University of Jordan  Yarmuuk University

Proceedings of

The First International Conference on Bilad-al-Sham

20-25 April 1974

1984

Acknowledgement

The Comittee for the History of Bilad al- Sham acknowledges with gratitude the kind support given to it by Professor Abdul- Salam Majali, President of the University of Jordan Professor Abdul-Karim Gharaibeh, Chairman of the First preparatory Committee (1973-1974), and Professor Muhammad Adnan Bakhit who in May 1972 intiated the idea of convening academic conferences to study comprehensively the historyof Bilad al-Sham.

Introduction

This volume contains the non-Arabic papers that were presented to the First International Conference of the History of Bilad al-Sham which was held at the University of Jordan in Amman in April 1974. The Committee of the History of Bilad al-Sham, which was formed after the Third International Conference of the History of Bilad al-Sham, found it necessary to pablish the non-Arabic papers that were presented to the first conference.

This volume consists of twenty five papers dealing with different topics and aspects of the history of Bilad al-Sham from the fifth to the nineteenth centuries A.D.

Professors Peters and Gaube treat in their papers some aspects of the history of the area before Islam. The first deals with the role and activities of the major tribal groups (Salīh, the Ghassānids and the Lakhmids) in the Badiyat al-Sham and their relations with the two great powers of the time, the Byzantines and Sassanids. Special emphasis is laid by the author on the dependence of the two powers on the Arabs as a supporting military force (cavalry) in their wars. Moreover, Professor Peters emphasizes how Christianity spread among the Arabs through the activities of saints and the privileges that were given by the Byzantines to those Arabs who embraced Christianity.

The careful and thorough study of Professor Peters of the literary evidence is supplemented by Professor Gaube's paper about the Arabs in sixth century Syria which is based on the evidence supplied by archaeological excavations.

Professor Graber's paper deals with the settlement of the Muslims in Badiyat al-Sham during the early Islamic period. He surveys the different opinions concerning the settlements that were established during the Umayyad period and explains why these opinions were not sufficient for explaining all kinds of settlements of which there are still some remains. To suport his new and comprehensive point of view, professor Graber studied Qasr al-Hayr al-Sharqi in detail and reached the conclusion that it served many purposes, military, and commercial and it housed a small industrial complex as well.

The settlements in Bilad al-Sham are treated by Professor Birche but from the point view of geo-politics.

The impct of the Arab occupation of Syria on the Byzantine empire is the main theme of Professor Hussey's paper. She treats the different aspects of that impact especially in the military and cultural fields.

Professor H. Mashhed discusses a special aspect of the relation between Byzantium and Syria during a particular period, the tenth century. Relying mainly on Arabic sources and French modern studies, he follows up the role of the Emirate of the Hamdanids in al-Jazira and northern Syria in defending the frontiers against the incursions of the Byzantines.

Professor H. M.Said treats in his paper the cutlural impact of Bilad al-Sham on Sind. After a sammary of the history of the occupation of Sind by the Muslims, he deals with the different aspects in which the life of the people of Sind was influenced by the new administration and what it brought with it during the Umayyad period.

Three papers in this volume deal with the non-Muslim minorities in Syria under Islamic rule. Professor Van Alderen studies the history of the Christians in Syria during the 6th-8th centuries in the light of archaeological evidenee.

Professor Spuler, however, deals also with the Syrian Christians and how they adapted themselves to Muslim environment in which they lived.

The connections between the Armenians and Syria through the ages, and how they settled in Bilad al-Sham is the main theme of Professor Sanjian's paper. He also evaluates the role of the Armenians in the life of Syria, especially in Lebanon, Aleppo and Jerusalem. In the second part of his paper professor Sanjian reviews the Armenian documents and writings related to Bilad al-Sham, with particular emphasis on the documents of the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem. The settlement of the Slavs in Syria is discussed by Professor Lewicky. He explains that the Slavs came to Syria either as refugees from the lands of Byzantium or as prisoners of war. Most of their settlements were in or near the area that was known as al-Thughūr. He summarizes in his paper the conclusions of East Europian historians who studied the subject and gives, through his detailed study, his own views and conlusions which explain the presence of the Slavs in the area, as well as their role and importance in the history of Syria

Professor van Ess's paper treats the beginnings, the rise and developments of al-Qādariyya and their relation with the authorities during the Umayyad period. He tries to answer two questions: were they a minority at the beginning? and was there a founder for this sect?

Concerning the Abbassid period there are two papers: Professor D. Sourdel writes about Syria in the time of the first Abbassid caliphs (750-878), stresses the importance attached to Syria by the Abbassids, and analyses the attitude and reactions of its people to Abbassid rule. Professor. M. Zahniser gives us insights from the "Uthmaniyya" of al-Jāhiz into the religious policy of al-Ma'mūn. He seeks to prove that this tract of al-Jāhiz was written during the reign of al-Ma'mūn from a Mu^{c}tazilite point of view, and that it was submitted to this caliph. Professor Zahniser holds that, despite the difference in view between al-Jāhiz and al-Ma'mūn

with regard to ʿAlī ibn abī Tālib, they were essentially in agreement in their stand against the conservatives.

Bilad al-Sham in the twelfth century is the theme of two papers, one by Professor .H. Elisseeff who presents a study on ways of communication in Syria, and the second by Dr.A.Dehkan who chooses as his subject the poet Saʿdī' s travels in Syria in the 6th Century. and his stay in Damascus. Dr. Dehkan informs us about Saʿdī's impressions of Syria and cites specimens from his poetry.

There are two papers about the Mamluk period: Professor. T. Sato studies the feudal system in Bilad al-Shām. After a discussion of the data given by al-Makrīzī, al-Nuwairī and Ibn Iyās in this respect Professor Sato shows that the Rawks which took place in the years 713/1313, 717/1317 snd 725/1325, in Damascus, Tripoli and Aleppo had the same purpose and character as those of Egypt in the same period.

Professor S. Hamarneh's theme is the life and work of the physician-surgeon Ibn al-Quff, who was born in al-Karak and lived in 'Ajlūn and Damascus. In his paper Professor Hamarneh outlines the main topics treated in Ibn al-Quff's works, and gives us an assessment of his achievements.

On the subject of Islamic antiquities, art and architecture in Bilād **al-Sham we** have three papers. Mme. Solange Ory studies the funerary inscriptions **in Syria. She** stresses the importance of these inscriptions for the study of the local history and draws our attention to the wealth of information they provide about the political and religious dignitaries as well as about prominent scholars. Through an analysis of the inscriptions she draws interesting conclusions about the types of script and their development, and the effect of all this on religious and social life. Also Mme. J.S. Thomine's paper underlines the importance of archaeological work for the study of the history of Bilād al-Shām, the fruits of archaeological research having been little used so far. In his paper Mr. M. Burgoyne reports on the project of the British School of Archeology in Jerusalem for the survey of Islamic Jerusalem and its architecture. This project, which was planned by the late Kathleen Kenyon, the former director of the school, started in 1968. Mr. Burgoyne underlines the urgent need for the preservation of the precious Islamic monuments in Jerusalem.

The Ottoman period in the history of Bilād al-Shām is the subject of three papers:

Professor B. Lewis's paper deals with land tenure and taxation under Ottoman rule, and discusses the origin and evolution of the Ottoman system. It shows that Ottoman land tenure was essentially based on the classical Islamic system. Professor Lewis' paper is based on the rich Ottoman archives in Istanbul.

Professor K. Salibi reviews the internal development in the Syrian desert and the Arabian peninsula from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, and determines the external factors which affected this development. He shows us how the development of the emirates and chieftainships was determined by the interplay of

three factors namely the existence of the Ottoman and Persian empires, the European penetration and the Egyptian influence.

Professor C.E. Bosworth acquaints us with the Scottish traveller William Lithgow and his travels in Europe, Turkey and Syria in the years 16 11 and 1612. He describes in particular his visits to and description of the Lebanon, Damascus, Jerusalem and Aleppo.

Finally there are two papers, one relating to the sources of the history of Bilad al-Shām, and the other to Anglo-Arab relations.

Dr. G.Atiyeh reviews the beginnings of Islamic studies in the United states and the development of Library materials related to the Middle East in American Libraries, such as printed books, archival material, manuscripts, etc. Dr. Atiyeh evaluates the material on Bilād al-Shām, and gives some specimens and titles, indicating the names of the libraries in which they are located. At the end of his paper he gives us some information about the manuscripts of 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulsīin the library of Congress.

Professor S. Nāsir'ś paper "Arabs and the English" gives us an insight into Anglo-Arab relations, as reflected in the works of English travellers.

AMERICAN RESOURCES ON THE HISTORY AND CULTURE OF BILĀ AD AL-SĀ HM (Geographic Syria)

George Atiyeh

American scholarly interest in the Middle East in general and in geographic syria in particular is not recent, although it has been and remains slight. In 1640, only four years after the University of Harvard was founded, a chair in Semitic Studies was established with instruction in Hebrew, Chaldaic and Syriac. Arabic was added at the end of the 17th century.

American political interest in the area was, likewise, limited. The Middle East was not considered a proper sphere for American involvement. The United States Government would protect its citizens and their interest in the area, but these interests were for the most part cultural, religious and philanthropic.

Both in the scholarly and political fields, American involvement has increased and this is reflected in the greater number of learning institutions that carry Middle Eastern programs.

American interest in Bilād al-Shām, in particular, stems from the Christian association with the Holy Land. In their early stages, Arabic studies in the United States existed as a function of that particular interest and not for the purpose of understanding the history and culture of the area for its own sake. This came as a by-product.

The incorporation of Arabic materials into American libraries reflected a more favourable atmosphere inasmuch as a great number of small collections were built during the end of the 19th and early 20th century in university and public libraries. Furthermore wealthy Americans, some inspired by the love of learning, others by an exhibitionist sense of value, collected rare and antique things, be it manuscripts or Greek vases. A point in case is Mr. Daniel Boline from Boston who collected the respectable sum of, approximately, 2700 manuscripts, mostly Arabic, representing Islamic Law, religion, literature, sciences and history, without realy knowing any Arabic. In many cases the collections were donated to libraries throughout the country. Example, the Yahuda collection at Princeton, made up of approximately 6,000 manuscripts, was donated by Mr. Robert Garrett.

Up to World War II, the incorporation of printed materials into American libraries was not impressive. During and after World War II, greater concern for the

study of the region became manifest as institutions of higher learning began to establish Near Eastern programs and as libraries began to acquire and process Arabic prints in greater numbers.

The establishment of the PL-480 program in 1962 by means of which 25 institutional libraries acquire all significant current Egyptian and other Arab publications enriched the American learning scene with Arabic publications to an umprecedented proporion in the Western World. We may safely state that as a result of this program the United States has assumed a leading role as a Center of Arabic studies.

In a recent survey made by the Middle East Librarians Association, approximately half a million volumes of Arabic prints and 18,000 Manuscripts are held by 25 major American Libraries. More than 1,000 scholars offer courses dealing directly or indirectly with matters related to the Near East and Geographic Syria.

Having said so much on the size and importance of American resources, I would like now to turn to more specific things. What kind of materials on Bilad al-Sham are available in the United States? What can a scholar expect to find if he decides to journey to the U.S.A. to do research on Geographic Syria's history and civilization?

At the risk of going over the time scope set by this conference, I will attempt to provide a profile of the resources that deal with Geographic Syria. I will first give an over all view of three forms of resources available, namely, printed books, archives and manuscripts. Other sources such as the numismatic and the archaeological will be left out for the time being. Later I will focus on the manuscripts of a Damascus author, 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulsī, held by the Library of Congress.

1. **Printed Books.** Printed books on **Bilād al-Shām** in all languages, it is needless to say, are found in abundance in the major libraries. I counted 20 books in Japanese at the Library of Congress dealing with various aspects of the area. I must confess, however, that these do not deal with the period covered by this conforence. The works of the great authors, be they Westerners or Arabs, histories of the Crusades, maps, and other sources on **Bilād al-Shām** are all well represented in most research libraries.

2. **Archival materials.** The archival materials available are concerned mostly with the relations of the United States with Bilād al-Shām. The recent past only is covered inasmuch as the United States were founded less than 200 years ago.

The National Archives in Washingtons D.C. houses most of the US Government documents. Of the 19th century records those of the State and Navy Department are more voluminous than those of any other Government agency. The diplomatic despatches (1818-1906) from Turkey which then included Bilād al-Shām have been recently micofilmed. Turkish administration of Syria and political problems there are the subject of some consular despatches from Damascus and Aleppo. Despatches from Beirut contain several communications from naval officers, 1895-1909, commenting on the unsettled political conditions in the regions. Some reports from

William Yale, special agent of the State Dept. at Cairo, discuss the political hopes of the Syrians during World War I and the Syrian Question. A document among the despatches (No. 582) is a State Departmont report on the Syrian Question, dealing with the political activities and aims of the Syrian Committee in Cairo.

Another archival source is the Presidential papers at the Library of Congress. These include the personal papers of the US presidents up to President Hoover, and papers by secrteraries of State and others. The Wilson era papers perhaps are the most significant for the modern history of Bilād al-Shām. They include the report of the King-Crane Commission and a set of maps, all related to the desire of the majority of the Syrians for independence and unity in Geographic Syria.

3. **Manuscripts.** In the manuscript category, most American collections hold items dealing either with the history or culture of Geographic Syria. Without being exhaustive, I will list the major manuscripts that I was able to locate in the few published lists or handlists that were available to me.

The University of Princeton collection contains perhaps the largest number of works related to Geographic Syria. Here are some of its holdings:

فتوح الشام للواقدى

من مختصر ابن عساكر لابي الفتح الخطيب

الفتح القسي في الفتح القدسي لعماد الدين الاصفهاني

مثير الغرام الى زيارة القدس والشام لبهاء الدين القاسم المقدسي

تاريخ الامير فخر الدين المعني لاحمد بن محمد الخالدى الصفدى

الدر المرصوف في حوادث جبل الشوف

فضائل الشام للسيوطي

الدر المنتخب في ذكر مملكة حلب لابن الشحنة

ترجمة صلاح الدين الحلبي الداراني الدمشقي

قطعة من فوات الوفيات

الوافي بالوفيات لصلاح الدين ابن ايبك الصفدى

تهذيب التهذيب لابن محمد العسقلاني

قطعة تاريخية في ٧ ورقات لاحمد بن الحمصي

الشافعي خطيب جامع دمشق فيها حوادث سنة ٧٦٣ و ٧٦٤ هـ. جعلها ذيلا على تاريخ الذهبي

Yale University holds the following manuscipts:

ديوان الوأواء الدمشقي

فتوح البلدان للبلاذري

كتاب الاعتبار لاسامة بن منقذ

رحلة محمد الشامي الى اوروبا

باعث النفوس الى زيارة القدس المحروس لابراهيم بن عبد الرحمن بن الفركاح

الرسالة الشهابية لمخائيل مشاقة

الجوهر المسبوك في علم السلوك لعلوان بن عطية الحموي

خمس رسائل لابي العلاء المعرى

(ثلاث بدون عناوين، الرابعة رسالة الآخرين والخامسة رسالة الهناء).

تاريخ دمشق لابن عساكر

مجمع الحسان وفواكه الجنان، لصلاح الدين خليل بن ايبك الصفدى

Harvard University holds

انس الجليل بتاريخ القدس والخليل لعبد الرحمن بن محمد العمرى

Columbia University holds

تاريخ دمشق الكبير لابن عساكر (نسخة قديمة كتبت في حياة المؤلف)

مجموعة فيها ١٥ كتابا من كتب الدروز

Catholic University, Washington D.C., holds

زبدة الاخبار ونبذ الاثار لاحمد بن محمد الترجمان، فيه اخبار غزوات الفرنج قبل الايام وبعدها وحروب وغزوات التتار.

Hartford Theological Seminary holds

فضائل القدس والشام لابن المرجا

The Army Medical library at Cleveland, Ohio, holds

بستان الاطباء وروضة الالباء لابن المطران الدمشقي.

Now, I would like to focus more closely on some manuscripts of works by a well-known, but not well-studied Damascene scholar 'Abd al-Ghanī Ibn Isma'īl al-Nā-bulsī. A small collection consisting of ten works of his is held by the Library of Congress.

Al-Nābulsī, who in a way symbolizes the affinities between the different regions of Bilād al-Shām in that his family moved from Nāblus to Damascus as did many othr families who, during that period looked at بر الشام as one country.

Al- Nābulsī was born in 1640 A. D./1050/A.H and passed away at the age of 91 in 1731/1143 A.H.He is looked upon by many scholars as a great رحالة traveler. He certainly left behind some most intersesting travel books which provide most

useful information on Jerusalem, Tripoli and other parts of Geographic Syria and of the Arab World. But al-Nābulsī is basically a عارف , a sufi scholar, who sums up in his theological writings the state of the religious sciences at the time. He provides us with the living proof that creativity was only subdued, but not dead, during the period between Ibn Khaldūn and al-Nahḍa. He was one of the few Arab sufies of the age who possessed insight and resourcefulness. Al-Nābulsī left behind him approximatly 188 works covering most fields of knowledge, including medicine and agriculture. He was most prolific however in the religious field; most of his writings deal with religious subjects.

The Library of Congress collection of Nabulsiana consists of the ten following manuscripts.

١ الجوهر الكلي شرح عمدة المصلي للكيلاني منسوخة سنة ١٢٣٣ هـ.

٢ كنز الحق المبين في احاديث سيد المرسلين

غير مؤرخة وعلى الارجح انها منسوخة في اواخر القرن الثالث عشر هجرى.

٣ المطالب الوفية في شرح الفرائد السنية في علم التوحيد، منسوخة سنة ١٢٦٦ هـ.

٤ – نهاية المراد في شرح هدية ابن العماد، منسوخة سنة ١٢٥٨ هـ.

٥ – نخبة المسألة شرح التحفة المرسلة، منسوخة سنة ١١٤٥ هـ.

٦ – قلائد الفرائد وموارد الفوائد في غرائب الفقه الحنفي. منسوخة سنة ١٢٠٦ هـ.

٧ – قصيدة عينية واخرى خمرية.

٨ – الرد المتين على منتقص العارف محيي الدين، منسوخة سنة ١٣٠٤ هـ.

٩ – كتاب الملاحة في علم الفلاحة، منسوخة سنة ١٢٧٠ هـ.

١٠ – كوكب المباني وموكب المعاني شرح صلوات عبد القادر الكيلاني.

The copyist recorded the date of authorship, 1127 H, but not the date of copying.

All these manuscripts are in good physical conditions, and one of them

كتاب قلائد الفوائد في غرايب فقه الامام ابي حنيفة النعمان.

is copied by al-Nābulsī's nephew Isma'īl ibn Muṣṭafa ibn al-Nābulsī.

Three of these works have been edited, namely,

no 4 نهاية المراد

no 8 الرد المتين على منتقض القارف محيي الدين

and no. 9 كتاب الملاحة في علم الفلاحة

The other ones, as far as I know, have not.

Nine of the manuscripts deal with religious subjects. This is explained by the fact that they once belonged to the Library of Shaykh al-Azhar al-Imām al-Mansūrī.

Except for the poems and kitab 'ilm al-Filahah, they consist of commentaries شروح which was the common form of writing of the time. This from represented a methodological format as well as a literary form. It does not prove necessarily that originality was arrested because of it. In fact the creativity of al-Nābulsī and his genius are manifest in the way he handles the commentaries. Sure, this format makes its difficult to detect the originality of an author but a serious examination of the details involved in the شروح will point out the deep insights and subtle distinctions found in their structure.

I must admit that I have not as yet read all the ten manuscripts. However, it became manifest to me, after reading some of them, that a wealth of information on the intellectual and religious history of the period is contained in them. They do indicate a living and continuous tradition of learning and shed a new light on the religious thinking of al-Nābulsī. He comes out from them as a teacher of high stature, able to impart to his students in a distinguished, lucid and organized from the thinking of his predecessors as well as his own thinking.

Because of time limitations, I will try to share with you my impressions on one of his works المطالب الوفية في شرح الفرائد السنية في علم التوحيد.

This book was authored in 1086 H , when al-Nābulsī was only 36 years old. It is a commentary on a منظومة ,poetical composition, by Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad al-Safadī, the imām of al-Darwīshīyah Mosque in Damascus and one of the preachers at the Ummayad Mosque.

Divided into two parts, the book deals, in the first part, with theology الالهيات and in the second part with prophecy. The author has structured the whole around, but bot on, the poem of al-Safadī. It seems to me the poem has served him as a tool rather than an object of study in itself. His purpose seems to be to explain what the science of theology is and not what al-Safadī meant to convey.

The first sections of al-Matālib deal with science العلم al-Nābulsī attempts to provide a definition of science. That leads him to attack the falāsifah and the Mu'tazilah. He specifies al-Nazzām in particular. According to him the two groups have confused what is religiously legal with what is rationaly plausible

خلطوا الشرعيات بالعقليات

From the definition of science in general, he proceeds to define the science of Divine Unity علم التوحيد, in other words, theology. First, he provides a linguistic definition and later a religious one. Theology is then classified into three kinds according to the following types of knowledge: faith ايمان intellectual certainty علم and mystical communication معرفة . Al-Nābulsi considers the study of

theology as a religious obligation تكليف على قدر المستطاع on the ground that the purity of religion was lost at the end of the third hijra century. The multiplication of the innovative sects calls for the study of theology inasmuch as these sects have contaminated purity of faith of the early Muslims with falsehoods and errors.

The major theological works of Islam are then discussed and the sciences classified into two basic ones: **legal** شرعية comprising Qur'ānic interpretation, jurisprudence and theology, **and non-legal** غير شرعية , comprising literature, mathematics and philosophy. These in turn are subdivided into a number of branches and some of the major questions of theology and philosophy expouneded and examined These include man and his nature, the attributes of God, the question of the eternity of the World, which he naturaly refutes. Christian and Jewisn doctrines are also discussed. His information on these two religions seems impressively reliable.

The second part of **al-Maṭālib** deals with Prophecy and its problems. Al-Nābulsī dedicates a whole section to the definition of prophecy and to distinguish between what is a prophet نبيّ and what is amessenger رسول . The conditions for prophecy, and the legislative functions of the prophet are discussed. Al-Nābulsī defends the sunnī attitude which maintains that prophecy is not ncessary as the Mu'taziltes claim, but is dependent on God's will and power. He also refutes the philosophers claim that prophecy may be acquired through training.Prophecy according to him is an act of God's choice. God chooses a man and reveals to him and through him His will.

The questions of saintship الولاية ,revelation, miracles and the nationality of the prophets are examined. It is intersting to note that when al-Nābulsī discusses the question of nationality, he comments on the declining prestige of the Arabs at the time and laments its eroding effects on the people.

All in all **al-Maṭālib** reveals a number of facts about the author, his times and the state of the religious sciences. It further shows al-Nābulsī as a man involved in the search for centainty. His deep religiosity leads him to journey in the world of the intellect as well as in the physical world surrounding him. His mystical proclivity did not stop him from developing an analytical approach as his capacity for classifying and establishing of relations clearly indicates.

I am convinced that a thorough study of al-Nābulsī and his works is overdue, as is overdue the need to reconstruct the history of the period lying between the death of Ibn Khaldūn and al-Nābulsi and called equivocally by some the "dark ages" of the Arabs.

WILLIAM LITHGOW OF LANARK'S TRAVELS IN SYRIA AND PALESTINE

1611-1612

C.E. Bosworth

William Lithgow of Lanark, in central Scotland, was a typical representative of the hardy and intrepid Scots of the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries, a breed which after his own time produced such figures as James Bruce, the explorer of Abyssinia and the Nile sources, Mungo Park, the explorer of the Niger River, and David Livingstone, the explorer of Central Africa. Lithgow's life extended from about 1582 to some time after 1645, after which he disppears from recorded history—a rather remarkable end for a person who had been much in the public eye, both as a fearless traveller in Europe, the Near East and North Africa, but above all as a Protestant martyr at the hands of the hated Spanish Catholics, for he was in 1620 arrested at Malaga in Spain as an English spy, imprisoned and tortured by the Inquisition, and was only saved from being burnt at the stake by the timely intervention of the English ambassador in Madrid.[1]

The **Wanderlust** developed early in Lithgow, and one source states that he had "a large infusion of the wandering spirit common to his country-men". Already by 1609, when he was probably 27 years old, he had made two voyages to Orkney and Shetland, and had travelled on the continent of Europe to Germany, Bohemia, Switzerland and the Low Countries, ending up in Paris, where he stayed ten months. From Paris, in March 1609, Lithgow set out on the first of the three journeys of which he gives an account in his **The Totall Discourse of the Rare Adventures and Painefull Peregrinations of long Nineteene Yeares Travayles from Scotland to the most famous Kingdomes in Europe, Asia and Affrica.** In this he claims that his "paynefull feet traced over (beside my passage of Seas and Rivers) thirty-six thousand and odde miles, which draweth neare to twice the circumference of the whole Earth".[2] After this collected edition of his travels was first published in London in 1632, four subsequent editions of **The Totall Discourse** appeared from London and Edinburgh over the next two centuries, and a Dutch translation was published in the later 17th century. Doubtless Lithgow's sufferings in Spain for his Protestant faith contributed to the book's popularity, for he certainly intended it to be read as an exposé of Roman Catholic fanaticism and superstition as well as for its interest as a travel narrative.[3]

Leaving Paris in 1609, Lithgow travelled through Italy, narrowly escaping the attentions of the Inquisition in Rome, to Venice and Padua. He noted approvingly many features of the constitution of the Republic of Venice and of life there. Thus he speeks with favour of the requirements at Venice and Rome that the Jews should wear red coats and yellow hats (like the **ghiyār** of the Dhimmīs in mediaeval Islam), and he thought that such distinctive dress regulations might well be applied to Catholics in England. To Lithgow, the Jews were as obnoxious as the Catholics, hence he applauded Venice for outlawing the Jesuits and Genoa for expelling the Jews.[4] From Venice, he sailed down the Dalmatian coast to Corfu and Zante, the latter a great centre for the export of currants to Britain, and thence to Crete, at this time enjoying its last decades of Venetian rule before the Ottoman onslaught on the island in 1644, leading to the complete Turkish conquest by 1669, the last great victory of Ottoman arms before the tide of warfare gradually turned in the Christians' favour. Once he had arrived on the island of Euboea or Nigroponte, and then on the Greek mainland, he was on Turkish soil, and was able to observe at first-hand how a Christian population lived under Muslim rule. He had in fact no love for the Greeks, whom he regnrded as

... Wholly degenerate from their Auncestors in valour, vertue, and learning; Universities they have none, and civill behaviour is quite lost: formerly in derision they tearmed all other Nations Barbarians: A name now most fit for themselves, being the greatest dissembling lyers, inconstant, and uncivill people of all other Christians in the World.

Moreover, he was especially harsh against the corrupt and superstitious Greek church, though he praises the monks of Mount Athos for their piety and their hospitality to travellers.[5]

In Istanbul, he stayed for three months with the English ambassador, Sir Thomas Glover, an interesting figure who had been brought up as a boy in Istanbul, and being half-Polish, was conversant with the languages of eastern Europe and the Ottoman empire. Lithgow gives interesting information on the Istsnbul slave trade, which he regarded with abhorrence, noting that the majority of these slaves were Hungarians, Transylvanians and Balkan Slavs.[6] Amongst the everyday customs of the Turks, he mentions their addiction to "a Cup of Coffa, made of a kind of seed called Coava, and of a blackish colour: which they drink so hote as possible they can, and is good to expell the crudity of raw meates, and hearbes, so much by them frequented[7]. This description of coffeedrinking is one of the earliest mentions in European sources. The earliest actual mention seems to be in the travel narrative of the German Leonhart Rauwolff (1573-4); and in 1590, two spanish Jesuits, who had been taken prisoner whilst travelling to Goa in India and who were taken from Ẓufār to Ṣan'ā', mention that at Tarīm in the Hadramawt, they were served with Cahua, "which is water boiled with the rind of a fruit they call Bun, and which they drink very hot, in place of wine".[8]

In the spring of 1611, Lithgow left Istanbul for the supreme goal of his travels, the journey to the Holy Land. His ship sailed along the southern coast of Turkey via Izmir, Ephesus and Rhodes (where he says he saw remains of the famous Colossus, destroyed by the Ottoman conquerors of the island; in fact, it was the Arabs who broke up its fallen fragments during their occupation of 653-8), to Cyprus. From Famagusta he took ship for Tripoli, for he reports that Christian commercial traffic had recently been diverted thither from its former goal of Iskenderun or Alexandretta.[9] Being in no great hurry to reach his goal of Jerusalem, Lithgow's desire to see as much as possible of distant and romantic places put him in mind to see Baghdad and Babylon, but first of all he gave his attention to the sights of Mount Lebanon. The places and buildings of the Near East which western travellers sought out first of all were inevitably those known from classical Greek and Roman antiquity or familiar from the Bible. Hence Lithgow first of all made a day's excursion to see the Cedars of Lebanon, from which Hiram, prince of Tyre, had sent timber for Soloman's temple (I Kings, v. 1-12); but like modern tourists, he was disappoimted to find a clump of a mere 24 trees, one of the two remnants of the forests which had presumably once clothed much of Mount Lebanon.[10]

He comments on the political state of Mount Lebanon, its control by the Druze Amīrs of the Banū Ma'n extended northwards from their original centre in the Shūf, and the recent vicissitudes of their fortunes through the revolt of the great Fakhr al-Dīn b. Qorqmaz[11] against the Ottoman Sultan. His chronology of the complex political and military events in Lebanon at this time is sketchy and confused, and it may well be that Lithgow used information acquired after his visit as if it were contemporary with his own travels there. He mentions the temporary exile of Fakhr al-Dīn with his Tuscan allies, and states that he had actually met him earlier in his voyages at both Leghorn and Messina in Sicily, stressing his pride and sturdy feelings of independence.[12] He was similarly confused and apparently misinformed about the religious communities of Syria as a whole. It is not surprising that the complicated divisions and sectarian animosities of the various eastern Christian churches baffled him. He speaks with enthusiasm of the kindness and hospitality of the Maronites, whose Patriarch entertained him in his own house. This Patriarch would be Yuhannā Makhlūf, who assumed the office in 1608, the first graduate of Rome to achieve the Patriarchate; he would, accordingly, have been able to converse with Lithgow in either Latin or Italian. The seat of the Patriarchate was from the mid-15th to the 19th centuries (sc. till the time of Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad Alī Pasha's occupation of Syria) at Dair Qannūbīn in Bsharrī. Yuhannā Makhlūf was forced in 1609, as a result of internal upheavals in northern Lebanon, to take refuge with the Ma'nīs at Majdal Ma'ūsh in the Shūf, but it seems more probable that Lithgow met the Patriarch in the northern rather than the southern parts of Mount Lebanon.[13]

Although the Patriarch was probably Lithgow's main informant on Lebanese and Maronite topics, Lithgow nevertheless remained in a state of confusion and misap-

prehension concerning many points. Thus he confused the Maronites with the (theologically very different) "Nazaritans" or Nestorians. He also commented on the use of Syriac, and if his information could be relied upon implicitly, it would be important evidence for the survival of spoken Syriac. He actually states, "There are none at this day, do speake the Syriack tongue, save onely these people of mount Libanbus: and in that language the Alcoran of Mahomet is writien".[14] Pace the comment of Père Fleisch that spoken Syriac apparently lasted on Mount Lebanon till the 16th or 17th centuries,[15] Professor Kamal Salibi doubts whether Syriac was ever spoken there in Islamic times. The Maronites are ethnically Arab, and not a scrap of Maronite literature, down to modern times, is in anything but Arabic (apart, of course, from the Syriac liturgy of the Maronite church). There is a story in the Maronite historians of a child who, in the 12th or 13th centuries, miraculously spok a few words of Syriac; this was regarded as a divine manifestation. It may be that Lithgow saw manuscripts or, conceivably, printed books in Karshuni, i.e. in the Arabic language but in Syriac script.[15a]

The Muslims were treated by Lithgow as a homogeneous group. He was not aware of the distinction between Sunnī and Shī'ī , although this should have been apparent in a province like Syria, and he thought that the Druzes were descendants of Frankish Crusaders who had fled northwards into the mountains after the loss of Jerusalem.[16] Like most other Europeans of his age, Lithgow refers to the Muslims not by a confessional term (such as "Muslim" itself), but by various terms which are vaguely ethnic and social in reference. Hence for the Muslims of Syria and Palestine, he employs the names of the Arabs or Arabians, the Moors and the Turks. The term Arabs or Arabians seems to denote for him primarily the Bedouins, called by Lithgow "for the most part Theeves and Robbers"; the sedentary Muslim population, ethnically Arab of course; and the Turks are the ethnic Turks. These last were, in Lithgow's opinion, marginally the best of a very bad lot. It does therefore seem that Lithgow's travels and experiences enabled him to make some differentiation here, at a time when the vast majority of his European contemporaries lumped all Mslims together as "moors" or "Turks" without distinction. However, forced as he was to pay out unceasingly for his safety and protection, Lithgow regarded all classes and varieties of Muslims as dominated by an all-consuming lust for gold.[17]

Whilst on Mount Lebanon, he visited the caves and refuges of various anchorites and holy men, and also the alleged tomb of Joshua, Yūsha' b. Nūn.[18] He then joined a Muslim caravan from Tripoli to Aleppo, travelling northwards on the coast, skirting Antioch, and apparently journeying through the 'Amq and the lower Orontes valley to Jisr al-Hadīd, the usual road to Aleppo, though he is not explicit about the route, and mentions merely that they saw en route a few miserable villages and passed through groups of nomadic, to whom they had to pay **Khifāra** or protectionmoney. Unfortunately, he reached Aleppo, hoping to take the Baghad caravan, but found that it had already departed. The Venetian Consul there told

him that the caravan usually halted for a while at Birejik on the upper Euphrates, on the fringes of Syria and Diyārbakr, so he went on after it, with an escort of three soldiers and a Janissary; but he was again unlucky, for the Baghdad caravan had left three days previously.[19].

This detour does, however, afford Lithgow the opportunity in his travel narrative to say something about Upper Syria, the old Arab province of al-Jazīra, and Upper Mesopotamia, which he identified in general with the Biblical land of Paddan Aram, where Laban dwelt and where Jacob kept his sheep (Gen, xxxi. 18, xxx. 9). He was especially impressed by the fertility of the agricultural land which he saw between Aleppo and Birejik, yielding two crops of wheat a year, and noted that the majority of villagers were Christians, ignorant in the faith but deeply attached to it in the face of persecution and other pressures.

Back once more in Aleppo, Lithgow's admiration was excited by the pigeon post between Aleppo and Baghdad, a service which conveyed letters and intelligence for local merchants in the space of 48 hours over a distance which required an overland journey of 30 days. This postal service was, of course, the development of an ancient Near Eastern institution, taken over by the Arabs and particularly well developed in Mamlūk Egypt and Syria. The Arab historians state that the Atabeg Nūr al-Dīn b. Zangī made the pigeon post part of the **barīd** or official postal system. Yet it seems to have been the Mamlūk Sultan Baibars (1259-78) who regularised what had previously been a somewhat haphazard service, with some 2,000 pigeons kept at the Cairo Citadel, which bore messages to Upper Egypt, to the Syrian frontiers on the Euphrates at Rahba and al-Bīra, and to the Taurus Mountains **Thughūr.** European travellers, from Rauwolff onwards, speak with enthusiasm of the service as it operated in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, being much employed by the European consuls and merchants in places like Iskenderun, Aleppo and Basra.[21] Lithgow spent the whole of the winter of 1611-12 in Aleppo, though he tantalisingly tells us nothing at all of life within the city, with its flourishing commerce, its western consuls and merchants and its communities of European missionaries and teachers.

In the spring of 1612 he at last set our for Damascus and Palestine in a caravan of 900 Armenians and Christian pilgrims plus 600 Turkish merchants, together with an escort 100 soldiers, 3 **Chāvūshs** or Imperial Ottoman envoys and 6 Janissaries. Lithgow himself hired a mule to carry his provisions, and secured a special charge from the Venetian Consul in Aleppo to the **karvān-bashi** for his safe conveyance to the Guardian of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. He had previously secured letters of commendation from the Venetian government, and at a time when Venice was still a dominant commercial power in the Levant, with an extensive network of consuls and factories, these letters stood him in good stead as a solitary traveller. People marvelled at his temerity in journeying thus, and this actually became a point of pride with him (''being alwaies alone which by all, was ever much admired''[22]). It did, however, mean that as a Frank, he was occasionally assaulted and beaten by

Bedouins and Turks and frequently mulcted of sums of money by chiefs through whose territories he passed. What facilitated this nine days' journey from Aleppo to Damascus was the ample supply of tobacco which Lithgow had brought with him. Tobacco began to be imported into the Turkish and Arab lands in the early years of the 17th century, half a century or so after supplies had started arriving in Europe from the New World, and became highly popular, despite opposition from the Muslim religious institution. Lithgow says that when he gave his Turkish mule driver a pound of tobacco, he was as delighted as if it had been a poud of gold. He says of the Moors, "they are excessively addicted to smoake, as Dutch men are to the Pot", and he describes the Turkish pipes as over a yard long and commonly composed of three sections of wood or cane joined by ties of iron or lead.[23].

As with many travellers who saw Damascus for the first time, the greenness and fertility of the Ghūta impressed him as unparalleled in the East. He calls Damascus "the mother City, and most beautiful place of all Asia", and he compared it, in the beauty and splendour of its houses, with Antwerp in Flanders. Lithgow mentions the great prestige of the Turkish Beglerbeg or Pasha of Damascus, who had under him 22 Sanjak Beys, 2,000 Janissaries and 40,000 Timariots, sc. Sipahis or feudal cavalrymen. Lithgow was an assiduous sightseer in a city which had so much of Biblical interest to offer. He saw the house of Ananias, who restored to Saul his sight, and the fountain where the latter was baptised; the place in the walls where Saul or St. Paul was let down in a basket to escape the Jews; and a metal gate, said to be from the Temple of Solomon and carried off by the Mongols (sic) from Jerusalem.[24]

The route from Damascus into Palestine was through the Jaulān and Galilee, which was the standard way to Jerusalem; the modern route directly southwards from Damascus through the Balqā' and then westwards across the Jordan, was not apparently in general use then. The caravan's armed escort continually on the alert against marauding Arabs, Lithgow had to pay out money continuously to local Arabs and Turks part of which he knew was returned as a kick-back to the caravan leader; but this leader otherwise showed such care and fairness to Lithgow that the latter accepted it as a necessary evil. They entered the region of Galilee north of the Lake, crossing the Jordan at a bridge called by the Armenians of the caravan "Jacob's Bridge", near to where Jacob was said to have wrestled with the angel and to have been confronted by his hostile brother Esau and his host (Gen. xxxii-iii)[24 a]. The land of Canaan or Palestine had, it seemed to him, declined sadly from being the land flowing with milk and honey in Old Testament times. This he attributed to God's curse over the land and over the Jews, its former inhabitants, in the first place. But on the wider plane, he viewed it as part of a general decline of the Near East, an aspect of the aging of the world:

Neither are the greatest part of these Easterne countries so fertile, as they have beene in former ages, the earth as it were growing olde, seemeth weary to beare the

burthen of any more encrease; and surely the two eyes of Day and Night, with the Planets, and Starres, are become neyther so forcible, so bright, nor warme as they have beene: Time, from olde antiquity, running all things to devasted desolation, making the strong things weake, and weake things feeble, at last it returneth all things to just nothing: and there is the end of all beginnings...[25]

Lithgow's caravan skirted the Lake of Galilee on the western side, where the ripuarian plain is wider, passing by Bethsaida and Tiberias, then striking westward across the hills to Cana, which he describes as a town of 200 fine houses, the inhabitants comprising Arabs, Jews and some Christian Georgians. Lithgow would have liked to have ascended Mount Tabor, in order to see the site of the Transfiguration of Christ, but was unable to persuade or bribe the caravan leader to make the necessary détour from the Nazareth road. At Nazareth, he saw the ruins of an old house, before which the Armenians fell down in prayer, saying that it was the house where Mary dwelt and received the Annunciation form the Angel Gabriel; the Armenian pilgrims all carried off a stone from this pile of rocks as relics, despite the fact that, as Lithgow pointed out to them, the Papists claimed to have Mary's house, miraculously transported by angels to Italy, at Loretto. His disillusionment with the Armenians further increased when the Muslim amīr of Nazareth supplied them with six whores at a cost of 15 piastres. Lithgow himself refused a share in these women, and he put the Armenians' beastliness here down to their residence amongst, and consequent corruption by, the Turks, since these Armenians "committed with these Infidelish harlots a twofold kind of voluptuous abhomination, which my conscience commands me to conceale".[26]

The caravan had intended to travel through the plain of Esdraelon to **Lydda**, but to avoid a planned ambush by Arabs of the Mount Carmel region, it **swung** northwards to Tyre. Here Lithgow took away with him a piece of marble from a pillar, allegedly one of those that Samson had pulled down over the heads of the Philistines (though Lithgow pointed out once more that the Temple of Dagon had been in Gaza!), and later presented it to King James I and VI of England and Scotland. He also met in Tyre a Mr. Brockesse, described as the English factor at Sidon, and presumably a member of the Levant Company.[27] The two of them retired to a tavern by the Mediterranean shores and drank so much wine that they were both nearly reduced to a stupor, "almost fastned in the last plunge of understanding", in his own words.[28] Passing by Mount Carmel and traversing the plain of Esdraelon, Lithgow was forced to pay a substantial **khifāra** of seven gold chickens[29], equalling 63 shillings sterling, to Bedouin chiefs there, as the only Frank in the caravan (the Armenian Christians being Ottoman subjects). The caravan went on through Samaria to Lydda, near to which they were attacked by a force of Arabs with bows and arrows, who were, however, frightened off by the muskets of the caravan escort, but not before 14 members of the caravan had been killed and 30 seriously wounded. At Ramla, Lithgow noted that here was the headquarters of the Christian dragoman who conveyed to Jerusalem those Christian pilgrims who had landed at

Jaffa, each pilgrim paying seven gold **sherīfis** in return for an ass and to cover the payment of various **khifāras.**[30]

They pushed on rapidly, covering over 43 miles on the last day before they reached Jerusalem, in the hope of being able to enter the city before sunset and the closing of the gates. Unfortunately, they arrived too late, and Lithgow was only saved from the extremities of hunger by the kindness of the Franciscan Guardian of the Holy Sepulchre, who heard that there was a Frank in the caravan and smuggled over the walls some bread and wine. Lithgow and the caravan entered Jerusalem on Palm Sunday 1612, his name having been entered at the gate (presumably the Jaffa Gate) by a clerk, so that he should not be able to avoid paying an entry due and a fee for seeing the Holy Sepulchre before leaving the city again. Later, a Jewish financial official of the Turkish Sanjak Beg of Jerusalem came to collect from each of the Pilgrims two gold **sherīfis** as an entry due, nine for the Holy Sepulchre visit, and one for himself. As a solitary Christian from the west, from such a remote land as Scotland, he was given a royal welcome by the Guardian and twelve friars, who escorted him through the streets with candles, singing the Te Deum, and who washed his fect at the monastery. Their enthusiasm abated somewhat when Lithgow revealed himself as a fervent Protestant, although the sectarian barrier did not prevent his staying in the Franciscan monastery, where he also met six German Protestants, including two barons, vassals of the Margrave of Ansbach, as well as some Frenchmen and Levant merchants, mostly Venetians and Ragusans.[31].

It is regrettable that Lithgow tells us virtually nothing of such things as the Turkish garrison and administration of the city, or of the commercial and artisanal activities carried on there, beyond noting the fact that the governor of the city was a Sanjak Beg. His time was taken up exclusively in visiting holy places and scenes of interest in the city and its environs, for he was determined to see everything possible whilst he was there—a pardonable ambition, in the light of the hardships and expenses which he had endured to get there. As a result, he claims in his book to have given the most complete account of the city's shrines and monuments available in the west at his time. His account is frequently interspersed with denunciations of the superstitions and ignorant practices of the local Christians and the sojourners there from the eastern Christian churches. He also attacks the rapacity of the friars who acted as guides, and that of the custodians, Christian and Muslim, of the various holy places, He gave a fervent Amen to the Guardian's after-dinner speech to the pilgrims on Palm Sunday, that the supreme desiderata for travellers to Jerusalem were Faith, Patience and Money.

Lithgow describes how the Franciscan Guardian, whom he names as Gaudentius Saybantus from Verona (the Guardian and his friars being changed in rotation every three years), led a re-enactment of Christ's entry into Jerusalem from Bethphage on Palm Sunday. The attempt of 6,000 eastern Christians who were following the procession to enter the city with the Guardian, led to the intervention of the Turkish

guard at the Zion Gate, the soldiers not only abusing the importunate eastern Christians, but dealing out blows to the Guardian and his friars.[32] A complete catalogue of the places and shrines visited by Lithgow would be tedious, but the two highspots of his stay in Jerusalem were firstly, an excursion to the Dead Sea shores, and secondly, the three nights' stay over Easter in the Churh of the Holy Sepulchre.

The expedition to the Jordan valley, Sodom and the Dead Sea was led by the Guardian and his friars, and cost each member of the party seven piastres, 42 shillings sterling. Lithgow refused a mule and adhered to his standard practice of going on foot. The party had an escort of 100 soldiers, comprising 60 cavalry and 40 infantry, and there were the usual alarums and attacks by the Bedouins. The Dead Sea, with its salinity and lifelessness, and its noisome miasmas, was impressive. The pilgrims bathed in the Jordan at the spot where Christ was said to have been baptised by John and to have received the divine charge. Lithgow broke off a staff from a turpentine or terebinth tree, which he later presented to James I and VI, and the whole party returned via Jericho, which Lithgow describes as a miserable village of nine houses only.[33].

The stay in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre lasted from Good Friday till midnight on Easter Sunday, and as well as the twelve **Sherifis** which had to be handed over at this point to the Sanjak Beg's representative, Lithgow and the pilgrims had to pay a further two to the Guardian, "for the Waxe Candles and fooleries hee was to spend, in their idle and superstitious Ceremonies, these three aforesaid nights". In the chapel of the tomb itself, Lithgow observed the lamps whose perpetual burning was maintained by the various Christian princes, and he noted that there was a golden lamp stand engraved with the name of King John of England. Like other western visitors to the church, Lithgow was intrigued by the deadly rivalries within it of the various Christian churches and their claims to different parts of the building. He estimated that there were 350 religious residents within the church and its precincts, comprising Italians, Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians,[34] Jacobites, "a sort of circumcised Christians", Nestorians and "Chelfaines of Mesopotamia," (Chaldaean Christians?). On Easter Sunday itself, he further estimated that there were about 6,000 eastern Christians present in the church. As a Protestant, he refused the Guardian's offer of admitting him to the order of the Knights of Jerusalem, even though the Guardian promised a reduction in fees from the usual 30 **sherifis** to a mere ten pieces of gold.[35].

Outside Jerusalem, he also went into the Judaean Hills to such places as Emaus, the tombs of Judas Maccabaeus and his sons,[36] and Bethlehem, where he lodged at the Franciscan monastery there. From the floor of a cave in Bethlehem where Mary was said to have hidden with the infant Jesus during the Herodian massacres, he took some white dust for King James's wife Anne of Denmark, since this dust had the property of causing the milk of a dry mother to flow after childbirth. Back in Jerusalem, he also had James's coat of arms engraved on Christ's tomb in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the inscription **Vivat Jacobus Rex** "Long live

King James!" at a cost of two piastres, somewhat to the scandal of the Guardian, that the tomb should be profaned with the name of an enemy of the Roman Church. Finally, he paid his bill of 5 pounds, 2 shillings sterling for his 16 days' stay in the monastery, plus two **Sherīfīs** for a diploma under the Guardian's great seal attesting to his having visited all the shrines and holy places in Palestine. Inevitably, a host of minions clamoured for reward, and Lithgow was forced to give two **sherīfīs** to the friar who had acted as their dragoman and guide, and lesser payments to the cook, steward, etc. His total expenses in Jerusalem itself, not counting all the payments he had made outside the city walls, came to 18 pounds, 16 shillings sterling; he cites these expenses as a warning to intending travellers and pilgrims, that the idea that such visitors benefit from free hospitality and travel is a complete delusion.[37]

He now made preparations to depart from the Holy Land for Egypt, via Gaza and Sinai, and on May 12th 1612 joined a caravan, paying a sum of 19 piastres to cover all tributes and **khifāras.** Lithgow and his Jerusalem companions now began an appalling journey across the Sinai Desert. Of the party, the two German barons from Ansbach died of heatstroke, and three Dutchmen died of a surfeit of undiluted wine-drinking on their parched stomachs when they at last reached Cairo. Lithgow buried the three Dutchmen in a Coptic Christian cemetery, sorrowing at the loss of such pleasant and faithful companions.[38] After seeing the sights of Cairo, he eventually embarked at Alexandria, still in 1612, and took ship for Malta and Naples, and thence through Italy and France to London.

Lithgow's account of his travels through Syria and Palestine is thus primarily oriented towards his British readership, i.e. he gave an account of all the places and shrines with scriptural connection, and was not really concerned with local politics or with the non-Christian aspects of Near Eastern life. He did, nevertheless, deal quite extensively with the history and administration of the Ottoman empire and the manners and customs of the Turks in that section of his book devoted to Greece and Istanbul, just as he also gives some sociological detail and political comment about Egypt and about the Maghrib, the latter being the object of his second journey of 1613-16. Nevertheless, Lithgow's book is an interesting one, as the expression of a vigorous and forthright observer of the Mediterranean world and the Levant. We have seen that his prejudices against Papists and Jews were acute ones, and that he had a low opinion of the ignorance and credulousness of Greek and oriental Christians. Concerning the Muslims, he noted amongst other things the prevalence of unnatural vice, though he condemned this equally in southern European countries like Italy. He could not of course regard Islam as anything but a false creed, and his view of the origins of Islam that Muhammad was an impostor, born of a Jewish mother and subject to epileptic fits, in which states the lunatic ravings of the Qur'ān were uttered, is entirely consonant with that of mediaeval European Christendom, a view which was not to be seriously modified till the 18th century.[39] Even so, he showed some appreciation of the Ottoman Turks' tolerance of their Christian

minorities, even though he knew that this tolerance arose from contempt and not from any disinterested motives. He specifically pointed out that Greek complaints about Turkish oppression were a "damnable invention", and that the **devshirme,** the tithe of male children from the Christian population of the Balkans, had now been abolished by Ahmed I (1603-17), together with the state levy on the wedding dowries of Christian women.[40] Accordingly, we cannot stigmatise Lithgow as being wholly blinkered by his prejudices, although he was very much a man of his age; he reflects a not uncommon Protestant view, at a time when Protestantism was struggling against the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation, which regarded Rome as almost as great an enemy as Islam, and was therefore disposed to see a certain amount of good in the Muslim faith.

Manchester University

NOTES

1. For a general account of his life and travels, see C.E. Bosworth, "William Lithgow: a seventeenth-century traveller in the Near East", **Memoirs and proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society,** CXIV (1971-2), No. 1, pp. 1-21, and for a short notice, M.A. Hachicho, 'English travel books about the Arab Near East in the eighteenth century', **Die Welt des Islams,** N.S. IX (1964), pp. 26-7.
2. **Totall Discourse** (see above), p. 439.
3. For a summary account of the bibliographical history of Lithgow's travels and the **Totall Discourse,** see the "Publishers' note", prefixed to the Glasgow 1906 edition of James MacLehose and Sons, pp. ix-xiii; the page references given in this present paper refer to this edition.
4. **Totall Discourse,** pp. 36-7.
5. **Ibid.,** pp. 65 ff., 105,115.
6. **Ibid.,** pp. 113-14, 122-3.
7. **Ibid.,** p. 136.
8. See C.F. Beckingham and R.B. Serjeant, 'A journey by two Jesuits from Dhufār to San'ā in 1590'. **Geographical journal,** CXV/4-6 (1950), p. 197. The use of coffee seems to have passed from the natural habitat of the bush in the Yemen to Egypt at the beginning of the 16th century and thence to Syria and Turkey by the middle of that century. Turkish sources say that coffee drinking was introduced into Istanbul in the reign of Sulaimān the Magnificent by two Syrians, who opened two coffee houses there and made enormous profits before retiring to Syria again. References in biographical dictionaries and in Ottoman decrees show that coffee drinking flourished in 16th century Damascus, whither it had been allegedly introduced from the Hijāz. The ulema opposed coffee as being worse than wine—it was believed that it dulled the sexual appetite—and not long after Lithgow was in Istanbul, the Sultan Murād IV (1623-40) took draconian measures against the practice, pulling down coffee houses and executing people found drinking the beverage. Nevertheless, the practice grew; the **muftis** eventually gave **fatwās** in its favour, and the habit passed to Western Europe by the mid-17th century (see C. van Arendonck, **Encycl of Islām,** first edn., art. 'Ḳahwa', and Bernard Lewis, **Istanbul and the civilisation of the Ottoman empire** (Norman, Okla. 1963), pp. 132-6). In confirmation of the two Jesuits' information about the mode of preparation of coffee, an early 19th century English traveller, James Silk Buckingham, says that the inhabitants of Mocha on the coast of Yemen did not drink the berries in a roasted and powdered form, but instead, made a nauseous decoction of the outer husk of the berry, which Buckingham says resembled a lukewarm mixture of glauber salts and senna tea **(Autobiography of James Silk Buckingham: including his voyages, travels. adventures, speculations, successes and failures, faithfully and frankly related** (London 1855), II, pp. 325-6.
9. The background for this transfer of traffic is delineated by A.C. Wood in his **A history of the Levant Company** (Oxford 1935), pp. 76-7. The Ottoman authorities, concerned at the exposed position of the Iskenderun harbour and its liability to pirate attacks, decreed in 1609 the transfer of all European trade and the European consuls (in ptactice, those of Venice, France and England) to Tripoli; in fact, the harbour of Tripoli proved equally vulnerable to raids, and its Pasha distressingly predatory, so that in 1613, after negotiations, the traders were able to return to Iskenderun.
10. **Totall Discourse,** pp. 170-1.
11. It seems that, in the light of Kamal Salibi's recent reseaches on the origins of the Banū Ma'n, we should not, as is conventionally done in the histories, describe this prince as Fakhr al-Dīn II. See his article, 'The secret of the house of Ma'n', **International journal of Middle East studies,** IV/3 (1973), pp. 272-87, in which he argues convincingly that the Fakhr al-Dīn I [b.] 'Uthmān who is supposed to have submitted to Selim the Grim in 1517 at Damascus and to have been confirmed in

the chieftainship of the Jebel Druze, cannot have been reigning at that time.

12. See Salibi, **Encycl. of Islām,** new end., art. 'Fakhr al-Dīn'; **idem, The modern history of Lebanon** (London 1965), pp. 3 ff.; and P.M. Holt, **Egypt and the Fertile Crescent 1516-1922** (London 1966), pp. 112-20.

13. See **Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique,** X/1 (Paris 1928), art. 'Maronite', col. 45, and K.S. Salibi, **al-Marawina: ṣura ta'rikhiyya** [The Maronites: a historical portrait] (Beirut 1970).

14. **Totall Discourse,** p. 172.

15. H. Fleisch, **Introduction à l'étude des langues semitiques** (Paris 1947), p.80 n. 2.

15a. A few years before Lithgow's time, a press using Karshuni characters had been established in the Maronite monastery of Qazḥayyā in Bsharrī, and this press issued a book of Arabic psalms in 1610 (Salibi, **The modern history of Lebanon,** pp. 126-7).

16. **Totall Discourse, loc. cit.**

17. **Ibid.,** p. 207.

18. According to the Old Testament story, Joshua died at the age of 110 years and was buried on the lands he had held from Moses at Timnath-Serah in the hills of Ephraim, i.e. northern Judaea. (Joshua xxiv. 30) - a long way from Mount Lebanon! But as with so many of the tombs and shrines of the Patriarchs, prophets and saints, several places in the Syro-Palestinian region claimed Joshua's tomb in Islamic times, including the "Jasmine Mosque" at Tiberias, the village of Busr in the Ḥaurān, Ma'arrat al-Nu^{c}mān and Ṣarafa in the Balqā', to the east of the Jordan. However, the best Muslim authorities considered, with justification, that the village of 'Awartā, on the road from Jerusalem to Nablus, had the best claim. See G. Le Strange, **Palestine under the Moslems, a description of Syria and the Holy Land from A.D. 650 to 1500** (London 1890), pp, 337, 404, 425, 496, 531, and A.S. Marmardji, **Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine** (Paris 1951), p. 151.

19. In the later 16th century, down to c. 1603, European travellers to Baghdad and Basra, such as Rauwolff and Sir Anthony Sherley, usually went by boat down the Euphrates from Birejik. But after this, such travellers as Jean de Thévenot in 1665 and Carsten Niebuhr in the 1760s preferred the land route Aleppo-Birejik-Urfa or Edessa-Mosul-Baghdad rather than the more direct river route through lands filled with predatory Bedouins. See C.P. Grant, **The Syrian Desert: caravans, travel and exploration** (London 1937), pp. 84., ff 89-90.

20. **Totall Discourse,** pp. 177-80.

21. Cf. J. Sauvaget, **La poste aux chevaux dans l'empire des Mamelouks** (Paris 1941), pp. 36-9, 77 (with a map of the pigeon post routes on p. 38); Grant, **op. cit.,** pp. 244-5; and F. Viré, **Encycl. of Islam,** new edn.; art. 'Ḥamām'. **Pace** Viré's statement that the use of the pigeon post disappeared in the course of the 15th century, the statements of several later writers and travellers show that it remained in full use long after this, at least for commercial and private correspondence.

22. **Totall Discourse,** p. 182.

23. **Ibid.,** pp. 182-3.

24. **Ibid.,** pp, 184-7.

24a. This bridge has in more recent times become known as the "Bridge of the Daughters of Jacob" and this designation may be quite old, since it is found in the 16th century Ottonan **mühimme defteris.** However, Dimashqī and 'Umarī (in Le Strange, **Palestine under the Moslems,** p. 53, and Marmardji, **Textes gégrophiques arabes sur la Palestine,** p. 7, respectively) mention the bridge only under its older name of "Jacob's Bridge".

25. **Ibid.,** p. 191.

26. **Ibid.,** pp. 192-6.

27. According to Wood, **A history of the Levant Company,** p. 77, the Company had no permanent consulate or vice-consulate on the Syro-Palestinian coast at this time, though there may have been occasionally establishments at Tripoli and Iskenderun; Wood suggests that members of the Company probably traded at Sidon and Acre under the protection of the French consuls there.

28. **Totall Discourse,** p. 199.
29. This curious term, much used by Lithgow, is an Elizabethan English version of Italian **zecchino,** also giving the standard English word "sequin". It was a gold coin circulating in Italy and the Ottoman empire, worth about 7 shillings sterling at the end of the 16th century; see the **Complete Oxford English dictionary,** s.v. "chequeen, chequin". The Ottoman term for this gold coin was **sherifi,** or **eshrefi,** see H.A.R. Gibb and Harold Bowen, **Islamic society and the West.** I. **Islamic society in the eighteenth century.** Part II (London 1957), pp. 50-1.
30. **Totall Discourse,** pp. 200-7.
31. **Ibid.,** pp. 208-11.
32. **Ibid.,** pp. 217-19.
33. **Ibid.,** pp. 224-34.
34. Lithgow mentions elsewhere, concerning the Ethiopian sojourners in Jerusalem, that he visited a chapel on Mount Zion and saw there the stone which was rolled in the entrance of Christ's tomb, and now used as an altar by the Ethiopians. He states that, as well as this chapel in Caiaphas's house, they also have a convent on Mount Moriah, where Abraham was to have made his intended sacrifice of Isaac, and describes the Ethiopians as "a kinde of people, which came from Prester Jehan's dominions", but more zealous in their blind faith than in their understanding. Also, the Ethiopian Emperor contributed to the maintenance of St. Catherine's monastery in Sinai, where there were 200 Ethiopian monks (**ibid.,** pp. 220-2). See on the Ethiopian community in Jerusalem in the firsh quarter of the 17th century, E. Cerulli, **Etiopi in Palestina, Storie della communità etiopica di Gerusalemme** (Rome 1943-7); II, pp. 56-85, who utilises here Lithgow's information and on pp. 64-7 cites the passages of his **Totall Discourse** relative to the Ethiopians. Cerulli doubts the accuracy of Lithgow's mention of the chapel of Caiaphas's house as one of the Ethiopians' holy places; Lithgow is the sole authority for this attribution.
35. **Totall Discourse,** pp. 234-43.
36. The home and the family grave of the Maccabees was at Modi'in, to the southeast of Lydda, the modern village of Midya; see George Adam Smith, **THe historical geography of the Holy Land,** 4th edn. (London 1897), p. 212.
37. **Totall Discourse.** pp. 243-55.
38. **Ibid.,** pp. 255-88.
39. For these views, see the standard works of N.A. Daniel, **Islam and the West, the making of an image** (Edinburgh 1960); R.W. Southern, Western views of Islam in the Middle Ages (Cambridge, Mass. 1962); and M. Rodinson, 'The western image and western studies of Islam', in **The legacy of Islam,** second edition, ed. J. Schacht and C.E. Bosworth (Oxford 1974), pp. 9 ff.
40. Lithgow was in fact mistaken here. Sporadic levies of children were made throughout the 17th century, and an attempt may have been made to levy it at the beginning of the 18th century, though by that time the whole **raison d'être** of the **devshirme** had been destroyed by the entry of free-born Muslims into the ranks of the Janissaries see V.L. Ménage, **Encycl. of Islam,** new edn., art. 'Devshirme'. The statement about the ending of the tax on Christian brides is also dubious. This was actually a standard Ottoman tax, levied on all brides, non-Muslim and Muslim alike, and not abolished till the 19th century; see Bernard Lewis, in **ibid.,** art., 'Arus resmi'.

THE LOCATION OF THE UMAYYAD RESIDENCES IN GREATER SYRIA AS INDICATORS OF THE GEOPOLITICAL CONDITIONS OF THE TIME

Klaus Brisch

In fact all researchers of Umayyad residential architecture are sufferers from the same difficulties: on one side we know now a rather elevated number of places earlier published or recently excavated, few of them datable with wantable accuracy. On the other side we possess a commonwealth of information contained in the literary sources pertaining to the Umayyad time, giving us place names and also events clearly connected with rulers and datable. But rarely can both sets of information be connected with each other. In the light of this situation of research it must look rather premature trying to detect an overall pattern which hopefully might explain why certain residences of the Umayyads were located in which parts of the bilād al-Shām.

Let us leave out in this context the question of which sites where primarily State Domains including Royal palaces, baths and lodgings for the court personnel. One fact seems clear to me at this stage that all or most of the residences served to house the mobile courts of the Califs, courts with a more or less constantly functoining government, well equipped to take the necessary action for an ever expanding Empire and to attend to the ever more exacting demands of administrations so differnt as al-Andalus and Khurāsān.

Our sources inform us too that for instance 'Abd al-Malik followed a yearly itinerary which allowed him to stay in Damascus only about two months each year. It is clear that a ruler residing in the capital only for such a short time would have been unable to attend to the governing of the Empire if he could not have at his disposition an ambulant court.

There is one thought which should be added to this observation. If we are entitled to assume that it was 'Abd al-Malik who set up a masterplan for the expansion and consolidation of the Islamic Empire we would be able to explain certain decisions of his successors as execution of those parts of the plan which were left unfinished by the death of the predecessor.

I do not want to raise the question here whether the land of Islam could not have been ruled from Damascus proper or why this was obviously not the case. But one

should feel entitled to raise the question whether there were models for reigning with ambulant courts. The most tempting proposition of course would be the example of the Ghassānids, in particular since it is knowm since long that the Umayyads took over several of their residences, for instance Jilliq which in times prior to Islam had begun to outshine Damascus. But a wider vision should not leave out of sight the fact that the Han-Dynasty of China, contemporary to the Umayyads, had to resign itself to changing places for its courts. The rather intimate knowledge of China by the early Caliphs—known since long from the historical sources of China herself—has been lately confirmed by early Islamic coins in tombs in China.

A virtual model closer to the region and beloning to a culture which the Umayyads held in high esteem after the conquest, would he the courts of the Sasanian Empire of which the Arabs had the most intimate knowledge centuries before the rise of Islam. But I am afraid that we have to leave this our of this context because I am given to the feeling that our colleagues dedicated to the history and the archaeolgy of the Sasanians are at the moment rather hesitating when asked to point out where the most important residences were and in which sequence they were used by the rulers.

If we now make a review of the most important residences of the Umayyad residences it seems clear that under the early rulers like 'Abd al-Malik and al-Walīd propably less country residences were built than in the time of Hishām, the members of his family and his successors, apparently because the great buildings meant to represent the power of the new faith—Jerusalem, Damascus, Mekka, Medina—had priority. Two reservations should be made before: we just now begin to receive information about the building of Umayyad residences in Iraq; and there are certain insecurities if it comes to the dating of certain residences.

In the time of al-Walīd we know of the foundation of Minya (Tabga) at lake Tiberias, certainly of Usais and probably of Qusair 'Amra. During the lifespan of Hishām there we have Hammām al-Sarāh (probably) Qasr al-Hā'ir al-gharbī and Qasr al-Ḥā'ir al-sharqī. And then of course khirbat al-Mafgar, Mushatta and Qaṣr at Tuba, the latter three almost for sure built by his nephew and successor al-Walīd II.

The earlier sites, it seems to me, can be best explained by being connected with the most important routes of communication between the bilād al-Shām on one hand and Egypt, Iraq and the Arabian Peninsula on the other, Minya serving the land route to Egypt. They are to be seen either as relating to the Wādī Sirḥān or to the other desert road reaching Damascus from the East of the Ḥaurān—connections which existed since the dawn of history as proven by the fact that some of the Umayyad residences are located on prehistoric sites. This seems to mean that the Umayyads wanted their residences located outside cities to serve them as temporary seats of government while traveling and to have an occasion to receive those parts of the Umayyad society in representative buildings which would not normally ap-

proach them in cities, mainly the Beduins which formed a constitutive element in that time. Therefore these country castles were built as important means for the consolidation of the heartlands of the Empire.

The move of Hisham to Palmyrenae and ruṣāfa to me seems to be the first clear indication that the center of gravity inside the Islamic realm was shifting. Byzantium could not be conquered as the Umayyads wearily had to admit after the great assault of al-Walīd I from both land and sea had failed. The conquest in the West had come to a more or less permanent standstill whereas the conqest in the Eastern provinces went on and the political tensions rising there. Contrary to this movement of Hisham and the same time centrifugal is the settlement of the members of his family in the originally preferred regions of the bilād al-Shām and the hectic building activity there. I ask myself whether we are not entitled to explain this move in the opposite direction as an architectonical imprint of the tensions reignig inside the Umayyad family. The final outbreak of civil war would tally with this.

At the end Marwān II saw that the shift away from Damascus was insufficient and therefore gave up Damascus as capital and transferred the seat of government to Harrān, the last capital of the Umayyad Empire.

So what for a long time looked as an arbitrary, radically anti-Umayyad shift by the Abbasids to Raqqa, Baghdād and on to Sammarrā could now be explained as the prolongation only, a prolongation of a movement tangential to the Byzantine territories which already was in full swing towards the end of Umayyad reign. It seems with the Eastern expansion of the Islamic rule the center of gravity could not be longer contained in the bilād al-Shām, the the force of the new and changing geopolitical conditions sucked the capital from the West to more Eastern locations. Futhermore, history seems to teach us that rarely do capitals survive if not located in the center of gravity. The most modern history of the bilād al-Shām and of Germany too provide us with more pertinent examples.

Museum of Islamic Art, Berlin

THE PROJECT OF THE BRITISH SCHOOL OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN JERUSALEM TO SURVEY THE MEDIEVAL ARCHITECTURE IN THE OLD CITY OF JERUSALEM

Michael H. Burgoyne

The history of Jerusalem in Biblical times has inspired intense archaeological exploration for more than a century now, albeit with often inconclusive or controversial results. Nevertheless our knowledge of the earliest history of the city is remarkably complete. We know that by 691 a.d., the date of the completion of the Dome of the Rock fifty-four years after the Islamic conquest, Jerusalem began to take on much of its present appearance. However, with the exception of inspired analyses of the Dome of the Rock and the Mosque of al- Aqsā, and Max van Berchem's masterly corpus of the Arabic inscriptions, the many surviving medieval Islamic monuments have been surprisingly neglected by scholarship even though the literary sources dealing with the later history of the holy city are detailed and conveniently accessible.

Sadly, this neglect is not confined to scholarship, and the future of these hitherto unrecorded buildings is in greater jeopardy now than ever before. A complete lack of maintenance has allowed the stonework to crumble, the fine carving of the architectural ornament has detriorated and the structural integrity of many buildings has been undermined. Almost all these medieval foundations are occupied by tenants who have neither the interest nor the money to carry out proper repairs, while the Muslim authorities which administer the properties have insufficient means to implement an overall maintenance programme, and so the risk of collapse is increasingly real. As a result we must now add the intensifying threat of demolition in the interests of safety, and, thanks to the everincreasing influence of unenlightened Western values and technology, so-called "progress".

It was against this background that Dame Kathleen Kenyon, Chairman of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, conceived the idea of a project to survey, analyse and publish the medieval monuments, both public and private, in the Old City in order to compile a permanent record and actively to encourage their conservation.

In 1968 work began on the "Jerusalem Project" to prepare a series of detailed plans, sections and elevations of the buildings. The Project represents the primary

research activity of the B.S.A.J. on the west side of the River Jordan, complementing the archaeological investigations of the School directed by Mrs. Crystal—M. Bennett at Buseirah, (east of the River Jordan). It is staffed by two architects with special training in environmental conservation, M.H. Burgoyne and A.G. Walls, and from the outset has enjoyed the enthusiastic co-operation of the Supreme Muslim Council of Jerusalem.

The buildings are recorded in two ways: Mr. Walls is preparing large scale (1: 50) drawings, supplemented by details of the decorative features drawn to scales of up to 1:1. I am working to the smaller scale of 1:100 for the major drawings, also clarified by up to full-size details. This latter technique allows a survey of large areas to be made more quickly but in rather less detail and is of particular value where a building or group of buildings is in immediate danger. In both cases the graphic record is augmented by a historical analysis of the monuments and their founders. Progress is reported regularly in **Levant,** the journal of the B.S.A.J.

The primary aim of the Project is to locate and survey every remaining medieval structure and ultimately to publish a complete chronological index to the Muslim monuments of Jerusalem, positioning each on a map, listing idetifying sources, biographical details of the founder and illustrated with the survey drawings and photographs.

From the literary sources we have details of 170 Muslim constructions in Jerusalem, including 9 mosques, 41 **madrasas,** 5 **Khānqāhs,** 6 **ribāts,** and many **turbas, qubbas, zāwiyas,** etc., 75% of which belong to the Mamlūk period. Although the inconsistency of building-type names in medieval Islam is well known, the problem of nomenclature is less acute in Jerusalem since the chronicle written by Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ulaymī in 1495 (**Al-Uns al-Jalīl bi Ta'rīkh al-Quds wa'l- Khalīl**), contains descriptions of most of these pious foundations, evidently based mainy on information contained in foundation deeds and inscriptions, which may be assumed to be quite accurate. Admittedly other authors, in their descriptions of Jerusalem, often contradict Mujīr al-Dīn's terminology but it can normally be shown, by comparison with foundation inscriptions and occasionally by examition of the architectural layout, that they have adopted later or assumed denominations.

Searching out the buildings is complicated by the fact that Jerusalem continues to thrive as a very densely populated commercial centre. The major foundations are usually relatively obvious, but less well-known ones can only be located by systematically knocking on doors and asking for permission to "look around".

In the course of looking closely at all the architecture of the Old City, several unedited inscriptions have come to light. A redaction of these, together with a map showing the location of all the Arabic inscriptions in Jerusalem, will be included in a forthcoming issue of **Levant.**

Of the 170 buildings mentioned in the texts, 15 have disappeared and 16 have still to be located, although many only survive as barely identifiable vestiges of the initial foundation. One of the difficulties of recording the medieval architecture of oriental cities is that the accretion of later additions often conceals the original structure. In order to be able to define the limits of the original it is therefore necessary to survey an extensive area. This is timeconsuming but unavoidable. Fortunately certain areas of Jerusalem, especially the Street of the Chain (Tarīq Bāb al- Silsila) and the north and west borders of the Ḥaram al-Sharīf, appear to have held a special attraction for the Mamluks. Thus we find a concentration of medieval constructions there. This allows the measuring of secondary elements to be reduced to a minimum when surveying. For this reason, and the obvious advantages of establishing and preserving a continuity of personal contact, Mr. Walls initially concentrated his attention on the mausoleums in the Street of the Chain, while I have recently completed the survey of a complete street, Tarīq Bāb al-Ḥadīd. This quiet lane leading to one of the western entrances to the Ḥaram is contained by buildings from all periods of the Mamlūk era and our investigations there revealed interesting details of the urban development of Jerusalem in the 13th—15th centuries.

Although Jerusalem was, economically and strategically, an unimportant province for most of this time following the expulsion of the crusaders, the Muslim conquerors regarded the sanctity of the place with renewed enthusiasm. This explains the many princely tombs and religious institutions situated close to the Ḥaram. Just as the examination of the architecture of the more prominent administrative centres of the Mamlūk empire has vastly increased our knowledge of many aspects of the history of this fascinating period, it is hoped that the work of the Jerusalem Project will shed new light on these historic times.

Magdalen College, Oxford

SAADI IN DAMASCUS

Abol Hasan Dehkan

Sheikh Mosharraff-al-Dīn Moṣleḥ Saadi Shīrāzī, the greatest Persian poet who ever lived, has been chosen to be the topic of a talk in this great gathering of Amman. As you notice, I have chosen only a tiny aspect of this great humanist, his relationship with "Greater Syria". Before discussing this subject at length, allow me to say a few words about the life, the importance and the epoch of Saadi. I shall then try to trace his path to this corner of the world.

The thirteenth century, corresponding to the seventh century of Hijra, is one of the most turbulent periods in Islamic history. Just prior to this epoch, the greater Khorāsān had attained the zenith of its civilization. The learned philosophers, mathematicians, chemists and physicians who numbered in hundreds were the great torch-bearers of human knowledge and advancement. It was just in this century that, from the depth of Asia, surged the great force of destruction led by the ruthless Gengiz Khān. The Golden Horde of Mongols massacred, destroyed and laid waste to all of these centers. It is said that in Bokhārā alone, Gengiz Khān rode to the Great Mosque, ordered all the leaves of the Holy Qur'ān to be thrown to horses and the great Ulama to attend the animals. While the Eastern part of the Islamic Empire was torn to pieces, the Crusaders also overran the fair provinces of Asia Minor, Lebanon and Palestine. The Holy City of Jerusalem suffered no better fate than Nieshāpūr. Godfrey de Bouillon, the Conquerer, in a letter to the Pope, boasted of trodding with his horse in the blood and the flesh of seventy thousand innocent inhabitants of the city. These two evil forces of the East and the West tried to join hands and finish once and for all what was left of the Muslim faith.

It was just in this turmoil that by chance, a son was born in a family of **Ulama** in Shīrāz who later became the greatest poet, advisor, trainer, and narrator in the literary history of Persia. Yes, it was just by sheer hazard that Saadi, the great Humanist, was born in Shīrāz, because he belongs to humanity. We do not exaggerate if we count Saadi among the most famous poets of all nations. No doubt, he ranks with Homer of Greece, Dante Alighieri of Florence, Al-Mutanabbī of Arabia, Shakespeare of the English-speaking peoples and Lamartine of France. He must favourably be compared with Shakespeare, because, he too, brought new features to the Persian language. The language we, Iranians, speak today, could rightly be called **Saadi language.** His entire and complete contribution to Persian literature could easily be compared to an immortal encyclopedia. He speaks of all aspects of human life. In his invaluable "Garden of Roses" (Golestan) alone, within eight

chapters, he so skillfully treats all human characters and behaviours that, until now, no other poets or writers or philosophers have excelled him. What makes his writing and poems so delicate and so easily understood, is that he relates his own experiences and adventures. In these eight chapters he deals with the behaviour of rulers, the characters of Dervishes, supremacy of being contented, benefits of keeping silent, anything related to love, how to behave in old age, what are the results of education and how to treat others in the society. Those are just a few of his contributions. In one word, I can claim with certainty, that after eight hundred years, Saadi is quoted daily in writings and speeches by all the strata of Persian-speaking people.

