

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

C. E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, W. P. HEINRICHS AND CH. PELLAT

ASSISTED BY F. TH. DIJKEMA AND MME S. NURIT

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES



LEIDEN

E. J. BRILL

1987, 1989, 1990, 1992

After the attack of King Dāwūd of Nubia on Aydhāb in 671/1272, the power and independence of Mukurra was curtailed, and Mamlūk interference brought a Muslim king to the throne by 717/1316. Arabic sources generally refer to al-Mukurra as al-Niḅa [q.v.] or Dunkula (Dongola), but a Coptic letter to Mark III of Alexandria (1166-89) from Kasr Ibrīm, refers to Nobadia, Makuria, and Alodia as being under his jurisdiction. In the 14th century A.D. the kingdom seems to have broken up into smaller regions, with royal seats at Daw and Dongola, and a possible splinter kingdom around Djabal Adda called Dotawo. The last king of Nubia mentioned by the sources is Nāsir (800/1397); but a King Joel of Dotawo is known from a leather document from Djabal Adda as late as 1484.

Bibliography: (in addition to references given in BAKR, DONCOLO and NUBA): Ya'kūbī, *Ta'rikh*, i, 217; Ma'sūdi, *Murūj*, iii, 31-2; Ibn Hawkal, 58; Yāqūt, iv, 605; Dimashki, *Nuḅha*, 268; Ibn Sulaym al-Uṣwānī, in Makrūzī, *Kāfi*, iii, 252 ff.; L. P. Kirwan, *Notes on the topography of the Nubian Kingdoms*, in *JEA*, xvi (1935), 57-62; U. Monneret de Villard, *Sonia della Nubia cristiana*, Rome 1928, index; Y. F. Hasan, *The Arabs and the Sudan*, Edinburgh 1967, esp. ch. IV; G. Vantini, *The excavations at Faras, 1970*, index; Jakobietzki, *Faras III, A history of the Bishops of Pachōra*, 1972, index; J. M. Plumley, *Qasr Ibrīm 1974*, in *JEA*, lxi (1975), 7; G. Vantini, *Oriental sources concerning Nubia*, 1975, index; W. Y. Adams, *Nubia, corridor to Africa*, 1977, index (s.v. Makourra).

MUKUS [see MAKS].

MULADL [see MUWALLAD].

MULAZEMET (v. *mūlazama*), an Ottoman administrative term for the certificate of eligibility for office. In the *ʿilmīyye* [q.v.], *mūlazemat* indicated the candidacy for office of those *medres* students who had completed their studies and received an *idāzāt*, a diploma for practice. It gradually came to refer to the time period between the graduation and the actual appointment to an office: in this period, the candidates waited and gained professional experience by attending the assemblies, *medāris*, of the Rūmelī and Anadolu *kāzī ʿaskers* [q.v.]. To document their attendance, they recorded their names in the register referred to as *mūlazeh*.

The *mūlazemat* system was systematised during the reign of Sultan Süleymān I as the *kāzī ʿasker* of Rūmelī, Ebu'l-Su'ūd Efendi, instituted the practice of keeping a register for *mūlazims*, i.e., the candidates, and notifying each *ʿilmīyye* member how many trainees for office they could nominate among their graduating students. The Topkapı Palace Museum Archives contain one such *mūlazemat* register from the early 10th/16th century (D5605/1). The Ottoman state kept on issuing many decrees throughout the centuries to regulate the system; see, for example, *mühimme* 73, decree number 740 in the Prime Minister's Archives.

In addition to the *ʿilmīyye* usage [for which, see *mūlazim*] *mūlazim* referred, in the Ottoman administration, military, the palace and guild system, to the candidates or "reserves" for office. Administratively, Sultan Süleymān I assigned the collection of the poll-tax, *ghizya*, to tax-farmers who were called *mūlazim* officers and who formed a special corps to collect this tax in certain districts. The term was also used for the 300 special mounted bodyguards whom Sultan Süleymān I selected from among his household to accompany him on campaigns. These personal aides-de-camp were called *mūlazim* because

Encyclopaedia of Islam, VII

they were preparing for important administrative posts which came by way of reward for their services to the sultan. As the Ottoman army was reorganised during the 19th century, the term *mūlazim* came to apply to the lowest two ranks of officers, corresponding to the rank of "lieutenant".

