

and the relations between parts found in most later Iranian facades and in most interior compositions of Iranian architecture. While not as richly inventive nor as exuberant as the Islamic dome, the *iwān* served as a major vehicle for the growth and development of one of the world's most impressive vaulting traditions and its walls were covered with all the various types of decorative techniques and ornamental designs known in the Muslim world.

Bibliography: Most of the immediately appropriate bibliography will be found in the text. Additional examples and discussions of individual monuments can be found in standard books on Islamic and especially Iranian and Central Asian architecture. For textual information on the uses of the *iwān*, see D. Sourdel, *Questions de Cérémonial Abbasside*, in *REI*, 1960. For the development of the religious building with four *iwāns* in Iran recent investigations and discoveries have made the traditional interpretation far less certain; see, for instance, O. Grabar, *Notes on the Great Mosque of Isfahan*, in *Bulletin of the Asia Institute in Memory of A. U. Pope* (Shiraz, 1972).

(O. GRABAR)

IYĀD, an ancient Arab tribe whose ancestor Iyād is according to the genealogists the son of Nizār b. Ma'add and the brother of Rabi'a, Anmār, and Muḍar. They dwelt first in the Tihāma. The Meccan tradition (see Wüstenfeld, *Chroniken*, ii, 137 ff.) tells that they drove the *Djūrhūm* from Mecca and made themselves masters of the Ka'ba, but were turned out after a quarrel with the *Khuzā'a*. They went to Bahrayn, where they formed with other tribes the confederation al-Tanūkh [q.v.]. Then they moved into 'Irāk where the Sawād, the fertile region between the desert and the Euphrates, offered them grazing grounds and 'Ayn Ubāgh a perennial waterplace; this happened about the middle of the 3rd century A.D. if the statement is correct that they clashed with the ruler of al-Ḥīra, *Djadhīma* b. Malik al-Azdī, who was a contemporary of Zenobia of Palmyra. Some Iyād settled at al-Ḥīra and became urbanized and christianized, if they had not been converted earlier; some were employed by the Sāsānids: Laḳīṭ b. Ya'mur [q.v.], (for his father's name see al-Shammākh, *Diwān*, 1302 h., p. 29, 2) was secretary in the department of Arab affairs; the poet Abū Duwād [q.v.] was in charge of the horses of al-Mundhir III b. Mā' al-Samā' (reigned 505-54 A. D.). Others remained Bedouins wandering about the desert, often harassing the peasants. In the reign of Khusrāw I (r. 531-79) they even kidnapped a Persian lady and defeated the Persian cavalry sent against them at Dayr al-Djāmādjīm [q.v.]; but being heedless of the warnings given them by Laḳīṭ in his famous poems they were crushed by the Persians; the survivors fled, some into the desert, others into Syria and even into Byzantine territory to a place called Ankara (mentioned by al-Aswad b. Ya'fur an-Nahshalī, *Mufaḍḍaliyyāt*, No. 44 = A'shā Nahshal, No. 17 Geyer) at the exit of the Euphrates from the mountains, whilst a third group went to Kūfa, the *Djazīra*, and Takrīt; from Takrīt they were driven out by the Persians but later came back, for in 16/637 the Iyād secretly supported the garrison of Takrīt against the Muslims. Those who remained in 'Irāk had to join the Persian forces; they were sent against the Bakr b. Wā'il in the battle of Dhū Kār [q.v.], c. 604 A. D., but went over to the Bakr; so the Persians were defeated for the first time by Bedouins.

