

hardly surprising that the form ceased to be widely cultivated after the end of the 19th century.

Bibliography: Critical accounts of Anīs and his *marāthī* may be found in Muhammad Sadiq, *History of Urdu literature*, London 1964, 155-63; Abu 'l-Layth Šiddīqī, *Lakḥnāū kā dabistān-i shā'irī*, Lahore 1955, which also contains examples from previous and subsequent *marthīya* poets. Ram Babu Sakṣena's *History of Urdu literature*, Allahabad 1927, in a general chapter on "Elegy and elegy writers" (123 ff.), contains a genealogical table of Anīs's family (p. 136), showing the poets in the family before and after him.

Among critical studies of Anīs are Amīr Aḥmad, *Yādgār-i Anīs*, Lucknow 1924, and Dja'far 'Alī Khān, *Anīs ki marthīya nigārī*, Lucknow 1951. Shibli Nu'mānī's *Muwāzana-yi-Anīs-o-Dabīr* is still the standard comparison of the two poets, though heavily weighted in Anīs's favour. There are numerous editions of Anīs's poetry, none complete. One of the fullest is *Marāthī Anīs*, ed. Na'ib Husayn Nakwī Amrotā, 4 vols., Karachi 1959. The three-volume edition of Nawāb Ḥaydar Dīang, Badāun 1935, is less full, but has an introduction by Nizām al-Dīn Husayn Nizāmī Badāunī.

(J.A. HAYWOOD)

ANŠĀRĪ, SHAYKH MURTAḌĀ, despite his being rather unknown in the West, is considered to have been a Shīrī *muḍtāhid* whose widely-recognised religious leadership in the Shīrī world has not yet been surpassed. He was born into a noted but financially poor clerical family of Dizfūl, in the south of Iran, in 1214/1799; his lineage went back to Djabīr b. 'Abd Allāh Anšārī (d. 78/697), a Companion of the Prophet. After learning the recitation of the Qur'ān and related primary subjects, Anšārī studied under his uncle Shaykh Ḥusayn Anšārī until 1232/1816 when he, accompanying his father, Muḥammad Amīn, went to visit the shrine cities of 'Irāq. While in Karbalā', he attended the teaching circle of the then Shīrī leader, Sayyid Muḥammad Muḍjāhid (d. 1242/1826), who found Anšārī a man of extraordinary genius and urged Anšārī's father to let his son remain in Karbalā'. Anšārī then studied under Muḍjāhid until ca. 1236/1820, when Anšārī, together with hundreds of other Iranian people, fled from Karbalā' due to the pressures imposed by the Ottoman governor at Baghdād, Dāwūd Pasha, after the growth of the Perso-Ottoman hostility at that time (S.H. Longrigg, *Four centuries of modern Iraq*, Oxford 1925, 242-9; Sir Percy Sykes, *A history of Persia*, ii, repr. London 1963, 316 ff.). Anšārī then returned to Dizfūl.

In ca. 1237/1821, Anšārī again went to Karbalā' and attended the circle of the famous *muḍtāhid* Mullā Muḥammad Sharīf al-'Ulamā' (d. 1245/1829). In ca. 1238/1829 he proceeded to Naḍjaf and continued his studies under Shaykh Mūsā Kāshif al-Ghītā' (d. 1241/1825), and after a year or so he again returned to his home town, Dizfūl. Heading for Mashhad in 1240/1824 with the intention of attending the circles for religious learning in different Iranian cities, Anšārī joined the teaching circle of Shaykh Asad Allāh Burūdjirdī (d. ca. 1271/1854) in Burūdjird ('Abd al-'Azīz Šāhib al-Djawāhīr, *Dā'ira al-mā'arīf al-islāmīya: Irān wa hama-yi mā'arīf-i Shī'a-yi Imāmīyya-yi Iḥnā'a-asharīyya*, ii, n.d., 155, under "Asad Allāh") and that of Sayyid Muḥammad Bakīr Shaftī (d. 1270/1853) in Iṣfahān (Anšārī's biography written by Muḥammad Riḍā al-Raḍawī al-Kh'ānsārī (sic), in Anšārī, *Kitāb al-Matāḍjir (al-Makāsib)*, Tehran 1908, 1), each for no more than a month.