In the Ottoman Palace, *mūlazim* referred to the reserves among the 40 subordinate valets in the retinue of the Head Valet, *Bağlı Cümada*. The first 20 valets were accounted with finery supplied from the treasury of the sultan; the second twenty, regarded as their *mūlazims*, i.e. candidates for succession to their posts, had to supply their own.

In the Ottoman guild system, *mūlazim* alluded to the reserves among the 31 men who were under the command of the Inspector over the Guild Affairs, the *mudaris*. Of the 31 men, 15 were referred to as the privileged, *gedikli*, since they held posts by virtue of a privilege which was hereditary; in the event of a *gedikli* dying without a son, their posts were filled by the seniors among the other 16 men, who were called *mūlazim*.

Bibliography: M. D'Ohsson, *Tabkân gineval de l'Empire ottoman*, Paris 1788-1824, iv, 466-9; A. de Juchereau de Saint-Denys, *Histoire de l'Empire ottoman depuis 1792 jusqu'en 1844*, Paris 1844, i, 29; Seyyid Mustafa Nuri, *Nelâ'îdî al-uwakîf*, 1327, i, 145, ii, 92; Ahmed Dîwâder, *Ta'rikh*, Istanbul 1309, i, 112; Ahmed Râsım, *Öğünantî ta'rikhî*, Istanbul 1326-8, i, 381; Tavyârzâde Ahmed 'Alâ', *Ta'rikh*, Istanbul 1293, i, 190; O. N. Ergin, *Medicilî-yi umûr-i belâdiyye*, Istanbul 1922, i, 270-1, 327-9; Gibb and Bowen, *II*, 288, 328, 342, 246, 172, 147, 253; M. İpsirli, *Osmanî ilmiyye teşkilâtında mūlazemat sisteminin önemi ve Rūmelî kadâsıkeri Mehmed Efendi zamanına ait mūlazemat keşifleri*, in *İst. Üniv. Ede. Fak. Günöğütü Arayış Araştırmaları Dergisi*, x-xi (1981-2), 221-32.

(F. MİTÇE GÖÇEK)

MULAZİM (v.: Turkish form: *mūlazim*), an Ottoman administrative and military term (e.g. denoting in later times a lieutenant in the army), the most notable use of which was to designate a candidate for office in the Ottoman learned hierarchy (the *ʿilmīyye* [q.v.]) whether at the beginning of his career (in which case he was, strictly, a *mūlazim-i rasu*) or at any later stage when he was awaiting a post; in this last respect, the former usage is by far the more commonly met with in the literature (usually without the addition of *rasu*), since attaining the status of a *mūlazim*, or of *mūlazama* (*mūlazemat* [q.v.]), was an essential step in the qualification of a (usually young) scholar for entry into the learned career.

Once a student had completed, or nearly completed, his studies, it was necessary for him to secure the sponsorship of the holder of one of a number of high-ranking posts in the learned hierarchy—for example, the *Shaykh al-Islām* [q.v.], the *kāzī* of an important city such as Istanbul, or the *mudarris* of an important *medrese* such as one of the Süleymāniyye *madrâses*—whose backing would enable him to be enrolled as a *mūlazim*, i.e. a candidate for office, in the register of one of the two *kāzī ʿaskers* [q.v.], which enrolment, in turn, entitled him to appointment to a vacancy in the learned establishment when one occurred. The right to become a *mūlazim* was often, though not necessarily, earned by the student through performing a service for an established scholar, such as acting as *muʿad* for a *mudarris* or as *vediklergâhî* for a *kāzī ʿasker*. The investing of students, their own or others', with the right to become *mūlazims* was regarded by the holders of the high learned posts, each of which was assigned a quota, as an important perquisite and was

