amongst the Ḥanafīs. However, he does not give titles of works by the followers of other *madhhabs* (al-ʿAbbādī, 1–6).

One must mention here the importance of his major work on *fiqh*, entitled *al-Mabsūṭ*, which apparently consisted of about thirty volumes (Ḥājji Khalīfa, 2/1581–1582). Except for two cases, one Imāmī and one Mālikī, dating from later centuries (Ḥājji Khalīfa, 2/1581–1582), the history of the composition of *fiqh* works shows that Abū Yūsuf (q.v.) and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī were the first two famous Ḥanafī *faqīhs* to write books with this title. After them, numerous Ḥanafīs developed the *mabsūṭ* genre (a literary style which enters into great detail and argumentation, in contrast to *mukhtaṣar*, which synthesises and summarises) in which they produced works or commentaries all with exactly the same title. The *Kashf al-zunūn* by Ḥājji Khalīfa gives a list of such works (Ḥājji Khalīfa, 2/1580–1582). At least three Khurāsānī scholars who were contemporaries of al-ʿAbbādī, that is al-Sarakhsī, Pazdawī and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Ḥalwāyī, all wrote works with this title (Ḥājji Khalīfa, 2/1582). It is possible that al-ʿAbbādī, like Bayhaqī in Nīsābūr, wrote a book entitled *al-Mabsūṭ* in order to compensate for the relative shortcomings of the Shāfi'īs in this field.

It seems that the principle governing al-ʿAbbādī's composition of the works *Ẓiyādāt* and *Ẓiyādāt al-Ẓiyādāt* is similar to that found in *al-Mabsūṭ*. The *Ẓiyādāt* and *Ẓiyādāt al-Ẓiyādāt*, along with numerous commentaries, also appear under the list of works by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (Ḥājji Khalīfa, 2/962–963). Al-Sarakhsī, a famous Ḥanafī scholar contemporary with al-ʿAbbādī, also wrote the commentary *al-Nukat* on al-Shaybānī's *Ẓiyādāt* (Ḥājji Khalīfa, 2/963). Thus, the content and

also the motivation behind this latter work by al-ʿAbbādī should be understood in the context of the opposition between the Shāfi'ī and Ḥanafī schools referred to earlier.

The *Radd ʿalā al-Qāḍī al-Samʿānī* (see al-Samʿānī, 4/123) was also produced in this atmosphere of intellectual or cultural confrontation. Al-Qāḍī Abū Manṣūr al-Samʿānī was the last Ḥanafī of his line as he later became a Shāfi'ī (al-Samʿānī, 3/298 et passim).

Another book by al-ʿAbbādī is *al-Hādī ilā madhāhib al-ʿulamāʾ* (al-Samʿānī, 4/123). This work is not only evidence of al-ʿAbbādī's profound knowledge of the different schools of *fiqh*, but is a continuation of a genre of works on the differences between Ḥanafī and Shāfi'ī thought begun by his contemporaries in Baghdad and Nīsābūr, namely Abū Ishāq al-Shīrāzī, al-Qudūrī, Abū Muḥammad al-Nāshihī, and Bayhaqī.

Thus al-ʿAbbādī should be regarded as a significant personality in the eastern tradition of Shāfi'ī thought, in which the Shāfi'īs tried to expound and theorise on their opposition to the Ḥanafīs and promote their own doctrines. The western strand of this movement was established in Baghdad. It is important to note that, on the one hand, al-Ashʿarī's thought was highly regarded and influential in the Shāfi'ī circles of the east, and on the other hand, at the same time, the Ḥanafīs proposed severe measures against the Ashʿarīs; measures which were strictly applied by the Ḥanafī vizier Abū Naṣr al-Kundurī (d. 456/1064) who strongly opposed Ashʿarī activities. As a result, it seemed natural for those closely associated with Shāfi'ī circles, who were inclined towards Ashʿarism, to show their disagreement with the Ḥanafīs and to attempt to put forward their own intellectual positions.

The promotion of their doctrine reveals itself in *Ṭabaqāt al-fuqahāʾ al-Shāfiʿiyya*. Apart from the book's particular features,

what is to be noted is that, even though before al-‘Abbādī scholars such as Abū Ḥafṣ al-Muṭṭawwī and Abū Ṭayyib al-Ṭabarī produced similar works, it was al-‘Abbādī’s work which was accepted by the Shāfi‘ī, who preserved the book by copying and transcribing its contents.

To explain al-‘Abbādī’s dominant role in expanding the influence of the Shāfi‘ī school of *fiqh*, reference can be made to the introduction to the *Ṭabaqāt*, where he restates al-Shāfi‘ī’s Qurayshī lineage. Using a number of Prophetic *ḥadīths* he defends the idea of an ‘*alīm* who would rise from amongst the Quraysh and identifies this man as al-Shāfi‘ī (pp. 6–7). Furthermore, he gives alongside Shāfi‘ī jurists the names of a number of authoritative and independent jurists, as well as others who were highly regarded jurists, who are known as ‘*aṣḥāb al-ikhtiyār*’, such as Ibn Rāḥawayh (p. 38), al-Ḥumaydī (p. 15), Dāwūd al-Zāhirī (p. 58), Abū Thawr (p. 22), Ibn al-Mundhir (p. 67), al-Ṭabarī (p. 52), Ibn Khuzayma (p. 44), Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām (p. 37) and even Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (p. 14); in so doing he highlights their association with al-Shāfi‘ī, together with the fact that they studied under him and cited his opinions in their own transmissions. In this way he sought to consolidate the identity of the members of the Shāfi‘ī *madhhab*.

