

October 1389, and went on to lay siege to Damascus. The *amīrs* of the main towns of the north of Syria banded together and came to the help of the city, but on the way, some of them decided to go over to Barḳūk. When, at the beginning of Muḥarram 792/end of December 1389 a warning was given of the approach of Timūrbuḡhā Mintāsh, Barḳūk left Damascus after a violent battle at Bāb al-Djābiya, within the eastern area of the city. He fell back towards the Mardj al-Şuffar, passed through Kiswa, and went on to camp at Şhakḡhab. According to Ibn Şaşrā, the two armies confronted one another on 17 Muḥarram/5 January 1390. In this critical situation, Barḳūk was looking for cover when he suddenly came face to face with the sultan al-Manşūr Ḥādjdjī, the caliph of Cairo al-Mutawakkil I, and the great *kaḏīs* who, since they had only a feeble escort, quickly surrendered. Hence at that point, the situation was reversed. Mintāsh tried three times to release Ḥādjdjī and his companions but without success, since a violent storm of hail and rain forced the adversaries to abandon their conflict. Though the number of dead on both sides was less than 50, it was nevertheless a battle important for history. While Mintāsh sought refuge in Damascus, Barḳūk went back to Cairo with the caliph and the *amīrs* who had joined his cause, and was restored to the office of sultan in Şafar 792/February 1390, whilst al-Manşūr (al-Muzaʿffar) Ḥādjdjī disappeared without any more trouble.

One may note that during the 8th/14th century, *khāns* [q. v.] were built in the Mardj al-Şuffar, a sign of a certain prosperity in the district. One *khān* was built to the north-west of the Ladjaʿ at Şhakḡhab in 716/1316-17 by the *amīr* Tankiz b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Nāşirī, the viceroy of Damascus. In 725/1325 another was built between Kiswa and Ḡhabāḡhib in the *nāhiya* of al-Katf al-Buşrī (?) in the Mardj al-Şuffar, at the expense of al-Amīr al-Kabīr ʿIzz al-Dīn Khaṭṭāb b. Maḡmūd b. Murtaʿiṣh (?) al-ʿIrākī al-Ḡhazakī, and it attracted many travellers. The *Khān* Dantūn, a very large *khān*, built 5 km. south of Kiswa on the road to Adḡriʿat, was completed in 778/1376 during the reign of sultan al-Aşraf Şhaʿbān. One should also mention a *khān* at Ḡhabāḡhib, north of Sanamayn, on the Pilgrimage route, and another, the *Khān* al-Zayyāt, to the south-west of Kiswa and north-east of Şhakḡhab.

In 1941, during the course of hostilities between the Free French forces (supported by the British and Commonwealth troops) and the Vichy troops, there was a battle on the Mardj al-Şuffar, which took place on the very spot where the Byzantines had been forced to yield ground to the Arabs 1300 years before, and this later battle allowed the Allies to enter the Syrian capital.

*Bibliography:* Arabic texts. Masʿūdī, *Tanbih*, 261, 286; Ibn Hawkal, tr. Kramers-Wiet, 210-11; Ibn al-Kalānisī, *Dhayl* (Ibn al-Azrāk al-Fārīkī), Beirut 1908, 115/10, 132/35, 213/65; Harawī, *K. al-Ziyārāt*, ed. and tr. J. Sourdel-Thomine, Damascus 1953, 12/28; Yāḡūt, *Buldān*, Beirut 1957, iii, 413; v, 101; Ibn al-Aṡḡir, *Kāmil*, Cairo 1930, ii, 276-78; viii, 132, ix, 216; Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Zubdat*, ed. K. Dahhān, Damascus 1968, iii, 146; Ibn Şhaddād, *al-Aʿlāk al-khaṭīra (Dimashk)*, ed. Dahhān, Damascus 1956, 182; Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya*, vii, 4; xiii, 76, 78; xiv, 21, 24; Ibn al-Furāt, *Taʿrīkh*, ed. K. Zurayḡ, Beirut 1936-9, viii, 205; ix, 152-3, 185-6; Makrīzī, *Khiṭāt*, iii, 58, 92; Ibn Kāḏī Şhuhba, *Taʿrīkh*, ed. A. Darwish, Damascus 1977, index, s. v.; Ibn Tagḡribirdī, Cairo, vi, 121, 122, 149, 222, 223, 304, vii, 267, viii, 159, 204-6, xi, 260, 355, 367, 371.—Geography and

topography. G. Le Strange, *Palestine*, 482, 503, 504; H. Sauvaire, *Description de Damas*, in *JA* (1894-6), ii, 402, iii, 469 n. 139, n. 140, viii, 285, 307 n. 83, xi, 249, 251, 283 n. 59 bis, C, 477 n. 8, O.T. 409 n. 20; R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie*, Paris 1927, 218, 306, 317-22, 334, 340, map II; A. Musil, *Palmyrena*, New York 1928, 71 n. 17, 100; R. Thoumin, *La géographie humaine de la Syrie centrale*, Tours 1936, 56, 232; N. Elisséeff, *Description de Damas d'Ibn ʿAsākīr*, Damascus 1959, 97 n. 5; E. Wirth, *Syrien*, Darmstadt, 1971, 403-5; G. Cornu, *Atlas du monde arabo-islamique*, Leiden 1983, 12, map I.—History. Ibn Şaşrā, ed. W. M. Brinner, *A chronicle of Damascus 1389-1397*, Los Angeles 1963, 25 (37) b. 26 (38) a, 49 (15) b, 51 a, 51 b, 55 b, 95 a; N. Elisséeff, *Nūr ad-Dīn*, Damascus 1967, 264, 308, map: 5 - c; R. Grousset, *Hist. des Croisades*, Paris 1934-6, i, 275, 637-44, 663, iii, 203; R. S. Humphreys, *From Saladin to the Mongols*, New York 1977, 111-13, 157, 159, 160, 176, 243; H. Lammens, *L'avènement des Marwanides et le califat de Marwān*, in *MFOB*, xii/1 (1927), 39-40, 42, 61-3; R. Le Tourneau, *Damas de 1075 à 1154*, Damascus 1952, 10 and n. 3, 35, 123-5, 165-7, 184-7, 213; Ch. Oman, *A history of the art of war in the Middle Ages*, London 1924, i, 302-4; J. Praver, *Royaume Latin de Jerusalem*, Paris 1969, i, 293, 309; J. Sauvaire, *Caravansérails syriens du Moyen Age*, in *Ars Islamica*, vii (1940), 1-19; K. M. Setton, *History of the Crusades*, Philadelphia 1955-62, i, 401-3, 426, 430, ii, 390, 398, 775; C. Thubron, *Mirror to Damascus*, London 1967, 201. (N. ELISSÉEFF)

**MARDJA'I TAKLĪD** (pl. *marādji'*-i *taḡlīd*, Pers. for Ar. *marḡja'*/*marādji'*-i *al-taḡlīd*), title and function of a hierarchal nature denoting a Twelver Imām Şhīʿī juriconsult (*muḡṡṡahīd*, *faḡḡh*) who is to be considered during his lifetime, by virtue of his qualities and his wisdom, a model for reference, for "imitation" or "emulation"—a term employed to an increasing extent by English-speaking authors—by every observant Imāmī Şhīʿī (with the exception of *muḡṡṡahīds*) on all aspects of religious practice and law. As in the case of other institutions, the history of this function (called *marḡja'īyyat*-i *taḡlīd* or simply *marḡja'īyyat*, the term *marḡja'ī*-i *taḡlīd* often being abbreviated as *marḡja'*, pl. *marādji'*) is to be understood in the context of the protracted doctrinal development of Imāmism. Although the Arab element played and continues to play an important part in this development, historical circumstances prevalent in Iran since the establishment of Imāmī Şhīʿism as the state religion under the Saʿawīds (907-1135/1501-1722 [q. v.]) were ultimately responsible for giving to the Imāmī *muḡṡṡahīds* a dominant spiritual and temporal influence. Under the Kāḏjārs (1794-1925 [q. v.]), the Imāmī *ʿulamā'* developed or re-interpreted various concepts or points of doctrine (*niyābat*, *aʿlamīyyat*, *marḡja'īyyat*, *wilāyat*) which contributed to the increase of their power. Having undergone an eclipse since the 1920s—a period corresponding with the renaissance of Ḳum [q. v.] as a theological centre—the influence of the Imāmī *muḡṡṡahīds* and the role of the *marḡja'ī*-i *taḡlīd* were seriously reexamined in the early 1960s as a result of doubts concerning the succession to Ayatullāh al-ʿUzmā Burūḡdīrdī (d. 1961 [q. v. in Suppl.]), sole *marḡja'ī*-i *taḡlīd* since 1367/1947. Discussions and debates were held by members, religious and lay, of the Islamic societies (*andjumanḡah-yi islāmī*) concerning the method of selection and the functions of the *marḡja'ī*-i *taḡlīd* and the institution of *marḡja'īyyat* in general, the position of Imāmism with regard to *idjṡihād*, *taḡlīd* and the various problems posed by the

relations between religious and political authorities, the forms and the degrees of power which could be exercised by the *muḍṭīyahids*, etc. It was especially after the publication of these discussions (*Baḥthī*, 1341/1962; cf. Lambton (1964), 120), of which the authors, Āyatullāh Ṭāliḳānī (d. 1979) and Miḥdī Bāzargān, were arrested and imprisoned following the demonstrations of spring 1963 against the "white revolution" of the *Shāh* (in which Āyatullāh *Khumaynī* played a prominent role) that abroad there ensued a wide-ranging debate concerning these questions, of which the salient points are summarised below in their historical context.