voussoir arches, and the semi-dome of the *mihrab* all represent the earliest structural precedents yet recognised on the sub-continent, in a fully assured technique. In the city itself, the possibly earlier tomb of Shāh Yūsuf Gardizī, said to date from 547/1152-3, has been extensively rebuilt. Its flat-roofed orthogonal mass is enhanced by the Iranian expedient of tile sheathing, here both flat and in relief, with no interruption but for the lean projections of door frame and *mihrab*, and the mentioned parapet. Later tombs comprise with a format in three zones, the lower having battered walls with few openings, the next a tall octagonal drum with an opening on each face, and the third a hemispherical dome pierced in a panelled frieze around the base. In that of Bahā' al-Dīn Zakariyā (Bahā' al-Hakk) (d. 661/1262 or 666/1267 [q.v.]), the base is a massive square chamber left completely plain, and relieved only by the strong projection of a *piłlık* of full height around the doorway which, like the preceding example, is framed by paired rectangular fillets, and houses successively recessed arches: the octagon of half the height, whose windows with four-centred arches set in shallow panels echo the doorway, affirms its stable proportions, and the blind merlons at both levels have *guldasta* at the angles. The recessed base of the dome is set with repeated small niches. Damage repaired after the siege of 1849 appears not to have affected these lines. The small tomb of Shāh Dāna Shāhid, martyred in 668/1270, largely unaltered, is similar, as is that of Shams al-Dīn Sabzawānī (misnamed Tabrizī) (ca. 1300 but rebuilt 1780), though more ornate. A model for this combination is to be found in Khurāsān, in such tombs as those of Abū Sa'īd at Mayhāna [q.v.] (d. 440/1049) and of 'Alambardār near Karkī (d. 394/1004): domestic architecture in the Marw region had long combined a central dome with a square plan and strongly battered walls as a response to the limitations of mud as a material.

The great tomb said to have been built by Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tuğluk for himself ca. 715/1315, but later devoted to Shāh Rukn-i 'Alam by Firuz Shāh, differs in that the lower story is octagonal instead of square, with tapered round buttresses at the angles which enhance the batter, and like the angles of the octagonal drum above, are crowned with small domes surrounding the main one, which is now highly four-centred. This form too may have come from Khurāsān, where polygonal tombs with comparable corner towers were built in the 5th-6th/11th-12th centuries. Inside, a series of sixteen concentric arches in recessed planes form squinches and clerestory windows alternately, supporting a thirty-two sided cornice, and the slightly stilted dome. Outside and in, the brickwork is relieved by intricate carving, work in relief, toothed string courses at intervals, and girdles of *shigām* wood, all contributing to unity. The fine timber carving of the *mihrab* is completed by an inscribed architrave bordered on both sides with vigorous spiralling tendrils. The generously decorated pannels of the exterior are set and edged with ceramic tiles in blue, white, and turquoise only, with geometric patterns in deep relief.

Bibliography: For a description, plans and photographs of the tomb of Khālid b. al-Walīd, see Ahmad Nābi Khān, *Naked brick architecture of the early period in Pakistan*, in *Pakistan archaeology*, xxiii (1987-8), 303-25; for other tombs see A. Cunningham, in *ASI*, v (A.R. 1872-3), 133 ff. and pl. xxxvi ff.; for Rukn-i 'Alam, see J. Burton-Page, *The tomb of Rukn-i 'Alam*, in R.E.N. Wheeler (ed.), *Splendours of the East*, London 1965, 73-81; for general comments

on sequence and related monuments, see Ahmad Nābi Khān, *The mausoleum of Sa'īd 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Pāpānā (Punjab)*, in *East and West*, xxiv/3-4 (1974), 311-26; for comparisons with Khurāsān, see A. M. Pributkova, *Pamyatniki arkhitekturni XI veka v Turkmēni*, Moscow 1953, figs. 20-36 and 84-5, pp. 28 and 65; also G. A. Pugachenkova, *Puti razvitiya arkhitekturni yuzhnoye Turkmēniāna poni rābolāzaniya i Jeddāzma*, Moscow 1958, 292 ff.; for general sources, see HIND. See also UČKH.

(P. A. ANDREWS)

MÜLTEZİM (A., *multezim*), the term which denoted a tax-farmer who, from mid-16th century on, collected taxes and dues on behalf of the Ottoman Treasury; on its application in the Arab provinces of the Ottoman empire, see İTTİZÂM.