Among other noteworthy instances of his efforts to underpin Shāfi‘ī precedence, one may refer to al-‘Abbādī’s reference to certain renowned Ḥanafī jurists who studied under al-Shāfi‘ī, such as Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭahāwī (a Shāfi‘ī who changed *madhhab* and joined the Ḥanafīs) and ‘Īsā b. Abān (p. 41). Such examples were cited in order to uphold the pre-eminence of the Shāfi‘ī *madhhab* and also to affirm the influence of al-Shāfi‘ī’s scholarship on the followers of other *madhāhib*. In line with al-‘Abbādī’s effort to promote and forge an intellectual culture for the Shāfi‘ī *madhhab*, one should note that he refers in his *Ṭabaqāt* to famous figures in the field of *ḥadīth* transmission,

such as al-Bukhārī, al-Nisā‘ī, al-Dārimī, al-Tirmidhī, Ibn Abī Ḥātim and Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān (pp. 37, 43, 45, 51, 53 ff.).

In addition to the above, other works have also been ascribed to al-‘Abbādī, including the *al-Aṭ‘ima*, the *Aḥkām al-miyāh* and the *Adab al-qaḍā’*, the latter being linked to his role and experience as a judge (al-Nawawī, 1(2)/249; al-Isnawī, 2/190; on the subject of his legal opinions see al-Subkī, 4/108–109; Ibn al-Mulaqqin, 151, 152).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

al-‘Abbādī, Muḥammad, *Ṭabaqāt al-fuqahā’ al-Shāfi‘īyya*, ed. Gösta Vitestam (Leiden, 1964); al-Baghdādī, *Īdāh*; al-Dhahabī, Muḥammad, *Sīyar a‘lām al-nubalā’*, ed. Shu‘ayb al-‘Arna‘ūṭ et al. (Beirut, 1405/1984); Ḥājji Khalīfa, *Kashf*; Ibn al-Mulaqqin, ‘Umar, *Ghāyat al-sa‘ūl*, ed. ‘Abd Allāh Baḥr al-Dīn ‘Abd Allāh (Beirut, 1414/1993); Ibn Nuqta, Muḥammad, *Takmilat al-ikmāl*, ed. ‘Abd al-Qayyūm ‘Abd Rabb al-Nabī (Mecca, 1410/1989); Ibn al-Ṣalāh ‘Uthmān, *Ṭabaqāt al-fuqahā’ al-Shāfi‘īyya*, ed. Muḥyī al-Dīn ‘Alī Najīb (Beirut, 1413/1992); al-Isnawī, ‘Abd al-Raḥīm, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘īyya*, ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Jubūrī (Baghdad, 1391/1971); al-Muqaddasī, Muḥammad, *Aḥsan al-taqāsīm*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden, 1906); al-Nawawī, Yahyā, *Tādhīb al-asmā’ wa al-lughāt* (Cairo, 1927); al-Sam‘ānī, ‘Abd al-Karīm, *al-Ansāb*, ed. ‘Abd Allāh ‘Umar al-Bārūdī (Beirut, 1408/1988); al-Subkī, ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘īyya al-kubrā*, ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥulw and Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ṭanāḥī (Cairo, 1383/1964).

FARAMARZ HAJ MANOUCHEHRI
TR. RAHIM GHOLAMI

Al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Abū al-Faḍl al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī (killed in the massacre at Karbalā’ on 10 Muḥarram 61/10 October 680), known as ‘*Qamar Banī Hāshim*’ (‘Moon of the Banū Hāshim’), was a famous son of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, and half-brother of al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī.

His mother, Umm al-Banīn (see Abū Naṣr al-Bukhārī, 88, where she is given the name Fāṭima), the daughter of Ḥizām b. Khālīd b. Rābī’a from the Arab tribe of Banū Kilāb, was the mother of three more of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib’s sons, and for this reason she became known as Umm al-Banīn (‘mother of the sons’) (see Ibn al-Kalbī, 31; al-Balādhurī, 2/413, 3/389; al-Ṭabarī, 5/153, 415; regarding her circumstances after the battle of Karbalā’ see Abū al-Faraj, 85).

A number of sources refer to him as ‘al-‘Abbās al-Akbar’ (‘the elder/greater ‘Abbās’) (see Ibn Sa’d, 3/20; al-Balādhurī, 2/413) which is apparently why ‘al-‘Abbās al-Aṣghar’ (‘the younger/smaller ‘Abbās’), is given as the epithet for ‘Alī’s other son of that name (see Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, 2/50; Ibn al-Ṣūfī, 12; al-Maqrīzī, 7; al-Ḥusaynī, 98; cf. al-Bayhaqī, 1/337 who regards al-‘Abbās al-Aṣghar also as a son of Umm al-Banīn).

According to Ibn Sa’d (3/40), al-‘Abbās had not yet reached puberty when his father, ‘Alī, was killed. Furthermore, the claim made by other sources that al-‘Abbās was thirty-four at the time is incompatible with Ibn Sa’d’s account (see Abū Naṣr al-Bukhārī, 89; al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān, 3/194; al-Bayhaqī, 1/397; see also Baḥr al-‘Ulūm, 309, who gives 4 Sha‘bān 26/15 May 647 as the date of his birth).

Naturally, what is said about al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī in the sources is largely in connection with the battle of Karbalā’. The reports by the earlier generation of chroniclers differ substantially from the accounts given in later historical sources; it seems that the

reason for this discrepancy is due to the manner in which later historians selected and interpreted the reports of the earlier chroniclers, chief among these being Abū Mikhnaḥ (q.v.) (see below).