When Anšārī met Mullā Aḥmad Narākī (d. 1245/1829) in Kāshān, he decided to remain there because he found Narākī's circle most congenial for learning. Narākī also found Anšārī exceptionally knowledgeable, saying that within his experience he had never met any established *muḍtāhid* as learned as Anšārī, who was then ca. thirty years of age (Murtaḍā al-Anšārī, *Zīndigānī wa shakhsīyyat-i Shaykh-i Anšārī kuddisa siruh*, Ahwāz (sic) 1960, 69).

In 1244/1828, Anšārī left Kāshān for Mashhad, and after a few months living there he went to Tehran. In 1246/1830, he returned to Dizfūl, where he was widely recognised as a religious authority, despite the presence of other important 'ulamā' in that town. It is said that Anšārī suddenly left Dizfūl secretly after sometime because he, as a religious-legal judge, was put under pressure to bring in a one-sided verdict in a legal case. He then arrived in Naḍjaf in ca. 1249/1833 and joined the teaching circle of Shaykh 'Alī Kāshif al-Ghītā' (d. 1254/1838) and, according to some sources, that of Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan Šāhib al-Djawāhīr (d. 1266/1849), but each for only a few months, and soon organised his own teaching circle independently.

Anšārī's life as a distinguished religious scholar entered a new phase in 1266/1849 after he had received an overwhelming recognition from all the Shīrī communities which formed a population then estimated at 40 million across the Muslim world, so that the institution of *marḍja'-i taklīd* [q.v.] reached its highest point. "The Twelver Shīrī population of Iran," wrote one of Anšārī's contemporaries, Muḥammad Ḥasan 'Itimād al-Saltāna, "and the numerous Shīrī groups who live in India, in Russia, in some of the Ottoman provinces, and in several other cities of Afghānistān, Turkistān, and elsewhere used to send to Anšārī their endowment funds, alms taxes, one-fifth of their annual savings . . . and other similar payments, which amounted to 200,000 *tūmāns* [ca. \$ 30,000.00] annually" (*al-Ma'āthīr wa 'l-āthār*, Tehran 1888, 136-7).

Despite his vast income and his overwhelming leadership, Anšārī, according to a number of eyewitness accounts, nevertheless denied his family a comfortable life and himself lived an ascetic life, as was evident from his appearance (cf. *inter alia*, Muḥammad Ḥīrz al-Dīn, *Mā'arīf al-riḍā'āl*, ii, Naḍjaf 1964, 399-404). Instead, he gave the money to the poor and needy, to the students of religious schools, and at times to those Muslims who, on their way to visit the shrine of Imām Riḍā in Mashhad, were taken captive by the Turkomans. When Anšārī died in 1281/1864 his wealth and belongings were worth only seventeen *tūmāns* (less than three dollars), for an equal amount of which he was in debt. One of his followers therefore took charge of the funeral expenses.

Anšārī's piety, and above all his scholarly qualifications, deserved of course such recognition, but other factors also were certainly instrumental in establishing his leadership: the then great *marḍja'-i taklīd*, Šāhib al-Djawāhīr, shortly before his death declared Anšārī to be the legitimate sole *marḍja'-i taklīd* of the Shīrī. This endorsement was compounded with the earlier death of other distinguished religious authorities such as Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥusayn Šāhib al-Fuṣūl (d. 1261/1845). In addition, this development was preceded by the gradual decline of Iṣfahān as religious centre, a process which had begun its course since the fall of the Šafawīd dynasty and was accelerated by the death of such religious authorities of Iṣfahān as Shaftī and Ibrāhīm

Karbāsī (d. 1262/1845). Consequently, Nadjaf began then to enjoy an unprecedented attention from the Shī'ā of Iran, and most of this attention was certainly focused on the person of Anşārī.

Anşārī not only established a new era in the history of the Shī'ī leadership but was also an important figure in the field of Shī'ī jurisprudence, being credited with introducing a new methodology in the field of *uṣūl*. His interpretation, for instance, of the "principle of no harm" (*kā'ida lā darar*), which had long engaged the Shī'ī 'ulamā', opened up a more settled way for practising *idjtiḥād* in general and for dealing with the problem of private ownership in particular. Anşārī's system in jurisprudence laid great importance on the *marḡā'a-i taklīd*'s being the most learned man of his time; he said that 'aql (reason) and 'urf (social conventions and common practices) are to be taken as criteria and bases for introducing new laws. His name is also mentioned as an authority with original views on such *uṣūl* subjects as the principles of *istishāb*, *barā'a*, and *zamm*, each of which were the subject of an independent study done by Anşārī (for a concise definition of the above terms, cf. Dja'far Saḍjdjādī, *Farhang-i 'ulūm-i naḡlī va adabī*, Tehran 1965, 51-3, 136, 359).