The officials who collected revenues for the Treasury could either deliver all the proceeds while drawing a salary, or could buy the right to retain the proceeds themselves by paying the Treasury an agreed sum in advance; it was the latter system that was known as the *iltizâm*. *İltizâm* differed from the other term used for a tax-farm, *muğāla'a* [q.v.] in that it referred to the collection of revenues from the Imperial Domains, *ikāwat-i hümāyūn*. *Muğāla'a* was applied to the collection by contract of other revenues. In the case of *iltizâm*, the contractor was called *multezim*, in that of a *muğāla'a*, he was called *muğāla'agī*. The origins of the *iltizâm* system are thus located in the revenue collection from the Imperial Domains. This collection had originally been executed by salaried officials called *emins* and then leased yearly to officers who had distinguished themselves in war. The latter paid the Ottoman Treasury a fixed sum which was determined in relation to the normal yields of the lands concerned; in return, they acquired the right to collect, for their own benefit, all the tithes and taxes legally due from the inhabitants. Although they were not empowered to exact more than the amounts authorised by law from the inhabitants, their contracts allowed them a sufficiently wide margin of profit and some exercise of authority over the peasantry.

The first usage of the tax-farming system by the Ottoman sultans is unclear: it may have been in existence as early as the reign of sultan Mehmed II Fāh [q.v.] when the reference to *multezims* appears in connection with a signature fee of 1% specified for them. Most Ottoman historical chronicles state, however, that, until the reign of sultan Süleymān I, the *iltizâm* system was not regularly used and then only for the collection of revenue from the Imperial domains. In Süleymān's reign, the Ottoman treasury added the military fiefs which it seized to the original Imperial domains and also farmed out the new revenues it acquired; all these contracts came to be known collectively as treasury leases, *muğāla'at-i miriyet*.

The Ottoman treasury did not deal directly with the farmers in arranging tax-farms; farms were put up to auction. Only bidders who had appointed a banker or money-changer to guarantee the payment on their behalf to the Treasury of the sums due to it could participate. These bankers, in turn, had to be approved by the Inner Treasury, *iz'âzime*, to assume this responsibility; upon approval, they were furnished with an official license, called *kuyruklu berat*, and were then entitled to deal with the Treasury over tax-farm and other official business. The actual conduct of *multezims* depended on the source of the contracts; if they had contracted with a fiefholder or a proprietor, they were obliged to be circumspect, owing to the interest of such persons in their property and its pros-

peity. Otherwise, the aim of *mültezim*s was to get as much out of the peasantry as possible in order to render their bargains profitable.

As tax-farming extended to almost every variety of land-holding, it exploited both the land and the peasantry, thereby undermining the preservation of Ottoman sources of revenue. As matters further deteriorated toward the end of the 17th century, a system of life-leases called *malkâne* [q.v.] was introduced, by giving the contractor a life interest in the yield of whatever revenue source he was empowered to tap, this system improved the taxpayer's position relatively until it got beddled with its own problems.

The *iltizam* system was abolished in 1839 as the *Tanzimat* altered the Ottoman taxation system. Yet it was later reinstated and reformed by laws and regulations promulgated in 1855, 1858, 1861 and 1871. From 1897 onwards the system was gradually phased out and abolished in 1905, the duties of a *mültezim* were then left to cadastral officers.

Bibliography: D'Ohsson, *Tablcau g n ral*, vii, 242-3, 243, 248-9; Abd al-Rahm n Welk, *Taklif kauf s d*, Istanbul 1328-30, i, 62, 102-3; Seyyid Mustafa Nuri, *Mak t p al-mulk t l*, Istanbul 1327 i, 124; P. A. von Tischenhof, *Das Lehnenen in dem moslemischen Staate*, Leipzig 1872, 50; *TOEM*, xiii (1911), 19, xiv, (1912), 29; I. Husev, *Turk k p k n z y n*, Istanbul 1934, 169-73; Gibb and Bowen, *I/I*, 170, 238, 253, 255, *I/2*, 6, 21-4; *Turk ansiklopedisi*, Ankara 1977, xxv, 29.

M L K AL-TAWĀ'IF (أ) I. In pre-Islamic

Persia.