Like his brothers, al-‘Abbās most probably lived in Medina. He and other members of his household were with al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī, when the latter travelled by night from Medina to Mecca after refusing to give the oath of allegiance (*bay‘a*) to Yazīd b. Mu‘āwiya (al-Dīnawarī, 228). ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād, who was the governor (*‘amil*) of Iraq, sent Shamir b. Dhī al-Jawshan to ‘Umar b. Sa’d; Shamir and ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī al-Ḥaml, who both belonged to the tribe of Banū Kilāb and were related to al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī’s mother (see Ibn al-Kalbī, 327–328; al-Ṭabarī, 5/415), asked Ibn Ziyād to write an official letter guaranteeing the safety of al-‘Abbās and his maternal brothers. Ibn Ziyād agreed, but, according to Abū Mikhnaḥ, when the letter was sent to al-‘Abbās and his brothers, they refused to accept Ibn Ziyād’s protection and said: ‘God’s protection is better than the one offered by Sumayya’s son’ (al-Ṭabarī, 5/415; al-Kh^wārazmī, 1/246). Nevertheless, when Shamir arrived at Karbalā’ on 9 Muḥarram 61/9 October 680, he again offered protection to al-‘Abbās and his brothers, but as before they refused and this time they cursed Shamir, pledging their full support to al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī (al-Balādhurī, 3/391; al-Ṭabarī, 5/416; al-Shaykh al-Mufīd, *al-Irshād*, 2/89; see also al-Kh^wārazmī, 1/246 where al-‘Abbās’s uncompromising response to Shamir is given).

After receiving orders from Ibn Ziyād to engage al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī, ‘Umar b. Sa’d decided to start the battle after the afternoon prayer (*al-‘aṣr*), but al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī sent al-‘Abbās and a number of his companions to the commanders of the Umayyad forces, and as a result the confrontation was put off until the following day (al-Balādhurī, 3/391–392; al-Ṭabarī, 5/416–417; al-Shaykh al-Mufīd, *al-Irshād*, 2/90–91; see also al-Kh^wārazmī, 1/250).

When al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī besought his followers in an impassioned speech, on the eve of ‘Āshūrā’ (10 Muḥarram 61/10 October 680), not to endanger their lives for his sake, al-‘Abbās was the first to speak, saying that neither in life nor in death would he cease to follow his brother, al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī (al-Ṭabarī, 5/419; Abū al-Faraj, 112; al-Shaykh al-Mufīd, *al-Irshād*, 2/91). On the morning of ‘Āshūrā’, after deploying his small band of followers, al-Ḥusayn told his brother al-‘Abbās to be the standard-bearer (al-Balādhurī, 3/395; al-Dīnawarī, 256; Abū al-Faraj, 85). From early on this was regarded as an important sign of al-‘Abbās’s high standing and privileged position among the companions of the imam (Ibn Shahrāshūb, 4/108; Ibn al-Ṭiḡṭaqā, 328; see also al-Diyārbakrī, 2/284). It should be added that in the heat of battle, a group of al-Ḥusayn’s companions who were surrounded by horsemen from Kūfa were rescued with the help of al-‘Abbās (al-Ṭabarī, 5/446).

There are two sets of accounts concerning the circumstances surrounding al-‘Abbās’s death. According to Abū Mikhnaf’s report, which does not make any reference as to how he was killed, al-Ḥusayn told al-‘Abbās to go with fifty men, who were both mounted and on foot, to fetch water from a tributary of the Euphrates. Although this entailed confronting the enemy, there is no reference to al-‘Abbās being killed during this episode of the battle (al-Balādhurī, 3/389–390; al-Ṭabarī, 5/412–413; see also al-Dīnawarī, 255; Ibn Abī al-Dunyā, 120; Abū al-‘Arab al-Tamīmī, 147, taken from Abū Ma’shar Sindī; Ibn al-Ṭiḡṭaqā, 328). However, another well-known report (see Ibn al-Ṭiḡṭaqā, 328; Ibn Ṭāwūs, *al-Luhūf*, 51) clearly says that al-‘Abbās was killed while he was fetching water: al-‘Abbās was carrying a large water-skin (*mashk*) filled with water when his way was blocked by the enemy at a point near the river bank and far from the camp. Fighting the enemy, he first lost his left arm and then his right, and he was then

killed (al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān, 3/191–193; Ibn Shahrāshūb, 4/108; al-Majlisī, 45/40–42; al-Qummī, 334–335). The accuracy of the report claiming that al-‘Abbās was killed when he was fetching water is given credence by the fact that he was buried at a site which is some distance from where al-Ḥusayn and all his other companions are buried (al-Shaykh al-Mufīd, *al-Irshād*, 2/114, 126; Abū Naṣr al-Bukhārī, 89; see below, al-‘Abbās’s shrine). The account of events given by ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn, known as Imam al-Sajjād (see Ibn Bābawayh, 462–463; al-Majlisī, 44/298), also confirms the reliability of these reports. It should be said that in the traditional supplications read aloud by pilgrims at his shrine, mention is made of him being sent to fetch water and also of his arms being cut off (al-Shaykh al-Mufīd, *al-Mazār*, 107–108; Ibn Ṭāwūs, *Iqbāl*, 574). He later became known by the appellation *al-Saqqā’* (the water carrier) or ‘Abū al-Qirba’ (*qirba* meaning ‘a water-skin’) (al-Balādhurī, 2/413; Ibn Abī al-Dunyā, 120; al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān, 3/193; Ibn al-Ṭiḡṭaqā, 328; see also Abū al-Faraj, 84). After the battle, some soldiers from the Umayyad forces stripped al-‘Abbās’s garments from his corpse, and his head was cut off and carried away by Ḥarmala b. Kāhil al-Asadī (see al-Balādhurī, 3/406, 13/256; al-Ṭabarī, 5/468; Abū al-Faraj, 85 citing Muḥammad b. ‘Alī [Imam al-Bāqir]; al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān, 3/191 who mentions one or two others in relation to the killing of al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī).