So much and so little to praise this "Great Figure" whose immense work and contribution could not be dealt with within so short a space. Going back to his life history, Saadi left his native town, Shīrāz, to travel while he was a young man. For sometime, he stayed as a student and scholar in the Nizāmiyah School of Baghdad. There he completed his knowledge of Arabic and theology. We do not know, how long he stayed in that great seat of the Caliphate. We know that he performed seven pilgrimages to Mecca and most of them on foot. After acquiring full knowledge of that school and attaining the highest degree from Nizāmiyah, he comes to his beloved "Al-Shām" and stays for quite a good number of years in Damascus. Again, we do not know exactly how long he spent in "Greater Syria". We know, for sure, and after studying his own writings, that Saadi went out of Shīrāz as an immature young man, and came back as a full-fledged experienced poet and writer. Quoting him, from his own poetry, he portrays his going out of the country and his coming back, in this beautiful verse:

"Saadi went on foot and came back with Head".

When he came back to Shīrāz around the year 656 H. he was fifty years old. This year coincides with the holocaust of Baghdad, murder of Musta'ṣim, the last Abbāsid Caliph and by chance the reign of a just and benevolent ruler in Shīrāz, Abu-Bakr Saad ibn Zangī. On several occasions, Saadi depicts his "come-back" to his native town and mentions that he learned a lot from his Syrian friends and great learned men of Damascus. It was only by good fortune that Shīrāz was spared from destruction by the Mongols through the wise and far-sighted policy of the above-mentioned ruler. So, when Saadi comes to his native town, he finds tranquillity, leisure, and a just ruler who patronizes the learned people. He is well-treated by the authorities, receives regular pension and settles down in a small village only six kilometres out of Shīrāz. He goes on to live a long life, of nearly ninety years; and so he is contemporary to successive rulers, governers, and high ministers. Amazingly enough he is respected, appreciated and well received by all classes of society. Seldom do we find somebody like Saadi to be so well-known during his own lifetime. Quoting him again from his own account, he boasts of being known throughout the Islamic world of his day. He mentions his journey to Kashgar, in the

province of Sinkiang, when he is recognized and asked to recite one of his poems. But we find that his Persian poetry is better understood than his Arabic. Anyhow, while still living happily in his abode, he conducts a school to which pupils come from all over Iran. Many of his poems and prose writings were written after he had passed the mature age of fifty and that is why he appears so fluent, well-versed and knowledgeable. For one thing, he knows his Holy Qor'ān by heart, and he is inspired by the Prophet and the Four Respected Caliphs. He never fails to mention and praise them all when he starts on a new book.

Saadi is not only a great poet. He is a great philosopher, theologian, preacher and writer. He has gained a lot from his long stay in the Arab world. There are more than a hundred references to Baghdad, Damascus, Jerusalem, Tripoli and Lebanon. Of all the places he visited or lived in, none is so dear to him than his beloved Al-Shām. Why was he so fond of Damascus and lived there for such a long time? Most probably one reason is the great geographical and climatic resemblance between Shīrāz and Damascus. Both are situated in a fertile valley and enjoy a mild climate and the people of both cities are genuinely polite and hospitable to foreigners. On many occasions, Saadi compares his native town with the oldest city in the world and praises its inhabitants for their kindness, hospitality and understanding. He spent the years of his prime youth in "Greater Syria." As he had learnt Arabic like his own native language, he indulged in different professions to gain his livelihood. Once, he even acted as a "water-carrier" in Damascus. His main occupation was to preach and that shows he was considered as a learned man and was well-acquainted with Qur'ānic verses and Ḥadīth. On several occasions, he mentions the Great Ummayad Mosque in Damascus and the Communal Mosque in Baalback, where he conducts discussion with other learned men to preach to the public. One of his most famous stories, of the "Golestan" or "Garden of Roses" concerns his experience in the latter mosque and with the permission of eminent scholars, I read it in Arabic.

كنت في جامع بعلبك أقرأ كلمات وعظية. الى جماعة كالصخر في الجمودية. قلوبهم ميتة. وعقولهم مشتتة. ما امالوا طريقها من علم الصورة الى جانب المعنى. ولا استضاءوا بكل مالمعناه فنظرت ان انفاسي المتصاعدة وناري الموقدة كلاهما لا يتأثر به حطَبَهُم الاخضر. فتأسفت على ضياع التربية في بهائم الحيوان، ووضع المرآة في زاوية العميان غير ان باب المعنى كان مفتوحاً مع الاتساع. وسلسلة الكلام طويلة الباع. في سر هذا الآية الفريدة، وهي قوله تعالى «ونحن اقرب اليه من حبل الوريد». لكنه طول الطريق. وقلة الرفيق. اطوى القول في سجله. حتى واصل الكلام لمحلـه وقلت.

نظم

حبيبي من ذاتي أشد تقربـــا لذاتي فبعدي عنه اعجب ما يُدرىٰ
وما الصنع فيمن اجمع الكون أنه تخلل قلبي ثم أوسعه هجـرا

فبينما انا من مدام هذا المقام نشوان بما فوق الحد وفضلة القدح تلمح في افق اليد. اذا بعابر سبيل كان جائزا في اطراف الناس. وقد انتعش من تصافي اخر دورة في الكاس، فصاح صيحة تحركت بها الجمادات الساكنة. ودبت فيهم حرارة الذوق بغليان الشوق حتى فارت هيولا هم الكامنة. فقلت سبحان الله البعيد حاضر بالخبر والقريب غائب بفقد البصر.

اذا لم يذق [معنى] العبارة سامعٌ فلا تطلب الإطنابَ من متكلِّمّ
فأوسعْ من الاسماعِ ميدانَ رغبةٍ تجدْ كُرَةَ الإفصاحِ تدنو من الفم

Sometimes again, he gets annoyed with the people of Damascus and seeks his fortune in other cities. The period coincides with consistant fighting between Muslims and Christians. He escapes from the Great City and wanders in the desert where he is captured by the Franks and forced to hard labour in the trenches. This adventure is the subject of another of his famous stories in Golestan and he relates it in this way:

ظهر لي في بعض الاعوام. ملل من صحبة الاصدقاء في دمشق الشام. فهمت برأسي في صحراء الوادي المقدس. واخترت الانس بالوحوش عن من تأنس. فما شعرت الا وانا في خندق طرابلس مع الافرنج أسيراً أسيرُ في القيود. وقد كلفوني بعمل الطين مع اليهود. فاتفق أن جاز علَيَّ واحدٌ من رؤساء حلب الشهبا وقد كان بيننا معرفة فما مر من الدهر وبنا[؟] فقال ما هذه الحال وكيف وقعت في هذه الأثقال؟. فقلت

نظـــم

وكنت عن الانصار سِرْتُ مهاجرا الى وحدتي اذ لم اشاهد سوى الله
فها انا في هذا الاوان مقيد مع البهم عن رغمي وليسوا بأشباهي

مفـــرد

تَحَمُّـــلُ زنجيـــرِ أمـــام أحبـــةٍ يُفَضَّلُ عن روضٍ مع الغربـــاء

فرق لحالي الحقير. وخلصني من قيد الافرنج بعشرة دنانير. واخذني معه الى حلب في المسا وكان له بنت فعقد لي نكاحها بصداق مائة دينار. ومضت مدة بعد تلك الشدة غير ان البنت كانت رديئة الطبيعة. مجبولة على العناد فليست بمطيعة. فابتدأت في سلاطة اللسان. ونغصت عيشي كاغلب النسوان. لأنهم قالوا.

رجـــز

المـــــرأة السوْ بدار الصالـــــح تريه في الدنيا سعير الطالح

حذار من احرازهـــــــــا حذار وقـــل قنـــا رب عذاب النـــار

وقالت لي مرة بلسان التعنت والتحقير اما انت الذي اشتراك والدي من قيد الافرنج بعشرة دنانير؟ فقلت اشتراني بذلك المقدار و أوقعني في أسر يديك بمائة دينار.

In this story he tells us of Jerusalem, Tripoli, and Allepo; so he is familiar with all of them. After all these adventures, he returns to Damascus and lives there for some more years. At that time, he is between thirty and fifty years old and in mature age. He lives as a pupil scholar in one of the innumerable theological schools of the city. By that time, his fame has spread far and wide. He conducts his own class and teaches philosophy, theology, Qur'ān, Hadith, and religious matters. He has extensive connection with learned men and civil authorities. By that time, Jerusalem had been liberated and Egypt and Syria had passed to the Mamlūks. By and by and through pilgrims, news reached Saadi that the Southern part of Iran had been saved from the Mongol onslaught through the wise policy of the ruler of the province of Fars, that is to say, his native town. It was his earnest wish to return to his cherished Shīrāz. The time was ripe for him to come back. We do not know when and by what way he travelled. According to his own account, it must have been around 650 H. The date corresponds to the reign of Saadi's patron.

What concerns us here is to discuss what Saadi brought back to Persia after such a long sojourn in Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine. A wealth of knowledge, experience, understanding, and humanity. He plainly and honestly confesses that it was through travels and contacts with other peoples that he attained such a high position and renown during his own lifetime. His fame spread throughout the entire Islamic world, because he recited both in Persian and Arabic and so fluently and easily that everybody could grasp him with interest and pleasure. Notwithstanding all these honours and respect he never forgot his beloved Damascus. Going through all Saadis poems and pross we find that he mentions Domascus five times, Shām fourten times Baalback once, Tripoli once. This is in addition to the many references he made to the mosques, the desert and mountains of Lebanon. But the importance of Shām becomes very clear when we study his adventures and when he returns to his native city. Then he clearly confesses that he has acquired his knowledge from "Greater Syria." So Saadi lived in a short period of Syrian history and in gratitude for his magnificent contribution to Damascus, one of the main thoroughfares of the city was named after him only a few years ago.

To conclude this short essay, I mention one of Saadi's great contributions to the cause of Human Brotherhood and World Peace.

بني آدم اعضاء يگد يگرند كه در آفرينش زيك گوهرند

ان بني الانسان جميعا اعضاء للبعض او هم في الخلقة من جوهر واحد (ومن اصل واحد)

جوعضوی بدرد آورد روزگار دگر عضوها رانماند قرار

إذا اشتكى –يوما– عضو من هذه الاعضاء فباقيها لا يذوق طعم الراحة والصفاء

توكز محنت ديگران بيغمى نشايدكه نامت نهند آدمي

(حديث از بيغمبر)

انت. يا من لمحن الاخرين، لا تحس بالغم ولا تشعر بالالم الا يليق بك ان تشعر بالآدمي؟[1]

ان مثل ابن آدم كالبنيان يشد بعضه بعضا، اذا اشتكى منهم عضو تداعى له سائر الجسد بالسهر والحمّى.

وقتى افتادفتنه أى درشام هركس ازگوشه أى فرارفتند

وقعت حادثة وواقعة في بلاد الشام وعلى اثرها هرب الناس وتفرقوا.

روستازاد گان دانشكند به وزيرى بادشاه رفتند

يسران وزير ناقص عقل بگذائيْ بروستا رفتند

وابناء الفلاحين العلماء اصبحوا وزراء للملك (بينما) اولاد الوزراء ناقصو العقل ذهبوا كشحاذين الى الريف.

جنان قحط سالي شداندر دمشق كه ياران فراموش كردند عشق

اصاب دمشقا الجدب والقحط بحيث نسى المغرمون (العشاق) الغرام

جنان آسمان برزمين شد بخيل كه لب ترنكرد ند زرع ونخيل

وقد اصبحت السماء تضنّ على الارض حيث ان الزرع والنخيل لم تبل الريق

درآن حال پيش آمدم دوستي كزومانده ازاستخوان يوستى

وفي هذه الاثناء جاء الى صديق حميم ولم تبقَ عليه مسحه من اللحم، اللهم الا عظاما

وگرچه بمكنت قوى حال بود خدا وند جاه وزرو مال بود

وان كان ذا مكنةٍ وثراء، ورب المال والجاه والطَّول

بد وگفتم اي ياريا كيزه خوى چه دمعا ندگيها ييشت آمد بگوي	وقلت له ايها الصديق الطيب النفس، قل ماذا حدث لك (ماذا جرى لك)
نه بينى كه سختى بغايت رسيدمشقت بحد نهايت رسيد	الم تر الوضع قد اصبح عسرا جدا وقد بلغت المشقة والاسى مَبْلغها
نكَه كرد رنجيده درمن فقيه	فقد نظر الى مُعدم نظرة فاحص فقيه
نكَه كردن عالم اندر سفيه	كنظرة النحرير الى السفيه
كه مرد ارجه بر ساحل است أى رفيق	
نيا ساييد ودوستانش غريق	اذا ايها الرجل وان كان انسان على الشاطىء فانه يغتم اذا ما رأى صحابه غرقى
من أز بينوائى نيم روى زرد	صفار وجهى ليس ناشئاً عن الفقر
غم بينوايان رخم زرد كرد	انما رؤية البؤساء قد صفّر صورتي وملامحي
نخوا هدكه بيند خرد مندريش	العاقل بطبيعته لا يستطيع ان يرى غيره يتعذب
نه برعضو مردم برعضو خويش	ويتالم ولا يزيد تعذيب نفسه

(١) هذه الابيات اختيرت لتكون شعارا للسلام الدولي في عصبة الامم في جنيف. واخيرا في الامم المتحدة نفسها.

Pahlav, University

REFERENCES:

1. Literary History of Persia by Prof. E.G. Browne
2. Literary History of Persia by Zabihullah Safa
3. Literary History of Persia by Jan Rypka
4. Literary History of Persia by S. Rezazadeh Shafag
5. Pahlavi University Congress on Saadi and Hafez 1350 H.
6. Adam Olearius:-
   Article on Saadi
7. James Morier, A Journey to Persia
8. Tavernier: Voyage en Perse
9. Eugene Flandin: Voyage en Perse
10. Comte de Gobineau: Trois ans en Asie
11. S.J. Wills: The Land of Lion and Sun.
12. Ibn- Batuteh- Accounts of People and Lands
13. Sykes, Sir Percy:- Ten Thousand Miles in Persia
14. Bradly Best: Persia, from Gulf to Caspian
15. Morton- Herman: Under Persian Sky.
16. J. Ebn- Yousof: Arabic Translation of Golestan.
17. Sheikh- Ajal Saadi Shirazi: Mazahér Mossafa
18. Ali Asghar Hekmat: Seven Hundredth Anniversary of Saadi's Death.
19. Ali Dashti: In the Domain of Saadi.
20. A. Equbal: Sheikh Mosharaff- al- Din Mosleh Shirazi.

CHRISTIANITY IN EARLY ISLAM: THE ARCHAEOLOCICAL EVIDENCE

Ṣāliḥ Ḥamārneh and Bastiaan Van Elderen

Archaeological research in Jordan in recent years has thrown considerable new light on Christianity during the Byzantine Period in the Middle East. During the Byzantine Period, A.D. 324 to 640, Christianity was a leading movement in this area. In the fourth century began an extensive flurry of church building which continued unabated in the fifth, sixth, and early seventh centuries.

However, very little is known about the spread of Christianity to the East prior to the Byzantine Period, in what might be called the Pre-Constantinian Period. In fact, virtually nothing is recorded in the New Testament about this eastward movement. Rather, a sizeable portion of this literary source deals with the expansion of Christiamity to the West in the first century. One reference to the Christians in Transjordan is found in the account of the conversion of St. Paul, who at the time was en route to Damascus to persecute Christians there. Eusebius (HE 3.5) reports that shortly before the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 the Christians fled to Pella in the northern Jordan Valley, east of the Jordan River (modern Tabaqat Fahl). Prior to that, Antioch in Syria (modern Anṭākya in Turkey) became the center from which Chrisianity spread to the non-Jewish peoples.

The literary sources have provided many accounts of the Christianization of various cities and areas, but legendary aspects of many of these accounts cast doubt on their reliability. Direct archaeological evidence has also been scarce. The "house-church" uncovered at Dura-Europos, dating about A.D. 232, is a valuable and unique discovery from the Pre-Constantinian Period.

In sharp contrast, the arehaeological evidence relating to Christianity in the Byzantine Period is not only extensive, but also continuing to expand. In 1949 Fathers Saller and Bagatti listed 141 places in Transjordan with Christian monuments and 85 places where churches and chapels exist. This figure must be revised, since in recent years many new churches have been identified. Regarding this enlarged body of evidence, I would like to make the following observations:

1 . These churches are found throughout Transjordan and Syria. They are not simply concentrated around Mādabā, but many are found in the south--around Kerak, Petra, Rabba; in the central region, around Amman, Jerash; in the north, around 'Ajlūn, Umm Qeis, Riḥāb, and Umm al—Jimāl. On the other hand, the concentration around Mādabā is very extensiv—Umm al-Riṣāṣ, Makāwir, Mukhayyaṭ, Mt. Nebo, Mā'īn, Kfeir Abū Sarbūt, Ḥisbān, Māsouḥ.

2 . In many of these places there are multiple churches. For example, at Mādabā we have now identified 14; in Umm al-Risās at least ten have been identified; Mukhayyat, 4; Kfeir Abū Sarbūt, 3; Mā'īn, 4; Rihāb, 7; Umm al-Jimāl, 15. Similarly, there are numerous churches at Jerash, Umm Qeis, Rabba, etc.

3 . In almost every one of these churches that have been identified there are beautiful mosaic floors and elaborate architecture, suggesting wealthy Christian communities.

4 . The majority of these churches, date from the sixth century. There are some dating from the late fifth century and others from the early seventh century. The existence of some churches from the middle seventh century and early eighth century will be discussed below.

This was the extent and appeared wealth of Christianity in Transjordan and Syria when Islam appeared. In the early seventh century Byzantine Christianity had been weakened by the Persian invasions and internal theological controversies.

My field research and studies have concentrated in the past few years on the excavation of Byzantine churches and mosaics, principally in the Mādabā area. I would like to share with you some of these results relating to the sixth century to illustrate the wealth of Byzantine Christianity, and relating to the seventh century to present evidence of Christianity in early Islam.

First of all, I would like to cite archaeological evidence of Christianity in the seventh and early eighth century.

1 . The Chapel of the Virgin Mary is dated in A.D. 662/663, in the beginning of the Umayyad Period.

2 . The church at Rabbat Moab (Areopolis): Dr. Fawzī Zayādine has recently published an inscription from al-Rabba, near Kerak, dated in the Year 582, i.e., A.D. 687. The text refers to the building of an ol'ofoun.

3 . The mosaic in Yadoude has been dated by Savignac and Abel in A.D. 653, although Alt has aruged for 502/503.

4 . The church at Mā'īn, published by Pere de Vaux (RB 47 (1938), pp 227-58) dates the restoration of the mosaic, after mutilation by iconoclasts, in 719/720. De Vaux suggests that the original floor was laid in the last quarter of the sixth century or the first part of the seventh century.

These are all examples of churches being built and/ or mosaic floors being laid in the Umayyad period. Such indication of at least some church building in the late 7th century and 8th century would suggest that the use of other church buildings can be assumed. This evidence comports with the literary evidence cited by Dr. Hamarnah indicating a tolerant attitude of Islam towards Christianity.

Finally, I would like to make some observations about inconoclasm. That there was an iconoclastic movement in the Byzantine Period is now generally accepted.

It is reported that in A.D. 394 or 395 Epiphanius entered a church in Palestine

where he saw a curtain with a sacred image. Incensed, he tore down the curtain and destroyed it.

It is very well possible that some of the iconoclastic acitivity seen in mosaics occurred in the Byzantine Period. Unfortunately, such iconoclasm is not dated, and its restoration only rarely. However, I am inclined to date the iconoclasm seen in the Māsouh mosaic in the sixth century.

On the other hand, there is evidence of iconclasm in the early eighth century. The Mā'īn mosaic is a good example of it since its restoration is dated-- A.D. 719/720. De Vaux suggests that the iconoclasm occurred in the reign of Umar II, perhaps in 717 or 718, and not in the reign of Yazīd II (p. 257).

Although Crowfoot (Gerasa, p. 172) suggests that no new church building occurred in Gerasa after the Persian invasion, he contends that the churches remained in use for another century or two. He dates the iconoclasm in the mosaics in the eighth century during the reign of Yazīd II (A.D. 720-24). Crowfoot concludes: "The sorry way in which the mutilations were repaired shows the wretched plight of the Christians, though it proves also that the community survived and still used the churches." (p. 173).

LES VOIES DE COMMUNICATION DANS LE BILAD AL-SHA'M AU XII ème SIECLE.

Nikita Ellsseeff

A - LES SOURCES LITTERAIRES:

I - Textes arabes :

a) antérieurs au XIIè siècle:- al-Muqaddasī
- Ibn Ḥauqal
- Nāṣir i Khusraw

b) contemporains et postérieurs:

1) Les voyageurs: Ibn Jubayr
Benjamin de Tudèlé
Ibn Baṭṭūṭa

2) Les Kutub al-Ziyārāt ('Alī al- Harawī)

3) Les géographes:

— Idrīsī, Nuzhat al- Mushtāq
— Kamal al-Dīn Ibn al 'Adīm, lère partie de la Bughyat
— ᶜIzz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, A'lāq al-Khaṭīra (édition Sourdel et S. Dahhān)
— Yāqūt, Mu'jam al- Buldān
— Abu'l- Fidā, Taqwīm al- Buldān

II- **Textes non arabes:**

a) Les récits de voyages archéologiques des XIX et XXé:

— Brunnow et Domascewski
— Clermont- Ganneau
— Max van Berchem et Fatio
— Melchior de Vogüé
— Max von Oppenheim
— plus prés de nous: Sarre, Herzfeld, R. Dussaud et Alois Musil.

Ces auteurs étaient surtout préoccupés du passé biblique du Bilād al-Shām et de l'Orient latin.

b) des recueils de textes traduits:

— Tobler, Itinera et descriptiones Terrae Sanctae, Genéve, 1877
— Karl Ritter, Die Erdkunde (qui constitue un recueil des informa-

tions géographiques puisés chez les voyageurs), en 21 volumes publiées à Berlin 1841-1899.

— Guy Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems. A description of Syria and Holy Lands. Translations from medieval Arabic Geographers, London, 1890.

P.P. Marmardji, Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine, Paris, 1951.

c) des guides de voyage ou manuels de voyageurs comme ISAMBERT (guide Jouanne), BAEDEKER, sans oublier la première édition du GUIDE BLEU de 1932.

III- **Etudes sur la Topographie antérieure à l'Islam:**

— E. HONINGMANN, Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinischen Reiches (évoque la frontiére arabo- byzantine de 363 à 1071).
— A. VASILIEV, Byzance et les Arabes, Bruxelles.
— V. CHAPOT, Frontière de L'Euphrate de Pompée à la conquete arabe, Paris, 1957.
— DILLEMANN sur la géographie historique de la Haute Mésopotamie du Vè B.C. au VIé A.D., Paris, 1962.
— G. TCHALENKO, LEs villages antiques de la Syrie du Nord, 3 vol. B.A.H. Beyrouth, 1954- 59.

R. DUSSAUD, La Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale, B.A.H., Paris, 1925. Ouvrage de base pour notre étude.

B - **LES CARTES:**

en dehors de celles qui figurent dans les ouvrages cités plus haut, voir:

— les cartes au 1/50 000 du Service géographique de l'Armée du Levant.
— les cartes anglaises pour la Palestine.
— la carte syrienne au 1/50 000 de 1971, avec un relief trés expressif.
— la carte de Jordanie au 1/250 000 en 3 feuilles.
— les cartes géologiques, notamment celles de Dubertret.
— utile mais difficile à trouver dans certaines bibliothéques, l'Atlas de Karl Kiepert (fin XIXè) intitulé: carte de la province asiatique de l'Empire ottoman.

LES ITINERAIRES

A) Rappel de la géographie physique:

I - Les grands traits du relief de Bilād al-Shām:

a) Les plissements géologiques
b) le système hydrographique

II - Les principales voies de passage

Les relations Nord- Sud et Est- Ouest

a) le rôle des vallées
b) nature des routes:

— de littoral
— de plaine
— à travers le désert
— de montagne
— de crête

III- Les types d'itinéraires:

— anciennes voies romaines
— route du Pélerinage et de pèlerinages
— intinéraires militaires et routes stratégiques
— itinéraire de la Poste (barīd)
— voies commerciales et routes de caravanes
— voies pour les relations quotidiennes entre la ville et son environnement

IV- Quelques exemples d'itinéraires en Syrie

V- Problèmes de la notation des itinéraires. Nous manquons de renseignements explicites sur les tracés.

En s'inspirant de la Sémiologie graphique de Jacques Bertin (Gauthier-Villars-Mouton, 1967), il faudrait s'attacher à mettre en relief:

a) les points d'eau: sources, puits, birkets.
b) les obstacles sur le chemin: nature du terrain, gorges, falaises.
c) les passages obligés:

1) de riviére: ponts, gués
2) de montagne: défilés, cols.

d) les haltes principales et secondaires marquant les étapes.
e) les postes de péages
f) les points frtifiés: châteaux contrôlant une région, fortins protégeant un passage.

CONCLUSION:

Les renseignements que l'on pourra obtenir de l'étude de voies de communication seront précieux pour connaître la répartition des ressources économiques, le rôle militaire de certains points, l'importance religieuse de certains sites. Un des points essentiels sera de bien noter la nature du terrain, pour éviter les tracés orthodromiques d'une ville à l'autre comme sur la carte de Spenjer, Die Post und Reise routen des Orients (1864) ou M. Dussaud dans sa Topographie.

Université de Lyon II

THE QADARIYYA IN SYRIA: A SURVEY.

Josef Van Ess

The Qadarite movement flourished in Umayyad times; it is of primary importance for the political and religious history of Syria in the latter half of the first and the early decades of the second century H. But our insight into the phenomenon is still rather undifferentiated. This is partly due to our imperfect knowledge of the sources. The **Ansāb al-ashrāf** of al-Balādhurī and the **Ta'rīkh Dimashq** of Ibn 'Asakir which contain a lot of precious information, are to a considerable degree still inedited; for the moment we have much more material about Iraq than about Syria. But besides that, the sources we possess do not see the movement as a historical entity with a development of its own, changing according to the different aspects of the political situation and of its internal growth and decline. The historians are only interested in dates and events; their tendency of referring to reports of eyewitnesses and contemporaries, helpful as it is, prevents them from thinking in terms of continuity or at least from giving us a coherent picture of longer intervals. The heresiographers, however, treat their subject systematically and not chronogically; they talk about the community and its sectarians, the community always being the triumphant majority and the sects arising as small subversive cells circling around a doubtful personality. And there remains, besides all that, the ambiguity of nomenclature: Qadariyya is not a fixed term with definite contents, but depends in its meaning on the character of the source in which it is used. It has always derogatory overtunes; nobody ever defined himself as a Qadari. But derogatory terms never tell us what somebody is, but only what somebody else thinks he is or wants him to be. And more than that: sometimes they are used in both directions. This is here the case: a Qadari primaily only means somebody who talks about God's qadar in the sense that he talks too much about it or in the wrong way, the direction of this "wrong way" remaining undefined. 'Amr b. 'Ubaid who, as a Mu'tazilite, believed in free will, wrote a K. al-Radd 'ala' l-Qadariyya in which he must have attacked the predestinarians, and this is one of our earliest secure testimonies for the term.

This means that the Orientalists used the word in a much stricter sense than the Muslims originally did. They were the slaves of their sources, and the sources they used dated from a time when the Qadarites had ceased to be a living reality and evoked the conception of something like an early Mu'tazila. The Orientalists therefore continued to regard the Qadariyya as a sect—with all the consequences involved: splitting away from the broad path of right belief, a "sect" is always younger than the community and in general also smaller in number; it has a founder who, for certain reasons, did not accept the ideas of the majority. Seen with the eyes

of a Medieval Muslim, this was a verdict in itself: a sect lacks the living continuity of tradition which links it with the origins; it is a "novelty" (bid'a). The Orientalists, of course, keeping themeselves at a distance and proclaiming the ideal of the neutral observer, did not adopt this attitude; on the contrary, the sects found with them a certain—and not always completely neutral—sympathy. But in spite of this, the other prejudices remained: as an unbiased historian, we must in all seriouness ask the question whether the Qadariyya really was a minority in the beginning and whether it had a founder at all.

It seems that we are not yet able to answer the first question. It is true that, in several places, we get lists of Qadarites. But we cannot build any statistics upon them because nobody counted the other side; our sources sorted them out as isolated persons who, for some incomprehensible ideosyncrasy, indulged in an odd deviation. Besides that, the lists are usually confined to one special group of people which does not seem to be representative for the whole umma in this specific question: the muhaddithūn who, as is testified by material transmitted by them, rather early in increasing numbers joined the block of the anti-Qadarites. The percentage may have beem different among the jurists, and certainly was among the ascetics, probably also among the intellectuals on the whole. All we can do with these lists is to analyze them according to the origin and the domicile of the personalities mentioned; this tells us how many names their authors were able to find for the different centres of the Islamic world (Basra, Kūfa, Syria, Hijāz), and we may trust that this roughly corresponds to the real proportions at that time[1]. But the life-dates of the persons and the fact that they were very well known at their time and after their death shows something else: the Qadarites were not isolated or boycotted up to the end of the second century H. at least, which means that their Qadarite convictions were not considered to be a decisive issue up to that period. This either derives from the fact that the whole question was not so furiously debated as our sources want us to believe, or that they had the majority at least in some places and could therefor not be attacked so severely. The latter case can be proved with certain persuasiveness for Basra; the contrary was nearly as certainly true for Kufa. For the moment, the majority question only leads us to the conclusion that it has to be put with much greater geographical differentiation, for each center separately.

We are here concerned with Syria. Our material for this section of our problem, on the whole, concentrates on an earlier period than that for Iraq—for obvious reasons: as long as Damascus remained the capital of the Islamic empire religious movements in Syria immediately interfered with the life and the political decisions of the court; afterward the country fell back into complete provinciality for some time and the sources lost all interest in it. Here, then, we may hope to touch the beginnings of the phenomenon; it may, therefore, seem appropriate to turn to our second question, the problem of the founder.

One name immediately comes to one's mind: Ma'bad al-Guhanī who was crucified in the time of 'Abd al-Malik in Damascus[2]. But nearly as immediately one

discovers that most traditions about him did not originate in Syria, but in Basra. This has to do with the fact that Ma'bad was active there for some time. But it is the kind of activity which counted: he took part in the revolt of Ibn al-Ash'ath against al-Hajjāj, and was executed for his adventure in 83 H. This is what one remembered of him; there is not a single report about a specific doctrine of his. It is this fact, therefore, which one wanted to stress: he offered an ideal possibility of proving that the Qadarite doctrine meant revolutionary spirit and represented a danger at least as much to the sectarian's safety as to the state. The foremost spokesman of Qadarite doctrin at Basra was not Ma'bad al-Guhanī, but Ḥasan al-Baṣrī who had kept aloof from the rebellion—at least according to the testimony of most of our sources[3]. It is interesting to note-that it was some of his own students who pushed Ma'bad al-Guhanī posthumously to the fore. They had joined the predestinarian cause, but did not want to give up solidarity with their teacher who was venerated throughout the town; they therefore made it clear that as long as doctrine was concerned a compromise was not yet out of sight, and that a Qadarite only became a real Qadarite when he tried to disturb the established order. Let us remember that they apparently represented a minority at Basra at that time, probably even among the pupils of Hasan al-Baṣrī; regarded from this side, too, it was not altogether advisable for them to take too intransigent a position.

This demonization of Ma'bad took place, with successive steps, in the years between 110/728 (when Ḥasan al-Baṣrī died) and 130/748 (the year when the oldest one of these pupils, Maṭar al-Warrāq, died at the latest). Later on a new element was added to the story: Ma'bad was supposed to have learnt his heresy from a Christian convert, a Persian **maula,** who is sometimes depicted as belonging to the lowest class of the population; this was brought up especially by 'Abd Allah b. 'Aun who died in 151/768—another pupil of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, but belonging to a younger generation. The main contemporary target of these reports seems to have been 'Amr b. 'Ubayd who had also belonged to the circle of the great Baṣrian master and even transmitted his commentary of the Qur'ān, but as a matter of fact pushed the Qadarite movement into a new direction.

Seen under the Syrian aspect, all this looks rather different. It is true that there, too, we find the tradition that Ma'bad al-Guhanī was the founder of the Qadariyya and that he was influenced by a Persian convert. But now it is brought up even later, divulged by the famous jurist—and predestinarian—Awzā'ī (died 157/774) who seems not to have relied on Syrian testimony, but on the Baṣrian material we mentioned. On the other hand, we get some rather reliable, because unintentional, information about Ma'bad's personality. He was a well-known and influential jurist; in this qualification he transmitted important decisions and hadīth from the caliphs 'Uthmān and Mu'āwiya. A report that he played a certain role during the arbitration after Ṣiffīn, after the first meeting of 'Amr b. al-'Ā s and Abū Mūsā al-Ash 'arī at Dūmat al-Jandal, is not altogether trustworthy, at least told with a Kūfian tendency. But he must have been rather familiar with Mu'āwiya, and 'Abd al-Malik

overwhelmed him with honors: he sent him as an ambassador to the Byzantine court and made him the tutor of his son Sa'īd (the Sa'īd al-Khayr of our sources). Both events are said to be more or less simultaneous; we might put them into the time between 69 H. when 'Abd al-Malik concluded a ten years' treaty with the **basileus,** and 73 H. when, after the collapse of the caliphate of 'Abd Allah b. al- Zubayr, the agreement came to a premature end.

When Ma'bad was executed ten years later, he must have been at leant in his sixties.There is no doubt that a certain critique of the government had induced him to join the rows of Ibn al-Ash'ath; but to what extent this critique was motivated by religious reasons is difficult to say. We may be sure that he was not the founder of a theological doctrine. It is probable that he would not have objected against the Qadarite position; but this was, at that time, only one side of an alternative which was just about entering into the consciousness of the age. In Syria, at the court of 'Abd al-Malik, it did not prevent him from gaining great influence. We may surmise that Qadarite ideas were involved in his rupture with the caliph, but it is not much more than a mere guess.

There is, however, some evidence that the polarization started at that time, although as yet in a rather concealed way. 'Abd al-Malik was pleased to hear from poets like Farazdaq or Jarīr that his caliphate was a token of right guidance (hudā), and that those who rebelled against it went astray, and there is, above all, a long text in which the " Qadarites" (who are not yet mentioned by name[4] are attacked and refuted in a way he must have liked. This text was written by Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya, a grandson of 'Alī, and it is preserved in forty fragments which seem to come up to approximately its complete length[5]. The "Qadarite" position referred to sounds surprisingly elaborate whereas the predestinarian counter arguments used by Hasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya frequently turn out to be rather primitive and besides the point. Should we infer from this that the "Qadarites" had had more time to prepare their ideas and the longer tradition, and that the predestinarians were the newcomers in the theological field? Again we are in the danger of transgressing the limits of demonstrableness, but this reversal of the **communis opinio** is at least not impossible. As the recent study by H. Raisanen has shown,[6], the Qur'ān does not exclude a Qadarite interpretation in any passage. Ḥasan's treatise is early; it does not yet mention some specific ideas brought forth by Ḥasan al-Baṣrī in his famous Epistle to Hajjāj and 'Abd al-Malik which seems to have been composed between 75 and 80 H.

Why it was just a grandson of 'Ali—and, besides that, the brother of the famous Abū Hāshim, imām of the Kaysāniyya after the death of Mukhtār—who attacked the Qadarites and by that found himself in agreement with the wishes of the government, cannot be sufficiently explained. But we may note at least that Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya wrote besides this text another one, a K. al-Irjā' of which I succeeded in finding the complete text two years ago; this short epistle which

marks the beginning of Murji'ite thinking shows the same respect for the Umayyads and blames all those Shī'ite extremists in Kūfa who rejected Abū Bakr and 'Umar and did not acknowledge the reigning dynasty. The fact then that he does not fight for the rights of the ᶜAlids or the Shī'ites—and that, equally astonishing, he writes books at such an early epoch of Islamic culture, is not isolated at all; and that he hated the Qadarites, like many other moderate Shī'ites after him, especially in Iraq, is attested by a remark in the Ibāna of Ibn Batta.

There was thus explicit attack, but there was no persecution: the Qadarite position was not uncontested as it may have been before the time of 'Abd al-Malik, but it was not considered to be dangerous. This constellation remains unchanged for nearly one generation. We do not know anything about the development in the time of Walīd and Sulaymān, although, in the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadīm, Sulaymān is said to have "talked about qadar". And 'Umar II, was not the uncompromising adversary of the Qadarites as he is sometimes depicted in our sources. Some members of the movement who later on became involved in political action for their convictions, still held responsible offices under his government; Ghaylān al-Dimashqi seems to have been the director of the mint in Damascus at that time. The reports about his discussion with the caliph about qadar and about 'Umar's forbidding him to further propagate his ideas can be proven to be a mere concoction of clichés[7]. 'Umar considered moderate Qadarites of the type of Ḥasan al-Baṣri as **ahl al-sunna**; he only reacted violently when the doctrine was carried to extremes. This is what happened in his time in circles around the Khārijite Shabīb al-Najrānī who believed that the deeds of man and his destiny in the Hereafter are not foreknown by God; God has no will concerning man's actions, he leaves them to his own discretion (tafwīḍ). The caliph wrote a Risāla against them which is preserved in the **Ḥilyat al-awliyā'** by Abū Nu'aym[8]. But this is far away from what the Qadarites usually believed: that God preordains the Good, by his **tawfīq**, but only foreknows the Evil which comes about through the fancies of man or through the instigation of Satan. It is interesting to note that it was not the caliph who started the debate; his extremist opponents had blamed him for his ideas, and only then did he launch his counter-attack. There is no trace of governmental initiative; his reign was too short and his interest in a religious peace-policy too great to leave space for intransigence.

We have to wait for the clash until the time of Hishām; during his reign Ghaylān al-Dimashqī was executed. But even now we must differentiate. In the beginning Ghaylān was still on good terms with the caliph; he accompanied him on the Pilgrimage in 106. And the reasons for his execution remain obscure. When away on a mission in Armenia he was suspected of having disparaged the caliph; spies claimed to have heard him say that God had not conveyed any power to Hishām. This was somewhat ambiguous: it could mean that Hishām had no power at all, or that although being in righteous possession of his power, he held it only by chance, as a member of the reigning dynasty, not by divine preordaining. The first is what Hishām will have understood, and the second is what seems to have been meant.

Power is a **rizq** according to Ghaylān, and the **rizq** is not predestined by God according to Qadarite doctrine, but only made available by Him in order to be acquired by man in a just or forbidden manner. On his way back from Armenia, Ghaylān was arrested near Qaryatain at the border of the Syrian desert, together with one of his companions, Sālih b. Suwayd, and after severe flogging both were executed in Damascus.

There is no doubt that Ghaylān's concept of rizq contradicted the Umayyad ideology which tended to interpret kingship (mulk) as an inalienable possession (mulk). But, on the other hand, we may assume that his attitude was not to the caliph. Hishām's spectacular reaction therefore seems to have further reasons which are not mentioned by our sources. The situation in Armenia was precarious throughout the reign of Hishām; in 112 the governor Jarrāh b. 'Abd Allāh al-Hakamī was killed in a battle against the victorious Khazars. It would certainly not have been very diplomatic to speculate about the nature of the caliphal power in such a difficult situation an in such and imperiled region, especially as the succession of Jarrāh b. 'Abd Allāh was taken over by Marwān b. Muhammad, the later Marwān II. who, as we know from his attitude during his caliphate was a bitter enemy of the Qadarites. We do not know whether Ghaylān committed such a blunder; but even if he did not do and say anything the situation was apt to get rid of him. And if he really was imprudent enough this may be due to a growing exacerbation about the policy of Hishām who did nothing to continue the course towards equality of Arabs and non-Arabs pursued under 'Umar II. and stopped after his death; Ghaylān was a Copt.

Signs of discontent could not escape notice. In 117 Harith b. Surayj started his insurrection in Khurāsān, and although he was not a Qadarite at all, his political slogans came very close to what some of our sources attribute to Ghaylān, too, and what as a matter of fact was only a simple consequence of his ideas: the Quraysh cannot claim the caliphate for themselves; everybody is eligible who keeps to Qur'ān and sunna. It seems that the combination of these threats and the wave of insubordinate spirit which menaced the outskirts of the empire made the Qadarite doctrine look suspect and subversive to the caliph; he certainly did not differentiate too much between doctrinal details. This would mean that Ghaylān's death for which none of our sources gives an exact date, has to be put in the years between 712 and 718 approximately. In the same time, a number of Qadarites were exiled to Dahlak, the island in the Red Sea where the Umayyads used to send their most unwelcome prisoners.

It is impossible to decide whether Ghaylān wanted the revolution, but there is no doubt that the government understood him like that and that he at least paved the way for the further development. We hear in Ṭabarī that Walīd II did not change the anti-Qadarite policy chosen by his predecessor. When Yazīd III, however, started his rebellion against him, he justified his behaviour with ideas which came close to

what one believed to have heard from Ghaylān: one must not obey a caliph who invites to sin; on the contrary, such a sovereign has to be deposed if he does not repent. Yazīd, of course, had Walīd II in mind, but the program would have had to be applied universally. His partisans were therfore called Ghaylāniyya[9], sometimes also simply Qadariyya. The latter denominatior may be premature; it is, in each individual case, not always easy to decide whether, beyond the political program, they were also Qadarites in the theological sense of the word. Many of them wee Kalbites, especially from Mizza near Damascus; the movement which, in the time of Ghaylān, seems to have been supported mainly by **mawālī** who did not agree with the priviledges of the Quraysh, was now taken over by genuine Arabs who felt frustrated by the predominating influence of the Qays.

After Yazīd's untimely death, the "Qadarites" fixed their hopes on his brother Ibrahīm; when he surrendered to Marwān II they were persecuted again. Some of them were assassinated by order of the caliph, others fled to Baṣra where they could be sure to find an intellectual atmosphere which suited them and enough security to live with. Soon afterward, this security was firmly established: with the rise of the 'Abbasids, the Qadarites were free to express themselves; 'Amr b. 'Ubayd was highly appreciated at the court of Ma'mūn But in the same time they found themselves integrated into the new society; their revolutionary period was over. It had remained restricted to Umayyad Syria.

Tubingen

NOTES

The conclusions expounded in this article are based on several studies on the **Qadariyya** which I finished during the last months. Material on the movement in general may be found in my article **"Ḳadariya"** in EI[2] and in my book "Zwischen Hadit und Theologie" (Berlin 1974, cf. especially the last chapter).

1. At least for the places they were interested in: as our sources are usually working with Iraqian material and do not give any information about peripheral centres as Khorāsān or Egypt, we must abstain from any judgment about these countries.
2. For documentation of the following statements cf, my article "Ma'bad al- Guhanī" in: Festschrift F. Meier.
3. A report to the contrary is found in Ibn al-Nadīm's Firhrist (cf. trs. B. Dodge, p. 382) where it is said that he paid homage to Ibn al- Ash'ath.
4. Safe documentation for the term **Qadariyya** does not seem to be earlier than 100 or 120 H. (cf. my "Zwischen Hadit und Theologie", p.).
5. I have edited these fragments in "Anfänge muslimischer Theologie" (Beirut 1974).
6. The idea of Divine Hardening; Helsinki 1972.
7. Cf. my chapter on Ghaylān in "Anfänge muslimischer Theoiogie" (Beirut 1974).
8. A new critical edition of this text may be found in my "Anfänge muslimischer Theologie".
9. Material on the Ghaylānyya is found in my article "Les Qadarites et la Gailaniya de Yazid III" in: Studiea Islamica 31/1970/269 ff.

ARABS IN SIXTH CENTURY SYRIA: SOME ARCHAEOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

Heinz Gaube

In the course of travels in the region east of the line Bosra, Damascus, Ḥamā, and Ḥalab, together with archaeological work at Khirbet al-Baidā', some observations occurred to me which may be worth communicating. These observations suggest certain conclusions which further archaeological work shoud substantiate. The matter at issue concerns Arabs within and about the eastern borders of Syria in the late pre-Islamic period.

Literary scholarship has undertaken to elucidate this question. Many of these studies, however, tend to become intellectual exercises for their own sake[1]. Studies of this genre leave a depressing vacancy in the mind of one who knows the area on the ground. The impression is given that men who played an important historical role between Byzantium and Persia are paper amalgam of consonantal changes, chronological harmonizations, and combinations of literary sources.

Those who like myself are not fully satisfied by this ask the question, whether a better basis for an understanding of this matter may not be found in the archaeological record of the region. Since so little archaeological work of this nature has been carried out previously, any such inquiries are amply justified. Bear in mind that some scholars are not yet convinced that Mushattā is Islamic![2] They adduce the graffiti on the socle to make the building fit Imralqais.[3] Qasṭal, not far from Mushattā, awaits a careful study. Ḥarrān is not yet securely dated.

Everywhere unsolved problems

The existing monuments have not yet been made to accord with the literary sources. E.g., Herzfeld[4] in 1921 did not succeed in identifying the Ghassānid buildings mentioned by Ḥamza Iṣfahānī in his chronicle.[5] In these circumstances it is necessary to restudy the known archaeological material and to discover new material.

Motivated by such conceptions as these I visited several times the area east of Jabel al-'Arab, one of the least known areas of Syria. Some of the ruins in this region were visited in the last century by Graham[6], Wetzstein[7], De Vogue[8], and Dussaud[9]. Among these ruins Khirbet al-Baidā' and Namāra are the most frequently quoted in connection with the penetration of the Arabs into Syria.[10] A chronological relation between the two was proposed by Dussaud[11].

Namāra, nowadays an amorphous heap of stones, is the tomb of Imralqais, who died in 328 A.D., as is witnessed by the Arabic inscription[12] in Nabataean letters which was found on the site. This inscription calls Imralqais "King of all Arabs" and specifies a number of tribes under his rule.

Khirbel al- Baidā' is situated about 30 km north of Namāra, looking out to the east over the Ruhbe, a fertile depression, 30 km long and 10 km wide. During my work there I produced a plan of the ruin and could identify the original disposition of the building.[13]

Khirbet al- Baidā' was a palace set out as a square, 60 m x 60 m. At every angle and in the center of each side, except the eastside, there are circular towers. The eastside contains the gate, 3.85 m wide, giving on to a courtyard of ca. 43 m x 43 m. This courtyard is surrounded on the other sides by ranges of rooms, 7.6 m deep and ca. 5.1 m (type 'a'), 6.1 m (type 'b'). 7.6 m (type 'c'), and 6.8 m (type 'T') wide. All these rooms were living quarters. On the eastside there were two small rooms flanking the entrance and four long rooms which must have served as store-rooms. The state of preservation of the walls is such, that the detailed plan of these rooms can be recovered fully. On the south-, west-, and northside we find an arrangement giving a schema: c- a- b- a- T- a- b- a- c-.

On the south- and northside these rooms were articulated into two groups with the schema c- a- b- a and a- b- a- a- c respectively. Entrance from the courtyard was given by doors in the b-rooms, whence doors led to the a-rooms and further doors led from there to the c-rooms. On the westside were two groups of rooms following the schema a- b- a which were also accessible through doors in the b-rooms. Thus we have on three sides of the courtyard two groups of rooms separated by an isolated room of the T- type.

The residential character of the building is attested by the organization of the rooms which reminds of the bait of the Umayyad palaces, together with the abundant mural decoration (especially lintels). First impressions suggest that Khirbet al-Baidā' was another example of the genre of Umayyed palaces (e.g. Khirbet al-Minye, Jabal Seis, Qasr al-Ḥeir al- Gharbī. Qasr al- Ḥeir al- Sharqī, and Khirbet al-Mafjar). But closer investigation, however, reveals this identification to be impossible. Khirbet al-Baidā' lacks many elements shared by these Umayyad palaces, principally the bait, the peristyle, brick and vaulted construction, and stucco decoration.

Since on this showing Khirbet al- Baidā was not built in the time of Walīd I and his successors, the question is whether it belongs to one of his predecessors or is pre-Islamic. The only pre-Walīd I building to be preserved is the Dome of the Rock which in plan is closely comparable with pre-Islamic monuments and its mosaic decoration is a first class example of pre-Islamic east-Mediterranean art. Naturally, in comparison with the Dome of the Rock, Khirbet al'-Baidā is mean and provin-

cial. However, if it is obvious that within the perspective of Umayyad imperial art Khirbet al- Baidā' is a product of provincial craftsmanship, equally within the narrow confines of Syrian basalt architecture Khirbet al'-Baidā' occupies an outstanding position. Both the decoration and the techniques of construction demonstrate an ambitious local craftsmanship. The decoration shows this craftsmanship to be working with ecumenical patterns of the Vth and VIth centuries (cf. especially those found in floor mosaics). That is to say, the magnate who ordered this building had at his disposal only local Syrian craftsmen as opposed to the Umayyad rulers.

The relations of this local Syrian craftsmanship can be more closely determined. Masonry comparable with that of Khirbet al-Baidā' is found in the ᶜAlā region and the Jabal Ḥaṣṣ, not in the neighbouring Ḥawrān. Equally the ornament is not Hawrānean, but resembles closely the ornament found by Butler[14] and Lassus[15] north- east of Ḥamā.

These facts togehter with the eastern situation of Khirbet al-Baidā' indicate that the perspective of those who constructed it derived from the East of Syria rather than Central Syria. This in turn suggests that Khirbet al-Baidā' was built by one of the Arab rulers, clients to the Byzantine state. These clients in return for subsidies acted as 'desert police' and as buffers to the nomadic tribes so that cultivated areas of Syria were spared harassment.

Imralqais, of whose tomb at Namāra we spoke earlier, was one of these Arab princes who received the 'tāg' from Constantinople as a symbol of his instalment over the Arab tribes. At Namāra the style of some decoration, the Nabataean letters of the inscription, and the use of the Bosra era connect this building with the southern slopes of the Jabal al-'Arab and adjacent regions to the south. On the contrary, the conceptions of the structure and decoration of Khirbet al-Baidā', as we have noted, are not connected with these south-eastern parts of Syria which show strong Nabataean influence. Rather they show striking parallels with the art of the eastern parts of Central and Northern Syria which were brought under cultivation much later.

Our knowledge of the antiquities of this area which lies to the east of the line Ḥamā, Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, Ḥalab is very incomplete. This conclusion can be drawn from Lassus' work[16] which is a very careful survey of a limited area. Since his work relates not only to archaeological but also to historical evidence it provides a good basis for showing relations between this area and Khirbet al-Baidā'.

Two things are obvious from consideration of Lassus' material:

1 . The distinct predominance of decoration belonging neither to the inner parts of Syria nor to the regions of the Ḥawrān and the Lagāh.
2 . The extraordinary high proportion of the VIth century inscriptions.

These two facts suggest the following thesis: In the VIth century many new

buildings were erected in the region northeast of Ḥamā, decorated in a style which has little in common with the more western parts of Syria.

Regarded from the standpoint of Khirbet al-Baidā' (itself a VIth century building) certain connections could be established with this region. We have said that craftsmen from this region were employed at Khirbet al- Baidā'. These observations give rise to two questions:

1 . Why did a specific style of decoration develop in the region north-east of Hamā?
2 . Why, during the last period of Byzantine rule in Syria, was there such intensive building activity in the 'Alā region and surrounding regions, itself an indication of lively colonization?

The decorations are characteristically in low relief and tend to the overall pattern based on a geometrizing of 'Rankenwerk'. Decorations of this type occur equally on simple buildings as on the major monuments of Qaṣr b. Wardān and al-Andarīn. To describe this decoration with such words as 'provincial' and 'late' does not help in our inquiry which sounds in political history rather than art history. There is no question that a more sophisticated style of decoration than this occurs in some basalt areas of Syris. But such decoration (e.g. in the Lagāh, the Ḥawrān, and the Jabal al- 'Arab) is much earlier. If from these latter areas we find decoration of the Vth and VIth centuries then it is copies of earlier prototypes (cf. cathedral of Busrā[17] or very simple vegetal forms as at Umtā'īyah.[18] The difference between the northern and southern basalt areas is well illustrated by a comparison of Umm al-Jimāl and al-Andarīn.[19] At the former decoration of the Vth and VIth centuries is almost entirely missing, whereas some very sophisticated examples are found at al-Andarīn.

The specific climate of these areas north-east of Ḥamā which is our concern, can be only understood on the presumption that in the Vth and VIth centuries they were settled by a people little susceptible to the taste in ornament of the Hellenized parts of inner Syria. Their taste in ornament was that of nomads who everywhere show preference for geometrical forms. On this analysis we must be justified in supposing that the eastern parts of Central Syria were inhabited by sedentary Arabs. This corresponds to the historical juncture, when the eastern borders of Syria were under the control of the Ghassānids. Although these nomad princes have become a standard item of Syrian history, in fact little is known of their actual role in Syrian politics of late antiquity. Even less is known of how these princes were integrated into the Byzantine administration. However, it can be said that even in the center of their power, the Provincia Arabia, their power was limited.[20] The cities and the zone did not belong to their sphere of influence. The atypical westward outlying pocket in the Jawlān where they are said to have operated, can only be explained by the supposition that they were accorded summer pastures in that area by the Byzantines.

Both in the south and in the north there seems to have been a coexistence of Byzantine and client Arab power. If the situation in the north is considered it can be

seen that buildings like Qasr b. Wardān and Stabl 'Antar[21] manifested the central power whereas, on the other hand, the Ghassānids exercised a certain function—that of protecting the newly cultivated land from ghazawāt of the nomads. It was the Ghassānid hegemony over the border nomads in this area of Syria which made possible this last large scale colonization in Byzantine Syria. One of the witnesses of the hegemony of the Ghassānids is the extra-mural building at Rusāfa where the Ghassānid princes received the Shaykhs of other Arab tribes on their visit to the shrine of St. Sergios.[22]

It was a consequence of the expansion to the east of cultivated Syria that a confrontation took place of traditional Syrian and Arab conceptions of decorative style. Justinian's policy towards the Monophysites whose sponsors the Ghassānids were, suggests mutual tolerance.

In presenting the foregoing material the aim has been to point out the reciprocal commingling which further archaeological work has to illustrate in detail. This work should culminate in a reconstruction of socio-economics of East Central Syria as Tchalenko[23] has provided for the northwestern massif. As a contrast and complement to Tchalenko's work it would clarify the pre-Islamic history of Syria and make the role of the Arabs therein more concrete.

NOTES

1. e.g. ALTHEIM, F. + STIEHL, R.: Die Araber in der alten Welt. II (Berlin 1965) 312-332: Die Araber an der oströmisch- persischen Grenze im 4. Jahrhundert.
2. ALTHEIM, F. + STIEHL, R. loc. cit. DUSSAUD, R.: La Pénétration des Arabes en Syrie avant l'Islam. Paris 1955. 60-70.
3. ALTHEIM, F. + STIEHL, R.: op. cit. I (Berlin 1964) 592-607: Msattā und der Beginn der arabischen Kunst.
4. HERZFELD, E.: Mchattâ, Hîra und Bâdiya. Die Mittelländer des Islam und ihre Baukunst. In: Jahrb. d. Kngl. Preuss.-Kunsts. 42 (1921) 113-115.
5. HAMZA AL- ISFAHANI: Tārīḫ sinī mulūk al-arḍ wa-l-anbiyā'. Ed. J.M.E. Gottwaldt. Leipzig 1844-48. 114-122.
6. GRAHAM, C.: Explorations in the east of the Hauran and in the ancient land of Bashan, In: G.J. (1858) 226 f.
7. WETZSTEIN, J.G.: Reisebericht über Hauran und die Trachonen. Berlin 1860. 62-64.
8. DE VOGÜÉ, J.M.: Syrie centrale. Architecture civile et religieuse. 1. Paris 1865. 69-70.
9. DUSSAUD, R. + MACLER, F.: Voyage archéologique au Safā et dans le Djebel ed- Druz. Paris 1901. 43-46.
10. DUSSAUD, R.: L:a Pénétration des Arabes---- Paris 1955. 66-70
11. DUSSAUD, R.: loc. cit.
    DUSSAUD, R. + MACLER, F.: Mission dans les régions désertiques de la Syrie moyenne. Paris 1903. 480.
12. RCEA. I No. 1.
13. For an analysis of the site see our: Ein arabischer Palast in Südsyrien. Hirbet el- Baida. Beirut 1974.
14. e.g. BUTLER, H.C.: Princeton Expedition (Leiden 1907-1920). II/B/1: 22/81, 86.
15. LASSUS, J.: Inventaire archéologique. Damas (1935/36).
16. LASSUS, J.: op. cit.
17. BUTLER, H.C.: Early churches in Syria^{2}. Amsterdam 1969. 233,
18. BUTLER, H.C.: loc. cit.
19. BUTLER, H.C.: Princeton Expedition (Leiden 1907-1920). Qasr b. Wardān: II/B/1: 29 f. al-Andarīn: II/B/1: 50 f.
20. NÖLDEKE, TH.: DIe ghassānischen Fürsten aus dem Hause Gafna's Abh. d. Kngl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1. 1887. 16.
21. BUTLER, H.C.: Princeton Expedition (Leiden 1907-1920). Qasr b. Wardān: II/B/1. 29 f. Stabl 'Antar: II/B/2 (end).
22. SAUVAGET, J.: Les Ghassanides et Sergiopolis. In: Byzantion 14 (1939) 115-130.
23. TCHALENKO, G.: Villages antiques de la Syrie du nord. 1.-3. Paris 1953-58.

EARLY ISLAMIC SETTLEMENTS IN BADIYAT AL-SHAM

Oleg Grabar

For many decades the numerous Umayyad settlements in Jordan, Palestine, and Syria were interpreted as pleasure residences and hunting lodges belonging to the caliphs themselves or to members of the Arab aristocracy of the time. It is difficult to deny that Qusayr 'Amrah, Khirbat al-Mafjar, and Qasr al-Ḥayr al-Gharbī were luxurious establishments, probably reserved and exclusive in their use, but they can hardly be considered as **typical** of the over 200 settlements from early Islamic times in the Syrian **bādiyah.** Therefore even though one still finds occasional references to pleasure palaces reserved for the private enjoyment of Umayyad aristocrats, this theory with romantic implications has generally been abandoned.

A second interpretation has been developed primarily by Jean Sauvaget, who unfortunately did not live to put it into final form. In simple form it proposes that the overwhelming majority of these establishments were agricultural enterprises. At times transformations or enlargements of pre-Islamic agricultural seettlements were involved. At times only minimal necessary constructions or mere farmhouses were built, while at other times elaborate palaces meant that for whatever presons the owners resided in their estates or at least sought to give them unusual distinction. But in all instances the primary purpose of Umayyad establishment is seen in this model as the agricultural development of the land. Thanks to large funds available from the conquests of North Africa and especially of northeastern Iran, such investments were easily possible either to bolster up a Syro-Palestinian economy damaged by being cut off from the rest of the Mediterranean or to develop new sources of revenues thanks to new programs for irrigation as in the Jazīrah for instance or to improvements in existing ones.

There is little doubt that an agricultural model coincides much better than the princely pleasure one with much of the available evidence. Thus few Umayyad sites of whatever type are far away from large canalization or other devices to hold and distribute water. Even Qusayr 'Amrah must be understood in relationship to a series of dikes and small houses, now gone, and in all likelihood to Uwaynid, a larger and still insufficiently explored site nearby. In fact, insofar as I can tell, only Qasr Kharānah shows no sign of possible agricultural use. Granted the likelihodd of a few exceptions, we could be satifsfied with the agricultural explanation and proceed to investigate archaeologically the physical character of such establishments, economically the nature of the crops grown on them and of the labor inbolved in

their growth, socially the religious make-up of agricultural population (thus ascertaining the speed of Islamicization in the county), and historically the proportion between newly created and simply continued or rejuvenated sites as well as the time of decay and of disappearance of most of them. Such scholarly endeavors which require a combination of textual and of archaeological investigations are certainly worthy of pursuit and the information which can be gathered from them would be of tremendous significance for the social and economic history of the area in the early Middle Ages.

Yet one may question whether the agricultural model is entirely satisfactory even as a hypthesis for the understanding of early Islamic settlements in the **bādiyat al-Shām** and in fact in the whole of the bilād al- Shām.

The completion in 1972 of the excavation of Qasr al-Ḥayr al-Sharqī some 100 kilometers to the northeast of Palmyra has suggested much more complicated coordinates for an entirely new Islamic creation in the **bādiyah.** Five separate elements are involved at Qasr al-Ḥayr. The small Enclosure. until now considered to be a palace, can be demonstrated on the basis of its plan and of the absence of princely decoration to have been a caravanserai, the first example of the monumental architecture of trade which will become so characteristic of Islamic art both inside cities and ond the main commercial roads of the empire. It is true, of course, that the external arrangement of the Small Enclosure, its monumental façade, and its interior planning are closely related to characteristic features of buildings usually thought to be palaces. But, on the one hand, it is not really certain that all of them were palaces and Jabal Says, Qaṣr Kharānah, Burqu', Qasr Abyaḍ, and many others may have also been caravanserais. And, on the other hand, early Islamic architecture frequently utilized a simple basic type, for instance the square building with one entrance, a porticoed courtyard, and varying arrangement of covered halls around the court, for several different purposes. A place at Khirbat al-Mafjar could, with a few transformations, become a ribāt in Sussa.

The second unit at Qasr al-Ḥayr is the Large Enclosure, a walled square of some 160 meters to the side with four axial gates and two secondary gates on the east side facing the Small Enclosure. It had been known even before excavations that there was a mosque in the southeastern corner of the enclosure and that a cistern was located in the center; excavations brought to light that the whole enclosure had an open central area surrounded by a portico, which we propose to call a **raḥbah.** The rest was divided into twelve nearly equal units. One was a mosque and near it was a sort of industrial complex consisting of presses for olive oil. Then there were six nearby identical living units with a court, apartments, rooms, latrines, and backyards, the latter occupying the northeastern, northwestern, and southwestern units of the enclosure; we propose to call each one of these living units a **dār.** Finally a seventh unit is similar to the living dārs but is provided with at least three entrances and with considerable stucco decoration; it lacks in latrines. We propose to interpret it as a **dār al-'imārah,** the official building of early Islamic times. So far no exact

parallel has been found either to the form of this enclosure or to its functions. It is, however, possible to interpret it as a madīnah in the restricted early Islamic sense of a primarily official center with minimal (or secondary) residential functions. This interpretation would be confirmed by the inscription found there nearly 170 years ago (and disappeared since then) which did indeed refer to a **madīnah.** An additional historical coordinate of the enclosure will be discussed later on.

The third unit at Qasr al-Ḥayr is a bath. Although larger than most baths known so far in Syria, it is not particularly original except in two areas: its meeting-hall in the shape of a very classical basilica and the presence of a water tower for the distribution of water.

The fourth feature of the site is the huge (14 kilometer) walled enclosure artfully adapted to the flow of water from a **wadī** to the nothwest. This enclosure was provided with two independent systems of sluices, with several gates, and with deflecting walls protecting against flash floods. Inside the enclosure no traces were found of buildings or of continous human occupation. There was only one long underground canal without any side branches. This suggests that the main function of the enclosure may not have been cultivation but animal breeding, especially horses and donkeys (possibly also camels) necessary for caravans as well as for military operations.

Finally to the north of the main enclosures traces were found of two small settlements of poor houses around a canal leading up to a large cistern. This, toghether with an irrigated area south of the large Enclosure, was the purely agricultural part of the site.

Altogether, then, Qaṣr al-Ḥayr was built to meet a combination of needs, with trade and possibly military supplies predominating over subsistence agriculture. It is possibe, although the point cannot be proved, that the whole site was created by the Umayyads as a residence for a branch of the Kalb tribe, as a way to secure their attachement to the dynasty through control of a major trade route (Iraq-Aleppo and newly developed Jazīrah-Damascus). While these concrete historical identifications are not entirely certain, the key point is that a purely agricultural purpose is not sufficient to explain a site like Qaṣr al-Ḥayr and that commercial as well as possibly military considerations were involved as well. In other instances, such as those that surround the foundation of Salamiyyah and of Ramlah, industrial concerns may have been involved as well. Many additional investigations are necessary to make these conclusions more precise and more secure, but the main hypotheses I should like to present are that early Islamic foundations in the **Bilād al-Shām** reflected the whole range of the needs developed by the new culture and that these needs were partly considerations of older possibilities in the land but partly new ones created by the change introduced by the very fact of a Muslim empire. These novelties can probably best be seen in the **bādiyah,** for the bādiyah had a strictly military frontier function in per-Islamic times but became a vital center for communications after the

conquest, the link between such various provinces as Syria, Arabia, the Jazīrah, and Iraq. Each of the bādiyah's hundreds of sites must therefore be re-examined within a far wider range of possible interpretations than has hitherto been the case.

There are two additional areas for which the excavations at Qaṣr al-Ḥayr have provided new information and especially a new framowork of hypotheses for the understanding of the **bilād al-Shām** in Islamic times. One is that the site survived from the Umayyad period until the early Mamlūks, although it dwindled considerably in importance and, after the twelfth century, changed from a motel-town into a small village. This continuity in use over six centuries is unusual and seems not to have existed in the comparable foundation of Transjordan or of southern Syria. The reason is, in all likelihood, that the tremendous development of the Jazīrah in Abbasid times required a hinterground of communication for trade, armies, possibly even certain agricultural and mineral products. No comparable development existed to the south. Although the question as a whole may still need further elaboration, the key point is that the development of the **bādiya,** if not of the whole **Bilād al-Shām** was consistently affected by what happened around the area.

The other point of significance concerns the technology and art of a site like Qaṣr al-Ḥayr. While much of the techniques and forms used there belong to the general vocabulary of pre-Islamic Syria with perfectly common Iraqi adjunctions, in many aspects of the technology of water in particular it has seemed to us that Arabian features were brought in, possibly even Yemeni. Their evaluation is made difficult by the insufficiency of information about the peninsula itself but it is easily understandable that much in the technical apparatus of bādiyah foundations would have derived from the homeland of those for whom they were built.

WITH
THE PHYSICIAN-SURGEON IBN AL-QUFF
FROM AL-KARAK TO DAMASCUS

Sami Khalaf Hamarneh

The Arab physician-surgeon Abū al-Faraj ibn al-Quff (630-635/1233-1286) is one of the greatest figures in Arabic medicine, surgery and therapeutics in medieval Islam, yet very little is known of his time, life and works. In this paper, therefore, an attempt will be made to evaluate the contributions of this prodigy from Jordan and trace his life activities from his birth place al-Karak until his untimely death in Damascus.

Abū al-Faraj Amīn al-Dawlah b. Muwaffaq al-Dīn Ya'qūb b. Ishāq, known as Ibn al-Quff, was an Arab Melakite Christian who was born in the city of al-Karak, then the capital of the Ayyūbid king al-Nāṣir Dāwūd, on the 13th of Dhū al-Qi'dah, 1630/22 August, 1233. His father was Muwaffaq al- Dīn Ya'qūb, a very close friend to the physician-historian Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ah (d. 1270). In the revised edition of the latter's book on the classification of physicians, **'Uyūn al-Anbā' fī Ṭabaqāt al-Aṭibbā'** (printed in Cairo, 1882, vol. 2 pp. 272-73), the author concludes with an enlightening biography of Ibn al-Quff, enriched by his personal and thorough acquaintance with both father and son. He praises the father as a scholar for his great learning, literary ability and competence. "He was surpassed by none in his days in the elegance and accuracy in handwriting", he reported. Being an administrator in the service of the Ayyūbids, he was transferred to Sarkhad (Salkhad in Hawrān of Syria) about mid 1240s. This writer believes that it could have taken place when king al-Sāliḥ Najm al-Dīn took over the rule in Sarkhad, 1246. When young Ibn al-Quff was fourteen or being intelligent and industrious his father intended to give him the best possible education. He asked Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ah if he would teach him medicine, and he accepted. Thus Ibn al-Quff embarked on what became his life career.

Under Uṣaybi'ah, who made Sarkhad his second home after Damascus, Ibn al-Quff studied the medical books that were recommended at the time for beginners. He started with the Hippocratic Aphorisms and Prognostics, and the **Masā'il fī al-Tibb** (introductory book to the healing art) by Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq al-'Ibādī (d. 873). He thereafter read the detailed works of al-Rāzī (d. ca. 925) on the classification of diseases, their diagnosis and treatment, and the methods of administering medications.

When the father was promoted and transferred from Sarkhad to Damascus, Ibn al-Quff moved to the Syrian capital. Here he had even greater opportunities for learning. He continued his studies under some of the most important centers for education in Islam. There were also at least three important hospitals in the city: al-Nūrī al-Kabīr, the Quymarī, and Bāb al-Barīd hospitals. One would assume that Ibn al-Quff, with the great interest he had in education and the healing arts, would have made excellent use of these great centers for health. One would also presume that he practiced medicine in that city and possibly in connection with one or more of these hospitals.

By the year 1260, the Ayyūbid dynasty in Damascus ended and a new dynasty was appearing on the scence, the Baḥriyyah Mamlūks. The real founder of the dyansty was king al-Ẓāhir Baybars who conquered Damascus and al-Karak beside Egypt and was proclaimed sultan of the entire region. He repaired and refurbished both citadels in al-Karak and 'Ajlūn in the early 1260s. About this time a need arose for a full time physician-surgeon to serve the health need of the garrison and their family stationed in 'Ajlūn. Ibn al- Quff was apparently selected for the job. He was the first highly educated physician we know to have pioneered health services in 'Ajlūn for several years.

Very probably in the early 1270s Ibn al-Quff was promoted and transferred to work at the citadel in Damascus, a position which he held until his death in 1286. Here in the citadel beside troops and military personnel, there were several mansions and halls for the royal family and attendants. The number and need was great so that actually at the time there were several doctors serving there during this time. It is during this decade and a half of years he spent in Damascus that Ibn al-Quff became a well known medical educator and parctitioner as well as a prolific author on medicine and its philosophy and application. The following works were reported, and a majority of them are extant in manuscripts complete or in part. We will name and define them according to the arrangement followed in the revised text of Ibn A. Uṣaybi'ah, which could be analogous to the date of their appearance.

1 . **Kitāb al-Shāfī fī al-Ṭibb** (the book that fills the gap in the healing art and satisfies the reader), in two parts, theoretical and practical. The theoretical (nazarī) part consists of 12 treatises. They cover such topics as definitions of the healing art and generalities such as humors, temperaments and body faculties; causes; the four necessary things (al-Lawāzim) for living as health, age, sex, and appearance; body's general conditions (dalā'il); disease of the skin; fevers; toxicology; psycho-therapy; diseases of the thorax; the digestive system (a'rāḍ 'ālat al-ghidhā'); diseases of sex organs in male and female; and diseases of the joints and arthritis. I am not certain if the book includes a separate part on other practical metters in medicine (but I doubt it, assuming that the last five treatises are meant). Unfortunately, only the first part of this work containing the first seven treatises is extant in a manuscript (Vat. Arabo

183) housed at the biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (thanks to the B.A.V. for their courtesy in sending me a microfilm of this part of al-Shāfī). It is in 183 pages, 19 lines per page written in elegant large vowelized Naskh script by Dāwūd b. Ya'qūb al-Masīhī, a humble physician", completed on the 10th of Sha'bān, 670 (March 1271), during the life time of the author. This led me to speculate on two things: one, that Ibn al-Quff's first name if it was Dāwūd (and we have no way to confirm that) then, two, this copy would be the autographed one indicating the date of completion of this part of the work.

2 . **Sharḥ al-Kulliyāt min K. al-Qānūn** by Ibn Sīnā (a commentary on Avicenna's book of al-Qānūn fī al-Ṭibb), an encyclopaedic work in six volumes. This author consulted one manuscript of it; the Ẓāhiriyah in Damascus incomplete at the beginning and end. It begins with the nineteenth chapter on the anatomy of the hand (muscles); and ends in a discussion on the year's seasons. In 290 folios; 19 lines per page, partly vowelized in Naskh script. This seems the only known copy of this work. It discusses the anatomy and physiology of the body and the various parts according to a classical method: muscles, bones, mentioning the text as in al-Qānūn (qāla al-Shaykh), then the commentary on the particular passage or topic (al-sharḥ).

3 . **al-Uṣūl fī Sharḥ al-Fuṣūl** (commentary on the Hippocratic aphorism) apparently originally completed in early Muḥarram, 681 (April 1282), in two parts. It exists in several copies and an edition by Bisharah Zalzal was printed in Alexandria, Egypt, 1902. I have not yet seen the copies in the Asafiyah, India, Gotha, Germany, or Alexandria, Egypt. But I consulted the ones in the British Museum in London, Dār al-Kutub in Cairo; Algiers; Beirut; and Paris. The one in Yani **Jāmi' tells** the date of the original copy. It contains the commentary on the seven treatises of the aphorisms in twenty-four chapters. The one in Alexandria seems to be a revised edition completed in 683/1284 and was read before the author. As to the copy at the National Library of Medicine A 66, it seems to be the commentary by Ibn Abī Sādiq (d. shortly after 1068). Ibn al-Quff's commentary included explanations of the matters that al-Rāzī raised and discussed in interpreting the Aphorisms of Hippocrates. Ibn al-Quff takes every opportunity in his elaborate commentary to include his own views on health matters.

4 . A treatise on hygiene of which no copy is reported or known to this writer.

5 . **Jāmi' al-Gharaḍ fī Ḥifz al-Siḥḥah wa-Daf' al-Maraḍ** (on preservation of health and medical treatment), of which several copies are extant. I consulted the ones at the British Museum, the Wellcome Historical Library and the Dār al-Kutub in Cairo. The work seems to have been known in Latin under the title **Corpus optatorum de servanda sanitate et depellendo morbo,** also in 60 chapters. It presents original ideas on embryology and attempts to interpret empirical biological concepts such as predicting the sex of a child and the resemblance of the child to its parents. In it the author also speaks of the

formation of the embryo in the various stages of its growth and development. He also discusses aspects related to the health of the mother and child after birth and through the stages of his life growth from childhood to ripe age. He also explains other aspects of environmental health including housing, seasons, natural products and waters.

The most important book, however, and the best known is his manual on surgery, **al-'Umdah** or **'Umdat al-Jarrāḥ fī Sinā'at al-Jarrāh.** This work has been published at the Osmānia Oriental Publication Bureau, Hyderabad, India, 1937, and several copies of its manuscript are still extant in several oriental libraries. I have personally examined several including those in Cairo and London.

The surgical manual is composed of twenty treatises on all theoretical and practical applications needed by contemporary surgeons. Besides anatomy, description of organs temperaments, humors and diseases, it includes sections on materia medica, pharmaceutical preparations and recipes, cauterization and surgical manipulations. In this manual, almost four centuries before the Italian anatomist, Marcello Malpighi (1628-1694) descrived the capillaries which he observed under the microscope, Ibn al-Quff spoke of these "unseen pores" which connect the arteries and the veins to facilitate the circulation of blood.