"The kings of the territorial divisions" is the Arabic phrase used by Muslim historians originally for the regional rulers of the Parthian or Arsacid period, and afterwards also for the rulers of principalities which arose on the ruins of the Umayyad empire of al-Andalus. In the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries, their information is said to have come from the lost works of Ibn Khur d bih, M s  b.  s  al-Kisrawi, the *mab d s* of Sh raz, (B)Sh p r, and F r, the *Al b r al-Fur* of  mar Kisr , the *Sh h-n ma* of  bd al-Razz k, a *T y h s r*, *mulk al-aw 'if* and the Sasanian *Azra*. Some of this information may go back to a lost Arsacid king list or chronicle.

This period lasted from the defeat of D r  b. D r  by al-Iskandar until the rise of the S s nid dynasty under Artashir b. B bak. After D r 's death, local rulers took over each district and were confirmed or appointed as kings by al-Iskandar, in some accounts at the advice of Aristotle, to keep them divided. After al-Iskandar the region from the Tigris to the Oxus, in some accounts, extending to al-Yaman, Syria and Egypt was divided among 70 to 100 independent Persian, Aramaean, Arab and Greek rulers (al-Tha il bi anachronously includes the Hay t la [q.v.] of Tukh rist n and the Turks of Khur s n). Each made his position hereditary and sought to defend and expand his territory; none paid taxes to another. The Arab kings included Dhu 'l-Shan r, the powerful ruler of  man, al-Bahrayn, al-Yamama, and the sea coasts, and S tir n of al-Hadr. The Greeks and their Persian *wazirs* ruled Babylonia (the Saw d) for 54 years after al-Iskandar's death until A hak b. A h k n or Akfirsh h (Pacorus), ruler of the D jb l, deposed and killed Antiochos at al-Maw l and conquered al- rak. The other regional rulers recognised his pre-eminence, called him king, and sent him gifts but not taxes, and he did not appoint or dismiss them. They honoured him because of his royal descent (from D r  al-Akbar, Kay Kub dh, Kay K w s, or another king) and because he established the throne of the A h k n

dynasty at T sf n (Ctesiphon) in the centre of the world.

Muslim historians report the dynastic succession of only the A h k niyy n but admit of no agreement on their names, the order of succession or the length of their reigns. Over 20 dynastic lists count as few as nine and as many as 19 rulers and make the length of the dynasty as short as 201 or as long as 455 years. Nor do these lists agree with the Arsacid succession according to coins and Greek and Latin authors. They include Sasanian royal names, are interwoven with didactic tales, and are coordinated with prophetic history. Lewy identifies two traditions, one with eleven rulers that ignores Artaw n II and his successors and one with 19 rulers, grouped into eleven and eight kings, that preserved the replacement of the A h k niyy n by another family. Muslim historians with a concern for chronology calculated the duration of the *mulk al-aw 'if* at over 500 years (often 523 years) and tried to explain the discrepancy with the length of the A h k n dynasty. Al-Bir n , based on dates in the Seleucid era and the testimony of M n  in the *Sh b rkan*, gives 528 or 537 years between al-Iskandar and Artashir and reports that, according to Ibrahim al-Zanjan , the mathematician, the Persians only counted the reigns of the A h k niyy n and those only from when they first combined al- rak and the D jb l under their rule in 246 S.E., which Lewy notes is the year Phraates II took the title of "king of kings". Al-Mas 'ud , who gives 513 years for the *mulk al-aw 'if*, reports as "a religious and political secret" of the Persians that Zoroaster had prophesied in the *Azra* that the Persian religion and kingdom would be destroyed after 1,000 years, and that when Artashir came to power less than 200 years were left, so he set the death of Artaw n at 260 years after al-Iskandar, cutting the duration of the *mulk al-aw 'if* in half, in order to lengthen the duration of his own dynasty. Lewy suggests that the year of Artashir's accession (538 S.E.) was changed to 538 years from the appearance of Zoroaster. Since al-Iskandar died 272 years later, that left 266 years for the A h k niyy n, which number occurs fairly consistently in Islamic sources that depend on the Sasanian *Azra*.