Al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī was much admired for his handsome looks on account of which he was given his epithet (Abū al-Faraj, 84–85). Reports from ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn (Imam al-Sajjād), and Ja’far b. Muḥammad (Imam al-Ṣādiq) pay tribute to the great faith and fortitude he showed when defending Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī (Ibn Bābawayh, 463; al-Majlisī, 44/298; Ibn ‘Inaba, 356).

Al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī had a son called ‘Ubayd Allāh, whose mother was Lubāba bint ‘Ubayd Allāh b. al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib (Ibn Qutayba, 217). This child is

said to have been taken captive after the battle of Karbalā' (al-Qaḍī al-Nu'mān, 3/196, 198). It was through him that al-'Abbās's lineage continued (al-Balādhurī, 2/413; al-Ṭabarī, 5/153, 155; for his descendants see al-'Ubaydalī, 275–277; Ibn al-Ṭiḡtaqā, 328 ff.; for the grave said to be 'Ubayd Allāh's in Ṭabariyya (Tiberius) of Shām, see Yāqūt, 3/512–513). Some of his descendants were famous in the first centuries after the *hijra* (al-Khaṭīb, 10/313–314, 346; al-Najāshī, 140; Ibn Ḥajar, 9/352–353). One of the chapters in al-Ṣūfī's (d. 335/946 or 947) *al-Awraq* consists of poetry written by the descendants of al-'Abbās b. 'Alī (see Ibn al-Nadīm, 167–168). One descendant of his was the poet and scholar al-'Abbās b. al-Ḥasan al-'Alawī, who was famous during the reigns of Hārūn al-Rashīd and al-Ma'mūn (al-Khaṭīb, 12/126). Furthermore, 'Alī b. Muḥammad Ṣāhib al-Zanj, who started the Zanjī rebellion in Bahrain and Iraq in the middle of the 3rd/9th century, claimed to be descended from al-'Abbās b. 'Alī (see al-Ṭabarī, 9/410).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abū al-'Arab al-Tamīmī, Muḥammad, *al-Miḥan*, ed. Yahyā al-Jubūrī (Beirut, 1403/1983); Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, *Maqātil al-Ṭalībīyyīn*, ed. Aḥmad Ṣaqr (Cairo, 1368/1949); Abū Naṣr al-Bukhārī, Sahl, *Sirr al-silsila al-'Alawīyya*, ed. Muḥammad Ṣādiq Āl Baḥr al-'Ulūm (Najaf, 1381/1962); Baḥr al-'Ulūm, Ḥusayn, Annotation on *Maqatal al-Husayn, aw wāqī'at al-Ṭaff*, ed. Muḥammad Taqī Baḥr al-'Ulūm (Beirut, 1412/1992); al-Balādhurī, Aḥmad, *Ansāb al-ashraf*, ed. Suhayl Zakkār and Riyād al-Ziriklī (Beirut, 1417/1996); al-Bayhaqī, 'Alī, *Lubāb al-ansāb*, ed. Mahdī Rajā'ī (Qumm, 1410/1989); al-Dīnawarī, Aḥmad, *al-Akhhār al-ṭiwāl*, ed. 'Abd al-Mun'im 'Āmir (Cairo, 1960); al-Diyārbakrī, Ḥusayn, *Ta'riḫ al-khamīs* (Bulāq, 1302/1885); Ibn Abī al-Dunyā, 'Abd Allāh, *Maqatal al-Imām Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalīb*, ed. Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī (Tehran, 1411/1990); Ibn Bābawayh, Muḥammad, *al-Amālī* (Tehran, 1355 Sh./1976); Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, Aḥmad, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb* (Hyderabad, 1326/1908); Ibn 'Inaba, Aḥmad, *Umdat al-ṭalīb fi ansāb Āl Abī Ṭalīb* (Najaf, 1380/1961); Ibn al-Kalbī, Hishām, *Jamharat al-nasab*, ed. Najī Hasan (Beirut, 1407/1986); Ibn al-Nadīm,

