

the province of Ṭabaristān to the east [see MĀZANĀ DARĀN], and it is the *Hudūd al-ʿālam* which first gives the name, but as a district, not a town (tr. Minorsky, 137, § 32.25). It does appear as a town in Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, writing soon after the Mongol conquest of Gīlān in 706/1307, and by that time, the silk of Gīlān was famous and, according to Marco Polo, sought after by Genoese merchants whose ships had recently appeared on the Caspian waters. Subsequently, Rasht became the seat of a minor dynasty of Gīlān, the Iṣhākids of Fūmin, until these rulers were replaced by the Kiyā princes of Lāhidjān [q.v.], and then, in 1000/1592, Shāh ʿAbbās the Great [q.v.] annexed Gīlān to the Persian state.

Among the events of this period was the establishment in Gīlān, of which Rasht became the administrative and economic centre, of the "Muscovite Company" founded in 1557 by Anthony Jenkinson, Richard and Robert Johnson, who, taking the Russian route, sent ten expeditions into Persia between 1561 and 1581. It is to noteworthy that the last independent ruler of Gīlān, Aḥmad Shāh, sent ambassadors to Moscow to seek help against Shāh ʿAbbās and obtained promises of protection which, however, came to nothing. The Cossacks at the same time were plundering in Gīlān and Rasht and trying to gain the support of the Persian court. The most notable invasion was that of Stenka Razin who sacked Rasht in 1045/1636. On 2 Šafar 1082, the day of Stenka's execution, the Persians in Moscow at the time were invited to be present at it (cf. the journal *Kāweh*, 12, N.S., 1 December 1921). From 1722 to 1734, Rasht and Gīlān were occupied by the Russians (Shipov, then Matushkin) invited by the governor who was threatened by the Afghāns. In 1734, Gīlān was restored to Persia after a treaty. Rabino quotes a Persian testimony in favour of the Russian occupation. For military reasons the Russians cleared the jungle round Rasht.

The history of Gīlān and that of Rasht, which has always played a preponderant part in it, merges into the general history of Persia after its annexation. During the Persian Revolution, a body of Social Democrats was sent by the Regional Committee of the Caucasus to Rasht, and there helped in February 1909 to overthrow the authority of the Shāh and to establish a revolutionary committee which elected as governor the Sipihdār ʿAzam, who played a prominent part in the history of the period along with Sardār Asad Bakhtiyārī (cf. *Persia v borbě za nezavisimost*, by Pavlovič and Iranskii, Moscow 1925). Rasht then became the base of operations of the northern revolutionary army. A few years later, during the First World War, Rasht again attracted attention in connection with the movement of the *Djanggalis*, created by Mirzā Kūčak Khān [q.v.]. Assisted by German (von Passchen), Turkish and Russian officers, an armed force was organised to oppose the passage of the British troops under General Dunsterville on their way to Bākū, without, however, much success (battle of Mandjil, 12 June 1918). The British were able to force their way through with the help of Bičerākhov's detachment of Cossacks and established a garrison in Rasht. A second battle with the *Djanggalis* in the town itself on 20 July 1918 also ended in British victory. On 25 August peace was signed with Kūčak Khān at Enzeli. At one time, at the end of March 1918, the position of Kūčak Khān was so strong that the capture not only of Kazwin, but even of Tehran, was feared (cf. *The adventures of Dunsterforce* by Maj. Gen. L.C. Dunsterville, London 1920).

Rasht again became the arena of the revolutionary

*Djanggalī* movement, aimed at the pro-British government in Tehran of Mušhīr al-Dawla in 1920. After the capture of Bākū on 28 April 1920 by the Reds, the White Fleet sought refuge in the port of Enzeli, which was held by the British. Enzeli fell to the Soviet forces, who then twice occupied Rasht. But after the Perso-Soviet agreement of May 1921, Russian and British troops left Persian territory, Kūčak Khān's movement was suppressed by Riḍā Khān's [see RIḌĀ SHĀH PAHLAWĪ] Cossack Brigade, and Persian authority re-established in Gīlān and Rasht.

Rasht was again occupied by Russian forces in the Second World War. At the present time, it is the administrative centre of the *ustān* of Gīlān. It has road connections with Tehran and Bandar Anzali and an airport. In 1972 it had an estimated population of 160,000.

*Bibliography*: H.L. Rabino, *Les provinces caspiennes de la Perse. Le Guilan*, in *RMM*, xxxii (1915-16), 1-499; Le Strange, *Lands*, 174-5; Admiralty Handbooks, *Persia*, London 1945, 532-3 and index; Razmārā, *Farhang-i djuḡhrāfiyā-yi Irān*, ii, 130-2; Barthold, *An historical geography of Iran*, Princeton 1984, 236-7. (B. NIKITINE-[C.E. BOSWORTH])

**RASHTĪ, SAYYID KĀZIM** b. KĀSIM (d. 1259/1844), the head and systematiser of the Shaykhī school of Shīʿism after Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī [q.v.]. The son of a merchant, Sayyid Kāzīm was born in Rasht [q.v.], in northern Persia, between 1194/1784 and 1214/1799-1800. Details of his early life are sparse and contradictory. Educated in Rasht, he underwent mystical experiences and, somewhere between his mid-teens and early twenties (between 1809 and 1814?), became a pupil of al-Aḥsāʾī, then living in Yazd. He also studied under and received *ijāzāt* from other *muḍītahids*.