1. Discussions of *idjītihād* and *taklīd*. The evolution of Imāmī attitudes towards *idjītihād* and *taklīd* may be analysed in the context of what has been called, sometimes retrospectively and anachronistically, the conflict between the *Akhbārīs/Akhbāriyya* [*q.v.* in Suppl.] and the *Uṣūlīs/Uṣūliyya* [*q.v.*]. The eminent scholars of the period of the Būyids [see *BUWAYHIDS*] who formulated the Imāmī *uṣūl al-fikh* (al-Mufīd, d. 413/1022; al-Murtaḍā, d. 436/1044; *Shaykh* Ṭūsī, d. 460/1067) reject both *kiyās* and *idjītihād* (although al-Murtaḍā acknowledges a subordinate role for *idjītihād*: Brunshvig, 210; Arjomand (1984), 53). Even while employing its techniques, the Imāmī *'ulamā'* continue to reject *idjītihād*. At the same time, *Shaykh* Ṭūsī describes the traditionists as literalists (*aṣḥāb al-djūmal*, cf. Kazemī Moussavi (1985), 36). *Akhbārīs* and *Uṣūlīs* appear as opposing factions in the *Kitāb al-Nakd*, an anti-Sunni polemical work written by the fervent *Uṣūlī* 'Abd al-Djalīl al-Kazwīnī al-Rāzī (d. 565/1170; on this source, see Calmard (1971), Scarcia Amoretti (1981)). In the *Ilkhānid* period, al-Muḥaḳḳīḳ al-Hillī (d. 726/1325) admits that—although rejecting *kiyās*—the Imāmī *'ulamā'* have practised *idjītihād*. His pupil Ibn al-Muṭaḥḥar al-'Allāma al-Hillī (d. 726/1325) formulated the methods of Imāmī *idjītihād*. According to Muṭaḥḥarī (*Baḥthī*, 42), he was the first Imāmī jurist to use the term *muḍṭīyahid* to describe one who derives religious precepts (*ḥukm-i shari'*) on the basis of authentic articles of the *shari'at*. According to other opinions, al-Mufīd is said to have been the first Imāmī *fakih* to practise *idjītihād*, al-Ṭūsī having given him a definitive formulation (J. M. Hussain, 150, quoting M. Ramyar, 88, 92).

Like *idjītihād*, *taklīd* is rejected by the first Imāmī theologians, notably al-Kulaynī (cf. Arjomand (1984), 139) and al-Mufīd (cf. McDermott, 257 ff.). For al-Murtaḍā, the disciple of al-Mufīd, the *taklīd* of an *'alim* is permitted (with reservations). He is followed three centuries later by Ibn al-Muṭaḥḥar al-Hillī who—while no longer basing the competence of the *muḍṭīyahid* on the entirety of the *shari'at*—draws a distinction between *idjītihād al-mukallaḳīn* and *idjītihād al-muḍṭīyahidīn* or indeed between the *muftī* and the *muṣtaḳṭī*, i.e. between the jurisconsult and the simple believer (Arjomand (1984), 139 f.; Kazemī Moussavi (1985), 37).

2. Basis and extent of the influence of the Imāmī *muḍṭīyahids*. According to Imāmī tradition, the world cannot exist for a single moment without a *ḥudjja* ("proof" or "guarantee" of God), this function being supplied, after the Prophet, by the Imāms. During the Minor Occultation (*ghaybat al-sughrā*, 260-329/874-941), the *fukahā'* were able to consult the Twelfth Imām through the intermediacy of his four *safirs* or *wakīls*. On the instructions of the Imām, the fourth *wakīl* did not appoint a successor (Madelung, (1982), 163 ff.). During the Major Occultation (*ghaybat al-kubrā*, after 329/941), the Imāmī com-

munity therefore lived in a state of messianic expectation which compelled it to seek out solutions for its spiritual and temporal organisation. Unlike the Sunnis, the Imāmī *fukahā'* generally denied the legitimacy of powers established *de facto* during the *ghayba* (the basis and the logic of this attitude have been questioned by Arjomand (1979) who criticises the interpretations of N.R. Keddie, A.K.S. Lambton, H. Algar etc.; cf. Calmard (1982), 255, Calder (1982 A), 3, n. 2).

In the acknowledged absence of an infallible guide or of a just sovereign, or of transmitters of traditions (*muhaddithūn*), the Imāmī *fukahā'* became scholastic theologians (*mutakallimūn*) before extending their prerogatives in the capacity of *muḍṭīyahidūn* (J. Hussain, 150). Their influence increased under the Būyids (who professed *Shi'ism*), with whom they felt able to collaborate without sacrificing their loyalty to their Imām (Kohlberg (1976 A), 532 f.). Numerous Imāmīs, including some *'ulamā'*, collaborated with Sunnī authorities and occupied senior posts in the service of the 'Abbāsids and the Saldjūqs (Calmard (1971), 55 f.). The theologian Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī (d. 672/1274) and the *Shi'ī* vizier Ibn al-'Alkamī promoted, in varying degrees, the accession to power of the Mongol *Ilkhāns* (Calmard (1975), 145 ff.). The *Ilkhān* Ōljeitū/Uldjaytū (1304-17) showed favour to eminent Imāmī *'ulamā'* such as Ibn al-Muṭaḥḥar al-Hillī and his son Fakhr al-Muḥaḳḳīḳīn (d. 771/1369-70): *ibid.*, 150 ff.; Arjomand (1984), 57 f.).

Whether accepting or contesting the powers established *de facto*, the Imāmī *'ulamā'* continued to seek, within the structural limits of the *shari'a*, a means of coming to terms with their existence. According to a theory elaborated under the Būyids, during the *ghayba* certain parts of the *shari'a* (such as *djīhād* or *ḥudūd*, legal penalties) are inapplicable (this is the doctrine of the *sukū*: cf. Calder (1982 A), 4, quoting the same (1979 A), ch. 3). Points of doctrine concerning especially *djīhād* and the duties incumbent (such as *amr bi 'l-ma'rūf wa-nahy 'an al-munkar*, ordering the good and forbidding the bad) are thoroughly discussed (Arjomand (1984), 61 ff., see also Kohlberg (1976 B)). But the Imāmī political ethic expounded especially by al-Murtaḍā (and adopted by his successors) recommends in judicial and administrative matters "a positive and ethically responsible involvement in the existing political order" (Arjomand (1984), 65; see also Madelung (1980)).

With the rise of *Sūfism* in the post-*Ilkhānid* period (14th-16th centuries), *Shi'ī* themes began to permeate the *tarikāt* and the thought of various messianic or millenarian politico-religious movements inspired by charismatic chieftains or miracle-workers who seized power (the Sarbadārs, the *Muḡha'sha'īs*, the *Ṣafawids*, etc.). Various *Sūfī* movements threatened the existence of the existing established powers or compromised with them (Kubrāwiyya, *Dhahabiyya*, *Nūrbakhshīyya*, *Ni'matullāhiyya*, *Hurūfiyya*, etc.). The case of the *Shi'ī* order of the *Mar'ashī* Sayyids [*q.v.*] constitutes a separate example of politicisation of *Sūfism* from which *Mahdism* is absent (for a socio-historical study of these movements, see Calmard (1975), 154 ff.; Arjomand (1984), 66 ff.). Although these socio-political changes were unconnected with the efforts of the *'ulamā'* to formulate and practise the Imāmī doctrine, their advice was sometimes solicited by politico-religious chiefs, as in the case of the "*Shi'ī* republic" of the Sarbadārs which created a precedent regarding the functions which could henceforward be exercised by Imāmī *'ulamā'* in a *Shi'ī* state.

It was in this context of Šūfism and extremism that there came about the rise of the Šafawiyya and its transformation in the course of the 15th century into a militant order exercising an increasingly extravagant messianic hold over the Turkoman dervish-ghāzīs, the *kizilbaş* [q.v.]. The imposition of Imāmī Šhīr'ism as the state religion by Shāh Ismā'īl (1501-24 [q.v.]) had the notable consequence of incorporating into the Šafawid state Persian dignitaries who were men of high religious or administrative rank and the owners of large properties (Aubin, 39). Since Šafawid "imperio-papism" was based simultaneously on the ethos of Iranian nationalism and on Šhīr'ism, state policy led to the ruthless suppression of messianic and Šūfī tendencies both outside and inside the Šafawid movement and to the persecution of Sunnīs. With the appeal to the dogmatic principles of Šhīr'ism, this situation favoured the establishment and the ascendancy of a hierarchy of Imāmī 'ulamā' who, from the outset, under Shāh Ismā'īl, were subject to the hostility of Persian religious dignitaries (Glassen, 262; Arjomand (1984, 133). The decisive initiative for the establishment of an Imāmī hierarchy was taken by Shāh Tahmāsp (1524-76). A devout Imāmī, professing no messianic pretensions, he favoured the installation of Imāmī 'ulamā', "imported" from the Arab countries (Syria, mainly the Djabal 'Āmil, Arab 'Irāk and Bahrayn). With their Persian students or colleagues recruited from the hostile camp of the Persian religious dignitaries, they ultimately constituted a "brotherhood" of religious specialists. The *farmān* through which Shaykh 'Alī al-Karakī al-Āmilī (d. 940/1534), the "Propagator of Religion" was awarded the titles of *Nā'ib* (deputy) of the Imām and of *Khātām al-mudjtahidīn* ("seal of the *mudjtahids*") could be considered both as the ratification of the establishment of the Imāmī hierarchy in Iran and as the definitive transition from extremism to Imāmism (Arjomand (1984), 129 ff., 133 f.).