Ibn al-Quff here also described with clarity for the first time the function of the cordial vavles and the direction in which they open to permit the flow of fluids in or out of the heart chambers. This important anatomical phenomenon was mentioned and vaguely described by William Harvey and more fully by the French anatomist Raymond de Vieussens (1641-1716). Furthermore, in this text Ibn al-Quff appeals for unification of weights and measure standards throughout the Arab world. He saw the hazards of multiplicity of traditional and regional standards. When medication, especially potent drugs are in question, this matter of unified weights and measures becomes a serious business. Ibn al-Quff saw that and called for implementation of accurate and enforced standards for all physicians and pharmacists of the area. Alas, his plea went by, unheeded. He came at the very end of a great era of intellectual activities in the near East. It was soon eclipsed by rapid decline due to loss of political freedom and stagnation in the intellectual, spiritual and economic life of the nation. It, nevertheless, proved that our author preceded his time by several centuries in his appreciation of health problems and the function of the human body and its growth.

Ibn al-Quff and his colleagues in the health field in Syria and Egypt presented original contributions that lifted the medico-pharmaceutical output to a climax. The whole period was exciting and challenging and their contribution was no less significant and far reaching. In the case of Ibn al-Quff, he was in our judgment the greatest medical author and educator to come from the region east of the Jordan River throughout the entire Middle Ages period and up to the nineteenth century. And this brief survey commemorates his great achievement.

Smithsonian Institution
Washington

BYZANTIUM AND ISLAM: SOME CONTACTS AND DEBTS IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

J.M. Hussey

Although the western historian Richard Southern is concerned almost exclusively with the Latin West, his verdict that 'the existence of Islam was the most far-reaching problem in medieval Christendom', and the basic principles of his perceptive analysis of the problems involved apply even more to Byzantium than to the Christendom of the western Franks[1]. For Byzantium and Islam the issue was practical in that it presented the paradoxical and perpetual problem of reconciling the rival claims of war and peaceful co-existence, as well as the promotion of mutually beneficial trade. It was theological in that two religions now faced each other, both to some extent sharing common ground and common roots. It had cultural and historical implications—for Islam,a young society, which found itself in close contact with, and to some extent, at any rate to start with, dependent on, older and well-developed civilisations—particularly both Sassanian and Graeco-Roman. Though Islam had perhaps much to learn at the outset, it had much to give, but in the end this cross-fertilisation proved as vital for Byzantium as for the Muslim world in the East Mediterranean and in the Near and Middle East. As long ago as 1956 Paul Lemerle stressed the urgent need for a close examination of the creative activity of Byzantium—and by implication of Islam also—as revealed in Byzantino-Islamic relations[2].

In this relationship Syria occupies a key position certainly in the earlier middle ages. 'Syria' is taken here in the wider sense, as comprising the lands stretching north from Egypt up to the Taurus range, and eastwards from the Mediterranean to the Syrian desert and the Euphrates, that is, it comprised North Syria with the Orontes Valley, Phoenicia (middle Syria) and Palestine (south Syria), together with the east Syrian lands, the old provincia Arabia. Its two north to south mountainous formations, broken by deep valleys, and by gaps affording access to the fertile coastal strip, had long made for a development of small city principalities under the domination of stronger neighbours.[3] The cities, mostly coastal, retained importance under the Greek Macedonian, and then the Roman, conquest, and were to some extent hellenized. Other so-called urban units, on the desert fringe, emerged, but this late Roman (Byzantine) development did not in effect alter the character of Syriac speaking village life in the interior[4]. It is then this area from Antioch (Syria I) in the north to Sinai (Palestrina III) in the south, divided as it was into some eight provinces under the sixth century Justinian[5], which must be considered on the eve of the Muslim conquest in the seventh century. What did the Muslim cenquerors find?

To the Byzantine historian the obvious landmarks and characteristics of these Syrian lands were the highly developed urban life, the vital ecclesiastical developments of the Christian church in what was after all the land of its origin, and, less obvious, but not less important, the 'entrepôt' character of the area, particularly the middle and north Syrian regions, designed by nature to afford easy access to the East Mediterranean from the great trade routes of the Middle and Far East, from China and central Asia, for instance, through the industrialised Mesopotamian area to the Syrian coast[6]. It has even been maintained that 'the centre of gravity of Antique culture lay in Syria and Egypt.[7] Egypt apart, as being outside our terms of reference, this is indeed understandable in the light of the achievements of Syria's urban and rural life. And one might add that this centre of gravity was not simply one of culture. It is true that the archaeological reconstruction of cities such as Aleppo or Antioch, the reputations and splendours of Gaza, Tyre, Sidon, all point to a highly sophisticated and individual way of life, and not only in the towns. There was the countryside with its princely country houses and hunting lodges, with its irrigated land. But it was also an area of strategic importance with its frontiers and garrisons or castella, linked to each other by an efficient road system, and thence connected through Asia Minor with the capital on the Bosphorus. Here full use was made of Arabic-speaking soldiers, and of a system of alliances with those desert tribes[8] who could be persuaded to favour Constantinople rateher than Persia, usually by tradition the Ghassanids.

Then the Christian church had from its inception been closely linked to Syrian lands, particularly Palestine with its special association with the life and death of Jesus Christ. Cities such as Antioch with its traditions of learning and theology had developed their own particular interpretations of Christian doctrine, as for instance the Antiochene school. It was in Syria almost as much as in Egypt that the vigorous growth of early Christian monasticism took place. Leading Christian figures were associated with Syria and Palestine[9]. Jerome lived in the Syrian desert. There was a rich Christian Syriac and Greek literature, and too a distinctive Syriac liturgy. Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, the late fifth century Chrisian neo-platonist, was of Syrian origin. The virtriolic Procopius, the historian and secretary of Justinian's general Belisarius, came from Caesarea in Palestine. The sixth century chronicler John Malalas probably born in Antioch, John of Antioch (seventh centry), Cyril of Scythopolis (the Greek hagiographer) were all from Syria. Romanus the sixth century author of some of the most outstandingly fine Greek hymns was born at Emesa, and these ntakia, still sung in the Orthodox Church, owe much to earlief Syriac ecclesiastical poetry, partly through Ephraem the Syrian (373), partly through his predecessors[10].

Syria also proved particularly fertile soil for the separatist non-Chalcedonian Christian Churches, which still exist—the Monophysites (or Jacobites from the name of their famous sixth century bishop, Jacobus Bardaeus), and further to the east, spreading through Irak and Iran into Central Asia, the Nestorians, both dif-

fering, though at opposite ends of the scale, in their interpretations of the relations between the divine and human natures of Christ, that is the con-substantiality of God the Father and God the Son as defined by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 and generally accepted by the Churches of Constantinople and Rome, and later by the Churches of the various branches of the newly converted Slav peoples.

This ferment of intellectual and creative activity took place against a background of flourishing economic activity. In late Antiquity and beyond Syria was particularly well known for its textiles and glass. It had the famous dye factories of Tyre, it made up raw silk imported from China, there were the armaments manufacturers of Damascus whose wares were not supposed to be exported[11]. Before the Islamic conquest this volume of trade had free access to the other provinces of the Byzantine Empire, consisting of both the manufactures of the Syrian regions and of the goods from the Far East, such as spices or pepper, which passed through on their way to the customs centre at **Attaleia** in south Asia Minor and thence to Constantinople and perhaps to the Latin west.

This was the world into which Islam projected itself in the second half of the seventh century—creative, flourishing, highly individual and by no means always expressing itself in the Greek idiom. Byzantium was always multi-racial and in many ways tolerant, but in Syria, as indeed in Armenia and the Caucasus area, it came up against deep-rooted deviations and idiosyncrasies which were never submerged in or intergrated into, the more purely Hellenic developments, and indeed in some respects seemed to flourish in deliberate reaction to such developments. This was true of theological, and also of political, attitudes, though as far as politics went it should be remembered that throughout Byzantium's history it was not only Syria or Egypt which on occasion showed antagonism towards the capital and the western provinces: the hostility between the troops of the Asian and European provinces was almost as marked. And it has even been argued that had Byzantium turned its back on the western provinces and concentrated on Asia Minor it might have been possible even in the post-1204 days of the Nicaean Empire to avert the Ottoman conquest. This would however have meant a capital in Asia Minor and it was hardly to be thought that the Greeks would abandon a city so deeply associated with the Christian imperium which was at the heart of their ideology.

The effect of the Arab conquest of Syria was a two-way process. The Muslims accepted and used much which they found on what was now their home territory as well as what came from their proximity to the ancient Graeco-Roman civilisation. The Byzantines in turn were not necessarily entirely cut off from the civilisation and trade of Syria, but they had to recognise an implacable enemy and to readjust their military resources and strategy, often strained to the utmost by simultaneous attacks on two, if not three, flanks. The various aspects of **Byzantino-Syrian** contacts, i.e. cultural cross-fertilisation, economic relations, military and diplomatic clashes and activities, all went on simultaneously. The subtlety and sophistication of the contacts and debts on both sides has often been obscured. This is partly by reason of the

enmity generated by the two rivals for the imperium in the East Mediterranean, each of whom also conflicted in the religious sphere, partly because of the limited outlook of many western historians, that is, historians of western Christendom, or so-called "European" history, who chose to represent the medieval history of Byzantium and Islam as a sterile conflict with an unfortunate outcome, except insofar as classical Greek writings trickled into western Europe through Muslim channels via Spain. This is of course both an over-simplification and an inaccuracy.

This may be demonstrated by touching briefly on the interaction of the two forces in political and institutional, social and economic, relations, as well as in learning and art (though in the presence of experts these topics will only be briefly mentioned). It should also be stressed that Byzantium was by no means the only influence at work and there was equal cross-fertilisation from other sources, for instance, Sassanian influence, and through this, Central Asian or Chinese.

For Byzantium, Islam constituted her toughest and most intractable problem. And for a people who believed that victory betokened the special favour of heaven and the reverse well-merited punishment for sin, it was especially humiliating to see the rapidity, and often the permanence, of the Muslim advance. The Germanic people had taken centuries to trickle into the Roman Empire, and then they had gratefully accepted and assimilated its civilization and its religion and to some extent the Latin language. The Slavs had likewise been drawn within the orbit of the Byzantine Christian world, though they kept their language. The Muslims, on the contrary, were not open to conversion and within less than forty years they were hammering in 674 at Constantinople itself and persisted from 674-678. This was part of Umayyad policy[12] and the capital was again threatened during the winter of 717-718. At the same time there was the perpetual seasonal warfare on the land frontiers of the Taurus mountain ranges, and on the islands in the East Mediterranean. I would not go as far as A.H.M. Jones[13] when he says that it was only the challenge of Islam which infused into Christianity, hitherto a religion of escape, "a fighting spirit and thus gave the empire in its religion a principle of unity and a motive for survival". This is to oversimplify and indeed fail to grasp the Christian concept of the terrestial **mimesis** of a transcendental world which surely lies at the heart of Byzantine political theory. It was a tribute to the military and administrative reorganisation of Asia Minor under the Heraclians and Isaurians and to their able diplomacy that the Umayyads failed to get either the capital or Asia Minor. One sighificant effect of the Muslim conquest of Syria was to emphasise to the Byzantines the need for developing and maintaning that militarisation of Asia Minor which distinguished it from the late Roman (or early Byzantine) period and is so characteristic of its medieval organisation, at least up to the Turkomen attacks and penetrations in the eleventh century. This involved a system whereby civilian officials were subordinated to military commanders. Land was also allotted to small soldier-farmers in return for military or naval service but in practice they were never able to compete with the powerful military families who were enabled to

establish themselves—they had high pay and booty and bought up land — and were eventually often in command of what could virtually amount to a private army. It goes without saying that 'militarisation' included the naval resources of the Empire, built up to combat the growing seapower of the Arab fleets, at first working from Alexandria or Tripolis in Syria. This was a change, for Byzantium had hitherto managed with its merchant fleet, or a special ad hoc ships built in the great shipyards on Golden Horn. But now the situation was such that the Arabs could winter in the Sea of Marmora[14] and piracy was ubiquitous. The late seventh century therefore saw a mobile Byzantine fleet of the **Karabisianoi** (from the ships **Karaboi**). With the North Syrian (Isaurian) Emperor Leo III, as with the land defences, came further development. He applied the theme system to the navy, thus providing additional protection for the harassed coast of Asia Minor. Certain coastal themes or islands were assigned to support this regional navy on the same terms as for the other Asia Minor provinces and the army. This eighth century theme system of defence has been described as 'national', in that it relied on native resources 'on call' in contrast to the employment of mercenaries[15]. The Arab challenge had thus evoked a response which served Byzantium well, enabling it from the mid-ninth century onwards to take advantage of Muslim difficulties and eventually in the tenth century to penetrate, if only temporarily, into Syria itsefl.

A second result, or at least a result in part, of the advance of Islam was the growth and eventual transplantation of certain peoples from the eastern front in Asia Minor and from the north Syrian, Armenian and Mesopotamian regions because their loyalty and orthodoxy were in question. It is clear that the presence of the Arabs in North Syria and their spasmodic penetration into Armenia was a major factor in determining both Paulician movements and the Byzantine attitude towards this powerful military sect of dualist heretics. The controversial problems of their origins and beliefs is outside my terms of reference[16]. They were said to have been founded in the second half of the seventh century by captives who escaped from the Arabs in Syria and stirred up one Constantine, later known as Silvanus. It is clear that during the late seventh century Arab attacks on Armenia drove them into Asia Minor where they founded strongholds in north east Asia Minor, notably Kibossa near Koloneia[17]. During the eighth century, certainly up to 780, the iconoclast emperors appeared oblivious of any danger of heresy and they did not persecute the Paulicians, and during their incursions with North Syria when Constantine V attacked Melitene and Theodosioupolis he was said by the Greek chronicler Theophanes to have transported 'Syrians and Armenians'[18] from these two towns to Thrace in 756, thus spreading the Paulician heresy. Already after the capture of Germanicaea in 746 he had moved Syrian monophsite heretics to Thrace[19]. One reason alleged by a later Greek source, Scylitzes-Cedrenus, was to make good population deficiencies due to the plague[20]. However this may be, the vital point here, as Loos stresses,[21] is the urgent Byzantine need for man-power and goodwill in Asia Minor and on the eastern borders, for instance, Armenia, in view of the Arab threat. In the eighth century the Byzantines about held their own in Asia Minor.

Their attitude to Paulicians, as to the iconoclasts of the eastern province borders, was conciliatory. Without the full support of the population the core of the Empire might have fallen to the Arabs.

In the ninth and tenth centuries the situation changed. The Byzantines were moving towards their peak and penetrating into Mesopotamia and North Syria. With iconoclasm in the Empire weakened and then eliminated, and the Macedonian dynasty blessed with a series of able generals, the Paulicians were attacked as heretics, and perhaps more important, recognised as allies of the Muslims, e.g. the emirs of Melitene or of Tarsūs. Their late ninth century attempt at setting up a satellite Mesopotamian state under the aegis of the emir of Melitene failed. Their prevalence in the Byzantine themes, the Armeniakon and Anatolikon, and particularly their strength in urban centres (Antioch in Pisidia, Coloneia, Mopsuestia), constituted a threat both to orthodoxy and to military defences. It is not surprising that the tenth century Byzantine John I, the Emperor who penetrated furthest into Mesopotamian and Syrian Lands, felt impelled to remove numbers of the militant heretic sect of the Paulicians to Byzantine provinces in Europe, notably Thrace. Scholars are still undecided as to the precise nature of their beliefs or their exact role in subsequent religious and political disturbances in anti-governmental Bogomil movements in the Balkans from the tenth century onwards. But there is no doubt that these disruptive non-Christian dualists, though not indentical with the Bogomils, were in part responsible for the perpetual troubles in the Balkans associated with the widely spread Bogomil heretics, and perhaps, though more remotely, they can be linked with the Catharists and Albigensians in western Europe. This problem, with political as well as religious implications was, then, in a sense generated by the Muslim pressure and presence. it was Islam which gave the Paulicians a chance to build up their movement at a time when man-power was vital for the Byzantines; it was the subsequent Byzantine penetration into Islamic Mesopotamia and North Syria which gave Constantinople a sense of security and confidence which enabled it to remove members of this fickle and heretical sect to the European provinces thus planting the seeds of incalculable future troube.

From the ecclesiastical point of view another link between Islam and Byzantium is often found in connection with the main Byzantine religious controversy of the eighth, and to some extent the ninth, centuries. The importance of the iconoclastic movement for Byzantium is well known. It is true that it failed to shake orthodoxy in its traditional use of icons, or in its traditional interdependence of Church and State. The problem for us is however the nature of the contact and debt between Byzantium and Islam in initiating the policy of banning the use of icons in the Orthodox Church within the Byzantine Empire.

This question has been frequently touched on during recent years and a point of view was recently presented by Professor Paul Lemerle[22]. He eliminates the argument from numismatic evidence, since there is no clear demonstration that use of images or otherwise on coins can necessarily be linked with iconophile views and

vice versa. In this field both emperors and caliphs were dominated by political and economic, rather than religious, motives. It is often claimed that the aniconic attitude of the Byzantine Leo III (717-741) shown—albeit often half-heartedly—from 726 onwards was motivated by the example of Yazīd II (720-724). It was in 726 that Leo III had the great image of Christ removed from over the bronze gate at one of the main palace entrances in Constantinople. But, as Lemerle however points out, in respect of date and content there is little precise information on the Muslim edict against images. Lemerle considers that John of Jerusalem's account presented to the Council of Nicaea in 787 is marked by obvious exaggeration, and sees no reason to discount the truth of the Greek Chronicler Theophanes' brief words. He prefers to give credence to Theopanes who states that Yazīd promulgated the decree in the year in which he died, i.e., between 1 September 723 (beginning of year) and 27 January 724 the day on which he died and,I quote,"most people had not heard of his satanic edict"[23]. This would agree with Professor Oleg Grabar's suggestion that Yazīd was engaged in a "smear campaign" against the Christians and was subsequently made a scapegoat for Byzantine iconoclasm by later Christian writers[24]. There is also eighth and ninth century evidence, cited by Lemerle, that the Byzantines attributed iconoclasm to Jewish rather than Muslim influence, and sometimes to both, but without any conclusive evidence to warrant the statement that it was an edict of Yazīd II which actually sparked off the action of the Byzantine Leo III[25]. On the other hand it is fair to consider that the Islamic attitude to figural representation, like that which undoubtedly existed independently among Christian clergy, army and population of Byzantine Asia Minor was one of a number of reasons which provoked the controversial reaction against the upsurge of that almost excessive veneration of icons which had raised protests within the Empire long before the official action in the early eighth century[26]. And here once again, the antipathy between the European and Asian provinces of Byzantium can be detected. Since it was on the eastern frontier that the Muslim pressure was greatest, it appeared particularly to the statesmanlike emperors of the mid-eighth century Leo III and Constantine V, essential to have behind them the population of the vital Asian provinces—by no means entirely hellenised—who after all at that time provided the bulk of their indigenous fighting military and naval forces and who were opposed to the use of icons, even in some of the monasteries, e.g., in the Cappadocian rock churches. This is the real link between Islam and Byzantium and the link between its internal and external crises, and perhaps **one** reason for the disappearance of iconoclasm in the ninth century as Muslim menace on the eastern frontier lessened.

The official character of formal warfare, or of imperial ecclesiastical policy, often tends to obscure all the minor informal contacts which occur, and on both sides there is evidence affording occasional insight into the various opportunities for relationships partly recorded in state documents. Byzantium was essentially a multi-racial polity and provided that a man was prepared to turn Christian and use the Greek language there was no bar to his advancement. The same worked in reverse in Muslim territory. There were various reasons for changing sides—at the

higher level, ambition, escape from the consequences of political defeat, or of crime. In the lower reaches the enticements were held out to prisoners of war on both sides. In Constantinople they were rather ostentatiously well-treated, even to receiving invitations to dine at the imperial table in the Great Palace[27]. Then there were the obvious channels through which information was obtained, such as trade contacts, on the frontiers. In both Byzantium and Syria there were frequent trade agreements laying down the accepted regulations and safe-conduct gurantees. It was recognised that merchants going about their lawful business were very well placed to be used by either side as members of an intelligence service. This was equally true of the inhabitants on the eastern frontier borders. Such regions have from time immemorial retained a foot in either camp, combined with an irradical and clannish adherence to their own interests. Here and there in the Greek sources there are hints as to how useful information was extracted by local guides, often bilingual, from travellers passing through the Taurus ranges[28]. And a reflection of contacts of a different kind at a somewhat higher level, between land-owning families on either side of the border, can be seen in the Greek epic poem **Digenis Akritas,** where the hero's mother is from an important Christian family, his father a converted Muslim emir. The activities of their son, the Cappadocian 'born of two races', as also his off-hand attitude towards the Byzantine emperor, are characteristic of the free and easy border-life on the eastern frontier far from the protocol and court and governmental circles. It should be noted that there is no impediment to the return of Digenis' father from Christian territory to visit his Muslim mother in Syria and the description of this meeting between mother and son is one of the finest passages in the poem[29]. It should perhaps be added in the poem the result of the visist the conversion to Christianity of the ex-emir's mother and kinsmen who return to Romania with him.

I have so far touched mainly on one or two of the effects on Byzantium of contact with, and continual pressure from, the Mulsim world. The other side of the coin, which was in some respects equally vital for the Greek world, was the continuity of Byzantine life within Syria and the action of Byzantine influence in a Muslim environment, particularly in Syria, though here some of the most important developments — which I hope others will consider — were post-Umayyad, and must of necessity involve areas outside Syria. Within Syria there were two kinds of debt or contact: that of Syrian Christians on Byzantium and of Byzantium on Syria. Naturally, in spite of the Muslim conquest trade, industry, rural population, and by reason of Arab tolerance, the Christian communities remained and pilgrims regularly visited the Holy Places[30]. In particular, the Christian monasteries and lauras, especially in Palestine, e.g., Mar Saba near the Dead Sea, continued their vigorous life. Two examples of the influence stemming from this background and exerted outside Syria on Byzantium may be cited. Firstly, the key development of Byzantine hymnography by the monks Andrew of Crete, born in Damascus and a monk from Mar Saba, John of Damascus and Cosmas of Maiuma, that is the introductionh of the canon which became—and still is—the standard form of hymn in

certain of the services in the Orthodox Church[31], and secondly the classic Orthodox statement of the principles of the Christian faith, the first part of which dealt with Greek Philosophy, particularly Aristotelian dialectic, by the same John of Damascus in his **Fount of Knowledge** (also used in the West in a Latin translation).

Then in this early period there was the impact of Byzantium on Syria itself. Here I can of course only indicate one or two points.

It is obvious that a young and in some ways inexperienced conqueror could, and perhaps had, to learn from an old and sophisticated civilisation. The retention of what might be called the Byzantine civil service, the use of Byzantine administrative, legal and numismatic traditions, and, to begin with, even language—all this was understandable though to some extent transitional[32].

Perhaps one of the most marked debts to Byzantine institutions was the Muslim assimilation of the Byzantine imperial ideal, though this Muslim conception also drew of course from other than Greek sources, as indeed did the Hellenistic tradition itself[33]. In the Umayyad period the influence of imperial Byzantium was demonstrated in various ways. The desire for territorial domination of East Roman lands, including the possession of Constantinople, has already been mentioned. H.A.R. Gibb has pointed out how this imperial ideal was also reflected in the building policy of the Umayyads, particularly in setting up religious monuments[34], and he produces evidence to support—pace K.A.C. Cresswell and Mlle van Berchem— the view that the Byzantine conception of imperial majesty as being reflected in the splendour of its buildings (not of course peculiar to Byzantium) was implemented by the Muslims with the practical assistance of those very rulers whom 'Abd al-Malik (c. 690) and al-Walīd (c. 705-712) wished both to emulate and to supplant, i.e., the Byzantine ruler was asked to provide mosaic workers and materials, even including columns donated by Justinian II according to the Greek chronicler Theophanes[35]. Such a view is further supported by Professor Oleg Grabar who regards the Muslim request as that of a ruler to his vassal, the very reverse of the Byzantine interpretation, i.e., that it was the gracious gesture of a Christian emperor[36]. The problem as to how far evidence of Byzantine political theory can be found in existing Umayyad iconography has been examined by Professor Oleg Grabar, particularly in relation to what he calls 'the iconography of power', demonstrated in representations such as the royal princes in four of the Umayyad palaces, of which those at Qasr al-Ḥayr and Qusayr 'Amra are "obviously Byzantine or at least late classical".[36] But in the case of the six kings at Qusayr 'Amra the view that they reflect the Byzantine conception of 'the family of kings', a hierarchy of rulers with the Christian Roman Emperor at the apex, is rejected in favour of the Sassānian theme of the kings of the earth paying homage to their overlord,[37] though Grabar notes that in general it was after the Umayyad period that re-orientation led to increased Iranian influence[38].

Any assessment of the nature and measure of non-Muslim influences in any aspect of the cultural field poses the problem of a kind of double dichotomy. On the

one hand, Muslim Syria was open to influences in part indigenous, in part external which often conflicted, and here the obvious instances are Sassanian and Byzantine[38a]. On the other hand, Byzantine influence was itself made up of different and conflicting traditions and styles, e.g., Hellenistic and Christian, naturalistic and transcedental in art and in litrature, rhetorical and classical versus the less consciously classical Christian hagiography and spirituality. And the Byzantines themselves had also absorbed a good deal from outside before they met the Muslim world[39].

Detailed consideration of this complex kind of Byzantino-Islamic cultural cross-fertilisation whether in the early pre-Abbasid period or beyond is clearly beyond my competence, though it comes to mind at every turn, ranging from the cosmological representations found in Greek baths as also at Qusayr 'Amra[40] to the animal figured silks of ecclesiastical vestments at Rome derived from Sassanian models made by Christian workmen perhaps in Syria, perhaps refugees from Syria[41], or later Amorian and Macedonian palace taste favouring eastern as well as classical models and looking to the Baghdad caliphate for the sumptuary arts which the Umayyads had earlier sought from Constantionople. It is true that in the cultural sphere developments in certain fields, such as philosophy or scientific works, lie mainly outside the Umayyad period. What is relevant here is the fact that they drew much of their Hellenistic and Byzantine material from Syria and Pahlavi translations[42] made during the early medieval period both in Syria and outside in Persian territory, as at Sassanian Jundī-shāpūr and elsewhere, as the ninth century al-Kindi recognised, 'It is then not right for us to be ashamed to acknowledge truth and we should assimilate it from whatever source it comes to us, even from former generations or from foreign peoplesn,,[43]. In the Islamic field the wealth of detaild work is well known. The erudite studies of scholars such as, for instance, Walzer, have laid the foundations not only of Arabic texts, but of better Greek texts, as well as presenting a wider appreciation of the nature of the Islamic achievement. In considering the nature of this achievement I should like to stress Walzer's plea that Islamic philosophy should be considered as part of western civilisation, which he regards as being derived from Jewish, Christian and Islamic thought. As he rightly points out, Islamic philosophy was not simply a 'preservation' but essentially a development and should be considered both in its own right and as 'a kind of vanguard of the classical "renaissance" in Europe.'[44]

In the first part of this paper I tried to assess the effect of the advance of Islam on Byzantine policy—administrative, military, ecclesiastical, in forcing the East Romans to consider the needs and significance ot its Asia Minor provinces[45]. I should like to end by suggesting that, important as practical politics may be, the cultural aspects of Byzantino-Muslim relations, which began in the early period, with which I am primarily concerned, are equally, if not more, significant. It is essential to think not simply in terms of a long drawn-out military struggle but to integrate the evolution of Islamic thought and of its many other achievements with

those of its contemporaries, and here I am admittedly thinking mainly of Islam's Christian contemporaries. It is worth bearing in mind that the Scottish orientalist H.A.R. Gibb went as far as to suggest that we should think in terms of a common spiritual enterprise[46]. Perhaps this is what Lemerle means when he speaks of the "creative" aspects of Byzantino-Islamic relations.

University of London

Notes

1. R.W. Southern, **Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages (Cambridge, Mass.**, 1962), pp. 3-7.
2. P. Lemerle, **Classicisme et declin culturel dans l'histoire de l'Islam,** Actes du symposium...organisé par R. Brunschvig et G.E.Von Grunebaum (Paris, 1957), p. 277.
3. See R. Dussaud, **Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et medievale** (Paris, 1927), passim; A.H.M. Jones, **The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces** (Oxford, 1937), pp. 227ff,; A. Philippson, **Das Mittelmeergebiet, seine geographische und kulturelle Eigenart** (Berlin and Leipzig, 1904), pp. 46 ff.
4. See A.H.M Jones, **op.cit.**, p. 295.
5. See E. Stein, **Histoire du Bas-Empire,** vol. 2 (Bruges, 1949), Map III. L'empire vers 560 apr. J. C. (Syria I and II, Phoenice, Phoenice Libanensis, Palaestina I, II and III, Arabia).
6. See A. Philippson, **op.cit.**, pp. 48 ff.
7. H.W. Haussig, **A history of Byzantine civilisation** (London, 1971), p. 127.
8. A. Vasiliv's last efforts were directed towards the pre-Islamic relations between the Byzantines and Arabs. See his posthumous notes on the Romans and Bedouins in **Dumbarton Oaks Papers,** 9-10 (1956), presented by M. Canard.
9. See D. Chitty, **The Desert A City** (Oxford, 1966), **passim,** and specially pp. 82 ff.
10. See E, Wellesz **A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography,** 2nd ed, (Oxford, 1961), pp. 183 ff.
11. See H.W. Haussig, **op. cit.**, pp. 58 ff.
12. See H.A.R. Gibb, 'Arab-Byzantine Relations under the Umayyad caliphate' **Dumbarton Oaks Papers** 12 (1958), pp. 222 ff., and especially pp. 232-3
13. **The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian** (Oxford, 1940), p. 304.
14. Theophanes, ed. C.De Boor, I, pp. 353-4 cited by H. Ahrweiler, **Byzance et la mer** (Paris, 1966), p.19.
15. H. Ahrweiler, **op.cit.**, p. 37.
16. There is a vast literature on the subject of the origins and nature of dualist movements in the middle ages. Of more recent works see the magisterial study of P. Lemerle and his colleagues, 'L' histoire des Pauliciens d'Asia Mineure d'apres les sources grecques', **Travaux et Memoires,** V (1973), pp. 1-144, and also M. Loos, **Byzantinoslavica,** 24 (1963), pp. 258-86 and 25 (1964), pp. 62-8. Lemerle deals with the Greek sources, and is somewhat critical of the treatment of the Armenian sources by N.G. Garsoian, **The Paulician Heresy: A study of the origin and development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the eastern provinces of the Byzantine Empire,** (Paris, 1967); at the same time he fully admits the importance of these sources. See Lemerle, **op. cit.**, pp. 12-15 and **passim.** Coneybeare's dating of (c.800) **Key of Truth?** by Lemerle. It may be later than 800 (the only MS. is eighteenth century).
17. It lies near Koloneia south-west of Trebizond; see the map of Paulician strongholds in Lemerle, **op. cit.**
18. Theophanes, ed. C. De Boor, I, p. 429, 1.19 ff.
19. Theophanes, **op. cit.**, I, p. 422, I.II ff.
20. Cedrenus, **II** (Bonn ed.) p. 10, 1.3 ff.

21. M. Loos, **op.cit.**, 24 (1963), pp. 266 ff.
22. P. Lemerle, **Le premier humanisme byzantin** (Paris, 1971), pp. 31 ff.
23. Theophanes, ed. C. Boor, I, p. 402, cited by P. Lemerle, **op. cit.** p. 32, note 26. 'The foolish Yazid promulgated a general decree againts the holy and venerated icons, but thanks to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the intercession of his pure (immaculate) mother and all the saints he died in the same year and most people had not heard of his satanic devilish edict.' (Bonn ed., p. 618). Cf. John of Jerusalem on whom A. Vasiliev tends to rely, 'The iconoclastic edict of the Caliph Yazid II. A.D. 721', **Dumbarton Oaks Papers 9-10** (1956), pp. 25 ff. John of Jerusalem dated Yazid's decree two and a half years before his death, i.e. July 721. He says that a Jew promised Yazid long life if he acted against the Christaian icons and Jewish hostility to figural representation and its influence on the Arabs is noticeable.
24. O. Grabar, 'Islamic Art and Byzantium', **Dumbarton Oaks Papers,** 18 (1964), pp. 83-4, note 40.
25. On the sources for the story of Jewish instigation see P. Lemerle, **op. cit.**, pp. 33 ff., and A.A. Vasiliev, **op. cit.**
26. Cf. N.H. Baynes, 'Icons before iconoclasm', **Harvard Theological Review** 44 (1951), pp. 93-106, reprinted in **Byzantine Studies and Other Essays** (London, 1955).
27. Constantine VII Prophyrogenitus, **Book of Ceremonies** (Bonn ed.) 1, p. 695.
28. See M. Canard, 'Les relations politiques et sociales entre Byzance et les arabes', **Dumbarton Oaks Papers,** 18 (1964), p. 45 citing Theophanes Continuator (Bonn ed.) pp. 95-6. Much Material on informal contacts has been collected by M. Canard in various articles. See also 'Quelques "a-cote" de l'histoire des relations entre Byzance et les Arabes', **Studi ... in onore di G. Levi Della Vida,** I (Rome, 1956) pp. 98-119; 'Deux episodes des relations diplomatiques arabo-byzantines au X siecle', **Bulletin d'etudes orientales de l'Inst. fr. de Damas,** 13 (1949-51), pp. 51-69.
29. **Digenes Akrites,** ed. J. Mavrogordate (Oxford, 1956), pp. 50 ff.
30. Cf. M.Canard, **Dumbarton Oaks Papers,** 18 (1964) **op. cit.**, pp. 41 ff.
31. See E. Wellesz,**op.cit.**, pp. 198 ff.
32. For a brief survey cf. H.A.R. Gibb, 'Arab-Byzantine relations under the Umayyad Caliphate, **Dumbarton Oaks Papers,** 12 (1958) pp. 223 ff.
33. The Byzantine imperial ideal, the subject of frequent treatment, has been analysed in detail by F. Dvornik, **Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosphy,** 2 vols. (Washington D.C., 1966).
34. H.A.R. Gibb, **op.cit.**, pp. 224 ff.
35. Id., **op. cit.**, p. 229 note 12 (communicated by J. Parker)
36. O. Grabar, 'Islamic Art and Byzantium,' **Dumbarton Oaks Papers,** 18 (1964), p. 82.
36. O. Grabar, **op.cit.**, p. 85
37. O. Grabar, 'The painting of the six kings at Qusayr 'Amrah', **Ars Orientalis,** I (1954), pp. 185-7.
38. One aspect of this dichotomy is admirably illustrated by R. Ettinghausen in his analysis of the various elements and influences found in the Throne and Banquet Hall of Khirbat al-Mafjar. See his **From Byzantium to Sasanian Iran and the Islamic World** (Leiden, 1972), pp. 16-65.
39. See **Dumbarton Oaks Papers,** 26 (1972), where Sassanian influence on Byzantium in the pre-Islamic period is discussed. In I. Shahid's contribution he seems to emphasise Rome rather than Persia in Heraclius's assumption of the title of **Basileus.** He also says that the Arab advance emphasised the importance of 'the West' to Byzntium. But surely it is the importanc of Asia Minor which should be emphasised? See I. Shahid, 'The Iranian Factor in Byantium during the reign of Heraclius', **op-cit.**, pp. 319-320.
40. See F. Saxl, 'The Zodiac of Qusayr Amra' in K.A.C. Cresswell, **Early Muslim Architecture,** 2nd ed., i. pt. 2 (Oxford, 1969), pp. 424-431. On the constellations, and also on Bedouin interpretations, See Emmy Wellesz, 'Islamic Astronomical Imagery: Classical and Bedouin tradition', **'Oriental Art,** 10 (1964), pp. 83-91, and 'An early al-Sufi MS. in the Bodleian Library in Oxford. A Study in Islamic Constellation Images', **Ars Orientalis,** 3 (1959), pp. 1-26.

41. A. Grabar, 'Le succes des arts orientaux a coeur byzantine sous les Macedoniens', **Munchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst,** Dritte Foge, 2 (1951), p. 38.
42. P. Lemerle, **op.cit.,** p. 23, note 2, emphasises the debt owed to the pahlavi translations and gives various examples.
43. Cited by R. Walzer, 'L'eveil de la philosophie islamique', **Rev. des etudes islamiques,** 38 (1970) p. 16; see also the comments of S.D. Goitein, 'The Intermediate Civilisation: the Hellenic Heritage in Islam', **Islamic Studies. Karachi,** 2 (1963), pp. 217-233, reprinted in **Studies in Islamic History** (Leiden, 1968), pp. 54 ff.
44. **Id., op.cit;** pp. 10 ff.
45. Cited without reference by N. Daniel, **Islam and the West** (Edinburgh, 1960) p. 306.

LE PROBLÈME DE COLONS SLAVES EN SYRIE

Tadeusz Lewicki,

Monsieur le Président, Chers Collégues, Mesdames, Messieurs,

J'ai choisi, comme sujet de mon exposé, le probléme de colons slaves venus en Syrie comme transfuges de l'Empire Byzantin, ou comme esclaves faits prisonniers par des Arabes pendant leurs luttes continuelles contre cet Empire, et établis par les califes omeyyades et abbasides dans le Nord de la Syrie, ainsi que dans les régions voisines de Cilicie, de Comagène et de Melitène qui constituaient, sous les Arabes, la province nommee al-Thughūr. Outre ces groupes, plus ou moins nombreux, de colons slaves, il y avait aussi certains personnages importants d'origine slave qui ont vécu et agi en Syrie au VII^{e}- XI^{e} siecle, c'est-à-dire à l'époque qui correspond au haut Moyen Age des historiens européens.

Le problème dont je vais m'occuper n'est pas tout a fait nouveau. Il a été déjâ étudié, en partie, vers le milieu du XIX^{e} siècle par le savant russe V. Lamanskiy et au commencement de notre siècle par le célèbre slavisant techèque L. Niederle qui lui a consacré un article. Je m'en suis occupé, moi aussi, dans trois petites études écrites entre 1952 et 1965. Cependant ces travaux, redigés principalement en langues slaves et par cette raison peu accessibles aux orientalistes occidentaux et arabes, n'épuisent pas toutes les informations fournies par les auteurs byzantins et arabes. Aussi me suis-je décidé à aborder ce problème de nouveau dans une étude plus approfondie que je prépare maintenant et dont je me propose de présenter les résultats les plus importants dans le présent exposé.

Tout semble indiquer que les premiers contacts entre Arabes et Slaves aient eu lieu antérieurement encore a l'apparition de Muhammad sur la scène de l'histoire. Ces contacts se développèrent dans l'Empire Byzantin. Nous savons, en effet, que le Danube que constituait la frontière septentrionale de ce vaste Empire, a été franchi, dés la première moitié du VI^{e} siècle de l'ére chrétienne, par de nombreuses peuplades slaves, les ancêtres des Serbes, Macédoniens et Bulgares actuels. Aux ordres des princes de leurs tribus respectives, ces peuplades s'établissaient progressivement sur le territoire byzantin, particulièrement en Illyrie, en Mésie et en Thrace, mais leurs fractions particulières s'avançaient jusqu'aux confins méridionaux du Pellopenèse. Se pliant, en fait ou en apparence, à la suprématie des empereurs byzantins, ces peuplades ne cessaient de jouir d'une independance à peu près complète. La capitale de l'Empire—Constantinople—fourmillait de gens appartenant a ces peuples. D'autre part, la province la plus avancée vers l'Est, la Syrie, se voyait, depuis une époque assez reculée, l'object d'une pénétration de tribus arabes affluant ici en

foule des territoires contigus de la Presqu'île Arabe. Ces tribus se fixaient en Syrie et y créaient des Etats, petits ou plus grands, semi-indépendants à l'égard de Constantinople. C'est à ce genre d'Etat tributaire qu'appartint le royaume des Banū Ghassān qui comprenait une partie considérable de la Syrie.

Etabli au cours de la première motié du **VIe siècle** il ètait censé constituer le boulevard défensif des frontières orientales de l'Empire Byzantin face à la poussée de la Perse sassanide limitrophe. Les ambassades envoyées par les princes arabes de la Syrie et des régions voisines de l'Arabie, ou bien les princes eux-mêmes devaient venir souvent à la cour de Constantinople, comme c'était le cas d'al-Hārith, prince ghassānide qui a été convié à la cour de l'empereur Justinien I en 563. Ce fut donc bien dans la capital même de l'Empire Byzantin ou convergeaient les voies suivies par les Arabes de Syrie d'une part et par les Slaves de Thrace, de Mésie ou d'autres provinces byzantines des Balkans d'autre part, que les premiers contacts entre Arabes et Slaves on dû avoir lieu. En tout cas, la dénomination arabe appliquée aux Slaves, à savoir Saqlab ou Ṣiḳlāb [au pluriel Ṣaḳāliba] indique clairement un emprunt fait aux Grecs byzantins. Les mots arabes nommés ci-dessus ne sont que la transcription suffisamment fidèle, de **Sklaboi** [prononce **Sklavoi],** terme qu'employaient les écrivains byzantins du haut Moyen Age pour désigner les peuples slaves. En effet, le **-oi,** final n'est que le signe d'un pluriel grec et la voyelle **a** [voire **i**] de la première syllabe des mots arabes **Saklāb** ou **Siglāb** accuse le caractère syllabe des mots arabes **Saklāb** ou **Siglāb** accuse le caractère d'une épenthèse: elle y a été placées rien que pour faciliter la prononciation du groupe de consonnes au commencement du mot, prononciation quelque peu compliquée pour la bouche d'un Arabe. Pareillement le **b** final est simplement une transcription du **beta** [prononcé **v** dans le grec moyen], ce son ne possédant pas son équivalent dans l'alphabet arabe. Ainsi, le **Saklab** arabe [avec ses variantes] rendrait-il quelque primitif ***Sklav-,** évoquant le nom greco-byzantin donné aux Slaves.

C'est en Syrie, chez al-Akhtal, poète arabe à la cour des califes omeyyades de Damas, dans la deuxième moitié du VII^{e} siècle de l'ère chrétienne, que nous retrouvons le témoignage arabe le plus ancien à propos des Slaves. Il qualifie ceux-ci de "roux" ou "rougeâtres", en arabe **al-suhb.** La critique moderne a admis ce terme soit comme l'équivalent de la notion "aux cheveux clairs", soit comme voulant dépeindre des gens "au teint rose clair". Les Slaves ayant été le premier groupe humain à avoir ce genre de traits caractéristiques avec lequel les Arabes se sont rencontrés, il n'est pas étonnant que les termes **Saklab** ou **Siklāb** aient été étendus par certains écrivains arabes médiévaux à d'autres peuples du Nord, à savoir: aux Germains, aux Finnois, parfois même aux Turcs, du moment ou le type physique de ceux-ci se rapprochait du type représenté par les Slaves, comme c'était p. ex. le cas des Bulgares de la Volga. Il y a donc lieu de se tenir sur ses gardes lorsque l'on pense voir des Slaves partout ou surgit, dans les sources arabes, la dénomination de **Saklāb, Siklāb** ou [en pluriel] **Sakāliba,** sans définition plus stricte.

Heureusement, il n'y a pas d'hésitation à avoir en ce qui concerne les Slaves

établis, dés la deuxieme moitié du VII[e] siecle de l'ère chrétienne, sur les territoires d'al-Thughūr et en Syrie proprement dite. Il s'agit ici en effet des vrais Slaves originaires de la Pressqu'île Balkanique qui sont venus dans ces provinces du Califat par l'intermédiaire de l'Asie Mineure, ou ils étaient établis de trés bonne heure par les empereurs byzantins. Ainsi nous savons qu'il y avait dèjâ vers l'an 650 des "foederati" slaves ayant leurs sièges dans le thème d'Opsikion qui occupait la partie occidentale de l'ancienne Bithynie, dans le Nord-Ouest de l'Asie Mineure. En effet, on a trouvé un sceau trec de ce groupement slave.

Un autre groupe important de Slaves provenant apparement de la région de Salonique en Macédoine a été transplanté, en 686 ou plutot en 688, par l'empereur Justinien II [685-695 et 705-711] en Asie Mineure et établi en Opsikion, probablement dans le voisinage de la colonie Slave mentionnée vers l'an 650. Nous devons cette information aux chroniqueurs byzantins Théophane [mort vers 817] et Nicéphore [mort en 829]. Selon V. Lamanskiy, le nombre de ces nouveau colons slaves transplantés en Opsikion était très important puisqu'il s'élevait à 80, 000 hommes. Ces colons habitaient probablement le pays dans les environs de Leukata, non loin de la Nicomédie.

A cette vague de colons slaves a succedé une autre, venue de Bulgarie, que l'empereur Constantin V [741-775] transplanta, en l'an 761 [ou plutot 762] de l'ère chrétienne, en Asie Mineure et établit sur la rivière nommée Artanas, non loin de Bosphore, c'est-à-dire toujours dans le même pays, ou l'on rencontre des établissements slaves à partir de l'année 650 environ. Nous devons cette information à Théophane et à Nicéphore: ce dernier ajoute que le nombre de ces Slaves "qui ont passé la Mer Noire", s'élevait à 208,000.

Dans la **thème** d'Opsikion, au Sud-Est de la ville de Nikea, capitale de cette province, sur la route menant de cette ville vers Dorylaeum et plus loin, vers la ville de Tarse sur la frontière arabobyzantine, se trouvait aussi la localité slave appelée Gordoserba, dont on trouve une mention dans une liste de dioceses byzantines du VII[e] siècle. Il parait qu'elle constituait la limite sud-est des terres occupées par les Slaves, au VII[e] siécle, dans la Bithynie.

C'est de ce pays, attribué par les empereurs byzantine aux colons slaves transplantés des Balkans au VII[e] et VIII[e] siècle que vinrent en Syrie plusieurs vagues slaves qui se fixèrent dans ce pays. Quant à la premiére de ces vagues, c'est le chroniqueur byzantin Théophane qui nous l'apprend. Or, selon ce chroniqueur, un certain Abderakhman fils de Khaledos, dans lequel on reconnait facilement l'éminent général arabe 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Khālid décedé en 666/667, organisa, en l'an 663 [ou plutôt 664] une expédition contre la Byzance. Il a passé l'hiver dans les provinces byzantines de l'Asie Mineure, qu'il dévasta. Pendant cette expédition, un groupe de guerriers slaves comptant 5,000 hommes qu'étaient au service de Byzance et appartenaient apparemment aux "foederati" d'Opsikion, avait quitté les Grecs pour passer du côté de 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Khālid et s'était retiré, avec ce chef, en

Syrie. Ils ont été fixés par les Arabes dans les environs de la ville d'Apamée sur l'Oronte—Fāmiya des sources arabes, dans un village que Théophane nomme **Seleukobolos** [prononce **Seleukovolos]** et qu'un autre chroniqueur byzantin, à savoir Anastase, apelle **Seleukobori** [prononcé **Seleukovori].** Il s'agit ici peu-être de **Seklebīye,** localité dont on retrouve le nom sur les cartes modernes de la Syrie, à proximité de l'Apamée. La dénomination nous renvoie, sans aucun doute possible, au Saklabīya arabe, ce qui signifie ("colonie") de Sakāliba", ou bien ("colonie) de Slaves". Il apparait plausible que les vocables notes par Théophane et par Anastase ne soient que des mutilations de **Seklebīye** pour assimiler celle-ci à des noms de lieu grecques du type de **Seleukeia, Seleukis** etc., connus sur toute l'étendu du ci- devant Etat seleucide.

Il parait que ces transfuges slaves étaient chrétiens et qu' ils sont restés sous l'influence de clergé syrien.

Etablir les guerriers slaves échappés à la domination byzantine dans la Syrie du Nord, à proximité de la frontière byzantine, signifiait que les Arabes, imitant en cela Byzance même, mettaient leur confiance en la valeur militaire des Slaves.

Environ vingt-sept ans aprés l'arrivée de ce premier groupe des colons slaves en Syrie, une deuxieme vague slave afflue dans ce pays, venue, elle-aussi, de l'Asie Mineurs, comme les transfuges qu'avait amenés avec lui "'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Khālid. Je veux parler ici des Slaves originaires de la Macédoine, etablis par l'empereur Justinien II en 686 [ou bien 688] dans la thème d'Opsikion, non loin de la ville de Nicomédie, dont un nombre considérable. 30,000 hommes selon Théophane [a été mobilise en 690 [ou plutôt en 692], lorsque Justinien II s'est décidé à faire la guerre aux Arabes. L'empereur confia le commandement de ces guerriers à l'un d'eux, un principicule slave nommé Néboulos ou Névoulos qui passa, avec 20,000 hommes, au général arabe Muamed [c'est-à-dire Muhammad ibn Marwān], et aprés la victoire de ce général sur les Byzantins, se retira, à la tête de ces gens aux côtés des Arabes, dans le pays du Califat. On sait d'une autre source, que ces Slaves ont été établis par le calife 'Abd al-Malik [685-705] dans les environs de la ville d'Antākiya [Antioche] et de celle de Kyrrhos [Qūrus de sources arabes], c'est-a-dire au Nord des sièges des premiers colons slaves qui se sont domiciliés à l'Apamée. Il n'y a aucun doute que ces nouveaux colons étaient chrétiens aussi et qu'ils sont restés chrétiens après leur établissement en Syrie, au moins pour un certain temps. En effet, les sources dont nous disposons ne font aucune allusion au passage de ces colons a l'islam.

Il nous semble que les guerriers slaves, d'entre ceux qui ont été établis dans le Nord de la Syrie, faisaient partie, dès le commencement, des troupes attachées aux personnes mêmes de princes omeyyades. Nous savons, en effet, grâce à un poème arabe cité par al-Balādhurī [IX^{e} siècle de] et attribué par cet auteur à Djarīr célèbre poète de la cour omeyyade mort en 728/729 ou bien en 732/33 de notre ère, que le prince ommeyyade Bishr ibn Marwān, fils cadet du calife Marwān ibn al-Hakam,

qui habitait en Syrie jusqu'à l'an 691 et qui est mosrt comme gouverneur de l'Irak en 694, avait à son service des "Slaves rouges" [en arabe: **Sakāliba humr].** Une trentaine années plus tard, en 720, les Slaves faisaient partie, selon Ibn Abd Rabbihi, de l'armée d'al-Abbās ibn al-Walīd, neveu de Yazīd II et général omeyyade de grande mérite aguerri au cours des annés de luttes contre Byzance, qui vint de Syrie en Irak pour combattre le rebel Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab. Il est très vraisemblable que les soldats slaves amenés de Syrie par al-Abbās ibn al-Walīd se rattachaient aux colons slaves habitant les régions d' Apamée, d'Antioche et de Kyrrhos, dont nous venons de parler, à moins qu'ils n'aient été recrutés tout récemment parmi les foederati slaves de l'Asie Mineure au service byzantin, qui ont quitté ce service et qui ont passé du cote de ce général au cours des longues guerres qu'il faisait aux Byzantins en Cilicie, en Cappadoce et en Pisidie. On sait d'ailleurs, que l'armée omeyyade ravagea, en 715-717, la partie occidentale de l'Asie Mineure et qu'elle penetra jusqu'aux villes de Nikea et de Nicomédie dans la thème d'Opsikion, colonisée depuis longtemps par les Slaves. Or, la population slave de cette région, demeurée sur place après la défection de Néboulos en 690 [voir 692] fit l'objet des répressions les plus violentes de la part de l'administration byzantine: une partie considérable de cette population a été tout simplement massacrée. Les colons épargnés par les Byzantins durent garder néanmoins un ressentiment profond vis-a-vis l'Empire et il n'est pas impossible qu'une partie d'entre eux se soit jointe aux unites arabes pendant leurs invasions dans l'Opsikion en 715-717. Ces transfuges se seraient retirés en 717 avec les Arabes rentrant en Syrie, et ce fait ne put qu' accroitre le nombre des colons slaves fixes dans la partie septentrionale de ce pays.

Le dernier calife ommeyyade Marwān ibn Muhammad [744-750] suscita l'immigration en Syrie et **al-Thughūr** de nouveaux groupes de colons slaves. Nous devons cette information à al-Balādhuri, selon lequel c'est de ces Slaves arrivés recemment dans les provinces du Califat omeyyade que tiraient leur origine deux éminents personnages, à savoir Salmān et Ziyād, apparemment officiers au service de Marwān ibn Muhammad. D'après al-Balādhuri, Salmān a donné son nom à une forteresse syrienne, a savoir **Ḥiṣn Salmān** qui était située, d' après cet auteur, dans le voisinage de Kūrus, du cote de Mar as. Quant à Ziyād c'est sans doute de son nom que provient celui de **Hisn Ziyād,** forteresse arabe située dans al-Thughūr, sur la frontière byzantine. Cette localité n'est pas inconnue à Ibn Khurradāadhbih, géographe arabe du IX^{e} siècle, qui la situe en Armenie, au Nord-Ouest de l'actuel Diyarbakr. Selon le dictionnaire géographique de Yakūt [XIII^{e} siècle], Hisn Ziyād était situé entre Amid [c'est-à-dire Diyarbakr] et Malatiya[°Melitene des anciens] et portait à son epoque le nom de Khartabirt. C'est le moderne Kharput, localité située à 8 km environ au Nord-Est de Malatiya. Al-Balādhuri mentionne encore une troisieme localité où Marwān ibn Muhammad a fixé les Slaves [d'ailleurs avec des Persans et des chrétiens syriens—**Anbāt Nasārā** du texte arabe], à savoir la ville d'al-Khusus située à l'Est de la rivière Djayhan Djihan actuel. Il parait que cette localité soit indentique avec Issos des anciens.

Les sources arabes révèlent encore une autre colonie des guerriers slaves située en Cilicie. Je veux parler ici de **Ḥiṣn al-Ṣaḳāliba,** localité qui était située, selon Ibn Khurrādādhbih au dela [c'est-à-dire au Nord] de **Darb al-Salāma** (Porte de la Sûreté", **Pylae Ciliciae** des anciens) qui constituait la frontière arabo-byzantine et sur la route qui menait du Tarse à al-Budhandun, Podendon des auteurs byzantins, Bozanti moderne. D'apres E. Honigmann qui a écrit un livre sur la frontière orientale de l'Empire byzantin dans le haut Moyen Age, **Hisn al- Ṣaḳāliba** serait identique avec Anasa Qal asy actuel, localité Située à dix kilometres au Sud-Est de Bozanti. On peut juger du nom de **Hisn al-Sakāliba** qu'il était, à l'origine, un établissement des **foederati** slaves au service de Byzance. Il était apparemment identique avec "la Forteresse des Slaves" mentionnée par Ibn al-Athīr et Ibn Khaldūn parmi les forteresses byzantines conquises par Hārūn al-Rashīd en l'an 806.

Les sources byzantines mentionnent aussi une localité appelée **Sthlabotilin [à prononcer Sthlavotilin]** qui était, en jugeant de son nom, une colonie slave: elle etait située, selon les sources en question, quelque part dans la Syrie du Nord-Est. Une autre forteresse habitée par les Slaves était, d'après ces sources, **Loulon,** lieu qui était situé sur les confins de la Syrie et de la Cappadoce. A mon avis, il s'agit ici de Mu'askar al-Malik, localité medievale située en plaine, immediatement au Nord du **Darb,** c'est-à-dire du defile de **Pylae Ciliciae,** a 10 milles arabes [environ 20 kilometres] au Nord de al-Budandūn c'est-à-dire Bozanti actuel. Or, ce Mu'askar al-Malik, dont le nom signifie "le Camp du roi" [il s'agit ici de l'Empereur byzantin], était situé, d'après Ibn Khurrādādhbih, près des sources d'eau thermale de **Lu lu a,** dont le nom correspond à Loulon des sources byzantines. C'était déjâ, au IX siecle de l'ère chretienne, le pays byzantin.

Nous savons, grace à Theophane, que les Slaves de la Syrie du Nord ont pris part aux luttes internes sous les premiers califes abbassides. En effet, c'étaient eux qui formaient, avec les gens originaires d'Antioche, la majeure partie de l'armée de l'oncle du calife abbasside 'Abu' 1-'Abbās al Saffāh [750-754]- 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Ali, qui se souleva contre le successeur de celui-ci, al-Manṣūr [754-775]. 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Alī essuya une defaite pres de Naṣībīn, et une importante partie de son armée périt dans ce combat. Il parait que les Slaves syriens qui prirent part, en l'an 754, dans la mutinerie de 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Alī, restèrent insoumis encore pendant trois ans suivants. C'est apparemment de ces Slaves qu'il est question chez al-Yaᶜḳūbī [IX^{e} **siècle]** dans son recit sur la guerre que Muhammad al-Mahdi, fils d'al-Mansūr et futur calife menait contre les **Ṣaḳāliba,** en l'an 757. Le demolissement de la ville d'al-Khusūs et la transplantation des habitants slaves, chretiens-arameens et persans de cotte ville dans celle d'al-Massisa-Mopsueste des anciens-ordonnée, selon al-Balādhurī par al-Mansūr dans la même année 757, n'était probablement qu'un épisode de la répression de cette révolte.

Le sort des Slaves Syriens posterieur a cette époque nous est inconnu. Il n'est pas impossible que le nombre de ces colons se soit augmenté de nouveaux groupes slaves dans la deuxieme moitié du VIII^{e} siècle et même dans le IX^{e} siècle. Un tel groupe put

p. ex. venir en Syrie à la suite de la guerre que l'empereur byzantin Theophil, fils du Michel II, entama en l'an 837, en attaquant la ville de Malatiya, une des capitales de la province al-Thughūr, et qui finit par une defaite complete de cet empereur. Or, celui-ci était aide, si l'on peut croire au temoignage d'al-Mas'ūdī, par les "rois slaves", **mulūk al-Ṣaḳāliba** du texte arabe. Il n'est pas impossible, qu' apres la défaite de l'armée byzantine par le calife al-Mu'tasim, les débris des troupes auxiliaires slaves faits prisonniers par les Arabes aient augmenté le nombre de colons slaves en Syrie et dans la province limitrophe d'al-Thugūr. Il parait qu'une partie des Slaves syriens se convertiv a l'islam [comme c'était, p. ex., le cas de Salmān et de Ziyād, dont il a été question]. Une autre partie de ces Slaves resta fidèle, au moins pendant un certain temps, au christianisme apporte par leurs ancêtres de l'empire byzantin, cette partie de Slaves, s'étant confondue avec les chretiens natifs de Syrie. En tout cas, les Slaves existaient toujours, dans le Nord de la Syrie, comme une éthnie a part, vers la fin du VIII^{e} siècle, quand apparut, dans le califat abbasside, le celèbre byzantin rebelle, Thomas le Slave.

Ce Thomas qui se souleva, en l'an 820, contre l'empereur byzantin Michel II [820-829] et qui a réussi à tenir tête à l'armée de cet empereur jusqu'a l'automne de 823, est compte par le continuateur de Theophane "aux Slaves que l'on peut rencontrer souvent en Anatolie". Cette informations s'accorde avec un passage de l'ouvrage d'un autre historian byzantin du IX^{e} siècle, à savoir Genesios, d'aprés lequel Thomas était un "Scythe" x, c'est-à-dire un Slave selon la termonologie ethnique en usage chez les auteurs byzantins du haut moyen Age. Il résulte d'une lettre de l'empereur Michel II à Louis le Pieux, fils de Charlemagne [814-840] que Thomas était au service d'un patrice byzantin sous la domination de l'imperatrice Irène [elle était régente, au nom de son fils mineur Constantin VI, en 768-797, et ensuite elle régnait, en son propre nom, en 797-802]. Il s'enfuit ensuite, pour des raisons personnelles, chez les "Perses", c'est-à-dire chez les Abbassides, et il a vecu chez eux pendant 25 ans, jusqu'aux temps de Leon VI[813-820], en se donnant pour Constantin, fils d'Irène et en jouissant d'une grande consideration parmi les musulmans. Genesios dit que Thomas a renié la foi chretienne et qu'il se convertit à l'islam. Cette derniére information ne nous parait pas vraie, vu qu'elle contredit les donnés d'autres sources. Selon la chronique syrienne de Michel le Grand, patriarche des Syriens-Jacobites au XII^{e} siècle, Thomas s'enfuit chez le calife Hārūn al-Rashīd [786-809] et ensuite il vécut à la cour du calife al-Ma'mūn [813-833], ou il était traité honorablement. Il parait que Thomas le Slave a sejourné, pendant un certain temps, en Syrie, probablement à Antioche, ou il a été couronné, avec une tiare [apparemment comme le futur empereur de Byzance] par le patriarche Job. Il en résulte que Thomas est resté chretien en dépit de ce qui est dit chez Genesios. Vu que Job est devenu patriarch en 813, le couronnement de Thomas dut avoir lieu à une date posterieure à cette année. Ajoutons, que d'apres Michel le Grand, Thomas a conclu une alliance avec al-Ma'mūn.

Thomas réapparut en Byzance sous l'empereur Leon V [803-820] et c'est vers la fin du règne de cet empereur qu'il a commencé une offensive contre l'Empire, en

occupant presque toute l'Asie Mineure. Nous savons que dans l'armée de Thomas il y avait des contingents de troupes arabes fournis par al-Ma'mūn, conformement à la teneur du pacte conclu entre lui et ce calife. On sait que la mutinerie de Thomas prit fin en automne 823 et que celui-ce perit.

Thomas, couronné empereur par le patriarche d'Antioche, était le plus important de tous les Slaves venus de l'Asie Mineure qui ont vécu en Syrie. Il nous faut attendre deux siècles pour rencontrer d'autres personnage importants d'origine slave qui ont vecu et agi en Syrie. Je pense ici aux esclaves d'origine slave devenus musulmans et se trouvant au service des califes fatimides, qui remplissaient differentes fonctions officielles dans ce pays au X^{e} et au XI^{e} siècles. Ainsi, un Slave appele Munir a été nommé, en 988, gouverneur fatimide de Damas et un autre Slave, du nom Wafi al-Saḳlabī, a été nommé, à la même époque, gouverneur de la ville de 'Akka. Au XI^{e} siècle on connait deux autres gouverneurs slaves de Damas, a savoir Ṭ Tārik al-Saklabī [en 1048] et Muẓaffar al-Ṣaḳlabī [en 1058]. On connait aussi, vers la même époque [en 1060], un général fatimide nommé Ḳā'id Muwaffaḳ al-Dawla al-Ṣaḳlabī. Ajoutons encore qu'un autre Slave nommé Mansuf al-Ṣaḳlabī était, en 1023, commandant de la forteresse fatimide à Ḥalab/ Alep.

Nous ne savons pas de quel pays étaient originaire ces esclaves slaves au service des califes fatimides. Cependant il est très vraisemblable qu'ils provenaient, en majeure partie, de Dalmatie, de la Croatie et d'autres pays slaves des Balkans, comme le veut mon éminent collegue docteur Ivan Hrbek qui a consacré une étude très detaillée aux Slaves au service des Fatimides.

Voici a peu prés tout ce que j'ai réussi à trouver sur les Slaves etablis en Syrie comme colons, et sur les singulieurs personnages slaves qui y ont vécu comme réfugies ou comme fonctionnaires au service des Omeyyades [comm p. ex. Salmān et Ziyād], et a celui des Fatimides. Il résulte des temoignages des sources que j'ai réussi à rassembler et que j'ai presentées dans le présent exposé, que parmi differentes vagues ethniques qui ont pénétré en Syrie pendant la longue histoire de ce pays, il ne manquait pas de nombreux élements slaves, blonds et au teint clair, qui ont contribué, sans doute, a un certain degré à la constitution de la nation syrienne, après s'être confondu avec la population araméenne et arabe de la Syrie.

Dept. of Science
and Technology,
Poland

OTTOMAN LAND TENURE AND TAXATION

Bernard Lewis

1. Documentation

The documentation for Ottoman land tenure and taxation is considerable—greater than for any other regime in Islamic history. By far the most important body of evidence comes from the very rich Turkish archives, and especially from the bound registers (**defter**) of which many thousands survive in the central archives of Istanbul. These are of two basic types—statistical, containing records of information collected by government officials concerning land holdings, population, crops, taxes and revenues, and diplomatic, containing copies of orders issuing from the central government and addressed to provincial governors, qāḍīs and other functionaries. These archives are very full indeed for the first century or so of Ottoman rule in the Syrian lands. Thereafter, for this area as for other parts of the empire, they reflect a decline in efficiency, and the records become scrappy and uneven. Apart from a brief interlude when competent and up to date record-keeping reflects the interval of firm government by the Koprulu vizirs, the archives remain in rather a poor state until the nineteenth century, when they document the restoration of central authority in the province and the resumption and extension of bureaucratic activity.

An important category of documents contained in the archives are the **kānūns.** These have sometimes been described, inaccurately, as enactments by the central government. They are not enactments in that they do not make law. Rather they are tabulations or formulations of existing law compiled for the guidance of governors and other officials. The laws which they contain derive from three main sources: the Holy Law of Islam, the régime existing in the province before its conquest by the Ottomans, and innovations introduced by the Ottoman government, whether by imperial decree or bureaucratic practice. These **kānūns** were renewed at intervals, and enable us both to follow changes in practice and to achieve a better understanding of the information contained in the registers.

The great bulk of archival material is contained in the Turkish archives, above all in the archives of the prime minister's office in Istanbul, to which a number of other collections have been moved. Another important centre is the Directorate of the Cadaster in Ankara, which contains a number of registers relating to the Syrian lands. Not all the registers were of course transferred to the capital. Many—and

notably the qādīs' record-books (Sijill) — were kept in the provincial administrative centres. A few of these have already come to light in the Syrian lands, and it is hoped that others will be discovered in due course.

Compared with the massive evidence contained in the archives the literary evidence from Turkish and Arabic sources is of comparatively minor importance, serving only to provide some additional detail or explanation here and there. Among the most valuable are the writings of the jurists and of the Ottoman memorialists who, from the sixteenth century onwards, commented with increasing urgency on the decline in power and efficiency of the Ottoman state and administration and made recommendations for their improvement.

External sources are of two main kinds, the reports of travellers, of whom there are great numbers, and the records of foreign governments and commercial companies with consuls or agents resident in the Syrian lands. The travellers have been well exploited and are on the whole of limited value—partly because of their somewhat restricted powers of perception, partly because of their tendency to repeat what they had heard or read rather than to report what they had actually seen. European archival evidence is of considerable value for the history of trade, but sheds only and indirect and occasional light on the problems of land-tenure or of taxes, apart from those affecting international commerce.

The evidence available for the period of Ottoman rule in the Syrian lands, especially during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, is of immense scale and variety and the expioration of these sources has barely begun. Any conclusions put forward at this stage must therefore necessarily be tentative.

2. **Background**

In Syria, as in other newly conquered provinces, the Ottomans began by confirming the existing rules and practices, which they then progressively modified to a greater or lesser extent to bring them into accord with standard Ottoman usage. The existing procedure was that of the Mamlūk Sultanate. The newly imported Ottoman usage was the system which had grown up in the Ottoman realm, in Anatolia and in Rumelia, during the immediate preceding centuries.

This consisted of a number of elements, by far the most important of which is the Islamic. The Islamic system of landtenure and taxation is in itself a complex thing of manifold origins and much modified in the course of the centuries. It includes elements going back to pre-Islamic antiquity—the ancient Middle Eastern empires: the practices of the Ptolemies and Seleucids who followed Alexander, the laws and practices of Rome, Byzantium and pre-Islamic Iran. In time Islamic lawyers on the one hand and Islamic functionaries on the other fixed the Islamic norms—the two not always agreeing.

The legal norms received their final and classical form final that is to say as laid

down in the standard law-books—by the third century of the Hijra. The evolution of practice however did not cease at that point, and Islamic practice was further modified by the abuses and the usage— the one often becoming the other—of later régimes, and notably those of the Buyids and of the Turkish régimes, the Seljūks and their various successors.

Further important changes were introduced by the Mongol conquerors and the Il-Khāns whose practice profoundly influenced not only the lands which they ruled and dominated but others where the Mongol armies never reched but which were nevertheless affected by Mogol example and practice. The post-Mongol régimes retained much of the classical Islamic system, but they also brought in important changes and new patterns reflecting the influence of the steppe people who for four centuries migrated into the Middle East and formed its dominant element, and also to some extent even of Far Eastern, notably Chinese practices, which they brought with them from their homelands or which were suggested by the Chinese advisors of the early Mongol rulers. A comparison between the systems in the post- Mongol régimes in Persia, India, Central Asia and Egypt brings forth very clearly their common origins in the practice of the Mongol Empire.

A second element after the Islamic is the local. At one time it was fashionable to ascribe the greater part of Ottoman government and culture to the inheritance of Byzantium, and to see the Ottoman sultanate as a lightly disguised Islamic version of the Byzantine empire. This picture of the Ottoman ruler as 'the sultan in Byzance' is much exaggerated, and the Byzantine element in Ottoman government is far less important than that inherited from the Islamic, the Persian, the Turkish and the Mongol past. It is not however negligible. It includes some elements of importance, as for example the Byzantine fief, the **pronoia**, the Byzantine system of tenants, the **paroikoi**, and also some earlier Byzantine borrowings, dating back to Seljūk and even Abbasid times, and absorbed in the Islamic system. Another influence which may be described as local is that of the Franks—the Crusaders, who, as well as in the coastal lands of Syria and Palestine, also established themselves in Greece and for a while even in Constantinople, and introduced a number of Frankish feudal usages which left their impact on Ottoman practice.

3. Land-tenure in the 16th and early 17th centuries

Our main information for this period derives from the central cadastral register, the **defter-i khāqānī**, a register of the provinces, cities, villages, districts, landholdings, population, revenues and, where these were assessed in kind, of crops. The registers also indicate the beneficiaries of the revenues, whether the sultan, some government official, the holder (**sipāhī**) of a military grant (**timar**) a freeholder, or a **waqf**.

The **defter-i khāqānī** was not an Ottoman invention, though it is only from Ottoman times that exapmples of it have survived in any number. Registers of this

kind seem to have been compiled by both the Mamlūk and Il-Khān régimes in Egypt and in Iran, and something of the sort existed in 'Abbāsid times, when it was known as the Qānūn (not to be confused with the Ottoman use of this term).

These registers serve a double purpose. One was that of accountancy, especially in directly administered taxation, i.e. where the taxes were collected by salaried government commissioners (**emin**). Another was surveillance, especially for leased or granted revenues, to make sure of a reasonable relationship between the services rendered or amounts paid for the leases or grants and the amount actually collected. In areas and periods of good Ottoman administration, these registers were renewed at frequent intervals. One of the clearest signs of the loss of control by the central government is when the registers become infrequent, inaccurate and finally cease, or are replaced by fixed notional lists of taxpayers assessed at global figures.

In theory land-tenure was based on the classical Islamic division into **'ushrī** and **kharajī** land. The Ottomans however added a third category, neither **ushrī** nor **kharajī**, but owned by the state and called **ard-i memleket.** This was a legal rationalisation devised by Ottoman jurists in the sixteenth century for the system applied by the Ottoman conquerors, especially in the Balkans where, as they were not in old Islamic territory, they had a freer hand. It was in effect a system of state ownership replacing the old native aristocracy and rulers in the proprietorship of lands. It was devised, probably for military reasons, to meet the need to maintain the armed forces in a state of perpetual readiness for the continuing war in Europe. This kind of land was also known as **Sultānī**, and more commonly as **mīrī**, a shortened form of **amīrī**, which became the usual term for the state and that which pertains to it in Ottoman Syria.

The formal legal situation was that the legal ownership of the land, the **raqabe**, belonged to the state treasury. The **sipāhī** or man cavalry held it in grant from the state. The peasant who actually cultivated the land had a right of usge or possession, known as **tasarruf**, for which he paid **kharāj** to the **sipāhī.** In legal terminology, the **kharāj** might be either **kharāj-i muqāsame or kharāj-i muwazzaf**, the one being based on a proportin of the crop, the other on the area cultivated. Ottoman jurists and especially the great chief mufti, Ebu' I-Su 'ūd, attempted to bring Ottoman usage into line with the **Sharī'a** by calling the first **'ushr**, strictly tithe, and identifying the second with the Ottoman **Çift akçesi.** The form of lease held by the peasant was known as **'ariyet.**

The classification and division of land-holdings may be schematized as follows:

a) upper level (tenure and collection of revenue)
1) **mülk** and **waqf**

The first of these was freehold, held usually by private persons. The second, **waqf**, constituted by private persons from their **mülk**, or by the rulers. **Mülk** is to be found principally in towns **and** their immediate surroundings, and

usually consists of land with buildings-houses, shops, baths, etc.—or fruit and vegetable gardens. In the Syrian provinces there is also some old **mülk** in the countryside, though this is infrequent.

2) **Grants**

i) **Ze'āmet,** worth over 20,000 aspers a year and mostly between twenty and thirty thousand, though some run as high as 100,000.
ii) **Timar** with certificate, over 6,000.
iii) **Timar** without certificate, under 6,000.

3) **Khāss** (domain land)

This is of two kinds, **Khāss-i shāhī**—domain of the sultan—and **khāss-i miriliwā, khāss** of the governor. **Khāss** was assigned to high officials and officers, later also as **pashmaklik**—a form of grant given to court women. This was regarded as an abuse of the system. It could also be given as what was known as **ghāzī mülk,** assigned in perpetuity to generals or statesmen as an exceptional reward. The holders of such grants had greater rights than the holders of **timar,** for example in taxing peasants. These and other appanages were more independent of the central administration. **Ghāzī mülk** was often changed into **waqf** established for the benefit of the family.

The holders of such grants constituted a powerful group, controlling both political power and economic resources and ready to join in the growing trade of the sixteenth century through the sale of grain and raw materials which were now the principal purchases of European traders. This enabled them to accumulate capital and invest it in lands and also in the purchase of **iltizam.**

The Ottoman state maintained control over the **sipāhīs.** The purpose of the system was to give them an income, to have them ready for war, to use them in peace but to keep them under control and to prevent the emergence of a landlord or aristocratic class. The Ottoman '**askarī,** or military class, was in principle one of function not status, though this was not entirely so in practice. The changes which took place in the latter part of the sixteenth century helped to erode and finally destroy the system.

b) Lower level (cultivation)

The peasant had **tasarruf,** that is to say the right to possess and cultivate the land. He did not own it; he could not sell or divide it, and if he failed to cultivate it for three years he could be deprived of it by order of a **qādī.** Normally his sons inherited. If he had no sons, in the sixteenth century other relatives were allowed to acquire it on payment of tax called **tapu**

In principle the peasant could not leave the land; if he did so he paid a tax called **čift bozan resmi,** the amount of which was fifty aspers in the fifteenth

century, seventy-five in the sixteenth century and then, after the great devaluation at the end of the sixteenth century, three hundred **aspers.**

The peasant could not change his use of the land—as between grain, fruit, vegetables and pasturage—without the permission of the **sipāhī.** If he did so, he could be compelled to change back, provided that this was done within ten years, after which a prescriptive right was established. He was expected to sow a specified quantity of seed on the land.

The concern of the state seems to have been a shortage of labour, not of land, and the main stress therefore was laid on use. The state was concerned to secure cultivation—hence the restriction on the peasant's movement and the system whereby the **sipāhī** was rewarded if he procured the settlement of vacant land and correspondingly punished if he provoked or otherwise caused the abandonment of cultivated land.

The division of land through inheritance was banned, jointed inheritance being allowed with joint ownership, known as **mushā'an.** The unit of peasant holding was called a čiftlik (Arabic **faddān**). and consisted of about a thousand square metres or less.

4) **Taxes**

In principle the Ottomans maintained the basic tax classification of the Holy Law, but with some confusion due to attempts to rationalize Ottoman practice in **sharī'a** terms. The basic categories were as follows:

i) **muqāsama (qism)**

This was a proportion of the crop claimed by the fisc. The proportion varied considerably, from as much as a half to as little as a fifth, the amount being determined by the quality and situation of the land, the availability of irrigation, and of course the existing usage.

ii) **misāha (kharāj-i muwazzaf)**

Some taxes were always assessed in money—fruits, nuts, vineyards, certain categories of olives, livestock including bees and silkworms, and the so-called summer crops. Increasingly these were collected by means of tax farms and appear in the registers with fixed amounts which do not vary very much. To these may be added the Ottoman administrative taxes, **rusūm-i urfiye,** notably the **čift resmi,** or plough tax, the basic tax paid by the Muslim peasant with one **čift.** Ebu'l-Su'ūd Efendi calls this a form of **kharāj-i muwazzaf** in order to fit it into the framework of the Holy law, but it is really Ottoman administrative practice. The **čift akčesi** was regarded as a commutation of service and levies, specifically of seven services to the timar-holder to provide hay and firewood and work on the estates. The Ottoman system was in general against privilege and preferred

to replace these services by a fixed money payment. At first this was at twenty-two **aspers** per **čift,** later it was subject to various increases and changes to thirty-three, to forty at which figure it is given in **Kānūnnāmes** of Tripoli (1548), Damascus (1570) and Aleppo (1570), and then to about fifty.