al-Fihrist; Ibn Qutayba, 'Abd Allāh, *al-Ma'ārif*, ed. Tharwat 'Ukāsha (Cairo, 1960); Ibn Sa'd, Muḥammad, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* (Beirut, n.d.); Ibn Shahrāshūb, Muḥammad, *Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭalīb* (Qumm, n.d.); Ibn al-Ṣūfī, 'Alī, *al-Majdī*, ed. Aḥmad Mahdawī Dāmaghānī (Qumm, 1409/1989); Ibn Tāwūs, 'Alī, *Iqbāl al-a'māl* (Tehran, 1390/1970); idem, *al-Luhūf 'alā qatlā al-ṭufūf* (Najaf, 1369/1950); Ibn al-Ṭiḡtaqā, Muḥammad, *al-Asīlī fi ansāb al-Ṭalībīyyīn*, ed. Mahdī Rajā'ī (Qumm, 1418/1997); al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Aḥmad, *Ta'riḫ Baghdād* (Cairo, 1348/1929); al-Kh'arazmī, Muwaffaq, *Maqatal al-Husayn*, ed. Muḥammad al-Samāwī (Najaf, 1367/1948); al-Majlisī, Muḥammad Bāqir, *Bihār al-anwār* (Tehran, 1385/1965); al-Maqrīzī, Aḥmad, *Itti'āz al-ḥunafā'*, ed. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl (Cairo, 1387/1967); Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Kūfī, *Manāqib al-Imām Amīr al-mu'minīn 'Alī*, ed. Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī (Qumm, 1412/1991); al-Najāshī, Aḥmad, *Rijāl*, ed. Mūsā Shubayrī Zanjanī (Qumm, 1407/1987); al-Qaḍī al-Nu'mān (al-Nu'mān b. Muḥammad, Abū Ḥanīfā), *Sharḥ al-akhhār fi faḍā'il al-a'immā al-aṭḥār*, ed. al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī al-Jalālī (Qumm, 1412/1991); al-Qummī, 'Abbās, *Nafs al-mahmūm*, ed. Riḍā Ustādī (Qumm, 1405/1985); al-Shaykh al-Mufīd, *al-Irshād* (Qumm, 1413/1992); idem, *al-Mazār*, ed. and annotated, Muḥammad Bāqir Abtaḥī (Qumm, 1409/1989); al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'riḫ*; al-Ḥusaynī, Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍā (ed.), *Ta'riḫ ahl al-bayt* (with annotations) (Qumm, 1410/1989); al-'Ubaydalī, Muḥammad, *Tahdhīb al-ansāb*, ed. Muḥammad Kāzīm Maḥmūdī (Qumm, 1413/1992); Yāqūt, *Buldān*.

ALI BAHRAMIAN

2. SOCIETAL AND CULTURAL

SIGNIFICANCE OF AL-'ABBĀS B. 'ALĪ

In Shi'i culture, Abū al-Faḍl al-'Abbās is regarded as one of the supreme paragons of heroism, chivalry, love, sincerity and self-sacrifice. In addition he is associated with the alleviation of grief and suffering, as well as the satisfying of people's needs and the granting of their requests. In this section we shall deal with certain general aspects of his status amongst Shi'is.

NAME AND TITLES

Al-'Abbās is associated with Aṣḫān and Asad (both names meaning 'lion') and is described with Persian phrases such as *shūr-i ghāzī* (the warrior-lion) (Wā'iz Kāshifī,

Rawḍat al-shuhadā', 335), *shūr-i awzhan* (the valiant lion) and *huzhabr-i bīshah-yi dīn* (the lion of the forest of religion) (Shahīdī/Bulookbashi, 447, 449). Stories found in religious literature refer to the sublime beauty of his face as well as his tall stature. They also say that when he was mounted on a horse his feet scraped the ground (Abū al-Faraj, 84; al-Qummī, 163; Rabbānī Khalkhālī, 1/142).

This image of al-ʿAbbās is also depicted in religious art and in particular in paintings belonging to the *'maktab-i qahwa-khānah'* (the coffee-house style of painting). A particular feature of this style is the depiction of crescent-shaped joined eyebrows, which became known in the Qājār period as *Qamar-i Banī Hāshimī* eyebrows (Shāmlū, 1/48).

SIGNS AND SYMBOLS

Certain elements of Shiʿi religious symbolism have been influenced by the personage of al-ʿAbbās, such as the green standards held during the mourning ceremonies in Muḥarram and known among Persian-speaking Shiʿis as the symbol of al-ʿAbbās, the *mīr-i ʿalamdār* (Lord Standard-Bearer) of al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī's army. In Iran, and in the Shiʿi regions of India, Afghanistan and elsewhere, a standard or the metal crest from the top of a standard (*sar-ʿalam*), believed to be the one carried by al-ʿAbbās at the battle of Karbalā', was traditionally preserved at a special site which became a place of pilgrimage (Calmard, 788; for the shrine of al-ʿAbbās's standard in Lucknow, see Cole, 98–99).

The people of Kāshān regard the *jarīda* (a special local standard) as symbolising al-ʿAbbās, and each of its components is considered representative of a part of the saint's body (Muʿtamidī, 1/558–559; for analogies for each part of the *jarīda*, see Bulookbashi, *Nakhl-gardānī*, 102–103). Similarly, in mourning processions in Bīrjand, a green standard larger than the rest is known as the standard of al-ʿAbbās (*ʿalam-i haḍrat-i ʿAbbās*). It is consecrated by people,

in the fervent hope that their requests will be granted (Barābādī, 74). One of the most famous symbols is that of a broad hand made out of metal (brass or silver), which not only symbolises the five holy members of the Prophet's family (*panj tan*) (Carra de Vaux, 3/459) but is also a sign for al-ʿAbbās's severed hand (Bulookbashi, *Nakhl-gardānī*, 100; for the same interpretation of the hand in India, see Sharīf, 159–160). Other symbols include a kind of a casket that is carried by mourners in processions in some towns, symbolising the site of his martyrdom or the shrine of the saint (for further information see Abū al-Faḍlī, 156–157; see also Bulookbashi, *Nakhl-gardānī*, 38). In addition to these, one also encounters manifestations of al-ʿAbbās in a variety of aspects in Shiʿi culture. For instance, the Shiʿis devote a day of mourning (*yawm al-tāsūʿā*) to al-ʿAbbās during the Muḥarram rituals (see Riḍāʿī, 470; Muʿtamidī, 1/562; for India see Holister, 165). *'Tarāsh-i ʿAbbās'* is another well-known occasion when men go to the public baths and groom themselves (Shādābī, 127). As well as having festivities in the month of Shaʿbān for the birthdays of the Imams al-Ḥusayn and Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, the Shiʿis of Afghanistan hold celebrations on 4 Muḥarram in honour of the birth of al-ʿAbbās (Farhang, 327).