The rise of Islam had no immediate influence upon

the Iyād; the story (*Aghānī*, xiv, 41 f.; Ibn Sa'd, i/2, 55) that they sent a deputation to Mecca in 8/629 belongs to the legends about Ḳuss b. Sā'ida [q.v.]. Some Iyād joined the pseudo-prophethood of the Tamīm Saḍjāh [q.v.]. We find Iyādis, who were doubtless Muslims, in Kūfa (Ṭabarī, i, 2482, 2495), freedmen (Ibn Sa'd, vi, 270, 277) as well as landowners (Balādhuri, 283, 5). When in 12/633 Khālīd b. al-Walīd conquered 'Irāk the Iyād together with other tribes and with Persian troops opposed him e.g. at 'Ayn al-Tamr (Ṭabarī, i, 2062) and Ṣandawdā' (Balādhuri, 310; Yāqūt, ii, 420); the statement (Ṭabarī, i, 2074) that the Iyād, Taghlib and Namir together with Byzantines and Persians were defeated by Khālīd at the fords (*al-firād*) of the Euphrates in 12/634 is dubious. About the same time, 13/634, the conquest of Palestine by the Muslims began. Towards the end of the same year Ḥimṣ was taken. Here in the northern parts of Syria lived Bedouins and amongst them Tanūkh, established there for centuries, often in separate settlements (*ḥāḍir*). In 17/638 many Iyādis and other Bedouins of 'Irāk joined the Byzantine army which tried to regain Syria, but when the Muslims conquered Mesopotamia the Iyād went over and became Muslims, whilst the Byzantines were defeated and fled to Cilicia. 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb demanded from Heraclius their extradition and the emperor was forced to send them back (Bakrī, 49). They settled in Syria and Mesopotamia. In later times Iyādis are seldom mentioned. The best known of them are the *ḥāḍī* of al-Ma'mūn, Aḥmad b. Abī Duwād [q.v.], whose claim to this descent was, however, contested by his enemies. Also Iyādis were Ibn Abī 'l-Layth, *ḥāḍī* of Egypt, d. 250/864 (Khaṭīb, *Ta'rikh Baghdad*, ii, 292), and Zāfir b. Sulaymān, *ḥāḍī* of Sijīstān (*ibid.*, viii, 494); see further *ibid.*, iii, 65 no. 1020; iii, 106 no. 1104; iv, 325 no. 2135; xii, 97 no. 6525). There were Iyādis in Spain (Maḳḳarī, i, 186, 15), amongst them the famous family of Ibn Zuhri [q.v.], in Seville.

The Banū Iyād b. Sūd were a clan of the Āzād.

Bibliography: in the article; see also al-Bakrī, *Mu'djam* (Wüstenfeld), 44-51 and *passim*; Ibn Kutayba, *Shi'r*, 97; Ibn Durayd, *Ishṭikāḥ* (Wüstenfeld), 104 f.; Hamdānī (gives on pages 178¹-179¹⁵ a list of their settlements); see further the indices to Ṭabarī, Ya'qūbī, Mubarrad, *Kāmil*, Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, *al-'Iḥd* (indices by Muḥammad Shaff'), Mas'ūdī, *Aghānī*, *Fihrist*, Ibn al-Aṭhīr, Yāqūt, *Mu'djam* and also W. Caskel, *Gamharat al-nasab des Ibn al-Kalbī*, i, 174; ii, 359 f. (J. W. Föck)

'IYĀD B. MÜSĀ b. 'IYĀD b. 'AMRŪN AL-YAḤṢUB AL-SABTĪ AL-ḲĀDĪ (476/1088-544/1149) was one of the most celebrated figures of Mālikism in the Muslim West. His existence coincided almost exactly with that of the Almoravid dynasty to whom throughout his life he remained inflexibly attached.

His family, of Yemeni origin through the Yaḥṣub, emigrated to the West very early and finally settled at Ceuta, after residing in Basta [q.v.], in Muslim Spain, in Fez, and also in Ḳayrawān at some indeterminate date. His great grandfather 'Amrūn was the first of the family to win fame, by reason of his perfect knowledge of the *Ḳur'ān*, and above all by his service under the celebrated al-Manṣūr ibn Abī 'Āmir [q.v.]. It was he who left Fez with his entire fortune—probably acquired in the service of al-Manṣūr—to settle in Ceuta, where he died in 397/1007 and where his descendants enjoyed a high rank among the notables of the town.