Anşārī's school of thought has been clearly dominant in the Shī'ī clerical circles since the middle of the 19th century, and his views have been discussed and adopted by most of the Shī'ī 'ulamā'. A descendant of Anşārī's brother has listed the names of 144 *muḍjtahids* who have written commentaries on Anşārī's various books (Anşārī, *Zindigānī*, 354-87). Anşārī's influence on the later 'ulamā' can also be found in the bio-bibliographical dictionaries compiled on the Shī'ī authorities (cf. *Bibl.*). The influence of Anşārī's ideas is further seen in the laws made for various Shī'ī communities, because many of those who were involved in the process of law-making were either Anşārī's disciples or were indirectly under the influence of his thought. The Persian civil law which was substantially based on the Shī'ī jurisprudence may be mentioned as an example; and the man who "translated into Russian the Islamic law according to which the Muslims of Caucasus were being tried in the legal courts" was Mirzā Kāzīm Bey, a disciple of Anşārī (Mahdī Khān Mumtaḥin al-Dawla Shākakī, *Khāṭirat*, Tehran 1974, 110).

Anşārī's circle of teaching was attended by numerous pupils, many of whom became great *marḡā'a-i taklīd*'s of their times, e.g. Husayn Kūhkarī (d. 1291/1874), Muḥammad Irwānī (d. 1306/1888), Habīb Allāh Raṣḥī (d. 1312/1894), Muḥammad Hasan Shīrāzī (d. 1312/1894), and Muḥammad Kāzīm Khurāsānī (d. 1329/1911). There are also reports that Sayyid Djamāl al-Dīn Asadābādī "Afghānī" was also a pupil of Anşārī (Aṣghar Mahdawī and Irādī Afshār, *Madḡmī'a-yi asnād va madārik-i cāpnaṣhuda dar bāra-yi Sayyid Djamāl al-Dīn mashhūr bi Afghānī*, Tehran 1963, 20) and that Afghānī studied in Anşārī's circle for four years prior to Afghānī's departure from Nadjaf in 1270/1854 (Mirzā Luṭf Allāh Khān Asadābādī, *Sharḥ-i ḥāl va āṭḥār-i Sayyid Djamāl al-Dīn Asadābādī mar'uf bi Afghānī*, Berlin 1926, 21-2; but these accounts are controversial. It cannot be accepted that Anşārī, despite his great caution in issuing a certificate of *idjtiḥād*, gave one to Afghānī, then only sixteen years of age (Khān Malik Sāsānī, *Siyāsāt-garān-i dawra-yi Kāḍjār*, i, Tehran 1959, 186, nor has Luṭf Allāh Khān been correctly quoted by Nikki R. Keddie that "Shaikh Murtaẓā gave Jamāl ad-Dīn an *iḡāzeh* (certificate of advanced knowledge)" (*Sayyid Jamāl ad-Dīn "al-Afghānī": a politi-*

cal biography, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1972, 15-16); rather, Luṭf Allāh reported that Anşārī gave a certain certificate to Afghānī's father (Asadābādī, *op. cit.*, 15, 21 and the Arabic translation of Asadābādī's book by 'Abd al-Na'īm Muḥammad Ḥasanayn, Beirut 1973, 64; see also Abdul-Hādī Hairī, *Andīshahā-yi Sayyid Djamāl al-Dīn Asadābādī dar pūrāmīn-i inḡitāt-i musalmānān va inkilāb-i maṣhrūṭiyat-i Irān*, in *Vahīd*, nos. 225-9 [1978], 47-52, 57-61, etc.).

Despite his being a one-eyed man, Anşārī was quite productive in writing. According to a report, he wrote over thirty books (Anşārī, *Zindigānī*, 131-4), twenty-four of which are listed as Anşārī's published works in Khānbābā Mushār, *Mu'allifīn-i kutub-i cāpī-yi fārsī va Arabī*, vi, Tehran 1965, nos. 126-35; many of these books have been published several times in India, 'Irāq, and Irān since 1267/1850. Two of his works are especially frequently consulted and have been considered by the Shī'ī 'ulamā' to be of exceptional importance: *Farā'id al-uṣūl (al-Rasā'il)* on *uṣūl* and *al-Makāsib* on *fiḡh*, which were first published in Tehran in 1268/1851 and 1280/1863 respectively. Both these have constantly been used as text books in all Shī'ī circles.