Saqqāʿī, carrying water

As noted above, historical accounts of the events of Karbalā' associate al-ʿAbbās with the carrying of water, and in Shiʿi culture this subject has undergone particular transformations (e.g. see Wāʿiz Kāshifī, *Futuwwat-nāmah*, 294–295). It is seen in the connection between al-ʿAbbās and water-carrying in Persian culture (see Massé, 1/48), in which he is presented as the patron (*walī*) and master (*pīr*) of water-carriers and placed on a par with the prophet al-Khaḍir (who drank the 'water of eternal life') (Massé, 1/158, margin). For this reason, one can observe the act of water-carrying, *saqqāʿī* (see Wāʿiz Kāshifī,

Futuwwat-nāmah, 293–294), and the presence of water-carriers marching with large *mashks* (water-skins) and *kashkūls* (derwish drinking bowls) in the processions of mourners during the month of Muḥarram (for the procession of water-carriers in Kāshān, see Mu‘tamidī, 1/417). One also sees depictions of al-‘Abbās with a large water-skin, symbolising the significance of water in the tragic events of Karbalā’, and the role of al-‘Abbās in attempting to fetch water (Bulookbashi, ‘Shamāyil-nigārī’, 6).

This is also the reason why *saqqā-khānahs* (public drinking-water repositories) are important locations for the imagery associated with al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī. The imagery is found on stone troughs (*sangābs*). It includes metal hands placed in the middle of the drinking cups and pitchers, or hands hanging from the walls and doors of such places and also from small banner heads (*sar-‘alam*). Also in *saqqā-khānahs* there are paintings of al-‘Abbās on horseback carrying the standard and a large water-skin, there are allegorical poetic verses painted on tiles and religious devotional paintings on canvas (for more information about ornamental tile settings and inscriptions in *saqqā-khānahs* and on stone troughs donated as charitable bequests in honour of al-‘Abbās, see Dādmīhr, 78–79; 87, 148). *Saqqā-khānahs* were built and endowed in the name of al-‘Abbās, with many of them being called after him or by one of his titles or *kunyas* (for one example in Ahwāz, see Mu‘tamidī, 2/504–505).

PLACES OF PILGRIMAGE

Aside from the shrine of al-‘Abbās in Karbalā’ (for more information see al-Muqarram, 126–128; Rabbānī Khalkhālī, 1/258–259), there are other shrines in areas where Shi‘is live that carry associations with this saint. There is a mention of a cemetery with the name of al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī near Sīrwān, in Luristān, visited by pilgrims from the region (Rawlinson, 160–

250). In the Hazārajāt region of Afghanistan, one of the most important sacred shrines situated in Murādkhānī is called ‘Ziyārat-i Ḥaḍrat-i Abū al-Faḍl’ (Farhang, 306). There is a shrine in Shīrāz called ‘Qadamgāh-i Ḥaḍrat-i ‘Abbās’, to which pilgrims go every Saturday (Rabbānī Khalkhālī, 1/499–500; for another instance of ‘Qadamgāh-i Ḥaḍrat-i ‘Abbās’, see Iqtidārī, 169). Edward Browne (pp. 249–250) mentions a mountain called ‘Shaykh Qannāb’ (cf. Massé, 2/413, where he states that this mountain was situated 2 *farsangs* (12 km), to the east of Īzād-Kh^wāst), and says that according to local belief, this mountain offered protection to two of the children of al-‘Abbās who took refuge there from their pursuers. In the south-west of Tehran (Jay district) there is an old shrine—possibly dating from the 7th/13th or 8th/14th centuries—in a green area at a distance from the tomb of Imāmzādah Ḥasan, which is known to the locals as the shrine of Imāmzādah ‘Abd Allāh, the son of Abū al-Faḍl al-‘Abbās (for more information see Muṣṭafawī, 1/203–204).

RELIGIO-ARTISTIC ICONOGRAPHY

Al-‘Abbās is also depicted in scenes painted on walls and frescoes, on canvas and also on stained glass. One of the scenes on a fresco wall painting that has survived from the Ṣafawid period in the shrine and covered area (*shabistān*) of Imāmzādah Zayd in Iṣfahān, depicts al-‘Abbās on horseback—with a halo around his head—on his way to the Euphrates with three women of the Household of the Prophet offering him a large water-skin (Godard, 2(2)/344–345).

Depictions of al-‘Abbās became more widespread in the Qājār period and found their way into both religious and secular contexts such as the aforementioned *saqqā-khānahs*, *Husayniyyas*, *takiyyas* (both being places used by Shi‘is to mourn the martyrdom of Imam al-Ḥusayn), *āb-anbārs* (water reservoirs), *zūr-khānahs* (traditional Persian gymnasiums) as well as *qahwa-khānahs*

(coffee-houses). The best-known representations of al-‘Abbās from this period are the paintings on the tilework in the Ḥusayniyya-yi Mushīr and the *saqqā-khānah* next to it in Shīrāz, as well as in the Mu‘āwin al-Mulk *takiyya* in Kirmānshāh and the Āqā Sayyid Ḥasan *saqqā-khānah* in Langarūd, in the province of Gīlān (Bulookbashi, ‘Shamāyil-nigārī’, 5). In the northern *ūwān* or porch of Ḥusayniyya-yi Mushīr there are scenes depicting the events at Karbalā’. In one, al-‘Abbās can be seen collecting a large water-skin from the women of the *ahl al-bayt* (the Prophet’s Household), and another shows him taking water from the Euphrates (Bulookbashi, ‘Shamāyil-nigārī’, 5–6; for the illustrations on this tilework see Humāyūnī, *Ḥusayniyya-yi Mushīr*, 42–43, 59; *Ta‘ziya dar Īrān*, 409–410).