According to al-Y k bi, the *mulk al-aw 'if* were not Mag s [q.v.] but Sabi'ans who worshipped the sun, moon, fire, and the seven planets, and spoke and wrote Aramaic. Al-Tha il bi claims that Akfirsh h recovered the *dir 'l-i-K w y n* [see K w l] and books on medicine, astronomy, and philosophy that al-Iskandar had taken from Iran. Nearly 70 books, including *Kal la wa-Dimna* [q.v.] and *Sindbad*, are said to have been composed in this period. The prophetic careers of Yahy  b. Zakariyy  and  s  b. Maryam are integrated with A h k n history by Muslim historians. The claim that a king called Kharid s attacked Jerusalem to punish the Israelites for killing Yahy  may reflect the capture of Jerusalem in 40 B.C. by Pacorus, the son of Orodes II, 266 years before the accession of Artashir. The version in which D gh rtz b. A h k n attacked the Israelites for killing Yahy  may reflect the massacre of the Jews of Seleucia in ca. 40 A.D. during the civil war between Gotarzes and Vardanes. Otherwise, they report that Titus destroyed the Bayr al-Makdis. The image of the period of the *mulk al-aw 'if* as a time of anarchy and cultural decay seems to be late Sasanian propaganda and may have contributed to  s id al-Andalus's comparison that after the Ban  Umayy , al-Andalus was divided among a number of rulers "whose condition was like that of the *mulk al-aw 'if* of the Persians" (see 2, below).

Bibliography: Bal dh r , *Fut h*, 197; Dinawari,

independent of Persia, Byzantium and Medina, especially in view of the decline of Persia and the likelihood that trade between the Yemen and 'Irāk would decrease.

While the movement led by Musaylima thus dealt with political and economic realities, it had a genuine religious basis, which is not entirely concealed by hostile Muslim propaganda. Many of the Banū Hanīfa were Christians, and Musaylima had clearly been influenced by Christian ideas. He spoke of the kingdom of heaven, and taught belief in resurrection and the judgement of the Last Day when people were judged according to their deeds. For his followers he prescribed formal prayers three times a day, fasting, and abstinence from wine; the contrary statement about wine (Ibn Hišām, 946) is to be rejected as Muslim propaganda. He also made use of *saḍī'*, rhythmic assonanced prose, as in the early *sūras* of the Kur'ān, and some examples of this have ostensibly been preserved.

About the end of the year 10 (beginning of 632) Musaylima is said to have written a letter to Muḥammad suggesting some division of spheres of authority, but the suggestion was rebuffed by Muḥammad. His following among Banū Hanīfa increased greatly after Muḥammad's death, and he was felt to be a serious threat to the nascent Islamic state. Abū Bakr therefore sent a large army against him under Khalīd b. al-Walīd. A fierce battle took place at al-'Akraba' [q.v.] with its centre in a walled garden or orchard (*ḡadīka*), which came to be known as "the garden of death", because of the numbers on both sides killed there. The Muslims were victorious, but lost many *ḡarrā'* or Kur'ān-reciters. Responsibility for the death of Musaylima was claimed by various men, including Wahshī, the Abyssinian slave who had killed Hanza. Shortly before this battle Musaylima is said to have married Saḡḡāh [q.v.], the propheticess of the tribe of Tamīm. W. G. Palgrave, travelling in Naḡd in 1862, found Musaylima regarded as a prophet, and people quoted what Palgrave calls "burlesque imitations" of the Kur'ān, though he does not reproduce any.

Bibliography: Ibn Hišām, 312-13, 566, 945-6, 964-5; Wākidi, ed. Jones, 82, 269, 286-7, 863; Balādhurī, 86; Tabarī, i, 1560, 1737-9, 1748-50, 1793-8, 1871, 1880, 1915-21, 1929-57; Ibn Kutayba, *Maḡrīf*, 206; Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 88, 108, 112, 18, 53; J. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, iv, 102, 113, 167-7; vi, 15-19; Caerani, *Annali dell'Islam*, ii, 450-1, 633-48, 727-38; W. N. Watt, *Muḥammad at Medina*, Oxford 1956, 132-7; D. S. Margoliouth, in *JRAS* (1903), 485 ff.; C. J. Lyall, in *ibid.*, 771-8; W. G. Palgrave, *Narrative of a year's journey through Central and Eastern Arabia*, London 1865, i, 380.