The principles on which the authority of the Imāmī 'ulamā' rests were redefined under the Šafawids. The combination of the concepts of *taqlid* and *idjtihād* is expressed in various works (*Zubdat al-bayān*, by Mullā Muḥammad Ardabilī al-Muḥaddas, d. 983/1585; *Zubdat al-uṣūl*, by Bahā' al-Dīn 'Āmilī "Shaykh-i Bahā'ī", d. 1030/1621; *Ma'ālim al-uṣūl*, by Hasan b. Zayn al-Dīn, d. 1011/1602). Although the "Mudjtahid al-zamānī" al-Karakī fulminates against the prospect of imitating a dead *mudjtahid* (*taqlid al-mayyit*), the general competence of the *mudjtahids* in all areas of the *sharī'a* (*idjtihād muṭlaq*) is confirmed, sometimes with the intention of restricting its performance to one or a few jurists, as recommended by Mīr Dāmād [see AL-DĀMĀD], d. 1041/1631-2 (*ibid.*, 138 ff.).

The authority of the *mudjtahids* during the *ghayba* is also redefined around the concept of *niyāba 'amma*, Pers. *niyābat-i 'amma* ("deputed authority") of the Hidden Imām exercised, in principle, collectively (Madelung (1982), 166). The prerogatives attached to this concept vary according to the *mudjtahids*. While al-Karakī limits their applications, 'Alī b. Zayn al-Dīn al-Āmilī, called *al-Shahīd al-ḡānī* (d. 765/1557), introduces a terminological innovation in describing the *fakīh* as the *Nā'ib 'amm* or *Hākīm-i sharī'i* of the Hidden Imām. Among the important implications of the *niyāba 'amma* is the right given to the *mudjtahids* to collect and administer legal taxes (*zakāt*, *khums*) which, with the management of mortmain property, enjoyed with other religious dignitaries, gives them financial autonomy (*ibid.*, 141 f.; Calder (1982 A), 4 f.; on the development of the doctrine of *niyāba 'amma*, see Calder (1979 A), chs. 4-6; on *zakāt* and *khums*, see

idem, (1981), (1982 B); Sachedina (1980)). The authority of the *mudjtahids* also derives formally from various *hadīths*, including a declaration by the Twelfth Imām which describes the 'ulamā' as the proof (*ḥudūdīya*) of the proof of God (i.e. of the Hidden Imām) for all the faithful. The 'ulamā' are also said to be the heirs of the Prophet (Hairi (1977), 59).

Although formulation of the concept of deputed authority was not pursued systematically in the Šafawid period, some of the attributes of the Imāms were then transferred to the *mudjtahids* (Arjomand (1984), 143). But the Imāmī hierarchy lacked an independent "clerical" organisation and needed political power in order to consolidate its position in relation to the religious dignitaries, especially the *sayyids*, who also enjoyed a certain mystique and wielded politico-economic influence. Claiming to represent the Hidden Imām, but incapable of assuming the heritage of Šafawid extremism, it legitimised the Šafawid dynasty only as a purely temporal power (this was the prudent attitude of Muḥammad Bākīr Maḍjlīsī [q.v.], d. 1111/1699; cf. *ibid.*, 184). But in spite of its efforts and the support of Shāh Tahmāsp, the hierarchy did not succeed in taking over the important religious and administrative function of the *sadr* (*sīdarāt*), which was increasingly. The mystique of the *nā'ib 'amm* did not fuse with that attached to the most learned *mudjtahid* to constitute a hierocratic institution. These setbacks were due in part to the fact that in addition to its rivalries with the religious dignitaries, the new Imāmī hierarchy experienced internal dissensions due to the diversity of its geographical origins and the diverse attitudes of its 'ulamā', some of whom directed their attention to worldly matters, while others sought refuge in philosophy (*ibid.*, 132 f.). Despite the considerable influence enjoyed by al-Karakī in the 16th century, it was only at the end of the 17th century, with Muḥammad Bākīr Maḍjlīsī, that there were established the bases of the future influence of the Imāmī 'ulamā', with solid popular roots rendering them independent of the State (*ibid.*, 159 and below).

3. Akhbārī resurgence and Uṣūlī reaction. After being dormant since the Salḡūk period, the opposition of the Akhbārīs towards the Uṣūlī school was renewed at the beginning of the 17th century, when Mullā Muḥammad Amin b. Muḥammad Sharīf Astarābādī (d. 1036/1626-7), encouraged by his teacher Mīrzā Muḥammad b. 'Alī Astarābādī (d. 1028/1619), formulated the Akhbārī doctrine in his *K-al-Fawā'id al-madaniyya*, the basis of the neo-Akbārism which flourished in Iran and in 'Irāk in the 17th and 18th centuries (on Akhbārism, notably in this period, see E. Kohlberg, AKHBĀRIYA, in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, i, 716-18). Both teacher and pupil belonged to the clique of Persian religious dignitaries. Neo-Akbārism was embraced by two eminent representatives of gnostic Šhīr'ism, the elder Maḍjlīsī, Muḥammad Taḳī (d. 1070/1660), and Mullā Muḥsin Fayḍ Kāshānī (d. ca. 1091/1680). The *shaykh al-Islām* of Mashhad, al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī (d. 1120/1708-9) was a fervent propagandist on its behalf. Rejecting the *idjtihād* and the *taqlid* of anyone who is not infallible (i.e. other than the Imām), Akhbārism reflects the thought of religious dignitaries who prefer philosophy, hermeneutism and mysticism. By extolling reverence for the Imāms, it constituted, for the simple believers, an attractive element of Šhīr'ism which gained in popularity. But with the anti-clerical policies of Shāh Šafī (1629-42) and of Shāh 'Abbās II (1642-66) and the resurgence of Šūfism in the mid-17th century, this tendency was in part restored

before being rejected by the Imāmī hierocracy (*ibid.*, 146 ff. and below).

In fact, despite the advance of Akhbārism at the time of the decline and collapse of the Šafawids and throughout periods of disorder and instability (Afghan conquest and domination, 1722-9; reign of Nādir Shāh, 1736-47; Afshāri-Zand interregnum, until 1763), an Uṣūlī reaction emerged in the very bosom of the Madjlīsī family, under Shāh Sulṭān Husayn (1694-1722). In an effort to destroy popular devotion to Akhbārī-inspired Imāms, thus regaining it for himself, and to isolate the Šūfī and mystical trend of the élite, as a prelude to attacking it, Muḥammad Bākīr Madjlīsī adopted Uṣūlism. This reversal and this strategy (adopted by other 'ulamā'), had decisive consequences for the consolidation of an Imāmī hierocracy (*ibid.*, 151 ff.; on the Madjlīsī family and its descendants see Cole (1985), 6 ff.).

During the years 1722-63, neo-Akhbārism was dominant in 'Irāk, especially among converts from Uṣūlism coming from Baḥrayn or Iran. But it was not long before in Iran and even in 'Irāk, Imāmī 'ulamā' were observed moving discreetly from Akhbārism to Uṣūlism. After a difficult period for the 'ulamā', imposed by the religious policy of Nādir Shāh, the Uṣūlī resurgence came about under the Zands, when Karīm Khān moved his centre of government to Shīrāz (1763-79). However, Karīm Khān had little regard for the 'ulamā' (Perry, 220 ff.) and the decisive struggles took place at the 'atabāt [q.v. in Suppl.], the Shīrī holy places of 'Irāk, where the Akhbārīs exploited alliances with wealthy financiers and even with heads of criminal gangs (the *lūṭīs* [q.v.]). The leading figure in this resurgence of Uṣūlism was Ākā Sayyid Muḥammad Bākīr Wahīd al-Bihbahānī (d. 1208/1793-4 [q.v.]), considered the "renovator" (*muḥaddid*) of the 13th century of the Hijra or as the founder (*mu'assis*) of Imāmī jurisprudence. He was linked both spiritually and genealogically to Muḥammad Bākīr Madjlīsī. Like other 'ulamā' of 'Irāk, he enjoyed the support of the merchant-artisan class (through the intermediary of family alliances). Forcibly imposing a reformulation of the Uṣūlī doctrine and refuting Akhbārism (*K. al-Idjīhād wa 'l-akhbār*), he went so far as to proclaim *takfīr* (excommunication) against the Akhbārīs, sending armed men (his *mirghadabs*) to harry them, and persecuted the Ni'matullāhī Šūfī order (Cole (1983), 39 ff.; *idem*, (1985), 13 ff.). Bihbahānī and his followers succeeded in "converting" to Uṣūlism numerous Akhbārīs, some of whom migrated towards Iran (in part on account of political tensions between Iran and the governor 'Umar Pašha concerning Iranian pilgrims, instability and outbreaks of plague). Some 'ulamā' of Northern India were then trained in the Uṣūlī doctrine, which they proceeded to canvass in India (Cole (1985), 21 ff.). The resurgence of Uṣūlism, which developed during the 1760s in the 'atabāt, was spread in Iran during the 1770s (*ibid.*, 26).