Of all these, 'Iyād was the most famous. On completing his studies in his native town, he went in

507/1113, to perfect his knowledge, not to the East—which he never visited, not even for the pilgrimage—but to Spain. In the *Šila* of Ibn Baṣṣkuwā, (i, 446, no. 972, reproduced by al-Nawāwiri, *Simṭ* Ms. B. N. Tunis no. 11396, p. 10), the expression *bi'l-Mashrik*, which occurs in connection with the studies he made under the direction of Abū ‘Alī al-Ṣadafi, denotes the east of Spain and not the Orient, as is made clear in the *Mu‘djam* which Ibn al-Abbār had dedicated to the disciples of the last-mentioned master. The traditional travelling for study (*riḥla*) lasted about one year: in all ‘Iyād had about a hundred masters, to whom he dedicated his *Ghumya* (still in ms.). These include Ibn Ḥamdīn (439/1047-508/1115), the most virulent opponent of the *Iḥyā’* of al-Ghazālī; Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī (468/1075-543/1149), who had met al-Ghazālī in the East and had probably introduced his *Iḥyā’* to Morocco and Spain in 493/1100; and also the celebrated traditionist Abū ‘Alī al-Ṣadafi (d. 514/1120-1).

On returning to Ceuta, ‘Iyād was raised to the rank of *shūra* [q.v.] and then, in 515/1121-2, to that of *ḥādī* of the city of his ancestors. On 1 Ṣafar 531/29 Oct. 1136, he was entrusted with the office of *ḥādī* of Granada. He was already a great personage, and his new place of residence gave him a triumphal welcome. The triumph was ephemeral. Being regarded as too censorious, ‘Iyād was discharged after some months at the request of Tāshfin, then governor of the city. Tāshfin's death (26 Ramaḍān 539/23 March 1145) won back for him the favour of the now tottering Almoravids. Towards the end of 539/1145, he was again nominated by the short-lived Ibrāhīm b. Tāshfin as *ḥādī* of Ceuta, where he was to play a political role of the first importance, in regard to which his biographers, unlike the historians, prefer to remain very reticent.

A convinced and militant Mālikī, ‘Iyād in effect constituted the centre of resistance to the Almohads in Ceuta. After the final triumph of the latter, he was at first exiled to Tadla, among the nomadic tribes, and then, together with other notables from the suspect city, was sent to forced residence in Marrākush where he died, dejected and exhausted, on 7 Djumādā II 544/13 Oct. 1149. Legend, echoing the hostility which he incurred under the Almohads, attributed his sudden death while in the baths (*ḥammām*) to the invocations of al-Ghazālī, or else, with the accusation of secretly practising Judaism, alleges that he was put to death by the Mahdī Ibn Tūmart.

‘Iyād was not without literary talent, but he was pre-eminently a traditionist and *faḥīh*. He was a truly typical *faḥīh* of the Almoravid period, strictly orthodox, and for whom there existed only one single unique truth, that which had been taught by Mālik and his school. He wrote more than twenty works, not all of which have survived. His best-known published works are: *al-Šifā’ bi-ta’rīf ḥukūḥ al-Mustafā’*, which enjoyed an enormous success and which still continues to play an important part in popular piety; *Mashārīḥ al-anwār ‘alā ṣiḥāḥ al-āthār*; *Tartīb al-madārik wa-takrīb al-masālik bi-ma’rifat a’lām madhhab Mālik*, which constitutes the best defence for and illustration of the Mālikī school.