MUSAYILMA (a.), an Ottoman military term alluding to provincial landed cavalrymen who later became transformed into auxiliary forces no longer employed in actual fighting but in discharging duties such as dragging guns, levelling roads, digging trenches, carrying provisions and casting cannon balls. Then, as the Ottoman state required them to pay taxes rather than serve in the army, they lost their privileged status and dissolved into the tax-paying populace.

The *müsellems* were established in the 8th/14th century during the time of Orkhan Ghāzī [q.v.]. They were each initially granted, in return for their service, a small parcel of land [see *ḡırtluk*], on which they were excused from any dues or taxes, hence the name *müsellem* "exempt." What differentiated them from other Ottoman cavalrymen, the *sipahis* [q.v.], was that

the *müsellems* worked their own land and did not receive funds from the collection of taxes as the *sipahis* did. This special condition necessitated that they support one another when called up for military service; the *müsellems* were therefore organised into groups of thirty men each called a "hearth" [see *ođak*]. They took turns in serving in the army; when five served, the other twenty-five in the hearth became "auxiliaries" [see *YAMAĞI*], providing a sum of money for the expenses and sustenance of the five during the campaign. The amount they gave ranged from 30 to 60 *akças* for the rich auxiliaries to 10 to 20 *akças* for the poor ones. The *müsellems* were under the command of troop leaders called *terbanhis* who were under the authority of the provincial governors. There were *müsellem* holdings in both Rumelia and Anatolia, and these were recorded in registers called *müsellem defteri*.

After the Janissary corps expanded in the 9th/15th century and started their own units, the *müsellems* were relegated from fighting to accompanying the armies on campaigns as auxiliary labour teams. They discharged such duties as trench-digging and the hauling of cannon, often moving ahead of the main body of the Ottoman army with their spades and axes. Groups such as the *gypsies* of Rumelia were also organised into *müsellem* hearths during this century, their status being reduced to paying taxes as they ceased to perform military duties. Towards the end of the 10th/16th century, some *müsellems* were employed in Ottoman naval service but proved to be unsatisfactory, since their interests lay not in the sea but in their parcels of land. Because of this inadequacy, rather than serving in person, each *müsellem* hearth was then asked to make a yearly contribution to the navy; this relegated them from being in the service of the state to giving taxes to the state as ordinary peasants. A factor which contributed to this transformation was the *müsellems'* practice of farming lands adjacent to their parcels which they then gave taxes on, or of leasing out their parcels to others to be farmed. Even though the *müsellems* thus disintegrated as a provincial organisation in the early 11th/17th century, their name kept being used at a much later date for certain infantry charged with the upkeep of roads and military works, mostly in the garrisons of frontier fortresses.

Bibliography: Seyyid Mustafa Nūrī, *Nehāğī ul-uzkūfā*, Istanbul 1909, iii, 92; M. D'Ohsson, *Tableau général de l'Empire ottoman*, Paris 1791, vii, 308-9, 378-9; I. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı tarihi*, Ankara 1975, ii, 566, 570-1; idem, *Osmanlı devletinin mekezi ve behirye teşkilatı*, Ankara 1984, 97, 103-4, 106, 382; Gibb-Bowen, i/1, 46-56, 99, 149, 188-192, 248-52, i/2, 16-7; Ahmed Refik, *Anadolu'da Türk asırları* (966-1200 h.), Istanbul 1930, 14; M. Zeki Pakalın, *Osmanlı tarih deyimleri ve terimleri sözlüğü*, Istanbul 1953, 627-8; A. de Juchereau de Saint-Denis, *Histoire de l'Empire ottoman depuis 1792 jusqu'en 1844*, Paris 1844, i, 90-2.

(E. MÜCE GÖÇEK)

MÜŞH, modern Turkish Muş, a town and a province of eastern Anatolia lying to the west of Lake Van and Ahlāt [q.v.] or Khilāt (modern Ahlat). The town lies in lat. 38° 44' N, and long. 41° 30' E, at an altitude of 1290 m/4,200 feet in the foothills of the valley which carries the Murad Su river—a fertile plain on which wheat, tobacco and vines have long been grown—and which in recent years has borne the railway branch from Elâzığ [see *MA'YÜRAT AL-'AZİZ*] eastwards to Tavan on the shores of Lake Van.

In the pre-Islamic period, it was the principal town of the Armenian district of Taraan (Hübschmann,