In the final phase of the conflict, the last important representative of the Akhbārī school, the *muhaddith* Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Nabī al-Nishābūrī al-Akhbārī, was discredited in the eyes of Faṭḥ 'Alī Shāh Kādjar (1797-1834), who was at that time sympathetic towards Akhbārism, by the Shaykh Dja'far Kāshif al-Ghīṭā' [q.v.] who declared him an infidel. In spite of the protests of the Shāh, he was expelled to 'Irāk and killed by the mob at al-Kāzimayn in 1233/1818 (Algar (1969), 65 ff.). Although the situation of the Akhbārīs subsequently declined rapidly, some groups survived

and aspects or concepts of their doctrinal positions remained, especially in Shaykhism (generally considered as being founded by Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsā'ī [q.v.], d. 1241/1826; see also McEoin, art. AL-AḤSĀ'Ī in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, i, 674-9). According to Shaykhism, each believer has, in principle, a vocation to *idjīhād*, the only authority to be followed or imitated (*taklīd*) being that of the Hidden Imām (Corbin, iv, 252 f.).

4. The institution of *mardja'īyyat-i taklīd*. Under the Kādjar, relationships of power with the Imāmī hierocracy were ambiguous. Since Nādir Shāh, the state had lost the "imperio-papal" character on which Šafawid power had been based. Despite the continuation of the "separation-collaboration", Faṭḥ 'Alī Shāh sought and obtained confirmation of a certain degree of legitimisation on the part of eminent 'ulamā' such as Mīrāzā Abū 'l-Kāsim Kumī (d. 1233/1817-18), and Ākā Sayyid Bihbahānī, grandson of Wahīd Bihbahānī, who extolled Ākā Muḥammad Khān and Faṭḥ 'Alī Shāh as Zill Allāh ("Shadow of God") (Arjomand (1984), 221 ff.).

While continuing to express themselves through *fatwās* or *tafkīrs* against one or other hostile or rival tendency or person (Akhbārī, Shaykhī, Šūfī), the Imāmī *muḥdītahids* were consulted by the temporal authority regarding important issues. Anxious to assure himself of their support, Mīrāzā 'Isā Kā'im-Makām, vizier of the crown prince 'Abbās Mīrāzā, consulted them in connection with the threat of invasion on the eve of the first Irano-Russian conflict (1810-13). Their attitudes and their *fatwās* which he collected in his *Risāla-yi dīhādīyya* testify to their influence. The most significant initiative came from Shaykh Dja'far Kāshif al-Ghīṭā' who—in the capacity of *niyābat-i 'amma* of the *muḥdītahids*—authorised Faṭḥ 'Alī Shāh to conduct the *dīhād* in the name of the Hidden Imām (on the parallels and divergencies between the *Risāla-yi dīhādīyya* and the positions adopted by Shaykh Dja'far, see Lambton (1970 A), 187 ff.; cf. also Kohlberg (1976 B), 82 ff., Calder (1982 A), 6, and Arjomand (1984), 224 f.). This was also a time of re-assessment of the notion of *niyābat-i khāssa*. Relating, in principle, to the only representatives of the Imāms (initially to the four *sufarā'*), it became, with the endorsement of the *fukahā'*, applicable to the just sovereign. Although the system of taxation had little connection with *dīhād*, the subject was discussed at this time, with the *muḥdītahids* re-affirming their rights concerning *kharaḍj* and especially *khums* of which a half, considered to be *sahm-i Imām* ("the Imām's share"), should revert to them after the period of the *dīhād* (Arjomand (1984), 229 f.).

The sharing of prerogatives between the 'ulamā' and the temporal power is well defined by Dja'far Kāshif in his *Tuḥfat al-mulūk*. His dualist theory of legitimate authority, recalled by eminent *muḥdītahids* under Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh (1848-96), permitted the 'ulamā' to acquire financial autonomy and judicial rights independent of the state (*ibid.*, 225 ff.). But it was especially the reformulation of concepts or doctrines regarding the powers and functions of the *muḥdītahids* which led to a structuralisation of their leadership. Long discussions of *idjīhād* and *taklīd* culminated in establishing the competence of the *muḥdītahids* in guiding the *muḥallīds* ("imitators") in matters of *furū'-i dīn* (i.e. the "branches" derived from "roots", *uṣūl*), the *taklīd* of a dead *muḥdītahid* being definitively ruled out. The problem of the application of the *hudūd* during the *ghayba* continued to be thoroughly debated (*ibid.*, 231 ff.). The faithful

Shīrī “being unable to understand the code” must entrust himself to the instructions of a jurist (Scarcia (1958 A), 237). The need for recourse to authorised interpreters of the *sharī'a*, in the name of the *niyābat-i 'amma*, is energetically reformulated by Mullā Aḥmad Narākī (d. 1245/1829-30) in *Awā'id al-ayyām*, where he employs the terms *wilāyat-i 'amma* and *wilāyat-i khāssa* to describe the delegation of devolved authority to the *muđjahids* in the name of the Hidden Imām (Kazemī Moussavi (1984); idem (1985), 40 ff.). Although making of the government of the jurisconsult (which he calls *saltanat al-sharīyya*) an independent subject of Imāmī *fiqh*, he does not seem to have considered the latter obliged to supplant the existing power or to function in parallel with it (*ibid.*, 43 ff.).

A new and decisive step was taken, however, with the doctrinal formulation of the concept of *a'lamīyyat* according to which the Imāmī community must follow or imitate the precepts of the most learned jurisconsult. Its premisses may be traced back to the Ilkhānid period (it was then applied to the Imāms, but one celebrated *muđjahid* then bore the title of “Allāma” al-Hillī). Under the Šafawids, the term *a'lam* is clearly applied to the Imāmī *muđjahids* (Hasan B. Zayn al-Dīn 'Amīlī, *Ma'ālim al-uṣūl*, quoted by Kazemī Moussavi, *ibid.*). When, after many cautious and hesitant attempts, the politico-religious context forced the Imāmī hierarchy to adopt a hierarchy, the rehabilitation of the concept of *a'lamīyyat* took on its full importance, since the title of *marđja<sup>c</sup>-i taqlīd* was given to the most learned *muđjahid*. In view of the obscurity surrounding the birth of the concept of *marđja<sup>c</sup>īyyat*—the initial signs of which may be traced back to the Šafawid period—the greatest *muđjahids* of the past have recently been reinstated, *a posteriori*, as prototype *marđja<sup>c</sup>-i taqlīdīs* (on the lists, beginning with al-Kulaynī, d. 328/939, generally including sixty-three names and ending with Burūđjirdī, see Bagley (1970), 31; Hairī, 62 f.; Fischer, Appx. 2, 252 ff.). This tendency to reassess, in regard to a concept or a doctrine, the great figures of the past is also found in the tradition according to which the beginning of each century of the Hıđjra should be marked by a renewer of the religion (cf. a provisional list of Shīrī *muđjaddīds* in Momen, 206, Table 7).

Having been in a process of gestation since the rebirth of Uṣūlism with Waḥīd Bihbahānī, the concept of *marđja<sup>c</sup>īyyat* took on precise form under his successors. But neither Bihbahānī nor Aḥmad Narākī bore the title of *marđja<sup>c</sup>-i taqlīd* (although Bihbahānī and his immediate successor Sayyid Muḥammad Maḥdī Ṭabāṭabā'ī “Baḥr al-ūlūm”, d. 1212/1797, are currently called *marđja<sup>c</sup>-i taqlīd* in Shīrī biographical works: cf. McChesney, 168). For numerous *muđjahids* and ordinary worshippers in Iran and 'Irāk, the first to have secured this title and this function was Hāđjdjī Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan Nađjafī, d. 1266/1849-50, known by the name of Šāḥib al-Djawāḥir (i.e. the author of *Djawāḥir al-kalām*, “The jewels of scholarship”, the most remarkable post-Šafawid work of *fiqh* (Cole (1983), 40 f.; McEoin (1983), 157). When the Imāmī community was riven by the rise of Bābism, Muḥammad Ḥasan Šāḥib al-Djawāḥir appointed Shaykh Murtađā Anšārī (d. 1281/1864) as his successor. Having initially offered it to Sa'īd al-'Ulamā' Māzandarānī who refused it, Anšārī occupied this function for fourteen years and became the single *marđja<sup>c</sup>-i taqlīd* (*marđja<sup>c</sup> al-taqlīd al-muṭlak*) for the entire Shīrī world. He encouraged Uṣūlī studies to a considerable extent and arranged direct payment of contributions (*sahm-i Imām*) to local centres of education. With him, the institution of *marđja<sup>c</sup>īyyat* attained its zenith. He defined its

functions in the manual of ritual practice entitled *Sīrat al-nađjāt* (“The Way of Salvation”). All the Imāmī Shīrī communities (Iran, 'Irāk, India, the Caucasus and the Ottoman Empire) sent contributions to him representing considerable sums of money, yet he led a pious, simple and ascetic life. His political attitudes were moderate and he adopted a conciliatory policy towards the Bābīs, who treated him with respect. Some of his works became manuals (*Farā'id al-uṣūl*, *al-Makāsib*), and many of his pupils became *muđjahids* and even *marđja<sup>c</sup>-i taqlīd* (see Algar (1969), 162 ff.; Hairī, art. ANŠARĪ, in Suppl.; idem (1977), 63; Cole (1983), 40 ff.; Murtađā al-Anšārī, list of his works, 131-4). Besides the piety and the wisdom of al-Anšārī, the emergence of a single *muđjahid* to occupy the supreme function of *marđja<sup>c</sup>īyyat* owes much to the disappearance of major Imāmī potentates as well as to the decline of Iṣfahān and the rise of Nađjaf as an Imāmī religious centre (art. ANŠARĪ, in Suppl.; Kazemī Moussavi (1985), 45 f.).