One of the financial foundations with which many of the Shī'ī 'ulamā' of 'Irāq were knowingly or unknowingly connected was the so-called "Oudh Bequest". It was, in the words of the British Minister of Tehran, a "powerful lever which helped to promote good relations between the Persian ecclesiastics and myself and . . . afforded opportunities for influencing the leading Persian Ulama" (Sir Arthur Hardinge, *A diplomatist in the East*, London 1928, 323-4). The British authorities, however, did not succeed in influencing Anşārī through the Oudh Bequest (Sayyid Muḥsin Amīn, *A'yān al-Shī'a*, xl, Beirut 1960, 43-6). He received money only for a short period of time, and then rejected further sums (Maḥmūd Maḥmūd, *Ta'riḡh-i rawābiṭ-i siyāsī-yi Irān va Ingīlīs*, vi, Tehran 1953, 1743).

In the arena of politics and public affairs, Anşārī was quite inactive. He refused to make use of his influence in the interest of his followers. Persian or otherwise, in their political and other struggles. Theoretically, however, he believed that the 'ulamā' are not only the custodians of religions, but are also unquestionably responsible for judicial and political affairs also (Hairī, *Shī'ism and constitutionalism in Iran: a study of the role played by the Persian residents of Iraq in Iranian politics*, Leiden 1977, 60). Anşārī's lack of interest in social and political issues has been criticised by contemporary modernist thinkers. Faṭḥ 'Alī Ākhūnd-Zāda, for instance, said: "God has not given Anşārī enough insight to understand why Irān is in the state of collapse and why the Iranians are suffering abasement" (*Alifbā-yi ḡadīd va maktūbāt*, Baku 1963, 121), and Akā Khān Kirmānī [q.v. above] believed that Anşārī contributed to the people's ignorance and perplexity (Firīdūn Ādamiyyat, *Andīshahā-yi Mirzā Akā Khān Kirmānī*, Tehran 1967, 66).

On the other hand, his aloofness from politics was warmly welcomed by the political authorities, who seem to have taken it as a sign of his asceticism. Thus we come across the reports that the governor of 'Irāq referred to him as the Greatest Fārūk (i.e. one who distinguishes truth from falsehood) and that the British Ambassador allegedly said: "Anşārī is either Jesus himself or his special deputy on earth" (Hasan Khān Shaykh Djabīrī Anşārī, *Ta'riḡh-i Isfahān va Ray va hama-yi ḡahān*, Tehran 1943,

inside the front cover). The cult formed around him led some people to say that Anšārī had met with the Twelfth Imām.

Anšārī has also been praised in Bābī literature as "... a man renowned for his tolerance, his wisdom, his understanding justice, his piety and nobility of character"; the leader of the Bahā'īs, Mīrzā Ḥusayn 'Alī Nūrī known as Bahā' Allāh [q.v.], included Anšārī among "those doctors who have indeed drunk of the cup of renunciation"; 'Abbās Efendī ('Abd al-Bahā') also referred to Anšārī as "the illustrious and erudite doctor, the noble and celebrated scholar, the seal of seekers after truth" (Shoghi Effendi, *God passes by*, Wilmette, Illinois 1944, 143). Anšārī is thus praised because he did not share the condemnation by other Shī'ī 'ulamā' of the Bābī faith and rituals. He did not attend the meeting convened by the Shī'ī 'ulamā' in Kāzīmāy in ca. 1863 for determining on the banishment of Bahā' Allāh and his adherents from 'Irāk (Muḥammad Khān Za'im al-Dawla, *Miftāḥ Bāb al-abwāb*, Cairo 1903, 347). According to Bābī sources, he did attend the meeting, but as soon as he was informed of the 'ulamā's actual design, he left, declaring that he was not acquainted with the new faith and that he had not witnessed in the Bābīs' demeanour anything at variance with Islam (E.G. Browne, ed. and tr., *A traveller's narrative written to illustrate the episode of the Bāb*, ii, Cambridge, 1891, 86-7).