Many of the representations depicted on the glass show al-‘Abbās seated on a white horse placed over a stream in a palm grove, holding a banner in his hand, with a woman from the household handing him a water-skin in which to fetch some water (Sūdāwar Dībā, 9). In the past there were also people known as *shamāyil-gardānān* (image-carriers) who walked the streets and alleyways with pictures of al-‘Abbās, the ‘five holy ones’ (*panj tan*) of the Prophet’s Household, and ‘Alī b. ‘Abī Ṭālib, depicted on the glass, which they took to people’s front doors (Bulookbashi, ‘Shamāyil-nigārī’, 6–7).

The works referred to earlier as ‘coffee-house style paintings’ (*naqqāshī-yi qahwa-khānah*) represent al-‘Abbās in various situations (Sūdāwar Dībā, 23–24). There are many examples of this sort of work of art by Muḥammad Mudabbir and Qūllar Āqāsī—the founders of the coffee-house style of painting—as well as by their students, depicting scenes from Karbalā’, with al-‘Abbās holding the standard of Imam al-Ḥusayn’s army in various poses and a variety of situations during the events of ‘Āshūrā’ (for more details see Bulookbashi, ‘Taṣwīr-garī’, 10–17; idem, ‘Shamāyil-nigārī’, 3–7; for images of al-‘Abbās in the coffee-house style, see Sayf, *Naqqāshī-yi qahwa-khānah*).

PASSION-PLAY PERFORMANCES

(*TA ‘ZIYA-KH‘ĀNI*)

Abū al-Faḍl al-‘Abbās has been given a distinctive role in the religious and ceremonial passion plays of Iran. One of the passion plays is exclusively devoted to depicting the martyrdom of al-‘Abbās at Karbalā’. As one of the oldest passion plays, the *ta‘ziya* of al-‘Abbās’s martyrdom is performed more often than any of the others throughout the year. From Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh’s time onwards there were several scenes or acts added to the performance in which al-‘Abbās self-vaunts and argues against Shamir (Shahīdī/Bulookbashi, 290; for a description of the details of this passion play, see Shahīdī/Bulookbashi, 272, 273, 411–412, 448, 449).

PRAYER AND SUPPLICATION

Shi‘is everywhere usually make the supplication of *tawassul* (the seeking of his intercession with God, requesting that he join his prayers to theirs) to al-‘Abbās and seek his aid by doing such things as: spreading a *sufra* (dinner cloth) for religious and charitable purposes in honour of al-‘Abbās and his mother, Umm al-Banīn, preparing a thick Persian broth called *āsh*, *ḥalwā* (sweets), or *ḥalīm* (a kind of pottage made of minced meat and mashed wheat-germ and other ingredients), or *girdfa-yi ‘Abbāsī* (*girda* means a loaf of bread, see Rasūlī, 311). A kind of bread is baked called ‘*nān-i ‘Abbās ibn-i ‘Alī*’ (Mu‘tamidī, 1/562), a light breakfast (*ḥāḍirī*) is prepared in the name of ‘*Ḥaḍrat-i ‘Abbās ‘alam-bardār*’ (‘His holiness ‘Abbās the standard-bearer’) (Sharīf, 138), and an offering of cheese and yoghurt is made. Water is given to mourners, in particular on the days of Tāsū‘ā’ (9 Muḥarram) and ‘Āshūrā’ (10 Muḥarram), by constructing *saqqā-khānahs* and endowing them for the purpose of pleasing God by offering people water and sherbet. Food and drink are given and special *sufras* are spread for charitable purposes, as part of a vow (*nadh*) made in the name of al-‘Abbās (Shakūrzādah, 48). A broth known as *āsh-i ‘Abbās-i ‘Alī*’ and a spread known as *sufra-yi*

Abū al-Faḍl, prepared by the people of Qūchān in a highly ceremonial fashion, are particularly well known in Khurāsān (for a full description see Shakūrzādah, 55–58).

FOLKLORE AND POPULAR

LITERATURE

In addition to the verses of poetry about al-‘Abbās on tilework in public religious buildings, and particularly in *saqqā-khānahs* (for examples of these verses, see Dādmīhr, 77–79; Shakūrzādah, 459–460; for accounts of his martyrdom in poetry in the *ṭawīl* metre, see Shakūrzādah, 50–54), there are references to his name in everyday speech, for instance in oaths, prayers or curses (see Humāyūnī, *Farhang-i mardum*, 297; Shāmlū, 1/131, 417; 2/473; Massé, 1/121). In the eyes of the chivalrous champions and of athletes, al-‘Abbās is seen as possessing all the fundamental attributes of heroism, courage, chivalry and self-sacrifice. He is a true model of all the exemplary qualities worthy of emulation. They also make their serious and sincerest oaths in his name (Bulookbashi, *Qahwa-khānah*, 139; Shahīdī/Bulookbashi, 650–561; Shāmlū, 4/1219).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abū al-Faḍlī, Muḥammad, ‘Marāsīm wa nishānahā-yi ‘azādārī dar māh-i Muḥarrām dar Kāshān’, *Majmū‘a-yi maqālāt-i awwalīn girdīhamā-ī-yi mardum-shināsī* (Tehran, 1369 Sh./1990); Barābādī, Sayyid Aḥmad et al., *Mardūm-shināsī-yi marāsīm-i ‘azādārī-yi māh-i Muḥarrām dar shahristān-i Bīrjand* (Tehran, 1381 Sh./2002); Browne, E. G., *A Year Amongst the Persians* (London, 1950); Bulookbashi, Alī A., *Nakhl-gardānī* (Tehran, 1380 Sh./2001); idem, *Qahwa-khānahā-yi Irān* (Tehran, 1375 Sh./1996); idem, ‘Shamāyil-nigārī dar ḥawza-yi hunarhā-yi ‘amma-yi Irān’, *Kitāb-i māh-i hunar*, 31–32 (1380 Sh./2001), pp. 3–7; idem, ‘Taṣwīrī-garī dar ḥawza-yi hunarhā-yi ‘amma’, *Dasthā wa naqshhā*, 5 (Tehran, 1376 Sh./1997), pp. 10–17; Calmard, J., ‘Alam va ‘alāmat’, *EIR*, vol. 1, pp. 785–790; Carra de Vaux, B., ‘Charms and Amulets (Muhammadan)’, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. J. Hastings, vol. 3, pp. 457–461; idem, *Les Penseurs de l’Islam: La scolastique, la théologie et la mystique, la musique* (Paris, 1923);