Henceforward, it was in the *'atabūt*, especially at Nađjaf, but also at Sāmarrā (site of the “catacomb” of the Hidden Imām), places of residence and instructions of the major *marāđjī<sup>c</sup>-i taqlīd*, that resistance was organised to Kāđjar autocracy and foreign domination. Although not political at the outset, the institution of *marđja<sup>c</sup>īyyat* became so, as a consequence of historical circumstances and the respective attitudes of each of the *muđjahids*. Unlike his predecessor, Anšārī issued no directives concerning his succession. But his definition of the institutional and ideological role of *marđja<sup>c</sup>-i taqlīd a'lā* (“supreme model”) offered opportunities for the exercise of political prerogatives of which his followers took advance, beginning with his immediate successor, Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥasan Shīrāzī (d. 1312/1894), who assumed the responsibility of issuing the *fatwā* to revoke a concession on Iranian tobacco awarded to a British company (the Excise Affair, *fatwā* of December 1891; cf. Bibl. in Hairī (1977), 111, n. 8).

The essential characteristic of the institution of *marđja<sup>c</sup>īyyat* in the 19th century is that the office was occupied successively by a single *marđja<sup>c</sup>-i taqlīd*. After the death of Mīrzā Shīrāzī, a number of *muđjahids*, equally qualified and unable to choose among themselves, were recognised as single *marđja<sup>c</sup>* only after the demise of their colleagues. This tendency towards selection by longevity—working to the disadvantage of numerous highly-qualified *muđjahids*—was continued until the death of Burūđjirdī. Since the beginning of the institution, the list of *marāđjī<sup>c</sup>-i taqlīd* who exercised the function in a sole capacity for a greater or shorter period of time until their death is summarised as follows:

1. Hāđjdjī Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan Iṣfahānī Nađjafī, “Šāḥib al-Djawāḥir” (d. at Nađjaf 1266/1850).
2. Shaykh Murtađā Anšārī (d. at Nađjaf 1281/1864).
3. Mīrzā Ḥasan Shīrāzī, *muđjaddīd* of the 14th century of the Hıđjra (d. at Sāmarrā 1312/1895).
4. Mullā Muḥammad Kāzīm Khurāsānī, “Ākhund Khurāsānī” (d. at Nađjaf, 1329/1911).
5. Hudđjdjāt al-Islām Sayyid Muḥammad Kāzīm Ṭabāṭabā'ī Yazdī (d. at Huwaysh, near Nađjaf, 1337/1919).
6. Mīrzā Muḥammad Takī Hā'irī Shīrāzī (d. at Karbalā, 1338/1920).
7. Shaykh Fađl Allāh Iṣfahānī “Shaykh al-Sharī'a” (died 1338/1920, surviving his predecessor by only four months).
8. Hāđjdjī Sayyid Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsawī Iṣfahānī (d. at Kāzīmāy, 1365/1946).
9. Sayyid Akā Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabā'ī

“Āyatullāh Kumī” (d. at Karbalā, 1366/1947, surviving his predecessor by only three months).

10. Āyatullāh al-‘Uzmā Hādjdjī Ākā Husayn Burūdjirdī (d. at Kum, 1380/1961).

After the death of Mīrzā Shīrāzī, religious leadership was shared between eminent *mudjtahids* of Nadjaf: Mullā Muḥammad Kāzīm Fāḍil Sharabyānī (d. 1322/1904); Shaykh Muḥammad Hasan b. ‘Abd Allāh Mamaḳānī (d. 1323/1905); and Mīrzā Muḥammad Kāzīm Akhund Khurasānī, who became sole *mardja<sup>c</sup>* after the death of Tīhrānī. A disciple of Mīrzā Shīrāzī, Khurasānī was a fervent supporter of the constitutional revolution of 1905/11. With the *mudjtahids* Tīhrānī and Māzandarānī, he issued *fatwās*, manifestos and telegrams and took part in the deposition of Muḥammad ‘Alī Shāh (July 1909). He also campaigned against foreign influences and supported the Young Turk revolution (cf. Hairī, art. KHURASĀNĪ idem (1976) and (1977), 98 ff. and index; Momen, 246 f.). His successor, Sayyid Kāzīm Yazdī, abstained from political activity, refused to cooperate with the constitutionalist ‘ulamā<sup>2</sup> and cultivated amicable relations with the British after their occupation of ‘Irāq (Hairī (1977), 96 ff., 117 ff. and index; Momen, 247). Mīrzā Muḥammad Takī Hā<sup>3</sup>irī, resident at Karbalā, declared that he had no part in the constitutional revolution. He was a determined opponent of the British in ‘Irāq, against whom he decreed a *djihad* in collaboration with other ‘ulamā<sup>2</sup> (Hairī (1977), 122 ff. and index).

With the revival of the centre of theological studies (*hawda-yi ‘ilmiyya*) of Kum, at the initiative of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Karīm Yazdī Hā<sup>3</sup>irī (d. 1937 [q.v. in Suppl.]), there was during the 1920s a period in which several high-ranking *mudjtahids* were considered as *mardja<sup>c</sup>-i taklīd*. For Iran, the rôle was entrusted, at Kum, to Hā<sup>3</sup>irī; for Nadjaf, to Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh Mamaḳānī (d. 1933), Shaykh Muḥammad Husayn Nā<sup>3</sup>irī (d. 1936) and Shaykh Abu ‘l-Hasan Iṣfahānī (d. 1946), who became sole *mardja<sup>c</sup>* after the death of the others. On the death of Āyatullāh Kumī (1947), Āyatullāh Burūdjirdī [q.v. in Suppl.] was recognised as sole *mardja<sup>c</sup>-i taklīd* (cf. below). Kum thus became the leading centre of Shī<sup>‘i</sup> studies, although many students, especially those from Arab countries and the Indian subcontinent, continued to frequent Nadjaf. Following the example of Yazdī Hā<sup>3</sup>irī and other *mudjtahids*, Burūdjirdī pursued a passive rôle in political matters. He occasionally collaborated with temporal authorities, especially from 1953 to 1958, and supported the anti-Bahā<sup>2</sup>ī campaign of 1955. It was not until shortly before the end of his life (1960) that he declared his opposition to the agrarian reforms proposed by the Shāh (see Algar (1972) 242 ff.; Akhavi (1980), 24, 77 ff., 102). Despite his title of Āyatullāh al-‘Uzmā (see below), and although his name has been mentioned as a *mudjaddid*, Burūdjirdī seems to have been acknowledged as the supreme *mardja<sup>c</sup>* in an organic rather than a charismatic sense (Binder, 132, MacEoin (1983), 161 f.). He succeeded no more than other *mudjtahids* in structuring the religious leadership to resist the initiatives of the Pahlavī régime which favoured as his successor Āyatullāh Shaykh Muḥsin al-Hakīm (d. 1970), an Arab *mudjtahid* resident at Nadjaf (Algar (1972), 244).

In the reformist religious movements of the “Islamic societies” (cf. above), besides discussion of doctrinal issues (*idjtihad*, *taklīd*, religious taxes, etc.), the idea was expressed that the function of *mardja<sup>c</sup>‘iyyat* had become too heavy to be entrusted to a single *mudjtahid* and should be exercised by a “council for religious decrees” (*shūrā-yi fatwā*): M. Ṭālikānī, in

*Bahthī*, 201-13; M. Džazā<sup>3</sup>irī, *ibid.*, 215-30. It was also proposed (by M. Muṭahharī) that, in accordance with the wishes of ‘Abd al-Karīm Yazdī Hā<sup>3</sup>irī, each *mudjtahid* should be “imitated” in the field of his speciality (cf. Lambton (1964), 127; Akhavi, 122 ff.). But the application of the ideas of this movement, revived in part in the 1970s by various reformist trends, did not open the way to a harmonious restructuring of the religious leadership, which henceforward became progressively more influenced by politics.

On the death of Burūdjirdī, the disintegration of the institution of *mardja<sup>c</sup>‘iyyat* led to a dispersal of *mardja<sup>c</sup>*: at Kum, the Āyatullāhs Sharī‘atmādārī, Gulpāygānī and Mar‘ashī-Nadjafī; at Mashhad, Āyatullāh Milānī (d. 1975); at Tehran, Āyatullāh Ahmad Khwānsārī (d. 1985); at Nadjaf, the Āyatullāhs Khū<sup>3</sup>ī, ‘Abd al-Hādī Shīrāzī (d. 1961), Kāshīf al-Ḡhitā<sup>2</sup> and Muḥsin al-Hakīm. Other less important *mudjtahids* were also considered as *mardja<sup>c</sup>* (Momen, 248, n. 2).

While Mashhad [q.v.] for some rivalled Kum in importance, the events of 1963 catapulted Āyatullāh Khumaynī into pre-eminence in the capacity of *mardja<sup>c</sup>* (at Nadjaf, from 1965 onwards). With Milānī and Sharī‘atmādārī, he was regarded as heir to Burūdjirdī (Algar (1972), 245), at least in Iran, since some consensus on the *mardja<sup>c</sup>‘iyyat-i kull* of Muḥsin al-Hakīm seems to have been reached in about 1966 (Bagley (1970), 78, n. 7). In 1975 there were six *mardja<sup>c</sup>*s of senior rank: Khū<sup>3</sup>ī and Khumaynī at Nadjaf; Gulpāygānī, Sharī‘atmādārī and Mar‘ashī-Nadjafī at Kum; Khwānsārī in Tehran (Milānī died at Mashhad in August 1975). But there are also numerous lines of *mardja<sup>c</sup>-i taklīds* linked by matrimonial alliances to the most important branches (see Fischer (1980), 88 ff., Fig. 3. 1. ff.).