In many villages the main tax on the crops was assessed not in kind but in money, at a fixed rate (**maqtū'**), according to the area cultivated. This tax was called **dīmūs,** a word of Greek origin, probably from **demosia.** The term occurs in both Greek nd Aramaic texts of the pre-Islamic period, and apears occasionally in the early Islamic papyri. After that it disappears from view, and is not, to my knoledge, used by classical and medieval Islamic writers on taxation. It reappears after the Ottoman conquest when, for the first time since the period of the papyri, we have contemporary administrative documents, as distinct from historical and juridical literature, relating to taxation. It seems reasonable to infer that the term remained in continuous use, though never accepted into the technical vocabulary of the jurists. A **kānūnnāme** of Damascus (955/1548) states that **dīmūs** was also called **fasl wa-mafsūl.** This term appears in Nuwayrī and other sources of the Mamlūk period, in the same sense of tax by fixed money assessment.

Peasants with less than half a **čift** or with no **čift** at all were called bennāk and were taxed at a lower rate, starting at six and then rising to nine, twelve and eighteen. The same term was sometimes applied to nomads. Widows paid a **bive resmi** or widow's tax at the rate of six. After the devaluation of the **asper** this system was replaced by the **avāriz,** a term familiar to the European travellers.

In addition to these there were miscellaneous taxes—tolls, taxes on mills, on roads, on markets etc. and of course the **jizye,** collected from the non-Muslim subjects of the Sultan. This was reserved to the state treasury, the **Bayt al-Mal,** and unlike other taxes was never granted to holders of **khāss, ze'āmet** or **timar.** It was, however, sometimes included in a royal waqf, and was often commuted as a lump sum paid by a given non-Muslim community.

Two terms which occur especially in Syria are **dirham al-rijāl** and **sarha** or **serče** (possibly a pseudo-Persian diminutive of **ser,** head, meaning small or lesser poll-tax). These are listed among the revenues of villages in areas with Nusayrī, Ismā'īlī and sometimes also Druze inhabitants, and represent a tax on members of non-orthodox Muslim sects. A **Kānūnnāme** of Tripoli of 978/1571 refers explicitly to the **dirham al-rijāl,** as a tax levied on the Nusayrīs. Between 1533 and 1539 a tax called **resm-i rijāliye** was collected from a group of Kurdish nomads in the region of Nabulus. This may be a variant of the same tax. It was probably imposed before the Ottomans arrived, at a time when the dirham was still current in Syria.

An Ismā'īlī village in the district (**nāhiya**) of Qadmūs may serve as an example of the level of taxation. According to a register compiled after 932/ 1525-6, the village consisted of 26 households and 8 bachelors. They paid, to the khāss, a total of 3857 aspers, consisting of **dīmūs,** 2,500 a.; **dirham al-rijāl,** 620 a.; serčḙe, 380 a.; fruit tax, 100 a.; bees' tax, 15 a.; vine-press tax, 12 a.; silk loom tax, 60 a.; **bād-i havā** (miscellaneus fines, escheats etc.), 170 a.

During the period of Ottoman rule two successive forms of grant or assignment predominated, though both existed at the same time. The first of these was the **timar,** the classical Ottoman military grant, evolving from the usage of the early Ottoman state. Under this system most rural areas or, to be more precise, the revenues drawn from these rural areas were assigned to **sipāhīs** as a return for the service which they owed and gave to the Ottoman state. these assignments were of various types and sizes, the great majority being known by the name of **timar,** an Ottoman equivalent of the earlier Islamic Iqtā', though with some changes. Timars could be small, granted by the governor on his own authority, or large, requiring the issue of a certificate from the capital. Very large assignments were known as **ze'āment,** these being assigned normally only to governors of districts (sanjaq), or high officers in the provincial administration, such as the **defterdār** (Intendant of Finances) or the Alay Bey (a military officer) of the Sanjak. Sometimes the registers list **ze'āmets** held by former holders of these officers, or even by brothers of these and of other influential persons.

The **sipāhī** has sometimes been described as a feudal fiefholder. As is usual with the use of such European terms in relation to Islamic institutions, the description is at best a loose analogy, and is in some respects misleading. The **sipāhī** held his grant in return for service, and forfeited his grant when he failed or was unable to render that service. The grant was always revocable, and transfers, as we see from the registers, were not infrequent. There was no right of inheritance, though it was not unusual for the **timar** of the **sipāhī** to be re-assigned to his sons, provided that they in turn could render the requistie military service. Where a **sipāhī** left only female heirs—widows or daughters—arrangements were sometimes made for a new husband or a son-in-law to take over the **timar,** again on the smae terms.

The **sipāhī** system was in its prime in the early and middle sixteenth century. Thereafter it began to decline under the influence of a number of factors which can here only be enumerated—the introduction of new military technology, making the **sipāhī** cavalry less troops and more revenues in cash to maintain them; the circumnavigation of Africa, which changed the patterns of trade—though not until about the end of the sixteenth century; the influx of Spanish silver of American origin, and the consequent collapse of the Ottoman silver-based currency, with disastrous inflationary effects on all those civil, military, judicial and other officers—in receipt of fixed incomes claculated in Ottoman silver aspers; and finally the whole series of internal changes, connected with or consequent to these, such as the growth of usury and speculation, the formation of large estates, the flight or migration of peasants

from the land, the growth of banditry, and other manifestations of economic stress and strain.

In the second phase, the **sipāhī** and his timar gradually became less important and were replaced by the tax-farmer. The process may be summarized as follows. As **timars** fell vacant by the death or dismissal of the holder, they were not re-assigned to new **sipāhis** but were instead incorporated in the imperial domain, the **khāss-i shāhī**, so as to ensure a greater cash revenue to the state exchequer.

These revenues were not, however, for the most part collected directly by state officials. Instead they were assigned as tax farms (mukāta'a) by a method called **iltizām.** This was at first on an annual basis, the tax-farmer purchasing the right to collect taxes for one year, in advance. Gradually the period of purchase of an **iltizām** became longer and longer until it finally developed into the **malikāne,** a form of tenure which, though in theory beginning as a tax-farm, was in fact for life and even became heritable and alienable. A decree of 1695 formally introduced the system of **malikāne** to the provinces of Damascus, Aleppo, Ayntab, Adana, and some others. A decision a few years later to abolish the system was ineffective.

This period saw the emergence and rise of the **A'yān,** the local notables. The **mālikāne** system provided the economic basis for their power; the weakness of the central government and its loss of effective control of the provinces facilitated the acquisition by the **a'yān** of political power and even at times of the status of autonomous local rulers. This process was facilitated by a new change in tenure, whereby these grants were in effect transformed into **mülk.**

This transformation into **mülk** (temlik) took place in a number of ways—by usurpation, by prescription, by puchase or by favour. At the same time the functions of the **a'yān** were extended to include the maintenance of law and order, for which purpose they raised and maintained their own armed forces. Some of them even became hereditary rulers of definite territories with their own armies.

The practice of tax-farming goes back at least to Seljūk times. At first the custom in Ottoman Syria was to issue an **iltizām** on some fiscal entity, such as for example the customs of a port or of a commodity, the Mint, the fisheries of an area, or of a whole region. Then the practice was adopted of taking payment in advance, with a **mufettish** or inspector representing the government. The next step is that the **iltizām** holder himself becomes the **mufettish,** as a result of which he was free to indulge in the most ruthless expolitation of the peasants. In time, even the surviving **timars** were incorporated in the system.

Who were the **iltizām** holders? and what money did they use to make their purchases? The most important groups were rich landowners, especially holders of one or other form of **khāss,** and **dhimmī** traders. These were followed even by a certain number of sipāhis who preferred this more profitable and less dangerous form of tenure. These, in turn, were jointed business on thier own account and through agents.

As the a'yān became more powerful the government found it expedient to delegate to them, to a very large extent, the conduct of provincial affairs and especially the running of provincial cities.

The overshadowing and impoverishment of the timariots from the end of the sixteenth century brought many harmful results. The most serious of them was the growing burden on the peasantry through increased taxes and demands, both by the owner and by the state. This led to the growth of tax arrears and the resort of the peasantry to usury, thereby inevitably worsening their situation. This in turn led to flights from the land, the growth of banditry and at times even to armed insurrection. All this helped to inaugurate a process of decline which was not arrested until the rise of the **a'yān** restored some kind of order and stability.

University of London

BYZANCE ET LA SYRIE[1] AUX IX[e] ET X[e] SIECLES

Hassan Gholi Moayedi Machad

Dans l'histoire de Byzance, le VIIe siècle (610-717) est une des pèriodes les plus sombres, une èpoque de crise grave, un moment décisif où il semble que l'existence même de l'empire soit en jeu. Au dehors, les invasions durables des Avars, des Slaves et des Bulgares en Europe, des Iraniens et des Arabes en Asie, ont pour effet des modifications considérables dans la composition ethnique de l'Empire.

A partie de 634, les Arabes battirent le frère de l'empereur , Thèodore, en 635 ils s'emparèrent de Damas, importante cité syrienne. En 636 le gouvernement de Byzance avait concentré en Syrie toutes les forces disponibles, cette armée subit à son tour une écrasante défaite au cours de la bataille du Yarmouk. En fin de compte, vers le milieu du VIIe siécle, Byzance, qui avait perdu la Mésopotamie, la Syrie, la Palestine et une grande partie de la péninsule balkanique, était composée d'un certain nombre de possessions éparses, dont chacune se trouvait sous la menace constante d'incursions ennemies.

Il serait certes illusoire de croire que la conquête arabe ou la rapacité de certains chefs n'avaient pu entraîner ni désordre ni mécontentement sporadique. En gros cependant, il est certain que l'établissement de la domination nouvelle n'avait entraîné de la part des autochtones aucune opposition systématique et ne leur avait occasionné aucune difficulté plus grande que celles auxquelles les avaient endurcis les régimes antérieurs.

Le régime Omayyade, on l'a dit, était syrien, c'est-à-dire que non seulement celles des traditions indigènes qui l'emportaient autour de lui étaient celles du régime byzantin, mais qu'il n'y avait pas plus de faveur à attendre pour les Arabes de Syrie que pour les autres. Leur large tolérance religieuse, l'allégement des charges fiscales avec le passage à un systéme simplifié de perception d'impôts, qui prévoyait même certaines exonérations en cas de conversion à l'Islam, ouvrirent aux Arabes les portes de nombreuses villes et garantirent l'attitude bienveillante des masses rurales. Les conquêtes arabes s'accopmagnaient de grandes transformations dans le domaine agraire.

Les propriétaires de Latifundia[2], comme le dit M.V. Levtchenko, n'entendaient pas subir le joug des conquérants et se faisaient évacuer avec l'administration byzantine. Les terres de ces aristocrates étaient aussitôt réparties parmi les colons, car selon Cl. Cahen, l'Etat nouveau avait distribué la plupart de leurs terres bon gré mal gré, en concession quasi emphytéotique[3], (ḳaṭi'a) à des notables arabes, qui

prenaient ainsi la suceession des propriétaires byzantins. Toutefois, alors que le Byzantin disposait de pouvoirs publics quasi-seigneuriaux, le concessionnaire arabe n'était qu'un possédant, sur les terres duquel en général les agents de l'administration pouvaient normalement pénétrer.

Il est donc probable qu'ily a eu un certain allégement temporaire de la condition paysanne. De toute façoc, l'ancien paysan n'avait eu aucune raison de défendre son ancien maître ni de le regretter. Sur le plan religieux, suivant Cl. Cahen, la population autochtone était en effet trés divisée. La conquête avait fait disparaitre le clergé grec, mais non, dans la population autochtone, les éléments qui, en parlant araméen, avaient adopté le rite grec (on les appelait, du nom Syriaque du Roi sous-entendu de Constantinople, les Melkites); à côté d'eux, un groups spécial, les Maronites coupés par la conquête des monothélites grecs dont ils partageaient les doctrines, commençaient à s'organiser en Syrie. Par ailleurs les nonophysites avaient une église de langue copte en Egypte, une (dite de Jacobite) de langue syriaque en Syrie et Mésopotamie; I'Eglise arménienne se rapprochait d'eux.

En somme, si le système fonctionnait au bénéfice des Arabes musulmans comquérants, il était tout de même caractérisé par une division institutionnelle en deux secteurs. D'une part, l'armée occupante touchait les revenus des territoires conquis, et des agents arabes musulmans s'occupaient des questions qui, au sein de la communauté, touchaient à la religion, à la justice, aux choses proprement arabes et islamiques. D'autre part, les indigènes, s'ils obéissaient aux Arabes, restaient organisés localement dans leurs anciens cadres, selon leur ancien droit.

Cependant Arabes et indigènes se mélangeaient peu à peu. Dans les régions anciennement urbanisées, comme la Syrie, les Arabes s'étaient installés dans les villes anciennes, Damas était la capitale du Califat Omayyade.

S'appuyant sur les Arabes de cette région, et spécialement sur les yéménites ou Kalbites, qui y nomadisent depuis le siècle précédent, le gouverneur musulman de Syrie, Mu'āwiya, s'empare du califat (661 A.D.) et fonde la dynastie Omayyade, qui de Damas règne sur l'Islam jusqu'en 750 A.D. Les Chrétiens de Syrie fournissent des administrateurs à l'Empire musulman et aux grands domaines, leur culture intellectuelle est à la base de la civilisation islamique; celle-ci se développe au VIIe siècle avec l'installation des soldats dans les villes, qui fait progresser l'Islam et la langue arabe.

La prédominance politique des Syriens disparaît avec l'avènement des califes abbassides (750 A.D.) qui s'appuient sur l'Islam, mais la Syrie garde sa richesse. L'affaiblissement rapide du Califat de Bagdad à partir du IXe siécle entraine le morcellement politique de la Syrie, oû les gouverneurs des grandes villes conquièrent l'autonomie, se posant en représentants du Calife en Egypte, lec Tulunides (879-905 A.D.), les Ikhchidides (935-969 A.D.), qui sauvegardant mieux les formes, n'eurent pas moins d'autonomie; puis au Xe siécle, la Syrie du Nord et la province de Mossoul tombérent aux mains des Hamdanides (944-1003 A.D.). Les Hamdanides

sont en somme la dernière dynastie arabe importante en Orient, ils ont sans nul doute favorisè les Arabes. Maic ils se sont servis aussi des Daylamites, des Turcs et des Kurdes[4].

Le fondateur de cette dynastie fut 'Abd Allāh Abu l'Hayjā' b. Hamdān b. Hamdūn, d'une puissante famille taglibite de Mésopotamie.

Selon M. Canard, il avait reçu en 302 H. du Calife Muktadir (295-320/909-932) le gouvernement de Mossoul. Quand il mourut, au cours de troubles à Bagdad, en défendant l'anti Calife Ḳāhir contre le Calife légitime Muḳtadir, en 317/929, son fils Ḥassan (Nāsir al-Dawlā)[5]. lui succéda à Mossoul. Son autre fils, 'Alī Sayf al-Dawla, né vers 301/914, grandit dans l'entourage de Nāsir al-Dawla et partagea les vicissitudes de sa vie agitée.

Il se distingua dans différentes opérations contre les Byzantins et ne tarda pas à jouer un rôle important là où le Califat était aux mains des émirs (''al'umara'') et où chaque gouverneur de province s'efforçait de devenir indépendant.

Ainsi, Byzance se trouva mieux armée pour reprendre l'offensive contre un Islam affaibli et il lui fallut un siècle (850-950 A.D environ) pour reconquér ir le centre de l'Asie Mineure. Sur les frontières orientales, à la fin du IXe siècle, Byzance a entrepris méthodiquement la reconquête des territoires enlevés à l'empire par les Arabes, et au X^{e} siècle, elle ne dissimule plus que la Terre Sainte est un des enjeux de la lutte.

Après la mort de Nāsir al-Dawla (967)[6], l'art de Sayf al-Dawla fut de savoir réveiller dans une assez large mesure la vieille tradition du djihad[7] chez Bédouins, qui avaient désappris la guerre sainte, mais qui n'avaient pas perdu le goût de la bagarre et du butin.

Il retrouvait d'ailleurs ainsi l'ancienne leçon de bien des chefs de nomades, qui avaient su, avant lui, qu'on ne commande solidement à ce genre d'hommes qu'en les conduisant à la guerre et à la victoire[8].

Les forces vives de l'Empire byzantin, situées plus loin, ne furent guère atteintes, mais ces expéditions eurent pour seul résultat sur les rives du Bosphore et en Asie chrétienne d'exciter la volonté d'en finir avec un voisin insupportable.

En fin de compte l'Empire byzantin, qui s'était maintenu derriére le Taurus, profite du déclin abbasside pour razzier le Nord de la Syrie; les victoires de Nicéphore Phocas (963-969 A.D.) de Jean Tzimiskés (969-976)[9] et de Basile (976-1025), aboutissent à la formation d'un duché grec autour d'Antioche reprise dés 960[10].

Commercialement, il est certain qu'au VIIe siècle la conquête de l'Egypte et de la Syrie par les Arabes fut un grave désastre pour le commerce byzantin. L'empire perdit de ce fait le grenier inépuisable qu'était la vallée du Nil, les richesses de l'industrie syrienne, qui avaient depuis le VIe siècle pratiquement conquis le monopole

de la fabrication des soieries et tant de ports admirables, centres d'une extraordinaire activité[11].

Mais d'après R. Guilland, peu aprés la mort de Nicéphore II Phocas, vers la fin de 969 ou au début de 970, le général byzantin qui assiégeait la ville d'Alep en Syrie traita avec le gouvernement de cette place et signa un traité qui était un véritable triomphe pour l'Empire byzantin[12].

1. On a prétendu que le nom Shâm sonné à Syrie venait des taches (Shamāt) noires et blanches que présente le sol et qu'on remarque sur la terre de labour en certaines localités, ainsi que sur les rochers les plantes et les arbres. Cette opinion appartient à al-Kalbi الكلبي . Enfin Charki, fils de Ḳoṭāmi الشرقي بن قطامي rapporta le mot Shām à Sam (Sem), fils de Noé, qui le premier s'arrêta dans ce pays et s'y établit. Quand les Arabes vinrent l'habiter, ils considérèrent lo mot Sam comme de fâcheux augure et changèrent en Shām. Masᶜūdi, Tome III, p. 141. مروج الذهب
2. L'origine des Latifundia est très lointaine; après les conquêtes républicaines consécutives à la deuxième guerre punique, les Romains se trouvèrent à la tête d'une quantité de terres supérieures aux possibilités des cultivateurs disponibles et de vastes domaines se constituèrent, exploités par un petit nombre de grandes familles, grâce à la pratique de l'esclavage. Voir G. Larousse.
3. Se dit d'un bail de longue durée dont le preneur bénéficie le plus souvent d'un faible loyer en compensation des importants travaux qu'il s'engage à effectuer: le bail emphteotique favorise la mise en culture de terres improductives. Voir G. Larousse.
4. Sayf al-Dawla avait un peu de sang kurde dans les veines, car son père Abu l'Hayjā' avait une mére kurde. Voir M. Canard, p. 202.
5. Nāsir al-Dawla reçut son lakab honorifique fin avril 942, après l'assassinat d'Ibn Ra'ik ابن رائق et Sayf al-Dawla reçut le sien en septembre. Voir Canard, p. 12.
6. Comme Nāsir al-Dawla ne put put enrayer le désordre financier, générateur de désordre tout court, au bout d'un an, plutôt que de tout perdre, il préféra se retirer à Mossoul dans sa province, qu'elle du moins, il tenait solidement. Et ce fut là qu'il se maintint jusqu'en 967 où il mourut. Hist. musulmane Vol III, p. 27.
7. La forte personnalité de Sayf al-Dawla et les menaces extérieures qui pesaient sur tous les Arabes de Syrie avaient pu cimenter une certaine union, elle pouvait difficilement durer. La conclusion normale devait être que le pouvoir fût conqus directement par les Kilābites. C'est ce qui se produisit au bénéfice de la famille dirigeante de cette tribu, celle des Mirdasiodes au début du XIe siècle. Hist musulmane, p.30
8. Les exploits du prince ont été célébrés en particulier, ce qui ausi y a contribué, par les deux grands poétes de son entourage, Mutanabbī et Abū Firās, propre cousin du Hamdānide. Hist. vol III, p. 28.
9. Jean Tzimiskés, petit fils de Théophile, frère du Domestique Jean Corcuas, né dans la région arménienne située entre l'Arsanas et le Kara-Su, devait avoir à cette époque le commandement, soit de théme de Mésopotamie, soit plutôt de la partie de ce thème comprenant la région de Hanzit et le Nord de Malaṭya. M. Canard p. 116.
10. Au dire de Marius Canard, l'activité de Sayf al-Dawla se divise en quatre périodes. Dans la première de 326/938 à 332/944, c'est comme gouverneur de Diyar Bakr qu'il combat en Arménie et Mésopotamie contre Corcuas. Dans la seconde, de 333/944, il a sous son autorité toute la frontière syro-mésopotamienne avec Alep en Syrie, Mayyafarikin et 'Amid dans le Diyar Bakr: c'est l'époque de ses plus grands succès sur un adversaire mal commandé par Bardas phocas. Pendant la troisième période de 343/ 954 à 349/969, les Bzantins avec Léon et Nicéphore Phocas, fils de Bardas, se réorganisent et préludent par plusieurs actions heureuses aux grandes victoires de la période suivante. A partir de 351/961, la direction de la guerre passe entièrement à Nicéphore Phocas, bientôt empereur en 936: secondé par son célèbre lieutenant Jean Tzimiscès, qui le remplacera ensuite sur le trône, il accable Sayf al-Dawla de toutes parts. Ses armées prennent pied définitivement en Cilicie et ravagent la Syrie du Nord. Les désordres extérieurs de l'émirat et la mort de Sayf al-Dawla (356/967) permettront aux successeurs de Nicéphore Phocas (969) de continuer l'avance byzantine, de s'emparer d'une importante partie de la Syrie du Nord et d'imposer une sorte de protectorat byzantin, d'ailleurs éphémère, aux émirs d'Alep, voir p. 35-36.

11. En Syrie débouchaient les routes des caravanes qui, à travers la Perse, reliaient l'Extrême- Orient à la vallée de l'Euphrate et au monde byzantin, celles aussi qui, venant du golf- Persique, apportaient les produits de Ceylan, de l'Inde, de l'Indochine, de la Chine. Les Syriens formaient même dans certaines certaines villes d'Occident des colonies assez importantes; ils y apportaient les étoffes, les cuirs travaillés, les vins de Syrie, les papyrus d'Egypte. Cf. Byzance, p. 91, 93.
12. Cl. Cahen note que le traité de 969 (entre Alep et Byzance) mentionne des importations, surtout textiles, de l'Empire byzantin en Syrie, assez inattendues, mais nous ne savons rien d'autre du commerce terrestre, et l'Etat hamdanide ne conserva pas longtemps ses débouchés côtiers que se partagèrent les Byzantins et les Fatimides. Alep profita du régime hamdanide moins par l'effet d'un essor économique que par la présence, pour la première fois, d'une cour dans ses murs; elle préludait ainsi au rôle de capitale nord-syrienne qui devait désormais être le sien et faire plus tard d'elle une grosse vill. Hist. Vol III, p. 30

Et voici ce que guillan ecrit:

"Pour la perception des impôt, des dîmes et des droits de douane, les agents de l'empereur, donc les agents byzantins et les agents de l'émir arabe, devaient opérer d'accord, de façon à éviter toute contestation et toute dispute. Les marchandises, dont les impôts prélevés sur la valeur étaient réservées à l'Empereur, étaient les suivantes (tous les impôts qui vont être prélevés sur les marchandises indiquées revenaient entièrement à l'Empire byzantin et non à l'Emir): c'était tous les objets en or ou en argent, toutes les étoffes byzantines en soie, toutes les soies brutes, toutes les pierres précieuses, les perles et les étoffes brochées d'or.

Par contre les employés des douanes arabes avaient le droit de prélever, exclusivement pour l'Emir, des droits de douane sur les étoffes ordinaires ainsi que sur les lingeries ordinaires, sur le bétail et sur toutes les "grosses marchandises".

Toutes les fois qu'une caravane de marchands venant de l'Empire byzantin était signalée se dirigeant sur Alep, le chef de poste arabe de la frontière byzantino-arabe devait en informer immédiatement l'Emir, qui prenait les dispositions nécessaires pour que la caravane parvienne à Alep sans inconvénient. Si cette caravane provenant de l'Empire byzantin était pillée en cours de route, ce qui était fréquent, sur le territoire arabe soit par des Bédouins, soit par d'autres sujets arabes, l'Emir devait rembourser à l'Empire byzantin les sommes perdues par suite des marchandises volées."

Finalement, au point de vue de la littérature, comme l'écrit Cl. Diehl, "quand les Musulmans au VIIe siècle firent la conquête de la Syrie et de la Mésopotamie, de grandes écoles y étaient florissantes, ā Antioche, à Edesse, à Nisibe, à Harrān, et les maîtres qui y enseignient étaient tout pénétrés de la culture grecque, de la philosophie d'Aristote, des sciences et de la médecine antique. Les Califes Omayyades s'adressèrent à eux pour traduire en syriaque et en arabe les oeuvre les plus importantes de la littérature grecque et byzantine, et après eux, les Abbassides eurent le même souci de rassembler des manuscrits grecs et de faire traduire en arabe les ouvrages les plus fameux de la science, de la médecine et de la philosophie helléniques. Durant tout le cours du IXe siècle, on s'appliqua à Bagdad à traduire Euclide et Archimède, Ptolémée et Dioscoride, Hippocrate et Galien, Aristote et Théophraste; et on a pu dire justement que, sans Byzance, sans les traditions byzantines que leur transmirent les écoles de Syrie, les Arabes, malgré leurs brillantes aptitudes, seraient restés ce qu'ils étaient au temps de Mohamet, des demibarbares. C'est par l'intermédiaire des traducteurs Syriens qu'ils ont connu la science et la philosophie de la Grèce, et c'est grâca à eux que s'est éveillé dans l'Islam, depuis l'Espagne jusqu'a l'Inde, un grand et fécond mouvement intellectuel. C'est par les écoles arabes de Cordoue enfin que l'Occident chrétien lui-même a connu Aristote, et par ce détour la scolastique doit un peu sa naissance à Byzance.

BIBLOGRAPHIE

ABOO ISMA'IL MOHAMMAD BIN ABD ALLAH AL AZDI AL BACRI, The Fotooh al-Sham, Calcutta, 1854

Cl. CAHEN, La première pénétration turque en Asie Mineure, Bruxelles, 1942

La ARISDAGUES, Histoire d'Arménie, 1964.

Ibin Al-ATHIR, K. al Kamil fi-t-Tarikh, Vol. XIII.

H.Gh. Moayedi, Empire byzantin, vol. I, Meched, 1966.

Cl. HUART, Histoire des Arabes, 2 vol., Paris, 1912-13.

J.M. HUSSAY, Cambridge Medieval History, vol. IV, The Byzantine Empire.

L.HALPHEN, Les Barbares, des grandes invasions aux conquêtes turques du XIè siècle, Paris, 1948.

M.CANARD, Sayf al- Daula, Alger, 1934.

M.V.LEVTCHENKO, Byzance des origines à 1453. Paris, 1949.

M.H.YINANC, Turkiye tariki, Selouklular devri, Istambul, 1944,

MAÇOUDI, Les Prairies d'Or, Paris, 1970.

E.PERROY, Le Moyen Age, Paris, 1961.

P.GUILLAND, Etudes Byzantines, Paris, 1959.

MICHEL LE SYRIEN, Traduit en français par J. B. Chabot.

Ch. DIEHL, Byzance, Grandeur et décadence, Paris, 1960.

ARABS AND THE ENGLISH

Dr. Sari Nasir,

The first significant British contacts with Arabs, both culturally and politically, came at a time when the Arab world was subject to the Ottoman Empire.

Before then, ideas about Arabs and Arab lands had reached England from various sources. First there was the Bible, which gave focus to the Middle East as being the scene of Christ's life. Many countries in the area became familiar to Christians; Egypt, the country where Moses lived and from which he led the Hebrews; Palestine, where Christ was born, raised and crucified; Syria, the land in which Saint Paul and Saint Peter travelled. Many other biblical places and names also became popular: places like Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Nazareth; names like the Queen of Sheba, Ruth and Salome. The 'Holy Land' held the attention of people and evoked an interest both religious and mystical.

A second source was the tales and fables circulating about the 'inscrutible Orient'; the dreadful hideous Egyptian beast 'and the enigmatic' Phoenix of Arabia', derived from the works of early Greek and Roman writers. There were also the stories of the Assassins and frightful evil spirits of the desert', as told by the Venetian explorer and adventurer, Marco Polo.

Then there was the European polemics about Islam and Moslems. The 'religion of the sword' and the dark 'infidels' who threatened 'Christianity and Christians. The legends of the Crusades provided another source of information for Christian bias. According to these fables, king Richard accomplished 'such mighty deeds that the Saracens stood in great fear of him', as reported in Jonville's 'Chronicles'. When the 'Saracen children cried, their mothers called out "Wisht!. here is king Richard", in order to keep them quiet and when the horses of the Saracens and Bedouins started at a tree or bush, their masters said to the horses, "Do you think that is king Richard?".

In general these legends and fables painted the Middle East as a land inhabited by demons and saints ; a world full of wonders and of the supernatural.

In contrast to these ideas very few Englishmen were aware of Arab contributions to human knowledge.

The making of the modern image of the Arabs in England began in the twelfth century. Two men, a scholar and a traveller, added two basic themes to the image.

In subsequent centuries new concepts in the portrayal of Arabs began to appear in the accounts of English merchants, travellers, scholars and adventurers; these first travellers were later followed by diplomats and soldiers.

In the twelfth century two important opposing themes concerning Arabs appeared in England. The first came from Adelard of Bath 'the pioneer of Arab learning in the West', who travelled extensively in Spain and Syria in the first quarter of the twelfth century. His aim was to study Arabic and Arab science and "being of good wit and being desirous to increase and enrich the same with the best things." Adelard translated many Arabic books into Latin and served as tutor to king Henry II. In his book the **Natural Questions,** Adelard wrote "I shall plead the cause of the Arabs, not my own". He then proceeded to show the superiority of the Arab method of learning and was instrumental in spreading it in the West. Adelard, addressing his nephew on the method he learnt from the Arabs in Spain, writes:

"I, with reason for my guide, have learned one thing from my Arab teachers, you, something different: dazzled by the outward show of authority you wear a head-stall. For what else should we call authority but a head-stall?. Just as brute animals are led by the head-stall where one pleases, without seeing why or where they are being led, and only follow the halter by which they are held, so many of you bound and fettered as you era by a low credulity, are led into danger by the authority of writers. Reason has been given to individuals that, with it as chief judge, distinction may be drawn between the true and false... We must first search after reason, and when it has been found, and not until then, authority, if added to it, may be received. Authority by itself can inspire no confidence in the philosopher, nor ought it be used for such a purpose."

This same theme of the 'superiority' of Arab learning was reinforced in the twelfth century within the same era by Robert of Chester and Daniel of Morley. The latter, dissatisfied with the Frankish Universities, went to the Arabs to "seek the wiser philosophers of the Universe." However, in the same century a diametrically opposed theme appeared in the accounts of the English traveller Mandeville. In his **Travels,** Mandeville while on a journey to the Holy Land in the latter part of the twelfth century, speaks of the "Arabians" and "Bedouins" who inhabit the "deserts" between Jerusalem and Syria and describes them as "evil", wicked and of "malice"; In those deserts dwell mickle people that men call Arabians, Bedouins and Ascopards. They are folk full of all evil conditions, and full of all manner of wickedness and malice" he wrote; "They are right foul folk and cruel and of evil kind". The Arabs are perceived by. Mandeville as an "evil kind", thus setting them aside from his own "kind", regarding them as an "outgroup", a theme which has survived to this day. Mandeville proceeds to describe the life of Arabs as roaming nomads who live in "tents": "Houses have they none but tents, which they make of skins of camels and other wild beasts and drink water when they may any get. And they dwell in places where they may have water. as on the Red Sea and other places where they find any water. And oft times it falls that, where men find water a (one) time of the year, another time is none found; and therefore make they no house in a certain place, but now there, as they may find water. This folk that I speak of travil not about tilling of land, for they eat no bread commonly but if it be any dwell near

some good town, that they may go to for to get them bread. They roast all their flesh and the fish that they eat upon stone through the heat of the sun."

However, Mandeville noted that they were "strong men" and good fighters: and not-for-they (nevertheless) "they are strong men and well fighting; and great multitude there is of them. "Also there is a mention of their independence and resentment of outside authority; "They do nought else but chase wild beasts, to take them for their sustenance. And they set not by their lives; and therefore they dread not the Sultan and none other prince of all the world, that they will fight with them, and they do them any grievance. They have oft-times fought with the Sultan, and namely that same time that I dwelt with him. Armour have they none to defend them with, but only a shield and a spear. They wind their heads and their necks in a white linen cloth. "It is interesting here to note that many of the qualities mentioned by Mandeville were seized upon and incorporated into the image of the Arab in England. At different times, as we shall see, various of these qualities are admired by subsequent English travellers.

In subsequent centuries two main themes, namely the superior Arab thought and dangerous desert dweller, appeared over and over again in accounts of English men of letters, merchants and travellers; to name but a few, Hakluyt, Pitts and Fitch.

An important source of information about Arabs reaching the ears of England, beginning in the fiftheenth century, came with the English merchants who sailed in quest of trade as far as the Levant. One of the earliest English vessels to reach the port of Jaffa in Palestine was the **Cog Anne.** The ship was commanded by the "Fulnotable Worshipful Merchant" Robert Sturmy of Bristol. It carried a group of pilgrims and a cargo of wool, tin, and other commodities. On the way back to England the vessel sank off the coast of Greece and thus never reached home, although Sturmy survived the disaster and carried news of his travels to England. Another attempt was made by him in 1457 on the vessel the **Katherine Sturmy,** with a cargo of leas, tín,wool and cloth to "diverse part of the Levant", the ship carrying back 'pepper and other spices". Again this vessel was also sunk near Malta by the Genoese, who considered the English merchants to be intruding on their own trade. In 1511 the famous Hakluyt recorded that "diverse tall ship of London... and of Southampton and Bristow" sailing to Crete, Cyprus and Syria carrying woollen manufactures, carried on their way back commodities such as silks, chanlets, rubabe, malmesies, muskades and other wines, sweet oyles, cotton, wool, twilisie, carpets, galls, pepper, cinamon and some other spices". Hakluyt also speaks of several English ships travelling to the Levant in the intervening years between 1512 and 1535.

In the meanwhile the Turks had conquered the Arab lands. These lands, inhabited by Arabs, which came under the Turkish rule included: Syria (Lebanon, Syria and Plaestine), Arabia, Iraq, Egypt and North Africa (Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco). The people who lived in these areas were referred to by Europeans as Arabas, Bedouins, Saracens, Moors, Moslems and later were confused with the Turks.

When the English merchants first obtained permission to trade in the Turkish dominions in 1553, the Arabs were, as pointed out, subjects of the Ottoman Empire. Those Arab territories which were of special significance to the early merchants included Syria, Palestine, Tunis, Algeria, Tripoli, Arabia, and Syria, especially Aleppo (situated in Northern Syria), as described by Wood, was "the terminus of the great caravan routes from Parsia and Mesopotamia" and also had an important factory which stood almost "on an equality with that of Constantinople, and in point of trade probably surpassed it". Palestine was of special concern for its Holy places, many pilgrims undertaking pilgrimages to Jerusalem. Tunis , Algeria and Triopli posed a special threat to English trade on Barbary coast. Wood describes them as the "three pirate states" and he describes the population "as a people who lived by plunder and rapine." The Barbry pirates (including English pirates) posed a "great" threat to English vessels, "enslaving all Christian captives".

Accounts of the Barbary pirates appeared as early as 1566. Bodenham who commanded a ship loaded with a cargo of goods bound for Spain described a battle which took place between English merchants and pirates; "I was bownde even at home at myne owne dores, being calm without brethe of wynd, I was besette with seven gallies of Tourked of Argell (Algiers)". He describes how he and his men put up a fight from "morning tyll noon", but finally they were "taken and stripped nakyd, and put in too the gallies". Voyages to the Barbary Coast by English vessels were first recorded in 1551. One such trip had two Moors as passengers, these "being noble men" on a "tall ship called the Lion of London".

Syria, on the other hand, was said to be much more hospitable than the Barbary Coast to the early English merchants. It was a haven for travellers who went as pilgrims or to search for the trade route by land to India (the sea routes were still under Portuguese control). One Master Robert Newberry, who embarked on a second trip to Syria with Ralph Fitch and a company of fellow-travellers, left England for Tripoli on **The Tiger of London**, a vessel which attained fame by the mention of it's voyage to Aleppo in the witches scene in Macbeth:

> Her husband's to Aleppo gone, master o' the Tiger:
> But in a sieve I'll thither sail,
> And, like a rat without a tail
> I'll do, I'll do, and I'll do.

While still in London Newberry apparently was asked to search in Syria for a book of "Cosmographie" written by one Abilfada Ismail. On 28th May, 1583 Newberry wrote from Tripoli to Richard Hakluyt describing the various stages of the long journey: "we remained upon our coast until the 11 day of March, and that day we set sail from Falmouth, and never ankered till we arrived in the road of Tripoli Syria, which was the last day of April last past, where wee stayed 14 days...

Since my comming to Triopli I have made very earnest inquire both there and here, for the books of Cosmographie of Abilfada Ismail, but by no means can here of it'.

English traders apparently prospered in the Levant. In 1580 the Levant Company was officially established with its headquarters in Constantinople and a main centre in Aleppo. Two Consuls were appointed in Arab lands; Harvey Millers in "Cayro, Alexandria, Egypt and other parts adjacent' and Richard Forester in Aleppo, Damascus, Amman, Tripoli and Jerusalem, with his head-quarters in Tripoli. Two years later (1585) John Tipton was appointed Consul in Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli (Lybia). Although a Company Consul was appointed in Egypt, trade within the country was "neither very prosperous nor very popular". John Sanderson, who had investigated the possibilities of trade with Egypt in various markets, reported back discouragingly of little chance of commerce due to the low prices of English wool and high prices of spices. It was not until very much latter, in the nineteenth century, that English trade flourished in Egypt.

In the sixteenth century trade began to acquire an increasingly special importance in England. In the first half of the century there were only two trading companies in England. In the second half of the same century the number increased to six. Each company traded with one area and merchants who wanted to trade in more areas were obliged to join several companies. The sixteenth century merchants were primarily motivated by self-interest. They believed in all sincerity that commerce was in the best interest of the country and thus began to promote it to the public as the life-blood of the nation". Dudley North, a Levant merchant, wrote: "wherever the traders thrive the public of whcih they are part thrives also". The Elizabethan merchants acquired prestige and power. Many were knighted, others became Lord Mayors and financial advisors to the Crown. "Trade is now become the Lady, which in this present age is more courted and celebrated than in any former", said the ever-astute Roger Coke. With this vital importance attached to trade, the news and views of English traders operating overseas became of great interest in England.

From the original explorers and encouraged by merchant journeys, a new spirit for travel emerged in England. Veryard wrote about "an insatiable desire for liberty, of giving (men's) thoughts a larger field to expatiate in and an occasion of actually viewing and contemplating such things in the original as they had often admired in the bare copy". A Flecker's Court poet sang as he set out from Baghdad for Samakand "for lust of knowing what should not be known". However, those who travelled reported of superficial and strange expericnces. Those were ridiculed and condemned by Samuel Purchas as returning home with "a few smattiering terms, flattering garbes, apish eringes, foppish fancies, foolish guises and disguises, the vanities of neighbour nations... without furthering of their konwledge of God, the world or themselves".

Lady Mary Montagu remarked about English merchants in the Near East, and said that the area was "seldom visited but by merchants, who mind little but their

own affairs, or travellers who make too short a stay to be able to report anything exactly of their own knowledge; and she added, "they can give no better idea of the ways here than a French refugee, lodging in a garret in Greek Street, could write of the Court of England".

It was from the accounts of such travellers who lacked knowledge of the Arabic language and did not have a vague notion of the people and their customs that many ideas about Arabs began to reach England. Daniel suggests that most writers in that period "depended largely on the myths of their own creating."

At the end of the sixteenth century new ideas began to appear in the accounts of English merchants. Ralph Fitch and John Eldred who left Aleppo, where they found "good company", "camels" with a "carovan" (caravan) to the River Euphrates. Eldred describes the city of Hammah as "fallen and falleth more and more of decay." He spoke of Turk who had earlier stormed the city and were desirable to let the town remain in ruins. "(The Turk) hath written in the Arabian tongue over the castle gate, which standeth in the midst of the Towne, these words: Cursed be the father and the sonne that shall lay their hands to the repairing hereof". However, Eldred was impressed with Aleppo, "greatest place of traffique". On the journey down the Euphrates Eldred came across "troops" of "Arabians on the river banks of whom "we bought milk, butter, eggs and lambs and gave them in barter (for they care not for money) glasses, combes, corall, amber, to hang about their armes and necks". He remarked that their hair, clothing and colour resembled 'those vagabond Egyptians which heretofor have gone about in England.'

Eldred described Arab women as heavily jewelled: "all without exception weare a great round ring in one of their nostrels, of gold, silver, or jorn, according to their ability, and about their armes and smalles of their legs they have loops of golde, silver or jorn." Arab women, children and men were said to be "great swimmers", but Eldred goes on to say that these people are verey "theevish" and relates how the Arabs stole his casket... with things of good value from under the head of one of his sleeping men. He concludes by warning travellers to take heed while passing down the Euphrates. The theme of thieving also appears in Ralph Fitch's account of the river journey: "For the Arabians that bee theeves, will come swimming and steel your goods and flee away.. you should have much a doe to save your goods from the Arabians which be always there about robbing." Those Arabs were said to be terrified of guns, "a gunne is very good, for they doe feare it very much." Fitch also spoke of customs that travellers had to pay to the sonnes of Aborise, which is Lord of the Arabians." It should be remembered that the European traders, such as the Venetians and the Genoese, were established long before the advent of the English merchants. Some of the accounts of the European merchants were translated into English and, according to William Lithgow, the Venetian travellers circulated many stories warning travellers of the dangers of the "Wilde Arabs".

Fitch's account of the Arabs down the Euphrates was almost identical (with minor alterations of merely a few words) to that of a Venetian merchant, one Caeser Fredericke, who had reported of them about twenty years earlier. Whether Fitch did actually experience first hand what he narrated or whether it is a secondhand report, is not crucial to this study. The important fact is that Arabs at the end of sixteenth century were portrayed in travellers' accounts as a hostile and dangerous element and part of the harsh and unfriendly environment surrounding travellers in those areas.

In the seventeenth century information about Arabs continued to emanate from two sources; from scholars and travellers, many of the earlier pre-conceptions of the Arabs survived and developed and new themes evolved throughout the century.

At the time when unfavourable information about the Arabs was reaching England from English merchants, scholars were engaged in unravelling the wealth of Arabic thought and its contribution to knowledge. Men such ad William Bedwell, Edmund Castell, John Greaves and Edward Pococke were among the scholars who established Arabic studies in the two great Universities of England. Bedwell became known as the "father of Arabic studies" in England. He emphasized the value of Arabic as the only language of religion and the "chief language of diplomacy and business from the Fortunate Isles and the China Seas". His chief work is an Arabic Lexicon **"The Arabian Trudgman"**, in which he explained Arabic terms used by Eurpean writers and travellers. The primary motive of early English scholars in studying Arabic was biblical research. Bedwell knew Arabic and was in general favourably disposed to the Arabs. However, this did not immediatly lead him to an understanding of the people, their religion and society. His missionary involvements as a Christian led him to the general biased attitude towards Islam, thus referring to Muhammad as 'the name of that famous imposter and seducer of the Arabians or Saracens... and inventor of the Alkoran and laws of that superstitious fection". Apart from studying the Arabic language for religious motives, Arabic texts were beginning to be translated in this century. Among the works of Edmund Castell (1606-85) the first Cambridge Professor of Arabic, was a translation of original Arabic poems, which he dedicated to King Charles II.

Castell's work also included a dictionary of the Semitic languages considered then to be of great importance and a long essay on the value of Arabic studies. John Greaves, an English mathematician, travelled extensively in the area, especially Egypt and acquired a large collection of Arabic manuscripts, coins and gems. Greaves also spent some time in 1638 measuring the Pyramids. However, his careful mathematical and astronomical computations failed to solve the puzzle of the Pyramids. But the 'greatest' of the seventeenth century scholars was Edward Pococke (1604-1691). Pococke, a missionary, worked as a chaplain with the Levant Company. He travelled extensively in the area and lived in Aleppo for five years. He made many Arab friends, and especially important was his friendship with Shaykh

Fath Allah, a Syrian who remained his life long friend. On his return to England Pococke was appointed Professor of Arabic at Oxford.

It is said that while at Oxford he spent much of his time under the shade of a fig tree which he had brought back with him from Syria. Pococke's work greatly enhanced Arabic studies in England and Europe. Pococke produced many important works; among these were: **Specimen of the History of the Arabs,** which was printed in Oxford in 1649. In it he made a detailed study on various aspects of Arab culture and history; **Lamiyat al-Ajam,** a study of the classical poem of **Tughrā'i** and **Al-Mukhtasar fi-d-Duwal,** a history of Abu'l-Faraj. Pococke left behind a very impressive list of works, which were later deposited in the Bodleian Library in Oxford. One of his sons, Edward Pococke (1648-1727), followed in his father's footsteps and became interested in Arabic studies.

The number of English scholars specialising in Arabic studies increased in the seventeenth century, as did the merchants and travellers who dispatched information about the area and its peoples. Travellers' accounts became popular in England, especially those dealing with the "Islamic World". Daniel remarks "there was a large public for accounts of Islamic World. Proportionately to the books in circulation there must have been more travellers' tales even than today." William Lithgow, an English tourist, travelled around the area in the first part of the seventeenth century. In his **Peregrination,** he makes allusion to the "wilde and savage Arabs', on his journeys in the Near East. Lithgow tells us that he was warned about Arabs by the Venetian Consul in Aleppo, who had told him of reports they had received to the effect that "Arabs lay for them in the desarts". From then on the "incrusive" and "blood thirsty" Arab was portrayed as lurking in the "bush" waiting to rob and plunder. To Lithgow, the Arabs were part of a hostile environment which menaced and threatened the traveller: "every one of these (Arab) savages, according to his power, dealt with men uncivilly and cruelly, even like a wilderness full of wilde beasts, living all upon rapine and robbery wanting all sense of humanity', he wrote.

Lithgow's account of the Arabs is reminiscent of what the first American settlers reported of the Red Indians. In one story the Arabs were said to use "bows and arrows" against their. The story in Lithgow's words was as follows:

"Scarcely were wee well advanced in our way, till wee were beset with more than three hundred Arabs, who sent us from shrubby heights an unexpected shower of arrowss" he wrote, and when the sodiers accompanying the group fired their guns, the Arabs scampered to safety, "For when any of them hear the shot of a Harquebuse, they presently turne backe with such speed, as if the fiends of the infernall Court were broken loose at their heeles".

Lithgow distrusted Turks, Moors and Arabs because they were infidels who hated Christians. Therefore he hired a Christian guide on a journey to 'Lidda' because the way being difficult, "roky, and hard to knowe and perilous Arabs". However, to

his disappointment and amazement, the Christian guide turned out to be in collusion with the Arabs; he "had sent a privie messenger before us, to warn three hundred Arabs... to meet him at such place as he had appointed, giving them to know, wee were rich and well provided." Lithgow warns all travellers who journeyed to that part of the world to refrain from "whoredome, drunkeness, and too much familiarity with strangers", he wrote, for it is "impossible he can return in safety from danger of Turkes, Arabs, Moores, wilde beasts and... the exremities of heat, hunger, thirst and cold."

Lithgow classified the "infidels" into two groups: the tolerable and intolerable. Turks and Moors seem to fit in the first category; the Arabs in the second: "The Arabians are for the most part theeves and robbers; the Moors cruell and uncivill.. the Turkes are ill best of all the three, yet all sworne enemies of Christ. The Arabs were said to hate all strangers. They were seen as a "wilde" unmanageable group who even "annoyed the Turkes". In his own words Lithgow describes the Arabs as people who "cannot be possibly brought to a quiet and well formed manner of living but are continuall spoilers of these parts of Turkes Dominions."

Lithgow's travel narratives evoked interest and admiration: one such admirer introducing one of his early travel accounts, marvels at his adventures:

> Thou durst go like no man else that lives;
> By sea and land alone in cold and raine,
> Through Bandits, Pirates, and Arabian Theeves.

The felonious and evil nature of Arabs became a pronounced theme in the accounts of early English travellers.

In the same year in which Lithgow journeyed to the Levant (1610), another Englishman, George Sandys, made a similar journey to the area, visiting Egypt and Palestine. In his **Relation of a Journey,** Sandys described the Arabs as the inhabitants of deserts who dwell in tents. "They dwell in tents, which they move like walking cities, for opportunities of pery, and benefit of pasturage". He follows Mandeville in pointing out that they are "independent" and proud people. The concept of "Nation" is first and significantly introduced in Sandys' accounts, who thus perceives them as a separate entity from the rest of the subjects of the Ottoman Empire. Another quality which appears in Sandys' description is worth noting and that is of "Nobilitie". Although he himself did not describe them as noble, he infers that because this "Nation from the beginning unmixed with others', therefore they boast of "their Nobilitie", as if Sandys, wanted to imply that their sense of nobility emanated from their pure stock. Nonetheless, Sandys, in keeping with the tradition of early accounts, portrays them as robbers and "of meane stature", and describes them as "rawboned" and "tawnie" having "feminine voyces" and creep behind you ere aware of them'. Sandys concludes "Their Religion Mahonetanisme, glorying in that the Imposter was their countriman; their language as farre as that Religion extendeth."

Sandys spoke of the Arabs as "merchants" selling camels and horses in the desert. "It seemeth strange to mee, how these merchants can get by their wares so far fetcht." Nonetheless, Sandys had something good to say about Arabs, "If one of these Arabians undertake your conduct hee will performe it faithfully: neither will any of the nation molest you", he wrote; 'They will lead you by unknowne neererways; and farther in four dayes, than you can travell by caravan in fourteen."

Sandys describes the camel as "a creature created for burthen.. a beast gentle and tractable, but in the time of his venery: then, as if remembering his former hard usage, he will bite his keeper, throw him downe and kick him forty dayes continuing in that fury, and then returning to his former meekness." He calls the camel a "ship" and the deserts "sea"; 'These (camels) are the ships of Arabia, their seas are the desarts.' Sandys makes a distinction between Arabia 'Felix' and Arabia 'desart'. Arabia, he wrote, is 'a barren and desolate country being neither grasse nor trees, save only here and there a few palmes which will not forsake those forsaken places."

Henry Blount, who was celebrated in a poem as
'Mongst a lawless straggling crew
Made up of Arab, Saracen and Jew...'

toured the Levant, especially Egypt. In his **Voyage into the Levant** (1638), he reports his experiences and makes allusions to the 'wild' Arabs. On a journey down the River Nile, Blount describes the Turkish houses on the river banks and compares them to the "Arabish" and "Egyptians". These houses, he wrote, 'which if Turkish they were high built, of bricke or other firme stone, but if Arabish or Egyptian, the houses were most of mud, just in forme of Bee-hives". At the end of the boat journey he saw 'six of the wild Arabs, five on horse-backe, one a foot, each with a launce, which they can use in hand'. The Arabs ran away after the boatmen fired gun shots.

Blount spoke of the city of Cairo as being guarded by "eight and twenty thousand men", against the "sudden incrusions of Arabs" who came from the wilderness.

Blount's apparent hatred of Arabs and 'Egyptians' is in juxtaposition to his appreciation of the Turks. At one point, he glowingly describes the "civilitie" and sweetness of Turkish sailors in the following terms:

> The strongest thing I found among the (Turks) was their incredible civilitie; I who had often proved the Barbarisme of other nations... and above all others, of our owne, supposed my selfe amongst Bears, till by experience, I found the contrary; and that only in ordinary civilitie, but with so ready service, such patience, so sweet and gentle a way..."

His praise of the Turks went further than that: "He who would behold these times seen then in Turkey", he wrote and went on to say that the Turks" are the only modern people, great in action... whose Empire both so suddenly invaded the world

and fixt itselfe such firm foundations as no other ever did''. Against this testimony of the greatness of the Ottoman Empire, Blount tells us that the Turks have to rule the Arabs and the inhabitants of Egypt with an iron fist because the Turks know ''them to be malicious, trecherous and effeminate''. He them proceeds to justify the many tortures the Turks practiced against them because it was not possible to rule them by a ''sweet hand''. Blount mentions several methods of torture used by the Turks, ''impaling, gaunching, flayed alive, cutting off the waist, hanging by the foot, planting in burning lime and the like''. He then, almost with glee, speaks of two torturing sessions which he witnessed. The first was of a man accused of burning his neighbour's house. 'He was first flayed alive, with such art, as he was more than three hours a dying; then was his skinne stuffed wiht chaffe, and borne stradling upon an ass up and downe the Towne.'' The second incident involved ''three Arabs'', who had robbed in the wilderness; they were taken and executed in the following manner: ''They were laid naked upon the ground, their face downeward their hands and legs tyed abroad to stakes'', he wrote, and proceeded to describe the grotesque manner in which they were executed: ''then came the Hangman, who putting their owne half pikes in at the fundament did with a beetle, drive them up leisurely, till they came out at the head, or shoulder. ''Two of the men died suddenly, the third took some longer until his brains were 'dasht out'. Blount remarks that the Turks have committed such atrocities to ''breake the spirits of this people''.

Sandys, Lithgow and Blount were among the many English travellers who reported on Arabs and Arab lands in the seventeenth century. Take for example, Fynes Moryson, who had travelled with his brother, Henry Moryson (who died later of a nose bleed) by sea to Palestine and who portrays Arabs as ''robbers'' and sinister. In his **Itinerary,** published in 1617, he makes a reference to a journey he wanted to take to the Jordan Valley, but was discouraged because of fear of ''Arabians and Moores''.

Henry Mundrell, in the latter part of the century, describes the Jordan Valley as ''a most miserable dry barren place it is... consisting of high rocky mountains, so torn and disordered as if the earth here had suffered some great convulsion, in which its bounds had been turned outwards.'' Of the Arabs, who lurked in caves in mountains, Mundrell wrote 'In most of these grots we found certain Arabs quartered with five Arabs who obstructed our ascent, demanding two hundred dollars for leave to go up the mountain.''

In the latter part of the seventeenth century two themes of the image of Arabs became particularly popular in England, namely piracy and slavery. Piracy, as mentiored earlier in this chapter, was a major headache to the English merchants. Slavery was related to it, since pirates captured Christian travellers and took them to the Barbary Coast on the promise of freedom for ransom.

The Englishman who contributed most to the popularisation of both themes of slavery and piracy was Joseph Pitts. Pitts, an Exeter boy, is claimed to have been

captured by Algerian pirates in 1678 when he was fifteen years of age. It is also said that the boy was sold as a slave twice over and ended up in Tunis. Whilst there the English Consul and two other merchants were said to have tried to free him, but these efforts failed because 'the price demanded proved too high'. Eventually, the story claims, the boy was taken back to Algiers where his master determined to force him to become a Muslim. English accounts describe the boy's dilemma: 'For a considerable period Pitts withstood manfully blows, hard fare, and other cruelties; but at last, utterly exhausted and hopeless, he gave way and pronounced the required formula, although with a troubled conscience.'' Pitts' eventual escape and experience ''excited much interest''. The accounts of Pitts' experiences were published in his **Faithful Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mahometans, with an Account of the Author's having been taken by his Master on the Pilgrimage to Mecca.** This work 'attracted considerable attention', for several reasons. The first being that Pitts was the first Englishman (with possible exception of an unknown renegade) to enter Arabia, and secondly, because he was a Christian slave in the Barbary States. Pitts in his book describes the Haj and speaks of the people of Arab lands. In his narrative he describes the Algerian slave traders as 'extremely addicted to cozening and cheating'. Of his capture and later beatings he wrote ''I being then but young'' could no longer endure the tortures inflicted upon him and 'turned' Moslem, 'God be merciful to me a sinner' he added. Whilst on a pilgrimage to Mecca Pitts described the desert 'caravan', the sea trip and an encounter with a ship laden with slaves and then once in Alexandria, a city which was 'a very famous city in former times' and now lies in 'ruins'. He was impressed with the Nile, but stated that it was infested with 'robbers' who 'rob in boats'. The inhabitants of Egypt are a 'mixture of Moors, Turks, Jews, Greeks and Copties'. All wear turbans, 'the Moors turbans being all white and the Copties white striped with blue'. However, all speak one language. He noted that Egypt has an abundance of 'East India commodities, as silks, muslins, callicoes, spices, coffee, etc, and also of milk, butter, cheese, oil, olives, etc.'' Egypt, Pitts claimed, is full of whores, ''There is no part of the world, I am apt to think, greater encouragement given to whoredom then in Egypt'', he wrote; these whores are ''very rich'' and ''use to sit at the door, or walk in the streets unveiled.''

In his accounts of the people of the area he travelled in, Pitts generalises that homosexuality is widely practiced 'Tis common for men there to fall in love with boys as tis in England to be in love with women', he wrote.

Pitts proceeds to speak about the city life of 'Grand Cairo, a place eminent in history'. He paints a picture of many Mosques with wells in them. ''If I mistake not, it is reported that in this city there are five or six thousand public and private Mosques' he declared.

He also spoke of Christian slaves in a slave market 'held twice a week for the selling of Christian slaves'. Pitts portrays a pitiful picture of these slaves:

"The boys, whose heads are shaved, when they stand in the market have a lock of hair, one part under their caps, the other hanging down their cheeks, to signify they are newly taken and are yet Christians", he wrote,Then he described Christian women slaves as being inspected and fondled by buyers:

'and altho' the women and maidens are veile'd, yet the chapmen have liberty to view their faces and to put their fingers into their teeth, and also to feel their breasts. Nay, further, as I have been informed, they are sometimes permitted by the sellers in a modest way to be searched whether they are virgins or no".

Pitts tells us that there are no Turks in Cairo except soldiers. The people of Cairo are "very rugged and much given to passion. They'll scold like whores, but seldom care to fight." The people are also described as 'robbers' addicted to cozening and cheating' and hate strangers. The city of Cairo is full with 'multitude' of beggars, especially Thursday evenings, 'the evening before the Sabbath'. Well-to-do people in Cairo keep "eunuchs" in their houses to guard their wives. Pitts then proceeds to describe the Holy City of Mecca and the Haj. The inhabitants of Arabia he described as a "poor sort of people, very thin, lean and swarthy". He spoke of "dervishes who constantly travel with a "sheep or goatskin on their back and lie on and a long staff in their hand." There are also the "effendies" who are Masters of learning, who daily expound out the Alcoran, sitting in high chairs."

Pitt describes travel in the deserts in "caravans":

'They travel four camels in a breast which are all tied one after the other, like as in teams. The whole body is called a caravan; which is divided into several cottors, or companies, each of which hath its name and consists (it may be) of several thousand camels; and they move one cottor after another, like distinct troops."

Pitts, whilst travelling back through the desert, does not overlook the lurking Arab thieves. In this journey many times the skulking, thievish Arabs do much mischief", he wrote.

Pitts' accounts of his experiences became popular in England at the beginning of the eighteenth century. His reference to Arabs was not always clear. At times Pitts would call them Algerians, Moors, Arabs and at other times he would refer to them as Egyptians and Turks. In general Pitts portrayed the Arabs as pirates, slavers, beggars, homosexuals and robbers. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the reports of the English merchants and travellers did not concern themselves with making a clear distinction between Arabs and Turks. In addition, Arabs were also rererred to as Saracens, Moors and Mamelukes: all these were described as "dark", 'tawny', 'black' and of "swarthy complexion". In general, however, the term Arab was used to refer to the desert Arabs (Bedouins); Saracens were the city Arabs who lived in Syria and Palestine; Moors, the Arab inhabitants of North

Africa and Mamelukes were generally the Arabs of Egypt. In these two centuries the Arabs of the desert were portrayed as a separate entity, as Sandys called them, a "Nation". They were described as 'wild' incursive, 'blood thirsty' and 'savage'. Their main occupation was said to be thievery and looting. This group was perceived as a dangerous element that threatened the safety of travellers and the "stability' of the Ottoman Empire. The Saracens were described as "cruel" enemies of Christians, those who fought the Crusasers and later added to the sufferings of Christian pilgrims. It has been noted that in Elizabethan England there were (and still are) many inns called the 'Saracen's Head", with the head pictured as "grotesque in features and of a red or garish colour". Joseph Hall wrote:

'His angry eyes look all so glaring bright .. like a painted staring Saracen'.

Moors were generally spoken of as the pirates in the Barbary States. They were portrayed primarily as the 'cruel' slavers of Christians, 'that fiend, that damn'd Moor, that devil, that Lucifer", were the descriptions of Eleazar, a character in **All's Lost by Lust.**

Samuel Chew, describing the image of Moors during the Renaissance in England wrote:

> 'From Spanish hatred of the Moors, reinforced by the general Christian hatred of Mohammedans and by experiences of practical depredations, came the Elizabethan emphasis upon the cruelty of these people and upon their blackness.'

The Mamelukes were generally portrayed as residing in Egypt and possessing the same qualities as Arabs, Saracens and Moors.

Arab lands also began to acquire certain reputation in the works of the sixteenth and seventeenth century travellers and some writers who had never left England. Arabia, Syria, Egypt, Palestine and North africa were often mentioned and became stereotyped.

Arabia was often spoken of as being divided into two parts; Arabia 'Deserta' and Arabia 'Felix'. Arabia the desert was described as 'barren' and 'rocky'. Sandys and Lithgow charcterised it as a 'forsaken' place. Spenser, the Elizabethan poet, wrote:-

> 'A silly man, in simple weeds forworne,
> And solid with dust the long dried way;
> His sandles were with toilsome travell torne,
> And face all tand with scorching sunny ray,
> As he had traveiled many a sommers day,
> Through boyling sands of Arabia and Ynde.'

Arabia 'Felix' on the other hand was watered and fertile; it was associated with wealth and luxury. This land evoked a colourful aura of sweetness, perfume and 'sabaean spices'. Marlow Barabas in the glow of Malta says:

'Well fare the Arabians who so richly pay
The thing they traffic for with wedge of gold!'

Fletcher exclaims:-

'The sweetness of the Arabian wind, still blowing upon the treasures of perfume and spices.'

Then comes the well-known passage in Milton's **Paradise Lost:-**

'off as sea North-East winds bolw
Sabaean odours from the spicy shore
Of Araby the Blest; with such delay
Well pleas'd they slack their course
and many a league Cheer'd
With the frateful small old Ocean
smiles.''

The 'robbers' of Arabia, Damascus, Egypt and the Arab lands were brought together in an English play in 1639. The play was called **The Phoenix in Her Flames,** by William Lower, and is a tragedy. The plot is thought to have been derived from the works of Heliodorus. The work involves an Egyptian Princess and a Prince of Damascus. Both were captured by 'Arab robbers' in the desert; the Princess whilst on her way to marry a Persian Prince and the Prince having fled his country in the face of an invasion by the Tartars. An Arab desert outlaw falls in love with the Princess, but is killed by the Prince of Damascus. The grateful Princess falls in love with him, but he does not love her. When the Prince of Persia hears that the 'Marauding Arabs' have taken his bride-to-be as prisoner, he invades them with his followers. This territorial incursion surpirses the King of Arabia who is unaware of the happenings. The Prince of Damascus, who had won the confidence of the Arab tribes in the deserts, fights against the Persians and brings their Prince as a prisoner to the King of the Arabs. Both the Prince of Damascus and the Prince of Persia fall in love with the daughter of the Arab King, Phaenicia. Later both are urged to a duel in which the Prince of Damascus kills the Prince of Persia, but is slain by the treachery of a Persian Duke. In grief for the Prince of Damascus, Phaenicia kills herself in ''clouds of incense'', while the Egyptian Princess returns sadly home, having lost both her faithless betrothed and her rescuer.

Egypt was portrayed as a land of mystery. The country evoked to the Elizabethans associations with the River Nile and the Pyramids. The Nile attracted the curiosity of many; its rise and fall, its source and the fertility of the river valley. The construction and descriptions of the Pyramids fascinated English mystical and mathematical thought. Egypt was also associated in Elizabethan literature with the captivity of the Israelites and with the plagues inflicted upon Egyptians. Cairo was perceived as a city of Mosques with slave markets, beggars and whores and 'multitudes' of people. Lithgow described it as 'this incorporate world... the most

admirable and greatest city seene upon the earth', where 'all sorts of Christians' and 'infinite number of infidels' meet. Syria with Damascus and Aleppo, were a haven for English travellers. The land was known as a "Garden of God" and, as Lithgow put it, "Earthly Paradis". There were also the biblical association revoloving around Saint Paul's journey in the city of Damascus. Also there was the ancient legend that Adam was created near that city and that Cain slew Abel at Damascus.

This be Damascus, be thou cursed Caine,
To slay thy brother Abel, if thou wilt.

Palestine, the Holy Land, naturally captured the imagination of many writers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Biblical associations with the 'Holy Family', the cities of Jerusalem and Bethlehem, the Jordan Valley and River Jordan, were described in detail and allusions were often made to the 'infidels' who controlled them and the dangers of Arab robbers who threatened travellers. The Sinai Desert was often described as infested with Arab 'robbers' and pointed out to be a dangerous crossing.

Algeria, Tunis and Lybia, the 'Barbary States', were primarily associated with piracy and slavery. The "pirates of Algiers" according to Frances Knight was a "Cite fatal to all Christians and the butchery of all mankind".

EPIGRAPHIE FUNERAIRE SYRIENNE

Solange Ory

C'est le bilan partiel des travaux que j'ai faits ce dernières années sur les cimetières syriens que je voudrais exposer ici pour montrer l'intérêt qu'offrent les recherches épigraphiques dans un domaine qui n'a été exploité que très partiellement.

J'ai étudié , jusqu'à présent, trois groupes de cimetières syriens: l'un dans une grande ville—celui d'al-Bāb al-Saghīr à Damas, le plus vaste et un des plus anciens cimetières de la capitale. ceux d'une petite ville du Sud, Bosrā sur les confins de la frontière syro-jordanienne et ceux d'un site archéologique de l'Eupharte—Bālis-Meskené, situé entre Alep et Rakka.

J'ai fait un inventaire systématique des stèles anciennes (jusqu'à l'époque ottomane) encore in situ dans les cimetières de Damas et de Busrā et de celles qui sont conservées dans les Musées de ces villes. Les cimetières de Bālis-Meskené ont fait l'objet de fouilles dans le cadre des campagnes archéologiques destinées à dégager les monuments et les principaux quartiers de cette ville médiévale. L'apport de ces travaux concerne différents domaines:

- celui de la typologie des tombes et des modes d'inhumation.
- celui de la connaissane de l'histoire locale à travers les recherches sur les personnages titulaires des épitaphes.
- celui du formulaire et de la langue de ces épitaphes.
- celui de l'onomastique.
- et enfin celui de l'étude de l'évolution de l'écriture et du décor qui l'accompagne.

J'ai recensé 85 stèles dans le cimetière damascain d'al-Bāb al-Saghīr. Celles-ci s'étalent chronologiquement entre le 5è/ 11è et le 10è/ 16è s. 52 sont datées. Les 33 autres peuvent l'être par approximation.

Dans les cimetières de Busrā j'ai recensé 60 stèles appartenant aux périodes umayyade, abbaside, saldjūkide et ayyūbide. 30 sont dtées; les 30 autres peuvent également l'être par approximation.

Les cimetières de Bālis-Meskené ne nous ont offert que de très nombreux fragments de stèles, datant probablement des époques hamdanide et saldjūkide, remployés dans des tombes plus tardives que nous pouvons attribuer, par hypothèse, à l'époque ayyūbide. Aucun de ces fragments n'est daté.

I) Typologie des tombes et des modes d'inhumation

Nous considèrerons à la fois le matériau utilisé et les différentes formes de tombes.

Le choix du matériau dépend naturellement des possibilités offertes par la région: à Damas, le matériau le plus courant est le calcaire: calcaire blanc, jaunâtre ou rosé dit mezzāwī parce qu'il provient des carrières de Mezzé. On trouve également quelques stèles en marbre, mais très rarement. Ce matériau sera surtout employé à partir de l'époque ottomane. A Bosrā, à quelques exceptions près, C'est le basalte qui est utilisé, et à Bālis-Meskené, c'est un calcaire très friable, provenant des collines qui surplombent la vallée de l'Euphrate.

L'évolution des formes des tombes et des stèles semble être dépendante des changements de dynasties qui provoquent la création de nouveaux usages. Il faut noter toutefois une coexistence entre les formes anciennes et les nouvelles, les habitudes acquises nécessitant toujours un certain temps pour céder le pas aux usages nouveaux. Ceci est nettement perceptible à Damas, où nous pouvons distinguer deux grandes classifications:

- les cénotaphes.
- et les tombes à dos d'âne, flanquées de deux stèles à leurs extrémités.

Les 7 cénotaphes du cimetière d'al-Bāb al-Saghīr qui ont subsisté jusqu'à nous, appartiennent tous au 5è et 6è/ 11è-12è donc aux époques fātimide et saldjūkide. Ils sont en pierre ou en bois, soit de forme parallélipipédique, soit composés d'un ou deux prismes à section triangulaire reposant sur un socle, plus ou moins élevé en forme de parallélépipède. Ces cénotaphes sont situés dans les petits mausolées du cimetière ou dans des enclos délimités par des murs peu élevés.

Au 5è-6è/ 11è-12ès, toujours à Damas, les stèles qui délimitent les côtés est et ouest des tombes à dos d'âne, offrent une forme rectangulaire, bordée d'un encadrement vigoureusement bisseauté. Une seule est oblongue et délimitée par des moulures plates. Enfin une autre offre une ogive inscrite dans un rectangle.

A la fin du 6è/ 12è s. apparaissent les stèles rectangulaires à tête circulaire et les stèles de forme ogivale, encadrées soit par un simple listel, soit par un bandeau épigraphique ogival. Ce type de stèle persiste jusqu'au 9è/15è s., mais au 8é /14è apparaît un nouveau type de tombe, très caractéristique de la période mamelouke. Il s'agit, soit d'une tombe à dos d'âne ou d'une tombe à caissons dont les stèles sont composées d'une dalle oblongue verticale, surmonteé d'une petite stèle ogivale, flanqueé de 2 colonnettes ornées chacune d'une sphère ou d'un bobèche prismatique. Au 8è/14è s. nous trouvons également une stèle en forme de colonne à calotte sphérique.

A Bosrā, la forme des tombes est extrêmement simple. Celles-ci sont généralement constituées du hauts caissons sans couvercle composés de blocs de basalte et

parfois même de stèles de remploi placées horizontalement, les côtés est et ouest du caisson sont formés par deux stèles dressées verticalement. Ces dernieres sont de forme carrée ou rectangulaire lorsqu'elles appartiennent à des époques anciennes (umayyade, abbāsside et saldjūkide). Au 6è/12è 'la partie supérieure s'enrichit d'un arrondi. Deux stèles seulement offrent une forme ogivale.

A Balis-Meskené, aucune tombe n'était visible en surface. 50m carrés de 3 x 3 m ont été implantés à l'emplacement présumé des cimetières et leur fouille a fait apparaître des tombes faites avec des matériaux de remploi. Celles-ci étaient composées de caissons de briques cuites au milieu desquelles s'inséraient des fragments de stèle épigraphique et des fragments de décor. Ces caissons délimitaient un dallage composé des mêmes élément. Aucune stèle n'était dressée aux extrémités des caissons, ce qui malheureusement, nous prive du nom du défunt et de la date de son décès. Les fouilles effectuées sous ce dallage ont fait apparaître les fosses d'inhumation correspondant à ces tombes, et, sous ces dernières des fosses plus anciennes, mais aucune tombe en place qui aurait été constituée par des stèles originelles.

Ces fouilles ont eu l'intérêt de nous permettre d'établir une typologie des différents modes d'inhumation, ce qu'il nous a été impossible de faire pour les cimetières de Damas et de Boṣrā, ceux-ci étant actuellement en service. L'intérêt de cette typologie sera, entre autres, de nous fournir des indications susceptibles de nous aider dans l'avenir à dater les tombes de ces cimetières.

Nous avons, en gros, deux modes principaux d'inhumation:

- le premier est une simple fosse, sans aucune construction au fond de laquelle le défunt est déposé,
- le second est une fosse construite, soit en pierres, soit en briques d'argile crue (leben), soit en briques cuites liaisonnées par un mortier. Le fond de ces fosses est souvent tapissé d'un mortier composé d'agrile et de paille, sur lequel le défunt est déposé.

Le premier type peut se différencier en différents groupes, selon les modes de signalisation de la tombe en surface ou par l'absence de cette signalisation. Nous distinguons donc:

1) aucun vestige de signalisation en surface.
2) une ou plusieurs briques de leben posées de champ ou en
3) bâtière.
4) des briques cuites posées en bâtière.
5) une murette de briques cuites disposées verticalement en suivant le grand axe de la tombe.
6) des stèles en pierre brute posées verticalement.
7) dis stèles taillées, anépigraphes, ou des fragments de stèles épigraphiques ou des fragments de décor, posés en bâtière.
8) un dallage de briques cuites ou de stèles de remploi délimité par un caisson. Parfois un autre dallage joint les tombes voisines.

Le second type se différencie à la fois par les techniques de construction des fosses et la signalisation en surface:

1) Les parois de la fosse sont tapissées de blocs de pierre brut (calcaire) qui forment une sorte de voûte au-dessus du corps du défunt. Il n'y a parfois aucune signalisation au-dessu de cette tombe. Lorsqu'elle existe, elle consiste soit en stèles de calcaire brut, soit en fragments de stèles remployés posées verticalement ou horizontalement comme une dalle.

2) Les parois de la fosse sont composées de pierres sèches disposées en assises horizontales, sans mortier, recouvertes de gros blocs de calcaire brut, disposés en ancorbellement. Pas de vestige de signalisation en surface

3) Les parois de la fosse sont construites en briques de leben soit disposées les unes au-dessus des autres en assises horizontales, soit posées de champ. Il n'y a pas de signalisation en surface, mais les modes de couverture des fosses sont différents:

   a) dans le cas des briques de leben posées de champ la couverture peut être composée de blocs de calcaire brut ou d'une grande brique de leben disposée horizontalement. Le défunt repose entre 2 couches de mortier.

   b) Lorsque les briques de leben sont disposées en assises horizontales la couverture peut être constituée:
   - de blocs decalcaire posés verticalement
   - des dalles de calcaire posées horizontalement
   - des briques de leben posées en encorbellement, quelquefois munies d'une arête composée de briques de leben posées de champ. Cette sorte d'épine dorsale est limitée à ses deux extrémités par deux briques perpendiculaires.
   - des briques cuites posées en bâtière.

4) Les parois de la fosse sont construites en briques cuites disposées en assises horizontales et liées par un mortier de chaux rose. Le fond est non maçonné. La couverture est composée de grandes dalles de calcaire blanc. Plus de signalisation en surface.