Cole, J. R. L., *Roots of North Indian Shi‘ism in Iran and Iraq* (Berkeley, 1988); Dādmīhr, Manṣūr, *Pazhūhishī darbārah-yi saqqā-khānahā wa saṅābhā-yi Iṣfahān* (Iṣfahān, 1378 Sh./1999); Dhakāwātī Qarāguzlū, ‘Alī Riḍā, ‘Ta’thīr-i taṣāwwuf bar sha‘ā‘ir-i ‘azādārī’, *Kitāb-i māh-i hunar*, 39–40 (1380 Sh./2001), pp. 14–17; Farhang, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn, *Jāmi‘a-shināsī wa mardum-shināsī-yi Shī‘ayān-i Afghānistān* (Qumm, 1380 Sh./2001); Godard, A., ‘L’Imāmzādē Zaid d’Iṣfahān’, *Athar-e Iran* (1937), pp. 341–352; Hollister, J. N., *The Shi‘a of India* (New Delhi, 1979); Humāyūnī, Ṣādiq, *Ta‘ziya dar Irān* (Shīrāz, 1368 Sh./1989); Iqūdārī, Aḥmad, *Āthār-i shahrhā-yi bāstānī* (Tehran, 1348 Sh./1969); Massé, H., *Croyances et coutumes Persanes* (Paris, 1938); al-Muqarram, ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Mūsawī, *Qamar Banī Hāshim al-‘Abbās b. ‘Alī* (Najaf, 1369/1950); Muṣṭafawī, Muḥammad Taqī, *Āthār-i tārikhī-yi Tīhrān* (Tehran, 1361 Sh./1982); Mu‘tamīdī, Ḥusayn, *Azādārī-yi sunnatī-yi Shī‘ayān dar buyūt-i ‘ulamā’ wa ḥawzahā-yi ‘ilmīyya wa kishwarhā-yi jahān* (Qumm, 1378 Sh./1999); al-Qummī, ‘Abbās, *Tuhfat al-ahbāb* (Tehran, 1369/1950); Rabbānī Khalkhālī, ‘Alī, *Chīhra-yi dirakhshān-i Qamar-i Banī Hāshim Abū al-Faḍl al-‘Abbās* (Qumm, 1375 Sh./1996); Rasūlī, Ghulām Ḥasan, *Pazhūhishī dar farhang-i mardum-i pīrsawārān* (Tehran, 1378 Sh./1999); Rawlinson, Henry, ‘Notes on a March from Zohab to Khuzistan’, *Islamic Geography*, vol. 254, selected and reprinted by F. Sezgin (Frankfurt am Main, 1997), pp. 160–250; Riḍā‘ī, Jamāl, *Bīrjand-nāmah*, ed. Maḥmūd Raffī (Tehran, 1381 Sh./2002); Sayf, Hādī, *Naqqāshī-yi qahwa-khānah* (Tehran, 1369 Sh./1990); Shādābī, Sa‘īd, *Farhang-i mardum-i Luristān* (n.p., 1377 Sh./1998); Shahīdī, ‘Ināyat Allāh and Bulukbāshī, ‘Alī, *Pazhūhishī dar ta‘ziya wa ta‘ziya-khānī* (Tehran, 1380 Sh./2001); Shakūrzādah, Ibrāhīm, *Aqā‘id wa rusūm-i mardum-i Khurāsān* (Tehran, 1363 Sh./1984); Shāmlū, Aḥmad, *Kitāb-i kūchah* (Tehran, 1361–1377 Sh./1982–1998); Sharīf, J., *Islam in India* (London, 1975); Sūdāwar Dībā, Laylā, *Hunar-i Irānī bā ilhām az ‘aqā‘id-i dīnī wa madhhabī* (Tehran, 1356 Sh./1977); Wā‘iz Kāshifī, Ḥusayn, *Futuwwat-nāmah-yi sulṭānī*, ed. Muḥammad Ja‘far Maḥjūb (Tehran, 1350 Sh./1971); idem, *Rawḍat al-shuhadā’*, ed. Muḥammad Ramaḍānī (Tehran, 1341 Sh./1962).

ALI A. BULOOKBASHI
TR. FARZIN NEGAHBAN

BRILL

P.O. Box 9000

2300 PA Leiden

The Netherlands

T +31 (0)71-53 53 500

F +31 (0)71-53 17 532

marketing@brill.nl

BRILL

153 Milk Street, Sixth Floor

Boston, MA 02109

USA

T 1-617-263-2323

F 1-617-263-2324

cs@brillusa.com

For more information about Brill's *Encyclopaedia Islamica*,
Please visit www.brill.nl/isla or our website www.brill.nl