After the death of Burūdjirdī, the Imāmī ‘ulamā<sup>2</sup>, together with the laity, were divided into various groups: radicals wishing to establish Islamic justice; social reformers; conservative heirs to the line of Burūdjirdī; collaborators with the Pahlavī régime (Akhavi, 199 ff.). The three first tendencies are to be found in the Islamic Republic of Iran (since February 1979), where rivalries have rent the religious leadership. The concept of *wilayat-i fakih* reformulated by Āyatullāh Khumaynī could be considered as the logical conclusion to the development of Imāmī religious institutions since the Ṣafawids, absolute political power being regained and reverting *de facto* to the *mardja<sup>c</sup>-i taklīd*, supporters of the idea of collective *mardja<sup>c</sup>‘iyyat* (including Āyatullāh Ṭālikānī, d. 1979) thus being defeated (Fragner, 98; see also the analysis of Calder (1982) regarding Khumaynī’s position regarding Shī<sup>‘i</sup> jurisprudence; F. Rajaei (1983) on Khumaynī’s attitude towards man, the state and international politics etc.; see also Rose (1983)). But this new situation has in fact led to another schism in the institution of *mardja<sup>c</sup>‘iyyat*; the most influential of the *marādji<sup>c</sup>* before the Islamic revolution, Āyatullāh Sharī‘atmādārī, a man of moderate tendency who retained numerous supporters, especially among the people of Ādharbāyḍjan, his native region, was progressively isolated and then, accused of subversion, deposed from his position as Āyatullāh al-‘Uzmā in April 1982 (Momen, 296, 320). Some pious Imāmīs follow the leader of the revolution in political matters and that of one or other of the *marādji<sup>c</sup>* in religious practice (the one with the largest following now, in 1986, apparently being Āyatullāh Khū<sup>3</sup>ī who also enjoys a large following in the Arab world, India and Pakistan). It seems, however, that for the new generation of Imāmī ‘ulamā<sup>2</sup>, the doctrine of *wilayat-i fakih* has ultimately prevailed (Momen, 296 ff.). It is

in this context that there is taking place the muted struggle over succession to Ayatullāh/Imām *Khūmaynī*, the Assembly of Experts (*madjlīs-i khibrīgān*), created at the end of 1982, a group of seventy-two experts chosen to appoint the future supreme *marḍja'* having recently (October 1986) criticized the "heir-apparent", Ayatullāh Muntazirī; *Hudjājat al-Islām Rafsanḍjānī*, President of Parliament, now appears to be a possible successor.

5. Qualifications, selection, functions, consultative rôle and titles of the *marḍja'-i taklīd*. Among the conditions necessary for assuming the position of *marḍja'-i taklīd*, six are judged indispensable: maturity (*bulūgh*), intelligence (*ʿaql*), faith (*īmān*), justice (*ʿadālat*), being of legitimate birth (*tahārat-i mawlid*) and of the male sex (*dhukūrat*; some women may, under exceptional circumstances, attain the level of *idjtihād*, but they cannot be *marḍja'-i taklīd*). Other conditions are sometimes required: literacy, possession of hearing and sight, and being free, i.e. not a slave (Algar (1969), 8 f., following Burūdjirdī, Sanglādji). In addition to these preliminary conditions, the future *marḍja'* must be qualified to practice *idjtihād*, receive the *idjāza* from *ʿulamā'* of repute and demonstrate his knowledge through his teaching, his sermons, his discussions, his writings, etc. The *marḍja'* must be generally acknowledged as the most learned (*a'lam*) person of his time. However, this title cannot be awarded to him through appointment, selection or election. His authority can only be confirmed by the universal recognition of the Imāmī community (Hairi (1977), 62; it seems however that there was at *Ḳum* a kind of "college of cardinals" deciding on the choice of the supreme *marḍja'*, the Ayatullāh al-ʿUzmā; see Binder, 134).

The essential function of the *marḍja'-i taklīd*—also called *muḳallad*—is to guide the community of those who "imitate" his teaching and follow his precepts, in particular concerning the following: application of the rules of the *sharīʿa* (*furūʿ-i dīn*); judicial solutions or legal qualifications (*ahkām*) in regard to the problems of contemporary life. Imitation or emulation of the *marḍja'* has no connection, in principle, with the *uṣūl-i dīn* which are derived from faith (*īmān*) and from inner conviction (*yaqīn*). The *muḍjtahid* established as *marḍja'* must pronounce judicial decisions (*fatāwās*) and write one or more books to guide his *muḳallids* (*risāla-yi ʿamaliyya*, a kind of practical treatise; *tawdīh al-masāʿil*, "explanation of problems" etc.).

For his part, the *muḳallid* has particular duties, especially as regards consultation of the *marḍja'-i taklīd* to whom access is sometimes difficult. The rules of conduct in this respect are explained at length by Anṣārī who forbids *taklīd* of a dead *muḍjtahid* and stresses the rôle of the most learned (*a'lam*) *muḍjtahid* in sanctioning worship and ritual. Every *muḳallid* is obliged to consult him, to follow or to "imitate" him, either directly, or in a case of obvious impossibility, through the intermediacy of an honest man who has himself witnessed to conduct of the *marḍja'*, or through consultation of a book of rules of behaviour written by the latter. In cases of doubt or contradiction, prudence (*ihtiyāt*) is recommended (on these complicated rules for consultation of the *marḍja'*, see the analysis in the *Sīrat al-nadjiāt* of Anṣārī, in Cole (1983), 42 ff.). These criteria represent only general principles, no specific process having been established for the choice of a *marḍja'* (cf. Algar (1969), 10).

With the development of the concept of *marḍja'iyat*, the economic power enjoyed by the *muḍjtahids* has been concentrated in the hands of one man or of a small group of men. Besides the collection and

distribution of *zakāt* and *khums*, the administration of *wakflawḳāf* (taken under state control by the Pahlavis), the *muḍjtahids* have economic and family ties with the merchant-artisan class of the *bāzār*. Imāmī *ʿulamā'* have also sometimes taken advantage of threats posed to political authority by movements such as the Šūfīs, *Šhaykhīs*, *Bābīs*, etc. In fact, they have taken the initiative in countering or representing the doctrines and activities of groups seeking to find alternative solutions to the prolonged absence of the Hidden Imām (*wilāyat-i šūfī*, *shīʿa-yi kāmīl*, *rukn-i rābiʿ* ("fourth pillar" of *Šhaykhism*), *bāb*, etc.). Despite periods of tension or confrontation, *muḍjtahids* and *marḍji'* claiming the *niyābat-i ʿamma* have in varying degrees given a certain amount of support to the existing temporal power and have formulated a "variable approach" towards accommodation with an illegal régime established *de facto* (cf. Calder (1982), 6). However, remaining generally mistrustful of both spiritual and temporal powers, the *marḍji'* claimed for themselves an important rôle in the political life of *Ḳādjār* Iran (see especially Algar (1969)). Although abstaining from political activity, Anṣārī formulated the notion of *marḍja'-i taklīd-i a'la* which offers the potential for political utilisation (cf. Cole (1983), 46 and below). Some of his successors have strongly resisted foreign economic, cultural and political influences favoured by the international context and by the political choices of the *Ḳādjārs*. They nevertheless held extremely diverse opinions regarding the events of the constitutional revolution of 1905-11 (cf. Lambton (1970 B); Hairi (1976-7), (1977), 55 ff.; Arjomand (1981)). In fact, neither the supporters nor the opponents of the constitution have ever preached the establishment of a government directly controlled by the *muḍjtahids*. It is quite clear that recent events in the Middle East (in particular the seizure of power by the religious in Iran (1979), the Iran-Iraq war (since 1980) and the situation in Lebanon) have added to the difficulties of *Shīʿī* believers, increasingly preoccupied with political choices and economic problems.

Since the *Ḳādjār* period, the number of titles and functions, civil as well as religious, has increased considerably in Iran. This has given rise to abuses, especially as regards the title of Ayatullāh [q.v. in Suppl.], often used to denote a *marḍja'-i taklīd*. Although the distinctions remain somewhat fluid, current usage seems to describe a *marḍja'-i taklīd* by the epithet *Ayatullāh al-ʿUzmā*, the term *Ayatullāh* alone being used to describe a *muḍjtahid* and *Hudjājat al-Islām* an aspiring *muḍjtahid* (Momen, 205 f.). According to a recent decree of *Khūmaynī* (September 1984), certain *ʿulamā'* who used to call themselves *Ayatullāh* are henceforward to bear the title of *Hudjājat al-Islām* (Momen, 298 f.; the two titles having been used interchangeably until the creation of the *hawda-yi ʿilmiyya* of *Ḳum* in the 1920s: *Djalāl Matīnī*, 583 ff.). The question may be asked whether the replacement of the title of *Ayatullāh* by that of *Imām* to designate *Khūmaynī* implies a change in the religious hierarchy (i.e. the creation of a title superior to that of *Ayatullāh al-ʿUzmā*) or is simply an indication of political function (Momen, *ibid.*; on these problems of *Shīʿī* titles and their historical precedents, see *Djalāl Matīnī*; on the epithet *Imām* for *Khūmaynī*, 603 f.).