The Sayyid soon came to hold an important position among al-Aḥsāʾī's entourage, acting as his *nāib* or deputy and spokesman, answering questions on his behalf, continuing and translating some of his writings, and defending him from the attacks of hostile ʿulamāʾ. On al-Aḥsāʾī's death, Rashtī succeeded him as head of the central group of his pupils in Karbalāʾ. This led to the emergence of a sort of order for the transmission of inspired knowledge within orthodox Shīʿism, with Rashtī as "the bearer of innate knowledge" (Kirmānī) and the interpreter of al-Aḥsāʾī's words. Although he denied trying to establish a new *madhhab*, he became embroiled in major public debates with leading ʿulamāʾ. These disputes, and Rashtī's own development of an esoteric teaching divulged to a privileged circle of students, made it inevitable that Shaykhism should be viewed as a school of heterodox opinion within Twelver Shīʿism.

In spite of this, Rashtī acquired considerable political influence in Karbalāʾ and Persia, where he numbered many members of the ruling Kādjar family among his admirers. His death on 11 Dhu 'l-Hiǧǧja 1259/1 January 1844 sparked off a leadership struggle within the school, resulting in the emergence of two sharply opposed branches: that of Karīm Khān Kirmānī, which attempted a rapprochement with orthodoxy, and that of ʿAlī Muḥammad Shīrāzī [q.v.], which grew into the Bābī sect.

*Bibliography*: D. MacEoin, *From Shaykhism to Babism. A study in charismatic renewal in Shiʿi Islam*, diss. Cambridge 1979 unpubl., ch. 3, at 95-124; H. Corbin, *Les successeurs de Shaykh Ahmad Aḥsaʾī*, in *En Islam iranien. Aspects spirituels et philosophiques. IV*, Paris 1972, Livre VI *L'École Shaykhīe*, ch. II, at 232-6; A.L.M. Nicolas, *Essai sur le Cheikhisme. II. Séyéd Kazem Rehtī*, Paris 1911; Abu 'l-Kāsim b. Zayn al-

‘Ābidīn [Khān Kirmānī], *Fihrist-i kutub-i Shaykh Ahmad Ahsāʾī wa sāʾir mashāyikh-i ʿīzām*, ʿKerman [1977], 112-28, 288-359 (a brief biography and a comprehensive listing of Rashṭī writings).

(D. MACEOIN)

**RASHWA** (A.) or, apparently preferred by purists, *rishwa/rushwa*, pl. *rushā*, Persian *rishwat*, *rishwe*, *rushwa*, Turkish *rüşvet*, the legal term for “bribe.” Like English “bribe”, its connotation is absolutely negative and whatever is called *rashwa* is strictly forbidden by law. The word itself does not occur in the Qurʾān. More general passages like II, 188, and V, 42, 62-3 (*suhū*) were interpreted to include the prohibition of bribe-taking. The *hadīth*, however, makes the matter perfectly clear. One of the most explicit statements invokes the divine curse upon those who offer and who take bribes (*rāshī*, *murtashīr*), sometimes adding the go-between (*rāʾish*) and the specification *fi l-hukm*.

Other words may refer to the process of bribery such as *djaʿāla/djuʿl* or, in the course of time, drift in that direction such as *itāwa* or *bakhshish* [q.v.], but none of them ever became as unambiguous and forceful as *rashwa*. An insignificant exception may possibly be *birṭil*, if it is derived from Greek *proteleia* and the interpretation of *proteleia* as “previous payment, advance” (Liddell and Scott, 1524) in a 6th-century papyrus from Egypt is correct; in this case, Persian *partala* “gift” could be secondary or another derivation from the Greek (see S. Fraenkel, *Aram. Fremdwörter*, Leiden 1886, 84). A picturesque euphemism for bribing, “pouring oil in the lamp” or simply *kandala*, is listed by al-Thaʿālibī, *Kināya*, Beirut 1405/1984, 70; al-Rāghib, *Muḥādaraṭ*, Būlak 1286-87, i, 128.