Il est intéressant de noter que certaines fosses, notamment celle construite en briques cuites, renfermaient plusieurs défunts et que plusieurs fosses contenaient des débris de bois et de nombreux clous qui laissent présumer que, contrairement à l'usage musulman, des cercueils étaient parfois utilisés. Tous les squelettes trouvés étaient axés est-ouest et le crâne était orienté vers le sud, dans la direction de la Mekke.

II) L'histoire locale à travers les personnages titulaires des épitaphes.

Nous ne pouvons, dans le cadre de ce bref exposé, citer que quelques personnages, à titre d'exemples, pour montrer l'apport sur le plan de l'histoire locale qu'offrent les recherches faites pour identifier les titulaires des épitaphes.

Ainsi, à Damas, dans le cimetière d'al-Bāb al-Saghīr, nous avons identifié le Ḳāḍī Abū Bakr Muhammad b. 'Aḳīl al-Sahruzūrī dont Ibn 'Asākir nous apprend dans son manuscrit تاريخ دمشق , qu'il fut Wa'iz dans cette ville et y enseigna le hadīth. Il mourut en 453/1061. Ce personnage eut un fils célèbre, fakīh et wa'iz également qui vécut à Damas et y mourut en 494/1100.

Le Musée de Damas possède la stèle d'un autre savant en ḥadīth et en fikh de la fin du 5è/11è s. stèle qui provient du cimetière d'al-Bāb al-Saghīr. Il s'agit d'Abu' l-Fatḥ Naṣr b. Ibrāhīm b. Dāwūd al-Makdisī, qui étudia à Jérusalem, Gazza et Amida et enseigna à Tyr et à Damas où il mourut en 490/1096.

J'ai également retrouvé l'épitaphe du célèbre Sūfī et homme de lettres, Abu l-Bayān Naba B. Muḥammad al-Ḳurashī al-Sāp'i qui fonda à Damas une confrérie qui porte son nom (al-Bayāniya). Ce personnage qui porte le titre de Shaykh al-Islām, mourut en 551/1156. Une autre épitaphe m'a permis de connaître un membre de cette confrérie, Abū 'Abd Allah Muḥammad b. Ḥasan; le texte de l'épitaphe précise en effet qu'il fut le compagnon du Shaykh al-Islām Abu '1-Bayān.

L'épitaphe de 'Alī b. 'Aḳīl décédé en 601/1204-05 nous apprend qu'il était imām du mashhad Zayn al-'Ābidīn à la grande mosquée de Damas, et, de ce fait, appartenait au corps des sept imām de cette mosquée qui dirigeaient les cinq prières quotidiennes dans les sanctuaires attenant à celle-ci.

Une autre confrérie, celle des Ḳalandariya, avait son siége au cimetière d'al-Bāb al-Saghīr, au début de l'époque mamelouke. C'est selon "Ilmawi", le Shaykh Jalāl al-Darkazīnī, puis le Shaykh Muhammad al-Balkhī qui fixa le siège de la confrérie dans ce cimetière. Baybars, le fondateur de la dynastie mamelouke, avait une grande estime pour ce Ṣhaykh et fit bâtir pour lui une kubba. Il existe encore aujourd'hui une petite kubba dans la partie nord-est du cimetière qui porte le nom d'al-Qalandariya. Un linteau avec une belle inscription du nom d'

السلطان الملك الظاهر بيبرس الصالحي

surmonte la porte d'entrée. De Chaque côté de la porte on peut voir le lion du blason de Baybars.

A côté de ces personnages réputés pour leur science ou leur piété les épitaphes du cimetière d'al-Bāb al-Saghīr nous permettent également de connaître des damascaines d'un milieu plus simple, ignorés des chroniques ou mentionnés seulement en référence aux personnages importants avec lesquels ils ont été en rapport, tel, par exemple l'affranchi de 'Izz al-Dīn al-Zindjārī, ancien gouverneur du Yémen qui s'installa à Damas en 578/1174 ou Sadbak al-Ḥasaki, membre du corps des gardes d'honneur du Ḳansūh al-Muhammadi qui fut gouverneur de Damas au début du 10è/16è s. D'autres personnages obscurs ont été identifiés grâce à leur appartenance à une grande famille, tels Djalāl al-Dīn 'Umar b. Muhammad al-Barīzi et Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. al-Barīzī, apparentés à la célèbre famille des Ḳadi de Ḥamā.

En marge de ces exemples, il faut également mentionner la tombe du Calife Mu'āwiya et celle des nombreux saints personnages, members de la famille du Prophète, Sahāba et tabi'īn dont les ouvrages de Ziyārat al- Shām et de Faḍā'il al-Shām affirment, pour rehausser les mérites de la ville de Damas qu'ils sont enterrés dans le cimetière d'al-Bāb al-Saghīr. L'authenticité de la majorité de ces tombes est contestable et contestée. . Il n'en reste pas moins vrai, que ces tombes sont encore aujourd'hui l'objet de pélerinages quotidiens (cars venant du Pakistan, d'Irān, d'Irāk) et qu'ainsi, ces saints personnages appartiennent toujours à l'histoire locale.

Les épitaphes des cimetières de Buṣrā nous ont permis également de découvrir quelques personnages intéresssants: deux shaykh qui enseignèrent à la madrasa hanafite, al-Mabrak: Abu 'l- Muẓaffar b. Aḥmad al-Sidjistānī et Abū ṬṬālib b. Muhammad al-Zāhid, deux membres de la famille Gawali, dont l'un l'émir Shams al-Dīn fut probablement le demi-frère de la célèbre princesse damascaine, Zumurrud Khātūn qui épousa en premières noces le Sultān Tādj al-Mulūk Būrī b. Tugtak et en secondes noces Zauki. Citons encore le fils de l'émir Abu'l-Fawāris Buzān, personnage important à l'époque des Atābak et enfin un gouverneur de la citadelle de Boṣrā, Ḥusām al-Din Lu'lu' dont les chroniques ne nous ont pas conservé le souvenir.

III) **Onomastique**

Sur le plan de l'onomastique, les épitaphes des cimetières de Damas et de Boṣrā fournissent également un matériel intéressant: ism, kunya, nisba ethnie rares, pour lesquels nous n'avons trouvé qu'une ou deux attestations et parfois même, aucune attestation, en dépit d'un ductus clair. Citons entre des noms comme Aqqus, Han Kaldi, Naba, Sadan, Sadbak dans les épitaphes de Damas, al-Zaggaf, Gatrif, Yasi, Qalag (peut être déformation du prénom turc Qilif) Qarqar, Fulayh etc. à Boṣrā.

Il est certain qu'une étude systématique de l'onomastique des épitaphes syriennes—étude qu'il est prématuré d'entreprendre—permettrait de recenser outre ces noms rares, les noms les plus usités à telle ou telle époque, les noms étrangers d'origine turque et iranienne et contribueraient à éclairer l'importance de l'implantation des éléments étrangers dans ces villes, du mouvement des populations à ces époques, compte tenu, bien entendu, de la part du hasard qui préside au nombre des stèles qui sont parvenues jusqu'à nous.

IV) **Le formulaire**

Il est non moins intéressant d'étudier le formulaire des épitaphes: ses constantes, son évolution, sa composition, sa langue. D'après nos observations, la première remarque qui s'impose est la sobriété et disons même, la concision des épitaphes syriennes. Comparées aux épitaphes égyptiennes elles apparaissent pauvers.

A Damas, le formulaire des épitaphes se compose généralement de:

- La basmala

- un verset coranique dont le choix est assez limité et dont le thème se rapporte à la mort à la résurection, à la rétribution ou consiste dans une profession de foi. C'est alors le verset du Trône آية الكرسي qui est utilisé.
- La Shahādā est rarement citée. Elle figure dans 7 stèles sur 85.
- La désignation de la tombe. Le mot utilisé est presque toujours **kabr,** mais on trouve également **ḍarīḥ, marḳad** et **turba.** Les mots **ḍarīḥ** et **marḳad** sont généralement préférés lorsque le défunt est un personnage important ou un mystique. Le mot **turba** est usité lors que la tombe est abritée par un mausolée.
- vient ensuite le nom du défunt introduit généralement par une formule pieuse qui est souvent العبد الفقير الى رحمة الله تعالى . On trouve également des formules plus rares الشاب المنغص بشبابه ou الشاب العفيف

Le nom est précédé ou suivi de la titulature du personnage selon les cas et parfois de sa fonction.

Puis suit la date de son décès et une invocation pieuse en sa faveur.

Rarement quelques vers figurant dans l'épitaphe mais à partir du 9è/15è siècle, l'usage d'écrire des vers deviendra plus fréquent et il sera presque habituel à l'époque ottomane.

La composition du formulaire des épitaphes de Buṣraessemble à celle que nous venons d'analyser rapidement à quelques différences près. Notons en particulier une expression originale, que nous n'avons trouvée nulle part ailleurs, pour désigner la tombe. C'est le mot **bayt:** هذا بيت **ou bien** هذا بيت الحق، بيت فلان **ou encore** بيت الحق، قبر فلان Signalons également qu'aux époques les plus anciennes, le for mulaire était extrêment concis: Un '**basmala tronquée (seulement** بسم الله **sans** الرحمن الرحيم **):** هذا قبر فلان **et une invocation, généralement** رحمه الله **et pas de date.**

V) L'Etude de l'évolution de lécriture et du décor

Nous ne nous étendrons point sur cet aspect qui pourrait à lui seul faire l'objet de plusieurs communications et nous nous contenterons de donner quelques aperçus sur les éléments que peuvent fournir les différent types d'écriture des épitaphes pour l'étude de l'évolution de la graphie et du décor qui l'accompagne.

Nous ferons d'abord quelques observations sur les techniques de gravure qui présentent certaines constantes à travers les différentes époques. Deux types de gravures se rencontrent en épigraphie:

- une gravure en creux et une gravure en relief.

Dans la première, la plus simple, le lapicide dessine ses caractères et évide la partie comprise entre les traits qui délimitent les lettres.

Dans la seconde, il évide l'espace compris entre les caractères de manière que ceux-ci apparaissent en relief sur le champ excisé.

A Damas, dans le cimetière d'al-Bāb al-Saghīr, nous n'avons trouvé aucune stèle dont la gravure soit exécutée en creux. Tous les caractères sont en relief. De plus, une constante se remarque à toutes les époques: la présence d'une moulure plate—un listel—qui sépare les lignes entre elles et qui comprime l'espace danse lequel se développe normalement les appendices des caractères qui dépassent sous la ligne de base (diapo si possible). Sur 85 stèles, nous en avons trouvé seulement sept où ne figurent pas ces listels, mais leur absence ne modifie pas la disposition des appendices qui conservent les mêmes particularités que lorsque les listels existent. Ce fait explique pourquoi bon nombre de ces appendices se transforment en queues remontantes, dans les types de graphie anguleuse dite coufique, à l'epoque des Fāṭimides et des Atābak. Ce phénomène s'atténue lorsque l'écriture cursive supplante l'écriture coufique. La ligne de base de l'écriture perd alors sa rigidité horizontale et se sectionne en tronçons disposés à des niveaux différents et qui peuvent être disposés obliquement dans l'espace compris entres les deux listels qui d'elimitent la ligne d'ecriture. Ce décalage permet au lapicide d'étaler plus facilement les appendices des caractères qui ratrouvent leurs dimensions normales (diapo si possible).

Les principaux types d'écriture représentés dans les épitaphes du cimetière d'al-Bāb al-Saghir sont les suivants:

- Coufique fatimide: sur fond nu dont les lettres se caractérisent par des indentations, des hampes à courbure et à contre-courbure, et des biseaux larges ou s'épanouissant en deux petites feuilles.
- Coufique fatimide sur fond de rinceaux à simple ou double involution.
- Coufique atabaki assez similaire au coufique fatimide, mais enrichi de caractères tressés ou de terminaisons plus fleuries
- Naskhi atabaki: caractères cursifs encore dépendant des caractères anguleux et qui coexistent avec des caractères coufiques sur le même cénotaphe.
- Naskhī ayyubide: caractères cursifs dont les arrondis sont plus accusés et disposés sur une ligne de base encore proche de l'horizontale, mais qui tend à se briser.
- Naskhi mamelouk: caractères cursifs, généralement élancés, enchevêtrés, les uns dans les antres a des niveaux différents.

Ce n'est là qu'une présentation très schématique, vu l'ampleur du sujet.

A Buṣrā, l'éventail des types représentés est encore plus large, puisque ces cimetières nous offrent des stèles des périodes anciennes.

Nous avons une dizaine de stèles de l'époque umayyade où les caractéres sont extrêmement géométriques, espacés les uns par rapport aux autres et disposés sur une ligne de base dont l'horizontalité est rigoureuse.

Les épitaphes du début de l'époque abbasside offrent des caractères anguleux

assez proches de ceux de l'époque umayyade, mais beaucoup plus tassés les uns sur les autres et de proportions moins harmonieuses.

Nous retrouvons le coufique atābaki que nous avons rencontré à Damas, mais plus simplifié. Simultanément avec ce type de graphie apparaît un type mi-anguleux mi-cursif qui tout en évoluant vers les caractères ronds, conserve quelques traits archaiques.

Les types de naskhī ayyubide sont plus ou moins élancés, ,mais ne diffèrent pas des types damascains.

Aucun type de naskhmamelouk n'a été relevé dans les épitaphes de Boṣrā.

A Meskené, les nombreux fragments découverts au cours des fouilles offrent tous une graphie coufique. Leur étude n'a pas encore été entreprise mais plusieurs types se distinguent à première vue: un type fruste gravé en creux mais postérieur au début de l'époque abbaside, un type exécuté en relief, dont les caractères sont de faible hauteur et assez épais, un type caractérisé par des biseaux très allongés, ornés de figures géométriques et très dépendants des types iraniens.

Les décors qui figurent sur les épitaphes syriennes sont généralement très sobres, exception faite pour ceux des cénotaphes du 5è-6è/11è-12è s. à Damas.

Ces derniers sont de type floral, soit issus des terminaisons des caractères, soit autonomes. Dans le premier cas, ils se réduisent à de petites feuilles, fleurons ou vrilles qui naissent à la pointe des biseaux des lettres. Dans le second, ils sont composés de riches rinceaux qui tapissent la surface sur la-quelle se détachent les caractères. Sur les stèles de l'époque ayyubide apparaissent quelques motifs isolés—spirales, volutes, fleurettes, rosaces, étoiles, cercle, croissant—qui s'insèrent dans les espaces vides entre les caractères.

A l'époque mamelouke, certaines stèles offrent des éléments plus figuratifs: lampes stylisées de deux candélabres des motifs en zig zag ornent les colonnettes flanquées de part et d'autre de la stèle ogivale. Les bobéchons qui les surmontent varient de la sphère au prisme dont les arêtes sont taillées en fuseaux, ou en polygone à tête d'obus.

Ajoutons les moulures qui encadrent stèles et cénotaphes: moulures plates, biseautées, polylobées, et nous aurons une vue d'ensemble du décor qui orne les stèles du cimetirère d'al-Bāb al-Saghīr.

A Buṣrā, le décor des stèles funéraires est extrêmement réduit et fruste: quelques moulures et figures géométriques trés simples: arcs de cercle, triangles, queues d'aronde, étoile. En revanche, les fragments de stèle découverts dans les cimetières de Bālis-Meskené révèlent des décors étonnant: petites balustrades composées d'arcades surmontées de merlons et richement ornées: motifs géométriques, où domine le cercle, fleurons, cyprès...etc.

Ce ne sont que de simples aperçus qui suffisent à montrer l'intérêt qu'offre à l'épigraphiste ces épitaphes syriennes qui lui fournissent des témoignages des différents types d'écriture utilisés à toutes les époques. Pour en suivre l'écriture utilisés à toutes les époques. Pour en suivre l'évolution, celles-ci demandent des analyses minutieuses, des comparaisons avec d'autres types d'inscriptions des mêmes époques et des régions avoisinantes; nous comptons élargir nos prospections dans les cimetières syriens et espérons ainsi contribuer à une meilleure connaissance de l'histoire de ce pays dans les différents domaines que nous avons exposés.

THE ARABS ON THE FRONTIER OF SYRIA BEFORE ISLAM

F.E. Peters

Let me begin by proposing a few definintions. I am not going to deal with all the Arabs of that time and that place. Indeed, many of them are all but invisible to the historian, like those who were assimilated on an individual basis into the prevailing Greco-Roman culture of Syria or the Irano-Aramaic complex of Iraq, or like those tribes that went their nomadic ways in the sixth and seventh centuries and are known only to the Arab genealogist. Rather, I shall deal with those Arabs who, by reason of their presence along the frontiers of the Byzantine and Sāsānian empires and by reason of maintaining their social and political identity in the face of those empires, were marked by contemporary historians. And I shall confine most of my attention to the century between 430 and 530 A.D., the critical period in their political and religious evolution.

By Syria I understand quite simply what the Byzantines called the Diocese of the East and the Sāsānian frontier lands that lay adjacent to it. Not all the provinces of **Oriens** are appropriate to our topic, of course, since they lay "**inland**" **from the** Syrian steppe that provided the Arabs with their sustenance and their passage; rather I shall have particular reference to the "frontier" provinces of **Palestina Tertia**, Arabia, Phoenicia Libanesia, Eupharatesia, Osrhoene and Mesopotamia. The Byzantine administration understood well enough that these provinces differed from the others in **Oriens** because of their exposed insecure position and they governed them accordingly: the frontier provinces were generally administered not by a a civil governor but by a military commander, a **dux** or duke.

We are well informed on these Byzantine administrative matters since in addition to all else we possess two major collections of legislation that deal directly and in detail with provincial administration, the Theodosian Code of 438 as well as Justinian's Code and the individual **novellae** that followed upon it.[1] Further we have the **Notitia Dignitatum**, an important list of provincial dignitaries and their disposition drawn up for a protocol officer at the beginning of the fifth century, and some parallel documents like the lists attributed to Hierocles during the latter part of the reign of Theodosius II and that compiled by George of Cyprus at the beginning of Justinian's.[2] Finally, there are lists of bishops and their sees normally attached to the acts of ecumenical and provincial councils of the Christian Chruch, lists which fill in additional details on the administrative and ecclesiastical geography of the eastern provinces.

The richness of this documentation provides a fully detailed backdrop against which the Arabs played out their role in the politics of the Byzantine Empire. As is well known, they played a somewhat similar role in the Sāsānian Empire, but there the documentary support is very different. We have, it is true, a number of conciliar acts of the Nestorian Church,[3] but the civil structure of that empire, and particularly its provincial administration, is still exceedingly dim to our eyes.[4] And what is known of their Arab auxiliaries, the Lakhmids, is, like much else in Sāsānian history, better known from Muslim and Byzantine Historians than from the archives of the Sāsānian Empire.[5]

Though I have chosen to focus here on the fifth and early sixth centuries of the Christian era, the Arab presence in the area long outdated both the Byzantines and the Sāsānians, and when the Romans came to the Near East in the first pre-Christian century they found there a number of what can be called Arab principalities struggling toward independence and even prominence. The case of the Nabataean and the Palmyrenes is well known, but there were others as well in a wide area stretching from Galilee to Edessa.

Roman imperial ambitions thwarted the Arabs' self-promotion from nomadism to sedentary principalities, and after a brief career as Roman client states the Arab princedoms disappeared into the anonymity of the Roman provincial system, while their nomad cousins who still roamed th Syrian steppe found themselves on a new political frontier.

The bedouin were slow to realize it since for the nomads there was not one but many frontiers, and then as now few of them corresponded to political boundaries. The nomads' frontiers are seasonal, the line between winter and summer pasturage, and beyond that latter, the passage from grazing to agricultural land where the ground is tilled and the population lives in permanent villages, towns and cities.

In an earlier day passage between these zones may have been relatively unhindered, but from Alexander onward parts of Syria became highly urbanized and the bedouin paths were curtailed. Then from the reign of Diocletian at the end of the third century the Romans began to delimit and defend what they conceived to be their frontier from the steppe that lay beyond. The **limites,** as they were called, are sometimes thought of as kind of Roman Maginot Line of fixed fortifications against an external enemy, here obviously the armies of Sāsānian Iran. Some forts in Mesopotamia may have had precisely that purpose, Anastasius' foundation at Dara, for example, but more often the Empire was defended against such external foes by regular army detachments stationed well to the rear of the **limes.**

From the **Notitia Dignitatum** we can sketch the defenses of **Oriens** in the early fifth century. There were six regular army legions stationed in and around Antioch and this constituted the regular field army, in number about twenty thousand men. There were, in addition the army groups of both infantry and cavalry assigned to frontier duty: two infantry legions each in Euphratesia (Tayyibi near Qasr al-Hayr

East and Sūrā on the Euphrates), Mesopotamia (Tella-Constantina on the upper Khābūr and Cephas on the Tigris), Osrhoene (Apatna on the lower Khābūr and between damascus and Palmyra and Palmyra itself), Arabia (Buṣrā and Lajjūn) and an one in Palestina Tertia (Ailah). Most had four regular cavalry units of five hundred men each attached to them and an equal or larger number of irregular cavalry and foot, with the whole under the command of the duke.

As is clear from the **Notitia,** the frontier troops **(limitanei)** were quartered in towns and not in isolated fortresses. There were some fortresses, to be sure, generally of modest dimension and strung out along the north-south trade routes where they skirted the steppe. Such could be found along the **Strata Diocletiana,** which ran south from the Euphrates at Circesium via Ruṣāfah to Palmyra, then southwest to Damascus via Dumayr, as well as along the **Via Nova Traiana** from Boṣra south to Ailah on the Gulf of 'Aqabah. Their function was not protection against external enemies but the security of those routes against the bedouin who lived astride them. In Palestine the **Limes** was in fact well within the boundaries of the Empire—it ran from a point on the Dead Sea near Masada to the Mediterranean south of Gaza and thus all of Palestina Tertia stood **outside** it—and had nothing at all to do with external enemies.[6]

In 1934 A. Poidebard pioneered the technique of aerial photography in his **Trace de Rome dans le desert de Syria** and since that time he and others have succeeded in tracing visible lines of fortifications not only along the **Strata Diocletiana** but in the area where the steppe runs up to Chalcis-Beroea,[7] across the Negev in Palestina Terlia,[8] in upper Mesopotamia[9] and even in the briefly held section of northern Iraq.[10] Poidebard's method has recently been subjected to severe criticism, however, on the grounds that it does not distinguish between buildings constructed in different eras and thus creates by accumulation a far denser **limes** than existed at any given time.[11]

The criticism is an apposite one in the present context since there is evidence to suggest that between the **Notitia** with its list of troops and their stations and the building activity described in Procopius' **On Buildings** a shift had taken place in the strategical thinking about the East. Where the emperors from Diocletian to Theodosius had put their faith in army units, Justinian invested his in fixed fortifications. Under his direction or their own instincts for survival eastern cities grew ominous and impressive walls within which the populace would presumably remain safe until help came or terms were arranged.[12] And in the sixth and seventh centuries more eastern cities were making their own terms with the enemy. The urban centers were increasingly on their own.[13]

According to Procopius, these forts were constructed to restrain the inroads of the nomads, the "Scenites" or tent-dwellers, as the Byzantines called them; in short, the Arab bedouin. "Inroads" is not perhaps entirely precise. Except for the special circumstances to be noted later, what the Romans were seeking to regulate, though

certainly not to inhibit entirely, was the bodouin transhumance, the seasonal migration of tribes and their herds from winter to summer pasturage, and the struggle for grazing rights between tribes, both of which often carried the nomad off the steppe into empire land.

Transhumance was a particular problem in Mesopotamia. After 363 the Perso-Byzantine frontier generally ran north and south along the Khābūr with Anastasius' protective fortress at Dārā just west of it and Nisibis just to the east. Three geographical zones lay diagonally across this line, however, and the bedouin who pastured their herds along the Euphrates in the winter passed northward in the dry season and occupied most of Mesopotamia up to the piedmont of the Taurus. Each summer waves of Arab herdsmen lapped up against the foothills of the Taurus, and farmers in the piedmont and the inhanitants of cities like Tella and Reshāyna must have felt besieged even in time of peace.[14]

Out on the full steppe around Palmyra it must have been inter-tribal warfare that was in question, and the fortification of Palmyra by Justinian may have been intended to curb that. But why should the Byzantines or indeed the Sāsānians concern themselves with such? Little commerce ran through Palmyra in the sixth centruy and one might have thought that the bedouin thereabouts would be allowed to spill each other's blood with marvelous impunity. The answer is clear. These antagonists were not simply bedouin in the sixth century; they were vassals and clients of empire.

As we have already seen, the Romans had earlier found clients among the Arabs. But those were Arab states, as the first century understood that term, and Roman imperial sovereignty did not long tolerate them. Thereafter the Romans' Arab neighbors were nomadic tribes, a politically acceptable condition, and they too were discovered to have their uses. The Roman knew well how fatal desert warfare could be for infantry legions—there were, among other examples, Crassus' fatal campaign around Harran, Aelius Gallus' expedition into Arabia and Julian's disaster in Mesopotamia. At Adrianople in 378 the Romans received their final, indelible instruction in the use of cavalry and shortly thereafter a contingent of Arab cavalrymen appears among the defenders of Constantinople against the Goths.[15]

Thus began the Romans' systematic use of the valuable Arab cavalry, and not merely as individual recruits formed into cavalry units under Roman auspices but as entire tribal groups bound to Rome by a formal treaty which permitted the tribe to retain its integrity but specified certain obligations and certain rewards. In the beginning the arrangement must have been somewhat haphazard; it is not at any rate, very clear to us who must try to puzzle it out on the inexpert witness of ecclesiastical historians like Sozomen, Socrates and Theodoret.[16] What does appear is the rise to eminence of one tribal group, the Salīḥ, who were the Romans' chief allies from among the dedouin for something over a century.[17]

It is unlikely that the Romans had either high strategic hopes or marked political

fears concerning their new allies at this juncture. If the Arabs' skills in warfare made them useful, they remained, nonetheless, "barbarians" in the classical manner, people who shared neither the culture, the language nor indeed the same racial identity that the Byzantines imagined for themselves.[18] The Christian Byzantines supplied the Arabs' past from the rich pages of the Old Testament: they were Ishmaelites, descendents of Abraham's son Ishmael and, consequently, either "Saracens", offspring of Sārah, or "Hagarenes," children of Hagar, depending on one's view of their maternal lineage.

Sozomen, a Christian historian from Gaza writing in the fourth century, has supplied some additional religious details to the portrait.[19] According to his account, the Arabs are descendents of Ishmael who live under the Abrahamic oral law, and since they do not have the benefit of the written Torah given to Moses, they have drifted into a perverted form of Judaism. They share, nonetheless, the Jewish practice of circumcision and dietary laws; indeed the pagan Arabs worship the same God as the Jews, and much the same manner. In tone and content Sozomen's judgment is not unlike some of Muhammad's own later sentiments.

One characteristic of the Arab bedouin not mentioned by Sozomen in this passage is their penchant for intruding themselves into the settlements and farmlands of the frontier provinces. The Arabs might be useful in warfare as irregular cavalry or as scouts, but the Byzantine battle narratives of the late fourth and early fifth contury make clear that the very qualities that made them useful in war were often turned against their patrons. The Byzantines for their part tried to harness those energies by concluding treaties with the "tribes of the nomads", **(phylai nomadon)** like the Salīh and by conferring money and titles upon their **Strategoi,** eparchs and phylarchs, the latter the designation that was to become the standard one for the Arab tribal leaders in the fifth century. The razziadelighting bedouin remained, howevr, notoriously insouciant of their treaty obligations toward the Empire, and for those bedouin particularly who lived on or near the **limites,** the opportunity for raiding isolated communities was a temptation frequently succumbed to.

Later in the sixth contury, when the Byzantines and Sāsānians had developed a strategic use for their Arab allies, the forays of the tribes frequently have discernible political motives and follow routes that have nothing to do with either transhumance or the normal type razzia. In the fifth century, however, the raiding was more random and its political repercussions may have arisen from a new demographic configuration in **Oriens:** the movement of settlers into what had previously been the more or less deserted preserves of the bedouin.

Those new inhabitants of the wilderness were the Christian ascetics who were living singly or in communities in some of the most inhospitable areas of the East in the fifth century. These were not simply settlers, of course; their shrines became magnets for rich gifts and their experiences were well publicized in the various lives of saints that circulated in Greek, Syriac and Coptic in the Christian communities of

the East.[20] On the testimony of the biographers of ascetics in Palestine and Syria, the remote cells and **laurae** of the monks were often overrun by bedouin from the **limites.** In some of these accounts Byzantine troops eventually arrive on the scene, often too late to do anything but pursue the fleet and elusive bedouin back onto the steppe. The monks, as it turned out, had a far more salutary defense against their tormentors than the lumbering Byzantine infantry. The Arabs proved to be vulnerable to the sanctity and marvelous powers of their ascetic neighbors and so began the conversion of the frontier tribes to Christianity.[21]

Though there are a number of such accounts,[22] the most elaborate sketch of the interreaction of bedouin and monk occurs in Cyril of Scythopolis' biography of Saint Euthymius, the fifth century choregos of Judaean monasticism.[23] Somewhere near the end of his reign Shāh Yazdigird I (d. 420) began a Christian persecution within his domains and the policy was continued by his successor Bahram V. Orders were given that the Christians of Iraq should be prevented from fleeing across the frontier to Byzantine protection and their surveillance was trusted to a certain Aspebetos, who is described by Cyrill as the commander of Arab federates of the Persians. Although not himself a Christian, Aspebetos declined the charge and led his tribe into Roman territory where he was received into Roman service in Palestine by the Master of Soldiers for the East and into the Christian faith by Euthymius. This must have occurred not long after 420, and some ten years later Aspebetos, now Peter, was consecrated "bishop of the Arab camps (parembolai)" and attended the Council of Ephesus in 431[24].

Peter was neither the first nor the last "bishop of the Arabs"; the Arab queen Māwia had demanded and received another such in the previous century,[25] and two of Peter's successors in those same parembolai are also known: Auxilaus attended the Brigandage of Ephesus in 449 and his successor John was present at Chalcedon in 451. All three are recorded on the conciliar lists under Palestina Prima and there are other "bishops of the Arabs" who are noted at various councils for the provinces of Arabia, Phoenicia Libanesia and Osrhoene, that is, in the frontier provinces of the Empire where reasons of state and the influence of Christian holy men contrived to attract the bedouin into Roman sphere.[26]

Aspebetos-Peter was evidently drawn to Christianity through the cure effected by the Blessed Euthymius on his half-paralyzed son Terebon.[27] and the family reciprocated, as did many another Christianized Arab **shaykh,** by endowing churches and monasteries. Elsewhere there were even more spectacular results from the Arabs' contact with charismatic sanctity. Theodoret and the Syriac life of Simeon Stylites (d. 459) combine to describe the numerous conversions that ensued as the sometimes unruly Arab tribesmen, including Lakhmids from far away across the frontier, flocked to the pillar of the saint in the region of Aleppo to look upon the holy man and to receive instruction, in Syriac one supposes, from his own lips.[28]

Personal conversion there doubtless was, but there was another motive urging the tribes toward Christianity. Settlement along the **limites** carried with it the necessary condition of embracing the Christian faith. The Empire was officially and professedly Christian, and Justinian in particular took pains that this profession was a reality. Paramilitary expeditions were sent out against the last pockets of paganism in Anatolia and Syria.[29] No such measures were required with the Arabs; if they wished the benefits of federation, they must join the Christian Church.

Where there were cities there were normally Christian bishops, but as one ancient source points out[30] the province of Arabia—and likely Palestina Tertia as well—was exceptional in that the episcopal sees there were often no more than villages and towns. The population was spread thin in both areas, and in neither was the distinction between the desert and the town, the sedentary town-dwellers and the nomadic bedouin, clearly drawn. The chief Arab tribes in the service of Byzantium later had their principal camps somewhat farther north between Damascus and Buṣrā, as we shall see, but for most of the nomads passing out of their pasturelands in Arabia into the orbit of the Christian religion and Roman authority it was probably in the provinces of Arabia and Palestina Tertia that they had their introduction to both.

In the sixth century there are indisputable signs that Christianity was widespread in the Arabian peninsula proper, but the organization of the Christian Church begins for us within the **limites** where archaeology and episcopal lists come together to form the barest outlines of an ecclesiastical geography.[31] There were five bishops from the province of Arabia at the Council of Nicaea in 325.[32] and even earlier there is testimony for a bishop of Boṣrā, the civil and ecclesiastical metropolis of the province. One of the very first was a certain Beryllus who was engaged in controversy with Origen and who is described by Eusebius as "bishop of the Arabs of Boṣrā."[33] A hundred and twenty five years after Nicaea at Chalcedon eighteen bishops from Arabia signed the conciliar acts,[34] the highest figure we have before the Muslim invasion when there was a precipitous decline.

In the two centuries following Chalcedon a considerable number of churches and monasteries were constructed in Arabia.[35] The archaeological evidence is strongest for Boṣrā where the cathedral dedicated to Saints Sergius and Bacchus, two early Christian martyrs whose cult was widespread among the Arabs,[36] was completed in 512. In 536 a sanctuary honoring Saint Job was built, and ten years later another church and a smaller oratory. Although on a smaller scale, ecclesiastical building activity was no less intense in the other towns of the province.

Both Arabia and Palestina Tertia were frontier provinces and so under the governance of a duke[37] but the latter province, which embraced the broad triangle from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea and southward to the tip of Sinai, was far less urbanized than Provincia Arabia. The most complete list of episcopal sees is that preserved from a local synod held in Jerusalem in 536 where ten localities are so described: Petra, the metropolis; Areopolis, Characmoba and Arindela, towns

along the route from Petra to Amman; Ailah at the head of the Gulf of 'Aqabah where the **Legio X Fretensis** was quartered in the **Notitia Dignitatum**, though it was withdrawn at some unknown later date; Zoara at the southern end of the Dead Sea; Phaeno, a mining town north of Petra; Elusa and Eboda in the Negev; and in the Sinai, Pharan; finally, there was a bishop on the island of Iotabe in the straits of Tīrān. All except Ailah, Petra and Elusa appear only in the sixth century.[38]

It was not these miniscule bishoprics that won southern Palestine for Christianity, however. Far more important was the arrival in the mid-fourth century of the Syrian ascetic Julian Saba who took up residence at the Mount of Moses in southern Sinai and so begn the conversion of the Jebel Musa into a monastic retreat and the goal of Christian pilgrimage. There may also have been a bishop at nearby Pharan before the end of the fourth century and another monastic center at Rhaithou on the Gulf of Suez early in the fifth.[39]

There are fragmentary reports on the monks of Sinai and the clergy of Pharan through the fifth and early sixth centuries. In the fifties of that latter century the fathers at Sinai petitioned Justinian to protect them from bedouin harassment in the vicinity. The Emperor acceded to their request—he may have done the same at Clysma and Rhaithou- and in 556 the monastery of Saint Catherine and its fortress (**castrum**) were dedicated.[40] We cannot be certain if security was improved—there continued to be "incidents" with the Arabs down to the Muslim invasion but we can conclude from the archaeological evidence and from pilgrim accounts that Christianity put down ever deeper roots in the towns of the Sinai and Negev.[41]

These local arrangements within Palestine and elsewhere were not the kind of formal treaty concluded between the Emperor and his phylarchs along the frontier. These latter were conditioned upon conversion, and the town councils of Palestina Tertia were hardly in a position to demand or enforce such a condition. The Emperor could and did. For the Arab tribes who so contracted conversion apparently posed no great difficulty, moral or political. Christianity was spreading among them of its own accord and the Arabs responded out of their spiritual needs or their political ambitions. And later in the sixth century that same combination of need and ambition conspired to cast the Arabs in a crucial role in the history of the eastern churches.

The spread of Christianity among the bedouin of the frontier only gradually carried in its train the literacy that was the normal consequence of conversion elsewhere. Inscriptions in Arabic script and language are exceedingly rare before Islam, and the two earliest, that from Zabad near Chalchis, dated 512 and another from Ḥarrān in the Lajāh dated 568,[42] are both Christian, and the latter makes specific reference to the phylarch Azrael as the benefactor of the church at Ḥarrān.

Was Arabic, then, the literary language of the Christian Arabs before Islam? The Arabic inscriptions, most of them in Christian context, appear to point in that direction, but there are in fact far more in Greek than in Arabic celebrating the

Christian generosity of the phylarchs.[43] and Greek too are the names, and indeed the literary language, of most of the bishops who served the Arabs from either Busrā or the "camps."[44] Nor can we easily conclude from the presence of a few monumental inscriptions in Arabic to the existence of literature in the same language and script. It is far more likely that the Arab converts to the Christian faith, many or most of whom were illiterate, were catechized orally or else were instructed in their Christian letters in the **koine** of eastern Christendom, Syriac.[45] There are Syriac inscriptions too in abundance along the frontier, and Syriac was the language, in many cases the sole language, of the ascetics who were the Arabs' first contact with the Christian faith.

If there was a Christian literary tradition in Arabic before Islam, it should be most apparently represented by an Arabic version of the Scriptures, if not in the form of an integral translation of the Gospels, then simply as a psalter or Gospel readings arranged for liturgical purposes. These were the means used in introducing other pre- literate peoples to Christianity, and yet the signs that something similar occurred among the Arabs of the fifth and sixth century are confused and ambiguous. There are parts of an Arabic psalter in tenth century manuscripts, and three manuscript examples, again from the ninth and tenth century, in which the Gospels in Arabic have been distributed across the liturgical year.[46] That either goes back in its original form to pre-Islamic days is subject, however, to serious doubt.

But the case has recently been reopened. Irfan Shahid of Georgetown University has just published a document that purports to be a Syriac letter of the well known Simeon of Bayt Arsham on the martyrs of Najrān.[47] I shall have more to say of this letter in another context, but what is to the point here is that Simeon claims that his account of the martyrs is derived in part "from documents which have been read to us (written) in the Najranite language **(sefrâ nâgraniyâ)**."[48] The translation is Shahid's own and it reflects his conviction that the phrase in Syriac can refer to none other than the Arabic tongue, albeit written in Syriac script.[49]. But as he himself concedes, **sefra** yields "document" or "record" as easily as "language", and on the face of it the entire phrase could mean "a document from Najran" as probably as it does "the Najranite language."

If both translations are possible, plausibility points to Syriac rather than to Arabic. To argue that Najrān was an "Arab city," as doubtless it was in some sense, says nothing about what language its literate citizens, who were surely a minority, used there as their **written** medium of communication. Najrān had a polyglot and cosmopolitan population,[50] as befitted a trade center, manitained immediate commercial relations with the entire Fertile Crescent, and was already a partner in the enmerging Monophysite Church whose **lingua franca** was Syriac. Syriac was the language in which Simeon, "the Persian," wrote to his fellow Monophysites of the **oikoumene** and Syriac too was the language in which James of Serug wrote to the Monophysite Christians of Himyar sometime about 520.[51] Their literary language

was being affected, of course, by contact with Christians at Najrān and elsewhre who spoke the vernacular Arabic in their homes and on the streets of the city, and Shahid had drawn attention to the Arabic loanwords and etymologies touched upon in passing in the newly discovered Syriac letter of Simeon. But far more important, I suggest, is the still invisible passage of a religious, moral, legal and liturgcal vocabulary from the Syriac of people like Simeon and James of Serug into the Arabic of Najrān and Ḥīrah to eventually surface, as we are all aware, in the sophisticated and nuanced language of the **Qur'ān.**

The Arabs' own traditions about their past are persistent in their belief that some at least of their number knew how to read and write in pre-Islamic days.[52] The rabbis at Medina, it was said, taught the pagan medinese the art of writing, and literacy was more common there than at any other place in the Ḥijāz. The biographer of Muḥammad gives us the startling fact that Waraqah, a Christian and one of the Prophet's in-laws at Mecca, was given to reading the Scriptures and another informant adds that he copied the Gospels in Hebrew characters.[53] Other Christians were also connected with the Arabs' introduction to literacy, and here the tradition focuses not on the phylarchates along the Byzantine **limites** but on their counterparts on the Sāsānian side of the steppe, and particularly on the Christian tribes connected with the town of Ḥīrah.[54]

The Arab penetration of the Fertile Crescent was not confined to the western or Roman side of the arc. Roman historians as early as Pliny and Strabo were aware that Arabs had settled into Mesopotamia from Edessa eastward to Mawṣil.[55] These were sedentary groups, usually called simply **Arabes** by the Latin historians. Distinct from them were the nomads, in the Greek historians Scenites or Sarracens and in the Syriac sources generally Tayyaye, who occupied the steppe land in Mesopotamia in summer and in winter withdrew onto the Syrian steppe.

Sedentary or nomad, the Arabs were an important element in the life of Mesopotamia. The early Sāsānian province east of Nisibis was called "Arabia"[56] and the Nestorian ecclesiastical province embracing the bishoprics of Hatra, Sinjār and Nisibis was likewise called Beth ᶜArabaye.[57] It was not the sedentary Arabs, however, who created problems in Mesoptamia but the Tayyaye, who often appear in troubled contexts in the Syriac chronicles. The chroniclers were not overly fastidious in supplying reasons why the Tayyaye went on periodic rampages in Mesopotamia, but there is one source that provides a clue. There is preserved a letter written in 485 by Barsauma, the bishop of Nisibis in Beth ᶜArabaye, to the Nestorian Catholicus Acacius in which he reveals that drought conditions on the steppe had forced additional tribes into Beth ᶜArabaye with consequent damage to the agricultural settlements there.[58] What we have is clearly a disruption of the normal pattern of seasonal transhumance, and the problem was solved only when Barsauma brought together the Byzantine, Sāsānian and bedouin leaders to delimit the pastoral zones.

The solution was not always so pacific. The Romans for their part preferred to direct and control the migrations through strong points like Thannouris on the lower Khābūr. There is no strong evidence that the Sāsānians adopted the fortress technique; rather, they pioneered a technique which, as we shall see, the Byzantines took up with enthusiasm, to give charge of the Arabs to the Arabs, in the Sāsānian instance, to the Arabs of Ḥīrah.

One of the earliest of the Arab tribal groups to make the passage northward from the Yemen was the Tanūkh who settled on the edge of the steppe west of the Euphrates from Anbār southward. Here a camp or stopping place, in Syriac **hêrtâ**, was established near the site of the later Kūfah.[59] Many of the Tanūkh continued in their bedouin ways but some at least settled down to town life in their former camp, now en route to becoming a permanent settlement, which the Arabs called al-Ḥīrah. Ḥīrah and its environs were understood to include both the bedouin Tanūkh and another group known as the ᶜIbād who were characterized not so much by the fact that they were townsmen as by their Christianity. Indeed, ᶜIbād is not a tribal name at all but is itself a characterization, the "servants of God" perhaps.[60] Ḥīrah may originally have been an encampment of the Arabs. But its religion was Christian and its culture, which came to it with Christianity, was Syro-Aramaic.

Among the most famous of the Ḥīrah Christians must be accounted the poet ᶜAdi ibn Zayd (d.c.604), an ᶜIbād from the Chistian tribe of Tamīm, who served as a kind of diplomatic go-between for the Shāh and his somewhat turbulent clients at Ḥīrah. ᶜAdi was doubtless literate, even though his preserved poetry in Arabic belongs to the oral tradition at its very end.[61] He is called a "translator", and it was said that he read "the books of the Arabs."[62]

That these sixth century "books of the Arabs" were in fact written in Arabic is highly doubtful. Everything we know about Ḥīrah indicates that the Arabs there, whatever they spoke to each other on the streets of the town, belonged to the Syriac Church, that like their brothers at Najrān they read and heard the Gospels read in Syriac and used that same language in their liturgical devotions. By one report Ḥīrah boasted a theological school in the sixth century; its founder, Cyprus of Edessa, a former teacher at Nisibis, wrote all his work in Syriac.[63] Syriac too was the literary language of the monk Abraham of Kashgar (d. 588) who did missionary work among the Arabs around Ḥīrah,[64] and George (d. 724), the last "bishop of the Arabs" known from the Persian side of the frontier, wrote all of his preseved writings in that tongue.[65]

The failure of the Arabs of the Byzantine frontier to develop into Arab analogues of the Copts, Syrians and Goths in leading their fellows into full literacy under Christian auspices may well have resulted from their unwillingness or inability to pass into a fully sedentary way of life. The contemporary sources describe the habitation of the nomadic Arabs in either of two ways, in Greek as a **Parembole** and in Syriac as a **hêrtâ**. The first term originally meant a company of soldiers, and in

Empire Greek it had come to refer to their quarters or barracks. The Fathers frequently used it to describe the mobile camp of the Israelites in Old Testament times. The Syriac **hêrtâ**, though etymologically different, came to have the same association of a camp or halting place, possibly with military overtones.[66] As long ago as 1887 Noeldeke concluded that the camp of the Arabs—he was speaking of the Ghassānids but the the conclusion fits the earlier evidence as well—moved from place to place as either military or economic conditions dictate,[67] and there is nothing that we have learned since then to deny that conclusion. Noeldeke was aware, of course, that certain permanent towns had Ghassānid associations as well. There are a number of such mentioned in Ḥamzah Isfahānī and other Muslim authors,[68] and we can confirm a number of them from archaeological evidence,[69] notably Jābiya, which had a particular importance to the early Ghassānids.[70]

By plotting the known sites it is possible to chart a "Ghassānid zone" which ran from near Palmyra, where in 539 the Ghassānids were contesting possession of the Strata,[71] past Damascus (Jilliq), to an area immediately to the north of Buṣrā (Jābiya, Jāsim, Ḥīrah-Hārith). And yet none of these towns is demonstrably the "camp of the nomads" where the Arabs were settling into permanent residence, a conclusion supported by the fact that none of these towns, not even Jābiya which possessed both a church and a monastery dedicated to Saint Sergius,[72] was the site of a bishopric and this in a region where bishops were attached to settlements not much larger than crossroads. What bishops the frontier Arabs did possess must surely have been those designated in the conciliar lists as "of Arabia."

That such parembolai-camps could evolve into a town or city is illustrated in Islamic times by the history of the **amṣār** and in the days before Islam by al-Ḥīrah. Ḥīrah too began as a camp,[73] but it soon developed into a sufficiently permanent town to boast its own bishops: Hosea, the first recorded bishop of Ḥīrah, attended the council of Seleucia in 410 and five of his successors are noted at similar synods down to the Muslim conquest of the town in 634.[74]

The early history of Ḥīrah is the history of the Banū Lakhm whose story is only somewhat less opaque than that of their fellow Arabs around the Fertile Crescent. The Arab historian Ṭabarī has inserted in the early Iranian acctions of his **Annals** excerpts from what appears to be a king list from Ḥīrah. Ṭabarī had attempted to synchronize the Lakhmid princes with the Sāsānian Shāhs who were their sovereigns, and if the results are not always convincing or accurate, we do have a somewhat better idea of the continuous history of the Lakhmids than of any other of the Arab tribes of the day.[75]

The later Arab historians, Tabarī among them, were much preoccupied with the tribal quarrels that went on among the Arabs during the first century of Islam. One element of that preoccupation was the distinction between "northern" and "southern" Arabs relative to their original home in Arabia. We are not by any means as convinced as they that the distinction was of such major importance in the

centuries before Islam. The Lakhmids were reckoned, at any rate, among the "southerners", and after their trek northward into the pasturelands west of the Euphrates we can in fact discern a continuing embroilement, either directly or through intermediaries like the Maᶜadd, with the politics of Ḥimyar. What is of, more immediate concern, however, is that in the fourth century the Lakhmids mobile encampment came to its final resting place on a site of commercial and strategic importance for the life of both the steppe and the cultivated land of Iraq that lay behind it.

The **shaykh** who converted the camp into a town by fortifying the side—and giving the place its name, **hêrtâ de Nuᶜmân**—is the first Lakhmid prince with any historical substance, Nuᶜmân I, son of Imr al- Qays, who ruled there from about 388 to 418. Who or what he was, and what his successors were later to be, is summed up by Masᶜūdī: Nu'mān was a "general of the Persians," that is, he already served the Shāh, in this case Yazdigird I, as a vassal with distinct military responsibilities. Indeed, he may have been, as his successors certainly were, a king, a title that evoked considerable less anxiety in the **Shahan Shāh** than it did on the Roman side of the frontier.

At this stage Nuᶜmān's responsibilities may have been principally to control the bedouin along the Euphrates. During the anarchical minority of Shapur II from 309 to 325 the Arabs known without a great deal of discrimination as the Tayyaye had overrun large tracts of northern Iraq and were controlled only with the greatest of effort.[76] To prevent a recurrence of this Nuᶜmān and his Lakmids were given a position of preeminence over the Arabs of Iraq of a type never quite yielded by the Romans to their own Arab clients and troubles with the Tayyaye appear to have abated.

The Lakhmids' position waxed ever greater with the accession of Bahrām V (430-438).[77] He came to the throne of the Shāhs only through the assistance of Nuᶜmān's son and successor al-Mundhir I (c. 418-462). Bahrām was probably raised at al-Ḥīrah, perhaps even with Mundhir, and when at the death of Yazdigird others were pushed forward to the throne, Bahrām called upon Mundhir and his Tanūkh troops to restore him to his hereditary rights. Some of the later Arab sources suggest that Bahrām's gratitude may have expressed itself in the form of an ecumenical phylarchate: Mundhir was given command of the entire territory of the Arabs on the Persian side of the steppe and accompanied the Shāh on his early campaigns against the Romans in Mesopotamia.[78]

Mundhir's immediate successors at Ḥīrah, his sons al-Aswad and Mundhir II, whose reigns cover the period between 462 and 499, have left only confused notices in historians.[79] What appears fairly certain is the report of a Syriac chronicler that at the height of Kavad's difficulties caused by his adherence to Mazdakism, perhaps in 495, the bedouin (Tayyaye) who were under Kevad's sway saw in the anarchy of the kingdom their own opportunity and conducted widespread raids in Iraq.[80] Although the Tayyaye are not necessarily the Lakhmids, the possibility remains

strong that the anonymous opportunist was Mundhir II.

Aswad's son Nu^{c}mān II came to power in Ḥīrah in 499 or 500 and with him the role of the Lakhmids took on a new and important dimension. Nu^{c}mān II was the first Persian phylarch to conduct his own raid into Roman territory. The incursion occurred about 500 and was met at Bethrapsa on the Euphrates by the **strateges** Eugene[81]. We are not certain whether this was a strategic raid prompted from Ctesiphon, particularly since a severe drought was reported in Mesopotamian Arabia at about the same time but it must have illustrated for the Emperor Anastasius, and perhaps for Kavad as well, the vulnerability of the Euphrates frontier to bedouin columns. And there was more. Shortly after these events in Euphratesia two different bedouin forces broke into Palestina Tertia, the Kindah under Ḥujr ibn ^{c}Amr and the Ghassānids under their phylarch Jabalah[83].

The Ghassānids were already known to the Byzantines. Earlier they had appeared in the Transjordan and had petitioned to settle on the **limes** under the same treaty terms granted to the Salīḥ.[84] Those conditions are not described but they almost certainly included conversion to Christianity–the Salīh were already Christian–and the payment of a tirbute was, as a matter of fact, the reason for what later threatened to be an abrupt termination of the agreement. A Roman tax collector was assaulted by a Ghassānid, and Roman troops were despatched from Buṣrā for retribution. The year must have been sometime about 497, and the target of the Romans' vengeance was the Ghassānid phylarch Jabalah.

As the event is described by Theophanes, Jabalah was defeated by Roman arms after some heavy fighting; the Romans decided that Jabalah was too difficult a prey to bring down and so came to some kind of terms. Theophanes and the Arabs may have been describing two separate campaigns, but there is a possible reconciliation of the accounts. Theophanes connects these events with the Byzantine reoccupation of the island of Iotabe in the Straits of **Tīran.** The Romans had lost that important commercial station a few years earlier to a certain Imr al-Qays, Amorkesos in the Greek sourccs, who was likely a Lakhmid from Ḥīrah. For reasons unknown he had come into Roman territory and begun to carve out an enclave for himself in northern Arabia.

In 473 we are told that Imr al-Qays seized Iotabe and expelled the Byzantine customs officials from the island[85]. To regularize his status the Arab sent a Christian bishop to speak for him in Constantinople. The Emperor Leo preferred to impress the phylarch himself; Imr al-Qays was summoned to the capital and given a royal reception. Not to any great avail. In the end the Emperor was forced to concede the **shaykh** his possession of Iotabe, and probably a treaty was drawn up confirming Imr al-Qays privileges and obligations as phylarch in the province of Palestina Tertia.

Ten years later, then, the Ghassānids appeared on the scene in the Transjordan and became clients of the emperor. At some unknown point after that they must have moved into Imr al-Qays' territory and expropriated Iotabe and its commercial

revenues for themselves. This may have been the real point of the dispute that brought the Romans out against Jabalah in 497. In the seuqel the Romans got back Iotabe and the Banū Ghassān were allowed to stay on in the Transjordan, at the expense of the Salīḥ.

The Ghassānids seem to disappear from history after that point or until the appearance of Ḥārith, the son of Jabalah, in Palestine late in 528. But the newly discovered letter of Simeon of Beth Arsham is a new document in the Ghassānid dossier. By its own testimony, the letter, which describes the slaughter of Christians at Najrān in South Arabia, was written "from the camp (**herta**) of Jabalah, king (**malka**) of the Ghassānids, in a place called Gabita... eight hundred and thirty of the era of Elexander (A.D. 519)."[86] If the dating were firmly established--at another point the letter suggests that it was written in 524--we would have Jabalah still alive in 519 and already established in Jābiya as "King of the Ghassānids"[87].

On the testimony of the letter, Jabalah was a Christian, a cause for no surprise, and one of Simeon's allies in the new Monophysite "Church" that was taking shape in **Oriens** during Anastasius' reign. The theological ambiguities of Anastasius' first years were resolved after the peace treaty concluded with the Shāh in 505. From that point onward the Emperor leaned visibly toward the anti-Chalcedonian sentiments of the sophisticated, Hellenized Severus, then a mork of Maiouma near Gaza and later (512-518) Patriarch of Antioch, and of the more rabid and radical Syrian, Philoxenus, bishop of Mabbug in Euphratesia (485-519.[88].

Neither man was directly concerned, however, with the haunts of the Ghassānids, whether these latter were still south in Arabia on the borders of Palestina Tertia or whether Jabalah and his Ghassānids were already at Jābiya in Gaulanitis. Severus propagandized in Constantinople and Philoxenus in Syria I around Antioch.

When Severus was consecrated Patriarch of Antioch in November of 512 there was resistance from among the eastern bishops who continued to regard the symbol of Chalcedon as the authoritative statement on the natures of Christ. Some of the strongest complaints were raised by Julian of Busrā and Peter of Damascus, the two metropolitans into whose jurisdiction the Ghassānids fell[89]. Their opposition availed nothing. Both men deserted their sees in protest in 515 and were replaced by pro-Severan Monophysites. At Buṣrā it was Cassian, and it was presumably he who marshalled all his suffragans in support of Severus at a triumphant synod held in Tyre in 515[90].

The triumph was short lived since with the accession of Justin in 518 a strong pro-Chalcedonian policy replaced the Monophysitism of Anastasius' later years. Monophysites were driven from their sees into exile. Severus fled to Egypt and Julian came back to Boṣrā in triumph. among the others who had to desert their sees in the face of Justin's theological views was a certain John, "bishop of the Tayyaye called Zizaye" of the see of Ḥawārīn[91]. Ḥawārīn is the town of Evaria in Phoenicia

Libanesia, and view is that the "Zizaye" Arabs were a detachment of Arab auxiliaries stationed at Zizā, the present day Qasṭal, on the route between Sūrā, Ruṣāfa and Damascus. Though the Ghassānids were later identified with this same region, it is unlikely that they were serving as an auxiliary detachment or that they had a bishop with a fixed see.

What all the information points to, however, is the spread of Monophysitism along the **limes** after 505 and particularly between 515 and 518 or 520.[92] If Jabalah and his Ghassānids were brought into the Monophysite camp, it was likely during this period, early enough, in any event, to explain the easy presence of the notorious Monophysite Simon at their camp in either 519 or 524.[93]. We know that there was proselytizing during those years. Before 518 Severus maintained an active correspondence and sent out missionaries besides. One such mission to the Arabs is mentioned by the historians, who date it c. 513 and direct it to "Mundhir, phylarch of the Saracens"[94]. This Mundhir, whoever he was, refused to desert his Chalcedonian beliefs. It was perhaps a symptom of the mounting tide against the Monophysites. By 521 their hierarchy was in full retreat.

Shahid, who has discovered Jabalah at his camp in 519 (or 524), claims also to have found testimony on the death of the phylarch in the demise of a mysterious Atfar who is described as "King of the Tayyaye' and dies figting on the Roman side in hostilities around Thannouris in 528.[95] The identification is possible, of course, particularly since we know nothing about Jabalah or the mysterious Atfar at this time, but the explanation of Atfar or Asfar as a nickname for Jabalah is highly conjectural. Further, the sources for this event are more than a little confused. Malalas too appears to describe the battle of Thannouris, and though he doesn't mention Thannouris itself, he does describe a great battle in which a Roman phylarch, whom he calls Tapharas, is killed and Coutzes, the military commander of Phoenicia, is captured[96]. Procopius, on the other hand, may have telescoped the campaign around Thannouris with another around Mt. Malebasa on the Tigris;[97] it was during the latter, at any rate, that he places the capture of Coutzes, though there is no mention of either Thannouris or Atfar.

In retrospect Leo's grudging recognition of Imr al-Qays has something fortuitous about it, the confirmation of a political situation which, though by no means new in the Roman experience, was solved by expediency. Anastasius may have been shrewder. Both he and his Sāsānian contemporary across the steppe were girding for a major war, and Anastasius'series of phylarchic treaties in 497-502 may have been intended to meet the Shāh's own discovery of a new geopolitical use for his Arab vassals, the Lakhmids.

Sometimes about 500 Romanus, the duke of Palestine, had beaten off the attacks of two troublesome phylarchs, as we have seen. One of them was the Ghassanid Jabalah but the other was a newcomer to the scene, Ḥujr of the tribe of Kindah. Ḥujr was probably killed in the affair but it was of little benefit to Roman security

since his brother Ma^{c}dīkarib continued raiding along the frontier[98]. In 502 Anastasius reached for a more permanent solution along the **limes.** A treaty was arranged by the Roman legate Euphrasius, **aliter** Euporus, a Semite whose son and grandson both served as diplomats to the Arabs throughout the first half of the sixth century. It recognized the paramount status of the Kindah and of their shaykh **Hārith,** the grandson of the unruly Ḥujr[99].

One of the most difficult aspects of the study of the Arabs of the **limites** before Islam is tracing their complex relationship to the politics of Ḥimyar. If one is to credit the latter Arab historians and genealogists, the Kindites were originally a southern tribe that migrated from the Yemen into the country of the Ma'add in central Arabia, perhaps as early as the third century. Thereafter the histories of the Kindites, Ma'add and Ḥimyarites of the south are inextricably intertwined, and on more than one occasion the Kindah were used as an extension of Ḥimyarite power against the Lakhmids[100].

All these Arab princedoms were known to the Byzantine historians. The latter's perspectives were extremely limited, however, on South Arabia and on the dimly perceived area that lay between Aqabah and the Kingdom of the "Homerites" far to the south. The contemporary historian has somewhat more to work with, notably the series of historical inscriptions brought to light in the Yemen,[101] but the few attempts at matching names and dates from the Byzantine--and Arabic--literary sources with the Ḥimyarite epigraphical evidence has not been without serious uncertainties[102].

To return to Anastasius, his treaty with the Banū Kindah in 502 may have looked to more than securing the **limes.** Kavad went to war in Mesopotamia later that same year and he sent his Arab client Nu'mān deep into Byzantine territory around Edessa and Harrān[103]. Unlike the raid of 500 Nu'mān's expedition of 502-503 was a strategic part of a wider military campaign and it opened a new chapter in Byzantine-Sāsanian warfare. We do not know if the Kindite response was promoted from Constantinople or was merely a piece of bedouin serendipity, but while Nu'mān was on the Euphrates in Osrhoene Hārith the Kindite appears to have crossed the steppe and established himself at Ḥīrah. Nu'mān was in no position to reply; his own campaign dragged on until August when the Lakhmid **shaykh** received a serious and, as it turned out, fatal head wound, even as he was counselling an all-out assault on Edessa[104].

The history of Ḥīrah is uncertain after the death of Nu'mān II. We know that Kavad himself appointed the new **shaykh** of the Lakhmids and that he was not of the royal family. The interregnum of Abū Ja'far ibn 'Alqamah lasted from 503 to 505 and Kavad's choice may have been dictated solely by military considerations since the period in question marked the climax of hostilities between Kavad and Anastasius. Abū Ja'far likely performed his imperial service at the front in Mesopotamia rather than at Ḥīrah where the Arab historians record the tradition

that at the beginning of sixth century it was the Kindite Ḥārith and not a Lakhmid who reigned there[105].

In 505 the fighting in Mesopotamia ended and with the peace the Arab phylarchate reverted to a Lakhmid of the royal line, Nu'mān's son Mundhir III, whom Procopius described with a not too benevolent eye toward Byzantium's counterpart among the Ghassānids, as "most discreet, experienced in war, totally faithful to the Persians and extremely energetic, who forced the Romans to their knees for half a century"[106]. Was Mundhir restored to Ḥīrah as well? On one view, probably not since Kavad was still deeply embroiled with the Mazdakite movement and so too was Mundhir, though on the other side. Indeed, Mundhir may have been in some sense a vassal of Kindah during this entire period between 505 and 528 when the collapse of Mazdakism emboldened the Lakhmid to do away with his Kindite rival, and father-in-law, Hārith ibn'Amr[107]. What is most curious about the position of Hārith ibn'Amr during these years is that he may have formally been the client of both the Persians and the Byzantines. If the Lakhmid Mundhir was a Kindite vassal, this was surely with the assent of Kavad. And yet the same Hārith is described in 528, on the eve of his death at the hands of Mundhir, as "phylarch of the Romans", which suggests that the treaty negotiated by Euphrasius in 502 remained in force until 528.

If such was the arrangement, it cannot be judged very successful. The evidence is incomplete, but on at least three occasions Mundhir went on a rampage in Byzantine Syria and Arabia. The first occasion was shortly after the fall of Amida, probably in 505[108], and then again in 519 and 520[109] and it may have been on this last occasion that the phylarch captured two high Byzantine officers and prompted Justin's embassy to his camp at al-Ḥīrah to negotiate their release[110]. The embassy was led by Abraham, son of the Euphrasius who had negotiated the treaty with Kindah in 502. Mundhir was not there and in the well known sequel the Byzantine delegation followed Mundhir to Ramlah where they received news of the massacre at Najrān.

This is not the occasion to enter into the complexities surrounding the Abyssinian invasion of the Yemen and the subsequent slaughter of Christians at the south Arabian city of Najrān. As has already been pointed out, the chronology is extremely difficult, and Irfan Shahid's recent publication of a new primary source has merely compounded the difficulty by presenting the historian with two acceptable dates for the martyrdom within one and the same document[111]. But whatever the date of Najrān, 518 or 523, the Arab princes were deeply involved. A call for help went out to the world, as has been seen, from the Ghassānid camp at Jābiya while the protagonist in the Yemen, Dhū Nuwās, sent an urgent request to the Lakhmid Mundhir, who had already provoked the Byzantines in Syria, to come to his aid in the face of an anticipated Byzantine-Abyssinian reprisal. He was requested, in addition, to bring pressure to bear upon the Christians of al-Ḥīrah, just as it was recommended to the recipient of Simeon's letter that the rabbis of Tiberias in Palestine be arrested as a form of coercion on the Jewish prince Dhū Nuwās.[112].

The Ghassānids were not drawn further into the affair at this point, but the extraordinarily rich documentation converging upon Najrān reveals the complex state of affairs in Syria in the early sixth century. The embassy of Abraham to Mundhir, for example, was more than simply an attempt to negotiate the release of prisoners; it had as its stated aim the religious freedom from what? Perhaps from Nestorian persecution. When Justin began his pursuit of the Monophysites in 519-520 a number of the latter fled to Sāssānian territory where they were met with hostility from Silas, the Catholicus of the Nestorians (d. 523), and support at al-Ḥīrah from al-Hajjāj ibn Qays, who is described as a "friend" of al-Mundhir.[114] Both men, Silas and al-Hajjāj, show up at Ḥīrah and Ramlah on the occasion of Abraham's mission and we are further informed that Hajjāj, in Greek Aggaios, is a **comes**[115] and "Christian ethnarch of the entire **parembole.**"[116] Simeon of Beth Arsham, another zealous Monophysite, was also on hand,[117] and his account of the proceedings makes it very clear that the religious controversy had to do with a struggle between Nestorians and Monophysites[118]. Indeed, it is not unlikely that Dhū Nuwās' request for a persecution at Ḥīrah was not directed against all Christians but against the Monophysites, a thesis which finds support in the reply of the Christians of Ḥīrah when threatened by Mundhir: "It was not **in your time** that we became Christians to deny Christ", a sentiment that would make sense on the lips of a recently persuaded Monophysite[119].

In the later years that are beyond the scope of this paper both Mundhir and the Byzantines would continue in their attempts to manage and manipulate the Arab tribes that lay in loose orbit around Ḥimyar. But in the immediate present it was to Syria proper that Mundhir turned his energies. In 527 he was sent as Kavad's engine of destruction first into Mesopotamia and then up to the very walls of Apamea and Emesa, where, according to the Syrian chroniclers he butchered four hundred nuns to his divinity al-'Uzzā[120].

These events shook the **limes** and Justin or his nephew Justinian, with whom he now shared joint rule (Aprilugust 518), reorganized the frontier by appointing Anastasius' nephew Hypatius as the new Master of Soldiers for **Oriens** with the stated purpose of protecting the **limes** against Arab raiders[121]. Palmyra was refortified and regarrisoned under the command of a duke as a shield for Jerusalem and the Holy Places,[122] but when Justinian attempted to do the same at Thannouris, another crucial bedouin crossroads on the lower Khābūr, he met with stiff resistance, as we have seen.

All this took place while Mundhir was apparently still the nominal vassal of the Kindah. But the days of Kindah were numbered. In 528 some unknown issue caused a falling out between Diomedes, the military commander of Palestine, and his subordinate, Ḥārith ibn ᶜAmr, phylarch of the Kindites. Ḥarith took fright and fled with his family to the inner steppe. His panic appears to have carried him directly into the arms of Mundhir III who forthwith destroyed his Arab rival[125].

For Mundhir it was an unexpected opportunity to regain control of Hīrah, if he had not done so already, but in disposing of Hārith ibn ᶜAmr he had also murdered a Roman phylarch. Hārith may have been out of favor in Constantinople, but that did not lessen the diplomatic and political mischief of his death, particularly at the hands of the violent and unpredictable Mundhir. Immediately upon hearing of his murder, the dukes of Phoenicia, Mesopotamia and Arabia alerted their other client phylarchs and a punitive expedition of some size was launched against the Lakhmid. Now it was Mundhir's turn to flee, but his **herta** was seized and with it a number of Byzantine prisoners and a considerable amount of booty[124].

In the sequel it was the Byzantines' phylarchs and not the dukes who reaped the rewards; it is unlikely that a Roman army would have marched very far from Busrā or Ailah in any event. And chief among those phylarchs was another Hārith, the son of Jabalah of the Banū Ghassān. Hārith was thus already a phylarch in 528, of what area we do not know for sure, even though his father had been chastised by a Roman army when he attempted to raid Palestine shortly before 500. Between 500 and 528 the Banū Ghassān had obviously made their peace with Byzantium and now Hārith ibn Jabalah had performed a valuable service for the Empire[(125)].

He was rewarded from the spoils of the Kindite holdings. Hārith was named phylarch of the province of Arabia,[126] and in what was clearly a related move, his brother Abū Karib received their father's old territory of Palestina Tertia as well as parts of the northern Ḥijāz and even the island of Iotabe which Jabalah had seized and been forced to disgorge some thirty years before. According to Procopius, who could scarecely conceal his disdain for the bargain, Justinian was to some extent moved by the fact that Abū Karib had formally ceded to the Empire some quite worthless palm groves[127].

The date-palm groves were doubtless of little enough value in the economy of the Byzantine Empire, but what they represented for Justininan was a foothold beyond the **limites** in the oasis settlements of northern Arabia. The entire western shore of the Red Sea already stood with Constantinople and Justin's carefully cultivated Abyssinian allies had crossed the Bāb al-Mandab and made the Yemen safe for trade and Christianity. Now through his client Abū Karib Justinian's grasp extended beyond Ailah down the western spice route to the port of Leuke Kome on the eastern shore and the oasis of Tabūk, Abū Karib's palm groves, further inland.

Despite Procopius' curt dismissal, Abū Karib was being given charge of a sensitive and potentially valuable area. The phylarchs were not encouraged to indulge in commerce on their own; they were doing it nonetheless, and each new conflict between Byzantium and Iran forced more of the international trade out of its originally designed channel through Mesopotamia and into the Red Sea area where the Arabs prevailed as both the guardians of the trade routes and the traders who used those routes.

The terms of a peace treaty concluded with Persia in 561 leave no doubt that the Arabs were effectively engaged in smuggling all across the frontier[128]. By this and other treaties the Byzantines attemptes to force the Arabs through the designated customs stations in Mesopotamia, though how they could police those regulations anywhere south of the Euphrates is difficult to understand. For the maritime trade from the Indies there were only two known stations, the port of Clysma at the head of the Gulf of Suez and the island of Iotabe at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqabah. And after 430 the Arabs controlled that latter in the person of Abū Karib, phylarch of Palestina Tertia.

It is impossible to say how much profit there was in this for the phylarch. Imperial customs duties were 12% **ad valorem** on the import-export trade, but the Arabs of Iotabe may never have imposed it on the products passing through there. Silks and spices, the staples of the Indian trade, were sold directly to state agents, **commerciarii,** and at Iotabe it is conceivable that the stuffs were bought right off the boats without benefit of either Arab middlemen or customs collectors.

Abū Karib's specific mandate was to make the territory under his control secure from plundering "by his own barbarians", as Procopius delicately put it, and to prôtect it from attacks by flying columns of the hostile Lakhmids of Mundhir. Unmentioned in the arrangement, though doubtless another source of concern, were the ambitions of the sons of Ḥārith ibn ᶜAmr. Many of them perished in what appears to have been a period of fierce inter-tribal warfare among the Kindite clans after 528. Some slipped into subjection to the Lakhmids, while one of Hārith's offspring, the famous poet Imr al-Qays, took his case for restoration to Justinian in Constantinople sometime about 540. But without success.[129].

The Byzantines did not intend to neglect the Banū Kindah; they simply had their own candidate among the dead Ḥārith's relatives and he was not the poet-prince. Imr al-Qays was allowed to die in political oblivion, while immediately after the death of Ḥārith in 528 one of the Empire's premier diplomats was sent into the Kindite camp with Constaninople's official recognition of Qays ibn Salāmah[130] What the embassy was likely seeking was a renewal of the treaty made by Anastasius with Ḥujr in 502, though wiht a Kindite tribe in much diminished circumstances.

On that earlier occasion the Emperor's legate has been Euphrasius, and now in 528 or thereabouts it was once again Euphrasius' son Abraham who sought out Qays. They agreed to assume the leadership of the Ma'add, a tirbe of certral Arabia that fluctuated between Yemenite and Kindite control but which Justinian wished to keep out of the expanding camp of the Lakhmids. Qays sent his son Mu'āwiyah to Constaninople to seal the bargain.[131]

Justinian's new arrangement along the frontier of **Oriens** received two quick shocks in 529. In March of that year Mundhir came up along the Euphrates, probably as far as Barbelissa, and then marched due westward through the Roman defenses into Syria Prima and devastated that province right up to Antioch.[132] A

Byzantine counterforce was eventually put together, but by the time it went into actiocn Mundhir was safely back on the steppe with his booty and hostages. Then in the following month the Samaritans of Palestina Secunda burst into revolt. A rump emperor named Julian was set up and Christian blood flowed anew in and around the Palestinian cloisters. Here, however, there was help from the Arab phylarchs, both of whom are anonymous in the sources but one of whom was almost certainly Ḥārith ibn Jabalah who rounded up some of the rebels when they fled into his "home" territory in and around Ḥawrān.[133]

The Samaritan revolt again magnified Ḥārith the Ghassānid and it brought a new military commander to **Oriens** in the person of Belisarius who in 530 marshalled Justinian's invasion army against the Shāh. Ḥārith played no part in that first campaign against Dārā in 530, but in the spring of the next year Syria experienced another blow from a Sāsānian army with Mundhir in the van.[134] The Lakhmid had, as Procopius pointed out, the benefit of great energy and considerable experience, but he was as well the **single** commander of all the Arab federates of the Shāh. Procopius was part of Belisarius' official party at the time and so his analysis may have gotten back to Justinian since shortly after Mundhir's attack the Emperor followed the Shāh's lead: Ḥārith the Ghassānid was appointed supreme phylarch of the Byzantine Arabs and apparently received in addition an honor granted to none before: he was raised to the rank of king **(basileus)**[135] It was an honor intended to raise Hārith to an equal rank with Mundhir, who was already styled king, and it probably counted for more in the camps to wait for eleven more years before he was given the more closely guarded **Roman** title of Patrician.[136]

Looking back from the perspective of Justinian's elevation of Ḥārith ibn Jabalah, we can observe the emergence of a new concept of the Arab phylarchate in the first quarter of the sixth century. The Arab tribes were bound to the Empire by a formal treaty **foedus, sponde** concluded between a high ranking representative of the Emperor and the headman of the tribe. The **shaykh** likely sealed the bargain as Qays did, by the venerable custom of sending a family hostage to Constantinople. At first the phylarch may have been expected to send tribute as well, but in the course of the sixth century, when the Arabs were fully incorporated into the military system as **foederati**—or **symmachoi,** "allies," as the sixth century preferred to call them—the flow of gold reversed itself. The phylarchs received a regular payment of the **annonae foederaticiae,**[137] originally provisions of grain, meat and wine for the troops but regularly commuted to payment in gold in the fifth and sixth centuries.[138] How much they received probably varied widely. In 634 Heraclius was paying the meager sum of thirty pounds of gold to his Arab clients in the Sinai,[139] while Justinian contracted to buy off his Lakhmid enemy Mundhir III with a thousand pounds of gold a year.[140]

Somewhat less expensively, and particularly for Justinian who was a spendthrift with titles, the phylarch was promoted through the senatorial ranks of **illustris, spectabilis** and **clarissimus,** and, in Ḥārith's case at least, achieved the exalted title of

Patrician.[141] The succession within the phylarchate, though not of course to the titles, was dynastic from father to son, a procedure that differs markedly from the custom of the Arabs on the steppe and in south Arabia where the kingship often passed from brother to brother.

The recipients of these honors obviously performed some highly useful service for the Empire. By their very nature and organization the tribes of the "tent dwellers" were mobile military units which would serve for pay in the cavalry warfare on the flatlands of Mesopotamia. They scouted for the regular troups, were drawn up on the flanks of the infantry in pitched battles and conducted mopping up operations afterward. On other occasions the Arab **foederati** were given freer rein to course the countryside in a kind of random destruction.

The treaties of the late fifth and early sixth century looked to somewhat different ends, however. They were concerned not so much with tactics in Mesopotamia as with the strategic situation along the **limes** running south from Damascus to 'Aqabah. There were new tribes there, the Kindah and the Ghassānids among them, and both Leo and Anastasius attempted to stabilize them by binding their phylarchs to the restraint of their own men, and whatever other bedouin might be living within their jurisdiction, from the kind of raiding and brigandage to which they were prone.[142]

When Anastasius resumed hostilities with the Shāh in 502 the emphasis shifted once again to Mesopotamia and the role of the Arabs changed accordingly. The notion of a supreme phylarchate may well have been initiated on the appearance of the Kindah who for a brief season dominated both sides of the steppe. With Ḥārith ibn 'Amr removed, however, and with the appearance of both Mundhir the Lakhmid and Ḥārith the Ghassānid as agents of their respective sovereign, the Arab phylarchs became the single most important military factor on the eastern frontier.