*Bibliography and abbreviations:* Concerning the abundant literature on the Imāmī *uṣūl*, see H. Löschner, *Die dogmatischen Grundlagen des šīʿitischen Rechts*, Cologne, Berlin, etc. 1971; Brunschvig [1970]; Abu 'l-Ḳāsim Gurdjī, *Nigāhi bi tahawwul-i ʿilm-i uṣūl*, in *Makālāt wa barrasiha*, xiii-xvi, 1352; H. Mudarrisi Tabātabāʾī, *An introduction*

to *Shi'î law. A bibliographical study*, London 1984 (presentation of the great, classical treatises plus a list of the modern ones and their various divisions; takes Tihirānī, *al-Dharr'a*, into account); among the numerous Imāmī biographical works, see 'Alī Shāh, *Tarā'īk al-hakā'īk* (on the Šūfīs and 'ulamā'), 3 vols., Tehran n.d.; Muhsin al-Amin, *A'syān al-Shi'a*, Beirut, from 1960; Muḥammad 'Alī Mu'allim Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-ūthār...*, 5 *dj*ilds in 4 vols., Isfahan n.d.; Muḥammad Bākīr Khwānsārī, *Rawḍat al-djannāt fi ahwāl al-ulamā' wa 'l-sādāt*, Tehran 1367/1947 (new ed., 8 vols. 1970); Shaykh 'Abbās al-Kumī, *Fawā'id al-riḍāwiyya fi ahwāl 'ulamā' al-madhhab al-djā'fariyya*, Tehran n.d.; Nūr al-Dīn 'Alī Mun'al-i Kumī, *Tadhkira-yi mashāyikh-i Kum*, Kum 1353; Muḥammad 'Alī Mudarris Tabrizī, *Rayḥānat al-adab*, 8 vols., Tabriz 1967; Ākā Buzurg Tihirānī, *al-Dharr'a ilā ta'sānīf al-Shi'a*, 25 vols., Tehran and Nadjaf 1355-98/1936-78; idem, *Tabakāt a'lām al-Shi'a*, Nadjaf and Beirut, from 1373/1953-4; Muḥammad Tunakābunī, *Kiṣaṣ al-'ulamā'*, Tehran n.d.; see also detailed bibls. in the works cited below, esp.: Algar [1969], Arjomand [1984], Calder [1979], Cole [1984] and [1985], Fischer, McChesney, MacEoin [1979], Momen, etc.).

Sh. Akhavi, *Religion and politics in contemporary Iran*, New York 1980; H. Algar, *Religion and state in Iran 1795-1906*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969; idem, *The oppositional role of the Ulama in twentieth-century Iran*, in *Scholars*, 1972, 231-55; idem, *Shi'ism and Iran in the eighteenth century*, in *Studies in eighteenth century Islamic history*, ed. Th. Naff and R. Owen, London and Amsterdam 1977, 288-302; Murtaḍā al-Anṣārī, *Zindagāni wa shakhsīyyat-i Shaykh Anṣārī*, (Ahwāz?) 1380/1960-1; S. A. Arjomand, *Religion, political action and legitimate domination in Shi'ite Iran: fourteenth to eighteenth centuries A.D.*, in *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, xx (1979), 59-109; idem, *The Ulama's traditionalist opposition to Parliamentarism 1907-1909*, in *MES*, xvii/2 (1981), 174-90; idem, *The office of Mulla-bashi in Shi'ite Iran*, in *Stud. Isl.*, vii (1983), 135-46; idem, *The Shadow of God and the Hidden Imam. Religion, political order and social change in Iran from the beginning to 1890*, Chicago and London 1984 (numerous articles taken from this work in *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* [xx, 1979; xxii, 1981], *Journal of Asian History* [xv, 1981], *JESH*, xxviii/2 [1985]); J. Aubin, *Études Safavides. I. Šāh Ismā'īl et les notables de l'Iraq persan*, in *JESHO*, ii (1959), 27-81; F.R.C. Bagley, *Religion and the state in modern Iran. I*, in *Actes du V<sup>e</sup> Congrès international d'arabisants et d'islamistes*, Brussels 1970, 75-88; idem, *ibid. II*, in *Procs. of the VIth Congress of Arabic and Islamic Studies*, Visby-Stockholm 1972 (ed. F. Rungren, Uppsala 1975), 31-44; *Bahṭī* = *Tabātabā'ī et alī*, *Bahṭī dar bāra-yi marja'iyyat wa ruhāniyyat*, Tehran 1341/1962, new ed., n.p., n.d. 1979); Hanna Batata, *Shi'î organizations in Iraq; al Da'uah al-Islamiyah and al-Mujahidin*, in R.I Cole and N.R. Keddie, eds, *Shi'ism and social protest*, New Haven and London, 1986, 179-200; M. Bāzargān, *Intizārāt-i mardum az marāḡī'*, in *Bahṭī*, 103-27; M. Bihshūtī, *Ruhāniyyat dar Islām wa dar miyān-i Muslimīn*, in *Bahṭī*, 131-61; L. Binder, *The proofs of Islam: religion and politics in Iran*, in *Arabic and Islamic studies in honor of Hamilton A.R. Gibb*, ed. G. Makdisi, Leiden 1965, 118-40; R. Brunschvig, *Les usūl al-fiqh imāmītes à leur stade ancien (X<sup>e</sup> et XI<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, in *Shi'isme imāmīte*, Paris 1970, 201-13; N. Calder, 1979A = *The structure of authority in Imami jurisprudence*, London Univ. Ph.D. thesis,

1979 unpubl.; idem, 1979B = *Judicial authority in Imami jurisprudence*, in *Bull. British Society for Middle Eastern Studies*, vi (1979), 104-8; idem, *Zakāt in Imāmī Shi'î jurisprudence from the tenth to the sixteenth century A.D.*, in *BSOAS*, xlv/3 (1981), 468-80; idem, 1982A = *Accommodation and revolution in Imami Shi'î jurisprudence: Khumayni and the classical tradition*, in *MES*, xviii (1982), 3-20; idem, 1982B = *Khums in Imami Shi'î jurisprudence from the tenth to the sixteenth century A.D.*, in *BSOAS*, xlv/1 (1982), 39-47; J. Calmard, *Le chiisme imamite en Iran à l'époque seldjoukide d'après le Kitāb al-naqd*, in *Le monde iranien et l'Islam*, i (1971), 43-67; idem, *Le culte de l'Imām Ḥusayn. Etude sur la commémoration du drame de Karbalā dans l'Iraq pré-safavide*, diss. Paris 1975; idem, *Les olamā, le pouvoir et la société en Iran: le discours ambigu de la hiérocrairie, in Le cuisinier et le philosophe. Hommage à Maxime Rodinson*, ed. J. P. Digard, Paris 1982, 253-61; J. R. Cole, *Imami jurisprudence and the role of the Ulama: Morteza Ansari on emulating the supreme exemplar, in Religion and Politics* (1983), 33-46; idem, *Imami Shi'ism from Iran to North India 1722-1856: state, society and clerical ideology in Awadh*, UCLA Ph.D. thesis 1984, unpubl.; idem, *Shi'î clerics in Iraq and Iran: The Akhbari-Usuli conflict reconsidered*, in *Iranian Studies*, xviii/1 (1985), 3-34; H. Corbin, *En Islam iranien. Aspects spirituels et philosophiques*, 4 vols., Paris 1971-2; M. Djazā'iri, *Taklīd-i a'lam ya shūrā-yi fatwā*, in *Bahṭī*, 215-30; J. Eliash, *The Ithna 'Ashari-Shi'î juristic theory of political and legal authority*, in *Stud. Isl.*, xxix (1969), 17-30; idem, *Misconceptions regarding the judicial status of the Iranian 'Ulamā'*, in *IJMES*, x/1 (1979), 9-25; M. M. J. Fischer, *Iran. From religious dispute to revolution*, Cambridge, Mass. and London 1980; B. Fragner, *Von den Staatstheologen zum Theologenstaat. Religiöse Führung und historischer Wandel im schiitischen Persien*, in *WZKM*, lxxv (1983), 73-98; C. Frank, *Über den schiitischen Mudschtahid, in Islamica*, ii (1926), 176-92; E. Glassen, *Schah Esma'īl und die Theologen seiner Zeit, in Isl.*, xlviii (1972), 254-68; K. H. Göbel, *Moderne Schiitische Politik und Staatsidee...*, Opladen 1984; Abdul-Hadi Hairī, *Why did the 'ulama participate in the Persian Constitutional Revolution of 1905-1909?*, in *WI*, xvii (1976-7), 124-54; idem, *Shi'ism and constitutionalism in Iran*, Leiden 1977; J. M. Hussain, *The occultation of the Twelfth Imam*, Cambridge 1982; S. A. Kazemi Moussavi, *Zindagī wa nakḥsh-i fikāhātī-yi Mullā Aḥmad Narākī*, in *Nashr-i dānīsh*, iv/3 (1363/1984), 4-8; idem, *The establishment of the position of marja'iyyat-i taklīd in the Twelver-Shi'î community, in Iranian Studies*, xviii/1 (1985), 35-51; N. R. Keddie, *The roots of the Ulama's power in Modern Iran*, in *Scholars* (1972), 211-29 (also in *St. Isl.*, xxix [1969], 31-53); E. Kohlberg, 1976A = *From Imamiyya to Ithna-'ashariyya*, in *BSOAS*, xxxix (1976), 521-34; idem, 1976B = *The development of the Imami Shi'î doctrine of Jihad*, in *ZDMG*, cxxvi (1976), 64-86; A. K. S. Lambton, *Quis custodiet custodes? Some reflections on the Persian theory of government*, in *St. Isl.*, v (1955), 125-48, vi (1955), 125-46; eadem, *A reconsideration of the position of the marja' al-taklīd and the religious institution*, in *St. Isl.*, xx (1964), 115-35; eadem (1970A) = *A nineteenth century view of Jihad*, in *St. Isl.*, xxiii (1970), 181-92; eadem, (1970B) = *The Persian 'ulamā and constitutional reform*, in *Le Shi'isme imāmīte*, 245-69; R. D. McChesney, *The life and intellectual development of an eighteenth century Shi'î scholar Sayyid Muhammad Mahdī Tabātabā'ī 'Bahr al-'ulūm'*, in *Folia Orientalia*, xxii (1981-4), 163-84; M. J. McDermott, *The theology of Shaikh al-Mufid (d. 413/1022)*, Beirut 1978; D. M.