Notwithstanding the legal prohibition, bribery was as common in Islam as in other large societies, although the degree of its prevalence no doubt widely varied. It was, therefore, necessary for jurists to define what distinguished it from allowable gifts [see *نِهَا*] and to circumscribe its boundaries. In contrast to supposedly disinterested and unconditional gifts, bribes were stated to be what was given for a purpose. This left open the possibility of beneficial purposes such as attempts to prevent wrongdoing and injustice, see, e.g., *L4*, s.v. *r-sh-w*: “gifts that lead to obtaining a right or ward off a wrong,” or al-Sharīshī, commenting on “death does not take bribes” in al-Harīrī’s twenty-first *maqāma*: “a gift given for warding off the harm of someone who has power over you” (*Sharḥ al-Makāmāt*, Cairo 1306, i, 279). In the legal view, however, the beneficial purpose did not invalidate the general prohibition; while the briber may be within his rights in offering a bribe, it is illegal to accept it, since the intended recipient should do on his own volition what is required and proper. It was, however, recognised by some that any gift whatever was given for some purpose. Al-Ḡhazālī thus discusses hypothetical situations such as giving something to a ruler’s officials or intimates in order to gain access to him, as well as other situations of gift-giving for expected services. The negative view mostly prevailed, but it is obvious that the very discussion opened up potential loopholes. Note that the alleged “first case of bribery in Islam” involves outstanding early Muslims and access to the caliph (Ibn Kutayba, *Maʿārif*, ed. ‘Ukkāshā, 558, and the *awāʾil* collections).

The environment where unlawful bribing was seen as particularly at home was the twin realms of government and judiciary. On a widely discussed problem where the two clearly intertwined concerned the expenditure of money for an appointment to a

judgeship, see, most concisely, al-Māwardī, *Adab al-kādī*, ed. M. H. Sarhān, Baghdad 1391/1971, i, 151-2, and Tyan. While bribery on various governmental levels, internally as well as internationally, was discussed (see al-Subkī, *Faṣl al-makāl fi hadayā al-ʿummāl*; Rosenthal, 137-8), the principal concern was with the judiciary, where the concept of bribery and its practical role were seen as most deeply embedded and unquestionably corruptive. In the case of judges, the acceptance of well-intentioned gifts even by relatives could constitute a problem calling for legal discussion. Gift-giving among ordinary individuals and, presumably, in business pursuits not involving officialdom was, it seems, not considered to incur the danger of developing into forbidden *rashwa*.

Someone found guilty of bribery could, of course, be dismissed. Legally, punishment was left to the decision of the judge (*taʿzīr*). The Ḥanafī Ibn Nudjāy appears to have considered public exposure as the most effective deterrent.

The attention paid to *rashwa* throughout the literature proves, if proof is needed, that bribery was an ever-present problem. Its social effects were no doubt considerable but cannot be accurately, or even approximately, quantified. It appears to have become institutionalised at certain periods and locations. From Ottoman times, an increase in monographs on the subject is noticeable. Political thinkers were much concerned with it and even ended up in almost despairing of finding a remedy for it (see Wright). Westerners often felt convinced that bribery was a way of life in the East. It may, however, be doubted whether detailed research will provide valid clues to a specific role of bribery in mediaeval Muslim civilisation as a whole, if, indeed, there was anything specific to it.

*Bibliography*: Some of the vast and scattered source material is cited by E. Tyan, *Histoire de l’organisation judiciaire en pays d’Islam*, Paris 1938-43, i, 425-31, 2nd. ed., Leiden 1960, 289-92, and F. Rosenthal, *Gifts and bribes: the Muslim view*, in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, cviii (1964), 135-44, repr. in idem, *Muslim intellectual and social history*, Variorum Reprints, Aldershot 1990. See, for example, Wakīʿ, *Akhbār al-kuḍāt*, ed. ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz Muṣṭafā al-Marāghī, Cairo 1366-69/1947-50, i, 45-60; Ḡhazālī, *Ihyāʾ*, book II, ch. 4 at end, tr. H. Bauer, *Erlaubtes und verbotenes Gut*, Halle 1922, 206-12, and Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī, *Ithāf*, Cairo 1311, repr. Beirut, vi, 157-69; Dhahabī, *Kabāʾir*, ch. 32; Ibn Nudjāy, *Risāla mukhtaṣara fi bayān al-rashwa wa-aksāmihā*, in *Rasāʾil*, Beirut 1400/1980, 110-17; Ḥādjdī Khalīfa, *The Balance of Truth*, tr. G. L. Lewis, 124-27; W. L. Wright, *Ottoman statecraft*, Princeton 1935, text, 38 ff., tr. 87-93; Ahmet Mumcu, *Osmanlı devletinde rüşvet* (Ankara 1969). (F. ROSENTHAL)

**RĀSIM** [see AHMAD RĀSIM].

**RASM** (A., pl. *rusūm*), the act of drawing, a drawing, is not always distinguished from painting; nor can it be. Drawing was performed both as a preliminary to painting and to produce works to stand alone. It might be representational [see TAŞWĪR] or decorative (historians of Islamic manuscripts confine the term illumination to decorative work). *Naḳkāshī* covers drawing and painting, whether representational or decorative; *tarāhī* is designing, in the context of pictures, the production of the underdrawing. In addition to the illustration of manuscripts, drawing is an important element in the decoration of ceramics and other forms of applied art; draughtsmen might exercise their skill in several fields. Writing in the ear-