Bibliography: This will be found in Brockelmann, I, 455-6, and S I, 630-2, and in M. Talbi, *Biographies aghlabides extraites des Madārik du Cadi ‘Iyād*, Tunis 1968, 51-8. In addition: Murtaḍā, *Ithāf al-sādāt al-muttaḥin bi-ṣarḥ Iḥyā’ ‘ulūm al-dīn*, ed. Būlāḳ, n.d., i, 27; Muḥammad Ḳuwaysim b. ‘Alī al-Nawāwiri, *Simṭ al-lā’lī*, ms. B. N. Tunis no. 11396, i, 10-14; M. A. Enan, *Aṣr al-*

Murābiḥin wa-l-Muwahḥidīn, Cairo 1964, i, 41-4; A. Merad, *‘Abd al-Mu’min à la conquête de l’Afrique du Nord (1130-1163)*, in *AIEO (Alger)*, xv (1957), 126-8; *al-‘Ilām bi-ḥudūd ḥawā’id al-Islām*, ed. al-Ṭandīj, Rabat 1964; *al-‘Ilmā’ ilā ma’rifat uṣūl al-riwāya wa-taḥyid al-samā’*, ed. A. Ṣafar, Cairo-Tunis 1970. See also AL-MAḲKARĪ. (M. TALBĪ)

‘IYĀFA (A.), as opposed to *fa’l* [q.v.] which denotes human omens (clondonism), is applied in a general sense to animal omens (zoomancy) and, in the strict sense, to ornithomancy, that is to say the art of divining omens in the names of birds, their cries, their flight and their posture (*TA*, vi, 207, l. 24 ff.). With certain names of birds a fatal quality is associated, though why this is so is not always known; in general, black and greenish plumage and down constitute the only justification. This is the case with the crow, the roller, the jay, and with any animal or bird with a coat or plumage of dark colour interspersed with white, such as a she-camel, a she-wolf or a dove (for animals regarded by the Arabs as a subject of divination, cf. *Divination*, 498-519).

Even more than with regard to the nature of birds (that is to say, their consecration to some particular divinity of either a propitious or an ill-fated character) and their categories (that is to say, those whose flight and cries are the basis for divination), the rich ornithomantic and zoomantic documentation gathered from ancient Arab literature makes it possible to give a precise statement of the principles and rules of mantic interpretation of the flight and cries of birds, as well as of their posture, and of the movements of certain quadrupeds.

For the flight of birds, two techniques originally existed, *fira* and *zadjir*.

Fira is the observation and mantic interpretation of the spontaneous flight of birds. This was progressively extended, particularly with sedentarization, to include all kinds of manifestations of animate or inanimate beings, and especially to domestic divinations which a man based upon the gestures and utterances of his wife, the inhabitants of the house, the utensils, or the animals in his service. Originally, it included divination of both good and ill; but Islam condemned it as a pagan practice, consigning favourable omens to *fa’l*, which is permitted, whilst it prohibited *fira* as an act of faith in the blind forces and the gods who represented these forces.

Zadjir too lost its primitive meaning in assuming a wider significance, in the same way as *fira*, with which it is generally confused. Originally, *zadjir* consisted in causing a bird to take flight by throwing a stone in order that its flight might be interpreted; if the bird flew to the *zadjir*'s right, it constituted a good omen for him, if to the left it was a bad omen (cf. *Divination*, 438). But Ibn Khaldūn, *Muḥaddima*, i, 195, already defined it as though it were a question only of *fira*. This also is a consequence of the change from nomadic to sedentary conditions.

Fira and *zadjir*, the two techniques of ‘iyāfa, consist essentially in the interpretation of the direction of birds' flights and their cries. The technical terminology used in this field derives from hunting and is applied to all zoomantic divination. It is not possible here to expatiate on these terms, which have been studied in *Divination*, 440-6; it will suffice to mention the two most commonly used terms, namely *al-sāniḥ*, “that which comes from your right, proceeding towards your left”, and *al-bāriḥ*, which is its antonym. These are their present meanings but they are sometimes found in the reverse sense, according to whether they are used in connection with ornitho-