MacEoin, *From Shaykhism to Babism: a study in charismatic renewal in Shi'ī Islam*, Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis 1979, unpubl.; idem, *Changes in charismatic authority in Qajar Shi'ism, in Qajar Iran 1800-1925. Studies presented to Professor L. P. Elwell-Sutton*, ed. E. Bosworth and C. Hillenbrand, Edinburgh 1983; W. Madelung, *A treatise of the Sharīf al-Murtadā on the legality of working for the government*, in *BSOAS*, xliii (1980), 18-31; idem, *Shi'ite discussions on the legality of the Kharaj*, in *Proc. of the Ninth Congress of the Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants*, Leiden 1981; idem, *Authority in Twelver Shi'ism in the absence of the Imam*, in *La notion d'autorité au Moyen Age. Islam, Byzance, Occident*, ed. G. Makdisi, Paris 1982, 163-73; Djalāl Matīnī, *Bahthī dar bāra-yi sabīka-i tarīkhī-yi alkāb wa 'anāwīn-i 'ulamā'* dar madhhab-i shī'a, in *Iran Nameh*, i/4 (1983), 560-608; H. Modarresi Tabataba'i, *Kharaj in Shi'ī law*, Oxford Univ. Ph.D. thesis 1982, unpubl.; M. Momen, *An introduction to Shi'ī Islam*, New Haven and London 1985; R. Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and leadership in an early Islamic society*, Princeton 1980; M. Muṭahharī, *Idjīhād dar Islām*, in *Bahthī*, 35-68; idem, *Mushkil-i asāsī dar sāmān-i ruhāniyyat*, in *ibid.*, 165-98; idem, *Mazāya wa khidmāt-i marhūm Āyatullāh Burūjirdī*, in *ibid.*, 223-49; J. R. Perry, *Karīm Khan Zand. A history of Iran 1747-1779*, Chicago 1979; F. Rajaei, *Islamic values and world view*. *Khomeyni on Man, the State and International Politics*, Lanham, New York and London 1983; M. Ramyar, *Shaykh Tūsī*, Edinburgh Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1977, unpubl.; *Religion and politics in Iran*, ed. N. R. Keddie, New Haven and London 1983; G. Rose, *Velayat-e Faqih and the recovery of Islamic identity in the thought of Āyatollah Khomeini*, in *Religion and politics* (1983), 166-88; A. Sachedina, *al-Khums. The fifth in the Imami Shi'ī legal system*, in *JNES*, xxxix/4 (1980), 275-89; idem, *Islamic messianism: the idea of the Mahdī in Twelver Shi'ism*, Albany 1981; G. Scarcia, *A proposito del problema della sovranità presso gli Imamiti*, in *AIUON*, N.S. vii (1957), 95-126; idem, *Stato e dottrine attuali della setta sciita imamita degli Shaikhī in Persia*, in *Studie e Materiali di Storia della Religioni*, xxix/2 (1958), 215-41; idem, (1958A) = *Intorno alle controversie tra Ahbārī e Uṣūlī presso gli Imamiti di Persia*, in *RSO*, xxxiii (1958), 211-50; idem, *Kermān 1905: La "guerra tra šeiḫī e bālādsari"*, in *AIUON*, N.S. xiii (1963), 195-238; B. Scarcia Amoretti, *L'imamismo in Iran nell'epoca Selgūchide: a proposito del problema della "communita"*, in *La Bisaccia dello Sheikh. Omaggio ad Alessandro Bausani*, Venice 1981, 127-40; *Scholars = Scholars, saints and Sufis*, ed. N. R. Keddie, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1972; *Shi'isme imāmīte = Le Shi'isme imāmīte*, ed. T. Fahd, Paris 1970; A. Tabari, *The role of the clergy in modern Iranian politics*, in *Religion and Politics* (1983), 47-72; M. H. Tabātaba'i, *Idjīhād wa taklīd dar Islām wa Shī'a*, in *Bahthī*, 13-22; idem, *Wilāyat wa zī'āmat*, in *ibid.*, 71-99; M. Tālīkānī, *Tamarkuz wa 'adam-i tamarkuz dar mardja'īyyat wa fatwā*, in *ibid.*, 201-11; idem, *Mālīkiyyat dar Islām*, n.p., n.d.; idem, *Djīhād wa shīhādāt*, Tehran 1385/1965; W. M. Watt, *The significance of the early stages of Imami Shi'ism*, in *Religion and Politics* (1983), 21-32; Abu 'l-Faḍl Mūsawī Zandjānī, *Sharā'ī wa wazā'if-i mardja'*, dans *Bahthī*, 25-31. (J. CALMARD)

**MARDJĀN** (A.), coral. As a rule, red coral (*Corallium rubrum*) is used as a piece of jewelry; the black and white coral are also mentioned. The Persian term *bussadh*, often employed as a synonym, strictly speaking is the root of the coral "which grows as a stone in the sea in the same way as a tree on land" (al-

Kazwīnī, *Cosmography*, i, 212,7), as well as the subsoil to which it is stuck.

With the pearl (*lu'lu'* [q.v.]) and amber (*kahrubā* [q.v.]), the coral belongs to the organic products which were however, as in our time, mostly associated with the precious stones (*djawāhīr*), i.e. the minerals (*ma'ādīn*). The most detailed information on the coral is given by al-Tifāshī (see *Bibl.*), according to which the coral belongs to the mineral kingdom on the one hand because of its petrification (*tahadīdjūr*), and to the vegetable one on the other because it grows on the bottom of the sea like a tree with branches and twigs. For the rest, descriptions are taken over from Antiquity. According to Theophrastus, the coral, which grows in the sea, is like a stone, red and round like a carrot (*De lapidibus*, 38). Pliny (*Historia naturalis*, xxxii, 11) repeats a number of older tales on the way coral is won. He describes it as a shrub which, on green stalks, sprouts green, soft berries which petrify, turn red the moment they come out of the water and look like cornelians. According to Aristotle, the coral is "a red-coloured stone which grows in the sea. If put in dung and putrescent material, it is often used [chemically]" (al-Kazwīnī, *Cosmography*, i, 238, 5-6). According to the so-called "Stone-book of Aristotle", the coral grows in the way branches do, and puts forth thin or thick twigs (*Kitāb al-Ahḍjār*, see *Bibl.*).

As opposed to these relatively sober statements, Ps.-Apollonius of Tyana [see BALĪNŪS] enlarges and speculates upon the double vegetable-mineral nature of the coral: "It resembles the waterplants; it originates from fire and earth through the intermediary of water... its body is mineral-like because hot fire and dry earth combine in it with the help of water, but its spirit is vegetable-like because water acts as a mediator... when water, warmed by the sun, absorbs the dryness of the earth, it becomes able, in its turn, to attract the warmth and dryness of the sun, and so the coral grows gradually like a plant; in cold air however it petrifies... its vegetable character is shown by the fact that it grows and branches in proportion to the warmth which the water, mixed with dryness, causes to mount in it as nourishment", see *Sirr al-khālīka wa-ṣan'at al-tabi'a. Buch über das Geheimnis der Schöpfung und die Darstellung der Natur*, ed. Ursula Weisser, Aleppo 1979, 348, 7-351,8; cf. also the shortened translation by the same author in *Das "Buch über das Geheimnis der Schöpfung" von Pseudo-Apollonius von Tyana*, Berlin-New York 1980, 120 f. (*Ars medica*, iii, 2). In al-Tifāshī, who in general quotes Apollonius extensively, the same passage is found on p. 178 f.

Coral is repeatedly said to be won at Marsā 'l-Kharaz (= La Calle in Algeria); from a boat, a wooden cross, weighted with a stone, is sunk on a rope to the bottom of the sea; the boat sails up and down so that the corals get caught at the extremities of the cross, which then is weighed with a jerk. Then emerges a body with a brown crust, branched like a tree. On the markets, these corals are abraded until they shine and show the desired red colour, then are sold in great quantities at a low price. Spain, Sicily and "the Frankish" i.e. probably the European, coast are given as other finding places. From the western Mediterranean, still nowadays the main deposit area of coral, it is shipped to the Orient, the Yemen, India and East Asia. At the finding places, coral is put on the market in quantities of 10.5 Egyptian *ratls*, costing, in Egypt and 'Irāk, 1,020 *dirhams* if polished, 1,100 *dirhams* if unpolished. Otherwise, prices fluctuate greatly according to the market situation (al-Dimashqī, *Kitāb al-Iṣhāra ilā maḥāsīn al-tijāra*, in *Wiedernann, Aufsätze*, i, 858).