The strategies that guided them were not identical. Mundhir was more aggressively free in his operations and was deeply involved in the commercial and religious politics of the Yemen. Justin and Justinian preferred to conduct their Yemenite policies through the agency of the Abyssinians rather than the Ghassānids. Further, Justinian's attention was drawn increasingly to the West and he may have conceived of Ḥārith's role as principally an element, and possibly the single most important element, in his new defensive posture in the Near East. Procopius' treatise **On Buildings** gives a detailed picture of Justinian's military construction along the eastern frontier. The bulk of the Emperor's efforts were invested in the north-south defense line running between the Euphrates, however, there was little building of a military nature. The **limites** were allowed to fall into decay, with the hope, apparently, that southern Syria, Phoenicia and Palestine were adequately covered toward the east by the barrier of the steppe and the presence of the Arab phylarchs with Ḥārith at their head.

This was the thesis put forward by Jean Sauvaget in 1939.[143] Sauvaget's argument rested chiefly on the lack of military building on the Syro-Palestinian **limes**—who or what woul defend Damascus and Jerusalem?—and on the obvious ease of the Muslimconquest after the dismemberment of the Ghassānid phylarchate in 584. The argument assumed, of course, that the Byzantines feared an external threat from the east across the steppe and that the Ghassānids were engaged to resist that threat. That assumption is not **prima facie** evident, however. The Sāsānians inevitably came through Mesopotamia and their intent was not invasion and occupation in the modern manner but rather the control of the trading posts and customs stations of the international trade route. The only international route that lay in the Ghassānids territory was that running southward from Gaza and Damascus to 'Aqabah, the Ḥijāz and the Red Sea, and Justinian had little to fear from an external enemy in that direction. In 531 his power stretched all the way to the Yemen.

Much of Justinian's carefully wrough network of alliances became unravelled before the end of the sixth century, but there were flaws that can be detected from the outset, and particularly in the area where the Muslim Arabs eventually made their appearance. Contemporary sources on Palestina Tertia make no mention of a "bishop of the Arabs" there or of any of the kinds of "camps" connected with the presence of Arab auxiliaries in the other frontier provinces of **Oriens.** Nor is there any trace, benevolent or otherwise, of the phylarch Abū Karib's activity in that province. Surely the conclusion is justified that Abū Karib's jurisdiction was **outside** the frontier, in this case east of the **Via Nova Traiana,** and that for the rest Justinian allowed the towns within Palestina Tertia, and elsewhere perhaps as well, to protect themselves from the local bedouin as best they could.[144]

This may in fact be the point of Procopius' remark that after the peace treaty (of 532?) Justinian allowed the defenses of the **limites** to fall into decay.[145] There is some testimony to bear this out, the literary testimony of **On Buildings,** for example, and the fact that what had earlier been fortresses in the Negev were converted into hostels for pilgrims during this period, while in Syria similar strongpoints were taken over as monasteries for ascetics.[146] It is equally likely, however, that Procopius, who was no great admirer of Ḥārith ibn Jabalah, was reflecting unfavorably upon Justinian's increasing reliance upon his Arab clients to preserve the security of the forntier, at the expense, Procopius thought, of the regular troops stationed there.

In the third decade of the sixth century the history of the Ghassānids becomes clearer with the emergence of Ḥārith Ibn Jabalah as the paramount **shaykh** of the Byzantines' Arab federates. An impressive number of literary sources, chief among them Procopius, converge on the phylarchate, and as this paper has already made clear, we are all indebted to Irfan Shahid for his painstaking analysis of those sources and the first detailed studies of the phylarchate since Noeldeke's in the nineteenth century. That is not to say that all the problems have been solved, and I

should like to end this already extended paper by reffecting on what I consider one of the most interesting and important of them.

An area of research in the history of early Islam is currently undergoing a fundamental revision, and the new and still somewhat tentative conclusions must effect our way of thinking about the Syrian **limites** and the Ghassānids' position upon them. I refer to the latest studies on the so-called Umayyad chateaux.[147] It was once thought that some of these sites were Ghassānid, a thesis that yielded to Pere Lammens' contention that they were Umayyad **badiyahs**, desert resorts of Umayyad princes who grew weary of the alien city life of places like Damascus and attempted to return to their nomadic origins, though on a considerably more luxurious scale.[148] The Lammens theory, which once held the field, was seriously damaged by Sauvaget.[149] Apart from other considerations, what Lammens did not understand about the Umayyad chateaux was that they were located on extensive and elaborately irrigated **latifundia**, a fact that undermines his vision of bādiyahs.

This is of no immediate concern to our purpose here, but where the chateaux become critical for an understanding of the Ghassānids is in the knowledge that many of the agricultural features of these **latifundia** were pre-Umayyad, that is, Roman or Byzantine. Some of the chateaux are located inside the **limes** ('Anjar, Khirbet al-Mafjar), some exactly astride the frontiers (Qasr al-Ḥayr West), but the greatest number of them lie outside what we conceive to be the limites of the Empire and thus in or very near the domains of the Ghassānids in Byzantine times.

Thus we have a somewhat startling new picture of the frontier provinces of Byzantine Syria where agricultural estates extended well into what we have thought of as a fact, very few detailed studies of the economic life of Byzantine Syria, simply because insufficient data has been assembled.[150] In one of the the rare instances where a detailed survey has been made on the sites,[151] analysis has revealed the growth of a vital village economy in northern Syria where there was an intimate connection between monastic settlements, most of them Monophysite, the prosperous local olive culture and villages tied to both.[152] At the very moment when the abandonment of farmland in Egypt was reaching crisis proportions,[153] large areas of northern Syria were developing a new agricultural prosperity.

Southern Syria too appears to have enjoyed a new vitality in the late sixth century, though here, perhaps, the energies were commercial rather than agricultural. In 1958 Roger Paret called attention to the remarkable building activity testified to by the sixth century archaeological evidence in the Transjordan,[154] and there are indications that something similar was going on in and around the towns in Palestina Tertia.[155] The Palestinian farmsteads of the late sixth century deserve further investigation since they represent a much closer analouge to the Umayyad **latifundia**, while Paret's argument runs off into quite another direction, to the migration of Arab traders from Mecca northward along the trade route from the Yemen to Damascus.

Paret's thesis has met with some skepticism,[156] though the evidence upon which it rests remains uncontroverted. If Justinian neglected the frontier defenses of **Oriens,** those same **limites** were obviously in an economically and artistically flourishing condition right down to the Persian invasion at the beginning of the seventh century. As yet we have no way of associating the Ghassānids, who were waxing in the thirties and waning in the seventies of the sixth centruy, with that prosperity, even though its chief manifestations surrounded them on all sides. Nor can we demonstrate any connection between that sixth century Syrian prosperity with the Umayyad steppe **lafifundia** without a far more exact knowledge of the date of the pre-Islamic features of the latter.

The chateaux and their environs have left no trace in the Byzantine historians of the period, not even in Procopius' **Buildings** which professed to survey that area. If the **latifundia** turn out to be Byzantine and not simply Roman estates deserted in a much earlier time, the historian will then have to address himself to the task of finding a place for the Ghassānids in that altered landscape. It appears certain that they did not work the **latifundia,** nor is there any evidence that they even inhabited them. The agricultural villa, the **qasr,** was, after all, a fixed residence with little or no military value and so a far cry from the mobile herta of the Ghassānids.

There is much to be done, then, though much has already been accomplished, to sharpen our understanding of those Arabs who were pressing against the frontiers of the great empires in the days before Islam. Scarcely a beginning has been made, for example, in connecting the Arab evidence, notably the testimony of the **jāhilī** poets and the early Muslim historians and genealogists, with the **limites** and their inhabitants who were so closely observed by the Byzantine and Syrian chroniclers. We still do not know enough about the spread and the quality of Monophysite Christianity along and beyond the frontier. The relationship of the Jews of the Yemen wiht their coreligionists further north, perhaps by way of places like Yathrib, still remains to be explored. It is not a discouraging prospect by any means; the evidence, archeological and literary, continues to accumulate, and with it our understanding of the Arabs before Islam.

New York University

NOTES

1. Of particular importance is Nov. VIII (A.D. 535) with its list of the civil governors of the eastern provinces.
2. The fullest treatment of these lists is by A.H.M. Jones, **The Later Roman Empire** III, Oxford, 1964, 347- 391.
3. Collected by J.B. Chabot, **Syndicon orientale,** Paris, 1902.
4. What there is to be known has been summed up by A. Christensen, **Iran sous les Sassanides,** 2nd ed. Copenhagen, 1944 and N. Pigulewskaua, **Les Villes de l'Etat iranien aux epoques parthe et sassanide,** Paris, 1963. I have not as yet seen the papers of the conference sponsored by the **Accademia dei Lincei** under the title **La Persia nel Medioevo,** Rome, 1971.
5. At least one sixth century Byazantine historian had access to those archives; see the passages of the historian Agathias translated and commented upon by A. Cameron, "Agathias and the Sasanians," **Dumbarton Oaks Papers** 23-24 (1969-1970), 67-183. Modern studies of the Lakhmids begin and end with Noeldeke's commentary upon Tabari (see n. 75 below) and G. Rothstein, **Die Dynastie der Lakhmiden in al- Hira,** Berlin, 1899.
6. See M. Avi-Yonah, **The Holy Land From the Persian to the Arab Conquest,** Grand Rapids, 1966, 119-122, 162-164.
7. R. Mouterde and A. Poidebard, **Le Limes de Chalcis,** Paris 1945.
8. M. Avi-Yonah, **loc. cit.** and the literature cited there.
9. L. Dillemann, **Haute Mesopotamie orientale et pays adjacents.**
10. A. Stein, "Notes on Remains of the Roman **limes** in Northern Iraq," **Geographical Journal** 92 (1938), 61-66.
11. See L. Dilleman, **Haute Mesopotamie,** 201 ff. and J. Sauvaget, **REI** 35 (1967), 5.
12. On the Byzantines' growing dependence on walls see D. Claude, **Die byzantinische Stadt im 6 Jahrhundert,** Munich.
13. See the examples cited by Claude, **op. cit.,** 127 ff., among which obviously belong the negotiations between Muhammad, and the bishop of Ailah in 630; on which see, in the same context, P. Mayerson, "The First Muslim Attacks on Southern Palestine," **TAPA** 95 (1964), 172-176.
14. Joshua Stylites, **Chronicle** XXXIX and XCI.
15. Ammianus Marcellinus XXXI, 16, 3-7
16. See the pieces assembled by I. Shahid (Kawar), **JAOS** 75 (1955), 5 ff.
17. I. Shahid (Kawar), "The Last Days of Salih," **Arabica** 5 (1958), 145-158.
18. See the three interesting studies by V. Christides: "The Arabs as 'Barbaroi' Before the Rise of Islam" **Balkan Studies** 10 (1969), 317-324; "The Names **Arabes, Sarakenoi** ect. and their False Byzantine Etymologies," BZ 65 (1972), 329-333. In contemporary art the Arabs were depicted as swarthy and exotic, at least until their conversion to Christianity when their skin tones became appreciably lighter: **idem,** "Pre- Islamic Arabs in Byzantine Illuminations," **Le Muséon** 83 (1970), 167-181.
19. **H.E.** VI, 38.
20. And elsewhere. Jerome, with his well-known connections with the monastic community, reported the widespread raids of 410-411 for his Latin readers: Ep. 126, 2.
21. Cf. Sozomen, **H.E.** VI, 38.
22. Two of the more interesting are those commemorated in the **Narratives** of Ps.- Nilus, **MPG** 79, col. 626 from the Sinai at the end of the fourth century and by John Moschus (d.634), **Spiritual Meadow,** 209-210 (Rouet de Journel). On the dating of the latter incident, see P. Goubert, **Byzance avant l'Islam** I. Paris 1951, 261-262.
23. E. Schwartz, **Kyrillos von Skythopolis,** Leipzig, 1939, 18-21.
24. **Ibid.,** 25, lines 8-9; on the **paremboiai,** see below.
25. Sozomen, **H.E.** Vi, 36.

26. The signatories to the conciliar acts from the Patriarchate of Antioch are assembled in R. Devreesse, **Le Patriarchat d'Antioch,** Paris, 1945, 124-141.
27. Terebon, his son and his grandson all followed Aspebetos as phylarchs of their tribe. Terebon illustrates another common motif of the day. He was captured and held prisoner by a rival phylarch until the influence of Euthymius was brought to bear; E. Schwartz, **Kyrillos,** 52-53
28. See the the texts cited in A. Vööbus, **History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient** II, Louvain, 1960, 352-353.
29. John of Ephesus, **H.E.** III, 36; Michael the Syrian II, 248.
30. Sozomen, **H.E.** VII, 19. The judgment is confirmed on topographical grounds: A.H.M. Jones, **The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces** 2nd ed., Oxford, 1971, 286.
31. See the synthesis in Devreesse, **Patriarchat,** 108-304.
33. **H.E.** VI, 33. The reference is not to Busrā as a **Parembole,** as in the later references to "bishops of the Arabs," but rather to the peculiar government of Buṣrā which, like the Mecca and Medina of Muhammad's day, still preserved the residue of a tribal organization and was governed by a council of delegates from the leading tribes; **Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes,** ed. Chagnat, III, 1276, 1277.
34. Devreesse, **Patriarchat,** 139
35. The archaeological evidence is collected in Devreesse, **op cit.,** 219-240; cf. n. 154 below.
36. A. Vööbus, **History of Asceticism** II, 351.
37. Called in Arabia a **moderator;** Cf. **Nov.** CII, **De moderatore Arabiae.**
38. All the descriptive evidence for the topography of Palestina Tertia is reproduced in tabular form in A.H.M. Jones, **Cities,** Table XL, 547.
39. On early Christianity in the Sinai see R. Devreesse, "Le Christianisme dans la peninsule sinaitique," **RB** (1940), 205-223 and, following him, D. Chitty, **The Desert a City,** Oxford, 1966, 168-178.
40. Procopius, **On Buildings** V, 8.
41. See P. Mayerson, "The Desert of Southern Palestine according to Byzantine Sources," **Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.** 107 (1963), 160-172.
42. H.C. Butler, **Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria 1899- 1900** II, 305; H.W. Waddington, **Inscriptions grecques et latines de Syrie No.** 2464. Both are reproduced with some additional material by N. Abbott, **The Rise of North Arabian Script,** Chicago, 1939, Pl. I.
43. For a chronological list of all the dated inscriptions of this area see Devreesse, **Patriarchat,** 313-316.
44. See, however, "Harith" (Arethas) and "ᶜAbdallah" (Theodoulos) who represented Elusa in Pal. III in the fifth century; Mayerson, "Desert of Southern Palestine", 168.
45. These are the possibilities put forth by G. Graf, **GCAL** I, 34 ff.
46. See A. Baumstark, "Das Problem eines vorislamischen christlich- Kirchlichen Schrifttums in arabischer Sprache," **"Islamica** 4 (1931), 562-575.
47. **The Martyrs of Najran. New Documents (Subsidia Hagiographica** 49, Brussels, 1971, Syriac text, III- XXXII; translation, 44-64,
48. Text XIX; trans. 62; comm., 91-98.
49. **Op. Cit.,** 242-250
50. **Book of Himyarites** 14b. CIX.
51. R. Schroter, "Trostschreiben Jacob's von Sarug and die himjaritischen Christen," ZDMG 31 (1877), 360-405.
52. See the evidence collected in I. Goldziher, **Muslim Studies,** ed. S.M. Stern, I, 106-107.
53. A. Guillaume, **The Life of Muhammad,** London, 1955, 83.
54. Goldziher, **loc. cit.;** Abbott, **Rise,** 5.
55. See the texts edited by L. Dillemann, **Haute Mésopotamie,** 88-89.
56. E. Honigmann and A. Maricq, **Recherches sur les Res Gestae Divi Saporis,** Brussels, 1953,39.
57. J.M.Fiey, "Balad et le Beth Arabiye irakien," **Orient Syrien** 10 (1964), 189-232.

58. Chabot, **Syndikon orientale,** 533-534.
59. The etymology of **hêrtâ** has long been debated and there was once an almost general agreement that the Arabic **ḥirah** was a borrowing from the Syriac. I. Shahid, "The Etymology of Hira," **Linguistic Studies... Richard Slade Harrell,** Washington, D.C., 1967, 163-173 has recently reinvestigated the question and has sought to demonstrate that, on the basis of the presence of the word in South Arabian inscriptions, **ḥīrah** is a genuine Arabic word (from Ḥara, Yuḥaru, "to stop" or "halt" and thus the Syriac may be the borrowing. Like its newly affirmed cognate, **ḥayr, ḥīrah/ herta** has distinct military connotations.
60. Rothstein, **Lakhmiden,** 21,
61. There was a persistent feeling among connoisseurs of the bedouin poetry that ^{c}Adi stood somewhat apart from the authentic tradition "because (his) expressions were not those of the Najd," that he betrayed in his style and diction not so much that he was a Christian but that he was not a genuine bedouin. Literacy was perhaps already taking its toll on the oral tradition in poetry; see A. Nallino, **La Litterature arabe,** tr. C. Pellat, Paris, 1950, 60.
62. Cf. Tabari- Noeldeke, 313 ff.
63. A. Vööbus **History of the School of Nisibis,** Louvain, 1965, 175.
64. A. Baumstark, GSL, 130- 131.
65. **Ibid.,** 257-258.
66. Cf. n. 59 above.
67. **Die Ghassanischen Fürsten aus dem Hause Gafna's,** Berlin, 1887, 49.
68. Assembled and commented upon by E. Herzfeld, "Mshatta, Hira und Badiya," **Jahrbuch der preussischen Kunstsammlunen** (1021), 113-115.
69. Cf. R. Devreesse, **patriarchat,** 279.
70. R. Dussaud, **Topogaphie historique de la Syrie antique et mediévale,** Paris, 1927, 332-333, 515; T. Noeldeke, **ZDMG** 29 (1875), 79.
71. Procopius, **Bp** II, 1, 1-15; cf. I. Shahid (Kawar), **BZ** 52 (1959), 321-343.
72. Dussaud, **Topographie historique,** 332; Devreesse, **Patriarchat,** 225.
73. On the early history of Ḥirah, see Rothstein, **Lakhmiden,** 12-17.
74. Chabot, **Syndicon orientale,** 275.
75. Thanks in large measure to the classic study of the material by Theodor Noeldeke, **Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden,** Leiden, 1879.
76. Tabari- Noeldeke, 53 ff.
77. Tabari- Noeldeke, 86 ff.; Rothstein, **Lakhmiden,** 68-69.
78. Theophanes, sub anno 5918; Socrates, **H.E.** VII, 18-20
79. There are persistent reports from both the Arab and the Greek sources of a hostile encounter on the Roman side of the frontier between Aswad and the Ghassānid Ḥārith, though there is no way the two men could have been contemporaries; E. Schwatz, **Kyrillos,** 75, lines 8-11 and Rothstein, **Lakhmiden,** 73.
80. Joshua Stylites, **Chronicle** XXII.
81. Theophanes, **sub anno 5990.**
82. Zacharias of Mitylene VII, 2.
83. Theophanes, **loc. cit.;** cf. I. Shahid (Kawar), **JAOS** 77 (1955), 206.
84. The evidence in Theophanes and the Arab historians for the events of these and the following years has been studied by I. Shahid (Kawar), "The Last Days of Salīḥ," **Arabica** 5 (1958), 145-158 and "Ghassān and Byzantium. A New Terminus a quo," **Der Islam** 33 (1958), 232-255.
85. Reported by the historian Malchus, fr. 1 in Muller, **FHG,** IV, 113.
86. I. Shahid, **Martyrs,** text XXXI; trans. 63. There is also an extant Karshuni version which has "tribe" (qabilah) for the important **herta; op. cit.,** 109 on line 40.
87. It should be noted, however, that "the **hêrtâ** of Jabalah" is possibly being used in a purely topographical sense, much in the way that Ḥirah continued to be called "the hêrtâ of Nu^{c}mān long after the death of Nu^{c}mān" I.

88. On the ecclesiastical policy of Anastasius see R. Haacke, "Der kaiserlich Politik in den Auseinandersetzungen im Chalkedon" in A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, **Das Konzil von Chalkedon** II, Wurzburg, 1951, 95-177. espec. 124-141 and C. Capizzi, **L'Imperatore Anastasio**, Rome, 1969, 100-137.
89. E. Honigmann, **Évêques et Évêchés Monophysites**, Louvain, 1951, 76-77.
90 See A. de Halleaux, **Philoxene de Mabbog**, Louvain, 1963, 82 for the texts affirming the presence of the "bishop of Arabia" at the synod. On the difficult question of the dating of the synod, see Honigmann, **Évêques**, 16-18 and de Halleaux, **op. cit.** 81-85.
91. Honigmann, **Évêques**, 98-99
92. The reaction promoted by Justin spread somewhat less quickly on the frontier, and in 519 or 520 two of the most famous Monophysite bishops were consecrated, John of Tella-Constantia and James of Serug; cf. W.H.C. Frend, **The Rise of the Monophysite Movement**, Cambridge, 1972, 242.
93. Simeon's letter likewise mentions (Shahid, **Martyrs**, text XXXI; trans. 63) Peter of Apamea and Thomas of Germanicia, both Monophysite bishops in 519 and in exile after that date, though it is not clear from the reference whether the letter was written to them in exile or not. There is likewise a reference to the consecration of Elias, bishop of the Ḥaḍramawt, by John of Tella, the Severan bishop who was himself consecrated in 519. This is strong support for the later dating of 524, though Shahid has attempted to reconcile it to the earlier one as well; **Martyrs**, 237-238.
94. Theodore Lector, **H.E.** II, 35 and, following him, Theophanes, **sub anno** 6005. The sources may well have been thinking of al-Mundhir the Lakhmid, but not many modern scholars have permitted the indentification since the Lakhmid phylarch elsewhere appears as a militant pagan. Shahid, however, is willing to accept the Christianity, though not the Chalcedonianism, of Mundhir III on the basis of a passage in the new letter of Simeon of Beth Arsham; cf. **Martyrs**, 269-272 and the earlier literature cited there.
95. Zacharias of Mitylene IX, 2; Shahid, **Martyrs**, 273-276.
96. Malalas, 441-442.
97. Procopius, **B.P.** I, 13, 2-8.
98. Theophanes, **sub anno** 5994.
99. Theophanes, **sub anno** 5995; Nonnosus **apud Photium, FHG** IV, 179.
100. Cf. W. Caskel, **Jamharat an- Nasab** II, Leiden, 1966, 372 and A. Grohmann, **EI**, new ed. I, 526.
101. Many of them published, or republished, by G. Ryckmans in **Le Muséon** 64 (1951)—69 (1956).
102. See, for example, S. Smith, "Events in Arabia in the sixth Century A.D." **BSOAS** 16 (1954), 425-468 and N. Pigulewskaja, **Byzanz auf den Wegen nach Indien**, Berlin, 1969. 211-271.
103. Joshua Stylites, **Chronicle** LI-LVIII.
104. Joshua Stylites, **Chronicle** LVII- LVIII. The most recent detailed study of the reign of Anastasius, C. Capizzi, **L'Imperatore Anastasio**, Rome, 1969, ignores most of this and, indeed, everything written on the Arab phylarchs during the last quarter century.
105. Tabari-Noeldeke, 48-50; Rothstein, **Lakhmiden**, 90-94. For a letter addressed to Abū Jaᶜfar by Philoxenus, see de Halleaux, **Philoxene**, 47-48, 203-208.
106. **B.P.** I, XVII, 40.
107. The aggressively pagan Mundhir would have married the piously Christian Hind, who many years later dedicated a church at Ḥīrah (Yāqūt II, 709), as part of the earlier alliance between the Lakhmids and the Kindites.
108. E. Schwartz, **Kyrillos**, 211.
109. See Shahid, **Martyrs**, 241 citing **Chronicon ad annum 724 pertinens**, 111 and Elias of Nisibis, **Opus chron.**, 56.
110. Procopius, **B.P.** I, XVII, 44. On another, later dating of their capture see I. Shahid (Kawar), **JNES** 23 (1964), 121 n. 7.
111. Cf. **Martyrs**, 235-242.
112. Zacharias of Mitylene, **H.E.** VIII, 3, citing the letter of Simeon.

113. **Acta Martyrii Arethae** No. 25.
114. **Chronicle of Se'ert** XXII, 142-144.
115. Which Shahid (**JNES** 23 (1964), 121-122) emends from the Syriac **Qomes** to **Bar Qays.**
116. **Acta Arethae, loc. cit.**
117. For his missionary work at al-Ḥīrah, see John of Ephesus, **Lives of Eastern Saints, P.C.** 17 (1923), 138 ff.
118. Cf. I. Shahid, **Martyrs,** 171-172 and his earlier "Byzantino-Arabica: The Conference of Ramla, A.D. 524" **JNES** 23 (1964), 115-131.
119. Zacharias of Mitylene, **H.E.** VIII, 3, citing letter of Simeon.
120. Zacharias of Mitylene, **H.E.** VIII, 5 and Michael the Syrian IX, 16.
121. Theophanes, **Sub anno** 6016; Malalas, 423.
122. Theophanes, **sub anno** 6020; Malalas, 425-426; cf. Procopius, **On Buildings** II, XI, 12.
123. Theophanes, **sub anno** 6021; Malalas, 434-435; cf. I. Shahid (Kawar), **BZ** 53 (1960), 60 and S. Smith, "Events in Arabia," 446-447, who is not convinced that Ḥārith was killed on this occasion.
124. Theophanes and Malalas, **loc. cit.**
125. See I. Shahid (Kawar), "Arethas, Son of Jabala," **JAOS** 75 (1955), 205-221.
126. Ḥārith's actual jurisdiction must have extended from the vicinity of Palmyra where he was disputing his and Rome's frontier with Mundhir in 539.
127. B.P. I, XIX, 8-13; cf. I. Shahid (Kawar), **BZ** 50 (1957), 376-378, N. Pigulewskaja, **Byzanz,** 261-262 and E. Stein, **Histoire du Bas Empire** II, Paris, 1949, 298 n. 1.
128. Menander fr. 11 in Müller, **FHG** IV, 212. The terms have been studied by I. Shahid (Kawar), "The Arabs in the Peace Treaty of A.D. 561" **Arabica** 3 (1956), 181-213, and N. Pigulewskaja, **Byzanz,** 153-155. On the dispute whether the term bound the Arabs of Southern Syria see the article of R. Paret cited in n. 154 below.
129. On Imr al- Qays see G. Olinder, **The Kings of Kinda,** Lund, 1927, 100-118. Stein, **Bas Empire** II, 299 n. 1
130 Nonnosus **apud Photium** in Müller, **FHG** IV, 179; Qays ibn Salāmah, the grandson of Ḥārith ibn ʿAmr, is Shaid's identification (**BZ** 53 (1960), following an **earlier** suggestion by Olinder. Smith ("Events in Arabia." 234-435), on the other hand, calls him **Qays** ibn Khuzāʿi and connects him with the brothers Qays and Muhammad cited in **Sirah** 31;cf. **Tabari**- Noeldeke, 203-204.
131. The subsequent history of Qays is exceedingly confused in the sources and it is impossible to put order in the fragmentary pieces of information on him except by constructing hypotheses. According to the Nonnosus fragment preserved by Photius (cf. n. 129 above), there were two additional embassies to Qays. The first, led by Nonnosus, had as its object to persuade Qays to come to Constantinople. This was actually part of a complicated diplomatic manoeuvre by Justinian (cf. Malalas, 456-459) which had as its dual object the restoration of Qays as **Shaykh** of the Maʿadd and a concerted attack on the Lakhmids. But when and why was he deposed? Procopius (**B.P.**) I,xx, 9-12), who has apparently telescoped two different missions into one, has a strange tale of a blood fued between Qays and Dhū Nuwās' Christian successor as ruler of Ḥimyar. We know little of what to make of this, but Shahid (**BZ** 53 (1960), 65,) thinks that Nonnosus was confronting Qays with a choice, either to come to Constantinople (for reassignment?) or return to Maʿadd. Though Nonnosus was unsuccessful, Abraham revisited Qays at some later date and persuaded him to come to the capital. Qays divided his rule over the Kindah between his brothers Yazīd and ʿAmr and went off to Constantinople where he was appointed to a command "in the Palestines" (Nonnosus, **loc. cit.**). A dam inscription discovered in the Yemen and dated 539 **Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum** Part, IV, vol. I, 295; cf. Smith, "Events in Arabia,"440) reveals that at that date Abū Karib was still phylarch of Palestina Tertia, and thus if Qays **replaced** Abū Karib (so Smith, "Events in Arabia," 445), the successful mission of Abraham must be placed after 539; if however, Qays were assigned to the "sinecure" of Palestina Prima and Secunda (so Shahid, **art. cit.,** 68-69), the mission of Abraham may be dated to 531. On this

view the Ma^{c}add would have slipped from Byzantine and Himyarite control with the deposition of Qays, whatever its reason, and this is verified by a South Arabian inscription (Ryckmans No. 506 in **Le Muséon** 66 (1953), 275-284) dating from the forties of the sixth century. It describes an expedition of Abraha, the newly independent Abyssinian ruler of Ḥimyar against the Lakhmids (cf. Procopius, **B.P.** I, xx, 13) and the consequent shift of the Ma^{c}add from the Lakhmid camp to Abraha's. For Smith ("Events in Arabia," 437) this is also the appropriate moment for the restoration of Qays to the Ma^{c}add; cf. n. 129 above.

132. Theophanes **sub anno** 6021; Malalas, 445.
133. Theophanes, **loc. cit.**; Malalas, 446-447; Zacharias of Mitylene IX, 8; cf. Shahid (Kawar), **BZ** 52 (1959), 324.
134. Procopius, **B.P.** xvii I. It was Mundhir's suggestion on this occasion that the invasion army march south of the Euphrates and so bypass the heavy Byzantine fortifications in Mesopotamia. The route led through the steppe which ran right up to Chalcis but Mundhir was an expert guide; **B.P.** I, xvii, 30-39. The suggestion was an attractive one and Khusraw came the same way in 542. He was unsuccessful in his attempted siege of Rusāfa- Sergiopolis—perhaps the bulk of his "steppe army" was composed of Arab federates who were notorious for their inability to take walled cities—but he was contemplating an even more ambitious assault on Palestine itself when an enormous plague swept over the Near East and forced his withdrawal; Procopius, **B.P.** II, xx-xxiii.

135. So Procopius in **B.P.** I, xvii, 47-48. The historian appears to be speaking in a straightforward manner and yet he adds, as either addition or explanation, "granting him the dignity (axioma) of king." The latter phrase would probably have passed unnoticed save that no other historian, nor Procopius himself in any other passage save this, nor any single inscription that mentions Ḥārith calls him by the title of basileus. Further, we know that in 580 Ḥārith's son al-Mundhir was summoned to Constantinople and granted the royal diadem, "which no king of the Arabs was ever given before" (John of Ephesus, **H.E.** IV, 39). The question of the kingship of Ḥārith ibn Jabalah must remain moot; cf. the remarks of R. Paret in **Arabica** 5 (1958), 251-262.
136. See I. Shahid (Kawar). "The Patriciate of Arethas," **BZ** 52 (1959), 321-343. While Ḥārith's other titles were attached to functions, the Patriciate, which dated back to Constantine, was designed simply to recognize the rendering of extraordinary services to the state.
137. In Greek, **rogai.** Shahid, **Martyrs,** 102, has claimed to discover in **Iqata** the Syriac translation of **rogai.** The passage in question in Simeon's letter is, however, a highly rhetorical one.
138. A.H.M. Jones, **Later Roman Empire** II, 630
139. Nicephorus Const., **Op. hist.,** 23 De Boor. The account in Nicephorus says that the thirty pounds of gold was payable **di'emporikes amoibes,** through commercial exchange. For its purchasing power in Palestine, see Mayerson, "First Müslim Attacks, "167, n. 3.
140. Menander, **Exc,** ex leg. in Muller, **FHG** IV, 223-225. Mundhir's son ^{c}Amr claimed the same for himself after his father's death.
141. He is so called in an inscription discovered at Qasr al- Ḥayr West; cf. D. Schlumberger in **Syria** 30 (1939), 368-372 and n. 136 above.
142. So in the Sinai where bedouin were paid to guard the "gateway" that led into central Sinai; Theophanes, **sub anno** 6123-6124 and cf Mayerson, "First Muslim Attacks." 157 ff.
143. "Les Ghassanides et Sergiopolis," **Byzantion** 14 (1939), 115-130.
144. See Mayerson, "First Muslim Attacks," 189, n. 109.
145. **Secret History** XXIV, 12-14; but cf. Mayerson, **art. cit.,** 189.
146. Mayerson, **loc. cit.** and "Desert of Southern Palestine", 170; for Syria A. Vööbus, **History** of **Asceticism** II, 165
147. See particularly the posthumously published notes of Sauvaget, "Chateaux umayyades de Syria. Contribution a L'etude de la, colonisation arabe aux I^{er}et II^{e} siecles de L'Hêgire, **"REI** 35 (1967), 5-49 and the hypotheses of C. Grabar, who has been excavating at Qaṣr al- Ḥayr East,

"Umayyad 'Palace' and the ^{c}Abbasid Revolution, "**Studia Islamica** 18 (1963), 5-18, more recently restated in his **Formation of Islamic Art.** New Haven, 1973.

148. Last stated in his **Études sur le siècle des Omayyades,** Beirut, 1930, 325-350.
149. **Op. cit,** 8-13, but compare Sauvaget's remarks about **hêrtâ- hirah** with the findings of I. Shahid in **Linguistic Studies... R.S. Harrell,** Washington, D.C., 1967, 163-173.
150. Most of what has been done may be found in the bibliography of Dietrich Claude's book cited in n. 12 above.
151. G. Tchalenko, **Villages antiques de la Syria du Nord,** 3 vols., Paris, 1953-1958.
152. See M. Rodinson, "De L'archeologie a la sociologie historique. Notes méthodologiques sur le dernier ouvrage de G. Tchalenko," **Syria** 38 (1961), 170-200.
135. Procopius, **Secret History** XXIII, 20.
154. "Les Villes de Syria du Sud et les routes commerciales d'Arabie a la fin du VI^{e} siècle, "**Akten des XI Internationalen Byzantinisten- Kongresses,** Munich, 1958, 438-444.
155. Mayerson, "First Muslim Attacks." 190.
156. Claude, **Die byzantinische Stadt,,** 170-171.

CULTURAL IMPACT OF BILAD AL-SHAM ON SIND

Hakim Mohammed Said

Syria, whose name in Arabic and Arabicized languages is Shām and in the Bible Aram, occupied a unique place in the recorded history of the world. It was because in the past, especially from the seventh century, this country experienced a continuous wave of immigrants of various races, such as Canaanites, Phoenecians, Hebrews, Aramaeans and finally the Arabs. They infiltrated from the adjoining areas and, when felt necessary, annexed their own territories to the mainland, federating it to a greater Syria or Bilād al-Shām. Thus during that period, it included the whole of Palestine, Lebanon, Jordan and parts of Iraq, Iran and Hejaz. Its boundaries at that time comprised an area almost threefold of the present 72 thousand square miles. Its great importance did not rest only with the vast expanse of its surface but also because of the significant role it played and the contributions it made to the intellectual and spiritual progress of mankind.

It had been the cradle of Judaism, a birth-place of Christianity and a seat of Muslim Caliphate. It provided the civilized world with three monotheistic religions which held close relationship with each other. Therefore the Jews, the Christians and the Muslims always turned their eyes to some sacred spot in that country and received some inspiration for their spiritual progress. In worldly affairs also, Syria was the benefactor of mankind because of its tremendous natural resources, properly utilized by its intelllectuals. Its great importance also resulted from its strategic situation between three continents.

After the death of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him), the Muslims advanced on all four sides to preach their religion and whenever they found stiff resistance, they fought and attained decisive victory.

Early in 661 A.D. Amīr Mu'āwiya was originally proclaimed Caliph at Jerusalem but later he chose Damascus as his capital and thus opened a glorious epoch in world history. Fifty years later, in 93 A.H. (712 A.D.) when Syria was under the Umayyad Caliphate, a great general Qutaibah ibn Muslim and his lieutenant Mūsa ibn Nasīr carried on a successful campaign in the eastern theatre of war. At the same time a yound and energetic general Mohammad ibn Qāsim al-Thaqafī conducted his

armies southward into Sind, which was an important part of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent. Sind at that time was culturally, politically, economically advanced and prosperous. It had centres of two great religions, Hinduism and Buddhism at Dewal (or Daibul) and Multan respectively, vast natural resources and a well-established political and social set-up.

Mohammmad ibn Qasim was admitted as the youngest and at the same time a victorious conquerer in the history of the world. He was only 17 years of age when he was appointed to command the expeditionary forces in foreign lands. Under him, Islam's most spectacular triumphs started after the death of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him).

Some Indian and many European historians are of the opinion that Muslims entered India only with the campaign of the latter. This is absolutely wrong. It can be said that it was the first offficial or State entry of the Muslim warriors into that part of the world. It has already been admitted that even before the advent of Islam, the Arabs had maintained their trade relations with the people living on the other side of the Arabian sea, i.e., on the western coast of India. These relations continued even after the birth of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) and also during the days of **Khulafa-i-Rashideen.**

The traders and businessmen had established their permanent colonies in many coastal cities of the country. When they embraced Islam along with other members of their families living in Arbia, they also preached their new religion to their Hindu partners and co-workers and got some of them converted to the folds of Islam. Even a ruler of the Malabar Hills, Raja Zamooran Samri accepted the new faith. The famous historian, Farishta, has narrated in his history, how the ruler of Sar Andeep (Ceylon) was much impressed by listening to the teachings and also after seeing the miracle of **Shaq-ul-Qamar** (breaking of the moon). So he embraced Islam along with many of his people. Similarly some tribes living in the territories, now called Baluchistan and Mekran, had been converted long before any organised expedition was carried on.

Mohammed ibn Qāsim's move was not under any motive of expansionism, but only incidental. It is said that some Arab merchants in Ceylon had died and their widows and children were left helpless in the island and wanted to go back to their native place. The ruler of Ceylon, who was already a faithful Muslim, arranged their migration along with their personal effects and valuable presents for the Caliph in appreciation of his justice shown on many occasions.

This sea caravan was intercepted and plundered by some Hindu pirates. They not only took possession of the booty, but also the inmates of the ship. When Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf heard all about this piracy, he was much aggrieved and sent a protest note to Raja Dahir, the ruler of Sind, who instead of taking a benevolent humane view, sent an insulting, rather ridiculous reply to him. This naturally infuriated Ḥajjāj, who

decided to take immediate action in retribution by sending a punitive force to the neighbouring country.

After taking permission from Caliph Walīd ibn 'Abd al-Malik, he sent two small-sized contingents to Sind, one after the other, to fight out the release of the arrested families and on their defeat deputed his cousin and son-in-law, Muhammad ibn Qāsim, to conduct the campaign with a larger army and secure the release of the prisoners. Since the intention was not to conquer the territory, the strength of the Islamic army was small. But when the resistance was found forceful, arrangement for a vigorous attack had to be made with fresh contingents. On the second round, the general took heavy artillery of experienced soldiers, fully equipped with weapons, such as arbalists, slings and bows, including a formidable stone-throwing catapult, "The Bride", which required the services of five hundred soldiers to operate it. It was brought for use against the massive walls of the fort at Dewal. A camel corps of six thousand men also accompanied them, with more ammunition, and food provisions for the warriors. The campaign was, therefore, decisive.

The Muslims entered the seaport area after subjugating Kanzpur and Arman Bela, two very important towns of Sind, and then swept over the lower valley and the delta of the river Indus to capture Dewal. This city, being heavily fortified seemed impregnable and Dahir's garrison inside the fort consisted of four thousand Rajputs. Besides this, the season was intolerable, being very hot and sultry, dusty and malarious and the faithful were fasting. But the seige continued and ultimately the walls were smashed on the 10th of the holy month of **Ramadān.** Some Hindu soldiers were killed, some of them were arrested and the rest were set free.

The Muslim warriors, under the code of military law and the laws of their land, did not start any carnage because the reason for the onslaught was an act of reprisal for piracy or brigandage near the coast of Sind, as has been pointed out earlier. So they were not inclined to carry on a destruction of the property or the extermination of the innocent people.

In the main temple of the city, one room eighteen feet long and ten feet wide, was full of gold pieces, which were donated to the goddess. They were taken over but not confiscated. A social welfare fund, like their own **Bayt al-Māl** was established with strict instructions, that the entire assets be spent for the welfare of the poor people. Nothing was sent to Damascus for the Caliph's treasury. This was the best gesture of good. will, and was much appreciated by the people.

In spite of this, the horrified residents, who had very unpleasant experiences of conquerers in the past, wanted to run away from their homes in panic. But they were fully pacified in various announcements and, therefore, showed no excitement later when they felt the unique humanly behaviour of the victorious soldiers. Not a single house was plundered, not a woman kidnapped or even molested and only those were killed who were persistently hostile and mischievous. Others were given lease to live

in peace. Even those who were arrested during the campaign were set free after the announcement of general amnesty.

These were the first deep impressions of the noble and most humane character of the victors on the defeated soldiers and civilians.

Muhammad ibn Qāsim, with due permission of Hajjāj, even married the widowed queen of Raja Dahir, who had been killed by a Syrian soldier during the attack on the royal palace. Being the supreme authority and commander of the forces, he could marry any young beautiful virgin of the soil, but he preferred a widow. So it can be argued that this marriage was not based on any other consideration except that it was an effort to break the age-old but very undesirable repugnant custom of Hindu society, forbidding the widows to remarry. At the same time he allowed all the widows of marriageable age to marry in their own community and if it were not possible, to have, in wedlock, any Muslim soldier of mutual choice and consent, after conversion to Islam. It created a stir in the community of Hindu religious heads, but a wave of great rejoicing and satisfaction ran among the women folk. Quite willingly many women embraced Islam before remarrying Muslim soldiers and the ceremony was performed according to the Islamic law. In this way several hundred marriages were solemnised at that time.

Along with the general amnesty proclaimed by the Muslim victorious general, he issued another order that all women, Hindu or converted to Islam, would get their shares from the properties of their fathers, husbands or other relatives. He also retained Hindu officials on their posts in the internal administration of the State. Only to fill up the gaps, some Muslim traders, who were living for long in Sind, or those, who had accompanied the Islamic army, were employed as new incumbents. For such employees, the remuneration was just enough to provide food and clothing and to maintain their position with decency. In some cases, Muslims had to work under superior Hindu officers. Even the governor of Dewal was for some time a Hindu gentleman. This was quite unbelievable for the people of the land, but naturally it raised the prestige of the conquerors.

Muhammad ibn Qāsim kept only one-third of the army in Dewal and ordered the rest to march on towards the north as some people in the interior had revolted. The Muslims after facing some resistance, took over Nerun (present Hyderabad) and brought under subjection the territories of Sehwan, Brahman-no (later named Brahmanabad under the Afghans), Alore, and Multan. The Syrians easily found themselves in possession of all the cities, because they were less defended and secondly because most of the people wanted to live in peace with the Muslims whose character was now known to them.

When the Islamic army marched from Dewal to Multan, the Muslim soldiers felt difficulty in the fixation of the right directions as the roads had not been properly demarcated. At some places even the rough tracks had been washed away by rain or

strong wind and were not traceable. However, they had the compass, an invention of the Arabs, which could guide and point out the way they had to take.

They travelled on horses and camels with adequate arrangement for food and lodging. They did not want ot snatch away anything from the local people, as other armies on march usually do. From Bilād al-Shām they had brought enough provisions which includedd not only flour of wheat, gram and rice but alos dry dates, dry grapes (maveez), dry figs and other fruits. During the journey they ate those dry fruits and threw away their stones or seeds on the way, which grew up in due course into tall trees whose progeny still exists. If one takes an aerial view of the surface of the land, he can locate a line of date trees, right from Dewal to Multan, and at some places big orchards to prove that the Syrian soldiers passed that way and stayed at those places for refreshments discarding seeds and stones of fruit. Later, they not only demarcated and built proper roads but also fixed milestones for reckoning.

Before the arrival of the Syrians, only a few horses were found in Sind and camels were totally unknown but later both these animals, particularly the camels, were imported. The climate was quite congenial for their breeding and they increased and multiplied rapidly. The camels were reared not only as beasts of burden but also for food.

After the administration became smooth and the political atmosphere calm and quiet, the Syrian governor-general paid attention to several reforms. Agriculture was given priority as most of the inhabitants were cultivators and existing under wretched conditions. The land tax was usually assessed at 40 per cent of the produce if the fields were watered by canals, 30 per cent if irrigated by wheels or other artificial means and 25 percent if unirrigated and depending only on rain water. Rotation of crops was unknown in Sind and the way in which the farmer could manage his crop without manure was astonishing. Only cattle manure and village refuse were known to some of them but quite inadequate in quantity. The greater part of such manure was consumed as fuel for cooking purposes and refuse could only be carried to the fields nearest to the villages. Composting was also not known to them.

The governor-general was directly responsible for assessment and realisation of these taxes. Thus he was, in fact, a kind of farmer-general. But he maintained no record and fixed up the amount in each case after the inspection of the site, which previously in most cases was wronly and arbitrarily done and it made the farmer to suffer. The Syrians taught them improved agricultural methods, and exhorted them to follow. Thus, on one hand, the crops improved and on the other, the state revenue increased, in spite of the fact that the tax rate had been decreased.

New crops were also introduced. Garlic, onion and ginger were widely grown and left unused as the local people never utilized them as food additives. They did not even know the medicinal values of these vegetables. Without giving any reason, the religious heads had put taboos on their use. When the beneficial qualities of spices and condiments were pointed out to them, they started to use them, as advised, in

their foods. The minced meat cutlets, called **Shami Kabab,** which grace dinner tables and feasts even today are a delectable culinary legacy of the Syrians, introduced a thousand years before. Similarly **Sharbat Gulab** (syrup made of roses), much enjoyed by the people in Damascus and other eastern towns, also became a favourite drink in Sind. Other Syrian sweets were also introduced, particularly those which were prepared with sugar, milk and flour and date-pulp.

Agriculture profited from the advent of the Bilād al-Shām conquest of Sind. The Sindhis learned better methods of cultivation with new field tools and implemetns and pest control including ravages by locust swarms which had plagued even Egypt during the days of Pharaohs. They were asked to dig up a chain of canals for irrigation right from river Indus to their fields. According to some historians, Sind might well be called "Darydino," i.e., the gift of the river. In fact, without Indus, Sind would be like Egypt deprived of the Nile. The average rain fall was meagre in both countries and they had to depend on their river water and at some places they were asked to dig up pools to store such water for future use. They were also advised to build up granaries and definitely stock sufficient quantity of grains for drought days. They were urged to increase the crops of some kinds of condiments which were grown in Sind and not in Syria, so that they could be exported to Damascus in exchange for other commodities.

In the field of industry also new horzions were opened before the Sindhis. This was done on bilateral basis. Some cottage industries in the newly conquered country were useful and attractive at the same time. They were, therefore, developed further with innovations introduced by their benefactors.

In matters of everyday use, new fashions in dress-making and home-furnishing were adopted. Many local women discarded wearing of traditional **Saris,** which were the remnants of primitive days when the art of sewing had not developed much and people could not stitch their dresses properly. The flowing robes of men were also replaced by militarylike tight dresses which were functional as well as elegant. Bilād al-Shām laid its imprint on arts and crafts such as textile, jewellery, literature and language. Damascene jewels properly cut, became popular and very much in vogue. The local people could get jewls from other parts of the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent but did not know how to cut them properly and so the jewellers learnt a new art from the foreign craftsmen. They, under the guidance of the Syrians, also prepared cosmetics, and mirrors of glass replaced those of polished steel. Improvements were also made in the handloom industry for making fine cloth. Fabrics, such as damask and muslin, based on the names of two Syrian cities, Damascus and Mawsil, became very popular on account of their colour, texture and durability. For this purpose fast colour dyes had to be prepared for printing various designs.

The Syrian Arabs were famous navigators, so, naturally, they knew the art of ship building also. In Sind they found several kinds of trees suitable for ship building.

Ohter material was also available in the country. So, with the help of the local people, they built big sea-going vessels and smallers ones for riverine purposes. Hitherto boats were constructed designed for travel on rivers but proving quite inadequate on open seas.

They also learnt to construct catapults with wooden planks and iron sheets, meant to throw heavy stones on enemy ranks, The Syrians did not withhold any knowledge in this respect although there was every possibility that the device could be used against their own army. In fact, the whole institution of chivalry was promoted in good faith. They were not afraid of facing any adverse reaction. With their peaceful intention and good behaviour they had created an atmosphere of confidence and also the reputiation which they had earned of being always true to their word. Another reason for their mutual confidence was due to the fact that the Sindhis, in order to create some intimacy, had started speaking Arabic and also adopted its script. Before the arrival of the people from Bilād-al-Shām, they were speaking a kind of Hindi and writing in Nagri script. Earlier some of the traders and businessmen having commercial relations with the Arabs, had started speaking Arabic. After the change of administration, every one thought it advisable to read and write the language of the rulers. The businessmen gladly played the role of instructors. In the beginning, they felt some difficulty as the alphabets of two the languages were absolutely different and they had to write not from left to right, as in the case of Nagri, but from right to left, like all semitic languages.

Gradually a new language of Sindhis evolved with about sixty per cent Arabic and the rest Hindi words, but the script chosen for it was **Nastalique.** The present SIndhi language bears almost the same ratio.

A historian, Buzurg ibn Shaheryar, in his book **'Ajāib al-Hind** (written in 300 A.H.) has narrated his river expedition observations, in which, among other things, he has said that a Hindu Raja, who ruled over Gujrat about a hundred years back, had got the Holy Qur'ān translated into Hindi and used to listen to a part of the text every morning.

Civiliations begin, flourish, decline, and disappear—or linger on as stagnant pools left by once life-giving streams. But the elements of culture and civilisation of Bilād al-Sham have been handed down like a patrimony to its heirs in Sind across the years and seas, still strong, still vigorous, still flourishing even today.

Hamdard National
Foundation, Pakistan

MIDDLE EASTERN PARALLELS: SYRIA-IRAQ-ARABIA IN OTTOMAN TIMES

Kamal S. Salibi

It has been customary to conceive of the history of the Arab Middle East in the Ottoman period mostly in terms of cities which were centres of imperial adminstration. Rural and tribal areas away from these cities were treated, for the most part, as though they did not exist. The neglected area consisted of the greater part of Syria, Iraq and Arabia: three regions whose history between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries is commonly thought to comprise little more than sporadic developments of marginal consequence. To gain a proper appreciation of these three regions during the period in question, the full extent of the internal developments in the neglected territory must be brought out, and the complete range of external determinants that affected these developments must be surveyed. Before this is done, a glance at the physical map would be useful.

Geographically, the territory of Syria-Iraq-Arabia may be simply described as a vast stretch of more or less level desert rising gradually from the basin of the Persian Gulf and the valley of Mesopotamia in the east, to end in the west in a fringe of mountains bordering the Red Sea in the south and the Mediterranean in the north. At the south-eastern end of this desert stand the lone mountains of Oman, overlooking the entrance to the Persian Gulf. In the north-east, the desert merges into the valley of Mesopotamia, or Iraq, which extends eastwards extends eastwards to the Zagros mountains. Beyond these mountains lies the plateau of Persia. In the north, the great Syro-Arabian desert (as it may be called) reaches the Taurus mountains which separate it from the plateau of Anatolia and the Armenian and Caucasian highlands.

Historically, this vast Arab region, with its mountain, lowland, and coastal peripheries, has never been known by a single, all-inclusive name (unless the Ottoman term "Arabistan" was such a name). It has comprised, throughout history, a shifting mosaic of names, and the diversity in names is matched by a geographical diversity in the area itself. Iraq, as a broad river valley which is mostly plain, is a country of fairly uniform topography where only a few natural divisions can be distinguished. Syria and Arabia, on the other hand, are broken up by mountains and deserts into a myriad of divisions and pockets, each with its own name and often peculiar character. The Lebanon, for example, is a rugged mountain region blessed by heavy rainfall and oriented towards the Mediterranean. Transjordan, another rugged region, has less predictable rainfall and is oriented in the north towards the Syrian interior, and in the south towards the Red Sea and the Arabian desert. Both regions stand in sharp contrast to a desert plateau such as that of Najd, lost in the centre of Arabia and surrounded on all sides by trackless sands; and neither Lebanon, Transjordan nor Najd bear any physical resemblance to the meandering valley of the Orontes, the oasis of Damascus, the basaltic plains of Hawrān, the rolling hills of the Aleppo region, or the torrid, bare coastlands of the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. Even in Iraq, the marshlands of the south, between Baghdad and Basra, bear hardly any resemblance to the flat expanse of the central regions or the hilly country of the north.

The diversity in the physical map of our area is indeed baffling. This, however, must not blind us to the fact that the various regions of Syria, Iraq and Arabia are in a way connected to form, together, one unit of natural and human geography. They are, after all, no more than the vast Syro-Arabian desert and its peripheries: a central area of desert table-lands which has been, historically, the great human reservoir of the area, and the mountain, coastal and alluvial peripheries which, throughout history, have attracted generation after generation of settlers from the desetrt. It was essentially this demographic pattern, involving wave after wave of human overflow form the central desert to the outlying territories, that lies at the basis of the fundamental historical connection between Arabia, Syria and Iraq. Between the sixteenth century and the nineteenth, this human overflow from the Syrian and Arabian deserts to the peripheries was still going on with rhythmic regularity, providing the link between the diverse historical developments that occured in the various parts.

During this period, two primary forces, the Ottoman and the Persian empires, cast their shadows over our territorial unit of Syria-Iraq-Arabia. Historians have been inclined to see this territorial unit from the point of view of those two empires, let us now turn the tables and see these two empires from the point of view of our unit.

First, let us consider the pattern of political developments in our agglomeration of Syria-Iraq-Arabia without reference to the two empires. To begin with, we must bear in mind that, outside the cities, the area was mainly dominated by tribes of pastoral Bedouins who inhabited the desert, and by sedentary folk who controlled the rural areas on the peripheries of the desert as well as a few clusters of Oasis settlements in the desert itself. It is easy to assume that many of the sedentary folk were originally tribal settlers from the desert, and most sedentary clans actually claimed a Bedouin origin or connection. Such claims, however, were normally mythical, and few of them can be historically substantiated. Ordinarily, a sedentary clan claimed an affiliation or connection with a powerful Bedouin tribe of the nearby desert to protect its rural territory from tribal raids, or to secure tribal help for its purposes; the Bedouin tribe in question confirmed the claimed affiliation or connection because this gave it ready access to the grazing lands and markets of the sedentary area. The claimed relationship thus reflected political expediency and illustrated the inevitable symbiosis, in the area, between the desert and the rural countryside with its villages and towns.

In the rural areas in the peripheries, and in the clusters of oasis settlements in the desert, political organization was territorial. In a given district, a strong man would emerge at the head of an alliance of powerful local clans, overpower rivals, secure the support of neighbouring desert tribes (if his discrict happened to be on the edge of the desert), and establish himself in local authority. Often such a strong man became the founder of a dynasty of local chieftains which lasted for a number of generations. When circumstances permitted, a particularly powerful chieftain extended a feudal overlordship over neighbouring districts and became the founder of a principality which could grow to include flourishing cities. When the favourable circumstances, for one reason or another, were reversed, such a feudal principality

would shrink back to its original core, or else entirely vanish. During our period, emirates such as those of the 'Assāfs, Sayfās, Ma'ns and Shihābs in Mount Lebanon, of the Jānbūlāds in Aleppo, of the Afrāsiyābs in Basra, of the Banū Khālid in the Ḥasā, of the Banū Yās in Abū Dhabī, of the Zaydānīs in Galilee, of the Āl-Sa'ūd in the Najd, and of the Āl Khalīfa in Bahrain-even the Zaydī imāmate of Sharaf al-Dīn Yaḥyā and his descenants in the Yemen and Ibādī imāmate of the Ya'rubids and Āl Bū-Sa'id in Oman--were all, more or less, principalities of this kind.

Hence, the political tendency in Syria-Iraq-Arabia involved the development of local chieftainships in the peripheral and oasis areas into principalities based on feudal power (as in Mount Lebanon), on tribal power (as in Abū Dhabī), or an a combination of both (as in Najd, or elsewhere). This political tendency, however, was never independent of external influences; between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, it was modified by the looming presence of the Ottoman and Persian empires. These two Muslim empires, despite the many similarities between them, affected our area somewhat differently. The Ottoman Sultanate, which controlled large sections of Syria-Iraq-Arabia for long periods of time, claimed legitimacy as the universal Sunnite Muslim State, and was recognized as such in the area wherever Sunnite Islam predominated. The Persian monarchy, which controlled smaller sections of the area for shorter periods, was more of a Persian national state; nevertheless, it also happened to be the principal Shī'ite Muslim state in the world, an hence, along with Shī'ites and other unorthodox Muslims in the region, challenged in principle the claim of the Ottoman State to universa Muslim dominion. On the other hand, because religious heterodoxy by its very nature lays emphasis on differences rather than on universalism, the Shī'ite Persian monarchy was not successful in spelling out a rival claim to universal Muslim dominion. Consequently, when the Ottoman State expanded its rule in Syria-Iraq-Arabia, it did so in the name of Islam and of Muslim orthodoxy. On the other hand, when the Persian State expanded, it did so merely as an imperial power, normally without religious justification.

Because the Ottoman State was gererally recognized as the universal Muslim, it was difficult, in our unit, to justify open resistance to its expansion, especially as most parts of Syria-Iraq-Arabia were predominantly Sunnite Muslim; on the other hand, resistance to the expansion of the Persian State could be justufied in the name of Muslim orthodoxy. Ottoman rulp, wherever it expanded in the area, was necessarily regarded, at least by Sunnite Muslims, as, in theory, legitimate. Those who resisted it knew themselves to be no more than rebels, or, at least, could be convincingly denounced as rebels or even as traitors. Persian rule in Iraq and Arabia was never regarded as necessarily legitimate and could be denounced, from the point of view of Sunnite Islam, as usurpation. When Ottoman rule withdrew from a region, the Ottoman State continued to be recognized in that region as the universal Muslim State. When Persian rule retracted, it was readily forgotten, and theoretical

allegiance to the Ottoman State readily resumed. There is an exception in the case of Oman and the highlands of the Yemen; there unorthodox forms of Islam predominated which recognized neither Sunnite nor Persian Shī'ite claims.

Such religious claims apart, the Ottoman and Persian empires were both conquerors. When Ottoman rule in our Arab area expanded to its utmost, it reached the borders of Persia in the east, the Yemen in the south-west, and the borders of the Persian Gulf in the south-east. When the Persian Empire expanded to its utmost, it overran Iraq and seized positions on the Arabian side of the Persian Gulf.

The primary determinant, then, of political conditions within Syria-Iraq-Arabia between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries was the existence of the two conquering empires, always pressing, probing and exploiting, when they were not otherwise engaged. There were, howevver, other determinants, some of which acted on our unit directly, other indirectly by preoccupying the two imperial powers. The first of these was the continuing confronation between the two empires themselves. This Ottoman-Persian confrontation became critical whenever the Persian monarchy felt strong enough to challenge the Ottoman State in war. This happened in the first half of the seventeenth century, during the reign of Shāh, 'Abbās the Great (1587-1629), and again, towards the middle of the eighteenth century, during the reign of Nādir Shāh (1736-47). In both cases, the mutual preoccupation of the two imperial powers provided the opportunity in Syria-Iraq-Arabia for the rise and expansion of a number of principalities.

Apart from the continuing confrontation between the two empires, another determinant of political conditions in our three regions was the European penetration. This had two consequences: first, it claimed the attention of the two empires, and hence increased the opportunity for the emergence of principalities; second, it furnished direct political pressure and manipulation within the three regions, prompting, encouraging or arresting the development of principalities. This European political pressure and manipulation was most continuously direct in the case of southern Iraq and the Gulf region of Arabia, where the European penetration was not only political and commercial, but also unremittingly military. In Syria, European political influence was not as continuously direct as it was in the Gulf, and the European powers were rarely present there in military force; nevertheless, the European penetration was also experienced, either spasmodically, or in a more diffuse cultural and diplomatic form.

Yet another factor which, for a period, threatened to be as determinative for the eastern part of our unit as for its western part, was the expansionist policy of Egypt. Until the early nineteenth century, Egypt, though technically part of the Ottoman Empire, was in effect under the rule of the Mamlūk Beys—a self-perpetuating establishment of Circassian slave officers. In the sixteenth century, the Mamlūks were conquered by the Ottomans and accepted their rule. During the seventeenth century, they began to regain political dominance in Egypt, at the expense of formal

Ottoman authority. During the eighteenth century, they became virtually independent and tried, in the latter half of the century, to extend their control to Syria. During the first half of the nineteenth century, an Albanian adventurer, Muḥammad 'Alī Pāshā, destroyed the Mamlūks in Egypt and laid the foundations of the modern Egyptian State. Like the Mamlūks before him, he tried to extend his control over Syria, and actually occupied the country for nearly a decade; he also intervened, for a time, in Arabia.

In summary, it can be said, therefore, that the external determinants of political conditions in Syria-Iraq-Arabia during our period were, in effect, three: first, the simultaneous existence of the Ottoman and Persian conquering empires and the continuing confrontation between them; second, the European penetration of the area; third, the occasional imperial activity of Egypt. It was the interplay between these three external determinants which determined, first, how far southwards Ottoman rule in Syria-Iraq-Arabia could extend; second, how effective or consistently effective it could be where it extended; third, how far westwards Persian influence or control could occasionally extend and, likewise, how far northwards or eastwards Egyptian influence or control could occasionally extend; founth, where and to what extent the European penetration could influence, promote, or arrest the growth of regional principalities; where and when such principalities could develop,how successful they could be, what character they would have, and how long they could last.

Before we begin our investigation, a distinction of prime importance must be drawn: we must differentiate between the heartlands of our Arab unit and its peripheries. The heartlands were only indirectly affected by the external determinants; as the home of the Bedouin tribes, which were always pushing towards the settled peripheries, they were the source of aggressive drives from our area itself with which the regional principalities as well as the empires and other external determinants had to reckon. These heartlands comprised the Najd plateau, in central Arabia, and its extensions northwards to the Euphrates and Tigris in the east, and to the first line of Syrian cities (Aleppo, Ḥamā, Ḥoms, and Damascus) in the west. The peripheries, on the other hand, were the parts directly affected by the external forces. They comprised, on the one hand, the various regions of western Syria, such as the Aleppo region, Mount Lebanon, Galilee, and Palestine: on the other hand, the Iraqi and Arabian borderlands of the Gulf, such as the Basra region, the Ḥasā, the Bahrain islands, and Oman.

A third area, in our Arab unit, partakes to some extent of the characteristics of both; it comprises the Arabian borders of the Red Sea, namely the Ḥijāz and the Yemen. Geographically, this area must be placed in the same category as the other peripheries. The fact that the Red Sea, until the nineteenth century, was an Ottoman lake, places, it however, in a category by itself. Here European influence was not felt, at any rate not before the nineteenth century. Too remote and rugged for an effective Ottoman conquest, and virtually unaffected by other external factors, the Yemen, under its Zaydī imāms, maintained a peculiar identity and a separate ex-

istence, most of the time outside the reach of Ottoman power. The Ḥijāz, like the Yemen, was remote and rugged, but in the Ḥijāz were located the Holy Places of Islam. The Ottoman State, as the principal Islamic state in the world, was under special obligation to keep these Holy Places, and the access to them through Syria, under its control regardless of the cost. In a way, the heavily escorted pilgrim caravans that set out from Damascus to Medina and Mecca, year after year, effected an annual reconquest of the Ḥijāz, keeping the region within the area of Ottoman rule and inhibiting the development of Hijāzī principalities. Because of the special circumstances of these western peripheries of Arabia, their history has been somewhat different from that of Syria and the Gulf regions; with this brief comment, we shall leave them for these other regions, whose political resemblance is greater.

It will be convenient to divide our investigation chronologically into two periods. In the first period, the Ottoman and Persian empires enjoyed a certain vigour-- great at the outset, lessening towards the end, but vigour nevertheless. The Ottoman and Persian policies during this period were the main determinants of political developments in Syria-Iraq-Arabia, although European penetration was also present, in its initial stages, as an additional determinant. In the second period, the Ottoman and Persian empires were both in decline; in the case of the Ottoman empire, this made the appearance of a subsidiary Egyptian imperialism possible. Meanwhile, the European penetration in our area made itself more keenly felt.

The first period, that of Ottoman and Persian power, began with a tremendous confrontation between the Ottomans on the one hand, and the Safawids of Persia and the Mamlūks of Egypt and Syria on the other. The outcome of the confrontation was the destruction of the Mamlūk empire and the defeat of Persia, and the consequent Ottoman occupation of Syria (1516), Egypt (1517). For the rest of the century, while the Mamluks in Cairo remained in subordination and the Safawids of Persia nursed their wounds, the Ottomans had no imperial rival to contend with in their control of Syria and Iraq, yet the Ottoman control of these two regions, even then, was not fully effective. An imperial administration was established in the cities: Aleppo, Damascus and Tripoli in the case of Syria; Mosul, Baghdad and Basra in the case of Iraq. From these cities, and from other carefully held positions, the Ottoman imperial administrators were sometimes able to control considerable stretches of the countryside which formed the **eyalets**, or administrative provinces, of the cities. At other times, the cities themselves were lost, or could barely be held, and the **eyalets** became little more than names. In Arabia, apart from the Ḥijāz, the Ottoman State never achieved a firm or lasting foothold. Even when Ottoman government in Syria, Iraq and Arabia was at its strongest, the tribal heartlands in the Syrian and Arabian deserts were virtually outside Ottoman rule. Where effective Ottoman control existed for any length of time, it was limited to the settled peripheries. Even there, Ottoman control was hardly ever regular, and local principalities kept emerging which the Ottoman State was normally compelled to tolerate.

In Syria, the Ottoman conquest was hardly completed when the emirate of the 'Assāfs, in the central Lebanon, began to take shape. 'Assāf, the founder of this emirate, was a Sunnite Turkoman chieftain whose ancestors had controlled the Kisrawān region, to the north of Beirut, since 1306. Taking advantage of the ineffectiveness of Ottoman control over the Lebanon mountain regions, he and his successors expanded their territory northwards and southwards until their emirate came to comprise considerable sections of the **eyalets** of Tripoli and Damascus, including the port of Beirut. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, as the 'Assāf emirate died out, its northern territories were absorbed into the rising emirate of the Sayfās of Tripoli who were also Sunnite Turkomans, originally the chieftains of the 'Akkār region, at the northernmost corner of Mount Lebanon. The southern territories of the 'Assāfs, including Beirut, were ultimately absorbed into the rising emirate of the Ma'ns of the southern Lebanon who were Druze Arabs, and who also held the port of Sidon. At about the same time, an emirate emerged in the hilly regions around Aleppo, under the house of Jānbūlād, the paramount chieftains of the Kurdish clans of the Anatolian borderlands.

For the Ottoman State, these internal obstructions to imperial administration in Syria were intensified as our other determinants came into play. Even in the sixteenth century, European policies had begun to affect the Ottoman position in the country. In 1571, the Ottoman fleet suffered a crushing defeat by the Catholic Armada at the battle of Lepanto; in consequence, Western Europe gained virtually free access to the eastern Mediterranean for the first time since the Crusades. European traders increased their activity in the Syrian ports and markets, and some European powers began to establish contacts with the emerging Syrian principalities, encouraging their growth and expansion at Ottoman expense. The Roman Catholic Church, prompted by the zeal of the Counter-Reformation (or Catholic Reformation) the broad lines of which had been laid down in the middle decades of the century by the Council of Trent, contributed to the European penetration of the Levant from another direction; it reactivated its missionary activity among the Christians of Syria, took measures, in particular, to tighten up the union of the Maronite church in Mount Lebanon with the Papacy (the establishment of the Maronite College in Rome in 1585, and the reorganization of the Maronite church by the Synod of Qannūbīn in 1596), and came to hold, thereby, an important outpost from which European influence over the region could be regularly exercised.

Not long after Lepanto, the Ottoman-Persian confrontation entered the scene. In Persia, the Safawid monarchy, after a period of weakness, reemerged under Shāh 'Abbās the Great (1587-1629) as a powerful rival to the Ottomans. In 1598, the Persians began to regain the border provinces which they had lost to the Ottomans earlier in the century: by 1621 they had reconquered Baghdad. While the Ottomans were busy fighting Persia, the Ma'n emirate seized the opportunity to expand its realm in Mount Lebanon and the adjacent parts, profiting from its developing European connections, particularly with Tuscany, and also from the good will of

the Papacy and its Lebanese Maronite followers. Likewise, in the Aleppo region, the Jānbūlād emirs seized the opportunities of Ottoman preoccupation and European support to evict the Pāshā of Aleppo and establish themselves in the city. Because of the strategic position of Aleppo at the junction of roads between Anatolia, Syria and Iraq, the Ottomans could not afford to be patient with the Jānbūlāds. In 1607, they interrupted their Persian campaigns to crush them and reintegrate their territory into the Ottoman system. Later, after the Ottoman reconquest of Baghdad in 1638, the Sayfā emirate in Tripoli was also destroyed. The Ottomans, however, were not able to root out the Ma'n emirate in the rugged reaches of the southern Lebanon; they therefore allowed this principality to continue, on a reduced scale, establishing a fourth Syrian **eyalet** administration in Sidon to prevent its renewed expansion.

In Iraq, the Ottoman-Persian confrontation provided the opportunity, in 1624, for the establishment of the Afrāsiyāb emirate in Basra. The founder of this principality, Afrāsiyāb, was a military adventurer of undetermined racial origin who managed to establish his authority over the clans of the Basra region, and who secured Ottoman recognition of himself as Pasha in the city. The Ottomans continued to tolerate the Afrāsiyāb presence in Basra for as long as the Persians remained in control of Baghdad. Once the Persians had been driven out of Iraq, the Ottomans began to prepare for the reduction of Basra, and a long conflict between them and the Afrāsiyābs followed. In the course of this conflict, the Afrāsiyabs defied the Ottomans by expanding southwards to the Gulf coast of Arabia, where they incited the Banū Khālid, a local tribe, to overthrow the Ottoman Pasha of al-Ḥasā and establish their own control over the region. In 1668, the Ottomans conquered Basra and destroyed the emirate of the Afrāsiyābs. As for the emirate of the Banū Khālid, it continued in the Hasā region until the early nineteenth century.

On the Persian Gulf even more than on the western side of our area, European penetration took its place beside the Perso-Ottoman rivalry as a major political determinant. Just as the increasing European influence in the eastern Mediterranean favoured the growth of the Ma'n and Jānbūlād principalities, so the European penetration of the Gulf affected the development of the Afrāsiyāb principality in Basra, the Banū Khālid principality in the Ḥasā, and other regional autonomies. During the sixteenth century, the European naval predominance in the Gulf was that of the Portuguese, who rounded the Cape of Good Hope and appeared in the Indian Ocean for the first time in 1498. From the island of Hormuz, at the mouth of the Gulf, which they had occupied in 1515, the Portuguese controlled the sea trade between Persia, Iraq and Arabia. In about 1521, they seized the island ob Baḥrain, which became their second major outpost in the region. By the turn of the century, however, Portuguese power in the Gulf was already in decline. In 1602, Baḥrain was lost to Persia. In 1622, Hormuz was lost to the English newcomers, who seized it with the help of a Persian force and handed it over also to Shāh 'Abbās. The Portuguese maintained themselves in Basra, in association with the Afrāsiyābs, until about 1640, and in Muscat until 1650. Meanwhile, the Dutch appeared in the Gulf

to compete with the English; and later, in the second half of the century, the French made their appearance as a third European competitor.

Hence, in the course of the seventeenth century, a complex balance of power came to prevail in the Gulf region. On the one hand, there was the continuing Ottoman-Persian confrontation on the mainland; on the other hand, there was a developing balance of power first between the Portuguese, English and Dutch, then between the English, Dutch and French. This complex balance continued unresolved until the collapse of Persian power following the death, in 1747, of Nādir Shāh. After that, it was the balance of power between the European forces which was the principal determinant of the politics of the region.

One principality which took advantage of the continuing balance of power in the Gulf to perpetuate itself was the Ḥasā emirate of the Banū Khālid. Another, further south, was the Ibāḍī principality (originally called imāmate, later called sultanate) of Oman. In 1650, the Ya'rubid **imāms,** who were the rulers of this Omani principality, seized Muscat from the Portuguese. Profiting from the favourable political circumstances that prevailed in the region, and also from the growth of trade in the Indian Ocean, the Omanis strengthened their position and, before long, began to extend their authority to important positions in East Africa. The growth of Oman continued in the eighteenth century, under the dynasty of the Bū-Sa'īds; by the early nineteenth century, the Omanis, apart from maintaining their positions in East Africa (notably in Zanzibar), had also established themselves in Hormuz, in the adjacent Persian coastlands of Bandar 'Abbās, and even, for a short while, in Baḥrain.

The emergence of this miniature Omani empire was made possible by a particular development of European relations. Just as the conflict between Ottomans and Persians produced at times a temporary vacuum which local potentates could fill, so also did conflict between the European powers provide opportunities. These wars between the European powers broke out in Europe, but they had the inevitable effect of bringing the European colonial conflict in the world of the Indian Ocean, as elsewhere, into sharp focus. It was, indeed, during the period of the Seven Years' War (1756-63), and more particularly during the period of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars (1793-1814), that the modest empire of Oman emerged. The final outcome of these great European wars, where our area is concerned, was the establishment of British imperial supremacy in the Indian Ocean. With the establishment of this British supremacy, the developments of local power in Oman and the rest of the gulf were arrested and brought under British control.

By now we are already trespassing on our second period, that of Persian and Ottoman decline. The process began in Persia following the death of Shāh 'Abbās the Great in 1629, was checked during the reign of Nādir Shāh, and after his death continued rapidly and disastrously. Symptomatic of it, in the Gulf, was the weakening of the Persian hold over Baḥrain, which was conquered by the Āl Khalīfa, from the Arabian mainland, in 1783. The Ottoman State declined less catastrophically, but

its decay went inexorably on. As far as the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf were concerned, Ottoman naval power, by the eighteenth century, was already a thing of the past, and the effect of the growing weakness was displayed throughout the Arab provinces. Iraq, in the period from 1747 to 1831, fell under a succession of local Mamlūk Pāshās who, like the Mamlūk Beys of Egypt, paid little more than lip service to the Ottoman State. In Syria, the local 'Azm family, for the greater part of the eighteenth century, controlled most of the Syrian **eyalets** as Ottoman Pāshās; after them, a Bosnian adventurer of Mamlūk type, Aḥmad Jazzār, became Pāshā of Sidon and Damascus and remained the dominant political figure in Syria from 1775 to 1804.

It was during the eighteenth century, while the Mamlūk Pāshās ruled Iraq and the 'Azm Pāshās, followed by Jazzār, controlled Syria, that the most intersting of the parallel regional developments in our Arab area tock place, on the one hand in Mount Lebanon and Galilee, on the other hand in central Arabia. In Mount Lebanon, the Shihāb emirs, who had succeeded to the principality of the Ma'ns in 1697, made use of the opportunity of Ottoman decline, as they made use of European sympathy and of the emerging Egyptian political ambitions in Syria, to promote the autonomy of their Lebanese emirate; they tightened up the feudal organization of this emirate, extended its territory to include nearly the whole of Mount Lebanon, protected the silk production which was the mainstay of the country's economy, and began to exercise a determining influence on their immediate neighbourgood. In the first half of the nineteenth century, under Emir Bashīr II (1788-1840), the Shihāb emirate gained **de facto** recognition, internationally, as something of a Lebanese national entity.