Although Bābism appeared at the outset as a religious sect within Shī'ism, it did eventually assume a variety of political aspects, aspects which Anšārī was very reluctant to deal with. It seems, therefore, that Anšārī's lack of publicly-expressed opinions here was substantially a result of his lack of interest in and cautious attitude towards issues of political and public significance.

Anšārī, however, remote from politics, did train disciples who made use of the highly influential position he had earned for the Shī'ī 'ulamā' of 'Irāk by their taking part in contemporary social and political movements; thus Mīrzā Ḥasan Shīrāzī issued a *fatwā* against the Tobacco Concession (cf. *inter alia*, Firuz Kazemzadeh, *Russia and Britain in Persia, 1864-1914*, New Haven 1968, 241 ff.), and Khurāsānī [q.v.] actively supported the 1906-11 Persian Revolution and helped to depose the then Persian monarch (Abdul-Hadi Hairī, *Why did the 'Ulamā participate in the Persian Constitutional Revolution of 1905-1909?*, in *WI*, xvii (1976), 127-54).

Bibliography: In addition to the sources mentioned in the text, see Muḥammad 'Alī Mudarris, *Rayḥānat al-adab*, i, Tabriz 1967; 'Abbās Ḥummī, *Hadiyyat al-ahbāb*, Nadjaf 1929; idem, *Fawā'id al-radawīyya fī ahwāl 'ulamā' al-madhab al-djāfariyya*, Tehran 1947; idem, *al-Kunā wa 'l-alkāb*, 3 vols., Nadjaf 1956; 'Alī Mahfūz, *Sirr bakā' al-Nadjaf wa-ḥulūd al-'ulamā'*, in *Madjallat al-Nadjaf*, no. 10 (1957), 6 ff.; Hamid Algar, *Religion and state in Iran 1785-1905*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969; Muḥammad Bākīr Khānšārī, *Rawḍāt al-djāmmāt*, Tehran 1889; Mīrzā Ḥusayn Nūrī, *Mustadrak al-wasā'il*, iii, Tehran 1949; 'Alī al-Wardī, *Lamahāt idjtimā'iyya min ta'riḫ al-'Irāk al-hādith*, i-v, Baghdād 1969-74; Ḥulām Ḥusayn Mušāhib, ed. *Dā'ira al-ma'arif-i fārsī*, i, Tehran 1966; 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Amīnī, *Shuhadā' al-fadāla*, Nadjaf 1936; Muḥsin al-Mu'min, *al-Nadjaf al-ashraf: 'Ulamā' al-dīn al-'alām wa-bayān 'anhum*, in *Madjallat al-Rābi'a al-Arabīyya*, no. 193 (1938), 28 ff.; Murtaḍā Mudarrisī, *Ta'riḫ-i rawābi't-i Irān wa 'Irāk*, Tehran 1972; Muḥam-