A second instance, though briefer, links the Syrian with the Arabian part of our area, for the northward movement of Arabian tribes in the eighteenth century was responsible for the foundation of a Bedouin principality in northern Palestine. At the same time as the Shihābs were making use of Ottoman decline to develop their power in Mount Lebanon, the Bedouin tribes of the Arabian and Syrian deserts also sensed the weakening of the Ottoman grip on the peripheries and became politically active. Bedouin tribes from Arabia pushed northwards into Syria, came into conflict with the Syrian tribes, and forced those to push, in their turn, westwards towards the settled area. As a result, the rural regions of northern Syria became devastated by Bedouin raids, while further south, in Galilee and northern Palestine, the Zaydānī chieftains, who were themselves originally Bedouin, established for themselves a short-lived emirate based, at least in part, on tribal power.

It was about this time that a strikingly similar development took place on a larger scale in central Arabia. Here the Āl Sa'ūd, chieftains of an oasis settlement in the Najd, became associated, towards the middle of the eighteenth century, with a puritan religious revival of muslim orthodoxy led by Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, and subsequently known as Wahhābism. By their association with this religious movement, the Āl Sa'ūd rapidly transcended the ordinary level of local

chieftainship and became the temporal leaders of a religious order with a mission to expand. The association of the Āl Sa'ūd with Wahhābism coincided, in time, with the collapse of Persian power in the Gulf region following the death of Nādir Shāh. As they sensed the collapse of Persian power, the tribes of the Najd began to push towards the Gulf coast, and it was probably in connection with this Bedouin movement towards the Gulf coast that the Āl Khalīfa, chieftains of a settlement of 'Utūb Arabs in the Ḥasā region, then in the Qatar peninsula, crossed over from the mainland to occupy Bahrain. The rise of the Āl Sa'ūd in the Najd, and their adoption of the Wahhābī religious cause, had the effect of transforming the confused movement of Arabian tribes northwards towards Iraq and Syria, and eastwards towards the Gulf, into an organized religious conquest. By the early nineteenth century the Wahhābis had overrun the Banū Khālid emirate in the Ḥasā, captured the Holy Cities in the Ḥijāz, and pushed their conquests northwards to the peripheries of Iraq and Syria. Acting on behalf of the Ottoman State, Muḥammad 'Alī Pāshā of Egypt sent an expedition to Arabia which put an end to Wahhābī expansion and overthrew the Āl Sa'ūd principality. Wahhābism, however, was not eradicated nor were the Āl Sa'ūd wiped out. Before long, a second Wahhābī principality began to take form in Najd.

In Arabia, the opportunity for the emergence of the Sa'ūdī principality and the expansion of Wahhābī power was provided by the recession of Ottoman and Persian power on the peripheries of the region, and by the inability of any single European power to establish an uncontested presence in the Persian Gulf. These same circumstances prompted the growth of the little maritime empire of Oman, as they also provided the opportunity for the establishment of smaller principalities like those of the Āl Khalīfa in Baḥrain and the Banū Yās in Abū Dhabi, and for the settlement of the Al Ṣabāḥ (another branch of the 'Utūb Arabs) in Kuwait. At the same time, in Syria, the recession of Ottoman power, coupled with other more elusive determinants, opened the way for the development of the Shihāb emirate in Mount Lebanon, and of the Zaydānī emirate in Galilee. In the nineteenth century, as the Ottoman State made a last determined effort to pull itself together, Ottoman authority returned to the Arab provinces of our area in force. With the help of Egypt, the Sa'ūdī emirate, by 1818, was reduced. In 1831, direct Ottoman rule was restored in Iraq; in 1840 regular Ottoman administration was restored to Syria; in 1841 the Shihāb imirate was brought to end; in 1849, Ottoman rule returned to the Yemen. The disagreements of the European Powers over the Middle East, and the conflict of their interests in the Ottoman Empire, was the opportunity for the Ottoman State to set its house in order, which involved putting an end, as far as possible, to the development of local autonommies in our area. Meanwhile, the establishment of British supremacy in the Persian Gulf was freezing the local developments there. For the remainder of the Ottoman period, while Wahhābī power was slowly and quietly rebuilding itself in central Arabia, the sultanate of Oman and the persian Gulf emirates continued their existence, in a stunted form, as British protectorates.

Because of its association with a powerful religious idea, the principality of the Āl Sa'ūd, in the Najd, survived its plight in the nineteenth century to reemerge in our own times as the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Because of their association with the British empire, the Gulf principelities also survived to reemerge today, one after another, as sovereign states. Because the idea of the Lebanese national entity, after the downfall of the Shihābs, survived through the period of the autonomous mutesarrifate, jealously guarded by the Maronite church and community, and fostered on the international level by France, the Lebanese entity, at the western extremity of our unit, reemerged in our own times as the Lebanese Republic. Where the principalities that developed in out unit, during the Ottoman period, became associated with ideas, institutions, economic developments, or external policies that guaranteed tneir continuity, they were able to outlast the Ottoman period and reconstitute themselves, ultimately, as modern states. Where these principalities did not succeed in transcending the ordinary level of political opportunism, as was the case with the emirates of the Sayfās of Tripoli, the Jānbūlāds of Aleppo, the Afrāsiyābs of Basra, the Banū Khālid of the Ḥasā, and the Zaydānīs of Galilee, they were hardly able to outlive the opportunities that permitted their emergence, and sooner or later vanished.

To determine why certain principalities which emerged in Syria-Iraq-Arabia between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries survived to develop into modern states, while others did not, is a subject worthy of detailed study on its own. The brief survey provided by this paper cannot give the full answer. It does demonstrate, however, that local developments in our Arab area during the period in question are not as unrelated as they have often been taken to be. It is by no mere coincidence that the Ma'n and Sayfā emirates in the Lebanon, the Jānbūlād emirate in Aleppo, and the Afrāsiyab emirate in Basra, not to mention others, flourished at about the same time; likewise, it was no mere accident that caused the growth of the Omani empire to be contemporary with the rise of Wahhābī power in central Arabia, the development of the Shihāb emirate in Mount Lebanoa, the establishment of the Khalīfa emirate in Baḥrain and of the Banū Yās emirate in Abū Dhabi, and the emergence of the Zaydānī emirate in Galiles and northern Palestine. Upon even a preliminary examination, these various developments, often thought to be completely separate and independent local phenomena, turn out to be parallel developments fundamentally related. In a way, they form an intelligible pattern; together, they tell one story, which is the history of the Arab East during the first four centuries of modern times.

THE ARMENIANS IN BILĀD AL-SHĀM

Avedis K. Sanjian

Any definitive history of Bilād al-Shām must also include an in-depth study of the minority groups that have inhabited the region since ancient times, for they too have played a significant role in its political, economic, and social development. The Armenians constituted one of these minority groups, and yet very little is known of their long and intimate associations with historic Syria. This presentation will, therefore, attempt briefly to trace the Armenians' historical associations with Bilād al-Shām. It will also examine the significance of the Armenian source materials relating not only to the Armenian settlements but also to the history of the region in general.

I

As early as the first millennium B.C. the Armenian people settled in their historic homeland, whose boundaries were roughly the Trans-Caucasus and the Pontus in the north, the Taurus range in the south, the present Turco-Iranian boundary on the east, and the Euphrates River in the west. This mountainous country was coveted at various times by its powerful neighbors: Greeks, Romans, and the Byzantines on the west; Medes, Persians, Arabs, and Turks on the east and south. The eastern powers strove to control this highland for its easy access into Asia Minor; the western powers sought possession of the valleys of the Euphrates and of the tributaries of the Tigris which led into Iran and eastern Mesopotamia. From time immemorial, therefore, the Armenians were compelled to emigrate from their native country to neighboring as wel as distant lands, and a number of Armenian colonies were founded abroad.

Armenian associations with Bilād al-Shām began as early as the Achaemenid period (6th-4th centuries B.C.). Within the bounds of this ancient Persian empire, Armenia constituted part of the thirteenth satrapy, which was contiguous on the southwest to the fifth satrapy of Syria. Armenian settlers and traders were found in the Achaemenid territories of the Pontus, Cappadocia, and Commagene, as well as Cilicia and Syria. As mercenaries in the imperial armies they participated in practically all the wars waged by the Persians against the Scythians, Greeks, and Egyptians.[1] Following the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C., the Armenian vassals of the Achaemenids recognized the suzerainty of the Seleucids.[2] During their long associations with the Seleucids, Armenians settled in large numbers in the

basins of the Lycos and Halys rivers as well as in the territories west of the Euphrates and in northern Syria, in particular the capital of Antioch.[3]

In 189 B.C. the Armenian princes Artaxias (Artashes) and Zariadris (Zareh), who governed Armenia as vassals of the Seleucids, took adavntage of the defeat of Antiochus the Great by the Romans near Magnesia to establish two independent kingdoms, the first in Armenia Major and the second in Armenia Minor.[4] In the first century B.C. a descendant of Artaxias, Tigranes the Great (95-55 B.C.), not only united all Armenia under his scepter but established at the expense of the Parthians and the Seleucids a vast Armenian empire. At its peak, this empire extended from the Caspian Sea and the Kura River in the north to the Mediterranean and the borders of Egypt, and from Media on the east to Roman-occupied Cappadocia and the mountainous regions of Cilicia on the west. Unlike Palestine, southern Syria, and the Phoenician coast south of Ptolemais (Acre), which merely recognized Tigranes' suzerainty, northern Syria and Cilicia Pedias were integrated into his empire as a satrapy, with Antioch as its capital.[5] During his short-lived hegemony, Tigranes transplanted to Armenia and his capital of Tigranocerta a considerable number of native inhabitants from the territories which he occupied. Probably an appreciable number of Armenians were transplanted to Syria and the Levantine coastal regions, some of whom remained there even after Tigranes' defeat at the hands of the Romans.[6]

King Khusrow of Persia occupied Edessa and Antioch in 539, and transplanted to these two cities a considerable number of Christians, including numerous Armenians.[7] Since these regions were strongholds of the Nestorian sectarians, Catholicos Christopher I felt compelled to send an epistle to his Armenian flock urging them to remain steadfast in their faith ; he even journeyed to northern Syria to ensure that his instructions were discharged.[8]

Arab occupation of Greater Armenia, from the close of the seventh to the middle of the ninth century, marked a new phase in Armeno-Syrian relations. During their early expeditions, beginning in 639/40, the Arabs not only attacked several provinces but also carried off thousands of native captives to the territories adjacent to the Euphrates, principally to Edessa, Antioch, and northern Syria.[9]

During their occupation of Armenia, the Arabs provided a haven in their territories for those Armenians who were victimized by the religious persecutions of Byzantium. For instance, when in 711-713 Emperor Philippicus expelled a large group of Armenians from Asia Minor for refusing to conform to the Greek Orthodox faith, the Arabs permitted these refugees to settle in Armenia proper as well as in the regions of Melitene and northern Syria.[10] Many were enlisted in the Muslim frontier guards in the Taurus Mountains and in Mesopotamia to defend these lands against Byzantine attacks. On the other hand, the Arabs countered with ruthless reprisals all Armenian attempts to rid their country of Arab rule. In 653, for instance, the Arabs carried off to Damascus some 2000 Armenian princes and their

families as hostages. After an insurrection in Armenia in 665, about 1775 of these hostages were put to death.[11] The greatest and most fiercely fought insurrection occurred in 851/2. In order to guard against the recurrence of such uprisings, large numbers of Armenian nobility were carried off into captivity and a segment of the population of the province of Taron was dispersed to all parts of the Arab empire, particularly northern Syria.[12]

In 963/965 Emperor Nicephorus Phocas succeeded in rrcapturing Cilicia, the Amanus, and northwestern Syria from the Arabs, all of which remained in Byzantine hands for more than a century. The outflow of Muslims from these territories was accompanied by a considerable inflow of Armenians, stimulated by the Byzantine practice of using Armenian officers to defend the country against Arab reconquest.[13] Moreover, in 999 Emperor Basil II transplanted a sizable number of Armenians to Caesarea in Syria, on the Orontes River.[14] Finally, the devastation of Armenia by the Seljuk Turks towards the end of the eleventh century exacerbated the emigration of Armenians in the direction of the Taurus Mountains, the Cilician plain, the Amanus, and northern Syria.

The emergence of the Armenian kingdom in Cilicia (1080-1375), and its intimate associations wiht the Crusaders and the subsequently established Frankish principalities of Edessa, Antioch, and Tripoli and the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, marked a significant turning point in the fortunes of the Armenians in historic Syria. The Frankish-Armenian community of political interests, the religious bonds which united them, and finally intermarriage among the Armenian nobility in Cilicia and the ruling classes of the Crusaders—all these contributed to the sizable increase of Armenians in these territories.

As seen earlier, long before the advent of the Latins the Armenians already constituted an important proportion of the populations of the regions of Edessa and Antioch. With the entrenchment of the Crusaders in the valley of the Orontes and the Levantine coastal region, an appreciable number of Armenians from Cilicia and the Amanus colonized these lands as well. Hence, in addition to the Antioch region, the hinterlands of Emessa and the maritime towns of Alexandretta, Seleucia, Laodicea (Latakia), and Tripoli became the new habitat of Armenian settlers. In due time, these colonizers organized themselves into ecclesiastical units as evidenced by the fact that the Armenian church council, held at Hromkla in 1179, was also attended by a number of prelates representing the episcopal seats in Syria and Palestine. Among these, specific mention is made of the bishops of Antioch, Cyprus, Apamaea (Ḥamā), Laodicea, and Jerusalem.[15]

It is known that a number of Cilician-Armenian princesses were married to the Latin princes of Tyre and Sidon. Arab geographers assert that subsequent to its occupation by Baldwin I in 1104, Acre—which had a mixed population—also had an Armenian element which in the middle of the twelfth century had its own hostel. In the middle of the following century there was still a large Armenian community at

Acre, as attested by the fact that in 1248 they had a prince.[16] This was the period when, after Saladin's conquest of Jerusalem, Acre had become the principal center of Christian power in Palestine.

In the first half of the thirteenth century the Mongols swept through Armenia and far into Anatolia. Hence, with a view to protecting the integrity of Cilicia, King Hetum I of Cilicia concluded military alliances with the Mongol Guyuk Khan in 1247 and also with his successor Mangu Khan in 1253. As a result, Armenian contingents fought side by side with the Mongols in Anatolia as well as Syria. They joined forces with Hulagu in the occupation of Aleppo, Ḥamā, Ḥomṣ, Heliopolis, Damascus, and other Syrian cities.[17] They had also planned the conquest of Jerusalem, but the news of Mangu Khan's death compelled Hulagu to interrput his successful campaign. In consequence, the Armeno-Mongol troops left behind in Syria suffered defeat near Nablus, in Palestine, at the hands of the Mamlūks in 1260.[18] Henceforth, the Cilician Kingdom became one of the principal targets of Mamlūk attacks. The Mongols' preoccupation with internecine conflicts prevented them from coming to the aid of the Armenians, forcing Hetum to surrender to Sultan Baybars (1260-77) a number of his fortresses in the Amanus and along the Syrian border. When the Mongols renewed their Syrian expedition they, together with Hetum, scored temporary victories at Homs and Damascus in 1299; but another invasion in 1303 ended in the decisive defeat of the Mongols near Damascus. In the meantime, Tripoli (1289), Acre (1291), and Arwād (1302) having fallen into Mamlūk hands, Latin rule in the Levant had already come to an end. With the fall of the capital of Sis in 1375, the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia became incorporated into the Mamlūk empire.

The Cilician Kingdom distinguished itself in cultural achievements; it also attained an important position in the international affairs of the east. No less significant was the Armenian role in the economy of the Levant under Latin rule, both on the local and international levels. The accounts of contemporary travelers, pilgrims, and geographers,[19] indicate that the Crusaders' hegemony in this area stimulated maritime activity and international trade to a degree whcih had not been attained since Roman times. After the dissolution of the Kingdoms and principalities in Armenia proper in the eleventh century, Armenian traders had established important commercial contacts with the Levantine maritime centres as well.[20] These merchants engaged in a vast international trade; their caravans brought manufactured goods, such as silk, dyes, and spices, from interior Asia to the Latin principalities.[21] This merchandise was not only sold locally but also traded wiht European firms through their representatives in the Latin commercial centres. The local Armenians, who constituted an appreciable segment of the Levantine populations, also distinguished themselves as artisans and craftsmen. In the first half of the thirteenth century, the cosmopolitan town Tripoli had a considerable number of Armenians who were active in this seaport's economic life, especially in the silk manufacturing industry.[22] It can be conjectured that the same was true in the other Latin-

dominated towns—such as Acre, Tyre, Sidon, and Beirut—whose manufactured goods found markets in Europe.

The Mamlūks' occupation of Palestine and Syria, and their periodic invasions of Cilicia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, had most adverse effects upon the large Armenian settlements in Syria as well as those in the Cilician kingdom. In Cilicia the Mamlūks destroyed numerous towns, fortresses, and villages, as well as large number of religious establishments and cultural centres. They decimated the Armenian population in Cilicia and northern Syria, carrying off countless captives and slaves to their territories in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. Thousands of Cilician Armenians, unable to withstand the Mamlūk tyranny and cruel exploitation, migrated to Cyprus[23] as well as to various European countries where they founded new colonies.

In Syria itself, the prominent position which the Armenians occupied under the Latins was dealt a severe blow under the Mamlūks. Despite the absence of documentary evidence, it may be assumed that many of the captives and slaves from Cilicia and northern Syria were gradually assimilated with the Muslim populations in the Mamlūk dominion to escape the anti-Christian discriminatory restrictions and burdensome taxation. It is not unlikely that a substantial segment of the Armenians inhabiting the Levantine coast took refuge in the Lebanese mountains and eventually were assimilated with the Maronite community. It seems equally probable that others joined with the Latins who returned to Europe, particularly to the Italian cities. And, finally, the drought, famine, pestilence, earthqakes that punctuated almost the entire Mamlūk era and reduced the population of Syria and Egypt to about one third of its former size,[24] must have taken a heavy toll of the Armenian communities in the Levant. In consequence, the once prosperous and multitudinous Armenian population was appreciably diminished. Whereas under the Latins members of this ethnic group were found almost everywhere from the Taurus Mountains to Egypt, under the Mamlūks they were represented by small enclaves in Cilicia, in northwestern Syria,[25] Aleppo, Latakia, Damascus, Mount Lebanon, and in the Palestinian towns of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Jaffa, Ramla, Gaza, and so forth. This state of affairs continued until the Ottoman conquest of historic Syria in the beginning of the sixteenth century.

The principal Armenian enclaves in northwestern Syria were located in Antioch and its neighboring villages. In the Amanus there were communities at Payas, Alexandretta, Suwaydiyah, and their immediate villages. On the slopes of Mūsa Dagh (also known as Jabal Mūsa), Armenians were concentrated in six exclusive villages, and also lived with the local Turkomans, Alawīs, and Arabs in nearby villages. In the region of Jabal Aqra[c] (Mount Cassius) not only the principal town of Kasab but also twelve neighboring villages were inhabited almost solely by Armenians. The existence of a number of sanctuaries, now in ruins, in the vicinity of Kasab[26] suggest the presence over the centuries of an organized network of Armenian monastic and ecclesiastic institutions. They also indicate the large size of

the community there in medieval times as well as under the earlier period of Ottoman rule.

Throughout the Ottoman period the Armenian settlers in northwestern Syria were, in the main, peasants. In contrast, the Armenians at Alexandretta were petty merchants and small-scale commission agents;[27] at Antioch they were largely artisans and craftsmen, though not a few were engaged in commerce;[28] at Kills they were traders, artisans, and farmers;[29] and at Beylān, a resort town, and its neighboring villages, they were primarily fruit and vegetable growers.[30]

As we have seen, Latakia was the seat of an Armenian bishopric during the Frankish hegemony in the Levant. This testifies to the existence of a substantial colony and a large organized ecclesiastical institution ecnompassing the city and the villages in its environs. Under Mamlūk and Ottoman rule the size of these communities was considerably diminished by emigration to other, especially Christian, countries and by assimilation with the native Christian and Muslim populations, since in this later period the records no longer refer to an Armenian bishopric. Nevertheless, Latakia continued to serve as an important transit station for pilgrims to the Holy Land. The hospice there was built in 1755, and the church was constructed in 1776.

Following the downfall of the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia in 1375 a large group of Armenians migrated to Lebanon and settled principally in Tripoli, the neighboring villages of Zaghartā and Ihdin, the region of Ghazīr. In the course of time most of these migrants were assimilated by the native Christian populations.[31] Not until the seventeenth century is there any record of another sizable Armenian migration to Lebanon. This was the period when Fakhr al-Dīn II encouraged the settlement in his territories of political refugees and religious minorities, and when Christian families migrated from Syria to Lebanon to escape Ottoman tyrannical rule.[32] According to an unpublished Armenian manuscript,[33] several thousand Armenians, who had fled from Sis in Cilicia during the years 1683-90, had settled among the Maronites in the region of Jubbat Bisharri. The document also asserts that the Maronite Baladi monks had appropriated some fifteen monasteries which the Armenians had founded in that region.

Toward the end of the seventeenth century, the Maronites began to welcome to their territories in Lebanon Greek, Syrian, and Armenian refugees who had defected from their historic native churches, and also admitted pupils from these groups into their seminaries. Moreover, the Maronite feudal lords, notably the Khāzin shaykhs of the district of Kisrawān, bestowed lands and money on these newcomers and helped establish them in their adopted home.[34] Under the hereditary governorship of the Khāzins, Kisrawān became a flourishing Christian district,[35] and Syrian, Greek, and Armenian Catholic communities were planted in north Lebanon.

The Armenians who migrated to Lebanon in the last quarter of the seventeenth century were for the most part people who were persecuted by the authorities of the Armenian church and millet because of their adherence to the Catholic faith and who sought a safe refuge among the Maronites. It must be assumed that the monasteries founded in the region of Jubbat Bisharri belonged to these converts, and that after their assimilation with the natives these institutions passed into the hands of the Maronite church.

The Armenian Catholics in Greater Syria, who had defected from the national church, established several religious institutions in Mount Lebanon in the eighteenth century. The first of these, known as the "Antonian" monastic order, was founded in 1716 by four brothers from Aleppo who built a monastery at Kraym, near the village of Ghusta in Kisrawān, on a site granted to them by the Maronite Prince Ṣakhr al-Khāzin.[36] The rules of this order were patterned after those of the Maronite order by the same name. In 1742 Bishop Abraham Artsivian of Aleppo founded a separate Armenian Catholic patriarchate with jurisdiction over Armenian adherents to Catholicism in Cilicia and Greater Syria.[37] Artsivian organized bishoprics and missions in these regions, which he directed from the monastery of Kraym. In 1750 his successor, Hakob-Petros II, transferred his seat to the monastery of Bzommar (Armenian Zmmar), and the small ecclesiastical community in this institution became the nucleus of a second Armenian Catholic monastic order known as "Zmmarian."[38]

Little is known of the actual size, organization, and administration of the Armenian Catholics in historic Syria before the middle of the nineteenth century. By 1860 they had founded sixteen churches and several parochial schools to accommodate their community needs.[39] On the eve of World War I, there were 7500 Armenian Catholics in Greater Syria: 5000 in the qaḍās Aleppo, Iskenderun, and Beylān; 2000 in the qadās of Antioch, Shughūr, and Sahyūn; 300 in Beirut and its environs; and 200 in the **sanjaks** of Mount Lebanon and Jerusalem.[40]

The origin of the Armenian colonization of Aleppo cannot to easily determined because of the absence of documentary evidence. Nevertheless, it can safely be assumed that Armenian associations wiht this important commercial city date back to the earliest Christian centuries. It can be surmised that subsequent to the establishment of the Cilician state Armenians who inhabited the region of Antioch spread into Aleppo as well. With the growth of commercial contacts between the Cilician kingdom and Syrian mercantile centers, more and more armenians were attracted to the city of Aleppo.[41]

The earliest indication of an organized community at Aleppo is found in a colophon of an Armenian Gospel manuscript copied in that city in 1329.[42] Following the fall of Sis, the Mamlūks carried off some 40,000 Armenian captives, a number of whom settled at Aleppo.[43] Before the end of the fourteenth century the Armenian community had developed to an extent that warranted the erection of two churches

adjacent to those of the other Christian communities, namely, the Greek Orthodpx, Maronite, and Syrian. The Armenian church in Aleppo soon acquired the status of a separte bishopric which, as attested by the extant manuscripts copied in that city, progressed sufficiently to establish a regular scriptorium to meet the growing demand for religious and liturgical books. This scriptorium emerged as the cultural, intellectual, and artistic centre of the Aleppine community.[44] As the Armenian community's ecclesiastical life advanced, Aleppo attracted an increasing number of transient clergy who travelled between Armenia or Cilicia and the Holy Land.[45] Finally, with the founding of the regional catholicosate of Cilicia at Sis in 1446, and the growing prosperity of the Aleppine colony, the bishopric of Aleppo was destined to occupy a position wihtin the see second in importance only to that of the catholicosal seat itself.

Since the institution of the pilgrimage to the Holy Land in the earliest centuries of Christianity, Aleppo must have served as one of the most importat Syrian stations for Armenian pilgrims, and in the course of time facilities must have been established for their accommodation and comfort. The first privately owned Armenian ecclesiastical institution, which dates back to the middle of the fourteenth century, undoubtedly assumed the responsibility of caring for the pilgrims. At the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century the Aleppine Armenian magnate Reis Isa built a number of inns and hostels for the accommodation of transients and particularly for pilgrims bound for Jerusalem.[46]

In the Ottoman period, Armenian émigrés first arrived in Aleppo from Cilicia in the second half of the sixteenth century. Toward the end of the same century another group, consisting primarily of traders, came from Julfa in Armenia. The émigrés in the middle of the seventeenth century were principally from Sasun; these colonizers, who were followed by others from the same town in later times, distinguished themselves as bakers, millers, and wheat traders. An Armenian monk from Poland, Simeon Lehatsi, who visited the city in 1616, reports that in that year there were three hundredd Arabic-speaking Armenian families in Aleppo, most of whom were merchants who engaged in commerce with India, Baghdad, and Isfahan.[47] In 1737 Armenian settlers arrived from Erzurum, and in the late 1740's there was a new wave of migration from Cilicia. The magnates originally of Julfa, after occupying a position of prominence in Aleppine commerce and in the administration of the local Armenian community's affairs for over two centuries, gradually dwindled in number and influence. They were replaced by a group of enterprising merchants who, beginning in the eighteenth century, arrived from the Anatolian cities of Akin, Arapkir, and the villages in their vicinities. These traders, and the artisans who accompanied them, gradually emerged as the dominant class in the Aleppine community. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Armenian colonization was principally from Erzurum, Erzincan and Akin, as well as from Cilicia, notably 'Ayntāb and Mar'ash. And finally, after the Hamidian massacres of 1895-96, refugees arrived from eastern Anatolia as well.[48]

The period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries stands out as the most prosperous era in the history of the Armenians of Aleppo, from the standpoint of the organization of their ecclesiastico-national institutions as well as their economic status. The preeminent position of Aleppo among the Armenian communities of northern Syria stemmed primarily from its significance as one of the most important centres of international trade. Armenian traders began to play significant roles as intermediaries in this international trade as early as the sixteenth century.[49] By the 1550's the local Armenian community of Aleppo counted in its ranks a large number of prominent merchants from Julfa, who as enterprising and wealthy magnates occupied an important position in Aleppo's international trade. They engaged in largescale transit trade between Europe and the Orient, principally by acting as intermediaries between the European colonists of Aleppo and the eastern markets or by establishing direct contacts with the producing firms in Europe through the agency of foreign consuls. During the years 1590-1632 the French, English, Dutch, Venetian, and Spanish merchants at Aleppo conducted their silk trade solely with the mercantile firm of Khoja Petik, who apparently monopolized the supply of this product. He and his brother Khoja Sanos operated a vast network of commercial establishments in Anatolia, Persia, and India, supplying raw silk and in exchange distributing European manufactured goods.

During the years 1630-60 a number of Armenians were entrusted with the superintendency of the mint at Aleppo, and even as late as the end of the seventeenth century local Armenian **ṣarrāfs** (money changers) for the most part handled the business of foreign exchange.[50]

The period extending from the middle of the sixteenth to about the end of the seventeenth centuries marks the golden age of Armenian Aleppine commece. The gradual decline of the role of mechants of Julfa origin conincided with the inflow of Armenians from Akin and Arapkir in Anatolia. These enterprising merchants soon replaced those of Julfa as commercial tycoons, on a relatively smaller scale. Many at first entered into the service of governors, high-ranking civilian and military officials, foreign consulates, and commercial firms; in time these amassed great wealth by establishing independent commercial enterprises. Indeed, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries many natives of Arapkir distinguished themselves as chamberlains, commercial agents, and bankers in the more than one hundred khans and caravansaries at Aleppo.[51] Despite Aleppo's economic decline resulting from the opening of the Suez Canal, the local Armenian community still possessed a number of well-known merchants whose firms had branches in eastern Asia Minor, as well as in Baghdad, Basra, and Persia. Beginning in the 1880's the commercial activities of the leading members of the Armenian Aleppine community were in the main confined to the role of middlemen or commission agents and to small-scale banking. After the widespread Turkish pogroms in Anatolia in 1895-96 a large number of refugee merchants chose Aleppo as their new home and established commercial contacts wiht firms in the eastern provinces. Armenians continued to

serve in the khans, banks and foreign consulates until the general massacres of World War I dealt a severe blow to the once-flourishing Armenian community.

The economic functions of the Armenian Aleppine community were not confined to commerce alone. Indeed, since the first settlement in the fourteenth century the majority of the colonists brought with them their traditional arts, crafts, and trades, and established small workshops, developing their trades as hereditary family occupations.[52]

The history of the Armenian colonization of Damascus prior to the Ottoman period is still obscure. The Arabs during their rule in Armenia, periodically carried off Armenian captives to other parts of their empire, including the Umayyad capital of Damascus. Whether there was an established community in this important Syrian metropolis under the Arabs as well as under the Mamlūks cannot be easily determined from historical works. Nevertheless, it is perhaps safe to assume that even before the Arab conquest Damascus served as a way station for pilgrims from Armenia. It can also be surmised that as elsewhere an Armenian ecclesiastical institution had been established to meet the spiritual needs of the small community and to provide facilities for the comfort of the pilgrims. By the mid-seventh century there was an Armenian cultural centre at Damascus where monks engaged in intellectual pursuits, as evidenced by the translation into Armenian of St. Basil's Discourses in 661.

Under the Ottomans the monastery and church of St. Sarkis was the nucleus of the small Armenian ecclesiastical and secular community of Damascus. The date of the construction of this church is unknown, but the fact that it was restored in 1617 suggests that it was built at the latest in the sixteenth century.

Unlike those of Aleppo the Armenians of Damascus do not seem to have played a notable role in the city's commerce. A certain proportion engaged in commercial activities and operated small-scale businesses, but the majority were artisans and shopkeepers.

Throughout the long history of the Armenian communities in **Bilād al-Shām** the patriarchate of Jerusalem has always been distinguished as the single most important institution. Its position of preeminence among the various sees of the Armenian church stemmed first, from its unique association with the dominical sanctuaries in the Holy City and its custodianship, wiht the Greek Orthodox and Latin churches, of the shrines; secondly, from its control of a sizable number of privately owned monasteries and churches in the Holy Land and neighboring countries; and, thirdly, from the great influence which the see exercised over the large segment of the Armenian communities in Syria and even beyond which were under its direct administrative jurisdiction.

The official recognition of Christianity by Constantine the Great, and the construction of the dominical sanctuaries at Jerusalem and Bethlehem in the first half

of the fourth century, induced numerous pilgrims to see for themselves the places hallowed by Christ. The extent of the pilgrimage can be judged by the fact that by the beginning of the fifth century the number of monasteries and hostels in the Holy City where pilgrims could be housed was over three hundred.[53] The same period, especially from the fourth to the sixth centuries, witnessed the rise of monasticism and asceticism centered in regularly organized monastic institutions. Early church historians attest to the fact that the initial monasteries in the Holy City and its environs were multiracial and that devotional services were conducted in various vernaculars.[54]

Along with other Christian groups, Armenians began to arrive in Jerusalem in substantial numbers as pilgrims and as residents after the proclamation of Christianity as the official religion of their country in the beginning of the fourth century. They at first shared the multiracial monastic facilities, but in due time, not unlike others, they founded a number of private monasteries and churches throughout the Holy Land.

Religious harmony among the heterogeneous Christian communities at Jerusalem was not seriously affected for a whole century after the wide breach occasioned by the decisions of the controversial Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), for all Christians remained under the spiritual authority of the bishop of Jerusalem. The persecutions of the monophysites, among them the Armenians, were initiated by the Byzantine Emperor Justin I (518-527) and reached their climax during the reign of his successor, Justinian I (527-565), a staunch adherent of the Chalcedonian creed. As a result of these persecutions, the Armenian clergy of the Holy Land severed their ecclesiastical ties with the hierarchy of Jerusalem. Many monophysite clergy abandoned their monasteries in the Holy City and sought refuge in other regions of the Holy Land and in neighboring countries. Those who remained formed an Armenian see independent of the Greek. Henceforward, the see of Jerusalem was split into the Greek patriarchate exercising jurisdiction over the dyophsite Christians regardless of nationality or language, and the Armenian hierarchy having authority over the monophysite communities, notably the Jacobite Syrian, Coptic, and Abyssinian.

Byzantine domination in Palestine and Syria came to an end in the first half of the seventh century. The Muslim Arabs from the Arabian Peninsula had occupied several strategic towns in Syria. It was to check their further advance that the Armenian-born Emperor Heraclius (610-641) mustered from the vicinity of Antioch and Aleppo an army of some fifty thousand mercenaries, mostly Armenians and local Arabs.[55] The crushing defeat of this army by the Arabs at the battle of Yarmuk in 636 sealed Byzantium's doom. Jerusalem surrendered to Caliph 'Umar I in 638. The terms of the capitulation allegedly offered by the caliph to the non-Muslim inhabitants of the city are preserved in several versions.[56] The authenticity of this charter seems highly questionable,[57] but its terms essentially reflect the Arab policy vis-à-vis the non-Muslim subjects under their dominion generally.[58] The Christian

inhabitants of Jerusalem were granted religious liberty and security for their lives, property and churches; and in return they were to pay the **jizyah** and to assist the Arab rulers in warding off Byzantine troops and raiders.

The roster of Armenian patriarchs of Jerusalem begins with the reign of Abraham: it was he who, upon the Arab conquest of Jerusalem in 638, allegedly received a charter from the Caliph 'Umar guaranteeing the integrity of the Armenian possessions in the Holy Land and recognizing him as the spiritual leader not only of the Armenian community but also of the other monophysite Christian communities. With the Arab conquest of Jerusalem, the Armenian See of the Holy City attained a stature which perhaps equaled the Greek patriarchate, whose associations with the Byzantine empire rendered it suspect in the eyes of the conquerors.

A widely published document attributed to a seventh-century monk, Anastas Vardapet, contains a list of seventy monasteries and churches which the Armenians are said to have owned in that century in Jerusalem and its environs[59]. The list supplies the barest minimum of information regarding the alleged Armenian institutions, and is limited solely to recording of their names, locations, and the feudal families in Armenia which provided their endowments. The document asserts that an unspecified number of Armenian monasteries confiscated by the Greeks were eventually recovered by the Armenian princes after payment of a large sum of money to the Byzantine Emperor Justinian. When subsequently the Greek authorities in Jerusalem warned the monophysites—that is, the Armenians, Jacobite Syrians, Copts, and Abyssinians—that unless they adhered to the Chalcedonian doctrine they would not be permitted to sojourn in the Holy City, some five hundred Armenian monastics were advised by Catholicos Hovhannes II (557-574) to abandon their monasteries rather than make doctrinal concessions to the Greeks. Although many of the monks are said to have left for Caesarea in Palestine and Egypt, others remained in their institutions at Jerusalem, despite the persecutions meted out to them by the Byzantine authorities, until the Arab conquest. Under Arab rule the Armenian monastic institutions gradually disintegrated and fell to ruins; some that had been left without administrators were occupied by the Greeks. This disintegration is ascribed to the failure of the catholicoses and princes to dispatch the revenues from the endowments in Armenia and to the heavy taxes imposed by the Arabs. The last section of the text, which appears to have been a much later addendum, asserts that there remained only fifteen monasteries in the hands of the Armenians. These were scattered on the Mount of Olives, in Bethlehem, on Mount Sinai, along the shores of the Sea of Galilee and Jordan River, on Mount Hermon, and on Mount Tabor.[60]

In a separate study I have shown that the document attributed to Anastas Vardapet is of doubtful authenticity.[61] Though probably containing a core of truth going back to an earlier document, in the form in which the text is preserved there are many elements which clearly show that it is not reliable. Nevertheless, there is ample

evidence that the Armenians did indeed have important religious institutions in the early Christian centuries, albeit not to the extent claimed by the document attributed to Anastas.

The existence of these establishments at an early date is confirmed by the fact that in the mid-fifth century the Armenians had established a scriptorium in Jerusalem.[62] This scriptorium also emerged as an important intellectual center, where a significant number of religious and canonical works as well as patristic texts written in Greek, Syriac, and Latin were rendered into Armenian.[63] Evidence of a fully organized Armenian religious community there is also furnished by the extant Armenian Lectionary, a translation of the Greek Liturgy—or Christian liturgy in general—as it was performed in the Holy City in the fifth century.[64] More importantly, it is substantiated by the remains of mosaic pavements with Armenian inscriptions found on the Mount of Olives and in Jerusalem, as well as by one with a Greek inscription which mentions an Armenian.[65] Though scholars are not in complete agreement respecting the exact dates of these mosaic pavements, various suggestions have placed them as early as the fifth and no later than the ninth to tenth centuries.[66] These artistic remains provide ample and most reliable evidence for the presence of Armenians in Jerusalem and its environs and for the important religious institutions which they had maintained there from the Byzantine period to the time of Arab rule.

With the arrival of the Crusaders and the establishment of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem (1099-1187), many Christians, mostly Armenian, from Antioch, Edessa, Tarsus, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Mesopotamia, and Syria, flocked into Jerusalem, some to establish permanent residence there and others performing pilgrimages. As a result of this influx and because of the close relationship between the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem and the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia, the Armenian religious institutions and secular community in Jerusalem enjoyed a period of prominence and prosperity, perhaps never attained before of after. Almost all the Latin queens and a substantial number of the princesses were either Armenian or of Armenian blood.[67] The kingdom had in its service an infantry corps of Armenians.[68] In addition to a sizable number of ecclesiastics, there was a considerable secular comunity as well. These colonists had a number of private hostels or inns, and they also occupied several quarters in the city, one of which was known as "Ruga Armenorum" as late as the year 1222.[69]

During and after the Latin rule in Palestine, the patriarchate of Jerusalem enjoyed, particularly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the active interest of the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia whose royal family and princes bestowed on it munificent gifts. Moreover, a number of Armenian princes and prelates from Cilicia visited Jerusalem and secured significant privileges for the local community from the Frankish authorities. Among these, Catholicos Grigor III Pahlavuni (1113-1166) attended the Latine church council held at Antioch in 1141, and then accompanied the papal legate Albericus on a pilgrimage to Jeusalem, where he was

given a place of honor at the second Latin council. In consequence of the considerably enhanced bond of friendship between the Latins and the Armenians which was consummated on this occasion, the Armenian community not only secured important privileges guaranteeing the continued prosperity of the institutions which it already possessed, but was able to increase the number of its monasteries and hostels in the Holy City.[70] In 1165 the Armenians erected the large monastery and cathedral of St. James on Mount Zion, consisting of a complex of sanctuaries, which became the principal headquarters of the Armenian ecclesiastical institutions in the Holy Land. The accommodations of the monastery were considerably enlarged for the benefit of the local monastics as well as for the countless Armenian pilgrims who annually arrived in the Holy City.[71]

Saladin's occupation of Jerusalem in 1187 and the fall of the Latin kingdom marked another turning point in the fortunes of the Armenians in the Holy Land. The Armenians of Jerusalem, comprising some five hundred monks and one thousand families were—unlike the Latins—neithen expelled nor taken as slaves by the lieutenants of the sultan.[72] As an avowed enemy of the Latins and ever suspicious of the Greeks, Saladin found it expedient to endow the Armenians of the Holy Land with greater privileges. The Armenian Patriarch Abraham and his leading clerical associates are said to have hastened to pledge their loyalty to the sultan and to pay him the prescribed poll tax. The patriarch requested the sultan to reaffirm all privileges previously guaranteed to the community in the charters allegedly granted to the Armenians by the Prophet and by the Caliphs 'Umar and 'Alī. The text of the charter[73] issued by the sultan reconfirmed the "sacred and benevolent acts" of his revered predecessors. The sultan enjoined that not only his successors but also the Muslims generally should faithfully honor the new pact granted by him. Saladin guaranteed absolute religious freedom of the Armenians and their communicant Copts, Syrians, and Abyssinians, as well as the integrity of the Armenian sanctuaries.

The four centuries of Ottoman rule in the Holy Land produced a marked change in the fortunes of the various Christian communities in the Holy Places. From the second half of the sixteenth century until the nineteenth century time and again the paramountcy alternated, although generally the Greek Orthodox secured the balance of power in their favor at the expense of the Latins.

The strongest and almost continuous challenge to the Armenians and their holdings in the Holy Land came from the Greek community, despite the fact that the charters issued in March 1517 to the Armenian and Greek patriarchates by the Ottoman conqueror of Jerusalem, Sultan Selim I, did no more than sanction the **status quo.** On the basis of ancient edicts, among which special mention is made of those granted by the Caliph 'Umar and Saladin, Selim guaranteed the integrity of the Armenians' age-old possessions within and without the Holy City, as well as those of their dependent non-Armenian communities.[74]

Under Ottoman rule, the Armenian communities in Syria and Palestine constituted an integral part of the empire's Armenian millet, whose **de jure** and **de facto** representative before the Sublime Porte was the patriarch of Constantinople. As in the past so also under Ottoman rule, the administrative jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Jerusalem extended not only over the Armenian monastic and secular communities in the Holy Land, but also over the small and scattered communities in Transjordan, the provinces of Damascus and Beirut, and the bishoprics of Egypt and Cyprus. As leader of the monophysite group of Christian churches, the patriarchate extended its protection, as well, over the small Jacobite Syrian, Coptic, and Abyssinian communities in the Holy Land, notably in Jerusalem.

Besides Jerusalem, Armenian religious and secular communities were found in other localities in the Holy Land as well as in Transjordan.

From time immemorial there has been in Bethlehem a monastic community to oversee the Armenian interests in the Nativity cathedral, which is controlled jointly with the Greeks. The secular community there is perhaps as old as the ecclesiastical, for its presence has been indispensable for the protection of the Armenian possessions in the Nativity cathedral. A privately owned monastery adjacent to the cathedral, which still occupies a dominant position in the Nativity Square, housed the ecclesiastics and accommodated pilgrims.

Jaffa, the principal port of entry for pilgrims arriving by ship, has had an Armenian hospice and the monastery of St. Nicholas. The monastery is claimed to have existed as early as the time of the Arab conquest of Palestine in the first half of the seventh century.[75] This assertion is by no means certain, but there seems to be little doubt about the establishment's antiquity.

Like Jaffa, the nearby town of Ramla had always been an important way station for pilgrims. Here the patriarchate had established a hospice and a monastery. The founding of this monastery is generally attributed to the seventeenth-century Patriarch Yeghiazar, but it seems more logical to assume that it antedates his incumbency.

At Gaza, too, there was an Armenian monastery and church as well as a hospice where the Armenian pilgrims from Egypt lodged and rested before continuing their journey to the Holy City. It is generally believed that these institutions were founded during the Latin kingom of Jerusalem,[76] but there is no historical record supporting this claim.

In the twelfth century the Latin fortress cities east and south of the Dead Sea constituted part of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, which administered them through princes. The prosperous trade of this region attracted many Christians, including pehaps Armenians as well. The first historical reference to Armenian association with this area dates back to the second half of the twelfth century, when Prince Reuben of Cilicia married the daughter of Prince Renald de Châtillon of

Kerak.[77] In 1257 the combined forces of King Hetum I of Cilicia and the Mongol Khan Hulagu occupied the territories east of the Jordan River, which remained under Armenian dominion for seven years (1257-64), until their seizure by the Mamlūks.[78] The fact that King Leon IV of Cilicia, after a visit to Jerusalem in 1330, donated an expensive manuscript to the Armenian church of Kerak[79] testifies to the importance of the cummunity in this outlying region. There is also some evidence of an Armenian settlement at the town of Salt, where they had a small church named after St. George.[80]

The Armenian communities which were established in Transjordan during the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem continued to exist until about the middle of the nineteenth century. As early as the seventeenth century, however, their numbers had begun to diminish because of emigrations to New Julfa in Persia, Jerusalem, and Europe, notably Italy, and because of assimilation with the native populations.

II

Historical writings represent one of the most important genres in the rich legacy of Armenian literature, which began in the fifth century A.D. Despite the fact that Armenia never emerged as a first-rate power in Middle Eastern history excepting the brief period under Tigranes the Great in the first century B.C.—and its borders were physically narrow, its geographical position afforded Armenian writers a close view of major world events. Hence, while narrating the history of their own country, the Armenian authors give us a great deal of information, often otherwise unknown, on the the affairs of the oriental world. This assertion is also true of the large number of Armenian chronicles which have survived,[81] as well as the colophons of Armenian manuscripts.[82] These colophons were written by scribes in localities extending from Central Asia and Iran on the east to Constantinople and Europe on the west, and from the Crimea and the Caucasus on the north to Egypt on the south. Although the historical information contained in them are for the most part local in nature, many colophons however provide data that are broader in scope and therefore of interest to those who are concerned with major Middle Eastern developments. The uniqueness of the Armenian colophonic literature lies in the fact that the authors of these texts did not confine themselves to brief statements concerning the circumstances of the production of the manuscripts. In the process of providing these essential data, they also recorded contemporary information on a broad range of subjects. More importantly, they supplied eyewitness and contemporary accounts of historical events which transpired during the production of the production of the manuscripts. In view of these, the colophons emerge—alongside the Armenian historical works, the chronicles, and the inscriptions—as important primary sources for the history not only of Armenia but also of the entire Middle East.

As seen in Part I of this study, the Armenians from earliest times were compelled to emigrate from their native homeland to neighboring countries and distant lands, resulting in the founding of many Armenian colonies abroad. Some of these colonies have survived for centuries, while others could not withstand the powerful assimilationist factors. Armenian scholars, especially since the beginning of the nineteenth century, have produced a considerable wealth of monographic literature on the various historic and modern colonies in the Armenin Diaspora. Probably unique in its extent among minority groups, this literature constitutes an important source for scholars engaged in the general study of minority colonies and their problems.

The nature and scope of some the works dealing with specific Armenian colonies are examined in a bibliographical study by this author.[83] Many of these works are historical, sociographic, and ethnographic studies. In the main, they discuss the topography and history of the area under study, the settlement of the Armenians there, their religious institutions, and the cultural, economic, and social life. They also discuss the local dialects, social customs and traditions, prejudices and superstitions, and popular literature.

There are only two attempts at a comprehensive scholarly history of all the Armenian colonies. The first of these is A. Alboyajian's three-volume **History of Armenian Emigrations** (Cairo, 1941-1961); the second is A. G. Abrahamian's two-volume **Brief Outline of the Armenian Colonies** (Yerevan, 1964-1967). Both works have serious shortcomings but they are broadly conceived, contain a wealth of information, and lay the groundwork for future historians of the Armenian colonies. Moreover, Sukias Eprikian's **Dictionary of Natural History** (2 vols.; Venice, 1900-1905) is a valuable reference work which provides general information on localities inhabited by Armenians in Armenia and elsewhere, including the settlements in Greater Syria.

The historic and modern Armenian settlements in Bilād al-Shām are the subject of a number of monographs which however, in contrast to works on other communities, are limited in variety and scope. There is, of course, no dearth of historical works on the religious community of Jerusalem. Hovhannes Hanne Vardapet's **History of Jerusalem** (Constantinople, 1807) is a very valuable source for the history of the Armenian patriarchate in the first half of the eighteenth century. A. Ter-Hovhannesiants' two-volume **Chronological History of Jerusalem** (Jerusalem, 1890) covers the history of the same institution up to 1865. T. Savalaniants' two-volume **History of Jerusalem** (Jerusalem, 1931) supplements Ter-Hovhannesiants' and brings the history up to 1872. And, finally, M. Ormanian's three-volume **National History** (Constantinople-Jerusalem, 1913-1927)—to date the most comprehensive and authoritative history of the Armenian church—deals at considerable length with historical developments affecting the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem to the year 1910.

The works of Ter-Hovhannesiants and Savalaniants concentrate on the history of the Armenian religious institutions in the Holy Land, particularly Jerusalem, against the background of the history of the Holy Land. Both monographs begin by tracing chronologically the historical developments of the Christian Church in Jerusalem. It is only after Saladin's conquest of the Holy City that they concentrate on the Armenian church and become choronicles of events relating to the controversies with other churches over rights in the Holy Places, the various court proceedings and rulings, and so forth. In essence, therfore, their contributions are limited primarily to ecclesiastical history. Both authors utilized a large number of original Armenian historical writings, as well as secondary sources in Western and in Arabic and Turkish languages. More importantly, both Ter-Hovhannesiants and Savalaniants made use of the manuscript and archival materials available in the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem. These included numerous edicts issued to the Armenian patriarchs of Jerusalem by the Mamlūk sultans of Egypt and by Ottoman sultans beginning with Selim I, and a large number of official documents issued by provincial governors and local functionaries. Many of these texts, which are totally unknown to non-Armenian scholars, have been reproduced in Armenian translation.

Other works dealing with the community in Jerusalem include: M. Aghavnuni's **Ancient Armenian Monasteries and Churches in the Holy Land** (Jerusalem, 1929), a valuable scholarly work on the history and topography of forty ancient Armenian places of worship based upon archaeological findings and other historical evidence; Ghevond Alishan's **The Monasteries of Jerusalem** (Venice, 1896), a historico-topographic study utilizing ancient and medieval Armenian sources; and Barnabas Hovsepian's (Gandzaketsi) **Chronology of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem** (Constantinople, 1872), a study of the Armenian patriarchs who occupied the hierarchical see founded by St. James, the brother of Jesus, at Jerusalem. M. Aghavnuni's **Armenian Monks and Visitors in Jerusalem** (Jerusalem, 1929) is a kind of "Who's Who" of monks who have served in the monastery of St. James, and of historically important clerical and civilian pilgrims. Mention should also be made of M. Ormanian's **Armenian-Jerusalem** (Jerusalem, 1931), which describes the monastery of St. James and its administrative, monastic, and educational life at the time of writing (1915). There is some historical value, as well, to E. Chilinkirian's two-volume **Memoirs and Documents** (Beirut, 1928-1929), which encompass the author's correspondence (1901-1908) during his tenure of office as **locum tenens** of the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem.

In the nineteenth century there also appeared a series of monographs describing the Christian sanctuaries in the Holy Land, particularly those in Jerusulem and its environs. Many of these topographic studies also provide historical data concerning the indivdual dominical shrines based upon texts preserved in medieval Armenian manuscripts. Among such works special mention can be made of the following: M. Artsrunian's **Description of Jerusalem** (Jerusalem, 1859); A. Ter-Hakobiants' **The**

Holy Land or Palestine (Tiflis, 1883); Khoren Mekhitarian's **A Brief History of Jerusalem and Description of the Holy Places** (Jerusalem, 1867); and Trdat Balian's **The Holy Land: A Description of Holy Jerusalem and the Holy Places** (Constantinople, 1892). In all these studies the major emphasis, of course, is on the Armenian sanctuaries and religious institutions in the Holy Land.

The Lebanese-Armenian community has been treated in only one work: S.H. Varjabedian's **The Armenians in Lebanon** (Beirut. 1951). Its sub-title, **History of the Lebanese-Armenian Colony** (from the most ancient times to the end of World War I), is misleading, since its historical discussion is sketchy at best. Actually, the chief merit of the monograph lies in its collection of biographical studies on individual Armenians and families who have been prominent in the poplitical, cultural, and economic history of Lebanon, particularly in the nineteenth century; and in the discussion of the final period (1895-1918), where the author also touches upon the internal organazation and institutions of the Armenian colony. While abounding in irrlevant and superfluous details, the volume on the whole contains much material for a future definitive study of the Lebanese-Armenian community.

M. Terzian's **The Armenian Monastery of Zmmar** (Beirut, 1949) is confined to the Armenian Catholic institution in Mount Lebanon, and is dedicated to the second centennial (1749-1949) of its founding. Besides discussing the institution's history and ecclesiastical, literary, and missionary activities, the monograph also provides considerable information about the Christian communities in Mount Lebanon.

Artavazd Surmeyan's three-volume **History of the Armenians of Aleppo** (I, Aleppo, 1940; II, Beirut, 1946; III, Paris, 1950) is an ambitious endeavor, but unfortunately the author's scholarship was not equal to his task. He has felt it necessary— without any real justification—to devote two large introductory volumes, one to the history of Syria and the other to that of Aleppo, before tackling his primary objective. Hence, only Vol. III, which deals with the history of the Aleppine colony from the middle of the fourteenth century to 1908, bears directly to the title. Its material is drawn from a rich variety of sources, principally from the manuscripts and archives of the prelacy, and from multifarious inscriptions in the Armenian churches of Aleppo. However, the study revolves to a very large extent around the religious institution. In the process of providing the history of the Aleppine Armenian ecclesiastical institution and to some extent the economic role of the Armenians, the author also gives a great deal of information concerning the other Christian minorities. Nevertheless, the generally unbalanced presentation, irrelevant material, and extensive quotations detract considerably from the value of the study, which otherwise is replete with important information.

It is by no means suprising that the works on the Greater Syrian Armenian colonies are generally confined to ecclesiastical history, since most of the authors were clerics. Hence, the scholar engaged in the general historical study of these com-

munities, and in the more specific study of the economic and social institutions. is confronted with serious, but not insurmountable, difficulties.

My own monograph, **The Armenian Communities in Syria under Ottoman Dominion** (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), is the only attempt at a comprehensive historical study of the settlements in **Bilād al-Shām.** Although it is a detailed study of the evolution and internal organization of the Armenian communities, social institutions, and economic functions throughout the entire Ottoman era, it is nevertheless presented against the background of their historical associations with the area prior to the advent of the Ottomans in the beginning of the sixteenth century. The preponderant use of Armenian-language sources in the preparation of this work was a part of the original design of the study—that is, to make available materials hitherto inaccessible to scholars who do not read Armenian. Indeed, a good deal of the information provided in this work is based upon hitherto untapped materials.

It should be pointed out that the secular history of the Armenian communities in Syria is far from adequately illustrated by the limited Armenian-language sources. For instance, it is known that under Ottoman rule, Armenian merchants controlled much of the trade of the Middle East and Central Asia, and that much of the economic and social power of the secular Armenian community, particularly in Allepo, stemmed from its important role in commerce and finance. A study of these aspects of Armenian activity might be expected to throw valuable light on the organization of international trade among Europe, the Middle East, and farther Asia; the relations of urban and rural communities in Syria; and the role of Christian and Jewish bankers in the Ottoman administration. Regrettably, however, the Armenian deocuments contain little detailed information on the economic activities and foreign relations of the Syrian communities; hence, for these aspects other source materials will have to be exploited. Because of this, the commercial and financial role of the Armenians in the Ottoman administration is presented in my work only in general terms, and the major emphasis has been on the economic activities and occupations of the communities scattered throughout historic Syria.

Despite the fact that the Armenians have been associated with Bilād al-Shām for over two millennia, there does not exist a single history of the area written in the Armenian language. Moreover, we do not know of any ancient or medieval Armenian or non-Armenian historical work that deals with any of the Armenian settlements in historic Syria. On the other hand, certain historical writings in Armenian, Arabic, and Greek occasionally make peripheral references to some of these communities, usually in the context of the description of some specific events.

We have seen that many of the major ancient and medieval Armenian historical writings provide ample information on developments in the countries neighboring Armenia. Some of these refer to developments in Mesopotamia and historic Syria and supply data not only on the Armenian settlements but also the various ruling powers and the Christian minorities. Among these, special mention shoud be made

of the Armenian historian Matthew of Edessa, whose **History** covers the years 952-1136; this work was continued by the Priest Grigor who brings it up to 1162. Another important work is the **Chronicle of General Smbat,** which covers the history of Cilicia for the years 951-1274; the work was continued by an anonymous author who brings it up to 1331. An appreciable number of other Armenian historical works deal with the Frankish, Mamlūk, and Ottoman conquests of Syria and Palestine..

The general histories of the Armenian church also contain a wealth of information pertaining to the Armenians and other Christian religious institutions in Greater Syria, notably M. Ormanian's three-volume monumental work referred to earlier, which is based upon documentary sources. Monographic studies of the various hierarchical sees of the Armenian church also are important secondary sources on the communities in historic Syria.

By far the most important source materials relating to the Armenian settlements in **Bilād al-Shām** are to be found in the colophons of the Armenian manuscripts. It is known that there were active Armenian scriptoria in ancient and medieval times at Antioch, Edessa, Aleppo, Damascus, Jerusalem, and elsewhere, and the colophons written by the scribes in these localities contain considerable historical data. For the medieval period, also, the accounts of Armenian travellers in the Near East, mostly ecclesiastics, provide first-hand information on the local communities. Among these, particular mention should be made of the **Chronicle of Grigor Vardapet Daranaghtsi,** and Simeon Lehatsi's **Account of His Travels.** A widely travelled cleric, Simeon provides a most interesting eyewitness acount of conditions at Constantinople, Aleppo, Cyprus, Jerusalem, and elsewhere during the years 1608-1619. Armenian manuscripts also contain a considerable number of accounts written by medieval Armenian travellers in the Holy Land; these also supply extensive historico-topographic descriptions of the Christian as well as non-Christian sanctuaries. Regrettably, only a small fraction of these texts have been published.

Insofar as other primary sources pertaining to the Syrian-Armenian settlements are concerned, the archival materials found in the patriarchate of Jerusalem, the catholicosate of Cilicia in Anṭiliās near Beirut, the monastic institution at Bzommar in Mount Lebanon, and the chancery of the bishopric of Aleppo—to mention only the major holdings—are of considerable importance. The patriarchate of Constantinople, which during the entire period of Ottoman rule had jurisdiction over all the Armenian institutions and communities within the empire, periodically compiled demographic and statistical data pertaining to them, including those in Syria and Palestine, particularly in the nineteenth century. Equally important for the latter period are the archives of the European and American missionary societies, and the memoirs and travel accounts of individual missionaries. To date, these important resources have not been adequately utilized.

By far the most extensive and important archival and documentary sources are

those in the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem, which has had an unbroken history since the early Christian centuries. It was pointed out earlier that, in composing their respective histories of the Armenian religious institutions in Jerusalem and the Holy Land, Ter-Hovhannesiants and Savalaniants had made extensive use of and had repreduced in Armenian translation many of the official edicts issued to the patriarchs by the various Mamlūk and Ottoman sultans and by local functionaries. It should be noted, however, that these represent only a relatively small proportion of the documents that were available. Hence, the true magnitude and historical significance of these documentary resources still await exhaustive examination, assessment, and pulication in their original languages. This will undoubtedly make a significant contribution not only to a better understanding of the historical evolution of the Armenian religious and secular communities; it will also shed important light on the history of **Bilād al-Shām**, particularly under Fāṭimid, Ayyūbid, Mamlūk and Ottoman rule.

Pending a personal, on-the-spot examination of this rich collection of archival materials, this author has secured a copy of a list of 160 official documents found in the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem. The list is confined only to those edicts issued by Mamlūk and Ottoman sultans, as well as provincial and local functionaries, that relate to the Armenian rights in the Holy Places, privately owned religious properties, and restoration of such establishments, the institution of the pilgrimage, and the system of taxation, and so forth. Among these, the oldest document is a charter, dated A.H. 583 (A.D. 1187) and attributed to Saladin; the oldest decree by an Ottoman ruler is that given by Sultan Selim I in A.H. 923 (A.D. 1517). Reference to these documents has already been made in Part I of this study.

Insofar as their contents are concerned, the 160 documents can be divided into nine groups:

1 . Documents that reaffirm the rights of the Armenian church in the commonly-held Christian sanctuaries in and around Jerusalem, as well as in Bethlehem. These documents, as a rule, confirm the Armenian jurisdiction in specific shrines, particularly vis-à-vis the Greek Orthodox and Latin churches.
2 . Documents that permit the restoration or reconstruction of specific Armenian religious edifices in the Holy Land.
3 . Documents that reaffirm the legal jurisdiction of the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem over the smaller monophysite Christian communities, namely, the Copts, Abyssinians, and Jacobite Syrians, and the superintendency of their institutions and property holdings, which occasionally had been a source of controversy between the Armenians and the Greek Orthodox.
4 . Documents that enjoin Ottoman functionaries on the provincial and local levels not to harass the nuncios of the Armenian patriarchate and to guarantee their free travel during the performance of their missions.
5 . Firmāns issued by Ottoman sultans confirming the election or appointment of patriarchs to the Armenian hierarchical see in Jerusalem.

6 . Documents relating to the Armemenian patriarchate's **waqf** properties in the Holy Land, in the provinces of Damascus, Aleppo, and Beirut, and in Egypt, all of which were under the administrative jurisdiction of the patriarchal institution. These included the monasteries, churches, and other properties, as well as the hostels for pilgrims. One of these edicts enjoins that Muslims could not be appointed as custodians or agents of **waqf** properties anywhere in the Ottoman empire belonging to the Jerusalem see, unless of course this was done with the patriarch's consent. Apparently as a result of disputes among Armenian monks in Jerusalem, in A.H. 1162 (A.D. 1748) an edict issued by the Sublime Porte ruled that properties acquired by individual monastics legally belonged to the patriarchal institution. This edict was reaffirmed on four other occasions subsequent to its first issuance.

7 . Documents dealing with the levying of legal and, more importantly, illegal taxes by Ottoman governors of Damascus as well as district and local officials upon the Armenian ecclesiastical institution and pilgrims traveling to and from the Holy Land. In these edicts the officials are prohibited from imposing levies beyond the prescribed limits and from making other excessive demands from the inhabitants. Several of the edicts exempt from taxation the Armenian religious institutions and the monastics. Similarly, customs officials also are frequently ordered not to impose illegal levies. The earliest documents pertaining to taxes date back to A.H. 1112 (A.D. 1700) and A.H. 1166 (A.D. 1752).

8 . Documents relating to Armenian pilgrims who annually at Easter-time arrived in the Holy Land from all parts of the Ottoman empire. Some of these documents instruct Ottoman officials not to harass the pilgrims anywhere, especially when they arrived at such ports as Latakia, Beirut, and Jaffa. Some enjoin that pilgrims are to be free in making their voyage on any ship of their choice, and that ships carrying pilgrims should not allow Muslim passengers to join them. In other documents, customs officials in the Holy Land are instructed not to collect the poll-tax from pilgrims, and they are prevented from confiscating their possessions under any pretext. Finally, a number of documents prohibit the levying of taxes or fines by government officials when a pilgrim happened to die in the Holy City of Jerusalem.

9 . One document, dated A.H. 1239 (A.D. 1823), which decrees that Ottoman troops who had been stationed in the Armenian monastery at Jaffa should be promptly removed and its recurrence strictly prohibited.

Even this partial list underscores the great value to historical research of the archival materials preserved in the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem. It can be assumed, therefore, that an examination of all the documentary resources in this institution will yield most important data for the history of **Bilād al- Shām.**

University of California,
Los Angeles

NOTES

1 .See A.T. Olmstead, **History of the Persian Empire** (Phoenix Books Edition, Chicago, 1960), pp. 515-516.

2 .Armenian-Seleucid relations are discussed in René Grousset, **Histoire de l'Arménie, des origines à 1071** (Paris, 1947), pp. 79-84.

3 .See J. Laurent, **Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam, depuis la conquête arabe jusqu'en 886 (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome,** CXVII, Paris, 1919), p. 301.

4 .Consult Hakob Manandian, **Critical History of the Armenian People** (in Armenian; 3 vols. Yerevan, 1945-1957), I, 114-135, for the history of these two Armenian kingdoms.

5 .Among the original sources dealing with the military exploits of Tigranes the Great consult, in particular, Strabonis, **Geographica,** ed. A. Meineke, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1915-1925); Appiani Alexandrini, **Historia Roma,** ed. L. Mendelssohn, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1879-1881); Justini Juniani, **Epitoma historiarum Philippicarum Pompeii Trogi,** ed. F. Ruehl (Leipzig, 1915).

6 .For Tigranes' military conflicts with and eventual defeat at the hands of the Romans see Manandian, **Tigranes II and Rome** (in Armenian; Yerevan, 1940). Consult also H.Y. Asturian, **Political Relations between Armenia and Rome, 190 B.C. to 428 A.D,** (in Armenian; Venice, 1912); and K. Güterbock, "Romisch-Armenien und die römischen Satrapen im 4. bis 6. Jahrhundert" in **Schirmer Festschrift** (Königsberg, 1900).

7 .See E. Ter-Minasian, **The Relations between the Armenian and Syrian Churches** (in Armenian; Etchmiadzin, 1908), p. 122.

8 .See Maghakia Ormanian, **National History** (in Armenian; 3 vols. Constantinople-Jerusalem, 1913-1927), I, cols. 356-357.

9 .See [Asoghik], **Stepanos Vardapet Taronetsi's Universal History** (in Armenian), ed. K. Shahnazarian (Paris, 1853), bk. II, p. 24; Ghevond Patmich, **Arab Invasions of Armenia** (in Armenian), ed. K. Shahnazarian (Paris, 1859), bk. III, pp. 26-27, 30.

Asoghik's work is an important primary source for the history of Armenia, particularly in the eleventh century, as well as the neighboring countries. Besides several Armenian editions, this work is translated into French, Part I by E. Dulaurier, Sdepanos Asoghik, **Histoire universelle,** Paris, 1883, and Part II by F. Macler, **Etienne Asolik de Tarôn, Histoire universelle,** Paris, 1917; and into German by H. Gelzer and A. Burckhardt, **Armenische Geschichte,** Leipzig, 1907.

Ghevond Patmich's work is one of the more important Armenian primary sources dealing with the Arab occupation of Armenia to the year 788.

10 .See **Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarch Jacobites d'Antioche,** trans. by J. B. Chabot (3 vols. Paris, 1899-1910), II, 482; Theophanes, **Chronographia,** ed. C. de Boor (2 vols. Leipzig, 1883-1885), I, 382; Abu al-Faraj (Bar-Hebraeus), **Chronicon syriacum** (Paris, 1890), p. 121.

11 .See [Sebeos], **History of Heraclius by Bishop Sebeos** (in Armenian; Constantinople, 1851), bk XXXVIII. (The title of this historical work is somewhat misleading. Besides providing considerable information on Emperor Heraclius, it is also the most important and reliable Armenian primary source on the Arab occupation of Armenia in the seventh century and has valuable data on Persia. The work is translated into Russian by K. Patkanian (St. Petersburg, 1862), and into French by F. Macler (Paris, 1904).

12 .See [Tovmas Artsruni], **History of the House of the Artsrunis by Tovmas Vardapet Artsruni** (in Armenian; Tiflis, 1917), p. 131. (This work is a detailed history of the feudal Artsruni dynasty of Armenia from the most ancient times to the year 907; continued by another author or authors down to 1226. The earlier accounts are replete with legendary stories).

13 .See **Chronique de Michel le Syrien,** III, 198; also a. H. Sayce, **Les Hetéens; Histoire d'un empire oublié** (Paris, 1891), p. 250.

14 .See G. Schlumberger, **L'Epopée byzantine á la fin du dixième siècle,** 3 vols. (Paris, 1896-1905), II, 151.

15 .See [Nerses Shnorhali], **Encyclical Letters by St. Nerses the Gracious** (in Armenian; Jerusalem, 1871), pp. 198-199. Whether the above-named bishoprics were the only ones in Syria and Palestine at this time cannot be easily determined, particularly since it is known that not all of the Armenian episcopacies in the east were represented at this council.

16 .See Ghevond M. Alishan, **Sissouan; Documentary Study of Armenian Cilicia and Leon the Great** (in Armenian; Venice, 1885), p. 482, note 2.

17 .See Manandian, **op. cit.**, III. 233-236.

18 .See (Kirakos Gandzaketsi), **History** (in Armenian; Venice, 1865), pp. 372-373.

19 al-Idrisi. **Nuzhat al-Mushtaq: Dhikr al-Sham**, ed. j. Gildemeister (Bonn, 1885), pp. 12, 15; Theodorich, **Description of the Holy Places,** trans. Aubrey Stewart (london, 1896), pp. 71-73; Joannes Phocas, **The pilgrimage of Joannes Phocas,** trans. Aubrey Stewart (London, 1896), pp. 9-10; William of Tyre, **History of Deeds,** Babcock-Krey trans., II, 6.

20 .Manandian, **op. cit.**, III, 166.

21 .Arshak Alboyajian, **History of Armenian Emigrations** (in Armenian; 3 vols. Cairo, 1941-1961), II, 453-454.

22 **Ibid.**, II, 453.

23 .**Ibid.**, II, 550-553.

24 .Philip K. Hitti, **History of Syria, from the Earliest Times to the Present** (London, 1957), p. 638; cf. also D. Ayalon, "The Plague and Its Effects upon the Mamluk Army" in **Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,** 1946, pp. 67-73.

25 .For specific reference to historic and modern Armenian settlements in northwestern Syria, see Paul Jacquot, **Antioche** (3 vols. Beirut, 1931).

26 .**Ibid.**, III, 501-502.

27 .Sukias Eprikian, **Dictionary of Natural Geography** (in Armenian; 2 vols. Venice, 1900-1905), I, 51.

28 .**Ibid.**, I, 220-222.

29 .A. Ter-hovhannesiants, "A Brief journey to North Syria" (in Armenian) in **Sion,** 3 (1868), p. 231.

30 .**Ibid.**, p. 174; also A. Surmeyan, **History of the Armenians of Aleppo** (in Armenian; 3 vols. Aleppo, Beirut, Paris, 1940-1950), III, 745-746.

31 .Sisak Varjabedian, **The Armenians in Lebanon** (in Armenian; Beirut, 1951), pp. 8-9.

32 .Comte de Volney, **Voyage en Syrie et en Egypte** (2 vols. 2nd ed. Paris, 1787), II, 68.

33 .MS. no. 669 of the Armenian monastery of Bzommar (Lebanon) written by Andreas Agheksandrian, superior-general of the same institution (1880-1909). The passage referred to here is reproduced by H. Topjian, "The Armenians in Syria" (in Armenian) in **Hayastani Kochnak,** 28 (1928), p. 747.

34 .Raphael, **The Role of the Maronites,** pp. 32-33, 37-38, 41-42, 88.

35 .Tannus al-Shidyaq, **Akhbar al-A'yan fi Jabal Lubnan** (Beirut, 1859), pp. 85, 201-203.

36 .There is an unpublished history of the Antonian order, which now is in the library of the monastery of Bzommar in Mount Lebanon. This MS. has been extensively utilized in vol. III of Ormanian's **National History** (see note 8).

37 .Consult Serafino Davidian, **Biografia di sua beatitudine Abramo Pietro I patriarca di Cilicia e catolicos degli Armeni** (Cairo, 1861). For a monograph on the Armenian Catholic patriarchate see Andreas Agheksandrian, **Brief History of the Twelve Catholicoses of Cilicia** (in Armenian; Venice, 1906).

38 .See Mesrop Terzian, **The Armenian Monastery of Zmmar, 1749-1949** (in Armenian; Beirut, 1949).

39 .**Ibid.**, p. 78.

40 .See M. Ormanian, **The Church of Armenia,** trans. from the French by G. Marcar Gregory and ed. by Terenig Poladian (London, 1955), p. 207.

41 .Surmeyan, **op. cit.**, III, 5.

42 .**Tbid.**, III, 25-26.

43 .Misak Keleshian, **Sis-Matian** (in Armenian; Beirut, 1949), pp. 59, 72.

44 .Surmeyan, **op. cit.**, III, 68, 77-79, 82-83, 146-210, 227, 392; also Nerses Akinian, "The Armenians in Aleppo, 1605-1635" (in Armenian) in **Handes Amsorya**, 47 (1933), pp. 312-315; Alboyajian, **op. cit.**, II, 451-452.

45 .Surmeyan, **op. cit.**, III, 26-27.

46 .**Ibid.**, III, 32-33.

47 .See Simeon Lehatsi, **Accounts of His Travels** (in Armenian), ed. Nerses Akinian (Vienna, 1936), pp. 319-320.

48 .For details concerning the Armenian colonization of Aleppo during the Ottoman period, consult Surmeyan, **op. cit.**, III, 67, 103, 116 120, 680-682, 694-695, 728-729, 770, 894.

49 .**Ibid.**, III, 270-271.

50 .**Ibid.**, II, 531-533.

51 .**Ibid.**, III, 738.

52 .**Ibid.**, III, 421-422, 680-682, 701-702, 972-977.

53 .See A. Couret, **La Palestine sous les empereurs grecs** (Grenoble, 1869), p. 212.

54 .See F. Lagrange, **Lettres choisies de St. Jérome**, p. 160.

55 .See Tabarī, **Annales**, ed. M. J. de Goeje, 15 vols. (Leyden, 1879-1901), I, 2125; Theophanes, **Chronographia**, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1883-1885), I, 337.

56 .See Tabarī, **Annales**, I, 2405-2406; Beladsori [al-Balādhuri], **Liber expugnationum regionum (Futūḥ al-Buldān)**, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leyden, 1866), p, 139; English trans. by P. Hitti, **Origins of the Islamic State**, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, vol. 68, pt. 1 (New York, 1915); al-Y-a^{c}qūbī, **Historiae (Ta'rikh)**, ed. M. T. Houtsma, 2 vols. (Leyden, 1883), II, 167. An English translation of the document will be found in William Muir, **The Caliphate, Its Rise, Decline, and Fall** (Edinburgh, 1924), p. 134; and an Italian version in Leone Caetani (ed.),**Annali dell' Islam**, 10 vols. (Milan, 1905-1926), vol. III, pt. 2, pp. 956-957, A.H. 17, para. 173.

57 .See Caetani, **op. cit.**, pp. 956-957.

58 .It is generally asserted that the Greek Patriarch Sophronius arranged the terms of the capitulation of Jerusalem with Caliph 'Umar I. The Greek claim that the Arab conqueror granted a charter to the same ecclesiastic, entrusting the custody of **all** the Holy Places exclusively to the Greeks, is based on a later forgery designed to further this community's claims to the sanctuaries. (See L. G. A. Cust, **The Status Quo in the Holy Places**, London, 1929, p. 6.) Equally unauthentic are the edicts which the Armenian patriarch of Jerusalem is alleged to have received not only from Caliph 'Umar I but also from the Prophet Muhammad and the Caliph 'Ali. (For details see A. K. Sanjian, **The Armenian Communities in Syria under Ottoman Dominion**, Cambrdige, Mass., 1965, pp 351-352, note 2.) All of these documents, which must have been fabricated to support rival claims to the dominical sanctuaries, have no historical foundation.

59 .For a study of this text see my article "Anastas Vardapet's List of Armenian Monasteries in Seventh-Century Jerusalem: A Critical Examination" in **Le Muséon**, LXXXII, nos. 3-4 (1969), pp. 265-292.

60 .It is alleged that Anastas Vardapet also prepared a list of the Caucasian Albanian monasteries at Jerusalem. See this text in C. J. F. Dowsett, **The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movses** Dasxuranci (London, 1961), pp. 184-185.

61 .See note 59.