mad Tunukābunī, *Kīyāsh al-'ulamā'*, Tehran 1886; Ḥabīb Allāh Sharīf Kāshānī, *Lubb al-albāb fī alkāb al-atiyāb*, Tehran 1958; Shaykh Dja'far Mahbūba, *Mādī al-Nadjaf wa-hādīrūhā*, i, Nadjaf 1958; Muḥammad Ḥusayn Nāshir al-Sharī'a, *Ta'riḫ-i Kum*, Kum 1971; Muḥammad 'Alī Tamīmī, *Mashhad al-Imām*, ii, Nadjaf 1954; Āghā Buzurg Tīhrānī, *Muṣaffā al-makāl fī muṣannifī 'ilm al-riḍāl*, Tehran 1959; idem, *al-Dhārī'a ilā taṣānīf al-Shī'a*, i-xx, 1936-74; idem, *Tabakāt al-'alām al-Shī'a*, i-ii, Nadjaf 1954-62; Muḥammad Mahdī al-Aṣṭā, *Murūr kam' 'alā wafāt al-Shaykh al-Anšārī*, in *Madjallat al-Nadjaf*, iv, no. 8 (1961), 29 ff.; Muḥammad Ḥāshim Khurāsānī, *Muntakhab al-tawāriḫ*, Tehran n.d.; Mullā 'Alī Wā'iz Khīyābānī, *Kitāb-i 'ulamā'-i mu'āṣirīn*, Tabriz 1946; Naṣr Allāh Turāb Dizfūlī, *Lama'āt al-bayān*, n.p., n.d.; Ḥabīb Allāh Raṣhtī, *Bad'ī al-aykār*, Tehran?, 1895; 'Alī Akbar Nihāwandī, *Akhāk-i rabī'i: bunyān-i rafī'*, Tehran 1926; Yahyā Dawlatābādī, *Ta'riḫ-i mu'āṣir ya hayāt-i Yahyā*, i, Tehran 1957; Muḥammad Mahdī al-Kāzīmī, *Aḥsan al-wadī'a*, i-ii, Nadjaf 1968; Homa Pakdaman, *Djama'at-Din Asad Abadi dit Afghani*, Paris 1969; 'Abbās 'Alī Kaywān Qazwīnī, *Kaywānāma*, Tehran 1929; Muḥammad Tāhā Nadjafī, *Iḳān al-maḳāl fī ahwāl al-riḍāl*, Nadjaf 1921; 'Abd Allāh Mamaḳānī, *Tankīh al-maḳāl fī ahwāl al-riḍāl*, Nadjaf 1933; Dja'far Khalīlī, *Mawsū'a al-'Atabāt al-muḳaddasa*, 4 vols., Baghdād 1965-6; 'Abd al-Raḥīm Muḥammad 'Alī, *al-Muṣṭah al-muḳāhid al-Shaykh Muḥammad Kāzīm al-Khurāsānī*, Nadjaf 1972; Nādjī Wadā'a, *Lamahāt min ta'riḫ al-Nadjaf*, i, Nadjaf 1973; Muḥammad Mu'īn, *Farhang-i 'alām*, v, Tehran 1966, under "Anšārī"; Murtaḍā Āl Yāsīn, *Uslūb al-dirāsa al-dīnīyya fī madrasa al-Nadjaf*, in *Madjallat al-Nadjaf*, i, no. 3 (1956), 2 ff.; 'Abd Allāh al-Mudarris al-Ṣādīqī al-Iṣfahānī, *Lu'lu' al-sadaf fī ta'riḫ al-Nadjaf*, Iṣfahān 1959; 'Abbās Iḳbāl, *Ḥudūdīyat al-Islam Ḥādīdj Sayyid Muḥammad Bākīr Shaḥīfī*, in *Yādgar*, v, no. 10 (1949), 28-43; Mīrzā Ḥusayn Hamadānī, *Ta'riḫ-i djadīd*, ed. E.G. Browne, Cambridge 1893; Ismā'il Rā'īn, *Huḳūk bigīrān-i Ingīlīs dar Iran*, Tehran 1969; Khān Malik Sāsānī, *Dast-i pinhān-i siyāsāt-i Ingīlīs dar Irān*, Tehran 1950; Muḥammad 'Alī Muḥammad Riḍā Tabasī, *Dhīkrā Shaykhīnā al-Anšārī ba'd kam'*, Nadjaf 1961 (?); art. *Anšārī*, *Shaykh Murtaḍā*, in *Lughat-nama-yi Dihkhudā*, no. 86, 1963, 408; Drīyā' al-Dīn al-Dakhīlī, *Ta'riḫ al-hayāt al-'ilmīyya fī djamī' al-Nadjaf al-ashraf*, in *Madjallat al-risāla*, vi (1938), 1509-11, 1555-8.

(ABDUL-HADI HAIRI)

ANTHROPOID [see KIRD].

ANZARŪT, greek σαρκοκόλλα, is a gum-resin from a thorn-bush which cannot be identified with certainty; known from antiquity, it is used for medical purposes. Synonyms are: *anzarūt*, *anzarūt*, *kuhl fārisī*, *kuhl kirmānī*; in Persian: *anzarūt* or *anđjarūt*, *tashm* (< *čashm*), *kandjūbā*, *kandjūdhā*, *kandjūdak*, *bāzahr-i čashm* (so instead of *zahr dīsham*, Antāki, *Tadhkiva*, see *Bibl.* below). Much has been written on this drug. Formerly, the species *Penaea*, belonging to the Thymelaeaceae, was generally considered to be the original plant, namely either *Penaea mucronata* L., or *P. Sarcocolla* L. or *P. squamosa* L. But in 1879 W. Dymock was able to prove that at least the Persian *Sarcocolla* is the product of what he called *Astragalus Sarcocolla* Dym. (Leguminosae). Widely known in antiquity, the drug has practically disappeared from the