62 .See Nerses Akinian, **Classical Armenian and the Mekhitarist School in Vienna** (in Armenian; Vienna, 1932), pp. 69-70.

63 .See A. G. Abrahamian, **Brief Outline of the History of Armenian Colonies** (in Armenian; 2 vols. Yerevan, 1964-1967), I, 264, 266-267.

64 .Consult A. Renoux, "Un Ms. du lectionnaire arménien de Jérusalem (Cod. Jérus. arm. 121)" in **Le Muséon**, 74 (1961): 361-385, and "Lectionnaires arméniens et commémoraison de la sépulture du Christ le Vendredi Saint" in **L'Orient syrien**, vol. 7, no. 4 (1962), 463-476.

65 .These mosaic pavements are described in M. Avi-Yonah, "Mosaic Pavements in Palestine" in **The Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine,** 2 (1932): 136-181, and 3 (1933): nos. (of mosaic entries) 117-120, 132.

66 .Consult Sanjian, **Armenian Communities in Syria,** p. 315 note 19.

67 .See F. Macler, **Les Arméniens en Syrie et en Palestine** (Marseille, 1919), pp. 11-12.

68 .See Jacques de Vitry, **The History of Jerusalem,** trans. Aubrey Stewart (London, 1896), p. 79.

69 .Alishan, **op. cit.,** p. 482.

70 .H. Vincent and F. M. Abel, **Jérusalem; Recherches de topographie, d'archéologie et d'histoire,** vol. II, pt. 3, **Jérusalem Nouvelle** (Paris, 1922), p. 522.

71 .In later times the limits of the monastery were extended through the acquisition or purchase of lands. The whole complex, consisting of many buildings, occupies a dominating position on Mount Zion in the southwestern elevation of the city.

72 .See A. Ter-Hovhannesiants, **Chronological History of Holy Jerusalem** (in Armenian; 2 vols. Jerusalem, 1890), I, 154.

73 .Armenian translations of this charter will be found in **ibid.,** I, 160-163; and in Tigran Savalaniants, **History of Jerusalem** (in Armenian; 2 vols Jerusalem, 1931), I, 409-413.

74 .The Turkish-language Armenian-script text of this charter will be found in Savalaniants, **op. cit.,** II, 880-889; a classical Armenian translation of same appears in Ter-Hovhannesiants, **op. cit.,** II, 222-229.

75 .Barnabas Hovsepian (Gandzaketsi), **Chronology of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem** (in Armenian; Constantinople, 1872), p. 32.

76 .Alboyajian, **op. cit.,** II, 456.

77 .It has been suggested that, upon his return to Cilicia, Prince Reuben encouraged his fellow Armenians to settle in the prosperous city of Kerak as traders, especially in view of the facilities provided by the Latin authorities. See M. Aghavnuni, **Ancient Armenian Monasteries and Churches in the Holy Land** (in Armenian; Jerusalem, 1931), p. 52.

78 .See Macler, **op. cit.,** pp. 5-6.

79 .The colophons of this manuscript (no. 1822 of the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem), which record its donation to the church of Kerak, are reproduced in Savalaniants, **op. cit.,** I, 512-513.

80 .See Aghavnuni, **op. cit.,** pp. 438-439.

81 .See, for example, **Short Chronicles, XIII-XVIII Centuries,** ed. V. A. Hakobian (2 vols. Yerevan, 1951-1956). This is an important collection of the original Armenian texts, with extensive annotations.

82 .See A. K. Sanjian, **Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts, 1301-1480: A Source for Middle Eastern History** (Cambridge, Mass., 1969); also **idem,** "The Historical Significance of the Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts" in **Le Muséon,** LXXXI (1968), pp. 181-195.

83 .See Sanjian, "àArmenian Works on Historic and Modern Armenian Communities" in **Report on Current Research on the Middle East, 1958** (Middle East Institute, Washington, D.C., 1958), pp. 47-54. This study mentions only a fraction of the vast literature that is available. Moreover, works on the colonies by non-Armenian scholars, as well as studies by Armenian authors in languages other than Armenian, are excluded.

HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF AL-RAWK AL-NĀṢIRĪ IN MAMLŪK SYRIA

T. Sato

The structure of Mamlūk Sultanate was composed of both the "Mamlūk regime" under the sultan and the iqtā' system as a socioeconomic foundation of this regime. Generally the Mamlūk regime is used as a term giving a general name of the Mamlūk state, but in this report I would like to define this as the regime in which Mamlūk soldiers form the ruling class and govern the towns and villages through their iqtā' holdings. Such a regime as defined above was not formed at the same time of the establishment fo the Mamlūk dynasty in 1250 because the non-Mamlūk knights (ajnād al-halqa) still formed the main part of the soldiers at the beginning of this state. I think it was after the Sultan Husām's cadastral survey (al-rawk al-Husāmī) and Nāsir's cadastral survey (al-rawk al-Nāsirī) that Mamlūks came to monopolize the amirates as iqtā' holders (muqta's).

By the way there existed the following two contradictions in the Mamlūk iqṭā^{c} system at the end of the 13th century: (1) both politically and socially the gradual rise of Mamlūks forced the government to increase the number of iqtā's. But it was very difficult to find out the new villages or lands for iqtā's because the territory of the Mamlūk dynasty was fixed after the liberation of Syria (Bilād al-Shām) from the Crusaders; (2) the amīrs took the iqtā's of the soldiers of lower class into their protection (himāya), which was the cause of the troubles between the great amīrs and the soldiers. This came to be in contradiction to the principle of the iqtā' system as "all iqtā's should be distributed by the sultan".

In oredr to solve these two contradictions, the government carried out two cadastral surveys called al-rawk al-Ḥusāmī (1298) and al-rawk al- Nāṣirī(1314-1325). As about al-rawk al-Husāmī and al-rawk al-Nāsirī in Egypt, such scholars as S.N. Poliak, Ali Ibrahim Turkhan, Hassanayn M. Rabī' and P.M. Holt have already published fairly delaied studies. There is no need for us to repeat the contents of these surveys. But before proceeding to analyze the character of al-rawk al-Nāsirī in Syria, I would like to mention the following point: that is, the power of the amīrs in Egypt and Syria was too strong on the vice-sultan (al-Nā'ib) to govern the state, so he intended to raise the state of the sultan's Mamlūks in order to gevern or rule at his will. Thus as a result of al-rawk al-Husāmī the iqtā's of Mamālīk al-Sultān were increased while those of the amīrs and ajnād al-ḥalqa were decreased. This policy led to the assassination of sultan Ḥusām and his nā'ib Mankūtamr. Therefore, the government was obliged to carry out the more fundamental cadastral survey and the reformation of the iqtā' system.

Al- rawk al-Nāsirī was carried out four times 1314 to 1325. The year and place of each survey are as follows:

(1) 713 A.H. (1314 A.D.) al-Bilād al-Shāmiyya
(2) 715 (1315) Miṣr
(3) 717 (1317) Tarābulus
(4) 725 (1325) Ḥalab

Now I take up the rawks of numbers (1), (3), (4), and try to describe the contents of these surveys.

(a) Survey of the year 713:

Though A.N. Poliak says this survey was carried out in 1313. I think it was carried out in 1614 because this survey was completed in Dhū al-Hijja of the year 714 taking perhaps fifty or sixty days as in the other rawks. The directors of this survey were amīr 'Alam al-Dīn Sanjar al-Jawalī (nā'ib of Ghazza), Mu'īn al-Dīn Haffa Allāh (Nāzir al-Jaysh bil-Shām) and amīr 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Ba'labakkī. Though nā'ib Dimashq, who was also called (nā'ib al-Shām), was the most important among the Syrian nā'ibs, he was not appointed as the director to this survey. Anyhow, the survey was carried out under the direction of the above-mentioned three persons mobilizing the officials of dīwān al-jaysh at Egypt and Syria, and all the soldiers of Syria and Ghazza. Both Maqrīzī and Ibn Iyas mention that the survey of "al-Bilād al-Shāmiyya" was carried out. But it seems to me that it was not the survey of all the territory of Syria (from Ghazza to Aleppo) because the surveys of Tripoli and Aleppo were done after this survey. In fact, Nuwayrī reports correctly that the sultan ordered to investigate al-Bilād al-Shāmiyya, villages and districts of Damascus, Ḥims, Ba'labakk,Ghazza and Safad.

As there reamins no document of this survey, it is very difficult for us to know its real contents. The later historian Maqrīzī describes it approximately as follows:

Al-Jawali (nā'ib Ghazza) went to Dimashq and remained there with amīr Tankīz (nā'ib al-Shām) until the do'uments concerning the 'ibra and mutaḥaṣṣil of each village, iqtā's, waqf and milk of the village were compiled in Dhū al-Hijja (Sulūk, II, 127).

According to this description, iqtā' revenue ('ibra or mutaḥaṣṣil) of each village was investigated, and then iqtā', waqf and milk were surveyed respectively. As the government intended to increase the number of iqtā's, all the lands that were illegally made waqf or milk were perhaps confiscated as in the case of al-rawk al-Ḥusāmī.

The documents written in the various districts were sent to the capital Cairo. Relying on these documents, the government redistributed the iqtā's giving the new document (mithāl) to the soldiers. Qutb al-Dīn Ibn Shaykh, who was appointed a new director of dīwān al-jaysh at Syria, brought these documents to Dimashq and gave them to the soldiers. At the same time of this survey, several taxes (mukūs)

sush as muqarrar 'alā al-sujūn, sukhr, muqarrar al-aqṣāb (tax on sugar), muqarrar ḍamān al-qawwāsīn (tax on the bow-makers) were abolished by the sultan.

(b) Survey of the years 717 and 725:

As I have mentioned above, the survey of the year 713 was not on all the territory of Syria, but on the southern part of Syria excluding the northern part of it. The survey of Tripoli was carried out in the year 717, and that of Aleppo in the year 725. As far as I know, no one has referred to these two rawks in Mamlūk Syria.

Taking up the survey of Tripoli first, Sharaf al-Dīn Ya'qūb, the chief of dīwān al-jaysh in Aleppo, was appointed as the director of this rawk. The reason why the chief of dīwān al-jaysh in Aleppo was appointed as the director of the survey at Tripoli was, may be, to refrain from injustice of the chief of Tripoli as in the 713's survey. In this rawk the government surveyed al-mamlaka al-tarābulusiyya and its surroundings, the fortresses and the frontiers. After finishing this survey the documents (awrāq al-rawk) were sent to Cairo, and the government began to redistribute the iqtā's to determine the sultan's domain, to distribute the funds for the fortresses and to calculate the expenses. According to Nuwayrī and Maqrīzī, the iqṭā's for 6 amīrs of al-tablakhāna, 3 amīrs of al-'ashara and 50 Bahrī Mamlūks and ajnād al-halqa, were secured as the result of it. And also in this rawk the mukūs amounting to 110,000 dirhams, for example rusūm al-ifrāh and rusum al-sujūn, were abolished as in the other rawks.

The cadastral survey of Aleppo was carried out in the year 725 (1325 A.D.). But unfortunately Maqrīzī and Ibn Iyās only mention this rawk briefly as follows : the director of this survey was the nā'ib of Aleppo, and from Cairo Maghaltai' al-Janali, Makīn al-Dīn b. Qaruyana and other officials were sent to Aleppo to help in the survey. They did the rawk of Aleppo (al-mamlka al-halabiyya) in the same way as the rawk of Syria. And at this rawk every sort of tax on the corn was abolished all over Syria. According to Ibn Iyās, the rawk of Aleppo was the last cadastral survey of the main districts under the Mamlūk sultanate.

As mentioned above, there existed no fundamental difference between the rawks of Tripoli and Aleppo and the rawk of Syria in the year 713. But if we compare the rawks in Syria with the rawks in Egypt, it is not clear whether the 'ibra of iqtā' in Syria was calculated on the kharāj, jawālī and ḍiyāfa as in the case of al-rawk al-Nāsirī in Egypt. According to Nuwayrī's manuscipt in Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, it was permitted to some iqta' 'holders to take from the fallahūn weed (ḥashīsh), salt (milḥ) and ḍiyāfa which were not their right before the rawk. So I think we can see the same purpose or character in the rawks in Syria as in the Nāsirī rawk in Egypt. In any case, we may suppose that these three rawks in Syria led to the systematization of distribuing the iqtā's and to the raising of the Mamlūk soldiers. Thus the Mamlūk regime was, in fact established as the result of al-rawk al-Nāsirī in Egypt and Syria at the beginning of the 14th century.

LA SYRIE AU TEMPS DES PREMIERS CALIFES ABBASSIDES (132/750-264/878)

Dominoque Sourdel

Sous les premiers siècles de la domination abbasside, c'est-à-dire de l'avènement des califes abbassides en 132/750 à la domination toulounide de 264/878, la Syrie, réduite à l'état de simple province de l'empire, passe, aux yeux des historiens, pour une région délaissée dont les califes se désintéressent, bien plus dont ils se méfient parce que ses habitants ne se sont ralliés qu'à contre-coeur au nouveau régime, pour une région en outre agitée par des révoltes fréquentes et qui, en tout cas, ne semble plus destinée qu'à jouer un rôle très secondaire.

Bien que cette vue comporte une part de vérité, elle demande cependant à être nuancée sur certains points et il ne me parait pas inutile de procéder à cette révision tout en dressant le bilan de nos connaissances sur cette période de l'histoire des **Bilad al-Shām.**

Les sources relatives à cette période sont relativement pauvres.

Il n'existe guère de documents d'archives, en dehors des quelques papyri publiés par N. Abbott en 1938 et remontant à l'époque d'al-Mutawakkil, ou des papyri découverts à Khirbet al-Mird et publiés plus récemment par A. Grohmann. Même les documents de Damas conservés à Istanbul, dont la richesse en actes anciens relatifs à la région est particulièrement grande, ne comprennent pas de plèces aussi anciennes, en dehors de manuscrits coraniques parmi lesquels il faut signaler les fragments du Coran constitué wakf par l'émir Amagur, gouverneur de Damas à la fin de la période considérée, irrécusable témoignage de l'intérêt que ces émirs turcs, portés au pouvoir par les circonstances politiques, manifestaient pour les sciences religieuses islamiques.

A défaut donc de pièces d'archives, les sources fondamentales sont constituées par les grandes chroniques arabes classiques, celles de Ya'kūbī (à l'orientation particulière), de Tabarī, de Mas'ūdī, auxquelles il faut ajouter—les **Futūḥ al-Buldān** de **Balādhrī** et la chronique de Khalīfah b. Hayyāt, récemment publiée,— ainsi que la chronique locale d'Ibn al-'Adīm sur l'histoire d'Alep—et des chroniques plus tardives, mais intéressantes pour la Syrie, comme d'Ibn Kathīr.

A côté des chroniques prennent place les oeuvres des géographes anciens: Ya'ḳūbī, Ibn Khurdadhbih, Ibn al-Fakīh, dont les descriptions concernent la Syrie à la fin du IIIe/ IXe siècle, mais dont les informations à ce sujet restent brèves. Enfin on ne saurait oublier les dictionaires biographiques très importants d' Ibn 'Asākir et

d' Ibn al-'Adīm (ce dernier d'une valeur à coup sûr primordiale, mais dont on attend toujours la publication). De même doivent éventuellement entrer en ligne de compte les traités d'hérésiographie rédigés pendant la période classique.

Quelles que soient l'inégalité et la disparité de ces sources très fragmentaires, il est utile de grouper ce que nous savons de la Syrie à cette époque en examinant successivement son organisation administrative, sa situation économique et fiscale, sa situation religieuse, enfin et surtout sa situation politique et militaire en tenant compte notamment des interventions des califes et des insurrections locales qu'ils purent avoir à y réprimer.

* * * *

L'organisation admnistrative de la Syrie à l'époque abbasside reste fondée sur l'existence des circonscriptions militaires remontant à l'époque des conquêtes. Mais cette organisation est alors améliorée en fonction des nécessités militaires.

Les pays syriens constituent cinq gund: celui de Ḳuinnasrin (l'ancienne cheleis) au Nord qui avait été créé par Yazīd b. Mu'āwiya et qui englobait la ville d'Alep; celui de Ḥimṣ qui s'étendait au nord- ouest jusqu'à al-Lādhikiyya; celui de Dimashḳ qui englobait les villes du littoral, Beyrouth et Ṣayda, ainsi que le Balkā' le Gawlān, le Ḥawrān et le pays de Mu'āb, c'est-à-dire en fait la plus grande partie de la Transiordanie ; celui d'al-Urdunn, avec Tibériade pour chef lieu, qui englobait le nord de la Palestine, mas aussi la ville de Jarash, enfin celui de Filasṭīn qui englobait Jérusalem, al-Ramla et 'Asḳalān.

Du gund de Kinnasrīn le calife Hārūn al-Rashīd détacha l'ensemble des places fortes appelées **al-'awāṣim** et comprenant essentiellement Manbij, Bālis, Rusāfat Hishām, (au nord d'Alep), Antākiya et diverses places situées entre Antākiya et Ṭarusūs. Le gund de Ḳinnasrin se trouva ainsi réduit territorialement et il semble qu'il ait même été en fait très souvent réuni à la **Djazīrah.** Quant à la zone frontière proprement dite, elle s'étendait au nord de ces **'awasim,** d'une part en Syrie, d'autre part en **Djazirah** Ce qui est importnt c'est que ces zones ayant été entièrement détachées des gund du point de vue militaire, la défense des frontière du cté byzantin se trouvait confiée, à l'époque à des contingents Khora saniens plutôt qu'à des troupes arabes levées en Syrie.

Chacun des gund ainsi déterminés avait, à ce qu'il semble, un gouverneur, appelé généralement **'āmil** dans les textes anciens; mais ces gouverneurs n'apparaissent dans les chroniques que de façon très épisodique. Il semble en tout cas probable qu'une province de Shām englobait alors l'ensemble de ces gund, du moins à certains époques où nous connaissons le personnage investi du gouvernement de cette province. Mais il est singulier que les listes de gouverneurs fournies, pour la période ancienne, par Khalīfa b. Hayyat et par Tabarī passent la Syrie totalement sous silence. L'histoire d'Alep d'Ibn al-'Adīm fournit certes une liste assez complète des

gouverneurs de cette région, mais on ne sait jamais s'il s'agit uniquement des gouverneurs de Kinnasrīn ou des gouverneurs de la Syrie entière.

Si l'on considère toutefois la personnalité de ceux qui furent, en diveses occasions, chargés de la région syrienne, on constate que les califes utilisèrent, tantôt des princes de famille abbasside tantôt des **mawālī**. C'est ainsi qu'après la révolte de 'Abd Allāh b. 'Alī au début du règne de son neveu al-Mansūr, Abū Muslim est nommé un moment gouverneur de la Syrie, mais il est bientôt rem-placé par Sālih b. 'Alī, autre oncle du calife, qui en 152/769, se trouve à Alep, mais qui rétablit l'ordre également dans la Bikā'. Par la suite d'autres princes de la même famille occupent cette fonction: al-Fadl b. Ṣālih, puis 'Alī b. Sulaymān b. 'Alī. Certes sous al-Mahdī, le Barmakide Yaḥyā, secrétaire du prince héritier Hārūn, est un moment (163/779-80) chargé de la Syrie, où l'on voit revenir ensuite un autre fils de Sālih, 'Abd al-Malik, qui s'installe à Manbij en 175/791-92, pour être peu après éliminé par les Barmakides; mais son frère Ismā'īl revient en 182/798 diriger les affaires syriennes pour une brève période. 'Abd al-Malik b. Sālih prend ensuite sa revanche sous al-'Amīn qui le fait sortir de la prison où al-Rashīd avait cru bon de l'enfermer en trouve en lui un partisan loyal ayant juré de ne jamais se soumettre à al-Ma' mūn, ce qu'il n'eut pas à faire car il mourut avant la victoire d'al-Ma'mūn.

Ce dernier, une fois calife, confia la Syrie—et la Djazīra à son fidèle Tāhir, qui ne lui en fut pas très reconnaissant, puis au fils de ce dernier 'Abd Allāh. Mais, à la fin de son règne on vit réapparaître les descendants de Sālih, 'Isā b. 'Alī b. Sālih, puis 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd al-'Azīz b. al-Fadl b. Sālih (en 218/833). 'Ubayd Allāh réussit à se maintenir sous al-Mu'tasim, bien qu'Asnes le Turc eût été chargé nominalement, à la fin du règne, des provinces occidentales (225/840). Il recouvra ensuite son gouvernement sous al-Wāthik, pour être remplacé par Muḥammad b. Sālih b. 'Alī b. Sālih. Puis d'autres descendants de Sālih disputèrent à diverses reprises le gouvernement de la province à des émirs turcs sous al-Mutawakkil et ses successeurs, et c'est seulement sous al-Mu'tamid qu'ils furent définitivement écartés de cette charge.

Des princes abbassides, plus précisément **Hāshimides**, jouèrent donc dans les régions syriennes un rôle plus important qu'on ne le soupçonne d'ordinaire. C'est sans doute en raison des bonnes relations que ces ces Hāshimides entretenaient avec les tribus des gund qu'ils furent choisis de préference comme gouverneurs de ces régions. Il semble d'autre part qu'ils s'étaient solidement implantés en Syrie, car c'est un des membres de cette famille, 'Abd Allāh b. Sālih, qui fonda, sous al-Mahdī, la ville de Salamiyya, après y avoir fait creuser un canal. Cette nouvelle ville avait sans doute une valeur stratégique, commandant les routes du désert qui reliaient Ḥimṣ à la vallée de l'Euphrate. Mais cette fondation permit également aux Banu Sālih d'acquérir, par la vivification des terres mortes, d'importants domaines, où leurs descendants vivaient encore au temps d'al-Ya'kūbī. Ces descendants sont encore signalés à Alep au VII/XIIIe siècle par Ibn Shaddād, ce qui montre combien la famille s'était 'syrianisée''.

Comme le prouve l'exemple de Salamiyya, de nouvelles villes virent le jour dans les régions syriennes durant l'époque abbasside, mais surtout dans la vallée de l'Euphrate. La première et la plus importante fut al-Rafīḳa qu'avsait fondée al-Manṣūr en 155/772, quelques années après Bagdad, à côté de l'ancienne Raḳḳah, et où il installa une garnison de Khurāsāniens. Sans doute Rakka et Rafīḳa font elles partie plus exactement de la Djazīra, mais elles sont si proches des régions syriennes qu'on ne peut les passer ici sous silence. Rakka avait une valeur stratégique évidente et les Khurāsāniens installé là étaient destinés autant à surveiller les gund qu'à défendre les frontières.

Les deux autres villes fondées durent leur existence à des initiatives privées, semble-t-il, Tel fut le cas de Salamiyya. Tel fut aussi le cas de Rahba, dans la vallée de l'Euphrate, en aval de Raḳḳa, fondée sous al-Ma'mūn par un chef arabe du nom de Mālik b. Tawk, dans des circonstances mal connues, mais en tout cas à une époque où les relations étaient assez tendues entre Khurāsāniens et Arabes syriens.

Par illeurs les califes ne se désintéressèrent pas, quoi qu'on ait dit, des villes existates. Al-Manṣūr, puis al-Mahdī firent fortifier les villes de la côté, évidemment dans un dessein défensif, ce qui explique que les villes de l'intérieur telles que Damas et Alep aient été davantage négligées (encore que les Banī Sālih se soient préoccupés de restaurer l'enceinte d'Alep et se soient fait construire des Palais aux environs de la ville). On notera aussi que les califes continuaient à s'intéresser tout spécialement à la ville de Ramala, fondée à l'époque omeyyade, pour laquelle on dut exécuter d'importants travaux d'adduction d'eau. Une inscription de la citerne de Ramala, datée de 172/788, au temps d'al-Mahdī, confirme les informations fournies par al-Balādhurī à ce sujet. De même des fondations importantes eurent lieu à cette époque dans la zone frontière, qui ne nous concerne pas ici directement. Rappelons toutefois que c'est aux califes al-Mahdī et al-Rashīd que sont dues les fondations de Tarsūs, d'Aḍana, de 'Ayn Zarba, outre d'autres cités dont l'emplacement n'est pas exactement connu, et que dans toutes ces villes des garnisons de Khurāsāniens furent installées.

Que savons-nous d'autre part de la population de ces régions syriennes? Les seuls renseignements précis nous sont fournis par al-Ya'ḳūbī en ce qui concerne la répartition des tribus arabes: il nous apprend que les représentants des tribus yéménites étaient surtout nombreux dans le nord, dans la région de Ḥimṣ, à Palmyre, dans la région de l'Euphrate (les Kalb étant surtout fixés autour de Ḥimṣ et les Tanūkh autour de Ma'arra), mais aussi en Palestine. Les Ḳays en revanche se rencontraient surtout dans le centre at le sud du pays. Quelques éléments iraniens avaient en outre été installés l'époque omeyyade, en diverses villes, notamment à Ba'alabak, et sur la côte, à Sidon, Beyrouth, Tripoli, 'Arka.

Sur la situation économique des régions syriennes nous ne possédons que quelques informations trops dispersséss pour pouvoir être interprétées de façon sûre. L'activité commerciale était grande dans la vallée de l'Euphrate assurément, important aussi le trafic caravanier entre les villes de l'intérieur et l'Arabie, mais nous ne

possédons aucune information chiffrée à ce sujet, pas plus que sur les ressources et productions locales dont on ne trouve pas d'inventaire même succint avant l'époque d'al- Maḳdisī et d'Ibn Ḥawḳal. En revanche nous possédons quelques indications sur le montant de l'impôt foncier des divers gund pour l'époque d'al-Rashīd, ainsi que pour l'époque où écrivit al-Ya'ḳūbi (milieu du IIe/ IXe siècle) et pour celle où écrivit Ibn al-Faḳīh (vers 290/903).

A l'époque d'al-Rashīd les chiffres fournis par al-Djahshiyārī sont les suivants:

Kinnasrīn et 'Awāṣim	: 490 000 dinārs
Ḥimṣ	: 320 000 dinārs
Damas	: 420 000 dinārs
al-Urdunn	: 96 000 dinārs
Filasṭīn	320 000 dinārs

(sans compter les raisons secs fournis en nature)

Si on les compare aux chiffres fournis pour les époques postérieures, on constate:

- que pour Kinnasrīn les chiffres d'Ibn al-Fakīh sont très inférieurs à ceux que l'on aura en suite mais cela peut s'expliquer par le fait qu'ils n'englobent pas le revenu des **'awāṣim;**

- Que pour Ḥimṣ et Damas les chiffres d'Ibn al-Fakīh sont sensiblement les même, mais que ceux d'al-Ya'ḳūbī accusent une diminution d'un tiers environ. Il semblerait donc que les troubles que connut la Syrie au milieu du IIIe/ IXe siècle aient eu une répercussion sur son activité agricole. En revanche le revenu d'al-Urdunn aurait augmenté de façon considérable au temps d'Ibn al-Faḳīh (pour atteindre 350 000 dinārs), de même que le revenu de Filasṭīn atteignait de son côté 500 000 dinārs) Faut-il en conclure que les régions palestiniennes auraient donc connu un brusque développement à la fin du IIe/ IXE siècle? Si cette supposition est exacte, il faudrait en chercher surtout l'explication dans les effets de la politique toulounide, ce qui dépasse notre propos.

Quant à la situation religieuse des régions syriennes à l'époque abbasside, nous sommes en fait réduits là aussi à des indications sommaires, car, si nous connaissons les grands mouvements religieux ou politico-religieux, il est souvent difficile d'en localiser les manifestations.

Chrétiens et Juifs étaient encore à cette époque assez nombreux, semble-t-il. Les chroniques mentionnent les dhimmis du Liban et de la Biḳā' qui se révoltèrent sous al-Mansār, les dhimmis, chrétiens et juifs de Ḥimṣ, qui participèrent, eux aussi, à des insurrections. Mais l'islamisation paraît avoir progressé durant la période considérée, au moins parmi les Arabes Tanūkh, dont une partie s'était ralliée à l'Islam au moment de la conquête et dont l'autre partie se convertit au temps d'al-Mahdī. Mais on ne saurait affirmer que les mesures prises par al-Mutawakkil à l'encontre des dhimmis aient eu pour effet de provoquer de nouvelles conversions. Les

persécutions dont furent victimes, sous son règne, les chrétiens de Hims étaient dues en fait à leur participation à une insurrection locale.

En ce qui concerne les musulmans, le sunnisme était dominant dans ce pays des Omeyyades. On sait plus précisément que l'école juridique d'al-Awzā'ī, qui vécut à Damas et mourut à Beyrouth au tout début de l'époque abbasside, était largement répandue et que cette école, à laquelle appartint notamment un certain Duhaym, qui fut kādī de Palestine et Jordanie et mourut en 245/860, était encore vivante au IXe/ Xe siècle, mais d'autres écoles juridiques avaient été adoptées en Syrie. Ainsi al-Shaybānī, disciple d'Abū Ḥanīfa, fut ḳādī de Raḳḳa sous al-Rashīd. Et c'est en Palestine que naquit al-Shāfi'ī, qui devahit mourir au Caire en 264/820. L'orientation d'al-Shāfi'ī, arabe d'origine qurayshite, qui accordait une place éminente au Hadīth, est sans doute à mettre en rapport avec l'intérêt que les Syriens, au dire d'Ibn Kathīr, attachèrent à cette branche du savoir religieux. Mais on ne pourra se faire une idée précise de l'activité des docterurs syriens en ce domaine tant que l'on ne pourra dépouiller les dictionnaires d'Ibn 'Asākir et d'Ibn al-'Adīm (notons toutefois que sous Al-Mdhdī les docteurs de Shām, placés comme conseillers auprès des vizirs Ibn 'Ubayd Allāh sont traités à égalité avec ceux de Baṣra et de Kūfa.

Par ailleurs il ne faut pas oublier que des doctrines non traditionnelles ou même sectaires s'étaient répandues en Syrie. Il n'y a pas lieu d'évoquer le problème des **Kadariyya;** mais il n'est pas inutile de rappeler que, selon un auteur mu'tazilite digne de foi comme al-Balkhī (qui mourut en 319/932), le mu'tazilisme s'était diffusé parmi les groupes arabes kalbites dans la vallée de l'Euphrate, à Palmyre, en Syrie du nord ainsi qu'en certains points de la région damascaine. Ce succès de la propagande mu'tazilite aurait de quoi surprendre an premier abord. Il s'explique par le fait que le mu'tazilisme fut aussi une secte de tendance politique, rappelant à certains égards le khārijisme, qui avait d'ailleurs des représentants en Syrie dans les premiers temps de l'époque abbasside, et justifiant en tout cas la révolte dans certaines circonstances.

D'autre part il semble que l'isma'ilisme se fût aussi implanté en Syrie, si l'on en croit certaines traditions relatant la présence de Muhammad b. Ismā'īl fils du septième imām, à Palmyre au temps de al-Rashīd. On sait aussi que c'est de Salamiyya, ville assez proche, que partit à la fin du IIIe/ IXe siècle le dā'ī fatimide.

On signale aussi en Syrie du nord des chī'ite extrémistes, les Rāwandiyya qui se seraient manifestés dans la région d'Alep et de Ḥarrān. Là aussi le calife al-Mahdī aurait engagé une persécution contre les **zindīk.** Chi'ites extrémistes et zindīk n'avaient-ils pas subi l'influence des Sabéens de Ḥarrān ét de leurs doctrines gnostiques? Ne serait-ce pas à la suite de contacts qui s'établirent en Syrie du nord entre sectaires de diverses tendances que se forms en partie la doctrine ismā'ilienne?

* * * *

Envisageons maintenant la situation politique du pays, l'attitude des califes à son égard et sa réaction au niveau régime. Quel intérêt les califes successifs portèrent-ils à la Syrie? Tout d'abord ils s'attachèrent à la défendre et en firent une base de départ pour les expéditions lancées contre les Byzantins. La Syrie, dit un interlocuteur d'al-Manṣūr, est le **ḥiṣn al-'umma.** Les expéditions furent fréquentes, comme on l'a vu, au cours du premier siècle de la domination abbasside. Dabik, au nord d'Alep, était généralement le point de rassemblement des troupes, du moins au temps d'al-Manṣūr et d'al-Mahdī, mais encore sou al-Ma'mūn. Ce qui est à noter c'est que les expéditions menées contres les Byzantins faisaient appel naturellement aux Khurāsāniens des garnisons frontières, mais aussi aux Adjnād al-Shām donc aux Arabes. Le fait en est attesté pour l'époque d'al-Saffāḥ, lorsuqe 'Abd Allāh b. 'Alī part en expédition, mais l'est encore plus tard. Ainsi al-Ma'mūn en 218/ 833 exige des quatre gunds syriens 4000 hommes. Jusqu'à quand les contingents arabes seront-ils employés? On ne le sait exactement, mais il est évident qu'avec l'entrée en scène des Turcs ils se trouvèrent progressivement éliminés, sans qu'on connaisse exactetment leur situation. La dernière mention de leur existence remonte en fait à l'époque de la guerre entre al-Amīn et al-Ma'mūm.

Les califes abbassides, d'un autre côté, visitèrent la Syrie ou y séjournèrent à différentes reprises et dans des circonstances variées. Al-Manṣūr vint en Syrie deux fois, la première en 140/757-58, au retour de Pélerinage; il visita alors Bayt al-Maḳdis, fait intéressant, et fit la prière dans sa mosquée; de là il remonta à Raḳḳa (el-Rafiḳa n'était pas encore fondée) et regagna Kūfa. Il revint à Jérusalem en 154/771, au dire d'al-Ṭabarī. Il devait être accompagné alors de son fils al-Mahdī. C'est ce qui expliquerait qu'une inscription de 'Asḳalān, datée de 155/772, relatant la fondation d'une mosquée et d'un minaret, soit faite au nom d'al-Mahdī, qualifiée étrangement du reste d' **amīr al-mu'minīn.** L'intérêt porté par al-Manṣūr et son fils à la Palestine mérite en tout cas d'être souligné.

Al-Mahdī, une fois calife, visita lui aussi le pays syrien. Il passa à Dabik en 163/779-80, et ordonna de pourchasser les **zindīḳ** de la région. Il accompagnait alors, dit-on, son fils al-Rashīd chargé de mener la **ṣā'ifa** contre les Byzantins. Lui-même se rendit alors en Palestine, visita Bayt al-Makdis et y pria. Il était accompagné dans ce voyage par son oncle Yazīd b. Manṣūr, ainsi que par al-Faḍl b. Sālih. Il voulut alors révoquer Ibrāhīm b. Sālih, gouverneur de Palestine, puis y renonça sur l'intercession de son oncle Yazīd. On suppose généralement que c'est à l'occasion de ce voyage qu'al-Mahdī ordonna, au Masdjid al-Akṣā, des travaux dont la nature exacte est difficile à préciser, mais qui témoignent de l'intérêt qu'il portait à cette région.

Quant à **Hārūn al-Rashīd,** il éprouva le besoin, au milieu de son règne, de s'établir à Rafiḳa **dont il agrandit** l'agglomération audelà des murailles, tout en laissant les services **administratifs** à Bagdad. Etait-ce pour mieux surveiller les opérations de pacification **menées** alors en Syrie qu'il se transporta à Raḳḳa, ou pour fuir une capitale **qui commençait** à devenir tentaculaire? On ne le sait, les informations des

chroniqueurs restant laconiques. Il résidait en tout cas à Rakka à l'époque où les Barmakides furent disgrâciés et c'est que Yaḥya et Faḍl furent emprisonnés. Bien qu'on en soit réduit aux hypothèses, il y a tout lieu de croire que Hārūn al-Rashīd préférait résider en un point qui permettai un meilleur contrôle à la fois du "croissant fertile" et de la zone frontière. On rapporte aussi que Hārūn al-Rashīd aurait émis le désir de s'établir à Anṭākiya, mais que les habitants de cette ville lui auraient fait savoir que ce n'était pas "son pays".

Si al-'Amīn ne vint jamais en Syrie, al- Ma'mūn en revanche conduisit, à la fin de son règne, des expéditions dans la zone fronrière et on signale son passage à Dabiḳ en 215/830. Il serait passé à Damas la même année pour se rendre en Egypte et y aurait pour la première fois rencontrer Abū Tammām qui serait ensuite venu â la Cour. Puis al-Ma'mūn se serait rendu à Rakka en 218/833, à l'époque de la **miḥna**, et il aurait alors voulu faire évacuer al-Rafika pour y établir sa suite (ḥasham), mais il y renonça devant l'opposition de la population. On sait que le calife se trouvait dans cette région lorsqu'il donna ordre à Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm, gouverneur de Bagdad, de procéder à l'examen des ḳadīs et hommes de religion sur la question du "Coran créé". On sait aussi que c'est à Rakka que al-Ma'mūn fit venir, pour les examiner lui- même, sept des traditionnalistes les plus réputés, parmi lesquels Ibn Sa'īd. C'est là aussi qu'il fit venir Abū Mushīr al-Ghassānī, mālikite qui refusa de confesser la nouvelle doctrine et qui fut envoyé à Bagdad où il fut emprisonné. II est à noter qu'al-Ma'mūn, devant le refus d'Abū Mushīr, lui aurait dit: "Travailles-tu pour al-Sufyānī"?, c'est-à-dire pour le révolté umayyade qui s'était manifesté quelques années plus tôt. C'est dire que le calife interprétait l'opposition au mu'tazilisme comme une attitude politique anti-abbasside. C'est à Tarsūs ensuite que seront envoyés Ibn Ḥanbal et Ibn Nūḥ qui, arrivés à Adana, apprennent la mort du calife et sont renvoyés à Rakka, puis à Bagdad.

Toutjours est-il que, selon Ibn 'Asākir, le gouverneur de Damas d'alors, Isḥāq b. Yaḥyā reçut une lettre, en 218, l'invitant à examiner les kadīs et leurs témoins. On rapporte aussi qu'al-Ma'mūn fit enlever la **maḳṣūra** des grandes mosquées, sous prétexte que c'était là une innovation de Mu'āwiya. La politique anti-umayyade d'al-Ma'mūn est ainsi soulignée par al-Ya'ḳūbī. Elle ressort aussi d'un autre fait, indiscutable, la transformation de l'inscription de fondation de la coupole de Rocher, où le calife fit substituer son propre nom à celui du calife 'Abd al-Malik: c'était supprimer tout ce qui rappelait le souvenir des Umayyades et en même temps s'approprier une oeuvre que glorifiait l'Islam.

Après al-Ma'mūn al-Mu'tasim passa à Alep en 223/838, encore pour mener une expédition saisonnière. C'est donc en tant que zone frontière que la Syrie intéressa les premiers califes abbassides jusqu'à l'époque de Sāmarrā. Mais le souci d'honorer les lieux saints de Jérusalem apparaissait assez chez certains d'entre eux.

L'époque de Sāmarrā al-Mutawakkil eut è l'égard de la Syrie une attitude inattendue. Ce calife, comme on le sait, adopté une politique contraire à la politique

''mu'tazilite'' d'al-Ma'mūn et de ses successeurs, manifesta son hostilité aux 'Alides et sa sympathie pour l'oeuvre des 'Umayyades: c'est ainsi en effet qu'il faut comprendre l'appui qu'il accorda à un auteur tel qu'al-Balādhurī, dont l'ouvrage **Ansāb al-Ashrāf** est une glorification des grandes familles arabes. C'est sans doute cette orientation d'al-Mutawakkil qui explique la décision qu'il prit d'établir sa capitale à Damas. Il resta effectivement un peu plus de deux mois à Damas, entouré de sa garde turque à laquelle il avait dû accorder une augmentation de solde, fit transférer les bureaux et ordonna de construire une nouvelle résidence. Mais, dit-on, le climat froid et venteux de Damas l'amena à renoncer à ce projet.

Cet épisode marqua la fin d'une période où les califes, quelles que fussent leurs orientations, avaient attaché une certaine importance à la Syrie, bastion de l'Islam et réservoir de troupes. Désormais les Turcs dominèrent la politique, la guerre contre les Byzantins devint moins active et les califes eurent à régler de graves problèmes en Irak même, problèmes qui les détournèrent des affaires syriennes.

* * * *

L'étude des révoltes que éclatèrent en Syrie durant ces deux siècles fait également ressortir pareille évolution de la situation. Les révoltes connues sont en effet de diverses sortes et pas uniquement, comme on le dit souvent, des révoltes contre le ''joug abbasside''. Il y eut d'abord des révoltes de caractère dynastique,—celle de 'Abd Allāh b. 'Alī contre son neveu al-Manṣūr, révolte réprimée par Abū Muslim lui- même qui saisit Rakka, puis à Ruṣāfat Hishām, le trésor de 'Abd Allāh et celui de son frère 'Abd al-Samad, ce qui prouve que les deux agglomérations étaient des points centraux,—puis la révolte, ou prétendue telle, de'Abd al-Malik b. Sālih, descendant d'un autre oncle d'al-Mansūr, qu'al-Rashīd fit emprissonner,—puis celle d'al-Abbās, fils d'al-Ma'mūn, contre son oncle al-Mu'taṣim. Mais si ces révoltes se produisirent en Syrie du nord, c'est parce que cette région était le point de départ des expéditions et que des troupes s'y trouvaient concentrées, sans qu'un soutien actif fut mentionné de la part de la population. D'un autre côté une révolte de caractère khārijite est signalée à Kinnasrīn sous al-Mahdī, mais elle fut la seule de ce type.

D'un autre côté encore le régime abbasside, à ses débuts, paraît avoir pratiqué une fiscalité dure à supporter, ce qui explique la naissance de mouvements chez les dhimmis, notamment chez les montagnards du Liban sous al-Manṣūr (révolte signalée par al-Balādhurī et Ibn 'Asākir). Cette révolte faut réprimée assez sévèrement par le gouverneur Sālih b. 'Alī, trop sévèrement selon al-'Awzā'i qui aurait protesté contre le caractère collectif de la répression. Peut-être cet épisode doit-il être mis on parallèle avec les tribulations que subirent les paysans de Djazīra à la même époque, au dire de Benys de Tell-Mahré. Mais il s'agit là d'un incident qui ne se reproduira pas.

Une agitation d'un autre ordre se manifesta sous Hārūn al-Rashīd à partir de 174/790. Il s'agit cette fois de luttes entre groupes arabes, les uns nizārites (du

nord), les autres yéménites. Il fallut que le calife enveyât son fidèle bras droit, Dja'far le Barmakide, en 180/796 pour calmer cette agitation dont on ne sait lequel des deux groupes était responsable. Quelle en était la cause? Les chroniqueurs sont très laconiques. On est tenté d'y voir une querelle traditionnelle entre Arabes du nord et du sud. Mais il ne faut pas oublier qu'à l'époque umayyade déjà ces querelles soidisant tribales recouvraient des oppositions politiques ou politicoreligieuses. Or, lorsque l'on sait que les Kalb étaient attirés par le mu'tazilisme, on peut se demander si cette agitation proprement syrienne ne correspondait pas à l'opposition qui se manifestait, déjà sous al-Rashīd, entre une tendance traditionnaliste anti-chi'ite et une tendance plus ouverte, illustrée notamment par l'action des Barmakides. Simple hypothèse, mais qu'il faut proposer.

On rappellera ici également un épisode curieux qui survint plus tard: le meurtre, par les Arabes Kalb, du poète 'Alī b. al-Djahm aux environs d'Alep en 249/863. Acte de brigandage selon les chroniqueurs. Mais le poète était un Arabe du Khurāsān, très antichi'te, adhérant à la politique d'al-Mutawakkil. Ce n'est paut-être pas un hasard qu'il ait éte tué par les Kalb pro-mu'tazilites.

Il semble ainsi que l'agitation de ces groupes arabes ait eu souvent des motifs qui ne sont pas indiqués par les chroniqueurs, mais que nous devons rechercher dans le climat socio-religieux et les oppositions sectaires qui se manifestaient en pays syrien avec autant de violence et de profond enracinement local qu'en bien d'autres régions comme l'Irāk par exemple.

Toutefois si des divergences apparaissaient au sein des groupements arabes, ces divergences cessèrent par la suite. Sous al-'Amīn ces groupes semblent avoir d'un commun accord soutenu la tentative de révolte d'un descendant umayyade qu'on appelle al-Sufyānī qui se manifesta à Damas à la fin de 195/811 et qui y résista pendant plusieurs mois aux forces califiennes engagées par ailleurs en Iran contre al-Ma'mūn. Puis, lors de la guerre civile contre les deux frères al-'Amīn et al-Ma'mūn, on vit reparaître l'ancienne rivalité d'origine ethnique entre Arabes du gund et Khurāsāniens des villes-frontières. Al-'Amīn avait nommé comme gouverneur de Syrie le Prince abbasside Abd al-Malik b. Sālih dont nous avons déjà signalé le loyalisme à son égard et qu'il avait fait sortir de la prison où son père l'avait enfermé, lui demandant de rassembler les troupes des gund pour mener la guerre contre al-Ma'mūn. Les Arabes répondirent à son appel et se trouvèrent regroupés à Rakka auprès des Khurasaniens. Des incidents éclatèrent rapidement: des Arabes furent massacrés, ce qui provoqua l'indignation de 'Abd al-Malik qui s'écria: "les Arabes sont ici dans leur pays". Finalement les Arabes se regroupèrent à Rakka, tandis que les Khurāsāniens restaient à l'intérieur de l'enceinte d'al-Rafika, avec Husayn b. 'Alī b. Mahan; puis 'Abd al-Malik étant mort et de nouveaux incidents ayant éclaté, certains chefs arabes haranguèrent leurs camarades et déclarèrent qu'ils voulaient repartir pour leur pays plutôt que de rester à Djazīra. De faitcertains repartirent vers le sud, tandis que d'autres, avec Nasr b. Sabat, entraient en révolte ouverte et ne furent mis à la raison que sous le règne du calife al-Ma'mūn.

Ainsi les Arabes syriens ne paraissent pas avoir soutenu activement la cause d'al-'Amīn, qui leur était pourtant plus favorable que son frère, et avait éssayé de s'appuyer sur eux par l'entremise des Hāshimides installés depuis longtemps en Syrie. Mais après la victoire d'al-Ma'mūn ils se regroupèrent dans les gunds du sud, Damas, al-Urdun, Filasṭīn. C'est seulement en 206/821-22 que 'Abd Allāh b. Tāhir réussit à vaincre Naṣr b. Sabat en Djazīra et à obtenir la soumission des divers chefs arabes en Syrie, qu'on peut identifier avec les **mutaghallibin** dont parlent les chroniques. Le nouveau gouverneur aurait alors fait raser les enceintes des villes, mais se préoccupa néanmoins de la situation matérielle du pays, résuisit les **Kharadjs** et établit partout son autorité, selon Ya'qūbī. Les pays syriens auraient donc été semble-t-il longs à pacifier après la prise du pouvoir par al-Ma'mūn.

Dans les décennies qui suivirent, les révoltes prirent un nouvel aspect: elles furent généralement dirigées contre les gouverneurs khurāsāniens et surtout turcs qui représentaient le calife. Certaines furent d'ailleurs de faible empleur et très localisées. Ainsi sous al-Mu'tasim un yéménite nommé Abū Harb se révolta en Palestine, à la suite, semble-t-il, d'un incident avec un militaire peut-être non arabe. Il aurait réuni divers clans yéménites autour de lui. Mais il fut vaincu par l'émir qu'envoya le calife al-Wāthik, Rajā' b. 'Ayyūb al-Ḥaḍarī. Puis sous al-Mutawakkil la population de Ḥimṣ se révolta contre le préfet de police de la ville; ce qui aggrava la chose c'est que les chrétiens soutinrent les éléments révoltés; il s'ensuivit une répression brutale et des mesures contre les chrétions dont les égIleses furent détruites et qui durent quitter la ville.

Mais après la mort d'al-Mutawakkil l'agitation prit une nouvelle ampleur, notamment sous le régne d'al-Musta'īn, entre 248/862 et 252/866. Il ne semble pas que la politique ni la personnalité de ce dernier calife aient été plus spécialement en cause. Il semble plutôt que la demi-anarchie qui régna à Sāmarrā' après la mort d'al-Mutawakkil ainsi que la succession rapide de plusieurs califes aient encouragé les mouvements d'émancipation, dans le climat de déception qui avait sans doute suivi, pour certains éléments, de la population syrienne, l'abandon de la politique pro-traditionnaliste après l'assassinat d'al-Mutawakkil.

Dès 248/862 un chef arabe, d'origine Lakhmide, se révolta dans la province d'al-Urdunn; le gouverneur de Palestine n'ayant pu réprimer ce soulèvement, il fallut que l'émir turc Muzāhim b. Khākān qui avait été envoyé dans la zone-frontière pour combattre les Byzantins, vint leur prêter main forte.

La même année à Ḥimṣ la population se souleva contre le gouverneur, Kaydar al-Unsrasani, vraisemblablement d'après son nom turc. Le calife nomma un nouveau gouverneur, un Arabe (al-Azdī), mais ce dernier mourut avant d'être arrivé à son poste et fut remplacé par Faḍl b. Ḳārin al-Ṭabarī qui rétablit l'ordre.

Un ou deux ans après, nouvelle révolte des habitants qui recherchent l'appui des Kalb. A ce soulèvement auraient **participé** chrétiens et Juifs, dit al-Balādhurī, obligeant le gouverneur à se retrancher dans le kaṣr Khalid b. Yazīd, réussissant

finalement à s'emparer de lui et à l'exécuter (Rajab 250/864). Le gouverneur de Damas, Nawsarī al-Turkī, est alors impuissant à retablir l'ordre. Il fallut que le calife envoyât (en Ramaḍān-octobre) l'émir turc Mūsā b. Buga avec 6000 **mawālī, c'est-à- dire mercenaires turcs.** Les Kalb furent vaincus et la ville livrée au pilage.

A la même époque une révolte se produisait dans la région de Ma'arra: menée par un chef arabe, Yūsuf b. Ibrāhīm al-Tanūhkī, dit al-Kasīs, elle fut soutenue par les Tanūkh. Le révolté se retrancha dans Kuinnasrīn, puis dut s'enfui à l'arrivée du gouverneur, Muḥammad al-Muwallad. Là dessus les Kalb s'agitent à leur tour, obligeant Muḥammad al-Muwallad à se retirer à Alep. Finalement Muhammad fut remplacé, sous al- Mu'tazz, par Abu l. Sag al- Usrasani, qui réussit à négocier avec al- Kasis qu'il prit comme subordonné pour la surveillance de la route du Hijāz.

Mais bientôt une nouvelle agitation se manifesta en Palestine, agitation menée par un certain 'Isā b. al-Shaykh al-Shaybānī chef d'origine arabe qui avait obtenu le gouvernement de Ramla en 252 des incidents éclatèrent entre le gouverneur de Damas et 'Isā. Le calife al-Mu'tazz confia à Muhammad b. al-Muwallad, qui était déjà intervenu à Ḥimṣ, le soin de mettre 'Isā à la raison. 'Isā se rendit en Egypte, en revint avec des renforts, se retrancha dans une forteresse entre Ramla et Ludd; le général abbasside dut se retirer.

En 256/870 nouveaux incidents entre 'Isā et le gouverneur turc de Damas, Amgūr qui, avec des contingents plus faibles, repoussa l'attaque du fils de Isa, tué dans l'engagement. Ibn Shaykh se retrancha à Tyr. Pratiquement pendant plusieurs années il devait rester indépendant dans les provinces de Palestine et d'Urdunn, d'où il ne peut être délogé. Tenant tête ainsi aux gouverneurs turcs, il prépara en fait la sécession de la Syrie et la domination toulounide, car ce sont des gouverneurs turcs qui allaient profiter finalement de sa tentative d'émancination.

* * * *

En dépit de l'insuccès de ces révoltes diverses, le plus souvent localisées, il apparait ainsi que les pays syriens, durant cette première période de domination abbasside continuèrent d'affirmer leur caractère arabe. La Syrie était bien devenue, comme le dirsait le Hāshimī de ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ṣāliḥ, la "terre des Arabes" en même temps qu'elle était le "rempart de l'Islam" contre les Byzantins et le siège de la troisième ville sainte de l'Islam, dont le géographe Ibn al-Faḳīh vante les mérites exceptionnels. Cette période, troublé vers la fin, et parfois négligée par les savants, permit en fait aux **bilād al-Shām** de prendre mieux conscience de leur personnalité au sein de l'empire arabo-islamique, et ce fut l'évolution même de la politique abbasside, sous l'influence des éléments militaires turcs de plus en plus puissants, sous l'influence aussi des luttes sociales et religieuses, rompit l'équilibre qui avait commencé à s'instaurer et s'était partiellement maintenu entre pays syrien et irakien pendant la première partie de la domination abbasside.

INSIGHTS FROM THE 'UTHMĀNIYYAH OF AL-JĀḤIẒ INTO THE RELIGIOUS POLICY OF AL-MA'MŪN

Mathias Zahniser

One of the most interesting periods in Islamic history is the period of the caliphate of 'Abd Allāh ibn Hārūn al-Rashīd, called al-Ma'mūn (198/813-218/833). Not only was it characterized by great cultural advancement, greater sympathy for the aspirations of non-Arab Muslims, and a championing of the superiority of the fourth caliph, 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib; but also of Mu'tazilite orthodoxy and the persecution of a Traditionalism represented by an Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (164/780 -241/851).

Crucial to an understanding of al-Ma'mūn and his reign is the question of his relation to the supporters and champions of the claims of the Prophet's cousin and son-in law 'Alī (d. 40/661). While our oldest sources, al-Ṭabarī (224/839 - 310-923) and al-Ya'qūbī (d. 284/897) give no evidence as to what led al-Ma'mūn to champion the cause of the shī'a,[1] the traditional sunnī sources present the view that this was due to the strong influence of his entourage in general and his vizier, al-Faḍl ibn Sahl, in particular;[2] and the most reliable shī'ite sources attribute to the Caliph himself the formulation and execution of his pro-'Alid measures. As a matter of fact, these same sources consider his naming of the eighth imām, 'Alī al-Riḍā (148/765 - 203/818) as his heir apparent (**walī al-'ahd**) a betrayal of true Shī'ite principles, and seek to exonerate their imām from responsibility for this compromise by claiming that he was forced to accept his role as the successor to al-Ma'mūn by the caliph himself.[3] Gabrieli holds that al-Ma'mūn's motivation for taking up the cause of the 'Alids was a combination of personal veneration for the descendents of 'Alī and a desire to repair the wrongs undergone by the 'Alids at the hands of the 'Abbasids and others.[4] Sourdel rejects Gabrieli's explanation, believing the caliph was motivated by Mu'tazilite conviction regarding the nature of the imāmate itself, and a desire to unite the numerous dissident elements existing at the time under his authority.[5]

Sourdel suggests that the writings of 'Amr ibn Baḥr al-Jāhiz (160/776 -255/869), in some sense at least an apologist for al-Ma'mūn, provide an indication of the point of view which al-Ma'mūn championed.[6] The puprose of this paper is to show that al-Jāḥiẓ' most extensive treatise on the imāmate, his **'Uthmāniyyah,** was written for the information of al-Ma'mūn himself, and to suggest what insight this may give us into the nature of the Caliph's religious policy.

In his classic work, **al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn**, this same author records that he wrote a number of books on the subject of the imāmate for the Caliph al-Ma'mūn. These books pleased the Caliph very much and gave al-Jāḥiẓ the start he needed for his brilliant career. The passage runs as follows:

> After having ordered al-Yazīdī to look through the books which I had written on the imāmate and to convey to him his opinion about their contents, and after having read them himself.. [al-Ma'mūn] sent for me [and] said to me, "Someone whose intelligence we respect and whose information can be trusted informed me that these books were well composed and of great usefulness. I said to him 'May be the description will prove superior to first-hand contact.' But when I looked them over I found that on inspection they were better than the description of them. So I examined the books more closely and found that my pleasure with them had been as greatly increased by a second reading as it had been by the first... This is a book which does not require the presence of its author or other supporters to defend its contentions. It combines depth of meaning with fullness of treatment. It has excellent diction and smoothness of style. It is a book for the market place or the palace, for the common man or the specialist[7]

These books could not have been presented to the Caliph any later than the year 202/817-818, since al-Yazīdī, the Basran grammarian who presented them to the Calip for al-Jāḥiẓ, died in that year.[8] Therefore they came to the attention of al-Ma'mūn in a crucial period for his religious policy. In Ramaḍān of 201 (March 817) 'Alī al-Riḍā was designated heir apparent. Sometime prior to the month of Sha'bān in the year 202 (February 818) al-Ma'mūn left Marw for Baghdād, and on the second of that month al-Faḍl ibn Sahl was killed. Early in the following year (203/818) 'Alī al-Riḍā died. When al-Ma'mūn finally entered Baghdād on the fifteenth of Ṣafar, 204 (August 11, 819) he changed the colors under which he rallied from green to the 'Abbāsid black. Therefore, if we knew what books were among those which al-Jāḥiz presented to the Caliph we might know a little more about what went into the formulation of that policy.

Since the 'Uthmāniyyah is clearly the most complete of all the extant works on the imāmate from the pen of al-Jāhiz (280 pages in the Cairo edition of 1955), it would seem reasonable to consider it to have been among these books. Tāha al-Ḥājirī, the only scholar who has dealt wiht the question of the occasion for which the **'Uthmāniyyah**[9] was written, however, concludes that it could not have been written during the Caliphate of al-Ma'mūn. "... al-Jāḥiz," writes al-Ḥājirī, "(although he claims to be speaking for the 'Uthmāniyyah) proceeds to nullify the virtues of 'Alī one by one, practically eliminating them all."[10] al-Ḥājirī feels that al-Jāḥiz was too judicious to have offered such a book to al-Ma'mūn who was of the 'Alid persuasion and surrounded by a strong entourage convinced of the superiority of 'Alī.[11] A more reasonable date according to al-Ḥājirī, would be sometime during the

Caliphate of al-Mutawakkil (233/847 - 247/861) when the dynastic policy was directed against the 'Alids.

It cannot be denied that the **'Uthmāniyyah** presents a systematic argument against the claim that 'Alī was the most virtuous of the Companions of the Prophet. Indeed, in al-Jāḥiẓ' time the designation "Uthmāni" was equated with objection to the superior virtue of 'Alī,[12] and thus his claims to have been the immediate successor of the Prophet. The book deals with two main subjects, first, the contention that Abū Bakr "was the most virtuous individual in the Islamic community and the most worthy of the imāmate"[13] and, second, the view of the 'Uthmāniyyah on the nature of the caliphate and how the imām ought to be selected. Since the 'Uthmāniyyah maintain that God made clear that the most virtuous in the Community should be its leader (227), the first of these subjects is clearly the most crucial. The argument in the **'Uthmāniyyah,** therefore, demands for its success the subordination of the virtue of 'Alī to that of Abū Bakr. al-Jāḥiẓ attacks first the superiority of 'Alī's conversion to Islam. He concludes that he was not the first male convert (3-4); but, even if he were, the conversions of even Zayd and Khabbāb, to say nothing of Abū Bakr, would have been superior to his (22-27). In the critical period when the nascent Muslim community was experiencing persecution in Mecca, 'Alī, as a youth, was safe, both because of the protection granted by his family, and because no adult warrior could derive any honour from challenging him. What share could he then have in the heroic virtue of those who suffered in this period? "None at al," claims al-Jāḥiẓ (27-39). Even the virtue said to be 'Alī's as a result of his heroism as a warrior in battle is denied by our author who suggests that many motives may bring a warrior into the thick of battle, only one of which is true courage. 'Alī could very well have been motivated by some baser motive, we cannot be sure (45-50). On the other hand, al-Jāḥiẓ contends, Abū Bakr served as a trusted military advisor to the Prophet, and was in greater danger than 'Alī, since his capture or death would have been a greater boon to the enemy than that of 'Alī (50-66). Indeed the latter's heroism is considerably lessened by the fact that the Prophet had promised him that he would live to fight Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr(49). After a lengthy discussion of the 'Alid evidence for dissent at the time of the pledge of allegiance to Abū Bakr, al-Jāḥiẓ, argues that if such dissent were proof against Abū Bakr it could also be used against 'Alī, since his caliphate upset the entire world (195, 196). The Conquests did not end until 'Alī was in power; the great schisms did not commence until he was in control (185-186)!

On the other hand, there is convincing evidence, both external and internal, that the **'Uthmāniyyah** could not possibly have been written during the caliphate of al-Mutawakkil, and probably was written during that of al-Ma'mūn.

The fact that the book was answered by al-Iskāfī[13] who died in 240/854 provides a date after which the **'Uthmāiyyah** could not have been written. Although this date would still allow seven years in the reign or al-Mutawakkil during which the book could have been written, the probability that it was written during these years is

considerably lessened by the testimony of Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd that the refutaion of al-Iskāfī was written when he was a young man.[14] If we knew al-Iskāfī's age at death we could be more certain of this point. Other evidence, however, contributes to the conclusion offered here. al-Jāhiz mentions in the introduction to his **Ḥayawān** a **Qawl** al-**'Uthmāniyyah** which is certainly this **'Uthmāniyyah.**[15] Furthermore, al-Jāhiz states in the **'Uthmāniyyah** that he will inform his reader "about the point of view of the 'Abbāsiyyah after finishing with that of the 'Uthmāniyyah" (187). This must be the treatise **Kitāb al-'Abbāsiyyah** mentioned also in the introduction to the **Ḥayawān.**[16] Since the **Hayawān** was addressed to Muḥammad al-Zayyāt who died in Rabī'1 233/ November, 847, to have been written in the reign of al-Mutawakkil both the **'Abbāsiyyah** and the **'Uthmāniyyah** would have to have been completed within the four-month period between the accession of al-Mutawakkil (Dhu al-Hijja 232/ August, 847) and the death of al-Zayyāt. Furthermore, al-Jāḥiz was evidently in very poor health during this period.[17]

There is a decidedly Mu'tazilite stamp upon this treatise. It is as though the author expects his reader to accept the categories of reason and dogma championed by this movement. al- Jāḥiẓ accepts unequivocally the position that prophets made errors (91-92). He evidences a strong dislike for taqlīd in several passages (7,10,17). He appeals repeatedly to the mean between extremes in deciding questions of historical accuracy (e.g. 5,7). al- Jāḥiẓ discusses what is possible that God should do and what is not, viewed of course from the Mu'tazilite conviction that God's acts be consistent with his unity and justice (8,255). His critical theory concerning the use and value of Prophetic tradition (**ḥadīth**) and other historical data for proof is clearly Mu'tazilite (e.g. 116).[18] Under these circumstances al-Mutawakkil could not conceivably have been the intended reader of the treatise, since his opposition to the Mu'tazilites was nearly as strong as his opposition to the supporters of 'Alī.

There are also indications in the **'Uthmāniyyah** that it is part of a **series** of books on the subject. The reference to the **'Abbāsiyyah** has already been mentioned. In this passage the reader is addressed in the singular. In another passage al-Jāḥiz apparently refers to his **Kitāb Wujūb al-Imāmah,**[19] or at least a book of similar contents. Notice the context of this reference.

> If it were not for the fact that those whom the Prophet left as leaders in Medina during the various raids were included in.... all the **sīrah** literature, I would have included them in my book which I wrote for you (sg.).... in which I refuted those who belittle the value of the Imāmate.... Except for this book, my books do not reflect my own point of view; rather, I let the book explain itself (187)

At the end of al-Jāḥiẓ' closing statement about the book, a passage in which his reader is addressed in the singular, he says, "Now we are beginning the **Kitāb al-Masā'il**...." (280).[20]

In the light of this evidence it seems safe to conclude that the **'Uthmāniyyah** was written during the caliphate of al-Ma'mūn. It would now seem that the burden of proof falls upon those who wish to show that it was not among those books on the imāmate which al-Yazīdī brought to the attention of al-Ma'mūn. Why should a treatise on the point of view of the **'Uthmānlyyah** have been left out of a series of books describing the views of various sects on the imāmate? In what other period would it have been safer to give views critical of 'Alī? Although al-Ma'mūn's political and official championing of the 'Alid cause ended with his entry into Baghdād, his personal proclivity for that view continued, as witnessed to by his decree in Rabī' I 212/June, 827 that the Qur'ān was created and that 'Ali ibn Abī Tālib was the most virtuous Muslim after the Prophet himself.

What then may we offer as the significance of the conclusion that the **'Uthmāniyyah** was among the books read by al-Ma'mūn during the period when he was formulating his religious policy?

The most obvious is that sound criticism of 'Alī and his supporters was not out of the question at the court of al-Ma'mūn.

It is true that al-Jāḥiz softens the blow of his criticism of 'Alī by suggesting that he is reflecting the views of the **'Uthmāniyyah** and not his own personal views. As we have seen, he says only one of the books which he has written on this sensitive subject represents his own point of tiew. It is clear however from a reading of the **'Uthmāniyyah** that this is more of an ideal than a reality.[22] ;that his readers could have concluded this is clear from the refutation of al-Iskāfī, and al-Jāhiz' reaction to that refutation, mentioned above. al-Mas'ūdī in his discussion of the **'Uthmāniyyah** implies that al-Jāḥiẓ expresses his own views in it[23]. al-Jāhiz himself in the introduction to his **Ḥayawān** shows that his effort was not completely successful, ''Why do you criticize the views expressed in the **'Uthmāniyyah** as though they were my own but do not criticize me for my views when I am representing the position of the Shī'a?''[24]

That al-Jāḥiz does recognize the impact that he is making is clear from his attempts to cushion the blows he is inflicting upon 'Alī and his supporters. ''There is'', he says, ''a lot that could be said here against 'Alī; but to engage in that would be to do something we disdain'' (185, 186). In another context he writes, ''We don't mean by all this to remove credit from 'Alī for what he underwent [in battle], just as we would not diminish what others like him have done....''(48). [25].

Nevertheless, what al-Jāḥiẓ seeks to show in this book is that, while 'Alī was an excellent and virtuous Companion of the Prophet, Abū Bakr was more virtuous and thus deserved to be the first imām. To do this he had to refute many claims of the Shī'a, both ''Rāfiḍite and Zaydite'' (279).

al-Ma'mūn was not convinced. Throughout his Caliphate he held to the position of the superiority of 'Alī. Nevertheless, to argue the claims of Abū Bakr was

evidently not sufficiently risky to prevent al-Jāḥiẓ at the start of his career from presenting the **'Uthmaniyyah** to the Caliph.

If we assume that al-Jāḥiẓ wrote the **'Uthmaniyyah** with al-Ma'mūn in mind as a reader, we can also learn something from the book about the Caliph himself.

We have already shown that its reader is sympathetic with the basic views of the Mu'tazilite rationalists, a fact which is in agreement with what we know of al-Ma'mūn's sympathies. There is further the assumption in the work that the imām ought to be an accomplished scholar and the person of highest merit in the Muslim community. al-Jāhiz answers the question, "How can the superior individual who is worthy of being made caliph be recognized?" He writes,

> A person cannot be the most knowledgeable individual about religious and secular matters without being heard of, since he only becomes knowledgeable by frequenting the company of the **'ulamā'** and sitting long hours with the **fuqahā'** studying at length the books of God and the books of men, and by scholarly debate (266).

Further, both the nature of man, which impels him to reveal the things discovered by him which have escaped others, and religion, which requires him to benefit the community of believers with the knowledge and skill which he has gained, assure that his superior stature will be recognized by the community of the faithful (267). This is in agreement with what we know about the personal qualities of al-Mamūn[26]and may suggest that his choice of 'Alī al-Ridā may have resulted at least in part from his for the spiritual and scholarly attainments of the imām. Indeed al-ma'mūn was the first 'Abbāsid to take title of imām, a designation which implies more of the qualities attributed to the office by al-Jāhiz than had been associated by the 'Abbāside with the designation Caliph[27].

The **'Uthmāniyyah** warns its reader against allowing his natural biases to stand in the way of evaluating objectively the arguments of the treatise. al-Jāḥiz writes,

> Because sects like individuals are of different "personalities" **(ṣuwar),** and just as some personalities are more compatible with your (sg.) basic nature than others...so a given sect may have a "personality" more in harmony with the emotions, desires, and spirits of men than another. Therefore beware of the appeal to your desires and compatibility of spirit! It is more difficult to detect than the invisible... This is true even if the meaning and point of view are presented plainly and openly. How much more true when the proponent embellishes and decorates his argument with sweet words and well-turned, elegant phrases (279).

The import of this information is that al-Ma'mūn was a man sympathetic with learning and with a recognized bias against the position which al-Jāḥiẓ was taking. Nevertheless, not only was the climate in his entourage such that criticism of the

superiority of 'Alī was permitted, but, within the context of an appreciation for his own secular and religious superiority, the Caliph could even be reminded of his bias and still commend his critic for the excellence of his work.

As has been mentioned above, al-Jāḥiẓ' younger contemporary, al-Iskāfī, wrote a refutation of the **'Uthmāniyyah** in which he argued for the superiority of 'Alī over Abū Bakr and thus his right to have been the immediate successor of the Prophet. al-Iskāfī, also a Mu'tazilite, argued from the same point of view as al-Jāḥiẓ , viz. that the caliph was to be the most virtuous member of the Community. He simply favours 'Alī over Abū Bakr. But he does not identify himself with the Shī'ites of the Imāmite persuasion (318)[28]. al-Iskāfī, then, probably represents the position which al-Ma'mūn took. However, al-Jāḥiẓ was never penalized or in disfavor for having taken the opposite position[29].

This evidence contributes to the conclusion that the crucial concern of al-Ma'mūn's religious policy was not to champion Shī'ism as over against Sunnism, or non-Arabs as over against Arabs, but rather to champion a point of view represented by the Mu'tazilites and designated broadly as Rationalist[30]. This was the view of the elite. The opposition that he sought to combat can be broadly designated Traditionalist and was represented by the populace of Baghdad. al-Jāḥiẓ, though he disagreed with al-Ma'mūn on the matter of who between Abū Bakr and 'Alī was the most deserving of the imāmate, was considered an ally in this struggle rather than an opponent.

The Caliph hoped that by selecting 'Alī al-Riḍā as his successor he was following a policy like the one advocated by both al-Jāḥiz and al-Iskāfī, namely, that the imām should be a man of scholarly achievement and personal piety[31]. In addition, he hoped that this move would serve to bring to his aid those who were sympathetic to the cause of 'Alī. He was to discover, however, that this plan did not work. Indeed, the Imāmite Shi^{c}ites either disowned ^{c}Alī al-Riḍā for cooperating with al-Ma'mūn's efforts, or claimed that he was forced to comply with them. al-Ma'mūn after the deaths of his vizier al-Faḍl ibn Sahl and 'Alī himsedf, and upon entering Baghdād, abandoned green as a color to rally behind for the black of the 'Abbāsids. However, political realities forced him to make this polity, since he was to make known his own preference for 'Alī on more than one future occasion.

Central Michigan University

NOTES

1. Francesco Gabrieli, **Al-Ma'mun e gli Alid,** Morgenländische texte und Forschungen...., II bd., hft. 1 (Leipzig, 1929), p. 32.
2. Sidqi Ḥamdi "The pro-Alid policy of Ma'mūn", **Bull. Coll. Arts Sci. Baghdad,** I (1956), p. 96.
3. Ḥamdi, p. 101.
4. Gabrieli, p. 34.
5. Dominique Sourdel, "La politique religieuse du calife 'Abbaside al-Ma'mun", **REI,** XXX (1962), p. 47.
6. Dominique Sourdel, "The 'Abbāsid Caliphate," **The Cambridge History of Islam:** Vol. I: "The Central Islamic Lands", ed. P.M. Holt, Ann K.S. Lambton, and Bernard Lewis (Cambridge, 1970), p. 121.
7. 'Amr ibn Bahr al-Jāḥiẓ, **al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn,** ed. Hasan al-Sandūbi, 3 vols., Maktabat al-Jāḥiz, 2 (Cairo, 1926-27), Vol. III, p. 374.
8. Ṭāha al-Ḥājiri, **al- Jaḥiẓ : ḥayātu-hu wa āthāru-hu,** Maktabat al-Dirasat al-Adabiyyah, 28 (Cairo, 1969), p. 181.
9. 'Amr ibn Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ , **al-'Uthmāniyyah.** ed. ᶜAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, Maktabat al-Jāḥiz, 3 (Cairo, 1955).
10. al-Ḥājiri, p. 187.
11. **ibid.**
12. 'Amr ibn Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ, **al-Ḥ ayawan,** ed. 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, Maktabat al-Jāḥiz , 7 Vols. (Cairo, 1938-1945), Vol. Vll, p. 7.
13. Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Iskāfi, **al- Radd 'alā kitāb al-'Uthmāniyyah.** Only portions of this book are extant. These portions have been preserved in the **Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah** of Ibn Abi al-Ḥadid (ed. Ḥasan Tamim, 5 Vols. Beirut, 1963, Vol. IV, pp. 219-269). Hārūn published these portions after the text of the **'Uthmaniyyah** in his edition referred to above (pp. 282-343).
14. "al-Jāḥiẓ entered the quarter of the booksellers of Baghdād and said, 'Who is this common youth who I have heard has dared to fefute my book?'" Ibn Abi al-Ḥadid, Vol. V, p. 96.
15. al-Jāḥiẓ , **Ḥayawān,** Vol. I, p. 11. See also Charles Pellat, "Gahiziana III. essai d'inventaire de l'oeuvre Gahiziene, "**Arabica,** III (1965), p. 178.
16. al-Jāḥiẓ , **Ḥayawān,** Vol. 1, p. 12; Pellat, "Gahiziana III...", p. 156.
17. Charles Pellat, **The Life and Works of Jāḥiẓ,** trans. D.M. Hawke, The Islamic World (Berkeley, 1969), p. 7.
18. See the unpubl. diss. (Johns Hopkins, 1973) by Mathias Zahniser, "The **'Uthmaniyyah** of al-Jāḥiz: an analysis of content, method, and sources", Ch. IV.
19. Pellat, "Gahizianna III,..", p. 161.
20. Zahniser, pp. 12 ff.
21. Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabari, **Tārikh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk,** ed Muhammad Abu Faḍl Ibrāhim, Dhakhā'ir al-ᶜArab, 30, 10 Vols. (Cairo, 1937-1962), Vol. VII, p. 619 (= III, 1099). See also Aḥmad Ibn Abi Ṭāhir Tayfūr, **Baghdād fi Ta'rikh al-Khilafa al-'Abbāsiyyah** (Baghdād, 1968),p.9.
22. For details on this from the **ᶜUthmāniyyah** see Zahniser, pp. 18ff.
23. 'Ali ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Mas'ūdi, **Les Prairies D'Or,** C. Barbier de Meynard, trans., and ed., 10 Vols. (Paris, 1871), Vol. Vl, p. 56f.
24. al-Jāḥiz, **Ḥayawān,** Vol. l, p. 11.
25. See also **'Uthmāniyyah,** pp. 87, 89, 93, and 153 for similar defenses of ᶜAli.
26. al-Rifā'i points out al-Ma'mū'ns personal proficiency in the Islamic disciplines (Ahmad Farid al-Rifāᶜi, **'Aṣr al-Ma'mūn,** 2nd ed., 2 Vols. (Cairo, 1927), Vol. 1, p. 215). This is cearly shown by an anecdote in Ibn Abi Ṭāhir Ṭayfūr, pp. 30 and 31.
27. Sourdel, "La Politique....", p. 37.

28. See also Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, Vol. 1,p. 782 where al-Iskāfī is mentioned as the most sincerely convinced and the most effective exponent of the Baghdādī school of Mu'tazilites who opted for the superiority of 'Alī.
29. Sourdel ("La Politique...", p. 38, 39) shows that al-Ma'mūn took exactly the position which al-Jāḥiz refutes in his **'Uthmāniyyah.**
30. See George Makdisi, "Remarks on Traditionalism in Islamic Religious History", **The Conflict of Traditionalism and Modernism in the Muslim Middle East,** ed., Carl Leiden (Austin, Texas, 1965), p. 81.
31. Sourdel, "The 'Abbāsid Caliphate", p. 121.

CONTENTS